

UNITED KINGDOM ACCREDITATION SERVICE

POLICY ADVISORY FORUM

Agreed Report of 5th Meeting Held on Tuesday 10th March 2015 at the BIS Conference Centre

1- Welcome and Opening remarks

The Chairman welcomed members to 5th meeting of PAF. He explained that the meeting would be to a new format, following requests for more time for discussion and feedback. The agenda consists of a number of short presentations followed by opportunity for discussion and feedback using the BIS Meetingsphere technology. It was hoped that this format would allow a greater degree of engagement and opportunity for members to contribute to the UKAS strategy planning process.

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

The Chairman welcomed Lord Lindsay and noted the work he does for UKAS in influencing at the highest levels of Government.

Lord Lindsay welcomed members on behalf of UKAS and also welcomed two fellow non-executive directors, Michael Mainelli and Sir Duncan Nichol. He noted that the PAF is now well established as the main stakeholder forum for UKAS and is providing very valuable advice for the UKAS board and executive. Feedback from PAF and PAC has supported board decisions on business strategy, particularly regarding calls for better communication, faster turnaround of extensions to scope and greater accessibility to accreditation for small businesses.

He reported that UKAS continues to go from strength to strength with an increase in assessment days delivered year on year and continued growth in the reach of accreditation. This is most notable in the health sector but UKAS is receiving more and more enquiries from a wide variety of sources reflecting a growing acceptance of the contribution UKAS can make to assurance and confidence, particularly within Government at the highest levels.

Lord Lindsay invited members to make full use of the opportunity to provide feedback in the formal sessions and during the coffee and lunch breaks.

2- Introduction to Meeting Sphere

Michele Barker, BIS, introduced the Meetingsphere technology by inviting members to address the following questions:

How do you think awareness of UKAS has improved over the last few years?

What more could UKAS do to improve awareness?

Secretary's note: A printout of the comments received in response to these and the other questions tabled is attached at Annex B. A more detailed analysis of the feedback received will be prepared for discussion at the July meeting of the Policy Advisory Council.

3- Report on PAC activities in 2014 – Ron Gainsford

The Chairman explained that the Policy Advisory Council is the smaller, elected group that meets three times a year to discuss more detailed issues relating to UKAS policy. The membership was re-elected last year for a three year term. He thanked the PAC members for the additional input

they provide.

He reported that the PAC met three times last year, in March July and November. The main subjects discussed were: the revision of the UKAS customer agreement; pathways to accreditation and certification for small organisations and UKAS' reputational risk strategy. PAC also received presentations on the work of the Chartered Quality Institute and the Better Regulation Strategy Group as well as regular reporting from UKAS on Board meetings, international and operational activities.

He noted that PAC papers and minutes are sent to all PAF members and invited members to address the following questions:

How useful do you find the circulation of PAC papers?

Is there too much information circulated - what would be important to you?

What else could we do to improve communication between PAC and PAF?

4- Review of 2014/15

Paul Stennett provided a review of UKAS activity in 2014/15 and a look ahead to the main objectives for 2015/16.

Main points from 2014/15 were:

- Most business objectives were met except that growth was lower than expected
- Recruitment of technical staff is becoming more difficult
- Successful transition of new ISO17020:2012 standard
- Successful upgrade of communications equipment
- Customer portals delayed due to prospective upgrade of the Dynamics operating system
- Customer feedback indices are still improving although there is still room for improvement in dealing with extensions of scope
- Planning for operational restructuring to help with responsiveness
- Good growth in healthcare accreditation: improved relations with the Care Quality Commission and the Welsh Government including the first accreditation for social care provision
- Growth in interest in the UKAS Health and Social Care Sub-committee.

Objectives for 2015/16:

- IT system upgrade
- Upgrade of intranet and launch of new website
- Office refurbishment or relocation
- Operations restructure and review of processes
- Transition of more accreditation standards
- Maintaining links with Government through a period of change
- Customer portals
- Accreditation in financial services
- Pilot for very small inspection bodies

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

Richard Hulmes noted the large amount of capital expenditure needed to meet the objectives for next year and asked how this would impact on customer costs. Paul Stennett advised that the costs had been fully factored in. As a company limited by guarantee, UKAS was required to invest any profit made back into the business so the costs would be covered and would be drawing on the reserves built up over a number of years to help fund these improvements. He advised that the Board was keeping a close watch on all such investments to ensure a reasonable payback for

the business and the Non-Executive Directors scrutinised carefully the financial implications of any major capital investment.

The Chairman asked if UKAS was recruiting from abroad. Paul Stennett reported that some assessment managers had been recruited from abroad, eg Romania. He also advised that the website had been redesigned to facilitate the recruitment process.

Members were invited to address the following questions:

What worked well last year? How could UKAS have done better?

How can PAF members help UKAS deliver its priorities for this year?

Who does UKAS need to work with to deliver these priorities?

What barriers could there be to achieving the objectives set out and how could they be overcome?

5- Operations report – Jeff Ruddle

Jeff Ruddle presented a report on UKAS operations including details of a proposed reorganisation of the operations sections. The changes are based on customer feedback from survey data and focus groups indicating that dissatisfaction with UKAS service is mainly from larger, complex customers. Records also show that extensions to scope come from only 25% of customers.

