

Minutes of the NERSAP Meeting

Lloyd's Register EMEA, Birmingham on 18th July 2017

Attendees:

Nigel Evans (Chair)	ScottishPower	nigel.evans@spenergynetworks.co.uk
Paul Costelloe (Secretary)	Lloyd's Register	paul.costelloe@lr.org
Mike Cahill	Lloyd's Register	mike.cahill@lr.org
Mel Swift	GTC	Mel.Swift@gtc-uk.co.uk
Brian Hoy (via Webex)	EWL	brian.hoy@enwl.co.uk
Paul Smith	WPD	psmith@westernpower.co.uk
Ian Cairns	NPG	ian.cairns@northernpowergrid.com
Steve Rogers	UKPN	steve.rogers@ukpowernetworks.co.uk
Colin Jamieson	ESP	colin.jamieson@espug.com
Cathy Falconer (via Webex)	SSE-N	catherine.falconer@sse.com
Graham Smith	HEA	graham@thehea.org.uk
Mike Bracey	Morrison	michael.bracey@morrisonus.com
Paul Wragg	Power On Connections	paulwragg@poweronconnections.co.uk

Delegates:

Steve Bolland	Power Systems UK	steve.bolland@powersystemsuk.com
Glyn Jones	CiC CoP Working Group	glyn.jones@sterling-power.co.uk

Apologies:

Hayley Connor	Harlaxton	hayley@harlaxton.com
James Veaney	OFGEM	
Eirwyn Thomas	Power Systems UK	et@powersystemsuk.com

1. Introductions

All attendees were welcomed to the meeting and apologies noted.

The membership of NERSAP going forward was discussed with the number of DNO's and IDNO's in mind.

Action:	LR to contact IDNO's by end of August '17 asking if they wish to attend future NERSAP meetings and if so, to nominate a representative.
Action:	Attendees at next NERSAP meeting on 21 st November '17 to suggest different scenarios of how NERSAP operates due to numbers.

2. Review of the Minutes & Actions of the NERSAP Dated 14th March 2017

2.1 NERS Website

MC stated that he was unable to advise on when the proposed changes/improvements to the website would be made since the decision about the overall corporate 'look and 'feel' of the whole website (not just the Utilities section) is being made at Group level.

Action:	PC agreed (by the end of August '17) to request an approximate date of when the changes would be made.
---------	--

Nigel Evans in a previous meeting had asked if LR have an internal SLA for updating the website. Dave Ball had investigated and reported back that SLA is 5 working days from confirmation of acceptance of LR's Request for Services by an ICP. MC clarified that the SLA should be 5 days from technical review of report recommending change to an ICP's accredited scope(s).

2.2 Low Smoke Zero Halogen Cables

Responses on DNO's/IDNO's approach to the use of cables within buildings and integral substations had been received from SSEN, ENWL, UKPN and Energetics.

Nigel Evans had asked the DNOs and IDNOs NERSAP members to provide details of their company's policies and approach to cables in integral substations.

Action:	PC to check before 31 st August '17 if Dave Ball has received outstanding responses from WPD, GTC, ESP and NPG and following this to re-request where appropriate.
Action:	Mel Swift to attempt to get an update on guidance document by 31 st August.

2.3 Mail Box

LR confirmed that a new mailbox had been set up, with the address:

NERES@LR.org

NERSAP discussed how the mailbox should be used. It was agreed at the last NERSAP that for the mailbox to be effective a set of robust rules and a defined process would be required.

Action: - Nigel Evans proposed an example list of suggested matters for communication to the new mailbox. Action Closed	LR to include criteria for using the mailbox on the agenda for the July '17 NERSAP meeting.
---	---

2.4 Design Scopes for Unmetered Connections

There was a question as to whether a new NERS design scope should be introduced to bridge a perceived gap between LV Design and the unmetered (construction) scopes, or whether the existing construction scopes for unmetered connections should be modified to include a limited element of design. Mike Cahill stated that it had previously been agreed at NERSAP that the construction scope for unmetered connections would naturally involve an (albeit very limited) element of design.

Action:	Designer Competency Working Group to consider. Report to NERSAP at November meeting (Action Mel Swift/Mike Bracey).
Action:	Dave Ball had emailed NERSAP 20/03/17 requesting outstanding updates on policies from WPD,GTC,ESP and NPG. Updates were received from NPG and GTC. PC to obtain before August '17 from Dave Ball the outstanding responses from NPG and GTC which he had received and to request the outstanding responses from WPD and ESP. PC further agreed to forward the NPG response to Ian Cairns.

3. Review of the Minutes and Actions of the NERS Provider Forum held on 4th July 2017

3.1 Integral Substations / Low Smoke Cables

The ICP's require communication of DNO requirements and collation of these requirements is being dealt with as a NERSAP agenda item.

3.2 Design Scope Requirements for Unmetered Connections

This is being dealt with as a NERSAP agenda item and actions have been allocated in order to address the issue.

3.3 NERS Requirements & Guidance Documents

Action:	LR has agreed to provide an update for review by NERSAP by end of August '17. Action PC
---------	--

4. Update on Competition in Connections Code of Practice

Glyn Jones provided an update on the working group but there are no further developments in terms of modification proposals coming through.

Formal request for items to be reviewed by the panel can be made by anyone via the CiC CoP Website. Informal approaches can be made to the chair of the CiC Working Group, Glyn Jones directly.

5. Designer Competency Working Group

Following the last NERSAP meeting there were 2 actions 1) Summary for Guidance Document and 2) Proposed matrix of what an ICP would use as proof of designer competency. This will reside in the revised NERS Requirements document.

