# Association of British Certification Bodies

**Minutes of the Management Systems Sector Committee Meeting
held on Wednesday 16 January 2013 at BSI, Kitemark Court,
Davy Avenue, Knowlhill, Milton Keynes, MK5 8PP**

**Members Present:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Mr Steve Russell | Ascertiva Group, Chairman |
| Ms Janet White | BSI |
| Mr Dylan Parsons | BSI |
| Mr Martin Gainey | National Measurement Office |
| Mr Ian Knott | SIRA |
| Mr Norman Charters | Certification International |
| Mr David Fenn | The British Assessment Bureau |

**In Attendance:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Mr Trevor Nash | Chief Executive |

**1.0    Apologies for Absence**

Apologies had been received from Karen Newman (AFNOR UK), Bernard Anderson (Eagle Certification) and Wayne Thomas (SIRA).

**2.0    Minutes of the Meeting held on 28 September 2012**

The Minutes were agreed as a true record.

**3.0    Matters Arising from the Minutes not Covered Elsewhere on the Agenda**

3.1    Ex Minute 3.2        -  China

Steve Russell reported that the person he has found to translate this regulation has been unable to do so due to other priorities.  Action carried over.

**Action: Steve Russell**

3.2    Ex Minute 5.2        -  EFAC representation on ISO CASCO WG 21

Trevor Nash confirmed that Steve Russell is the EFAC representative on CASCO WG 21.

### 4.0    Liaison Reports

#### 4.1    SBAC/CBMC

Dylan Parsons reported that there had been a meeting in December. The new auditor authentication scheme operated by APMG is now running.  They are turning applications round in ten days.  There is a review of all authenticated auditors being carried out and 47% of supporting documentation is missing, which makes tracing the basis of the original authentication difficult.  Where information is missing, auditors will be contacted and asked to provide the missing documents.  Letters are scheduled to be sent out in February.  The aim is not to remove auditors from the register, unless there is evidence of falsification of records.

Regarding the AS 9104 – 1 transition, accreditation bodies are required to suspend certification bodies if witnessed assessments have not been completed.  It was queried what would happen if UKAS did not have the necessary resource to  complete all witnessed assessments and the general view was that this would still result in suspension of the certification body's accreditation.

#### 4.2    DIQF

##### 4.2.1    DIQF Report

There was a DIQF Meeting on 13 December 2012.  Significant points from the meeting are as follows:

- AQAP 2310, the NATO equivalent of AS/EN9100 is under review.  No further action required at present,

- Kevin Thomas retired at the end of 2012 and his replacement is Chris Elliott who will chair future meetings.

- Another customer day is planned for July 2013 continuing to focus on counterfeit and suspect unapproved parts avoidance.

- There was a review of the role of DIQF and its mandate in line with the DIQF terms of reference – nothing specific aside from a review of:

  - The influence of DIQF
  - Communication mechanisms
  - DQIF aspirations
  - Resource implications

- MoD contracts are not mandating BS 11000 and it is not a contractual requirement

- There was a presentation on the role of the Government Quality Assurance Representative and this will be an input into the planning for the sector scheme.

### 4.2.2 MoD Sector Scheme

Dylan Parsons reported that the MoD sector scheme had been announced at the DIQF meeting. There was annoyance that there had been no feedback on the comments to the consultation paper that had been submitted by stakeholders some nine months earlier.

The scheme was launched on 2 January 2013 and certification bodies have been invited to express an interest in participating in the UKAS pilot programme by 8 February 2013. UKAS will be hosting a meeting of certification bodies that have expressed an interest on 26 February. The pilot assessment phase is planned to commence on 1 June with the aim of accrediting all successful certification bodies by 2 January 2014. The project manager at UKAS is Phil Shaw.

A number of ABCB Members have expressed an interest in the scheme and will be attending the UKAS meeting on 26 February.

### 4.2.3 Consultation Paper 10/2012 – Quality Planning

Members were asked to submit any comments on this paper to Trevor Nash by 1 February.

