

From: [Dukelow, Victor](#)
To: [Murphy, Shane](#)
Subject: FW: V4 RHI Assembly Debate 16 January 2017 Master QA
Date: 16 January 2017 10:07:13

Shane,

Might well be helpful to have these to hand – the maximum subsidy that each installation could lose at the tier/cap and will 24/7 usage.

Victor

From: Smith, Alan
Sent: 16 January 2017 09:33
To: Dukelow, Victor
Subject: RE: V4 RHI Assembly Debate 16 January 2017 Master QA

Victor,

As discussed, the following table shows the maximum impact on subsidies for participants operating at different heat levels between option 1 and 2.

Subsidy to 99kW boiler under option 1 and 2 at different running rates

	@ 15%		
	tier	@ cap	@100% running
Option 1	£8,429	£25,848	£56,371
Option 2	£8,429	£12,464	£12,464
Difference	0	£13,384	£43,907

Best regards,

Alan

From: Dukelow, Victor
Sent: 16 January 2017 09:21
To: Smith, Alan
Subject: FW: V4 RHI Assembly Debate 16 January 2017 Master QA

Alan,

See page 6

V

From: McCormick, Andrew (DFE)
Sent: 15 January 2017 21:24
To: Archbold, Claire
Cc: McMurray, Stephen; Cousins, Heather; McCann, Brendan; Coyne, Terence; Marten, Lucy; Dukelow, Victor; Murphy, Shane; Montgomery, Paul; McGinn, Paul; Smith, Alan
Subject: Fw: V4 RHI Assembly Debate 16 January 2017 Master QA

Many thanks Claire.

I have asked the team for a clear explanation re rate of return.

I think the figure for health opportunity cost is already what you suggested but will check.

Take your point re saying too much about legal advice.

Some tidying to do in the course of the morning, but we will probably need a lot of this for the Committee at 9.30.

A

From: Archbold, Claire <Claire.Archbold@finance-ni.gov.uk>
Sent: Sunday, 15 January 2017 19:15
To: McCormick, Andrew (DFE)
Cc: Dukelow, Victor; Marten, Lucy; Cousins, Heather; Smith, Alan; McMurray, Stephen; McGinn, Paul
Subject: V4 RHI Assembly Debate 16 January 2017 Master QA

Colleagues

A few small thoughts on the Q&A. I think it's important to shut down the breach of contract question quickly, because anyone with a mind to sue will be listening with their full attention. You'll recall that the AG said that on the documents briefed, there was no contract, and Paul McGinn's view is that this is a matter of public law rather than private law.

The speech reads well. Just a query about the section about the PWC investigation. On the one hand, you want to be transparent. But on the other hand, if more investigations are going to be carried out, I might not be so fulsome in saying exactly what the PWC inspectors are going to be looking for. Might encourage some folks to falsify records.

The other piece you will want to remind the Minister of is that if he agrees to release legal advice to one person, he could be seen to have waived privilege to others (eg on FOI, where legal privilege is a qualified, not an absolute exemption). And there is a constitutional convention, of which he'll be aware, which has been adopted in NI (we have correspondence from the AG dating back a number of years, and it has been our standard advice since receiving it) that the fact that legal advice has been sought from the AG, and the contents of that advice, are not referred to by Ministers.

Will take a quick look at the other matter and give you a ring.

Best regards

Claire

This communication (and any attachment) is covered by legal professional privilege. Its unauthorised use, disclosure, storage or copying is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please return or destroy and inform the sender accordingly. Internet e-mail is not a secure medium. Any reply to this message could be intercepted and read by someone else. Please bear that in mind when deciding whether to send material in response to this message by e-mail. This e-mail (whether you are the sender or the recipient) may be monitored, recorded and retained by the ITAssist. E-mail monitoring and blocking software may be used. You have a responsibility to ensure laws are not broken when composing or forwarding e-mails and their contents.