

Technical Committee Record of Meeting
Le Meridien Park Hotel, Frankfurt, Germany – Friday/Saturday 1st-2nd April 2016

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
01	Welcomes, Apologies and Introduction and Voting Member Identification (Romyanon)	The TC Chair Ekanit Romyanon opened the meeting with a welcome to all participants. He continued with the comment that all opinions are valuable and encouraged everyone to participate. He continued that constructive discussions include a balance of views from all stakeholders and respect for different viewpoints. He warned that any disrespectful comments will not be tolerated. He explained that he would summarize the conclusions and decisions so they are accurately recorded. He concluded with the request for participants to please not hesitate to ask for explanations if they have a question or need clarification. The introduction was follow with a round of introductions.		
02	IAF TC Terms of Reference (Nash)	The Vice Chairs, Trevor Nash, reviewed the IAF TC Terms of Reference for the benefit of newer members. He pointed out the difference between a Task Force (TF) and a Working Group (WG).in terms of short versus long term projects. He continued that voting, if required, was based on one vote per IAF member. He concluded with the fact that the TC Chair was elected and the Vice Chair was chosen by the Chair.		
03	Agenda and Objectives of Meeting (Romyanon)	The Agenda was reviewed and agreed to by the members with no changes or additions.	Agenda Approved	
04				
04.1	Minutes of Meeting held on October 30-31 2015 in Milan, Italy (Brough-Kerrebyn)	The Secretary, Joan Brough-Kerrebyn addressed the draft minutes from the last meeting October 2015 in Milan. She requested any amendments/additions to these minutes in order to finalize them.	Minutes Approved	Post final version of minutes - Secretary
04.2	Log of Key IAF TC Decisions (Romyanon, Brough-Kerrebyn)	The Secretary presented the decisions from the Milan 2016 meeting. The decisions were accepted as presented to the members. The secretary indicated that the approved decisions would be posted in the decision log.	Approval of all decision from the October 2015 Milan meeting	Posting of decision in the decision log - Secretary
05	Working Groups/Task Force/Progress Reports (Romyanon Nash)			
05.1	Working Groups (Romyanon)			

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
05.1.1	WG Management System Certification (ISO/IEC 17021) (Gillespie / Savov)	<p>Lori Gillespie began her presentation stating that the Terms of Reference for the WG remained unchanged. She indicated that the list of present members of the WG was maintained by the conveners. There were 60 participants at their recent meeting.</p> <p>The Resolution 2015-14, regarding the issue of unaccredited certificates, caused significant discussion and was the topic of two discussion papers submitted to the WG. The WG supported the resolution that the certificate must have the symbol or reference on the certificate. They were willing to accommodate the rare exceptions. They recommended that the TC should issue a new resolution to allow this exception.</p> <p>She continued that the review of the discussion paper on the need for transition requirements was short as a TF had been setup, at the last TC meeting, to address that issue.</p> <p>The discussion paper on MD5 was reviewed but the WG could not come to a consensus.</p> <p>As a result of another paper the WG recommended a New TF on integrated audits to revise MD11 document as it needs to address audit time. TF also need to address a variety of standards. Ivan Savov offered to be co-convenor of this TF with someone from RVA .</p> <p>Decisions:</p> <p>1. Resolution 2015-14</p> <p>Members had another discussion on whether the logo must be used or if there could be exceptions. The TC conclusion was that it supported the mandatory use of the accreditation symbol or reference on all accredited certificates. The wording would be determined during the discussion paper session)</p> <p>The issue of how to communicate this position arose. (minutes, decision log, resolution). Members suggested a decision first followed by a resolution for the GA. It was agreed that a separate resolution in follow up to resolution 2015-14 would be written on the use of symbols on accredited certificates and transition dates.</p> <p>2. TF for MD11 for review.</p>	<p>Next meeting 0.5 day- 50-60 persons- avoid overlapping on other WGs.</p> <p>New TF endorsed</p>	

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		<p>The proposed new TF was endorsed by the TC. Lori expressed the need that the new document would be generic enough to accommodate any standards. Ivan Savov had offered to convene this TF with a representative from RvA.</p> <p>Ivan Savov also requested that he step down from his role as the co convener of WG MSC. In response Guillaume Gignac from IIOC (Intertek) offered to take on the co-convener position for the WG MSC.</p>	<p>Ivan and RvA rep to co-convene.</p> <p>Guillaume Gignac endorsed as the co-convener WG MSC</p>	
05.1.2	WG Product Certification Accreditation (ISO/IEC 17065) (Moliski / Kotaro)	<p>Paul Moliski indicated that there were 43 participants at his meeting with 6-8 new observers. He provided his agenda and added that the formal membership list was not yet established but would be reviewed.</p> <p>He continued that the WG was briefed on the work of the TF Conformity Assessment Schemes. The discussion included if the new CAS document should include products and if the new document should be informational or mandatory but no decision was made. As a result the WG Product will participate in the TF.</p> <p>Paul indicated that AFRAC and ARAC provided an update on the status of the transition to ISO 17065.</p> <p>He continued that the EA survey on the need for a 17065 guidance document was reviewed. The IAF survey was planned from April 2016 to June 2016. The WG agreed to form a working group to implement the survey</p> <p>PAC reported to the WG on their TF on Accreditation Scopes for products.</p> <p>There was an enquiry on MD12 regarding the need to revisit for Product Certification, however, the WG did not feel there was a need.</p> <p>Paul reported that the IAF/ ILAC/ IEEC Steering Committee had a new secretary, Ms. Tara Mitchell (IEEC), in Geneva and that their Unified Assessment Guidance Document was approved by ILAC and is waiting for IECEE approval.</p> <p>The WG was requested to review a discussion paper and their final consensus version was presented.</p> <p>Paul requested Global Gap to provide an update the WG Product.</p>	Survey approved	<p>Survey letter to IAF AB and Regional AB members.</p> <p>0.5 day meeting on October 26th</p>

