

**AdvanceETV**



**1<sup>st</sup> Stakeholders Workshop**  
**Providing the European basis for**  
**mutual recognition of Environmental**  
**Technology Verification schemes**  
**Brussels, 22 September 2009**

### What is ETV?

Convincing purchasers about the advantages of an environmental technology becomes a frequent challenge for technology vendors. This refers in particular to eco-innovative solutions about which the knowledge is scattered and proven successful implementation cases are not available. In consequence the visibility of these technologies on the market is hindered by lack of confidence with regard to the environmental performance of these technologies. Therefore the European Union is preparing a dedicated mechanism: **environmental technology verification (ETV)** system with the aim of enhancing diffusion of new environmental technologies into the (global) market to support achieving the technology boosting and environmental improvement objectives of the Environmental Technology Action Plan (ETAP).

The ETV system in Europe would be analogous to the ETV mechanisms existing in the US, Canada and Asia. The common feature of these systems is to *“to accelerate market acceptance of innovative technologies by providing users with information about performance, thereby substantially reducing the uncertainty for purchasers. Vendor-generated data have been viewed with scepticism and, consequently, high performing innovative technologies that have the potential to protect the environment have faced substantial market barriers. It has therefore been considered necessary to establish a market based verification process in cooperation with the private sector in order to overcome those market barriers and assure that data could be accessible, understandable, and credible.”* (JRC-IPTS, 2007).

For the purposes of establishing the ETV scheme, the following definition of verification has been used *“an independent quantitative assessment of the performance of an environmental technology, based on performance claims or pre-determined protocols.”* Certification, on the other hand, *“aims at guaranteeing that a technology meets technical standards or regulatory requirements permanently. Verification is most useful in areas where standards do not exist, in which case it may act as a standard precursor for specific products, tools or instruments, or in areas where standards are normally not applied. ETV does not constitute assessment, acceptance of technologies in terms of compliance with (existing) standards/guidance or environmental requirements or a system to compare technologies and judge them.”*

The upcoming European ETV framework is based on the outcomes of a series of projects preparing sectoral work methods carried out under EU Research Programmes, the LIFE programme, studies carried out by JRC IPTS and on experiences gathered from the US, Canadian and several Asian systems. Initiatives related to ETV or similar approaches in several Member States contribute also to the preparation of a EU scheme on ETV.

For more information on the ETV related activities please consult the web page:

<http://www.eu-etv-strategy.eu>

### Why is the mutual recognition of the existing ETV schemes so important?

**The ultimate goal of the mutual recognition is reached** when the different international ETV schemes recognize verifications done by other schemes without further assessment or procedures. To achieve this goal, verifications done jointly by verification bodies from two different schemes (**co-verifications**) and verifications done by a body from one scheme and surveyed by a body from another scheme (**joint verifications**) are regarded as useful tools in building mutual trust and common understanding.

The stakeholder consultations carried out both by the European Commission and by other ETV related activities revealed that the recognition of a European ETV system beyond the continent is a key issue for many vendors and technology developers and would increase the expected benefits significantly. Similar considerations known from the other ETV-systems in place have already initiated discussions between the members of the international ETV community and resulted in the establishment of the International Working Group on ETV (IWG-ETV) by the U.S., Canada, EU, and now also joined by the Philippines.

The mutual recognition of ETV schemes does not relate only to the verification outputs, i.e. to the reports or statements issued by the ETV schemes, but also to the actors participating in the verification process and to the value for the market of the different approaches.

In this context the objective of AdvanceETV is to support the elaboration of the European basis for mutual recognition of the ETV schemes. However, this basis cannot be established without an active participation of all stakeholders.

### What do we want to accomplish during the 1st stakeholders workshop?

This event is a unique opportunity to **identify and discuss** with the stakeholders **the needs and expectations concerning the European basis for ETV** which will: comply with the international standards, and support international actions to reach joint positions enabling mutual recognition of the different ETV systems.

The intention of the organisers is to get maximum feedback from the participating stakeholders on the issues mentioned in the Programme. Therefore the meeting will be organised in an interactive form using some practical examples, real documents e.g. protocols, verification statements etc, originating from the US and Canadian ETV systems as well as outputs of the ETV -related projects to facilitate the discussions. Session 1 includes a series of presentations to build a common background for the discussions in Sessions 2, 3 and 4. These Sessions will be conducted in a form of moderated group discussions with the objective to work out comments and recommendations by each group. Then, the outcomes will be jointly presented and discussed in the final Session 5.

### Who should attend?

The workshop is addressed to a broad spectrum of stakeholders: technology vendors, users, purchasers as well as potential actors of the verification process: standardization bodies, testing laboratories, research centres, branch associations, governmental administration, etc.

