IAF Technical Committee
Le Meridien Park Hotel, Frankfurt, Germany - Sunday 2nd April to Monday 3rd April 2017

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
01	Welcomes, Apologies and Introduction and Voting Member Identification (Romyanon)	The Chair ((Ekanit Romyanon) opened the meeting with a welcome and comments on how he conducts the proceedings. He hi-lighted that everyone's opinions are important and no one should consider their linguistic ability as a barrier. He asked those whose first language is English to speak slowly. Most important was that everyone respect each other's view. Use of disrespectful language will not be tolerated. When a decision need to be made, a balance of stake holders and geographical interests will be sought and considered. The decision will be summarized once made to ensure it is understood by all members and recorded correctly. A round of introductions occurred. The IAF Secretary (Joan Brough-Kerrebyn) explained the set-up of the meeting document section of the meeting website and how to upload and download files. She also demonstrated where Technical Committee papers are posted on the IAF website.		
02	IAF TC Terms of Reference (Nash)	The Vice Chair (Trevor Nash) reviewed the Terms of Reference for the IAF Technical Committee. He hi-lighted the difference between Working Groups (WG) as long term programs versus Task Forces (TF) as project focused, e.g. document development. He also mentioned the voting procedures where each IAF member is allowed only one vote regardless of the number of participants attending.		
03	Agenda and Objectives of Meeting (Romyanon)	The draft agenda for the meeting was reviewed and agreed to by the members with no changes.	Agenda Approved	
04				
04.1	Minutes of Meeting held on October 28-29 2016 in New Delhi, India (Brough-Kerrebyn)	The IAF Secretary presented the final draft of the minutes of the last meeting October 28-29, 2016 in New Delhi. As there were no comments provided the minutes were approved as presented. *Note: Post meeting, two comment on minor editorial corrections were received and adopted into the final version of the minutes.*	Minutes Approved	Post Final Minutes

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
04.2	Log of Key IAF TC Decisions (Brough-Kerrebyn)	The decision paper consensus responses from the New Delhi meeting were presented for endorsement of the members. As there were no comments the decisions were endorsed for inclusion in the Decision Log. These decisions will be added to the Decision Log on the IAF website.	Approved	Post revised Decision Log
05	Working Groups/Task Force/Progress Reports (Romyanon)			
05.1	Working Groups (Romyanon)			
05.1.1	WG Management System Certification (ISO/IEC 17021) (Gillespie / Gignac)	Guillaume Gignac provided a presentation on their meeting. The Terms of Reference was noted. He indicated that they have 30 names on their revised membership list, however, 80 participants attended their meeting. He continued that they would be revising their membership list. The majority of the meeting time was spent addressing and preparing responses to the discussion papers submitted for the TC Meeting. They also discussed the Consistency Forum in preparation for the TC discussions. There was also discussions regarding the IAF MD17 on Witnessing. Since most of the half day meeting was devoted to last minute discussion papers it was decided in the WG that their next meeting will prioritize the agenda items and then address discussion papers if there is time. The WG also submitted a proposed TC Resolution for consideration regarding the transition of ISO/IEC 17021-3:2013 to ISO/IEC 17021-3:2017. • **IAF Resolution 2017-## – Transitional Arrangement for the Revision of ISO/IEC TS 17021-3:2013 to ISO/IEC 17021-3:2017**- The General Assembly, acting on the recommendation of the Technical Committee, resolved that the transition period for ISO/IEC 17021-3:2017 *Conformity assessment — Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of management systems — Part 3: Competence requirements for auditing and certification of quality management systems*, will be two years from the date of publication of the revised standard *(i.e. 31 March 2019)*. In regards to the resolution there is a new policy of ISO, to only publish the month not the day of publication. As a consequence the TC decided to base its transition deadline as a month and year.	TC will propose the resolution at the next GA Based on the end of the month	

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		There was some discussion concerning the need to have a resolution for a transition period that was the IAF default period of two years. It was suggested that a resolution provide a means to publish the transition deadline so that the issue was clarified for everyone. The WG requested a full day meeting as there was a need for extra time to deal with discussion papers as well as being proactive with other related issues.		Want a full day meeting want to be proactive.
05.1.2	WG Product Certification Accreditation (ISO/IEC 17065) (Moliski / Kotaro)	Paul Moliski reported that their WG had 40 participants which included representatives from all Regional Bodies as well as ABs and CBs and vested interests. Their first agenda item was to update their membership list. To this end they requested a copy of the last membership list from the secretary. Regarding the Terms of Reference, the WG concluded that they need a mechanism to liaison with other TFs and WGs. They requested a copy of the terms of reference of all WG/TC. Another suggestions was to provide a short meeting period to have all conveners meet before/after the WG/TC meetings. Paul continued that Brahim Houla of GAC provided the WG an excellent presentation on halal product certification. IAAC and PAC also presented updates on their programs both including deliberations on scoping of Product Certification. The WG reviewed their survey results on implementation but their TF but had not performed any further analysis to date. The WG will propose a mechanism in the future to address any issues from the survey. Regarding a discussion paper, sent directly to WGPCA from COFRAC, regarding cconsultancy activities and ISO/IEC 17065 from COFRAC, the WG discussed the questions relating to consultancy and prohibited activities of the CAB for maintaining their impartiality. The WG did not come to a recommendation for the TC, instead the WG proposed to hold a half day workshop during the next IAF GA meetings in Vancouver to analyse case studies, exchange views and share experiences relating to the ISO/IEC 17065 requirements. There was general support for the workshop. In response to the workshop proposal some members felt that a half day meeting was sufficient to also fit in the workshop session. A compromise was made to extend the meeting into the evening in case extra time was needed.	TG agreed to the workshop.	Secretary to send member ship list. TC Chair to consider meeting opportunity for WG/TF conveners to liaison Schedule a half day P.M. meeting (60)/ work shop on Product Certification consultancy ISO/IEC 17065

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
05.1.3	WG Person Certification (ISO/IEC 17024) (Woodley / Sheehan)	Cynthia Woodley began her presentation with the Terms of Reference for this WG. Her membership list includes 70 members, however, 38 participated at this last meeting.		
		The WG continued their work on the ISO/IEC17024 implementation survey. A sub group that had been formed to perform a deeper analysis had not yet completed their task. The WG decided to re-assign the task with a goal of completing it in the next few months to prepare for the workshop in Vancouver.		
		The WG had previously requested a full day workshop on the implementation of ISO/IEC 17024 at the next general assembly in Vancouver (October 2017). The workshop will be designed to prevent the need for a guidance document on ISO/IEC 17024. They plan to audio tape the workshop with detailed minutes (not videotape) for future reference.	TC agreed on the full day workshop.	Schedule full day workshop
		A discussion paper submitted, directly to the WG Persons by RvA, resulted in an alert by IAF that such conflicts would need to go the Joint ISO IAF ILAC Committee (JSC). However, the WG did discuss the interpretations and agreed that while training is an acceptable recertification activity, it does not absolve the CB from confirming the continuing competence of the certified person.		
		The ISO/CASCO representative indicated it could be possible to propose additional wording to refine the CASCO clarification to address the concerns. The additional wording would make it clear that acceptance of any particular activities does not absolve the CB from fulfilling the requirements of the standard. The WG agreed this would likely resolve the issue and no further action would be required. Reinaldo Figueiredo suggested that there should be a documented output for any workshop held by IAF.		Half day not in conflict with WG Food