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
05.1.3	WG Person Certification (ISO/IEC 17024) (Woodley / Sheehan)	<p>Cynthia Woodley reported on her meeting and provided the agenda. She indicated that the Terms of Reference as provided had been implemented.</p> <p>She continued that the Implementation survey, to reveal any issues was launched in December 2015 and closed in March 2016. There were 122 respondents. Results had been tabulated. They still need to analyse the open ended comments and a small group has been formed to do this task. AB and CB comments will be analysed separately. At the next meeting, the WG will discuss the results to determine if there are implementation and/or interpretation issues.</p> <p>Cynthia continued that schemes were being developed that do not meet ISO/IEC 17024. As a response a “does and don’t” document was developed by CASCO which will be released in a few weeks.</p> <p>In terms of a formal membership list the WG is working on a new list and wanted IAF to request members from each IAF member.</p> <p>Cynthia noted that there are a number of Persons Certification Scheme with small number of participants and therefore not financially viable for accreditation. If this becomes a problem she suggested that there may be a need to discuss other alternatives to accreditation.</p> <p>She continued with the issue of CB that were only certifying their own employees. The WG had agreed that there was nothing in ISO/IEC17024 that prevent this as long as it was not restricted to their employee. The issue of digital badges was also discussed as there are some issues there.</p> <p>There may be the need for a competence in AB assessors to assess the security of badges and other electronic certificates.</p> <p>The next step for the WG was determined to be the establishment of specific information on competence for persons certification/accreditation.</p> <p>The WG was also formulating a statement of interpretation to be sent by IAF to CASCO.</p>	Need full day meeting at next meeting.	E-mail be sent to all IAF members requesting nominations and appointment of members to the WG on Certification of Persons
05.1.4	WG Forests (Rantanen / Berger)	Varpu Rantanen first indicated that the Terms of Reference had been reviewed and remained unchanged. She noted the membership was small and changed frequently. Sixteen participants attended the last meeting.		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		<p>Topics of the recent meeting included:</p> <p>PEFC Standard Revision Process: 3 ABs will be involved. PEFC will develop requirements for Accreditation Bodies. New PEFC International Standard about the transfer of emission data in the supply chain is under public consultation and in a pilot phase.</p> <p>DAkKS provided a discussion paper based on the accreditation and scheme evaluation process for PEFC Germany. Further consideration of these items to will occur in the PEFC Standard Revision Process</p> <p>Another issue discussed was how to refer to certification that does not imply product certification.</p> <p>Next Meeting will focus on PEFC requirements.</p>		<p>May need teleconference facilities to connect with Michael who will not be in New Delhi.</p>
05.1.5	WG Food (ISO 22000) (Greenaway / Sheehan)	<p>Kylie Sheehan explained that their meeting would occur tomorrow afternoon and therefore there was no report at this time.</p> <p>She indicated their meeting would include a workshop with Global Gap and review of the expected outcomes document. They will also consider a survey on implementation issues of TS 22003 and if time, initiatives in the USA</p>		
5.1.6	WG Medical Devices (ISO 13485) (Ramaley / Nakagawa)	<p>Grant Ramaley indicated that there were 14 participants at the WG meeting.</p> <p>He continued that the issue at hand was the significant number of medical device suppliers (not manufacturers) that are certified and meet ISO 13485 but the scopes are not suitable. In addition, MD8 and MD9 basically address manufacturers particularly in regards to risk assessment. These documents therefore need to address the complete supply chain as well as improve its alignment with ISO 17021-1. Changes proposed were agreed to by the WG.</p> <p>Another issue was competences and qualification for different levels of the supply chain (annex c).</p> <p>The WG started to resolve comments received on the draft IMDN document, currently out for TC member comment.</p> <p>As a result of a discussion paper regarding scoping of medical device supplier the WG proposed the following action. In order to adapt the MD 8 and MD9 for suppliers the WG proposed the addition of a table (A 1.7) from another document. A TF will be established to revise MD8 and MD9 will be convened by Lori Gillespie</p>	<p>TC agreed to establish a TF.</p>	

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		<p>and Grant Ramaley. Grant added that the table would ultimately be incorporated into the revised MD documents.</p> <p>Another revision of MD8 and MD9 will follow. Randy pointed out that the document could be revised before India.</p>	<p>TC agreed to add the table.</p> <p>TC agreed to short cut process (no TC comment period).</p>	
05.1.7	WG Greenhouse Gases (GHG) and Energy (ISO 14065) (Makino / Howard)	<p>Ann Howard reported that there were 24 participants including the US Department of Energy - Clean Energy Ministerial</p> <p>The meeting was split into 2 halves, GHG and Energy.</p> <p>1. EnMS</p> <p>The WG agreed to use technical content from existing normative document (ISO 50001) and the addition of ISO 50003 for scoping ((table for scoping by ABs plus MD17 ID 1). They agreed on an approved MLA structure and reviewed the peer evaluation process. They now seek approval for the MLA structure</p> <p>2. GHG:</p> <p>Ann mentioned that there was new sectorial capping of emissions. The importance of this program is significant in view of the recent Paris agreement</p> <p>She proposed that IAF consider registering as NGO with UNFCCC so members can participant and provide input. The TC Chair responded that it would depend on member being able to attend</p> <p>She noted that revisions to ISO 14064 and 14065 are underway. The WG is looking at the revision of the standards. The WG also agreed that it would be worthwhile to look at various approaches to scoping.</p> <p>Decisions:</p> <p>1. WG seek TC endorsement from technical point of view for EnMS</p> <p>Norman Brunner (Chair-MLA) informed the members that the MLA program would still need to be discussed and approved by the MLAC at the next meeting.</p>	<p>TC approved of the EnMS MLA process.</p>	

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		<p>2. Endorse GHG MLA.</p> <p>TC noted that the program was already approved, there was a need to encourage applications.</p> <p>3. IAF as a NGO to the UNFCC.</p> <p>4. <i>Resolution: Add table for use by ABs (table 2). Agreed to send it to the GA</i></p> <p>Alister Dalrymple requested that the fact that the decision log is not binding be recorded in these minutes. Pierre Salle and Norbert Borzek reminded members that the original role of the decision log was to manage discussions and avoid repetition. Randy advised that there were two routes to make a mandatory requirement, as content in a MD or a GA resolution.</p>		<p>IAF register as NGO with UNFCC. TC Chair- will review at the executive committee.</p> <p>Requested a full day for GHG and Energy not during WG MSC.</p>
05.1.8	WG Information Technology Management Systems (ITSM) (ISO/IEC 20000) (Takeshi)	<p>Takeshi Nonaka first reported that eight participants attended the WG meeting. He reported on the current activities.</p> <p>MD 18 had been published, The MD is regarded as a provisional document until ISO/IEC 20000-6 (Requirements for certification bodies of ISO/IEC 20000-1) is published.</p>		Next Meeting need 0.5 day meeting
05.1.9	WG Information Security Management System (ISMS) (ISO/IEC 27001) MLA Scope (Nakagawa / Zhigao)	<p>Azusa Nakagawa reported on the recent developments on the related standards. The WG reviewed recent revisions and development of the ISO/IEC 27000 series.</p> <p>The WG exchanged the information on the progress of transition of ISO/IEC 27006:2011 to 2015. The WG asks the TF on Transitions to consider to synchronize the deadlines of various transition if possible.</p> <p>In regards to the review of IAF MD 13 the WG suggests the review to be conducted after the publications of IAF MDX Generic Competence for AB Assessors and the revised ISO/IEC 17011.</p>		
05.1.10	WG Business Continuity Management Systems (BCMS) (Dougherty / Savov)	Randy Dougherty reported that there had been no recent meeting.		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
05.1.11	Auditing Practices Group and Accreditation Auditing Practices Group [APG and AAPG] ISO 9001 (Ezrakhovich / Yang)	<p>Alex Ezrakhovich indicated that there were 5 Accreditation Bodies and 8 stakeholders at the meeting. He continued that it was a productive meeting and all APG papers were reviewed to up-date with ISO 9001:2015. These papers are now uploaded on the website.</p> <p>He indicated that there had been a re-grouping of the papers.</p> <p>He promoted and encouraged everyone to reference the papers. He added that they were now more user friendly. He also requested suggestions for new topic for AAPG/APG papers.</p>		Next Meeting – 0.5 day meeting

