

## Minutes of UR Contestability Working Group (CWG) - Meeting 3

<b>Location</b>	<b>Date</b>
SONI Offices, Belfast	12 <sup>th</sup> February 2015

**Attendance:**

Jody O'Boyle (JO'B) – UR	Billy Graham (BG)
Ronan McKeown (RMK) – UR	Gorman Hagan (GH)
Nigel Crawford (NC) – NIE	Iain Wright (IW)
Malcolm Robinson (MR) -NIE	Bob Weaver (BW)
Eimear Watson (EW) – SONI	Andrew Prinsloo (AP)
Stewart Hall (SH)	

**Apologies:**

Tanya Hedley (TH) - UR
Mervyn Adams (MA)

**Copies:**

--	--

	<i>Responsibility - Action Items</i>
<b>1. Previous Minutes</b>	
The Minutes from Meeting 2 were approved as being accurate and passed to be published.	Noted
<b>2. Introductions</b>	
JO'B chaired the meeting in TH's absence. This was the first meeting SH had been able to attend so round the table introductions were completed.	Noted
<b>3. Matters Arising from Previous Actions</b>	
<p>JO'B confirmed Action 4 from Meeting 1 and Actions 2 and 4 from meeting 2 were now complete.</p> <p>AP was asked if there had been any response back from Lloyds regarding his Action from Meeting 2 to obtain costs for ICP accreditation. AP advised no response has yet been received. JO'B suggested AP provide the UR with Lloyds contact details and the UR would seek the costs from Lloyds directly.</p> <p>UR confirmed that it was the intention that competitive connections would probably be enacted for all types of new connection works and at all voltages.</p> <p>Action 1 - Lloyds Accreditation contact details to be provided to UR</p>	AP
<b>4. Workflows Discussion</b>	
<p>EW had previously circulated comments on all WF's and was asked to take the group through the comments made.</p> <p>On <b>WF1</b> regarding comparison of ICP vs NIE/SONI there was an extended discussion around the table with various views on the advantages and disadvantages of requiring accredited ICP status to carry out contestable work in NI.</p> <p>BG said he can see the benefit/need for having accredited ICP in small scale generation connections who would be responsible for design and build the contestable aspect of the connection.</p> <p>MR said NIE was still considering the benefits of ICP's but they recognise additional resources would be required on the part of the DNO if no accreditation was required. This is because NIE would need to be more engaged in the interactions</p>	Noted

**Responsibility -  
Action Items**

with the contestable contractor during all stages of the process.  
GH pointed out that the idea behind contestability is to introduce competition in the connections market and the high costs of over £100k to get accredited may rule out a lot of local companies considering this work due to the small marketplace in Northern Ireland. JO'B said his own view at this stage would be there will be some form of accreditation in place but after listening to the points raised he wouldn't rule out considering a separate NI version.  
BW highlighted that there could be issues around NIE and SONI being involved in establishing the ICP accreditation framework in NI.  
AP provided the cost for accreditation that his own company has just paid. For partial accreditation up to 132kV the cost is £14k and full accreditation is £28k up to 132kV. The previous figure of £100k he had mentioned was the potential costs involved in starting from a new company perspective and included the man hours to establish working practices to align with GB policies. AP stated any company already established and operating in the UK may already have almost all it will require to meet the accreditation specs.

BW confirmed that any accreditation scheme adopted (or not adopted) must provide clarity and security to developers, ICP's and funders such that works undertaken by the ICP or contractor must be capable of being built out and finally adopted in a structured and commercial manner. It was noted that any subsequent disputes would likely end up with the Regulator for resolution and determination.

The discussion around WF1 dominated the meeting and all agreed this aspect along with a final definition on what is contestable and what isn't are what the work group needs to resolve before anything else. With the discussions around WF1 being so drawn out, the other WF's were not discussed specifically but rather were covered under open discussion.

Noted

**5. General Discussion**

BG asked the question what the next step is. He restated his view that small scale jobs being connected using an accredited ICP is likely, but a decision was still required regarding large scale jobs being carried out by an accredited ICP or will NI follow the Rol model. He added the decision should be based on the option that best promotes competition.

JO'B said the UR has taken all the views on board and will consider them along with the responses to the consultation before making a decision on the ICP vs Rol model.

IW raised a query asking if it would be possible to swap the term ICP to something different as referring to contractors delivering contestable works as an ICP inferred the decision on accreditation had already been made. The alternative example IW presented was "sufficiently experienced contractor".

There was discussion around pre-commissioning, commissioning and communications, and if these would be contestable items. In Rol commissioning is non-contestable whereas in GB the DNO is only responsible to witness the commissioning works being carried out by the ICP. GH stated in his view the commissioning and communications, up to and including the RTU works should be deemed as contestable.

Noted

**6. Next Steps**

BG suggested the working group begin to start doing work on the documents listed in the Consultation paper, but RMK pointed out that because the consultation response period was still open, it would be premature to begin works on the

	<i>Responsibility - Action Items</i>
<p>documents before all the responses had been received.</p> <p>AP said his company had commissioned a GB DNO connections process map showing detail from beginning to end including the various policies and legislative requirements. He offered to forward this onto NIE.</p> <p>AP suggested WPD as a good benchmark with regards to the engineering specifications they have published. JO'B said the UR would circulate a link to example specifications on other GB DNO's.</p> <p>Action 2 – Forward GB DNO connections process map to NIE</p> <p>Action 3 – Circulate links to GB DNO published engineering specification</p>	<p>AP</p> <p>JO'B</p>

### Actions Summary From Meeting 1 on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2015

Action Number	Section	Action	Responsible	Required By
1	Minutes	NIE to issue draft and agreed pdf. format of minutes for all meeting associated with this topic.	NC	Completed
2	Terms of Reference	Following some discussion it was agreed that UR would amend the TOR and circulate to the working group.	RMK	Complete
3	CMG Workstreams	Named individuals to complete initial assessment and circulate	AP, BG, EW, BW	Complete
4	Dates for meeting	UR to suggest meeting for next 6 months for diaries	RMK	Complete

### Actions Summary From Meeting 2 on 28<sup>th</sup> January 2015

Action Number	Section	Action	Responsible	Required By
1	Previous Minutes	Amend Minutes from meeting 1 to include the point raised concerning NIE having ISO 9001 accreditation.	MR	Complete
2	WF1 Update	The group will make comment on all WF's within the next 5 days.	ALL	Complete
3	WF2 Update	Details of CDM changes to be circulated round the group	MR	Complete
4	AOB	TOR to be published on UR Website	TH	Complete
5	AOB	Provide an indication of costs from Lloyds for getting ICP accreditation	AP	Requested No Response

### Actions Summary From Meeting 3 on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2015

Action Number	Section	Action	Responsible	Required By
1	Matters Arising	Lloyds Accreditation contact details to be provided to UR	AP	ASAP
2	Next Steps	Forward GB DNO connections process map to NIE	AP	ASAP
3	Next Steps	Circulate links to GB DNO published engineering specification	JO'B	ASAP