The current structure of the operational sections is based on technical sector and on the assumption that all customers are the same. There is now a greater recognition that this is not the case. Customers have different needs and staff have different skills. The new structure has been designed better to match customer needs and staff skills. It will help Assessment Managers to be better focused and peripheral activities will be separated out.

The new structure will be based more on customer needs: there will be a Corporate Customer Team for large, complex customers, an Enterprise Customer Team for small less complex customers and four Core Customer Teams dealing with the middle band, still based on technical areas. There will be an Operations Support Team to deal with peripheral issues. Technical input will be maintained by technical meetings and technical focus persons. The new structure will be in place by February 2016.

Secretary's note: A copy of Jeff Ruddle's presentation is circulated with these minutes.

Members were invited to address the following questions:

Aside from cost reductions what could UKAS do to improve accessibility to accreditation for small businesses?

What can UKAS do to encourage more regulators or other specifying bodies to make stronger recommendations about the use of accreditation?

What can UKAS do to encourage customers to seek accreditation for new activities early and therefore reduce unaccredited services from accredited bodies?

Are there any other areas that UKAS should be focusing on in relation to service improvement?

6- Financial services, standards and regulation – Michael Mainelli

Michael Mainelli presented his report [Backing Market Forces – How to make voluntary standards work for financial services Regulation](#). He said there was a long history of standards in the City, eg through the guilds, but the financial sector still has difficulties. Regulation is often suggested as

the answer.

The report was produced in 2013 following joint research with BSI and the Chartered Institute for Securities and Investment. He suggested there is a complete ignorance of standards in the sector (cf the Lambert Review). Regulators are neutral; they recognise the value of standards but are not prepared to do much with them.

He reported some progress eg Fairbanking is now certified and some standards are coming through eg on fair tax. The report recommends that the standards community needs to be clearer on what it is offering given that there is much confusion about standards and certification etc.

Since the report, he has been looking at specific sectors eg investment and asset management, insurance and financial technology. He is also considering how to engage with regulators.

Secretary's note: A copy of Michael Mainelli's presentation is circulated with these minutes.

James Berry suggested that UKAS, BSI and others need to work together to convince regulators of the benefits of standards and accreditation. The Chairman suggested that the pensions sector could be worth considering.

Members were invited to address the following questions:

How can accreditation make a positive contribution in the finance industry?

Which specific sectors of financial services would be suitable for accreditation?

How could accreditation help the financial regulators supervise the sector?

What can UKAS do to convince financial regulators to make greater use of accreditation?

Are there other sectors that could benefit from the introduction of UKAS accreditation?

7- Feedback on PAF

The Chairman asked members to provide feedback on the meeting. Members were asked to address the following questions:

Have we achieved a better balance between presentation and discussion?

Was the technology helpful?

Should we use this for future meetings?

How could we improve future UKAS forums?

What have you found most useful about today?

Michele Barker reported that 16 out of 18 responses to the first three questions were positive.

The Chairman recognised that the agenda was diverse but was pleased that the response to the new format and the use of the technology was generally positive. He said that the session would be left open on the web until the end of the week for further input. He also confirmed that the output for all the sessions would be circulated with the report of the meeting and that the UKAS executive would review and consider all comments with a view to reporting back to the next PAC meeting.

8- Confirmation of Next Meetings

The Chairman confirmed the dates of the next meetings as follows:

PAC	Thursday 9 July 2015 at the Lansdowne Club
PAC	Thursday 12 November 2015 at UKAS
PAF/PAC	Wednesday 16 March 2016 at the BIS Conference Centre

9- Closing remarks

The Chairman thanked all speakers for their input and members for attending and contributing so positively.

UKAS POLICY ADVISORY FORUM - 10 MARCH 2015

Attendees

Georgia	Alsopp	UKAS
Tim	Bailey	United Kingdom Organic Certifiers Group
Guy	Bampton	Department for Communities and Local Government
Michele	Barker	BIS
Philippa	Bassett	UKAS
James	Berry	BSI Standards
Rob	Bettinson	UKAS
Sue	Brand	Care England
Andrew	Damant	Food Standards Agency
Chris	Elliott	Ministry of Defense
Richard	Evans	Society and College of Radiographers
Paul	Everall	Construction Industry Council
Ron	Gainsford	Trading Standards Institute
Duncan	Giddens	Environment Agency
Alan	Gower	Federation of Certification Bodies
Richard	Green	Chartered Quality Institute
David	Greenwood	Ministry of Defense
Paul	Greenwood	UKAS
Martin	Hall	Association of Independent Research and Technology Organisations
Martin	Hanley	Association of Forensic Science Providers
Richard	Hulmes	Safety Assessment Federation
Malcolm	Hynd	UKAS
Simon	Iveson	Forensic Science Regulation Unit
Stefan	Kukula	Engineering Equipment & Materials Users' Association
Mike	Lawson	Association of British Certification Bodies
Lord Jamie	Lindsay	UKAS
Michael	Mainelli	UKAS
Stephen	Mitchell	UKAS
John	Mortimer	Department for Business, Innovation & Skills - Innovation Infrastructure
Lisa	Moyle	TechUK
Jon	Murthy	UKAS
Trevor	Nash	Association of British Certification Bodies
Prof Adrian	Newland	Academy of Medical Royal Colleges
Sir Duncan	Nichol	UKAS
Anthea	Nicholson	Department for Communities and Local Government
Graham	Oliver	Association of Independent Research and Technology Organisations
Mike	Pearson	Federation of Small Businesses
Jeff	Ruddle	UKAS
Richard	Sanders	National Measurement Office
Alison	Severn	UKAS
John	Southerden	Society of Maritime Industries
Paul	Stennett	UKAS
Jane	Tebbey	National Physical Laboratory
Sarah	Veale	Trades Union Congress
Julian	Wade	United Kingdom Organic Certifiers Group
Steve	Williams	Independent International Organisation for Certification
Jane	Willis	Health & Safety Executive
Virginia	Wykes	Royal College of Radiologists

