



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

Date: 21st September 2017, 10:30 – 17:00
Venue: Gemserv offices, 8 Fenchurch Place, London, EC3M 4AJ

Attendees:

No.	Name	Representing	WG no.	Organisation
In attendance				
1	Griff Thomas (GT)	PV (Chair)	WG02	GTEC Training
2	John Holden (JH)	MCS Product CBs (Vice-Chair)	n/a	BRE Global
3	Dani Putney (DP)	MCS Contractor CBs	n/a	Certsure LLP
4	Andrew Hopton (AH)	Biomass	WG05	HETAS
5	Gideon Richards (GR)	MCSSCo Interim CEO	n/a	MCSSCo Ltd
6	Graham Hazell (GH)	Heat Pumps	WG06	HPA
7	Christine Schams (CS)	Government	n/a	BEIS
8	Peter Beasley (PB)	Micro CHP	WG07,0 8,09	British Gas
9	David Cowburn (DC)	MCS 001	WG011	Competent Persons Scheme
10	Louise Evans (LE)	MCS Administrator	n/a	Gemserv
11	Adele Thain (AT)	MCS Administrator	n/a	Gemserv
Apologies				
1.	Danny Jones (DJ)	Competence Criteria	n/a	Expertina
2.	Graham Wright (GW)	Heat Pumps	WG06	Daikin
3.	Mark Lewitt (ML)	Biomass	WG05	KIWA
4.	Neil Sawers (NS)	Solar Thermal	WG01	Grant UK
5.	Stuart Elmes (SE)	Roofing Issues	WG10	Viridian Solar

Agenda:

No.	Agenda Item	Led by	Document Reference	Time
1	Welcome and approval of the agenda	Chair	Verbal	10:30
2	Minutes and actions from last meeting	Chair/Vice Chair/ MCS Administrator	➤ SMG_170921-02a - Minutes from previous meeting	10:35



The Certification Mark for Onsite Sustainable Energy Technologies

MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

			➤ SMG_170921-02b - Action Log	
3	MCS scheme updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering Group • Novation • Management Panel 	Steering Group Chair	Verbal	11:00
4	MCS Working Group proposals and updates	MCS Administrator	➤ SMG_170921-04a - Pitched Roof Guidance	11:30
		Heat Pump Representative	Verbal	11:45
		mCHP WG Representative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ SMG_170921-04d - MCS 014 ➤ SMG_170921-04e - MCS 015 ➤ SMG_170921-04f - MIS 3007 ➤ SMG_170921-04g - MIS 3007-2 ➤ SMG_170921-04h - Add-On Calculator (late paper) ➤ SMG_170921-04i - Add-On Test Methodology (late paper) ➤ SMG_170921-04j - Impact Assessment 	11:55
Lunch				13:00
5	Draft commissioning scenarios	JH	➤ SMG_170921-05 – Draft Commissioning Scenarios	13:30
6	MCS 023	DP	➤ SMG_170921-06 - MCS 023 – PAS2030 alignment	14:15
7	Implementation date of competency requirements	Chair	Verbal	15:15
8	AOB	All	Verbal	15:45
9	Dates of next meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 22/11/2017 • 30/01/2018 	MCS Administrator	Verbal	16:00

9 **1. Welcome & Approval of Agenda**

10

11 The Chair welcomed attendees and thanked JH for chairing the previous meeting.

12



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

13 The Chair proposed some changes to the circulated agenda and the revised agenda was agreed as
14 above.

15

16 The SMG agreed to postpone discussions regarding the Change Process and MCS Standards in ROI
17 until the next meeting. The Chair requested that members review the respective papers in advance
18 of the November meeting.

19

20 GR requested that attendees declare any conflicts of interest and that the Energy Performance
21 Validation Scheme (EPVS) be added to the agenda. The Chair confirmed all SMG members have
22 signed conflict of interest declarations and went on to invite admissions of conflict of interest from
23 attendees of which none were raised. JH suggested that attendees hear the Anti-Competition
24 Statement used by BRE at their meetings which was read out as follows:

25

26 *“Please be mindful that competitors are present and that all discussions about business
27 practices that might distort the market must be avoided, for instance discussions about
28 joint fixing of prices, apportioning markets or collusive tendering. We ask that you refrain
29 from such discussions and recuse yourself if you find yourself in such a conversation or have
30 any doubts or concerns.”*

31

32 The SMG heard that the budget was not yet approved at Steering Group level therefore, until such
33 a time as the budget is approved, there is no funding confirmed for projects.

34

35 GR clarified, as Director of MCSSCo, that there is £30k included the budget for SMG funded
36 projects, however, these funds have been allocated to other projects in previous years (Biomass
37 WG - Percussive Ignitions and Minor explosions guidance and Wind - CE72 scoping study).

38

39 GT queried why these projects had not yet commenced and was advised by GR that the contracts
40 were still being drafted by the schemes legal advisors, GT asked for the new MP to review this
41 without delay.

42

43 The Chair highlighted the need to be mindful of requesting SMG decisions in the context of the
44 ongoing budget discussions.

