

From: [Iain Morrow](#)
To: [Hutchinson, Peter](#)
Cc: [Clydesdale, Alison](#)
Subject: RE: Memo to CEPA re RHI analysis and policy options
Date: 04 March 2011 13:35:53

Peter

Can I check a few more things with you – some detailed, some not:

1. Starting off with the big one. We have thought more about only assessing the NI RHI in the second scenario, and have some concerns about doing that. It is likely to score badly on things like fairness and accessibility particularly to the poorer households, because it requires a lot of cash upfront to cover installation costs. We also think an approach like the GB RHI makes some strong assumptions about how good the data used to calculate the incentive is. Experience with the take-up of renewable heat (particularly domestic) is very limited, and there's a real risk that the tariffs could be set at a level that doesn't give people enough of an incentive (or requires them to be quite wealthy to afford the installation cost). You can of course review the tariffs after a few years, but this might be too late to have much impact on 2020. **I'd appreciate the chance to discuss this with you and Alison – could we have a conference call about it in the next day or two?**
2. Now for more detailed issues. First, using Ofgem to administer an NI RHI. Is this something you have discussed with Ofgem and they have agreed to? Should we mention it in our report as a possible benefit?
3. For fuel poverty, I understand that DSD have a fuel poverty ready reckoner based on BRE data. For consistency, would you want us to use this to assess any fuel poverty impacts? Would Eilish at DSD be able to point me in the right direction?
4. For consumer bill impacts, the impact is zero if we are in the scenario where there is £25m funding (subject perhaps to a small increase in gas prices), but things get a little more complex in the scenario with more funding, since it's not clear where that funding comes from. In the worst case, it could all be from consumer bills, so I propose that we'd show the funding requirement as a percentage of expected bills and say that that is subject to decisions about where funding comes from. Is this OK?

Regards

Iain

From: Hutchinson, Peter [mailto:Peter.Hutchinson@detini.gov.uk]
Sent: 01 March 2011 16:19
To: Iain Morrow
Cc: Clydesdale, Alison
Subject: RE: Memo to CEPA re RHI analysis and policy options

Iain,

Thanks for your email, just by way of response;

1. In scenario 2 it will be important that the spend is profiled to 2015 and then an expected or required budget is profiled post 2015. This should probably also be accompanied with

advice on when the RHI should close to new entrants, be reviewed, or seek an alternative method of funding? A lot of this will depend on the final GB scheme, if they continue with long term tariffs then we should also expect to receive a share of DECC funding post 2015. I think working on the premise "of what funding do we need" to continue the scheme is best as it will provide a firm evidence base for DECC/HMT if needed.

2. We can rule out solely using "green oil" but it should be included as an element in other scenarios. In terms of having an obligation, this could either be a stand-alone policy or work alongside a traditional RHI but instead of incentives for bio-fuel or bio-gas the emphasis is on the existing oil and gas suppliers to increase the levels of these technologies. The obligations could be set realistic levels depending on available resource. It may not be feasible because of technological issues (bio-gas injection) or the cost/confusion in administration but it might be worth considering for these two technologies only? If they would be better incentivised under a straight forward RHI that is fine.

3. Agree - it is unlikely we will be able to proceed with the industry only option, we just want to speak to Invest NI to ensure that they don't hold a differing opinion or raise something we haven't considered. I think from all the reasons we have already discussed it is unlikely that this option is feasible.

4. Agree, a position where we have funding secured (in-line with GB) post 2015 would mean a longer-term approach similar to the draft GB model. I think it would take elements of some of your proposed options already, i.e. NI RHI which is based on GB model however with different tariff levels, consideration of alternative technologies, increased role for refurbishment, renovation and energy efficiency, consideration of the heavy industrial sector, impact on gas mitigated. In essence it's the most effective and appropriate RHI for NI.

