CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM

MCS 017 The Bespoke Building Integrated PV Standard

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 the feedback. The form is in two parts: the first part includes a table where you can make comments on each line/paragraph 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 our updated MCS 017, Issue 2.0, Product Standard.  The standard has been partially re-written to improve the overall structure, simplify the language, clarify unclear sentences, and incorporate a new document style and layout. Every effort has been made to ensure consistency between this standard and the solar PV standard, MCS 005. New test conditions have been introduced to account for bifacial modules and clarification has been provided on whether modules with module level power electronics, such as micro inverters, can still be approved under this standard. |

| Respondent Name: | Company Name: |  |  | Date | Document |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  | MCS 017 The Bespoke Building Integrated PV Standard |

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

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

**Consultation Questions**

1. Clause 5.1.2.8 addresses the conditions for connectors in product families. Currently the standard allows a manufacturer to vary the DC connectors without retesting/recertification, which could be seen as introducing an arc risk if different DC connectors are used in the same batch or product family. Do you think manufacturers should be able to vary the connectors on their BBIPV modules? If no, why not? If yes, how might this be worded to avoid giving the impression that the mating of different connectors, either by the manufacturer or the installation contractor, is condoned? Please state your reasoning in the box below.
   1. Yes
   2. No

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. The introduction of Bifacial Name Plate Irradiance (BNPI) test conditions (defined within the standard) for bifacial modules has raised the question over whether product testing should take place at only BNPI conditions or at both BNPI and STC test conditions. This will affect the requirements under both ‘Product Families’ (clause 5.1) and ‘Product Marking and Data’ (clause 5.8) and the text of clauses 5.1.2 and 5.8.2. Which of these approaches do you agree with?
   1. BNPI conditions only (please explain why)
   2. BNPI and STC conditions (please explain why)

|  |
| --- |
|  |