

Date:	30 th August 2017	Time & Location	13:30 – 16:30 – CER Offices, Dublin
Chair:	Elaine Gallagher, CER		
Attendees:	Name	Location	
	Carl Murphy, Alice Mooney	RMDS	
	Elaine Gallagher	CER	
	John Bracken, Aileen Greaves, Jim Long,	ESBN	
	David Kemp, Sarah Fuller	Gemserv	
	Keith Plunkett	MRSO	
	Siobhan Melvin	SSE Airtricity	
	Seán Doolin, Maria Ferris	Electric Ireland	
	Stevie Donnelly, Gillian Kinsella	BGE	
	Kevin Sheridan, Krystle Chapman	Energia	
	Jessica Gregory	PrePayPower	
	Eamonn Murtagh, Linda Tully	Panda Power	
Apologies:			
Version Number	2.0		
Status			

Agenda:	
1.	General
2.	Actions from Previous IGGs/Conference Calls
3.	New IGG Actions
4.	De-harmonisation Update
5.	CER Update
6.	Gemserv Update
7.	MRSO Update
8.	ESBN Update
9.	Retail Market Design Update
10.	Notice Board Planned Maintenance, Reminders from IGG, etc.
11.	AOB

1 – General

C Murphy enquired if everyone was happy to sign off on the minutes V1.0 of the last IGG meeting.

Minutes Approved.

2. Actions – Previous Conference Call & IGG

C Murphy provided the Action Item Update.

17 IGG actions were closed since the last IGG Meeting (not including this current IGG meeting). Suppliers may email RMDS if they require the closure details for any of these actions.

Closed Action 1054.

S Donnelly requested that closed Action 1054 (*De-energisations - ESBN to engage with the Data Protection Commissioner in relation to the use of personal information held by Meter Readers being used by NT's charged with disconnecting premises. – ESBN and CER to consider if this meeting should include Suppliers and/or CER*) be left open. This action was raised by BGE but wasn't part of the scope of the de-energisation Workshop and this issue is still to be resolved. NTs are responding with "Cannot Locate the Meter" when Meter Readers are gaining access. BGE request that the Meter Readers pass on the location of the meter to NTs.

S Melvin commented: The NT is not looking to gain access but seeking to find the location of the meter.

E Gallagher replied that ESBN has acknowledged that it would look at this issue as part of ongoing Data Protection/Regulation work.

J Bracken added that ESBN's priority at the moment is preparing for GDPR. He agreed to take a new action for ESBN to provide clarity with regard to the location of the Meter.

A new action was logged:

Action 1081 De-energisations - ESBN to provide clarity with regard to the location of the meter (Linked to Action 1043).

A number of Market Participants queried how GDPR was being approached, it was suggested that it may be beneficial to all market participants for ESBN to outline their position on GDPR.

A new action was logged:

Action 1082: Industry position on GDPR - ESBN to consider providing information on the ESBN GDPR Project.

11 IGG actions have been carried forward.

2 relate to De-energisation (1045 & 1080)
2 relate to the Debt Flagging (1073 & 1074)
4 relate to the P2 Safety Incident (1075, 1076, 1077 & 1078)
3 - others

They are outlined below.

Action Items

1045	De-energisations - ESBN to consider ways of making the Market Message & Engagement Process between ESBN and Suppliers clearer. ESBN and Suppliers to consider what can be done to benefit Suppliers and to revert with detailed suggestions. (Follow-on from Actions 948/1004 closed at IGG on 08/03/2017).		
Update for IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This action has been carried forward since the de-energisation workshop. ▪ ESBN presented slides as input into the discussion of this action. ▪ The following actions were agreed at the De-energisation workshop. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>ESBN to re-brief Supervisors and NT's on the correct process to be followed when completing supplier requests.</i> ▪ <i>ESBN to include in the briefing the importance of the accuracy of information being sent.</i> ▪ <i>Suppliers to provide additional helpful information (e.g. Eircode, Lat/Long) if available.</i> ▪ <i>ESBN and Suppliers to work together to tackle special / difficult cases.</i> ▪ <i>ESBN to review the LTNA process and aged access profile and outline the initiatives in place to obtain meter readings.</i> ▪ ESBN/Suppliers to provide an update. 		
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ C Murphy reported that since the de-energisation workshop RMDS has put in place a provisional date of Thursday 16.02.2018 for follow-up De-energisation workshop. ▪ MPs agreed that this action should remain open. 		
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: ESBN/Suppliers	Status: Action remains Open	Due Date: 04.10.2017

