

**To:** Amy Powell-Tuck[Amy.Powell-Tuck@ofgem.gov.uk]; Catherine Avenell[Catherine.Avenell@ofgem.gov.uk]  
**From:** Jacqueline Balian  
**Sent:** 2014-08-26T10:38:16Z  
**Importance:** Normal  
**Subject:** FW: NI Submissions (Approval needed)  
**Received:** 2014-08-26T10:38:00Z  
**RE:** Potential fraud (incorrect opening meter readings)

Hi there,  
Could you let me know where we are with this?  
Jacqueline

---

**From:** Lewis Martin  
**Sent:** 26 August 2014 08:12  
**To:** Edmund Ward; Teri Clifton; Jacqueline Balian  
**Cc:** Amy Powell-Tuck; Robert Martin  
**Subject:** RE: NI Submissions (Approval needed)

Hi all,  
Just picking this up (post-annual leave) – so apologies if some of this has been picked up already.  
We previously spoke to the participant (4<sup>th</sup> July) and advised (after discussion) that the submissions had been selected for additional technical review and that these would take c.4 weeks to complete (previous email attached). He has since contacted us again regarding payment and the fact that he has subsequently submitted a second set of submissions for both his installations which are requiring approval. I'm concerned that it has been several weeks since our initial conversation and he is now chasing again. With regards to the second submissions (and the subsequent payment) we can explain that these cannot be reviewed until the first submissions have passed through the system.  
Are we delaying payment until the audit report has been reviewed? If so, the participant will not be aware of this – from the conversation that was held on 4<sup>th</sup> July – unless this has been discussed when the audit letter went out. I would be minded that if we are delaying payment then this information is disseminated from our compliance team so that any additional queries can be resolved.  
Regards  
Lewis

---

**From:** Mhairi McQuillan  
**Sent:** 21 August 2014 10:17  
**To:** Edmund Ward  
**Cc:** Catherine Avenell; Robert Martin  
**Subject:** RE: NI Submissions (Approval needed)

Hi Edmund – thanks for this.  
Have you contacted the participant in the past? Robert and I are not sure whether he knows why his payment has been delayed.  
Mhairi

---

**From:** Edmund Ward  
**Sent:** 20 August 2014 18:45  
**To:** Mhairi McQuillan  
**Cc:** Catherine Avenell; Robert Martin  
**Subject:** RE: NI Submissions (Approval needed)

Hi Mhairi  
Yes, I believe the audits will have taken place but we'll still be awaiting the final audit reports before we move to process the data.  
Cat will be able to provide more context/update I think.  
Sorry for delayed reply.  
Edmund

---

**From:** Mhairi McQuillan  
**Sent:** 19 August 2014 14:17  
**To:** Edmund Ward  
**Subject:** FW: NI Submissions (Approval needed)

Hi Edmund,  
I wondered if you could help me in Teri and Lewis' absence with the email below.  
I can see there has been an audit case created in the CRM but I don't think there is a report yet. Are you waiting on this before you approve? Also, do you know what the applicant has already been told by Lewis or Teri?  
Happy to chat if it's easier.  
Thanks,  
Mhairi

**From:** Robert Martin  
**Sent:** 19 August 2014 13:44  
**To:** Mhairi McQuillan  
**Subject:** NI Submissions (Approval needed)

Hi Mhairi,

As discussed, [Sensitive investigative information redacted by the RHI Inquiry] has phoned to chase up payment of submissions made for [Sensitive investigative information redacted by the RHI Inquiry]. These submissions were reviewed by me some time ago, but still need approval from Edmund. Due to potential non-compliances, I think Edmund has been hesitant to approve these. Please find attached the email I originally sent to compliance for some context of the situation.

[Sensitive investigative information redacted by the RHI Inquiry] has phoned at least twice previously regarding these payments and I relayed the requests on to Lewis/Teri, so I have no idea if the previous requests were followed up or if they were, what was said.

His number is [Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry] and he is expecting a call back regarding this.

If you need any further information, please let me know and I'll get it to you.

Thanks,

**Robert Martin**

Assistant Manager - Renewable Heat Incentive

New Scheme Development

Ofgem

2nd Floor, Cornerstone

107 West Regent Street

Glasgow

G2 2BA

Tel: 0207 901 3913

[www.ofgem.gov.uk](http://www.ofgem.gov.uk)

**ofgem e-serve**

**To:** Jacqueline Balian[Jacqueline.Balian@ofgem.gov.uk]; Edmund Ward[Edmund.Ward@ofgem.gov.uk]; Amy Powell-Tuck[Amy.Powell-Tuck@ofgem.gov.uk]; Teri Clifton[teri.clifton@ofgem.gov.uk]  
**From:** Lewis Martin  
**Sent:** 2014-07-22T11:53:35Z  
**Importance:** High  
**Subject:** RE: Potential fraud (incorrect opening meter readings)  
**Received:** 2014-07-22T11:53:35Z

Hi,

Do we have any further information for the participant? He's awaiting a call back today as he has phoned to query when he will receive payment. I'm conscious that our last discussion with him was over two weeks ago and since then he submitted his second set of periodic data which has been reviewed but yet to be approved.

I'd like someone to get back to him today, but prior to that it would be helpful if we have an update regarding these ones.

Regards

Lewis

---

**From:** Lewis Martin  
**Sent:** 04 July 2014 16:24  
**To:** Jacqueline Balian  
**Cc:** Edmund Ward; Amy Powell-Tuck  
**Subject:** RE: Potential fraud (incorrect opening meter readings)

All,

I have just spoken with [Sensitive Investigative] and explained (as discussed) that both submissions are currently going through a quality check (+4 weeks), as a number of submissions are selected at random, which is why he hadn't received payment yet. He seemed completely content with this and didn't query. To be honest, he was more concerned/worried with the fact that his second submission was due in the next few days and that he would be on holiday [Irrelevant information redacted by the RHI] when his meter reading was due – I have explained the difference between the 'meter reading window' and the 'submission window'.

