

From: [Linton, Rachel](#)
To: [Cousins, Heather](#); [McMurray, Stephen](#); [Clydesdale, Alison](#); [Conliffe, David](#); [McFarlane, Iain](#); [Woods, Michael \(DETI\)](#); [Coyne, Terence](#); [Moore, Stephen \(DETI\)](#); [McGinn, Paul](#)
Cc: [Stewart, Chris \(DFE\)](#); [Wightman, Stuart](#); [Marten, Lucy](#)
Subject: Minutes of RHI Steering Group 6 June 2016
Date: 15 June 2016 12:09:30
Attachments: [Minutes of meeting 06 June 2016.doc](#)
[image001.gif](#)

Dear All,

Please see attached draft minutes of the RHI Steering Group meeting which took place on Monday 6 June at 10.30am.

I would be grateful if you could review and let me have any amendments by way of tracked change by COP 22 June.

Kind regards,

Rachel

Rachel Linton

Financial Governance
Department for the Economy
Adelaide House
39-49 Adelaide Street
Belfast, BT2 8FD
Tel: 028 9025 7955 (ext: 57955)
TextRelay: 18001 028 9025 7955
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?

MINUTES OF RHI STEERING GROUP MEETING HELD AT 9.30AM ON 31 MAY 2016 IN CLARENCE COURT

Present: Heather Cousins (HC)
Stephen McMurray (SMcM)
Alison Clydesdale (AC)
David Conliffe (DC)
Iain McFarlane (IMcF)
Michael Woods (MW)
Terry Coyne (TC)

Paul McGinn (PMcG) (DSO)
Stephen Moore (SM)

Apologies: Chris Stewart
Stuart Wightman

Secretariat: Rachel Linton

State Aid

1. SM advised that in order to determine whether there are any state aid issues the rates of return being attained by users needs to be determined. SM stated that if these rates are higher than those approved in the business case the Department will have to re-notify the scheme to the European Commission. AC advised that based on the data available to date the rates being achieved are consistently above the approved rates.
2. SM stated that based on the rate of return evidence to date it would be advisable to notify the European Commission of the issues and the actions being taken to correct and also seek their advice on next steps. MW noted that if the actual rates of return are higher than those approved, this would breach state aid approval and asked who would be responsible for repaying the grant. SM confirmed and stated that grant already paid would be recovered from the beneficiary but that there is an opportunity to correct overcompensation over the life of the scheme by amending the tariffs.
3. HC requested information on the mechanism in place to engage with the European Commission. SM advised that contact is made via UKRep and BIS who arrange all meetings with the Commission. SM advised that a paper on the purpose of the meeting would need to be prepared and a meeting at Head of Unit level would be appropriate at this stage. SM reiterated that early engagement is preferable and that only the European Commission or the European Courts can decide if there has been a breach in the LoO.
4. AC noted that the NIAO Report does not reference State Aid. MW advised that the current report is for the accounts but that the NIAO is aware of the State Aid issues and the next report which will be on VfM will include reference to State Aid, therefore it is important to look at the issue now.

5. SM advised that the Commission will most likely expect the Department to bring the rate of return back to the average figure quoted in the approvals of 12%. SMcM asked how this rate of return compares with the rate under the GB scheme, AC advised that the rate of return on the GB scheme is less than 12%.

