

Renewal of FDE System Design Accreditation



The document describes the process that will be followed for application for renewal of the Farm Dairy Effluent System Design Accreditation. It includes details on the process, the application and agreement forms that need completion by the applicant organisation (appendix A and B) and the checklist form that the assessment panel will follow during the audit (Appendix C).

1. Outline of Process

- 1.1. At the end of the two year accreditation period, the organisation must apply to renew their accreditation. This will be initiated through [the accreditation website](#).
- 1.2. The renewal of Accreditation will involve an on-site audit visit by an Assessment Panel member or appointed auditor. This will normally take place within one month prior to expiry of accreditation.
- 1.3. The Accreditation Programme Manager will notify the accredited organisation of its accreditation renewal date three months prior, and inform the organisation of the renewal process.
- 1.4. The organisation must complete the application form for renewal as per Appendix A and agree to follow the process of the audit as described in 1.7. They must submit their application form within one month of the expiry of their accreditation.
- 1.5. The organisation must also sign the FDE re-accreditation agreement for re-accreditation as outlined in Appendix B.
- 1.6. The organisation must nominate a staff member who will be available for the period of the audit. They must be fully knowledgeable and have to hand all the required paperwork necessary for the assessment panel member to view.
- 1.7. The Accreditation Programme Manager will inform the organisation of the assessment panel member who will visit with them. The assessment panel member will arrange a suitable time for a visit with the selected staff member from the organisation. Once on site they will:
 - Review the Quality Assurance records held by the organisation
 - Review one design completed by the organisation
 - Review two system commissioning, operation and maintenance reports

1.8. The Accreditation Programme Manager shall receive a written report from the assessment panel member with their recommendation for re-accreditation or any concerns raised. The wider assessment panel may also be solicited for their advice to ensure consistency of assessment between panel members.

1.9. The Accreditation Programme shall summarise the proposed actions from the audit and present to the Accreditation Advisory Group for discussion. Any complaints received by the Accreditation Programme Manager made against the organisation during the period of accreditation shall also be considered. The Accreditation Programme Manager shall then determine whether an organisation's accreditation shall be renewed.

1.10. The re-accreditation will then be granted for a further **two** years.

1.11. An organisation whose renewal is not granted shall receive notification of this in writing with reasons outlined. The organisation has three months in which to correct the issues raised or their accreditation will be revoked. Their accreditation will be extended to cover this period. If the organisation disagrees with the findings of the assessment panel member who conducted the audit or the decision made by the Accreditation Programme Manager, they can appeal in writing to the Accreditation Programme Manager outlining their concerns. This will be considered and discussed with the Accreditation Advisory Group and a decision provided to the organisation.

1.12. If outstanding issues are not resolved within the 3 month extension period then the accreditation will be withdrawn.

2.0. Assessment Panel Member for Audit

2.1. The Accreditation Programme Manager in consultation with the Assessment Panel chair will select the assessment panel member to conduct the audit as part of the reaccreditation process. If for some reason, the organisation feels there is a conflict of interest with this assessment panel member, then they may declare this and the reasons why.

3.0. Assessment Panel Member Audit Procedure

3.1. The Assessment Panel Member will arrange a mutually agreeable time to meet with the company. The audit is expected to take 2-3 hours on site. After meeting with the company, they will complete a report consisting of completion of the audit forms (appendix C) and submit to the Accreditation Programme Manager their recommendations.

3.2. The Assessment Panel member has no authority to grant accreditation, they provide a report and recommendation only.

3.3. If the accredited company does not have the paperwork prepared for the audit or does not have the appropriate knowledgeable staff member available then a second audit meeting will be required. The accredited organisation will then be required to pay an additional fee to cover these costs. The renewal of accreditation fee does not include costs for a second visit.

