UNITED KINGDOM ACCREDITATION SERVICE

POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL

Minutes of 24th Meeting held on Tuesday 2nd July 2019
The Lansdowne Club 9 Fitzmaurice Place, London W1J 5JD

Present
Andy Evans (AE Chair)   GAMBICA
Carol Stewart (CS)   British Measurement & Testing Association
Steve Brunige (SB)   British Standards Institution
Sue Brand (SuB)   Care England
Alex Woods (AW)   Chartered Quality Institute
Richard Sanders (RS)   Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy
Dr Stefan Kukula (SK)   Engineering Equipment & Materials Users' Association
Chris Rowe   Health and Safety Executive
Dave Thomas (DT)   Ministry of Defence
Wayne Terry (WT)   ABCB

Matt Gantley (MG)   UKAS
Lorraine Turner (LT)   UKAS
Hugh Taylor (HT)   UKAS
Suzi Daley (SD Sec.)   UKAS

1- Welcome, Apologies

The Chair welcomed members to the 24th meeting of the UKAS PAC. Apologies were received from Ron Gainsford, for whom AE was standing in as Chair, Sarah Veale, Estelle Clark and Sarah Smith. Alex Woods and Richard Sanders represented the CQI and BEIS respectively. **AE** welcomed the new MoD representative, **Dave Thomas** and **Hugh Taylor,** the new UKAS Divisional Director of External Affairs, to their first PAC and initiated round table introductions for the benefits of new attendees.

2- Minutes of the 23rd Meeting of the Policy Advisory Council   PAC/06/19

SD reported that no comments had been received on the draft minutes circulated. The only comment at the meeting was a typo under item 6.1 (since amended). Some attendees had not received the UKAS Executive organogram as actioned in item 10 – Action Log. **SD** confirmed that it had been circulated but agreed to recirculate the most recent version which now reflected Executive appointments since the March PAC.

[Action: SD]

3- Matters Arising

3.1 Review of 2019 PAF Meeting (5.1)

The Chair said that this would be covered under item 5.

3.2   Non accredited certification (3.1)

AW outlined CQI's proposed amendments to the UKAS/ABCB policy statement circulated with the PAC agenda and papers. In summary, CQI proposed a more concise but stronger statement which was more explicit about the risks and unreliability associated with non-accredited certification. CQI would also like more reference to accreditation as part of the national quality infrastructure. **MG** added that this is a longstanding issue and agreed that the statement needed to be as strong and robust as possible, in line with UKAS' strategic priorities e.g. profile and influence. He added that this messaging chimed well with the new UKAS database for accredited CBs, currently in development. He thought that more work needed to be done on the statement and that BEIS, HSE and MoD should be drawn in. **CR** then flagged the relevance of this work to the HSE's recent report on Blue Tape. **SuB** suggested that UKAS also involve Care England as a way of letting social care providers know about this work, as they were predominantly SMEs and didn't understand the distinction. **LT** reiterated the importance of ensuring the statement was aligned with BEIS policy (which it is) and of having broader Government and regulator buy-in . All representatives round the table from Government Departments and regulators were in agreement. **LT** added that we needed to develop an effective and joined up communications strategy . **The Chair** acknowledged all these points and it was agreed that a final statement and comms plan would be in place by September 2019.

[Action: AW to recirculate current draft with CQI's comments]

[Action: SD/HT to ensure final version agreed by September]

4- Members Issues

SK raised the issue of Apprenticeships . He outlined how EEMUA provided the external quality assurance at the end point assessment of level 7 for the Institute of Apprenticeships on behalf of DfE. EEMUA is concerned that the Institute of Apprenticeships has created a parallel quality infrastructure and has asked the Institute to discuss this with BSI/UKAS/CQI. **LT** recalled that UKAS has previously had discussions regarding apprenticeships that may be relevant to this; this will be followed up with Malcolm Hynd [**Action: LT**]. **SK** agreed to provide IoA contacts **[Action: SK]**. **SB** thought the Government White Paper on Regulation for the Fourth Industrial Revolution might provide an opportunity in this area.