DSO Advice

6. PMcG stated that the Department has an obligation to make payments as presented in the legislation. PMcG advised that the legislation can be amended by the Department but that any amendments would only apply to future payments, the Department cannot amend the legislation retrospectively. PMcG advised that in order to amend the legislation the Department will first have to carry out a consultation exercise on the proposed changes, allowing sufficient time for people to respond. PMcG stated that the consultation exercise should clearly support the changes and provide a recent set of arguments grounding the decision.
7. PMcG advised that a potential obstacle to the Department being able to amend the legislation would be if it was deemed that users had a substantive legitimate expectation to achieve the current rates of return, however cases of this are rare as it would need to be proved that the changes were so unfair they would be considered to be abuse of the Departments power. PMcG advised that if the scheme remains viable and there is no significant financial loss suffered by those who have invested in the scheme, it would be unlikely that a substantive legitimate expectation claim could be made.
8. PMcG advised that if the scheme is being changed to achieve better VfM, the rationale for this needs to be clear and show the court that the scheme as it stands is too generous and the changes the Department is proposing to make will not have an adverse effect on the end user. PMcG suggested that the consultation exercise should look at not only the rate of return but also the implementation of a cap as it is better to argue one coherent whole case rather than run two arguments as each change is affected by the other.
9. HC asked whether the courts will compare the NI scheme to the GB scheme. PMcG advised that the courts will have regard to other schemes but will be focussed on the specifics of the NI scheme.
10. MW asked whether it would be appropriate to analyse a range of proposals and their impact or choose one preferred option. PMcG advised that the number of options to be brought to consultation is at the Departments discretion but it is important that consultees be provided with enough information and time to give their input and that there must be analysis of how the changes impact on the integrity of the scheme and on businesses.
11. TC asked whether a PAC hearing could prejudice any legal proceedings. PMcG stated that the Department must be able to prove that it has taken into account the consultees but that if the situation arose whereby the

Department was under criticism from the PAC it could lead to applications for judicial review. PMcG advised that all published material will be reviewed therefore the Departments approach must be consistent. AC noted that most of the responses to the consultation are likely to be to not make changes to the scheme. PMcG stated that even if all responses were against the changes the Department can implement the changes provided it has dealt with the responses fairly.

12. SMcM asked whether legal advice on implementing a cap has been provided. PMcG advised that implementing a cap would require a change to the legislation and the Department needs to produce evidence to justify this. PMcG added that it is not possible to implement a cap retrospectively.
13. AC stated that the Department does not yet have enough evidence to be able to justify implementing a cap as they need a full years data for a variety of users, including seasonal variances, to be able to get a complete picture. PMcG confirmed that it would be preferable to have a full years data over a range of users in order to keep assumptions to a minimum. HC stated that obtaining the necessary evidence is a priority.
14. AC asked whether a user have an argument that 'grandfathering' was built into the legislation. SM stated that in the original approval of the scheme it was clear that the average rate of return was expected to be 12% over 20 years. PMcG advised that grandfathering is linked to the legitimate expectation argument in that as long as the changes are not unfair or oppressive there should not be an issue.
15. HC expressed thanks to PMcG and SM and they left the meeting.

Action 1: AC to review data available to date with a view to assessing when the consultation can be commissioned

Action 2: AC to begin process of alerting European Commission

Minutes and Action Points of previous meeting

16. HC referred to the minutes of the previous steering group meeting which took place on 31 May 2016. The Steering Group agreed the minutes as final. Attendees provided a progress update on each of their respective Action Points recorded in the minutes of the previous meeting.
17. HC referred to the meeting with NIAO scheduled for 2pm on 6 June and noted that a suggestion should be made to delay a PAC hearing until after consultation. DC requested an estimate of when the evidence will be available to enable the consultation to take place. AC advised that in order to provide an estimate of this the Energy Economist will first need to carry out an equality impact assessment.
18. HC referred to the proposed site inspections and requested an update on contact with Ofgem to date. MW stated that the Ofgem position is not strong enough and suggested they should be treating this as an investigation rather than standalone 'site inspections' as this should be an

investigation into whether fraud or abuse is taking place, not whether there is a working system. MW raised concerns that the Ofgem auditors are not independent enough to carry out the rigorous and robust level of inspections required and that there appears to be reluctance to express an opinion on whether fraud or abuse is occurring. MW also stated that the timelines need to be accelerated and suggested that it would be useful for the Department to carry out their own inspections in parallel with Ofgem as soon as possible.

Action 3: AC to arrange teleconference with Ofgem to discuss the proposed site inspections.

Draft ToR

19. DC suggested that the new Energy Efficiency Grade 7, Lucy Marten, should be added to the Steering Group membership. AC confirmed. MW stated that Andrew McCormick will attend Steering Group meetings when he is available. HC added that Chris Stewart should also be invited to all meetings. HC confirmed that other than the addition of Lucy Marten to the Steering Group membership there are no further changes required to the ToR and it can be finalised.

