

IGG Conference Call Meeting Minutes

Date:	30 th September 2020	Time & Location	3pm - Conference Call
Chair:	Lisa Fahy, CRU		
Attendees:	Name	Location	
	Lindsay Sharpe, Alice Mooney, Catherine Keane	RMDS	
	Oisín O’Sullivan, Tamas Stirling, Emer Gerard	CRU	
	Alan Keegan, Siobhan Melvin, Emer Corcoran	ESBN	
	Sarah Fuller, Simon Fox-Mella	Gemserv	
	Jim Long	MRSO	
	Eoin McGurk, Gillian Kinsella	BGE	
	Colm O’Gormain	SSE	
	Daniel Michalowski	Glow Power	
	Alan Davidson, Jessica Gregory	Iberdrola	
	Mark Phelan	Electric Ireland	
	Jessica Gregory	Community Power	
	Antoin O’Lachtnain	Pinery	
	Andrew McKinnon	Flogas	
	Leslie Robinson	Bright Energy	
	Emer Horgan	Brookfield	
	Alan Reynolds	Panda Power	
Fergal Purcell	Arden Energy		
Donovan Sheridan, Caroline Connaughton	Prepaypower		
Apologies:			
Version Number	1.0		
Status			

Agenda:	
1.	General
2.	Actions from Previous Call
3.	New Conference Call Actions
4.	CRU Update
5.	Retail Market Design Update
6.	MRSO Update

7.	ESBN Update
8.	De-harmonisation Update
9.	Gemserv Update
10.	Notice Board Planned Maintenance, Reminders from IGG, etc.
11.	AOB

1 – General

L Fahy requested approval of the previous IGG Minutes of 2nd September 2020.
Minutes v2.0 deemed approved.

2. Actions – Previous Conference Call & IGG

L Sharpe provided the Action Item Update:

- **1 – Carried forward Action from the last IGG.**
- **2 – Actions logged at the last IGG.**

1137	Revenue Protection Workshop – RMDS to organise a Revenue Protection Workshop for early 2020 on behalf of ESBN		
Update for CC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ L Sharpe reported that RMDS had been holding out and was hoping that MPs might be able to meet face to face this year. She doesn't think that this is going to be a possibility, looking realistically at the Government restrictions and the 6/9-month plan. She will speak to the Revenue Protection Manager and come back via email or at the next IGG with a plan for the best way to hold the revenue protection workshop this year. 		
Discussion at CC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action to remain open. 		
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: RMDS	Status: Action Remains Open	Due Date: 04.11.2020

1141	Comms Technically Feasible (CTF) - Suppliers to respond to ESBN via RMDS with an email address to use for receiving the CTF file		
Update for CC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ L Sharpe reported that RMDS had asked Suppliers to respond with an email address to receive the CTF file on 31st December 2020. RMDS received a number of contacts but not from all Suppliers. She asked Suppliers who had not responded with an email address to respond with their email address if they wished to receive the file. 		
Discussion at CC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Action to remain open. 		
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: Suppliers	Status: Action Remains Open	Due Date: 04.11.2020

1142	Virtual Meetings - RMDS to investigate if virtual meetings could be used for forum Meetings in the future		
Update for CC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ L Sharpe reported that this action is for bi-monthly meetings and when MPs have slide decks to present and to look at better ways of doing this. It looks like MPs won't be meeting face to face for the rest of this year at a minimum. The next IGG in on 4th November. When RMDS is issuing out the details of the meeting, it will include details of how it plans to host the meeting. 		

Discussion at CC	▪ Action to remain open.		
Forum Logged: IGG	Assigned to: RMDS	Status: Action Remains Open	Due Date: 04.11.2020

3. Actions – New Conference Call Actions

No new Actions were logged at the Conference Call.

4. CRU Update

O O'Sullivan & E Gerrard provided the CRU update.

PO Box

O O'Sullivan reported that CRU's Customer Care Team has received a few queries about this. There is no cut-off point as such. CRU would like MPs to update the address on the new Smart Bills when they come in.

C O'Gormain asked if the no cut-off point means that CRU is not closing the PO Box and that it will remain open for the foreseeable future? If Suppliers continue to use the PO number will they not be in compliance with anything in terms of correspondence?