45 **2. Minutes & Actions from the last meeting**

46

47 The draft minutes from the previous meeting were reviewed, corrected and agreed to be an
48 accurate reflection of the meeting subject to the following amendments:

49

- 50 • Page 1: Amend GR organisation to MCSSCo Ltd
- 51 • Page 1: Amend the MCS 001 WG no. from n/a to WG11
- 52 • Page 1: Amend DP organisation to Certsure LLP
- 53 • Page 6: Amend the actions update for SMG 021-004 to *“The group agreed that this action
54 could be closed as the action is no longer being dealt with by the SMG and instead by the
55 novation parties. These parties include BEIS, MCSSCo Ltd, MCS Charitable Foundation and
56 Gemserv in part.”*

MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

- 57 • Page 7: Clarify origin of equivalence view - *The Management Panel reported that Ofgem have*
 58 *previously determined indicated that both Eurovent Certita Certification and Heat Pump*
 59 *Keymark cannot be equivalent to MCS as they only offer product certification only whereas*
 60 *MCS includes both product and installer certification.*
- 61 • Page 8: Remove square brackets around *under the MCS requirements of the day.*
- 62 • Page 16: Remove reference to MCS 001 during MCS 023 discussion.
- 63 • Page 16: The SMG agreed that significant changes have been proposed for MCS 023,
 64 particularly in the design and pre-installation sections ~~where the currently published version~~
 65 ~~of MCS 023 largely acted as a signposting document to sections of PAS 2030.~~ DP explained
 66 that this is because the sections related to renewable technology have also been removed
 67 from PAS 2030 as part of ~~the a previous~~ PAS 2030 review.
- 68 • Page 16: Amend sentence to read *The SMG discussed whether the competency criteria have*
 69 *has changed.*
- 70 • Page 18: Clarify GH statement regarding equivalence *GH expressed concern regarding the*
 71 *future of the scheme if the requests for equivalence are rejected as manufacturers have*
 72 *indicated that post-subsidy they would have to carefully consider which schemes they are*
 73 *certificated to. products in the EU are often tested to more test points than specified in the*
 74 ~~*MCS standards and manufacturers would currently need to meet different requirements for*~~
 75 ~~*European schemes and MCS.*~~
- 76 • Throughout: Refer to JH consistently as Chair.

77
 78 The SMG, considering the time constraints, began by reviewing the priority 2 and 3 outstanding
 79 actions and reverted to reviewing priority 3 actions plus any particular actions of interest raised by
 80 attendees. The following updates were noted:

Reference	Action	Status	Update
SMG 021-004	BEIS to confirm whether WGs own the MCS standards and, if so, whether a formal handover is required.	Closed	The group agreed that this action could be closed as the action is no longer being dealt with by the SMG and instead by the novation parties. These parties include BEIS, MCSSCo Ltd, MCS Charitable Foundation and Gemserv in part.
SMG 22-014	MCS Administrator to refer request for additional funding to carry out fire test to the Management Panel.	Ongoing	This action is pending until novation is completed and will be considered as part of the budget discussions regarding SMG funded projects.
ACTION SMG_160928-04	The SMG to let the MCS Administrator know where unique work has been carried out as part of the due -diligence work being carried out.	Ongoing	GT reiterated that this action will be further examined at a more appropriate stage of novation.



The Certification Mark for Onsite Sustainable Energy Technologies

MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

<p>ACTION SMG_170622-04</p>	<p>PB to collect positive reviews for calculator from various interested groups.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Enertek were invited to complete a review of the Add-On calculator and Test Methodology and a further update will be provided under Agenda Item 4.</p>
<p>ACTION SMG_170622-06</p>	<p>CS to confirm the timeline from the FiTs team perspective for publishing the mCHP documents.</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>CS, the mCHP Chair and MCS Administrator have agreed that a December publication would be practical if SMG approval is achieved. An update will be provided to the FiTs team following the September SMG meeting.</p>
<p>ACTION SMG_170622-011</p>	<p>MCS Administrator to add SMG funded projects contracts to the agenda of the next Management Panel meeting.</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>The draft contract was reviewed by the Management Panel on 18th July. Since that meeting a decision will be taken regarding the 2017/18 budget and any allocated fund for SMG funded projects.</p>
<p>ACTION SMG_170622-019</p>	<p>DP to review PAS 2030 against the scheme competency criteria.</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>DP confirmed that PAS 2030 contains no competency criteria to compare to the MCS competency criteria.</p>
<p>ACTION SMG_170622-03</p>	<p>PB to investigate discrepancy in efficiency percentages between MIS 3007 and MIS 3007-2 efficiencies.</p>	<p>Closed</p>	<p>PB provided the following update in advance of the SMG meeting:</p> <p>In the current published MCS documents, MIS 3007 refers to a SEDBUK efficiency of 86% and the MIS 3007-2 refers to a SEDBUK (2009) efficiency of 88%. It is important to note that these Standards have only been updated to include Add-on appliances, there being no scope to update either PAS 67 or the associated APM spreadsheet. The respective efficiency values have not changed.</p> <p>The APM spreadsheet used to manipulate PAS67 data was developed to support heat lead mCHP appliances only (MCS 014 & MIS 3007), it has not been updated in line with changes in SAP and therefore the calculations are still</p>