Action:	Proposed summary & matrix to go in NERS Requirements document to be forwarded by Mel Swift/Mike Bracey to Paul Costelloe for inclusion in draft re-issue of NERS Requirements document by 31 st August.
---------	--

Regarding the issue of Self Determination of PoC scopes Martin Crocker (UKPN) had previously requested that NERSAP discuss the circumstances under which an ICP possessing Network Connections scopes could self-service connections up to 70kVA using a pre-determined point of connection matrix and standard DNO pre-approved designs without any specific input from a designer. Confirmation was sought as to whether an ICP would need full design scopes to undertake this activity.

Action:	Designer Working Group Mel Swift/Mike Bracey to confirm that this has been included in their work plan by 30 th September 2017.
---------	--

6. NERS Mailbox (setting criteria for use).

Action: - Nigel Evans proposed an example list of suggested matters for communication to the new mailbox. Action Closed	NERSAP had agreed that the setting up of these would be an agenda item for the July meeting.
---	--

7. NERS 12 Month Action Plan

The extracts of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) are provided below, along with the NERSAP's assessment of their current compliance with the requirements.

Extracts from MoU

The role of the NERSAP will be as follows:

1. *“To establish and maintain an overall view of the performance of LR as the Accreditation Body and its compliance with the Scheme guidance documents and standards.”*

The Panel believed that this requirement was only being partially met. They wish to assess the consistency of how assessments are carried out and how effective LR is in undertaking NERS assessments. The Panel wanted to consider whether some benchmarks be introduced. The first step to be pursued is to carry out a gap analysis to determine how effective LR is currently at undertaking assessments.

Action:	Steve Rogers and Nigel Evans agreed to carry out a gap analysis of the NERS assessment process at LR's offices in Birmingham on 28 th September 2017.
---------	--

2. *“To provide guidance to the Accreditation Body as to the resolution of disputes that may arise with Service Providers seeking registration and DNO's seeking the withdrawal of such registrations, should they remain unresolved, having exhausted the disputes and appeals procedures defined in the Scheme guidance document.”*
Actively being progressed, compliant with this requirement.

3. *“To establish a process, as necessary, to resolve disputes that may arise between the Advisory Panel and the Accreditation Body”*
Actively being progressed, compliant with this requirement. ■

4. *“To act as a forum for feedback from both DNO’s and Service Providers as to the Scheme performance and advice as to how the Scheme may be revised in the light of such feedback”*
Compliant with this requirement. ■

5. *“To review and accept Scheme guidance documentation, assessment procedures and practices and provide guidance and advice on subsequent revisions thereto”.* The panel suggested that the current NERS documents used for assessments had not been recently reviewed to assess if they are fit for purpose. ■

Action:	A review will form part of the gap analysis mentioned in (1) above.
---------	---

6. *“The NERSAP members will be responsible for informing their respective stakeholder interests of Scheme changes etc.”*
Compliant with this requirement. ■

The NERSAP will be able to maintain an awareness of the performance of the Accreditation Body by the following means:

7. *“Each member will be able to gain access to the assessment reports which will be posted on the LR intranet for restricted access by members only. These reports will be sanitised as some members may be considered competitors of Service Providers who are the subject of the reports.
 NB - DNO Panel representatives will be provided with details of the Service Providers being reported upon, upon request”*
 The panel discussed whether this was practical and relevant to the current maturity of the competition in connections market. Members find it more informative to be provided details on frequently found deficiencies. Panel asked if this requirement could be removed from the MoU. ■

Action:	This will be removed at the next issue of the MoU by PC
---------	---

8. *“DNO Panel representatives will have access to the assessment processes and check sheets”*
 The Panel believed that this requirement was only being partially met. They wish to review the effectiveness of the NERS assessment process. The panel wish to look at the Assessment Process and completed Assessment reports. ■

Action:	These will be provided at the gap analysis meeting scheduled for 28 th September.
---------	--

9. *“The NERSAP will be provided with the job description for the role of Scheme Assessor, which will detail the minimum qualifications and experience of the Accreditation Body’s staff who would be assigned to this role, for agreement.”*
 The panel wished to review the job description of a NERS Assessor. ■■■

Action:	PC to re-circulate email containing Scheme Assessor job description which was previously sent to the chairman only by 31 st August 2017.
---------	---

10. *“NERSAP members may perform audits on the Accreditation Body as part of their ongoing performance assessment”*
 The Panel do not believe they are compliant with this requirement and have suggested that Panel representatives undertake future audits of LR’s performance while undertaking assessments. The suggestion was that one IDNO and one DNO representative undertake these. ■■■

Action:	These will be provided at the gap analysis meeting scheduled for 28 th September.
---------	--

An annual review of progress would be undertaken in the March 2018 NERSAP meeting.

8. NERS data

The NERS data was reviewed. A request was made for the following information to be included in future data:

- Number of assessments carried out where a resulting report stated “not recommending”

Action:	LR to include number of assessments carried out where a resulting report stated “not recommending” to be included in future data presented to NERSAP.
---------	---

9. AOB

Brian Hoy raised concern about a small number of ICP’s working under their own safety rules (Option 1 of CiC CoP) where subsequent audits by ENWL had revealed substandard workmanship i.e. a neutral conductor which had been stripped of insulation back to the crutch of the cable so that it could contact earth (where neutral and earth were supposed to be separate) and also an example of work where rather than pot-ending, the jointer had simply used insulating material.

A discussion took place on whether LR should make more frequent visits to ICP’s working under their own safety rules.

Action:	LR to consider following meeting with ENWL and the ICP’s concerned.
---------	---

10. Dates of next meetings

Dates for the meetings of the NERS Provider Forum and NERSAP are:

NERS Forum: 7th November 2017

NERSAP: 21st November 2017