CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM

Consultation on MCS 025: Competency Standard and Competency Framework

Thank you for taking the time to comment on this consultation. MCS values the input from all interested parties in the development of its Standards as, without you, we would not be able to define and raise the quality of installations. We would be grateful if you could use this form for your response which helps with collation and consideration of responses. The form is in two parts: the first part includes a table where you can make comments on each page/clause of the draft document; the second part includes specific questions that will help arrive at a final published version.

|  |
| --- |
| Introduction:  This consultation is to seek feedback on a rewrite of MCS 025 and the competency requirements associated with achieving and maintaining MCS certification.  The Standard update is part of the MCS Standards project review and addresses:   * A modernised document style and update to new MCS standard text * Introduction of a framework to accommodate the competency criteria applicable to a technology * Reduction to the previous range of ‘Company Roles’ referred to in the existing version of the Standard * Strengthening of the requirements around Nominated Technical Persons (NTP) * Introduction of the requirement for individual reassessment after 5 years, with the intention of maintaining the sector’s competency as technology and working practices change. * Removal of references made in the existing Standards to a ‘Competency Checker Tool’ * Retirement of the ‘Experienced Worker Route’ |

| Respondent Name: | Company Name: |  |  | Date | Document |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Page / Clause Number | Comments | Proposed new text |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Note: You may add as many additional rows as required to table above.

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Comments: |

**Consultation Questions**

In addition to commenting on the content of the draft document detailed above, we have these more general questions:

QUESTION 1: Do you agree with the proposal for reassessment of a Nominated Technical Person’s competency every 5 years? If you disagree, please explain why.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

QUESTION 2: Do you agree with the proposal for a MCS Contractor (certified business) needing to identify one or more Nominated Technical Person (NTP) depending upon the volume and complexity of their activity? If you disagree, please explain why.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

QUESTION 3: MCS proposes to remove the ‘Experienced Worker Route’ as an option for assessing individual competency. Do you agree with this proposal and if so, why? If not, what are the advantages offered by an 'Experienced Worker Route'?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

QUESTION 4: What should MCS consider when approving new training provision that has been assessed as meeting the Scheme’s competency requirements?

|  |
| --- |
|  |