Action 4: MW to add Lucy Marten to the Steering Group membership and arrange for finalisation of the ToR

Update on NIAO Report

20. HC advised that a request should be made to NIAO to remove the annual rate of return example which assumes 24 hours a day, seven days a week use on the basis that this sort of usage does not adhere to the principles of the scheme.
21. SMcM advised that Andrew McCormick has requested that copies of the emails in relation to AME allocations referenced in the report in paragraphs 47 and 54 should be provided to NIAO.

Action 5: AC to check what documentation NIAO has been provided with to date and ensure emails referenced in the report are included in this

Preparation for Audit Committee

22. TC confirmed that AC is going to provide an update on timelines to Audit Committee. TC requested an update on the draft Internal Audit Reports. MW advised that David Beck is aware of the reports and that if NIAO request sight of the reports they will be provided. TC confirmed that David Beck has had sight of the NIAO Report.

AOB

23. There being no further business the meeting was adjourned.

From: [Moore, Stephen \(DETI\)](#)
To: [Linton, Rachel](#)
Cc: [Cousins, Heather](#); [McMurray, Stephen](#); [Clydesdale, Alison](#); [Conliffe, David](#); [McFarlane, Iain](#); [Woods, Michael \(DETI\)](#); [Coyne, Terence](#); [Moore, Stephen \(DETI\)](#); [McGinn, Paul](#); [Stewart, Chris \(DFE\)](#); [Wightman, Stuart](#); [Marten, Lucy](#)
Subject: FW: Minutes of RHI Steering Group 6 June 2016
Date: 15 June 2016 15:41:00
Attachments: [Minutes of meeting 06 June 2016.doc](#)
[image001.gif](#)

Rachel

Please find some suggested revisions in the attached document. I have marked these up as tracked changes and have also included some comments to explain my suggested revisions.

Happy to discuss.

Stephen

Stephen Moore

State Aid Unit
Department for the Economy
Netherleigh
Massey Avenue
Belfast, BT4 2JP
Tel: 028 9052 9415 (ext: 29415)
Mob Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry
TextRelay: 18001 028 9052 9415
Web: www.economy-ni.gov.uk

NEW - 'State aid: A Beginner's Guide for Public Bodies in Northern Ireland' can now be accessed through the DFE Internet site: <https://www.detini.gov.uk/publications/state-aid-beginners-guide-public-bodies-northern-ireland>



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

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

From: Linton, Rachel
Sent: 15 June 2016 12:09
To: Cousins, Heather; McMurray, Stephen; Clydesdale, Alison; Conliffe, David; McFarlane, Iain; Woods, Michael (DETI); Coyne, Terence; Moore, Stephen (DETI); McGinn, Paul
Cc: Stewart, Chris (DFE); Wightman, Stuart; Marten, Lucy
Subject: Minutes of RHI Steering Group 6 June 2016

Dear All,

Please see attached draft minutes of the RHI Steering Group meeting which took place on

Monday 6 June at 10.30am.

I would be grateful if you could review and let me have any amendments by way of tracked change by COP 22 June.

Kind regards,

Rachel

Rachel Linton

Financial Governance

Department for the Economy

Adelaide House

39-49 Adelaide Street

Belfast, BT2 8FD

Tel: 028 9025 7955 (ext: 57955)

TextRelay: 18001 028 9025 7955

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?

MINUTES OF RHI STEERING GROUP MEETING HELD AT 9.30AM ON 31 MAY 2016 IN CLARENCE COURT

Present: Heather Cousins (HC)
 Stephen McMurray (SMcM)
 Alison Clydesdale (AC)
 David Conliffe (DC)
 Iain McFarlane (IMcF)
 Michael Woods (MW)
 Terry Coyne (TC)

Paul McGinn (PMcG) (DSO)
 Stephen Moore (SM)

