

From: [McCormick, Andrew \(DETI\)](#)
To: [Mills, John \(DETI\)](#)
Cc: [Clydesdale, Alison](#); [Stewart, Chris \(DETI\)](#); [Hill, Janice](#); [McIlwrath, Linda](#)
Subject: RE: DECC letters
Date: 31 December 2015 15:22:00

Yes, great – many thanks.

From: Mills, John (DETI)
Sent: 31 December 2015 15:13
To: McCormick, Andrew (DETI)
Cc: Clydesdale, Alison; Stewart, Chris (DETI); Hill, Janice; McIlwrath, Linda
Subject: RE: DECC letters

Andrew,

On NIRO I guess I would prefer to have given yourself and Chris and then SPAD some time to read the detail first and chance to challenge it – for example, there won't necessarily be a direct impact on NI consumers' bills now and that would need to be explained. I wouldn't want confuse the Minister so he becomes less inclined to take a decision or offer him an alternative that we then can't deliver.

On the other hand it may be too good an opportunity to miss. There's also RHI though I presume the message is simply that we would welcome the Minister giving the issue his immediate attention.

I'll assume attendance unless you think it better to wait a few days.

From: McCormick, Andrew (DETI)
Sent: 31 December 2015 14:05
To: Mills, John (DETI)
Cc: Clydesdale, Alison; Stewart, Chris (DETI); Hill, Janice; McIlwrath, Linda
Subject: RE: DECC letters

Many thanks. Would it be helpful if you came to the Issues meeting on Monday morning with the Minister? – might be a chance to cover the ground (or would you prefer to wait until some details have been marshalled?).

From: Mills, John (DETI)
Sent: 31 December 2015 14:03
To: McCormick, Andrew (DETI)
Cc: Clydesdale, Alison; Stewart, Chris (DETI); Hill, Janice
Subject: RE: DECC letters

Andrew,

Thanks. Makes sense. We'll try to circulate a draft sub today and focus the recommendation as you suggest. DECC have changed tack somewhat in terms of how they will react to our non-closure which, unfortunately, requires a lot of explanation. We were thinking of some other options like (alas) splitting the Order but think the real decision is what you say.

From: McCormick, Andrew (DETI)
Sent: 31 December 2015 13:04
To: Mills, John (DETI)
Cc: Clydesdale, Alison; Stewart, Chris (DETI); Hill, Janice
Subject: RE: DECC letters

Our Minister's letter asked for absolute clarity on the "all or nothing" point. They have not given the concession we asked for (extension of socialisation of costs of small scale developments to 31 December) but the "freedom" for NI consumers to pay for an extension of small scale is, I suppose a concession – and I guess the point is that the Assembly Committee is likely to want to take it up though it may be theoretical given the grid position.

So the submission needs to give the Minister two options – to proceed as previously planned or to provide for some additional small scale development. That means it's necessary to draw out the implications of any such option – a realistic view of:

- a. what additional development (if any) would actually be possible before a specified closure date (do we need to address more than one option for that parameter?); and
- b. the costs to consumers.

If there is no real gain from any concession to small scale, then we should recommend against it – though the Minister may regard it as politically worthwhile.

Does this all make sense? – if not please give me a call – indeed happy to discuss in any case.

I hope this is of some help.

Many thanks.

From: Clydesdale, Alison
Sent: 31 December 2015 12:23
To: McCormick, Andrew (DETI)
Cc: Mills, John (DETI)
Subject: DECC letters

Andrew

Letters from DECC to Jonathan Bell and Patsy McGlone.

They confirm that projects that do meet the eligibility criteria will continue to have their costs socialised.

Alison