45-50 people

Ekanit to suggest this to the EC. |
| | | It was recognized that the objective of the workshop on Persons Certification was to reduce inconsistency? | | |
| 05.1.4 | WG Forests (Rantanen / Berger) | Varpu Rantanen reported that there was 11 participants at their meeting. A discussion forum and the T of R have not been modified. Membership changes often and list continues to expand. The main topic of their meeting was the PEFC standards and the status of the PEFC revision process. The PEFC WGs for group certification in Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) requirements were progressing. PEFC still needed to look at | | Next Meeting:

2-3 Hours 15 Try to avoid not overlapping with |

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		the IAF MD documents for suitability. It was agreed for SFM group certification that a risk based approach and grouping (as e.g. in primary production) could be used as a basis for sampling and that the sampling criteria should be defined by the scheme owner. The PEFC WG on AB requirements was on hold. Other topics included, the interface between SFM and Chain of Custody (CoC) regarding ISO/IEC 17021-1 vs. ISO/IEC 17065. In the future, PEFC will not accept ISO 17065 for SFM certification. While for CoC multisite certification, PEFC 2003:2012 includes all the required criteria and no guidance is therefore needed.		ISCP, MS and Product WGs Web Access Evening meeting OK
05.1.5	WG Food (ISO 22000) (Greenaway / Sheehan)	Kylie Sheehan first indicated that the WG Food had not yet met but she did provide a short presentation on their past activities She continued that the WG meeting would be held on 3 April. It will include a number of scheme owner representatives (FSSC 22000, IFS, BRC, FAMI-QS, GLOBALG.A.P and GFSI, in addition to, IIOC, other CAB representatives, a US FDA representative and the balance of AB members. 1. Action items from the last meeting include; ISO/TS 22003 and IAF MD16 survey which was recently finalized and distributed to IAF AB members and through them to CABs for completion. She requested cooperation from AB members to ensure distribution of the survey to their CABs. Exploration of the need for an IAF document on organics to be reported back at the next meeting, As EA is to redevelop EA-6/04, it was decided to circulate to IAF members during the comment period for this document, to see if there is some benefit to adopt, or input into the current multisite sampling document(s), Request for clarification (from FAMI-QS) was sent to ISO/TC34/SC17 but no response received at the time of this meeting. An invitation was sent to US FDA to provide a presentation to the next WG meeting and Kari Barrett will be present on 3 April, Drafting of transition requirements for ISO 22000 revision.		AB to distribute survey to their CABs

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		2. Agenda item for the up-coming meeting include: Three main presentations will occur at the meeting, Albert Chambers on ISO 22000 revision and CODEX HACCP Guidelines revision, Aldin Hilbrands from FSSC 22000 on version 4 of their scheme rules, and Kari Barrett from US FDA on the FSMA arrangements for ABs and CABs. The meeting will also include reports on: GFSI v 7 Guidelines, FAMI-QS update, and a EA food group update; The WG also has two discussion papers to address.		Next Meeting: Half day Not same time as WG Persons 40 people May require video – conferencing/ WebEx facilities
5.1.6	WG Medical Devices (ISO 13485) (Ramaley / Nakagawa)	Azusa Nakagawa provided an oral report on the WG activities. She first noted that IAF MD 8 and 9 were under revision to include a new table. The 60 day IAF member comments were reviewed but a significant percentage were outside the scope of the amendment to the document. She continued that these other comments would be revisited at the time of the next major revision to the documents. She proposed an application date of twelve months for the present revision. The next revision of ISO 13485 would address the lack of qualified medical devices auditors Grant Ramaley provided a brief presentation on a proposal to address the issue of a lack of qualified medical devices auditors. He noted that with some 26,000 certificates in the global market the demand for auditors has increased beyond the present supply. One solution he proposed was to adjust competency requirements by allowing more ISO 9001 type auditors into "non-medical" device audits with the acquisition of 13485 +14971 additional competency. The WG is considering more training on ISO 13485:2016 in the future. Training at the next meeting could be within the WG meeting.		
05.1.7	WG Greenhouse Gases (GHG) and Energy (ISO 14065) (Makino / Howard)	Ann Howard provided an oral report that the WG met yesterday with 25 participants. She indicated that they split the day between EnMS and GHG. They received reports from the regional bodies on the status of the EnMS and GHG MLAs		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		1. EnMS program. The WG discussed terminology for audit duration in ISO 17021-1 and ISO 50003. They agreed that the IAF WG consensus on use of audit duration (consistent with ISO 17021-1) should be put to TC 301 for clarification. They also discussed "effective personnel" and encouraged the WG members to share experience with different sectors (e.g. transportation). 2. GHG program: The WG discussed ISO WG 46 and WD1 of ISO 17029 (WD1 is open for comment for 6 weeks). They also discussed the CD3 of ISO 14064-3 and asked that any comments be submitted to the liaison (Phil Shaw). The upcoming revision of ISO 14065 was discussed and the WG agreed to gather inputs from the ABs on revision subjects. 3. ICAO: The WG was provided with information on ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organization) and their proposed CORSIA (Carbon Offsetting and Reduction Scheme for International Aviation) and discussed potential future actions. The WG will circulate progress made on practices for scoping of GHG accreditation and requirements for selection of sector witness assessments for discussion at the October meeting.		Next Meeting: Requested a full day meeting
05.1.8	WG Information Technology Management Systems (ITSM) (ISO/IEC 20000) (Takeshi)	Takeshi Nonaka reported on the WG with a presentation. He first noted that IAF MD 18 is regarded as a provisional document until ISO/IEC 20000-6 (Requirements for certification bodies of ISO/IEC 20000-1) is published. During the WG meeting there was a report on the current situation of ISO/IEC 20000-6 The current status of ISO/IEC 20000-6 is FDIS. The next meeting of SC40/WG2 will be in Okayama, Japan in May 2017. The WG also addressed the discussion paper (12.7) from SAS.		Next Meeting: Half day meeting 10 people
05.1.9	WG Information Security Management System (ISMS) (ISO/IEC 27001) MLA Scope (Nakagawa / Zhigao)	Fu Zhigao reported on the WG with a presentation report. They had 16 participants. He first reported on the liaison to ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 27. This JTC provided the revisions and development of ISO/IEC 27000 series and developed the outline of ISO/IEC DIS 27021: Competence requirements for ISMS professionals. The WG also addressed the issues of the application of ISO/IEC 27006 and ISO/IEC 27001 from their survey. They received feedback from four ABs and the issues were discussed in the WG.		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		They identified a potential discussion topics for the next meeting, including certification which covers only part of the organization.		Next Meeting: Half day
05.1.10	WG Business Continuity Management Systems (BCMS) (Garner / Savov)	Tia Garner provided a summary of the status of this WG. A written report had been provided by Randy Dougherty. The WG plans to continue to meet remotely. They are working on a position paper for a MD document for BCMS. As a new co-convener Tina's appointment to this WG was endorsed by the TC members.	TC endorsed Tina Garner	
05.1.11	Auditing Practices Group and Accreditation Auditing Practices Group [APG and AAPG] ISO 9001 (Yang)	Norbert Borzek reported on this meeting as the temporary convener in the absence of Fei Yang. He first indicated that they had a lot of participants. They discussed the past minutes and future work in terms of topics for potential papers. It was noted that due to the revision of ISO/IEC 17011 that the AAPG papers should be reviewed. He continued that there was general agreement to include EM papers (ISO TC 207) within the group. General discussion followed on the future structure of the APG and AAPG. These indicated that additional discussion with ISO is needed as secretarial services and oversight from ISO need to be addressed from both TC 176 and TC 207. An IAF liaison to TC176 was sought. Sheronda Jeffries offered to represent IAF as she attends the TC 176 meetings.	Sheronda Jeffries - endorsed by TC as the IAF liaison to TC 176.	
05.2	Task Forces (Nash)			
05.2.1	TF Competence of AB Assessors & Experts (Krishna / Sahni)	Vijay Krishna provided an up-date on recent TF activities. He noted that IAF MD 20 was published. The TF's next project was a specific job task analysis for Auditors of Persons Certification. To this end, a job task analysis meeting was held in January/February in Milan, Italy with 20 participants hosted by Accredia. The TF agreed that the time required to develop all the applicable specific competence documents was a concern. He presented an approach where phase 1 address the main scope (level 3) and phase 2 would address specific sub-scope		TC Chair will request JEC to consider possible cooperation on the issue of competence of AB assessor

