




Contestability Working Group Meeting		 Utility Regulator ELECTRICITY GAS WATER	
Subject: Constestability Working Group		Date: 06/10/22	Time: 13:00
Attendees:	Title	Representing	
Luke Matchett	LM	UR	
Kenny McPartland	KMP	UR	
Jody O'Boyle	JOB	UR	
Aidan Gunning	AG	EW	
David Thornton	DT	NIEN	
Graham Caldwell	GC	NIEN	
Nicola McMahon	NMM	SONI	
Michael Boyle	MB	NIEN	
Karl Miller	KM	LRQA	
Nigel Crawford	NC	NIEN	
Nigel Watkin	NW	NIEN	
Apologies:			
Circulation: External			

Item	Main discussion points
1	<p>Actions from the last meeting agreed.</p> <p>Safety Rules:</p> <p>DT asks to begin meeting with update on Safety Rules. KM says they've received comments on the safety rules and whether some elemets (Ivy removal from poles) should be in the list or already exist in other documents.</p> <p>NC asks what time period there is for LRQA to have something agreed and in place. KM states he would need to have spoken to his team.</p> <p>NC asks if document on safety rules will be private or shared with the group. NW states it can be shared to the group if requested. Happy to share with KMP who will attach to the working group webpage.</p> <p>DT aks if its obvious from that paper what the next steps are. KM to engage with the LRQA team before deciding next steps. Document highlights the issues but has yet to indicate next steps.</p>

Item	Main discussion points
	<p>KMP moves onto item number 4. Dt asks if the agreement that they should be available a month before becoming effective is published on NIE website. JOB – Yes it is.</p> <p>Update on proposed amendments to the Statement of Connection Charges: Some wording tweaks to be made and resubmitted by NIEN for UR approval.</p> <p>Access Agreement Update:</p> <p>Almost on final draft. MB - Hoping to have changes back within next week before completing a final draft which can be shared. Aiming for completion in around 2 weeks.</p> <p>DT says ICPs need to be aware they need to enter into framework agreement and then process for the final connection.</p> <p>NC raises the need for tweaks to the Adoption Agreement. DT says they are looking at the minute whether they can tweak a single adoption agreement which covers both circumstances or whether they need to tweak two adoption agreements. In good shape.</p> <p>JOB asks if that is part of the offer or a sub-section. DT – Adoption Agreement not really part of the offer. NC – Adoption Agreement only becomes applicable if the applicant has gone for non-contestable works. It is a very similar process as it is right now with no legal difference.</p> <p>Aiming to finish in parallel with the Access Agreement and hopefully finished soon.</p> <p>Updated Project Plan:</p> <p>DT hasn't yet circulated an updated plan and will do so in next few days.</p> <p>Phase 3:</p> <p>Planned go-live date for phase 3 is December 2022.</p> <p>Existing completed work will benefit Phase 3 but there is other work needed.</p> <p>SRI 12 defines 'routine' work which requires SAP input and may require an outage.</p> <p>Some LV Final Connections will be non-routine and presents a choice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NIEN could undertake 'existing' non-contestable works to ensure the final connection is 'routine' - The ICP could undertake the work as non-routine

Item	Main discussion points
	<p>NIEN would like a discussion on whether or not they should still introduce Contestable LV Final Connections to Plant in December, as planned, or pause for a period to gain experience and assess processes on overhead & underground LV Final Connections.</p> <p>DT emphasises how NIEN are trying to understand how much of a push it is to get connections to Plant in December as they are still learning how to undertake the work.</p> <p>KMP says any responses the points raised can be collated and shared next week.</p> <p>UR Update:</p> <p>KMP states UR will start forming a document which will be shared around the group then published as a follow up to last year's next steps paper.</p> <p>NC asks for a timescale and whether responses will need to be given.</p> <p>KMP states it is more of an information note without the need for responses. Will start drafting today and hopes it will not take long.</p> <p>KMP questions if a separate note is needed for Phase 1 and 2 and a note for Phase 3, or whether that can be one note.</p> <p>NC asks if they need to wait for the UR before proceeding. JOB – Not at the minute.</p> <p>NC nervous about 1st November and doesn't want to put LRQA under pressure. JOB states the UR is similar and does not want to place a deadline which will not be met.</p> <p>NC states need for another meeting in the last week of October. KMP can organise.</p> <p>ICP Feedback:</p> <p>AG - no point in rushing the final stages.</p>
2	<p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organise meeting for last week in October. - Updated plan to be circulated (NIEN)

|

Item	Main discussion points
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- UR to have note completed which will be sent to the group
3	<div><div>Attachments</div><div><div>NIEN Proposed agenda V1.pptx</div><div>Discussion on the Timing of Phase 3 - F</div></div></div>

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed