



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

Date: 17th March 2015, 11:00 – 16:00
Venue: Gemserv, 5th Floor, 8 Fenchurch Place, EC3M 4AJ

Attendees:

No.	Name	Constituency	Representing
In attendance			
1.	Griff Thomas (GT)	Chair; GTEC Training	PV (Chair)
2.	Andrew Hopton (AH)	HETAS	Biomass
3.	Danny Jones (DJ)	Expertina	Competency Criteria
4.	Graham Wright (GW)	Daikin	Heat Pumps
5.	Graham Hazell (GH)	HPA	Heat Pumps
6.	David Sharman (DS)	Vice Chair; Independent	Small Wind
7.	Kevin Sweeney (KSw)	Intertek	Product Certification Bodies
8.	Jan Muller (JM)	Solar Century (TBC) – <i>(part dial in)</i>	Roofing Issues
9.	John Holden (JH)	BRE Global	Installer CBs
10.	Chris Yates (CY)	Johnson and Starley	MCS 001
11.	Neil Sawers (NS)	Grant UK	Solar Thermal
12.	Tom Chapman (TC)	Gemserv	MCS administrator
13.	Louise Evans (LE)	Gemserv	MCS administrator
Apologies			
1.	James Timbs-Harrison	Mitsubishi	Heat Pumps
2.	Tony Bowen	HPA	Heat Pumps
3.	Rick Beament	Ecoelectric	Hydro
4.	Paul Collins	Certsure	Installer CBs
5.	Howard Roche	Vital Energi (Invitee)	Metering

Post meeting note: Paul Rochester and Gideon Richards had also made their apologies.



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

10 **Agenda:**

11

No.	Item Name
1	Welcome and Approval of the Agenda
2	Minutes and Actions from last meeting
3	Update on Expenses and Funding Criteria papers
4	WG updates
5	MCS EU Notification
6	European heat pump certification
7	Standardisation of standards: Terms and definitions
8	Change Process
9	MCS Calculators for Heat Technologies
10	Training
11	AOB
12	Dates of next meetings

12

13 **1. Welcome and Approval of the Agenda**

14 The Chair welcomed SMG members to the meeting and apologies were noted. There were no
15 comments on the agenda and the Chair agreed the items for discussion.

16 **2. Minutes and actions from the last meeting**

17 The minutes from the last meeting were reviewed and several minor typographical errors were
18 noted:

- 19 - DS – Page 11, Paragraph 2: Change ‘effect’ to ‘affect’.
- 20 - AH - Page 8: Change ‘feel outside of group’ to ‘fell outside of the group’.
- 21 - JH – Requested that page numbers be added to the previous minutes and be included going
22 forward.
- 23 - KSw – Noted that the minutes were inconsistent when attributing comments to members or
24 anonymising. TC acknowledged that the ToR for the working groups specify that minutes
25 should be redacted. The group agreed that the ToR should be updated to attribute all
26 comments to members unless otherwise specified.



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

- 27 - Page 8 and the use of the term 'Intercede' meaning to 'plead on behalf of'. The group
28 agreed to change the term to 'intervene'.
29 - GT suggested adding in another column to the attendee list within the minutes that specifies
30 what group the individuals are representing in addition to their company.

31 In relation to MCS 012, the group discussed concerns around CBs interpreting scheme requirements
32 in different ways. GT acknowledged that MCS is unusual in that the MCS administrator both sets the
33 standards as well as acts as the administrator for the scheme which can prove challenging. Normally
34 an entity creates standard and another runs the scheme according to that standard.