Apologies

Sarah	Barnard	ADS Group Ltd
Martin	Baxter	Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment
Charlotte	Beardmore	Society and College of Radiographers
David	Brackston	British Retail Consortium
Dr Penny	Bramwell	Food Standards Agency
Steve	Brimble	Public Health England
Phil	Curnock	ADS Group Ltd
Dr Hywel	Davies	Construction Industry Council
Neil	Davies	Environment Agency
Francesca	Gauntlett	Department for the Environment and Rural Affairs
Paul	Hadley	Department for Business, Innovation & Skills - Innovation Infrastructure
Andrew	Hall	Royal College of Radiologists
Mark	Hattersley	TechUK
Lesley	Larkin	Department for the Environment and Rural Affairs
Dr Jeff	Llewellyn	British Measurement and Testing Association
Daniel	Mansfield	BSI Standards
Dr Gwyn	McCreanor	Association for Clinical Biochemistry
Dr Jane	Needham	Institute of Biomedical Science
Prof Tim	Reynolds	Association of Clinical Pathologists
Prof Ian	Sharp	Public Health England
Bill	Slocombe	Federation of Certification Bodies
Tony	Smith	British Measurement and Testing Association
Graham	Topley	National Physical Laboratory
Dr Gillian	Tully	Forensic Science Regulator
Kevin	Walkin	Health & Safety Executive
David	Wilkes	InnovateUK
Steven	Wilson	Health Improvement Scotland
Dr Marion	Wood	Association of Clinical Pathologists



Report UKAS Policy Advisory Forum - 5th Meeting

Date March 10, 2015
Location BIS Conference Centre
Host Michele Barker

Participants
Anonymous (47)

Contents

- 1 UKAS Policy Advisory Forum - 5th Meeting.....10**
 - 1.1 Discussion: Introduction to meetingshere - Using the technology ice breaker..... 10
 - 1.2 Discussion: Report on Policy Advisory Activities (PAC) in 2014 11
 - 1.3 Discussion: Review of 2014/15 by Paul Stennett..... 12
 - 1.4 Discussion: Operations Report - Jeff Ruddle..... 14
 - 1.5 Discussion: Financial services, standards and regulation - Michael Mainelli 16
- 2 Feedback on the format of today's PAF meeting.....19**
 - 2.1 Rating: Feedback on today's session 19
 - 2.1.1.T0 Single results table: Feedback on today's session 19
 - 2.2 Discussion: Feedback on today 20



Materials:

PAF March 15 Review of 2014-15.pptx

PAF March 15 Operations report.pptx

PAF March 15 Financial services.pptx

1 UKAS Policy Advisory Forum - 5th Meeting



1.1 Introduction to Meetingsphere - Using the technology ice breaker

Number of participants: 23



Participant instructions:

click on a bubble to add your answer/comments to the question

Please think about awareness from Government, Business and Consumer point of view

All contributions are anonymous.



How do you think awareness of UKAS has improved over the last few years?

- Great improvement (#2)
- Increased awareness over a wide range business/activities (#4)
 - that is very good (#18)
- Definitely improving in the marketplace. need to improve awareness and purpose with policy makers/ government to more openly support UKAS (#5)
- Greater spread of activity... (#7)
- Communication has improved, however there is still work to be done (#8)
- Yes...and increasing (#10)
- Much improved awareness in the Healthcare Sector. Naturally driven by expanding interest in accreditation programs amongst professions and regulators. (#11)
- Yes - definitely (#12)
- Working in conjunction with other agencies to improve understanding and communication. (#13)
- Awareness of UKAS has improved over the past year; particularly in health and social care. (#17)
- Small businesses still very hard to reach (#20)
- Has listened and implemented PAF recommendations year on year. (#24)
- Very low when government seems to go off and start things without using accreditation/certification. (#25)
 - agree (#28)
- Across certain sectors awareness has improved eg health and medical. (#26)
- Greater awareness within medical sector, (#30)
- Not significantly as many organisations still define competence through various schemes and appear unaware that UKAS accreditation can be an assurance of competence. In particular the inspection industry (ISO/IEC 17020) where schemes such as CHAS, Safe Contractor, Achilles, CSCS etc. are evident. (#31)
 - less awareness in non-medical sectors (#34)
- Still not understood by man (or woman) in street (#38)
- Some improvement in construction sector but more needs to be done (#46)



What more could UKAS do to improve awareness?

