

## Minutes of GIRS Advisory Panel Meeting



### Microsoft Teams Meeting

24<sup>th</sup> May 2022 10:00 am

#### **In attendance:**

Les Thomas (LT)	LRQA Verification Limited (Secretary)
Leigh Keegan (LK)	leigh.keegan@sgn.co.uk (Chairperson)
Gareth Arnold (GA)	gareth.arnold@indigopipelines.co.uk
Dave Morgan (DM)	dave.morgan@morland-utilities.co.uk
Geoffrey Harle (GH)	GHarle@northerngas.co.uk
John Fellows (JF)	john.fellows22@cadentgas.com
Damon Swanton (DS)	damon.swanton@cadentgas.com
Dean O'Dee (DO)	dean.odee@me.com
Keith Johnston (KJ)	Keith.Johnston@gtc-uk.co.uk
Michael Erskine (ME)	Michael.Erskine@espug.com
Zenon Przybyszewski (ZP)	Zenon.Ski@lastmile-uk.com
Carl Day (CD)	Carl.Day@wwutilities.co.uk
Paul Leighton (PL)	Paul.Leighton@fulcrum.co.uk
Andrew Collin (AC)	andrewcollin@EnergyAssets.co.uk

#### **1. Welcome introductions and apologies for absence**

After brief introductions, LK welcomed everyone to the 2<sup>nd</sup> GIRSAP meeting of 2022.

**Apologies:** Apologies were received from Karl Miller LRQA Verification Limited

#### **2. Acceptance of previous minutes**

The previous minutes dated 25<sup>th</sup> January 2022 were accepted as a true record of events.

#### **3. Matters Arising**

##### **3.1 MM1 & MM2 forms**

The action related to the completion of MM1 and MM2 forms holding the operative's date of birth and National Insurance number and whether this gives UIPs an issue with GDPR.

At the January GIRSAP It was agreed that a generic letter would be sent to all network owners asking them to consider a move to the use of EUSR numbers rather than the NI number and DOB as this the EUSR number is less sensitive.

During discussion it was identified that W&WU and Fulcrum had responded supporting the change to the EUSR.

The W&WU Letter (see attached) was discussed further as Jodie McEvoy the W&WU Network

#### **ACTION BY**

Controller suggested that collaboration between the Gas Distribution Networks (GDNs), Independent Gas Transporters (IGTs) and Utility Infrastructure Providers (UIPs) to redevelop the MM1/MM2 so that it requests only the information required was beneficial as a form that is universally accepted by all Networks will also assist companies which may hold multiple applications across different GDNs and will be a step towards consistency across the industry. LK stated he had agreed to facilitate the meeting with the GDNs.

LK

KJ clarified the INA had also discussed the issue and a formal response would be issued on behalf of the IGTs.

KJ

### **3.2 LRQA Reporting Developments**

The UIPs have been notified of the changes to reporting but the 3rd Party Technical Advisors asked if they could have time to ask their employers for their thoughts. This has been discussed at the UIP Forum and there had been no objections. The list of all Major and Minor findings identified will now be published and reported at each forum and GIRSAP Cycle. The UIPs had however requested that the report be for the period between the last meeting date and the final report date as this would mean that a finding identified in January is not repeatedly reported.

This was agreed and the appropriate wording and clause for documenting the requirement for LRQA to disclose all findings in GIG 2 is as follows:

**1.3.1 All Major and Minor Deficiencies identified during the reporting period are reported to GIRSAP on a provider by provider basis at the appropriate advisory panel meeting.**

**The Reporting Period is defined as – The period following the last UIP Forum meeting**

Please note the annual report in January of each year will include the full list of findings identified at the Surveillance visits.

It was agreed that this wording be added to the next version GIG2

LT

### **3.3 Revised Kite Mark Letter and Cadent acceptance of GF branch saddle connections**

The revised kitemark letter was discussed at the UIP Forum and a question was raised as to whether Cadent were allowing the use of the GF branch saddle connections, there was tacit agreement that as the fittings have the appropriate approvals and Cadent were party to the ENA letter that there was no reason why this could not be used.

DM had urged caution as a major stumbling block with these fittings was not the kitemark but as there is no stub flange fitted, there are issues with clamping the socket.

