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Brief history

- 2009-10: Regulator discussions with CRC CARE as part of CRC CARE II bid
- July 2011: Study of CL:AIRE model (Sept 2011)
- July 2012: ACLCA paper “Certifying contaminated land practitioners – a national perspective” (LanePiper)
- Dec 2012: discussions in Adelaide with regulators, ACLCA, ALGA, petroleum industry, mining industry, CRC CARE
- Site contamination profession is vast – no one scheme currently works or could be modified to work
- Workgroup formed by CRC CARE
Workgroup

- Dennis Monahan (Independent Chair)
- Ravi Naidu (CRC CARE)
- Andrew Pruszinski (EPA SA), Rebecca Hughes (EPA SA), Jason Borg (EPA Vic), John Coffey (EPA NSW)
- Paul Lightbody (ACLCA), Alex Simopoulos (ACLCA), Michael Dunbaven (ACLCA), Steve Bos (ACLCA)
- John Hunt (ALGA), Peter Nadebaum (ALGA)
- Rod Lukatelich (AIP)
- Stuart Rhodes (Rio Tinto)
- Bruce Perkin (Consultant)
ACLCA paper

- Limited number of environmental accreditation schemes
- Even further limitations for site contamination
- Most schemes are similar - educations, experience, competency, CPD
- A strong and rigorous process is needed
- Further review and research is required to develop a scheme and this should be completed following initial stakeholder consultation.
Workgroup

- Scheme title
- Objectives – quality, efficiency, regulatory acceptance, professional conduct
- Auspices – new body, ACLCA, ALGA, EIANZ, IE, Uni, regulator (fed or state), CRC CARE
- Other models – IE, I geo-sciences, architects, CPA, IEANZ, SILC, CL:AIRE, US, Canada, Europe
- Criteria - Competency based assessment, quals/experience, interview assessment, course work (compulsory/optional), formal assessment (eg exam), international models, initial criteria and ongoing criteria (eg professional development), technical, professional conduct, communication
Workgroup

• Levels of certification – individual, (company), single level, multi-level, general, specialist, comparison to auditor
• Governance - Governance Board, Advisory Committee from stakeholder bodies, expertise base to oversee the process of certification assessment, decision making by Governance Board or Advisory Committee, quality system accreditation for the certification process, appeals
• Funding – user pays, seed funding, expenses, secretariat, executive officer, insurance
• Integrity – database management, authoritative comms (website?), surveillance of misuse, action on claims of misuse
Scheme measures of success

• Self funding
• Very high levels of take up
• Respect from community, regulators and clients
• The ability and will to certify and withdraw certification
• Career progression
Proposed scheme...