

Final Decisions and Actions

Meeting Title: Green Deal Certification Body Forum

Date of Meeting: 24th April 2013

Attendees:

No	Company	Name	Installer Session	Main Session	Assessor Session
1	APHC	Patrick Murray	√	√	
2	BBA	Chris Hunt	√	√	
3	BESCA	Catherine Withington	√	√	√
4	BESCA	Bob Towse	√	√	√
5	Blue Flame	Richard Payne	√	√	√
6	BM Trada	Simon Beer	√	√	
7	BRE	Andy Butterfield	√	√	√
8	BSI	Mike Inman	√	√	√
9	Certass	Samantha O'Neill	√	√	
10	CIBSE	Andrew Geens			√
11	MCS	Gideon Richards	√	√	√
12	DECC	Matthew Webb			√
13	DECC	Alan Clifford			√
14	DECC	Rob Davis	√		√
15	DECC	Dean Thomas	√	√	
16	ECMK	Claire Mirfin		√	√
17	ECMK	Debbie Lawrence		√	√
18	EST	Rod Hanchard-Goodwin			√(Part - dial in)
19	EST	Tom Lock	√	√	
20	FENSA	Liam Gilsenan	√	√	
21	Gemserv	Inga Jirgensone	√	√	√
22	Gemserv	Brendan McGarry	√	√	√
23	Gemserv	Daniel Barnes	√	√	√

Final Decisions and Actions

24	HETAS	Tina Seymour	√	√	
25	Landmark	Bob Maskell	√	√	√
26	NAPIT	David Cowburn	√	√	√
27	National Energy Services	Becky Axtell		√	√
28	Ocean Certification	Richard O'Neill	√	√	
29	OFTEC	Adrian Lightwood	√	√	
30	OFTEC	Paul Rose	√	√	
31	Quidos	Philip Salaman	√	√	√
32	REAL	Virginia Graham		√	
33	REAL	Yousouf Jhugroo	√	√	
34	Stroma	It was the other guy - not Mark but Stephen Gaskell?	√	√	
35	UKAS	Janet Gascoigne		√	√
36	UKAS	Vicki Shaw		√	√
37	West Midlands Kick Start	Adenike Titiloye		√	√

Apologies:

Brian Such (BSI)
Katie Searle (EST)
Mark Rollins (Stroma)

Installer Session - Welcome and introductions

1. **Installer Session - Welcome and introductions**
2. **Actions from the previous meeting**

Actions 7 and 8 were carried over from the last Forum. Other actions have been closed. With regards to action 7, the CB Forum participants were informed that the Branding Guidelines are being updated in order to support the suggested amendments to the quality mark i.e. what is accepted when the full listing of measures below the Quality Mark is not feasible, and will be made available to all stakeholders once the revised version is

Final Decisions and Actions

published. In relation to action 8, ORB is to consider long term solution for the weekly data transfer templates.

Action 1: ORB to circulate the revised Branding Guidelines to the Forum (once finalised).

3. Update from the Installer Forum

ORB circulated the Installer Forum draft decisions and actions from the meeting held on 14th March 2013. CB representative had also shared an update with the CB Forum before the meeting. No issues or actions were raised during the Installer update.

4. Transitional Arrangements

The Transitional Arrangements for PAS 2030 Edition 2 were circulated before the meeting. There were some concerns raised in relation to the updating of schedules and what the nature of the assessment will be, which were raised to UKAS during the next session under AOB. There was a general consensus that the Transitional Arrangements on ORB's side required no specific actions.

5. Insurance requirements for solid wall/cavity wall insulation

A Provider specifying an external/internal or cavity wall insulation product must give the customer a 25-year warranty, and by extension the Provider is likely to seek similar from the installation company. Any perceived lack of competition in the provision of such warranties may now have been addressed by Ofgem having published a list of several warranties acceptable for fulfilling similar requirements under ECO. However, several organisations had previously noted that the dominant players in this market required a slightly enhanced approach to certification before they would offer their warranty to certified installers. The ORB has approached several of the companies offering warranties, to clarify what requirements they place on installers before they will offer them warranties. The main such requirement identified so far is for installers' work to be audited at each stage and not just post-installation. No CB objected to this being a sensible way to conduct assessment or surveillance for these measures. A discussion took place that if this was implemented, it is likely that there would be a cost implication to installers as this would entail extra site visits to audit the measures; therefore this proposal was unlikely to be cost neutral.