During Discussion it was confirmed that Cadent had now approved the fittings for use and that a Briefing Note had gone out which is being Issued. LT asked if a copy could be issued to LRQA for circulation. LK asked if the Briefing Note was a collaborative piece of work, signed off by all the DN's. JF was going to confirm. This was agreed

JF/LT

### 3.4 Specialist Connections - Iris stop

The forum had asked if reinforced bags could be carried out under Iris Stop or does this fall under a CNRB connection.

There was consensus that as IRIS stop is generally uncommon within the new connections' community, it would be beneficial that the Specialist Connections - IRIS stop was replaced with Specialist Connections – Flow stopping to include all invasive flow stopping techniques.

However, during discussion, the different risks associated with the traditional WASK 312 equipment and the ALHD and MP Flow stopping equipment were discussed, and it was agreed that as the original scope was merely related to Iris Stop there was a need to prevent scope creep.

It was therefore agreed that LRQA would update GIG 2 and replace the Term IRIS Stop with Flow stop, but that the Flow stop scope would be defined as Metallic and PE Bag Stop operations >12" Diameter and or >75mbar.

LT

### 3.5 Design Changes Due to Inaccurate Records

The UIP forum has identified that the cross checking in Cadent between Network Control and New Connections is causing site delays.

Cadent are asked to review their internal processes to expedite the issue. Peter O'Neill (PO) agreed to review their internal processes to assist. JF was to prompt PO for a response.

No update provided – Action Remains outstanding

PO

## 4. LRQA Report

### 4.1 Surveillance visit results - 2022

The surveillance visit detailed results are included as an attachment to these minutes. There are 182 active companies listed on the web site, 48 of which are currently at Partial

A detailed report of those companies holding the various scopes was described.

#### 4.1.1 Discussion of Findings raised - 2022

- 70 on site Surveillance visits completed
- 9 Recertification visits
- 8 Partial Assessments and
- 5 Partial to full Assessments have been completed

During the surveillance visits the following deficiencies have been identified:

- 3 Major Deficiencies (4 in 2021)
- 28 Minor Deficiencies (160 in 2021)
- 33 visits with no deficiencies (106 During 2021)

A breakdown of the sections with the highest findings was provided that demonstrated the majority of findings are raised under section 7 of GIG 2 *Work Issue and Control* and Section 6 *Methods of working*. Further interrogation reveals that the majority of the deficiencies in

section 7 related to section 7g *Equipment Calibration and control*, and that the majority of deficiencies identified in section 6 related to 6g *Work being done to specification and as directed by method statements*. Some examples of the issues identified were explained.

As there had been two findings relating to Section 4, Competency, these were also listed.

The major deficiencies identified during so far this year are detailed in the attached report.

The inspection questions with the most failures and the Surveillance Visits with highest percentage of deficiencies per items checked since the last GIRSAP were also reported.

## **5. Review of UIP Forum Minutes 10<sup>th</sup> May 2022**

The minutes had been circulated with the agenda for this meeting. LT informed the meeting that the UIP forum had 43 attendees.

The key areas of discussion were highlighted as follows:

### **5.1 IGEM TD4 Update**

TD4 panel has completed the review and subject to a few grammatical amendments to be finalised in a meeting of the 14th June, the Draft will be issued for industry comment shortly afterwards

### **5.2 IGEM G 5 Update**

IGEM/G5 has been published and Sheila Lauchlan is delivering updates on behalf of IGEM. Sheila explained that the update was a one-day course, split over two mornings, delivered online generally monthly. The next update is being delivered on the 8th and 9th June. Contact IGEM via the web site or direct if you wish to attend.

### **5.3 New Pressure Gauge**

Louise Boccaccini presented a new gauge to the UIP Forum and confirmed that the cost was significantly cheaper than the Druck. However, she did reiterate, supported by Alec Bromiley, that experience is showing the gauge to be very sensitive to temperature change and that care has to be taken to ensure that pipes are sufficiently backfilled or covered to reduce the impact of the sun acting on pipe surfaces.