DRAFT

05.1.12	JWG to Improve Accreditation Bodies Consistency (Jauhri / Guay)	<p>Anil Jauhri reported that the meeting was attended by 60 participants and they reviewed the progress of the on-line forum on Accreditation Body Consistency. The majority of the comments were supportive. The policy on inconsistency still needs to be captured in an IAF policy and peer evaluations will need to incorporate implementation of the policy.</p> <p>JWG discussed feedback received from UAC and GlobalGAP and the need more information from GlobalGAP.</p> <p>Marcus Long was invited to present a report on the proposed on-line forum. He explained the purpose of the forum, to encourage debate and dialog to improve consistency.</p> <p>He explained that there was two routes identified to develop the forum.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create our own forum (more flexibility but higher cost) 2. Use a <i>LinkedIn</i> forum (some limitations but quicker and less costly) <p>Each IAF member would be allowed access to the forum. As a topic is raised it would need to be approved by TC Chair or Vice Chair. Once the topic is approved it is posted and open for any member to comment. Members are responsible for the quality of the debate.</p> <p>If IAF has its own system it is possible to store and link discussions. However it was suggested that the forum be tried out in Linked In by a limited number of members to test it out. A group will be formed to test out the forum out in the next few months.</p> <p>The key objective is actions that results in an expected outcomes which could range from nothing to a standard's revision.</p> <p>The forum will be complimentary to the existing processes. The forum could replace the need for the JWG.</p> <p>There followed general questions about the mechanics of the forum.</p> <p>Anil suggested that with the launch of the on-line forum the JWG should be considered for disbanding.</p> <p>Anil continued that the original issues (that initiated the JWG) no longer exist as they were referenced to 17021-2011.</p> <p>While the TC was agreedable to disband the group, the Chair of the MLA indicated MLA MC cannot decide until the next meeting since it was a joint WG. It was agreed the JWG may need to continue until the online forum is seen to be functional and effective.</p>	TC agreed to that JWG may continue until forum is established and MLA MC also considers the	
---------	---	---	---	--

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		It was recognized that there may be issues of confidentiality. Therefore, it was agreed to plan for a short meeting in New Delhi based on issues of the forum.	recommendation of disbanding it.	
05.2	Task Forces (Nash)			
05.2.1	TF Competence of AB Assessors & Experts (Woodley / Shaw)	<p>Cynthia Woodley reported that the TF meeting, held the day before, reviewed the comments from the ballot on the MD - Auditor Competence. She reviewed that this document had a lengthy development process. As a result of the TF review, they addressed the comments from the ballot including adding an introduction to Annex A, adding an explanation of the items in the pyramid as well as some punctuation changes. The document is now ready to be published.</p> <p>Cynthia added to this point that she wished to send an Introductory letter with the notice of publication of the MD is sent to members. Text to be provided by Cynthia.</p> <p>The TF discussed the possible push back and the difficulty with implementation of the document. As a result, the TF decided to ask for a workshop for AB to provide experience on implementation of the document. She described the workshop as including implementation, best practices and methodology related to the document. They also want it videotaped to share with those that cannot attend. It would require a full day.</p> <p>She also noted that IAF is involved in coordination with ILAC with a competence document. Copies of this document have been provided to ILAC.</p> <p>With the completion of the document Cynthia indicated that she wanted to step down as convener of this TF. Phil Shaw also indicated he wished to step down. The TF will attempt to find another set of conveners. Next meeting will be the last for both conveners.</p> <p>Vijay (ANSI) volunteer as a new convener.</p> <p>Cynthia indicated that new business for the TF would be to identify specific competences with a focus on Persons program due to the high number of ABs starting to implement accreditation of CBs for Persons and the high number of requests for training on ISO/IEC 17024. To start the process the TF agreed to conduct a job/task analysis in the first quarter of 2017 and a number of ABs agreed to host the event.</p>	<p>Chair agreed to forward to publish</p> <p>TC agreed to the training session</p> <p>TF can proceed with a specific competences on Persons</p>	<p>Send document to Chair for approval to publish.</p> <p>Text to be provided by Cynthia.</p> <p>Raised at JEC re ILAC coordination. Cynthia to write a T of R for a JTF with ILAC.</p> <p>TC to replace both conveners. (Vijay offered to be the convener)</p> <p>Next Meeting: 0.5 day meeting and full day train</p>

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
05.2.2	TF Complex, Multi-Site Certification without Sampling (Dalrymple)	Alister Dalrymple reported that the ballot on MD 19 resulted in 69 votes for and 7 votes against, with 15 comments received. The comments were reviewed and resolved with the TF. The MD 19 was published 31 March, 2016. The TC agreed to disband the TF as work on this topic would be merged with a revision of MD 1.	TC Agreed to disband	
05.2.3	TF Counterfeit Certificates (Schattner / Savov)	Ivan Savov indicated that the TF would meet on Sunday. They plan to discuss their information document.		
05.2.4	TF Control of Entities Operating on behalf of Accredited Certification Bodies (Savov)	Ivan Savov reported that the first draft of the TF document was ready to be submitted for TC comment.		Documents to be sent to TC members for 30 days comment once approved by the Chair.
05.2.5	TF Remote Assessment (Morr)	Trevor Nash reported that the document had been published. The work of the TF was complete.	TC agreed to disband the TF	
05.2.6	TF Conformity Assessment Schemes (CAS) formally Industry Specific Certification Programs (ISCP) (Salle / Geneiatakis)	<p>Pierre Salle began with acknowledgement of his co-convener Manolis. He continued that a key issue for this TF is the issues of the scheme owners need to be understood and balanced with the IAF requirement. The requirement also need to be clear and harmonized amongst members. The TF is discussing the need for requirement for individual programs (MS, product, persons) The other issue is the need for a mandatory versus information document. Another concern was the application of the requirements by the regions or individual economies, as the document could be limited to schemes that need IAF recognition.</p> <p>In discussion it was offered that the original idea was guidance for AB to evaluate schemes. It was agreed that the document should focus on being applicable to any scheme, national or international. After a lengthy discussion it was agreed that the TF should continue with the development of an MD as that was the original mandate from the TC, but there was no agreement about whether it should be extended to include products or persons as that question would have to be referred to the applicable WG's.</p>		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
05.2.7	TF Principles for Determining Duration of AB Assessments (Garner / Purnomo)	Lori Gillespie reported on behalf of the conveners. The TF continues work on its ID. In order to complete it needs examples of current processes to determine the time required for an assessment. They have received one from ACCREDIA but it requires more examples. IAF TC members were requested to contact Tina Garner if they can provide one.		IAF AB Members to send in example processes for assessment duration.
05.2.8	TF OHSAS 18001 migration to ISO 45001 (Dougherty / Omodeo-Zorini)	Leonardo Omodeo-Zorini reported that the revised migration document was circulated after the resolution of initial comments. It has now been circulated to IAF members for 60 day comment. He continued that ISO 45001 is at the DIS stage and the ballot ends mid-May. There is also a new work item on an auditor competence document. EA has produced a new document on application of the standard and it will be requested that IAF take on this document. It was also noted that due to the needs of local regulators (references in regulations) there is likely going to be a delay in withdrawal of 18001 (OHSAS decision).		
05.2.9	TF Multi-Site Certification and MD1 (merger) (Dalrymple / Keeling)	Already covered above – 05.2.2. Will have their first meeting after this meeting.		
05.2.10	TF Transfers (revision to MD2) (Nash / Nakagawa)	Trevor Nash informed members that the first TF meeting was scheduled for Sunday. There was a prepared proposed draft and TF members would be asked to review the document and send in comments.		
05.2.11	TF Transitions (new MD) (Gillespie / Omodeo-Zorini)	Lori Gillespie reported that the TF had technical difficulties meeting electronically and planned an ad-hoc meeting tomorrow. Day 2 Addition: Lori reported that the TF had an ad-hoc meeting to start up. The TF objective is a mandatory document to provide consistent transitions for all programs. They drafted a table of contents and intend to develop an interactive document. The members will be drafting the document and will meet electronically in May 2016.		
05.2.12	TF CAAT (revision to MD4) (Jeffries / Omodeo-Zorini)	Sheronda Jeffries explained that the objective of this TF was to technically update the CAAT document, introducing newer technology and methods. Their initial action was to survey AB members on potential content. They also reviewed the terms of reference. The TF had two electronic meeting to establish tasks. They agreed on a new survey with four questions to TC members and members of CAB associations.		TC members to complete a survey regarding MD 4 updates by June 3, 2016:

