

Brian Hood  
BS Holdings Ltd  
8 Tamar Street  
Belfast  
BT4 1HR

By post and email ([brian@bsh-limited.com](mailto:brian@bsh-limited.com))

19 January 2018

Dear Sir

**Re: The Independent Public Inquiry into the Non Domestic Renewable Heat Incentive (RHI) Scheme**  
**Provision of a Section 21 Notice requiring the provision of evidence in the form of a written statement (No 2)**

I am writing to you in my capacity as Solicitor to the Independent Public Inquiry into the Non Domestic Renewable Heat Incentive (RHI) Scheme (known as 'the RHI Inquiry') which has been set up under the Inquiries Act 2005 ('the Act').

I know that you are aware of the work of the Inquiry from previous correspondence and communications which I have had with you. As you know, it is intended that you will give oral evidence to the Inquiry on 8 February 2018. In advance of that, however, and as I indicated in my recent email communication with you, the Inquiry would find it helpful to clarify a small number of issues with you further by way of written evidence. The provision of such additional written evidence is likely to shorten and simplify your oral evidence. I will be writing to you separately shortly to provide some further details and information in relation to your attendance to give oral evidence on the morning of 8 February.

In the meantime, however, I enclose a further Section 21 Notice with a number of

additional queries arising out of evidence or information you have previously submitted to the Inquiry, or other evidence which it has received. In light of your forthcoming attendance to give oral evidence, the timescale for response is relatively short but I hope it should provide sufficient time for you to respond comprehensively.

As before, and as the text of the Section 21 Notice explains, you are required by law to comply with it.

I also enclose a copy of your previous statement and the information which you have provided to the Inquiry which has the Inquiry's numbering (known as 'Bates' numbering) in the top-right hand corner.

Receipt of this correspondence and its enclosures places you under a duty of confidentiality to the RHI Inquiry in respect of them. You may share the correspondence and the enclosed Notice with;

- (i) your legal representative(s);
- (ii) Mr Wayne Cullen;
- (iii) Mrs Sharon Hood;

but neither you nor they may show, communicate the contents of, nor provide this correspondence or the Notice to any other person or organisation without the express permission of the RHI Inquiry. Any breach of this duty of confidentiality is actionable at the suit of the Inquiry Chairman. In addition, a similar restriction is contained in Restriction Order No 2 of 2017 made by the Inquiry Chairman and available on the RHI Inquiry website.

You will also find attached to the Section 21 Notice a Guidance Note explaining the nature of a Section 21 Notice and the procedures that the RHI Inquiry has adopted in relation to such a notice. In particular, you are asked to provide your evidence in the form of the template witness statement which is also enclosed with this correspondence.

Finally, I would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this correspondence and the enclosed notice by email to [Patrick.Butler@rhiinquiry.org](mailto:Patrick.Butler@rhiinquiry.org).

Please do not hesitate to contact me to discuss any matter arising.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Patrick Butler". The signature is written in a cursive style and is contained within a thin black rectangular border.

**Patrick Butler**

Solicitor to the RHI Inquiry

02890408928

**SCHEDULE**  
**[No 6 of 2018]**

*Sheridan & Hood letter of 27 November 2012*

1. Please set out how you sent the letter from Sheridan & Hood Ltd of 27 November 2012 (a copy of which is attached, bearing Inquiry reference WIT-197392 to WIT-197393) to (a) the Minister for Justice; (b) each of the recipients said to have been copied into the letter (including whether this was by post or email and, if by email, to which email address and from which).
2. Describe the response, if any, you received from each of the recipients who were copied in to the letter (*not* including the Department of Justice, whose response you have already addressed in information which you have previously provided to the Inquiry).
3. In your email to the RHI Inquiry of 10 January 2018, you indicated that, in your letter of 27 November 2012, your company “*correctly represented what the DETI had marketed, a fact confirmed at the time by DETI Peter Hutchinson when we verbally referred him to a response from the justice department which made outrageous and unfounded claims to attempt to discredit what we had stated in our letter*”. In relation to this:
  - a. Please provide as full details as you can of the discussion you had with Peter Hutchinson in relation to this matter including, as far as possible:
    - i. The date and location of the discussion;
    - ii. Who was present;
    - iii. What was said by each party;
    - iv. What documents, if any, were being discussed or considered.
  - b. State whether, to your knowledge, the Sheridan & Hood letter of 27 November 2012 was ever shared with, or shown to, Peter Hutchinson (or any other DETI official).

*Engagement with Patsy McGlone MLA*

4. Please set out full details of any involvement or interaction you had with Patsy McGlone MLA in relation to:
  - a. The use of biomass at the Northern Ireland Community Safety College site at Desertcreat;
  - b. The RHI Scheme generally; and
  - c. The asking of any questions in the Northern Ireland Assembly about either of the above issues.
  
5. Without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing, please specify:
  - a. Whether, to your knowledge, Mr McGlone ever saw or discussed the Sheridan & Hood letter of 27 November 2012; and
  - b. Whether Assembly Question AQW 17011/11-15 (set out at WIT-197395) was asked at your instigation, request or encouragement (and, if so, please give details).
  
6. Specify the email addresses from which, and to which, the following emails were sent:
  - a. Your email to Mr McGlone of 4.47 pm on 5 December 2012 (at WIT-197394); and
  - b. Mr Cullen's email to Mr McGlone of 1.01 pm on 10 December 2012 (also at WIT-197394).
  
7. Set out whether, to your knowledge, there was ever any response or further communication arising out of either of the emails mentioned in the previous

paragraph.

*Email correspondence to the Finance Minister*

Information you have provided to the Inquiry suggests that Mr Wayne Cullen of BS Holdings Ltd (BSH) (a company related to Sheridan & Hood Ltd) emailed the then DFP Minister, Minister Wilson, on 6 December 2012 (a copy of this email is attached, bearing Inquiry reference WIT-197398 to WIT-197399) to draw to his attention, and to invite him to discuss with you, the potential for government buildings to “*have zero fuel heating overhead costs*” through use of the RHI Scheme. The email contained a number of attachments, namely (a) a ‘Bio Fuel Heating Systems’ presentation or booklet [at WIT-197400 to WIT-197478]; (b) a BSH savings leaflet [at WIT-197479 to WIT-197480]; and (c) a draft agenda for a proposed meeting [at WIT-197481]. Arising out of this:

8. Please explain the relationship between Sheridan & Hood and BS Holdings and your, and Mr Cullen’s, position in or in relation to each company.
9. Please explain why Mr Cullen used Minister Wilson’s Assembly email address to send this correspondence, rather than corresponding through the Department of Finance.
10. To your knowledge, did you, Mr Cullen or any of your associated companies ever receive a response or acknowledgement in relation to this correspondence? If so, please provide details.
11. Please set out whether this – or similar – correspondence was sent to other public bodies or public representatives.
12. The email notes that, “*We have also had a number of similar cross-table discussion with ELBs and MLAs to date.*” Please provide as full details as possible of which ELBs and MLAs you, Mr Cullen and/or your companies had discussed these matters with (including, so far as possible, the dates of the discussions and what was covered).