The Certification Mark for Onsite Sustainable Energy Technologies

MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

			<p>based on a carbon intensity factor for gas of 0.198, (SAP 2009). Since MCS 014 requires you to have a HPER ≤ 0.230 kgCO₂/kWh, this is equivalent to an old SEDBUK boiler efficiency of 86%.</p> <p>The electric led MCS documents (MCS 015 & MIS 3007-2) came along later, and were never supported by PAS 67 or the APM spreadsheet. In fact, they should never have been published unsupported as they were.</p> <p>The efficiency figure in MIS 3007-2 is based on Seasonal efficiency, which is quite different. Hence the tighter HPER value of ≤ 0.225 kgCO₂/kWh, published elsewhere in the amended MIS 3007-2.</p>
<p>ACTION SMG_170622-07</p>	<p>DP and VG to feedback to the MCS 001 WG that the Scope and sections 8, 9 and 10 require further review and mapping the change in clauses in MGD 001 would be beneficial.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>DC confirmed that DP and VG have provided feedback to DC as Chair of the MCS 001 WG, however, DC noted that the SMG specified that the MCS 001 WG not change the content of the standard in the process of splitting the standard into two parts.</p> <p>DC requested that the SMG reconsider and that any comments related to the content of the standard be reviewed at the next MCS 001 WG meeting.</p> <p>The SMG agreed and the MCS Administrator were requested to circulate the documents to the SMG post-meeting for electronic decision.</p>

82
83
84
85
86
87

ACTION SMG 170921-01: MCS Administrator to circulate the outstanding actions to the persons responsible and request progress updates by no later than 6th October 2017.

ACTION SMG 170921-02: MCS Administrator to review the outstanding actions with GT ahead of the November SMG meeting.

MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

88

89

ACTION SMG 170921-03: MCS Administrator to update the draft minutes from the previous meeting to reflect recommended changes.

90

91

92

ACTION SMG 170921-04: BEIS to provide an update to the SMG when available regarding intellectual property of the MCS Standards and guidance documents.

93

94

95

ACTION SMG 170921-05: MCS Administrator to circulate MCS 001-1 and MCS 001-2 to the SMG for electronic vote.

96

97

98

ACTION SMG 170921-06: MCS Administrator to circulate AH comments regarding MCS 001-1 and MCS 001-2 to DC for consideration ahead of the next MCS 001 WG meeting.

99

100

101

3. MCS scheme updates

102

103

- Steering Group

104

105

As the Steering Group Chair, JH informed the SMG that it will be necessary to hold another Steering Group meeting as novation has not taken place as expected and therefore the existing governance structure for the scheme remains in place. The current preferred date for the next meeting is 18th October 2017. The Chair noted that responses from Steering Group members are critical to ensure a quorate meeting.

110

111

There has been a lot of discussion regarding the reporting and actions arising from the Steering Group, including some challenges from MCS Contractors on how decisions have been made and communicated. The Steering Group Terms of Reference state that the Decisions and Actions paper must be circulated to the SG, must be agreed, and then published within 20 WD of the meeting. The process is currently being reviewed as a matter of priority.

116

117

It is important to ensure that the commitments are practical, as under the current process, decisions cannot be published until the minutes are approved and committees have expressed a preference to approve minutes at the following meeting.

119

120

121

The Chair raised a need to address the lack of response from the Steering Group. There are requirements for MCS committee members to actively participate or else they may be removed from their respective committee.

122

123

124

125

- Novation

126

127

JH confirmed that novation is still underway with the necessary documentation being drawn up by the relevant parties. The Chair commented that it feels like the process is further than the final quarter. JH agreed and confirmed it will be finalised as soon as practically possible.

128

129

130

131

- Management Panel

132



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

133 JH informed the SMG that a new Management Panel has been formed in accordance with the
134 Management Panel Terms of Reference. The members were selected based on nominations
135 received from, and a vote by, the Steering Group membership. The existing Management Panel
136 members ratified the vote. Arrangements are underway to convene an inaugural Management
137 Panel meeting for 9th October.

138
139 JH explained that BEIS have raised concern that there is no longer a Consumer Code representative
140 within the Management Panel membership to represent the consumer stakeholder group. JH
141 added that consumer protection is an essential element of the MCS and consumers should be
142 represented on the Management Panel to ensure balanced representation. JH added that the
143 Management Panel members have demonstrated willingness to ensure consumers are protected.
144 In terms of next steps there will need to be an induction process and handover.

145
146 JH gave an update that the MCS fee increase has been delayed. There have been some significant
147 challenges, hindered by the fact that actions taken are not always in line with the Terms of
148 Reference. JH confirmed the Scheme is at liberty to raise the fees. The increase is necessary to
149 ensure the scheme is financially viable. The challenge is with not following due process. There are
150 some cases of installers reporting that they were not made aware of the fee increase with enough
151 notice and are suffering a financial loss as a result.

152

153 **4. MCS Working Group proposals and updates**

154

- 155 • MCS Roofing Issues WG Representative (MCS Administrator)

156

157 LE introduced the paper *SMG_170921-04a - Pitched Roof Guidance* and explained that the MCS 012
158 Important Information guidance document has been updated by the Roofing Issues Working
159 Group to address queries received by the MCS Helpdesk seeking clarification of what constitutes a
160 pitched roof as there is currently no MCS guidance on this subject.

