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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
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