13. In relation to the leaflet you have provided to the Inquiry, which was enclosed with the above correspondence (and which may be found, amongst other places, at WIT-197479 to WIT-197480 in the information you have provided to the Inquiry), please address the following matters (insofar as you can):
  - a. When was this leaflet produced?
  - b. How many such leaflets were produced?
  - c. How were they used?
  - d. To whom, and how, were they distributed?
  - e. To your knowledge, was a copy of this leaflet ever provided to any DETI official?
14. Please provide similar details as are requested in the paragraph above in relation to the 'Bio Fuel Heating Systems' presentation or booklet (at WIT-197400 to WIT-197478).
15. Please describe generally the steps taken by (a) you and your companies and (b) as far as you are aware, other renewable heating companies in the market, to publicise and market the benefits available under the RHI Scheme (as explained in your literature referred to above).
16. The email correspondence referred to above was followed up with a further email from Mr Cullen on 10 December 2012 (at WIT-197396 to WIT-197397). Again, to your knowledge, did you, Mr Cullen or any of your associated companies ever receive a response or acknowledgement in relation to this correspondence? If so, please provide details.

*Engagement with Janette O'Hagan*

17. Information provided to the Inquiry by Ms Janette O'Hagan indicates that she and her company was in discussion with BS Holdings in the course of 2013. (See, in this regard, enclosed for your convenience an extract from her witness statement to the Inquiry at WIT-264819 to WIT-264824; and emails provided by

her to the Inquiry at WIT-264959 to WIT-264970). As to this:

- a. Please provide full details of any interactions with Ms O'Hagan which you, Mr Cullen and/or your companies had.
- b. Please provide details of the “*twenty years of free heat to suit your needs*” promotion undertaken by BS Holdings referred to by Mr Cullen in his email of 4 September 2013 (at WIT-264963).
- c. Specify whether you accept Ms O'Hagan's characterisation that, in light of the benefits available under the RHI Scheme, (at least some) potential customers were no longer worried about becoming more efficient.
- d. Explain the background to the document purporting to provide assurance from Peter Hutchinson which is set out at WIT-264970.

*Other engagement with DETI, etc.*

18. Please provide further details, insofar as you can, of the “*public briefings*” at DETI offices which you attended, referred to in your previous statement to the Inquiry (at WIT-197218) including when they occurred and who was present.
19. Please provide details of any trade or marketing events attended by you, Mr Cullen and/or your companies (including, as far as you can, the date; the location; the organiser of the event; who was present in terms of exhibitors, speakers, etc; whether any DETI and/or DARD officials were present; and what was said about the benefits available under the RHI Scheme).

*'Spike' periods*

20. Please provide your view of the explanation for the ‘spike’ in applications in the Scheme in September to November 2015. In particular, please explain:
  - a. When, to your knowledge, the first indication arose in 2015 that the

Scheme was to be amended to introduce tiering or cost controls;

- b. How this information first came to the attention of the market; and
- c. Whether and how this information spread; and
- d. The effect, if any, this information had.

In particular, please expand on your answer to enquiry 6f in the Schedule to Chairman's Notice No 329 of 2017 (addressed in your previous statement at WIT-197217), which is lacking in detail.

- 21. Please also specify as precisely as possible when you and your companies became aware that changes were likely to be introduced to the Scheme which would make it less attractive.
- 22. Please provide similar details as are requested at paragraphs 20-21 above in relation to the proposed suspension of the Scheme, and the further spike in applications, in February 2016.

*General*

- 23. Please provide any further information you believe to be relevant in light of the RHI Inquiry's Terms of Reference.

**NOTE:**

It is important for the efficiency of the RHI Inquiry that the issues identified above are addressed as fully as possible and by reference, where available, to the dates and locations of specific incidents to which reference is made. The statement should be broken down into paragraphs, which should be numbered sequentially from '1' to the end. The use of appropriate section headings or sub-headings is also encouraged. A template witness statement is provided with this Notice for your assistance and should be used as the format for your response.

## RHI Inquiry Section 21 Notice

item	schedule reference	schedule item	schedule statement	BSH response statement
92	No6 of 2018	1	Please set out how you sent the letter from Sheridan & Hood Ltd of 27 November 2012 (a copy of which is attached, bearing Inquiry reference WIT-197392 to WIT-197393) to (a) the Minister for Justice; (b) each of the recipients said to have been copied into the letter (including whether this was by post or email and, if by email, to which email address and from which).	We have looked at all the questions relating to schedule No6 of 2018 and to research all the history, trace all the information, who received what & when, recall all the conversations is now not practical. We are not a government body and have a business to run and manage. Whilst civil servants have attended to research, attendance, legal council provided by their departments, even those that have admitted they have not performed to an adequate standard of work, they are being paid, we, as industry professionals are required to attend without such remunerations. We have sent through the information we have to assist the RHI inquiry. BSH goal at the start of the NIRHI was to check the accuracy of the NIRHI scheme information from DETNI/Ofgem and to market this to potential customers in both the public & private sectors to broaden and encourage the uptake of a product which we manufactured and encouraged.
91	No6 of 2018	2	Describe the response, if any, you received from each of the recipients who were copied in to the letter (not including the Department of Justice, whose response you have already addressed in information which you have previously provided to the Inquiry).	The enquiry has all the information that has come to light in our records thus far.
90	No6 of 2018	3	In your email to the RHI Inquiry of 10 January 2018, you indicated that, in your letter of 27 November 2012, your company "correctly represented what the DETI had marketed, a fact confirmed at the time by DETI Peter Hutchinson when we verbally referred him to a response from the justice department which made outrageous and unfounded claims to attempt to discredit what we had stated in our letter". In relation to this:	
89	No6 of 2018	3a	Please provide as full details as you can of the discussion you had with Peter Hutchinson in relation to this matter including, as far as possible:	From memory, as our telephone discussion was not noted as being recorded, it was to confirm that correctly the independent buildings being created within the project could be fed by separate energy cabins. This was permissible within the RHI regulations something the Justice committee's team rejected. It displayed to us, and presumably in the course of the conversation with the DETNI official, the lack of competency within the professional team managing this project for the Justice department.
88	No6 of 2018	3a i	i. The date and location of the discussion;	Unknown sometime after receiving their correspondence concerning the project which you already have. Location was from our office to the DETNI by telephone.
87	No6 of 2018	3a ii	ii. Who was present;	N/a
86	No6 of 2018	3a iii	iii. What was said by each party;	see 89 above
85	No6 of 2018	3a iv	iv. What documents, if any, were being discussed or considered	RHI regulations pertinent to NI.
84	No6 of 2018	3b	State whether, to your knowledge, the Sheridan & Hood letter of 27 November 2012 was ever shared with, or shown to, Peter Hutchinson (or any other DETI official).	unknown cannot recall