O O'Sullivan replied that it is for the foreseeable future. CRU prefers if Suppliers update to the new address especially on Smart Sills. Suppliers will not be non-compliant if they are still using the PO Box number.

Smart Bills/Approvals

O O'Sullivan reported that there has been a delay and the Smart Bills are being prioritised for approval at the moment. They will be approved once all the requirements have been met and the CRU Customer Care Team will be in contact with individual Suppliers on this matter.

Microgeneration Working Group Terms of Reference.

O O'Sullivan sought approval of the Terms of Reference for the Microgeneration Working Group which were issued to MPs. CRU welcomes the number of comments it received from MPs. One comment related to a working practice and CRU is not entirely sure of the relevance of the comment. Some other comments were regarding Governance. The Working Group will follow the structure of the IGG. In terms of the meetings and their frequency, they will be scheduled as required.

F Purcell reported that Arden Energy submitted comments to CRU. The first being that there is no definition of what microgeneration is in the Terms of Reference. The other comment was that there is no reference to WP14 in the Terms of Reference which deals with Data Aggregation and settlement for export data from existing import/export meters, which is basically any connection with an MEC of over 11 kilowatts is already included in WP14. As it is, the Terms of Reference are adding to the whole confusion around microgeneration and small-scale generation. Arden Energy hasn't received a response to these queries.

O O'Sullivan replied that as regards to the definition of microgeneration, that sits with the Department and is going to be consulted on later this year. With regard to the working practice, the details of this will be considered in the Working Group once it is underway.

J Gregory added that she supports what F Purcell has said especially in relation to the settlement procedure. She understands that as part of the Working Group, it is essential that we have something referenced in the Terms of Reference that the settlement mechanism will be agreed in the Working Group. Likewise, she also made the comment to CRU about the definition of microgeneration. There are a number of items that she feels the Working Group Terms of Reference are still short of.

L Fahy reported that the purpose of the Working Group is to figure out the settlement process for microgeneration to facilitate payment of a support mechanism by next June 2021. The Department is working on deciding what they consider microgeneration is in this context. The European legislation points to up to 50 kilowatts. This might give some indication as to where the Department might go. She is not sure whether defining the MEC of a connection point is going to fully impact or have any real impact on how we define a settlement process around how information is collected and managed with Suppliers. There is a resolution here in that we can all assume the definition is x, or we can progress on the basis that a settlement process should be applicable to generators that are defined as microgenerators. She apologised to F Purcell and stated that CRU didn't fully understand Arden Energy's comments they were making in relation to WP14. It seems that Arden Energy is saying that there is already a settlement process in place for connections that are 11 kilowatts or above. She asked if Arden wants CRU to include a reference so that it can consider any implications of that existing process?

F Purcell replied that this is it exactly. There is a process in place for meters with a MEC over 11 kilowatts and if the microgeneration paper is suggesting that the definition of microgeneration is going to be up to 50 kilowatts, you are overlapping with a settlement process already in place. There is a lack of coherence between different documents and it would be good to reference applicable documents in the Terms of Reference.

L Fahy replied that it would be useful to acknowledge that WP14 does exist. Unless ESNB say that CRU shouldn't do this, CRU might include this in the Final Terms of Reference that will be circulated. She can't see why CRU wouldn't acknowledge that something already exists and consider what the impact might be on it.

G Kinsella reported that there is a broader point here, Section 3 of the Terms of Reference refers to only the provision of export data to Suppliers. It doesn't actually clarify CRU's point that we are going to be looking for a settlement and an interim settlement solution. The scope is too narrow, but it is comforting to hear that CRU's explanation is closer that what BGE expected. This is not clear in the Terms of Reference. The other point is that it was useful to hear CRU say that it will follow the IGG Terms of Reference and the IGG protocols, but this is not mentioned in the Terms of Reference. This needs to be in there otherwise there is a lack of clarity about how this will actually work. The points that BGE has raised have been clarified at this meeting but it would like to see them reflected in the document itself.

