



For IEC use only

CAB/470/R

2004-05

INTERNATIONAL ELECTROTECHNICAL COMMISSION

CONFORMITY ASSESSMENT BOARD (CAB)

Meeting 15, Geneva, 2004-06-08

SUBJECT

Agenda item 8.3.1

Mr de Ruvo: Report on the ILAC/CAB Technical Panel meeting, 29 April 2004 (Geneva, Switzerland)

BACKGROUND

Under the auspices of the CAB and the International Laboratory Accreditation Conference (ILAC), the Technical Panel met in Geneva for the third time, to follow up the resolution taken during the first meeting, to collaborate further in the field of joint assessment programmes, and to seek ground for common understanding of key elements of ISO/IEC 17025.

ILAC and its National Accreditation Members are simultaneously being invited to support the resolutions for further follow-up action.

At the June 2004 CAB meeting, Mr de Ruvo will orally highlight the most significant items in this report, and also mention the results of the meeting of the Joint Working Group CAB/ILAC (JWG) on "Common understanding of ISO/IEC 17025".

ACTION

This report is for consideration at the June 2004 CAB meeting. CAB members and the IEC Schemes' managements are invited to support the resolutions for further follow-up action.

**REPORT ON THE ILAC/CAB TECHNICAL PANEL MEETING
29 April 2004 (GENEVA, SWITZERLAND)**

Present

Participant	Representing	Affiliation
Pierre de Ruvo	Head of CAB delegation	Executive Secretary IECEE
Chris Agius	CAB delegation	Secretary IECEX
Joe Gryn	CAB delegation	IECEE CTL Chairman, Vice Chairman IECEX
Jan Hattingh	ILAC delegation	SANAS Technical Assessor
Uwe Kausmeyer	CAB Observer	Chairman IECEX
Bent Winther	CAB delegation	Deputising for Mr D Mader US Member of CAB and IECEE Lead Assessor
Colin Watson	ILAC delegation	ILAC delegate & UKAS Technical Assessor
John Mitchell	Head of ILAC delegation	NATA Manager Electrical Testing, Lead Assessor Convenor ILAC TAIC EMC Working Group
Chris Bestwick	ILAC delegation	UKAS Technical Assessor
Shigeo Nonaka	ILAC delegation	Japan Accreditation Board for Conformity Assessment
Norbet Muller	ILAC delegation	ILAC-TAIC delegate

Overview

The third meeting of the CAB/ILAC Technical Panel was convened to discuss progress with the resolutions that were defined at the second meeting on 22 January 2003. The roles of chairing and minuting the meeting fell to the CAB delegation.

Discussion of some topics occurred out of sequence with the agenda and some matters were revisited as became necessary. For simplicity, the following report has been constructed as per the agenda rather than the chronological order of discussions.

Abbreviations used

AB	ILAC member Accreditation Body
APC	ILAC's Accreditation Policy Committee
CAB	IEC Conformity Assessment Board
CTL	IECEE Committee of Testing Laboratories
PP	IEC CAB/ILAC Policy Panel
AAG	IECEE Assessment Advisory Group
TAIC	ILAC Technical Accreditation Issues Committee
TP	IEC CAB/ILAC Technical Panel

Report of Meeting

Item 1 Opening and welcome

In the spirit of rotating the meeting Chair, Mr de Ruvo assumed the role of Chairman.

The Chairman welcomed the delegates, a particular welcome being extended to those delegates attending for the first time. The Chairman then called for delegates to introduce themselves.

Apologies were received from Mr D Mader who sent his wishes for a most productive meeting.

Item 2 Agenda

The Chairman referred delegates to the IECEE website where CAB/ILAC TP documents are hosted including these meeting documents.

Delegates then referred the meeting to the agenda document CAB/ILAC-TP/12/DA.

The delegates approved the agenda as presented.

Items 3, 4 + 5 Report and follow up on meeting of 22 January 2003

Note was taken of the report issued by the IEC CAB following the second TP meeting on 22 January 2003, noting in particular the following action items.

Item 7.2

The meeting noted the item 7.2 concerning the development of some guidance on the application of ISO/IEC 17025. General discussion took place noting the importance of ensuring a common application of 17025 noting the meeting of the Joint Working Group CAB/ILAC planned for the next day.

Item 7.4

There was detailed discussion on the issue of testing versus evaluation with delegates noting that in some areas such as Ex field there are instances where some ILAC members may not cover assessment of the laboratory's ability to conduct evaluations or assessments. ILAC delegates agreed that this is a matter for ILAC to consider and report back. Mr Mitchell agreed to undertake this action.

Action Mr Mitchell to refer the issue to ILAC community and report back to this TP.

The Chairman then referred to the issue of Uncertainty of Measurement & Accuracy. The Chairman referred to the IECEE document with ILAC agreeing to table the IECEE document Guide 001 among ILAC community. Mr Muller undertook to conduct this action. Chairman thanked Mr Muller.

Action Mr Muller agreed to ensure that the IECEE Guide 001 Document is circulated among the ILAC
--

Chairman referred to list of minimum test equipment required as located on the IECEE website. Noting that this list is publicly available and commend its use to ILAC members when operating in this field.

Mr Mitchell raised the question of adding to the list with Mr Gryn commenting that the list deliberately does not include general items like consumables.

Mr Hattingh raised the issue of subcontracting and whether or not there is a need to use these lists when considering subcontractors. The meeting then discussed in detail in terms of what can be accredited where a laboratory does not have the facilities or demonstrated capability. ILAC agreed to take this matter back to ILAC members, with Mr Mitchell agreeing to take this on.

Action	Mr Mitchell agreed to refer this matter back to ILAC and report back to this TP.
---------------	---

ITEM 7.7

The meeting noted the past agreement on this subject with all agreeing that the use of IEC Scheme Test Report formats should be used.

ITEM 7.8

Chairman noted the synergies between IEC Schemes and ILAC positions. Members discussed difficulties of calibrating test equipment by the manufacturer when the manufacture sees no benefit in seeking accreditation. Mr Gryn commented on a possible approach where the laboratory may carry out its own assessment of the manufacturers laboratory. There was general agreement.

ITEM 7.9

Chairman commented on progress with proficiency testing programmes, with the meeting discussing the level of reporting by the PTP provider, with Mr Gryn advising that CTL has requested to obtain specific reports for CBTLs operating within the CB Scheme.

The Chairman reiterated the earlier invitation for ILAC members to take advantage of the PTP operated within the IECEE.

Mr Mitchell commented that he attended the last CTL meeting and commented on the technical detail dealt with during both the meeting and workshop.

Mr Winther also commented on the use of PTPs to improve the standards development process.

ITEM 7.10

Chairman advised that of those joint assessment programmes that have taken place these have been very successful and are reported later in this report. Chairman also identified some of the challenges for these to take place including issues relating to scope, timing and assessment team size. Mr Winther suggested the benefits of introducing common assessment reports to cover both ILAC and Schemes.

There was further general discussion on the issues and aims of Joint assessments including the desire to reduce the number of administrative forms and overall demand of assessments, with Mr Agius commenting on the different needs of the various IEC Schemes as they serve different needs citing the situation within IECEx which requires annual surveillance of Test Labs and Certification Bodies where national accreditation is used as part of annual surveillance only where the national accreditation has been found to cover IECEx requirements, which means a real reduction in the number of assessments.

Chairman commented on the different approaches to surveillance by the IEC Schemes noting that while there is no formal annual surveillance for the CB Scheme, the fact that members review CB Test Reports in itself represents surveillance along with a full 3 year re-assessment program. He further reiterated the importance among the IEC schemes to instil and maintain mutual confidence among the IEC scheme members

and added that a proposal will be tabled at the next IECEE CMC meeting whereby CBTLs that are not accredited will be subjected to an annual surveillance of their QMS part in accordance with ISO/IEC 17025.

Chairman then referred to the list of planned re-assessments for IECEE with Mr Muller seeking updated information on future assessments and agreed that ILAC need to improve their dissemination of information and agreed to contact the Secretariats for both IECEE and IECEX on planned assessments that ILAC members have planned for Test labs operating within IEC Schemes.

Mr Gryn commented on the importance and value of Peer Assessments to the IEC Schemes. Mr Gryn commented that the early joint assessments are an opportunity to gain further confidence in our operations.

There was general discussion the approach forward for collaboration with members with the meeting discussing possibilities for formalising this approach including a possible list of ILAC members that are willing to participate in joint assessments noting that a previous questionnaire was issued to ILAC members and that this inquiry was already made by the IECEE with a unanimous positive willingness to participate.

