

<b>Date:</b>	6 <sup>th</sup> April, 2016	<b>Time &amp; Location</b>	3pm - Conference Call
<b>Chair:</b>	David Walshe, RMDS		
<b>Attendees:</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	
	Jessica Gregory, Alice Mooney, Catherine Keane	RMDS	
	Seán mac an Bhaird, Priti Stack, Dana Paraschiv	CER	
	John Bracken, Aileen Greaves, Mary Mulcahy	ESBN	
	Gerry Halligan	MRSO	
	Siobhan Melvin, David Mulholland	SSE Airtricity	
	Sean Doolin	Electric Ireland	
	Cathal Murphy	Prepaypower	
	Stevie Donnelly, Mark Speers	BGE	
	Kevin Sheridan	Energia	
	David Gascon	Panda Power	
<b>Apologies:</b>			
<b>Version Number</b>	2.0		
<b>Status</b>	Draft		

<b>Agenda:</b>	
1.	General
2.	Actions from Previous Call
3.	New Conference Call Actions
4.	CER Update
5.	Gemserv update
6.	MRSO Update
7.	ESBN Update
8.	Market Design Update
9.	Notice Board Planned Maintenance, Reminders from IGG, etc.
10.	AOB

<b>1 – General</b>
D Walshe requested approval of the previous Conference Call minutes.  Minutes v1.0 deemed approved.

<b>2. Actions – Previous Conference Call &amp; IGG</b>
D. Walshe provided the Action Item Update:
<b>Action Items</b>

<b>948</b>	<b>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.</b>		
<b>Update for CC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ This action is linked to action 1004.</li> <li>▪ ESNB to provide an update.</li> </ul>		
<b>Discussion at CC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ J Bracken reported that he has met with the Data Protection Manager for ESB Group and outlined this action to him. The Data Protection Manager has asked some questions in relation to the holding of data, and as to why ESNB holds the data and what it holds onto it for.</li> <li>▪ J Bracken has put together an IT Group to answer these questions raised by the Data Protection Manager.</li> <li>▪ Based on that, ESNB will then proceed with this action and will have an update at the next IGG in May.</li> <li>▪ S mac an Bhaird asked J Bracken if it is still his intention that this matter would be brought to the Data Protection Commissioner as part of a wider review, or has he changed his position on that.</li> <li>▪ J Bracken replied that firstly he is going to get answers to the Data Protection Managers questions. These questions would need to be answered by ESNB before going to the Data Commissioner.</li> <li>▪ J Bracken confirmed that the IT Group will also look into action 1004.</li> <li>▪ Action to remain open.</li> </ul>		
<b>Forum Logged:</b> IGG	<b>Assigned to:</b> ESNB	<b>Status:</b> Action remains <b>Open</b>	<b>Due Date:</b> 04.05.2016

<b>986</b>	<b>Technical Details - DR covering the importance of appropriate Technical Details (name and phone) to the 010 to be drafted. Detail to be added to MPD 01 &amp; 02</b>		
<b>Update for CC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ ESNB to provide an update.</li> </ul>		
<b>Discussion at CC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ J Bracken reported that this DR is still on the ESNB to-do list.</li> <li>▪ Action to remain open.</li> </ul>		
<b>Forum Logged:</b> IGG	<b>Assigned to:</b> ESNB	<b>Status:</b> Action remains <b>Open</b>	<b>Due Date:</b> 04.05.2016

