

Archived: 21 November 2024 17:38:11

From: [Sean Halligan](#)

Sent: Tue, 8 Oct 2024 11:44:03 +0000Authentication

To: [REDACTED] [Denise Blundell](#)

Subject: RE: Formal Complaint Regarding Conflicts of Interest and Oversight Failures Comp-156-24 - Connor Chapple

Sensitivity: Normal

Attachments:

[RE_ Subject_ Request for Clarification on Evidence Reviewed.msg](#)

Hello Denise.

I note that Mr Chapple's email to us, follows on from my 13th September email to him, and not after the last email I sent him on 17th September where I signposted him to the HSE complaints and "unreasonable behaviour" guidelines. My 17th Sept email makes it clear we now see his behaviour as unreasonable and points him to the guidance examples i.e "repeated contact on same/similar issues" and mentions potential actions we can take in response e.g. "stop all future communication with you on a defined issue".

Two things from me on this:

1. Re the formal complaint:

If its about how he's been dealt with by BSR correspondence I don't think I can actually be involved in processing this formal complaint, as I've had past dealings (but happy to discuss on phone or email if my input is needed). I think complaints guidance suggests a line manager needs to be involved.

2. Re the correspondence itself/allegations and how to respond:

I don't think there's anything new in there, except the allegation about Sandra Ashcroft and the UKAS member of ICC. To that my response would be "these people you have named have played zero part in processing the complaints/correspondence you have made to BSR – so there is nothing to investigate". Regarding the rest, it is exactly the same stuff he keeps persisting about, and BSR (via Mussa meeting with UKAS colleagues) have already investigated the issues he has raised and we have logged Mussa's advice and the UKAS information provided.

This page explains how to deal with "unreasonable behaviour" - [How to deal with individuals demonstrating unreasonable behaviour \(sharepoint.com\)](#) and there is a word document "warning response template" we could now send out however my 17th September acts as the warning letter I believe – [REDACTED] was aware we were going to go this route when required so in effect has previously cleared us to warn him. That email points out behaviours he's exhibited i.e "*repeated contact on same/similar issues*" and mentions potential actions we can take in response e.g. "*stop all future communication with you on a defined issue*".

I personally think he's been warned, and we should now apply to a divisional manager [REDACTED] to seek approval to restrict their further contact with HSE (ie. By allowing us to file his further correspondence without a response). I would suggest doing this after providing a formal complaint response or at the same time – probably need to discuss this with [REDACTED]/CEPS team!

I've copied guidance from the above page:

\cbpat3Who makes this decision to send a warning letter?

\cbpat3If the person dealing with the individual is not a divisional manager, they must seek the approval of such a manager before they restrict someone's contact with HSE.

KR,

Sean

Sean Halligan | Chief Inspector of Buildings Office Team - BSR Secretariat & Correspondence Leader |

Health and Safety Executive (HSE) | Building Safety and Construction Division (BSCD)



From: BSRCorrespondence <BSRCorrespondence@hse.gov.uk>

Sent: Tuesday, October 8, 2024 11:20 AM

To: Sean Halligan <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Formal Complaint Regarding Conflicts of Interest and Oversight Failures Comp-156-24 - Connor Chapple

Importance: High

Hi Sean,

Please can you have a look at this complaint from Connor Chapple and see how we should respond in view of the previous emails we have sent him.

As I said as he is now naming individual HSE staff in his complaint I don't know if we need to do a full review of the points he has raised or if we can bat this off as unreasonable behaviour?

Could do with your correspondence excellence before you go off.

KR

Denise

Denise Blundell | Chief Inspector of Buildings Office Team – Divisional Support Team Leader

Health and Safety Executive (HSE) | Building Safety and Construction Division (BSCD)



From: HSE Complaints <HSEComplaints@hse.gov.uk>

Sent: Monday, October 7, 2024 1:50 PM

To: BSRCorrespondence <BSRCorrespondence@hse.gov.uk>

Cc: HSE Complaints <HSEComplaints@hse.gov.uk>

Subject: FW: Formal Complaint Regarding Conflicts of Interest and Oversight Failures Comp-156-24

Hi Denise,

I've logged this one as Comp-156-24 and will send Mr Chapple an acknowledgement shortly.

The Tier 1 response will be due on **28th October**.

