

UNITED KINGDOM ACCREDITATION SERVICE POLICY ADVISORY FORUM

Agreed Report of 3rd Meeting Held on Tuesday 5th March 2013 at the BIS Conference Centre, London

1- Welcome and Introductions

Lord Lindsay, UKAS Chairman, welcomed members to the third meeting of the UKAS Policy Advisory Forum. He emphasised the importance of PAF to UKAS' corporate governance and thanked members for attending.

He referred to further progress made by UKAS in the important health sector with the start of the transition to UKAS accreditation of clinical pathology laboratories and the launch of accreditation for physiological diagnostics. He said that the health sector would remain a major focus for UKAS moving forward but that there was growth in other parts of the business too.

Lord Lindsay congratulated Dr Martin Jones, the PAF Chair, on being awarded an MBE in the New Year's Honours List. This award was in recognition of his sterling work in support of accreditation. Lord Lindsay thanked him for his contribution over a number of years.

Lord Lindsay also thanked the elected members of the Policy Advisory Council for their support in attending additional meetings to consider more detailed policy issues.

Dr Jones also welcomed members to PAF, especially those attending for the first time. He particularly welcomed representatives from the Scottish Government and the Chartered Institute of Environmental Health, organisations that have been added to the membership since the last meeting. He encouraged members to contribute actively to the meeting and particularly to the table discussions planned.

Secretary's note: A list of attendees and apologies received is attached as Annex A.

2- Report of the 2nd Meeting of the UKAS PAF

PAF/04/12

The Chair reported on progress since the last PAF meeting.

The PAF membership had been kept under review, resulting in the Scottish Government and the Chartered Institute of Environmental Health accepting invitations to join. He invited further suggestions for additional members.

He reported that good contact had been maintained with the Better Regulation Executive to provide input into the Focus on Enforcement exercise. Useful input had also been received from PAF members to the study into the economic benefits of accreditation which would be considered later in the meeting.

The table discussions and feedback received relating to the preparation of UKAS strategy for the next five years had also provided some very useful input and the resulting strategy would also be discussed later in the meeting.

The Chair invited any final comments on the report or the follow up actions. There were no further comments.

3- Report from 3rd and 4th Meetings of the UKAS PAC

PAC/12/12
PAC/24/12

The Chair reported on the two successful PAC meetings held since the last PAF in July and November of last year. The minutes have been circulated giving details of the attendees and discussions. Main items covered by PAC included: new areas of accreditation such as the IQIPS scheme for physiological diagnostics services; the UKAS international programme; Government

limitations on trade with Iran and implications for accredited bodies working in that country; consideration of the principles for UKAS agreements with third party organisations and individual agreements with third parties such as EU Skills and ADS; reports from the working group on non-accredited certification established by UKAS, ABCB and other stakeholders.

He confirmed that PAC papers were circulated to all PAF members and invited input from those not on PAC.

4- Establishment of PAF Health Sector sub-group

Mr Stennett explained the background to the creation of the healthcare sub-group as a new area of activity that required separate input to UKAS. A preliminary meeting was held in February when agreement was reached that a formal sub-group of PAF should be formed. He invited any PAF members wishing to take part in the group to contact the PAF secretary.

5- Review of 2012/13

Mr Stennett presented a review of the last year. He reported on the following main items:

- The increased demand for accreditation and continued interest from Government due, in large part, to the efforts of the UKAS Chairman;
- Senior staff changes had resulted in a great deal of experience being lost with the retirements of Jane Beaumont and Graham Talbot but he reassured PAF that the new Director and Divisional Director appointments all had long experience of UKAS and accreditation;
- Business levels were up by 15%, some of which was due to catching up from the implementation of Darwin but there was still underlying growth;
- UKAS had encountered some recruitment difficulties, especially at the technical level;
- Darwin was now up and running and the main implementation difficulties overcome. The new Finance Director was now refining the financial reporting elements;
- The peer evaluation had involved a large team of evaluators from other accreditation bodies plus observers from EA, the Commission and BIS. The work put into Darwin and the management system had helped the peer evaluation go smoothly;
- The large number of responses to Government consultations, many in the health sector;
- Progress in a large number of development projects including: the Green Deal; physiological sciences; crime scene examinations; competent persons schemes; private security management systems; a fair banking scheme to support the Universal Credit; KPIs for pathology laboratories;
- Recognition of the contribution accreditation made to compliance as demonstrated by the horsemeat scandal where no accredited certification (eg Red Tractor) or testing had been questioned.