## RHI Inquiry Section 21 Notice

item	schedule reference	schedule item	schedule statement	BSH response statement
83	No6 of 2018	4	Please set out full details of any involvement or interaction you had with Patsy McGlone MLA in relation to:	A discussion took place and from memory it was held in the bar/restaurant at Stormont over coffee. Mr McGlone, the MLA in the area was briefed / lobbied by us, as part of our campaign to broaden renewables use (specifically biomass) to public buildings in general. With the introduction of RHI, and the DETNI need to increase its use as it was not achieving the uptake it needed annually (this was not a surprise to us as GB took nearly 2 yrs before a substantial increase was observed) and we were promoting the concept of reductions to the public purse and therefore domestic and commercial rates savings to the NI public, as costs for running public buildings could be derived in heat and cooling terms by the RHI funding if using our products.
82	No6 of 2018	4a	The use of biomass at the Northern Ireland Community Safety College site at Desertcreat;	The scheme proposed by the justice ministry promoted large biomass boilers over the maximum duty then set as permissible by the NIRHI. Those boilers were to be wood chip and would heat a large underground district heating main pumped hot water around the various buildings on the site. Working on a pricing scheme for this we noted major flaws that as engineers we could see would improve costs, efficiency and hence for those contractors desiring to us our company, may have provided us with a competitive edge to win a contract. We redesigned the system according to our best engineering views using our products whilst achieving the energy profiles of the buildings all using separate energy cabins manufactured by us. This provided a very significant capex saving to the overall scheme as well as determined that it was to gain RHI income should the project proceed. Flaws in the project teams design were simple, they were to grow their own chip, given the land they were to use represented a crop every third year and would only run the boiler for 3 months, what were they to do in between each crop? Purchase wood chip which the RHI would not pay for as the boilers selected were too large and outside scope of the tariff bands.
81	No6 of 2018	4b	The RHI Scheme generally; and	It was a good scheme with flaws but properly monitored and controlled would have a major success. Our tariff when introduced was 3-4p/kwh less than that of GB, crucially GB differed by having a two tier control of the funding stream and also it was monitored by Ofgem who published each quarter application statistics showing performance data and what renewables balance across GB made up their totals. NI was a black hole and no information was ever provided or displayed. I rang Ofgem and asked why, I was told DETNI were doing that role themselves. As it turns out now, obviously they weren't. I have advised before that we did not feel the tariff, as has been muted in this forum and the media, set within NIRHI was wrong, it was not. Comparable calculations indicate tariffs between GB and NI if using similar run times per annum of 6000hrs on their maximum boiler capacities in each case (99kw tariff v's a 199kw tariff) brings a difference in capex payments by either scheme of a few thousand pounds, an insignificant difference in our opinion. The main reason the scheme faltered in NI poor governance and management. The DETNI had multiple competing roles for energy regulation at that time, the RHI and the West gas network, ask yourself which gave more jobs, more benefit and more potential for carbon reduction, gas is the clear winner, so the DETNI I would suggest bolstered that wing within its department with more resources and governance.
80	No6 of 2018	4c	The asking of any questions in the Northern Ireland Assembly about either of the above issues.	Written question by MLA and response I believe you have copy of
79	No6 of 2018	5	Without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing, please specify:	
78	No6 of 2018	5a	Whether, to your knowledge, Mr McGlone ever saw or discussed the Sheridan & Hood letter of 27 November 2012; and	The letter states it was cc'd to him, we can only presume his office received same but have no records of such.

## RHI Inquiry Section 21 Notice

item	schedule reference	schedule item	schedule statement	BSH response statement
77	No6 of 2018	5b	Whether Assembly Question AQW 17011/11-15 (set out at WIT-197395) was asked at your instigation, request or encouragement (and, if so, please give details).	Yes, from memory we requested this information during our discussion with Mr McGlone see 83 above
76	No6 of 2018	6	Specify the email addresses from which, and to which, the following emails were sent:	see above we cannot be more specific
75	No6 of 2018	6a	Your email to Mr McGlone of 4.47 pm on 5 December 2012 (at WIT-197394); and	I believe this is in response to the receiving the written answer from the minister which Mr Glone had tabled.
74	No6 of 2018	6b	Mr Cullen's email to Mr McGlone of 1.01 pm on 10 December 2012 (also at WIT-197394).	This correspondence was to encourage / stimulate investigation by Mr McGlone or his party into the benefits to be found in challenging the Desertcreat professionals managing the design into realising how large a missed opportunity they had made and how foolish their argument was for saying they were to grow their own fuel to supply their wood chip scheme. Had the correspondence of been successful it would have meant major savings for the public purse and hence also stimulated employment in the area and business for engineering and construction firms within NI. Perhaps had they changed the business model the Ministry may have found the project would have succeeded instead of the folly it became again loosing Millions to the public purse. The justice ministers professionals had specified the use of NONE UK boilers available only through a UK agent so no NI direct employment would have engaged the delivery of that scheme to the detriment of the local economy.
73	No6 of 2018	7	Set out whether, to your knowledge, there was ever any response or further communication arising out of either of the emails mentioned in the previous paragraph	Unknown
72	No6 of 2018		Email correspondence to the Finance Minister Information you have provided to the Inquiry suggests that Mr Wayne Cullen of BS Holdings Ltd (BSH) (a company related to Sheridan & Hood Ltd) emailed the then DFP Minister, Minister Wilson, on 6 December 2012 (a copy of this email is attached, bearing Inquiry reference WIT-197398 to WIT-197399) to draw to his attention, and to invite him to discuss with you, the potential for government buildings to "have zero fuel heating overhead costs" through use of the RHI Scheme. The email contained a number of attachments, namely (a) a 'Bio Fuel Heating Systems' presentation or booklet [at WIT-197400 to WIT-197478]; (b) a BSH savings leaflet [at WIT-197479 to WIT-197480]; and (c) a draft agenda for a proposed meeting [at WIT-197481]. Arising out of this:	Sheridan & Hood was not related to BSH. S&H shared a Director and had comment interests brought by that Director.
71	No6 of 2018	8	Please explain the relationship between Sheridan & Hood and BS Holdings and your, and Mr Cullen's, position in or in relation to each company.	BSH was an engineering manufacturing and design company. S&H were a building services engineering company. Mr. Cullen was employed within BSH as an engineer specifically engaged to deal with the NIRHI introduction to the NI market place and engage with our PLC clients and others in obtaining business from them and then in a role managing on going commitments for them on their Ofgem requirements on each project we completed. Mr B Hoods role was as Managing Director, a role he fulfilled in each of the two businesses.