- Use a larger font. (#1)
 - greater use of social media (#9)
- Use Insight techniques to understand UKAS audiences and clients better and tailor communication channels accordingly (#3)
- Use of new media/social forum (#6)
- The benefits of accredited certification as a means of reducing red tape (#14)
- Advertises for general population as opposed to specialist users. (#15)

1.2 Report on Policy Advisory Activities (PAC) in 2014 (Discussion)

- This will only work if the general population is educated as to what accreditation represents (#37)
- Create a good standards scandal! Cash for certification... (#16)
 - Good idea (#21)
 - Horse meat scandal? (#27)
- Ensure resourcing matches expanded business remit... (#19)
- We stakeholders must lobby BIS to ensure awareness funding is not cut (#22)
 - BIS role is to promote awareness, but should funding come from within the UKAS business model? (#44)
- Disagree that accreditation always reduces red tape (#23)
 - always look for the Holy Grail and hope! (#29)
- collaborate with external champions (#32)
 - use business to communicate to other businesses B2B (#40)
- Representative organisations could do more to support BIS and UKAS activities (#33)
- Explain difference between Accreditation and certification. Put presentations on the website aimed at various levels in organisations. (#36)
- Advertise more (#39)
 - Expensive (#43)
- Better endorsement from clients and stakeholders (#41)
- Engage with relevant professional bodies (#42)
- Perhaps less emphasis on 'regulatory' language (#45)

1.2 Report on Policy Advisory Activities (PAC) in 2014 (Discussion)

Number of participants: 19

Participant instructions:

Ron Gainsford, PAF Chair, will give an overview of the 2014 activities of the Policy Advisory Council

Please add your thoughts/comments in the bubbles below.

All contributions are anonymous.

How useful do you find the circulation of PAC papers?

- Very useful but I sift through to the arts of our interest (#2)
- Good in theory but never have enough time to trawl them properly (#3)
- need to check if these are being circulated within our stakeholder group (#4)
- Not very (#7)
 - why not? (#19)
- The PAC papers are useful in that they provide information as to the issues covered & decisions made (#10)
- Very informative and useful (#12)
- Slightly useful. Really just to see what is being said and whether our scheme and sector is hitting the board discussions (#16)
- I sometimes don't have time to read the papers (#17)
- The papers are of benefit and provide update on position and items of interest. There is always the question of volume of papers to read in general but this is a question of priorities (#24)
- Please include FSR Enquiries...not sure the FSR has been getting them all...still go to Andrew? (#26)
- Find them okay. Scan them. Not all relevant but ones that are are good. International programme snippet form good. Like the format. Accessible. (#27)
- Is information provided to PAC relevant to PAF? (#28)

Is there too much information circulated - What would be important to you?

- Amount is ok (#1)
- Sector based information or groupings would be useful (#6)

1.3 Review of 2014/15 by Paul Stennett (Discussion)

- would be tricky, but could be explored (#13)
- No it is just right (#9)
- If there was a members area on the website it would be possible to 'self-serve' (#14)
- No just right (#15)
- Probably but then you are appealing to a wide audience - it is up to individuals to sift through and view what is important to them (#20)
- Yes. Need a summary doc. (#22)
- Hard to judge by those of us new to PAF and not 100% clear they were relevant to us. (#23)
- There is more than I read in detail but difficult to be sure about what to leave out. Like the idea of a web-based repository where we can choose. (#31)
- It would be helpful to have executive summaries of the papers and prior activities , to reduce the volume of papers that have to be read through (#36)
- No, you select what is relevant and read this. (#37)
- Cross-reference the items in a summary to the PAF references (#42)
- A members area on the web site would be useful (#44)
- No...useful (#45)
- Keep papers brief (#46)

What else could we do to improve communication between PAC and PAF?

- Members area on UKAS website for PAC and PAF so that the 2 forums can communicate between meetings (#5)
 - Excellent idea - as a PAC member I would find this very useful (#11)
 - Agreed (#21)
 - Good idea but yet more passwords to remember! (#38)
 - agreed (#41)
- Nothing (#18)
- Produce a summary (#25)
- Summarise on an electronic web based basis (#29)
 - Agree (#43)
- Would like clearer indication of which group my organisation fits into (#30)
- Not a lot - it is also up to PAF members to communicate with their PAC lead (#32)
- Reduce or explain the many acronyms used in the documents, this is particularly apparent in the information on the international programme. Some explanation of the background of some of the groups, particularly in relation to UK Bodies, would also be useful. (#33)
 - include glossary each time - standard sheet (#39)
- Not needed (#34)
- Create an extranet for members to access rather than circulating by email (#35)
- Too much info is counterproductive. best to condense and let those interested pick up on specific areas with UKAS (#40)
- Really difficult to say (#47)
- A glossary of terms and progress report (#48)

1.3 Review of 2014/15 by Paul Stennett (Discussion)

Number of participants: 21

Participant instructions:

Please add your thoughts/comments in the bubbles below
if you have a question which wasn't raised during the Q&A session please add in the Additional Questions bubble
All contributions are anonymous.

What worked well last year? How could UKAS have done better?

- Inspection accreditation was good and particularly the management through the accreditation manager. (#1)

- Our assessment and office visit (#4)
- Assessment visits went well and good assessment manager (#8)
- UKAS worked very pragmatically to diffuse the "heat" around the DH / BIS spat over health accreditation. This has continued to build good relations in the CSAA. Well done. (#13)
- Unacceptable extension to scope timelines-2 separate incidences of waiting > 6 months for a decision! (#15)
- Assessment teams well received. positive contributions (#25)
- UKAS had a good year - could it have done better? Probably yes if it can overcome recruitment challenges to enhance its delivery capabilities (#26)
- Communication regarding transition of ISO17020 was very well received (#30)
- Operational interaction was excellent - support service interaction lacked i.e. putting an ETS on hold without informing the customer due to an invoice payment being delayed which was less than 1% of annual spend. (#37)
- Agree that the progress on ISAS has been improved through better partnership with colleges. Still concerns over process speed. (#38)
- UKAS completed a major programme of assessing and accrediting Building Regulations competent person schemes. They could have done more to merge this with assessments for the Green Deal. (#40)

■ How can PAF members help UKAS deliver its priorities for this year?

