



Contestability Working Group - Conf Call			
Subject: Contestability Working Group		Date: 20/07/22	Time: 15:00
Attendees:	Title	Representing	
Aidan Gunning	AG	EW	
Kenny McPartland	KMP	UR	
Jody O'Boyle	JOB	UR	
Michael Boyle	MB	NIEN	
Dave Thornton	DT	NIEN	
Emmet Herron	EH	RNI	
Apologies:			
Circulation: External			

Item	Main discussion points
1	<p>KMP- Welcomed the group to the meeting. EH is welcomed as a new member representing RNI.</p> <p>KMP shares the agenda (attached below) and hands over to DT to begin.</p> <p><u>Feedback to Routine and Non Routine work</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DT highlights that in Junes CWG a proposed decision was taken that non routine work should remain not contestable and asked the group if there was any feedback on this? The CWG were content with this proposed decision.</li> <li>- KMP reiterated that these are not formal decisions, but proposed, a direction of intent.</li> </ul> <p><u>Feedback on the application of ICP Safety Rules</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DT highlighted the proposed decision from June's CWG that ICPs would be using their own safety rules going for these proposed contestable works that are being established for LV final connections.</li> <li>- The group did not object to this proposal.</li> </ul> <p><u>Comparison of ICP's safety rules with NIEN's safety rules</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No one from LRQA on the call. NIEN would like a comparison done between ICP's safety rules and NIEN's to identify any issues that may prevent an ICP from carrying out the contestable works. Hoping LRQA could pick up this work.</li> </ul>

Item	Main discussion points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- KMP to set up a meeting with NIEN (Nigel Crawford) and LRQA separately.</li> </ul> <p><u>Go live Criteria</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NIEN working on 'Go Live Criteria' document, this identifies all the essential criteria that must be in place before the contestable works for LV final connections will become live.</li> <li>- NIEN intend on sending a draft to UR to circulate to the CWG.</li> </ul> <p><u>Access Agreement update</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Further work has occurred internally in NIEN and is progressing well</li> <li>- This a legal framework agreement that ICPs will enter into, there will be site specific documents for ICPs in relation to the final connections works in each project.</li> <li>- JOB asks if ESQCR regulations has been taken into consideration, for example does the access agreement cover the handing over of NIEN's responsibilities (as identified in the ESQCR) to ICP's/3<sup>rd</sup> parties.</li> <li>- MB – don't think NIEN are handing over any responsibility, they are just providing ICP with access to the network.</li> <li>- NIEN to take this away and consider/review this.</li> <li>- *Following from this meeting NIEN have reviewed at the ESQCR Regs Part 7 (Supplies to Installations and to other Networks) and are satisfied they are in compliance and will remain so on expansion of contestability.</li> </ul>
2	<p><b>Actions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UR to set up meeting on safety rules comparison</li> <li>- UR to organise next CWG meeting</li> <li>- NIEN to review and consider ESQCR in relation to access agreements (complete)</li> </ul>
3	<p><b>Attachments</b></p> <div data-bbox="406 1563 459 1624">  </div> <p>Proposed Agenda.pdf</p>