5. I think Friday, 18th March should suit us but will check and let you know asap. Morning would be best for us also.

6. The most important thing is that the potential impact on gas (current network, future extension and distribution costs) is understood for each of the scenarios and, where possible, mitigated against. For the final scenarios we need to be clear on what the impact will be so an informed decision can be taken. As you say, no matter what policy option is developed there will be an impact on gas by increasing the level of renewable heat to 10%, all we can do is factor this into our considerations and ensure we fully understand the impact when the final policy option is selected.

I hope this answers your queries. Happy to discuss.

Thanks,

Peter

Peter Hutchinson

Sustainable Energy

Department of Enterprise, Trade & Investment

Netherleigh

Massey Avenue

Belfast, BT4 2JP

Tel: 028 9052 9532 (ext: 29532)

Textphone: 028 9052 9304

Web: www.detini.gov.uk

From: Iain Morrow [<mailto:Iain.Morrow@cepa.co.uk>]
Sent: 01 March 2011 12:01
To: Hutchinson, Peter
Subject: RE: Memo to CEPA re RHI analysis and policy options

Peter

Thank you for this note. I had a few follow-up questions on it:

1. In scenario 2 (funding post 2015 available), what level of funding should we assume? Do you want us to assume that the funding from 2014/15 continues at the same level, or work backwards to say “what level of funding do we need to deliver X”?
2. You mention in paragraph 5 a Renewable Heat Obligation (RHO), but then in paragraph 6 rule out the “Green Oil” option on the basis of the likely supply and resource of bioliquids. An RHO would probably suffer from the same problems as “Green Oil” – could we discuss whether it is worth considering?
3. From paragraph 7, it sounds like exploring a “Focus on industry” type of option may not be necessary, so I propose that we don’t work on it until you’ve had a chance to speak to InvestNI. The more I think about that option, the less attractive it looks so it may not be worth discussing very much in any case.
4. There are lots of choices to be made for the NI RHI in scenario 2. Do you want us to propose something for our next meeting?
5. Talking of the next meeting, I think you’d previously suggested the 18th. Is that still OK? Morning would be better if that’s possible.
6. Gas. I’m going to speak to Sam about this later today. Having thought a little about this, you are inevitably weakening the case for gas, since anyone you persuade to switch from oil to renewable heat is no longer a potential gas customer (why give people an incentive to take up renewables and then one to switch to gas). If you approach 10% renewable heat, you are significantly reducing the number of potential new gas customers. This might make more of a difference in areas where you already have gas (since you are further reducing the small pool of potential new customers) than to the case for extending the network, but since the economic case for extension is not very strong (I understand from Fred) it may have an effect. This is all assuming you target oil customers, or at least are technology neutral - other options are I think worse for gas. So I’m not sure that we can say that we aren’t weakening the case for gas – I know this probably isn’t what you are looking for, so happy to discuss and see how we might

present this.

Regards

Iain

From: Hutchinson, Peter [mailto:Peter.Hutchinson@detini.gov.uk]

Sent: 28 February 2011 16:45

To: Iain Morrow

Cc: Hepper, Fiona; Clydesdale, Alison; Frazer, Fred; Connolly, Samuel; Mark Cockburn; Paget Fulcher; Mahmoud.Abu-ebid@aeat.co.uk; Oliver Edberg

Subject: Memo to CEPA re RHI analysis and policy options

Iain,

Please see attached note following on from last week's video-conference.

Thanks,

Peter

Peter Hutchinson

Sustainable Energy

Department of Enterprise, Trade & Investment

Netherleigh

Massey Avenue

Belfast, BT4 2JP

Tel: 028 9052 9532 (ext: 29532)

Textphone: 028 9052 9304

Web: www.detini.gov.uk

From: [Hutchinson, Peter](#)
To: ["Iain Morrow"](#)
Cc: [Clydesdale, Alison](#); [Connolly, Samuel](#)
Subject: RE: Memo to CEPA re RHI analysis and policy options
Date: 08 March 2011 14:08:00

Iain,

Sorry for the delay in responding.