- Publicise within constituencies (#2)
- Keep focus on accreditation delivery (#6)
- UKAS need to articulate a clear message and PAF members will deliver this. (#9)
- comment on their business plan (#10)
- Ongoing dialogue with PAF members though the year or at intervals (#14)
- Have a clearly defined strategy setting out future plans (#16)
- Taking the temperature of accreditation in the marketplace and feed that back (#18)
- Foster secondments and joint working between PAF members and UKAS? (#19)
- If PAF members were consulted regarding the plans in more detail, such as the Operational Restructure, we would be able to contribute throughout the year. (#27)
- Highlight the existence of bodies offering so-called accreditation in their areas when these have no recognised authority to do so (#34)
- Ensuring that UKAS uses PAF members to get ideas in relation to the needs & expectations of the market (#39)

■ Who does UKAS need to work with to deliver these priorities?

- The management systems certification bodies would expect that UKAS will work with bodies such as the EA & IAF to ensure that there is a consistent approach taken during the various transitions coming over the next 12-18 months (#5)
 - agreed (#22)
- New government (#7)
- Other industry trade associations or better recognition (#17)
- With PAF, by giving them a clear message (#23)
- To deliver the very small business accreditation pilot, UKAS should work with organizations representing small businesses such as the FSB, CBI, Local Enterprise Partnerships tec. (#24)
- Concentrate on policy makers and regulators. (#31)
- UKAS need to work closely with their stakeholders (particularly clients) and ensure transition to changed standards takes in account the realities of the applications within the businesses. (#32)
- Relevant professional bodies and trade associations - essential! (#33)
- With regulators and others who interact with UKAS direct customers (#36)
- Identify key stakeholders and representative groups; i.e. consult with AIRTO when ISO17025 comes up for review (#46)

What barriers could there be to achieving the objectives set out and how could they be overcome?

- With lower growth this year - is that likely to continue to decline in future? (#3)
- Competition from non-accredited schemes billed as equal to accreditation (#12)
- Ensuring that UKAS has sufficient resources to deliver the services needed by its clients in the next 12-18 months (#20)
- Less sympathetic new government administration (#28)
- Industry sectors defining their own standards without understanding the role of ISO/EN/SSI standards and accreditation/accredited certification (#29)
- Could UKAS be under resourced? (#35)
 - Secondments and joint working? (#45)
- There is a lot of change - restructure/new premises / transitions of standards / new areas of accreditation (#41)
- Customer/Stakeholder knowledge of objectives and change programme (#42)
- Better/more PR to use UKAS accreditation/accredited certification as the primary route to compliance and competence (#43)
- Resources and recruiting staff of the right caliber (#44)
- Clearly there is a high level of customer satisfaction currently and this will be challenging to maintain during the coming period of change - IT systems, office move, etc. IT will be important for UKAS senior management to maintain an outward focus on customers during this time. (#47)
- Is UKAS perhaps trying to do too much? Perhaps concentrate on quality of core areas? (#48)
- Delays in scheduling visits need sorting out. Better operational management needed, better coordination within UKAS e.g. between admin staff and assessors, and between CPS & Green Deal teams. (#50)
- "Accredited" not a protectable term - could a protected term be found? (#52)

Additional Questions/comments

- Will the lower customer satisfaction ratings on "extensions to scope" - does this inevitably mean the employment of extra staff? Or are there other things that UKAS can do to improve satisfaction? (#11)
- Will the output of the software sessions be made available to PAF members? (#21)
- Based on current meeting schedules the FDIS of 14001 is not now expected until July/Aug so publication is likely Sept/Oct (#49)
- Do UKAS maintain links with HM loyal opposition, in case they take office? (#51)
 - Yes, UKAS is working with the manifesto groups of all the main political parties, to ensure that there are 'no surprises' whatever the election outcome. (#53)
 - Outside of the national election UKAS works with the devolved nations, e.g. events at Holyrood to engage with Scottish Gov't agencies, regulators, etc. (#54)

1.4 Operations Report - Jeff Ruddle (Discussion)

Number of participants: 17

Participant instructions:

The questions below ask what more can UKAS do in the areas highlighted below
Please add your thoughts/comments in the bubbles below
All contributions are anonymous.

Aside from cost reductions what could UKAS do to improve accessibility to accreditation for small businesses?