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		standards. Such documents would also need to be aligned to the new ISO/IEC 17011. One implementation solution proposed was to have each WG to develop their related technical competencies. In relation to this means of implementation, a methodology document could be developed by the TF for use by the other WGs. At the next meeting the TF would present a methodology document. They would also report on identifying competences for AB Persons certification. The TF felt that the TC needs to make a declarative statement re implementation of MD 20. Finally, Vijay asked if there had been any progress on IAF/ILAC cooperation to develop these document. The TC Chair noted that the approach was still being encouraged by IAF.		Next Meeting: Half day 40 persons Not to conflict with the IAF WG Certification of Persons.
05.2.2	TF Control of Entities Operating on behalf of Accredited Certification Bodies (Savov / Houla)	Ivan Savov provided a summary of the TF's background. It was established in 2011 to develop an MD on control of franchises of CBs and then redefined as a MD on control of entities operating on behalf of accredited certification bodies. The draft document was reviewed with the 30 day TC comments and then the 60 day IAF member comments at this meeting. The IAF member 60 day review raised a number of issues based on the comments related to the purpose and scope of the document, the TF focused on these issues and reviewed the document from that perspective. The scope was clarified in that the MD will now only apply to MSC accredited CABs only. The entire document was reviewed considering the scope clarification and all inconsistencies resolved. The draft will now need a second 60 day comment period as it was significantly modified. The TF requested the TC to approve the clarified scope of the MD draft to only cover MSC accredited CBs. The TF will submits the latest draft for a second 60 day comment period.	TF to submit draft to the TC Chair for approval.	
05.2.3	TF Conformity Assessment Schemes (CAS) (Salle / Geneiatakis)	Pierre Salle reported orally that this TF's document was ready for 30 day TC comment and it will be submitted. Thirty people attended their meeting. Originally intended to apply to all scopes. It was noted that the IAF executive decided to limit the scope of the document to IAF schemes and not national schemes. Xiao clarified the executive position	TF to submit draft to the TC Chair for approval	