161

162 The guidance has been reviewed by the Solar PV Working Group, the Solar Thermal Working Group
163 and the Certification Body Forum.

164

165 LE confirmed this document is intended as guidance and clarifies the degree range of a pitched roof
166 so that MCS Contractors and consumers understand whether an MCS approved Pitched Roof
167 Installation Kit is required. JH commented that the guidance will give Certification Bodies a tool to
168 determine if a roof is pitched.

169

170 GH raised the point of consistency regarding quotes and accepted contract with respect to the MCS
171 standards and guidance implementation timelines. Regarding section 2 'Implementation of MCS
172 012 for existing quotes and contracts' GR commented that some quotes are legally binding and
173 noted that the Management Panel are in discussion on this topic.

174

175 The SMG then voted to approve the updated MCS 012 Important Information guidance, (Vote – In
176 favour: 7, Abstentions: 1) LE agreed to add the relevant dates and arrange to publish the revised
177 guidance on 25th September 2017.

178



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

179 **ACTION SMG 170921-07: MCS Administrator to update the dates within the MCS 012 Important**
180 **Information guidance document and publish on 25th September 2017.**

181

- 182 • MCS Heat Pump WG representative

183

184 At this point GH noted the tight deadline constraints to secure the funding for the proposal to
185 update the MIS 3005 guidance document (MGD 002), the timescales for which have already
186 extended by one month. GH went on to explain that at the last meeting he agreed to confirm post-
187 meeting what the remaining £600 is to be used for; the £600 was originally for management fees
188 but the Scottish Government funding will now cover it. GH also confirmed that written
189 confirmation has been received from the proposal parties that MCS can own the intellectual
190 property rights for MGD 002.

191

192 GH highlighted that GH and RECC have committed to completing the work at no extra cost to the
193 scheme even if the actual resource required to deliver the work exceeds that set out in the
194 proposal. GH met with Energy Saving Trust (EST) and RECC earlier this week. To avoid further work
195 whilst pending the SMG approval, draft contracts are on hold. If this project is further delayed, then
196 the Scottish Government funding will be lost. The proposal was voted for at the last SMG meeting
197 and circulated for voting on 5th September 2017.

198

199 The Chair asked GH to confirm the final date approval is required by for the project, which GH
200 confirmed is 31st October 2017. The Chair surmised that it is not yet certain if there is budget
201 allocation for SMG funded projects for FY17/18. The purpose of the document is to aid MCS
202 Contractor understanding of the changes to the MIS 3005 requirements. The Chair suggested a
203 pragmatic approach of asking the SMG to score the proposal subject to funding for the projects
204 being confirmed later. The SMG supported this suggestion and agreed that the same approach
205 should be used for the Solar PV proposals.

206

207 LE confirmed that four SMG members have scored the proposals to date. Some members did not
208 review the paper on the basis that funding for the projects had not been confirmed or they could
209 not locate the scoring criteria (the scoring criteria were included in the covering email). LE
210 confirmed that the Solar PV and Heat Pump proposals are 1 vote off being quorate. Of the three,
211 the Heat Pump proposal had received the highest scores to date.

212

213 LE raised that version 1.2 of MGD 002 is currently published and several queries have been
214 received so far from the team relating to the changes in MIS 3005 requirements. LE queried what
215 the next steps would be for updating the document if funding for the project is not approved. GH
216 suggested that a more basic revision could be published with significantly less detail.

217

218 LE agreed to collate any helpdesk queries regarding MIS 3005 to support updates to MGD 002 and
219 JH agreed that MGD 002 could be added to the agenda for the next Heat Pump Working Group
220 meeting scheduled for 1st November 2017.

221

222 **ACTION SMG 170921-08: MCS Administrator to circulate the Solar PV and Heat Pump proposals in**
223 **separate emails, supporting documents and scoring criteria on 25th September requesting that**
224 **SMG members score the proposal by no later than 6th October 2017.**



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

225

226

ACTION SMG 170921-09: MCS Administrator to add MGD 002 to the agenda of the next Heat Pump Working Group meeting scheduled for 1st November 2017.

227

228

229

ACTION SMG 170921-10: MCS Administrator to collate any helpdesk queries received regarding MIS 3005 to support updates to MGD 002

230

231

232

GH declared a conflict of interest in approving the budget when the Heat Pump proposal was in the pipeline and noted he would abstain from voting or attending meetings as needed.

233

234

235

- MCS micro CHP WG Representative

236

237

PB introduced the mCHP papers and explained that at the June SMG meeting, the SMG voted in favour of the principle of publishing the mCHP documents subject to clarification of the identified discrepancies ahead of formal approval to publish. At the last meeting, GH raised a difference between boiler efficiency figures in MIS 3007 and 3007-2. A response to this query is provided within the actions updates for ACTION SMG_170622-03.

238

239

240

241

242

PB planned for the Enertek review of the updated Add-On Calculator and Add-On Test Methodology to be completed in time to be circulated before the SMG meeting however, there are some revisions to the Add-On calculator to be made to address the outcomes of the Enertek review such as indicating clearly whether the results equal a pass or fail. PB suggested that an organisation may look to fund this project and confirmed the project is still running to previously agreed timescales.

