


Contestability Working Group - Conf Call		 UTILITY REGULATOR ELECTRICITY GAS WATER	
Subject: Contestability Working Group – kick off meeting		Date: 29/9/2020	Time: 2:00pm
Attendees:	Title	Representing	
Aidan Gunning	AG	EW	
John Gunning	JG	EW	
Owen McGuckin	OM	EW	
Chris Kingston	CK	EW	
Kevin Collins	KC	EW	
Roisin McLaughlin	RML	UR	
Kenny McPartland	KMP	UR	
Jody O'Boyle	JOB	UR	
Killian Halpin	KH	NIRIG	
Sinead Ferris	SF	NIEN	
Nigel Crawford	NC	NIEN	
Sarah Friedel	SFD	SONI	
Conan Hodgkinson	CoH	SONI	
Apologies:			
Circulation: External			

Item	Main discussion points
1	<p>Agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review last minutes and changes to the Terms of Reference • Review NIE presentation • Discuss what needs to be considered for implementation • How this can be progressed • Estimated timelines • AOB <p>Presentations can be found at - https://www.uregni.gov.uk/contestability-working-group</p> <p>-----</p> <p>RML thanked and welcomed the attendees to the meeting. She reviewed the minutes of the last meeting and the revised terms of reference, the action of the last meeting were deemed complete and therefore both documents were adopted.</p> <p>NIE Network was then invited to present the presentation.</p> <p>SF - went through the presentation</p> <p>Slide 1 - Intro</p> <p>Slide 2 - Agenda</p> <p>Slide 3 - What needs to be considered? The primary considerations are Safety</p>

Item	Main discussion points
	<p>and Transparency, existing assets are non-contestable, new connections are contestable</p> <p>The CWG need to consider</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • likely safety implications • risks and liabilities • how any risks will be mitigated • how proposed changes are open and transparent beyond CWG • how changes can be accommodated without creating barriers to market entry <p>these are the first primary considerations</p> <p>Slide 4 - In addition we will need to consider the following deliverables ;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • requirement to change NIE safety rules to accommodate any changes • Need to look at additional technical jointing instructions to cover LV live jointing and jointing instructions • Modified Interface agreements, need to consider existing and new assets may need new Interface agreements • New/modified interface procedural documentation • Changes to existing NERS (Loyds) scope templates for NI to enable LV jointing and additional activities • Need to look at any changes to asset handover and adoption arrangements, also any legal agreements • New procedures to enable ICPs to interact with NIE Networks and carry out the increased scope of work. Who is responsible for what and how is info transferred. • IT Changes – network data, and final connection. <p>CK – Asked if there are any considerations or any differences between NI and the GB/NERS model/platform,</p> <p>SF - No, however will come on to it later on in the presentation, we hope to invite a NERS person onto the group for shared learning. NIE need to look at a stepped approach, eg open up LV final connection and then LV operational activities, need greater access to control systems in LV network and NI safety operations process.</p> <p>Slide 6 – How can this be progressed?</p> <p>1. Membership of CWG</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need good representation on CWG from a broad range of key stakeholders – multiple ICPs , UR, NIE Networks, SONI, Lloyd’s Register National Electricity Registration Scheme (NERS) <p>SF stated that it would good to get representation from Lloyds and a representative from the NI Health and Safety Executive to keep them informed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared learning from GB experience will be important • CWG should keep HSE (NI) informed of progress in this area <p>2. CWG assessment of safety, risks and liabilities and how any risks will be mitigated – this will be a key deliverable of this group, key docs will need</p>

