



# Report from Breakout Session II Accreditation & Verification

**Annette Prendergast, EPA, IE**

**7<sup>th</sup> EU ETS Compliance Conference  
Brussels, 8 November 2016**

# Main discussion points

- *Diverging opinions on the role of the CA in approval of waive of site visit.*
  - *In favour of removing requirement: it is not the role of CA to assess the risk analysis, administrative burden.*
  - *Against: consequences if a site visit is waived in error, CA has compliance knowledge and can check justification of waive of site visit, administrative burden shifts to later in the year.*
- *Main difference between non-conformities/non-compliances is the improvement report requirement for non-conformities. Distinct roles of CA and Verifier should be clear, no duplication of the CA task. Follow-up of issues to be treated in similar manner.*
- *Information exchange. The level of information received from the NAB following complaints and other issues can be insufficient. There are confidentiality issues.*

# Main Discussion Points

- *Site visit integral part of Verification. Waiver only considered in exceptional circumstances based on verifier's risk analysis. Visit to HQ constitutes site for AO. Can a visit to head office for AO be telephone, email, video contact and log into system in Verifier Office be considered site?*
- *It may be a good suggestion to elevate criteria for waiving site visits from guidance to AVR; but the flexibility to change criteria if necessary is removed in that case*
- *Scope 98 (allocation related) accreditation not required in some MS as there is no legal basis, or the specifics of CIMS are different from AVR and MRR. Some MS implement Art. 12 (3) MRR: additional data on activity level requested by some MS*

# Conclusions

- *Continue to discuss the treatment of non compliances and other issues in the task force.*
- *Information exchange is an ongoing issue for the Taskforce and EA to work on.*
- *Majority of CA in discussion group require accreditation to scope 98. There are issues with quality of verification reports in some MS due to lack of Verifier knowledge, mistakes.*

# Recommendations – Next Steps

- *Suggestion could be to include a definition for non-compliance in the AVR.*
- *Do we need to redefine site for AO? Overall feeling clarification of site definition required in guidance document. Await feedback from TF aviation.*
- *Scope 98 accreditation requires further guidance and updates to the legislation. Extend scope of AVR has been suggested by some MS. A Verification report template should be developed for allocation data.*
- *Issues raised can be added to the TF AVR Work plan for 2017.*