

Date:	14 th January 2015	Time & Location	14:00 pm, CER Offices, Dublin
Chair:	Seán mac an Bhaird		
Attendees:	Name	Location	
	Jessica Gregory, Alice Mooney, Catherine Keane	RMDS	
	Carmel O Connor, Theresa O'Neill, Kathleen Cleary	ESBN	
	Gerry Halligan	MRSO	
	Neil Grennan-Heaven, Lizzie Montogomerie	Gemserv	
	Sean Doolin, Maria Ferris	Electric Ireland	
	Seán O'Rourke, John O'Dea	Eirgrid	
	Keith Deacon	Vayu	
	Ray Gilmartin, David Mulholland	SSE Airtricity	
	Thomas Heasley	Energia	
	Seán mac an Bhaird, Priti Stack	CER	
Apologies:			
Version Number			
Status			

Slides of the meeting are issued separately and are posted on Meeting Date on <http://www.esbextra.ie/RMDS/>

Agenda:		
1.	Minutes from Previous IGG Meeting	Jessica Gregory, RMDS
2.	Review of Action Items	Jessica Gregory, RMDS
3.	CER Update	Seán mac an Bhaird, CER
4.	Gemserv Update	Lizzie Montgomerie, Gemserv
5.	MRSO Update	Gerry Halligan, MRSO
6.	ESBN Update	Carmel O'Connor, ESBN, Theresa O'Neill, ESBN, Kathleen Cleary, ESBN
7.	RMDS Update	Jessica Gregory, RMDS
8.	AOB	Jessica Gregory, RMDS
9.	Next Steps	Jessica Gregory, RMDS

1. Minutes from Previous IGG Meeting
Minutes from IGG Meeting - 5th November 2014
Minutes were updated to Version 2.0.

Approved.

2. Review of Action Items

J Gregory presented the Review of Action Items.

8 Actions have been closed since the last meeting.

There are currently 15 IGG Actions open and carried forward.

The actions have been structured differently at this presentation. A list of closed actions are shown first followed by actions associated with Meter Tampering and finally all other open actions. J Gregory reminded Suppliers to contact RMDS if they require detail in relation to any of the closed actions.

J Gregory gave an overview of the actions within the Meter Tampering area. She provided a status update on these Actions. 2 actions required ESB Networks and Gas Networks Ireland (formerly BGN) to submit a step by step process detailing how they deal with tampering of PAYG meters. These processes have been distributed by RMDS to Market participants and the actions subsequently closed. The ESN process was distributed to Suppliers last week. Suppliers would not have had sufficient time to respond to the process and provide feedback on **Action 938: On receipt of the processes in action items 929 and 930 above Suppliers to review the processes and submit comment.** Suppliers are requested to recommend to ESN as to how PAYG tampering should be handled. RMDS will collate all responses received from Suppliers and submit to ESN and CER if necessary. Once all information has been received, collated and distributed a Revenue Protection workshop will be scheduled by CER.

S mac an Bhaird stated that CER aims to write a terms of reference for the Revenue Protection Work Stream – an action was taken for this.

Revenue Protection Actions.

New Action 942: Revenue Protection – CER to write a terms of reference for the Work stream.

Action 927: Revenue Protection – Market to provide feedback as to how they recommend ESN to handle PAYG sites. The due date of this Action has been extended to 28.01 for Suppliers to revert.

Action to remain open

Action 928: CER to convene a meeting re Disconnection Taskforce actions as well as circulating actions. CER intend to have a Disconnection Taskforce meeting in February. CER will circulate the relevant documents in due course, probably early next week.

Action to remain open.

Action 929: ESN to provide a step by step process for tampering. This process was provided by ESN last week. Action deemed closed.

Action 937: ESN to contact NIE regarding the Anti-PAYG Meter Tampering workshops recently held. S Gray agreed to Action this item.

C O'Connor reported that ESN has discussed this action with NIE. The workshops involved NIE a UR representative and NI Suppliers. The workshops focussed on PAYG tampering and what was being done in relation to the approximately 300,000 PAYG Meters that are currently in NIE. NIE reported to C O'Connor that if meter tampering is found on a PAYG meter the tampered meter is replaced with a new

meter that has the updated software. ESNB and NIE have had numerous discussions around the PAYG magnet issues over the last few months. It is understood that ESNB and NIE have virtually the same processes in place to deal with meter tampering.