Received from Brian Hood (BS Holdings Ltd) on 29.01.2018

Annotated by RHI Inquiry

WIT-200042

## RHI Inquiry Section 21 Notice

item	schedule reference	schedule item	schedule statement	BSH response statement
70	No6 of 2018	9	Please explain why Mr Cullen used Minister Wilson's Assembly email address to send this correspondence, rather than corresponding through the Department of Finance.	Cannot recall but both addresses were in use to the MLA.
69	No6 of 2018	10	To your knowledge, did you, Mr Cullen or any of your associated companies ever receive a response or acknowledgement in relation to this correspondence? If so, please provide details.	Unknown
68	No6 of 2018	11	Please set out whether this – or similar – correspondence was sent to other public bodies or public representatives.	Unknown too long ago to recall and all correspondenc after 12 months are usually deleted / destroyed if the projects were unsuccessful or li
67	No6 of 2018	12	The email notes that, "We have also had a number of similar cross-table discussion with ELBs and MLAs to date." Please provide as full details as possible of which ELBs and MLAs you, Mr Cullen and/or your companies had discussed these matters with (including, so far as possible, the dates of the discussions and what was covered).	See item 19
66	No6 of 2018	13	In relation to the leaflet you have provided to the Inquiry, which was enclosed with the above correspondence (and which may be found, amongst other places, at WIT-197479 to WIT-197480 in the information you have provided to the Inquiry), please address the following matters (insofar as you can):	
65	No6 of 2018	13a	When was this leaflet produced?	We cannot be specific, somewhere around the commencement of the start of the NIRHI regulations coming into force and after our due diligence had been completed with the DETNI.
64	No6 of 2018	13b	How many such leaflets were produced?	Hundreds
63	No6 of 2018	13c	How were they used?	Marketing dispersal
62	No6 of 2018	13d	To whom, and how, were they distributed?	We cannot be specific as mail shot marketing of prospective clients and industry was made
61	No6 of 2018	13e	To your knowledge, was a copy of this leaflet ever provided to any DETI official?	Unknown
60	No6 of 2018	14	Please provide similar details as are requested in the paragraph above in relation to the 'Bio Fuel Heating Systems' presentation or booklet (at WIT-197400 to WIT-197478).	Unknown too long ago to recall and all correspondenc after 12 months are usually deleted / destroyed if the projects were unsuccessful or li

## RHI Inquiry Section 21 Notice

item	schedule reference	schedule item	schedule statement	BSH response statement
59	No6 of 2018	15	Please describe generally the steps taken by (a) you and your companies and (b) as far as you are aware, other renewable heating companies in the market, to publicise and market the benefits available under the RHI Scheme (as explained in your literature referred to above).	see item 63
58	No6 of 2018	16	The email correspondence referred to above was followed up with a further email from Mr Cullen on 10 December 2012 (at WIT-197396 to WIT-197397). Again, to your knowledge, did you, Mr Cullen or any of your associated companies ever receive a response or acknowledgement in relation to this correspondence? If so, please provide details.	please item 69
57	No6 of 2018	17	Information provided to the Inquiry by Ms Janette O'Hagan indicates that she and her company was in discussion with BS Holdings in the course of 2013. (See, in this regard, enclosed for your convenience an extract from her witness statement to the Inquiry at WIT-264819 to WIT-264824; and emails provided by her to the Inquiry at WIT-264959 to WIT-264970). As to this:	
56	No6 of 2018	17a	Please provide full details of any interactions with Ms O'Hagan which you, Mr Cullen and/or your companies had.	You have a list from Ms O'Hagan, we have no further records to add to these. We can explain a little of what we were seeking and why we contacted her company. Heatboss was a wireless control system and we felt this was the way forward in the control of commercial installation equipment. Several contracts, not using Heatboss, were procured for GB RHI scheme's by us across England and Scotland, all three were leaders in the GB field for technological advances and several industry awards. Those buildings and client with heating and cooling by biomass meaning they could turn off electric air conditioning systems, normally used in these environments, which were much more carbon heavy and save taxation as well as obtain RHI income. Ferrari Maserati Belfast was the first building in the UK to be developed using this technology and obtained high accolades from Ferrari Director's as well as from a professor in the agri food science department in NI. These advances allowed BSH to export their technology to GB and provide increased manufacturing and employment in NI.
55	No6 of 2018	17b	Please provide details of the "twenty years of free heat to suit your needs" promotion undertaken by BS Holdings referred to by Mr Cullen in his email of 4 September 2013 (at WIT-264963).	We had performed due diligence and using the DETNI figures calculated using BSH technology, properly managed and maintained, Free heat was available for 20yrs and this is what we marketed.
54	No6 of 2018	17c	Specify whether you accept Ms O'Hagan's characterisation that, in light of the benefits available under the RHI Scheme, (at least some) potential customers were no longer worried about becoming more efficient.	The wording within the regulations did leave opportunities for potential abuse, but it also must be said that inspection processes to be used both announced and unannounced, much like we have with Power companies today asking for individuals or companies to read their meters, were to form the means to tackle that potential within the regulatory enforcement. Any projects with which our company were engaged to perform these works did so with the clear intention of removing carbon emissions, as was the intent of the DETNI documents and these included proper and correct use of controls systems including timer clock's, thermostat's and building management systems to ensure as best as possible <b><u>they complied with statutory building control regulations</u></b> as well as Ofgem.