1. I think we need to pursue the development of a NI RHI but consider how issues such as fairness and accessibility can be addressed within it. We share your concerns that a RHI does not reduce the initial capital outlay and therefore might have limited appeal. Could we consider how it could be designed to address these problems, i.e. front-loading of tariffs, specific/higher tariffs for social housing or esco's, staged introduction of rhi (eg large-scale industrial/commercial technologies in year 1, community heating size year 2, domestic micro-generation year 3). These are only early thoughts on how it could be designed, I will give more thought - **I agree that it would be useful to discuss, would Thursday suit you for a teleconference?** In terms of rate of return do you have a feel for how the DECC figure of 12% rate of return (6% for solar thermal) will affect uptake? I think we accept that the capital cost will always be a barrier but we need to consider how this could be limited - can discuss more on Thursday.

2. We had preliminary discussions with OFGEM re administration. We will seek to discuss with them again in advance of the final report so the position is cleared and can be included.

3. I'll speak to DSD re fuel poverty ready reckoner and if I can share I will do so. Then this could be used to assess impact.

4. Agree that the future funding section will be tricky and accept that you would need to show the expected costs going forward and how this could be met via a levy and the impact on bills, whilst stressing this would be worst case scenario. **Sam may wish to add further however?**

Let me know what suits you for a teleconference on Thursday.

On a side issue, no further word from DECC on final RHI design?

Thanks,

Peter

Peter Hutchinson

Sustainable Energy

Department of Enterprise, Trade & Investment

Netherleigh

Massey Avenue
Belfast, BT4 2JP
Tel: 028 9052 9532 (ext: 29532)
Textphone: 028 9052 9304
Web: www.detini.gov.uk

From: Iain Morrow [mailto:Iain.Morrow@cepa.co.uk]
Sent: 04 March 2011 13:36
To: Hutchinson, Peter
Cc: Clydesdale, Alison
Subject: RE: Memo to CEPA re RHI analysis and policy options

Peter

Can I check a few more things with you – some detailed, some not:

1. Starting off with the big one. We have thought more about only assessing the NI RHI in the second scenario, and have some concerns about doing that. It is likely to score badly on things like fairness and accessibility particularly to the poorer households, because it requires a lot of cash upfront to cover installation costs. We also think an approach like the GB RHI makes some strong assumptions about how good the data used to calculate the incentive is. Experience with the take-up of renewable heat (particularly domestic) is very limited, and there's a real risk that the tariffs could be set at a level that doesn't give people enough of an incentive (or requires them to be quite wealthy to afford the installation cost). You can of course review the tariffs after a few years, but this might be too late to have much impact on 2020. **I'd appreciate the chance to discuss this with you and Alison – could we have a conference call about it in the next day or two?**
2. Now for more detailed issues. First, using Ofgem to administer an NI RHI. Is this something you have discussed with Ofgem and they have agreed to? Should we mention it in our report as a possible benefit?
3. For fuel poverty, I understand that DSD have a fuel poverty ready reckoner based on BRE data. For consistency, would you want us to use this to assess any fuel poverty impacts? Would Eilish at DSD be able to point me in the right direction?
4. For consumer bill impacts, the impact is zero if we are in the scenario where there is £25m funding (subject perhaps to a small increase in gas prices), but things get a little more complex in the scenario with more funding, since it's not clear where that funding comes from. In the worst case, it could all be from consumer bills, so I propose that we'd show the funding requirement as a percentage of expected bills and say that that is subject to decisions about where funding comes from. Is this OK?

Regards

Iain

From: Hutchinson, Peter [mailto:Peter.Hutchinson@detini.gov.uk]
Sent: 01 March 2011 16:19
To: Iain Morrow
Cc: Clydesdale, Alison
Subject: RE: Memo to CEPA re RHI analysis and policy options

Iain,

Thanks for your email, just by way of response;

1. In scenario 2 it will be important that the spend is profiled to 2015 and then an expected or required budget is profiled post 2015. This should probably also be accompanied with advice on when the RHI should close to new entrants, be reviewed, or seek an alternative method of funding? A lot of this will depend on the final GB scheme, if they continue with long term tariffs then we should also and expect to receive a share of DECC funding post 2015. I think working on the premise "of what funding do we need" to continue the scheme is best as it will provide a firm evidence base for DECC/HMT if needed.