There is a further consultation paper on Process Audit or Product Certification which is out for comment. Trevor Nash agreed to circulate this and Members were asked to submit comments to him by 18 February.

## 4.3 JTISC

### 4.3.1 JTISC Report

There have been two committee meetings since the last update but no changes to report.

### 4.3.2 PAS 555

The draft PAS 555 had been circulated to Members with the Agenda. Members were invited to submit any comments to Trevor Nash by 31 January.

## 4.4 SES/1/1

There was nothing to report from SES/1/1 other than that Nonn Reynolds' role in BSI has changed and that ABCB's representative on this committee in the future will be Clare Hann of BSI.

4.5    CAS/1

Steve Russell reported that the periodic review of ISO/IEC 17021 had commenced at a meeting of CASCO WG 21 in November 2012.  He had, unfortunately been unable to attend due to illness.  It has been agreed that the revised ISO/IEC 17021 will incorporate ISO/IEC TS 17022.

The main concern continues to be the proliferation of supplementary standards to ISO/IEC 17021 specifying requirements for competence for auditing and certification for the different management systems standards.  ISO/IEC TS 17021: Part 2 covering environmental management systems was published in 2012.  Part 3 covering quality management systems and Part 4 covering event sustainability management are currently under development.  A new work item for the development of Part 5 covering asset management systems has recently been agreed.  It is interesting to note that there were 30 positive votes supporting this project out of a total of 57 votes cast.  The problem is that there were only 5 negative votes, the remaining 22 being abstentions.

The BSI Conformity Assessment Policy Committee called a telephonic meeting in December to consider the objections of certification bodies and other stakeholders to the proliferation of these supplementary standards.  The issues put forward were that with the current process no proposal for a new work item will fail and that there is little or no real justification for the proposed standard.  Development of these standards has commenced within two years of the publication of ISO/IEC 17021:2011 and the transition to the full implementation of that standard is not due to be completed until 31 January 2013.  Therefore, it is questionable how additional sector based standards for competence can be justified before it is known whether ISO/IEC 17021: 2011, as it stands, is delivering the necessary levels of competence.  If there are to be these additional standards there needs to be concrete evidence that the competence of certification bodies accredited to ISO/IEC 17021: 2011 is lacking and that their assessments are ineffective.  No such evidence has been presented to justify the development of these standards.

Trevor Nash had been unable to participate in the telephonic meeting, but had provided input via Roger Bennett of IIOC.  No feedback has been received to date.

**5.0    Meetings**

5.1    EA HHC - 3/4 October

EA 2/13 EA Cross Border Accreditation Policy and Procedure for Cross Border Cooperation between EA Members (Mandatory) was published in October.

With regard to paragraph 6.3 of EA 2/13 there was discussion regarding difficulties that arise from different practices of AB's. It was agreed that with goodwill from AB's these difficulties should be able to be addressed. HHC will be reviewing the implementation of EA2/13 and any problems in implementation will be fed back to the HHC.

There is now a draft supplementary document, Interpretation of terminology used in clause 5.1 of EA2/13 and guidelines to assessment focus, out for comment. Once approved it will become a standalone supplement to EA 2/13.

There is a draft document on EA-3/09 Surveillance and Reassessment of Accredited CABs which also includes some guidance on the assessment of CAB's subcontractors. The main purpose of this document is to achieve a harmonised way of defining timelines for surveillance and reassessment by accreditation bodies.

5.2    IAF - 16 – 26 October

There were two issues concerning potential conflicts of interest regarding consultancy. The first concerned branding of consultancy and certification under the same corporate brand. The consensus was that the only effective solution to this is to enforce a two year period between the provision of consultancy and certification. The IAF position will be to support the inclusion of the two year period of separation as a requirement, rather than a note, in the revision of ISO/IEC 17021.

The second issue concerned certification bodies providing generic guidance, templates, sample manuals etc. It was agreed that if these documents are in the public domain, generic and do not provide a specific solution, then providing them to clients should not be regarded as consultancy.

