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DEFINITIONS

Assessment: The process of determining the capability or competence of an individual against standards by evaluating performances.

Assessor: A professionally registered person who carries out the Experience Appraisal assessment.

Category: A mode of registration defined in or under the ECSA Act which has a distinctive purpose, characteristic competencies, defined principal routes to registration and educational requirements.

Certification: Formal recognition awarded to an education or training programme through a quality assurance procedure that it meets criteria laid down for the type of programme.

Certification criteria: Statements of requirements that must be satisfied by a programme in order to receive certification.

Certified Engineering training programme: A programme that has been evaluated and recognised by ECSA as meeting stated criteria.

Competency Assessment: A summative assessment of an individual’s competency against the prescribed standard based on evidence in the individual’s work, reports by qualified observers and other tests that may include a professional review.

Competency Standard: Statement of competence required for a defined purpose.

Comment: Communicates to the organisation impressions of the team, commendations or constructive criticism on negative factors that are not classified as deficiencies or concerns

Concern: A matter, not viewed as a deficiency, which a certification team considers to be potentially affecting the training programme’s future compliance with a certification criterion or criteria.

Continuing Professional Development (referred to in this standard as CPD): Continuing education and training as contemplated in section 13(k) of the Engineering Profession Act, 46 of 2000. Continuing Professional Development also refers to the systematic maintenance,
improvement and broadening of knowledge and skills and the development of the necessary personal qualities for the execution of professional and engineering duties throughout a person's engineering career. It is the learning and development that takes place after completion of educational studies and by which registered persons maintain and develop competencies to continue to perform their roles efficiently.

**Deficiency:** Terminology used to identify a condition or combination of factors that do not in conform with a certification criterion or criteria.

**Engineering problem solving:** The process of finding solutions through a conscious, organised process that relies on the application of engineering knowledge, skills and generic competencies.

**Evaluation:** Determining compliance of a result with prescribed criteria, based on documentation, inspection and the application of judgment supported by reasoning.

**Exercise judgment, take responsibility and act ethically:** Be responsible for making sound decisions and acting ethically on part of or all engineering activities.

**Final visit:** Visit held at a time within the cycle stated by the Central Registration Committee in the decision on findings of previous visit.

**Final report:** An evaluation of aspects of a training programme for an organisation that has been given notification of termination of certification by the Central Registration Committee after the previous visit and may require a visit.

**Candidate:** A qualifying learner, irrespective of whether the qualification is a degree or diploma.

**Level:** A measure of learning demands in terms of types of problems, knowledge required skills and responsibility, expressed in terms of level descriptors.

**Impacts of Engineering Activities:** The reasonably foreseeable social, cultural and environmental effects of engineering activities that must be recognised and assessed.
Initial Professional Development: Undertaking of professional development activities, accredited or non-accredited, sufficient to maintain and extend competence during the candidacy phase.

Managing Engineering Activities: Management is directed at achieving engineering results through the management of people, resources, processes, systems and money, which this involves planning, organising, leading, implementing and controlling activities.

Mentor: A professionally registered person who guides the competency development of a candidate in an appropriate category.

Programme: A structured, integrated teaching arrangement with a defined purpose and pathway leading to a qualification.

Regular visit: A visit that is held on a four-year cycle after the Training Academy has been certified by ECSA.

Standards: In the context of engineering training programmes, statements of outcomes to be demonstrated, the level of performance and content baseline requirements.

Outcome: At the professional level, a statement of the performance that a person must demonstrate to be judged competent.
### ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPD</td>
<td>Continuing Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Central Registration Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td>Curriculum Vitae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECSA</td>
<td>Engineering Council of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>Engineering Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Engineering Profession Act, 46 of 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPD</td>
<td>Initial Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NQF</td>
<td>National Qualifications Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPS</td>
<td>Research, Policy and Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDF</td>
<td>Skills Development Facilitator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. INTRODUCTION
The Engineering Council of South Africa (ECSA) is a statutory body established in terms of Section 2 of the Engineering Professions Act, 46 of 2000 (EPA). ECSA’s primary role is to regulate the engineering profession in terms of the EPA.

ECSA’s core functions are the accreditation of engineering programmes, registration of persons as professionals in specified registration categories and regulation of the practice of registered persons. ECSA is the only body in South Africa authorised to register engineering professionals who meet the necessary professional registration standards.