5- UKAS Issues

5.1 Summary of PAF 2019 Meetingsphere feedback (SD)   **PAC/08/19**

SD went through the paper highlighting in particular the comments around the need for better management of PAF papers to optimise access, and the opportunity for meaningful comment from all members. PAC members were content with UKAS proposals to review the use of zip files and to include short summaries of main papers in covering emails. PAC members also agreed that the plans to refresh and restructure the PAF next year would address many of the concerns raised. **SD** also drew members' attention to the PAF's overwhelming support for the UKAS strategic priorities but noted that some respondents again described the potentially 'prohibitively expensive cost of accreditation' for some SMEs. On this latter point, **the Chair** asked what UKAS was doing to address cost. **MG** said that as part of our strategic priorities, UKAS will continue to look at cost. Also, as part of a broader programme of work to support the use of accreditation, UKAS will be commissioning research to look at the value/cost/ benefit analysis of accreditation. UKAS would also consider subsidising areas as part of its investment strategy, where it might help increase uptake in areas of broad public interest. **RS** said that BEIS welcomed this. This was a message that BEIS would be keen to cascade across Government. He thought also that it would prove helpful in countering some of the negative

language used in Government Department Impact Assessments whereby Departments sometimes cite accreditation as a high-cost alternative to regulation. **WT** said it would be good to have a comparison of UKAS accreditation against the costs of accreditation by other national accreditation bodies. UKAS is participating in a European accreditation body (AB) benchmarking project that may provide some new data; previous studies had shown UKAS to about average compared to other ABs.

Aside from costs, **HT** picked up on some of the views expressed on the appropriateness of a Net Promoter Score (under Stakeholder engagement/customer satisfaction) for UKAS as it is the sole accreditation body.

5.2 <u>Options for revising structure of PAF 2020 (SD)</u>   **PAC/09/19**

The Chair invited **SD** to go through the proposals outlined in the paper before opening it up for broader discussion. He added that absent PAC members had confirmed that they were happy with the proposals but had flagged the risks associated with moving the event out of London post 2020. PAC members were broadly supportive of the proposals for next year's PAF. PAC agreed that a new location, a more interactive format, facilitator roles for PAC members and UKAS colleagues with sufficient opportunities for networking would foster a more productive, enjoyable event and result in better outcomes. With regard to events post 2020. **MG** said that one of the options currently being considered is holding the PAF as part of a bigger company conference that could incorporate technical committee meetings, assessor workshops and customer sessions.

5.3 <u>Amendments to BEIS/UKAS MoU (LT):</u>   **PAC/10/19**

i. Recent changes to Appendix 2 (for info)

LT informed the PAC that Appendix 2 of the BEIS/UKAS MoU had been amended to reflect the fact that the ISAS standard for imaging services is now known as the QSI standard. The reference to ISO Guide 34 has also been removed as the transition is complete .

ii. <u>Proposed change to include ISO 20387 Biobanking</u>

The Chair invited **LT** to introduce her paper to seek PAC comments on the proposal to include ISO 20387 into Appendix 1 of the MoU. **SK** asked if the testing processes under this standard could also be covered under ISO/IEC 17025. **LT** confirmed that some biobanks have already been accredited for their testing but that this new standard covered the whole biobanking process including acquisition, characterisation, storage and chain of custody. ISO 20387 does include the relevant requirements for testing from ISO/IEC 17025.
The Paper was approved.

5.4 <u>Risk Register (LT)-</u>   PAC/14/19

The Chair asked **MG** to introduce this paper which was tabled at the meeting. **MG** explained that there was a detailed evaluation and mitigation index behind this register of high/moderate and low level risks which is monitored by the Board. The paper was presented here to request input from PAC as to whether the register had identified all the correct risks. **WT** asked about the risk of losing key personnel and **CS** asked about the challenges in recruiting technical experts to which **MG** replied that it depended on the sector. **MG** informed the PAC that a new dedicated Resources Manager post had been created and that this role would ensure that UKAS targets the right areas for recruitment. Various members highlighted the risks associated with Brexit (see next item).

