Minutes of the Certification Committee
Thursday 14th November 2019
at
UKAS, 2 Pine Trees, Chertsey Lane, Staines-upon- Thames, TW18 3HR

Members present:

Steve Russell (Chair)	NQA
James Gibb	Advanced Certification
Keith Goddard	Advanced Certification
Nonn Reynolds	BSI
Amanda Pakes	BSI
Martin Coles	International Associates
Mike Tims	BAB
Mark Salt	AFNOR UK
Stephen Carter	QAICL
Rachel Davidson	BESCA
Mark Nutburn	BAB
Nick Wright	NQA
Bal Gil	ForeFront Certification
John Duncan	ForeFront Certification
David Daly	EQA (Ireland)
Andrew Daly	EQA (Ireland)

In attendance:

Wayne Terry	ABCB Chief Executive
Kevin Belson	UKAS
Steve Randall	UKAS
Eleanor Eaton	SSIP (part attendance)

1.0   Apologies for absence

Wayne Thomas (SIRA), Tony Duff & Jim Spiers (System Certification)

2.0   Minutes of the meeting held on 15th August 2019

It was confirmed that the Minutes were a true record of the previous meeting.

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

There were no matters arising.

4.0   Standards Committees

WT reported on the following Standing Committees.

4.1   QS/1 (ISO TC 176) - Standing Committee 2

Following the successful completion of its revisions of ISO 9004, ISO 10005, ISO 10006 and ISO 10007, TC 176/SC 2 has no formal standards development projects ongoing at this time.

4.2   SES/1/1 (ISO TC 207/SC1 & SC) - Environmental Management

4.2.1   **Approved New Work Items (AWI)**

SO/AWI 14015: Environmental management — Environmental Due Diligence Assessment (revision of ISO 14015:2001)

ISO/AWI 14017: Requirements and guidelines for validation and verification of water information and related reports.

4.2.2   **ISO/DIS 14016: -** Guidelines on assurance of environmental reports.

DIS ballot closed.

4.2.3   **ISO 14002-1: -** Guidelines for using ISO 14001 to address environmental aspects and conditions within an environmental topic area — Part 1: General.

Under publication.

4.2.4   **ISO/FDIS 14006: -** Guidelines for incorporating eco-design.

Preparing FDIS for ballot.

4.2.5   **ISO 14007**: **Environmental management Systems:** — Guidelines for determining environmental costs and benefits.

Published.

4.2.6   **ISO/CD 14009: Environmental management system:** Guidelines for incorporating redesign of products and components to improve material circulation.

DIS registered.

4.3   TC 34/SC 17 - Management Systems for Food Safety

4.3.1   **ISO/CD 22003-1:** Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of food safety management systems — Part 1.

CD approved for registration as DIS – Replaces ISO/TS 22003:2013

4.3.2   **ISO/AWI 22003-2:** Part 2: Requirements for bodies providing audits of food safety management system elements in conjunction with safe food product/process certification.

New project approved.

4.4   ISO/TC 301 - Energy Management and Energy Savings

4.4.1   **ISO/CD 50003:** - Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of energy management systems.

Committee draft approved for registration as DIS.

4.4.2   **ISO/DIS 50004:** - Guidance for the implementation, maintenance and improvement of an ISO 50001 energy management system.

DIS Ballot closed.

4.4.3   **ISO/CD 50009:** Guidance for multiple organizations implementing a common (ISO50001) EnMS

CD draft, voting closed for comment.

4.4.4   **ISO/CD 50005, ISO/AWI 50010, ISO/PRF TS 50044 & ISO/DIS 50049**

All at various stages of development, if anyone requires further details please let me know outside the meeting?

4.5   CAS/1 (ISO/CASCO)

4.5.1   **ISO/IEC CD 17000: Conformity assessment** - Vocabulary and general principles.

DIS ballot closed.

4.5.2   **ISO/CD TS 17021-12:** Conformity assessment — Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of management systems — Part 12: Competence requirements for auditing and certification of collaborative business relationship management system.

CD ballot initiated.

4.5.3   **ISO/IEC 17029:** Conformity Assessment -- General principles and requirements for validation and verification bodies.

International standard published.

4.5.4   **ISO/IEC 17030:** Conformity assessment — General requirements for third-party marks of conformity – current version 2003.

Under development.

4.5.5   **ISO/IEC TR 17032:** Conformity assessment -- Guidelines and examples of a certification scheme for processes (Product and Company Certification. Conformity Assessment).

