



Association of British Certification Bodies

**Minutes of the Management Systems Sector Committee Meeting
held on Wednesday 25 September 2013 at BSI, Kitemark Court,
Davy Avenue, Knowlhill, Milton Keynes, MK5 8PP**

Members Present:

Mr Trevor Nash	Chief Executive, Acting Chairman
Ms Janet White	BSI
Mr Keith Goddard	Certification Europe
Mr Wayne Thomas	SIRA
Ms Helen Taft	SIRA
Mr Keith Ranouf	Certification International
Mr Kostas Lampadariou	BASEC
Mr Bernard Anderson	Eagle Certification
Mr David Fenn	The British Assessment Bureau

1.0 Apologies for absence

Apologies had been received from Steve Russell, who had asked Trevor Nash to Chair the meeting. Trevor Nash welcomed Keith Ranouf and Kostas Lampadariou to their first meeting.

2.0 Minutes of the meeting held on 8 May 2013

The Minutes were agreed as a true record.

3.0 Matters arising from the minutes not covered elsewhere on the agenda

There were no matters arising.

4.0 Liaison reports

4.1 SBAC/CBMC

There is an auditor conference in October for all AS9100 auditors. The focus from UKAS at present is on making sure PEARS and associated aerospace documentation is completed correctly in terms of requirements and intent. At the last meeting changes to auditor qualification and authentication were discussed and this will continue at a forthcoming IAQG conference in Montreal. Members noted that the new scheme for auditor qualification is more difficult as auditors now have to register individually and the APM Group will only talk to

individuals, not certification bodies. In addition if an auditor misses the registration date they have to wait a year before they can re-register.

Witness audits were also discussed as it is not just a case of a single office audit and witness audit being required for EN9104-001 accreditation. Certification bodies are required to have multiple witness audits per year and planning is key as not arranging the required number of visits will lead to suspension of accreditation.

4.2 DIQF

Progress on the development of the MoD sector scheme has been delayed due to lack of QCM Policy resource and a revised launch date has not been agreed. It is hoped that this will be progressed later in the year.

There are three further issues which are impacting on the progress of the development:

- MOD internal procedures
- the CQI Body of Knowledge (required for auditor competence)
- training of UKAS Assessors

AQAP 2310, NATO Quality Management System Requirements for Aviation, Space and Defence Suppliers was published in April 2013 and some nations are now implementing it in contracts. To date the UK has not made a decision, although it is anticipated that the UK will be exposed to the AQAP via overseas contracting. There are a number of issues regarding the use of the AQAP in the UK, including the impact on small and medium businesses and the MOD appropriate certification policy. A way forward on the future use of AQAP 2310 in the UK will be established.

4.3 JTISC

The next versions of the Core Scheme Requirements and BPL are expected to be published at the start of October. UKAS indicated that one additional certification body has applied for TickITplus accreditation.

The approach of the start of the twelve month transition to TickITplus is now beginning to drive interest, with visits to the TickITplus web site and enquiries to accredited certification bodies increasing.

A public event is being organised by BSI on the 1 October 2013 at their Milton Keynes location. This is being marketed by certification bodies to their clients, as well as on the TickITplus web site, where further information on the event is available.

ISO/IEC 27001 and ISO/IEC 27002 are now at the FDIS stage and publication is expected during October, although this date is not firm. The revision of ISO/IEC 27006 is at Working Draft 3.

There is a new work item for ISO 20000-6 which will be the IT service management equivalent of ISO 27006, and will impact certification bodies if it becomes mandated for accreditation.

4.4 SES/1/1

There is no desire to progress to CD2 of the revision of ISO 14001 at this stage. Not all clauses/ comments were considered at the last meeting of TC 207 WG5 and some of the clauses that were worked on are still not satisfactory. It was agreed to hold a further meeting in October/November to resolve all of the outstanding issues, so that CD2 can be circulated for ballot.

The implications of this are that there will be a delay to the project timetable and the final completion date is likely to be delayed by a couple of months. This means it is unlikely that WG5 will meet at the 2014 TC207 plenary meeting (June 2014) as the document will probably be out for DIS ballot.

4.4 CAS/1

ISO/CASCO WG 21 met in June and work is continuing on the revision of ISO/IEC 17021-1. The revision did not progress to the DIS stage as was thought possible and there is a further meeting in November.

ISO/IEC 17023 Conformity assessment – Guidelines for determining the duration of management systems audits was published in August.