Secretary's note: A copy of Mr Stennett's presentation is circulated with these minutes.

The Chair recorded the thanks of PAF to Jane Beaumont and Graham Talbot for their contributions to PAF over the years and congratulated UKAS on its management of the senior staff changes.

Mr Gainsford confirmed the value of accreditation to quality and measurement in the food chain. He asked if unmet demand for accreditation was leading to greater use of non-accredited testing and certification. He also asked how UKAS was maintaining a corporate culture given the large numbers of remote workers.

Mr Stennett reported that he did not see great evidence of unmet demand for accreditation although more could be done to raise awareness to ensure that accreditation was being used

wherever it was appropriate to do so. He said that UKAS had a programme to deliver the company vision to all employees and would continue to work on this.

Mr Pearson considered that UKAS should not be too concerned about remote working and suggested that it was essential for recruitment, particularly of technical staff.

Mr Mansfield suggested there should be greater high level communication between UKAS and BSI to ensure co-ordination of approach between standards and accreditation.

6- BIS monitoring of UKAS and peer evaluation

Mr Mortimer explained that the basis for BIS monitoring of UKAS was set out in the MoU. It was delivered by provision of information, regular meetings with the Chief Executive and monitoring of performance eg of customer complaints. Specific issues discussed were: staff changes; CPA transition; implementation of Darwin (which he considered had greatly improved the provision of information); funding for the international and awareness programmes; management of PAF and PAC (which he thought was performing well); usefulness of events; assisting UKAS communicate with other Government departments eg MoD, GCHQ and healthcare; IQIPS (about which he had had some concerns); accreditation to award the GS mark in the UK; non-accredited certification; development of an e-learning package for officials; and the economic benefits study. He confirmed that he was broadly content with UKAS performance.

Mr Mortimer reported that, as part of his monitoring activities, he had attended the European co-operation for Accreditation (EA) peer evaluation of UKAS as an observer. It was a stiff test for UKAS which had taken the process very seriously as shown by the availability throughout of the top management team. The peer evaluation team was well organised and prepared, led by a very focused and determined team leader. The team had undertaken 18 man days of witnessed assessment supplemented by very thorough paper examinations with the opportunity to clarify findings with UKAS as necessary. He was satisfied with the process and found the exercise very useful. He understood that the European Commission and EA observers were also satisfied with the process.

Mr Evans asked about the doubts expressed about IQIPS. Mr Mortimer explained that he had wanted to ensure that assessment process envisaged against the IQIPS standards met the rigour expected of the national accreditation body.

In response to a question about the levels of funding provided by BIS to UKAS, Mr Mortimer confirmed that these were subject to a gradual decrease in line with the reductions to public expenditure more generally.

7- Economic Benefits of Accreditation Study – Update

PAF/03/13

Mr Hynd reported on this research study which was introduced by Dr Ray Lambert at the last PAF meeting and to which a number of PAF members had contributed. The research work was complete and a draft summary report was circulated as PAF/03/13. The full report would be finalised shortly and would be published on the UKAS website.

Mr Hynd commented that the report would include some very useful findings on the economic value of accreditation in terms of the premium that businesses are prepared to pay for accredited conformity assessment and the more general impact of accreditation via the national measurement system. These benefits were calculated to be in the region of £600m per annum. However, the report would also recognise that this figure represented only those benefits that could be quantified. Within the bounds of this project, it had not been possible to quantify a number of other important benefits such as the contribution accreditation makes to public health and safety, trade facilitation and error reduction in industry. It was estimated that the benefits accrued in these areas would also be substantial. BIS, UKAS and other partners were considering arrangements for publicity for the key findings and the prospects for further work.

Mr Jones asked what the main purpose was in commissioning the report. Mr Hynd explained that it was intended mainly to help with the evidence base for policy makers and to quantify the

contribution of UKAS to the economy.

Secretary's note: The full report will be from the UKAS website at the end of March (see www.ukas.com/media-centre/news/latest-news/Latest_News.asp).

8- Election of new PAF Chair

PAF/02/13

The Chair introduced the nomination of Ron Gainsford as the only candidate for the next Chair of the UKAS PAF and PAC. There were no objections and Mr Gainsford's appointment was confirmed for the next 3 years.

Mr Gainsford accepted the appointment and stressed his recognition of the importance of the PAF and PAC to UKAS and to the growing number and range of stakeholders. He paid tribute to the work of the outgoing Chair and hoped that he would be able to continue his good stewardship. In advising the meeting of his trading standards background he commented that he hoped to be helpful to UKAS as the self-regulatory momentum increased towards a greater reliance on accreditation and earned recognition for businesses, products and services in the UK, EU and globally.