*Technical Report P*u*blished.*

4.5.6   **ISO/TS 17033:2019:** Ethical claims and supporting information — Principles and requirements (Product and Company Certification. Conformity Assessment).

This document contains principles and requirements for developing and declaring ethical claims and for providing supporting information, where specific standards have not been developed, or to supplement existing standards.

This document is intended for use by all types of organizations and is applicable to all types of ethical claims relating to a product, process, service or organization.

Technical Standard published.

4.5.7 **PAS 7050, Specification for Bringing Safe Products to Market: -** Sponsored by BEIS ABCB (WT) on the Steering Committee.

4.5.8 **Energy Smart Appliance (ESA) Strategic Advisory Group** – ABCB working alongside BEIS & BSI on future certification requirements for;

- PAS 1878 Energy Smart Appliances Classification, &
- PAS 1897 DSR Framework

5.0 Liaison Reports

5.1 Defence Sector

5.1.1 SBAC/CBMC & DIQF

KG reported on the Defence Industries Quality Forum held on 12th September 2019.

Counterfeit Avoidance Working Group (CAWG): Defence Standard 05-135 Version 2 has been published. DEFCON 524A will support Def Stan 05-135 and is in draft for comment.

Counterfeit Avoidance Framework that aligns to the six stages of the acquisition cycle and is now open for comment.

Improved Understanding & Implementation of AQAP 2110 Rev D Supply Chain Requirements: NATO guidance is being finalised. It was also explained that Babcock have produced a booklet that explains how AQAP2110 is cascaded through the Supply Chain. They also conducted an online survey to ask if Suppliers are cascading AQAP2110.

Attracting and Retaining Competent People in Quality across the Defence Sector: Activity has been focussed upon determining the structure for the Defence Body of Quality Knowledge; a DSIG survey, planned for release to the Defence Community in the next month or so will also invite feedback from the sector on topic headings.

Industry continue to work with the CQI and once the CQI 2030 strategy has been briefed internally to CQI stakeholders and the development of a career pathway is finalised.

Defence Equipment Fault Reporting and Analysis: Workstream members to develop a form that collates a question set. The form needs to be simple to complete and will look at subjects that are important to stakeholders.

DE&S Quality Assurance: DQA Field Force have produced a surveillance report on Supply Chain fragility following Brexit. More information will be available on Defence Share as soon as it's received.

Additionally, when looking at the escalation of quality concerns with suppliers, DQA Field Force are focussing more attention on containment activity relating to QDR's rather than corrective or root cause activities.

Standards update: Both AQAP2110 SRD 1B and AQAP2131 are in working group silence. AQAP2210 software scope has been defined and an initial review will take place in October 2019.

Defence Standard 05-135 Counterfeit Materiel has been updated to version 2.

Def Stan 05-057 Configuration Management is under review and Def Stan 05-100 and DEFCON 638 are out for comment.

5.2 Aerospace

5.2.1 IAQG

KG reported on the IAQG meeting held on 3rd September 2019.

IAQG 9104/1 - Requirements for Aviation, Space, and Defence Quality management System Certification Programs. A 'Coordination Draft' is in accordance with IAQG Procedure 105.3, but this is not a ballot.

The 9104/1 Document Is a complete rewrite of the existing Standard and that the standard contains requirements that are complementary and in addition to:

- ISO/IEC 17011
- ISO/IEC 17021-1
- IAF MD 1,2,3,4,5,11,12

IAQG 9101F and 9104/3 (revised) were included.

KG explained the rationale for the changes, which are;

- Align criteria with the changing business environment, keep pace, address future needs
- Align with ISO17021-1:2015, ISO 17011:2017 criteria and IAF Mandatory Documents
- Language to align with ISO9001 and 9100:2016 principles, and IAQG Dictionary
- Incorporate Stakeholder feedback (SWOT Analysis)
- To incorporate Lessons Learned and address identified weaknesses

5.3 UKAS PAF/PAC

5.3.1 PAF Not met since 12th March, which was reported at the last meeting. Next PAF is planned for 10th March 2020.

5.3.2 **UKAS PAC** **5th November 2019**

Two main but related topics;

a. Unaccredited Certification Statement: Now finalised but waiting on permission to use Government department logos. However, publication may be delayed due to;

b. UKAS are working closely with BIES and Trading Standards on a related but confidential project so it may be more beneficial to release the statement once this work is completed.

