

Minutes of the N.C.P. meeting  
13th June 2005 at Stafford County Council Social club.

1. Present: D. Baines, T. Peacock, N. Ball, G.N. Mollard.
2. Apologies for absence: D. Proctor, T. Flanagan, T. Smith.  
D. Baines represented N. Wales and Derbyshire and N. Ball represented C.I.C. panel and the N. of England.
3. The minutes of the meeting held on 14th July 04 were read and approved as a true copy of the proceedings.
4. Matters Arising:
  - 4.1 The new cover for the handbook is now complete and appears to have had a positive response from all who have seen it. Members present felt that it would be a positive move if all Trainers/ Assessors had a copy as there had been so many changes. G.M. to ask Training Committee. It was also suggested that it may be more productive if the new handbook was available on CD ROM - a much cheaper alternative to the book form.
  - 5.1 Porth-y-ogof - G.M. reported that the Training Committee felt the same as the N.C.P. in that the cave should have no riders added to it as to where candidates can go. However South Wales emphasized that if PYO was on a candidates list they should be carefully questioned as to the area to be entered and if the resurgence is present then they should be assessed as to how they would handle it.
6. D. Carlisle is now covered by the B.C.A.'s insurance to carry out mines inspections but not to assess or train. Dave has made arrangements with the centres he has run his courses at to get them to cover him whilst running Training or Assessments. G.M. spoke directly to the heads of the centres involved to smooth the way for this arrangement.

10.5 There has been little advance on the problem of insurance for Trainers/Assessors except that more and more are without insurance. DB has approach D. Judson to establish who the underwriters for the B.C.A. policy are but the information was not forthcoming. What N.C.P. wants is a policy to cover Trainers /Assessors that provides:

1. Professional indemnity.
2. Public Liability.
3. Product liability.

This they require whilst carrying out the work on behalf of the B.C.A.

There is the possibility of reducing costs if this was open to all C.I.C.s and possibly all LCMLAs within their listed caves. Lastly on this issue N.C.P. would like to bring to the attention of Training Committee that we are in real danger of losing a wealth of experienced people from the Trainer/Assessor list if we do not address this problem quickly, which could eventually make both C.I.C. and LCMLA unworkable

10.5 One other point that was raised was that whilst a candidate was under an assessment he/she was the ultimate responsibility of that Trainer/Assessor. If you allowed a candidate to use their own technical equipment that you have no history of and there is a failure who is liable? Most felt it was the Assessor, therefore it may be prudent to only use technical equipment that you supply.

One other query was that we see candidates in one cave in one set of conditions with a group and although we can question them deeply about all the caves on their list, should we automatically have a form of words that states that they met the required standard in this cave on that particular day in these conditions.

That concluded matters arising.

## 5. Handbook Issues.

5.1 In the case where a candidate has taken module one or three and passed but then goes on to take module two or four and fails they should be given a maximum of twelve months to retake this module.

5.2 Under Eighteens. N.C.P. agreed to allow a Level one training course that had an under eighteen candidate on it to stand. However under no circumstances should candidates be assessed under the age of eighteen. N.C.P. agreed that there may well be candidates that are ready for training under eighteen but that every case must be referred to the Training Officer prior to the course and only Trainer/Assessors registered with ALA would be allowed to carry out such training.

5.3 Symonds Vat caves continue to be covered by both the Forest of Dean panel and South Wales.

5.4 A candidate has done a three year revalidation but failed to do a six year LDR on time. N.C.P. agreed that this candidate would be allowed twelve months maximum in which to carry out the LDR and the revalidation would run from the date the six years was originally due.

5.5 A candidate does a LDR more than twelve months before a standard three year revalidation is due. N.C.P. feels that the next revalidation should be a standard revalidation and should be no more than four years from the date of the workshop.

5.6 A candidate does an LDR. Less than twelve months before a standard revalidation is due. The N.C.P. feels that the next revalidation should be a standard revalidation and be dated from the date the standard revalidation was due.