35

36 A discussion around material change boiler plate text took place. DS asked whether the proposed
37 material change text was taken from the old Renewable UK standard or the new one (which refers
38 to the IEC standard). The text used in these documents is substantially different. It was confirmed
39 that proposed material change text came from the IEC standard. The IEC text has the concept of
40 material change as something agreed between a manufacturer and a Certification Body. GT
41 suggested the issue of material change be raised at the next CB forum. KSw clarified that the
42 Certification Body Forum are intending to adopt a common approach across all documents. The
43 group noted that the final text will need to cater for differences in technology and allow each group
44 to add any technology specific requirements e.g. there is also some guidance for solar PV which
45 should be considered too.

46

47 **ACTION 19-001: DS and KSw to draft boiler plate text for material change based on wording in the**
48 **IEC standard. MCS administrator to raise the issue of material change in RH UK standard and IEC**
49 **standard at the next CB forum.**

50

51 KSw suggested that on page 7 (section 6 – Energy related Products Directive) the reference to
52 'strength of proposed calculation shall be determined by the NMO' be clarified to explain that the
53 NMO's approach to testing is risk-based and it is the manufacturer who is responsible for ensuring
54 that testing is robust enough. It was agreed that a post-meeting note would be included to clarify
55 that there will be specific product testing prior to this stage.

56



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

57 **ACTION 19-002: MCS administrator to liaise with KSw to agree correct wording to update previous**
58 **minutes when referring to product testing and to add 'risk-based' as a post-meeting note.**

59

60 DS discussed the validation process for MCS calculators and questioned whether the calculators
61 correctly reflect the standards and whether installers are using this correctly as there is no
62 independent validation. The group determined that it would be beneficial to create one calculator
63 that everybody can use. The MCS administrator agreed to add a post-meeting note to advise that
64 Certification Bodies should check that the most up to date / correct version of the calculator is being
65 used.

66

67 Additional points which were raised:

68

- 69 - On page 8 of the minutes, AH made the group aware of the sentence, 'SMG noted that this
70 falls outside remit of Working Group', this is inaccurate as the issue was raised in a working
71 group meeting in April. MCS agreed to add in a post-meeting note to clarify this.
- 72 - On page 11, JH brought to the attention of the group the debate about what constitutes a
73 material change, the example provided gives example of a non-material change. MCS
74 administrator agreed to change this.
- 75 - On page 12, JH noted that 4 lines from bottom 'dangerous ramifications' should be changed
76 to 'can have liabilities'.

77 Actions – high priority actions

78

79 The MCS administrator provided an update on the high-priority actions from the previous meeting.

80 The Group reviewed progress and discussed the following actions:

- 81 • Action SMG 12 008 no update currently received from GR, TC agreed to follow up;
- 82 • Action SMG 17 005 TC and GT to finalise this after the meeting;
- 83 • Action SMG 18 007, TC agreed to update action to make clear that the action is in relation to
84 funded work.

85 The SMG action log was updated.



The Certification Mark for Onsite Sustainable Energy Technologies

MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

86 3. Update on Expenses and Funding Criteria papers

87

88 Expenses Paper

89

90 GT acknowledged that no feedback had been received from the group on this paper and proposed
91 that the responsibility for finalising the paper be devolved to GT to drive it forwards as he sees fit
92 with the support of TC post-meeting. The group unanimously agreed. AH queried whether the
93 expenses described in the paper can be re-reimbursed this financial year, and the group confirmed
94 that the process has indeed worked so far.

95

96 **ACTION 19-003:** GT and TC to finalise expenses paper and submit this to the Management Panel for
97 final agreement. MCS administrator to notify relevant contacts once the process has been signed off.

98

99 Funding criteria paper

100

101 The funding criteria paper was reviewed and several points were noted. CY identified that the
102 document included several typographical errors. TC acknowledged that the scope and foreword of
103 the document require further work.

104

105 The group agreed that it might be a better option to try implementing the funding criteria first and
106 then review and amend the paper afterwards. GT confirmed that the SMG would evaluate between
107 4 and 5 projects according to the funding criteria currently specified in the paper, and then review
108 how the process has worked to ensure gaps are covered.