S Doolin said that the PAYG tampering problem is a substantial issue and that Power NI has produced statistics quantifying the problem. They have also proposed the method to resolve the issues. The proposal has not yet been accepted by the taskforce. There are a number of meetings still to be held before the final positions are made. He stressed this is a really important item for everyone. If NI figures are correct then the situation is really very bad.

C O'Connor added that to date, ESNB investigations have also shown the incidence of tampering to be significant. There are currently 60,000 hardship meters in place. It is easier to identify tampering on the lifestyle meters as the ESB standard meter is the reference point and can be compared to the vendor meter. She urged Suppliers to flag to ESNB if they have any problems with the PAYG meters. She stressed that a revenue protection workshop will enable ESNB to present all their findings to Suppliers. She added that a workshop would probably add more value than emails on the matter as all stakeholders would be together to discuss the issue.

S Doolin suggested that a targeted programme for key areas of tampering may be beneficial. He highlighted that there are certain high value sites which would provide a good focus for a tampering programme. P Stack stated that the targeted approach was a good suggestion and may be assisted by some accompanying PR related messages.

C O'Connor stated that ESNB have targeted some areas in the past. She highlighted however, that there have been intimidation issues within some of the targeted areas.

S Doolin stated that there are two separate issues here for discussion, the tampering of keypad (PAYG) meters and meter tampering in general. These are two complimentary issues but they are separate. He stressed that a workshop is the appropriate mechanism for dealing with these issues.

P Stack agreed that the focus should be on both the PAYG meter tampering and the broader tampering issue.

C O'Connor stated that ESNB has undertaken a lot of work on revenue protection particularly since 2012. She added that a Revenue Protection Work stream would be the ideal place to outline all this information.

Action to be closed.

Action 938: On receipt of the processes in action items 929 and 930 above Suppliers to review the processes and submit comment. As some Suppliers have yet to provide comments this action is to remain open.

Action to remain open.

General IGG Actions.

Action 915: CER to ensure gas revenue protection processes are shared with the IGG. Detailed slides were provided by CER and sent to Suppliers.

Action deemed closed.

Action: 917: Notification Address – Suppliers to complete data cleanse and update training material as a preventative measure for future incidents. This is a standing item and has been

around for a while. Some Suppliers have managed to resolve this issue and others have ongoing work to resolve it. Linked to Action 941(see pg 6 for details). The action will remain open until all data cleansing is complete.

Action to remain open.

Action 922: RMDS to provide a list of outstanding approved MCRs including date raised and any previous inclusion in a prioritisation exercise. This is an ongoing activity. RMDS will continue to work on the register and bring to an IGG once complete. The completion of the action has no impact on any schema/non schema releases for 2015.

Action to remain open.

Action 925: CER to get back with a formal response as to what further information they require on LTCA. CER provided the response. RMDS circulated this information to the LTCA working group on 13.01.15.

S mac an Bhaird added that the suggestion by S Doolin raised at the last conference call for a face to face meeting between the CER and some LTCA working group representatives could be accommodated.

C O'Connor stated that ESNB will collate the many LTCA queries assigned to ESNB before the next LTCA meeting. S Doolin added that ESNB has provided a lot of good information in response to date. RMDS will send on a suggested date for the next LTCA Conference call. It is hoped that the conference call can take place within the next three weeks.

Action deemed closed.

Action 932: MRSO/RMDS to co-ordinate the raising of a DR in relation to Cancellation Reason Code OS. This Action can be closed as DR 1156 has been raised. The outcome of this Action will be discussed later in the Presentation in the form of DR1156.

Action deemed Closed

Action 933: Suppliers to revert with the position on the Revenue Code of Practice in light of supporting or otherwise, the revised version. RMDS have received two responses, one of which is in full support of the Revenue Code of Practice. The second response identified concerns and would not support unless changes were made.