I did explain that we would be in touch when we had further information.

Regards

Lewis

---

**From:** Jacqueline Balian  
**Sent:** 04 July 2014 15:51  
**To:** Lewis Martin  
**Cc:** Edmund Ward; Amy Powell-Tuck  
**Subject:** RE: Potential fraud (incorrect opening meter readings)

Managed to speak to Edmund – he hasn't spoken to the complainant so the line is:

Your case has been selected for a quality check. (If pressed – we carry out quality checks on a number of applications some on a random basis)

The quality check can take up to 4 weeks. (If pressed – we are paying out public money so we are required to be absolutely sure that our payments are accurate and appropriate)

We will let you know as soon as we have any further information.

Amy is setting up the audits asap so hopefully they will hear direct from AEA Ricardo within the next week or so.

Let me know if you need me to speak to him

All the best

Jacqueline

---

**From:** Lewis Martin  
**Sent:** 04 July 2014 15:35  
**To:** Jacqueline Balian  
**Subject:** FW: Potential fraud (incorrect opening meter readings)

As per our discussion, these NI submissions were flagged with F&C as well – please see the below.

Regards

Lewis

---

**From:** Robert Martin  
**Sent:** 26 June 2014 15:52  
**To:** Lewis Martin  
**Subject:** FW: Potential fraud (incorrect opening meter readings)

FYI

**From:** Edmund Ward  
**Sent:** 03 June 2014 17:28  
**To:** Robert Martin  
**Subject:** RE: Potential fraud (incorrect opening meter readings)

Hi Robert, no I'd only seen your PDS review comment of the year... *my favourite line* - "He had given me the weights of the chickens in each shed instead." - I'll read this tonight and get back to you tomorrow.

Thanks!  
Edmund

---

**From:** Robert Martin  
**Sent:** 03 June 2014 15:09  
**To:** Edmund Ward  
**Subject:** FW: Potential fraud (incorrect opening meter readings)

Hi Edmund,  
Unsure if you may have seen this email already regarding those two NI submissions. If not, please see below for some further information of the situation.

Cheers,  
Robert

---

**From:** Robert Martin  
**Sent:** 20 May 2014 16:29  
**To:** RHI Compliance  
**Cc:** Lewis Martin  
**Subject:** Potential fraud (incorrect opening meter readings)

Dear F+C team,

I am writing this to alert you to an installation where I have suspected fraud, but unfortunately cannot act any further myself to prove this. The installations in question are chicken farms in Northern Ireland. Sensitive investigative information redacted by the RHI Inquiry

When this participant first entered data, our load factor calculations found that the heat generated by the installation was over the feasible amount. When I spoke to the participant about this at first he was adamant both of his meter readings were correct and that his boiler is always on.

Unsatisfied with this, I looked to his application to see if I could find anything. My suspicion lies with the fact that that the opening meter readings are both 0kWhth for each application.

In the applications there are Commissioning Certificates for the meters with a date of 28/11/2013 issued by a Keith Bailey of UK Metering with a contact name Lydia Cooper. The effective date of these applications is 10/01/2014, almost 2 months later.

<http://loniis2:102/Accreditation/DownloadDocument.aspx?Mode=stateless&DocumentId=89969>

Before contacting, I investigated the website of UK Metering which lists what's included in Energy Metering Commissioning:

<http://www.uk-metering.net/meter-services.htm>

This states that they will:

- Confirm the meters are installed, set-up and working correctly
- Check all connections/terminals are wired correctly and securely
- Ensure operating conditions are within the specifications of the meters
- Sealing of the meters to prevent tampering
- A certificate stating the serial number, location and confirming all checks have been completed.

As you can imagine, this led me to presume the meter was fitted on site almost two months before the effective date. This would then make it highly doubtful that the opening readings were 0kWhth.

I then phoned Lydia Cooper who confirmed to me that the aforementioned would be true for this site.

Not half an hour later I received a call from Keith Bailey who told me these certificates are only to confirm that the meters have been reconfigured to allow suitability for fitting in the flow pipe, not the return. I am unsure if this is even possible from someone other than Kamstrup and is a cause for concern in itself. He did not address the disparity in dates.

He explained that the usage is so high because the boiler is effectively undersized to squeeze into the higher tariff rate.

So, I left this for a week or so to allow me to take another reading from the participant that I could analyse further usage from. The data taken from this did indeed show much lower usage, which negated the installer's previous remarks.

Further to this, the participant told me that the meter readings previously given to me were incorrect. *He had given me the weights of the chickens in each shed instead.*

<http://rhicrm:5555/OfgemRHI/activities/email/edit.aspx?id=%7b047017FD-3FDC-E311-8F84-005056B50C32%7d>

I'm unfortunately in the position where I have to take the participant's word for this and proceed with the data. Hopefully, you may be able to request something more stringent with regards to the meter commissioning certificates.

If you have any further queries about this, please don't hesitate to ask.

Kind regards,

**Robert Martin**  
Assistant Manager - Renewable Heat Incentive

New Scheme Development  
Ofgem  
2nd Floor, Cornerstone  
107 West Regent Street  
Glasgow  
G2 2BA  
Tel: 0207 901 3913  
[www.ofgem.gov.uk](http://www.ofgem.gov.uk)

**ofgem e-serve**