

**Cc:** James Robinson; Gareth John; Edmund Ward; Jane Pierce; James Kilmartin; Teri Clifton; Patricia Dregghorn

**Subject:** Re: Letter [OFFICIAL Internal Only]

Thanks to all of you for input. If you can shape something between you and get it too me on Wednesday that would be great.

All the views are valid, and it may not be sent. But these are the three areas I am worried about. The challenge I'm setting you is to get as close as you can to highlighting these in a way that as James noted, doesn't get us called back as I don't think that's where we want to be. And if that means adding something about progress i.e. Saying we are doing a governance review as well as new arrangements in progress with NI, that may give us a window

Thanks,

Chris

Sent from my iPhone

On 2 Dec 2016, at 09:43, Alison Hardie <[Alison.Hardie@ofgem.gov.uk](mailto:Alison.Hardie@ofgem.gov.uk)> wrote:

Chris

I'm feeling more cautious about this approach. Ideally we should have a hook for this letter, and when we spoke immediately after the hearing on 26 Oct there was a suggestion we could provide more information which supported what the committee referred to as our "financial obligation to Northern Ireland plc" – in other words any ways we were now actively helping reduce the burden of the scheme to tax payers in NI. I am concerned that the approach of blaming the DoF for badly advising you will not play well, with the chairman taking the view it was our responsibility to prepare ourselves in advance.

The clerk to the committee would be able to advise us if a letter along the lines you propose would now be welcomed. Without that steer, my concern is there's a risk it could look slightly random and could beg the question that if this is so important, why we didn't say it to the committee in the four hours we had?

Others have had concerns before about speaking to the clerk, worrying it would prompt them to ask us back. But I suspect a letter that opens up new issues around fraud, risk and audit would have the same effect.

However, I'd look to James K to give a view on this from an External Relations point of view.

Alison

---

**From:** Chris Poulton

**Sent:** 02 December 2016 09:26

**To:** James Robinson

**Cc:** Gareth John; Alison Hardie; Edmund Ward; Jane Pierce; James Kilmartin; Teri Clifton

**Subject:** Re: Letter [OFFICIAL Internal Only]

Thanks James

Gareth/ Alison - can you weave this approach into the letter for a review on Wednesday ?

Chris

Sent from my iPhone

On 2 Dec 2016, at 08:48, James Robinson <[James.Robinson@ofgem.gov.uk](mailto:James.Robinson@ofgem.gov.uk)> wrote:

Chris,

Sorry, a bit late to this chain. One way into this – if you decide to send the letter – might be to come at it from the point of view of "conscious that the Committee was concerned that I didn't make an opening statement; I'm also concerned about that and consider myself badly advised by [DfE/whoever it was]. Having listened to the subsequent sessions I'd appreciate the opportunity to set out clearly Ofgem's role and to clarify a number of possible misunderstandings about our role...". There's a balance against the risk of the Committee calling you back and giving you more of the same...