C O'Connor provided background and context to the current status of the Revenue Code of Practice. The original Code of Practice dates back to 2002. A number of revised versions were drafted. The last issue of concern for suppliers appeared to be a clause which gave CER the ability to rule in relation to which Supplier should take on a de-registered customer. Suppliers have not been eager to take on a customer that has been involved in theft as the New Supplier has to pay the DUoS for the period of time the customer was illegally connected. C O'Connor added that there are very few cases where there are issues that cannot be resolved and would have required arbitration. She indicated that generally MRSO talks to the Suppliers and the ESNB Revenue Protection team and an agreement is made. She added that there are not that many customers who are not registered when ESNB discover theft.

Due to the issues with sign off, ESNB had discussions with CER and drafted a revised Code of Practice which took into account these concerns with the previous Code of Practice. The document which is referenced in action 933 is the revised Code of Practice.

R Gilmartin indicated that SSE would not sign off on the document unless the document stated that when they take on a customer under these circumstances that they would not be liable for any backdated charges previous to the CoS date. C O'Connor added that the Supplier in question had a

concern with taking on a customer without knowing until later that there were revenue protection issues associated with that customer. The Revenue Protection team do have a process where they notify a Supplier of Revenue Protection issues. The issue is that this notification may take place after the customer has been registered.

J Gregory suggested that the issue relating to how a situation is governed and resolved where Suppliers cannot agree on taking on a customer should be dealt with outside of the Revenue Code of Practice. C O'Connor responded that she thought that had been achieved through the amended Revenue Code of Practice. She highlighted that the issue around taking on a customer and being liable for backdated charges was indeed an important question requiring resolution but that it should be addressed separately. She added that the Revenue Code of Practice does not specifically deal with costs but is designed to broadly outline obligations and responsibilities of the suppliers and the DSO around Revenue Protection. She added that the issue of cost allocation was directly linked to the broader LTCA issues which have been under discussion for the last two and half years.

S Doolin asked whether the issue is that where Suppliers cannot agree to take on the responsibility of a defaulting customer with significant debt that CER have the right to adjudicate and determine which supplier must take the customer on. C O'Connor replied that this was the clause that caused an issue previously and has been stripped out of the amended version.

S Doolin responded with a query as to what the status quo is in the absence of the clause. That is, how is a decision made? G Halligan added that when the dispute comes back to MRSO, MRSO seek to get agreement. If no agreement is reached then it goes back to revenue protection who generally come to some kind of agreement with the last supplier involved.

S mac an Bhaird asked whether he was correct in saying that, to date, the existing process has always led to a customer being re-energised and re-registered.

J Gregory commented that the discussion was about the Revenue Code of Practice and that the item under discussion had been omitted from the latest version. This item along with the cost allocation discussed earlier are separate issues and need to be dealt with outside of the Revenue Code of Practice document. The purpose of this action is that sign off is required for a more generic, less specific Code of practice. The issues identified in discussions today need to be addressed outside of this action.

C O'Connor agreed and stated that it is important that the Market does not have a 12 year old Revenue Protection Code of Practice Document (pre market opening) still in use. She understands that there is an important question requiring an answer in relation to whether CER has the legal right to instruct a supplier to take on a customer. This question should be dealt with as a separate issue outside of the approval of the existing Code of Practice. CER stated that they had not considered this matter, in the context of the revenue protection code of practice and outside deemed contracts, from a legal perspective.

There was discussion around whether Electric Ireland as Supplier of Last Resort should take on the customers in question. Reference was made to a revenue protection Supplier of Last Resort. S Doolin stated that the Supplier of last Resort obligations as set out in the PES licence does not include any obligation to take a customer with revenue protection issues. S mac an Bhaird stated the CER was not aware of the term revenue protection Supplier of Last Resort. The CER did however note that Electric Ireland still retains the PES licence and that they are designated as the Supplier of Last Resort – details of these obligations can be found on the CER website and in legislation. S Doolin stated that all Suppliers have the duty to Supply not just Electric Ireland/Supplier of Last Resort.