5.3.3 UKAS Strategy update

On 15th October a strategy discussion took place prior to the UKAS AGM. As you know UKAS are a non- profit organisation and as such are exploring opportunities to reinvest and/or support our industry via their retained earnings. Items discussed by ABCB were;

a) SME Support: Given the potential new SME's needing certification, such as the output of the Hackitt review, offer free guidance to help companies understand the requirements this may be done in conjunction with ABCB.
b) Sponsor or support innovation in the supply chain.
c) Explore the potential for a 'risk based' approach to surveillance visits.
d) Given the potential uncertainty of the economic climate in 2020, UKAS should consider a price freeze.

5.4 EA General Assembly

WT reported that EA GA had not met since May meeting in Rome and that the next meeting in Budapest, Hungary 21st & 22nd November.

However, as previously reported, following the EA GA meeting in Rome on 22 and 23 May 2019, EA continues to have an issue in hearing the views of Stakeholders, and there is clear concern amongst CBs that the voice of the EA stakeholders is simply not heard.

Examples include:

a) Concerns raised about EA Resolution 40 (2017) 13 in November 2017 from CB/CAB recognised stakeholders, EA Advisory and the European Commission are being ignored.

b) The new EA structure includes a new Technical Management Board, but still no place for stakeholders either on the new TMB or the existing Executive Committee.

c) (related to b) Uncertainty on the participation of stakeholders in future technical work, since it will be under the discretion/invitation of each Technical Committee Chair.

d) EA-1/15 EA Policy for Relation with Stakeholders, "*gives EA and its stakeholders the framework to maintain constructive and transparent cooperation through active participation in EA work" (EA website)*. Does the theory of EA-1/15 work in reality?

To address these concerns, stakeholder representatives held a meeting with Hans Ingels (and his team) of the European Commission on 25th September 2019.

The meeting was very cordial, and our issues were listened to. One positive that did come out of the meeting is, that going forward, the Commission wish to have ongoing engagement with stakeholders.

The commission have advised that they plan to raise our concerns directly with EA on 15 October 2019, but we still await to hear the outcome.

5.5   IAF   **21 – 30 Oct 2019**

WT feedback on the main topics covered the meeting held in Frankfurt during October.

<u>**Discussion Papers**</u>

5.5.1   **AB Consistency**: ABCB received several questions from one of our members in relation to being assessed by different AB's in different locations and the lack of consistency in application of the same standards, in particular:

- MD12 is applied differently, with some AB's opting for annual assessment of key locations, and some opting for once per cycle (once every 4 years for some AB's). From a CAB perspective, it would be good to have something more consistent (and concise) so that CAB's could use it to build into their commercial strategies.
- Whether a site (defined as a key location by an AB) may begin work without being assessed by the AB?
- Exploring the difference in approach if a key location only participates in one key process (as defined by policy), as opposed to two or three key processes?
- There is a perceived lack of benefit for an AB to visit overseas CAB's just to interview staff. With the abundance of technology available today, why do some AB's insist on travelling?

Outcome

MSC WG – Recommendation to create a Task Force to revise IAF MD 12:

Considering the new ISO/IEC 17011:2017

- *Is IAF MD 12 still needed?*
- *If IAF MD 12 is still needed; then revise to accommodate the changes in ISO/IEC 17011:2017.*
- *If IAF MD 12 is not needed; recommend a withdrawal of IAF MD 12, with a transition period for ABs to revise processes in accordance with ISO/IEC 17011:2017.*
- *IAF MD 12 refers to A5 which also refers to ISO/IEC 17011:2004 and key activities (for the JWG).*

ACTION: Form a small working group to discuss desired outcome of a revised MD12.   WT

5.5.2   **MD2 (Part 1) - Transfer of Certification**: Is it sufficient for the accepting CB, that the documentation to be reviewed, as specified within MD2 2.2.4 will be provided by transferring client, or does the issuing CB need to provide the documents?

IAF TC was requested to confirm that it is sufficient to accept the documentation from transferring client as long as issuing CB confirms that there are no open issues (non-conformities, complaints etc.).

MD2 - (Part 2) Transfer of Certification: Is it mandatory that the accepting certification body must always communicate with the original CB regarding adequacy and eligibility of the customer for transferring the certificate or is it only required when the information given by customer looks insufficient? In IAF MD2 clause 2.4.1, the "If required" can be interpreted that communication with the original CB is only needed when the accepting CB requires it.

Outcome

Transfer documentation required in IAF MD 2, should be provided by the issuing CB. In accordance with IAF MD 2, section 2.4 Cooperation Between the Issuing and Accepting Certification Bodies.