1049	CER Rebrand - CER to circulate an update on the CER Rebrand		
Update for IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CER to provide an update. 		
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ E Gallagher reported : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 5th September 2017 - CER is planning to issue a letter to Suppliers and licence undertakers to assist in the preparation for the CER name change. ○ 2nd October is the effective from date for the change. ○ Updating Customer facing material should be prioritised. ○ Official Brand Launch is scheduled for 5th October. ▪ S Melvin reported that some changes such as changes to websites etc. could be made quickly but changes to bills etc. are going to take longer to deliver. ▪ Action to remain open. 		
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: CER	Status: Action remains Open	Due Date: 04.10.2017

1068	Consumer Survey Results - CER to clarify timelines for publication of consumer survey results		
Update for IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At the Conference Call S mac an Bhaird was unable to give clarity on this action item at this time. The timelines will be issued to Suppliers once CER has received them. ▪ CER to provide an update. 		
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ E Gallagher reported that these timelines were issued. ▪ A Mooney reported that these timelines were not received by RMDS. ▪ E Gallagher reported that she will look into this and revert. ▪ Action to remain open. 		
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: CER	Status: Action remains Open	Due Date: 04.10.2017

1073	Debt Flagging - MRSO to provide RMDS with written information in relation to Debt Flagging Rejection COLE. RMDS will then issue this information to the Market		
Update for IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New Action logged at the Conference Call. 		
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ K Plunkett provided an update on this action in the MRSO presentation. See Section 7 MRSO update for details. ▪ Action deemed closed. 		
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: MRSO	Status: Action deemed Closed	Due Date: 30.08.2017

1074	Debt Flagging - RMDS to investigate if there is a historic reason why the registered company number provided on MMs was not validated by ESNB.		
Update for IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New Action logged at the Conference Call. ▪ RMDS to provide an update. 		
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ C Murphy reported that RMDS undertook some investigation into this matter. RMDS found that MCR78, which was raised in 2006, was subsequently withdrawn in 2012. ▪ S Melvin reported that the registered company is a field on the Market Message and could be used by Suppliers to validate as part of Debt Flagging. If you debt flagged on the registered company number then it wouldn't matter if the name was different. ▪ C Murphy replied the question of debt flagging was raised back in 2012 but the decision was still given to withdraw. This was included in the minutes of an IGG Meeting in May 2012. ▪ C Murphy agreed to issue the detail in question of these minutes to MPs. ▪ Action to remain open. 		
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: RMDS	Status: Action remains Open	Due Date: 04.10.2017

1075	P1 Safety Incident - ESNB to confirm the email address to be used by Suppliers in relation to the process described in the P1 safety Incident document.		
Update for IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ On 27.07.2017 RMDS sent a briefing note on behalf of ESNB which confirmed the email address. 		
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action deemed closed. 		
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: ESNB	Status: Action deemed Closed	Due Date: 30.08.2017

1076	P1 Safety Incident - Suppliers to confirm that they have briefed all agents with regard to the importance of logging de-energisations with service removal correctly.		
Update for IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ RMDS issued a reminder to Suppliers to brief agents and inform RMDS when this was done. ▪ 3 responses received. 		
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ C Murphy urged Suppliers that have not briefed their agents to do so. ▪ Action to remain open. 		
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: CER	Status: Action remains Open	Due Date: 04.10.2017

1077	P1 Safety Incident - ESNB to investigate and potentially raise a DR on how the existing market design could be improved to lessen the likelihood of such an incident occurring again.		
Update for IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ESNB to provide an update. 		
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ESNB plans to raise a DR for this enduring solution. ▪ Action to remain open. 		
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: ESNB	Status: Action remains Open	Due Date: 04.10.2017

1078	P1 Safety Incident - RMDS to investigate adding the detail listed in the P1 Incident document to MPD9.		
Update for IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A new DR 1188 has been raised by RMDS to address this matter and is being brought to the IGG today for approval. 		
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DR1188 was approved as a DR and MCR at this forum. Action deemed closed. 		
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: RMDS	Status: Action deemed Closed	Due Date: 30.08.2017

1079	CER to update the IGG with regard the ESNB SLAs.(Linked to Action 1051).		
Update for IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Action logged at the de-energisation workshop. CER to provide an update. 		
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E Gallagher reported that she doesn't have an update on this action at this time. CER agreed at the De-energisation workshop to look at this issue on an ongoing basis. If and when there are any changes, CER will update the IGG but she is not sure if there will be a meaningful update by the end of the year. S Donnelly reported that at the moment the wording of the SLA doesn't make any sense. It says "Suppliers will be responsible for providing access arrangements in order to de-energise" BGE has requested that this wording be changed by the CER Networks Team. It doesn't make sense that a Customer will give a Supplier an address to enable a Supplier to de-energise. E Gallagher reported that there are two separate elements to this action. The first is to review the SLA and the CER compliance piece and then to look at incentivising ESNB to look review this. She will engage with S Donnelly directly after this meeting to discuss BGE's request. She will also engage with the CER Networks Team and ESNB to look at the broader issue and provide periodic updates to the IGG. Action to remain open. 		
Forum Logged: De-energisation Workshop	Assigned to: CER	Status: Action remains Open	Due Date: 04.10.2017