- Continue with schemes such as ADIPS to ensure a 'tailored' approach to accreditation of very small bodies. (#1)
- Offer a lower cost desktop review option to enable businesses to 'feel their way' at obtaining accreditation and hopefully realise that the bar isn't too high (#4)

1.4 Operations Report - Jeff Ruddle (Discussion)

- Is it possible to have diet or low-fat accreditation to help small businesses? (#6)
- How are you engaging regionally? Look to develop local advisors/partners to advise SMEs on how to access UKAS services. (#7)
- Pathway approach (#13)
- Get sectors to apply globally - commonality of management system would simplify the assessment of this area for all participants (#20)
- Consider bite sized/stepwise approaches (#23)
- Cost reductions are really important for small businesses (#27)
- Has to be very easy to access and use as small businesses tend to be time limited. Quick and obvious return on investment (#34)
- Engage with small businesses to find out what is stopping them from applying and how a pathway approach could be realistically structured - Mind labs / policy labs (#36)
- Use a range of communication channels - don't rely on the internet alone (#37)
- Sector champions, willing to act as case studies/mentors. (#39)
- Tap into the LEP network (#40)

■ **What can UKAS do to encourage more regulators or other specifying bodies to make stronger recommendations about the use of accreditation?**

- More direct contact, communication, sharing intelligence, provision of assessment reports facilitated by sector based agreements (#2)
- Demonstrate that accreditation is lower cost than direct enforcement (#5)
- Increased engagement with government bodies (and political parties) (#9)
- More awareness raising and education on the benefits of accreditation and the risks of not doing it. (#14)
- Engage directly with the regulating bodies such as CQC, HSE etc., etc. (#15)
- More robust assessment of legal compliance via accredited certification and inspection - certificates have to mean something - not just the piece of paper - in order for confidence from regulators and consumers/citizens (#17)
- Ensure regulators attend meetings? Haven't of late.... Regulators under pressure - show accreditation is an answer to their problems. (#18)
- HSE do recognise UKAS accreditation for inspection but not as a mandated or even primary course (#19)
- Use positive return on investment or risk reduction case studies to persuade the "powers that be" (#22)
- Secondments potentially good idea plus other types of closer working relationship with regulators (#24)
- As has been seen with the CQC recently, a relentless approach, with partners / customers to make the case for sustainable quality assurance. The idea that accreditation can outlive changes in government is becoming more attractive. Make the most of it. (#25)
- Offer pathway approach....allows managed change with targets set by the Reg (#28)
- Be clear on the benefits of accreditation and continue lobbying. Make links up and down government. (#30)
- Further demonstrate the benefits (and also the risks?) and how accreditation can reduce workload of regulators. (#31)
- Pathway again...allows more time for sector while giving stepwise Quality Assurance (#35)
- Work with e.g. BRDO/BIS to correlate UKAS accreditation with business/regulator support tools like Primary and Home Authority (#41)
- Explain the benefits to regulators of using accreditation and standards to support regulation e.g. New Approach (#42)

■ **What can UKAS do to encourage customers to seek accreditation for new activities early therefore reducing unaccredited services from accredited bodies?**

- Increase end user awareness of value of accreditation, be more willing to challenge (#11)

1.5 Financial services, standards and regulation - Michael Mainelli (Discussion)

- There is a need for UKAS to be more aware of what the market is looking for in relation to accreditation for new areas, this may come from new standards or schemes that the market see as being needed, so better market intelligence (#12)
- Ensure UKAS continues to encourage feedback from stakeholders regarding potential opportunities/ new schemes interest. to gauge market demand use some form of online poll (#16)
- Use of transition status for new activities/extensions. To allow some form of accreditation to be demonstrable to potential clients before formal assessment. Like a provisional driving licence. (#21)
- Promote the value of UKAS accreditation as a best industry practice (#29)
- Develop advocates/champions who are in a position to advice customers - e.g. LEPs, other regional and local business advisors. (#32)
- What incentives can be offered to encourage this? (#33)
- Make sure the rules for issuing certificates are clear and very easy for lay people to understand. (#38)
- Commercial viability is a key theme - the cost of gaining accreditation is acceptable but the maintenance is extremely hard due to limited workflow, continued competence and internal cost. Innovative approach in terms of maintenance of competence through a pilot programme between a provider and UKAS may find a lead concept that could become commercially viable. (#43)
- Friendly, easy to use list of codes. Don't miss EA and NACE codes. (#44)
- Discounted schemes for early adoption (#45)
- Look at successful industry models for learning (e.g. Gas Safe) (#46)
- Better scoping statements (#47)

Are there any other areas that UKAS should be focusing on in relation to service improvement?

- EXTENSION OF SCOPE - This is business driven and speed is the essence; the system needs to be streamlined. (#3)
- More rigorous ongoing policing of assessment so end users can have confidence in e.g. accredited inspection bodies (#8)
- Pathways...stepwise accreditation (#10)
- If the restructuring is that radical UKAS will need to ensure that they have measures in place to see that the current level of service delivery doesn't fall away during the changes (#26)

1.5 Financial services, standards and regulation - Michael Mainelli (Discussion)

Number of participants: 16



Participant instructions:

Please add your thought/comments in the bubbles below

All contributions are anonymous.

How can accreditation make a positive contribution in the Finance Industry?

- Improve trust by users (#1)
 - restore confidence (#2)
- Restore (perceived) confidence (#3)
- Restore trust (#7)
- Will only be of value if it's international, understood, and given worth by customers. We are sceptical any of this is the case. (#9)
- Might improve public trust (#15)
- if adopted it could provide a basis to reduce variation, make comparison of services easier. Introduce agree markers of performance. improve skill level/ training, (#18)
- Will enable innovative progressive financial services businesses to demonstrate quality service, good customer service etc.. (#19)