9- UKAS strategy 2013-2018 – Table discussions and feedback

PAF/04/13

Mr Stennett introduced the UKAS strategy for the next five years as agreed by the UKAS Board. He thanked PAF and PAC members for their input to the development process. The key objectives, as summarised in PAF/04/13, focused on stabilising the business and then looking for further growth. The main objectives were grouped into four main areas: People; Core business; Business development (including in existing markets); and Customers and stakeholders. He invited members to provide comment on how the strategy could be implemented.

The Chair invited members to discuss one or more of the questions posed in PAF/04/13 and prepare feedback. Reports from the table discussions were received as follows:

Question One: What are the main actions required for UKAS to develop its position in the health and social care sectors during the course of the strategy plan period?

- Bring stakeholders together and explore the convergence between different accreditation schemes in health to reduce burdens on providers
- Explore soft incentives with DH (potential for BIS/DH dialogue?)
- Develop Healthcare sub-group. Consider what it needs to encompass a variety of disciplines eg pharmacy, personalised diagnostics ("over the counter" tests) and the wide diversity of the market place
- Develop a cross-country approach recognising the different evolving healthcare systems in the four UK countries
- Develop the right relationships with Public Health England and the devolved governments
- Develop relationships with policy makers and clinical experts
- Map out the landscape to define where accreditation might be most effective
- Develop list of major influencers

Question Two: How can 'pathways' to accreditation be offered to assist new applicants, especially SMEs, achieve accreditation?

- Need to understand the benefits of a staged approach especially to SMEs
- Take into account that some businesses prefer inspection by the regulator rather than a CB
- Consider the need of services for recognition that they are working towards accreditation
- Consider how much training and support for services can be provided
- Stages to achieve accreditation may be helpful to spread the burden on SMEs
- A 'Buddy System' might help
- Work with partner agencies e.g. BRC, representative bodies, certification bodies

- Demonstrate the values and worth of UKAS and the implications of not using UKAS accreditation (throughout the sectors)
- Develop graded approach to entry (manageability and costs) with 'brownie points' at each stage

Question Three: How could the UKAS pricing model be made simpler and more flexible?

- Adjust in accordance with size, capacity and volume of the business
- Encourage engagement through differential pricing models
- Remove the DEFRA requirement for UKAS accreditation of organics certification and open up to competition

Question Four: What action could UKAS take to extend the reach and effectiveness of its stakeholder engagement programme in particular at the sectoral/technical level?

- Government Drive towards reducing regulation and earned autonomy provides opportunity to work more openly with regulators eg EMS plus
- Take care with use of the word 'customer' – not all end users are customers
- Greater transparency of the peer evaluation process, especially how it will impact stakeholders and customers
- More involvement of stakeholders in transition planning and implementation
- Have a full set of technical advisory committees
- Provide an educational programme all the way down the supply chain, especially SMEs, specifiers, purchasers
- Promote accreditation to reduce regulation
- Early involvement of stakeholders when new schemes and standards are developed

Question Five: What growth sectors should UKAS consider for the latter years of the strategy plan?

- Develop system for point of care medicine (not diagnostic/testing)
- Recognise the wide spectrum and delivery of increasingly sophisticated devices
- Industry regulation
- Follow-up support and advice
- Extension of KPIs to cover external lab testing

Question Six: What actions could UKAS take to improve the effectiveness of its customer service over the period of the strategy plan?

- Get on-line interface up and running (on-line portal)
- Improve the way accreditation suspension and withdrawals are communicated
- Ensure that action close-out time by UKAS remains within 1 month
- Maintain list of who are the relevant contacts for different technical areas
- Improve consistency of assessors including the relevance of context
- Ensure demonstrable assessor competence
- Maintain a single point of contact for each customer
- Publish Certification Body assessments (contact certification bodies for permission)
- Continue to provide a competent auditor (shadower) alongside a technical assessor where the assessor is new (This cuts down waiting time for the customer significantly)
- Make quality auditing a career that people aspire to
- Look at bringing in industry secondees with different skills from across the sectors
- Provide access to direct technical advice

Question Seven: How can UKAS develop the use of technology to reduce the number of on-site assessments whilst still maintaining the rigour of the accreditation process?

- Look at Environment Agency model where information is provided online although some visits still necessary
- Regulators in health need to understand role of UKAS

The Chairman noted that the breadth of comments received would be very helpful and that all comments would be recorded and considered by UKAS.