This document defines the standard required for certification of engineering training programmes and subsequently certification of training academies. An application process must be followed by organisations wishing to certify their academy.

2. BACKGROUND
The illustration below defines the documents that comprise the ECSA system for Standards for certifying engineering training programmes for academies. The illustration also locates the current document.
3. STANDARD STATEMENT

This standard addresses ECSA’s strategic objective 1.4 (as per ECSA Strategic Plan 2015–2020), which states that the engineering profession must grow by increasing the number of engineering practitioners to meet existing and future demands. The engineering training academies are to ensure that the candidacy phase is fast tracked and in turn, more Candidates are professionally registered. A Candidate who is involved in an academy enjoys the benefit of training within an organisation that is certified by ECSA, which give the Candidate the advantage of being a well-rounded registered candidate who has already addressed the stage 1 requirement for professional registration.

Figure 1: Documents defining the ECSA Certifying Engineering Training Programmes for Academies
Note: This standard is designed to meet the basic fundamental requirements for the establishment and certification of the Engineering training programme academy to meet the criteria required and offer a training that enhances Candidates' level of competency required to make them eligible for professional registration in the appropriate engineering category in a particular discipline.

4. APPLICABLE LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK

The following legislative documents are applicable to this standard:

- Engineering Profession Act, 46 of 2000
- Council for Built Environment Act, 43 of 2000

Note: Policy directives are as determined from time-to-time by the minister of Public Works and Infrastructure as the shareholder on behalf of the South African government.

5. NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL COMPLIANCE

This standard is in line with ECSA’s core functions of accrediting the engineering programmes, registration of persons as professionals in specified registration categories and regulation of the practice of registered persons. ECSA is a member of International Engineering Alliance (IEA) and has signed number of Mutual Recognition Agreements with other authorised members of IEA. This standard has incorporated rules and guidelines of IEA Competency Agreements to ensure compliance with IEA rules.

6. STANDARD PROVISIONS

This standard sets the criteria for certifying engineering training programmes for training academies. It is to assist the training academies to support Candidates to meet the requirements of all the 11 outcomes for professional registration. As per A-01-POL document, there are four criteria that should be addressed when certifying training engineering programmes:

- Competence outcomes
- Work horizon
• Qualified Mentors
• Resourcing and sustainability of engineering training programme.

6.1 Criterion 1: Competency Outcomes

The 11 educational, Graduate Attributes combined with the building blocks of competencies lay a robust foundation for the satisfactory achievement of the 11 professional registration outcomes. Policy documents R-02-STA-PE/PT/PCE/PN and R-02-STA-SC define competence as the ability to provide sufficient evidence of having obtained applied theoretical or academic knowledge outcomes at exit level from the university or practice for Candidates following the alternative route to a wide range of organisational activities, including engineering activities.

The 11 outcomes have therefore been classified into five groups to facilitate easy and more convenient matching of the outcomes with an operational structure of business organisations. Policy documents R-02-STA-PE/PT/PCE/PN and R-02-STA-SC provide a comprehensive description of these outcomes in the context of their relevance to the work environment.

6.1.1 Group A: Engineering Problem Solving

Registration is not possible without all the following three outcomes being satisfactorily met. These outcomes represent the core of engineering and the training of academics must be structured such that it enables a Candidate to develop the competencies required to meet this group of outcomes.

While engineering Candidates are expected to supply evidence of having achieved this group of outcomes in all or most of their engineering work, it is critical that they also demonstrate capability in achieving these outcomes in the type of work that involves complex/broadly-defined/well-defined/specifically-defined engineering activities.

Outcome 1: Define, investigate and analyse complex/broadly-defined/well-defined specifically-defined engineering problems as appropriate.
Outcome 2: Design or develop solutions to complex/broadly-defined/well-defined /specifically-defined engineering problems.

Outcome 3: Comprehend and apply advanced knowledge, principles and specialist knowledge, as well as jurisdictional and local knowledge.

These outcomes are the manifestation of the first 3 of the 11 Graduate Attributes associated with academic learning at Institutions of Higher Learning. They constitute the core of all engineering disciplines.