- Interesting parallel with how accredited standards (underpinning good practice rather than regulatory minimum thresholds) helped restore consumer/user confidence in the red meat industry after BSE (#20)
 - Until horsemeat scandal? Is this still a success story? (#33)
 - yes - horsemeat scandal generally a success story for accredited labs and food assurance schemes (#50)
 - Accreditation can't guarantee everything-an established accredited food cert system stopped the UK agri and food industry imploding. Demand for UK product increased demonstrating benefits of accreditation (#54)
- Need clear enforceable standards as basis for accreditation. Clarity on whom or what is being accredited? (#21)
- We are not clear which parts of the finance industry are regulated so it is difficult to answer the question. (#30)
- Help convert it to a standards based profession again with the associated competency and professional regulation that assists improvement and prudence. (#36)
 - Agreed. it should be more a respected profession and less an industry purely to maximise profit at any cost (#45)
- Help to provide confidence in products and services (#40)
- There is potential to engage professional pride in the sector in taking control of the quality assurance agenda. Let the professionals drive quality through accreditation and they will do it better than the external regulatory bodies could ever hope (#42)
- Reduced cost of regulation, and effectiveness overcoming unnecessary barriers to entry (#56)
- Ultimately to help distinguish between legal and fair business practice and illegal, unfair, unregulated practice (#58)
- greater suitability for a digital economy (B2B , crowd sourcing, on line payments by retail/resale portals) than traditional approaches (#60)
- Accreditation can only assess to a standard - it is therefore it is only as good as the standard (#78)
- More reliable and prompter payments. (#79)

Which specific sectors of financial services would be suitable for accreditation?

- from a layman's point of view probably all (#10)
- pensions advice / mortgage/ investment / insurance / loans (esp. payday loans) / standardised approach to being able to compare products/services (#11)
- What sectors have the worst reputation? Start there! (#22)
 - Good approach - highest risk first. (#28)
- Retail banking, insurance, investment/pension fund management (#26)
- financial advice for both individuals (IFAs) and businesses (#27)
- those conducting due diligence (#46)
- accredit the people doing the due diligence (#49)
- For certifying bodies e.g. mortgage (#57)
- Pension sector. Unregulated, profit lead advice has long term consequences for the nation. (#63)

How could accreditation help the financial regulators to supervise the sector

- improve transparency (#5)
- Accreditation can undertake inspection freeing up resources in the Regulators (#13)
- accreditation must have the teeth to impose sanctions and be supported by regulators to do so (#16)
 - If accreditation is required by regulators, is it de facto regulation? (#24)
- By assuring some degree of self-regulation (#32)
- Very generally accreditation could help support the regulators (#34)
- Focus on outcomes which can be done more easily by using accreditation than regulation. (#35)

- regime of stds underpinned by accreditation will help regulators "risk-map" their efforts so that they can better target their regulatory resources (#37)
- By making clear the roles of both accreditor and regulator and how they work together (#39)
- How is the FCA 'Treating Customers Fairly' scheme 'regulated' and could UKAS accreditation assist operational application and transparency? (#43)
- Regulators would need to be very clear that they welcome accreditation programmes and that achievement of accreditation will make a tangible difference to the burden of compliance. There will need to be political courage to back this but, hey, they have spectacularly failed so far... (#48)
- introduce financial sector scheme (#51)
- Use the laboratory model? (#55)
- Follow and take account of good practice in established sectors using accreditation such as food, medical products etc. (#67)
- Not a good fit to this question but consumer awareness might drive demand as consumers look for accredited "badges" of trustworthiness (similar to the reassurance they may seek/gain from a kite mark on a kettle) (#69)

■ **What can UKAS do to convince financial regulators to make greater use of accreditation?**

- Capture the evidence (#4)
- Convincing Treasury ministers will be an important part of this (#6)
 - Need heavyweight political champion to sell it to Minister and the treasury (#72)
- Provide exemplars from other areas that have accreditation. (#8)
- Needs to be worldwide uptake. (#14)
 - Could UKAS lead on this? (#38)
- better involvement in developing standards in conjunction with regulators and BSi (#23)
- they need to be clear on their product, speak the right language and then sell it (#44)
- By demonstrating added value of having accredited products and services in terms of meeting/complying with regulations (#47)
- UKAS, BSI, the regulators and industry need to work together to ascertain which sub-sectors of the finance industry would benefit from/need standards and accreditation. (#53)
- In order to build evidence and a results base start off with the simpler sub-sectors and build up from that (#59)
- Work with HMT and Cabinet Office to promote as a lighter-touch regulatory approach (#64)
- Difficult to break through the closed doors that exist in the sector - high levels of resistance to change / increased regulation - need to seal the benefits that accreditation can bring / simplification / cost efficiencies?? (#68)
 - sell (#70)
- Need to focus one on issue/area and use the evidence of the benefits to sell the wider use of standards and accreditation (#80)

■ **Are there other sectors that could benefit from the introduction of UKAS accreditation?**

- UKAS is always seeking new areas - should it focus on current areas and do those well. (#12)
- Look at 'the most complained about' (by consumers) sectors and determine whether standards and UKAS accreditation activity might improve those sectors e.g. the motor industry, leisure sector etc. and as an industry self-improvement alternative to regulation (UK or EU) (#17)
- As a UKAS customer, I would be concerned about UKAS spreading itself too thinly - therefore impacting on our service (#25)
- UKAS has a lot of priorities - refurbishment, IT, restructure - too much too soon? (#29)
- Identify areas of high risk and public concern (#31)
- Education / judiciary / public services (value for money) (#41)
- Property and property investment industry (#52)
- Yes, almost certainly!!! (#61)