Item 6 Analysis of replies received from a survey of Test Labs concerning Joint assessments

The meeting reviewed the survey results from document CAB/ILAC-TP/13/INF with Chairman commenting that all replies seem to indicate a very positive result.

Mr Hattingh gave the meeting a brief verbal report of his involvement in the joint assessment conducted in South Africa (SANAS/IECEE) to SABS commenting that while there was some early difficulties in transmitting the documents his experience was very positive but commented that this is largely a result of the willingness of the parties to be involved.

Item 7 Analysis of replies received from a survey of Assessors concerning Joint assessments

The meeting reviewed the survey results from document CAB/ILAC-TP/14/INF with Chairman commenting that the replies seem to indicate a very positive result.

The Chairman commented that it may be worthwhile for a meeting between the ILAC and IEC Scheme assessors the day before the site assessment to take place in order to prepare the assessment and distribute the role of each assessor.

The meeting noted that there may be difficulties when the scope of applications varies among IECEE and ILAC and the possibilities of overlap when dealing with large scope.

The meeting also discussed the advantages of having a single Assessment Report Format and agreed to table this issue at the next meeting.

In conclusion of this review the meeting noted the importance of establishing clear roles of assessors and the ready availability of all documents.

Mr Muller requested with agreement from the meeting that the IEC Questionnaire results be provided for communication to ILAC, with Mr Mitchell agreeing to provide a similar information to CAB delegates.

Action	Mr de RUVO to provide ILAC with the results of the appreciation questionnaires circulated to IECEE assessors.
	Mr Mitchell to provide P. de RUVO with the results of the appreciation questionnaires circulated to ILAC assessors.

Item 8 Analysis of Questionnaire of Test Labs on results of Joint Assessments

The meeting reviewed the survey results from document CAB/ILAC-TP/15/INF with Chairman commenting that the replies seem to indicate a very positive result.

The meeting highlighted the positive benefits of joint assessments to Test Labs, especially the reduced disruption to their work program that arises from multiple separate assessments. The meeting also noted that the issue of scope is one that clearly needs to be sorted out prior to joint assessments and cited earlier discussions concerning meetings held the day prior to assessments among team members.

Item 9 Questionnaire of Assessors on results of Joint Assessments

The meeting reviewed the document CAB/ILAC-TP/16/INF with Chairman and Mr Mitchell inviting the delegates to comment on the presentation of the form.

The meeting considered Mr Muller's suggestion for the inclusion of a numerical scale for quick identification of results with the delegates agreeing to consider this as a future enhancement.

In conclusion the meeting endorsed the form as presented.

Item 10 Models for Joint Assessment

The meeting considered document CAB/ILAC-TP/17/INF and a sample assessment plan with Chairman inviting Mr Mitchell to introduce the document, with Mr Mitchell advising that the intended purpose is for guidance.

Some important points raised by Mr Mitchell included:

- it is an early draft;
- it provides guidelines for preparation and the conducting of Joint assessments along with guidelines for reporting;
- the plan is a structured model for a 1 day assessment;
- the document also includes task allocation and an activity table as prepared jointly with the IECEE Lead Assessor that experienced joint assessments in Australia;
- the document does not mean compulsory involvement by the Accreditation Bodies.

Chairman conveyed his thanks to Mr Mitchell for his work in preparing this draft proposing that further consideration by all members of the CAB/ILAC TP with delegates of this TP being given 1 month for consideration and the submission of comments to the Chairman by 1 month.

It was agreed that the Survey resulting from the comments received would be circulated among the members of CAB/ILAC T.P. in view of finalizing a Draft Guide that could be considered at the next meeting for approval as joint Guide on Peer Assessments.

Action	TP Members are asked to consider the Draft document and submit any comments within 1 month back to the Chairman
---------------	--

Item 11 Guidelines on how IECEE/ILAC Joint Assessments have to be conducted

The meeting considered document CAB/ILAC-TP/18/INF, JAB RL 360 and summary on JAB and JAB RL 360 with Chairman commenting

The Chairman posed the question to ILAC Delegates how they would handle measurement uncertainty during assessments with ILAC delegates commenting that they look for:

- Organisational Policy on MU
- Capability
- Demonstrated practice

In borderline cases, they expect the test report to highlight this as a potential failure and report it to the customer. Measurement uncertainty is not required in the test report for each test (except where required to validate a borderline measurement) but typical MU values (uncertainty budget) must be on file for each measurement type.