L Fahy thanked MPs who provided feedback on the governance of Terms of Reference. CRU had felt that the governance was outlined in section 5.1 but if there is a need to say that this Working Group will operate in line with existing IGG governance structures, CRU will add this in.

On the other point and unfortunately, she is going to have to reiterate this a number of times over the next few months, the final settlement process is heavily contingent on what the Department defines as a support scheme. If this Working Group is trying to ensure that something can be delivered by June 2021, and in order for a Supplier to engage with the customer, to access the data, and to be able to process the data the way they might need to, that's why the scope of the work is written in the way that it is. If the Terms of Reference say that we are going to define the settlement process, but actually we are not able to, maybe because that Department will make the decision that will impact the work, or limits the options for the Working Group, that might be an issue. The scope as outlined is very much trying to address the fundamentals of what is required, collection of the data, location of the data and that is why it is written in the way that it is. From a CRU perspective, it is trying to manage the expectation here as well as making sure outcomes that are approved are actually deliverable and this is going to be the consistent message you will get from CRU throughout the time the Working Group is activated. Collectively we will all work towards defining a process that we can all understand and are comfortable with. She imagines it will get to a DR/MCR stage. The final gloss won't be put on it until the Department work is concluded also.

J Gregory reported that she completely gets what L Fahy is saying. She thinks it is critical that we call out

that one of the objectives of this Working Group is that some sort of a settlement process is agreed for the interim solution and this is not clear in the Terms of Reference. She completely gets the fact that the Department holds a lot of the strings here but ultimately, they will have to permit something, and this Working Group has to be able to convert that into a deliverable outcome. She suggests what you will be having is an MCR, but an equivalent working practice to WP14 or something like that for this segment of the market but we have to make sure this is clear in the Terms of Reference because there is no mention of it.

L Fahy reported that CRU will consider the wording and will define this a bit better under the objective. She is conscious that we can't start working until we agree them, she asked if Suppliers want CRU to take them away and have one more stab at them and re-circulate them or are they comfortable approving them just on the basis of what CRU said it would do.

A O'Lachtnain asked if the amendments can be taken as read and the changes will be made in the document and MPs approve them today.

L Fahy replied that she is happy to do this if other MPs are happy with this.

G Kinsella suggested that a slight variation might be that CRU circulates the updated Terms of Reference and unless it receives an objection by email then they are taken to be agreed.

A Keegan replied that ESNB would prefer to see updated wording.

L Fahy reported that CRU will take the Terms of Reference away and update them in line with the discussion at this meeting. She will endeavour to get them circulated tomorrow and CRU might do a quick turnaround of 4/5 working days and if it doesn't have any feedback it will take them as approved.

Annual Audit on Supplier Compliance 2020

E Gerrard gave an update on the Annual Audit on Supplier Compliance for 2020.

Refer to slide for details.

She reported that CRU has decided to take somewhat of an adjusted approach to the audit this year due to Covid-19 and the recognition of Suppliers' timelines for the rollout of Smart services. There will be no on-site audits held this year. Instead CRU will potentially organise a video call if it deems it necessary following responses it receives. CRU will contact all Suppliers shortly with information on scope and timelines.

5. Retail Market Design Update

L Sharpe gave the Market Design Update.

MCR1205 Application of the PSO to Commercial Storage

L Sharpe reported that this MCR was re-versioned to include the working practice.

L Sharpe asked for approval for the MCR.

MCR1205 approved.

DR1208 - Smart Metering – Default Day/Night/Peak/Bi-Monthly Reads

L Sharpe reported that RMDS received feedback from a couple of Suppliers in relation to the DR. She ran through the high-level feedback RMDS received and provided answers to the questions.

RMDS received feedback from one MP who was looking to get the following line removed from the next version of the DR or MCR: *“ESBN anticipate this requirement may cover interval export data and instrumentation/power quality data”*. RMDS and CRU are happy to remove the line from the DR/MCR.

From the second MP feedback RMDS received a couple of questions, the first being: will the user of the repository be optional for Suppliers? RMDS doesn't have an answer to that yet. RMDS has spoken to CRU on this. It will depend on a number of different things including the value of the investment when deciding on this. The second question is: will the data provided be of billable quality? The data format and repository has yet to be decided. The source of the data repository and the billing data will be the same.