P Stack stated that the situation on the ground should be no different whether Suppliers sign the document or not. The current practise will stand whether the document is signed or not – that is if there is a dispute over taking back a customer, ESNB will call upon the previous supplier to see if they'll take on the customer. The wider issues identified will need to be worked through separately and resolution to these could impact the practice on the ground. She enquired whether Suppliers could sign off on the document as it stands and put in a new Actions in relation to the other issues.

As a result of the discussion, two new actions were taken.

New Action 943: ESBN to create generic note to Suppliers detailing items to be considered outside of the Revenue Code of Practice. The items include but not limited to costs, dates, re-registrations etc.

New Action 944: CER to develop terms of reference for Revenue Protection(linked to action 933)

Action 933 to remain open.

Action 934: DR1149 – Suppliers asked to consider if they can check the MPBREF on 016 and 300MM on their side so as to validate the correct Market Message. Linked to previous action 924. This Action was raised at the Conference Call on 3rd December. All Suppliers have agreed with this proposal, the action can be closed.

Action deemed closed.

Action 940: Statement of Changes. CER to feedback Supplier concerns in relation to timing and applicability of ESBN Charges to Paul Brandon. Paul to circulate a response Statement of Charges. CER sent a response to Suppliers via RMDS. CER is going to review this further in PR4. Suppliers urged to feedback any suggestions to CER.

S Doolin stated that he thought the action was around the inadequate notice of the Statement of Charges rather than the statement of charges per se. He added that there was a delay in them being available in 2014 and no indication that the new charges had been published. He requested that in 2015 notification be sent as soon as the charges are published. J Gregory re-iterated that RMDS will send a notification once informed by ESBN and/or CER that the Statement of Charges has been published.

Action deemed closed.

Action 941: ESBN to investigate the addition on UK addresses to BGE Customers. This is currently being investigated by ESBN. ESBN will respond as soon as they have more information.

Action to remain open.

3. CER Update

S mac an Bhaird presented the CER Update.

Two workshops were held in Q4 2014, the 1st on Change of Supply and the 2nd on Debt Transfer. Responses have been very limited to date. Suppliers were asked to submit their responses as soon as possible. A new action was taken for Suppliers to submit their responses to the CER Workshops by 23.01.15. S mac an Bhaird requested that Suppliers submit as much detail as possible in their responses.

New Action 945: Suppliers to provide feedback to CER on CoS/Debt Transfer Workshops that were held Q4 2014.

CER plan to give a detailed update on their Work plan for 2015 at the next IGG in March 2015. A view of RMDS' Work plan may also be given.

4. Gemserv Update

L Montgomerie presented the Gemserv Update.

L Montgomerie provided detail around the number and type of Assured Parties by Gemserv since

2005. They have assured

- DSU:8
- Large:8
- Small:7
- Self Supplier 17

There are currently two parties going through the Assurance process, one large Supplier and one small Supplier.

Gemserv is currently undertaking a post Implementation Review of the Non Schema Design Release and defect changes that it assured in 2014. Gemserv has received some responses back via RMDS which will be investigated in due course. Gemserv may request more responses as it has the minimum number and require more for the review.

S mac an Bhaird asked the group whether it would be more beneficial if Gemserv issued the PIR closer to the event/release cutover. The details of the event would be more accessible than if the review was issued many months later. A supplier stated their strong support for such.

IPT will be run for a Large Supplier and a Small Supplier Requalification at the end of March.

S Doolin enquired how long a Supplier's qualification with Gemserv lasts for if they don't go live. J Gregory replied that Suppliers have six months to become effective in the market after they receive assurance. If they do not become effective during the time period they are required to requalify once again.

5. MRSO Update

G Halligan presented the MRSO Update – see slides for statistics and updates

S mac an Bhaird stated that some Suppliers were not adhering to the ten day window to respond to the objection. There was an issue with one Supplier in particular. CER has spoken to this Supplier who has agreed to adhere to the ten day window in the future.

S Doolin stated that a debt flag profile highlighting the nature of these cancellations and acceptances for 2014 would be beneficial to Suppliers. CER highlighted that it was a business decision for the gaining supplier whether they can cancel a debt flagged CoS or not. As such, they would not be able to provide debt flagging data, which would identify individual suppliers. However the CER stated that it would ascertain what additional debt flagging data could be presented at the next IGG in terms of trends over time.