SANAS documents were provided for information as an example of how one accreditation body reviewed. It was noted that IECEE Non-conformance reports are very similar to those of SANAS.

Item 12 Elements of Reciprocal Recognition between IEC Schemes and ILAC Members of Each others assessment process

The meeting considered the longer term objectives of reciprocal recognition of assessments among schemes and ILAC members noting that IECEE already takes into account National Accreditation and that IECEx recognise National accreditation for the purposes of surveillance, where national accreditation addresses IECEx requirements but includes a 5 year re-assessment program. Mr Agius informed the meeting that as IECEx operates in a strongly regulated area ExTLs without acceptable national accreditation are subjected to an annual assessment by the IECEx Scheme. Mr Agius advised there are such ExTLs that receive annual assessment visits by IECEx.

The meeting then focused on the broader areas for cooperation with Mr Muller commenting on the advantages of an assessment program early in the planning process. Chairman commented that Mr Mitchell's assessment plan is a good start.

Item 13 Common Database of CAB/ILAC Registered Assessors/Auditors

Chairman informed the meeting about the future training program for IECEE Assessors and extended an invitation for a limited number of assessors from ILAC members and asked to be notified to Mr de Ruvo by end May 10th of any that may wish to take this offer up with Mr Muller agreeing to notify Mr de Ruvo of any such candidates.

Action	Mr Muller agreed to notify Mr de Ruvo by end May of any ILAC assessors that may wish to be included in the IECEE assessor training program
--------	--

Mr Mitchell proposed and the meeting agreed that an exchange of training information between ILAC and IECEE takes place, with the meeting agreeing.

Chairman informed the meeting of IECEE training material.

The meeting were informed about some of the details regarding IEC Scheme assessments such as mechanisms for appointments of teams, qualification requirements for assessors.

Meeting agreed on the future possibility of a sharing of assessors among both IEC Schemes and ILAC members.

Item 17 Draft MOU Between CAB/ILAC or IEC Schemes/Individual Members of ILAC

In line with the policy resolution between CAB and ILAC, the Chairman introduced the concept of the future drafting of a MOU between CAB and ILAC underlining that a formalized agreement between the parties would imply that their Members do implement the decisions taken by their respective Management Board.

Mr Gray, as CAB Chairman suggested that it would be helpful for this TP to consider some items that may assist in being included in an MOU

Mr Mitchell considered that working towards an MOU would be useful but would require some considerable consultation within the ILAC community and considered that the same would be required for the IEC Schemes. He also suggested that an MOU should identify

- Expectations of both parties
- Definition of participants
- Clear identification of the depth

The meeting agreed that in light of the successful trial joint Assessment there would be the need to established some formalised arrangements between CAB and ILAC and/or the Schemes and the Accreditation Bodies that would support it.

The meeting also agreed that such formalized arrangement would facilitate the ongoing cooperation between the IEC Schemes and ILAC members to the benefit of the international conformity assessment community and associated stakeholders.

Action	Mr. de Ruvo to report to the CAB accordingly. Mr. Mitchell to report to the ILAC accordingly.
--------	--

Item 18 Other Business

1) Notificatication of a communication of an MOU between ILAC, IAF and ISO

The Chairman referred the meeting to a joint notification from ISO, ILAC and IAF expressing the CAB delegates' concern for clarification over what it actually covers and is meant to achieve. At this point the CAB Chairman advised that this is intended to facilitate the standards development process and not intended to serve any other purpose.

2) Technical cooperation at the technical level between IEC Schemes and ILAC

Mr Mitchell raised the possibility for ILAC and Schemes Technical Committees to offer some assistance and cooperation at the technical level, eg metrology practises and techniques with Mr Gryn extending an invitation as Chairman of the CTL for ILAC to attend CTL meetings.

Mr Mitchell offered ILAC expertise as a resource to IEC Schemes on certain technical matters and suggested that this may be included in any formal arrangements

3) Question from Mr Winther concerning advantages of having National accreditation as well as maintaining IEC Scheme acceptance

Mr Mitchell mentioned that this is largely a commercial decision by the Test Laboratories with the meeting agreeing.

Item 19 Next Meeting

The meeting agreed to hold the next meeting on January 27-27, 2005 in Sydney at the kind invitation of NATA with alignment of other IECEE related meetings.