Final Decisions and Actions

It was agreed that the ORB would draw up a paper outlining the additional requirements specified by the insurance providers, and also consulting on which measures might require more than just post-installation assessment. That paper may result in guidance on how the scheme owner expects these audits to be carried out. This could be added to a 'Commonly Agreed Positions' log, maintained by the CB Forum and used as part of the UKAS and ORB audits of CBs.

Action 2: ORB to circulate a paper for consultation regarding potential enhancements to satisfy warranty companies, as well as a commonly agreed position on the audit of each measure.

Action 3: ORB to establish Commonly Agreed Positions log once the outcome of the above is known.

6. AOB - Installer CBs

ORB noted that discussion have been taking place in relation to facilitating a smoother entry into the Green Deal scheme for installation companies. There may be some hesitation in the marketplace as installers are required to be certified to get a job, but must have done a Green Deal installation in order to become certified. This refers back to *UKAS Green Deal Pilot Project Communication No. 2 Certification of existing customers by Accredited Certification Bodies* issued in August last year advising certification bodies to be pragmatic and flexible in their assessment approach.

Action 4: UKAS to re-circulate via ORB the above 'Communication Number 2', and issue further communication if available to clarify what assessment approach may be accepted by UKAS.

DECC approached the CB Forum with a request for market intelligence on the size and regional coverage of the installer companies. DECC had attempted to gather this information via ORB but response rates have been rather low. DECC alluded to the importance of gathering this data in order to ascertain whether supply will meet demand. ORB suggested that perhaps the CBs could send a survey out to the installers on behalf of DECC.

Action 5: DECC to consider creating an online a survey for Certification Bodies to disseminate to their installer base.

Final Decisions and Actions

It was pointed out that the current wording of the Gas Registration may require updating. The Forum agreed that an amendment was required. The Draft that was proposed by the Group was:

“A Green Deal Installer installing gas boilers and / or heating systems under the Green Deal must either be Gas Safe Registered or in cases where the gas work is sub contracted, the Green Deal Installer retains responsibility for ensuring the work is carried out by a Gas Safe Registered installer.”

It was also agreed that ORB would check which measures should be referred to by the above, prior to the wording being finalised.

Action 6: ORB to propose the agreed change to the CoP in relation to the requirements of the Gas Safe Registration.

A question was raised as to whether an installer’s certification should be withdrawn if they did not carry out any work under Green Deal, even if it was PAS 2030 work under ECO. PAS 2031 states: ‘Surveillance valuation of certified EEM installation service processes and deliveries shall be undertaken at intervals not exceeding 16 months’. It was noted that this would allow for ‘analogous’ work to be assessed, but members questioned whether this was acceptable to UKAS

Action 7: ORB to raise with UKAS whether the assessment of analogous work is acceptable.

A question was raised about the separate routes to demonstrating competence under PAS 2030 in England/Wales and Scotland and whether these are accepted cross-border. ORB and DECC confirmed that this is currently being clarified with the relevant sector skills councils and the Scottish Government

Action 8: ORB to issue an update to the Forum once it has been clarified whether the route to demonstrating competence in England and Wales is recognised for carrying out work in Scotland and vice versa.

In relation to PAS 2030, a question was also raised about the route to competencies via mapped courses. ORB confirmed that this is being discussed with DECC by relevant sector skills councils, but that as a minimum the ORB website will continue to signpost to the skills councils.

Final Decisions and Actions

Some concerns were expressed in relation to PAS 2030 Edition 2 and the renewable solution outside of MCS and the Forum expressed the need for clarification on installations over 50KWh (electricity) or 45kWth (heat).

7. CB Joint session - Welcome and Introductions

8. Actions from the previous meeting

All of the previous actions have been completed.

9. GD ORB update/DECC update

ORB provided an update on the current key activities across the schemes and the participant numbers. It was noted that the Code of Practice (CoP) will be laid before Parliament at the beginning of June 2013. The nature of this legal document is that there is no 'transition period' - all participants must comply with it from the day of its implementation. However, the nature of the proposed changes this time around means that it is unlikely that additional surveillance would be required outside the scheduled visit, to confirm compliance to the latest version.

Action 9: ORB and DECC to confirm to CBs, once CoP drafting is finalised, whether additional surveillance is required.

ORB informed the group that the Brandling Guidelines are being updated and the amended version will be circulated in due course.

ORB highlighted the compliance and auditing procedures and REAL provided an oral update to the Forum on the process and the initial stages of the compliance procedure. Six CBs have received compliance audit questionnaires.