As always, guidance and letter templates can be found at <https://hse.gov.sharepoint.com/sites/complaints/SitePages/Handling-complaints-about-HSE.aspx>

Please also CC the complaints account on the response, when sent.

If the complaint should be partially or fully upheld, please send me a completed "lessons learned" proforma, which can also be found at the above link.

Thank you,

Sarah

[REDACTED] | Complaints Officer

Health and Safety Executive | Chief Executive, Parliamentary and Secretariat Office

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



From: BSRCorrespondence <BSRCorrespondence@hse.gov.uk>

Sent: Monday, October 7, 2024 10:54 AM

To: HSE Complaints <HSEComplaints@hse.gov.uk>

Subject: FW: Formal Complaint Regarding Conflicts of Interest and Oversight Failures

Hi [REDACTED],

The email below came into BSR correspondence mailbox on Saturday.

Please can you review and log as a formal complaint and send acknowledgement to correspondent.

KR

Denise

Denise Blundell | Chief Inspector of Buildings Office Team – Divisonal Support Team Leader

Health and Safety Executive (HSE) | Building Safety and Construction Division (BSCD)

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Spark Electrical Services <sparkelectrical.sw@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 5, 2024 1:40 PM
To: BSRCorrespondence <BSRCorrespondence@hse.gov.uk>
Subject: Formal Complaint Regarding Conflicts of Interest and Oversight Failures

Dear Health and Safety Executive (HSE)

I am writing to formally lodge a complaint regarding serious concerns about conflicts of interest and oversight failures involving personnel with ties to both HSE and UKAS, and the broader implications this has had on my case with UKAS and NAPIT. I believe these conflicts have compromised the integrity of decisions made about my case, which revolves around allegations of fraud and systemic failures within these organizations.

Key Points of Concern:

1. Conflicts of Interest: Sandra Ashcroft (HSE), Sarah Veale (UKAS)

As identified, certain key individuals from UKAS and HSE have overlapping professional roles and responsibilities. Notably, one individual with “oversight of the Competence Person Scheme in the Building Safety Regulator (BSR)” is serving on the “BSR’s New Industry Competence Committee (ICC)” with Lorraine Turner from UKAS, raising questions about impartiality. Additionally, a UKAS Non-Executive Board Member also has a history as an HSE employee, which I believe exacerbates these conflicts.

Quoting HSE Code of Conduct:

In accordance with the HSE Code of Conduct, it is stated that

“ 2.2 Conflict of interest

2.2.1 You must not allow a conflict of interest to compromise your objectivity/impartiality.

2.2.2 If you become aware of a conflict of interest, you must manage it in an effective way.”

I strongly believe that these conflicts have led to decisions that are biased or influenced by personal and professional associations, thus breaching the HSE’s own standards of conduct.

2. Oversight Failures:

There appears to be a significant lack of due diligence and independent investigation in handling my concerns. The initial investigation has resulted in conclusions that I feel are inadequate and not supported by proper oversight mechanisms.

3. UKAS and NAPIT’s Fraud Allegations:

I have reason to believe that UKAS and NAPIT have engaged in fraudulent actions, and the failure to properly investigate these claims further undermines the credibility of the regulatory framework that is meant to protect the public and industry standards.

4. Request for Investigation:

Given these overlapping connections and the nature of the concerns, I urge the HSE to conduct an independent review of the handling of this case, focusing on whether conflicts of interest have played a role in the outcomes. I am also seeking clarity regarding the role that HSE personnel have played in this matter and request full transparency in the review process.

I trust that HSE, as a regulator committed to safeguarding public safety and maintaining high professional standards, will take these concerns seriously and initiate a formal investigation. I look forward to your response and any steps that will be taken to address this matter.

Yours sincerely,
Conor Chapple

On 13 Sep 2024, at 17:33, BSRCorrespondence <BSRCorrespondence@hse.gov.uk> wrote:

\u65279?

Dear Mr Chapple.

BSR is satisfied that UKAS have considered the evidence and reached a conclusion regarding the complaint to which your correspondence relates.

BSR consider this matter to be closed and would not encourage you to continue sending us correspondence of slightly varying content, on the same matter repeatedly.

We hope this response is helpful.