<b>993</b>	<b>LTCA Next Steps - LTCA WG to convene following CER decision to support appointment of the auditor. Terms of reference to be reviewed to account for pending I-SEM design confirmation. WG to submit update on terms of reference, chairperson, plan for progressing and project managing next stage of LTCA initiative at next IGG</b>
<b>Update for CC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ D Walshe reported that the LTCA TOR (Terms of Reference) was circulated to the LTCA WG and RMDS has received responses.</li> <li>▪ The current position is that the next version of the TOR is with CER who is reviewing them at the moment.</li> <li>▪ RMDS hopes to issue a final version of the TOR to the Auditor and Suppliers by Friday 8<sup>th</sup> April 2016 dependant on when CER responds with its comments.</li> <li>▪ The Auditor has yet to see the TOR and review what is required.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ RMDS received a question from SSE Airtricity regarding the time it may take for the Auditor to perform his review. The Auditor will come back with his own informed view as to how long the review will take place.</li> </ul>		
<b>Discussion at CC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ S Doolin asked if the TOR were altered in any way from the set that were sent to Suppliers for review, as a result of any inputs or responses back.</li> <li>▪ J Gregory replied that the original TOR went to the Auditor but that was over a year ago. RMDS wanted to include reference to I-SEM in the TOR. The LTCA WG was asked for comments and these comments were incorporated and then sent to CER for their comments before they issue to the Auditor or WG again. Once CER reviews the comments, which are not substantial, the WG will have a view of the updated TOR. It is also important to note that once the Auditor formally starts engaging on this there could be a few iterations of the TOR to iron out any questions he may have.</li> <li>▪ S Doolin asked whether the WG will get a copy of any revisions that have been issued. J Gregory replied that this will be the case and all versions will available on the RMDS private website under the LTCA section.</li> <li>▪ S mac an Bhaird added that the CER received the most up to date version last week which includes Suppliers comments. CER will review this document and make any necessary changes. CER will endeavour to get its version back to RMDS before the end of this week 8<sup>th</sup> April 2016.</li> <li>▪ S Donnelly asked if it would be possible to see final version before it goes to the Auditor and J Gregory replied that this will be the case.</li> <li>▪ Action to remain open.</li> </ul>		
<b>Forum Logged:</b> IGG	<b>Assigned to:</b> Suppliers/LTCA WG Group	<b>Status:</b> Action remains <b>Open</b>	<b>Due Date:</b> 04.05.2016

<b>1002</b>	<b>Eligible Customer Files - Suppliers/CER/ESBN to review the 3 Options presented by RMDS and respond to RMDS with their position by selection of one option and/or provision of comment.</b>		
<b>Update for CC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ RMDS has received 3 responses to date. All but one is happy to remove the Eligible Customer lists and continue with the Downloadable Meter Files.</li> <li>▪ SSE Airtricity to revert with some details based on the discussion at the last IGG.</li> <li>▪ ESNB to provide an update.</li> </ul>		
<b>Discussion at CC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ J Gregory added that at the last IGG an assumption was made that any Suppliers who haven't responded are comfortable with the Eligible Customer files being retired.</li> <li>▪ S mac an Bhaird reported that it would be good if this action could be closed at the next IGG in May. He requested that Suppliers who wish to keep the files provide a response and provide the rational behind this.</li> <li>▪ Action to remain open.</li> </ul>		
<b>Forum Logged:</b> IGG	<b>Assigned to:</b> Suppliers	<b>Status:</b> Action remains <b>Open</b>	<b>Due Date:</b> 04.05.2016

<b>1004</b>	<b>CoLE Process - ESNB to review the CoLE Process in relation to a Customer moving out with no immediate Customer move in. Determine recommended Technical and Business process options for managing this, including the implications for ESNB processes. Suppliers to provide comment on how they handle this CoLE scenario and highlight Supplier/Customer implications.</b>		
<b>Update for CC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ New Action logged at the IGG.</li> </ul>		
<b>Discussion at CC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ This action was discussed in conjunction with action 948.</li> <li>▪ J Bracken has put together an IT Group to look into this action.</li> <li>▪ S Melvin reported that SSE Airtricity requested that this action be delayed until the 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2016 as there is a similar action in NI. Suppliers in NI are discussing this at the workshop on the 19<sup>th</sup> April 2016 so it would be good to get a harmonised approach to change of tenancies across both markets. She added that she can circulate what is agreed at the NI workshop to all ROI Suppliers to get their feedback before SSE Airtricity responds to ESNB.</li> <li>▪ S mac an Bhaird reported that for information purposes this would be useful. He added however, that ROI and NI are separate markets and although there is some degree of co-ordination there</li> </ul>		