When reviewing section 2.4.1; "When requested", does not mean "if requested", it means the timing of when the accepting CB requests the information to be provided by the issuing CB. The accepting CB must contact the issuing CB for the documentation, it is not an option.

There are additional requirements in 2.4 to address CBs no longer in business, recording reasons why communication to the issuing CB was not completed, if the issuing CB does not cooperate, etc.

Further detail as to why the accepting CB must contact the issuing CB to gather the documentation, in section 2.2.4 it requires accepting CB to review various documentation, which per ISO/IEC 17021-1 the issuing CB may be the only entity with the information (e.g. details on complaints).

5.5.3 **ISO 45001 Migration:** ABs have taken different positions regarding the end of the migration period for ISO 45001, please clarify.

Outcome

The end of the ISO 45001 migration period is 31 March 2021.

If needed, ABs are requested to revise their migration process and communicate to CBs that BS OHSAS 18001 certifications will expire on 31 March 2021, instead of 12 March 2021.

5.5.4 **Maintaining OHSMS Certification History:** Although it does not seem to be documented anywhere, ABs have different points of view as it relates to the maintenance of OHS Management systems certification history when certified clients migrate from accredited OHSAS 18001:2007 to ISO 45001:2018.

This relates to situations where the "initial certification date" is indicated on the certificate.

Outcome

The initial certification date, including a statement as to what the initial certification was for, can be maintained on certification documents when an accredited certification has been migrated from BS OHSAS 18001 to ISO 45001.

There was some discussion as it related to allowing the date or not and if a statement was necessary seeing that IAF is allowing a migration and both standards

are OHSMS standards. It is still an OHSMS standard, which is why IAF allowed a migration. Why could the initial date not be maintained, as an OHSMS certification?

45001 is not the same standard, but IAF recognize they are both OHSMS standards.

The initial certification date can be maintained, with a statement to be clear what the initial certification was for.

WT explained that there were more discussion papers but due to limited time it's impossible to go through them all, but I will send out all the discussions and clarifications will be posted on the website.

Approved Resolutions

5.5.5   **IAF Resolution 2019-14 – Endorsement of ISO/IEC 17029:2019 as a Normative Document.**

5.5.6   **IAF Resolution 2019-15 – Accredited Certification Only Issued Against Normative Documents That Contain Requirements**: Accredited certification shall only be issued against documents/standards that contain requirements.

5.5.7   **IAF Resolution 2019-16 – Withdrawal of IAF MD3:2008 - Advanced Surveillance and Recertification Procedures**: To immediately withdraw IAF MD3:2008 Advanced Surveillance and Recertification Procedures (ASRP), Issue 1, Version 2, issued on 01 February 2008.

Certification bodies will have one year following withdrawal, to transition their certified organizations away from IAF MD3.

5.5.8   **IAF Resolution 2019-17 – Transitional Arrangements for ISO 22301:2019:** Transitional Arrangement for the Revision of ISO 22301 Societal security – Business continuity management systems – Requirements be three years from the last day of the month of publication of the revised standard.

All ISO 22301:2012 certifications shall expire or be withdrawn at the end of the transition period.

Within this transition timeline:

   • ABs shall be ready to carry out transition assessments for ISO 22301:2019 within six months from the last day of the month of publication of the revised standard

   • CABs shall complete the transition with ABs for ISO 22301:2019 within 18 months from the last day of the month of publication of the revised standard.

   • CABs shall cease conducting initial and recertification audits to ISO 22301:2012 18 months from the last day of the month of publication of the revised standard.

5.5.9   **IAF Resolution 2019-18 – Transitional Arrangements for ISO 14064-3:2019** - Revision of ISO 14064-3 shall be four years from 30 April 2019. Any Greenhouse Gas

Validation and Verification engagements commenced after 30 April 2023 shall be performed to ISO 14064-3:2019.

Within this transition timeline:

> • ABs shall be ready to carry out ISO 14065 assessments using 14064-3: 2019 for conformity assessment schemes that reference ISO 14064-3 within 18 months from 30 April 2019.
>
> • Where local legislation/regulation requires accredited validation/verification referencing ISO 14064-3:2006 and has not been amended to reference ISO 14064-3:2019, the use of ISO 14064-3:2006 in accredited validation/verification may be extended.

5.5.10 **IAF Resolution 2019-19 – Transitional Arrangements for ISO 14065:202x** - Transition arrangement for the revision of ISO 14065 shall be three years from the date of publication of ISO 14065:202x.

