CWG Meeting Subject: CWG Meeting		Utility Regulator ELECTRICITY GAS WATER	
		Date: 15/12/22	Time: 15:00
Attendees:	Title		Representing
Kenny McPartland	KMP		UR
Luke Matchett	LM		UR
Nigel Crawford	NC		NIEN
Dave Thornton	DT		NIEN
Michael Boyle	MB		NIEN
Nigel Watkin	NW		NIEN
Ciaran Maginn	CMG		NIEN
Nichola McMahon	NMM		SONI
Chris Kingston	CK		Electricty Works
Michael Proctor	MP		LRQA
Apologies:			_ I
Circulation:			

Item	Main discussion points		
	1. Comments on minutes of 25 November meeting:		
		DT – Walked through minutes, no additional comments beyond those provided by NIEN and the changes of the minutes were approved	
	2.	NERS NI document:	
		DT – Had thought LRQA had would be providing any feedback on the document in this meeting.	
1		KMP – Asks LRQA if they are happy with suggested changes?	
		MP – Happy with it, if there are no comments, they are content to progress.	
		DT – Believes 'commissioning' term should be removed as it is not true that all work to connect the assets will be undertaken by NIEN as suggested. NERS document does not give a true definition of what the term means.	
		DT - When it is an LV connection and the ICP makes the final connection, the ICP does the commissioning tests. In HV cases, NIEN completes the commissioning tests.	

Item Main discussion points KMP – Would there be a risk of removing the term and is it contained in GB NERS? DT – 'Commissioning' is not in the latest GB version. Not really a definition of commissioning but more of an explanation of how commissioning is KMP reiterated the current definition in NI. DT – This is true but not a true definition of commissioning. KMP asked for any objections to removing the term. No objections from the group. KMP – Markups from LRQA will need to be sent around the group. KMP will send it around and responses will be due back on 6th Jan 23 with a CWG to follow. DT thought there was also an agreement that LRQA would circulate it to all accredited ICPs in NI. MP - Belief was that once it was signed off by the working group then it could be sent out. KMP asked a clarification question, referred to additional annex at the bottom of the NERS document which referenced sub-station layouts. Asked if these would fall under plant 'connections'? NC – Sub Station is completely different to plant and therefore out of scope for LV final connections. 3. Feedback on Distribution Guidelines: DT asked for any received comments. KMP – None received. Would be interested to hear if there is feedback from ICPs on the call in relation to the new flowcharts. CK – Content with charts. It is what they expected to see on the whole and similar to the GB process. 4. Adoption Agreements: DT – Two adoption agreements were tabled (one where the ICP undertakes the final connection and one where NIEN does the final connection). DT covered NIEN final connection adoption agreement first-

Item Main discussion points Clarifies the ICP is responsible for performing pre-commissioning tests and NIEN will perform commissioning tests. Added 'or during commissioning tests' to section 3.6 ICP final connection adoption agreement: In section 3, it clarifies the ICP is responsible for performing precommissioning and commissioning tests. IN 3.6 if any major defects are found at the final connection/commissioning stage, the customer counterparties must immediately notify NIEN who will disconnect the assets, if reasonably practical, to allow the ICP to rectify any major defects. 'Final Contestable works' and 'Low Voltage' definitions added. KMP asked if these 2 documents can go out with the NERS document for comments. DT – Yes. 5. Project plan: DT: The plan highlights 6th February target date for go-live. Should have a meeting the week before to consider the go-live decision. Key factor is whether there are ICPs that have gained partial accreditation. Must have 1 or more at that meeting with partial accreditation to go ahead. If we decide to go ahead, there should be an announcement from the UR that we are going live. NC asks if we are certain we are going to be ready to issue the NERS document on time. KMP – Reiterates the importance of giving the CWG the opportunity to comment on the NERS. Can now be sent out for comment following the circulation of minutes as we know LRQA are content. Maybe wise to push publication of NERS to the start of January to give people time to consider NERS and adoption agreement docs, considering Christmas holidays. NC – Maybe need a meeting after the publication of the NERS document in early January 23 to review comments. KMP – Agreed. DT – Asks if the time is long enough to get some ICPs partially accredited.

CK – Electricity works won't be ready and won't be applying within those

n N p	urrent timescales. CK unsure when Electricity Works will be applying. Will eed a conversation to decide when to apply. IC – There is maybe a decision to make in the new year in relation to the ossibility of going live. Ultimately, we cannot go-live without an ICP pplying.
р	ossibility of going live. Ultimately, we cannot go-live without an ICP
D	T – The go-live date may need to be moved back 4 weeks to early March.
6. U	JR update:
	When LRQA and the UR are announcing the scopes are open, it is important to have a similar message.
reardii could s	asks if there is anything needed from SONI to indicate their approvaling the Contestability Guidelines. DT – If they are happy to do it, then they say they've reviewed it and are happy with it. NC – It would be helpful to SONI's support with a short line of approval.
Action	is
	ne of Friday 6 th January 23 for comments and feedback on the minutes, o adoption agreements and the NERS document.
Update 2.	e the project plan with additional steps.
	o send a short line of approval re the Contestability Guidelines.
Aim fo	or the next meeting the week commencing the 9 th January 23.
Attach	ments
3 -	NIEN & ICP Adoption Agreements Draft NERS document