	<p>may be ROI specific considerations. Suppliers should be cognisant of that and also submit any other comments or proposals they may have on the matter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ D Walshe reported that RMDS has only received 3 responses on this action to-date and requested that more Suppliers provide a response.</li> <li>▪ J Bracken stated that ideally a solution or guidelines could be agreed between ESNB and Suppliers on this matter. CER could then oversee the proposals and confirm if appropriate. S mac an Bhaird replied that once CER had seen options they could consider next steps at that point.</li> <li>▪ J Gregory added that the issue around move out with no immediate move in has been an issue for many years and a consistent Retail Market approach/s to dealing with this area needs to be determined. Any solutions/guidelines agreed would be added to the Market Design. This may happen in time, but the investigations by both ESNB and Suppliers form the initial steps in this process.</li> <li>▪ Action to remain open.</li> </ul>		
<b>Forum Logged:</b> IGG	<b>Assigned to:</b> ESNB/Suppliers	<b>Status:</b> Action remains <b>Open</b>	<b>Due Date:</b> 04.05.2016

<b>1005</b>	<p><b>Green Source Products - CER to send the Green Source Submission that was presented at the IGG to Suppliers. Suppliers to respond with comments and/or gaps. Suppliers to provide feedback on the Verification process being suggested, timelines outlined, the retrospective application and the need for a consistent set of guidelines for the Terms of Reference Suppliers need to supply coming out of the Audit.</b></p>		
<b>Update for CC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 2 Reponses were received which were forwarded to CER.</li> </ul>		
<b>Discussion at CC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ S mac an Bhaird reported that CER received responses from SSE Airtricity and BGE. Electric Ireland has previously provided comments about this.</li> <li>▪ Following the last IGG, CER circulated the table showing the information that would be required in the Green Source Submission to SEMO. At the IGG some queries arose challenging whether the table was detailed enough. The feedback CER received from both Suppliers support this opinion.</li> <li>▪ He has reviewed the Green Source Decision Paper and there are also some further principals outlined in Appendix 1 in relation to the principals to which an Auditor should adhere to. For this to progress CER needs comments from Suppliers on what is missing from the table rather than the fact that there is generally something missing. From his perspective, he is still of the view that there is sufficient detail there for the Auditor to be given sufficient direction to do a job consistently from Supplier to Supplier. To move this forward he suggests that Suppliers respond with submissions by 15<sup>th</sup> April 2016 outlining specifically what additional information they need and where they think the gaps are.</li> <li>▪ CER also received comments from BGE saying that the timelines were tight. Electric Ireland had raised the same concern at the last IGG but premised it on the clarity in relation to the data required and extent of such.</li> <li>▪ BGE has highlighted concerns relating to changing the information on their website etc. by June 2016. Also, BGE raised at the last IGG the retrospective element of the decision. The decision was made in August 2015 and BGE sees any verification process that goes back beyond August time as being a retrospective decision and not appropriate. S mac an Bhaird indicated that he has had initial discussions within CER but needs to discuss this further before coming back to the group on this point.</li> <li>▪ CER will come back to the group in relation to the retrospectivity. He requested that Suppliers respond to CER by COB on 15<sup>th</sup> April 2016 in relation to the gaps or specific additional information that they need pertaining to the guidelines for the Auditor. This will clarify additional information that Suppliers need to give the Auditor for the Auditor to do their job robustly and in a consistent way between Suppliers.</li> <li>▪ Action to remain open.</li> </ul>		
<b>Forum Logged:</b> IGG	<b>Assigned to:</b> CER/Suppliers	<b>Status:</b> Action remains <b>Open</b>	<b>Due Date:</b> 04.05.2016