109

110 In the context of procurement, DS noted that the document specifies no requirement for how a
111 contract will be awarded to one supplier over another and enquired how the assessment of the
112 bidder will be delivered. GT explained that working groups should be determining the competence
113 of suppliers and then present a proposal to the SMG based on their assessment. The working group's
114 assessment will need to include evidence that an informed decision has been made when selecting
115 one supplier over a number of others. The decision will take into consideration competence as well
116 as cost. GT suggested therefore that a note should be included in the document to advise the



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

117 working groups of this responsibility. The document will also need to be revised to make it clear that
118 the application form will need to be completed by the working group. The working group will be
119 responsible for evaluating the potential suppliers and putting forward their preferred supplier using
120 the application form. The SMG will effectively review the recommendation put forward in the
121 completed application form.

122

123 AH queried how the funding criteria will be promoted and it was confirmed by GT that, at this stage,
124 the criteria can be circulated to constituents and that the group should encourage the adjustment of
125 projects to suit the specified criteria and evidence that this has been considered when drafting the
126 proposal. GT also confirmed that the approximate timescale for filing project proposals is by the next
127 SMG meeting. GT clarified that project proposals should be submitted by the WG for the relevant
128 technology.

129

130 The group were made aware of 2 projects that have been approved by the Management Panel (MP).
131 The group questioned what criteria the projects were evaluated against. TC clarified that the MP
132 had signed off these proposals in the absence of an agreed process at SMG level and had requested
133 feedback on the technical content of the proposals from the SMG. The group stated that it should be
134 explained to the MP that if funding of projects groups is approved outside of the process outlined in
135 the Funding Criteria document then the SMG would be unable to comment on the proposals. The
136 group commented that the decision to approve these projects was the responsibility of the MP.
137 Alternatively the MP could request that these projects be reviewed against the funding criteria
138 however this would mean that the projects would have to be directed back to the relevant Working
139 Groups.

140

141 **ACTION 19-004: MCS administrator to feedback SMG comments on approval of funded projects to**
142 **the Management Panel.**

143

144 NS enquired whether the dates of SMG meetings could be organised so that they take place after
145 WGs. TC acknowledged that this probably isn't feasible due to the variation in the frequency that the
146 groups meet.

147



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

148 The following amendments were also discussed:

149

- 150 • The group agreed that it should be a requirement for MCS to own the IPR for any outputs.
- 151 • JH raised the issue of scoring and suggested there be a minimum score per category. GT
- 152 suggested that each category must:
 - 153 ○ Score 2 or more out of 5 using a scoring matrix; and
 - 154 ○ The total score must be a minimum of 60%.
- 155 • GH suggested that there be some indication of a daily rate included in the proposal and that
- 156 'Project Costs' be broken down to include:
 - 157 ○ Labour;
 - 158 ○ Materials;
 - 159 ○ Expenses; and
 - 160 ○ An indication of a number of days work.
- 161 • GT confirmed that the process for submitting project proposals will be for:
 - 162 ○ WG to score proposal → Proposal goes to SMG → SMG to agree or disagree with
 - 163 the scoring.

164 GW queried whether the entire working group will need to be involved in the scoring process and
165 the group agreed that this would not be practicable. GT suggested that from each working group, 4
166 constituents will need to be present to do the scoring including the group's Chair or WG
167 representative to the SMG. The group agreed that, whilst this may be challenging with some working
168 groups, it is feasible and achievable.

169

170 GT suggested that the SMG only consider 1 project at a time per technology type in order to manage
171 the budget and ensure work is prioritised. It is also unlikely that there will be more than 2 or 3
172 people applying for the same project. These provisions should address the possibility of an
173 unmanageable number of proposals submitted, a point noted by JH.