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		The next meeting will be held electronically. The TF plans to move quickly to produce the document.		https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/DZZW3KY
06	Sector Liaison Reports (Nash)			
06.1	QuEST Forum - Telecoms (Jeffries)	<p>Sheronda Jeffries reported on QuEST Forum's recent activities. Their Requirements Handbook TL 9000 version 6 has gone through review with 25 comments. The new TL handbook will likely published June or July.</p> <p>She described the QuEST data base that contains information on ISO 9001 and TL certification. There is also a private data base of monthly data submissions which is retained behind a secure fire wall.</p> <p>Certification bodies submit data on a quarterly basis. She reviewed some of the data analysis.</p> <p>QuEST will also be launching a third party effectiveness program which will include data collection from ABs and CBs.</p> <p>She reminded the members that the QuEST website has free webinars available at http://www.questforum.org/news-events/quest-forum-academy-webinars/..</p>		
06.2	PEFC - Forestry (Berger)	<p>Michael Berger provided an overview of the status of PEFC. He noted there were significant changes to the statistics as Russia had been suspended and a new member India has been accepted. PEFC and competitors covers 10% of the globally available forests, therefore significant potential growth.</p> <p>Chain of Custody has experienced some small growth since Milan.</p> <p>PEFC has commenced a Standard Revision Process and 3 Accreditation Bodies have become involved. Some of the revisions include the requirement for publically available reports from ABs and the need for energy program data from the supply chain.</p>		
06.3	IAQG – Aerospace (Borzek / Geer)	Norbert Borzek reported that the IAQG would be meeting in April in Singapore. The organization is presently up dating their requirement standards. The transition to meet the new requirements is expected to be shorted than that of ISO 9001.		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
06.4	GFSI - Food Safety (Greenaway)	<p>Skip Greenaway reviewed that the IAF–GFSI discussion had been at a standstill due to a significant GFSI staff turnover. However, IAF representatives recently meet with GFSI Board members in Berlin which resulted in an agreement on a path forward. He indicated that Boards Members are committed to the MLA with GFSI.</p> <p>He continued that the guidance document was being revised (version 7) and the hope was to complete the version by the end of the year.</p> <p>GFSI will be further discussed at the WG Food meeting on Sunday. Izabela Palgan is the GFSI representative to IAF. From GSFI's perspective, auditor competence is the most critical concern.</p>		
06.5	Global G.A.P- Food Safety (Fekete)	<p>Andras Fekete provided an overview of the Global GAP, a member based organization and its programs. He explained that Global GAP is a retail based non-profit organization with some 160,000 retailers globally. It has a number of programs, with numerous un processed food sectors, the Integrated Farm Assurance being the focus of IAF recognition. It presently has 30 accreditation bodies and 140 certification bodies offering the program and 6 ABs that are inactive but will eventually offer accreditation recognized by the program.</p> <p>Other Global Gap standards include a food safety, chain of custody, feed, livestock transportation, and social practises.</p>		
07	Liaison Reports (Romyanon)			
07.1	ISO TC 176 (Kwong)	<p>The written report from the ISO 176 secretariat was acknowledged by the members. It was conveyed from Kwong that ISO TC 176 will appoint a liaison member to IAF in the future.</p>		
07.2	ISO TC 207/SC1 (Makino)	<p>Chikako Makino reported that at the ISO/TC 207/SC 1 plenary meeting on 10 September 2015 SC1 agreed to develop a new work item proposal (NWIP) for guidance on how to apply the ISO 14001:2015 framework to environmental aspects, environmental topic areas and environmental conditions that affect an organization. SC 1 further agreed to establish an Ad Hoc Group (AHG) on guidance standard to develop a proposal on a new work item for 14002. The AHG is scheduled to complete its review and submit its final report to SC1 by 15th May 2016, for the SC1 2016 Plenary.</p>		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
07.3	ISO/TC 207/SC 7 (Shaw)	Phil Shaw reported that the subcommittee documents (revisions to ISO 14064 - 1, 2, and 3) were works in process. Part 3 is expected to be a CD by the end of April 2016. ISO 14065 will follow after 14064 is completed.		
07.4	ISO/IEC JTC1/ SC27 WG1 (Takeshi)	Takeshi provided an update on the revision status of draft standards in the 27000 series. At the WG last meeting in October 2015 reviewed the status of all the documents being developed. The next meeting will be on April 11-15, 2016.		
07.5	ISO/TC 242 (Kotte/Makino)	<p>Sheronda Jeffries reported on behalf of Baskar. His report indicated that work on ISO 50001 had reached DIS stage. Anticipated Publication date is July-August 2016.</p> <p>TMB has Approved the Merger of TC 242, TC 257 and JPC2 and will be known as TC 301.</p> <p>The next meeting is in Stockholm Sweden, June 13, 2016.</p> <p>Chikako Makino also offered to collect comment from IAF members on ISO 50001 DIS until the deadline April 20, 2016.</p>		
07.6	ISO-CASCO (Mac Curtain)	<p>Sean Mac Curtain provided a review of current CASCO activities. He first announced that Lane had completed a very productive term as Chair and there now was a new Chair from South Africa.</p> <p>He noted that 91 of 131 members participate in the CASCO standards development process. He provided a breakdown of the CASCO structure which also included the Chair Policy Group and the STAR Group of international regulators.</p> <p>He continued with a listing of current technical activities: 17021-1, 17011, 17025, 17034, 17021-2, 3, 9, 10 and TR17028. He added that there was a WG set up to work on a definition of validation and verification.</p> <p>The presentation provided a list of current events.</p>		
7.7	Interpol - Counterfeit Certificates (Savov)	No report at this time.		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
07.8	ISO/CASCO WG 34 (van Erp)	<p>Casper van Erp provided this first report on WG 34. He commented that the last 3 day meeting was very positive with members with a drive to get the task accomplished.</p> <p>The document, revision of ISO/TS 17021-2, as drafted had a 4th chapter on criteria, 5th on considerations on EMS concepts, 6th on environmental issues and a 7th on personnel.</p> <p>The new version has better linkage with the intended outcomes. It is also ungraded in terms the use of space and determining risks and opportunities. The presentation listed some of the proposed changes.</p> <p>Presently in the DIS phase, it will need two months for translation, 3 months to ballots. There will be a second meeting in September.</p> <p>It has been proposed that the document be upgraded from a TS (technical specification) to an international standard.</p>		
08	Regional Accreditation Group Liaison Reports (Romyanon)			
08.1	EA (Belson)	<p>Kevin Belson provided a report on EACC's recent activities.</p> <p>He highlighted that the new EA guidance on application of ISO/IEC 17021 for OHSMS was generic in approach, and not specifically aimed at ISO 45001. This document will be forwarded to the IAF TC for consideration as the basis for an IAF level document.</p> <p>Their FAQ data will shortly also be published on the EA public website and includes EACC consensus to questions as a harmonization tool.</p> <p>He continued that there was a new work item to develop a user friendly annex to EA-1/22 (Handling of sector schemes) guidance on differentiating between ISO/IEC 17065 and ISO/IEC 17021 schemes.</p> <p>There had been a workshop event to develop information on scheme standard selection from which the output will be used by the task force.</p> <p>Kevin's presentation also reviewed the documents under development and the specific activities of the various WGs.</p> <p>The next CC meeting is in Estonia 13-14 September 2016.</p>		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
08.2	PAC (Yang)	<p>Fei Yang provided a report on PAC activities. He first commented that a key attribute and strength of the region was its diversity.</p> <p>He outlined the key topics for the next PAC TC meeting. Those being: PAC Technical Document on the Application of ISO/IEC 17011 in Accreditation of EnMS Certification Bodies, a PAC Technical Document on the Application of ISO 50003 in EnMS Certification, PAC peer evaluation process for EnMS MLA, and Guidelines on how to describe accreditation scope for product certification.</p> <p>He also mentioned that PAC has a call for tender for a new secretariat.</p>		
08.3	IAAC (Melo)	<p>Liliane Somma provided the report for the IAAC. The report provided statistics on the number of members (21 MLA signatories) and the new program where they are accrediting, including 2ABs in FSMS and 2ABs in ISMS.</p> <p>IAAC has currently signed MOUs with APLAC, PAC, EA, ARAC, SADCA and AFRAC.</p> <p>A significant number of training workshops for 2016 were approved by Executive Committee.</p> <p>The last CBSC meeting took place on September 9, 2015 and the topics discussed were provided.</p>		
08.4	ARAC (Barrak)	<p>Moslem Barrak spoke to the ARAC report, high lights included:</p> <p>Harmonization of the ARAC membership categories definition with the International (IAF& ILAC) and other Regional Cooperation Bodies The new ARAC membership categories are Full members, Associate members, Stakeholders and Affiliate members.</p> <p>The current membership includes 15 members (11 Full members and 4 associates) covering 17 Arab countries. Among the ARAC 11 full members 3 are ARAC MLA, IAF MLA and ILAC MRA signatories (Dubai Accreditation Center, Egyptian Accreditation Council and Tunisian Accreditation Council).</p> <p>In November 2015 in Milan, Italy, ARAC and PAC (Pacific Accreditation Cooperation) signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU).</p>		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		<p>ARAC documents have been prepared and updated by the ARAC MLA and Technical Committees.</p> <p>The 2nd ARAC MLA workshop was held on 8 February 2016, Tunis, Tunisia, for the ARAC MLA members and Peer evaluators.</p> <p>The ARAC Executive Committee has commenced the process to formulate a Strategic Plan for ARAC for the period 2016 – 2021.</p> <p>ARAC held a successful fourth Annual Meetings in Tunis, Tunisia from the 8 - 11 February 2016.</p> <p>In preparation for the upcoming IAF/ILAC peer evaluation of ARAC a regional evaluation Team Leader, Roxanne Robinson, conducted a mock peer evaluation of the ARAC Secretariat on 22-24 February 2016 in Rabat, Morocco, with the participation of ARAC Chair and ARAC MLA Committee Chair.</p>		