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		A discussion occurred then Anil Jauhri asked for clarification. It was noted that while IAF cannot oblige governments to adopt the document, could it be used for best practises. Another issue was whether the document should be a MLA document? Xiao indicated that the EC would clarify this, the document should define the criteria. This would be used in place of criteria in PL3 and PL3 would only address the recognition procedure.		
05.2.4	TF Principles for Determining Duration of AB Assessments (Garner / Sagala)	Tina Garner reported orally that their ID document went out for TF member comment which are now being reviewed. The revision will then go on to the TC for comment.		
05.2.5	TF OHSAS 18001 migration to ISO 45001 (Dougherty / Omodeo-Zorini)	Leonardo Omodeo-Zorini orally reported that the ISO 45001 document was in translation and would be circulated for ballot/comment in May ending in July 2017. The resulting comments will be reviewed at the next meeting in September 2017. Publication is forecasted end of 2017 (November) or early 2018 (in case FDIS is needed). In both cases the ballot results must be positive. Draft competence document (ISO 17021-10) is being held until the next meeting of ISO/PC 283 (ISO 45001) in September. The IAF migration document completed the 2nd 60 day comment period and was revised. The document is ready for ballot buy only once the OHSAS Project Group is clear on the period of validity of certificates (OHSAS 18001).		
05.2.5A	TF OH&SMS (Omodeo-Zorini / Cerri)	Leonardo Omodeo-Zorini indicated that this new TF had its first meeting with 28 participants. It began discussion on a new MD document by;' reviewing the EA-3/13M, discussing the scope of the IAF document and considering the additional requirements to ISO/IEC 17021-1:2015. The TF will commence a draft based on the MD format in preparation for a 30 days TF comment period and a 60 day IAF member comment period. Requested a fast track process from the TC which members agreed to.	Fast track approved	Next Meeting: Half day 30-40
05.2.6	TF Multi-Site Certification and MD1 (merger) (Dalrymple / Keeling)	Steve Keeling reported orally that the TF will meet tomorrow to review the draft document. The document may be sent out for comments before the meeting in Vancouver.		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
05.2.7	TF Transfers (revision to MD2) (Nash / Nakagawa)	Document went out for 60 days and after their meeting will hopefully be ready to go out for ballot.		
05.2.8	TF Transitions (new MD) (Gillespie / Omodeo-Zorini)	Lori Gillespie reported that the bulk of the work on this document was done remotely. The TF has planned to meet tomorrow evening. Will have something for comment tomorrow.		Meet electronically
05.2.9	TF MD4) (Jeffries / Omodeo-Zorini)	Sheronda Jeffries provided a presentation that included a history of the TF activities, their Terms of Reference and a revised list of members. The TF works remotely and is developing the first draft of their document. They used the results and conclusion of their survey as input to the document. Their next task is to review the first draft considering the applicable certification body requirement standards. They also need to consider the potential impact upon audit duration and the factors upon which duration is determined. There was a discussion regarding the expansion of the scope of this document to other certification programs. It was evident that the TF would need to consult other WG/ before any decision was made. Member discussed the scope extension proposal and some felt there was a value for other programs to apply the potential techniques within such a document.	TF need to consult with the other WG with first draft to explore scope extension.	Meet electronically
05.2.10	TF Integrated Audits (revision of MD11) (Savov / Perez)	Ivan Savov provided a presentation on the TF's Term of Reference and their first meeting. He indicated the TF will release a draft 1 of the document to the TF members on April 1, 2017. The draft was revised with the addition of an alternative Extended Audit Approach. The draft was also up dated with relevant standards and IAF documents.		
05.2.11	JTF Counterfeit Certificates (Savov / Murthy)	Ivan reported the JTF would meet two day from this meeting. He indicated that most of the JTF tasks went to the Joint Communications Committee. At this meeting they will discuss their first draft of their ID document.		
06	Sector Liaison Reports (Romyanon)			
06.1	QuEST Forum - Telecoms (Jeffries)	Sheronda Jeffries provided a presentation on activities of QuEST. She high-lighted that they will be releasing four new standards and the results of the validation audit program which will impacts CB and AB. They will require AB to take action. They continue to collect data on a quarterly basis.		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		She clarified that they continued to work on AB that have not submitted data. Lori mentioned that the refinements of data cannot go further until all AB submit their data.		
06.2	PEFC - Forestry (Berger)	No report submitted.		
06.3	IAQG – Aerospace (Borzek / Geer)	No report submitted. However, Norbert Borzek reported on IAQG. He noted that the organization was on track for the development of their new standards.		
06.4	GFSI - Food Safety (Greenaway)	No report submitted.		
06.5	Global G.A.P- Food Safety (Fekete)	No report submitted.		
07	Liaison Reports (Romyanon)			
07.1	ISO TC 176 (Kwong)	Nigel provided a presentation on recent activities in TC 176 based on the official report from TC 176. Subject to a successful ballot the ISO TC 176 co-convener will be Joana Guimaraes Sa. He reviewed the standards published over the last year as well as those in process. High-lighted was ISO 18091 QMS for local government which defines 39 parameters for good local government. He noted that there is significant free QMS guidance available on the ISO website that should be taken advantage of. While TC 176 has an interpretation process it presently has no requests for interpretation. He continued that TC 176 has attempted to discourage any sector specific proliferation of QMS standards. An introduction of "light" versions of QMS for service providers (incorporation elements of ISO 9001) s being discouraged. The next TC 176 meeting is in September 2017 I Bali, Indonesia.		
07.2	ISO TC 207/SC1 (Makino)	Chikako Makino spoke to the TC207 liaison report.		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		She noted that the TC 207 had new interpretation procedures. There was a request to collect interpretation requests from members of SC1 for compilation by the SC! Secretariat. ISO 14002-1 had been approved. The TC approve the establishment of ISO/TC 207/SC 1/WG 11 Applying ISO 14001 framework to environmental aspects by topic areas. The SC1 CIB Proposal for ISO14008 Monetary valuation of environmental impacts and related environmental aspects — Principles, requirements and guidelines (amended title and scope -2nd committee draft is currently subject to a committee internal ballot and comment. The ISO TC 207 Environmental Management Plenary occurs June 7- 16, 2017 in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada		
07.3	ISO/TC 207/SC 7 (Shaw)	The members noted with appreciation the report provided by Phil Shaw.		
07.4	ISO/TC 301 (Kotte/Makino)	Baskar Kotte briefly explained the merger and the level of nations (56) participating. He provided a detailed report of the TC 301 standards and activities. He reviewed the standards involved and published.		
07.5	ISO/IEC JTC1/ SC27 WG1 (Takeshi)	A copy of the Liaison Statement from ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 27 to IAF was provided to members A copy of ISO/IEC DIS 27021 was also provided. Members noted with appreciation the report		
07.6	ISO/CASCO/JWG 48 (Omodeo-Zorini)	This topic was covered in the related TF agenda item. 5.2.5		
07.7	ISO/CASCO WG 34 (van Erp)	No report		
07.8	ISO CASCO WG on NWIP ISO/IEC 17029 (Howard)	Anne Howard provided a report. The WG 46 draft was just released and now opened for comments.		
07.9	ISO-CASCO (Mac Curtain)	Sean MacCurtain high-lighted from his report that ISO had a new Secretary General as of July 17. 2017 Sergio Mujica. He also noted that there was a NWI in the establishment of WG 50 and a number of systematic reviews including ISO/IEC 17065, 17024 and ISO/IEC 17020.		
7.10	Interpol - Counterfeit Certificates (Savov)	No report		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
08	Regional Accreditation Group Liaison Reports (Romyanon)			
08.1	EA (Belson)	Kevin Belson provided a presentation on the EA's European Accreditation Certification Committee (EACC). He high-lighted that the EACC was addressing: Certification and consultancy and had a workshops to identify the line not to be crossed, i.e. publishing of list of consultants was a point of contention. The aim is to have enough consensus to provide a guideline document. They also discussed the effect of the IAF resolutions on accredited certificates. Other topics of discussion include: MD2 - transfer of certificates, issues of unaccredited certificates of suspended CBs, labelling rules concerning packaging, finding a legal breach during a witness, and IAF MD17and MD20. They discussed the results of a survey on AB involvement in scheme development, which included how many ABs, what aspects, how it is done, fees. They now need to decide what to do with it. Kevin also provided a description of the WGs within the EACC.		
08.2	PAC (Yang)	PAC did not provide a report, however, Chicago Makino provided a verbal summary on activities. She mentioned that PAC has expanded into Global Gap, EnMS, OHASA and Medical devices. They are also preparing for the PAC re-evaluation and the APLAC/PAC merger in 2019. There are a number of workshops being planned including one on the Halal program.		
08.3	IAAC (Melo)	Andrea Melo provided a presentation on IAAC that included a status their membership, statistics for scopes, meetings from 2016 and planned for 2017, as well as training activities. The Certification Body Subcommittee (CBSC) developed a scope system for product certification. Their meeting schedule was provided including training such as a workshop on ISO/IEC 17021-1.		
08.4	ARAC (Barrak)	Moslem Barrak provided a presentation and report on ARAC. It included an update on membership and MLA status, the on-going evaluation of ARAC, their 5 year strategic plan, status of the update to ISO 17021-1:2015, recent training events and meetings recently held and planned for 2017.		
08.5	AFRAC (Milgo)	Sammy Milgo provided a presentation on AFRAC. It included: the status and statistics on membership and MLA signatories, the on-going peer evaluation of AFRAC, document up dating, approval of the strategic plan, training activities for		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		peer evaluators, recent meetings and the status of transition to ISO/IEC 17021-1:2015.		
08.6	SADCA	SADCA provided a verbal report on SADCA. He reviewed the membership status. He also indicated that SADCA intended to apply for MLA status once their MLA is established with three MLA signatories. He noted that their major challenge was a lack of peer evaluators and language barriers. He added that SADCA have a peer evaluator training plans to address their need for evaluators in expanded scopes.		
09	Any Other Business (Romyanon)			
09.1	TC207 SC1 letter to IAF and CASCO ref interpretations	Ekanit welcomed Dr. Anne-Marie Warris via teleconference to the TC meeting. Anne-Marie provided a presentation on TC207 SC1 that included: Its scope, standards and approach, their website and material, an Update on developments since IAF meeting October 2016, the possibility of setting up an APG for ISO 14001 and the proposal of a workshop on ISO 14001 at the IAF meeting in October 2017. She reviewed the standards within the responsibility of SC1 and how they relate to each other. She described the free documents and information available on their website for the users of ISO 14001:2015. This included examples of FAQ and a description of the interpretation process. She encouraged people to visit and use this website, especially the FAQ section. She reviewed the interpretation process with examples on the website. She continued that the letter of sent to IAF was not intended to be a complaint rather a concern and a means to ensure that the information is available and used. The concern was based on examples of auditors' ability to obtain sufficient applicable audit evidence' and the 'competence' of auditors specifically since ISO 17021-2 was not yet approved. The changes in 14001 are significant and issues are going to happen. Anne thanked IAF for the response and support with these matters.		
09.1.1	Revision of IAF ID10	Anne-Marie noted that the decision of the IAF concerning not updating the ID19 which was communicated to the SC1.		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
09.1.2	Formation of an APG EMS (15:00)	Anne-Marie supported the IAF TC initiative to form an APG/AAPG to be jointly resourced by members of the ISO TC/207 /SC1 and the IAF TC. She indicated that SC1 liaisons have been asked to come to the June SC1 plenary prepared to nominate a SC1 expert. She suggested the APG/AAPG could develop and publish papers that communicate to CB auditors and AB assessors how to audit specific requirements of ISO 14001:2015. This new APG/AAPG for ISO 14001 would build upon the success of the APG/AAPG jointly resourced by members of the IAF TC and ISO TC/176. Discussions continued that ISO 14001 audit techniques are different than ISO 9001 and there is a need to understand how the two would be coordinated. It was recognized that relevant papers could be posted on the TC 207 website. There may be some papers that simply need a name change. Other papers could be modified for both TCs while others will be more specific. There would be a need to search for EMS experts to join the APG. There is a need to identify a few papers to commence with.	TC endorsed Steve Williams (IIOC) and Casper van Erp (RvA) to be IAF Reps to work with TC207 on APG EMS	TC Chair to liaise with TC207 on the way forward of this project
09.1.3	Presentation from TC207 Competence for EMS auditors (Warris)	It was suggested that the APG/AAPG meeting could be used for the workshop. There was a discussion on the pros and cons of having the workshop within the meeting. Anne-Marie indicated that she had in mind one or two experts who she will approach at their Halifax meeting regarding doing the workshop. Steve Keeling and Casper van Erp offered to be the IAF experts. However, a poll was taken of the TC members indicated there was not significant support for a workshop. It was decided that the workshop content was needed to decide on the workshop.		Ask Anne Marie Warris re the content of the workshop and to decide if a workshop is needed.
09.2	Halal Scheme (Houle)	Brahim Houla reported that they had an IHAF meeting on March 13 where they approved the terms of reference. One scheme owner has applied. The organization intends to follow the IAF documents and principals. The program is growing slowly but carefully.		
09.3	Consistency Forum (Long)	Marcus Long first provided the history of the Consistency Forum project launched in New Delhi. Since the launch of the forum 45 members have joined (~40% of the membership). There were 4 issues submitted. He expressed concern over the level of involvement and wished to explore the issues effecting IAF membership participation. He offered that use of Link-In may be an issue or perhaps the access only to lead delegates as it causes restrictions. As the Forum wishes to manage any issues and work between meetings. He also recognized that many past issues were resolved with the new ISO/IEC17021-1 standard. He requested member's feedback.		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		In response the TC members offered a number of comments. There were a number of positive responses. 1. Factors identified that may discourage use of the forum included: Fragmented structure of the reply methodology, time consuming, lack of an immediate collective response. The informality and need to then have a discussion paper to formalize Need for a reminders at this point of time because a new process takes time to adopt. Lack of time due to other priorities. Lack of full access, need to sign on to Linked-In, time required, posting procedures, public exposure for the person posting, and the existence of an alternative mechanism (discussion papers). To encourage use is there a need to submit an issue to the forum first before being allowed to submit a TC discussion paper? Is there a need to have co-conveners of WG access? If so, the response would need to be shared (developed) with all WG members Is a notification made when items are posted, as this may help? Viewing rights could assist members to share with their colleagues. Lack of a means to ask for clarification questions on an issue. 2. Factors that indicate there was not a problem included: Only a short period had passed since the Forum was posted, it takes time for members to adopt to the Forum, and the number of issues is not important but rather the significance of the issue. In conclusion, the TC members suggested that it was too early to modify the forum as not enough time had passed to test the existing mechanism. Marcus thanked the TC members for their input and welcomed to the "town hall" data base meeting later that week 4:30 pm on Tuesday.		
09.4	Market Surveillance as an Alternative Mechanism for Witnessing under MD 17	Will be discussed in Section 12.0		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
10	Meeting Conclusion and Results (Romyanon)			
10.1	Update of the Work Program (Brough-Kerrebyn)	**Working Groups:** • 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 & Horward) • ISO 9001 Auditing Practices Group and Accreditation Auditing Practices Group [APG and AAPG] (Yang) • IAF Working Group on Management System Certification (ISO/IEC 17021) (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) (Garner & Savov) **New (Joint) Working Groups:** None **Working Groups Terminated:** None **Continuing Task Force Projects:** • Log of key IAF Technical Committee Decisions (Brough-Kerrebyn) • IAF Task Force Competence of Accreditation Assessors and Experts (Sahni & Krishna**)** • IAF Task Force Entities Operating on behalf of Accredited Certification Bodies (Savov & Houla)		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		- 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 (Savov & ILAC Member) - Multi-Site Certification and MD1 (*merger*) (Dalrymple and Keeling) - Transfers (*revision to MD2*) (Nash and Nakagawa) - Transitions (new *MD)* (Gillespie and Omodeo-Zorini) - CAAT (*revision to MD4)* (Jeffries and Omodeo-Zorini) - IAF Task Force Integrated Audits (revision of MD11) (Savov & Perez) - IAF Task Force OH&SMS (Omodeo-Zorini & Marco Cerri) **New Task Forces:** none **Task Forces Terminated:** none		
10.2	IAF TC Resolutions for the IAF General Assembly (Romyanon)	**IAF Resolution 2017** – **Transitional Arrangement for the Revision of ISO/IEC TS 17021-3:2013 to ISO/IEC 17021-3:2017**- The General Assembly, acting on the recommendation of the Technical Committee, resolved that the transition period for ISO/IEC 17021-3:2017 *Conformity assessment — Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of management systems — Part 3: Competence requirements for auditing and certification of quality management systems*, will be two years from the date of publication of the revised standard (*i.e. 31 March 2019*). **IAF Resolution 2017- ISO 31000** The General Assembly, acting on the recommendation of the Technical Committee, resolved that there will not be any accredited certification to ISO 31000 (publication date 13 November 2009). ISO 31000 explicitly states that it is not intended or appropriate for certification, and any certification would be a misuse of the standard. Therefore, Certification Bodies are strongly urged not to promote or provide certification to ISO 31000 and Accreditation Bodies and Certification Bodies are requested to report any misuse or need for certification, to the ISO Secretariat.		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
11	Next Meetings (Romyanon)			
11.1		21 October to 30 October 2017 - Vancouver, Canada		
11.2				
11.3	Draft IAF TC Program for the Next Meeting (Brough-Kerrebyn)	The secretary noted that the draft schedule of the Vancouver 2017 meeting had been circulated 30 days before the meeting. Member were reminded to ensure they review this schedule in the next 24 hours and convey their requests for change before the schedule is finalized at the JEC meeting held in two days.		
12	Discussion papers for action by the TC (Nash)			
12.0	Market Surveillance as an Alternative Mechanism for Witnessing under MD 17 - CNAS	This paper was discussed at the WGMSC meeting During discussions it was clarified that CNAS was not looking for a decision only opinions. The question being, can market surveillance replace witnessing? The opinion was that witnessing is required and there are differences between the two procedures. It is clear there is minimum witnessing. Market Surveillance cannot replace but only sublimate witnessing.		
12.1	Impartiality Committee - OAA	Consensus of the IAF TC: Decision Log: 17/04/01 Impartiality Committee First question; Could a CB which is a critical office, use the Committee Impartiality of its Head office? Answer: It depends on the structure of the CB. Refer to ISO/IEC 17021-1, sections 5.2 and 5.2.3 to manage risk of impartiality. Second question; If the CB uses the Impartiality Committee of another CB, It would consult with relevant stakeholders? They were being represented their clients or customers certifies organizations? Answer: It also depends on the structure of the CB; both CBs could belong to the same organization. However, it seems the question is asking about two (unrelated) CBs belonging to different organization; then this is not acceptable, a CB can't use the committee from another (unrelated) CB.		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		Note; Stakeholders are to be defined by the CB; however, it should at least include local input.		
12.2	Required knowledge and skills of Decision Makers - OAA	Consensus of the IAF TC: Decision Log: 17/04/02 Required knowledge and skills of Decision Makers ISO/IEC 17021-1:2015 is very clear as it separates the competence necessary for an audit team and the decision maker (may include more than one person in the decision-making process); therefore, the decision maker does not have to have the same level of competence as an audit team of the terminology, practices and processes common to a client's business sector. It is required for the decision maker/s to have some competence in the client's business sector for the decisions being made; however, not the same as an audit team and the competence can be determined by the CB following ISO/IEC 17021-1 as well as additional competence requirements (e.g. ISO/IEC TS 17021-2:2012 & ISO/IEC TS 17021-3:2013, etc. have additional competence necessary for the decision makers). Note; Scheme owners may have additional requirements necessary of the decision makers (in addition ISO/IEC 17021-1).		
12.3	IAF Codes (NACE) - SEMAC	Consensus of the IAF TC: Decision Log: 17/04/03 IAF Codes (NACE) First, we must keep in mind the IAF Scopes are optional (in an Informative Document) for an AB to use and not mandatory. Each AB will have its own rules as it relates to accreditation scope. Some ABs scope at the IAF level, some scope at the NACE level and some could create its own way to scope. However, as it relates to the discussion above, if the CB has demonstrated competence in an IAF code then they can be provided the full code or, depending on the AB's process; if they have only demonstrated competence at a specific NACE level, the accreditation could be limited to the specific NACE codes within the IAF code.		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		No matter the accreditation scoping process used by the AB; the CB is still responsible to manage competence and perform work in areas for which they are accredited.		
12.4	Halal Food Certification - SEMAC	The IAF TC recommends SEMAC to contact GAC regarding this issue.		TC Secretary to contact SEMAC
12.5	Clause 8.3.3 of ISO/IEC 17021-1:2015 CNAS LP	Consensus of the IAF TC: Decision Log: 17/04/04 Clause 8.3.3 of ISO/IEC 17021-1:2015 The AB should allow the CB to manage this exception with their customer and then the AB can evaluate if the situation is acceptable and under control. It does not need to have so many conditions nor IAF's acceptance.		
12.6	Delay in Transition ISO/IEC 17021:2015 – SAS **LP**	Consensus of the IAF TC: Decision Log: 17/04/05 Delay in Transition ISO/IEC 17021:2015 Is 9.6.3.2.5 only applicable for the post-audit process, closure of major non-conformities that could not have been solved before expiry of the certificate? No; it states "recertification activities", it does not refer to specific parts of the recertification process. Are postponed recertification audits within the six months after expiry of the certificate acceptable to restore certification (violation of 9.6.3.1.1)? Yes; as long as the recertification process is completed within the 6-month period and the certification documents are clear there was a gap in certification. How interprets paragraph 9.6.3.1.1 and 9.6.3.2.5? ISO/IEC 17021:1, section 9.6.3.1.1, is in regard to the CB's process for planning & conducted the recertification audit. ISO/IEC 17021-1, section 9.6.3.2.5, is managing exceptions of "recertification activity" not being completed before the expiration.		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		In conclusion; ISO/IEC 17021-1 does not define what is included in "recertification activities"; however, ISO/IEC 17021-1, section 9.6.3.2.4, includes the CB explaining the consequences to the client if the audit is not completed or corrective actions are not completed prior to expiration. Then the next section, 9.6.3.2.5, explains the process when "recertification activities" are not completed. This can lead us to conclude "recertification activities" can include the recertification audit. ISO/IEC 17021-1 section 9.6.3.2.5, is addressing an exception and should not be the normal process. The CB must manage the recertification process and risk with its clients, considering all circumstances. Keep in mind if the recertification (activity) is not completed prior to expiration, the certification does expire on the expiration date and the client remains uncertified throughout the (up to) 6-month timeline as recertification activities are completed. Also, as we learned through our discussions; IIOC and EACC issued a clarification to ISO on this same subject. Responses were provided by CASCO and should be reviewed by the author of this discussion paper as well as other members. http://isotc.iso.org/livelink/livelink?func=ll&objId=17855094&objAction=browse&viewType=1		
12.7	Application of MD18 ISO 27006 – SAS **LP**	The WG had two opinions. 9 to 7 The final proposal was that the WS ISMS comment will be sent to the SC27 WG1 by the next liaison report of IAF and the WG ISMS will request ISO/IEC JTC1/SC27 WG1 to provide its explanation.		
12.8	Monitoring auditors on site – EACC **LP**	Consensus of the IAF TC: Decision Log: 17/04/06 Monitoring auditors on site The TC decided IAF should not determine a maximum number of years between onsite monitoring. The frequency of onsite monitoring should be left up to the CB; based on the CB's process and how the CB determines risk and what is appropriate; however, the standard does require "periodic monitoring" so the CB must include the timeline in its process.		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		Because this requirement is not prescriptive; the AB's focus must be on effectiveness, not just conformance. The AB must evaluate the CB's process and decide if the process is effective or not. If the output of the process demonstrates the process is not effective (e.g. incompetent auditors) then the AB may take issue with the onsite monitoring process.		
12.9	Reference to ISO IEC 17021 series standards – EACC **LP**	Consensus of the IAF TC: Decision Log: 17/04/07 Reference to ISO IEC 17021 series standards Some ABs reference ISO/IEC 17021 on the certificate with the assumption that it includes the dash standards (e.g. ISO/IEC 17021-2) as it is applicable to the scope of accreditation, and they do not reference all the parts. The ABs feel this is appropriate because the foreword of ISO/IEC 17021 standard states, ISO/IEC 17021 consists of the following parts… Some ABs include all normative documents used in the assessment of the CB (per ISO/IEC 17011), including all individual parts of ISO/IEC 17021 (e.g. ISO/IEC 17021-2) and IAF MDs. One word of warning with including everything (including versions) is that it can become an issue of maintenance; however, it is the ABs decision on the level of detail included. The TC reached consensus that the ABs can decide how to manage the accreditation certificate on their own, recognizing accreditation certificates can vary in level of detail.		
12.10	Variation in interpretations of competency within ISO TS 22003-2013 – CF **LP**	Decision pending input from WG Food.	WG will feed their consensus decision back to the forum.	
12.11	Inconsistency between ISOIEC 17021-1-2015 and the IAF MD5 – CF **LP**	Consensus of the IAF TC: Decision Log: 17/04/08 Inconsistency between ISOIEC 17021-1-2015 and the IAF MD5 The IAF MD 5 was written to support ISO/IEC 17021 (not ISO/IEC 17021-1). The revision to ISO/IEC 17021-1 now includes the term "calendar year" instead of "annual" causing inconsistency; however, ISO/IEC 17201-1 takes precedence as the main standard for accreditation. The intent of the term "calendar year" within ISO/IEC 17021-1 is 1 January through 31 December (unofficial clarification).		

