

## **Note to IGEM Technical Co-ordination Committee**

### **From the Chairmen of IGEM/G/1 & IGEM/G/5**

#### **Excess Flow Valves &/or Thermal Cut Off Devices & End of The Network in Multi-occupancy Buildings**

##### **Introduction**

From the time of the first edition of IGEM/G/5 published in 2006 it was recognised that under certain circumstances a design risk assessment would identify the need for either or both an excess flow valve (EFV) and a thermal cut off valve (TCO) to be fitted as near as practicable to the point of delivery of gas into the dwelling.

Traditionally, the TCO was fitted immediately up-stream the ECV and the EFV was fitted immediately downstream of the ECV. In more recent times, a combined EFV/TCO has become available and this can be fitted immediately downstream of the ECV.

It has always been acknowledged that the pressure drop of such fittings should be taken into account in the design of the gas supply to the appliance.

Maintenance or replacement of such fittings requires the operation of a valve located up-stream of them.

##### **Letter from MAMCoP Board & Association of Meter Operators to IGEM**

On 1<sup>st</sup> June 2020 a letter was sent to IGEM on SPAA headed notepaper. The text of that letter was as follows:

I am writing to make you aware of a discussion recently had within the Association of Meter Operators Gas Forum and at the MAMCoP management board. With the agreement of those groups I agreed to set out for consideration by the relevant IGEM technical committees a joint AMO/MAMCoP position statement drafted on behalf of meter operators and installers.

In recent months a number of meter installers have come across situations where an excess flow valve or thermal cut-off valve has been fitted downstream of the service emergency cut-off valve and located within the apparatus normally designated as the meter installation. The protection devices have been fitted in that position by a party other than the meter operator. This gives rise to a number of concerns for meter installers and operators including potential conflict with standards such as BS6400 and great ambiguity over ownership and responsibilities for maintenance and management of the device.

I have brought this question to the attention of various parties including representatives of the gas transporters but discussions have not led to any clear resolution. We believe that clarity might be added as a part of reviews of IGEM standards. The view of meter operators is that protection devices such as excess flow valves should be positioned as a network device upstream of the ECV. If this positioning is not possible the device should be considered as a part of the ECV and/or the end of the network should be clearly redesignated. This possibility should be recognised in the definitions set out in IGEM/G/1. It may also be opportune to consider the positioning and clarity of responsibility for management of these devices as a part of review of IGEM/G/5

I would be grateful if you could forward this letter on the relevant chairmen of IGEM's technical committees;

Vic Tuffen (GMC), Rod Hancox (G5) and Jez Obbard (G1). Dave Wright or I would be happy to provide further information if that will assist.

Yours sincerely,

Eric Fowler, CEng MIGEM  
Chairman, Meter Asset Managers Code of Practice

Dave Wright  
Chairman, Association of Meter Operators

## **Deliberations by IGEM/G/1 & IGEM/G/5 Panels**

Both the G/1 and G5 panels have considered the letter and the underlying issues. Both panels are aware that for both new developments and gas infrastructure replacement projects the Meter Asset Managers (MAM) are most unlikely to be involved in the design risk assessments process which would identify whether EFVs and/or TCOs were required.

In the new development scenario the MAM will not appear on the scene until after a gas supply contract has been signed whilst in the gas infrastructure replacement scenario, there could be numerous gas suppliers and hence MAMs involved against a backdrop of the GT having to get gas supplies restored as soon as practicable.

The panels have decided that the following paragraphs or similar should be included in the updated versions of IGEM/G/1 and IGEM/G/5.

*Where following the design risk assessment a GT provides a thermal cut off valve and/or an excess flow valve located immediately on the outlet of the ECV, it shall be either*

- a) an integral part of the ECV, or*
- b) a separate fitting connected directly to the outlet of the ECV with the joint protected with an anti-tamper type seal indicating the GT's ownership of the fitting.*

*In either case, it shall be the GT's responsibility to*

- a) account for the expected pressure drop of the fitting in the design of the network pipeline, and*
- b) inspect/maintain/replace the fitting as required.*

*In either case, the outlet of the fitting shall be designated as being part of the ECV and hence the end of the Network.*

TCC is asked to endorse this approach