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

PB added that the Add-On calculator and accompanying methodology were developed by Santokh Gataora (SG). SG has since retired and the Excel spreadsheet is locked. LE confirmed that the MCS Administrator can provide an unlocked version of the calculator.

250

251

252

253

ACTION SMG 170921-11: MCS Administrator to provide PB with an unlocked version of the mCHP Add-On calculator Excel spreadsheet.

254

255

256

The Chair requested that the SMG consider the draft mCHP standards and Impact Assessment and vote on these documents.

257

258

259

JH commented that the Impact Assessment refers to Figure 3 however there is no Figure 3 contained within in the paper. LE clarified that Figure 3 is included within the Add-On Test methodology which is yet to be voted on. JH noted there is also a 'P' missing in the word 'comparison'.

260

261

262

263

264

PB agreed the paper required a quality review and took an action to investigate and update the references.

265

266

267

ACTION SMG 170921-12: PB to update the mCHP Impact Assessment with the missing Figure.

268

269

The SMG discussed the proposed publication date for the documents and LE noted that it is difficult to confirm a publication date before the standards and supporting documentation are

270



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

271 approved. Subject to approval, BEIS have supported a proposed December 2017 publication. LE
272 confirmed there is a mCHP Working Group scheduled for 5th October and PB agreed to confirm
273 arrangements for amending the calculator which he expects to be completed within 1-month.

274

275 **ACTION SMG 170921-13: PB to liaise with SG regarding updates to the Add-On Calculator and**
276 **accompanying methodology and confirm funding arrangements.**

277

278 The SMG then voted on the proposed changes to the mCHP standards – MCS 014, MCS 015, MIS
279 3007 and 3007-2 (Vote – In favour: 6, Abstentions: 2), meaning the changes are approved.

280

281 PB informed the SMG that he will be leaving British Gas however he is hopeful of continued
282 involvement in the industry and his intention is to remain in post as the MCS micro CHP Working
283 Group Chair. Attendees wished PB well for the future.

284

285 At this point, GR left the meeting.

286

287 **5. Draft Commissioning Scenarios**

288

289 *At this point, CS joined the meeting.*

290

291 JH introduced the item and explained that some MCS Contractors are registering installations on
292 the MCS Installation Database (MID) and either leaving some details blank or entering incorrect
293 details. MCS has discovered that some Heat Pump installations are not able to claim RHI due the
294 lack of a compliance certificate. Ofgem reviewed one application and found the compliance
295 certificate was blank. Further investigation proved that the MID contains a number of invalid
296 compliance certificates. The installer responsible has since gone out of business.

297

298 This raises the question of whether those installations are considered commissioned by MCS and
299 what options are available to the customers. DC confirmed that the building regulations allow a
300 route for another installer to assess an installation and deem it compliant referred to as
301 regularisation.

302

303 *At this point GR re-joined the meeting.*

304

305 JH explained that to deem an installation compliant, it would need to be recommissioned by
306 another MCS Contractor; the MCS certificate is invalid without the compliance certificate. The Chair
307 gave an example of an MCS Contractor taking on responsibility for the installation by
308 recommissioning. JH commented that the system owner needs to prove when the installation was
309 first commissioned. There have been cases when an installer has used an installation for their site
310 assessment for their MCS Certification but never commissioned the system. The legal term may be
311 'failed commissioning'.

312

313 GT noted that other schemes allow for documents to be uploaded and accepted without technical
314 review therefore this situation is not unique. DC and DP highlighted that if a hard line is taken and
315 the MCS Certificate is withdrawn, then the consumer is being penalised, provided the system is
316 running and working.

MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339

CS highlighted that if a customer ends up without an MCS Certificate for any reason, including the installer going into liquidation, this is a cause for concern.

The SMG debated what constitutes commissioning. GH explained that ‘commissioning’ means something different to industry than it does to the Scheme. The SMG heard that it is important for the scheme to define these terms as the MCS helpdesk receives calls regarding recommissioning and what this means for the MCS certificate, as well as the impact on RHI applications.

The SMG reviewed the definition of Commissioning within MIS 3005 in conjunction with the Handover requirements. The SMG discussed whether a missing compliance certificate would invalidate the MCS certificate. LE explained that the Commissioning definition and Handover Requirements section was reviewed at the last SMG meeting where the SMG agreed the need to clarify the different scenarios.

CS noted there are situations where redress is required for installations. LE added that it has been agreed at several MCs committees including the SMG that there are circumstances where recommissioning is permissible by the scheme however, the acceptable scenarios have not been determined.