They must be demonstrated in both general engineering practice and discipline specific training experience. For example, while the workplace may require that Candidates undertake general engineering work as part of the suite of services or products that the organisation offers, it is important for Candidates to become involved in a sufficient amount of engineering work at the level defined by R-02-STA-PE/PT/PCE/PN and R-02-STA-SC.

6.1.2 Group B: Managing Engineering Activities

This group of outcomes requires a Candidate to be actively involved in as many organisational activities as possible and be an advocate of merging and aligning the engineering activities with other activities in the business value chain. Management of activities transcends the management of people and resources. It requires Candidates to be particularly involved in the management of external and internal stakeholders such as clients, regulators, suppliers and departments or functional divisions within the organisation.

Effective communication and presentation skills form a critical element of the management of activities. It is therefore important for the candidate to develop competencies required for Group A activities so that they are able to articulate these competencies well in their organisational activities through the effective management and communication skills developed in the following Group B outcomes.

Outcome 4: Manage part or all the organisational activities including engineering activities, as well as individual, team and multidisciplinary working.
Outcome 5: Communicate clearly with others in the course of engineering activities.

6.1.3 Group C: Risk and Impact Mitigation
Engineering work is associated with enormous risk to the safety and health of the public. Engineering activities are also associated with environmental degradation and thus pose a threat to the continued existence of natural resources required to sustain future generations. It is therefore critical that Candidates are knowledgeable about all matters of safety, health and environmental protection that are applicable to their work environment. The following outcomes have been developed to meet this objective.

Outcome 6: Recognise and address the reasonably foreseeable social, cultural and environmental effects of complex/broadly-defined/well-defined engineering activities.

Outcome 7: Meet all legal and regulatory requirements and the health and safety of persons in the course of engineering activities.

6.1.4 Group D: Act ethically, Exercise judgement and take responsibility
Engineering work may have huge safety, health, environmental and financial ramifications if it is not undertaken with due diligence and accountability for the beneficial value of all the stakeholders involved. This means that, in the course of undertaking their engineering work, Candidates must be meticulous, methodical and systematic in their approach. The following outcomes have been developed to equip Candidates with the skills required to demonstrate the sense of due diligence and accountability in their work.

Outcome 8: Conduct organisational activities ethically with due regard to corporate governance issues.
Outcome 9: Exercise sound judgement in the course of complex/broadly-defined/well-defined engineering activities.
Outcome 10: Be responsible for making decisions on a part or all of the complex/broadly-defined/well-defined engineering activities.
6.1.5 Group E: Initial Professional Development

The engineering profession is continually evolving with frequent introduction cycles of lines of new products, systems, processes and services. It is therefore important that Candidates keep themselves at the cutting edge of knowledge with regard to the development and activities taking place in the engineering profession. They must actively engage in new learning at their workplaces and through the network of open learning offered by voluntary professional associations and bodies, service providers and/or academic institutions. Through the process of continuous learning and training, engineering professionals will have access to the latest developments in the knowledge economy and will therefore be able to utilise this knowledge to introduce innovative and more efficient work practices.

Outcome 11: Undertake professional development activities sufficient to maintain and extend competency.

6.2 Criterion 2: Work Horizon

This is by far the most important part of professional development because the nature of the work that Candidates perform in their respective organisations contributes enormously to the development of their professional registration competencies. It is therefore critical that academies ensure that Candidates’ work activities and assignments mostly fall in line with the engineering training programmes that have been developed by the organisation to enable them to register with ECSA. The essential elements of this engineering training programme are the following:

- Must ensure that there is a reasonably sufficient variety of tasks that Candidates perform.
- The nature of the tasks must progressively increase the level of competence in addition to all other mandatory work activities that the organisation requires Candidates to perform.
- Must provide Candidates with an opportunity to become involved in an increasing level of responsibility in their execution of tasks.
Workplace learning and training forms the foundation underlying the building of competencies required to meet all or most of the outcomes, depending on the nature of business an organisation may be involved in. In the case where some of the outcomes may not be achieved satisfactorily due to the limited scope of the organisation's line of business, the other stages of the training process, namely, continuous professional development and mentoring including secondment, may be used to augment this shortfall.