### Date and venue

The workshop is scheduled for 9:30 – 16:00 on 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2009, at the Meeting Center of the European Standardisation Organisation CEN in Brussels, 17, Avenue Marnix, Brussels.

### The Programme

<b>9:30 – 10:00</b>	<b>Registration</b>
<b>10.00 – 10:45</b>	<b>Session 1: Building a common background for discussions</b>
	<p><b>Moderator: Thomas Track, DECHEMA</b>  <i>Issues to be presented:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What is the overall concept of the European ETV system, its role and development status in the EU? – <i>Pierre Henry, DG Environment</i></li> <li>▪ What are the other ETV schemes in the world and how do they work? – <i>Spyridon Merkourakis IPTS</i></li> <li>▪ What are the outcomes of the ETV related research projects and how they can contribute to the mutual recognition? – <i>Uwe Fortkamp, IVL</i></li> <li>▪ What is the current state of the mutual recognition process? – <i>Christian Grøn, NOWATECH</i></li> </ul>
<b>10:45 – 12:00</b>	<b>Session 2 Mutual recognition of the verification outputs</b>
	<p><b>Moderator: Christian Grøn, NOWATECH</b>  <i>Issues for group discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How should a vendor claim be defined: scope, predefinition, additional supporting data in view of mutual recognition?</li> <li>▪ What are the mutually satisfying minimum verification scopes behind the claims?</li> <li>▪ What are the interactions of the claim and the supporting data with the regulatory frameworks?</li> <li>▪ Would it be acceptable for the European ETV system to use the U.S./Canadian existing verification protocols and test plans for specific groups of technologies? Under which conditions?</li> <li>▪ Should ETV statements include non-verifiable information relating for example to operating conditions, service life-time?</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Which parts of the EU verification report could be similar with the U.S. and Canadian statements and which differ in terms of scope?</li> <li>▪ Would it be acceptable for the European ETV system to take a U.S./Canadian ETV verification statement and complete it according to the EU ETV procedure and vice versa?</li> </ul>
<b>12:00 – 13:00</b>	Lunch
<b>13:00 – 14:00</b>	<b>Session 3 Mutual recognition of the verification process actors</b>
	<p><b>Moderator: Ignacio Calleja, Labein / Tecnalia</b>  <i>Issues for group discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Could an ETV organisation from Canada or U.S. be recognised as EU verification body?</li> <li>▪ What should the European ETV scheme require from a U.S./Canadian organisation to participate in verifications based on a mutually recognised system?</li> <li>▪ Should the QA/QM procedures be standards based? What kind of standards?</li> <li>▪ Could U.S./Canadian stakeholders get involved in verifications based on a mutually recognised system? Under which conditions?</li> </ul>
<b>14:00 – 15:00</b>	<b>Session 4 ETV mutual recognition as a value for the market</b>
	<p><b>Moderator: Thomas Ertel, et- environment and technology</b>  <i>Issues for group discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What does the mutual recognition mean to the technology vendors, purchasers, and users in Europe and what are their expectations in that respect?</li> <li>▪ Which types of actions and in which areas e.g. policy, legal etc. should be taken under the mutual recognition effort to ensure that ETV substantially helps eliminate global market barriers for environmental technologies?</li> <li>▪ Will a U.S. or Canadian verification statement satisfy a European purchaser in terms of building confidence to a new solution?</li> <li>▪ What are the other issues impacting the overall market value of the ETV scheme, which should be taken account of in the mutual recognition process e.g. confidentiality issues, verification costs, etc?</li> </ul>
<b>15:00 – 15:30</b>	Coffee break
<b>15:30 – 16:00</b>	<b>Session 5 Wrapping up: conclusions and developing recommendations</b>
	<b>Moderator: Thomas Track, DECHEMA</b>

### How to register

Please fill in the attached registration form and return it **before 16<sup>th</sup> September 2009** by e-mail or fax to: Institute for Ecology of Industrial Areas, 6 Kossutha Street, 40-844 Katowice, Poland

**e-mail: [rat@ietu.katowice.pl](mailto:rat@ietu.katowice.pl)**

**fax + 48 32 254 17 17**

### For more info contact:

Izabela Ratman-Klosinska, Institute for Ecology of Industrial Areas, Katowice Poland  
 phone + 48 32 254 60 31 ext. 243; e-mail: [rat@ietu.katowice.pl](mailto:rat@ietu.katowice.pl)

Dr. Thomas Track, DECHEMA e. V.  
 Theodor-Heuss-Allee 25, 60486 Frankfurt am Main, Germany  
 phone +49 69 7564-427; e-mail: [track@dechema.de](mailto:track@dechema.de)