174

175 The group's attention was drawn to the scoring matrix and the question 'Will the project benefit
176 more than 1 technology?' under 'Impact on scheme', as this question could generate a score of 1
177 and therefore not meet the minimum criteria. It was agreed that this question be removed from this



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

178 section of the document and included in the general criteria to consider under Section 2. It was
179 noted that projects that benefit more than one technology would be preferable but the group
180 agreed that in many cases this would not be possible.

181

182 **ACTION 19-005: TC to liaise with GT to update the funding criteria paper, incorporating the changes**
183 **agreed at the meeting and progress for immediate publication.**

184

185 **4. MCS EU Notification**

186

187 *At this point JM joined by teleconference.*

188

189 GT informed the group that MCS 012 has never been mandatory for Solar Thermal, however, in the
190 PV guide, it is written that products must be certified to MCS 012 although this part of the guide had
191 been superseded by correspondence from MCS to the effect that it is still not mandatory for either
192 technology.

193

194 The group discussed the results of the MCS Roofing Issues Working Group electronic vote to
195 determine the views of the group on whether or not to make MCS 012 mandatory for PV
196 installations and subsequently notify the standard to the EU Commission.

197 The MCS Roofing Issues Working Group voted for one of the following options:

198

199 A): Mandatory from xxx date (with a xxx month sunrise period)

200 B): Non-mandatory and “on hold” until it can be re written (re-writing will be done once the
201 extended application project is complete – this will delay implementation by at least 6
202 months)

203 C): Non mandatory but as an “acceptable means of demonstrating compliance” (wording as
204 per Solar Thermal standard)

205

206 In terms of the votes for the MCS 012 status, most votes were for option B i.e. for PV systems to be
207 non-mandatory until it can be re-written.



The Certification Mark for Onsite
Sustainable Energy Technologies

MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

208

209 GT clarified that EU notification is only a requirement if the standard is mandatory. Notification can
210 happen at the same point as the standard is updated. The group discussed the pros and cons of the
211 standard being made mandatory prior to re-drafting to clarify certain areas.

212

213 It was agreed that any update to MCS 012 to cover the extended application guidance would not be
214 a significant change in wording of the standard but rather act as an enhancement of how to
215 undertake testing.

216

217 Given that two MCS certification bodies are interpreting the requirements of MCS 012 in different
218 ways, the group agreed that making MCS 012 mandatory without the extended application guidance
219 in place could create further confusion. Others in the group questioned whether this was as big an
220 issue as it seemed.

221

222 GT noted that the MCS licence agreement provides gives the MCS administrator wide ranging
223 powers. These powers may be useful in the event of a dispute between two CBs on the universality
224 of MCS 012 certification. The group agreed that the MCS 012 working group needs to consider what
225 is in the best interests of consumer protection when making its decision.

226

227 In conclusion, the group concluded that the MCS 012 working group had not fully understood the
228 implications of any decision to make the standard mandatory. In particular the MCS 012 group needs
229 to be made aware that EU notification can take place at the time of any update being published and
230 also that EU notification is only required if a decision is taken to make the standard mandatory. As
231 such GT suggested that the matter should be discussed at a face-to-face meeting with the MCS 012
232 working group and stated that he was happy to attend that meeting if it was scheduled for a time
233 when he could make it.

234

235 **ACTION 19-006: MCS administrator and JM to work with Jon Sturgeon and GT to book a date**
236 **for a face-to-face MCS 012 meeting so all information can be discussed.**



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

237 5. WG updates

238

239 Solar PV – IET guide and battery storage guidance

240 DS informed the group that a meeting with Ofgem, ENA, Energy Networks, MCS and NMO took place
241 where there were no PV representatives present. DS comment that participants took a narrow view
242 on their organisation's interest in the matter and there was no unified response. Due to the varying
243 perspectives, it may be generally challenging to progress the issue at this stage. In particular, there
244 was no firm agreement on the need for DC metering guidance.