However, the emphasis must be first placed on saturating the engineering training programme with all the required activities for professional development that the organisation is able to offer. For this reason, as part of the ECSA certification process, the organisation is required to provide the list of activities that occur within its work environment and to subsequently demonstrate how these activities have been incorporated in the Candidates’ training programme. This is discussed in further detail under the structure of the programme.

It is therefore important that when structuring the workplace engineering training programme, academies must ensure that this programme forms an integral part of the work activities and that it is not an isolated process. It is only through this integrated approach that Candidates will be able to progressively take over, increasing levels of responsibility in their workplaces because they develop confidence with time as they become directly involved with organisational activities.

The organisation must have a work horizon within the engineering programme that is not less than the minimum certification period of four years.

6.3 Criterion 3: Qualified mentors
As defined in A-01-POL, a mentor is a professionally registered person who guides the competency development of a Candidate in an appropriate category, and the supervisor/coach is a person who oversees and controls engineering work performed by a Candidate and coaches the Candidate to fulfil the requirements for registration.
A person or persons must be assigned to guide the Candidate to develop appropriate competencies aligned with the outcomes. The company must identify either within or outside the organisation, or both, whichever option is preferable, persons to act as mentors for the candidates. The persons should be professionally registered persons with ECSA in an appropriate category and have contextual knowledge in the Candidate’s discipline.

Registered persons should adhere to the code of conduct and it is paramount that mentors must be in good standing with ECSA. Once a person is a registered professional, the onus is upon them to inform ECSA if there any changes in their circumstances as contemplated in section 19(3a) of the EPA. Part of being in good standing entails complying with CPD as it is crucial for the mentor to be up to date with current practice in industry.

Mentors must ensure that Candidates are exposed to real world projects, dealing with clients and design teams, and working to real deadlines defined in the contracts.

6.3.1 Performance monitoring and measurements
The engineering training programme must have a system to measure performance of Candidates in all the areas of their work and career development towards professional registration. This performance measurement must also include the monitoring of the performance of the mentors and supervisors towards the development of their Candidates.

Therefore, academies are required to implement performance measuring systems for Candidates in their engineering training programmes as part of the certification process. The mandatory requirements of the system must include the following:

- A database system that captures all the training and learning activities as they are completed.
- An evaluation process that determines the level of competence achieved.
- Work based key performance indicators that are integrated to a reasonable extent with the competencies required by the ECSA registration outcomes.
- A functional performance management system. The performance of the supervisors and mentors must be built into this system.
The effectiveness of the training will be calculated by determining the percentage of Candidates that progress to professional registration after completion of the engineering training programme.

6.4 Criterion 4: Resourcing and sustainability of the training programme

The training programme must be adequately planned, resourced, led and executed to ensure it is suitable over the period of certification. It must be set up so that most of the learning and training takes place in functional departments or areas of work where Candidates are placed. To qualify for certification and ensure sustainability, organisations must ensure effective learning takes place through direct participation in organisational activities. The following lists must therefore be established and evidenced:

Organisational mission and organogram – The training and learning programme must be managed and directed from the executive management level with a well-defined delegated line of responsibilities within the programme structure. An organogram that explains this delegated line of responsibility must be available and must clearly indicate how cross-functional responsibilities are linked to the organogram.

Organisational work area and activities – A list of all areas of work to be provided, including a list of key organisational activities per work area, suitable for satisfying each ECSA outcome and as such, specified in an engineering training programme.

Engineering training programme – The specified training programme structure must mirror the professional registration outcomes through the work methods, processes and normal work routines of the organisations where Candidates are placed. Outcomes that may not be mirrored in the normal work processes have to be mitigated through other means, including continuous professional development activities. Records of these activities and evidence of the organisational commitment towards the Initial Professional Development (IPD) process must be kept. In the end, the programme must satisfy all the requirements of each outcome for it to qualify for certification Staff responsible for the training development programme
must be adequately qualified, experienced and skilled in line with the Skills Development Act.

**Candidates** – The selection and admission of Candidates should be linked to the organisation’s equity and diversity plans; this includes the ability to take on disabled Candidates.

**Candidate internet facilities** - this will enable the candidate to successfully complete relevant training on engineering activities.

