





CWG Meeting			
Subject: Contestability		Date: 24/10/22	Time: 10:00
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	NEIN	
Nigel Watkin	NW	NIEN	
Sarah Friedel	SF	SONI	
Nichola McMahon	NMM	SONI	
Michael Proctor	MP	LRQA	
Emmet Heron	EH	RNI	
Apologies:			
Circulation:			

Item	Main discussion points
1	<p><b>1. Framework Network Access Agreement – Final Draft:</b></p> <p>NIE Networks is proposing a 2 stage process where ICPs initially enter into a framework network access agreement which lasts until termination, then for specific connections they enter into a network specific access agreement. NIE Networks provided copies of these Agreements and a Daily Whereabouts Register (Weekly report that specifies daily whereabouts, which would be required to be submitted in advance).</p> <p>During the meeting NIE Networks highlighted some sections in the Framework Network Access Agreement - sections 4, 5, 7 and 12.1.f. However, ICPs should review the entire document themselves and provide comments ASAP as NIE Networks is at the final stages of completing the document.</p> <p>NIE Networks believes it is a comprehensive document but would appreciate feedback from users. It was outlined that extension of contestability cannot go live until ICPs enter into a framework network access agreement.</p> <p><b>2. Network Specific Access Agreement</b></p>

Item	Main discussion points
	<p>Applications must be submitted 3 weeks in advance of the date the ICP wants access to the distribution system to give NIEN an opportunity to check everything is in place.</p> <p>There is a proposed access completion date and time for the final connection works. MB states that larger jobs can take place over a number of days but it is expected that for the majority of jobs, the final connection works will be started and finished on the same day. This agreement falls off after the specified date and time. MB states that new agreement forms will need to be applied for after the date and time if the final connection works have not been completed.</p> <p>JOB asks if something stops the work from happening on the day, will ICPs need to apply again. MB says NIE Networks will try to accommodate but more likely a new submission is needed. JOB asks if they need to wait a further 3 weeks. MB states likely not but will be undertaken pragmatically.</p> <p>DT makes reference to clause 12.1.d and e. This clause states unexpected circumstances could mean that NIEN could suspend work and will check if a new request would be needed. Potential for NIEN to unsuspend works to be explored further by NIEN to see if this is feasible.</p> <p><b>3. Weekly Whereabouts Register</b></p> <p>DT asks MB if there is already a register to be submitted. MB – yes there is.</p> <p>NC – the purpose is so NIE N have a knowledge of work being undertaken by ICPs for example if a fault comes in.</p> <p>JOB states it can be sent to ICPs for additional comments by the end of the week following the meeting.</p> <p><b>4. Adoption Agreement Update</b></p> <p>NIE Networks legal is currently considering two options –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Two separate adoption agreements (one where NIEN does the final connection and one where ICPs do the final connection), and</li> <li>2. A single adoption agreement covering both situations.</li> </ol> <p><b>5. Guidelines</b></p> <p>The distribution connection flowchart has been updated to include additional detail and will be circulated soon.</p> <p><b>6. Statement of Connection Charges</b></p>