## RHI Inquiry Section 21 Notice

item	schedule reference	schedule item	schedule statement	BSH response statement
53	No6 of 2018	17d	Explain the background to the document purporting to provide assurance from Peter Hutchinson which is set out at WIT-264970.	This formed a part of our due diligence process and was seeking such confirmation in print that we could reassure customers of the longevity of the scheme. As it now turns out the wording and implied phrases used in these documents and reassurance letters meant nothing and were not worth the paper they were written on. This president leaves NI in a dangerous place, for a government to provide such assurances both to the public, businesses, business leaders, investor's and other carbon saving promotion bodies, then because they mismanaged the scheme, to tear up a perceived contract, what does that say to the companies seeking to come to NI to invest? Answer, can we trust the NI Executive and civil servants to pay what they said they would?
52	No6 of 2018	18	Please provide further details, insofar as you can, of the "public briefings" at DETI offices which you attended, referred to in your previous statement to the Inquiry (at WIT-197218) including when they occurred and who was present.	Can only recall attending these public forums where Carbon reduction and RHI was the topic. See records from DETNI offices for agendas.
51	No6 of 2018	19	Please provide details of any trade or marketing events attended by you, Mr Cullen and/or your companies (including, as far as you can, the date; the location; the organiser of the event; who was present in terms of exhibitors, speakers, etc; whether any DETI and/or DARD officials were present; and what was said about the benefits available under the RHI Scheme).	We met with too many people and bodies to name or detail. Councillors in Antrim Mr Adrian Watson) and their energy team, Chairman of the N Education board and his team, S Education board energy manager accompanied by as a representative of Brites, MLA's (Mr P. McGlone and Mr. Agnew to recount two). All meetings and discussions with the clear intention of bringing the carbon saving and tax payer saving potential to their attention. Our main focus was why run public buildings and pay for them to be heated when another government depart will pay for it and you can clearly demonstrate to your community that you are playing your part in carbon reduction for the future generations.
50	No6 of 2018	20	Please provide your view of the explanation for the 'spike' in applications in the Scheme in September to November 2015. In particular, please explain:	We have no view as our sales did not see any spikes.
49	No6 of 2018		When, to your knowledge, the first indication arose in 2015 that the Scheme was to be amended to introduce tiering or cost	Somewhere through 2015 and these came about in discussions with fuel suppliers during conversations about some of our customers biomass business which we managed for them.
48	No6 of 2018		How this information first came to the attention of the market; and	Unknown to us, our involvement was purely discussion in our office meetings, see 49 above.
47	No6 of 2018		Whether and how this information spread; and	Unknown
46	No6 of 2018		The effect, if any, this information had.	See information within the DETNI domain for facts
45			In particular, please expand on your answer to enquiry 6f in the Schedule to Chairman's Notice No 329 of 2017 (addressed in your previous statement at WIT-197217), which is lacking in detail.	We cannot be more specific on these details.
44	No6 of 2018	21	Please also specify as precisely as possible when you and your companies became aware that changes were likely to be introduced to the Scheme which would make it less attractive.	Upon the announcement at the Energy committee meeting with the DETNI minister bringing forward regulation changes which were then approved.
43	No6 of 2018	22	Please provide similar details as are requested at paragraphs 20-21 above in relation to the proposed suspension of the Scheme, and the further spike in applications, in February 2016.	see above we cannot be more specific

## RHI Inquiry Section 21 Notice

item	schedule reference	schedule item	schedule statement	BSH response statement
42	No6 of 2018	23	Please provide any further information you believe to be relevant in light of the RHI Inquiry's Terms of Reference.	<p>I am unsure if what I state now is within the TOR but that said it is a forum where something should be categorised. The NIRHI was introduced with the sole purpose of carbon reduction. By far the largest contributor to this in GB was biomass, the same I presume can be said of NI but in absence of correlation data, I cannot be sure. That said if we assume it is correct, NI as part of the devolved administrations within UK has a responsibility to meet their element of the climate change targets set and agreed by Westminster, we were effectively signed up to meet those and fines had we not achieved those. I noted recently in the press that the Ireland government has somewhere around £360m in fines pending should they not achieve their commitments and to date they have not introduced anything to incentivise carbon reduction, had Stormont not have done so these fines would have arrived in a similar manner. Now, if we assume the largest majority of NIRHI installations are sound and within scope of the regulations (and to date no evidence of prosecutions have been brought forward by the press despite many accusations of empty sheds being heated), so the vast majority we cite are probably within scope. The NIRHI has produced excess carbon savings, it has to have as it has overspent its budget by a factor of we estimate 2. Westminster having been handed those carbon savings puts them with the other developed nations and gets a comprehensive pot within which it displays to the EU what UK has done in meeting climate change obligations. The net effect of NIRHI producing excess Carbon savings has a two fold effect, 1. we overspent and that's why this enquiry came into being. 2. We have not been granted an equal amount of money for that excess carbon production. The outworking of this excess production and free handing to Westminster means they now pocket that saving in monetary terms at Stormont's &amp; the NI taxpayers expense because GB do not have to spend their RHI budget to the same level as NIRHI has given them free Carbon savings, (all be it by the mistakes of the civil servants overseeing the running and development of the scheme. Fall out between Ofgem and the DETNI department meant the DETNI felt they could do a better job in managing the RHI than Westminster's chosen partner, as it now looks they were clearly very wrong and the tax payers in NI are now paying for civil service incompetency. Another out working of the change in tariff now forced on the NIRHI investor is, are the DfE now sure they can sustain the carbon target set by GB and avoid additional fines in the future? We say this because by the mechanism they have used to reduce RHI funding we are finding many of our clients are switching their systems off when they become uneconomic meaning what was relied upon as a true carbon saving scheme approved by the department is now less so and endangers whether we will actually achieve our set target. Has the DfE completed its calculations on the down turn of demand hence downturn of carbon offset to ensure we meet our target. I suspect they have not even considered it given the lack of transparency in the working of the scheme to date. <a href="https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/publications-and-updates/non-domestic-renewable-heat-incentive-rhi-quarterly-report-july-september-2017">https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/publications-and-updates/non-domestic-renewable-heat-incentive-rhi-quarterly-report-july-september-2017</a></p>
41	No6 of 2018		It is important for the efficiency of the RHI Inquiry that the issues identified above are addressed as fully as possible and by reference, where available, to the dates and locations of specific incidents to which reference is made. The statement should be broken down into paragraphs, which should be numbered sequentially from '1' to the end. The use of appropriate section headings or sub-headings is also encouraged. A template witness statement is provided with this Notice for your assistance and should be used as the format for your response.	The enquiry seems to be asking us to recount 5 yrs history. In business when projects are unsuccessful files are destroyed, emails wiped and a cleaning of house is performed. We usually did this annually within our business. Much of what you now ask is consigned to the bin many years ago and memory is a fical thing.
40	No 330 of 2017	1	Any document relating to or touching upon any of the issues raised in the Schedule to Section 21 Notices No 158 of 2017 and/or No 329 of 2017, dated 12 May 2017 and 29 June 2017 respectively and served upon you, Brian Hood.	BSH had numerous NI enquires relating to biomass solutions for NI business buildings and processes. Some of these enquires became contracts with BSH and the remainder did not. For each enquire there were various amounts of correspondence. Unsuccessful enquiry information is binned when seen as of no benefit for future use. Successful contracts are then developed to the specific technical and commercial requirements of each client. As each biomass related contract is site specific there are no generalisations that one solution fits all. Each contract has specific energy generation requirements, energy distribution requirements, heating/cooling loads, building heat gain & heat loss criteria, hot water requirements for domestic or process use, HVAC control requirements, back-up & top-up load requirements, associated infrastructure requirements, exhaust gas requirements, associated capital expenditure, carbon trust options, lease or asset finance options, ESCO, through life costs, etc. We have submitted to the Inquiry information that directly involves the clarification of the specific NI RHI scheme as this was part of our research to gain clarity for potential customers. This clarification information
39	No 330 of 2017	2	Any other documents, weather in electronic or hard copy, which relate to a matter in question at the RHI inquiry, or which might be relevant to the matters the RHI inquiry is investigating (see, further note below)	

