

**UNITED KINGDOM ACCREDITATION SERVICE**  
**POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL**  
**Confirmed minutes of 3rd Meeting**  
**Held on Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> July 2012 at the Lansdowne Club, London**

**Present**

Dr Martin Jones (Chairman)	CBI
Susan Brand	ECCA
Christine Burgess (deputising for Prof Ian Sharp)	HPA
Chris Elliott	MoD
Ron Gainsford	TSI
Dr Jeff Llewellyn	BMTA
Daniel Mansfield	BSI
John Mortimer	BIS
Trevor Nash	ABCB
Prof Adrian Newland	AMRC
Mike Pearson	FSB
Paul Stennett	UKAS
Lorraine Turner	UKAS
Dr Jane Beaumont	UKAS
Malcolm Hynd (Secretary)	UKAS

**Apologies**

Prof Ian Sharp (deputy Christine Burgess)	HPA
---	-----

**1- Welcome, Apologies**

Dr Jones welcomed members to the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the UKAS Policy Advisory Council. He particularly welcomed Christine Burgess who was attending for the first time in place of Prof Ian Sharp of HPA who had tendered apologies.

**2- Minutes of 2nd Meeting of the UKAS Policy Advisory Council****PAC/17/11 Rev**

Mr Mortimer reported that the list of harmonised standards, referred to under Item 7.2, had been further updated and published in the EU Official Journal (Ref C149/1 of 25 May 2012). There were no other comments and the minutes were agreed as drafted.

**3- Matters Arising (not covered elsewhere)****3.1 Provision of information on BIS monitoring of UKAS (Item 3.4)**

Dr Jones confirmed that Mr Mortimer had reported on BIS monitoring of UKAS at the PAF meeting in March and considered that this was helpful. Mr Nash welcomed the BIS report and suggested it should be a standing item on PAF agendas. Mr Mortimer referenced the discussion on the EA peer evaluation of UKAS and informed PAC that he would witness the peer evaluation due in the autumn. Mr Mortimer also confirmed that he had discussed the BIS policy statement on non-accredited certification with Mr Gainsford (as discussed under Item 3.1) and it was understood that BIS could not make accreditation mandatory.

### **3.2 Development of e-learning package (Item 7.3)**

Mr Mortimer reported that the e-learning package on standards and accreditation was still being developed and would be made available within BIS in due course.

### **4- Report of 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the UKAS Policy Advisory Forum**

PAC/04/12

There were no comments and the report was agreed as drafted.

### **5- Matters Arising (not covered elsewhere)**

#### **5.1 Review of PAF membership (Item 3)**

PAC/02/12

Mr Stennett commented that the healthcare sector was new to UKAS advisory groups and so may need some help in providing a co-ordinated view. Prof Newland said that they had discussed the possibility of establishing a sub-group to coordinate the views of the health sector including social care and HPA. He proposed calling a meeting to develop a common view on accreditation and to consider other areas in the health sector where UKAS could operate. Dr Jones agreed that there were particular challenges in consolidating the use of accreditation in the health sector, given the longstanding tradition of peer assessment, and that a sub-group would be a good way forward.

Mr Gainsford asked about local government representation, which also had relevance to health and social care, given the closure of Local Government Regulation. Mr Hynd explained that UKAS was corresponding with the Local Government Association, with a view to the LGA providing local government representation, but so far without success. Mr Gainsford suggested that UKAS could also consider inviting the Better Regulation Delivery Office (BRDO) to take part. It was also noted that Citizens Advice would pick up some of the consumer policy work following the closure of Consumer Focus and that Which would also have an expanded policy role. Mr Mansfield suggested that the Better Regulation Executive (BRE) could be invited to join. Mr Hynd agreed to discuss the involvement of BRDO and BRE with Mr Mortimer given that they were integral parts of BIS.

Mr Hynd suggested that UKAS may wish to invite the Scottish Government to nominate a representative to PAF given the importance of maintaining good relations with the devolved administrations. Dr Jones invited members to send any further suggestions to Mr Hynd.

#### **5.2 Economic Benefits of Accreditation Study (Item 6)**

PAC/0312

Dr Jones explained that the interim report was tabled mainly for information as work on the study was ongoing. He invited members to contact Ray Lambert direct (r.lambert@bbk.ac.uk) if they wished to make further input. Dr Llewellyn reported that he had met with Ray Lambert to provide input and that BMTA was also circulating a questionnaire to its members to gather wider contributions. Mr Hynd reported that a questionnaire would be sent to all UKAS customers shortly.