2. We can rule out solely using "green oil" but it should be included as an element in other scenarios. In terms of having an obligation, this could either be a stand-alone policy or work alongside a traditional RHI but instead of incentives for bio-fuel or bio-gas the emphasis is on the existing oil and gas suppliers to increase the levels of these technologies. The obligations could be set realistic levels depending on available resource. It may not be feasible because of technological issues (bio-gas injection) or the cost/confusion in administration but it might be worth considering for these two technologies only? If they would be better incentivised under a straight forward RHI that is fine.

3. Agree - it is unlikely we will be able to proceed with the industry only option, we just want to speak to Invest NI to ensure that they don't hold a differing opinion or raise something we haven't considered. I think from all the reasons we have already discussed it is unlikely that this option is feasible.

4. Agree, a position where we have funding secured (in-line with GB) post 2015 would mean a longer-term approach similar to the draft GB model. I think it would take elements of some of your proposed options already, i.e. NI RHI which is based on GB model however with different tariff levels, consideration of alternative technologies, increased role for refurbishment, renovation and energy efficiency, consideration of the heavy industrial sector, impact on gas mitigated. In essence it's the most effective and appropriate RHI for NI.

5. I think Friday, 18th March should suit us but will check and let you know asap. Morning would be best for us also.

6. The most important thing is that the potential impact on gas (current network, future extension and distribution costs) is understood for each of the scenarios and, where possible, mitigated against. For the final scenarios we need to be clear on what the impact will be so an informed decision can be taken. As you say, no matter what policy option is developed there will be an impact on gas by increasing the level of renewable heat to 10%, all we can do is factor this into our considerations and ensure we fully understand the

impact when the final policy option is selected.

I hope this answers your queries. Happy to discuss.

Thanks,

Peter

Peter Hutchinson

Sustainable Energy

Department of Enterprise, Trade & Investment

Netherleigh

Massey Avenue

Belfast, BT4 2JP

Tel: 028 9052 9532 (ext: 29532)

Textphone: 028 9052 9304

Web: www.detini.gov.uk

From: Iain Morrow [<mailto:Iain.Morrow@cepa.co.uk>]
Sent: 01 March 2011 12:01
To: Hutchinson, Peter
Subject: RE: Memo to CEPA re RHI analysis and policy options

Peter

Thank you for this note. I had a few follow-up questions on it:

1. In scenario 2 (funding post 2015 available), what level of funding should we assume? Do you want us to assume that the funding from 2014/15 continues at the same level, or work backwards to say “what level of funding do we need to deliver X”?
2. You mention in paragraph 5 a Renewable Heat Obligation (RHO), but then in paragraph 6 rule out the “Green Oil” option on the basis of the likely supply and resource of bioliquids. An RHO would probably suffer from the same problems as “Green Oil” – could we discuss whether it is worth considering?
3. From paragraph 7, it sounds like exploring a “Focus on industry” type of option may not be necessary, so I propose that we don’t work on it until you’ve had a chance to speak to InvestNI. The more I think about that option, the less attractive it looks so it may not be worth discussing very much in any case.
4. There are lots of choices to be made for the NI RHI in scenario 2. Do you want us to propose something for our next meeting?
5. Talking of the next meeting, I think you’d previously suggested the 18th. Is that still OK? Morning would be better if that’s possible.
6. Gas. I’m going to speak to Sam about this later today. Having thought a little about this, you are inevitably weakening the case for gas, since anyone you persuade to switch from oil to renewable heat is no longer a potential gas customer (why give people an incentive to take up renewables and then one to switch to gas). If you approach 10% renewable

heat, you are significantly reducing the number of potential new gas customers. This might make more of a difference in areas where you already have gas (since you are further reducing the small pool of potential new customers) than to the case for extending the network, but since the economic case for extension is not very strong (I understand from Fred) it may have an effect. This is all assuming you target oil customers, or at least are technology neutral - other options are I think worse for gas. So I'm not sure that we can say that we aren't weakening the case for gas - I know this probably isn't what you are looking for, so happy to discuss and see how we might present this.