## RHI Inquiry Section 21 Notice

item	schedule reference	schedule item	schedule statement	BSH response statement
38	No 330 of 2017	note	By virtue of section 43(1) of the Inquiries Act 2005, "document" in this context has a very wide interpretation and includes information recorded in any form. This will include, for instance, correspondence, handwritten or typed notes, dairy entries and minutes and memoranda. It will also include electronic documents such as emails, text communications and recordings. In turn, this will also include relevant email and text communications sent to or from personal email accounts or telephone numbers, as well as those sent from official or business accounts or numbers. By virtue of section 21(6) of the Inquiries Act 2005, a thing is under a person's control if it is in his possession or if he has a right to possession of it	was then part of the commercial decision making process by each potential contract company. As it has now turned out the guarantees given by DEITNI representatives are now not being honoured for NI RHI accredited systems.
37	No 329 of 2017	1	Please provide further details on your engagement and/or that of your companies (i.e. Sheridan & Hood Ltd and BS Holdings Ltd) with DETI in order to seek assurances about the RHI Scheme for your customers. Please provide relevant dates, venues and the names of the individuals involved, along with a summary of the assurances sought and received.	The people we had contact with in the DETI were Peter Hutchinson and Joanne McCutcheon. We met with both on subject and communicated by email/telephone to seek clarity on the NIRHI scheme. See emails. We also met with invest NI on same subject to seek clarity on carbon trust funding and other funding options. We met with the officials in Invest NI and the Green bank, a low interest government backed loan body. We also met with the carbon trust directly on same subject of potential funding options. The DETI clearly stated that the NIRHI tariffs were as stated and protected. The carbon trust management also stated that NIRHI tariffs would form part of the application for potential carbon trust loans for biomass related projects. The contact names within invest NI are Olive Hill, Trevor Kerr, James McEvoy. Contract names within Carbon Trust are Janine Cobain, Geoff Smyth, Linda Logan,
36	No 329 of 2017	2	Please provide further details on the public briefings which you and/or representatives of your companies attended at DETI offices in relation to RHI Scheme. Please provide relevant dates, venues and the names of the individuals involved.	
35	No 329 of 2017	3	Please provide further details of written assurances you and/or your companies received from DETI in relation to the RHI Scheme. Please provide relevant dates, means of communication and the names of the individuals involved.	
34	No 329 of 2017	4	Please explain in detail why you and/or your companies were of the opinion that the tariffs were sufficient to amount to 20% return required by businesses for investment	Most company management look for a reasonable return on their investment within seven years but again each company/site is a specific solution subject to business needs and existing infrastructure. The commercial decision making to proceed is with each company representative. When using a BSH product, income streams, energy saved from fossil fuel sources and an ability to provide cooling allowing expensive and carbon heavy electric sources to be removed played a major part in achieving those aspirations.
33	No 329 of 2017	5	Please specify when you first became aware that there may have been an incentive in some cases to produce heat merely to make profit from the Scheme; how you became so aware, and the actions (if any) you took in respect of such knowledge (such as, for example, communicating with DETI, DFP or Ofgem, or with persons in the renewable energy sector, or others).	All our customers and enquires were for Ofgem eligible heating and/or cooling uses for business buildings and processes. Awareness of any ineligible heating and/or cooling uses were hearsay through local media. The ofgem associated documentation and application process determines eligibility of heating and/or cooling uses in order to achieve RHI income support. Our commercial model demonstrated a 20% to customers that chose to use our products. Without a commercial return on investment no business will invest money, that is a reality of business.

## RHI Inquiry Section 21 Notice

item	schedule reference	schedule item	schedule statement	BSH response statement
32	No 329 of 2017	6	Issues arising from the email sent to Austen Lennon dated 3 August 2015. It appears to the Inquiry from information received by it that, on 3 August 2015, you sent an email to Austen Lennon ( a copy of which is enclosed for your assistance) discussing the expected imminent introduction of tiering into the RHI Scheme. As to that, please address the following matters:	See below items on subject
31	No 329 of 2017	6a	Why were you in contact with Austen Lennon in relation to the RHI Scheme and the proposed introduction of tiering?	As an on-going interested potential client regarding renewable energy we were making him aware of the potential changes to the existing NI tariffs. This is also the case for GB tariffs as each degression schedule is proposed.
30	No 329 of 2017	6b	What relationship did you and/or you companies have with (i) the Hastings Hotel Group or related business, (ii) Howard Hastings, and (iii) Austin Lennon?	Potential customers for heating and/or cooling systems within the hotel business type.
29	No 329 of 2017	6c	What is meant by the reference in the subject heading of the email, "Stormont 10273 16.6.15"?	Our enquiry reference number and associated date.
28	No 329 of 2017	6d	What evidence did or do you have to support the allegation that abuse had been taking place within the RHI Scheme (in the poultry industry or more generally)?	Awareness of any ineligible heating and/or cooling uses were hearsay through local media. As far as we are aware no prosecutions have ever been brought to manage abuse within the framework of your question. Speculation is one thing, actual prosecutions another.
27	No 329 of 2017	6e	What evidence did or do you have to support the allegation that the RHI poultry sector had been running their systems night and day even without poultry present?	Awareness of any ineligible heating and/or cooling uses were hearsay through local media. See 28. We met with one poultry farmer who was interested in using biomass and our products. We performed our due diligence and upon discovering how he intended to manage his scheme, it clearly demonstrated that his intention was to run the plant much more than what he had done previously, nearly twice as much compared to the LPG costs he had given us for our computations. On our proposal it may have taken upwards of 10 years to pay off his investment, running it for twice as long would have reduced that payback period. He supported our discussion by saying yes his neighbours having the scheme pay it off much morre quickly than 10 yrs. Wheather that amounted to abuse or merely having larger poultry stock increased in value is not a field within which i am competent, the project did not go any further with us. I suspect it went to another manufacturer installer. It is correct to say however that poultry heated by biomass warm air removing flue gases from the birds breathing environment will be a good thing for animal welfair is undisputed in our opinion.
26	No 329 of 2017	6f	How had you heard of the proposed introduction of tiering or costs controls into the RHI Scheme? From whom and when had you learned of such matters? (Please include details of any relevant communications other than those giving rise to your email to Austen Lennon, as well as any communications which gave rise to that email.)	On-line news on subject, Wood pellet fuel suppliers, local media
25	No 329 of 2017	6g	What did you mean when you suggested that Hastings Group "may be better to get it underway and get it labelled as working even it is 60% their on site [sic]"? What actions, if any, are you aware of arising out of this advice or encouragement?	We design & build bespoke package plant room solutions that complete a high percentage of the associated work off site which leaves a minimum amount of work on site for final hook-up, perhaps as quick as 1 day. Works can progress both off site and on site so dependent on the specific project these percentage values will change. In this case 60% must have been an element of work needed on the site, the balance being off site works. No order was placed with BSH and we are not aware of any further actions taken by the Hastings Group.
24	No 329 of 2017	6h	What else, if anything, did you do with the information shared in the email to Austen Lennon? In particular, did you share this information with anyone else? If so, please give details.	Again each potential site/customer is specific to business needs, infrastructure, heat & cooling loads, etc and the commercial decision making to proceed is with each company representative.
23	No 329 of 2017	6i	To your knowledge, following the email to Austen Lennon, did the Hastings Hotel Group, Howard Hastings or Austen Lennon apply to the RHI Scheme either on their own behalf or on behalf of any others or related persons or businesses?	Not aware of any RHI applications relating to their business buildings or processes.