A question was put to the ORB in relation to the Search Tool / Participant Register hosted on the ORB website. ORB illustrated the importance of participants keeping their details up to date, via the CB or (for some items) directly via the participant login area of the ORB website. ORB outlined that an installer can update the areas they cover/operate in by going through the participant login area of the ORB website, however, their personal details i.e. contact number or address, and their certification scope must be amended through their CB who then contact ORB with the appropriate updates.

Final Decisions and Actions

Action 10: ORB to issue guidance to Certification Bodies explaining the process for updating the participant details on the ORB Search Tool / Participants Register.

10. Multi-site Certification

UKAS provided an oral update on multi site certification. UKAS drew the Forum's attention to principles of a European Scheme document (*IAF MD1, please find the scheme document [here](#)*) that deals with the Food & Forestry sector and multi site certification principles. It requires a central controlling office, with sampling of an appropriate number of sites, and a certificate to then be issued covering all the sites. It also has a section on group or 'umbrella' certification

Additionally, one CB mentioned that the 1% sampling would need to be spread across several sites.

Action 11: UKAS to circulate the paper on multi site certification (via ORB).

(Post meeting note: The document is available on the following link http://www.compad.com.au/cms/iafnu/workstation/upFiles/IAFMD12007_Certification_of_Multiple_Sites_Issue1v3Pub5.pdf)

11. Complaints Processes

It was agreed that CBs would review how easily accessible their complaints process is on their websites, and the ORB will look to signpost to these in future.

Action 12: CBs to ensure complaints processes are easily found on their websites, and provide ORB with links for signposting.

In addition it was noted that the Code of Practice requires all participants except CBs to acknowledge complaints within seven days, but that no such requirement is placed on CBs. It was agreed to recommend adding this requirement to the CoP as part of the forthcoming updates.

Action 13: DECC to align complaint acknowledgement requirements in the CoP for CBs with those of other GD participants.

12. Monthly reporting requirements

Final Decisions and Actions

ORB presented an update on the current status and state of play of the monthly reporting procedure. ORB acknowledged that substantial progress has been made in comparison to last month and previous months. However, a reminder was issued to CBs that there are inconsistencies and late submissions containing errors are still being received. ORB emphasised the importance of alleviating these inconsistencies as soon as possible in preparation for the automated system going live shortly. The Forum's participants raised questions relating to postcodes in England and Wales and whether a country code is required. ORB confirmed that all fields of the report must be completed, and that if there is nothing to report a nil return is still required.

Action 14: ORB to circulate the GD ORB postcodes for Wales & England and lookup formula that can be applied.

13. AOB - All

A member of the group requested an update on PAS 2030 Edition 2 and its current status and what the next steps are. UKAS confirmed that assessments will be carried out on a case by case basis and UKAS may carry out a desktop review.

A follow up question to UKAS focused on surveillances and if a scenario could transpire whereby, a particular party should / or could be suspended if they have not carried out any Green Deal work. A member pointed out that under the MCS scheme, there is a clause that states that assessments will be carried out once the relevant party / individual have undertaken work.

Action 15: ORB to circulate the dates of the forthcoming Forum meetings.

14. CB FORUM - ASSESSOR SESSION - Welcome and introductions

15. Actions from the previous meeting

DECC provided an update for the actions 15 and 16. It was clarified that currently there are not additional information security requirements on Certification Bodies (apart from their obligations to register with the Information Commissioner's Office under the Data Protection Act) to access the EPC Register. This may be reviewed in the future. It was also noted that the Assessor Specifications and the Code of Practice are currently being updated.

Final Decisions and Actions

It was noted that DECC is working with the EPC register Operators in order to formalise the suspension processes (action 18). Action 19 is considered in line with the update for the Assessor Specifications.

16. Assessor Forum update

CB Representatives at the Assessor Forum provided an update for this section. One CB representative drew upon the complexities and potential challenges to the market with regards to organisations being certified by multiple Certification Bodies and advisors being members of multiple EPBD schemes and the complexity that it adds to the auditing processes of the EPCs and Occupancy Assessments.

DECC noted that some 'go early' funding remains, but those accessing it must complete their training and assessment by the end of May. It was questioned to whom this money is available.

Action 16: DECC to confirm whether this funding is available to new entrants or only to existing DEAs who are up-skilling to become GD Advisors.

17. EPC Register Operator/Certification Body

Please see actions in the table below.

