

<b>Meeting Name</b>	<b>Stakeholder Expert Challenge Group (SECG)</b>
<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>25 September 2018</b>
<b>Location</b>	<b>Utility Regulator Office</b>

#### Participants:

<b>List of Participants:</b>
Jenny Pyper (opening of meeting), Tanya Hedley, Roisin McLaughlin, Ciaran MacCann, Roy Colville, Aidan Girvan ( <b>UR</b> )
Alan Campbell, Leigh Greer, Bill Thompson, Nick Fullerton ( <b>SONI</b> )
Joanne McClements ( <b>Government DfE</b> )
Yuliya Moore
Stacy Feldmann
Ronan McKeown
Paul McGuckin
Richard Williams
Meabh Cormacain
Harry McCracken
Stephen Kelly
William Steele
Declan Billington
David de Casserres

#### Agenda:

<b>Item</b>	<b>Main discussion point topics</b>
1	Non-Disclosure Agreement
2	Clarity on role of SECG
3	MO Licence (out of scope)
4	CMA appeal: previous price control
5	Existing NI TSO price control
6	Price control outcomes and framework design principles
7	<b>ACTIONS</b>

## Key Meeting Notes

Main discussion points and markers	Discussion
1. Non-disclosure Agreement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consensus that a non-disclosure agreement should be established to deal with a concern that participants may not be able to otherwise disclose their views freely.</li> </ul>
2. Clarity on role of the SECG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consensus that the SECG role is to input and challenge the Utility Regulator's (UR) emerging approach position as well as SONI's business plan.</li> <li>The main area of discussion was about the role of the group in certain aspects</li> <li>One question was how the outputs from the SECG would feed into the SONI business plan. For example, how work during the initial SECG phase on UR policy development feeds into SONI's business plan. UR noted that its role in setting regulatory expectations can help in this regard and that certain aspects of SECG group discussion (e.g. roles and services) may be of value to SONI to inform its business plan.</li> <li>Another question was how the SECG members can provide an optimal challenge to the business plan if SECG does not input into SONI's business plan as it develops. UR noted that it was a valid point and it would give it further consideration.</li> <li>Overall, UR agreed more clarity was necessary.</li> </ul>
3. MO Licence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was confirmed that the Market Operator Licence is out of scope for SECG.</li> </ul>
4. CMA appeal: previous price control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One participant asked whether the SECG needs to have an understanding of the outcomes of the CMA decision from the previous price control.</li> <li>UR confirmed that if anything was referenced in the SECG in relation to the CMA decision the relevant background would be provided.</li> <li>SONI had a preference to focus on the next price control (for which the SECG is intended).</li> </ul>
5. Existing NI TSO price control policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Group asked if there was anything which it should be made aware of that was already agreed for the price control.</li> <li>UR confirmed that there was not, but it would raise with the group as when necessary.</li> <li>One participant from SONI stated a preference for no re-openers as is reasonably practical</li> </ul>
6. Price control outcomes and framework design principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SONI agreed with these as set out by UR.</li> <li>UR noted that its working assumption is that this control will be a 5 year, single revenue control, but this has not been confirmed yet. SONI noted its preference for this.</li> </ul>
<b>7. ACTIONS</b>	<p><b>UR to develop a Non-Disclosure Agreement</b>  <b>UR to provide greater clarity on role of the SECG</b>  <b>SONI to consider how it might use SECG and feed back to the group</b></p>