

CWG Meeting		 Utility Regulator ELECTRICITY GAS WATER	
Subject: Development of NERS NI Documents and Timescales to go-live		Date: 25/11/22	Time: 13:00
Attendees:	Title	Representing	
Kenny McPartland	KMP	UR	
Luke Matchett	LM	UR	
Nigel Crawford	NC	NIEN	
Dave Thornton	DT	NIEN	
Michael Boyle	MB	NEIN	
Nigel Watkin	NW	NIEN	
Karl Miller	KM	NIEN	
Aidan Gunning	AG	ICP/ EW	
Sarah Friedel	SF	SONI	
Michael Proctor	MP	LRQA	
Emmet Heron	EH	Renewables NI	
Apologies:			
Circulation:			

Item	Main discussion points
1	<p>1. Development and finalisation of the NERS NI document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently at a draft document with the view to identify the steps needed to finalise on this call • NIEN had provided LRQA with comments on the current draft document (including the new scopes that are going live), this included a few comments. LRQA content with the paper. • DT raised issue with the use of the word “Commissioning” in the document as it is out of line with current terminology used in NI. MP says it needs to remain for any LV/HV pre-energising works etc. • MP says they have added unmetered charging points in relation to electric vehicles in GB. NC says typically all NI connections will be metered, unless there was a commercial arrangement, NC unaware of any existing currently. MP says he will remove mention of unmetered charging points. • DT asks if there are any blockages to approval of the document? • MP states in GB the NERS is signed off by NERS approval panel but in NI, there is none, therefore it will likely be signed up by this working group. DT states LRQA needs to be satisfied the document is practicable. • KMP asked how NERS panel in GB came about? With or without legislation? KM answered it was developed as part of NERS scheme with

Item	Main discussion points
	<p>a memorandum of understanding and is updated every 3 years. Although there is only one DNO in NI, we may need something similar in NI to act as an advisory panel/working group. In GB the advisory panel consists of the Networks, the Independent Networks and some of the NERs connection providers. DT highlights there is a difference between GB and NI, with GB having more governance (licence conditions, Code of Practice etc).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DT states NI is currently not as formalised as GB. CWG is all NI has and if it is happy with what we have, we can go with it. KMP – In NI could the advisory panel be the representatives of the working group? KM and DT highlight they feel this would be a suitable approach in NI. • NC – Must make sure they are reasonable representatives from all interested parties ie ICP etc. Probably falls with KMP and UR to ensure some representation and some form of attendance, feedback etc. • DT – Conclusion is that we are almost there with the document. No showstoppers. From when the NERs document goes live, ICP’s can come and ask for accreditation. Until partial accreditation is achieved by an ICP we cannot say the additional contestable works are live. • KMP – Can put something out to alert ICPs that they can now apply for additional scopes once the NI NERs document. Should put thought to wider publicity to attract other groups. • KM asks if the document looked at this morning is the latest document. DT – Yes. • DT states the effort next week is to get the document finalised, circulated and if no final comments then published. KM says it can be refined over time and therefore we should not get caught up in making it perfect beforehand. • DT states next part after NERs publication is up to ICP’s to apply for partial accreditation. • DT asks if LRQA can get document published within 2 weeks (middle of December). Asks if UR can put a note out in the middle of December. • DT asks KM how long it takes to get out to ICPs and go through safety rules etc. KM – can be a month (at the quickest) to get partial accreditation following application but can also take years if they do not read the document, therefore depends on the readiness of the ICP. Shouldn’t take too long. MP – Some companies will have a number of actions to complete if not ready and have gaps and will take longer, whereas others will be more experienced and ready and will be quicker to accredit. <p>2. Discussion on timescales to get us to go live</p>

Item	Main discussion points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NC – February more likely to be the date. DT agreed but possibility to get existing players partial accreditation by end of January. Early February most likely go-live date. • MP says there is normally a time lag before go-live date and the companies actually completing work. • NC says that when issuing a connection offer, NIEN have to split the offer into contestable and non contestable. ICPs cannot cherry pick, ICPs will have to have obtained partial accreditation before connection offers can be issued and doing the works. • NC states that attendance and work being completed clearly demonstrates it is not NIEN holding anything up. • KMP – agrees, UR appreciates the work being put in by NIEN and understands that safety is priority here and we must ensure everything is right before we go live with the additional scopes. • KMP states that ICPs will need to get partial accreditation before we can say its live. • KM – NIEN must and will only allow others to use the network if they are comfortable that they are fully safe. • DT says a new plan must be developed to show how we can go live in early February. MP – It depends on how much interest is generated to analyse whether it is actually viable. DT – If we do everything we can, and nobody applies then the project could get suspended until somebody expresses an interest. • DT states he is sensing that people within NIEN are keen to finish this work and concentrate on their normal jobs. NC – Agreed • DT – NIEN to draw up a plan and circulate <p>3. Review of the Contestability Readiness Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2 on Safety. DT asks NW in relation to safety rules, if statement saying that anyone working on Distribution system must be NIE Networks' staff has been changed. NW – Can be done very quickly. Currently NIEN updating existing safety rules, but amendments can be made in advance of Go-Live if current safety rules updates are not finalised before then. • Access Agreement is complete • Guidelines has been updated and is being finalised • Adoption Agreement- NIEN legal has final minor amendments • Tech specifications and policies- has been updated • Internal Processes – NC, completed a review and one round of contestability training with staff who will be completing contestability inspections. 2nd training upcoming. • Internal staff training – Completed with NIEN planning staff

Item	Main discussion points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IT Requirements – NC states minor update required on portal but not a showstopper • Few changes within NIEN to be completed in relation to External Communications. No longer taking the approach that an ICP will submit safety rules to LRQA for assessment. The process will be when ICP goes for partial accreditation LRQA will look at the gaps that NW identified. This will be covered off at partial accreditation stage. LRQA content with this approach. • LV final connection trails will not be happening in NI. <p>4. Next Meeting.</p> <p>Next meeting during week commencing 12th December. NC – Likely driven by LRQA aspect.</p> <p>LRQA to provide any comments to the latest NERS document, once provided, the document to be circulated around the wider CWG. If no comments received, we can go-live and inform ICPs through UR note of the plan on the website and ICPs on the LRQA distribution list. KMP – Yes, 2 way publication from UR and LRQA.</p>
2	<p>Actions</p> <p>KMP to do doodle poll to organise next meeting on week commencing 12th December</p> <p>NIEN to draft a plan for Go Live and provide the group</p> <p>NIEN to provide guidelines update (flowchart)</p> <p>UR to circulate minutes.</p> <p>KMP to circulate current document for comments to be completed by end of next week.</p>
3	<p>Attachments</p>