JH introduced the draft commissioning scenarios document and scenarios 1-7 (of 12) were reviewed and agreed as follows:

Scenario	MCS Commissioned or Not	Can the system be MCS Commissioned?	Steps required to become MCS Commissioned
1. MCS Contractor installs but goes bust before MCS commissioning completed and certificate needs creating	No	Yes	New MCS Contractor creates certificate and takes full responsibility for installation.
2. MCS Contractor installs and commissions* but goes bust without providing MCS documentation	No	Yes	New MCS Contractor creates certificate and takes full responsibility for installation.
3. MCS Contractor			



The Certification Mark for Onsite Sustainable Energy Technologies

MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

<p>completes installation but refuses to provide a valid MCS Certificate</p> <p>a. refuse to provide an already generated MCS certificate</p> <p>b. refuse to generate a MCS certificate</p>	<p>a. Yes</p> <p>b. No</p>	<p>a. N/a</p> <p>b. Yes</p>	<p>a. Customer advised to complain to CB and CB raise a non-conformity requiring the installer to comply</p> <p>b. Same as above. If MCS contractor loses MCS certification see scenario 11.</p>
<p>4. Non-MCS Contractor does the install and is unable or unwilling to complete the project</p>	No	No	Consult with Trading standards, Citizens Advice and/ or take legal advice.
<p>5. Non-MCS Installer installs and commissions* the installation and consumer wants incentive (RHI/FiT)</p>	No	No	Consult with Trading standards, Citizens Advice and/ or take legal advice.
<p>6. MCS Installer installs and commissions second-hand kit (partially or completely)</p>	Yes	N/A	MCS commissioned but check 'no' at new at install in MID for RHI.
<p>7. Non-MCS Installer installs and commissions second-hand kit (partially or completely)</p>	No	No	Consult with Trading standards, Citizens Advice and/ or seek legal advice.

340



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

341 *Commissioned in accordance with manufacturer's instructions but not in a manner compliant with
342 the requirements of MCS.

343

344 Whilst reviewing scenario 4, the SMG reached the agreement that if a non-MCS Contractor
345 completed the installation, the installation should not under any circumstances be eligible for an
346 MCS certificate.

347

348 DC raised circumstances where the customer is able to provide a compelling case that they were
349 mis-sold. The SMG agreed that the Management Panel could consider levels of support available,
350 however, the system could not be MCS certified.

351

352 *At this point DP left the meeting.*

353

354 LE raised the point that if no MCS Contractor will take on an installation which will not be eligible
355 for an MCS certificate, this leaves the consumer without access to a quality scheme. The Chair
356 suggested that under these circumstances, MCS cannot assist and the consumer is advised to
357 review their contract and consult with Citizens Advice, Trading Standards and/or seek legal advice.

358

359 *At this point DP joined the meeting.*

360

361 The SMG discussed the text currently published on the MCS website relating to recommissioning
362 and LE confirmed that this text was approved several years ago by the MCS Management Panel
363 members at the time.

364

365 The SMG agreed that the following be raised with MCS Management Panel:

366

367 *The SMG view is that Recommissioning should not be a route to allow a non-MCS certified*
368 *installation to become certified and that the MCS website text be reviewed.*

369

370 **ACTION SMG 170921-14: MCS Administrator to request a decision for the new Management Panel**
371 **as to whether the website text regarding recommissioning be removed from the MCS website.**

372

373 Whilst reviewing scenario 6, the SMG agreed that secondhand products could be installed
374 and be eligible for an MCS certificate but not RHI, therefore the MID question: '*Was the*
375 *renewable heating system new when it was installed?*' Should be checked 'No'.

376

377 The SMG agreed that the wording of this question should be reviewed by the MCS
378 Management Panel.

379

380 **ACTION SMG 170921-15: MCS Administrator to raise a review of the MID question '*Was the***
381 ***renewable heating system new when it was installed?*' with the MCS Management Panel.**

382

383 The SMG discussed recommissioning in the context of replacement plants. CS and LE
384 confirmed that the MCS certificate represents a snapshot of the whole system at the time of
385 commissioning.

MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

386

387 The Chair asked what happens in cases where consumers want to add additional panels to an
388 installation? LE explained that this is an exception to the process where a new MCS certificate is
389 generated for the panel extension. DP noted that systems extensions have recently been banned
390 from claiming FITs. GR added that one of the Ofgem annual declaration requirements to be
391 completed by the customer is that the generating capacity of the system must not vary.

392

393 DC raised that building regulations, gas safety notification and other certification schemes work by
394 recertifying changes to the system. GH added that he is aware of current practice where MCS
395 certificates are generated for replacement MCS products where much of the existing system
396 remains the same and this is common within the heat pump industry.

397

398 The SMG discussed the current MCS Administrator and Ofgem process. LE confirmed that Ofgem
399 flag multiple certificates in the MID for a single specific address. This does not necessarily mean the
400 original certificate was incorrect. The SMG agreed that if an MCS certified product is replaced and
401 all MCS requirements have been met, the installation should be eligible for a new MCS certificate.
402 DC suggested that historical certificates could be marked as 'superseded' in the MID.

403

404 The SMG then debated the issue of routine maintenance vs repairs as the scheme does not cover
405 maintenance. e.g. parts wear out, break, need replacing; where is the line between repair and a
406 new installation? JH highlighted the need to clarify the position of the scheme and GR stressed the
407 importance of being clear regarding what is and is not allowed as a change to a system.

408

409 DC suggested a recommendation from the SMG be raised with the MCS Steering Group as this is a
410 strategic issue.

411

412 The SMG agreed their view is that it should be possible to issue a new certificate for a new MCS
413 certified product at the same address provided that the certificate history is clearly stated. In
414 addition, a note to MCS Contractors reminding them to be clear with the consumer when
415 undertaking that type of work would need to be agreed. GR recommended that the agreed
416 position is reviewed by lawyers. GT confirmed this is a decision for the Steering Group

417

418 LE and CS agreed to raise the issue with Ofgem at the meeting on 26th September and ask if they
419 have any concerns.

