



---

**Publication Date:**

14/11/2023

**Methodology:**

M001

**Version:**

V1.0

**Contact:**

Ecosystem Restoration Standard  
25 Rue de Frémicourt  
75015 Paris, FRANCE  
[info@ers.org](mailto:info@ers.org)

---

**TEMPLATE**

# Validation and Verification Body Performance Evaluation



# Table of *Contents*

<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>General Information</b>	<b>2</b>
Validation & Verification Body	2
ERS SECRETARIAT	2
<b>Performance Evaluation</b>	<b>3</b>
AUDIT TEAM	3
AUDIT PROCESS	3
AUDIT REPORTS	4
BEHAVIOUR IN THE FIELD	5
<b>Evaluation Conclusion</b>	<b>6</b>



# General *Information*

## Validation & Verification Body

Name	
Incorporation ID/n°	
Accreditations	<input type="checkbox"/> ISO 19027 <input type="checkbox"/> ISO 14064 <input type="checkbox"/> ISO 14065 <input type="checkbox"/> ISO 14066 <input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe) Description:
Team Leader	Name and position
Contact	Email & phone number

Audit Assignment(s)	Audit date	Audit Report link
Name of the Project	xx/xx/xxxx	Report in ERS' registry link

## ERS SECRETARIAT

Evaluation Agent	Name and position
Contact	Email & phone number
Evaluation date	



# Performance *Evaluation*

- When verified, the evaluator must tick all the boxes, showing the item was assessed and the Auditing Body is in compliance.
- If a box is not checked, it will be considered the ERS Secretariat did not have enough elements to assess the item.
- If an issue or concern is identified, the respective box must be checked.

## AUDIT TEAM

List of professionals assessed (members of the auditing teams)

- **Technical competence**
  - All auditors assigned to the assessed missions had the technical competence to perform it.
    - Educational experience in the assigned knowledge-field
    - Practical experience in the assigned knowledge-field
    - Continuous professional development
  - Issue or concern is identified

### Conclusion

Justification for conclusion, documents used to evaluate and main findings. If concerns or discrepancies arise, describe it in detail, precising the name of the Project concerned and the name of the professional(s) affected.

## AUDIT PROCESS

- **Adherence to ISO guidelines**
  - Issue or concern is identified



- **Data handling and absence of neglect**

- Respect to GDPR
- Appropriate data set used
- Issue or concern is identified

- **Respect to deadlines**

- Met deadlines as set out in the contract and Audit Plan
- Issue or concern is identified

### Conclusion

Justification for conclusion, documents used to evaluate and main findings. If concerns or discrepancies arise, describe it in detail, indicating the name of the Project concerned and the name of the professional(s) affected.

## AUDIT REPORTS

- **Accuracy and Quality of Reports**

- Report is complete and detailed
- Calculations are accurate (no mistakes are found)
- Assessments are accurate (no mistakes are found)
- Issue or concern is identified

- **Clarity and comprehensiveness**

- Results are shown in a clear and comprehensive manner
- Issue or concern is identified

- **Consistency**

- Reports are consistent, showing the same level of engagement and diligence
- Issue or concern is identified

- **Actionability of recommendations**

- Recommendations are actionable and in line with the Project's context and needs
- Issue or concern is identified



### Conclusion

Justification for conclusion, documents used to evaluate and main findings. If concerns or discrepancies arise, describe it in detail, indicating the name of the Project concerned and the name of the professional(s) affected.

## BEHAVIOUR IN THE FIELD

*Only applicable for validation/verification assignments where a site visit occurs.*

- **Cultural sensitiveness**

- Addressed local stakeholders with respect
- Was able to communicate in local language or dialect
- Respected cultural practices
- Issue or concern is identified

- **Professionalism**

- Held a professional conduct when in direct contact with locals
- Observed agreed upon engagements
- Issue or concern is identified

- **Effective communication with project stakeholders**

- Stakeholders were kept informed of the goals of interactions
- Stakeholders were informed of the process in a comprehensive manner
- Collected information were confirmed before included in reporting
- Issue or concern is identified

### Conclusion

Justification for conclusion, documents used to evaluate and main findings. If concerns or discrepancies arise, describe it in detail, precising the name of the Project concerned and the name of the professional(s) affected.



# Evaluation *Conclusion*

**Cleared**

**Suspension**

Grounds for suspension:

- Unannounced changes to audit teams without prior approval from the ERS Secretariat.
- Loss of relevant accreditation outlined in the eligibility criteria.
- Negligence in the preparation of reports or auditing methods.
- Reasonable doubt that VVBs' requirements are not being followed in the field.
- Unconfirmed allegations of fraud.

Duration:

**Termination**

Grounds for termination:

- Confirmed allegations regarding fraud, e.g. bribes or deliberately misleading statements.
- Persistent issues with performance or inconsistent quality of reports in terms of methods, information, or language.
- Breach of applicable legislation.
- Loss of relevant accreditation outlined in the eligibility criteria.

## Conclusion

Justification for conclusion. Description in detail of the grounds for the decision. Precising the name of the Projects concerned and the name of the professional(s) affected.

**Performed by** (Name of the evaluator), **on** (date).

Signature



**Ecosystem Restoration Standard**

[info@ers.org](mailto:info@ers.org) | [www.ers.org](http://www.ers.org)