

## Proposed standard U83000780

### Reference 0.2

Comment type technical

#### Comment:

Throughout the body of the standard it is not clear what is mandatory and what is optional

#### Proposed amendment:

Add a section that guides intent of the standard by using specific words to indicate what is REQUIRED, and what is GOOD to have and revise the text looking at the correct use of verbs

Please use translation of the section that all ISO standards use:

*"In this UNI Standard, the following verbal forms are used:*

*"shall" indicates a requirement; DEVE, DOVRA'*

*"should" indicates a recommendation; DOVREBBE*

*"may" indicates a permission; PUO', POTREBBE*

*"can" indicates a possibility or a capability." PUO', POTREBBE*

### Reference 6.1

Comment type: technical

#### Comment:

PMI believes that oral interviews/role playing, as designed, implemented, and non-uniformly applied in the context of the UNI standard, do not meet ISO/EIC 17024:2012 requirements for construction of a "fair, valid, and reliable" assessment. In fact it is very difficult to insure the reliability and fairness of this type of assessment method, as implemented by the UNI Standard, because of the differences in experience between the interviewer and another interviewer, as well as differences with the applicant. There are big differences in how projects are managed by industries, different organization types and sizes, and project size, scope and budget, thus the oral exam script/set of questions developed by interviewers will be different from one examination location to another and will therefore lack impartiality, uniformity, and standardization in their implementation. In short, oral assessments will differ in level of difficulty, validity in scoring, and will result in cases where some candidates who have the same professional competences pass, while others fail.

We propose to make the oral interview optional. By making the oral interview optional and allowing for candidates to demonstrate their competency through a rigorous, uniform, and standardized assessment/credentialing process, the community of certified practitioners



## Proposed standard U83000780

will be in a position to continuously demonstrate to the market that they have met standardized requirements for demonstrating they have at least the minimal competencies required to perform the functional and technical elements of their roles. The PMI certification program, with over 700,000 global credential holders, is an example of a

certification program that continues to effectively assess project, program, and portfolio management competency through a comprehensive set of certifications that require a candidate to meet stringent eligibility requirements, adhere to a Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct, and maintain their certifications through on-going professional development as required by the Continuing Certification Requirements process.

### Proposed amendment:

6.1 c) **optional**, or a exam, to assess the skill that consists.....

### Reference 6.2

**Comment type:** technical

### Comment:

The periodic evaluation must be carried out through a combination of formal, informal, and non-formal constructs. The number of credit hours required should be based upon predetermined criteria as defined by the credentialing body. Further, each unit of professional development measurement should be defined in a clear and cogent manner so that both certificants and those organizations by whom they are employed have a standardized way of assessing and quantifying their development.

### Proposed amendment:

Periodic validations should be carried out, according to the credential body definition, with an indicative number of credits at least:

- a)...
- b)-.....

### Reference 6.3

**Reference section / Figure / prospective / formula:** NOTA 2

**Comment type:** technical

## Proposed standard U83000780

### Comment:

Notes and Annex are NOT considered a requirement. The purpose of the Note or an Annex is to provide clarification or additional information. For that reason, we recommend to move Note 1 in the body of the Standard.

### Proposed amendment:

Move NOTE 1 in the body of the standard.

### Reference 6.3

Reference section / Figure / prospective / formula: NOTA 2

Comment type: technical

### Comment:

If NOTE 2 is clarification to Note 1 say that explicitly in the NOTE 2 text.

### Proposed amendment:

NOTE 2 : The evaluation and validation, in compliance with the requirements set out in NOTE 1 ....

### Reference ANNEX C

Reference section / Figure / prospective / formula: ~~C2e3~~

Comment type: technical

### Comment:

The primary goal of a certification exam is to separate those who have met the certification standard (passing) from those who have not (failing) in a fair and reliable manner. Certification exams are generally constructed to provide the best precision at the passing point. The passing point is usually established based on the level of difficulty of a specific set of the exam questions, and all exam sets are equated using valid psychometric method(s). Psychometricians perform "Standards Setting" activities, during which they often apply two or three methods to produce results which help to establish a fair, valid, and reliable pass/fail score. For that reason, the passing point values should not be declared by a standard, but by a psychometrically proven and statically-based passing point determination process.

Commento [NC1]: I mostly rearranged the text for sequence/logic.

### Proposed amendment:



### Proposed standard **U83000780**

- a) The pass fail score for the examination shall be established based on the valid psychometric method and documented.
- b) remove
- c) remove

NOTE: all the consideration about Credential Body (ODC) are delegated to ACCREDIA that certifies them according to .ISO/EIC 17024:2012.