



Stakeholder Advisory Group

California Environmental Technology Verification/Certification Program

November 17-18, 1998 Meeting

Meeting Summary

This document is a brief narrative summary of the proceedings of the California Environmental Technology Verification/Certification Stakeholder Advisory Group. Included with this summary is a list of action items and recommendations which came out of the meeting, and copies of all transparencies and flip charts used during the meeting. A comprehensive set of meeting notes has been compiled into an unofficial record of meeting minutes, and is available upon request.

The meeting commenced with a welcome and introductions by facilitator Daniel Yamshon, Jim Allen of DTSC, and Bob Stephens of DTSC. Then, each person in the room introduced themselves and shared a few words about why they were attending.

Following the self-introductions, Jim Allen presented the purpose of the Stakeholder Advisory Group and the objectives of the meeting.

After Jim finished his presentation, Penny Hansen of U.S. EPA spoke about U.S. EPA's ETV program. Penny covered the background of ETV, the benefits of ETV and the program's goals and operating principles. She discussed the current ETV pilots, their processes and outputs, and the functions and roles played by stakeholders. Penny shared some of what U.S. EPA has learned about hot and cold market areas and their experience with pollution prevention technologies. She also covered outreach activities and verification program quality criteria. Penny closed her presentation with a discussion of the upcoming report to Congress in the year 2001, and the ETV vision for 2005.

After her presentation Penny entertained a number of thoughtful questions regarding various aspects of ETV program funding, outreach, focus, etc.

Greg Williams of DTSC, then made a presentation on the California Certification Program. Greg covered program background and objectives, discussed technologies which have been certified, as well as those in process, and reviewed the certification process. Greg briefly discussed the similarities and differences between certification and verification. Greg concluded by covering the activities of interstate and international coordination.

After his presentation, Greg entertained quite a few questions, including questions on program focus, reciprocity with other programs, program process specifics, liability issues, costs, etc.

Norma Lewis of U.S. EPA gave the next presentation on the ETV Pilot Partnership between U.S. EPA and Cal/EPA. Norma covered the history, background and the many unique aspects of the

partnership. Norma talked about active projects, potential clients and plans for future efforts. Norma closed with a summary of some of the lessons learned during her tenure in the partnership.

Norma then opened the floor for questions and a very informative free-form question and answer/discussion ensued, continuing through lunch. The discussion started on the topic of quality assurance, and moved to integration and coordination of the various programs. The discussion then touched on the role of the certification/verification programs in helping to overcome the challenges posed by procurement process, especially in the public sector environment. This led to some discussion of the number and extent to which there are defacto certified programs which are not self-identified as such, and their impact on the overall picture.

There was further discussion of the issue of multi-agency, multi-jurisdictional control, and communication and coordination, including the role of partnerships, e.g. with the Interstate Technology and Regulatory Cooperation Work Group (ITRC), and under MOUs. Finally there was discussion of the role of a broader array of stakeholders in the certification/verification process.

Lunch arrived and the discussions broke up into small informal groups, which are not captured in these notes.

LUNCH

After lunch, Jim Allen opened with an overview and discussion of program products and services. After covering the types of services and products, Jim invited Tim Ogburn of the California Department of Commerce to expand on California's efforts to impact international markets for environmental technology. Tim discussed some of the projects, in which his group is involved in, Norma Lewis mentioned some USEPA efforts, and Jim talked briefly about our web site and coordination/involvement with other programs.

Dr. Wolfgang Fuhs of DTSC then made a presentation on the future options of the pilot program. Dr. Fuhs' presentation explored balancing costs and benefits, and covered a wide variety of issues including the role of existing data, lessons learned from other efforts, and the value-added nature of the program. Dr. Fuhs closed his presentation by reviewing several aspects of cost/benefit balancing, including the scope of evaluations, attribution of costs, and targeting of technology sectors.

Tony Luan then briefed the group on program marketing. He summarized program accomplishments and discussed current marketing efforts and the volume of inquiries, applications and other activities which resulted. Among the activities Tony covered were the program's use of mass mailings, Commerce Business Daily notices, advertisements, published articles and awards.

Tony's presentation precipitated a lively discussion and question-and-answer session which continued until the next break. The discussion initially focused on channels for distributing program information and the continuing need for additional outreach. The focus shifted to program priorities, and the value of outreach in providing value-added in the marketplace. The discussion then moved back to an emphasis on the importance of strengthening the marketing effort, becoming more focused in our efforts, and

developing timely response capabilities. There was a brief discussion of the value of certification/verification in the context of cleanup technologies, and the value to the public-at-large. Next, the focus shifted to talk of targeting opportunities in the recycling arena, and there was agreement that a focus meeting on this issue may be valuable. The discussion then centered briefly on the topic of performance-based versus regulatory-based approaches. The conversation then returned to the issue of marketing and the importance of inclusiveness of stakeholders was stressed.