1080	ESNB to consider providing more detailed de-energisation statistics to the IGG with particular focus on the breakdown of the following statistic: 30.7% could not be de-energised.		
Update for IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Action logged at the de-energisation workshop. 		
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action was raised on the 15.08.2017. This will be looked into for the next IGG. Action to remain open. 		
Forum Logged: De-energisation Workshop	Assigned to: ESNB	Status: Action remains Open	Due Date: 04.10.2017

3. Actions – New IGG Actions

The following 12 new actions were logged at the IGG.

New Action Items

1081	De-energisations - ESNB to provide clarity with regard to the location of the meter (Linked to Action 1043)		
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Section 2 IGG Actions Update for details. 		
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: ESNB	Status: NEW Action	Due Date: 04.10.2017

1082	Industry position on GDPR - ESBN to consider providing information on the ESBN GDPR Project
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Section 2 IGG Actions Update for details.
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: ESBN Status: NEW Action Due Date: 04.10.2017
1083	Price Changes - CER to communicate to CER networks team, concerns raised by Suppliers concerning tight timelines between publication of tariff papers and Supplier implementation dates, with a view to providing a workable solution.
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Section 5 CER Update for details.
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: CER Status: NEW Action Due Date: 08.09.2017
1084	Supplier Handbook – Suppliers indicated that the Supplier Handbook decision made reference to engagement or guidance from the CER with respect to explaining historic energy use to customers. EG to consult with CER team and revert noting suppliers concerns on implementing the Supplier Handbook considering that this item is outstanding.
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Section 5 CER Update for details.
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: CER Status: NEW Action Due Date: 15.09.2017
1085	Supplier Handbook - CER to consider Suppliers' request for a revised deadline to implement changes to the Supplier Handbook.
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Section 5 CER Update for details.
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: CER Status: NEW Action Due Date: 15.09.2017
1086	Debt Flagging Consultation - CER to provide an update as to when the Debt Flagging Consultation will be published
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Section 5 CER Update for details
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: CER Status: NEW Action Due Date: 04.10.2017
1087	Debt Flagging - MRSO to investigate if the Debt Flagging figures can be broken down to prepay versus credit
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Section 7 MRSO Update for details.
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: MRSO Status: NEW Action Due Date: 04.10.2017
1088	Debt Flagging - Suppliers to review the Debt Flagging CoLE examples provided by MRSO and to revert to MRSO with which decisions they agree with and which they do not
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Section 7 MRSO Update for details.
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: Suppliers Status: NEW Action Due Date: 04.10.2017
1089	Debt Flagging - Based on the feedback from Action 1088, MRSO to consider potential tweaks to their CoLE decision process
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Section 7 MRSO Update for details.
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: MRSO Status: NEW Action Due Date: 04.10.2017

1090	Debt Flagging - MRSO to confirm if QH MPRNs are subject to Debt Flagging		
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Section 7 MRSO Update for details. 		
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: MRSO	Status: NEW Action	Due Date: 04.10.2017

1091	Use of Change of Supply Process to facilitate Supplier Company Name Change Arrangements ("20 Day Rule") - CER & RMDS to assess how any future instances of this nature are managed considering Market Design, Market Communications and Customer Communications to include potentially: changes to market process, communication with customers and assurance.		
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Section 7 MRSO Update for details. 		
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: CER/RMDS	Status: NEW Action	Due Date: 04.10.2017

1092	ESBN I-SEM Presentation Market Trials - RMDS to include both T O'Neill's & J Long's email address on the ESBN I-SEM's slides published on the RMDS calendar		
Discussion at IGG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Section 8 ESBN I-SEM Update for details. 		
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: RMDS	Status: NEW Action	Due Date: 01.09.2017

4. De-harmonisation Update

C Murphy gave the De-harmonisation update.

De-harmonisation was discussed in detail at the earlier ReMCoWG Meeting.

C Murphy gave a brief summary of the discussion on De-harmonisation at the ReMCoWG.

A discussion ensued regarding the potential for all MPs to feed into a coordinated Industry Impact assessment or Cost Benefit Analysis.

