

**From:** [McCormick, Andrew \(DETI\)](#)  
**To:** [Mills, John \(DETI\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Stewart, Chris \(DETI\)](#); [Wightman, Stuart](#); [Hughes, Seamus](#); [McIlwrath, Linda](#); [Hill, Janice](#); [Cooper, Trevor](#); [Rooney, Eugene](#); [Brankin, Bernie](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Future of RHI and NIRO  
**Date:** 31 December 2015 13:20:58  
**Attachments:** [Submission - Future of RHI.DOCX](#)

---

Would the changes in the attached work?

Many thanks.

---

**From:** Mills, John (DETI)  
**Sent:** 31 December 2015 12:05  
**To:** McCormick, Andrew (DETI)  
**Cc:** Stewart, Chris (DETI); Wightman, Stuart; Hughes, Seamus; McIlwrath, Linda; Hill, Janice; Cooper, Trevor; Rooney, Eugene; Brankin, Bernie  
**Subject:** RE: Future of RHI and NIRO

Andrew,

Well spotted, should be 29 October – simply an error in the sub.

Suspension v. Closure. Yes, left that in. I recommend keeping open the option of suspension at this point because: 1) we will stop the scheme to new applications asap (if the Minister agrees) regardless of whether that is through closure or suspension; 2) as either will require notice, there will be little or no difference in timescale; 3) if closure can be done more quickly, we will do that; 4) we should not underestimate the opposition to closure or suspension but the latter will be more acceptable and suspension answers the “what happens in the future” questions that we face on the NIRO (albeit there would have to be several changes to the current scheme anyway); 5) although it may seem out of touch with present reality, had HMT not cut the UK RHI budget we would have been back in the black after 3 years. Things could change as the UK gets closer to failing its EU renewable obligations and would we want rule out even the prospect of future Westminster funding?

I think suspension is preferable but not if it takes longer. Happy to refer only to closure if you prefer

---

**From:** McCormick, Andrew (DETI)  
**Sent:** 31 December 2015 09:33  
**To:** Mills, John (DETI)  
**Cc:** Stewart, Chris (DETI); Wightman, Stuart; Hughes, Seamus; McIlwrath, Linda; Hill, Janice; Cooper, Trevor; Rooney, Eugene; Brankin, Bernie  
**Subject:** RE: Future of RHI and NIRO

Many thanks, John.

Two queries:

- If DFP approved expenditure from 1 October 2015 (paragraph 8) why does the table at paragraph make the distinction at 28 October (we need to be clear on the amount of expenditure which is irregular, and clearly the commitments in October affect this point in a very significant way). Please confirm this with Finance Directorate, as it will be important to have consistency with the treatment of this expenditure in budgets and accounts;
- In a couple of places there is still reference to possible suspension – if that is intended, the case would need to be made – simpler I would have thought just to drop the word.

Happy to discuss.

---

**From:** Mills, John (DETI)  
**Sent:** 30 December 2015 17:29  
**To:** McCormick, Andrew (DETI)  
**Cc:** Stewart, Chris (DETI); Wightman, Stuart; Hughes, Seamus; McIlwrath, Linda; Hill, Janice  
**Subject:** Future of RHI and NIRO

Andrew,

Not sure if you want to see RHI sub again. The attached is largely a tidied up version reflecting

the amendments you made before Christmas. I'll issue tomorrow unless you instruct otherwise.  
Hoping to get draft sub on NIRO also before new year.