



Main take-aways from the September AV Training Event

Outcome AV Training Event

Machtelt Oudenes
SQ Consult BV

Compliance Conference
24 November 2020

Set-up AV Training event

- Two rounds of online sessions on 16-18 September and 25 September 2020
 - Round I: Small discussion groups discussing a case study
 - Round II: Plenary session on key conclusions from Round I and implementation issues
- Discussions on AV training event centered around:
 - Impact complexity of the installation on scope and depth of verification
 - Time allocation
 - The type of checks to perform on specific M&R issues and controls/procedures
 - Sampling and data verification
 - Verification of annual activity level data
 - Impartiality, verification reporting, impact of COVID-19 on verification

Main conclusions on training format

- A balanced mix of CAs, NABs and verifiers within discussion groups allow for an exchange from different perspectives
- Overall online discussions went well and allowed for more participants to be trained
- Feedback received from participants:
 - Case study is a good way to instruct participants
 - Good way to inform all parties of new implementation rules and reoccurring issues
 - Useful for both new and experienced persons but new persons could hold back experienced participants
 - Split in sessions could be considered: sessions that are relevant to all parties and sessions where more in-depth training is provided to verifiers only

Main conclusions on training (1)

- Overall participants had a good understanding of how risks impact the focus and depth of verification → additional guidance is not needed
- Verifier's sampling is not always straightforward
 - An update of KGN II.4 on sampling is needed to clarify concepts
 - Verifiers do not tend to use statistical sampling
 - Training more suitable instrument to explain the different sampling methods in specific cases
- Further guidance on time allocation is needed to ensure more consistency
 - Possible update of the man-day tool according to phase 4 rules
 - Additional guidance on time allocation for annual activity level data
 - Clarification that time allocation is dependent on factors

Main conclusions on training (2)

- How verifiers deal with sector specific issues and MR specific elements remains challenging and could benefit from more training
 - Evidence non-accredited labs, CEMS, biomass, operator's sampling, uncertainty assessment,
- Sector specific case studies are the best instrument to explain the concepts of auditing, sampling, verification checks and application of materiality
- Verification of annual activity level data is a new topic → further guidance and training would be welcome
- The quality of internal verification documentation of a verifier has improved over the years. Further guidance is not needed
- Importance of starting early in verification, in particular this year with AER and annual activity level data verification

Main conclusions on training (3)

- Importance to have clarity on how to deal with the impact of COVID-19 on verification
 - Led to changes in AVR and update of KGN II.5 on virtual site visits
- Exemplars or training likely the best method to improve consistency in verification reporting
- Further guidance may be needed on how to deal with specific impartiality issues

Training handbook

- Training documentation will contain the entire case study including the model answers and explanations
- Training handbook expected to be finished soon
- Handbook will be sent to all participants and published on the Commission's Website: https://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/ets/monitoring_en#tab-0-1
- Training handbook can be cascaded further in the organisation

Thank you for your attention



© European Union 2020

Unless otherwise noted the reuse of this presentation is authorised under the [CC BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license. For any use or reproduction of elements that are not owned by the EU, permission may need to be sought directly from the respective right holders.