<p><b>1006</b></p>	<p><b>Green Source Products - CER to provide details of the data to be sought under the Audit to Suppliers, to engage an Auditor(s) to undertake a consistent Green Source Products review within their organisations.</b></p>		
<p><b>Update for CC</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ This action was discussed in conjunction with action 1005.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Discussion at CC</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ S Donnelly added that with regard to the retrospective application BGE has a difficulty implementing the timelines due to items like website changes. Specifically on the verification form that Suppliers are asked to submit and fill in all the MPRNs, BGE believes that there is a more efficient way of doing this using Supplier IDs as was suggested previously by BGE. This was also suggested by VAYU in the consultation for the Green Source Products. What's being suggested is a very manual process and he thinks that there is a better way of doing this if Suppliers are going to be doing this in the future.</li> <li>▪ S mac an Bhaird reported that details on an MPRN basis were included because it may not be the case that a green source product may not guarantee that 100% of the electricity is from renewable sources. S mac an Bhaird reported that on the specific Supplier Unit proposal that BGE stated, which was raised by VAYU in their submission on the Green Source Products Consultation Paper, CER reviewed this and decided that it was not appropriate. He added that there is text pertaining to this in the Decision paper. He highlighted that a decision has been made, the consultation process has been gone through and CER is reluctant to open that matter again. If BGE feel strongly about this position, he suggests that BGE raises it at a more senior level. Secondly, BGE did raise a question about a tolerance level in relation to Green Source Products. Once again that was referred to and considered under the decision making process and it is also something that a decision has been made on and CER will not be re-opening. He caveats that by saying that BGE can raise that at a more senior level if it so wishes.</li> <li>▪ S Doolin asked if Electric Ireland indicated that they felt there were gaps with the guidelines provided, would CER commit to review these comments and re-issue further guidelines or a complete set of guidelines that can be used with the Auditor?</li> <li>▪ S mac an Bhaird replied that CER will need to see the comments before it can commit but what S Doolin is saying seems reasonable. He suggests that on the week beginning 18<sup>th</sup> April 2016, CER will engage with the Market, summarise comments and issue them to the market. CER will perhaps schedule a short session to finalise any issues and decide on the next steps.</li> <li>▪ S Doolin asked that once Supplier Audits are completed by their selected Auditor can the assumption be made that SEMO will adjudicate on the adequacy of the Audit at that point? In other words, if there was a substantial difference in terms of both quantity and quality of other Supplier's Audits for example, will SEMO comment on this? This was always his concern that to complete the verification process someone has to adjudicate on the adequacy and the efficacy of the Audit that has to be completed.</li> <li>▪ S mac an Bhaird replied that the data being requested and the principals mentioned in Appendix 1 of the Decision Paper are structured to give some format to the Auditor. SEMO will receive the document from Suppliers. However, CER will be provided with information pertaining to the verification process and will have to publish a document in relation to the outcomes of that. If anything stands out to either CER or SEMO, it would be remiss of CER or SEMO not to highlight such.</li> <li>▪ S Doolin raised a concern that Suppliers may progress with the audit using incorrect interpretation of guidelines. Upon review by CER/SEMO they may be asked to go back and perform an additional audit if they had misunderstood guidelines. In summary he was concerned that the audit may not be able to produce a set of comparable Audits.</li> <li>▪ S mac and Bhaird added that Suppliers comments that are due on Friday 15<sup>th</sup> April 2016 may shed a bit more light on this matter.</li> <li>▪ Action to remain open.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Forum Logged:</b> IGG</p>	<p><b>Assigned to:</b> ESBN</p>	<p><b>Status:</b> Action remains <b>Open</b></p>	<p><b>Due Date:</b> 04.05.2016</p>