S Doolin stated that there appears to be some clear water in terms of the interpretation of requirements to deal with what is perceived to be a UR issue which is to do with freedom to regulate and to govern for that, versus ESBN's understanding that it was a technical issue that needed to be resolved. ESBN believed that it had dealt with the issue but K Shiels said that he didn't think it was dealt with from his perspective. There is some work that needs to be done by ESBN around what could be done to make matters better for UR and therefore impact on the decision to potentially de-harmonise.

J Bracken replied that there was the issue with regard to the blocking of releases of up to five or six years which has now been resolved. Every single item that UR and NIE Networks were looking for has been included in the Retail Market Program. There is no other item that is not in the program. All obstacles have been removed from his perspective. ESBN endeavoured to bridge the gulf but there appears to be something else that is outside of the ESBN ambit. At the ReMCoSG, however, the mention of de-harmonisation being a policy decision was stated by UR. S Melvin asked UR if the policy decision could be influenced to which UR replied no. He was taken aback by how firm UR is on this matter. You have to ask if there is merit into putting into a lot of energy into something that is outside our control.

E Gallagher stated that she detected from UR at the ReMCoWG that its decision was political. It is very difficult to influence a decision if it is indeed political.

S Doolin said that nobody, including K Shiels, said that it was a final decision. It was a "minded to" position based on the information he has received.

K Sheridan and S Donnelly expressed displeasure at the low level of engagement between CER and UR

to date and questioned if this lack of engagement lay at CER's door.

E Gallagher replied that there will be engagement between UR and CER on this matter. She acknowledges that this matter has huge importance for the Market.

S Doolin said that K Shiels stated he would take this matter up with L Brien and he thinks believes this is a step forward which we should accept. Everybody, at every level, will have to engage on this matter because there is commercial considerations at stake as well as economic and political ones.

J Bracken added that this issue requires all MPs to engage. A final decision has not been made yet but appears to be revving up in that direction.

K Sheridan agreed that engagement will have to happen at every level but it is concerning when K Shiels stated that UR regulates the Suppliers in NI and any price concerns they have is in NI and they are unconcerned about the cost implications in ROI. CER is key to stopping this. He would like more detail on how CER proposes to engage with UR.

E Gallagher replied that CER has already committed to engage with UR on this matter. K Shiels attended the ReMCoWG Meeting and committed to attend future ReMCoWG Meetings which she thinks is a positive step. She is not sure what else can be achieved discussing this matter any further at this forum. She will highlight the importance of Supplier's' concerns and the request for engagement to L Brien as it is very obvious that this decision is crucial for the market on the whole.

J Gregory stated that she attended previous ReMCoSG Meetings where it was agreed that there would be bi-laterals between CER and UR. These appear not to have ever happened. What assurances do Suppliers have from CER now that this matter is now going to be taken offline and discussed.

E Gallagher replied that CER has committed that it would interact with UR and come back with next steps.

J Gregory said that it might have been better if CER committed to interact with UR a year ago as it has been stated on a few occasions that CER would engage but that it appears this did not happen. In repeating this commitment there are heightened concerns.

E Gallagher replied that CER has committed at this forum that it will engage with UR.

C Murphy stated that this seemed fair enough. An action was logged at the ReMCoWG for both RAs to engage and come back with next steps. De-harmonisation is now a standing item on the ReMCoWG agenda and K Shiels has also committed to attend future ReMCoWG meetings. De-harmonisation will also be a standing agenda item for future IGG Meetings.

C Murphy queried what MPs are now saying in terms of the Impact Assessment/cost basis analysis and questioned if MPs are going undertake their own CBAs.

E Gallagher said that irrespective of any UR lobbying an impact assessment is something that has to happen.

J Gregory reported that there appears to be a need for the CER and UR to have an overall action plan as there is little merit in Suppliers undertaking their own Impact Assessments/CBAs without a consolidated view on direction.

S Doolin cautioned that if it is just an industry Impact Assessment/CBA it might just focus on Market interactions only. It would be valuable for individual Suppliers to conduct some sort of CBA in their organisations which may be used to lobby CER directly to say that if de-harmonisation goes ahead then it will cost a vast amount and may in fact cost Suppliers their business and could make a difference to any future investments decisions that Suppliers may make in NI. De-harmonisation could also have significant implications for employment, taxes etc.

G Kinsella added that in her opinion the collective view appears to have been missing to date. MPs must take a step back and look at the whole piece and not just URs view. She believes that Suppliers shouldn't wait for direction from CER on this matter and the first step should be initiating an impact assessment.

J Gregory agreed and stated that Suppliers Impact Assessment/CBA would support Supplier's positions and concerns.