#### **5.3 Developing the next UKAS 3 year strategy (Item 7)**

Mr Stennett reported that the output from the PAF and PAC discussions had been fed into Executive and Board considerations of the strategy and had been well received. He reported that UKAS directors agreed with the direction of the PAF/PAC input and had identified the resourcing of new work as the main issue to be addressed. Members would be invited to consider further at the AGM in October.

### **6- Reports**

#### **6.1 UKAS Board Report (including changes to the UKAS Executive)**

PAC/04/12

Mr Stennett reported that two Board meetings had been held since the last PAC, with the April

meeting held at Phoenix in Farnborough, UKAS' business continuity site. Main issues discussed were:

- Review of business continuity arrangements
- Organisational changes (as detailed in the paper)
- New pension deed reducing benefits
- Debrief from PAF
- Validity of UKAS accredited certificates in Iran
- Development activities

Dr Jones recorded congratulations to Ms Turner, Dr Beaumont and Mr Ruddle on their new appointments.

## 6.2 BIS International contract activity reports

PAC/05/12

PAC/06/12

The reports for the last two quarters were tabled. Mr Elliott asked whether he could have sight of the EA peer evaluator handbook (PAC/05/12 p6). Ms Turner advised that this was an internal European co-operation for Accreditation (EA) document but she would ask if it could be circulated to PAC. She also advised that there was a publicly available document on the peer evaluation process (EA 2/02) available from the EA website (circulated with these minutes).

**Secretary's note:** EA has recently produced its Annual Report on the Multilateral Agreement which also contains information on the peer evaluation process. A copy is circulated with these minutes.

Mr Pearson made a plea for acronyms to be explained in future reports. Mr Elliott asked about the reference to IOAS in PAC/06/12 (p7). Dr Beaumont explained that this was the International Organic Accreditation Service, a non-governmental organisation operating outside the established accreditation infrastructure. Mr Elliott asked whether the document on witnessing practices for certification (p7) could be made available. Ms Turner would advise.

## 6.3 UKAS Accreditation Report

PAC/07/12

The report covering 1 October 2011 to 31 May 2012 was tabled. Dr Jones suggested that the reports might focus more on new developments in future. Mr Mansfield, Mr Mortimer and Mr Gainsford agreed that the reports were useful to show the breadth of UKAS activity.

Ms Brand asked if there was any progress on discussions with the Care Quality Commission about social care. Mr Stennett reported that little progress was being made. A high level meeting between the UKAS and CQC chairs was planned but had been delayed.

Mr Mortimer welcomed the work on the ISO 50001 Energy Management System Standard which linked with work he had been doing with the Department for Energy and Climate Change (DECC). Mr Mansfield said that DECC had asked for evidence of the benefits of ISO 50001 but this was difficult as it was a new standard.

Mr Gainsford referred to the work being done to support the Green Deal and highlighted the exposure to reputational risk in being involved in this high profile project. Dr Beaumont acknowledged the risk and confirmed that UKAS was resisting any pressure to dilute the certification requirements.

## 7- PAC Members' Issues

Dr Llewellyn reported on a survey of members and noted that he was awaiting an opportunity to discuss with UKAS. Dr Beaumont said that she was considering feedback on the points raised before setting up a meeting.

## 8- UKAS Issues

### 8.1 Preliminary consultation on changes to the UKAS customer agreement

Ms Turner explained that the current agreement was out of date in that it did not reflect some of the changes in policy, particularly at the international level, and changes to standards. The agreement was being updated and all customers would be asked to sign the new agreement. A draft was being discussed with legal advisers following which it could be made available to customers, for information. Ms Turner said that the changes were not huge and the main change was to include a requirement to allow UKAS to sub-contract assessment work in third countries without having to seek the agreement of the customer on each occasion. It was also proposed to introduce a renewal process. Ms Turner would liaise with the main customer associations with a view to sending out the revised agreement in the next couple of months.

### 8.2 New accreditation service – Improving Quality in Physiological diagnostic Services (IQIPS)

PAC/10/12  
PAC/11/12

Prof Newland considered that IQIPS was an important element in the development of accreditation in the healthcare sector. Physiological measurement was un-coordinated and needed to be pulled together and delivered to proper standards. He welcomed the decision by the Royal College of Physicians to commission UKAS accreditation for this work. The introduction of quality control was important to support the 'any qualified provider' provisions being introduced.