New Action 941: CER with the assistance of MRSO to analyse and will decide whether to report back to IGG on the debt flag trends for 2014

6. ESNB Update

C O'Connor and T O'Neill presented the ESNB Update.

C O'Connor presented the Keypad Meter Stats. Please see slides in presentation.

T O'Neill provided an ESNB update in relation to the defect with the two reads in one message. Firmer delivery timelines will be given at the next meeting.

S mac an Bhaird stated that the ISEM project is underway and CER has asked the Network Companies to look at any impacts this may have on the retail market. CER will meet with ESNB and all parties in February to provide an update.

K Cleary gave a presentation on **LTNA (Long Term Non Access)**

See slides for details and photos

ESNB has four scheduled meter reads per year and two planned estimated. A team of three ESNB

people is working in Limerick in this area.

Currently there are over 43,000 LTNA customers which accounts for 1.95% of total customer base. K Cleary outlined the figures by county.

The following tasks are been undertaken by ESNB in relation to LTNA:

- All readers have been informed of their performance and provided with a list of LTNA customers with estimate count and contact details etc. for review.
- Reports have been issued quarterly to Suppliers.
- A Special project on DG 5 customers – each reader had to confirm reason for on-going non access, verify that premises is not in use, advise details of any letting agents/auctioneers details that may be displayed.
- All information is then recorded on ESNB's system. In many cases ESNB have photographs of the premises attached to the Business Partners.

C O'Connor stated that in some cases when ESNB do eventually get a reading after years of estimates, the bill is much higher than usual. In some cases, the customer refuses to pay which results in more issues. S mac an Bhaired requested that all Suppliers assist with the resolution of these LTNAs.

S Doolin enquired if there is any way to take action or disconnect a customer who won't provide a reading. C O'Connor replied that is a revenue projection issue, if there is a refusal to let the meter reader read the meter, there's little ESNB can do except to request an RP visit to check the meter.

The Age profile of LTNA Accounts are:

Estimate Account	LTNA
>100:	13
50-99:	612
25-49:	3,145
6-24:	39,000

The following initiatives have been undertaken to bring the number of LTNA Accounts down:

- Various estimate counts extracted through BW for Letter Campaign.
- Bulk Text Campaign.
- Pumphouse Campaign with meter readers Spring 2013.
- Mailshot in conjunction with Daffodil Day to land owners and advert in Farmers Journal 2014.
- Mailshot to dog owners.
- Mailshot to "electronic gate" customers.
- Contacts established with Local Authorities & multi site customers.
- Facebook Page.
- After Hours Pilot – Customers contacted between 6.30 and 9pm by NCCC.

The following issues have been identified:

- Access to Masts, RAX's (Rural Auto Exchanges)
- Suppliers not communicating to their customers re ESB Networks obligatory 1 read per annum
- Pre-pay customers under the impression that reading is automatic
- Readings at Change of Supplier
- Cost of Disconnection
- Low Usage Charge

- Billing Addresses
- Estimate Count over 50

K Cleary requested that Suppliers review the LTNA reports received by ESNB and provide feedback such as whether the reports are used, has the Supplier got meter readings or contact details ESNB does not, etc.

New Action 947: LTNA Suppliers to review LTNA reports received from ESNB and provide feedback to ESNB on any actual/potential initiatives or action taken in relation to them.

7. RMDS Update

J Gregory presented the RMDS Update.

DR 1155 V1.0 – Market Design Process Diagrams – conversion from ARIS to document format.

J Gregory provided an overview of DR 1155. All 89 of the Market Messages are completed. 9 of 41MPDs are still to be completed and will appear on a follow on DR. All changes need to be published as soon as possible in light of Smart Metering workshops. A request is being made to fast track the DR to MCR approval due to their use in the Smart Metering workshops.

All participants were in agreement to approve as DR and MCR.

Approved.

J Gregory highlighted that DR 1156 is related to **Action 932: MRSO/RMDS to co-ordinate the raising of a DR in relation to Cancellation Reason Code OS.**

DR 1156 V1.0 – Cancellation Reason Code OS on 111A MM

J Gregory provided an update on the issue, the scale of the issue and the proposed solution.