S Melvin said that it would be important for CER to see the costs for individual Suppliers. There will be an ongoing cost to dual jurisdictional Suppliers coupled with a cost for ROI Only Suppliers as there would be a requirement for a de-harmonisation project.

E Gallagher added that it is a matter for Suppliers to consider the impact of deharmonisation on them. It may be the case that lobbying by the MPs in NI may be more effective.

J Bracken added that there is nothing wrong in MPs lobbying on this matter but that reality is that in the next two to three months UR shall make a decision to de-harmonise or not. It's up to all MPs to engage on this matter with all stakeholders.

C Murphy stated that no further action will be logged on this matter at this forum and it is up to individual MPs to undertake their own Impact Assessment and lobbying on this matter.

5. CER Update

E Gallagher gave the CER update.

- SoLR – work is ongoing. A Consultation Paper shall be published towards the end of 2017.
- Supplier Audit Visits – Site Visits have been completed. A paper will be issued by the end of September / early October 2017. CER thanked all Suppliers for their co-operation.
- Debt Flagging consultation - work ongoing.

S Melvin enquired when the Debt Flagging Consultation findings will be published.

E Gallagher replied that she does not have a date yet. She will investigate this and revert with a date.

A new Action was logged:

New Action 1087: Debt Flagging Consultation - CER to provide an update as to when the Debt Flagging Consultation will be published.

- SMART Metering – A new phased approach proposal is being considered by CER. A decision is expected shortly.
- Consumer Survey – End of 2017 or start of 2018 for publication
- Fuel Mix Disclosure Paper – Due for publication in September 2017.
- Green Source Products - to follow.

S Donnelly reported that there is a date in the Green Source Products that Suppliers have to abide by which is reliant on the provision of information from CER.

J Gregory enquired about the Price Change Figures. Suppliers are awaiting them from CER but the price changes have to go ahead on Friday 1st September. Prepaypower has raised this matter separately with CER. Suppliers require these figures well in advance instead of leaving them with 24 hours to turn everything around and to give customers 30 Days' notice of any tariff changes as prescribed in the Supplier Handbook.

S Doolin agreed and stated that there is work to be done in order for Suppliers to meet the deadline and only being given a couple of hours by CER before the deadline comes into play seems less than generous.

E Gallagher agreed to raise this issue with the retail team and revert.

A new action was logged:

Action 1083: Price Changes - CER to communicate to CER networks team, concerns raised by Suppliers concerning tight timelines between publication of tariff papers and Supplier implementation dates, with a view to providing a workable solution.

K Sheridan stated that in the Supplier Handbook Decision, "further workshops whereby further clarifications were to be given" were mentioned. Effectively workshops haven't taken place so the Supplier Handbook decision is incomplete and further engagement with Suppliers hasn't been delivered.

S Donnelly also agreed that he has the same concerns. BGE has furnished several questions to A Keegan (CER) and is awaiting a reply.

S Doolin added that an October deadline is still hanging over Suppliers. Suppliers cannot complete a business specification for the piece of work in the Supplier Handbook without the CER input this is making the deadline impossible to complete. A workshop is required to clarify what Suppliers are to do. For Suppliers to deliver the Supplier Handbook to the original date is not possible given the absence of critical information from CER. The document clearly states that CER will organise a workshop.

K Sheridan agreed and said that it would be impossible for Suppliers to deliver the Handbook without that

Workshop. It clearly states that CER will engage with Suppliers via a workshop which hasn't happened.

E Gallagher agreed to brief the team on this issue and to revert.

Two new actions were logged:

Action 1084: Supplier Handbook - Suppliers indicated that the Supplier Handbook decision made reference to engagement or guidance from the CER with respect to explaining historic energy use to customers. EG to consult with CER team and revert noting suppliers concerns on implementing the Supplier Handbook considering that this item is outstanding.

Action 1085: Supplier Handbook - CER to consider Supplier's request for a revised deadline for to implement changes to the Supplier Handbook.

6. Gemserv Update

D Kemp gave the Gemserv update.

Refer to slides for details.

- **Assured Parties – August 2017**

D Kemp outlined a slide detailing the CER approvals since the last Meeting and the number and type of live participants assured by Gemserv since 2005, of which there are 62 in total to date.

CER approvals since last meeting: 1 new Large Supplier, 5 new Self-Suppliers, 1 Material Change RQ.

Assurance Services: August 2017.

- 1 Small Supplier is currently in the planning stage.
- 1 Extranet Broker Solution received by Gemserv.
- 1 Self Supplier request has come in.

S Doolin enquired what an Extranet Broker Solution is.

D Kemp replied that there is a document on the RMDS website explaining what a Broker Solution is.