1007	<b>Revenue Protection Timelines - Suppliers to send examples of Revenue Protection issues &amp; resolution timelines to ESNB via RMDS. ESNB to consider developing a voluntary SLA for Revenue Protection Activities.</b>						
Update for CC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ New action logged at the IGG.</li> <li>▪ RMDS received 1 response and ESNB has to provide an update.</li> </ul>						
Discussion at CC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ J Bracken reported that 1 Supplier responded with 5 examples. ESNB reviewed these examples all of which pertained to PAYG meters. 4 had magnets and 1 had no interference.</li> <li>▪ He reviewed the timelines submitted and he will write back to that Supplier in question.</li> <li>▪ He provided an explanation of each of the examples provided and how ESNB would deal with each. He has spoken to the Revenue Protection Team and they are happy to talk to any Supplier about the process and any issues they may have.</li> <li>▪ In terms of statistics ESNB is looking at about 50% of Supplier initiated Revenue Protection calls being cleared within 2 weeks. There have been others that have taken longer that needed further analysis.</li> <li>▪ S mac an Bhaird reported that a Supplier raised this issue at the last IGG and highlighted quite lengthy periods (months in some cases) for ESNB to react. He interpreted the concern raised by the MP as ESNB being informed and then not acting on the notification until months later. He added that from the explanation provided by J Bracken that it appears that it may have been that ESNB did respond to the notification but may not have informed the Supplier as to the actions that had been taken.</li> <li>▪ J Bracken reported that this was a correct assessment. He added that an issue appears to be where a Supplier notifies of an issue, ESNB investigate and find no interference and that Suppliers are not notified of the lack of interference. He indicated that in these situations, ESNB will address optimising communications back to the Suppliers.</li> <li>▪ S Melvin reported that SSE Airtricity is looking for an SLA from ESNB on Revenue Protection Matters. From the examples that SSE Airtricity sent to ESNB, SSE was notified that the technician was on-site but that's of little use until it receives the consumption adjustment report because SSE can't apply anything to the Customer's account until then. Of the 5 examples SSE Airtricity outlined, 4 took 7 months to come back and 1 took 6 months.</li> <li>▪ S mac an Bhaird asked SSE Airtricity if it has received a response from ESNB with sufficient detail for it to consider further what the issues or failings are.</li> <li>▪ J Bracken reported that ESNB has assessed the examples provided by SSE and is yet to issue the note in response. He added that it will be issued to SSE Airtricity after this Meeting.</li> <li>▪ S mac an Bhaird reported that the objective of this is to identify any persistent failings or weaknesses in the process. There seems to be a definite improvement in communication possible. He suggested that SSE Airtricity reviews ESNB's response and comes back on whether it is happy with the response or not. He added that he would also be keen for any lessons learnt or improvements to be shared with the Group. He suggested the Revenue Protection Team could attend the next IGG if the next steps need to be discussed.</li> <li>▪ Action to remain open.</li> </ul>						
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 25%;"><b>Forum Logged:</b> IGG</td> <td style="width: 25%;"><b>Assigned to:</b> ESNB</td> <td style="width: 25%;"><b>Status:</b> Action remains <b>Open</b></td> <td style="width: 25%;"><b>Due Date:</b> 04.05.2016</td> </tr> </table>				<b>Forum Logged:</b> IGG	<b>Assigned to:</b> ESNB	<b>Status:</b> Action remains <b>Open</b>	<b>Due Date:</b> 04.05.2016
<b>Forum Logged:</b> IGG	<b>Assigned to:</b> ESNB	<b>Status:</b> Action remains <b>Open</b>	<b>Due Date:</b> 04.05.2016				

<b>3. Actions – New Conference Call Actions</b>
1 new Action was logged at the Conference Call.

1008	Vulnerable Customers SI463 – ESBN to provide comments on Suppliers Questions to Suppliers via RMDS.		
Discussion at CC	▪ See Section 4 CER update for details.		
Forum Logged: CC	Assigned to: ESBN	Status: NEW Action	Due Date: 04.05.2016

#### 4. CER Update

D Paraschiv, M Mulcahy & J Gregory provided an update on Vulnerable Customers.

##### Vulnerable Customers

J Gregory reported that the Vulnerable Customer DR 1173 was issued to the Market last week for review. RMDS invited comment in advance of this forum but are not looking for any signoff today but at the next ReMCoWG in May.

D Mulholland reported that he has 3 questions pertaining to DR 1173 which he will submit via email as well as discuss today. They were:

1. Request to include dexterity in the Summary section of the DR. J Gregory reported that dexterity will be added into the summary as per D Mullholland's request. She added that any changes to the DR will result in a new version being issued in advance of the next WG.
2. Life and Non-Life Support - It states that applicability can be only life or non life and not both. He added that it did not make sense as these two codes could in reality be applicable to one customer.

J Gregory reported that the way Life and Non-Life works at present will continue to work, i.e. a customer is either Life or Non-Life and a Supplier cannot select both options for the same customer. The DR does not intend to change this existing functionality.

M Mulcahy added both these Customers will now be classified under the new SI463 as a priority Customer and there will be no differentiation between Life and Non-Life and neither will be disconnected at any time during the year. If a Customer is eligible for selection as both Life and Non-Life, ESBN would suggest that the Supplier indicate them as Life support.

D Paraschiv agreed that for cases whereby a Customer can be classified as both, the Life Support will prevail. She added that if a Customer is marked life or non life they will never be disconnected. She further indicated that ESBN is aiming to align the services that it currently provides to Life Support to Non-Life Support as well.