Item	Main discussion points
	<p>Recent submission approved by UR. Capable of being effective from 18 November at the earliest.</p> <p><b>7. Updated Project Plan</b></p> <p>Progress marked-up in timelines.</p> <p>DT asks KMP if any feedback came in for phase 3 being delayed to gain experience from phases 1 and 2. There has been no feedback from CWG. KMP and JOB say if NIEN feel more comfortable taking this approach they can.</p> <p>Given that there are activities which still need to be completed to allow go-live for phases 1 and 2, NIE Networks suggested the possibility that perhaps all three phases could go live at the same time – see agenda item 10.</p> <p>NC states framework agreement will need to be updated following the call to include Plant.</p> <p>JOB states that if there is a change to the framework it would need to be sent round the group again. DT – That’s fine, it’s possibly just a definition change.</p> <p><b>8. Safety Rules</b></p> <p>NW has written to Karl Miller at LRQA last Friday so they can consider their position on how to get the accreditation moving. MP states LRQA are happy with NIEN’s approach and they will ensure ICPs meet the criteria when accrediting. NW – With a small team at LRQA looking at this it will bring consistency at the early stages of the process and NW will be happy to assist if any further clarification is required.</p> <p>NC asks if there is any work ICPs would need to do in advance of go-live date. MP states there is a process needed that would identify ICPs currently able to conduct work in NI and whether they meet the specific requirements for distribution safety rules. A process to reaccredit ICPs would be needed.</p> <p>NC asks if this re-accreditation would be before or after go-live date. MP – Could be done before go-live. NC suggested that accreditation and paperwork including updated safety rules/processes / procedures etc would be needed to be completed prior to go live date to ensure if NIE Networks issue Connection Offers that they could be accepted by customers and completed by ICP’s</p> <p>MP will circulate these actions internally, LRQA are to review the existing ICP’s who are accredited to work in Northern Ireland to determine the version of Distribution Safety Rules they currently use. This will allow LRQA update the ICP’s who wish to extend their accreditation to this area of contestable works of</p>

Item	Main discussion points
	<p>the need to update their Distribution Safety Rules to become equal or equivalent to NIE Networks in advance of the change of contestable works.</p> <p><b>9. UR Update</b></p> <p>Will provide an updated document and publishing it following circulation amongst the group. Will consider the best date for publishing in relation to the go-live date.</p> <p>Will update the group with a proposed approach to the Update Document.</p> <p><b>10. Next Steps</b></p> <p>NC asks if there is any idea currently at what a go-live date would be so NIEN can plan ahead. KMP asks MP if he knows LRQA timelines. MP – no, will need to identify ICPs which are currently accredited but doesn't know yet and whether any changes required for updates to relevant ICP safety rules / processes/ procedures / paperwork.</p> <p>KMP proposes aim for 1<sup>st</sup> December. MP – okay for him. NC – Achievable.</p> <p>MP states that 3 weeks notice requirement will push it into new year anyway. Process wise there is no reason as to why 1<sup>st</sup> December is not achievable however, it won't kick in until new year. NC states that is correct for construction work but the connection offer is impacted by the go-live date.</p> <p>NC – 1<sup>st</sup> December is realistic but the question is whether LRQA is ready on that date so that NIEN can issue connection offers, see agenda item 8.</p> <p>MP proposes 1<sup>st</sup> January as a better date.</p> <p>DT states an option could be to aim for 1<sup>st</sup> December but having a meeting a few weeks before to discuss progress and whether date needs to be pushed back.</p> <p>NC asks if UR needs to provide a certain length of notice when publishing document. JOB – no notice needed.</p> <p>KMP circulating a poll for next meeting dates to discuss whether to go-live 1<sup>st</sup> December or push it out until the new year.</p> <p>NC asks if there can be a half hour slot to review feedback on what has been circulated prior to go-live date. KMP asks if that can be done between just the UR and NIEN or if the whole group is needed. NC states it would be better to have the whole group involved.</p>

Item	Main discussion points
	JOB states the UR will ask for feedback on meeting notes.
2	<p><b>Actions</b></p> <p>Organise next meeting.</p> <p>NIEN to explore if works can be ‘unsuspended’ in relation to 12.1.d and e of access agreement form.</p> <p>MP to identify ICPs which would need reaccrediting to the new safety rules and review updates to relevant safety rules / processes/ / procedures/ paperwork.</p> <p>Aim for go-live date of 1<sup>st</sup> December, but hold a meeting beforehand to evaluate whether it needs pushed back to January.</p> <p>UR to ask for feedback on meeting notes.</p>
3	<p><b>Attachments</b></p> <div>  ICP LV Network Access Agreement V_-contestability V6 - 24  Expansion of Weekly whereabouts v3.pdf  Network Access Agreement - CWG 21 </div>