Final Decisions and Actions

Call Date	Action	By Who	Status	Comment
11/04/2013	ORB circulate link to the advisor checklist to all assessor CBs	ORB	Closed	Action Closed
11/04/2013	CBs to make the checklists (or adapted version of checklist) available to all newly certified assessors / advisors to ensure everybody is aware of the processes.	Forum	Ongoing	
11/04/2013	ORB and DECC to confirm whether weekly data uploads this is the case going forward (weekly data uploads).	ORB/DECC	Ongoing	CBs suggested weekly or perhaps daily uploads
11/04/2013	DECC to confirm whether Green Deal Certification Bodies will be able to update the GDA qualification on the EPC register (currently only EPBD schemes are able to do this).	DECC	Ongoing	DECC to issue a paper on this action
11/04/2013	ORB / Landmark / EST Scotland to clarify how removal of advisor accounts will work on the registers and whether the same email address can be used again for a different registration.	DECC/Landmark	Ongoing	Landmark to issue clarification while DECC actively seek solution.
11/04/2013	EPC Register Scotland to confirm whether the summary assessment reports will be sent to assessor organisations in Scotland.	EST Scot	Ongoing	EST Scotland will make these available at the end of May
11/04/2013	DECC to clarify whether certification bodies will have visibility of the reports that are lodged in the Landmark register via the free BRE SAP tool.	DECC	Closed	All lodgements will be visible
11/04/2013	Landmark / EST Scotland to check whether this type of validation is in place (which software is associated with which Cert Body).	Landmark/EST Scot	Ongoing	
11/04/2013	DECC to communicate to the EPC Register in Scotland an indicative date for withdrawal of the free BRE tool (once known).	DECC	Ongoing	
11/04/2013	DECC / Landmark to clarify what is the status of Landmark Register in terms of non-domestic lodgements.	DECC/Landmark	Closed	DECC and Landmark clarified that the Register has gone live

Final Decisions and Actions

11/04/2013	DECC talk to Quidos in relation to occupancy assessment removal/cancellation issue raised.	DECC	Closed	
11/04/2013	ORB to clarify the requirement for Country codes in the monthly CB reports.	ORB	Closed	

Final Decisions and Actions

18. Guidance on empty/void properties

It was noted that the Occupancy Assessment Software has the void property function / feature that assign default data for void properties.

Action 17: ORB to propose to DECC a clarification on this point to be included in the Assessor Specifications requiring this function to be used for void properties.

19. Sampling methodology for advisors

The background of the issue was explained to the Forum. The specification does not stipulate at what point the count of the witness assessments should be carried out and this presents a particular risk where the number of advisors increases significantly over the initial six months period or equally over the subsequent 12 months. The Forum agreed with the approach described in the meeting paper.

Action 18: ORB to include the agreed change in the Assessor Specification.

Another issue was raised in relation to clause 23 of the Assessor CB Specification and a potential misinterpretation of that clause. The Forum agreed that the Certification Body should only assess those advisors that are registered with that particular Certification Body.

Action 19: ORB to include a clarification in the Assessor CB Specification.

20. AOB - Assessor CBs

A question was raised in relation to the consistency of suspensions and whether a suspension should be replicated with other CBs i.e. due to compliance issues or non payments. A clarification was sought on the course of action CBs should take in cases involving one CB implementing one course of action and if other CBs should follow suit.

Action 20: ORB put the processes in place to specify that the suspensions circulated to all Assessor Certification Bodies only relate to suspension due to non-compliance.

The 14 day rule was brought into question by one of the forum participants and whether this applies when there difficulties with lodgements. DECC outlined that assessors should

Final Decisions and Actions

seek their own legal advice and there is a risk attached i.e. a Green Deal Plan could be challenged and the assessor could be liable. DECC noted that they are looking at clarifying the wording around the 14 days.

Action 21: DECC to consider improving wording of 14-days requirement in the Assessor Specification.

One of the members questioned who is responsible for the content of the advisor occupancy assessment. DECC agreed that perhaps more clarity is required in the specification. Paragraph 75 of the Specification for GDAOs was highlighted and a lack of transparency and details in terms of content requirements were raised.

Action 22: ECMK to provide a paper clarifying GDAR review requirements

One participant pointed towards an issue surrounding the Non-domestic software and the quality of the tool and if it will be improved. DECC reassured the Forum that the software is in working order and it is fit for purpose. DECC requested detailed feedback from the group on their experiences into order to feedback into BRE.

Action 23: CBs to supply detailed feedback to DECC in relation to their experiences with the software tool.