245

246 GT suggested that he work with the MCS administrator to engage with Ofgem regarding battery
247 storage.

248 **ACTION 19-007: MCS administrator/GT to engage with Ofgem regarding battery storage of grid**
249 **connected systems.**

250

251 JM dialled out of teleconference.

252 IET Solar PV Code of Practice

253 The group discussed the publication of the IET Solar PV Code of Practice and whether this should
254 replace the MCS PV guide. The matter had already been discussed by the solar PV working group. GT
255 noted that there is no distinct upper threshold to the IET document. The general view of the solar PV
256 working group was that the performance elements of the MCS PV guide should be retained however
257 MCS should refer to the technical guidance in the code of practice. The SMG agreed that this matter
258 should be kept under review and requested that the solar PV group keep the SMG informed.

259

260 Heat pump – Updates to align with ErP and issues with solar assisted heat pump product 261 certification

262

263 GW provided an update on the work of the Energy related Products (ErP) directive sub-group. GW
264 confirmed that there was a high attendance at sub-group meetings to develop the ErP proposals and
265 that there were 248 responses to the consultation. The aim is to achieve alignment with the ErP
266 directive by September 2015. The ErP sub-group are hesitant to suggest too much initial product
267 testing which will act as a bar to market entry in the future.



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

268

269 It was confirmed that all products entering the market place from September 2015 must meet the
270 ErP directive. The ErP sub group has proposed that a 6 month transition (from the date of
271 publication) should be allowed for manufacturers to meet the new requirement.

272 It was agreed that the ErP sub group and the MCS administrator should consult with DECC before
273 proposing a transition period to the SMG.

274

275 GW confirmed that the proposed timescales were as follows:

276

- 277 • Final proposal to be agreed by the ErP sub-group and main working group within 2-3 weeks;
- 278 • SMG asked to sign off the updates by email by the end of April.

279 DECC has indicated that they would need the standards to be agreed by the beginning of April in
280 order to align with updates to the RHI regulations. The SMG noted the importance of agreeing the
281 implementation timeline with DECC. It was agreed that the MCS administrator and sub-group would
282 need to confirm the timeline with DECC prior to a proposal being submitted to the SMG.

283

284 The proposals stated that manufacturers would present their ErP data for MCS certification. This
285 data will be plugged into the MCS calculator by the CB. The CB will still require MCS 011 compliant
286 data at one test point to verify the data. The working group have chosen to keep this requirement as
287 it is unclear what level of surveillance will be completed by the NMO. The working group intend to
288 review this position after 12 months once the NMO surveillance is in place. There is also a concern
289 that MCS has to be careful about not placing unnecessary testing requirements on manufacturers.

290

291 KSw suggested that MCS should keep safety and performance considerations separate, MCS is a
292 good practice scheme not a best practice scheme. KSw drew a parallel with the EST recommended
293 scheme. MCS should decide if it will accept manufacturer's data or require the verification of data.

294

295 DS queried whether there are any significant changes required at installer level and it was confirmed
296 that there were not. It was suggested that in the long term MCS may wish to consider splitting the



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

297 MCS heat pump standards into different parts. However the group agreed that there was insufficient
298 time to make these changes for the current update.

299

300 **NOTE: DS took over as Vice Chair for the next part of the meeting.**

301

302 The group discussed the updates relating to hot water and solar assisted heat pumps. GW indicated
303 that there were still some issues to be resolved with the requirements which the ErP sub group are
304 still working on. This relates to the fact that there is no defined test procedure for solar assisted heat
305 pumps within ErP.

306

307 GH flagged up an issue with the existing certification requirements for solar assisted heat pumps.

308 One Certification Body felt that the outside part of the pump needs to be ducted and that the

309 manufacturer hasn't brought forward any relevant comments. The CB forum have not discussed this

310 issue as yet. It was agreed that SMG must monitor continue to monitor this situation. It is unclear at

311 this stage whether the reported issues are a problem with the certification requirements or the

312 interpretation of the CB.