Apologies: Chris Stewart
 Stuart Wightman

Secretariat: Rachel Linton

State Aid

1. SM advised that in order to determine whether there has been any breach of the European Commission's State aid approval are any state aid issues the rates of return being attained by users needs to be determined. SM stated that if these rates are higher than those approved in the business case the Department may need will have to re-notify the scheme to the European Commission. AC advised that based on the data available to date the rates being achieved are consistently above the approved rates.
2. SM stated that based on the rate of return evidence to date it would be advisable to advise notify the European Commission of the issues and the actions the department is proposing to take being taken to correct the issues and also seek their advice and agreement on next steps. MW noted that if the actual rates of return are higher than those approved, this would breach state aid approval and asked who would be responsible for repaying the grant. SM confirmed and stated advised that if there has been a breach of the State aid approval, in circumstances where a grant has been paid, the EC would typically require the Member State to claw back from the beneficiary some or all of the that grant that has been already paid, plus interest. -would be recovered from the beneficiary He added, in this case, where the aid is paid in the form of a tariff, but that there may be is-an opportunity to correct overcompensation over the life of the scheme by amending the tariffs.
3. HC requested information on the mechanism in place to engage with the European Commission. SM advised that meetings with the Commission are arranged by contact is made via-UKRep and that BIS and DECC should be made aware that a meeting was being requested, who arrange all meetings with the Commission. SM also advised that a paper on the purpose of the meeting would need to be prepared and that a meeting at Head of Unit level would be appropriate at this stage. SM He reiterated that early engagement is preferable and that only the European

Comment [SM1]: I am not sure I confirmed Michael's comment this would breach State aid approval. Whilst this could well be true, as suggested in paragraph 3 below, I think I said that only the EC and the European Courts can say there has been a breach.

Commission or the European Courts can decide if there has been a breach in the [State aid approval](#) ~~LeO~~.

4. AC noted that the NIAO Report does not reference State Aid. MW advised that the current report is for the accounts but that the NIAO is aware of the State [aAid](#) issues and the next report which will be on VfM will include reference to State [aAid](#), therefore it is important to look at the issue now.
5. SM advised that the Commission will most likely expect the Department to bring the rate of return back to the average figure quoted in the approvals of 12%. SMcM asked how this rate of return compares with the rate under the GB scheme, AC advised that the rate of return on the GB scheme is less than 12%.

DSO Advice

6. PMcG stated that the Department has an obligation to make payments as presented in the legislation. PMcG advised that the legislation can be amended by the Department but that any amendments would only apply to future payments, the Department cannot amend the legislation retrospectively. PMcG advised that in order to amend the legislation the Department will first have to carry out a consultation exercise on the proposed changes, allowing sufficient time for people to respond. PMcG stated that the consultation exercise should clearly support the changes and provide a recent set of arguments grounding the decision.
7. PMcG advised that a potential obstacle to the Department being able to amend the legislation would be if it was deemed that users had a substantive legitimate expectation to achieve the current rates of return, however cases of this are rare as it would need to be proved that the changes were so unfair they would be considered to be abuse of the Departments power. PMcG advised that if the scheme remains viable and there is no significant financial loss suffered by those who have invested in the scheme, it would be unlikely that a substantive legitimate expectation claim could be made.
8. PMcG advised that if the scheme is being changed to achieve better VfM, the rationale for this needs to be clear and show the court that the scheme as it stands is too generous and the changes the Department is proposing to make will not have an adverse effect on the end user. PMcG suggested that the consultation exercise should look at not only the rate of return but also the implementation of a cap as it is better to argue one coherent whole case rather than run two arguments as each change is affected by the other.
9. HC asked whether the courts will compare the NI scheme to the GB scheme. PMcG advised that the courts will have regard to other schemes but will be focussed on the specifics of the NI scheme.
10. MW asked whether it would be appropriate to analyse a range of proposals and their impact or choose one preferred option. PMcG advised that the number of options to be brought to consultation is at the

Departments discretion but it is important that consultees be provided with enough information and time to give their input and that there must be analysis of how the changes impact on the integrity of the scheme and on businesses.