420

421 **ACTION SMG 170921-16: MCS Administrator and BEIS to raise the replacement plant issue with**
422 **Ofgem at the meeting on 26th September and discuss any concerns.**

423

424 The Chair offered to draft the agreed position statement post-meeting and request SMG comments
425 regarding Scenario 8 to help populate the rest of the table.

426

427 **ACTION SMG 170921-17: GT and MCS Administrator to draft an agreed position statement and**
428 **ask for comments for scenario 8, to help populate the rest of the table.**

429

430

431



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

432 6. MCS 023

433

434 DP introduced MCS 023 which sets out the additional requirements for MCS Contractors to
435 demonstrate PAS2030 equivalence for the installation of MCS technologies. DP confirmed that MCS
436 023 was circulated to the SMG for comments after the last meeting. DP gave an update confirming
437 BSI are content for the extracts to be used. DP is now seeking for SMG to approve the MCS 023.
438 The Chair invited comments and questions from the SMG.

439

440 GR raised a question regarding Clause 8 Business and Financial Probity; are MCS Certification
441 Bodies qualified to audit on this? DP confirmed that they are, adding that the process is essentially
442 a credit check. DP went on to clarify that this requirement comes straight out of PAS 2030. DC
443 explained the wording has changed but the principles of the requirements remain the same.

444

445 GR explained he has written to the Management Panel following the Grenfell Tower fire and the
446 potential ramifications and implications for the scheme. GR raised some questions regarding the
447 phrase “resilience of installed measure to flood risk” in clause 9.2. GR expressed concerns that
448 while it is the Certification Bodies that make these decisions, it is the Scheme that will be open to
449 potential challenges. GR questioned what Certification Bodies are measuring against and where is
450 the evidence? DP answered that it is the Certification Bodies’ role to check the requirements have
451 been met and not to challenge how they were met. DP added the current version of MCS 023
452 would need to be withdrawn if a decision is not reached.

453

454 GR next questioned clause 10.2 which states “The inspection shall be undertaken at a level of detail
455 sufficient to confirm that the specified measure can be safely and effectively installed at the
456 designated location paying particular attention to potential moisture build-up as a result of the
457 installation and taking into account the functionality and/or safety of installed services (gas,
458 electricity, water, telecommunications, etc.)” GR challenged what could be deemed as ‘sufficient’
459 and expressed concern that the lack of clarity leaves the door open for interpretation.

460

461 The Chair and DC confirmed that the MCS standards already contain many uses of the word
462 ‘sufficient’. GR went on to explain there are issues in MCS 023 that MCS has never had to consider
463 before, e.g. flooding and fire risk. DC commented that installers are expected to be knowledgeable
464 and act in accordance with legislation, including Building Regulations which cover fire and flooding.

465

466 JH noted that under clause 5.2 which states “Once the Certification Body has completed
467 assessment against this Standard, and all non-conformities are closed, the Certification Body will
468 provide the installation company with a certificate detailing their certification to this and any other
469 relevant Standards under MCS” the word ‘will’ should be changed to ‘may’. The SMG agreed.

470

471 The SMG agreed to change the wording of clause 12.1 which states “The installation of each energy
472 efficiency measure claimed to be in compliance with the requirements of this standard shall be
473 supported by a declaration of conformity to this standard and issued to the customer” by adding
474 ‘selected from the options below’ after the word ‘conformity.’



MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

475 The SMG agreed to change the word 'can' to 'may' in Clause 5.4. JH raised that he has completed a
476 review of the draft changes and has identified some minor corrections which he agreed to provide
477 post-meeting.

478

479 The SMG then voted to approve MCS 023 subject to the agreed changes being made prior to
480 publication. It was agreed there would be no transition between versions. (Vote – In favour: 7,
481 Against: 1, Abstentions: 0) therefore the paper is approved.

482

483 **ACTION SMG 170921-18:** JH to provide DP with minor suggested changes to MCS 023
484 electronically.

485

486 **ACTION SMG 170921-19:** MCS Administrator to publish the amended version of MCS 023 with no
487 transition period.

488

489 **7. Implementation date of the Competency Requirements**

490

491 The Chair explained that the implementation date of the competency requirements was a late
492 addition to the agenda. The SMG previously agreed to keep a watching brief on this subject. The
493 Chair declared despite owning a training centre, is not involved with the mapping or the EWR route
494 and therefore does not perceive a conflict.

495

496 GR commented that the two issues here are being merged; the mapping and the competency
497 deadline. DP previously highlighted a risk that the scheme could be challenged if the deadline is
498 extended. DP agreed with GR that there are two issues. Existing installers were accepted by the
499 scheme based on experience prior to the introduction of the scheme competency criteria. Any new
500 installers since 2014 had to meet the qualification criteria. GR commented that qualifications are
501 regulated by Ofqual and there is a regulated process. GT pointed out that although these
502 qualifications are regulated by Ofqual they do not undertake a review of the content of each and
503 every qualification therefore, an assumption cannot be made that these qualifications are up to
504 date and/or still valid and that GT is aware that most if not all regulated offerings are in fact out of
505 date in terms of the outputs aligning with the MCS standards.

