

From: [Woods, Michael \(DFE\)](#)
To: [McCormick, Andrew \(DFE\)](#)
Cc: [Stewart, Chris \(DFE\)](#); [Cousins, Heather](#); [McCann, Brendan](#)
Subject: RE: Urgent FW: Public Accounts Evidence Session - Letter from CEPA to PAC
Date: 02 December 2016 16:57:04
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.gif](#)

Andrew

The paper on options to bring the scheme back within budget has a number of useful examples from GB, in particular in relation to addressing the issue of multiple boilers where one larger boiler may have been more efficient. The section headed targeted approach sets out these and draws attention to the NI rules, that a second boiler installed within the same year was intended to mean that the capacity for both would be the figure used for determining the tariff i.e. two 99KWH becomes one 198KW and therefore is on the lower tariff. The other example given at bullet point 4 is that for boilers installed after the first year the original boiler receives the full tariff but the subsequent ones receive the tariff based on cumulative capacity.

These are all good ideas and should be considered in any options analysis for bringing the scheme back into line with the original intentions. Alan/Stuart should model these options and the affect on budget and VFM and as part of the legal advice we seek the extent to which the point made at bullet point 2 that the NI scheme may allow multiple boilers to be combined for the purposes of determining the appropriate tariff should be explored further. The fact that this targets those that have gamed the system may also be a valid point of argument. The penultimate bullet point highlights that these are just outline ideas rather than specific actions but any approach that has already been applied to GB scheme (bullet point 4) is worth consideration.

Michael Woods

Internal Audit
Department for the Economy
Adelaide House
39-49 Adelaide Street
Belfast, BT2 8FD
Tel: 028 9025 7410 (ext: 57410)
TextRelay: 18001 028 9025 7410
Web: www.economy-ni.gov.uk



[NI Year of Food & Drink 2016](#)

Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this e-mail?

From: McCormick, Andrew (DFE)
Sent: 02 December 2016 13:31
To: Stewart, Chris (DFE); Cousins, Heather
Cc: Wightman, Stuart; Marten, Lucy; McCann, Brendan; Coyne, Terence; McFarlane, Iain; McMurray, Stephen; McCoy, Laura; Woods, Michael (DFE); Caldwell, Alison; Sterling, David; Sewell, Julie
Subject: Urgent FW: Public Accounts Evidence Session - Letter from CEPA to PAC
Importance: High

Please see attached.

The team will need to assess any implications for the PAC's questions to DfE.

On the second attachment, please review urgently for any implications for our papers for the AG and for DG Comp.

Many thanks.

From: Mark Cockburn [<mailto:mark.cockburn@cepa.co.uk>]
Sent: 02 December 2016 12:04
To: McCormick, Andrew (DFE)
Subject: FW: Public Accounts Evidence Session
Importance: High

Dear Andrew

Please find attached a copy of the recent information that we were asked to provide to the PAC. Please feel free to call if you have any questions.

Kind regards

Mark

From: Richard Rodger
Sent: 02 December 2016 11:51
To: pac.committee@niassembly.gov.uk
Cc: Mark Cockburn <mark.cockburn@cepa.co.uk>
Subject: Public Accounts Evidence Session
Importance: High

Dear Mr Swann,

Please find two documents attached in response to your letter of 25 November 2016.

Yours sincerely,

Richard

Richard Rodger
Head of Marketing

Cambridge Economic Policy Associates | Queens House, 55-56 Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, WC2A 3LJ | Tel: