



The Certification Mark for Onsite
Sustainable Energy Technologies

MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

Date: 13th January 2015, 10:30 – 16:00

Venue: Gemserv, 5th Floor, 8 Fenchurch Place, EC3M 4AJ

Attendees:

No.	Name	Constituency
In attendance		
1.	Griff Thomas (GT)	Chair; GTEC Training
2.	Andrew Hopton (AH)	HETAS
3.	Danny Jones (DJ)	Expertina
4.	Graham Wright (GW)	Daikin
5.	Gideon Richards (GR)	CWP
6.	Kevin Sweeney (KSw)	Intertek- (Dial-in)
7.	Jan Muller (JM)	Solar Century
8.	John Holden (JH)	Installer Certification Bodies
9.	Neil Sawers (NS)	Grant UK
10.	Paul Rochester (PR)	DECC
11.	Tom Chapman (TC)	Gemserv
12.	Verity Blake (VB)	Gemserv
Apologies		
1.	Chris Yates (CY)	Johnson and Starley
2.	Graham Hazell (GH)	HPA
3.	David Sharman (DS)	Ampair

Agenda:

No.	Item Name
1	Welcome and Approval of the Agenda
2	Minutes and Actions from last meeting
3	SMG Expenses Paper
4	Review, finalise and sign off SMG funding criteria
5	MCS EU Notification
6	Energy related Products Directive
7	Biomass cookers
8	Product data sheets
9	Standardisation of standards - Terms and definitions



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

	- Comparison of sections in standards
10	Construction Products Regulation
11	Recognition of Solar Thermal Systems
12	Change Process
13	MCS Calculators for Heat Technologies
14	AOB
15	Dates of next meetings

1. Welcome and Approval of the Agenda

The Chair welcomed SMG members to the meeting and apologies were noted. One participant requested that the EHPA heat pump certification scheme be added as an AOB. The solar PV representative noted that he also had several items of AOB to raise at the end of the meeting. The Chair agreed and noted these items for discussion. KSw joined the meeting via conference call.

2. Minutes and actions from the last meeting

The minutes from the last meeting were reviewed and one member suggested a number of modifications. In particular, it was requested that items numbered 1, 2 4, 6, as well as the 2nd and 3rd lines of point 13, be rewritten for greater clarity. Minor grammatical amendments to the action logs were also requested. The members requested that the actions be taken offline and that KSw draft a one page note on IEC RE. This was added to the actions log as an update to the relevant actions.

The MCS administrator provided an update on the actions from the previous meeting. The Group reviewed progress and discussed the future of hydro certification and whether the scheme should continue with installer certification given that there is no accredited certification body for this technology. The group agreed that a recommendation should go to the Steering Group that the hydro standards should be withdrawn. The group noted that the standards should be available on the MCS website in case any certification body wishes to begin offering hydro certification in the future. A note should also be added to the MCS website making it clear that the standard is withdrawn and that anyone wishing to offer or receive certification in accordance with the hydro



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

standards should contact MCS. The MCS administrator was also asked to notify the transitional installers of the outcome and remove the list of transitional installers from the MCS website.

**ACTION 18-001: MCS administrator to communicate SMG recommendation to the Steering Group.
Also to notify transitional installers of the outcome and remove from the website.**

Future updates to the MCS standards and aligning these with updates to RHI legislation were discussed and GT and GR noted that this work had stalled for the moment. There was a request for the MCS administrator to follow up with the parties involved in these discussions to move this forward. Further discussion took place and were noted in the action tracker.

ACTION 18-002: MCS administrator to contact parties involved in discussing process for aligning updates to the MCS standards and RHI regulations.

The proposed review of the 70kWth guidance document review was raised. Representatives from the heat pump group stated that they did not have any concerns. The Chair stated how biomass representatives have previously expressed concerns and these issues should be addressed. The Group noted that the scheme committed to a review of the 70kW requirements after 6 months

ACTION 18-003: A preliminary meeting will be held after the next Steering Group Meeting to review the 70kWth guidance document. It was requested that biomass representatives put forward evidence and examples of the exact type of situations that are being reported.

The definition of product families and the EHPA guidance document on this topic were briefly discussed. One member suggested that it be added to the meeting as an AOB and the Chair agreed.

An update on Action SMG 16-019 was given. The Group requested the MCS Administrator to convene a date for this meeting to discuss on how the scheme should integrate the recommendations of the report.



The Certification Mark for Onsite Sustainable Energy Technologies

MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

ACTION 18-004: MCS Administrator to arrange a meeting to discuss action SMG-16-019 (CPR Report).

3. SMG Expenses Paper

The SMG members managing this project gave an update on its progress. It was noted that it is an ongoing project, and GR and GT will aim to agree this document in the next 10 days.

4. Review, finalise and sign off SMG funding criteria

The Group discussed the funding that has been allocated to the SMG for the financial year 2014-15. It was agreed the purpose of the funding is to support and develop the standards, and that this needs to be measured. A member expressed that this should be a priority as the end of the financial year is approaching. There was a general consensus that criteria needs to be decided on in order for this to move forward and for proposals to be developed. Both the heat pump and solar PV groups have funding proposals that they would be looking to submit to the SMG. GT noted that he would update the Steering Group on progress with the SMG funding criteria paper and request that if unspent, the existing funding allocation be rolled over into the next financial year.

GR noted that the criteria document needs to cover the ownership of funded work, IP and copyright, so it is clear who will own the outputs. It was also suggested that the SMG should be changed to 'scheme' on point 5.

One member proposed using a scoring matrix that included the method, weighting and criteria. Other members agreed, as they believed such a proposal would allow others to self-evaluate their proposals.

The Group briefly discussed whether there should be a threshold that would exclude large projects, or projects that would have an ongoing liability / maintenance requirement. It was suggested that eligibility questions on this should be included in the application.



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

The group noted that in some instances that projects may need to go through the OJEU tendering process. In such cases multiple quotes / bids would be required however it is expected that this would be outside of the scope of projects covered by the SMG funding criteria.

The appropriate thresholds for funding were then discussed. There was debate about the appropriate thresholds and one member suggested 10K being the first threshold and second threshold being 20k. After further discussion about amounts, it was agreed on 15k as an absolute cap. It was also noted that larger projects that exceeded the cap would be considered, although there would be no guarantee of funding. These larger projects would need to be directed to the Management Panel and Steering Group for approval.

On the topic of rejected submissions, a member suggested any complaints should be referred to as appeals. The group discussed the review process and it was suggested that a sub group (formed from members of the SMG) could be formed to review funding applications. However there were concern about how any sub-group would be selected. There was further debate on how funding applications could be evaluated and members emphasised the need to objectively evaluate the group as whole and that there would need to be scoring matrix which could be used to assess applications. JH also suggested that reporting requirements be added to the criteria paper and in particular any requirements for an end of project report to the SMG. This could be in the form of a self-evaluation completed within a specified period after the project end.

The group agreed to devolve the process for finalising the criteria document to GR and GT to ensure the paper was signed off as soon as possible. GR raised additional edits which the group suggested he should send to GT outside of the meeting. GR also suggested that the scope and foreword be reviewed as these sections contain content which would be better placed in other sections.

ACTION 18-005: MCS Administrator to look into developing a matrix of scoring to see whether there is some standard points scale or methodology that can be applied to judge submissions.



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

ACTION 18-006: MCS Administrator to draft application form and tables for application process, look at scoring matrix and appeals processes and produce a draft to the SMG.

ACTION 18-007: GT to amend scope and foreword to explain the framework and the scoring method and cap. GR to feedback any additional editorial corrections to GT.

5. MCS EU Notification

The MCS Administrator inquired with PR whether any comments had come back from the MCS 007 EU Notification released in November. It was stated there had been no responses.

The group requested an update on MCS 012 notification. Members voiced concerns that the project had lost momentum. JM provided an update and explained that the group had identified a piece of work which needs to be completed before notification can take place. This issue was identified after two CBs had taken an opposing view as to whether fire testing needed to be completed for each module to be used with a fixing system or whether parameters could be agreed allowing universal fire test approval.

The MCS 012 group has identified the need to review this issue and carry out a piece of work to define categories of PV module. Defining categories could help to solve this issue. The MCS 012 group feel that this point needs to be resolved before EU notification can take place. The discussion was concluded as the Chair highlighted that there is an upcoming meeting designated to this issue.

The group requested that the MCS 012 group consider the materials being used i.e. aluminium, sealant etc. It was questioned whether any decisions made in the upcoming meeting may result in existing products being unable to be certified due to any new procedures or testing requirements decided in the meeting. The Group agreed that any changes implemented need to consider the products that are already certified and allow for a smooth transition.

ACTION 18-008: MCS Administrator to forward JM's note on the MCS012 issue to GR.



The Certification Mark for Onsite Sustainable Energy Technologies

MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

6. Energy related Products Directive

The Administrator began the discussion with an overview of the work currently being conducted with the heat pump group.

It was stated that the present aim is to have a consultation in February, followed by a final meeting to review the consultation comments in March and the main HP working group meeting a week after. The final proposals are projected to be submitted to SMG on the 19th of May.

GW provided an update on the work of the sub group which has been formed to develop the HP ErP proposals. A diagram was displayed to give an overview of the project being developed. Concern was raised about whether this was a fundamental alteration to MCS and if there could be potential issues around liability.

One member identified that there is a gap in the EU directive, as there is no clear definition of a 'combination heater'. The group debated whether MCS it was within the scheme's remit to address this issue or whether the matter should be referred back to the EU. GW confirmed that the scheme was seeking clarification on this point and other aspects from relevant parties. It was agreed that the working group could provide a recommendation however it would be an SMG decision regarding whether or not the proposals are accepted. Any decision may need to be taken alongside legal advice.

GW explained that there is a calculation that can be made and then proceeded to explain the current calculation methods being used. It was argued that this proposal would be more stringent than current procedures.

CE Marking was raised and the conflict between other market standards tests currently in place. It was stated that the success and strength of the proposed calculation will be determined by the surveillance completed by the NMO. It was also stated that the installer standard will need to be updated regarding system labelling.



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

Post meeting note: The responsibility for ensuring compliance with the EcoDesign Directive and CE Marking rests with the manufacturer. In its' role as the UK enforcement agency, the NMO adopts a 'risk based' approach to surveillance and compliance with the EcoDesign Directive. This may comprise documentation review, validation of performance claims and calculations and/or selection of product for independent verification.

It was suggested that the need for product testing can be reduced but manufacturers still need to have their products tested. However the ErP sub group would prefer that MCS accepts ErP test data rather than requiring that additional testing is completed. The group questioned whether accepting ErP test data would be sufficiently robust and debated the checks that the CB would be carrying out. The group discussed whether accepting ErP test data without additional checks would render the scheme obsolete. GW confirmed that the MCS CB would be responsible for checking the test data and completed FPC/safety checks.

A question was put forward about whether MCS can use ErP test data rather than carrying out additional testing for MCS. The MCS certification role will remain, although the cost for testing will be reduced. There was disagreement about whether this was possible. It was argued that this would not bring about any significant changes. Market surveillance by the NMO would not be able to replace the need for MCS data acceptance criteria.

The group agreed that this subject would be discussed at the next SMG meeting and if necessary the scheme would take legal advice. The MCS Administrator reported that there are at least two more ErP sub group meetings planned before the next SMG. The group asked that the MCS Administrator inform the Chair of the ErP sub group that the SMG were concerned about the timescales for this piece of work. Due to the importance of the updates being agreed then the SMG will intervene if necessary to ensure that the standards are updated.

ACTION 18-009: MCS Administrator to feedback comments to the ErP sub group Chair highlighting that if the sub group does not progress quickly then the SMG reserves the right to intervene.



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

7. Biomass cookers

Using a summary note circulated with the papers, the MCS Administrator provided an overview of biomass cookers. It was explained that a family of biomass cooking products had been issued with MCS certification and the WG did not think these products should be certified as the requirements are not covered in the MCS biomass standard. The group noted that the WG had written to CBs stating that biomass cookers fell outside the scope of the MCS biomass standard. The SMG noted that this action fell outside the remit of the WG and the matter should have been referred to the SMG. There has been no direct contact with the manufacturer. The CB for the product has provided a statement that verified the product's certification.

Post-meeting note: The sentence 'The SMG noted that that this action fell outside the remit of the WG and the matter should have been referred to the SMG' is incorrect as the action was discussed at a Biomass meeting in April.

The group discussed the possible cooking appliances that should be covered and tested. Points were raised about what standard is appropriate for these biomass cooking products. It was proposed that the working group collaborates with the manufacturer and certification body to develop a proposal for updating the MCS standards to cover biomass cookers. It was stated that there needs to be clarification as to what biomass cookers are included and the fuel type covered. The possibility of adding an annex to the biomass standard was raised.

ACTION 18-010: MCS Administrator to form biomass cooker sub group and engage with the product manufacturer. Other relevant CB and MCS representatives should be contacted to participate in this group.

8. Product data sheets

The MCS Administrator had circulated draft product data sheets to the SMG. The group agreed that the MCS Administrator should work with NS to review these data sheets outside of the SMG and refer the draft data sheets back to the working groups for review. The action log was updated accordingly.



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

9. Standardisation of standards

- Terms and definitions

The group decided that it was best to wait until the solar PV group met and went through the definitions before the definitions were finalised. It was agreed that the MCS Administrator would then update the terms and definitions in all standards by May and issue the update at the same point as the ErP changes.

- Comparison of sections in standards

The group discussed the comparisons document created by the MCS Administrator. It was suggested that certain categories within the standards be merged, or changed. The scope was provided as an example. The need for more uniform standards was raised by the Chair. It was suggested that paragraphs be numbered so paragraphs unique to a standard are clearly identifiable.

The group requested that the MCS Administrator update the standards in accordance with the comparison exercise (aligning the relevant sections), provided they do not make adjustments to any technical information. Any significant changes which would alter the technical intent of the standards should be highlighted and approved by the SMG beforehand.

ACTION 18-011: MCS Administrator to standardise sections across all standards as well as number each paragraph.

10. Construction Products Regulation

This item was covered in the review of minutes and the group did not need to discuss it further.

11. Recognition of Solar Thermal Systems

This item was covered in earlier topics and the group did not need to discuss it further.

12. Change Process

The SMG reviewed the Change Process. It was noted that the KS had been asked to make several updates to the change process during a previous SMG meeting. The group asked the MCS Administrator to follow up and check whether these updates had been completed by KS. The action tracker was updated accordingly.

The MCS Administrator presented a slide pack on the current change process and examples of situations where it is unclear how a change should be handled.



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

The slide pack contained four scenarios for discussion by the group. Scenario 1, the group agreed that the Chair would decide on whether a change was material or non-material change. As regards to scenario 2; who determines if it is a material clarification. The group stated that the change should be directed to the MCS Administrator who would determine which group would determine which working group to make the modification or clarification. Scenario 3, regarding a change coming in through a complaint. The group discussed potential technical difficulties or changes and commented that any technical issues or complaint changes would need to come to the SMG. It was agreed that the SMG would need to agree any changes however this could potentially be completed via email. Scenario 4, where a change is referred from the SMG to the WG, does this require an impact assessment. The group commented that it would need an impact assessment before it could be signed off.

It was proposed that MCS could introduce a document management system to help manage scheme documents. This system could be provided by a program similar to Vault, Google-drive or One-drive.

There was debate around what is considered a 'material change'. An example definition of a non-material change was stated as: something that does not alter, affect or change the intention of the standard. The final agreed position was that all change requests forms need to go to the SMG. In most instances this could be performed through electronic communication and will not require a meeting. If it is a non-material change, as determined by the Chair, the WG can make the amendments but must be submitted to the SMG for final approval before publication.

In summary:

- Material; SMG requires initial approval, then it gets directed to the WG before being referred back to the SMG for final sign off.
- Non-Material; The SMG Chair is responsible for determining whether a change is material or not. If non-material then the WG can work on the update without further approval from the SMG. It is then directed to the SMG for final approval.

