


CWG Meeting			
Subject: CWG Meeting		Date: 13/01/22	Time: 13:00
Attendees:	Title	Representing	
Kenny McPartland	KMP	UR	
Jody O'Boyle	JOB	UR	
Luke Matchett	LM	UR	
Nigel Crawford	NC	NIEN	
Dave Thornton	DT	NIEN	
Michael Boyle	MB	NIEN	
Nigel Watkin	NW	NIEN	
Ciaran Maginn	CMG	SONI	
Sarah Friedel	SF	SONI	
Alastair Ditty	AD	SONI	
Michael Proctor	MP	LRQA	
Karl Miller	KM	LRQA	
Apologies:			
Circulation:			

Item	Main discussion points
1	<p>1. Comments on minutes of previous meeting:</p> <p>KMP – No further comments, apart from those suggestions made already by NIEN.</p> <p>2. Actions from previous meeting:</p> <p>In relation to the Distribution Guidelines approval, AD states SONI just need to get a manager sign off. AD to check up on this.</p> <p>3. NERS NI Document & SONI Proposal</p> <p>KMP has inputted SONI's comments into the NERS Document re insurance liability increasing to £10M for Transmission contestable works</p> <p>KMP asks if there is anything to add on top of the comments. AD says what is there sums it up, transmission assets are at a higher value. Nothing more to say beyond what's in the comment.</p> <p>NC says that is a transmission request and the TOR of the group covers distribution. AD says it is just to flag this and highlight transmission.</p>

Item	Main discussion points
	<p>DT states the focus of this group is LV final connections therefore it is fine to note SONI's views, but it is important to get LV over the line then afterwards pick up transmission. No change to documentation now and goal is to get ICPs accredited for LV final connections. Group agreed with this proposal.</p> <p>DT asks why insurance is in the document? It seems out of place to him.</p> <p>No one in group to answer. No ICP representation to answer.</p> <p>DT – One of the risks is if insurance is expensive, ICPs will say they won't take out the insurance if they don't have any work. Would LRQA say they will lose their accreditation?</p> <p>KM – This appeared in NERS advisory document about 8 years ago and if it is in the NERS Requirement document then and a client doesn't have this, then yes, LRQA would have to raise it as a problem. This has never been raised as an issue across any NERS schemes in GB (for comparison it is £5 million at distribution).</p> <p>DT – This wouldn't have been tested in GB as there is no transmission contestability in GB.</p> <p>KM- Would only include this if it is relevant to what this document is trying to achieve.</p> <p>The group agree that this document related to the expansion of LV and therefore the comment should be taken out and no amendments are needed.</p> <p>Comment on design scopes: AD states it is just to flag there will be difference between distribution and transmission.</p> <p>DT - NIEN and SONI need to sit down with LRQA and discuss this. NIE Networks and SONI are planning a series of workshops to discuss Transmission Contestability and it will be discussed there</p> <p>The document can be published to reflect distribution and transmission amendments may be made moving forward.</p> <p>DT states the next step is to get the NERS document published. DT – If the document is now finalised it can now be published. LRQA can alert ICPs in NI of new NERS document and to apply for accreditation. We don't need to wait for transmission updates.</p> <p>KMP asks if everyone is content with the document so it can be published. It can be changed in the future to reflect future transmission updates. LRQA will publish the document and give message to ICPs. The UR will go out with the same message and publish a note on the website. It is important the UR and LRQA go out with the same message. UR will draft a message and discuss this with LRQA, and both will publish it following internal approvals. MP – Agreement from LRQA.</p>

Item	Main discussion points
	<p>MP asks if KMP will remove the transmission comments and then send the fully finished document. He will then call to have a quick discussion to plan next steps. KMP will remove the comments and send the document around the group, and they can discuss the next steps.</p> <p>NC Any ICPs currently accredited in NI and in GB will need to go through same process</p> <p>NC asks if any ICPs have shown an interest yet. MP – Not yet but it's not been published yet. Notes there are no ICPs on the call, so they seem happy to let the group work on issuing the document.</p> <p>4. Project Plan</p> <p>DT: The main activity now is 24 (ICPs apply for and gain partial accreditation) which runs out 21st February. Have got meetings in to consider where we are with ICP accreditation and whether we will go live. Working up towards a target go-live date of 6th March.</p> <p>Does this reflect everyone's understanding of last meeting?</p> <p>KMP – The start date of 12/01 will need to be pushed out until the message is published by UR and LRQA. NC – Suggests we should keep the end date.</p> <p>KMP –Asks about the length of time for an ICP to achieve accreditation would typically be?</p> <p>MP – ICPs are quite experienced, and you would expect them to have everything in place. However, it is a case-by-case basis and impossible to say how long partial accreditation will take.</p> <p>DT states we cannot run activity for months and months.</p> <p>MP – Suggests once the document has been published and ICPs have been told, then that effectively is already go-live.</p> <p>DT – Disagrees, as NIE Networks can't put out an LV contestable connection offer until ICPs have achieved partial accreditation. DT states what we are calling go-live is when we can put out contestable offers. KMP – Cannot say we have gone live until partial accreditation is achieved by at least 1 ICP.</p> <p>KMP states activity 24 (ICPs apply for and gain partial accreditation) is the scope of what we can do at the moment as a CWG. All we can do now is to get the document published and hopefully then ICPs will request and gain partial accreditation and we can go-live.</p> <p>NC asks if the UR have had any interaction or interest from ICPs. KMP – No.</p>

Item	Main discussion points
	<p>KMP states we can discuss the issue of a lack of movement in ICP(s) achieving partial accreditation if it arises, but we can only do that after publishing the NERs document.</p> <p>5. UR Update:</p> <p>Plan to go to board in February to provide an update of progress.</p> <p>KM - important we have some sort of mechanism to keep an eye on it following publishing of the message to ensure it doesn't die. This is only needed if no ICPs come forward for partial accreditation of the new scope once the NERs is published. There needs to be some sort of forum to keep this alive. DT states that this is a fair point.</p> <p>JOB suggests there could be a standing item update at RGLG to ensure it doesn't drop off. The group agree this could be a possibility.</p>
2.	<p>Actions</p> <p>KMP to remove SONI comments and circulate the final NERS document.</p> <p>KMP to contact LRQA next week regarding NERs publication and updating ICPs.</p> <p>Ur to circulate minutes with the group.</p> <p>AD to check up on SONI signing off on the Distribution Contestability Guidelines.</p> <p>UR will draft a message and discuss this with LRQA, and both will publish it following internal approvals</p>
3	<p>Attachments</p>