C Murphy reported that if Suppliers put in place an automated solution to retrieve information from the RMP Extranet, this broker agreement requires Suppliers to agree to adhere to certain guidelines. If Suppliers use software between the agent and the Extranet it needs to be assured in case it has any adverse impact on the RMP Extranet or backend systems.

I-SEM Retail Market Assurance:

- PQ responses received and received. Comments and queries were passed to ESNB.
- Next Stage: Formal assessment in November 2017.

Forward Work plan.

- Gemserv presented a slide on its Forward Work plan from September 2017 to November 2017.

7. MRSO Update

K Plunkett gave the MRSO update & an update on IGG Action 1073.

K Plunkett presented the abbreviated version of the MRSO Presentation. This version outlines Debt Flagging, Objections and any other key items that have come to light during the month. It now includes the number of Automated Debt Flagging figures (IGG Action 1023). The full standardised slide pack is available under the [Reference Section](#) on the RMDS Website and provides the status of Change of Supplier related activity in the ROI Market.

Refer to slides for details.

Debt Flagging Figures.

K Chapman stated that in the GAS Market, MPs have asked for these figures to be broken down to Prepay versus Credit and asked if this could be provided for the Electricity Market.

K Plunkett replied that he is not sure if this would be possible but he will take this request back to MRSO and revert.

A new Action was logged:

Action 1087: Debt Flagging - MRSO to investigate if the Debt Flagging figures can be broken down to Prepay versus credit.

IGG Action 1073.

K Plunkett presented slides on IGG Action 1073: (*MRSO to provide RMDS with written information in relation to Debt Flagging Rejection CoLE*).

He walked through some examples of the names that are outsourced and showed the CoLE and the No CoLEs.

S Donnelly reported that BGE has looked into the examples provided by MRSO in these slides. In some cases BGE doesn't agree with what MRSO considers a CoLE or a No CoLE. He asked K Plunkett to provide some rationale and the algorithm around how MRSO determines what is a CoLE and what is not.

K Plunkett replied that the automated threshold figure is a high percentage. Judgement calls are made by MRSO for outsourced decisions on a case by case basis.

E Murtagh asked if MRSO is looking at these on an individual basis if any other fields on the 010 Market Message, like mobile number or email address for example are taken into account.

K Plunkett replied that MRSO typically doesn't look at anything else on the Market Messages and makes a call there and then if it feels it is a CoLE or not.

S Donnelly stated that this is an opportunity for Suppliers to get an understanding as to the algorithm and threshold used and gain an understanding as to how MRSO makes its decisions and to see if MRSO is willing to make changes to the rules it has around this area. At the moment, in BGE's mind, Debt Flagging is not working.

K Plunkett replied that this is how MRSO makes its decisions for all CoLEs and not just in relation to Debt Flagging.

S Donnelly asked could there be improvements made to how CoLE were inferred for Debt Flagging cases.

K Plunkett said that this is something that MRSO could take away and look at but he can't see there being any real changes to current practises. He agreed to talk to G Halligan about this matter.

C Murphy suggested that in order to help MRSO, Suppliers review the CoLE examples presented by MRSO, look at the decisions that are acceptable and the ones that aren't and revert to MRSO.

S Donnelly replied that this is a very good suggestion. He asked if MRSO ever contact a Supplier on the foot of an outsourced CoLE that it is struggling to make a decision on.

K Plunkett replied that MRSO cannot contact Suppliers in these cases as there is a high volume of these cases every day. MRSO looks at the information it has on its database and has to protect the integrity of the data.

S Doolin added that you could receive a pile of complaints on the data protection side if you start making broad judgements on these CoLEs.

K Plunkett agreed and said that MRSO cannot second guess the information.

S Donnelly asked if QH Customers are included in Debt Flagging.

K Plunkett replied that he will check this out and revert.

At the end of the discussion on Debt Flagging, three new further actions were logged;

Action 1088: Debt Flagging - Suppliers to review the Debt Flagging CoLE examples provided by MRSO and to revert to MRSO with which decisions they agree with and which they do not.

Action 1089: Debt Flagging - Based on the feedback from Action 1088, MRSO to consider potential tweaks to their CoLE decision process.

Action 1090: Debt Flagging - MRSO to confirm if QH MPRNs are subject to Debt Flagging.

