Association of British Certification Bodies

Minutes of the Management Systems Sector Committee Meeting
held on Tuesday 29 September 2015 at BSI, Kitemark Court, Davy Avenue, Knowlhill, Milton Keynes, MK5 8PP

Members Present:

Ms Natalie Bennett	BSI
Mr Keith Goddard	The British Assessment Bureau
Ms Helen Taft	SIRA
Mr Max Linnemann	NMO

In Attendance:

Mr Trevor Nash	Chief Executive

1.0 Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Steve Russell(NQA), Tanya Kuchukova(TuV), Wayne Thomas (SIRA), Elaine Hanaghan(The Audit People), Gary Charlesworth(Avalon Certification) John Sexton(AFNOR UK), Richard Colwell(BASEC) and Janet White(BSI) for whom Natalie Bennett was deputising.

In the absence of the Chairman, Trevor Nash chaired the meeting.

2.0 Minutes of the meeting held on 21 May 2015

The minutes were approved as a true record.

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

3.1 Ex minute 6.2   UKAS Policy for witnessed assessments

There had been no time to discuss this at the UKAS Management Systems Certification Technical Advisory Committee meeting as discussion on the ISO9001:2015 took up most of the meeting. The action is carried over to the next MSCTAC meeting in December.

Action: Steve Russell

4.0 Liaison reports

4.1 SBAC/CBMC

AS9104-003 has still not been released. It failed ballot in August 2015 and it is hoped it will be finally approved by the end of this year.

BS EN 9101:2015 Quality Management Systems - Audit Requirements for Aviation, Space and Defence Organisations was only published in September 2015 but the technically equivalent AS 9101 revision E was published in March 2014, which suggests that the standards process is not carried out in a timely manner.

Certification bodies have been invited to be involved in the development and testing of the next generation OASIS database when available with the intention that any "bugs" can be ironed out before implementation.

It is expected that Plexus will make the AATT training courses available by August 2016, by which time one year of the transition timeframe will already have been lost.

The aviation industry is being encouraged to review the IAQG website regarding the timelines for publication of the revised 2016 editions of the AS 9100 series of standards.

The 2015 EASA/FAA International Aviation Safety Conference was held in Brussels between 10 and 12 June 2015 to encourage the use and possible adoption in the future of the IAQG 9110 Maintenance Repair Overhaul (MRO) QMS standard as a possible solution to reduce duplication of MRO second party assessment.

IAQG (International Aerospace Quality Group) MRO strategic objective has been restated, which is to reduce audits and improve performance by the development of an Aviation (Civil and Defense) Industry standard on MRO quality management systems and an accreditation scheme around MRO QMS which can be recognized and valued by all stakeholders.

A recent report from the Senate Armed Services Committee of the USA has identified a significant number of counterfeit electronic parts imported from China being used in US military equipment. According to the report more than 70% of an estimated one million parts are suspected to have been imported from China. The USA and Canada were found to be the next largest source countries for fake parts. The report also highlights that counterfeit parts have been found in US Navy helicopters and planes.

4.2 DIQF

The last meeting was on 24 September and consisted of a review of the current Work Streams:

> Work Stream 4 – Counterfeit avoidance

> The main concern was around the definition of 'counterfeit' where the draft AS9100 includes one that would not be legally enforceable. MoD

> Work Stream 6 – Confidence in third party certification

> The proposed MoD sector scheme has been on hold, but now revised standards have been published, MoD will relook at the aspect of assessor competence.

MOD now has agreement that, within contracts, they now have an option to require third party accredited certification.

MOD is carrying out a trial with OASIS as a means of raising issues around their suppliers.

4.3 JTISC

There have been no JTISC meetings this year and it is hoped to have a meeting before the end of the year. No date has yet been set.

TickITplus is planned to have 3 levels of accreditation offering 5 levels of certification.

- Foundation (offering Foundation certification)
- Capability (offering Bonze and Silver certification levels)
- Optimising (offering Gold and Platinum levels).