Within this transition timeline:

• ABs shall be ready to carry out transition assessment against the new version of ISO 14065 within 12 months from the date of publication.

• All accreditation against the new version of ISO 14065 shall require accreditation to ISO/IEC 17029.

• Where local legislation/regulation requires accredited validation/verification referencing ISO 14065:2013 and has not been amended to reference the new version of ISO 14065, the use of ISO 14065:2013 in accredited validation/verification may be extended.

WT explained that again, although there were other resolutions, due to our limited time it's impossible to go through them all, will also be posted on the website.

5.5.11 **Joint ILAC IAF Resolution**

Recommendation to Establish a Single International Accreditation Organisation (1) The Joint General Assembly endorses the recommendation of the Joint Executive Committee to establish a single international organisation for accreditation on the basis of the results of the "Survey In Support of the IAF 2020 – 2025 and ILAC 2021 – 2025 Strategic Plans"

5.5.12 **IAF CertSearch**

IAF CertSearch was launched on 28th October with currently in excess of 331,000 certificates.

All details and support information and material can be found at: https://www.iaf.nu/articles/Update_on_the_IAF_Database_of_Accredited_Certifica tions/618

Endorsed Global Support: the following organisation have sent letters of support and commitment to use CertSearch as their single source of certificate validation:

- IATF - International Automotive Task Force

- IAQG – International Aerospace Quality Group
- GFSI – Global Food Safety Initiative
- TIA – Telecommunications Industry Association
- UNIDO - United Nations Industrial Development Organization
- US Department of Energy
- DTA – Dental Trade Alliance
- IEA – International Energy Agency
- Natural Resources Canada
- Clean Energy Ministerial – Global Forum where major economies work together to share best practices and promote policies

5.5.13 MD20 Update

A Task Force was established some years ago to define assessor competence for AB's in support of MD20. However, since its establishment, ISO 17011 has been published and, a joint ILAC IAF project was set up also looking at competence with the view to establish a single document, which is still ongoing.

Disappointingly, the latter project was the catalyst for some AB's to make a vigorous attempt to put a stop to the work on assessor competence via a resolution.

WT was pleased to report that the CB Associations, including ABCB, along with the chair of the User Group and other AB's to stop the resolution being voted on.

5.5.14 GSFI Update

GSFI carried out a number of peer audits and found that around 25% were not to the required stand leading to disqualifying 5% of companies in the supply chain. Working with IAF are forming a Task Force to address the issues.

6.0 UKAS

6.1 UKAS MSCTAC

Not met since last ABCB Meeting.

6.2 UKAS update

KB provided further insight on the IAF and EA reports and also provided the following international UKAS developments.

6.2.1 Audit Time Rationalisation (MD5)

a) In support of this project an exercise was undertaken using 3 scenarios to calculate audit time.
b) Results showed a large range of calculated times for the scenarios presented. Interestingly. KB pointed out that the result showing the least audit time came form an AB, and the most from a CB.
c) However, results need to be considered with care as the scenarios left some details open to interpretation and subject to individual assumptions.

Next Steps

> a) Task Force Group conclusions and proposals accepted, so the TFG will continue to work with 2 the following two work-streams.
>
>   Create 2 new documents that are clear, unambiguous Guidance/rules for standards/ guidance developers.
>
>   Overriding guidance for users to direct them through the correct documents and considerations.
>
> b) In parallel, work to reduce the number of guidance tables as they become closer together due to the above.

6.2.2   Other Key Discussions

- Use of the new Web Forums
- Activities of Working Groups
- Application guidance for Anti-Bribery Management Systems
- Certification in support of EU Regulations for GDPR, eIDAS and Drones
- Joint workshop activity with HHC on choice of standards and new EA-1/22

6.3   UKAS Operations

SR gave an update on UKAS operations.

6.4   UKAS Database

Jeff Ruddle had written to those previously involved in the previous workshop to invite their participation in the next stage, which breakdown into the following;

- Security and support
- Database content
- UKAS/CB contractual agreements
- Marketing, awareness and added value

Dates to be arranged and WT explained that he was aware that some members have volunteered for some of the workshops.

6.5   Members' issues

SR requested that UKAS keep ABCB updated on MD17 implementation.

7.0   Opportunities

7.1   Hackitt Review - Competency Steering Group

A report issued by the construction industry's Competence Steering Group (CSG) is recommending the use of UKAS accredited certification to ensure the competence of personnel involved with High Risk Residential Buildings (HRRBs).