The final question received was: “will the aggregated data for MCC01 Customers on Smart Meters continue to be provided to Suppliers”? The answer to this question is yes.

G Kinsella reported that BGE requested that particular sentence to be removed from the DR. Once the sentence is removed BGE is happy to approve the DR on that basis.

L Sharpe reported that RMDS will remove the line in the DR.

L Sharpe asked for approval for the DR.

DR1208 approved.

DR1209 - Annual Consumption for HH Sites

L Sharpe reported that this DR was issued to the market on 16th September 2020 for discussion. It is schema impacting so it will need to go to the ReMCoWG for approval. RMDS was conscious that the next ReMCoWG isn't until 4th November 2020 so wanted to issue the DR to MPs for discussion.

A Davidson reported that Iberdrola raised this DR. From Iberdrola's point of view, it is somewhat critical in terms of how it manages its energy strategy. His biggest concern about this is the timeline and he realises that it is challenging from a schema point of view. He is open to suggestions and alternatives but there is a criticality for this DR from Iberdrola's perspective.

J Gregory asked if it is worth ESNB assessing the DR based on the timelines to see whether they could, because they appeared to have reviewed it as they have with all DRs, propose a non-schema alternative because of the schema impact.

L Sharpe replied that she will take this back to the ESNB Smart Team who were looking at his DR to look at alternatives as well as the proposed solution.

E Corcoran added that she will also take this away to discuss with the ESNB Smart Team.

A Davidson asked what the process of the DR will be. Iberdrola brought this DR at this forum and asked what will happen now.

L Sharpe replied that the governance rules around DRs differ slightly depending on whether they are schema or non-schema impacting. If it is non-schema impacting, it can be decided within the IGG forums. Anything that is schema impacting needs to be approved at a ReMCoWG forum which comprises of all of the ROI and NI Suppliers. Nothing that impacts the schema can be approved without being at this forum and MPs only meet every two months for ReMCoWG meetings. The next ReMCoWG is on 4th November

2020. The process in general for a DR is that a party, whether an MP, ESN or CRU raises a DR. It gets approved at the appropriate forum and if it is approved it becomes an MCR. Further work is done on it and it gets impact assessed by all parties and further details can be added. If it is a schema impacting MCR, it will go forward into a prioritisation exercise. When the next schema release is due all of the schema impacting MCRs go forward and it is and decided as to what will be included in the next schema release.

A Davidson reported that even if it is discussed at the next ReMCoWG that is clearly only part of the process and it feels like the further down the track we go, the less likely it is to get something implemented in a meaningful timescale.

L Sharpe replied that RMDS will ask the ESN Smart Team to include that in their considerations.

Access Agreement

L Sharpe reported that RMDS has issued four versions of the Access Agreement which covers the existing extranet, SFTS and the new webservice which is coming in as part of v13.00.00. One MP has an outstanding query and asked if MPs are happy to approve the Access Agreement at this forum.

E McGurk reported that BGE is the MP with the one outstanding query and has asked if ESN has put any thought into their query or has any views on it.

E Corcoran replied that in relation to the query that BGE raised, ESN will put it out to the floor as to what BGE is proposing. In a nutshell, in the original Access Agreement there was a reference to the Law Society as being there for the dispute resolution. In one of the earlier drafts, a change was requested by BGE to ask CRU to be the arbitrator in dispute resolutions. ESN made that change and that was accepted by MPs. Now it seems that BGE is looking to reverse this and actually have the Law Society in place for the dispute process. ESN will be asking if any MPs have an issue with reversing back to the original process. It not then ESN will issue a draft 5 and seek approval for it.

E McGurk reported that he would like to clarify one point. BGE never asked for the Law Society to be replaced as the arbitrator in the agreement but suggested that there might be a role for CRU in arbitrating process. BGE would be much more comfortable with the Law Society being included in the agreement if it had to make a choice between them or the CRU.