2.1 Rating: Feedback on today's session

- Any sector in which standards are used and/or essential to provide high quality products and services (#62)
- UKAS does need to ensure they do not spread their scarce resources too widely. any new area is for the long term (#65)
- Educational auditors (#66)
- Education is heavily regulated but with a curious lack of professional statutory regulation. I think the teaching profession might welcome the opportunity to work on professionally led accreditation, particularly if it reduced the burden of OFSTED processes in the long term. (#71)
- Anything with growing use of the internet for trading. (#73)
- Local government services and financial planning! (#74)
- Local government pensions?! (#75)
- Go to political masters and ask what is important to society (#76)
- Selection for members of the BBC Trust! (#77)
- Be careful not to overstretch yourself. Get existing house in order first (#81)

2 Feedback on the format of today's PAF meeting

2.1 Rating: Feedback on today's session

2.1.1. Feedback on today's session (rating by numeric scale) sorted by Mean




18 persons have submitted their ratings.
The Host does not participate in the Rating.

Participant instructions of rating 2.1.1

Have we achieved a better balance between presentation and discussion? please rank today's meeting using the voting buttons below

Label for scale value

0 = Yes 1 = No

Feedback on today's session (rating by numeric scale) sorted by Mean							
Criterion "Improvement". 3 items.							
Scale: 0-1. Abstentions not permitted. List of items randomized.							
Nr	Item	0	1	Ø	SD		n
1	Have we achieved a better balance between presentation and discussion?	16	2	0.11	0.31		18
2	Should we use this for future meetings?	16	2	0.11	0.31		18
3	Was the Technology helpful?	16	2	0.11	0.31		18

Have we achieved a better balance between presentation and discussion?

Scale value 1 "Improvement"

- Don't know as we weren't here last time; however, seemed to work. (#1)
- Perhaps a bit rushed on some questions - need more time to respond. (#3)

Scale value 0 "Improvement"

- 0 (#2)
- Helped to engage members (#4)
- Yes - particularly to get a wider contribution (#5)
- Need to get the feedback reviewed and results circulated (#6)
- Better than previous years but will depend on outcomes being provided / shared (#7)
- In some cases there were too many questions for the time available and some of the questions were a little ambiguous.- (#8)
- 0 Good balance (#9)

2.2 Feedback on today (Discussion)

Should we use this for future meetings?

Scale value 0 "Improvement"

- Yes as long as the hardware works correctly (#1)
- 0 (#3)
- Seems to work well (#4)
- Absolutely (#5)
- Definitely (#6)
- Nice balance of structured questions with opportunity for open floor (#7)
- Yes a better balance (#8)
- Good format but needs fewer questions and a bit more analysis of responses (#9)
- 0 Yes, useful. (#10)

Scale value 1 "Improvement"

- Yes, but more battery life/plugged in. (#2)

Was the Technology helpful?

Scale value 0 "Improvement"

- Allowed easier spontaneous interaction (#1)
- Yes as it allowed comments in a large audience (#2)
- 0 (#4)
- Easy to operate (#5)
- Yes - when I got used to it (#6)
- Larger text would be helpful. Questions on paper were good. (#7)
Assuming 0 is yes! Rapid method to get a large amount of structured feedback using the collective skills and knowledge in the room (#8)
- Quick and simple and focusses the mind (#9)
- 0 Quick to use. Better focus and allows more participation than a flip chart and rapporteur. (#10)

Scale value 1 "Improvement"

- Could do with a "Countdown clock." (#3)

2.2 Feedback on today (Discussion)

Number of participants: 14

Participant instructions:

Please give us your feedback

All contributions are anonymous.

How could we improve future UKAS forums?

- Timer/clock countdown (#2)
- Are we in PAF providing what UKAS wants? (#4)
- Presentations from users / customers of accreditation (#5)
 - agreed (#17)
- Greater interaction as today (#11)
- Bigger laptop screens! (#12)
- Just develop the new system rather than further innovation. Maybe more computers or tablets. (#14)
- More collective input - separated into clumps around machines; not whole tables. Maybe on some key topics whole table input. (#16)
- Feedback on the BIS monitoring of UKAS. (#18)
- Subject matter too disparate with such a broad base of participants. Use small groups for sector-specific discussion? (#19)
- The overall session is still very brief for such a large gathering. perhaps UKAS could ask for burning issues before the next PAF meeting to guide topic headings (#20)
- Have sight of questions before meeting (#23)

2.2 Feedback on today (Discussion)

- UKAS could formally ask for any questions in the run up to PAF. (#24)
- Feedback on peer reviews by other bodies (#25)
- Less oral presentations - provide written instead - use the time for discussion using the software (#26)
- Slicker use of the technology to fit with presentations. This was a good start. (#27)
- Get rid of microphones in a small room (#30)

What have you found most useful and valuable about today?

- Participation in the structured discussions (#1)
- Healthy interaction (#3)
- The information provided and the chance to feedback to UKAS on the topics discussed (#6)
- Jeff Ruddle's presentation. (#7)
 - thanks Jeff :) (#15)
- Good table discussions on a nicely diverse programme (#8)
- Financial presentation was very interesting (#9)
- Useful update on progress and plans (#10)
- UKAS update and networking (#13)
- Feedback system (#21)
- Opportunity to contribute rather than just listen (#22)
- Continual interaction and update on status of developments. (#28)
- General overview useful, financial not so for many of us (#31)



If you would like someone from MeetingSphere to talk to you , please give your details