08.5	AFRAC (Milgos)	<p>Sammy Milgos spoke to the AFRAC report to the IAF TC.</p> <p>AFRAC currently has a total of 14 Members: 4 Arrangement Members (MRA Signatories); 3 Full Members; 1 Associate Member; and 6 Stakeholder Members.</p> <p>AFRAC applied to ILAC and IAF in August 2015 for the international recognition of its MRA, and awaits the evaluation dates from ILAC and IAF.</p> <p>AFRAC is in the process of aligning their documents to international requirements.</p> <p>The trainees that received the Peer Evaluator training in October 2015 will receive training in AFRAC's MRA documents and forms in October 2016.</p> <p>The AFRAC mid-year meetings will be held from 30 May – 2 June 2016.</p> <p>The 7th AFRAC General Assembly meetings will be held in Abuja, Nigeria in September 2016.</p>		
08.6	SADCA (Goppe)	<p>Robin Goppe provided a verbal update.</p> <p>He indicated that SADCA had 15 member states and 3 Accreditation bodies, 1 being a multi-economy AB - SADCAS.</p> <p>SADCA had obtain MOU status with IAF and was preparing for a peer evaluation. It has formed a MLA committee and a training program for their 7 peer evaluators.</p>		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
09	Any Other Business (Romyanon)			
09.1	AB involvement in Scheme Owners	<p>The TC Chair introduced the issue involved and asked Varpu Rantanen to explain the details.</p> <p>She indicated that they had similar discussion in the EA. She explained that many ABs are approached to be involved in the process to develop schemes. As a result there is a need for a common understanding on the extent of the involvement (i.e. to only clarify the requirement and discuss the right standards. If an AB is involved in more than that there may be a problem as the AB needs to evaluate the same scheme that they have been involved in developing.</p> <p>The Chair offered that there was no need for TC action at this time but ABs should be aware of this issue when considering any such request.</p>		
09.2	Consistency Forum	Covered in 05.1.12		
9.3	Liaison to CASCO JWG 48 WG Occupation Health and Safety	Leonardo Omodeo-Zorini offered to be the IAF liaison to JWG 48. Competence requirement for Health and Safety.	TC agreed with the endorsement	TC Chair to seek endorsement from EC.
10	Meeting Conclusion and Results (Romyanon)			
10.1	Update of the Work Program (Brough-Kerrebyn)	<p>Continuing Task Force Projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Log of key IAF Technical Committee Decisions (Brough-Kerrebyn) • IAF Task Force Competence of Accreditation Assessors and Experts (Shaw & Woodley) • IAF Task Force Control Franchisees and Subcontractors (CFS) (Savov & Schattner) • IAF TF Conformity Assessment Schemes (CAS) (Salle & Geneiatakis) • IAF Task Force Principles for determining Duration of AB Assessments (Sagala & Garner) • IAF Task Force OHSAS 18001 migration to ISO 45001 (Dougherty & Omodeo-Zorini) • IAF/ILAC Joint Task Force Counterfeit Certificates (Schattner & Savov) • Multi-Site Certification and MD1 (<i>merger</i>) (Alister Dalrymple and Steve Keeling) 		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transfers (<i>revision to MD2</i>) (Trevor Nash and Azusa Nakagawa) • Transitions (<i>new MD</i>) (Lori Gillespie and Leonardo Omodeo-Zorini) • CAAT (<i>revision to MD4</i>) (Sheronda Jeffries and Leonardo Omodeo-Zorini) <p>New Task Forces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IAF Task Force Integrated Audits (<i>revision of MD11</i>) (Savov & Van den Akker*) <p>Task Forces Terminated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IAF Task Force Complex, Multi-site Certification without Sampling (Dalrymple) • IAF Task Force Remote Assessment (Morr) <p>Working Groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEC-IAF-ILAC Steering Committee (Dougherty) • IAF Working Group on Person Certification (ISO/IEC 17024) (Woodley & Sheehan) • IAF Working Group on Forests (Rantanen & Berger) • IAF Working Group on Product Certification Accreditation (ISO/IEC 17065) (Moliski & Kotaro) • IAF Working Group on Medical Devices (ISO 13485) (Ramaley & Nakagawa) • IAF Working Group on Food (ISO 22000) (Sheehan & Greenaway) • IAF Working Group on Greenhouse Gases and Energy [GHG] (ISO 14065) (Makino & Bowles) • ISO 9001 Auditing Practices Group and Accreditation Auditing Practices Group [APG and AAPG] (Ezrakhovich & Yang) • IAF Working Group on Management System Certification (ISO/IEC 17021) (Scheid-Gillespie & Gignac*) • IAF Working Group on Information Technology Management Systems (ITMS) (ISO 20000) (Nonaka) • Working Group on Information Security Management System [ISMS] MLA Scope (ISO 27001) (Nakagawa & Fu) • IAF Working Group on Business Continuity Management Systems (BCMS) (Dougherty) <p>Joint Working Groups:</p>		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IAF JWG to Improve Accreditation Bodies Consistency (Jauhri, [TC] & TBD [MLAC]) <p>New (Joint) Working Groups: None</p> <p>Working Groups Terminated: None</p> <p>*newly appointed</p>		
10.2	IAF TC Resolutions for the IAF General Assembly (Romyanon)	<p>Two developed at this meeting.</p> <p>1. Accreditation scoping for Energy Management System (EnMS)</p> <p>The General Assembly, acting on the recommendation of the Technical Committee, resolved to: Endorse Table 2 Technical Areas from ISO 50003:2014 Energy management systems -- Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of energy management systems as a normative reference for accreditation scope and grouping of sectors for witnessing of Energy Management System.</p> <p>2, Further information regarding Resolution 2015-14 (see 12.1 below)</p> <p>The General Assembly, acting on the recommendation of the Technical Committee, resolved that: In order for a management system certification document to be considered accredited it must display the accreditation symbol and/or reference the accreditation status of the CB. Note; If there is an exception to this the client must justify the exception to the CB, and if accepted, the certification is still considered accredited.</p> <p>The General Assembly further agreed that: Management systems certification bodies must transition certification documentation to include the accreditation symbol and/or reference the accreditation status of the CB at the time of recertification or within 3 years, by DATE (based on the date of the resolution).</p>		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
11	Next Meetings (Romyanon)			
11.1		26 October to 4 November 2016 – New Delhi, India		
11.2		31 March to 07 April 2017 - Frankfurt, Germany		
11.3		21 October to 30 October 2017 - Vancouver, Canada		
12	Discussion papers for action by the TC (Nash)			
12.1	IAF Resolution 2015-14 - HKAS, TAF, SAC and CNAS	<p>Consensus of the IAF TC: Decision Log: 16/04/01 IAF Resolution 2015-14</p> <p>The resolution applies to all ISO/IEC 17021-1 programs. The client cannot decide if its certificate is accredited or not. Per the resolution all certifications under the scopes of accreditation must be accredited. When a CB holds multiple accreditations it shall decide under which accreditation the certification will be issued. The certification does not have to be issued under multiple accreditations.</p>		
12.2	Application of IAF MD 15 - SAS	<p>Consensus of the IAF TC: Decision Log: 16/04/02 Application of IAF MD 15</p> <p>The application date is 14 July 2016 and the document was published in July 2014, there is no justification to extend the application date. The ABs and CBs have had time to put a process in place to collect the data as of 14 July 2016; recognizing the data may be limited at first.</p> <p>Overdue audits is still appropriate data to collect; the first surveillance audit has a due date and subsequent audits are required each calendar year (ISO/IEC 17021-1 section 9.1.3.3). Also, CBs may have a process for determining overdue audits that can be considered when collecting this data.</p> <p>The relevance of the data should be discussed when the MD is revised in the future. In order to implement the MD the data must be collected as required.</p>		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		IAF MD 15 should not be limited to the standards within the MLA. IAF MD 15 applies to all ISO/IEC 17021-1 programs. IAF MD 15's scope statement (section 1) states "this document applies to all AB members of IAF" and section 3 states "the indicators below shall be reported by country and by certification standard under the accreditation of each AB".		
12.3	Normative Requirements to Handle Transitions -IAAR	Consensus of the IAF TC Normative Requirements to Handle Transitions	To be addressed by the new TF on Transitions	
12.4	Requirements that IAF mandates for AB's Accept for CB Transfers -IAAR	Consensus of the IAF TC: Decision Log: 16/04/03 Requirements that IAF mandates for AB's Accept for CB Transfers The request should be sent to the CASCO WG for 17011.		Action IAF liaison to CASCO
12.5	Certification Body accredited by two ABs - CNAS	Consensus of the IAF TC: Decision Log: 16/04/04 Certification Body accredited by two ABs Though it is good practice that an AB samples primarily from files under its own accreditation however there are circumstances where an AB may request access to a client (file or witnessed audit) that is accredited under another AB. Further discussion is needed in the ABIEG		Further discussion is needed in the ABIEG
12.6	Extension of Timeline Resolution 2015-14 - SAC and HKAS	Consensus of the IAF TC: Decision Log: 16/04/05 Extension of Timeline Resolution 2015-14 CBs are required to transition all unaccredited certifications to accredited certifications (within the scopes of accreditation) at the time of recertification. As the date of application for the resolution is 2016/11/04, all unaccredited certifications shall be transitioned to accredited certification by 2019/11/04.	TC decided to also make this a resolution.	
13	Improvement for TC activities (Romyanon)			