D Mulholland reported that this is not documented anywhere and may be relevant for New Entrants. J Gregory added that all information relating to Vulnerable Customers will be available in a Briefing Document that will ultimately form part of Market Design around Vulnerable Customers. She added that this will need to be a DR and it will be progressed at some point in the future. New Supplier and existing suppliers will be able to reference this document.

S Melvin asked if the name of the fields (Life and Non-Life Support) could be changed to Priority so there would be no confusion. J Gregory reported that this suggestion has been discussed on numerous occasions and it was agreed that currently Life and Non-Life functionality would be retained. On the Extranet Register Life and Non-Life will be classified under priority services.

3. Medical institutions, it is unclear in the DR whether this is applicable to DG1, DG2 or DG5.

J Gregory reported that the existing functionality around Medical Institutions is retained and that medical institution can only be selected where an MPRN was DG5 or above. D Mullholland and M Mulcahy questioned whether the system was in fact operating like this at present. J Gregory indicated that if it was not, it was due to a defect. She added that she checked MCR 141 (issued in 2007) during the conference call which confirms that medical institution is not valid for DG1 and DG2. It is only valid for DG5 and above. D Mulholland added that he felt there was also ambiguity around the issue of what constitutes a

medical institution in terms of scope and definition. He added that there appears to be no full definition of Medical Institution. J Gregory indicated that at the previous VC workshop held in December that discussion had occurred around medical institution and its definition. It was agreed to be outside the scope of this DR. She further added that once the definition of it is determined, it can be added to the briefing document which was mentioned earlier in the discussion.

D Mulholland reported that he will submit these 3 comments to RMDS via email.

#### SI463 – ESBN responses to comments received from Suppliers.

M Mulcahy reported that ESBN has received some comments back from Suppliers regarding SI463. They are:-

- Reconciliation Exercise - ESBN issued a multiple list throughout a year. A Supplier questioned whether a full reconciliation has to be undertaken. There is an obligation on Suppliers and ESBN to undertake a full reconciliation once a year. The template that was issued will need to be completed by Suppliers and returned to ESBN once a year. ESBN will be issuing the Vulnerable Customer lists on a quarterly basis and it is up to each Supplier as to how much reconciliation they do on that.

D Paraschiv reported that she concurs with M Mulcahy and that a full reconciliation exercise will be conducted once a year. The template that ESBN and GNI jointly submitted must be completed once a year by Suppliers. ESBN will also issue portfolios of Vulnerable Customers every quarter and Suppliers may take this opportunity to do their own reconciliations if they wish. ESBN is obligated to send the data 4 times a year. If the CER ever decides to audit Suppliers on compliance with this CER will look at the template for the yearly reconciliation exercises undertaken to see which Supplier is pursuing discrepancies in line with good practise.

- Customer Mobile Numbers - A Supplier raised a question in terms of compliance whereby it states that ESBN would ask Suppliers to ensure they seek mobile phone numbers from Customers. This Supplier commented that it cannot force a Customer to provide a mobile number. ESBN agrees and will ensure that the word “ensure” be changed to possibly “encourage”.
- Braille - ESBN received comments from Suppliers questioning if ESBN are compliant by not issuing Outage Cards in Braille to visually impaired Customers. Back in 2005 CER made a decision that Suppliers must issue communication to Customers in Braille. Since 2005 technology has evolved and ESBN has been informed by the NCBI that Braille is no longer the best option for Customers that are visually impaired. There are very few visually impaired Customers who use Braille in Ireland. ESBN has been talking to the NCBI about the best method of informing visually impaired Customers. The NCBI has informed ESBN that a Text to Speak facility, whereby ESBN would text the Customer and the Customer would have a facility on their phone to convert it to speech, would be the best option. ESBN is investigating this. ESBN has also been in contact with the Deaf Association of Ireland with regard to the best way of communicating with Customers with hearing difficulties.

S Doolin asked that if the “Text to Speak” option is only acceptable to a proportion of the Customers questioned, is it the case that ESBN is proposing to continue or not continue with the Braille element option. M Mulcahy responded that ESBN has never issued planned outage notifications in Braille. S Doolin asked how that matches ESBN’s regulatory obligations. D Mulholland agreed that there has to be an alternative given to Customers.