There was debate about audit man days and that there are certification bodies that are deliberately falsifying information e.g. employee numbers in order to reduce man days beyond the permitted limits and thus win business through lower fees. After discussion in the Technical Committee, it was agreed to establish a Task Force to review IAF MD 5 to make it more effective.

It was agreed that where an accreditation body cannot provide oversight in a particular country (either directly or by using a subcontractor), for whatever reason e.g. security concerns, then they should not allow their accredited certification bodies issue accredited certificates in that country. This relates to long term issues rather than short term issues which are covered by IAF ID 3 on the management of extraordinary events.

It was agreed to establish a Task Force to address counterfeit and misleading organisations claiming to be certification bodies, accreditation bodies, IAF etc.

An IAF Mandatory Document on the assessment of certification body competence in accordance with ISO/IEC 17021 has been agreed for publication.

The ISO 20000 (Information Technology – Service Management) Working Group is producing a document on additional requirements to ISO/IEC17021.

The ISO 27001 (Information Security Management Systems) Working Group reviewed three options to scoping ISO 27001 accreditation:

> scopeless,
> 39 codes,
> develop a new approach.

The consensus was for scopeless accreditation and for the Working Group to develop a document on competence analysis.

The Accreditation Assessment Practices Group agreed that its papers need to be updated to take account of changes to conformity assessment standards e.g. ISO/IEC 17021.

There is growing support for the establishment of a global database of accredited certificates to protect against fraudulent activities.

ISO reported that the ISO survey this year will show some significant declines in certificate numbers. Ten accreditation bodies and many certification bodies did not respond.

The Task Force on EMS Scoping conducted a survey of IAF members which showed that most are currently using the 39 codes for scoping the accreditation of EMS certification. The Task Force is drafting an Informative Document looking at risk and common aspects as a basis for scoping.

A draft IAF Mandatory Document on audit man days for combined (more than one management system standard) and integrated audits is out for ballot.

Work has commenced on drafting an IAF Mandatory Document on the assessment of complex multisite organisations, without the sampling of sites i.e. all sites are assessed.

Revision of IAF Guidance Document 3 on cross frontier accreditation has been agreed for circulation to IAF members for comment.

There is a Task Force developing a Mandatory Document on

accreditation body assessor competence.  Progress is extremely slow.

There was consensus that certification bodies charging variable fees to different clients for the same service is a commercial issue for the certification body and is not discriminatory.

It was agreed that ISO/IEC TS 17021 - 2 will be a normative document for accreditation of EMS with a transition period of two years from its date of publication (deadline 15 August 2014).

The Technical Committee encourages the use of ISO/IEC TS 17022 but agreed it will not be a normative document for accreditation and will propose that it is taken into account in the revision of ISO/IEC 17021.

It was agreed that it is allowed for the logo of a certified organisation appear on certificates as long as it is not misleading e.g. appearing alongside the accreditation body or certification body logo.

5.3     EA General Assembly -  21/22 November

IIOC and PEFC have been granted recognised stakeholder status in EA.

The various transition periods for new standards agreed by IAF were endorsed by EA.

Graham Talbot has now left the employment of UKAS and stood down from his position as EA Chairman.  This has resulted in EA having to elect a new Chairman for an interim period of one year until the three yearly elections are due in 2013.  Thomas Facklam of DAkkS – Germany was elected Chairman.  This had a knock on effect to other positions and the following were also elected:

| | |
|---|---|
| Multilateral Agreement Committee Chair: | Nicole Van Laethem BELAC Belgium |
| Horizontal Harmonisation Committee Chair: | Ignacio Pina ENAC Spain |
| Additional Executive Committee Members: | Lucyna Olborska PCA Poland |
| | Peter Kronvall SWEDAC Sweden |

5.4     UKAS MSCTAC -  11 December

UKAS is on target to complete the ISO/IEC 17021 transition by the deadline.  It is expected that if any CB's fail to make it in time it will be

due their non-compliance, slow response or other issues such as suspension.

A detailed discussion took place regarding audit report content and there was general agreement on the level of information to be included, as well as a perceived general improvement on audit reporting in recent years. It was noted that EACC is preparing a paper to feed into CASCO for the review of ISO/IEC 17021.