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		It is possible that the program for surveillance audits may result in a gap between surveillance audits extending beyond12 months.		
12.12	Major NC and Technical Review – CF **LP**	No consensus from the WG. Referred to CASCO for clarification.		Refer to CASCO for clarification TC Chair to send request.
12.13	ISOIEC 17021-1 2015 9.3.1.2.2 and stage 1 requirement - CF **LP**	Consensus of the IAF TC: Decision Log: 17/04/09 ISOIEC 17021-1 2015 9.3.1.2.2 and stage 1 requirement ISO/IEC 17021-1 section 9.3.1.2.1 allows for a Stage 1 to be conducted onsite or offsite and the CB must have evidence that ALL objectives were met. It was noted that there are several objectives that would be difficult to meet offsite; however, it is recognized there are situations that all objectives could be successfully met offsite		
12.14	ISO 31000 certification – JAS-ANZ **LP**	In response the following resolution was proposed: The General Assembly, acting on the recommendation of the Technical Committee, resolved that there will not be any accredited certification to ISO 31000 (publication date 13 November 2009). ISO 31000 explicitly states that it is not intended or appropriate for certification, and any certification would be a misuse of the standard. Therefore, Certification Bodies are strongly urged not to promote or provide certification to ISO 31000 and Accreditation Bodies and Certification Bodies are requested to report any misuse or need for certification, to the ISO Secretariat. Note: Lengthy decision on this topic occurred. A vote of support for this resolution was performed with 26 in support, 13 not in support and 3 abstentions.		
12.15	Rate of ISO 9001:2015 and ISO 14001:2015 customer transition - IIOC/IQNet	As a result a discussion occurred with the following conclusion and action. What can we do to encourage and increase the transition rate? Casper van Erp reported a 15 to 30 % transition. CABs expressed concern about the potential market dropout. Maybe many have made significant progress but are not totally completed and ready for the transition audit. Not much would happen in the first 6 months Last transition CB had significant difficulties. The capacity of the CB auditors was not a problem unless there is a spike in demand near the deadline.	TC Secretary to add topic to next agenda.	ABs and CBs Associations to determine the extent of progress on transition and feedback.