Regards

Iain

From: Hutchinson, Peter [mailto:Peter.Hutchinson@detini.gov.uk]

Sent: 28 February 2011 16:45

To: Iain Morrow

Cc: Hepper, Fiona; Clydesdale, Alison; Frazer, Fred; Connolly, Samuel; Mark Cockburn; Paget Fulcher; Mahmoud.Abu-ebid@aeat.co.uk; Oliver Edberg

Subject: Memo to CEPA re RHI analysis and policy options

Iain,

Please see attached note following on from last week's video-conference.

Thanks,

Peter

Peter Hutchinson

Sustainable Energy

Department of Enterprise, Trade & Investment

Netherleigh

Massey Avenue

Belfast, BT4 2JP

Tel: 028 9052 9532 (ext: 29532)

Textphone: 028 9052 9304

Web: www.detini.gov.uk

From: [Hutchinson, Peter](#)
To: ["Iain Morrow"](#)
Cc: [Clydesdale, Alison](#)
Subject: FW: Memo to CEPA re RHI analysis and policy options
Date: 09 March 2011 15:05:00

Iain,

I contacted Eilish in DSD about the ready reckoner based on BRE data. She has advised that BRE have only recently been commissioned to carry out this work and it probably won't be completed for 3 months.

She advised that the current best source of information relating to fuel poverty is the 2009 Housing Condition Survey, this has information on fuel poverty by area, house type, age of householder etc. I have attached a link for the publication.

http://www.nihe.gov.uk/index/sp_home/research-2/house_condition_survey.htm

Thanks,

Peter

Peter Hutchinson

Sustainable Energy
Department of Enterprise, Trade & Investment
Netherleigh
Massey Avenue
Belfast, BT4 2JP
Tel: 028 9052 9532 (ext: 29532)
Textphone: 028 9052 9304
Web: www.detini.gov.uk

From: Hutchinson, Peter
Sent: 08 March 2011 14:09
To: 'Iain Morrow'
Cc: Clydesdale, Alison; Connolly, Samuel
Subject: RE: Memo to CEPA re RHI analysis and policy options

Iain,

Sorry for the delay in responding.

1. I think we need to pursue the development of a NI RHI but consider how issues such as fairness and accessibility can be addressed within it. We share your concerns that a RHI does not reduce the initial capital outlay and therefore might have limited appeal. Could we consider how it could be designed to address these problems, i.e. front-loading of tariffs, specific/higher tariffs for social housing or esco's, staged introduction of rhi (eg

large-scale industrial/commercial technologies in year 1, community heating size year 2, domestic micro-generation year 3). These are only early thoughts on how it could be designed, I will give more thought - **I agree that it would be useful to discuss, would Thursday suit you for a teleconference?** In terms of rate of return do you have a feel for how the DECC figure of 12% rate of return (6% for solar thermal) will affect uptake? I think we accept that the capital cost will always be a barrier but we need to consider how this could be limited - can discuss more on Thursday.

2. We had preliminary discussions with OFGEM re administration. We will seek to discuss with them again in advance of the final report so the position is cleared and can be included.

3. I'll speak to DSD re fuel poverty ready reckoner and if I can share I will do so. Then this could be used to assess impact.

4. Agree that the future funding section will be tricky and accept that you would need to show the expected costs going forward and how this could be met via a levy and the impact on bills, whilst stressing this would be worst case scenario. **Sam may wish to add further however?**

Let me know what suits you for a teleconference on Thursday.

On a side issue, no further word from DECC on final RHI design?

