



GAS PROTECTION VERIFICATION ACCREDITATION SCHEME AUDIT REPORT 2023

Introduction

This first audit of the Gas Protection Verification Accreditation Scheme (GPVS) was carried out between September and November 2023. As intended, it was confined to the process whereby an accredited “Specialist” under the GPVS known as SGPV implements the requirements of the GPVS, i.e. provides the documentary evidence specifically relating to that process. It did not look at any other aspects of projects or sites.

As stated in the GPVS audit plan

<https://www.claire.co.uk/component/phocadownload/category/70-gvps-guides?download=957:gpvs-audit-plan-2023>):

- a maximum of 5% (rounding up to the closest whole number) of the total number of declarations submitted in the previous two years would be selected for audit
- At least one declaration per SGPV would be selected
- Declarations will initially be selected randomly and declarations then added or deleted from the audit list, in order to meet the stated criteria with any subsequent selection likewise being carried out randomly.

Nine declarations were audited.

CL:AIRE undertook the audits and communicated with the SGPVs directly, requesting the relevant information in line with the audit plan. This included a copy of the signed declaration, a copy of the verification method statement/plan and a or the validation report linked to the declaration.

Apart from the auditor and the audit co-ordinator, the identity of the SGPV and the project/site which relates to each one of the audit results sheets remains confidential. All nine SGPVs selected are currently active.

The declarations to be audited were selected on a random basis from the total number of declarations submitted in the two years prior to the audit. As some SGPVs have submitted considerably more declarations than others, this inevitably resulted in those who had submitted the greater number of declarations being more likely to be chosen for audit. However, as this was the first year of audit, 5% of declarations equated to nine declarations and to fulfil the auditing criteria, , one declaration was chosen from each SGPV to ensure those SGPVs that have submitted more declarations were not disproportionately impacted. Therefore all SGPVs that had submitted declarations under the GPVS were audited.

When requested for the information, all SGPVs corresponded within the required time frame, however one requested additional time to obtain the detailed verification plan linked to the verification report and one sought clarification from CL:AIRE about the auditing process. One SGPV stated that some information (names/company details and contact numbers) are included within their company reports and therefore requested that this information was

redacted before being sent to CL:AIRE.

In general, there were no real difficulties in obtaining the required information and the SGPVs responded well.

Ahead of the audit, all SGPVs were made aware of the auditing procedures and template that CL:AIRE had prepared and would use to audit against for each audited declaration and supporting documentation.

Results

Out of the nine SGPV declarations and supporting information audited against the audit checklist, three SGPVs were fully conforming, four were conforming – improvement possible, one non-conforming – minor and one non-conforming – major, see Table 1.

There was a very wide spectrum of projects audited from simple one visit projects to multiple verification visits due to a complex membrane installation system.

Table 1: Summary of audit result grading

Number Graded in Category	Grading	Descriptor
3	Conforming - Good	Document accords well with GPVS guidance and meets the requirements
4	Conforming - Improvement possible	Document is acceptable but there are some areas that could have been completed better
1	Non-conforming - minor	Document is not sufficiently GPVS compliant
1	Non-conforming - major	Document is not close to being GPVS compliant

Observations on the declaration

- On a number of occasions the declaration questions in the drop-down menu had not been completed in sufficient detail with some SGPVs only putting a tick against the questions or had even been left blank. The purpose of the declaration is for the SGPV to demonstrate that they have checked the report in detail to ensure that they are satisfied that the verification report complies with industry standards and contains the level of detail required. **SGPVs are required to provide justification against each statement on the declaration.**

Observations on the reports submitted

- The verification reports did not always clearly state that the remedial objectives had been achieved and supported by a lines of evidence approach.
- The verification plan did not always provide details of what the inspection strategy would include. Just stating it would be in line with industry guidance is not sufficient.
- On occasion the verification plan requirements had been mixed up with the verification reporting requirements. SGPVs should use the checklist in the auditing report as an aide memoire of what should be included in the two documents.
- Details about the competency of the installer was often missing even if the verification plan states it is required. It is not sufficient to just say yes they are competent or experienced. It is acknowledged that personal details of the installer or certificates should not be included due to GDPR, but all NVQs are listed on CSCS

online card checker <https://cardcheck.gosmart.co.uk>, the surname and card number is the information required to check. The unique identifying number can then be replicated within the verification report. For those situations that an NVQ qualified installer is not present, additional justification should be provided to demonstrate their competency in installing.

- Greater details should be provided within the verification plan about the manufacturers product specification that is required to be installed. On occasions this was missing. Details of what is actually installed should be provided within the verification report and if there is deviation from what was specified in the verification plan, justification for the deviation should be provided in the verification report. If there is deviation of what was specified, a statement about the compatibility should be provided from the designer. Where materials are potentially mixed, again justification that this is acceptable should be provided.
- Declarations must always be included in the verification report either in the front of the report or as an appendix.
- Verification reports must be signed off by the SGPV stating their name clearly, signature and SGPV number to be compliant with the GPVS. It is the responsibility of the SGPV to review the information within the verification report, complete the declaration fully and then append with the report. It is acknowledged in bigger companies site visits may be carried out by others within the company, but the verification report must bring the site visit reports together and prepare a report in line with guidance providing suitable concluding remarks and signing appropriately to be compliant with GPVS.
- The declaration must be signed and dated in a timely manner. It is acknowledged that there can be delays in printing the declaration off, but the auto date (created when declarations are printed) should not be after the date of the declaration.

Recommendations

1. Questions on the drop-down menu on the declaration to be made mandatory for completion. SQPs will be reminded to complete the questions as fully as possible.
2. SGPVs to be encouraged to use the auditing checklist and keep on file with their reports in case of an audit to demonstrate they have reviewed all the information fully and that the report is compliant.