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		Conclusion: Prior to Vancouver CBs should investigate status of transition with their clients. Need to know the percentage that have made a start? If not significant improvement in 6 months - need to plan some communications to encourage transition. Need to communicate the advantages of change to the new standards. Possibly provide advantages on the transition on the IAF website and for others to use. AB could investigate the broader situation in their economies and market. Not all companies will make the transition.		Use a survey to collect data. Secretary: Add this item on the next TC agenda.
13	Improvement for TC activities (Romyanon)			
13.1	IAF TC Governance of operation (EA proposal for improvement of operation)	Ekanit provided a summary of improvement initiatives from this meeting 1. Structure of AGP/AAPG Investigate possible revised structure for the AGP/AAPG to accommodate common elements as well as specific QMS, EMS, and others MS issues. Since TC176 provides the secretariat services presently a new mean to support a multi discipline APG/APPG need to be determined. The first step would be to determine the structure of document and reflect this in the structure. It is possible to set up an APG/AAPG under TC 207 but this will involve the new Chair. There will be a need to further consult with the TC members. May be simpler and faster to set up a separate second APG structure. 2. Mechanism for Co-ordination among WGs/TFs Perhaps a remote platform available before TC meeting for the convenors to share concerns. Possibly a meeting before the TC if needed, however, it may not be necessary to add a structure to coordinate activities.	Will discuss with the EC.	Conveners to E-mail to request any concerns.