5.7 LDR was done more than twelve months before a six year LDR was due. N.C.P. feels that a standard three year revalidation will be due no more than four years from the date of the workshop.

5.8 LDR done less than twelve months before a six year LDR is due. N.C.P. feels that a standard revalidation is due three years from the date that the six year revalidation was due.

5.9 Only twelve months leeway will be allowed for overdue six year revalidations if done within this period then the date of the award will be the date the original LDR was due, following this re-assessment will be required.

## 6. Military Qualifications.

We have had several applications recently for exemption from training and or assessment module by military personnel holding military qualifications. This

matter was looked at several years ago by N. Ball with the intention of seeing if we could ratify military qualifications as being on par with LCMLA's and C.I.C.s, but he was unable to do this.

Military qualifications have developed a great deal over the past ten years and it would appear that it is time this matter was put to rest once and for all. N.C.P. felt that they would be happy for G.M. to look at Military Level One training and assessment to assess whether we can award level one LCMLA to military personnel who have achieved the military award. Until GM is able to do this, Idris and G.M. have given exemption from training at Level One and Two and Assessment Modules One, Three and Five but not Modules Two or Four.

#### 7. Risk Assessments.

There appears to be several views as to whether risk assessments should play a part in the LCLMA scheme. N.C.P. felt that in the main we are dealing with candidates who have minimal experience particularly at Level One and a reasonable number of the candidates do not work for large organizations so consequently they have no Managers looking after that side of the equation. N.C.P. felt that as the national provider of training and assessment in the skills necessary to lead novice caves then we were honour bound to provide some guidance in this area. All present felt risk assessments were a state of mind and that professional cavers do this as a norm but we are not dealing with highly experienced people. N.C.P. did not feel that it needed to be overly prescriptive but that at the least we should be presenting at least several alternatives for recording information with some advice on generic assessments. All present believe that such an exercise helps greatly to focus candidate's minds. It was agreed that ALOs would bring examples to the next meeting with a view to making final recommendations to Training Committee. It was interesting to note that Derbyshire, South Wales and North Wales already incorporate some work on risk assessments at training and assessment.

#### 8. LCLMA-CIC.

It has become apparent that some CIC. Training courses are having to spend an unreasonable amount of time dealing with Level Two skills and this appears to be due to the fact that all candidates require to attend a CIC. Training is to have attended a Level Two training course. This obviously does not ensure they are competent in these skills which they should be, to enter the CIC Scheme. N.B. has made the suggestion that the minimum requirements to enter CIC. should be a level two award. N.C.P. concurs with this view completely.

#### 9. Matters from Panels

Derbyshire raised the issue as to whether they could just have trainers on their panel. G.M. believed they could but it would be necessary for them to meet the same criteria as a full Trainer/Assessor. Derbyshire felt that this was too much but G.M. pointed out that good training was as important as good assessment and that any trainer had to be fully conversant with the full requirements of assessment. G.M. asked why the panel was not considering this candidate as a full Trainer/Assessor and D.B. replied that Derbyshire felt they were full of assessors at present.

There was some general discussion about panel sizes and the point was reiterated that it was not beneficial that some Trainer/Assessors may possibly only do one or sometimes no assessments in a twelve month period. Another point brought up

was the position of some L.E.A. Centres offering cheap training courses thus taking work from the private sector.

Some general discussion took place about daily rates and what was reasonable.

D.B. raised the problem of a mines transfer from one area to another and the problems this presented via the different types of mine. He worried that this was possibly only a paper exercise at times and that mines leaders could be let loose in mines they were totally untrained for. N.C.P. felt that this was the responsibility of the assessor who was looking at the area transfer to ensure that the mines leader met the criteria to operate in that area. It could be beneficial for mining areas to look at this problem in their workshops.

N.B. raised the problem of newly qualified CICs asking for panel membership within months of passing their CICs.

10. Date and time of the next meetings.

12th October 05	Wednesday
8th February 06	Monday
9th June 06	Friday

11. The meeting closed at 2.20pm.