11. TC asked whether a PAC hearing could prejudice any legal proceedings. PMcG stated that the Department must be able to prove that it has taken into account the consultees but that if the situation arose whereby the Department was under criticism from the PAC it could lead to applications for judicial review. PMcG advised that all published material will be reviewed therefore the Departments approach must be consistent. AC noted that most of the responses to the consultation are likely to be to not make changes to the scheme. PMcG stated that even if all responses were against the changes the Department can implement the changes provided it has dealt with the responses fairly.
12. SMcM asked whether legal advice on implementing a cap has been provided. PMcG advised that implementing a cap would require a change to the legislation and the Department needs to produce evidence to justify this. PMcG added that it is not possible to implement a cap retrospectively.
13. AC stated that the Department does not yet have enough evidence to be able to justify implementing a cap as they need a full years data for a variety of users, including seasonal variances, to be able to get a complete picture. PMcG confirmed that it would be preferable to have a full years data over a range of users in order to keep assumptions to a minimum. HC stated that obtaining the necessary evidence is a priority.
14. AC asked whether a user have an argument that 'grandfathering' was built into the legislation. SM stated that in the original approval of the scheme it was clear that the average rate of return was expected to be 12% over 20 years. However, he also noted that the State aid approval also mentions the grandfathering principle would only apply to new tariffs. PMcG advised that grandfathering is linked to the legitimate expectation argument in that as long as the changes are not unfair or oppressive there should not be an issue.
15. HC expressed thanks to PMcG and SM and they left the meeting.

Action 1: AC to review data available to date with a view to assessing when the consultation can be commissioned

Action 2: AC to begin process of alerting European Commission

Minutes and Action Points of previous meeting

16. HC referred to the minutes of the previous steering group meeting which took place on 31 May 2016. The Steering Group agreed the minutes as final. Attendees provided a progress update on each of their respective Action Points recorded in the minutes of the previous meeting.

Comment [SM2]:

Para 40 of the State aid decision letter states that when incentive levels are modified in future reviews, the revised levels only apply to the new installations entering the RHI scheme.

Paragraph 40 also details that this 'grandfathering' principle, whereby levels are guaranteed for existing installations, is intended to provide investor certainty and is consistent with the mainland UK scheme.

17. HC referred to the meeting with NIAO scheduled for 2pm on 6 June and noted that a suggestion should be made to delay a PAC hearing until after consultation. DC requested an estimate of when the evidence will be available to enable the consultation to take place. AC advised that in order to provide an estimate of this the Energy Economist will first need to carry out an equality impact assessment.
18. HC referred to the proposed site inspections and requested an update on contact with Ofgem to date. MW stated that the Ofgem position is not strong enough and suggested they should be treating this as an investigation rather than standalone 'site inspections' as this should be an investigation into whether fraud or abuse is taking place, not whether there is a working system. MW raised concerns that the Ofgem auditors are not independent enough to carry out the rigorous and robust level of inspections required and that there appears to be reluctance to express an opinion on whether fraud or abuse is occurring. MW also stated that the timelines need to be accelerated and suggested that it would be useful for the Department to carry out their own inspections in parallel with Ofgem as soon as possible.

Action 3: AC to arrange teleconference with Ofgem to discuss the proposed site inspections.

Draft ToR

19. DC suggested that the new Energy Efficiency Grade 7, Lucy Marten, should be added to the Steering Group membership. AC confirmed. MW stated that Andrew McCormick will attend Steering Group meetings when he is available. HC added that Chris Stewart should also be invited to all meetings. HC confirmed that other than the addition of Lucy Marten to the Steering Group membership there are no further changes required to the ToR and it can be finalised.

Action 4: MW to add Lucy Marten to the Steering Group membership and arrange for finalisation of the ToR

Update on NIAO Report

20. HC advised that a request should be made to NIAO to remove the annual rate of return example which assumes 24 hours a day, seven days a week use on the basis that this sort of usage does not adhere to the principles of the scheme.
21. SMcM advised that Andrew McCormick has requested that copies of the emails in relation to AME allocations referenced in the report in paragraphs 47 and 54 should be provided to NIAO.

Action 5: AC to check what documentation NIAO has been provided with to date and ensure emails referenced in the report are included in this

Preparation for Audit Committee

22. TC confirmed that AC is going to provide an update on timelines to Audit Committee. TC requested an update on the draft Internal Audit Reports. MW advised that David Beck is aware of the reports and that if NIAO request sight of the reports they will be provided. TC confirmed that David Back has had sight of the NIAO Report.

AOB

23. There being no further business the meeting was adjourned.

From: [Moore, Stephen \(DETI\)](#)
To: [Murphy, Shane](#); [Baker, Derek](#)
Subject: Minutes of RHI Steering Group 6 June 2016
Date: 15 June 2016 15:58:00
Attachments: [Minutes of meeting 06 June 2016.doc](#)
[image001.gif](#)

Shane

Please see attached my suggested revisions to the draft minutes of the RHI Steering Group meeting which took place on Monday 6 June.