DO Explained that the sensitivity of the gauges used over the last 30 years was in question as the new Gauges demonstrate that sunlight does affect the internal pressure of the test section and this gauge will drive people to ensure that the main is adequately backfilled along its length and not just have a thin layer of sand. He confirmed that a decent amount of backfill and a good Ground probe resulted in no issues.

### **5.4 Design of Multi Occupancy Buildings**

Sheila Lauchlan had identified a perceived disconnect between the requirements of GIRS that does not require DMOBS when designing gas supply to an MOB if the option adopted was a meter box on the outside of the building and the requirements of IGEM/G/5 which requires an overall risk assessment to be carried out before deciding upon the final design and that the GT Designer will supply a detailed and sufficient risk assessment to the principle designer.

There was no consensus reached during the debate, and the network owners agreed to consider the issue further before bringing their ideas to the next GIRSAP.

All

## **5.5 New EUSR Cards**

### **FOR INFORMATION**

At the UIP Forum, Dave Wilkins informed the meeting that the new Virtual EUSR cards do not appear to hold all the information even though the web site does. Alec Bromiley also confirmed that he had identified an issue that some of his qualifications were missing and, when questioned, EUSR re-established a link that gave him two cards, one for SHEA Gas and one for his SCO.

GH confirmed that EUSR knew they had issues with some operatives having SHEA on their cards but no SCO information. This has resulted with the Network Controller's having a to-and-fro with EUSR to obtain the information they need

## **6. Requirement for Insulation Joints when using cellar entries to manifolds etc**

LT explained Section 9 of G5 requires cellar entries to be fitted with an insulation joint. The Insulation joints currently available are not fire rated and their range is 100° C.

Obviously, Designers avoid below ground entries where possible, however on glass fronted buildings above ground entries are difficult, if not impossible to install and for listed buildings they would be prohibited.

Options such as inserting a TCO immediately up stream of IJ were suggested that would allow the fitting of Insulation Joints. However, if located immediately on the inlet, they may not be located to best protect the manifold. KJ also reminded the meeting that the requirement for insulation joints is to meet GIS/E17-2 2018 which shall retain its leak-tightness under a temperature of 650 °C for a duration of 30 minutes. If an IJ did not meet that specification it should not be installed. It was reiterated that the current suppliers maintain these are not available and therefore, the G5 requirements cannot be achieved.

During discussion it was clarified that as all manifolds have a PIV and consequently are subject to a risk assessment, this could be this be sufficient anecdotally at least, there are many cellar entries installed, without an IJ and no one in the meeting was aware of any issues.

One suggestion was that the Steve Vick Encapsulation Sheet (See Attached data sheet and work procedure) could be a suitable alternative

As the G5 requirement is quite explicit, the Panel members agreed to review the issue and return to the discussion in the next GIRSAP Panel. In the meantime, LRQA would continue raising deficiencies as and when identified.

All

## **7. LRQA Annual Rate increase**

In accordance with clause 7.2.9 of the GIRS MOU it is incumbent on LRQA to seek the GIRSMG acceptance of proposed increases in assessment costs.

The agreed formula that has been in use since 2013 is

$NR = \text{current fee} (0.1 + 0.9(\text{February Current year RPI indices} / \text{February Previous Year RPI indices}))$  Using this formula the annual increase for 2022 is 7.36% or £71.40

For reference, the office of national statistics also stated that The Consumer Prices Index (CPI) 12-month rate was 6.2% in February 2022 03 £60.14

LRQA are requesting 6% for this year which will be an increase of £58.20.

During discussion the increase was agreed and the new rate of £1028.22 was accepted.

## **8. AOB**

CD explained that W&WU had recently run an SCO briefing that was well attended by various Authorising Engineers and that a similar event was being run June 15<sup>th</sup> and W&WU were encouraging people to attend.

W&WU were requested to consider running the SCO briefing as hybrid with an option for attendance via Microsoft Teams. LT also asked if he could have an invite.

## **9. Date of Next Meeting**

LK thanked everyone attending and for participating in a very useful discussion.

The last remaining agreed dates for the 2022 meetings are as follows:

<b>GIRS UIP Forum</b>	<b>13<sup>th</sup> Sept 2022</b>
<b>GIRSAP</b>	<b>27<sup>th</sup> September 2022</b>