The CSG's report, issued on 16th August, recommends that all HRRB personnel are registered to a recognised professional body or certified by an independent certification body. The report goes on to advocate that those bodies carrying out the competency assessments of HRRB personnel should themselves be subject to rigorous oversight by an appropriate body, such as the Engineering Council or UKAS.

A meeting to place on 18th October and RD kindly attended on behalf of ABCB and gave the following feedback.

Competence for Building a Safer Future - 18th October 2019

Background:

Conference on *Raising the Bar*, the report on improving competence across safety critical professions and trades working on HRRB's.

The report sets out recommendations from the Competence Steering Group and its 13 Working Groups in response to Dame Judith Hackitt's call in her report, Building a Safer Future. It sets out radical and wide-ranging set of measures to improve the competence of those who procure, design, construct, inspect, maintain and operate HRRBs.

The interim report is now out for consultation (closes 31st October) and the conference was an opportunity to provide feedback to the CSG to feed into the final report, which will be published later in the year.

Hosted by: Informa and **led by Graham Watts, Chair of the Competence Steering Group**. CEO Construction Industry Council (CIC)

In attendance:

MHCLG: Lindsey Lewis, Deputy Director for Residents and Industry, Building Safety Programme.
MHCLG: Chandru Dissanayeke, Director Building Safety Reform.
Industry Safety Steering Group: Paul Nash (stood in for Dame Judith Hackitt and is a member of the ISSG that is providing strategic oversight of the Governments Building Safety Programme following Grenfell Tower fire.
National Fire Chiefs Council: Adreena Parkin-Coates.
RICS: Steven Thompson.
BSI: Scott Steadman.
UKAS: Malcom Hynd
Independent Chairs from each IRG

Representatives from Trade Associations, Institutions, LABC, National Councils, Engineering Council, Solicitors Regulation Authority etc.

Key Points:

- **Phase 1 Report for the Grenfell inquiry is expected end October 2019** - The report will set out in detail what happened during the night of 14 June 2017, minute by minute description of what happened, how the fire started, the report is limited to the night itself. Interim recommendations will not be made ahead of the Phase 1 report.

- **Phase 2 Report expected early 2020** - Phase 2 is focused on establishing <u>how Grenfell Tower came to be in a condition that allowed a tragedy of this scale to occur</u>. The Inquiry continues to plan for Phase 2 hearings to commence in January 2020.

- **Building Safety Regulations System Reform is looking to:**
  - Extend beyond fire safety
  - Extend buildings in scope
  - Flexibility to extend further to all buildings
  - Commitment for competence Oversight Body
  - Commitment to uplift competence across all professions and trades

- **MHCLG are looking for volunteers to take forward and shape the new overarching competence framework**
  - All competence frameworks are recommended to be **accredited by UKAS** or Engineering Council (check the checkers)
  - All ISG are recommending re-assessment of professions and trade competency between **2 and 5 years** (CPD annually with timed re-assessments, more work to be done on this)

Takeaway's:

- Culture change is happening across industry
- Commitment and a drive for change is apparent by the representation and work already started by organisations representing the Built Environment
- Improving competence will not start and end with HRRBs
- Industry is calling for government impetus and regulator to enforce the proposals

Dame Judith Hackitt says Industry should not wait for Government to raise the bar it should act now - but industry needs the support of Government to make it happen.

7.2   OGUK Update

WT reported that OGUK SQS Programme is still all systems go and that john McColl had thanked members for their patience and continued interest.

Initial 1-2-1 introductory discussions between OGUK and interested ABCB members to take place mid-November / early December but in the interim, any questions, queries or comments should be directly to: jmccoll@oilandgasuk.co.uk

7.3   SSIP

WT reported that ABCB, in order to help to raise the profile of the association, are now a Supporter Members of SSIP.

To give the meeting a better understanding of SSIP, Eleanor Eaton, Chair of SSIP gave a presentation, which was gratefully received.

8.0   Any other business

      a) KG gave a brief update on the proposed revisions to the high level structure of standards (Annex SL).

      b) WT informed the meeting of the new ABCB website, new format and sign in for members area.

      c) ABCB need a representative for the sector scheme PAS 43 on the Survive Working Group 2 to replace Gary Charlesworth of Avalon Certification.

ACTION: Email all members re vacant position on PAS 43.   **WT**

9.0   Date and venue of next meeting

27th February 2020 at UKAS, Staines.