- Another query was that GNI gave its Customers a month’s notice whereas ESBN only give Customers 3 days. 3 days is the minimum notice that ESBN gives to its Customers, the general rule is between 1 and 2 weeks.
- Customers without Supply. ESBN was asked as to why it doesn’t provide alternative arrangements to Customers that are without Supply. GNI provide Electric Hotplates and Electric Radiators in such circumstances. In such cases the only thing that ESBN might be able to provide is a Generator. However, this is not a facility that ESBN can provide to Customers as it would mean that wiring would have to be done which would interfere with the Customer’s wiring.

S Melvin asked if ESBN would be providing written responses to Suppliers queries. ESBN agreed to issue its comments to Supplier questions via RMDS.

A new action was recorded:

**Action 1008 – Vulnerable Customers SI463 – ESBN to provide comments on Suppliers Questions to Suppliers via RMDS.**

D Paraschiv added that CER welcomes ESBN's engagement with NCBI and the Deaf Association of Ireland. She suggested that ESBN put in some timelines and details as to when it will be in the position to implement some of these technologies mentioned and what is required. If the "Speak Text" option is based on a mobile number this may be an issue for cases pertaining to Customers who don't/won't provide a mobile number and ESBN will have to review how to notify them for planned outages. She also requested that ESBN provides an update on the timelines on the alignment between the services that ESBN provides to Life Support Customers and when these services will be extended to Non-Life Support.

M Mulcahy reported that ESBN wrote to Non-Life Customers asking them if they wanted to provide a mobile number for contact during faults. ESBN has only had a 22% response so far. ESBN are waiting for NCBI to come back to ESBN. ESBN will issue comments to Suppliers questions first and issue further updates regarding Braille etc. where necessary.

S Donnelly reported that he raised an issue with ESBN with regards to the timelines that were suggested by ESBN and GNI to complete the reconciliation. M Mulcahy replied at GNI has confirmed that it will change its dates (to a month later) and will issue a new calendar for both ESBN and GNI. This new calendar will be issued shortly.

Cooling Off Period Legislation

The group was informed that the CCPC may attend a forthcoming industry meeting to present on the cooling off period – the next face to face IGG was suggested. It was suggested that a specific session where both gas and electricity suppliers could attend may be preferable.

## 5. Gemserv Update

Gemserv were not present on this Conference Call to provide an update.

J Gregory provided an assurance update.

- RMDS and Gemserv are working to get all new entrants into the Market that have been delayed as a result of the TIBCO Upgrade delay.

As soon as the TIBCO upgrade Go-Live date is agreed (which was announced at the Supplier Conference Call on 6<sup>th</sup> April 2016), RMDS will start to engage with Suppliers on IPT2 for the TIBCO piece that is cross jurisdictional.

## 6. MRSO Update

G Halligan advised that there was no MRSO update.

## 7. ESB Networks

J Bracken provided a TIBCO update.

- The TIBCO Project is moving along in line with the plan. The project is coming out of successful functional regression testing and moving into UAT on 7<sup>th</sup> April 2016.
- The number of defects is dropping. 31 rectified and ready for re-test. 6 are outstanding and in progress. Of those 6, 3 relate to one particular fix that is being worked on. 2 relate to two separate EMMA issues that are also being worked on. 1 other defect, on duplicate messages, is also being rectified.
- The Project is working to a Go-Live date of 5<sup>th</sup> August 2016.

### TIBCO Outage

S Melvin enquired about the TIBCO outage that happened over the weekend 1<sup>st</sup> – 3<sup>rd</sup> April. There was a power outage at the premises that houses the TIBCO infrastructure that lasted 12 hours. It impacted on TIBCO systems and market website etc. She enquired whether Capita has a backup generator or business continuity plan for such cases so that market systems would not be out for 12 hours?

J Bracken replied that ESBN has asked Capita the exact same questions. Capita has committed to provide ESBN with a full Report on this outage.

S Melvin added that it would be beneficial if this Report could be issued to Suppliers seeing as something as innocent as a power outage caused the market to be down for 12 hours and this is a very significant concern/issue.

J Bracken reported that he will share the findings of the Capita report with Suppliers.

### TIBCO Upgrade Go-Live date

K Sheridan reported that he wishes to raise a concern regarding the Go-Live date of 5<sup>th</sup> August 2016. This date presents a risk for Energia in relation to the billing of metering and customer data. Energia would propose delaying this date by one week.

