

To: Adrian Falconer[Adrian.Falconer@ofgem.gov.uk]; Rita Chohan[Rita.Chohan@ofgem.gov.uk]; Keith Avis[Keith.Avis@ofgem.gov.uk]; Michelle Murdoch[Michelle.Murdoch@ofgem.gov.uk]
Location: 1M8
Importance: Normal
Subject: Declined: NI RHI Lessons Learnt
Start Date/Time: 2012-12-05T09:30:00Z
End Date/Time: 2012-12-05T11:00:00Z
Recurrence Pattern: None

Sorry Adrian, having been tasked with the E-serve quarterly report for this quarter I have zero time for anything else - Rita and Keith both know what my issues were and we all know what the systemic problems were before we even started the project which placed immovable barriers in our way. Short synopsis would be:

- Senior management made unofficial agreements without telling the project team - this cause significant problems for delivery and almost ruined all our hard work at stakeholder engagement and trust building;
- Senior management had agreed costs that were unrealistic during the Feasibility Study drafting stage. They also didn't fully convey to DETI the way we work and how contingency monies are to be 'earmarked' and made available if needed.
- In hindsight we should have agreed the Admin Arrangements either much earlier in the process or even before we'd started the development entirely. What this then would have done is expose all the different requirements and set the scope before we'd started.
- With experience we'd have picked up earlier that all those areas, such as reporting, that DETI were being particularly lackadaisical about we should have recognised that it would come back to haunt us and so should've really been pushed at an earlier stage.
- In hindsight, it also would've been good to meet DETI properly, in person and really got to the nub of their drivers and how it would play out.
- Where we had no control as the development team and therefore little we could've done about it, but factoring in 5% of one member of the operational team to be our SME for the project frankly set us up for failure. A development team needs access to one SME on an *ad hoc* basis and we'd need a minimum of 30-50% of one person's time.
- Also not placing/sitting the team with or within the GB RHI development team was frankly absurd and not taking advantage of incumbent knowledge and experience with the RHI register etc. in hindsight a poor decision at senior management level regarding architecture and planning.

Hope that helps,

Paul