## RHI Inquiry Section 21 Notice

item	schedule reference	schedule item	schedule statement	BSH response statement
22	No 329 of 2017	6j	How did the information you shared in the email to Austen Lennon impact on your companies, in particular in relation to business customers who were applicants or potential applicants to the RHI Scheme?	Again each potential site/customer is specific to business needs, infrastructure, heat & cooling loads, etc and the commercial decision making to proceed is with each company representative. Some investors proceeded, others owing to time pressures of achieving a completed installation in the expected time frame left for the RHI to remain open decided not to progress. Upwards of £1.5M in sales were ready to be booked by a PLC business in NI but insufficient time was left and we could not provide the guarantee they required to permit their executive board to sign off on the order. The project today remains on fossil fuel adding to the carbon emissions of NI.
21	No 329 of 2017	7	Please also explain why the email referred to above, and any associated communications or events, were not disclosed to or outlined to the inquiry in your previous statement or the documents provided along with that statement	see response to items 38, 39 & 40
20	No 329 of 2017	note	It is important for the efficiency of the RHI Inquiry that the issues identified above are addressed as fully as possible and by reference, where available, to the dates and locations of specific incidents to which reference is made. The statement should be broken down into paragraphs, which should be numbered sequentially from '1' to the end. The use of appropriate section headings or sub headings is also encouraged. A template witness statement is provided with this Notice for your assistance and should be used as the format for your response.	As stated
19	No 158 of 2017	1	Explain any direct or indirect involvement that you, and/or Sheridan & Hood Limited, its servants and agents ('the Company'), had in the Non Domestic Renewable Heat Incentive (RHI) Scheme in Northern Ireland ('the Scheme') or any aspect of it prior to its suspension in February 2016, including, in particular, any involvement that you or the Company had in the process leading to the creation of the Scheme such as, for example, any responses provided by you or by the Company, or by any person on behalf of you or the Company, in the 2011 public consultation exercise concerning the proposed Scheme (and provide copies of any relevant documents with your Witness Statement).	our company was actively involved with development of renewable biomass systems and we actively engage with the DETNI to seek assurances that for our growing base of customers interested in the RHI role out, it would be a genuine and truly beneficial scheme should they decide to invest in the technology required. We attended public briefings at the DETNI offices and obtained written assurances on the scheme. Sheridan & Hood Ltd were awarded a certificate by the DETNI Minister for the 1st company to have attained a commercial RHI in NI.

## RHI Inquiry Section 21 Notice

item	schedule reference	schedule item	schedule statement	BSH response statement
18	No 158 of 2017	2	In respect of the same period, please identify any flaws, problems, anomalies, loopholes, or other issues regarding the proposed Scheme, or the Scheme as enacted, which came to your attention, setting out details of when you first became aware of each such issue and the actions (if any) taken by you as a result (again, please provide copies of any relevant documents in this regard).	we became aware of differences between the GB RHI scheme and NI RHI scheme. Within our design team we performed due diligence by seeking and receiving confirmation on tariffs', length of the scheme proposed, grandfathering etc, all in line with what our clients had sought from us. The regulations in place within the NI RHI we felt were there for control of any abuse. Furthermore within NI, the NI Building Control departments are responsible for energy conservation as part of technical booklet F2 which provides a role to ensure compliance in commercial buildings and properties. We felt that being the commercial RHI under the DETNI and NI Building Control both departments had a role to play in this government scheme, it follows that proper governance dictated both would be overseeing it and policing it to stamp out any abuse or illegitimate installations. The RHI payment tariffs were reviewed by us and we felt that like other renewables, the government tariff proposed met the 20% return sought by businesses and therefore should be acceptable to them and allowed us to market our equipment.
17	No 158 of 2017	3	In respect of your letter to the Minister for Justice dated 27 November 2012, please address the following particular points:-	Acting as Managing Director of Sheridan & Hood Ltd we were asked to provide an estimate bid for works on the Desercreat project, a proposed training college in Cookstown funded through the Justice Ministry. Whilst reviewing the tender we noted that the professional team had a concept to use large 1Mw biomass boilers to power the sprawling site. Having completed an overview of the scheme we took note of the large costs involved with the proposed energy centre housing the biomass boilers, the extensive and large backup boiler support systems and very high costs relating to the district heating mains and pumps, from memory Grundfos the pump manufacturers price was more than £1M alone. Once our overview was complete we took a considered design review and arrived at the following conclusions; The scheme as designed by the professional team was elaborate and expensive. The scheme was outside of current or future RHI scope as far as we could judge at that time. The scheme did lend itself to a multi energy centre approach, like what we had been developing for the car retailer Charles Hurst on their Boucher Road and Antrim Road dealerships and their owners Lookers PLC on sites across GB. Site map of the RHI sites on Charles Hurst are enclosed proving the concept of multiple buildings on one site using individual energy centres, all were approved by the NI RHI and Ofgem teams in subsequent years. The NI RHI and UK RHI scheme permitted multi use boilers to develop across heating and cooling systems which were hydraulically separate and installed in accordance with the RHI regulations of the time. This was reconfirmed by the DETNI during the process of the Desertcreat proposals in 2012-2013 to counter allegations the professional team had made that what we had proposed was not in keeping with the scheme principals and regulations. The buildings proposed on designs for the Desertcreat project were all of a suitable size to accommodate our model of a 99kw RHI energy cabin with some having cooling where needed. The buildings were for the majority set in their own locations as these represented several departments Fire, ambulance and police with each having a differing need in training and administrative properties. Layout site plans are not available to demonstrate the project further. Backup or top up energy would be derived by oil fired boilers also fitted into the energy cabins. We approached a finance company who were also heavily involved in the RHI scheme and who since Desertcreat have energy cabins installed in clients premises where they run them as Esco's. We were considering a multi phased approach. To offer a straight sale of our energy cabins if the Finance Ministry wanted to save million from the project budget and secure the future energy prices for the complex for years ahead, or provide the finance minister with a no investment proposal where the energy cabins would be running as an Esco and lower prices for energy bought through us during the life time for the RHI scheme in NI. Further emails followed back and forward between the various persons within our sister company BS Holdings Ltd and the Desertcreat professional team and what we have of them are enclosed also. When the Desertcreat project was terminated by the Minister for cost reasons, our correspondence files were destroyed months later so access today has been limited to emailed communications still available to us.
16	No 158 of 2017	3a	explain the precise basis (for example, your experience of the operation of the Scheme and/or representations made to you by third parties and/or reliance by you upon documents relating to the Scheme) for each of the following representations made in your letter:	
15	No 158 of 2017	3a i	that it would be permissible under the Scheme for ten 99kW biomass heating plants (plus two others) to be installed to meet the client's needs rather than a smaller number of 1mW biomass heating plants which fell outside the scope of the Scheme;	
14	No 158 of 2017	3a ii	that the annual RHI income received in respect of your ten 99kW biomass heating plants (plus two others) would exceed the total annual cost of fuelling the said heating plants; (and include all relevant documents);	
13	No 158 of 2017	3b	provide details of each and every piece of correspondence between you, the Company, or other persons on your behalf or on behalf of the Company (of the one part), and the Department of Justice, its servants or agents (of the other part), following your letter of 27 November 2012 (and provide copies of same);	

