



# CA EED – Good Practice Factsheet Template

## Friendly audit (NL)

Core Theme and topic	<i>Core Theme 5, Working Group 5.2, After the audit: encourage the implementation of the identified measures</i>
Name of work programme/project	Friendly energy audit in the framework of Voluntary Agreement
<b>Project scope and description</b>	
Short description of the programme & what it hopes to achieve	<i>For the Dutch Paper Makers, the energy transition programme was started after 2004. Many mills were eager to implement an energy management structure. For this, the newly published ISO 50001 was chosen to become the standard for the paper industry, however, it became apparent that no experienced consultants were available or trained for the paper industry. To ensure that ISO 50001 would not become red tape, but really would raise awareness, a working group was formed. One of the activities was the organisation of the friendly audits. In this pilot, 8 companies participated.</i>
What is the scope of the project? e.g. - National/regional/local - Building type/owner	<i>National, Paper making industry (23 locations)</i>
Who are the key people involved? e.g.: - Installers - Local Authorities	<i>Steering committee: VNP (Dutch Paper &amp; Board Association) Organizing bureau: META BV (Bruno Mulder)</i>
Who was the target audience?	<i>Energy coordinators, Quality assurance staff (audit = whole mill)</i>
How was this work programme/ project financed?	<i>National subsidy for the Energy Transition Paper Industry</i>
What was the cost of the work programme/project?	<i>Part of a bigger programme. Practically no costs, because only the mills themselves worked on it.</i>
When did it start and end?	
<b>Project Outcomes &amp; Communication</b>	
What were the key achievements?	<i>Eight mills were visited for one day each. A three page report in PowerPoint was made at the end of each day and shared in the working group meeting afterwards, this included, for example, the vision (target) of every mill. Many ideas on ways of communicating with/to the mill personnel were also shared.</i>
What were the outcomes and expected benefits?	<i>The two auditors (from other mills) spoke 10 to 15 people in a day, including the CEO. Because the auditors were external, awareness was gained.</i>





What were the key lessons learned?	<i>The role playing before hand in the working group was very beneficial.</i>
Is there anything you would do differently in future?	<i>Not really. The mills have asked to repeat the friendly audit again next year. One issue raised was about the presence of the production manager during the friendly audit. Without his presence, the audit should not be held!</i>
What makes this a good practice example?	<i>This time, no consultants were involved, but experts from within the industry.</i>
Web links to further information	<a href="http://proceedings.eceee.org/visabstrakt.php?event=2&amp;doc=4-059-12">http://proceedings.eceee.org/visabstrakt.php?event=2&amp;doc=4-059-12</a>
Contact details of named person for further information	Bruno Mulder <a href="http://www.metabv.nl">www.metabv.nl</a>
Please indicate if you can give a short (15 minute) presentation at a Plenary Meeting or other event	Yes
Please indicate if this case study can be made available to the public?	Yes