Thanks,

Peter

Peter Hutchinson

Sustainable Energy

Department of Enterprise, Trade & Investment

Netherleigh

Massey Avenue

Belfast, BT4 2JP

Tel: 028 9052 9532 (ext: 29532)

Textphone: 028 9052 9304

Web: www.detini.gov.uk

From: Iain Morrow [mailto:Iain.Morrow@cepa.co.uk]
Sent: 04 March 2011 13:36
To: Hutchinson, Peter
Cc: Clydesdale, Alison
Subject: RE: Memo to CEPA re RHI analysis and policy options

Peter

Can I check a few more things with you – some detailed, some not:

1. Starting off with the big one. We have thought more about only assessing the NI RHI in the second scenario, and have some concerns about doing that. It is likely to score badly on things like fairness and accessibility particularly to the poorer households, because it requires a lot of cash upfront to cover installation costs. We also think an approach like the GB RHI makes some strong assumptions about how good the data used to calculate the incentive is. Experience with the take-up of renewable heat (particularly domestic) is very limited, and there's a real risk that the tariffs could be set at a level that doesn't give people enough of an incentive (or requires them to be quite wealthy to afford the installation cost). You can of course review the tariffs after a few years, but this might be too late to have much impact on 2020. **I'd appreciate the chance to discuss this with you and Alison – could we have a conference call about it in the next day or two?**
2. Now for more detailed issues. First, using Ofgem to administer an NI RHI. Is this something you have discussed with Ofgem and they have agreed to? Should we mention it in our report as a possible benefit?
3. For fuel poverty, I understand that DSD have a fuel poverty ready reckoner based on BRE data. For consistency, would you want us to use this to assess any fuel poverty impacts? Would Eilish at DSD be able to point me in the right direction?
4. For consumer bill impacts, the impact is zero if we are in the scenario where there is £25m funding (subject perhaps to a small increase in gas prices), but things get a little more complex in the scenario with more funding, since it's not clear where that funding comes from. In the worst case, it could all be from consumer bills, so I propose that we'd show the funding requirement as a percentage of expected bills and say that that is subject to decisions about where funding comes from. Is this OK?

Regards

Iain

From: Hutchinson, Peter [mailto:Peter.Hutchinson@detini.gov.uk]
Sent: 01 March 2011 16:19
To: Iain Morrow
Cc: Clydesdale, Alison
Subject: RE: Memo to CEPA re RHI analysis and policy options

Iain,

Thanks for your email, just by way of response;

1. In scenario 2 it will be important that the spend is profiled to 2015 and then an expected or required budget is profiled post 2015. This should probably also be accompanied with advice on when the RHI should close to new entrants, be reviewed, or seek an alternative method of funding? A lot of this will depend on the final GB scheme, if they continue with long term tariffs then we should also and expect to receive a share of DECC funding post 2015. I think working on the premise "of what funding do we need" to continue the scheme is best as it will provide a firm evidence base for DECC/HMT if needed.
2. We can rule out solely using "green oil" but it should be included as an element in other

scenarios. In terms of having an obligation, this could either be a stand-alone policy or work alongside a traditional RHI but instead of incentives for bio-fuel or bio-gas the emphasis is on the existing oil and gas suppliers to increase the levels of these technologies. The obligations could be set realistic levels depending on available resource. It may not be feasible because of technological issues (bio-gas injection) or the cost/confusion in administration but it might be worth considering for these two technologies only? If they would be better incentivised under a straight forward RHI that is fine.

3. Agree - it is unlikely we will be able to proceed with the industry only option, we just want to speak to Invest NI to ensure that they don't hold a differing opinion or raise something we haven't considered. I think from all the reasons we have already discussed it is unlikely that this option is feasible.