Item	Main discussion points
	<p>changes, process maps, should not do piecemeal, need to consider a holistic approach</p> <p>3. Concise Call for Evidence to determine what the market wants in terms of extending the scope of contestability in NI</p> <p>4. Review of evidence followed by public consultation</p> <p>CK – Was that already done the last time,</p> <p>SF - That is where the current framework came from, this will be a review from that call for evidence.</p> <p>NC - Need to hear from other ICPs, and a broad range of stake holders</p> <p>CK – We do want feedback from other ICPs, those ICP's can respond or not to the call for evidence.</p> <p>SF – It can be a concise call for evidence, does not need to drag it out.</p> <p>Slide 7 timeline</p> <p>Between now and the end of the year consider CWG to have identified;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • likely safety implications • risks and liabilities • how any risks will be mitigated • how proposed changes are open and transparent beyond CWG • how changes can be accommodated without creating barriers to market entry • publish a concise Call for Evidence to determine what the market wants in terms of extending the scope of contestability in NI <p>Report on Call for evidence in Q1 2021</p> <p>Slide 8 – may be other things to discuss</p> <p>SF - Based on evidence received we will need to issue public consultation on proposed changes to expand scope of contestability in NI.</p> <p>SF - Further discussion may be required between NIE and UR on any costs associated with opening up contestability.</p> <p>SF – It would be good to open up the group to bring in shared learning.</p> <p>RM – Thanked NIE Networks for the presentation and opened up the discussion for reactions from other group members.</p> <p>CK – Concerned with the timing is it the first qtr 2021 to go through details, call for evidence, that is at least 6 months away.</p> <p>SF - Q1 can be Jan/Feb or March, it is not be the end of Q1, we will be working on details now.</p> <p>NC - the work will involve consideration of the NIE safety rules and the call for evidence needs to consider NI specific assets, not a pick and mix, we need to consider the unique assets in NI. We also need time to consider what the market requires.</p> <p>CK - pointed to GB model, the processes here are mature, they understand that things take time, however within the GB model , a lot of the work is already</p>

Item	Main discussion points
	<p>done. We accept that it needs to refer to NI but we should be working for implementation early next year</p> <p>NC – Asked how long it took to get the GB model established?</p> <p>CK – Confirmed that it did take a long time, but stated that we have an opportunity here to learn from a well-established, safe, process and procedures. Q1 next year is doable. We are happy to do whatever we need to do to facilitate that process.</p> <p>JOB – Stated that need to learn for the GB process and that while the NERS process is established it may need to change of items that are specific to NI assets.</p> <p>SF – We will also may need time for legal review, access documents need to be reviewed etc and need to consider the NI legal framework from a NI point of view. We also need to understand what info do ICP's need in respect to NI. This is a significant bit of work from a NI point of view, and we need to go through due process, get the feedback and review it. NIE needs to do its own due diligence, and try to get a balance on what needs to be done.</p> <p>CK – We are willing to support where we can. We can learn/improve from GB via share learning and would like this to get implemented as quickly as possible.</p> <p>KH – Asked if there any prioritisation for renewable energy connection for small scale or domestic in the contest of contestability?</p> <p>SH – Confirmed that contestability is live for all connections; the reason for a call for evidence is to give everybody a voice as to what they want to expand the scope for contestability.</p> <p>RM – Asked for comment on the extend we can start to work on any of these issues, the frequency of meetings over the next 3 months to work through these issues and the tempo of work between now and Christmas,</p> <p>SK- depends on the attitude of the group, due consideration needs to be given on all the points</p> <p>NC -We need to first engage with Lloyds on shared learning and how they stepped through the process</p> <p>SK Will check with our contact in Loyds and their viability to attend future meetings and come back to the group on possible time slots for the next meeting.</p> <p>CK - We encourage engagement.</p> <p>NC –Asked if there was anything from we could learn from the regulators from the mainland.</p> <p>JOB – Will contact OFGEM and will also engage with the Department around a possible Health and Safety Exc.</p> <p>CK – Queried if we could not go out for Call for Evidence now,</p> <p>RML – commented that it might be better to wait until we engage with Loyds and learn any gap analysis subject to any other thoughts of the group.</p>

Item	Main discussion points
	<p>RM - covered off estimated timelines, any further questions of which none were received.</p> <p>KH – Highlight a query from an ICP that they are work with concerning adoption of NIE spec regarding cable route</p> <p>NC – comment that providing the ICP is complying with NIE spec, they should be adopted, but happy to be the point of contact on any issues</p> <p>Meeting was adjourned shortly after 3pm.</p>
2	<p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NIE Networks to engage with Loyds to invite them to the group to hear about the GB experience around LV final connections and live LV jointing being made contestable in GB and how the DNO's procedures and NERS accreditation were put in place to mitigate any risks. - NIE Networks to get dates of availability, engage with the UR who will send out possible dates for the next meeting. - UR to engage with OFGEM and with the Department around a possible Health and Safety Executive attendance.