

# [ CT3 – Training ]



Warsaw, 10-11 December 2007 | Lyon, 19-20 May 2008 | Prague, 1-2 December 2008 |

Berlin, 15-16 June 2009 | Amsterdam, 21-22 January 2010

## Summary

Key discussions took place on a wide range of topics, including

- Training specifications and requirements of experts,
- Training delivery,
- Quality assurance of certificates and of experts,
- categories of experts,
- Mutuality & recognition of experts across Member States (MS),
- Codes of conduct, Complaints & disciplinary procedures
- and Qualifying examinations for experts.

Discussions on Training have interfaced with other core themes, such as Inspections - for Harmonised profile for boiler/AC inspections, and with Certification, to discuss quality assurance and management of central registers of certificates and experts.



Concerted

Action II ◀

## [ CT3 – Training ]

### Lessons learned

The lessons learnt, during the period December 2007 until January 2010, can be summarised as follows.

- Most MS differentiate between boiler inspections, AC inspections, and certification of buildings. There is however less differentiation than anticipated.
- The role of experts and inspectors under the EPBD should be seen as a “top up” to the qualifications of existing professionals rather than the creation of a new profession.
- The structural approach in MS to training delivery and qualifying of experts and inspectors defines the scope of interaction between the Services directive (2006/123/EC), the Recognitions directive (2005/36/EC) and the EPBD recast proposal. MS need to be aware of the requirements of these directives as this has direct impact on the legislative basis for mutual recognition of experts from other MS.
- Specifications and training requirements for experts and inspectors are highly diverse across MS, even regionally within some MS. Requirements range from stringent (engineering degree + 5 years experience) to self-assessment. Standardisation is challenged by the variety of delivery mechanisms and qualification routes. A high entry level is not an automatic guarantee of high quality certification.

### Important recommendations

Important recommendations are already detected:

- Market-based solutions to training resulted in a wide variance in the quality of the training offered by commercial training providers. Effective methods of carrying out quality assurance of training providers need to be established.
- Effective acquisition and management of the data (registers of experts/inspectors, certificates, training providers) generated by implementation is a current challenge facing many MS. Cost-effective / self-financing models must be presented to MS, in order to encourage development of administrative/ ICT infrastructure sufficient to facilitate the quality assurance and other requirements of the recast EPBD.
- Despite the challenges to standardisation, there is clear potential for groups of MS (linked regionally / linguistically / common methodology) to engage in mutual recognition of experts & inspectors, and it is strongly recommended that work towards formalising the mutual recognition process is begun.
- Examination as an entry condition is an effective mechanism towards enabling standardisation, and can offer significant opportunity within such a project to advance the harmonisation agenda.
- It is important to have clear complaints procedures, adjudicated independently, with provision for sanctions. Although sanctions are in place in most MS, penalties are not yet being used against experts. Problem areas are usually identified as a result of quality assurance procedures, and most (~70%) errors are relatively minor.

For more detailed information, see the [extended summary](#) report on this topic (soon to be available)