Derek

I thought you might also like to see these minutes as State aid issues relating to the RHI scheme are likely to be discussed in your presence.

I think the main point I would want you to get across is that the department should, as soon as possible, 'discuss' and 'agree' the actions it is proposing to bring the RHI tariffs back in line with the EC.

We also should not assume that the Commission will 'blindly' endorse the actions we are proposing or will agree these quickly. Whilst I do expect the Commission will agree the actions proposed, I also expect the Commission will scrutinise our proposals closely, will not rush to provide advice or even an informal view and, if we have to re-notify, will take many months to adopt a new no objections State aid decision.

Happy to clarify any queries you might have.

Stephen

Stephen Moore

State Aid Unit
Department for the Economy
Netherleigh
Massey Avenue
Belfast, BT4 2JP

Tel: 028 9052 9415 (ext: 29415)

Mob: Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry

TextRelay: 18001 028 9052 9415

Web: www.economy-ni.gov.uk

NEW - 'State aid: A Beginner's Guide for Public Bodies in Northern Ireland' can now be accessed through the DFE Internet site: <https://www.detini.gov.uk/publications/state-aid-beginners-guide-public-bodies-northern-ireland>



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

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

From: Moore, Stephen (DETI)
Sent: 15 June 2016 15:42
To: Linton, Rachel
Cc: Cousins, Heather; McMurray, Stephen; Clydesdale, Alison; Conliffe, David; McFarlane, Iain; Woods, Michael (DETI); Coyne, Terence; Moore, Stephen (DETI); McGinn, Paul; Stewart, Chris (DFE); Wightman, Stuart; Marten, Lucy
Subject: FW: Minutes of RHI Steering Group 6 June 2016

Rachel

Please find some suggested revisions in the attached document. I have marked these up as tracked changes and have also included some comments to explain my suggested revisions.

Happy to discuss.

Stephen

Stephen Moore

State Aid Unit
Department for the Economy
Netherleigh
Massey Avenue
Belfast, BT4 2JP
Tel: 028 9052 9415 (ext: 29415)
Mob: Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry
TextRelay: 18001 028 9052 9415
Web: www.economy-ni.gov.uk

NEW - 'State aid: A Beginner's Guide for Public Bodies in Northern Ireland' can now be accessed through the DFE Internet site: <https://www.detini.gov.uk/publications/state-aid-beginners-guide-public-bodies-northern-ireland>



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

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

From: Linton, Rachel
Sent: 15 June 2016 12:09
To: Cousins, Heather; McMurray, Stephen; Clydesdale, Alison; Conliffe, David; McFarlane, Iain;

Woods, Michael (DETI); Coyne, Terence; Moore, Stephen (DETI); McGinn, Paul
Cc: Stewart, Chris (DFE); Wightman, Stuart; Marten, Lucy
Subject: Minutes of RHI Steering Group 6 June 2016

Dear All,

Please see attached draft minutes of the RHI Steering Group meeting which took place on Monday 6 June at 10.30am.

I would be grateful if you could review and let me have any amendments by way of tracked change by COP 22 June.

Kind regards,

Rachel

Rachel Linton

Financial Governance
Department for the Economy
Adelaide House
39-49 Adelaide Street
Belfast, BT2 8FD
Tel: 028 9025 7955 (ext: 57955)
TextRelay: 18001 028 9025 7955
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?

MINUTES OF RHI STEERING GROUP MEETING HELD AT 9.30AM ON 31 MAY 2016 IN CLARENCE COURT

Present: Heather Cousins (HC)
 Stephen McMurray (SMcM)
 Alison Clydesdale (AC)
 David Conliffe (DC)
 Iain McFarlane (IMcF)
 Michael Woods (MW)
 Terry Coyne (TC)

Paul McGinn (PMcG) (DSO)
 Stephen Moore (SM)

