

To: Jane Pierce[Jane.Pierce@ofgem.gov.uk]; Gareth John[Gareth.John@ofgem.gov.uk]
From: Teri Clifton
Sent: 2016-08-10T09:03:11Z
Importance: Normal
Subject: RE: [REDACTED] Site Audit Complete CRM:0217331 [OFFICIAL Internal Only]
Received: 2016-08-10T09:03:11Z

Sounds good - I'll keep CF informed

From: Jane Pierce
Sent: 10 August 2016 09:59
To: Teri Clifton; Gareth John
Subject: RE: [REDACTED] Site Audit Complete CRM:0217331 [OFFICIAL Internal Only]

I have had a chat with Mark who feels that this was an initial reaction and that we should give him chance to consider and respond to the formal compliance letter.

However to avoid any confusion, Mark is going to go back to him and say thanks for the initial response, this doesn't provide the evidence required. However, the details in the compliance letter provide more information about what is required and sets out the timescales. That way we are putting it in back in line with the formal process and giving him to seek advice/provide a more detailed/considered response.

Jane

From: Teri Clifton
Sent: 10 August 2016 09:06
To: Gareth John
Cc: Jane Pierce
Subject: RE: [REDACTED] Site Audit Complete CRM:0217331 [OFFICIAL Internal Only]

Hi Gareth

You know they haven't – they are being steered by me...I'll let them know we've had this response though and see what they would do if they received this 😊

Regards

Teri

From: Gareth John
Sent: 10 August 2016 08:58
To: Teri Clifton
Cc: Jane Pierce
Subject: Re: [REDACTED] Site Audit Complete CRM:0217331 [OFFICIAL Internal Only]

Yes we need to keep CF in the loop on this - it's their strategy - but I think being steered by 2 competent band Es such as yourselves in a joined up approach with CF team.

Ultimately we are white labelling this for CF to not arouse suspicion for applicant and ensure any evidence is not compromised - although given the speed of the response - you do wonder.

Prob need to check with Russell / Sam based on what they have seen in audit rep if the have made any judgement call yet on potential fraud v non compliance

Gareth John

Gareth.John@ofgem.gov.uk

On 10 Aug 2016, at 08:52, Teri Clifton <teri.clifton@ofgem.gov.uk> wrote:

Yes indeed – Jane is going to have a word with Mark, wasn't clear from this if he was going to do anything about it!

From: Gareth John
Sent: 10 August 2016 08:52
To: Teri Clifton
Cc: Jane Pierce
Subject: Re: [REDACTED] Site Audit Complete CRM:0217331 [OFFICIAL Internal Only]

Indeed

One for compliance to follow up with careful guidance ?

At the end of the day - evidence responses need to be made to satisfy any site findings

Gareth John

Gareth.John@ofgem.gov.uk

On 10 Aug 2016, at 08:33, Teri Clifton <teri.clifton@ofgem.gov.uk> wrote:

Interesting...

From: Mark George [<mailto:Mark.George@ofgem.gov.uk>]

Sent: 09 August 2016 09:46

To: Edmund Ward; Teri Clifton

Subject: FW: Re: Brimstone's RHI appl no re Site Audit Complete CRM:0217331

Hi both

FYI - see below the response received following us issuing the Audit Closure letter. Note - the participant responded immediately upon receipt and 'before' they received the Compliance information request letter, so we may potentially receive another response - or even a phone call - containing the same information.

regards

Mark

----- Original Message -----

From: Stephen Brimstone

Received: 08/08/2016 22:54

To: RHI Audit

Subject: Re: Brimstone's RHI appl no re Site Audit Complete CRM:0217331

This audit was carried out in my absence. The Audit company had been made aware immediately the date was proposed that it did not suit as I was away on holiday - they pressed quite hard to come on this date and so I arranged someone to open site for access. I had asked them to provide some alternative dates which they refused. They assured me that any information the auditor needed would be requested from me before he completed his report. No such requests were made.

Point 1 of the attached - this was queried during my application process and the RHI portal info was updated as required with the reasons being provided. I had assumed the auditor would have been provided with this? Please let me know if this is not the case.

Point 4 - If auditor had requested such information it would have been provided. No such request was made.

Point 5 - This single pre insulated pipe with a flow and return core is buried below ground post installation - is it necessary to dig up the pipe? I was not made aware during application that this pipe which is designed to be underground needed to remain above ground for any audits which may take place?

Point 6 - I am fully aware of my maintenance requirements for the heat meter - I am unsure what has led to this point being made in the audit - I have never been asked by the auditor as to my awareness of maintenance requirements for heat meters. Had I have been asked I would have confirmed Reg 34 requirements of recalibration every 10 years and ensuring the continuous operation and accuracy of the heat meter.

I would appreciate some help with the above if you are able to do so?