






Contestability Working Group - Conf Call			
Subject: Contestability Working Group		Date: 01/04/22	Time: 15:00
Attendees:	Title	Representing	
Aidan Gunning	AG	EW	
Chris Kingston	CK	EW	
Kenny McPartland	KMP	UR	
Jody O'Boyle	JOB	UR	
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	LRQA	
Bernie Woods	BW	LRQA	
Colin Towers	CT	Glenelly	
Dave Thornton	DT	NIEN	
Apologies:			
Circulation: External			

Item	Main discussion points
1	<p>KMP- Welcomed the group to the meeting. Set out the agenda which ran through of the various topics for discussion document that was previously sent around the group. KMP handed over to DT to run through each area of discussion.</p> <p>DT- Currently ICPs are able to work under their own safety rules as long as they comply with the Lloyds register accreditation. However, now it is proposed ICPs will be working directly on the distribution system, in undertaking this activity, should ICPs fall under the NIEN safety rules?</p> <p>BW- In GB, ICPs still use their own safety rules when connecting onto the network, most operate on the model safety rules.</p> <p>BW- confirmed that model safety rules are equivalent to the DNO safety rules, with some DNOs using the model safety rules. These safety rules were developed through the ENA. Typically ICPs don't have the option to work under DNO safety rules in GB. However, the ICP safety rules would be aligned to the model safety rules.</p>

Item	Main discussion points
	<p>LRQA would assess the safety rules the ICPs are operating to (with some DNOs doing some random sampling). However, the process of accreditation would look at ICP's safety rules.</p> <p>CK – Suggested it might be useful for NIEN to meet with ENA (as they are members) and discussing the model version of safety rules, may act as a useful aid.</p> <p>NC- NIEN looked at the model safety rules a few years ago but made the decision to stick with their own safety rules and they would advise anyone to follow this route. NIEN felt that from a risk management point of view they wanted to stay with their own safety rules. If NIEN were to switch to model safety rules this would take quite a bit of time to do so and would be a big change to the organisation.</p> <p>AG- Electricity worx have no problem working under NIEN's safety rules.</p> <p>BW- LRQA need to ensure an ICP (in GB) have a competency certificate that they have issued to their employee, LRQA don't look for a DNO authorisation certificate. The competency certificate ensures the jointer has been assessed on their technical ability as well as their knowledge of the safety rules. If this was the case in NI, they would have to adapt the scheme document to consider this.</p> <p>NIEN currently use VODCA device to distinguish between high voltage and low voltage cables that look similar. Is this something the ICPs are aware of it?</p> <p>AG- Electricity worx are aware of this and have access to one.</p> <p>NC asked JOB if this information will be going out to all ICPs that will be working on or registered to the NI system. It is important that all ICPs that want to work on the system will also have access to the VODCA device. We need to ensure any change in schemes will be communicated to everyone. JOB confirms this to be correct.</p> <p>DT asked if we will need a wider consultation once proposed decisions are made. JOB- Yes, anything we come up with as part of the CWG, will have to be open and transparent.</p> <p>KMP- UR have reached out to registered in the past, it could be useful to reach out again to update and ensure all registered ICPs are aware of the work ongoing and any updates and again invite them to join the CWG.</p> <p>NW- there are 2 classifications for LV work, routine and non-routine. Non routine work is whereby ICPs would need to be guided by a senior authorised person. Is this something ICPs are aware of?</p>

Item	Main discussion points
	<p>AG- Electricity work know this and would have availability for SAPs to supervise this as required.</p> <p>NC- Need to make sure all ICPs understand this and would be able to adhere to this.</p> <p>DT- Asked about ICPs borrowing equipment in GB?</p> <p>BW- Not aware of this occurring in GB. If an ICP had forgotten equipment on site, it would suggest they would be prepared. However, if there was a contractual borrowing of equipment being lent out, it may be looked upon differently.</p> <p>BW will check this and get back to the CWG.</p> <p>Update* Since the CWG meeting BW has provided additional information- In GB DNO's do hire out specialist equipment, but this is only the likes of test prods specific to the DNO's switchgear. This is managed and controlled by the DNO's representative to their rules and procedures. The actual test equipment is not hired out, it is up to the ICP to procure test equipment in line with the DNO's approved equipment list.</p> <p>There are instances whereby DNOs in GB provide an LV identification service if required, generally at a cost. If there is any uncertainty as to identifying the LV cable then the ICP MUST liaise with the (I)DNO. In an extreme situation where all cables are PILC and unarmoured (e.g. Southport) and the LV cable cannot be 100% identified by other means, then all cables should be made DEAD and the assumed LV cable spiked.</p> <p>DT – The next topic looks at “Authorisation, supervision, training and approved tools”. DT opened the floor for discussion.</p> <p>NW- Asked LRQA how they ensure ICPs have adequate live working experience. BW stated that LRQA look at CVs, where they have worked previously, their training courses and how they are verified, do they have DNO authorisation already?</p> <p>Access to live equipment – NIEN external solicitors are looking at this. DT asks what has to be known/aware of before ICP goes and does LV final joint.</p> <p>BW- ICP have to apply for point of connection, put forward a design to the DNO. The DNO will approve this or not based on their process. Some organisations have a scope to determine their own point of connection in GB, but in some cases the DNO will determine the point of connection.</p> <p>NC- In NI the point of connection is determined by NIEN. In some cases the ICP can ask for a slightly amended location which will be part of the design review.</p>

Item	Main discussion points
	<p>DT- What permission do ICP actually energise the final connection?</p> <p>BW- ICP have to do a daily/weekly whereabouts, they will have to send info in as to when works are being carried out etc. This will ensure the DNO is happening on the network. There has to be formal permission/agreement in place with the DNO before that the final connection is made by the ICP.</p> <p>JOB- There maybe crossover with ESQCR regulations (para 26), whereby consent is needed from DNO. Would need to check this to ensure this is at design and connection stage.</p> <p>DT- NIEN will be updating the work plan in the coming week to look for standardising some of the tasks.</p> <p>KMP- Thanked the CWG, next steps are for UR to set up the next CWG in a months' time to continue looking at the various work plan activities with the group. In the interim, NIEN and UR will meet to discuss the agenda/activities to discuss with the CWG at the next meeting</p>
2	<p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NIEN to update the work plan - NIEN/UR to discuss the activities to discuss at next CWG and circulate amongst the group - UR to set up next CWG meeting - UR to discuss best way to ensure all registered ICPs are aware of the ongoing works
3	<p>Attachments</p> <div>  SRI-013ATT1 issue 2.pdf  SRG-3.pdf  Topics for discussion - final.docx  SRI-013ATT2.pdf </div>