

Andrew McCormick

From: Andrew McCormick <andrewgmccormick@
Sent: 30 December, 2016 9:04 AM
To: 'Richard Bullick'; 'John Robinson'
Cc: 'S Hamilton'; 'David'
Subject: RE: RE: RE: RE: RE:

Might be prudent for that point to be made separately. The PR as in John's draft below is factual, not interpretative.

From: Richard Bullick [mailto:richardbullick@
Sent: 30 December, 2016 9:02 AM
To: John Robinson <johnrobinson@dup.org.uk>
Cc: Andrew McCormick <andrewgmccormick@
 S Hamilton <shamilton@dup.org.uk>; David
 <dgordonbt@
Subject: Re: RE: RE: RE: RE:

Do we miss the key point that the letter reinforces AF narrative and does not contradict it?

Sent from my iPad

On 30 Dec 2016, at 08:58, John Robinson <johnrobinson@dup.org.uk> wrote:

I assume the letters will be posted online too?

John Robinson | M:

From: Andrew McCormick [andrewgmccormick@
Sent: 30 December 2016 08:56
To: John Robinson; S Hamilton
Cc: 'Richard Bullick'; 'David'
Subject: RE: RE: RE: RE:

yes

From: John Robinson [<mailto:johnrobinson@dup.org.uk>]
Sent: 30 December, 2016 8:56 AM
To: S Hamilton <shamilton@dup.org.uk>; Andrew McCormick <andrewgmccormick@
Cc: Richard Bullick <richardbullick@>; David <dgordonbt@>
Subject: RE: RE: RE: RE:

Everyone happy with this draft?

A DfE spokesman said,

"Whilst the flaws in the initial scheme are now well documented, this was not the case in January 2013. Indeed, the subsequent reporting of this matter has demonstrated that the impact of the tariff and the rate of return are complex and technical issues.

When the then DETI Minister briefed lending institutions in January 2013 about renewable supports, the statement about the non-domestic RHI was entirely consistent with the Department's then understanding i.e. that the rate of return would be at a level of 12%.

At that time, the Department had not recognised the much higher rate of return due to a misunderstanding that the tariff was lower than the market price. Indeed, action to encourage uptake was being considered as there was an underspend. Such action, including the letters to the banks, would have been entirely reasonable and appropriate, but for the design flaws in the scheme which had not been recognized by DETI at the time when these letters issued.

The scheme, as set out in the letter would not have given rise to the problems about cost controls which were later experienced. Unfortunately, this was not how the scheme operated in practice due to errors back in 2012 which have already been detailed by the Northern Ireland Audit Office."

John Robinson | M: Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry

From: S Hamilton
Sent: 30 December 2016 08:53
To: Andrew McCormick
Cc: John Robinson; Richard Bullick; David
Subject: Re: RE: RE: RE:

Shouldn't go in my name in my view. Spokesperson better

Sent from my iPhone

On 30 Dec 2016, at 08:51, Andrew McCormick <[Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry">andrewgmccormick@Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry](mailto:andrewgmccormick@ wrote:

I can send this to DfE Press Office to set up as a Release in your name. Okay?

Many thanks.

From: S Hamilton [<mailto:shamilton@dup.org.uk>]
Sent: 30 December, 2016 8:50 AM
To: Andrew McCormick <[Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry">andrewgmccormick@Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry](mailto:andrewgmccormick@
Cc: John Robinson <johnrobinson@dup.org.uk>; Richard Bullick <[Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry">richardbullick@Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry](mailto:richardbullick@; David <[Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry">dgordonbt@Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry](mailto:dgordonbt@
Subject: Re: RE: RE:

Can we circulate a fully amended version?

Is this for DfE to release?

Sent from my iPhone

On 30 Dec 2016, at 08:48, Andrew McCormick <[Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry">andrewgmccormick@Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry](mailto:andrewgmccormick@ wrote:

I have added it in but also avoided saying the rate of return was "set" – if only it had been.....

Many thanks

From: John Robinson [<mailto:johnrobinson@dup.org.uk>]
Sent: 30 December, 2016 8:45 AM
To: Andrew McCormick <[Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry">andrewgmccormick@Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry](mailto:andrewgmccormick@
Cc: Richard Bullick <[Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry">richardbullick@Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry](mailto:richardbullick@ S Hamilton

<shamilton@dup.org.uk>; David <dgordonbt@>
Subject: Re: RE:

Personal information
redacted by the RHI Inquiry

Not sure Andrew's change is reflected in this. May need updated.

"Whilst the flaws in the initial scheme are now well documented, this was not the case in January 2013. Indeed the subsequent reporting of this matter has demonstrated the impact of the tariff and the rate of return are complex and technical issues.

When the then DETI Minister briefed lending institutions in January 2013 about renewable supports, the statement about the non-domestic RHI was entirely consistent with the department's then understanding i.e. that the rate of return would be at a level of 12%.

At that time, the Department had not recognised the much higher rate of return due to a misunderstanding that the tariff was lower than the market price. Indeed, action to encourage uptake was being considered as there was an underspend. Such action, including the letters to the banks, would have been entirely reasonable and appropriate, but for the design flaws in the scheme which had not been recognized by DETI at the time when these letters issued.

The scheme, as set out in the letter would not have given rise to the problems about cost controls which were later experienced. Unfortunately this was not how the scheme operated in practice due to errors back in 2012 which have already been

detailed by the Northern Ireland Audit Office."

John Robinson | John Robinson mobile phone redacted by the RHI Inquiry

On 30 Dec 2016, at 08:33, Andrew McCormick <andrewgmccormick@Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry> wrote:

Please see suggested addition.

Many thanks.

From: Richard Bullick Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry
[\mailto:richardbullick@Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry
Sent: 30 December, 2016 8:28 AM
To: John Robinson <johnrobinson@Dup.org.uk>; S Hamilton <shamilton@dup.org.uk>
Cc: Andrew McCormick <andrewgmccormick@Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry> David <dgordonbt@Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry>
Subject:

As an attempt to clarify last night's debacle can people have a look at this as a first attempt?

"As is evident from the flaws inherent in the initial scheme and the subsequent reporting of it the impact of the tariff and the rate of return are complex and technical issues.

It therefore should have been pointed out when the letters to the banks were released that the position adopted at that time was entirely consistent with the departments then understanding i.e. that the rate of return was set at a level of 12% and not the

much higher level that has actually been achieved due to a misunderstanding that the tariff was lower than the market price. Action to encourage uptake would have been entirely reasonable and appropriate, but for the design flaws in the scheme which had not been recognized by DETI at the time when these letters issued.

The scheme, as set out in the letter would not have given rise to the problems about cost controls which were later experienced. Unfortunately this was not how the scheme operated in practice due to errors back in 2012 which have already been detailed by the Northern Ireland Audit Office."

Sent from my iPad