E Corcoran apologised for the mix up. It was decided in this version to replace the Law Society with CRU because it was felt that a dual dispute process would cause issues and problems down the line. If other MPs are happy to agree to the removal of CRU from the agreement, then ESN can replace back in the Law Society in the agreement and issue draft 5. She is conscious that the next opportunity that we would have to get approval is at the next IGG in November which leaves us tight to get approval and signoff. ESN will have to have signed copies in place before the cutover weekend on 18th December 2020.

She asked if MPs could approve it today based on the fact that the version for approval will include the Law Society as the arbitrator. ESN will circulate the updated version.

E McGurk reported that if the text reverts to what it was in the first version of the agreement, BGE would be perfectly happy with that.

A O'Lachtnain asked if what we are talking about is that MPs apply to the Law Society for the appointment of an arbitrator not that the Law Society is the arbitrator?

E McGurk replied that he is correct.

ESN will issue out v5 of the Access Agreement with this change included and if Suppliers don't come back with any further comments before a set date then it will be taken as approved.

6. MRSO Update

J Long reported that there is no MRSO update.

7. ESB Networks

A Keegan & E Corcoran gave the ESBN update.

Covid-19 Activities

A Keegan reported that ESBN circulated a note to all MPs around the temporary restrictions introduced for Dublin and the suspension of indoor meter reading. ESBN received feedback from one MP on this. He thanked the MP for sending in the feedback. ESBN has responded to the MP. ESBN is continuing to monitor the guidance and advice published by the Government and the Health Authorities with regard to restrictions throughout the country.

Data Sharing Agreement

A Keegan reported that ESBN issued out counter-signed versions of the Data Sharing Agreement to all MPs last week. He thanked everyone for taking the time to get the signatures and send them in to ESBN which was tricky to do during the holiday period.

De-energised Sites

A Keegan reported that when a MPRN is de-energised it's EUF(s) should be automatically set to zero. It has come to ESBN's attention that there are approximately 1,482 MPRNs which are presently de-energised and have a non-zero usage factor value, of which approximately 771 still have a Supplier registered. This equates to approximately 0.03% of the total MPRN population. The issue was caused by a defect which occurred when a meter removal was processed in tandem with a de-energisation. The defect is now corrected. The result of this defect means that quantities included in Data Aggregation for settlement were overstated. DUoS Billing and Meter Reads provided to Suppliers were correct and unaffected by this. ESBN has begun to set the incorrect usage factors to zero and will engage with the impacted Suppliers directly by the end of this week.

L Fahy reported that there is a good bit of detail in the update. She encouraged Suppliers to get in touch with ESBN if they have any queries on it.

E Corcoran gave two updates from the Smart Project.

CTF File

E Corcoran reported that at the IPT Workshop which took place earlier today, a question was raised about the CTF file being shared. She confirmed with MPs that ESBN is planning to share a sample of the CTF File in advance of Cutover.

Batch scheduling Process for Sharing Market Messages

As part of the changes that have been made to accommodate the issuing of the new Smart metering interval Data MM343, which was due to be issued to Suppliers by 06:00. Following go-live there is going to be a delay in issuing the 300 series MMs or the validated non-interval readings schedule Market Messages. Instead of 06:00 ESNB is going to issue them at 06:45 which will facilitate the new MM343s which need to be issued to Suppliers by 06:00 as per the CRU request. ESNB will issue this detail to MPs in writing.

8. De-harmonisation Update

L Fahy and A Keegan reported that they have no update on De-harmonisation.

9. Gemserv Update

S Fox-Mella reported that there is no Gemserv update.

L Fahy reported that CRU is considering the v13.00.00 Report it received from Gemserv. There has been a delay due to the availability of the Director and CRU will get back to Gemserv soon.

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

L Sharpe reported that there are no outages planned for October as of yet.

There is an issue with the TIBCO Hub this morning, whereby Market Messages were slow on the HUB. ReMCoDS will issue an update on this as soon as it has one.

11. AOB

No items in AOB were raised.

Next Meetings:

- IGG 4th November 2020 (is due to take place in Belfast) – this meeting will probably be a Conference Call. Details will issue in due course.

Retail Market Design Service

39, Merrion Square East, Dublin D02 NP96. T +353-1-669 2410; info@rmdservice.com; www.rmdservice.com