10- Confirmation of Next Meetings

The Chairman confirmed the arrangements for the next meetings as follows:

PAC	Thursday 4 July 2013 (Lansdowne Club)
PAC	Thursday 7 November 2013 (UKAS, Feltham)
PAF/PAC	Thursday 6 March 2014 (BIS Conference Centre)

11- Closing remarks

The Chairman closed the meeting by thanking all present for attending and for the input received.

UKAS Policy Advisory Forum - 5 March 2013 - Attendance List

Tim	Bailey	United Kingdom Organic Certifiers Group
Martin	Baxter	Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment
Graham	Beddoe	Association of Independent Research and Technology Organisations
Roger	Bennett	Independent International Organisation for Certification
Rob	Bettinson	UKAS, Divisional Director Technical
Sue	Brand	English Community Care Association
Joe	Brown	Scottish Government
Mike	Byron	Independent International Organisation for Certification
Linda	Cavender	Trade Association Forum
Phil	Curnock	ADS
Alexander	Ehmann	Institute of Directors
Chris	Elliott	Ministry of Defense
Richard	Evans	Society and College of Radiographers
Paul	Everall	Construction Industry Council
Chris	Exeter	UKAS, External Affairs Advisor - Health
Ron	Gainsford	Trading Standards Institute
Paul	Greenwood	UKAS, Divisional Director Laboratories
Robert	Gunn	National Measurement Office
Andrew	Hall	Royal College of Radiologists
Malcolm	Hynd	UKAS, External Affairs Manager
Dr Martin	Jones	Confederation of British Industry
Derrick	Jones	Food Standards Agency
Graham	Jukes	Chartered Institute of Environmental Health
Mike	Lawson	Association of British Certification Bodies
Lord Jamie	Lindsay	UKAS, Chairman
Dr Jeff	Llewellyn	British Measurement and Testing Association
Daniel	Mansfield	BSI Standards
John	Mortimer	Department for Business, Innovation & Skills - Innovation Infrastructure
Jon	Murthy	UKAS, Marketing Manager
Trevor	Nash	Association of British Certification Bodies
Dr Jane	Needham	Institute of Biomedical Science
Prof Adrian	Newland	Academy of Medical Royal Colleges
Graham	Oliver	Association of Independent Research and Technology Organisations
Mike	Pearson	Federation of Small Businesses
Stefan	Robinson	Environment Agency
Jeff	Ruddle	UKAS, Operations Director
Prof Ian	Sharp	Health Protection Agency
Lisa	Shelton	UKAS, PA to Chief Executive
Tony	Smith	British Measurement and Testing Association
Paul	Stennett	UKAS, Chief Executive
Clive	Taylor	Engineering Equipment & Materials Users' Association
Dr Michael	Thomas	Association for Clinical Biochemistry
Rob	Turpin	BSI Standards
Lorraine	Turner	UKAS, Business Development Director
Jonathan	Vaughan	National Police Improvement Agency

Sarah	Veale	Trades Union Congress
Julian	Wade	United Kingdom Organic Certifiers Group
Andrew	Wilby	Independent Healthcare Advisory Service
Jane	Willis	Health & Safety Executive
Steven	Wilson	Health Improvement Scotland

Apologies Received

John	Adams	Gauge and Toolmakers Association
Dr Julian	Barth	Association for Clinical Biochemistry
Hazel	Beckett	Royal College of Radiologists
Hywel	Davies	Construction Industry Council
Neil	Davies	Environment Agency
Rob	Davis	Department for Energy and Climate Change
Clive	Fleming	Health & Safety Executive
Andy	Foster	Trading Standards Institute
Dr William	Fuggle	Association of Clinical Pathologists
James	Gibb	Federation of Certification Bodies
Jaimie	Isherwood	NPL
Dr Rachel	Liebmann	Royal College of Pathologists
Sara	Higham	Federation of Small Businesses
Mark	Holmes	Department for Business, Innovation & Skills - Innovation Infrastructure
Richard	Hulmes	Safety Assessment Federation
Peter	Mason	National Measurement Office
Anthea	Nicholson	Department for Communities and Local Government
Robbie	Pearson	Health Improvement Scotland
Andrew	Rennison	Forensic Science Regulator
Guy	Robinson	Intellectual Property Office
John	Roche	Chemical Industries Association
Bill	Slocombe	Federation of Certification Bodies
Siobhan	Stanger	Department for Energy and Climate Change
Graham	Topley	NPL