J Gregory reported there is extensive engagement going on at the moment between the Project, ESBN, NIE Networks and Energia on this matter. Energia is currently the only Supplier that has an issue with this date (5<sup>th</sup> August 2016) and NIE Networks is doing what it can to discuss this with Energia and the options for that weekend.

She added to be mindful that the billing queries that Energia raised are relevant to all Suppliers. In the interest of the market other Suppliers have issues with the alternative date of 15<sup>th</sup> August 2016 as suggested by Energia. The Go-Live date is never going to satisfy 100% of the Suppliers. Ultimately, a decision will be made by CER and UR on the basis of "in the best interests of the whole market". At the moment the CER and UR are minded to the date of 5<sup>th</sup> August 2016. This has been communicated to Energia and discussions are continuing. The project doesn't want to engage in any further delays and agreeing a feasible cutover date is essential to meeting and planning towards that. The Projects appreciates Energia's concerns but the reality is that a date will have to be agreed and it is unlikely that all 20 Suppliers will identify it as an ideal date.

S Doolin reported that he would need to clarify but his understanding is that Electric Ireland would also favour a slight delay. It does have impacts on resource planning within Suppliers and Electric Ireland has had to consider those as well.

J Gregory reported that P Mallon has been engaging with Senior Management in Electric Ireland and Electric Ireland is on board for 5<sup>th</sup> August 2016. S Doolin replied that he was not aware of this and will need to discuss internally.

J Gregory added that the TIBCO Upgrade discussion and the discussion around the cutover date is not the appropriate Forum for this conversation. She added that this must be raised on the Supplier Conference Call which is happening at the same time as this meeting.

S Donnelly asked ESBN if it can guarantee that Suppliers will have all the billing data that they need to bill customers for the previous month over the weekend of 5<sup>th</sup> August 2016.

J Gregory reported that this is part of the Cut-over Planning. She added that it is a consideration for every Supplier that is undergoing billing at the beginning of the month and so a priority to consider during cutover planning. The cutover planning needs to be worked on in order to mitigate any risk to that week and this matter is currently with the TUP.

J Bracken reported that P Mallon is working with Energia on the implication of the date of 5<sup>th</sup> August 2016.

J Gregory added that if Suppliers have any questions on this matter then they should raise them at the Supplier Conference Call and/or notify the TUP Inbox as well.

S mac an Bhaird added the CER would mirror what J Gregory and J Bracken has stated. In respect of the engagement with Energia on this specific issue this Conference Call is not the appropriate forum to discuss this matter. However, the concerns from Suppliers are noted and suggested that Suppliers should engage with their counterparts at the correct forum which is the weekly Supplier Conference Call that takes place every Wednesday at 3pm.

#### **8. Retail Market Design Update**

J Gregory gave the Market Design Update:

##### **CoBLCR 013**

ESBN notified RMDs that CoBLCR 013 went live on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2016.

##### **Schema & Non Schema 2016**

There is a considerable piece of work being undertaken by ESBN and NIE Networks, CER and UR around planning. The output of this will provide more clarity around the Schema and Non-Schema Releases for 2016 and 2017.

#### **9. Notice Board: Planned Maintenance, Reminders from IGG etc.**

##### **Outage Dates:**

- There are no outages planned for April at this stage.

#### **10. AOB**

##### **Next IGG:**

- 4th May 2016 in Dublin.

S Doolin raised a concern regarding the length of time given to this meeting. As this meeting is 40 minutes over the allocated time of one hour he suggested that more time be given to this meeting.

D Walshe replied that this meeting is scheduled for one hour and previous meetings have finished early and it depends on the content and the topics discussed. It's very difficult to restrict the contributions from the MPs and this is a rare occasion that it has gone over the allotted time.

J Gregory added that RMDS is more than happy to restrict discussion and ensure an action is taken offline or dealt with via email. RMDS will aim to do this in future. She added that the objective of the Conference Call Forum is to ensure that all contributors have time to discuss items that are relevant to them as well as ensure actions are being dealt with between IGGs. She added it is often difficult to judge exactly how long a call will take as it is dictated by the issues individuals wish to raise.

P Stack and S mac an Bhaird added that the duration of this Conference Call Meeting can be reviewed if necessary