Item #	Subject	Background/Discussion	Decisions	Actions
		It would assist if sub-committees do not deviate from their mandate terms of reference unless approved by the TC main committee. 3. Outcome of the workshop Briefing note containing suggestion for moving forward on the subject of the workshop. Describe the objectives of the workshop. Accessible to all members.		
13.2	Closure	The Chair and Vice Chair thanked all participant for their attention and contributions.		

List of Meeting Participants

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Amri	Zul	KAN	zul@bsn.go.id
Arnold	Thomas	TRA Certification Int'l	trarudd@aol.com
Barrak	Moslem	Arab Accreditation Cooperation ARAC	secretariat@arabarac.org
Belson	Kevin	UKAS	kevin.belson@ukas.com
Boriscava	Jarsic	Accreditation Body of Serbia	borislaviajansic@ats.rs
Borzek	Norbert	DAkkS GmbH	norbert.borzek@dakks.de
Brough-Kerrebyn	Joan	IAF	jbkerrebyn@gmail.com
Brunner	Norman	Akkreditierung Austria - AA	norman.brunner@bmwfw.gv.at
Buts	Bruno	BELAC	bruno.buts@economie.fgov.be
Cabioglu	Kayihan	TURKAK	kayihancabioglu@turkak.org.tr
Carpio	Maria Juanita	Philippine Accreditation Bureau	juanitacarpio@dti.gov.ph
Chang	Kwei Fern	Singapore Accreditation Council	chang_kwei_fern@spring.gov.sg
Chen	Cynthia	TAF	yuanchen@taftw.org.tw
Cohen-Kagan	Eli	IQNet Association	headoffice@iqnet.ch
Cortez	Leopoldo	IPAC	lcortez@ipac.pt
Croft	Nigel	ISO/TC176	nhc@tcaglobal.org
Cross	Stephen	Nigeria National Accreditation Service	stephencross2012@gmail.com
Dalrymple	Alister	IQNet	alister.dalrymple@afnor.org
Dokka	Tove Kristin	Norwegian Accreditation	tkd@akkreditert.no
Dougherty	Randy	ANAB	rdougherty@anab.org
Dozzo	Ilaria	ACCREDIA	i.dozzo@accredia.it
Ediriweera	Chanditha	Sri Lanka Accreditation Board (SLAB)	chanditha@slab.lk
Eklund	Maria	SWEDAC	maria.eklund@swedac.se
Fei	Yang	CNAS	feiy@cnas.org.cn
Figueiredo	Reinaldo	ANSI	rfigueir@ansi.org
Fu	Zhigao	CNAS	fuzg@cnas.org.cn
Gago	Edelio	ENAC	egago@enac.es
Garner	Tina	ANAB	tgarner@anab.org
Geer	Brian	IAQG	brian.geer@lmco.com