13. MCS Calculators for Heat Technologies

An overview of the current group meetings organised for this month was given. Both of the WGs that have their own calculators have requested that they be able to issue an update to their calculators. The group noted that they had already instructed that individual heat loss calculator



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

should not be updated until a single heat loss calculation method is agreed. Following discussion the group agreed that the biomass and heat pump groups would be permitted to issue one final update to their calculators. However no further updates should be issued and MCS should focus on agreeing a single standardised method.

NS explained the changes to the biomass calculator. These changes included adding an option to select building construction date so that the ventilation rate applied could be altered.

There was a question about website updates and whether or not installers are informed about the changes. The MCS Administrator confirmed that a notice is issued whenever the calculators are updated. It was decided that it was the responsibility of the CB to ensure that the calculators are valid.

Post-meeting note: SMG advise that Certification Bodies should check that the most up to date / correct version of the calculator is being used.

14. AOB Dates of next meetings:

European certification for heat pumps

JH updated the group on a move towards developing a standard heat pump certification scheme across Europe to avoid manufactures having to comply with multiple standards. The MCS model has been stated as the preferred model to be followed.

Core features would include options for manufactures to do their own testing. The next meeting to discuss this initiative is in late February. The EHPA have considered delivering the scheme on a similar model to the Keymark scheme however there have been recognised problems with this model and it is doubtful whether the scheme will develop as a Keymark scheme.

There was discussion about current standard requirements and how these could be merged with European standards. Issues were raised about product certification, product test cycles, product families, testing requirements and accredited testing.

It was agreed that one set of requirements was preferable and that working with the EHPA to develop universal standards is desirable. There were issues about whether development of this universal standard would eliminate the need for a heat pump working group.

The idea was suggested that the European standard could be developed with national annexes. JH will continue to monitor and report to the SMG with developments

ACTION 18-012: GR to have a conversation with the EHPA and report back at the next SMG.



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

Roles and responsibilities of WGs

The group noted that the biomass WG had submitted a letter to the Steering Group requesting clarification on WG roles and responsibilities. The group noted that the biomass group had taken decisions which appeared to be outside its remit. As such the group felt like a review of the WG Terms of Reference could help to clarify the role of the WGs.

The group discussed how the decision making process lies with the SMG. Any decisions made by the WG can have liabilities. It was agreed there needed to be clarity given to the WG.

Debate continued on the powers and limitations of the WG. It was agreed they do not have the discretion to make certification decisions.

There was consensus among the SMG that there is greater clarity needed in terms of reference.

ACTION 18-013: GT and GR to review the WG Terms of Reference.

Off-grid systems and storage

It was noted that DS had met with Ofgem to discuss developing guidance on metering of off-grid systems. DS had provided a note to the SMG indicated that the issue had been discussed however there had been limited progress. GT agreed to follow up with DS to agree next steps.

ACTION 18-014: GT to catch up with DS and discuss what the next step are with off-grid metering guidance and what needs to be done

The group noted that a meeting of the metering group had been organised. The group noted that the Chair of this group should be invited to the SMG.

JM proposed that MCS develop a standard on battery storage systems. This has been requested by the solar PV group and could assist with consumer protection. The group discussed whether the technology was sufficiently advanced and widespread to warrant MCS developing a standard or guidance document. The group agreed that it would be good to develop scheme requirements so that consumers are protected if they are considering a battery storage system.

The group agreed that the solar PV WG could move forward with developing proposals. The wind and CHP groups should also be asked whether they would like to be involved in this work.

ACTION 18-015: MCS Administrator to write to the Chairs of the CHP and wind groups asking if they want to participate in the development of battery storage guidance.



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

The group discussed material change text and noted that the biomass and heat pump groups had put forward proposed text. On review the group agreed that the text used in the Renewable UK standard covered the key points. It was suggested that this text be used for MCS and all group were asked to review the text prior to publication in May 2015 (alongside the ErP updates).

ACTION 18-016: MCS Administrator to confirm with WGs that they are happy to use Renewable UK Small Wind Turbine Standard material change text.

Date for next meetings:

Future SMG meeting dates are as follows:

- 17th March 2015
- 19th May 2015
- 21st July 2015
- 22nd September 2015
- 17th November 2015
- 19th January 2016