

To: Lewis Martin[Lewis.Martin@ofgem.gov.uk]; Robert Martin[Robert.Martin@ofgem.gov.uk]
Cc: Teri Clifton[teri.clifton@ofgem.gov.uk]
From: Amy Powell-Tuck
Sent: 2014-08-29T11:45:46Z
Importance: Normal
Subject: RE: Potential fraud (incorrect opening meter readings)
Received: 2014-08-29T11:45:47Z

Hi Lewis,

I'm afraid we haven't received the audit reports for NIRHI Sensitive investigative information redacted by the RHI yet- there is a backlog but I will chase Ricardo for these ones and as soon as we receive them we will prioritise them. If the reports don't need drastic alterations I will send you the drafts so you can decide how you want to act, however if they need major changes I will need to have these altered prior to sending.

Regards

Amy

From: Lewis Martin
Sent: 24 July 2014 07:47
To: Amy Powell-Tuck; Jacqueline Balian; Edmund Ward; Teri Clifton
Subject: RE: Potential fraud (incorrect opening meter readings)

Thanks Amy

Lewis

From: Amy Powell-Tuck
Sent: 23 July 2014 09:39
To: Lewis Martin; Jacqueline Balian; Edmund Ward; Teri Clifton
Subject: RE: Potential fraud (incorrect opening meter readings)

Hi all,

The notification letters for these sites were sent out yesterday (for audit w/c 4th)

Regards

Amy

From: Lewis Martin
Sent: 22 July 2014 12:54
To: Jacqueline Balian; Edmund Ward; Amy Powell-Tuck; Teri Clifton
Subject: RE: Potential fraud (incorrect opening meter readings)
Importance: High

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 he 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 information redacted by the RHI 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

Received from OFGEM on 25.05.2017
Annotated by RHI Inquiry

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://lonis2:102/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.html>

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

ofgem e-serve

To: Amy Powell-Tuck[Amy.Powell-Tuck@ofgem.gov.uk]; Lewis Martin[Lewis.Martin@ofgem.gov.uk]; Robert Martin[Robert.Martin@ofgem.gov.uk]
From: Teri Clifton
Sent: 2014-08-29T11:50:09Z
Importance: Normal
Subject: RE: Potential fraud (incorrect opening meter readings)
Received: 2014-08-29T11:50:00Z

Thanks Amy.

Please can you send the draft to Edmund as he will make the decision as to whether we can release the payment.

Regards

Teri

From: Amy Powell-Tuck
Sent: 29 August 2014 12:46
To: Lewis Martin; Robert Martin
Cc: Teri Clifton
Subject: RE: Potential fraud (incorrect opening meter readings)

Hi Lewis,

I'm afraid we haven't received the audit reports for NIRHI Sensitive investigative information redacted by the RHI yet- there is a backlog but I will chase Ricardo for these ones and as soon as we receive them we will prioritise them. If the reports don't need drastic alterations I will send you the drafts so you can decide how you want to act, however if they need major changes I will need to have these altered prior to sending.

Regards

Amy

From: Lewis Martin
Sent: 24 July 2014 07:47
To: Amy Powell-Tuck; Jacqueline Balian; Edmund Ward; Teri Clifton
Subject: RE: Potential fraud (incorrect opening meter readings)

Thanks Amy

Lewis

From: Amy Powell-Tuck
Sent: 23 July 2014 09:39
To: Lewis Martin; Jacqueline Balian; Edmund Ward; Teri Clifton
Subject: RE: Potential fraud (incorrect opening meter readings)

Hi all,

The notification letters for these sites were sent out yesterday (for audit w/c 4th)

Regards

Amy

From: Lewis Martin
Sent: 22 July 2014 12:54
To: Jacqueline Balian; Edmund Ward; Amy Powell-Tuck; Teri Clifton
Subject: RE: Potential fraud (incorrect opening meter readings)
Importance: High

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 he 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

Received from OFGEM on 25.05.2017

Annotated by RHI Inquiry

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)

Annotated by RHI Inquiry

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.html>

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://rhcirm: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

ofgem e-serve

To: Teri Clifton[teri.clifton@ofgem.gov.uk]; Lewis Martin[Lewis.Martin@ofgem.gov.uk]; Robert Martin[Robert.Martin@ofgem.gov.uk]
From: Amy Powell-Tuck
Sent: 2014-08-29T12:10:40Z
Importance: Normal
Subject: RE: Potential fraud (incorrect opening meter readings)
Received: 2014-08-29T12:10:41Z

Yes, no problem.
Amy

From: Teri Clifton
Sent: 29 August 2014 12:50
To: Amy Powell-Tuck; Lewis Martin; Robert Martin
Subject: RE: Potential fraud (incorrect opening meter readings)

Thanks Amy.

Please can you send the draft to Edmund as he will make the decision as to whether we can release the payment.

Regards
Teri

From: Amy Powell-Tuck
Sent: 29 August 2014 12:46
To: Lewis Martin; Robert Martin
Cc: Teri Clifton
Subject: RE: Potential fraud (incorrect opening meter readings)

Hi Lewis,

I'm afraid we haven't received the audit reports for NIRHI Sensitive investigative information redacted by the RHI yet- there is a backlog but I will chase Ricardo for these ones and as soon as we receive them we will prioritise them. If the reports don't need drastic alterations I will send you the drafts so you can decide how you want to act, however if they need major changes I will need to have these altered prior to sending.

Regards
Amy

From: Lewis Martin
Sent: 24 July 2014 07:47
To: Amy Powell-Tuck; Jacqueline Balian; Edmund Ward; Teri Clifton
Subject: RE: Potential fraud (incorrect opening meter readings)

Thanks Amy
Lewis

From: Amy Powell-Tuck
Sent: 23 July 2014 09:39
To: Lewis Martin; Jacqueline Balian; Edmund Ward; Teri Clifton
Subject: RE: Potential fraud (incorrect opening meter readings)

Hi all,
The notification letters for these sites were sent out yesterday (for audit w/c 4th)
Regards
Amy

From: Lewis Martin
Sent: 22 July 2014 12:54
To: Jacqueline Balian; Edmund Ward; Amy Powell-Tuck; Teri Clifton
Subject: RE: Potential fraud (incorrect opening meter readings)
Importance: High

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 he 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

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
Received from OFGEM on 25.05.2017

Annotated by RHI Inquiry

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://rhiicrm: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

ofgem e-serve