**Strategy and Performance Management** – Organisations should have a strategy in place for recruitment, development and retention of Candidates, supervisors and mentors that is aligned with their diversity plans. This should include succession planning strategies for Candidates to progress through the organisational layers of functional authority. Supervisors should be qualified and/or experienced to coach Candidates on the work assigned to them. The training programme must be quality assured.

**Programme Funding** – Organisations should provide adequate operational budget to be used for funding the engineering training programme, with part of the budget being allocated to mentor remuneration

In general, the resource allocation must be executed such that it can adequately and effectively support and maintain the activities in the programme content so that the programme structure can be a true representation of the programme’s ability to produce Candidate engineers that are fully eligible for professional registration. The resources allocated to the training programme must be capable of facilitating the relevant technical training.

7. **THE CERTIFICATION CYCLE**

The certification cycle is four years. Certification may be granted for a shorter period of one to two years for an engineering training programme that requires remediation to meet the certification criteria. The period of certification must not extend beyond the next Regular visit.
An engineering training programme certified for a period shorter than the full cycle, with the requirement that deficiency (defined in Section 7.3) be remedied, remains certified and should be so described to the public by ECSA and the organisation.

7.1 Types of Certification Evaluations

Training programme certification is classified into three types:

- **Initial Desktop Evaluation** – desktop evaluation of proposed engineering training programme
- **Provisional Certification** – visits held two years after initial desktop evaluation
- **Certification** – visits according to the certification cycle.

(a) Initial desktop evaluation

ECSA offers Initial Desktop Evaluations (endorsement) for new training programmes subject to Provisional Certification after two years of implementation. An Initial Desktop Evaluation on a new training programme considers the extent to which the programme:

- satisfies Criterion 1, as judged from a fully detailed proposed programme
- presents a scheduled work horizon plan that demonstrates how the organisation meets Criterion 2
- presents detailed CVs of all proposed mentors to meet the sub-criteria of Criterion 3
- presents evidence of planning and institutional commitment to the programme and providing resources for both start-ups of the programme and on an on-going basis against the sub-criteria of Criterion 4
- has at least a person to lead, who has experience and is qualified as specified by the Skills Development Act.

(b) Provisional Certification

Provisional Certification may be awarded to a new or extensively revised training programme through a quality assurance process evaluation after two years of implementation.
Provisional Certification indicates to the organisation and the Candidates in the training programme that those parts of the training programme already implemented are generally consistent with the applicable criteria and that, if the remainder of the training programme is implemented as planned and identified deficiencies and concerns are addressed, the training programme is likely to gain full certification. ECSA, however, gives no commitment to certify the training programme at this stage.

Provisional Certification is granted for a maximum of two years. Provisional certification may be converted to certification of the training programme by means of an Evaluation visit after at least four years of implementation of the training programme. Thereafter regular certification visits take place as scheduled for the organisation.

(c) Certification of the training programme
Within this policy, certification signifies formal recognition by ECSA, through a quality assurance procedure, that a training programme meets the certification criteria.

Certification of the training programme means that the training programme has been judged to satisfy the prescribed criteria and has been able to continue to produce candidates who meet the competency outcome criteria for a defined period of up to four years.

Should a training programme not satisfy all criteria but evidence exists of commitment and capacity on the part of the organisation to achieve full compliance within a stated time, the training programme may be certified for a period not exceeding two years.

7.2 Certification findings and decisions
Decisions of the Central Registration Committee regarding an engineering training programme are based on the report of the certification team’s findings at the visit. Findings are reported using the structure defined in document A-05-GL addressing the outcomes, content, effectiveness of learning and mentoring and critical success factors that confirm the sustainability of the engineering training programme.
In the case of an Initial Desktop Evaluation, only the prose part of the report should be completed. It should, however, be comprehensive and be guided by the detailed questions.

7.3 Responsibility for reporting

The Lead Evaluator for an engineering training programme is responsible for the quality of the report to the Central Registration Committee. The report must clearly distinguish between matters that affect certification decisions and those identified for the improvement of the engineering training programmes. The Visit report must provide sufficient detail for the Central Registration Committee to make an informed certification decision. The report is sent to the organisation and must clearly indicate matters that require remediation or that relate to the improvement of training programmes. The report must not prescribe any methods to address issues.