Currently TickITplus certification is only available at the Foundation level. It is planned to launch the Capability levels (Bronze and Silver) in late 2015/ early 2016. Accredited certification bodies will need to extend their accreditation to include the Capability levels. A pilot Capability level training course was held in July 2015.

The Base Process Library (BPL) is to be re-issued following a review against the final version of ISO 9001:2015. There are also plans to add two new standards namely PAS 754 (Software Trustworthiness. Governance and management) and ISO 26262 (Road vehicles - Functional safety).

4.4 QS/1

ISO 9001 :2015 was published on 23 September.

4.5 SES/1/1

ISO 14001 :2015 was published on 15 September.

4.6   CAS/1

ISO/IEC 17021-1 was published in July. It was noted that there is a two year transition period. Max Linnemann highlighted the changes to the requirements for management of impartiality, for the timing of recertification audits and validity dates on certificates.

A Committee draft of the revision of ISO/IEC 17011 is out for comment which closes on 8 October. The period for submitting comments to BSI closed on 25 September.

5.0   Meetings

5.1   UKAS MSCTAC   26 June 2015

The ongoing question regarding whether certification bodies should be able to offer non-accredited certification for accredited scopes was further discussed. This was discussed at the last EACC meeting and, while there was consensus that this is not good practice, there is no specific rule covering it. Many national accreditation bodies have a requirement to cover this in their terms and conditions and the MSCTAC asked UKAS to consider including such a clause.

The draft IAF document on accreditation body competence was discussed. It was considered too complex and the TAC supported a "no" vote from UKAS with a comment that the document should be redrafted.

Professor Tony Bendell gave a presentation on a proposed scheme for 6 Sigma and Lean Practitioners. It was agreed that the scheme would be best progressed as a personnel certification scheme under ISO/IEC 17024. UKAS will continue discussions with Professor Bendell.

The latest draft of the proposed new Management Systems Accreditation schedule was presented. The proposal is that all accredited activities under ISO/IEC 17021 will be included in one schedule with sections for each certification standard and the MSCTAC supported this.

UKAS sought advice regarding adoption of each newly published TS in the ISO/IEC17021 series and it was recommended that UKAS should adopt them on their publication, rather than waiting for IAF endorsement.

5.2   UKAS PAC   9 July 2015

Paul Stennett reported that the revised customer agreement was almost ready for issue. Final advice is being taken on the level of liabilities required.

Paul Stennett reported that the UKAS approach for the ISO 9001:2015 transition was supported by the majority of other accreditation bodies. The UKAS programme for early adopters is progressing against the

guidelines agreed as is the training programme for UKAS staff. Eight certification bodies are on the programme with the first accreditations expected by mid-October.

MoD noted the efforts made by UKAS to restore confidence in the process and expressed disappointment that the IAF has not supported the UKAS approach. There was concern that procurers, particularly in the USA, will write the new standard into contracts before UK companies are able to comply and that the failure to reach agreement has not reflected well on the international accreditation community.

The new Government is committed to finding savings of £10bn from deregulatory measures and there will be statutory monitoring against this target with the Secretary of State being required to report annually to Parliament. UKAS is working hard to build good relationships with the new Government, building on the successes of recent years. The continuity of many in the Ministerial teams is helpful in this respect as is the renewed emphasis on deregulation and public sector efficiency.

BSI reported on the results of a recent study into the economic benefits of standards which concludes that standards add £8.2bn to the economy each year. Sectoral results vary with food and drink showing the biggest added value. The report confirms that there are clear business benefits from using standards. Paul Stennett commented although not specifically stated, there is clear read-across to accreditation. He would consider whether more work could be done to link the results to accreditation.

Paul Stennett reported that the reorganisation is proceeding to plan. All posts have been advertised and the allocation of staff to posts has been completed. Staff will be taking up their new posts from 1 August. From September, customers will see a handover to new Assessment Managers with about half having new AMs.

Mike Pearson reported that he is still working to raise awareness of accreditation amongst the small business community. An article has been published in the FSB magazine, First Voice. He noted that the working group set up to discuss this subject has not met for some time and would welcome the revival of this group.