4. Agree, a position where we have funding secured (in-line with GB) post 2015 would mean a longer-term approach similar to the draft GB model. I think it would take elements of some of your proposed options already, i.e. NI RHI which is based on GB model however with different tariff levels, consideration of alternative technologies, increased role for refurbishment, renovation and energy efficiency, consideration of the heavy industrial sector, impact on gas mitigated. In essence it's the most effective and appropriate RHI for NI.

5. I think Friday, 18th March should suit us but will check and let you know asap. Morning would be best for us also.

6. The most important thing is that the potential impact on gas (current network, future extension and distribution costs) is understood for each of the scenarios and, where possible, mitigated against. For the final scenarios we need to be clear on what the impact will be so an informed decision can be taken. As you say, no matter what policy option is developed there will be an impact on gas by increasing the level of renewable heat to 10%, all we can do is factor this into our considerations and ensure we fully understand the impact when the final policy option is selected.

I hope this answers your queries. Happy to discuss.

Thanks,

Peter

Peter Hutchinson

Sustainable Energy

Department of Enterprise, Trade & Investment

Netherleigh

Massey Avenue

Belfast, BT4 2JP

Tel: 028 9052 9532 (ext: 29532)

Textphone: 028 9052 9304

Web: www.detini.gov.uk

From: Iain Morrow [<mailto:Iain.Morrow@cepa.co.uk>]
Sent: 01 March 2011 12:01
To: Hutchinson, Peter
Subject: RE: Memo to CEPA re RHI analysis and policy options

Peter

Thank you for this note. I had a few follow-up questions on it:

1. In scenario 2 (funding post 2015 available), what level of funding should we assume? Do you want us to assume that the funding from 2014/15 continues at the same level, or work backwards to say “what level of funding do we need to deliver X”?
2. You mention in paragraph 5 a Renewable Heat Obligation (RHO), but then in paragraph 6 rule out the “Green Oil” option on the basis of the likely supply and resource of bioliquids. An RHO would probably suffer from the same problems as “Green Oil” – could we discuss whether it is worth considering?
3. From paragraph 7, it sounds like exploring a “Focus on industry” type of option may not be necessary, so I propose that we don’t work on it until you’ve had a chance to speak to InvestNI. The more I think about that option, the less attractive it looks so it may not be worth discussing very much in any case.
4. There are lots of choices to be made for the NI RHI in scenario 2. Do you want us to propose something for our next meeting?
5. Talking of the next meeting, I think you’d previously suggested the 18th. Is that still OK? Morning would be better if that’s possible.
6. Gas. I’m going to speak to Sam about this later today. Having thought a little about this, you are inevitably weakening the case for gas, since anyone you persuade to switch from oil to renewable heat is no longer a potential gas customer (why give people an incentive to take up renewables and then one to switch to gas). If you approach 10% renewable heat, you are significantly reducing the number of potential new gas customers. This might make more of a difference in areas where you already have gas (since you are further reducing the small pool of potential new customers) than to the case for extending the network, but since the economic case for extension is not very strong (I understand from Fred) it may have an effect. This is all assuming you target oil customers, or at least are technology neutral - other options are I think worse for gas. So I’m not sure that we can say that we aren’t weakening the case for gas – I know this probably isn’t what you are looking for, so happy to discuss and see how we might present this.

Regards

Iain

From: Hutchinson, Peter [<mailto:Peter.Hutchinson@detini.gov.uk>]
Sent: 28 February 2011 16:45

To: Iain Morrow

Cc: Hepper, Fiona; Clydesdale, Alison; Frazer, Fred; Connolly, Samuel; Mark Cockburn; Paget Fulcher; Mahmoud.Abu-ebid@aeat.co.uk; Oliver Edberg

Subject: Memo to CEPA re RHI analysis and policy options

Iain,

Please see attached note following on from last week's video-conference.

Thanks,

Peter

Peter Hutchinson

Sustainable Energy

Department of Enterprise, Trade & Investment

Netherleigh

Massey Avenue

Belfast, BT4 2JP

Tel: 028 9052 9532 (ext: 29532)

Textphone: 028 9052 9304

Web: www.detini.gov.uk