6 - Brexit

LT outlined recent developments both in the UK and at EA, which have been minimal since the last PAF/PAC in March. UKAS continues to have regular useful meetings with BEIS (UKCA mark) and DIT (Mutual Recognition). The view was that following recent political developments the risk of 'no deal' had increased. **WT** asked for clarification on the situation for products already produced at time of leaving; would they need to be retested for access to European (EU) Market? **MG** clarified that in the event of 'no deal', products would have to have been already placed on the market in order for UKAS accredited testing/conformity assessment to be accepted by the importing EU country. If products have been manufactured but not yet placed in the EU (non-UK states), manufacturers/suppliers would have to get them retested before exporting to EU countries. Where UKAS accreditation is used outside of the regulatory area, it will continue to be valid. **SD** explained that in response to an increasing number of enquiries from UKAS customers she is working with her UKAS colleague Kevin Belson to produce a list of FAQs for the UKAS website, this is expected to be available by the end of the summer.

7 – Reports

7.1 UKAS Board Report

MG reported on the issues discussed at the last UKAS Board meeting on 13th April:

- Review of UKAS Strategic Plan/UKAS priorities

- 2018 Gender Pay Gap Report – published in April

- Review of Balanced Score Card

- End of Financial Year Financial Report

- Health and Safety Committee Report – no major incidents

- Brexit

- Competition from overseas Accreditation Bodies

- Risk Register

MG then informed PAC about the new appointments to the Executive team, Hugh Taylor Divisional Director of External Affairs and Mark Bohun, Commercial Director which have been made to provide additional resources to enable the strategic objectives to be delivered in the product and service development areas, UKAS has recently accredited NCVO as an inspection body for its Trusted Charity Quality Mark and SSIP. **MG** mentioned also our ongoing work with our NQI partners (BSI, NPL and OPSS) in areas like the White Paper on Regulation for the Fourth Industrial Revolution and the Research and Innovation Framework.

MG also reported on the work underway in support of the Board's commitment to improving the effectiveness of Board meetings and overall governance. As part of this, UKAS is looking at PWC's framework for Board effectiveness and conducting a collective skills analysis of Board members.

7.2 BEIS International contract activity report (2018/19 Q4)   **PAC/11/19**

SK asked about the EUROLAB position paper as reported on by Ian Ronksley in his report of the EA Inspection Committee (Page 3, para 10 refers). Specifically, he wanted to know who was the subject of the risk-based assessments referred to in the paper [**Action: LT** to check].

7.3 Operations Activity Report January- March 2019   **PAC/12/19**

There was a query on this report regarding the BSI GEL210/11 EMC Standards Committee meeting on 12 March (Page 1, para 4 refers) [**Action: LT** to find out which UKAS colleague was involved].

7.4 Development and Technical Activity Report May-Aug 2017   **PAC/05/19**

There were no comments on this report.

8- Any Other Business

There were no other issues raised.

9- Next meetings

The Chair confirmed the following meetings:

> **PAC: Tuesday 5 November 2019 (UKAS, Staines) – confirmed**

> **PAF/PAC   Tuesday 10 March 2020 (date confirmed Central London venue tbc)**

> **PAC: Wednesday 8 July 2020 (date and venue to be confirmed)**

Date raised	Topic	Action	Owner	update
2/7/19	July PAC agenda	Circulate updated Executive organogram	SD	To be circulated with these minutes
2/7/19	Statement on non-accredited certification	Recirculate revised statement with CQI comments	AW	
2/7/19	Statement on non-accredited certification	Ensure statement is finalised by September	SD/HT	SD has requested WT/AW and Jon Murthy from UKAS agree revised wording

				and start work on Comms plan in development
2/7/19	Institute of Apprenticeships and parallel Quality infrastructure	UKAS to find any records of earlier discussions with DfE on this or similar issue	LT	LT will speak to Malcolm Hynd
2/7/19	Institute of Apprenticeships and parallel Quality infrastructure	EEMUA to pas relevant IoA contacts to UKAS and BSI	SK	
2/7/19	International Report. EUROLAB Report on risk-based assessments	UKAS to find out who (which organisation) will be conducting the assessments	LT	LT to ask Ian Ronksley and report back to SK
2/7/19	Operations Report: SI GEL210/11 EMC Standards Committee meeting	UKAS to find out which UKAS 'College' was involved	LT	