There was some discussion regarding the section of the IAF summary regarding provision of consultancy. The overall view was that what was agreed is too close to consultancy. It was suggested that the UKAS assessor guidance on impartiality could be looked at by the committee. There was a strong feeling by the Committee that the provision of sample/generic manuals is a poor practice that should be discouraged.

The type of geographical information currently included on accreditation schedules was discussed, including the purpose for inclusion of such information. It was agreed that there needs to be a review to decide if the current system is valid or not and if not how it can be improved.

The issue of flexible scopes was discussed. EA Mandatory document EA 2/15 covers the application of flexible scopes to the accreditation of all conformity assessment bodies. It does not require that all EA members apply the flexible scopes approach, but if they do it must be in accordance with EA 2/15. UKAS has a document LAB39 covering flexible scopes in laboratory accreditation and this is being revised to apply to all accreditation activities.

It was suggested that there is a need to provide more guidance to CBs about how flexible scopes can be applied and how to make scope extension applications more efficient.

**6.0    UKAS**

6.1    UKAS Update

Jeff Ruddle reported, at the last Management Committee Meeting, that UKAS had two new Assessment Managers joining on 5 November, but that Ian Folland has resigned and will not now be returning to UKAS from EAQG. A review of workload has been completed and three further Assessment Managers will be recruited; one with an agricultural background and the others with a more generic skills. UKAS is looking for new Assessment Managers to have project management and customer service skills. One Assessment Manager is on maternity leave. Twenty Technical Experts are being trained as assessors with about 50% of them being ready to be signed off shortly.

There is one new member of the Liaison Team and one further vacancy. This will increase the Team form four to six members.

At the last meeting Jeff Ruddle had reported that forward bookings of visits were at 50% and that the aim was for this to increase to 75% but there had been little improvement in the situation.

There is still a backlog on decisions. Not many are very old but they are taking longer than the target timescale. The need for decisions in relation to the ISO/IEC 17021:2011 transition has not helped the situation. UKAS is looking to train one further Assessment Manager as a decision maker.

The average time to complete extensions to scope is reducing and is eighty days although there are still some that are long standing. The difficulty is to balance extensions for scope with routine work. There is, however, more internal awareness of the commercial pressures regarding extensions and customer expectations are being better managed.

6.2     ISO/IEC 17021:2011 Transition

All assessments are booked, with most having been completed by the end of September. There are a small number of certification bodies who are suspended or are moving premises that are being looked at separately. UKAS is doing everything to ensure that they are not the reason for any certification body failing to complete the transition within the timescale. The main issue at present is processing decisions.

6.3     Members' Issues

Norman Charters reported that Certification International is well behind on UKAS witnessed assessments compared to those from overseas accreditation bodies. UKAS will be performing 2012 witnessed assessments in 2013 as well as those planned for 2013. Certification International has 10 witnessed assessments planned in the first quarter of 2013 compared to 3 or 4 in the previous two years. Certification International has its fifth Assessment Manager in five years.

Certification International has also had an issue with non-mandatory findings being treated as mandatory.

Ian Knott reported that UKAS is also planning to perform 2012 witnessed assessments of SIRA this year. SIRA has offered dates but UKAS has been unable to provide the resource to perform the visits. Ian Knott also raised the question that if there were no resourcing issues, why had UKAS cancelled witnessed assessments with one week's notice?.

Martin Gainey reported that NMO is still trying to arrange its 2012 Head Office audit as well as witnessed assessments. Steve Russell stated that Ascertiva Group is also behind with its witnessed assessments.

Janet White reported that BSI is up to date with its witnessed assessments but does insist they are performed according to plan.

Steve Russell reported that in other areas Ascertiva Group is getting a reasonable service from UKAS with a good response from their Assessment Manager and Liaison Officer and always getting the technical specialists they want.

## 7.0    Any Other Business

There was no other business.

## 8.0    Date and Venue of Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday 8 May at the Ascertiva Group offices in Dunstable.