



Contestability Working Group - MS Teams Call		 UTILITY REGULATOR ELECTRICITY GAS WATER	
Subject: Contestability Working Group		Date: 28/02/22	Time: 3pm
Attendees:	Title	Representing	
Aidan Gunning	AG	EW	
Chris Kingston	CK	EW	
Kenny McPartland	KMP	UR	
Jody O'Boyle	JOB	UR	
Roisin McLaughlin	RML	UR	
Sinead Ferris	SF	NIEN	
Nigel Crawford	NC	NIEN	
Carl Hashim	CH	NIEN	
Nigel Watkin	NW	NIEN	
Graham Caldwell	GC	NIEN	
Michael Boyle	MB	NIEN	
Nicola McMahon	NMM	SONI	
Karl Miller	KM	Lloyd's Register	
Colin Towers	CT	Glenelly	
Killian Halpin	KH	RenewableNI	
Dave Thornton	DT	NIEN	
Apologies:			
Circulation: External			

Item	Main discussion points
1	<p>Agenda</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Welcome and recap of work since last CWG (UR) 2. Update from NIE Networks on project plan (NIEN) 3. Feedback on plan from CWG (All) 4. Discussion on further requirements in readiness for go live (All) <p>-----</p> <p>KMP – Welcomed the group and recapped the work that has occurred since previous CWG meeting. NIEN have been working on various elements to contestability (legalities, safety measures, documentation updates etc). Dave Thornton (NIEN) and Michael Boyle (NIEN) are welcomed to the group as new members.</p> <p>DT- Talked through NIEN's presentation on an update on contestability- There are implications of the expansion of contestability in NI, such as ICPs being allowed to carry out works on the distribution system for the first time, including working on live equipment.</p>

Item	Main discussion points
	<p>Although NIEN staff and contractors are working on the distribution system now, consideration is needed on various matters, such as safety management, legal requirements, accreditation and documentation.</p> <p>NIEN stated that ICPs work under their own safety rules when installing the contestable assets but when ICPs are at the point of connection to the existing distribution system and energising contestable works, NIE expect at this point work is done under NIEN’s safety rules.</p> <p>DT walked the CWG through the project plan – It follows the approach set out in UR’s Next steps paper. The plan will be a live document which will be updated. There are benefits to merging tasks across the 3 phases to reduce timescales through efficiencies.</p> <p>NIEN to date have appointed external solicitors, who have begun working on various tasks. NIEN are currently looking at safety management systems, readiness for energisation and authorisation of personnel. Finally, NIEN have begun working on a review of documentation and identifying what needs updated or newly created.</p> <p>CK – Electricityworx support the idea of merging tasks as there is duplication in the plan.</p> <p>DT – Contestability in GB took longer to establish, as 14 DNO’s were involved, thus difficult to get everyone to agree. Big advantage in NI with 1 DNO and we can take advantage of the work already done in GB.</p> <p>DT- Pointed out that if we look to merge various tasks of the 3 phases, this may lead to a later ‘go live’ date for Phase 1 (Overhead connections). DT asked the group for thoughts.</p> <p>AG- Stated there could be a lot of synergies between the first 2 phases, could potentially push back the date of phase 3 (Plant).</p> <p>DT – Agreed, a lot more synergies between phase 1 and 2 than phase 3. This is something we can consider.</p> <p>KH- Felt we should aim combining the synergies of the relevant phases. KH noted that it may be an advantage to only those with overheads on their contestable line. There might be a variety of different scopes in one particular connection and they would require one document.</p> <p>KH asked if ICPs are allowed to work on live equipment, is there scope for ICPs to work on reinforcements?</p>

Item	Main discussion points
	<p>SF – The scope is limited to that which is identified in the Next Steps paper, which looks solely at low voltage final connections, this wouldn't cover reinforcements.</p> <p>KM- asked in terms of timing of merging scopes of different phases, is there any issues involved of shifting end dates?</p> <p>SF – From a practical perspective (e.g. when looking at legal tasks) merging tasks of different scopes appears to be a sensible option to look at.</p> <p>KH – Stated there is various opportunities to identify efficiencies within documentation. NIEN will be looking for opportunities to make the process more efficient but will run it past the group and take on board any feedback.</p> <p>DT- Took the group through the work plan with the CWG. This is a working document that will be updated and improved upon with more tasks being done in parallel which will hopefully bring forward the end date.</p> <p>Various business process tasks that need to be looked at. For example;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in GB live jointing trials were done, we need to discuss if we want to do that in NI. • Interactions between NIEN and ICPs. <p>DT also talked the group through documentation and legal requirement tasks identified in the plan.</p> <p>KM- NERS documentation in GB is already written, a lot of this is common and things a can be sped up for the NI process.</p> <p>KMP- Indicated that moving forward it would be useful to continue to get suggestions and feedback from the group. KMP asked the group their thoughts on continuing to have further meetings as the tasks on the work plan progress.</p> <p>The group agreed that this should be a collaborative approach. It is a decided that we aim for monthly meetings for the time being (next meeting will be aimed for end of March). UR and NIEN to catch up before this to discuss talking points for the next group meeting. These talking points to be sent around the group before the next meeting.</p>
2	<p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - UR to set up a meeting for end of March - In advance of this meeting UR/NIEN to meet and discuss talking points. UR to send talking points around the group before next meeting.
3	<p>Attachments</p>

Item	Main discussion points
	 NIEN Presentation V2.pptx