

NIRHI Issues

Information was released into the Public Domain on Friday 16th March 2017. I have analysed this data in detail. It only represents 41% of the applications and significantly only 14% of Moy Park applicants from the data we have.

Until this point we had no official site specific data but information for the project costs and potential overspend from the Auditor General's report etc.

Our summary position has been we advocate the use of Hot Water Heating – the RHI scheme was an enabler and we recognised the “responsible use of heat” as a key tenant. We specifically recommended to government the need for technically competent business case justified audits to ensure such for all sectors.

Prior to the release of the data we knew we had limited information and we were striving to get a better data set to know what was going on within our third party estate.

When the scheme started to roll out in 2013 we were aware of suggestions by some users that conservative usage patterns were disadvantaged to a more heat generation target that the RHI scheme created as a non-intentional consequence.

In my role as Head of NI Agri Projects I was central in supporting and promoting the move to retro fit Hot Water Heating enabled with RHI. I became increasingly aware of the pull within the scheme away from a “responsible use” of heat and tried to get a handle on heat usage patterns.

I spoke to growers and got data about their houses crops etc. and started to build a limited data set. We asked for information from the committee and received 4 points for their farms. I also when on farm doing routine visits if the meter reading for the boiler was available I took a reading. However we did see a sudden sensitivity to data and our information dried up almost completely. Following a meeting in Craigavon in November I was tasked with asking for a more general release of information. I attended a Committee meeting in Cohannon explained the request and the need to advocate for a robust audit to support our genuine usage case – however no information was agreed to be supplied.

Additionally we faced pressure from our grower committee that the heating allowance (known then as the Gas Allowance) needed to increase as the heat requirement for Hot Water heating was greater. This was logical to a degree and we all saw the increased performance benefits of the husbandry method.

However we recognised that the heat usage was driven by 2 factors husbandry and RHI generation. I was the person who took point on this and we had a number of difficult conversations with the Broiler Committee. The April 2016 review was difficult (this now contested data set in summary was presented – I did not share any specifics other than one very high reading and on set of low readings with excellent performance) and I took the lead in setting out our position and challenging the arguments being put forward by the committee. In particular Tom Forgrave was strident in his approach and objection to my position.

During following discussions I was not required to be present and I registered by concerns as to why I was being excluded. We now have a series of other documented correspondence were Tom Forgrave has asked for me not to attend culminating in as yet unanswered allegations that I have carried out illegal activities while fulfilling my duties as a Moy Park employee.

This recorded allegation needs addressed. Specifically Tom needs to put on record his concerns and the evidence background of such concerns – to make a serious allegation of this nature I would expect reasoned and supported argument).

For the record I have data for 19 farms – of which 4 self-reported (committee), 7 were from discussion one on one with the growers, 2 were observed by me and the remainder were reported to me by staff after farm visits. Irrelevant information redacted by the RHI Inquiry

I have also recovered data from our GB operation and we have the CAFRE report from July 15.

These all point towards a "responsible usage for broilers" (I will discuss Parent stock later) in the 1,800 – 2,000kWh per thousand range – that said we feel that 1,400 is the economic conservative level and this is what we are using in the costings.

The snap shot from the contested data we established indicated a usage of 1,900kWh per thousand. The figures released on Friday for a larger sample showed a very similar number. The range was also consistent with the published figures showing up to 300% above standard against my limited data set of 250%. It is the range and the top side outliers that are of concern – the information on Friday gave worse top line spread than my numbers – and I fear that the remainder as yet unsupported while likely similar on average will have a greater top quartile contested area.

Actions

Moy Park Internal Matters –

Tom Forgarve has made allegations against me and they are on the record. These need to be investigated and concluded before any of us appear in a public place. Correspondence from Raymond on this matter states

"If we have obtained third party private information deceitfully then we should (1) personally speak to each individual farmer and explain what happened and apologise for the mistake/ error of judgment; (2) explain that it was not Company sanctioned; (3) advise that the relevant conversations have taken place with any Moy Park individuals concerned; and (4) confirm that the data has not been used and/or will not be used – also it has been permanently expunged. "

I want to state that I do not believe I have been "deceitful" in any of my actions while fulfilling my duties as I understood them for Moy Park. I believe that any actions I took were company sanctioned and appropriate.

The relevant conversations need to be had with me and recorded and if this needs to go into a disciplinary process so be it – but I am requesting it is done now.

I also want to record that I HAVE NOT EXPUNGED ANY DATA at this point – I can deliver all my records of this data to the business and get confirmation of such. It will be up to others to delete information and answer to the process for that.

External Matters –

We have based our position on "Responsible Usage" and "competent robust auditing". We are about to get that. Evidence shows for a proportion of the data set as we see it issues will emerge.

Growers still have time to react to this. The measures to be introduced in April will call all users to change their usage to endure economic returns. For those on standard or below (50%) or even 100 - 150% of standard this will not be extreme (25%) but for those on 200%+ (25%) it will be telling.

My view is that growers need to engage and be prepared to hear an honest challenge – currently they are being influenced by a very few who have convinced themselves that the contract is inviolate and they can carry on as is for the next 20 years.

These small number have the ability to damage Moy Park's reputation and some straight talking is required. Already this is informing our Customers and Tom Forgrave's campaign to influence Tesco is not helpful or wise for any party. To date I have seen no appetite for any straight talking with this group.

Within the Parent/Grand Parent group with one exception I have less concerns. The Lay farms are almost exclusively using the 199kWh Tiered system as are most of the Rear. However in the recent release we have 2 Rear farms with 99kWh un tiered tariff and they appear on first checking to be in one case 400% of standard and 200% on the other – even comparing to Broiler (7.75 crops v 3 crops per annum) they seem very high. I have alerted Irrelevant information redacted by the RHI Inquiry and he is investigating.