

From: [Stewart, Chris \(DETI\)](#)
To: [McCormick, Andrew \(DETI\)](#); [Mills, John \(DETI\)](#)
Cc: [Cooper, Trevor](#); [Wightman, Stuart](#); [Rooney, Eugene](#); [McIlwrath, Linda](#); [McCoy, Laura](#); [McIlwrath, Linda](#)
Subject: RE: RHI
Date: 29 June 2015 16:44:08

John

Content.

C

From: McCormick, Andrew (DETI)
Sent: 29 June 2015 16:39
To: Mills, John (DETI)
Cc: Cooper, Trevor; Wightman, Stuart; Rooney, Eugene; Stewart, Chris (DETI); McIlwrath, Linda; McCoy, Laura
Subject: RE: RHI

This is better – content if others are also content.

Many thanks.

From: Mills, John (DETI)
Sent: 29 June 2015 16:35
To: McCormick, Andrew (DETI)
Cc: Cooper, Trevor; Wightman, Stuart; Rooney, Eugene; Stewart, Chris (DETI); McIlwrath, Linda; McCoy, Laura
Subject: RE: RHI

Andrew,

Ta, we've revised, mainly around the budget points (deleting quite a bit of it) for reasons along the lines you say. Think there is a point to pursue with DECC, at least from what I understand of DFP position, i.e. if there is some relevance attached to an overall "UK pot", what's total spend and can we avail of any UK shortfall. If DECC definitively come back to say they have no interest, then DFP have to take forward with Treasury. If re-draft's no improvement, we can think again.

From: McCormick, Andrew (DETI)
Sent: 29 June 2015 15:45
To: Mills, John (DETI)
Cc: Cooper, Trevor; Wightman, Stuart; Rooney, Eugene; Stewart, Chris (DETI); McIlwrath, Linda; McCoy, Laura
Subject: FW: RHI

Not sure about a number of aspects of this – see DNs. Agree we need to do all we can to secure approvals, but are there not some vulnerabilities?

Happy to discuss (but heading to airport in about an hour).

Many thanks.

From: Mills, John (DETI)
Sent: 29 June 2015 15:07
To: Cooper, Trevor
Cc: Wightman, Stuart; Rooney, Eugene; McCormick, Andrew (DETI); Stewart, Chris (DETI); McIlwrath, Linda; McCoy, Laura
Subject: RHI

Trevor,

I attach suggested version 2 of letter to DFP on RHI. I wanted to step back to set the whole picture for the record. Apart from that it reflects the key points from the first version of the letter, your emphasis on VFM in respect of continuing expenditure (as discussed with Stuart and Alan), Eugene's point about improved VFM, Andrew's breakdown into governance, budget & VFM/controls and his emphasis on inescapable spend.

You emphasised the need to issue today if possible.

Are all content or wish to change or add?