ISO/IEC TS 17021-4 Competence requirements for auditing and certification of event sustainability management systems is due for publication at the end of September and ISO/IEC TS 17021-5 Competence requirements for auditing and certification of asset management systems is out for ballot. There is a new work item proposal for ISO/IEC TS 17021-6 Competence requirements for audit and certification of business continuity management systems.

There was discussion about the proliferation of these sub parts of ISO/IEC 17021 as it appears almost impossible that any proposed new work item will receive a negative vote. The UK default position is to abstain in the ballot for these new work items; if a negative vote is cast a justification has to be given.

However, the proposed new work item for the systematic review of ISO/IEC 17011 did receive a negative vote. This was mainly due to the influence of EA member accreditation bodies, although UKAS is in

favour of the review. Despite the negative vote, CASCO is reviewing the position and it is possible that the systematic review will proceed.

5.0 Meetings

5.1 EFAC - 5 June 2013

Individual certification bodies from Poland and Bosnia and Herzegovina have joined EFAC as associate members. Another individual certification body from Latvia has also expressed an interest in joining. Membership continues to be a concern as subscriptions are insufficient to fund attendance at EA and IAF meetings.

The meeting was mainly concerned with feed back from IAF and EA meetings. The next meeting is on 8 October.

5.2 UKAS PAC - 4 July 2013

Progress has been made on the revision of the UKAS customer agreement but a number of final amendments are being made to reflect International Accreditation Forum (IAF) and International Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation (ILAC) requirements. The next draft should be circulated to stakeholder groups for comment before the end of the summer.

The FSB representative reported that he had been unsuccessful in getting an article supporting accreditation in FSB's First Voice magazine. He has, however, had a letter promoting the use of accredited certification published. FSB has agreed not to accept advertising from non-accredited certification bodies.

At the previous meeting, Paul Stennett had reported difficulties in recruiting technical staff. He confirmed it remains difficult but is progressing. He also advised that UKAS was seeking to raise management levels. UKAS has appointed an internal training manager and is developing an internal training programme.

Paul Stennett drew attention to steps being taken to fill the gaps left by Graham Talbot's retirement. It is not the intention to seek to have someone taking up a top level position as had occurred with Graham, but to spread the UKAS influence more widely. Paul Stennett has been elected to the EA Financial Oversight Committee and Jon Murthy has been appointed as the Chairman of both the ILAC and IAF Communications and Marketing Committees.

There was an update on the EA peer evaluation of UKAS. Some reporting of UKAS activity to EA was still required but UKAS' continued membership of the EA Multilateral Agreement had been confirmed.

Paul Stennett announced the UKAS Board's intention to review pricing policy, particularly to consider if more could be done to help small businesses.

The BIS representative advised that a Handbook for Ministers on standards and accreditation had been prepared and Members asked if this could be circulated with the minutes.

Action: Trevor Nash

5.3 EACC

- 2 October 2013

There has been no meeting of the EACC since the last meeting of this Committee. There are three questions relating to management systems certification for discussion at the forthcoming EACC meeting:

- a) Is it acceptable for a certificate's validity to extend beyond the three years specified in ISO/IEC 17021? The proposed answer is no, but that when re-certification is shortly delayed it can be performed with recertification rules and not as initial certification. The Committee agreed with the proposed answer.
- b) How should a certification body deal with a situation where an ISO 9001 certified organization outsources manufacturing? The proposed answer is that if manufacture is included in the scope of certification, the manufacturing facility must be assessed. Otherwise the scope should reflect that the certified organization 'manages' the outsourcing of manufacture. The Committee agreed with the proposed answer.
- c) A number of issues regarding potential conflicts of interest have been raised:
 - a. An executive of an accredited certification body represents a national trade association on an international association. The proposed answer is that this would be acceptable as long as discussion was generic and related to technical matters. If it involved specific product design it would be unacceptable.
 - b. An executive of an accredited certification body is a trainer on a course restricted to members of a trade association. Would the situation differ if the course was open to non-members? The proposed answer is that it would be acceptable providing the training is generic and it would be easier to demonstrate impartiality if the course was open to non-members.
 - c. The spouse of an executive of an accredited certification body owns a consultancy company which provides consultancy to clients of the certification body. The proposed answer is that there is nothing in the accreditation standards or in EA 2/17 that would prevent this from happening in theory, however it clearly poses a threat to impartiality and may be very difficult to demonstrate impartiality. The certification body would have to demonstrate how the risks resulting from the relationship with the spouse are controlled such that it does not compromise the impartiality of the certification activities.