Apologies: Chris Stewart
 Stuart Wightman

Secretariat: Rachel Linton

State Aid

1. SM advised that in order to determine whether there has been any breach of the European Commission's State aid approval are any state aid issues the rates of return being attained by users needs to be determined. SM stated that if these rates are higher than those approved in the business case the Department may need will have to re-notify the scheme to the European Commission. AC advised that based on the data available to date the rates being achieved are consistently above the approved rates.
2. SM stated that based on the rate of return evidence to date it would be advisable to advise notify the European Commission of the issues and the actions the department is proposing to take being taken to correct the issues and also seek their advice and agreement on next steps. MW noted that if the actual rates of return are higher than those approved, this would breach state aid approval and asked who would be responsible for repaying the grant. SM confirmed and stated advised that if there has been a breach of the State aid approval, in circumstances where a grant has been paid, the EC would typically require the Member State to claw back from the beneficiary some or all of the that grant that has been already paid, plus interest. -would be recovered from the beneficiary He added, in this case, where the aid is paid in the form of a tariff, but that there may be is-an opportunity to correct overcompensation over the life of the scheme by amending the tariffs.
3. HC requested information on the mechanism in place to engage with the European Commission. SM advised that meetings with the Commission are arranged by contact is made via-UKRep and that BIS and DECC should be made aware that a meeting was being requested, who arrange all meetings with the Commission. SM also advised that a paper on the purpose of the meeting would need to be prepared and that a meeting at Head of Unit level would be appropriate at this stage. SM He reiterated that early engagement is preferable and that only the European

Comment [SM1]: I am not sure I confirmed Michael's comment this would breach State aid approval. Whilst this could well be true, as suggested in paragraph 3 below, I think I said that only the EC and the European Courts can say there has been a breach.

Commission or the European Courts can decide if there has been a breach in the [State aid approval](#) ~~LeO~~.

4. AC noted that the NIAO Report does not reference State Aid. MW advised that the current report is for the accounts but that the NIAO is aware of the State [aAid](#) issues and the next report which will be on VfM will include reference to State [aAid](#), therefore it is important to look at the issue now.
5. SM advised that the Commission will most likely expect the Department to bring the rate of return back to the average figure quoted in the approvals of 12%. SMcM asked how this rate of return compares with the rate under the GB scheme, AC advised that the rate of return on the GB scheme is less than 12%.

DSO Advice

6. PMcG stated that the Department has an obligation to make payments as presented in the legislation. PMcG advised that the legislation can be amended by the Department but that any amendments would only apply to future payments, the Department cannot amend the legislation retrospectively. PMcG advised that in order to amend the legislation the Department will first have to carry out a consultation exercise on the proposed changes, allowing sufficient time for people to respond. PMcG stated that the consultation exercise should clearly support the changes and provide a recent set of arguments grounding the decision.
7. PMcG advised that a potential obstacle to the Department being able to amend the legislation would be if it was deemed that users had a substantive legitimate expectation to achieve the current rates of return, however cases of this are rare as it would need to be proved that the changes were so unfair they would be considered to be abuse of the Departments power. PMcG advised that if the scheme remains viable and there is no significant financial loss suffered by those who have invested in the scheme, it would be unlikely that a substantive legitimate expectation claim could be made.
8. PMcG advised that if the scheme is being changed to achieve better VfM, the rationale for this needs to be clear and show the court that the scheme as it stands is too generous and the changes the Department is proposing to make will not have an adverse effect on the end user. PMcG suggested that the consultation exercise should look at not only the rate of return but also the implementation of a cap as it is better to argue one coherent whole case rather than run two arguments as each change is affected by the other.
9. HC asked whether the courts will compare the NI scheme to the GB scheme. PMcG advised that the courts will have regard to other schemes but will be focussed on the specifics of the NI scheme.
10. MW asked whether it would be appropriate to analyse a range of proposals and their impact or choose one preferred option. PMcG advised that the number of options to be brought to consultation is at the

Departments discretion but it is important that consultees be provided with enough information and time to give their input and that there must be analysis of how the changes impact on the integrity of the scheme and on businesses.