Company Name Change Arrangements (20 Day Rule)

J Gregory reported that a recent licence change took place with one Supplier which resulted in a significant number of rejections in the central market system. This issue had a significant impact on Prepaypower. She is raising it at this forum so that in the future if there is ever a licence change and mass movement of Customers from one Supplier ID to another Supplier ID and that before this takes place it follows an alternative procedure. Effectively, the recent customer movement blocked one Supplier losing any Customers for up to two months. Prepaypower had a significant number of customers that were blocked as a result. Prepaypower received a huge number of complaints and it affected them very negatively. J Gregory previously raised this matter with S mac an Bhaird and A Keegan in CER. From a Retail Market Design perspective she requests that an alternative procedure is used for any future licence change similar to this recent occurrence.

E Gallagher asked if J Gregory is looking for a change to the Market process.

J Gregory replied no. The standard Market Process was used to transfer thousands of Customers from one Supplier to another because this was some internal administrative change they were making that had the effect of inadvertently blocking of Change of Supplier of their full Customer base for a period of two months. This goes against the competition rules and for any future occurrence it should follow a different internal administrative process. The Supplier in question went through a re-assessment process through Gemserv.

S Doolin questioned whether Gemserv had identified any issue in terms of the re-certification process as well because it significantly impacted the operation of the Market. He was a little surprised that this matter was not commented on or mentioned earlier in Gemserv's work and presentation.

D Kemp reported that he will look into this matter and revert.

S Doolin added that it was a relatively Small Supplier in question this time but if this was a Large Supplier then this could have potentially caused havoc in the Market. It could also be used tactically for all sorts of

good and bad reasons by a Supplier who wished to gain some time and protection in the Market if there were cashflow issues for example. This was an exceptionally unusual thing which prevented activity against that Supplier's database for a full period of up to two months and was unfair to other participants in the Market. It is clearly a matter which should be considered by Gemserv but also by CER. Suppliers could gain an unfair advantage by this ruse of changing the name of your company. He thinks something is urgently needed because there is opportunity for bad behaviour here and is not in line of the principles of competition which underpin the whole Market.

E Gallagher asked if S Doolin is proposing a DR to look into this matter.

J Gregory replied that this issue needs to be raised again for CER to look perhaps at some alternative method as this is the first time this has happened at this magnitude. It has occurred before but on a much smaller scale. It is for CER to determine an appropriate way of dealing with this either via a DR or some other market process.

S Doolin added that he understands that this was the only way the Supplier could have done this in terms of existing market processes. It appears to him that some adjustment in the Market processes is needed to facilitate what is technically a change of name. There are lessons to be learned from this issue as in his mind it opens the market to gaming and this should be taken into consideration.

E Gallagher replied that there are a number of aspects to this matter. One is looking at it from a licencing angle in terms of change of name of a Supplier. This process needs to be reviewed to see if any changes need to be made. Secondly, the market processes need to be looked at to make sure that they are adequate to deal with the likes of changes caused by this issue which would lead to a DR.

C Murphy reported that we need to go away and consider a response to this issue with regard to the Market Design, the customer communications and the overall market communications.

A New action as logged

Action 1091: Use of Change of Supply Process to facilitate Supplier Company Name Change Arrangements (20 Day Rule) - CER & RMDS to assess how any future instances of this nature are managed considering Market Design, Market Communications and Customer Communications to include potentially: changes to market process, communication with customers and assurance.

8. ESB Networks Update

J Bracken & J Long presented the ESNB update.

ESBN Meter Project.

J Bracken gave an ESNB Meter Project Update.

ESBN I-SEM Programme

J Long presented an update on the I-SEM Programme. **Refer to slides** for details.

- At this time there is no change to ESNB's understanding and it remains unchanged.
- ESNB I-SEM is represented at the Market Trials Working Group which the I-SEM Programme has established.

Price Effecting Units.

Of the 7 Supplier Units, 6SUs have moved to become Price Effecting in the SEM, and the remaining

Supplier Unit is pending.

Market Trials.

I-SEM understands that the Unscripted phase will run from Mid-March 2018 through to Mid-May 2018. For planning purposes, ESNB I-SEM would like to know if any Suppliers intend to avail of the MM 341, M 59X and MM342 for a Supplier's own generators. If any Suppliers wish to get these messages then they will need to have a test EMMA available at this time.

J Long asked Suppliers to contact either himself or T O'Neill directly on this matter. As their email addresses were not included in the slides a new action was logged for RMDS to include both email addresses on the I-SEM Presentation which is available on the RMDS Calendar.

Action 1092: ESNB I-SEM Presentation Market Trials - RMDS to include both T O'Neill's & J Long's email address on the ESNB I-SEM's slides published on the RMDS calendar.

I-SEM Webpage

J Long added that there is an FAQ I-SEM webpage available on the RMDS website for MPs to review. A questionnaire was issued whereby MPs came back with some questions. Two or three questions were raised. ESNB I-SEM addressed the questions and posted the replies to the FAQ I-SEM webpage. Currently, there are approximately 12/13 questions on the RMDS website and these give MPs a good feeling about the types of questions that have been asked.