313

314 **NOTE: GT resumed chairing of the meeting.**

315

316 MCS 001 – new MGD/ QMS templates and QMS verification via an annual return

317

318 CY explained that the MCS 001 group were seeking approval to publish a new guidance document
319 and QMS templates to support installers. The aim of the guidance is to take the clauses and provide
320 guidance on how the installer can put the clause into practice.

321

322 CY responded that there is limited risk associated with introducing the guidance as it is designed to

323 be helpful to installers. NS noted that there will be many installers who may wish to move from

324 installing traditional fossil fuel systems to renewable technologies and it is important to make the

325 process of obtaining certification as simple as possible. There were some concerns that installers

326 could just follow the templates and without applying any thought to their application. The group



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

327 agreed that it is the responsibility of CBs to ensure that the QMS templates are being applied
328 correctly.

329

330 DJ suggested the following changes to the documents:

- 331 - Terminology differs to competency document and aligning this would be useful;
- 332 - Training matrix lists old training requirements, make this slightly more robust;
- 333 - It would it be useful to provide an example pdf of completed QMS documents.

334 AH suggested that MIS technology standards need to be referenced in the QMS templates and the
335 group discussed whether technology standards are relevant to the remit of MCS 001. The group
336 confirmed that the guidance should be published (once any final comments from the SMG have
337 been incorporated) but the templates require more thought to ensure they also reflect the
338 technology specific QMS requirements.

339

340 The next steps were agreed as below.

341

342 **ACTION 19-008:** All SMG members to submit feedback on the MGD document and QMS templates
343 within two weeks. QMS templates to be added to the agenda for the next SMG;

344 **ACTION 19-009:** CY to update MGD document in line with comments from the SMG. Updated MGD
345 to be published and circulated to the SMG and CB Forum for information;

346

347 CY presented a paper on QMS verification via an annual return. It was explained that the purpose of
348 the paper was to simplify the certification process. In cases agreed with a certification body the
349 paper proposes that installers would be allowed to verify their QMS via an annual return. GT states
350 that ECA had developed an approach which was based on company size. This approach had been
351 agreed by UKAS. DJ stated that gas industry requirements are less than MCS therefore it makes
352 sense to review the requirements. The SMG suggested that the matter should be referred to the CB
353 Forum for input and follow up work by the MCS001 WG.

354

355 **ACTION 19-010:** MCS administrator to add QMS verification via an annual return to
356 CB Forum agenda.



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

357 CHP – Change Request

358

359 The group discussed a change request in relation the CHP standard. It was agreed that the request
360 should be reviewed by the CHP working group. The SMG requested that a meeting be organised as
361 soon as possible and that the CHP group would be expected to have a representative attend the
362 SMG meetings. CY confirmed that he would be happy to Chair the first meeting of this group.

363

364 **ACTION 19-011:** MCS administrator to organise a micro CHP working group to
365 discuss change request.

366

367 Biomass – proposed update for industrial process heat

368

369 Ofgem requests that an MCS certificate be provided for renewable technology installations with an
370 output below 45kWth. In some cases this is forcing systems which are not covered by MCS to be
371 registered with MCS. For example a 10kW swimming pool on a commercial building. This issue has
372 been raised by both the heat pump and biomass working groups.

373

374 NS suggested going back to individual working groups to let them develop a guidance document. GH
375 suggested that he could raise this issue at a non-domestic RHI forum that he attends. GT agreed that
376 he would engage with Ofgem on this matter.

377

378 **ACTION 19-012:** GT and secretariat to contact Ofgem about requirement to register all non-domestic
379 sub 45kWth systems with MCS.

380 **6. European heat pump certification**

381

382 JH informed the group that EHPA are continuing work to develop a certification scheme. The
383 intention is that this will be aligned with ErP. GR is continuing to engage with EHPA on this matter.

384 **7. Standardisation of standards: Terms and definitions**

385 This item was not covered but TC and GT agreed to go through the document outside of the meeting
386 and for MCS administrator to update the document.