The Issue

- Cancellation reason code OS is being sent on the 111A. The code is not included in the allowable list of codes for 111A in the MM guide.
- Cancellation code OS means that the gaining Supplier is cancelling in response to an objection.
- The appearance of OS on MM 111A can only occur when OS is sent on 011MM after the 10 day objection period has lapsed.
- The primary cause of this issue is that the Gaining Supplier is not responding to the original Objection message (011 MM) in the allotted objection period time.
- At least 1 Supplier has validated against this code being received. Receipt of the OS code on the 111A causes issues for the Supplier who have validated against it.

Scale of Issue

- 2,900 111A MM sent March – October 2014.
- 10 of these had cancellation reason code OS.
- 6 messages were sent to 3 suppliers none of which failed on their systems.
- 4 messages were sent to one supplier which did fail and resulted in the Losing Supplier being unable to take the customer back after the gaining Supplier had cancelled.

What is proposed in DR 1156

- Market Design information is revised to instruct on the non use of Cancellation Reason Code OS on the 011 MM once the 10 day objection period has elapsed. This will prevent it being auto populated on the 111A.
- It is suggested that one of the other appropriate and allowable cancellation codes are used (such as SE) under these circumstances.

- Manage validation errors caused by Suppliers receiving 111A MM (where their systems cannot accept them) on a case by case basis in MRSO.
- Optional: A technical solution was investigated. The details of which are in the DR. It is suggested that based on the number of cases identified, that the technical solution is optional for Suppliers.

S Doolin stated that the issue of Suppliers who continue to break the objection period rules should be taken up by CER. S Doolin considered that such follow up by the CER would be sufficient to remedy the matter. S mac an Bhaird stated that he had engaged with the supplier in question and that they confirmed that they would comply with the necessary timelines. S mac an Bhaird highlighted however that documentation changes may still be beneficial so that any new comers to the market would be aware of the specifics.

J Gregory requested that this be approved as a DR. It will be brought to the next IGG as an MCR and if there are any issue it can be dealt with at MCR level.

All participants were in agreement to approve.

Approved.

MCR 1149 V2.0 - Request that Suppliers ensure that they submit only one active COLE 016MM for an MPRN'

J Gregory outlined that this DR was brought to the IGG dated 05-11-2014 as DR1149. Today's IGG sees the first presentation of MCR 1149 v2.0. J Gregory reminded the forum of the issue which was that some suppliers send multiple 016 MMs for a single MPRN in quick succession. This results in manual intervention, delays and processing complications. The **proposal** is for MPD 25 and MPD 14 Supplementary information to be updated with agreed best practise rules around COLE submissions with the aim of reducing the number of erroneous multiple 016 MMs sent for the same MPRN. In the cases where multiple 016 MMs are sent, Working Practice 26 has been drafted to support the communication between ESNB and MPs.

J Gregory requested approval for this MCR.

All participants were in agreement to approve.

Approved.

Non Schema Release 2015 – Update J Gregory gave a brief update on the Non Schema Release 2015 status. She indicated that the list of MCRs which were prioritised by Participants is currently under review with ESNB. ESNB will review the list in context of their work programme for 2015. ESNB aim to provide a proposal as to what can/cannot be delivered in 2015 by them. The Proposed Non Schema 2015 content and dates will be brought to an IGG early in 2015 for discussion and approval with the market and finally CER.

2014 Customer Satisfaction Survey J Gregory informed the group that the 2014 RMDS Customer Satisfaction Survey will be issued on 16 January 2015. To ensure the Annual Survey more accurately reflects the year being surveyed (in this case 2014) RMDS has moved the survey to the month of January. RMDS requests participants to return the survey by 14th February. J Gregory requested that all Market Participants respond as it allows RMDS to respond to feedback through actions which aim to improve service delivery to the Market. J Gregory added that a separate ReMCoDS survey will be issued.