9. Retail Market Design Update

C Murphy gave the Market Design Update.

LTCA

C Murphy gave a LTCA update.

Refer to slide for details.

- The LTCA Chairman presented and walked through the LTCA Working Group Report to CER on 16th August 2017 with RMDS in attendance.
- CER aims to reply to RMDS with next steps and guidance by Mid-September 2017.

DR1180 – New Registrations Default Supplier.

Refer to slides for details.

- This new DR is looking for approval as a DR.
- RMDS has received one comment back from two different MPs in relation to how the list of Suppliers is made available by ESNB.

C Murphy asked if Suppliers are happy to approve the DR as-is or do does the method of the delivery of the list of Suppliers need to be changed. At the moment what the DR stated it that on the documentation

made available by ESNB they will have a link to the CER website that contains a list of valid Suppliers.

Two MPs have requested that instead of having a link to the CER website that an actual list of Suppliers be provided in the documentation made available by ESNB.

A debate ensued regarding which design is best with ESNB and CER vying for a link being provided with reasons below mentioned:

- Everyone has access to a Smart Phone.
- Ease and speed of maintenance.
- Information being always up to date.
- Printed list could be outdated between time of printing and Supplier Registration request.
- Difficult to update in a timely manner.

A number of Suppliers supported the option to provide a printed list, with reasons below being mentioned:

- Process works well in the Gas Market.
- Information is made easily available for the Customer,
- Gas and Electricity Suppliers will be provided by GNI to the customer for Gas connections. Electricity only Suppliers could be at a disadvantage because they are not on a printed list that the customer has to hand.

J Gregory asked if there is a Cooling-off period necessary for new registrations.

S Melvin reported that she had asked this question in the first draft of this DR. The response that came back to her was that if the Customer goes to a change of Supplier they won't be restricted by the 20 day rule because the 20 day rule doesn't apply to New Connections. She was happy with this response.

C Murphy said that there isn't a cancellation process in place for new registrations. If the Customer wishes to change their mind then they would have to execute another Change of Supplier and they would be liable for the energy that they consumed while they were with you as a Customer.

J Gregory asked if all this detail will be included in the Market Design of how this will work and all the rules and implications around it. This was a very extensive DR previously and her concern is that there must have been some sort of rationale as to why this DR has been reduced significantly. She has concerns about the Cooling-off and the CoLE, service orders and there appears to be a whole lot of information which seems to have been omitted in this new version of this DR.

C Murphy reported that the Cooling-off DR (1184) did not require a change to the New Registration process. The Cooling-off DR was not included on the agenda as it was only issued yesterday and he thought it might be a bit unfair to look for comments on it at today's meeting. He requested that if anyone has any queries on DR1184, they should send them into RMDS.

J Gregory reported that she would like to see how this process works in the Market Design.

DR 1180 was recommended for approval by MPs on the understanding that it will include the following:

- **A printed list of Suppliers on the documentation that is sent to Customers/Developers.**
- **The documentation contains text providing direction to a URL with the latest list of Suppliers.**
- **Final Design of the list of Suppliers will be brought by ESNB to the IGG for agreement.**

DR/MCR1188 – Update MPD 09 to Reflect Actual Market Process in relation to Meter and/or Service Removal.

Refer to slides for details.

- This DR/MCR pertains to the P1 Safety incident that was raised by ESNB at the last IGG

Conference Call.

- This DR/MCR has been fast- tracked for approval as it is a safety issue. If this is approved, then the updated MPD 09 and the Market Message Guide MM017 will be published as part of MMR 11.1 on 2nd October 2017.

DR/MCR 1188 was approved.

MMR/Co-MMR 11.1 – Monday 2nd October

- MMR 11.1 Release date of Monday 2nd October 2017 - joint release with Co-MMR 11.1.
- This release will consist of MCR1188 and some other Non-Conformances to the Market Design.
- Full details will issue on Monday 4th September.

10. Notice Board: Planned Maintenance, Reminders from IGG etc.

Outage Dates:

There is one planned outages for September 2017 as follows:

- There is a planned TIBCO outage in Rol & NI from 20:00 on Friday 22nd September to 08:00 on Monday 25th September 2017.
- Workshop scheduled for Tuesday 12th September in the City North Hotel for Suppliers to meet the Atos Team.
- Full outage details are available, as usual, on the [RMDS Website](#).

11. AOB

No Items were raised in AOB.

Next Conference call:

- 4th October 2017.

Next IGG:

- 1st November 2017 in Belfast.