Sustainable Forestry Management Systems has been added to the list of management systems.

5.3   EACC   6/7 October 2015

The meeting will be held in Lisbon and will be the last chaired by the current Chairman. Kevin Belson will be taking over as Chairman after this meeting.

There will be a discussion session on ISO/IEC 17021:2105 focussing on the following two questions:

What are the implications of the changes to impartiality requirements, especially with regard to the removal of the specific requirement for an impartiality committee;

- what changes and alternatives might be implemented by Certification Bodies;
- what do NABs need to do differently to assess them?

Consider clauses 9.6.3.2.4 and 9.6.3.2.5. Please offer a practical interpretation of these clauses in terms of decision dates and information on certificates:

- can a CB take a recertification decision after the expiry date of the certification ?

There will be the usual session on frequently asked questions and Members commented on the questions on the Agenda. These cover:

- can an accredited certification body issue non-accredited certificates for accredited scopes,
- can details of sites be excluded from certificates for security reasons,
- for a multi-site certification body, is it only the head office that can grant certification,
- what is the meaning of temporary site,
- does a certification body assessor have to have competence in the legal requirements of a foreign country when performing an assessment in that country,
- can a certification body perform a gap analysis for its clients,
- can certification bodies pay a 'finders fee' to consultants,
- can certification bodies market training linked to a management systems consultancy,
- how does a certification body deal with a situation where a client outsources the whole manufacturing process,
- is non-fulfillment of a requirement of ISO/IEC 17021:2015 a major non-conformity?

The EA Executive Committee is still refusing to make the answers to these questions publicly available on the EA website.

5.4   IAF   28 Oct – 6 Nov 2015

EA is strengthening its position in IAF. Emanuele Riva (ACCREDIA - Italy) has been elected as IAF Vice Chair and Norman Brunner (AA - Austria) has been elected as Chair of the MLA Committee. Both take over these roles following the next round of meetings.

IAF is continuing with developing a business case for establishing a global database of management systems certificates. At this stage a principles document is being drafted and it is expected this will be on the General Assembly agenda. There will then need to be a ballot to agree the principles which will either be at the GA or following it depending on the level of comments. Essential elements are:

- It must be self funding but not a means of making money for IAF;
- It will include all MS standards and schemes accredited by IAF member accreditation bodies irrespective of whether they are MLA signatories;
- It will be mandatory for AB's to provide details of accredited CB's, but voluntary for CB's and their clients;
- There must be controls to prevent data mining;
- It should address as many languages as possible.

The Management Committee agreed that ABCB should vote against the proposal for a global database.

The Conformity Assessment Bodies Advisory Committee (CABAC) has sent a communiqué to the IAF Executive Committee regarding a number of areas that CABAC feels warrant the greatest attention. These are:

- Inconsistency between accreditation bodies;
- Greater active participation of members in meetings;
- Strengthening the peer evaluation process:
- Engagement with as wide an audience as possible on the proposed database of MS certificates.

This has been received positively by the Executive Committee and the Chair, Vice Chair and Vice Chair elect will attend the CABAC meeting in Milan.

5.5   EA General Assembly   25/26 Nov 2015

The main area of contention is the statement in EA-INF/04 regarding recognition of certificates issued to organisations in the EU by CB's in the EU under a non-EU accreditation.

For CABs established in EU: Regulation (EC) 765/2008 requires that, where a conformity assessment body requests accreditation, it shall do so with the national accreditation body of the Member State in which it is established (or with the national accreditation body to which it had recourse under the conditions of Article 7(1)). Hence <LOCAL AB> cannot make any statement on reports/certificates issued by a conformity assessment body established in the European Union under accreditations different from the above mentioned National Accreditation Bodies for activities to be carried out in the EU, or for attestations issued for the EU market as in these cases the relevant provisions of EU legislation have not been fully complied with.