11. TC asked whether a PAC hearing could prejudice any legal proceedings. PMcG stated that the Department must be able to prove that it has taken into account the consultees but that if the situation arose whereby the Department was under criticism from the PAC it could lead to applications for judicial review. PMcG advised that all published material will be reviewed therefore the Departments approach must be consistent. AC noted that most of the responses to the consultation are likely to be to not make changes to the scheme. PMcG stated that even if all responses were against the changes the Department can implement the changes provided it has dealt with the responses fairly.
12. SMcM asked whether legal advice on implementing a cap has been provided. PMcG advised that implementing a cap would require a change to the legislation and the Department needs to produce evidence to justify this. PMcG added that it is not possible to implement a cap retrospectively.
13. AC stated that the Department does not yet have enough evidence to be able to justify implementing a cap as they need a full years data for a variety of users, including seasonal variances, to be able to get a complete picture. PMcG confirmed that it would be preferable to have a full years data over a range of users in order to keep assumptions to a minimum. HC stated that obtaining the necessary evidence is a priority.
14. AC asked whether a user have an argument that 'grandfathering' was built into the legislation. SM stated that in the original approval of the scheme it was clear that the average rate of return was expected to be 12% over 20 years. However, he also noted that the State aid approval also mentions the grandfathering principle would only apply to new tariffs. PMcG advised that grandfathering is linked to the legitimate expectation argument in that as long as the changes are not unfair or oppressive there should not be an issue.
15. HC expressed thanks to PMcG and SM and they left the meeting.

Action 1: AC to review data available to date with a view to assessing when the consultation can be commissioned

Action 2: AC to begin process of alerting European Commission

Minutes and Action Points of previous meeting

16. HC referred to the minutes of the previous steering group meeting which took place on 31 May 2016. The Steering Group agreed the minutes as final. Attendees provided a progress update on each of their respective Action Points recorded in the minutes of the previous meeting.

Comment [SM2]:

Para 40 of the State aid decision letter states that when incentive levels are modified in future reviews, the revised levels only apply to the new installations entering the RHI scheme.

Paragraph 40 also details that this 'grandfathering' principle, whereby levels are guaranteed for existing installations, is intended to provide investor certainty and is consistent with the mainland UK scheme.

17. HC referred to the meeting with NIAO scheduled for 2pm on 6 June and noted that a suggestion should be made to delay a PAC hearing until after consultation. DC requested an estimate of when the evidence will be available to enable the consultation to take place. AC advised that in order to provide an estimate of this the Energy Economist will first need to carry out an equality impact assessment.
18. HC referred to the proposed site inspections and requested an update on contact with Ofgem to date. MW stated that the Ofgem position is not strong enough and suggested they should be treating this as an investigation rather than standalone 'site inspections' as this should be an investigation into whether fraud or abuse is taking place, not whether there is a working system. MW raised concerns that the Ofgem auditors are not independent enough to carry out the rigorous and robust level of inspections required and that there appears to be reluctance to express an opinion on whether fraud or abuse is occurring. MW also stated that the timelines need to be accelerated and suggested that it would be useful for the Department to carry out their own inspections in parallel with Ofgem as soon as possible.

Action 3: AC to arrange teleconference with Ofgem to discuss the proposed site inspections.

Draft ToR

19. DC suggested that the new Energy Efficiency Grade 7, Lucy Marten, should be added to the Steering Group membership. AC confirmed. MW stated that Andrew McCormick will attend Steering Group meetings when he is available. HC added that Chris Stewart should also be invited to all meetings. HC confirmed that other than the addition of Lucy Marten to the Steering Group membership there are no further changes required to the ToR and it can be finalised.

Action 4: MW to add Lucy Marten to the Steering Group membership and arrange for finalisation of the ToR

Update on NIAO Report

20. HC advised that a request should be made to NIAO to remove the annual rate of return example which assumes 24 hours a day, seven days a week use on the basis that this sort of usage does not adhere to the principles of the scheme.
21. SMcM advised that Andrew McCormick has requested that copies of the emails in relation to AME allocations referenced in the report in paragraphs 47 and 54 should be provided to NIAO.

Action 5: AC to check what documentation NIAO has been provided with to date and ensure emails referenced in the report are included in this

Preparation for Audit Committee

22. TC confirmed that AC is going to provide an update on timelines to Audit Committee. TC requested an update on the draft Internal Audit Reports. MW advised that David Beck is aware of the reports and that if NIAO request sight of the reports they will be provided. TC confirmed that David Back has had sight of the NIAO Report.

AOB

23. There being no further business the meeting was adjourned.