MMR

J Gregory provided an overview of the upcoming Minor Market Release (MMR). The MMR is specific to the ROI market only. The next MMR is scheduled for Wednesday 11th February 2015. It will contain

various small changes to the ROI market design The changes include:

- Non Conformances identified during Market design use (for example during Smart Metering workshop preparation).
- MCRs that involve document only changes (e.g. MCR 1155)

The Market Design documentation will be versioned at 10.4

An email will be sent to participants on 28.01.15 detailing all changes that are to be made to the market design.

ROI Postcodes – EIRCODES

J Gregory reminded participants about the postcode/Eircode presentation that is scheduled to take place at the O'Callaghan Alexander Hotel on Thursday 29.01.15 from 10.00 – 12.00 (Tea/coffee from 9.30). The presentation will be industry specific and will include information on the Postcode Enablement programme that is being run with Public Sector Bodies and ESNB. She requested that questions in relation to the initiative be submitted in advance of the workshop. This will allow, where possible and appropriate, the presentation content to be tailored to respond to any question received. Participants are requested to notify RMDS of attendees as well as questions to be addressed by Monday 26th January.

Upcoming Outages:

An outage will be held on 18 January 2015 and will involve an outage in ROI and NI. There will be an outage on the third Sunday in February (15.02.2015). Details of the outages are held on the RMDS website.

8. AOB

R Gilmartin raised an issue in relation to Data Protection and the Change of Legal Entity Process. He provided information relating to the issue where Suppliers are unable to send Last Occupier when a customer wishes to move out. If customer A moves out from a premise, Customer A details are retained as an active customer at that site. J Gregory indicated that there was a way of identifying that the customer had moved out but that ESNB would be able to notify the details around this. R Gilmartin stressed that retention of customer details for a customer who was not the legal entity appeared to be a Data Protection Issue. An action was taken for ESNB to investigate further.

IGG Action 948: Data Protection - ESNB to report back on how the COLE process currently records the moving out of an occupant to identify whether the moved out customer details are retained in the ESNB system. If details are retained data protection concerns need to be investigated.

9. Next Steps

Next IGG Meeting:

Wednesday 4th March 2015 in Belfast

Next Conference Call: Wednesday 11th February 2015

10. Action Items Open at End of Meeting

No.	Title	Owner	Due Date
927	Meter Tampering – Market to provide feedback as to how they recommend ESNB to handle sites	Suppliers	28.01.2015
928	CER to convene a meeting re Disconnection Taskforce actions as well as circulating actions	CER	11.02.2015
938	On receipt of the processes in action items 929 and 930 above Suppliers to review the processes and submit comment	Suppliers	11.02.2015

939	CER to review comments on processes from Suppliers (Action 938) and set up a PAYG Metering Tampering Workshop. Action 923, 925, 926 to be used as supporting documentation.	CER	11.02.2015
917	Notification Address – Suppliers to complete data cleanse and update training material as a preventative measure for future incidents	Suppliers	11.02.2015
922	RMDS to provide a list of outstanding approved MCRs including date raised and any previous inclusion in a prioritisation exercise	RMDS	11.02.2015
933	Suppliers to revert with the position on the Revenue Code of Practice in light of supporting or otherwise, the revised version	Suppliers	11.02.2015
941	ESBN to investigate the addition on UK addresses to BGE Customers	ESBN	11.02.2015
942	Meter Tampering – CER to write a terms of reference for the Work stream.	CER	11.02.2015
943	ESBN to create generic note to Suppliers detailing items to be considered outside of the Revenue Code of Practice. The items include but not limited to costs, dates, re-registrations etc.	ESBN	11.02.2015
944	CER to develop terms of reference for Revenue Protection(linked to action 933)	CER	11.02.2015
945	Suppliers to provide feedback to CER on CoS/Debt Transfer Workshops that were held Q4 2014.	Suppliers	23.01.2015
946	CER with the assistance of MRSO to analyse and report back to IGG on the debt flag trends for 2014	CER	11.02.2015
947	LTNA Suppliers to review LTNA reports received from ESBN and provide feedback to ESBN on any actual/potential initiatives or action taken in relation to them.	Suppliers	11.02.2015
948	Data Protection - ESBN to report back on how the COLE process currently records the moving out of an occupant to identify whether the moved out customer details are retained in the ESBN system. If details are retained data protection concerns need to be investigated.	ESBN	23.01.2015