The Committee agreed with the proposed answers.

5.4 EA HHC - 24/25 September 2013

There has been no meeting of the EAHHC since the last meeting of this Committee.

5.5 IAF TC - 20/21 October 2013

The IAF TC would be meeting on 20 and 21 October. Prior to the TC meeting there would be a number of Working Group and Task Force meetings. A new Task Force developing a document on witnessing of management systems certification bodies would be meeting for the first time. This TF would be taking over the work started by an EA Task Force Group. Another new Task Force developing a document on control of certification bodies' franchisees and subcontractors would also be meeting for the first time. Other Task Force meetings will cover:

- reviewing IAF MD 5,
- accreditation body assessor competence,
- EMS scoping,
- complex multi-site certification without sampling, and
- remote assessment.

Discussion papers include the following:

- (a) A request for the development of guidance on the duration of accreditation assessments. The Committee agreed that the ABCB position should be that some guidance would be helpful for both accreditation bodies and certification bodies. However, it was considered unlikely there would be agreement to proceed.
- (b) Whether it is acceptable for an accredited certification body to offer consultancy in areas that it is not accredited e.g. it is accredited for QMS and provides EMS consultancy. The Committee agreed that the ABCB position should be that as ISO/IEC 17021 states that a certification body shall not provide management systems consultancy, this includes all management systems consultancy, irrespective of whether or not it is within their accredited scope.
- (c) A question regarding ISO 9001 certified organisations outsourcing manufacture, similar to the EA question above.
- (d) In the case that a certification body loses its accreditation due to non-compliance, are accredited certification bodies taking over their clients required to agree how to proceed with transfer on an individual certificate basis or can there be a more general agreement on how to proceed? The Committee agreed that the ABCB position should be that there could be a

general agreement, but the certification body should review each certificate individually. The plan should include how the certification body will deal with situations where the validity of the previous certificate is questioned.

- (e) Whether the investigation of an appeal, against a decision taken by an accreditation body, by an independent person or group of persons includes making the decision on the result of the appeal. The Committee agreed that the ABCB position should be that it is acceptable that the individual or group investigating the appeal can make the decision or that they make a recommendation and the accreditation body makes the decision. In the latter case the certification body should be provided with a copy of the recommendation as well as the decision.

6.0 UKAS

6.1 UKAS update

Trevor Nash circulated a draft Technical Bulletin on extensions to scope which would shortly be available on the UKAS website. Members generally welcomed this and hoped that this clarification would help speed up the processing of extensions of scope. It was, however, noted that as a consequence of the TB, form AC1 would be revised and Members asked if a copy of the draft revision of this form could be obtained.

Action: Trevor Nash

6.2 Members' issues

Members reported that there are still issues with progressing extensions of scope. This is not helped by the fact that communication with Assessment Managers continues to be a problem and Keith Renouf reported that he had been trying, unsuccessfully, to contact his Assessment Manager for eight weeks. Trevor Nash informed Members that at the last Management Committee meeting Nigel Overton had advised Members to contact their Assessment Manager regarding progressing extensions to scope and that if this proved unsuccessful, they should contact him.

Members had noted that UKAS is still catching up on witnessed assessments to ensure the required number are carried out within the accreditation cycle. Trevor Nash advised Members that although the EA peer evaluation of UKAS had noted a significant improvement in this area, it is still being monitored as some further improvement is still necessary. Wayne Thomas reported a reluctance from UKAS to witness combined assessments.

7.0 **Any other business**

Bernard Anderson reported that he represents ABCB for the PAS 43 and Highways Agency vehicle recovery schemes. He wished to bring to the attention of Members the unsatisfactory situation regarding these schemes. Bernard had recently met with UKAS regarding a withdrawn certificate where the ex client had been quickly recertified by CARS QA. He had also received threatening texts from the ex client.

The AA has notified UKAS they are not satisfied with the PAS 43 scheme and will withdraw their support. They are now performing their own checks and are aware of which certification bodies are at fault. Bernard will document instances of inappropriate certification and advise UKAS. Kevin Belson has indicated that UKAS will be performing spot checks of certified organisations. Bernard's vigilance in trying to protect the integrity of these schemes has resulted in him receiving threatening calls from some of the other accredited certification bodies.

8.0 **Date and venue of next meeting**

Trevor Nash agreed to liaise with Steve Russell regarding a date for the next meeting.

Action: Trevor Nash