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
13.1	IAF TC Governance of operation (EA proposal for improvement of operation)	<p>The TC Chair reviewed the proposed changes to the TC operational procedures. These included:</p> <p>A formal voting procedure for new work items, (member's agreed)</p> <p>Convenorships normally from ABs with specific exception from other stakeholders, (some members felt this was not necessary)</p> <p>Convenorships should be elected with a terms of service (2 to 3 years maximum) with a possible 2nd term reconfirmation.</p> <p>(opinion on this was mixed, need for special knowledge, need to train new leaders)</p> <p>Implementation of procedures could be commenced before documents are revised. PR2 does not accommodate the need for internal procedures.</p> <p>This document is an internal TC document, however, it should be transparent to all. PR2 is the document where the procedures need to be communicated.</p>		TC Chair to inform IAF Quality Manager of the status of this document.
13.2	Draft IAF TC program for the next meeting	The secretary advised the conveners to inform her of any changes needed by the next day as the JEC will be finalizing the schedule at their meeting.		
13.3	Closure			

List of Meeting Participants

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Ark	Sami	TURKAK	sami.arik@turkak.org.tr
Arnold	Thomas	TRA Certification Int'l	trarudd@aol.com
Au	Alfred	IIOC	alfred.au@bsigroup.com
Barrak	Moslem	Arab Accreditation Cooperation ARAC	m.barrak@arabarac.org
Belson	Kevin	UKAS	kevin.belson@ukas.com
Berger	Michael	PEFC Council	michael.berger@pefc.org
Birbil	Gokhan	TURKAK	gokhan.birbil@turkak.org.tr
Borzek	Norbert	DAkKS GmbH	norbert.borzek@dakks.de
Brough-Kerrebyn	Joan	IAF Secretariat	tc@iaf.nu
Brunner	Norman	Akkreditierung Austria / BMWFW	norman.brunner@bmfwf.gv.at
Cerna	Eva	CAI	cernae@cai.cz
Chang	Kwei Fern	SAC	chang_kwei_fern@spring.gov.sg
Chen	Yunhua	CNAS	cheyh@cnas.org.cn
Chernik	Volha	BelGISS	o.chernik@belgiss.by
Cohen-Kagan	Eli	IQNet Association	headoffice@iqnet.ch
Cortez	Leopoldo	IPAC-Portuguese Accreditation Institute	lcortez@ipac.pt
Dahl	Helen	Swedac	helen.dahl@swedac.se
Dalrymple	Alister	IQNet	alister.dalrymple@afnor.org
Dougherty	Randy	ANAB	rdougherty@anab.org
Duff	Adrienne	Irish National Accreditation Board	adrienne.duff@inab.ie
El Desouki	Hany	EGAC	hanyeldesouki@gmail.com
Ezrakhovich	Alexander	IQNet	headoffice@iqnet.ch
Fei	Yang	CNAS	feiy@cnas.org.cn
Fekete	Andras	Global G.A.P.	
Figueiredo	Reinaldo	ANSI	rfigueir@ansi.org
Gago	Edelio	ENAC	egago@enac.es
Garner	Tina	ANAB	tgarner@anab.org
Gehrke	Stephen	SAS	stephan.gehrke@sas.ch
Geneiatakis	Emmanuel	Fami-QS	manu@fami-qs.org
Gezehegn	Araya Fesseha	Ethiopia National Accreditation Office	arayaf@ena-eth.org
Gignac	Guillaume	IIOC (Intertek)	guillaume.gignac@intertek.com
Gillespie	Lori	ANAB	lgillespie@anab.org
Gopee	Robin Neeren	MAURITAS	rngopee@govmu.org
Greenaway	Albert Skip	EAGLE Certification Group	skip.greenaway@eaglecertificationgroup.com

