



## **Management Systems Certification Technical Advisory Committee (MSCTAC)**

**Meeting 1 – 19 July 2012**

**UKAS Feltham – Boardroom – 09:30 to 12:30**

### **Minutes**

#### **Attendees**

Trevor Nash; Ben Keen; David Bell; John Sydall; Sam Hicks; Mike Byron; Alan Gower; Chris Elliott; Colin MacNee (by phone); Nigel Overton; Kevin Belson; Lorraine Turner (for specific agenda items).

#### **Apologies**

John Mortimer; Linda Cavendar

#### **Introductions**

Each member present of the TAC gave a brief introduction to themselves and their backgrounds.

#### **The Role of the MSCTAC**

LT gave an introduction to the MSCTAC and its importance to UKAS. This was followed by a discussion regarding the terms of Reference document. Among the items discussed were the ability for the committee to set up sub-groups and working groups and the need for confidentiality.

The Terms of Reference document was discussed generally the document was acceptable to members. It was suggested that some form of quorum rule, including no single interest predominating, should be introduced.

Action point: KB to include quorum rules in the Terms of Reference

## **Appointment of Chair**

After a brief discussion it was agreed that Trevor Nash would become the first Chairman of the TAC. Trevor is thanked for volunteering to take on this role.

## **Representations still to be filled**

It was explained that there were still a few positions on the TAC to be filled:

A further CB customer representative

A further regulatory authority representative (possibly Highways Agency)

An Environmental Professional\*

\*post meeting note: The environmental representative will be Lucy Candlin, of Planet & Prosperity Ltd., nominated by IEMA.

For the CB customer representative it was suggested that Mike Pearson of the Federation of Small Businesses (a member of the PAC) should be approached for ideas.

## **Setting the Scene**

KB gave a brief presentation regarding UKAS's current Management System Certification activities (presentation enclosed with these minutes).

## **IAF ID4 – Market Surveillance Visits to Certified Customers**

TN led discussions regarding the pre-circulated new IAF informative document. It was explained that this being classified as an ID means that UKAS are not obliged to adopt it. The discussion was to provide advice on the level of adoption UKAS should be considering.

There was some variation on opinion but overall it was considered that this ID introduced some positive concepts although a number of participants were not in favour of UKAS adopting the document as a whole. It was considered that some aspects were not well defined and there were concerns over the criteria that could lead to this type of visit taking place. It was also felt that there were a number of contradictions in the document.

Some attendees thought that this could be a useful additional tool whereas other comments indicated that an 'enhanced witnessed audit' could be as effective.

## Conclusions

It was concluded that some of the concepts in the ID could be usefully adopted although there was little support for this to become part of the routine surveillance process. It was considered that the most useful place for this to be used would be in the investigation of serious complaints or other customer feedback. Contractual arrangements would be key to any successful implementation.

Action point: KB, with input from Jackie Burton (Customer Feedback Manager) to consider the possibility of use to improve the effectiveness of the customer feedback process and to present a paper for circulation prior to the next meeting.

## **Growth in PAS documents**

LT led a discussion regarding the apparent growth in the use of PAS documents and demand for accreditation against them. It was considered that the positioning of PAS as an accredited scheme document was not always clear.

It was considered that suitability may vary from PAS to PAS and that there was a need for UKAS to have confidence in the robustness and longevity of each PAS and was suggested that the TAC could have a role in reviewing potential schemes to advise on suitability. It was also suggested that a set of criteria would be useful; this could be based on the current criteria for Development schemes.

## Conclusion

Any new 'stand-alone' PAS (i.e. one that is not part of a management systems standard scope) to be referred to the MSCTAC to be evaluated against a set of rules for suitability.

Action Point: KB to liaise with UKAS Development to review the current criteria for suitability for this purpose.

## **Activities in Iran**

LT presented current concerns and status with regard to certification activity in IRAN. It is expected that EU will soon announce restrictive measures imposing sanctions on trade with IRAN. This will affect a number of UKAS accredited Certification Bodies that carry out work, or have locations, in IRAN.

UKAS is currently in communication with BIS and FCO on this matter and its implications but it will possibly result in work in Iran not being allowed within the scope of accreditation with IRAN not being allowed to be included in the list of critical locations or the list of countries where certificates are issued.

Concern was expressed regarding how effective withdrawal of certificates from Iran could be fully demonstrated and confirmed.

There was general discussion around the purpose and technical implications of the accreditation schedule table for countries in which certificates are issued. This should be a topic for discussion at a future meeting.

### **Future Work Items**

- The UKAS customer Feedback Process and how IAF ID4 could be incorporated
- Geographical Information on accreditation schedules
- Role of ICT in accreditation and certification
- Competence process for UKAS assessors
- Cross-frontier issues
- Flexible scopes

It was agreed that, prior to the next meeting, UKAS would produce a full list of potential discussion subjects and highlight suggested priorities: Action; KB/NO

It was also agreed that any relevant EA and IAF documents issued for comment or ballot should be circulated to TAC members for consideration and comment: action KB

### **Next Meeting**

December 11<sup>th</sup> 2012, 10am start, UKAS Feltham

## Annex A: Action Tracking List

| Action  | Responsible                                      | Status |
|---|--|--------|
| include quorum rules in the Terms of Reference  | Kevin Belson                                     |        |
| Contact Mike Pearson (PAC) regarding possible CB customer representative  | Kevin Belson                                     |        |
| Consider the possibility of using IAF ID4 to improve the effectiveness of the customer feedback process and to present a paper for circulation prior to the next meeting. | Kevin Belson<br>(Jackie Burton)                  |        |
| liaise with UKAS Development to review the current criteria for new schemes for suitability regarding PAS documents   | Kevin Belson                                     |        |
| Produce prioritised work items list.  | Kevin Belson<br>Nigel Overton<br>Lorraine Turner |        |