A deficiency may be declared if the organisation fails to produce evidence in the documentation or at the site visit to demonstrate that a certification criterion has been satisfied.

7.4 Certification decision rules

Decision rules D1–D9 below are guided by the following principles.

An engineering training programme judged by the Central Registration Committee to have:

- no deficiencies must be granted certification to the year of completion of the certification cycle
- deficiencies, that after the interim and final reports still compromise the candidate’s competency requirements for registration must not be granted further certification
- deficiencies that do not compromise the candidate’s competency requirements for registration must be granted certification for a period not exceeding two years, conditional on the organisation undertaking to improve the engineering training programme and that the improvements be verified by means of an interim evaluation before the end of the period.
Certification decisions are made guided by the four criteria highlighted in this document which can lead to any of the decisions.

**In the case of an engineering training programme that produces candidates:**

**D1.** For any type of visit: If no deficiencies are identified, grant certification until the year of the next regular visit. Concerns may exist that must be addressed with the result being assessed at the next visit. If deficiencies are identified via the four criteria, apply rules D2 to D7 appropriate to the type of visit.

**D2.** In the case of a regular visit with identified deficiencies: grant certification for a period, not exceeding two years, on the understanding that the Central Registration Committee will allow the organisation time to bring about the required improvements. Select one of the following mechanisms, (a) or (b), to verify that the provider has remedied the deficiencies:

(a) An interim visit within one to two years of the original visit.
(b) The submission of an interim report within 6 to 24 months of the original visit.

The Central Registration Committee must adopt this measure only if it is clear that:

- the result of remediation can be assessed objectively
- deficiencies can be remedied within two years
- verification by report is appropriate.

Concerns may exist and must be addressed with the result being assessed at the next regular visit. The Central Registration Committee must specify in the decision letter the parts of the documentation defined in document **A-06-TEM** that must be included in the self-study report of the visit.

**D3.** In the case of evaluation by an interim report with identified deficiencies: may require an interim visit within 6 months of consideration of the report.
D4. In the case of evaluation by means of an interim visit with identified new or previously declared deficiencies: issue a notice to terminate certification and require a final visit within 12 months of the interim visit.

D5. In the case of a final visit with identified new or previously declared deficiencies: withdraw certification. Determine whether withdrawal is to take place with immediate effect or whether certification extends to the Candidates of the current year.

D6. At any visit with current or previously declared deficiencies: if the Central Registration Committee judges that there is a demonstrable lack of commitment or capacity on the part of the organisation to address deficiencies, issue a notice to terminate certification and require a final visit within 6 months of the decision.

D7. If the Central Registration Committee judges that the engineering training programme is likely to receive certification if implementation continues according to the documented plans and deficiencies or concerns identified can be remedied, grant Provisional Certification; otherwise

D8. Provisional certification must not be granted for the programme.

Organisation response in cases of decisions with identified deficiencies

In the case of Decisions D2, D4 or D6 (other than certify at the next regular visit), the provider must, within two months of the date of the letter conveying the certification decision, acknowledge the decision and commit to the time scale laid down for the next report or visit.

In the case of a programme submitted for Initial Desktop Evaluation, the following must be noted:

The Central Registration Committee must express an opinion on the planned programme taken from O1, O2 or O3 or O2 and O3 in combination:

- O1: The planned training programme as reflected in the documentation is free from deficiencies and concerns.
• O2: Aspects of the planned training programme as reflected in the documentation are potentially deficient in the respects listed above.
• O3: Aspects of the planned engineering training programme as reflected in the documentation are cause for concern in the respects listed above.

General requirement:
Where deficiencies and concerns are to be addressed, the organisation must be given freedom by the Central Registration Committee to determine how it will bring about the necessary improvements, including alternative approaches.

7.5 Material change during a period of certification
During the period of certification of a training programme, the organisation is required to notify ECSA of:
• any changes to the engineering training programme that potentially affect compliance with the certification criteria, including changes to the programme structure, content, outcomes assessed
• altered conditions which could be detrimental to the sustainability of the training programme.

Certification or provisional certification may be reviewed if such changes take place. The organisation is expected to provide ECSA with any information that it may request. The Central Registration Committee, having considered the information provided, must determine a course of action within the policy and procedures.
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