I have asked the Chair of the HHC what this actually means and have not received a clear answer. The conclusion given was that when asked the question about the recognition of such certificates an EU AB remains silent.

The issue has been raised with IAF by IAAR (the American MS systems certification body association) and is likely to be raised at the IAF (and possibly ILAC) General Assembly. The question is whether this stance complies with the obligations of IAF (and ILAC) MLA signatories to recognise the equivalence of each others accredited certificates. At the previous GA there was the suggestion that if EA proceeded with this approach it could results in the suspension of EA (and its members) from the IAF MLA.

Randy Dougherty's initial view is that it is not a problem as AB's must comply with local legislation. However, there is an argument that whilst the Regulation requires an EU based certification body seeking accreditation to do so from its national accreditation body, there is nothing to prevent the certification body also seeking accreditation from a non-EU accreditation body nor that they shall only issue EU based accredited certificates in the EU. Therefore, the statement that the EU has not been fully complied with can be questioned. To use the HHC Chair's words, the Regulation is silent on the subject.

In reality the recognition of certificates is unlikely to be a major problem but the suspension of EA from the IAF MAL would have a significant impact on EU based CB's.

6.0   UKAS

6.1   UKAS Update

Transitions are the major issue for UKAS at present. The ISO/IEC 17024 and ISO/IEC 17065 transitions were both successfully completed on time and UKAS is learning from these in planning future transitions.

The ISO 9001:2015 transition is under way with the early adopters and UKAS is working with other certification bodies. Although there are differences in approach from accreditation bodies, others, such as ANAB, are following the document developed at the IAF Technical Committee meeting in April. It has been suggested that future IAF transition documents should be mandatory rather than informative, to prevent a recurrence of what has happened with this transition. UKAS has held a webinar on ISO 9001:2015, which was well received, but there will not be one for ISO 14001:2015 as it is too late. It is, however, the intention to hold webinars for all future transitions. The ISO 14001:2015 transition is in a similar position but slightly behind ISO 9001:2015. Certification bodies are reminded that if they performed an assessment against the FDIS they must verify the validity of the assessment against the published version.

A webinar on ISO/IEC 17021-1:2015 is planned and details of the transition arrangements have been circulated. UKAS is, however, not pushing for assessments due to the other transitions and the need to check the compliance of schemes with the revised standard.

UKAS has submitted two discussion papers to the EACC. The first relates to whether it is acceptable to omit details of certain sites from certificates

due to significant security risks. Max Linnemann commented that, if it was agreed, care would be needed to prevent abuse and that certification bodies would need to provide the justification. The second relates to the relationship between certification bodies and consultants.

The UKAS restructure is on target to be completed by February 2016 and all staff know their new positions. Most customers have been allocated internally. Approximately 30% (800) are classified as smaller customers and will not have a dedicated Assessment Manager. Complex customers will have a dedicated Assessment Manager who will be the focal point for all accreditations. A complex customer is generally one with more than one standard or multiple sites, but size may also play a part as could overseas sites. Only around 15 certification bodies are classified as small customers and most are laboratories.

Customers will be informed of their Assessment Manager later in the year commencing in October. Assessment activity will continue as normal as the new structure settles down. Natalie Bennett stated that BSI has been notified of its Assessment Manager, but still has a separate contact fro aerospace. Other Members had not been informed of their Assessment Manager.

Changes to the technical team have been announced and a technical support team is being established to provide a technical focus with individuals looking after sectors and technologies.

6.2   Other UKAS Matters

With the expected publication of ISO 45001 in 2016, there was discussion about whether it would be necessary to conduct a new stage one and stage two assessment to upgrade existing OHSAS 18001 certified clients to accredited ISO 45001 certification. Trevor Nash replied that as ISO 45001 is a new standard, the term migration is being used rather than transition. An IAF Technical Committee Task Force is developing a migration document and more information should be available after the forthcoming IAF Technical Committee meeting.

7.0   Any other business

There were no items of other business.

8.0   Date and venue of next meeting

The next meeting will be on Tuesday 15 December at NQA, subject to confirmation.