## RHI Inquiry Section 21 Notice

item	schedule reference	schedule item	schedule statement	BSH response statement
12	No 158 of 2017	3c	provide details of each and every meeting (whether face-to-face or through telephonic or other means of communication) between you, the Company, or other persons on your behalf or on behalf of the Company (of the one part), and the Department of Justice, its servants or agents (of the other part), following your letter of 27 November 2012 (and provide copies of any relevant documents);	
11	No 158 of 2017	3d	provide details of each and every communication passing between you, the Company, or other persons on your behalf or on the behalf of the Company (of the one part), and any person or body other than the Department of Justice, its servants or agents (of the other part), touching or concerning the issues regarding the RHI Scheme raised in you letter of 27 November 2012 (and provide copies of same);	
10	No 158 of 2017	3e	provide details of each and every meeting (whether face to-face or through telephonic or other means of communications) between you, the Company, or other persons on your behalf or on the behalf of the Company (of the one part), and any person or body other than the Department of Justice, its servants or agents (of the other part), touching or concerning the issues regarding the RHI Scheme raised in your letter of 27 November 2012 (and provide copies of any relevant documents).	
9	No 158 of 2017	4	In respect of the period prior to the suspension of the Scheme in February 2016, provide details of all dealings that you or the Company, or other persons on behalf of you or the Company, had with Ministers, SPADs, politicians, Civil Servants, or their respective servants or agents which are relevant to the matters which the RHI Inquiry is investigating as set out in the Inquiry's Terms of Reference (and provide copies of any relevant documents).	<p>emails enclosed on the closure of the scheme and our communications with politicians and members of the energy committee. Although not part of this inquiry it seems very clear to me that GB have compromised NI and are treating our local Government very improperly in these matters. Whilst the scheme was set up to meet the total UK carbon target to Europe, NI formed its own policy to achieve this. The overall scheme has been oversubscribed by a factor of 2 through what I see as clear negligence of the scheme management; hence we have contributed twice as much carbon to the UK pot than we should have. GB meanwhile has taken that contribution. GB now has a greater contribution to the overall pot than was set aside for NI, this is to GB's benefit because they do not have to invest as much of the GB portion than they previously had to. GB keeps the excess value of money they had set aside for their own RHI scheme to make the equivalent amount of carbon saving to our society's detriment.</p>
8	No 158 of 2017	5	In respect of the period prior to the suspension of the Scheme in February 2016, provide details of all dealings that you or the Company, or other persons on behalf of you or the Company, had with persons or bodies other than Ministers, SPADs, politicians, Civil Servants, or their respective servants or agents (such as, for example, persons involved in the Renewable Heat industry including suppliers and/or installers, Scheme applications and/or potential applicants, and representative bodies) which are relevant to the matters which the RHI Inquiry is investigating as set out in the Inquiry's Terms of Reference (and provide copies of any relevant documents).	

## RHI Inquiry Section 21 Notice

item	schedule reference	schedule item	schedule statement	BSH response statement
7	No 158 of 2017	6	In respect of the period prior to the suspension of the Scheme in February 2016, please identify any instances of whistle-blowing in relation to the Scheme, or any disclosures made raising concerns about the Scheme, of which you are aware, setting out details of when such communications occurred and to whom, and by whom, each such communication was made (and provide copies of any relevant documents).	
6	No 158 of 2017	7	In respect of the period prior to the suspension of the Scheme in February 2016, please identify any instances of lobbying or encouragement of Ministers, Special Advisers, Civil Servants or other relevant persons in relation to the terms of the Scheme and/or the introduction, non-introduction, variation or delay of the introduction of cost control into the Scheme (including, but not limited to, the amendment of tariffs, tiering, degression and Scheme suspension or closure) (and provide copies of any relevant documents).	
5	No 158 of 2017	8	Identify any instances, to your knowledge or belief, where a Minister, Special Advisor, Civil Servant or any other person involved in the RHI Scheme (including, if applicable yourself):	
4	No 158 of 2017	8a	breached relevant standards (including, but not limited to, the Nolan Principles, the Ministerial Code of Conduct, the Civil Service Code of Conduct, the Code of Conduct for Special Advisers and/or terms of conditions of employment or service) or acted in a way incompatible with their duties;	
3	No 158 of 2017	8b	acted in circumstances relating to or touching upon the Scheme in any way where they had a real or perceived conflict of interest;	
2	No 158 of 2017	9	Provide any further evidence within your knowledge or belief which is relevant to the matters which the RHI Inquiry is investigating as set out in the RHI Inquiry's Terms of Reference (and provide copies of any relevant documents).	

## RHI Inquiry Section 21 Notice

item	schedule reference	schedule item	schedule statement	BSH response statement
1	No 158 of 2017	note	It is important for the efficiency of the RHI Inquiry that the issues identified above are addressed as fully as possible and by reference, where available, to the dates and locations of specific incidents to which reference is made. The statement should be broken down into paragraphs, which should be numbered sequentially from '1' to the end. The use of appropriate section headings or sub headings is also encouraged. A template witness statement is provided with this Notice for your assistance and should be used as the format for your response.	as stated



RENEWABLE HEAT  
INCENTIVE INQUIRY

General

23.

Statement of Truth

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

29/1/18