Appendix C Assessment Panel Audit Forms

There are four forms to be completed

1. Accreditation Assessment Panel Member Audit Form
2. Quality Assurance Checklist
3. Design Checklist
4. Commissioning, operation and maintenance reports checklist (x2 as 1 for each report reviewed)

1. Accreditation Assessment Panel Member Audit Form

Assessment Panelist Name:	
Date and time of audit:	
Organisation name:	
Contact person for audit:	
Physical address for audit:	
Email address:	
Business telephone number:	
Cell phone number:	

2. Quality Assurance Checklist:

Aim is to assess whether the Quality Assurance system developed for the application for accreditation is active within the organisation. The assessment panel auditor will review the QA system as submitted in the company's original application which is likely to include some or all of the topics below.

	Quality Assurance Component	Evidence	Comment
2.1	Training register	Check training register for staff	
2.2	Health and Safety	Check Health and Safety incidences reported and how dealt with.	
2.3	Quality Indicators	Did the organisation set up Project checklists? Check if being used for customer designs.	
2.4	A Recording System	Recording design information such as use of dairy effluent storage calculator, where accessing nutrient budgets , how is this monitored for accuracy, soil type information etc.	
2.5	Documented Corrective Action	Check if any complaints received and how handled	
2.6	Documented Internal Audit Programme	What programme is in place for checking calculations used in designs?	
2.7	Documented Management Reviews	Evidence of review of company approach around system designs	

3. Designs Checklist

This section is for the assessment panel member to review a design provided to a client. A few key areas will be assessed rather than the complete design.

Many accredited companies may be supplying upgrade services to a dairy farmer rather than a complete design. This should be taken into consideration, however all the points below should still apply but it is possible there may be some exceptions which should be noted.

Design Information provided for review	Note specific farm or relevant date/file name

	Design feature	Evidence	Comment
3.1	Farm Map	Was a farm map(s) provided with clear outlines of existing infrastructure and detailed outline of effluent system design?	
3.2	Soil identification	How were the soil types determined and was there evidence of on-farm verification?	
3.3	Dairy effluent storage calculator file	Were there any obvious anomalies in the file i.e. very large or very small storage volume for number of cows and soil risk?	
3.4	Off-pasture systems	How was effluent from off-pasture systems such as feedpads and stand-off pads managed in the design?	

3.5	Regulatory requirements	Was there evidence of knowledge of regional and district council rules? Does the design comply with the property's discharge consent conditions?	
3.6	Nutrient budget	Does the nitrogen loading comply with the FDE discharge consent condition(s) or permitted activity rules?	
3.7	Irrigation system	Was the irrigation system recommended suitable for the soil type and effluent area used on farm?	
3.8	Fail safes	Were adequate fail safes recommended in the design e.g. travelling irrigator stop systems, on/off timers for low rate systems, alarms, or antisiphon devices?	

4. Commissioning, Operation and Maintenance Reports

This section is for the assessment panel member to review **two** commissioning, operation and maintenance reports for effluent systems provided to a client. A few key areas will be assessed.

If the accredited company did not carry out the installation then Table 4.2 should be used instead.

If section 4.1 is not relevant please state why

--

Table 4.1 Design and Install

	Topics	Evidence	Comment
4.1	Training of staff to run effluent system	How was training provided to farm owner/staff on running the system?	
4.2	Safety recommendations	What safety features were installed with the system?	
4.3	Recording	What assistance was provided to farm for recording effluent application?	
4.4	Application depth	What checks were made on irrigation application depth?	
4.5	Operation and Maintenance	What operation and maintenance assistance was provided to the farm?	

Table 4.2 Design only

No commissioning, operation and maintenance reports so an additional design will be reviewed.

	Topics	Evidence	Comment
4.6	Training of staff to operate the effluent system	What was recommended in the design around training needed to operate the designed system?	
4.7	Safety recommendations	What safety features were recommended?	
4.8	Storage	What storage options were recommended and why?	
4.9	Future Proofing	What future expansion/changes were discussed with client?	
4.10	Soils discussion	How were soils assessment factored into the design	
4.11	Regulations	What knowledge of designs meeting regulatory requirements?	