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

387

388 **ACTION 19-013:** MCS Administrator and GT to agree final version of terms and definitions. Once
389 agreed update all standards for publication at next opportunity.

390 **8. Change Process**

391 TC informed the group that the change process has not yet been updated and took an action to work
392 internally to update.

393 **ACTION 19-014:** MCS administrator to update change process

394 **9. MCS Calculators for Heat Technologies**

395 The group agreed the principles of a single methodology. The group responsible for this work are
396 developing a specification listing all the parameters required. A further meeting is planned in the
397 next few weeks.

398 **ACTION 19-015:** MCS administrator to organise a heat loss calculator meeting.

399 **10. Training**

400 The group agreed that there is a lot of work going on around training however there was a concern
401 that this work is not being coordinated. DJ noted that he is aware of some of the communications
402 around training and has recently completed a questionnaire on this matter.

403 **11. AOB**

404

405 DECC's 3rd party finance question

406

407 GT explained that DECC had requested comments from the SMG on interpretation of "customer" in
408 relation to 3rd party finance models – in particular whether it is possible that a third party finance
409 provider could be considered the customer for MCS purposes. The group agreed that MCS is clear
410 that the customer is the 'end user' of the renewable installation. GT agreed to feedback the
411 comments to DECC.

412 Request from PV group to agree boiler plate text for all product standards requiring products to be
413 installed in compliance with MIS document

414



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

415 The group heard that the solar PV working group had proposed that boiler plate text be added to all
416 product standards stating that products have to be installed in accordance with the relevant MIS
417 document. The group noted that there are a small number of cases where a product can be MCS
418 certified which is not covered by the MIS document e.g. swimming pool heat pumps. It was agreed
419 that this matter would need to be considered further.

420 CB Transition period for Medium Wind Scope on Accreditation Schedules

421
422 This item will be discussed at the next SMG meeting.

423 Biomass Incident Report – Proposal from Kiwa Gastec

424
425 The group heard that there have been a number of incidents involving biomass boilers. As such a
426 proposal has been considered and approved by the MP to fund a research paper on this topic. In
427 some cases the cause has been at least partly attributed to poor installation practices or
428 maintenance.
429 However it has been agreed that there needs to be a better understanding of how these issues have
430 occurred which led to a request by KIWA to produce a paper.

431
432 The SMG noted the earlier conversation regarding the funding criteria. It was re-confirmed that the
433 SMG viewed any decision to approve funding for this project as a Management Panel decision. If the
434 Management Panel want the SMG to review the proposal then it should be submitted via the
435 relevant working group using the Funding Criteria document.

436 437 Micro-hydro working Group and SMG representation

438
439 TC showed the group an email from the Chair of the micro-hydro working group. The group
440 acknowledged the email and expressed their thanks to the Chair for his contribution to MCS and the
441 work of the SMG.

442
443 The SMG noted that micro-hydro technologies are now no longer an active part of the MCS scheme
444 and therefore there is no demand for a working group for that technology. The group agreed that it



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

445 could be beneficial to keep the group as 'dormant' to make it easier to revive the group in the future
446 and to continue have the technology represented in SMG. MCS administrator agreed to check the
447 ToR to see if the micro-hydro representative would be excluded from SMG in the event of a working
448 group being made dormant. TC and GT agreed to look into this issue further.

449

450 **ACTION 19-016: MCS administrator and GT to review ToR to see if document allows for the Chair of**
451 **a dormant working group to continue to attend the SMG.**

452

453 **Date for next meetings:**

454

455 Future SMG meeting dates are as follows:

- 456 • 21st May 2015 (PLEASE NOTE THIS DATE HAS CHANGED)
- 457 • 21st July 2015
- 458 • 22nd September 2015
- 459 • 17th November 2015
- 460 • 19th January 2016

461