Kind regards,

Sean for BSR Correspondence

Sean Halligan | Chief Inspector of Buildings Office Team - BSR Secretariat & Correspondence Leader |

Health and Safety Executive (HSE) | Building Safety and Construction Division (BSCD)

<image001.png>

From: Spark Electrical Services <sparkelectrical.sw@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, September 13, 2024 6:26 AM

To: BSRCorrespondence <BSRCorrespondence@hse.gov.uk>

Subject: Urgent Concern: Failure to Act on Conflicts of Interest Within UKAS

I am writing to express my serious concern regarding the Building Safety Regulator's (BSR) handling of conflicts of interest within UKAS. The BSR was established to prevent regulatory failures that contributed to the Grenfell Tower tragedy, yet the response to these significant issues has been deeply inadequate.

Rather than fulfilling its mandate to ensure proper oversight, the BSR's response has been limited to sending an email to UKAS, with no clear direction for further action. Even more troubling is the fact that the BSR has stated they are "unable to comment further," leaving the issue unresolved and without a clear path forward.

This passive approach contradicts the very purpose for which the BSR was created. As the Grenfell Tower Inquiry

revealed, passive oversight and failure to act decisively led to the disaster. By failing to provide any actionable follow-up or enforce meaningful investigation into the conflicts of interest at UKAS, the BSR risks perpetuating the same kind of inaction that allowed the tragedy to occur.

The public deserves transparency, accountability, and a regulator that takes its responsibilities seriously

Many Thanks

Conor Chapple

Spark Electrical Services

On 12 Sep 2024, at 15:48, Spark Electrical Services <sparkedrical.sw@gmail.com> wrote:

\u65279?Hello Denise.

All my correspondence is posted openly on my platform so prior to this I want to confirm that the BSR accepts a review by the senior manger, Kevin Belson as acceptable. Are you aware the EA oversee UKAS yet he operates for both and the IAF? He can be found in formal ea documents as recent as July 2024, yet carried out the independent review against UKAS?

I will have to take a no response as approval or complicity of this conflict of interest in accreditation.

Conflicts of Interest; Kevin Belson holds multiple influential roles across UKAS, EA, and IAF:

- Previous Chair of the EA Certification Committee.
- Project Manager for EA's Accreditation for Notification (AN) Project. (July, 2024)
- Chair of the Technical Committee within IAF. • UKAS Technical Manager

At the time of the internal review conducted by UKAS, these overlapping roles introduced significant concerns about impartiality. His dual positions allowed undue influence over the review process of Spark Electrical Services' complaint. According to UKAS guidelines and Regulation (EC) No 765/2008, individuals involved in both oversight and accreditation roles must maintain impartiality and avoid conflicts of interest. However, Belson's involvement in the review violates these requirements.

Breach: Regulation (EC) No 765/2008 (

As noted in the regulation, "accreditation bodies must ensure impartiality in their activities, and conflicts of interest must be avoided." Belson's overlapping roles at UKAS, EA, and IAF violate this mandate, as his influence could compromise the independence of the investigation into Spark Electrical Services' complaint.

Breach of EA-1/06 - Multilateral Agreement

The document states that NABs must "report any significant changes in its status and/or operating practices without delay to the EA Secretariat," including changes that affect issues like competence and impartiality. The failure to report Belson's involvement in overlapping roles represents a direct violation of this principle.

Many Thanks

Conor Chapple

Spark Electrical Services

<AFN-PROJECT-2024.pdf>

<ea-1-06-A-AB.pdf>

On 12 Sep 2024, at 10:58, BSRCorrespondence <BSRCorrespondence@hse.gov.uk> wrote:

\u65279?

Dear Mr Chapple,

We acknowledge receipt of the further information you have submitted regarding your enquiry and have now reviewed this. However, BSR's response on this matter remains unchanged and we direct you to our previous responses – i.e. BSR have been in contact with UKAS who confirm that they have investigated this matter in line with their complaint process, including internal review by UKAS senior manager and that UKAS find no evidence that NAPIT have broken the recognised accreditation rules etc.

BSR considers this matter closed from our point of view.

We hope that while this is not the response you hoped for, you can appreciate BSR's position.

Kind regard

Denise

Denise Blundell | Chief Inspector of Buildings Office Team – Divisonal Support Team Leader

<image001.png>