

<b>Contestability Working Group - Conf Call</b>		 UTILITY REGULATOR ELECTRICITY GAS WATER	
<b>Subject: Contestability Working Group</b>		<b>Date: 09/09/22</b>	<b>Time: 14:00</b>
<b>Attendees:</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Representing</b>	
Kenny McPartland	KMP	UR	
Jody O'Boyle	JOB	UR	
Luke Matchett	LM	UR	
Michael Boyle	MB	NIEN	
Dave Thornton	DT	NIEN	
Emmet Herron	EH	RNI	
Nigel Crawford	NC	NIEN	
Bernie Woods	BW	LRQA	
Nicola McMahon	NMM	SONI	
Nigel Watkin	NW	NIEN	
Graham Caldwell	GC	NIEN	
<b>Apologies:</b>			
<b>Circulation:</b> External			

<b>Item</b>	<b>Main discussion points</b>
1	<p>KMP- Welcomed the group to the meeting. LM is welcomed as a new member representing UR.</p> <p>DT asks JOB if matter of ESQR is settled. MB states they're content and have no issues following emails about it. JOB satisfied if NIEN are content.</p> <p>Moved through agenda irrespective of ICPs not attending.</p> <p><u>Safety Rules</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DT – Needs to be comparison between what ICPs are doing and what NIEN would like to see. NIEN will form a list of concerns to be shared.</li> <li>- BW - if model safety rules weren't enough, ICPs would build in specific safety rules.</li> <li>- NC asks if there's a timescale on this information. BW – Sooner the better. He's on leave for two weeks but someone else can look at it.</li> <li>- NW rightly through safety rules list and can provide updates on gaps mid-next week.</li> <li>- DT asks BW if need to update LRQA role in Ireland. BW – possibly to specify role in Northern Ireland but unlikely too much need to.</li> </ul>

Item	Main discussion points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DT concern for no approved safety rules by go live date causing LV contestability to stop. NC confirms this is correct. BW – Additional work needed to review this (documentation checks) can be done remotely.</li> <li>- DT asks about partial and full accreditation. BW – Each scope is partial, each job in that scope has to be witnessed and then goes from partial to full. One witness is enough to go from partial to full. Would witness a job of each type as they are different scopes and different voltages. National coverage means they can use an achieved scope anywhere.</li> <li>- NC asks how many visits to NI LRQA have done. BW – 4 or 5 surveillance visits since they’ve been certified. Tried to do 2 surveillance copies back to back to keep costs and travel down.</li> </ul> <p><u>Readiness Criteria</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Went over readiness criteria document shared by KMP.</li> <li>- Need to have further discussions if gaps in safety rules.</li> <li>- Modifications to NIEN safety rules went to committee on Monday and should pass by end of month.</li> <li>- Some inaccuracies in the adoption agreement. ICP will make the contestable works live and post energised testing will be carried out by ICPs. ICPS will hand over a completion document then NIEN will take on contestable works.</li> <li>- Guidelines for Contestability document not contractual.</li> <li>- Accreditation documents will let everyone know what has to be in place.</li> <li>- Issue over how routine and non-routine work is defined. Who makes this decision?</li> <li>- Decisions been made that LV Final Connection Trials are not required and NIEN will monitor instead.</li> <li>- What’s the benefit of doing LV Connection trials before it went live – KMP. DT – they decided to leave it and keep a close idea to reduce risks</li> </ul> <p><u>Guidelines</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Distribution and Transmission guidelines separate.</li> <li>- Change in phrase Contestable Works to Contestible Assets.</li> <li>- Transitional Arrangements – Proposal that all offers prior to transition date are drafted on basis that LV Final Connections are non-contestible and all offers after should be drafted on the basis all LV Final Connections are contestable. Situation only lasts maximum 3 months.</li> <li>- Would need to be updated at the go-live date to say its effective. Would need to provide warning it is becoming effective.</li> <li>- JOB says all offers must be in accordance with the charging statement.</li> <li>- EH asks about what spec they should follow to avoid long leading time. NC states they wouldn’t have to follow a specific spec and could go to a different supplier but would then have to go through a process. EH asks how long process would takes. NC says it depends on the situation.</li> <li>- After connection assets are made live it is then down to the ICP.</li> </ul>

Item	Main discussion points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MB preparing something for ICP portal for Sealing of Equipment to be aware of who is sealing what and where.</li> <li>- BW asks about cost implications of sealing pliers and suggests plastic seals with number identifier have been used successful. MB had suggested these to metering department however they decided more traditional pliers.</li> <li>- Some changes to diagrams at the back which need to be looked at and understood.</li> <li>- New definitions – contestable assets, LV and HV</li> <li>- JOB asks if exactly 1000 volts would fit within LV according to the definition. DT says 1000 is covered as LV as it is not exceeding 1000 volts.</li> <li>- Process Map has had a decision box added on whether it is LV.</li> <li>- NMM says SONI need to publish a Transmission guidelines and have a look at the Distribution guidelines from a SONI point of view and will come back to any comments.</li> </ul> <p><u>Statement of Connection Charges</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Few changes to Table B and Table C</li> <li>- Some charges very hard to quantify.</li> <li>- Small elements would be submitted rather than the full document.</li> <li>- KMP asks if required to be included for the assistance category in Table to make it look less required at all times. It says if requested in the license agreement.</li> </ul> <p><u>Timescales</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Depends on how many changes to the charging statement there is.</li> <li>- An information note would come out from the UR instead of a public consultation</li> </ul> <p><u>Access Agreement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Final drafts should be ready in next couple weeks</li> </ul> <p><u>Project Plan</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Created a 2.6 Monitoring of LV Final Connections section</li> <li>- Updated progress</li> <li>- All down to documentation</li> <li>- Information Note rather than a public consultation</li> <li>- Confident with progress, especially in the last month.</li> </ul> <p>Next meeting next month</p>
2	<p><b>Actions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Safety Rules list</li> <li>- JOB – send round all documents and ask for any comments.</li> <li>- Organise meeting for October</li> </ul>

Item	Main discussion points
3	<p><b>Attachments</b></p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: flex-start;"> <div style="text-align: center;">             Contestability Readiness Criteria - C'         </div> <div style="text-align: center;">             NIEN Proposed agenda.pdf         </div> <div style="text-align: center;">             Summary of new costs.pdf         </div> <div style="text-align: center;">             Expansion of contestability V6 - 9 S         </div> <div style="text-align: center;">             Contestability Guideli         </div> </div>