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Geneiatakis	Emmanuel	FAMI-QS	manu@fami-qs.org
Gehrke	Stephan	Swiss Accreditation Service SAS	stephan.gehrke@sas.ch
Georgieva	Marina	Executive Agency, Bulgarian Accreditation Service	m.georgieva@nab-bas.bg
Gezehegn	Araya	ENAO	arayaf@enao-eth.org
Gignac	Guillaume	IIOC (Intertek)	guillaume.gignac@intertek.com
Gillespie	Lori	ANAB	lgillespie@anab.org
González	Rosa Maria	ENAC	rgonzalez@enac.es
Gozukucuk	Ahment	Turkish Accreditation Agency (TURKAK)	Ahment.Gozukucuk@turkak.org.tr
Greenaway	Albert Skip	EAGLE Certification Group	skip.greenaway@eaglecertgroup.com
Guay	Chantal	SCC	cguay@scc.ca
Held	Manuela	IIOC (DEKRA)	manuela.held@dekra.com
Houla	Brahim	GCC GAC	brahim@gac,org,sa
Hilger	Thomas	Swiss Accreditation Service SAS	thomas.hilger@sas.ch
Howard	Ann	ANSI	ahoward@ansi.org
Ionescu	Daniela	Romanian Accreditation Association - RENAR	daniela.ionescu@renar.ro
Iwamoto	Takeo	JACB(JCQA)	iwamoto@jcqa.co.jp
Jackson	Nikki	American National Standards Institute (ANSI)	njackson@ansi.org
Jang	Jina	Korea Accreditation Board	jnjang@kab.or.kr
Janicijevic	Aco	Accreditation Body of Serbia	aco.janicijevic@ats.rs
Jauhri	Anil	NABCB	ceo.nabcb@qcin.org
Jeffries	Sheronda	QuEST Forum	sjeffrie@cisco.com
Keeling	Steve	JAS-ANZ	steve.keeling@jas-anz.org
Kobayashi	Megumi	Japan Accreditation Board	megumi.kobayashi@jab.or.jp
Kotte	Baskar	Quality Systems Enhancement	baskar@enhancequality.com
Krishna	Vijay	ANSI	vkrishna@ansi.org
Kuo	Liang-Yu	Taiwan Accreditation Foundation (TAF)	ariana1509@taftw.org.tw
Laake	Inger Cecilie	Norwegian Accreditation	icl@akkreditert.no
Long	Marcus	IIOC	marcus.long@iioc.org
Mac Curtain	Sean	ISO	maccurtain@iso.org
Mahdoui Melki	Sonia	Arab Accreditation Cooperation ARAC	sonia.mahdoui@tunac.tn
Makino	Chikako	JAB	chikako.makino@jab.or.jp

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Milgo Sammy	Koskei	Kenya Accreditation Service (KENAS)	md@kenyaaccreditation.org
Milito	Cynthia	SCC	cynthia.milito@scc.ca
Miller	Rob	A2LA	rmiller@a2la.org
Moliski	Paul	Intertek	paul.moliski@intertek.com
Mutasa	Maureen P	SADCAS	mpmutasa@sadcas.org
Nagaoka	Yuki	JACB / PJR	ynagaoka@pjr.com
Nakagawa-Inoue	Azusa	Japan Accreditation Board	azusa.nakagawa@jab.or.jp
Nash	Trevor	ABCB	trevor.nash@abcb.org.uk
Ndalamo	John	SANAS	azra@sanas.co.za
Niero	Christine	Professional Testing, Inc.	cniero@proftesting.com
Nonaka	Takeshi	JIPDEC	nonaka-takeshi@jipdec.or.jp
Ochieng	Susanah	Kenya Accreditation Service	susan.munyiri@kenyaaccreditation.org
Okanya	Celestine	Nigeria National Accreditation Service NiNAS	c.okanya@ninas.ng
Okoro	Lawrena	Nigeria National Accreditation Service NiNAS	l.okoro@ninas.ng
Oliveira	Marcos	CGCRE	malima@inmetro.gov.br
Omodeo-Zorini	Leonardo	IIOC (Representative of DNV GL Business Assurance)	leonardo.omodeo.zorini@dnvgl.com
Piedrahita	Francisco	ONAC - Organismo Nacional de Acreditación de Colombia	francisco.piedrahita@onac.org.co
Palgan	Izabela	CGF	i.palgan@theconsumergoodsforum.com
Prasetya	Bambang	National Standardization Agency of Indonesia	sekre.kabsn@bsn.go.id
Queiroz	Andrea	CGCRE	amelo@inmetro.gov.br
Ramaley	Grant	Dental Trade Alliance	gramaley@aseptico.com
Rantai	Mark Mariba	Department of Standards Malaysia	markmariba@jsm.gov.my
Rantanen	Varpu	FINAS	varpu.rantanen@finas.fi
Rekha	Sashi	NABCB / Quality Council of India	dirnabcb@qcin.org
Riva	Emanuele	ACCREDIA	e.riva@accredia.it
Romyanon	Ekanit	Office of National Standardization Council	ekanit_romyanon@hotmail.co.th
Ronksley	Ian	UKAS	ian.ronksley@ukas.com
Růžička	Jiří	Czech Accreditation Institute	ruzickaj@cai.cz
Sadana	Parveen	United Accreditation Foundation	gm@uafaccreditation.org
Saelzle	Uwe	EFAC	u@saelzle.net
Saito	Tetsuya	Japan Audit & Certification Organization for Environment and Quality	saitou-t@jaco.co.jp

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Salle	Henri Pierre	IAAR	pierre.salle@gmail.com
Saveant	Nathalie	COFRAC	nathalie.saveant@cofrac.fr
Savov	Ivan	EFAC	isavov@erpi.be
Sheehan	Kylie	JAS-ANZ	kylie.sheehan@jas-anz.org
Shu	Brian	Taiwan Accreditation Foundation	brianshu@taftw.org.tw
Shum	Wai Leung	Hong Kong Accreditation Service	wlshum@itc.gov.hk
Siripornmongkol	Roongsiri	Office of National Standardization Council	roong_siri@yahoo.com
Somma	Liliane	OUA	liliannesomma@yahoo.es
Stadler	Martin	BDI / Siemens AG	martin.stadler@siemens.com
Taina	Alina	Romanian Accreditation Association - RENAR	alina.taina@renar.ro
Tanabe	Kunihiro	JAB	kunihiro.tanabe@jab.or.jp
Tollose	Karsten	DANAK	kat@danak.dk
Vácha	Dušan	Czech Accreditation Institute	vachad@cai.cz
Valencia	Rogelio	ema	carolina.garcia@ema.org.mx
van Erp	Casper	Dutch Accreditation Council	casper.van.erp@rva.nl
Vehring	Stefanie	VdTUEV	stefanie.vehring@vdtuev.de
Wasmer	René	IQNet	headoffice@iqnet.ch
Williams	Steve	IIOC (LRQA)	steve.williams@lrqa.com
Woodley	Cynthia	Professional Testing Inc.	cdwoodley@proftesting.com
Woźniak	Krzysztof	Polish Centre for Accreditation	k.wozniak@pca.gov.pl
Xiao	Jianhua	CNAS	xiaojh6@foxmail.com
Xu	Na	CNAS	xun@cnas.org.cn
Xuan Thuy	Vu	Bureau of Accreditation (BoA)	vuthuy@boa.gov.vn
Yang	Zhe	CNAS	yangz@cnas.org.cn
Yeh	Wei-fen	Taiwan Accreditation Foundation (TAF)	melissa.yeh@taftw.org.tw
Yoshida	Kotaro	International Accreditation Japan	yoshida-kotaro@nite.go.jp
Zengel	Barbara	Polish Centre for Accreditation	b.zengel@pca.gov.pl