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Greenberg	Ted	CSA Group	ted.greenberg@csagroup.org
Halebi	Armond	Accreditation Albania	armond.halebi@dpa.gov.al
Hallenbeck	Lane	ANSI	lhallenb@ansi.org
Han	Sub	KAB	icare@kab.or.kr
Held	Manuuela	IIOC	manuela.held@dekra.com
Hilger	Thomas	Swiss Accreditation Service SAS	thomas.hilger@sas.ch
Howard	Ann	ANSI	ahoward@ansi.org
Iwamoto	Takeo	JACB(JCQA)	iwamoto@jcqa.co.jp
Jackson	Nikki	ANS	njackson@ansi.org
Jahn	Jorg	Sew-EURODRIVE GmbH & Co KG	diana.effenberger@sew-eurodrive.de
Januardhi	Donny Punomo	KAN	donny@bsn.go.id
Jauhri	Anil	NABCB	ceo.nabcb@qcin.org
Jeffries	Sheronda	QuEST Forum	sjeffrie@cisco.com
Keeling	Steve	JAS-ANZ	steve.keeling@jas-anz.org
Khuumrak	Narathip	NBACFS	
Kim	Young Oh	KOLAS	
Kim	Seon-Bin	KAB	kimsb6094@kab.or.kr
Komalasan	Dewi	KAN	
Kotte	Baskar	Quality Systems Enhancement, Inc.	
Krishna	Vijay	ANSI	vkrishna@ansi.org
Laake	Inger Cecilie	Norwegian Accreditation (NA)	icl@akkreditert.no
Lee	Jia Juan	SAC	lee_jia_juan@spring.gov.sg
Long	Marcus	IIOC	
Leonard	Coralie	Sigma-Aldrich Chemie GmbH	coralie.leonard@sial.com
Mac Curtain	Sean	ISO	maccurtain@iso.org
Mahdoui Melki	Sonia	TUNAC	sonia.mahdoui@tunac.tn
Makino	Chikako	JAB	chikako.makino@jab.or.jp
Melo	Andrea	Inmetro	amelo@inmetro.gov.br
Milgo	Sammy Koskei	KENAS	md@kenyaaccreditation.org
Moliski	Paul	Intertek	paul.moliski@intertek.com
Moudyine-Schweningen	Nora	ANS	nmoudiyne@ansi.org
Mutasa	Maureen	SADCAS	mpmutasa@sadcas.org
Nagaoka	Yuki	JACB / PJR	y-nagaoka@pjr.jp
Nakagawa-Inoue	Azusa	JAB	azusa.nakagawa@jab.or.jp
Nash	Trevor	ABCB	trevor.nash@abcb.org.uk
Nonaka	Takeshi	JIPDEC	nonaka-takeshi@jipdec.or.jp
Ochieng	Susanah	Kenya Accreditation Service	susan.munyiri@kenyaaccreditation.org
Omodeo-Zorini	Leonardo	IIOC (Representative of DNV GL - Business Assurance)	leonardo.omodeo.zorini@dnvgl.com

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Park	Jong-Il	KAB	international@kab.or.kr
Palgan	Isabela	GFSI	
Phaloane	Mpho	SNAS	
Pina	Ignacio	ENAC	ipina@enac.es
Prakarnkamanant	Apisit	National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards	papisit@hotmail.com
Ramaley	Grant	Aseptico, Inc.	gramaley@aseptico.com
Rantanen	Varpu	FINAS	varpu.rantanen@finas.fi
Rekha	Sashi	NABCB	dirnabcb@qcin.org
Riva	Emanuele	ACCREDIA	e.riva@accredia.it
Romyanon	Ekanit	NSC	ekanit_romyanon@hotmail.co.th
Sabaratham	Mohan	IAS	msabaratham@iasonline.org
Saelim	Bussaba	NSC	bussaba.saelim@gmail.com
Saelzle	Uwe	EFAC	u.saelzle@empus.de
Sahni	Vipin	NABET	nabet@qcin.org
Saito	Tetsuya	Japan Audit & Certification Organization JACB	saitou-t@jaco.co.jp
Salle	Henri Pierre	IAAR	pierre.salle@gmail.com
Saveant	Nathalie	COFRAC	nathalie.saveant@cofrac.fr
Savov	Ivan	EFAC	ivan.savov@eerpi.org
Shaw	Phil	UKAS	phil.shaw@ukas.com
Sheehan	Kylie	JAS-ANZ	kylie.sheehan@jas-anz.org
Shu	Chin-Sin	TAF	brianshu@taftw.org.tw
Shum	Wai Leung	Hong Kong Accreditation Service	wlshum@itc.gov.hk
Somma	Lilliane	OUA	lilianesomma@yahoo.es
Subhan	Atta	GAC	atta@gac.org.sa
Tanabe	Kunihiro	JAB	kunihiro.tanabe@jab.or.jp
Tollose	Karsten	DANAK	kat@danak.dk
Unger	Peter	A2LA	punger@a2la.org
Van Erp	Casper	RvA	martha.smits@rva.nl
Valencia Ilizaliturri	Rogelio	ema	carolina.garcia@ema.org.mx
Wei	Juling	TAF	jlwei@taftw.org.tw
Wibisono	Nurilla Gunawan	KAN	wibi@bsn.go.id
Woodley	Cynthia	Professional Testing Inc.	cdwoodley@proftesting.com
Wozniak	Krzysztof	PCA	k.wozniak@pca.gov.pl
Xiao	Jianhua	CNAS	xiaojh@cnas.org.cn
Xia	Qing	CNAS	xiaq@cnas.org.cn
Xu	Na	CNAS	xun@cnas.org.cn
Yang	Zhe	CNAS	yangz@cnas.org.cn
Yeh	Wei-Fen (Melissa)	Taiwan Accreditation Foundation (TAF)	melissa.yeh@taftw.org.tw

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Yeo	Renny	SACS	
Yoshida	Kotaro	International Accreditation Japan (IAJapan)	yoshida-kotaro@nite.go.jp
Yuksel	Salih	TURKAK	sayuksel@gmail.com

DRAFT