At this point a break was called. At Norma Lewis's suggestion, it was agreed that the group would stay together, rather than splitting up for break-outs as originally planned, in order to maintain the momentum and synergy that the discussions had demonstrated thus far.

BREAK

The entire group reconvened after the break. The marketing discussion continued with the suggestion that it would be valuable to inventory all of the various certification/verification programs. The discussion moved through several related topics including reciprocity, the need to involve users and procurers, and possible legislative action to establish preferences for certified/verified technology. There was a brief discussion focusing on funding mechanisms, and the possibility of outsourcing some tasks, such as quality assurance plans.

At this point Jim Allen redirected the group's attention to Dr. Fuhs's topic, the future of the program, and the discussion moved to issues of independent testing, QA/QC considerations, and different models of process control by verification/certification entities. The discussion then focused on the subject of cost attribution, first addressing fee-for-service scenarios, and then touching on topics such as subscription consortiums, institutional research, and the appropriate level of public funding for verification/certification efforts. Data quality and equity concerns were consistently at the forefront throughout this dialogue.

The discussion centered on eligibility criteria for a short time and then moved to the subject of protocol development. The types, role, and value of protocols was discussed, as well as how to fund protocol development and program activities, including public funding mechanisms, SBIR funds, percentage of future sales, and the possibility of establishing differential fees for the first technologies up the learning curve. There was also some discussion of risk and the potential utility of a pre-evaluation letter assessing the potential of a technology for vendors and lenders.

The focus of the discussion then shifted to the topic of the international marketplace, and a number of panelists shared their experiences in dealing with the challenges posed in globally marketing technologies or technology certification/verification programs. This led to a more general discussion of how to impact procurement policies via technology certification/ verification. The idea of targeting efforts for maximum effect was stressed, along with a reiteration of the importance of stakeholder involvement. Jim reaffirmed the commitment to the need for a focus group to address recycling issues.

The time allocated for meeting had run out, so Jim thanked everyone and adjourned the meeting until the next morning. A number of the group members got together for informal networking and discussion at

various dinner locations.

DAY 2- Morning Session

The group reconvened for the second day and Jim Allen kicked off the discussions with a review of the highlights of the previous days discussions. The group then returned to the discussion and question-and-answer format which had proved so productive on Day One. The discussion started with suggestions on improving awareness and communication through distribution of printed materials, and touched on the importance of distinguishing between the various programs and opportunities that are currently available. There was a brief discussion of recertification versus certification which lead into the topic of matching program focus with the needs of the marketplace, particularly in the international arena.

The discussion moved on to the role of technology certification/evaluation programs in marketing, especially to public sector users, including how to improve marketing, what the marketplace really values, and how to enable stakeholders to become more involved. The idea of having an exhibition of certified/verified technologies was explored in some detail, and the emphasis was on interacting with public sector users, possibly in conjunction with a major trade show or conference. There was some discussion of efforts to catalogue certification/verification programs.

BREAK

After the break, Jim Allen began with a review of some action items pertaining to establishing a focus group on recycling. The discussion returned to the subject of an exhibition/conference to showcase technologies and the certification, verification programs. Several panelists shared their views and experiences of the challenges and value of such events. The group then spent some time on issues related to facilitating procurement of certified/verified technologies by governmental users. The procurement process was reviewed, including some of the hurdles, alternatives to standardized bidding processes, the overall degree of flexibility in the state procurement process, and where future opportunities for improvement may be found. Jim Allen agreed to meet soon with Tom Lee of the Department of General Services to explore how certified technologies can best be considered for procurement by the State of California. Next, the group revisited the reciprocity issue, communication and outreach, and process hurdles, and ultimately returned again to the reciprocity issue. It then moved on to a few comments reiterating the suggestion to involve a broader and more diverse mix of technical experts.

At this point, the discussion focused on protocol development, types of protocols, the role of protocols in the process, harmonization of protocols across program boundaries, QA/QC of protocols, and the challenges of developing protocols for use internationally, etc. Members shared their views and experiences regarding protocol development, the appropriate level of resource commitment, the relative importance for various types of technology verification, certification, the definition of protocols, and specific versus general protocols.

After the protocol discussion, Jim focused the group's attention on the question of what the program can

do to improve marketing. The discussion reiterated the group's earlier emphasis on targeting the marketing approach for best effect, involving the stakeholders to a greater extent, especially potential users, and increasing coordination between verification/certification programs.

Jim reminded the group that we want to revisit the topic of the appropriate level of public subsidy, based on public benefit, which should be associated with certification/verification programs, and that we intend to convene focus groups on this and other topics in the spring of 1999.

Jim thanked the group and adjourned the meeting. A number of panelists remained after the meeting to network and join in informal conversations over lunch.