506

507 The Chair explained the problem is if there is no driver for the training or assessment. The criteria
508 are broadly valid however the way in which the criteria are met will have changed over time (e.g.
509 by the introduction of updated performance estimates).

510

511 DP confirmed this has been discussed and raised as a concern at the PAS2030 & PAS2031 Steering
512 Committees and Each Home Counts development groups.

513

514 CS confirmed these are ready to be developed and be deployed. DP commented that QCFs are out
515 of date. They are confirming the courses match but not commenting on the quality.

516 The Chair explained there is the option to amend MCS 025. DC noted that the standards currently
517 say either mapped course or EWR are permissible. LE clarified that MCS 025 currently states that:

518

MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

519 *“The relevant competencies can be demonstrated either through the attainment of*
520 *nationally recognised qualifications and/or through the Experienced Workers Route*
521 *evaluation undertaken by a Certification Body.”*
522

523 The Chair noted that as the EWR route is still in pilot stage, the regulated qualifications are out of
524 date and that there is no mapping process in place nor could there be in the timescale before
525 implementation, and that there is a risk to the scheme that numerous installers, particularly those
526 who were early adopters of the scheme, will be removed. The Chair added that the Experienced
527 Workers Route (EWR) pilot was due to end in August and feedback has not been provided to date.
528

529 GR noted the importance of there being a managed process in place. The Ofqual courses are not
530 out of date however GT explained that this was not correct.
531

532 A proposal was put to the Steering Group for a mapping solution however, the vote was not
533 quorate. If MCS 025 did allow for Certification Bodies to assess Installer competence, this places a
534 heavy caveat/burden on the Certification Bodies.
535

536 LE explained that a data gathering exercise has taken place where course details of ~75% of the
537 Ofqual regulated courses have been collected to be included in Version 2 of the Competency
538 Checker Tool (CCT).
539

540 The Management Panel have approved in principle that Ofqual regulated courses where data are
541 available could be accepted by the scheme and other courses (including those mapped and out of
542 date or never mapped) be marked accordingly within the CCT.
543

544 GT again expressed his concerns at this decision.
545

546 LE asked DC if an installer presented a report generated by the CCT stating they have met 80% of
547 the criteria through Ofqual regulated courses within the tool, what would be required by the
548 Certification Body to determine the competence of the Installer? DC noted that it would be a gap
549 filling exercise at a higher cost to Installers but could be done provided there is an update to MCS
550 025.
551

552 GR explained the proposed mapping solution as presented to the Steering Group which is an online
553 platform which would facilitate the review of courses against the scheme criteria by technical
554 industry experts assigned on an automated basis. DP confirmed that current take up of courses is
555 low.
556

557 GR stressed the need to resolve the process failure. This is currently sitting with the Competency
558 Criteria Working Group scheduled to meet on the 3rd October 2017.
559

560 There is a reputational risk to the scheme either way, including the risk of challenge from the
561 industry. At this point, the Chair terminated the argument presented to bring the agenda item to
562 order. DC expressed interest in hearing all views of all parties.
563

564 The Chair highlighted that the MCS Competency Criteria has a deadline of 3rd January 2018.

MCS Standards Management Group Final Minutes

565

566 *At this point, CS, AH, DC, and GR left the meeting and GT declared the meeting was no longer*
567 *quorate.*

568

569 JH surmised that ultimately the decision is the scheme's risk. Is it sufficient for a Certification Body
570 to assess and incorporate their assessment of the gap? The Chair suggested that an option could be
571 for the MCS Charitable Foundation to fund a training course. The remaining members seemed to
572 support this option and agreed that for approximately £100k, MCS could fund training course for all
573 7 technologies but it would take time to implement.

574

575 *At that point, GH and PB left the meeting.*

576

577 DP, GT, JH, LE and AT remained:

578

579 The Chair confirmed that as far as he is aware the EWR is still in pilot. DP noted it could come out of
580 pilot stage.

581

582 The Chair expressed serious concerns with accepting Awarding Organisation qualifications as
583 Ofqual is completely absolved of any responsibility however as this has now been raised with MCS,
584 MCS has a duty to verify the MP belief that regulated qualifications will always be up to date. GT
585 suggested expanding MCS 025 and postponing the 3rd January 2018 competency criteria deadline.

586

587 JH noted that whilst the process of redrafting MCS 025 would not take long, the required
588 consultation would impact the timescales. JH suggested that if a course was available, not all
589 installers will be compelled to attend and some would still need to be removed from the scheme as
590 a result.

591

592 DP confirmed the point of the course mapping was to make the scheme better by providing
593 consistent requirements.

594

595 GT highlighted that something has to happen and in his view the implementation date must be
596 moved as this was potentially the only way to prevent further issues arising.

597

598 **8. AOB**

599

600 There was no further business.

601

602 **9. Dates of next meeting**

603

604 The next SMG meetings are scheduled to take place as follows:

605

- 606 • Wednesday 22nd November 2017
- 607 • Tuesday 30th January 2018

608

609 The Chair thanked the attendees and closed the meeting.