Mr Mortimer said that BIS welcomed the provision of accreditation in new areas but needed to ensure that any new work was suitable for the national accreditation body. He mentioned the discussions within the European Commission that might restrict the provision of accreditation by National Accreditation Bodies only to work covered by harmonised standards. Stakeholder views were therefore very important.

Dr Jones asked about the analogy with the Imaging Services Accreditation Scheme. Dr Beaumont confirmed that IQIPS followed the same structure as ISAS with three non-clinical domains: , patient experience, safety and facilities, equipment and resources, as well as a clinical domain. There were no British or international standards in this area so consultation in a wider stakeholder forum had not taken place but there had been broad consultation across the health sector. UKAS had encouraged the use of international standards and had mapped across to ISO 17020, ISO 17025 and ISO 15189. She said there was good read across and even though there were some elements not covered by the IQIPS standard they were covered by other scheme documentation.

Mr Mortimer asked for an unequivocal statement that IQIPS was consistent with ISO 17011. Dr Beaumont confirmed that the agreed process was consistent with ISO 17011. The assessment process was based on reassessment every four years and assessment every two years with web based assessment in the intervening years.

Dr Jones asked about how the accreditation process would consider the qualification and experience of the practitioners. Dr Beaumont confirmed that staff competence was an important part of accreditation as well as process.

Mr Mortimer asked whether the Department of Health (DH) would make IQIPS mandatory under the 'any qualified provider' policy. Prof Newland responded that DH would not mandate any particular scheme but would make IQIPS a pre-requisite.

Mr Stennett acknowledged that the debate in Europe may have a bearing in future but for the time being it was important for UKAS to continue to embrace new schemes. Ms Turner was aware of concerns in EA that any restrictions on accreditation might stifle innovation. She said that EA may need to look at the methodology for considering emerging standards but the important point was that ISO 17011 and other relevant guidance documents would apply.

Mr Mortimer confirmed that it was not BIS policy to restrict UKAS unnecessarily but BIS needed to be sure that the appropriate level of rigour was in place. Mr Mortimer also raised the question of undue pressure on the timing of the first accreditations. Dr Beaumont said that UKAS had trained assessors ready but no applications had been received. She confirmed that UKAS would defend

proper process.

Mr Gainsford commented on the quality of the information provided and confirmed he was happy to support the work going ahead. Ms Burgess supported the need for regulation in this area.

Dr Jones considered that there was PAC support for taking IQIPS forward and for matching the work as closely as possible to the international standards.

### **8.3 UKAS international role**

**PAC/08/12**

Ms Turner introduced the paper which had been prepared to address PAC enquiries about the international expansion of UKAS business. The paper placed these opportunities in context with the restrictions on cross border activities. Mr Mansfield considered that the paper was very useful and should be a standing paper for PAF/PAC members. UKAS could also consider whether it should be on the website. Dr Llewellyn reported that, where cross border requirements had required his members to use other accreditation bodies, they had been less happy with their performance. Dr Jones recorded his thanks to Mr Talbot for the paper.

## **9- Any Other Business**

### **9.1 Insurance company use of UKAS accreditation**

**PAC/09/12**

Mr Stennett explained that a complaint had been received from a customer about UKAS endorsement of Towergate as shown in the paper. Other customers had found the services offered extremely useful and UKAS took great care not to favour one insurer over another. There was agreement that there was no risk to UKAS impartiality in the manner of endorsement used, provided that UKAS did not favour any one particular company. Mr Mansfield reported that the Better Regulation Executive was interested in how insurance could be used to reduce the regulatory burden.

### **9.2 Trade with Iran**

Mr Stennett explained that the EU embargo on trade with Iran mainly concerned equipment for military and nuclear use but there was also a general view that UK companies should not be trading with Iran. It was also not clear where certification was being used. UKAS was awaiting final guidance from FCO but would probably need to remove Iran from certification body schedules. PAC members concurred with this course of action.

### **9.3 Non-recognised accreditation**

Mr Nash drew attention to the European Commission paper on non-recognised accreditation and noted that ABCB supported these efforts to clarify the legal position in respect of these organisations.

## **10- Next meetings**

The following dates and venues for future meetings were confirmed:

Thursday 8 November 2012 – PAC at UKAS, Feltham

Tuesday 5 March 2013 – PAF at the BIS Conference Centre, London

Thursday 4 July 2013 – PAC at Lansdowne Club, London