



CAB/595/R

For IEC use only

2006-03-31

INTERNATIONAL ELECTROTECHNICAL COMMISSION

CONFORMITY ASSESSMENT BOARD (CAB)

Meeting 19, Geneva, 2006-05-12

SUBJECT

Agenda item 9.3.2

Report from the CAB/IAF Technical Panel (TP) meeting held in San José, 1st March 2006

BACKGROUND

This report is based on the outcome of the discussion that took place in the meeting.

ACTION

The CAB is invited to support/approve the CAB/IAF TP Resolutions as applicable.



CAB/IAF Technical Panel

SUBJECT

Report from the CAB/IAF Technical Panel meeting held in San José, CA, USA 1st March, 2006

BACKGROUND

This report is based on the outcome of the discussion that took place within the subjected meeting.

ACTION

The CAB is invited to support/approve the CAB/IAF TP Resolutions as applicable.



CAB/IAF Technical Panel

SUBJECT

Report from the CAB/IAF Technical Panel meeting held in San José, 1st March 2006

BACKGROUND

This report is based on the outcome of the discussion that took place within the subjected meeting.

ACTION

The CAB/IAF TP is requested to approve this report and to circulate it to the respective boards to seek support/approval.



..

Members:

Pierre de RUVO
Don MADER
Joe GRYN
Chris AGIUS
Ron SINCLAIR
Stan SALOT
Norbert MUELLER
Lorenzo THIONE
Randy DOUGHERTY
Jeff CHEN
Klaus OBERSTE-LEHN
Alex EZRAKHOVICH
John OWEN

Head of CAB Delegation: Acting Chairman
UL Inc: Acting Secretary
CSA
IECQ, IECEx Secretary
Baseefa, IECEx
BQPM, IECQ
Head of Delegation for ILAC
SINCERT
Head of Delegation for IAF
TAF
TUEV NORD CERT
IQNet
IAF

Apologies

Apologies

Apologies

Apologies

Special Observers:

Gösta FREDRIKSSON
Rich PESCATORE
Jun XIE
John MITCHELL
IECEE Chairman
HP, Chairman of USNC/IECEE
IECEE Vice-Chairman
NATA



1 APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIRMAN

The CAB/IAF TP agreed to appoint the head of the CAB delegation, Pierre de Ruvo, as Acting Chairman and Don Mader as Acting Secretary for this meeting. The CAB/IAF TP also agreed that the Acting Chairman will be fully responsible for any follow-up action until the next meeting.

DECISION: Pierre de Ruvo was appointed as the Chairman for the first full year and Randy Dougherty of IAF will be the Chairman for the second full year. The Chairmanship will be on a rotational basis between the CAB delegation and the IAF delegation. Don Mader was appointed as the Secretary.

2 OPENING OF THE MEETING

The Chairman welcomed members and the special guests of the first CAB/IAF Technical Panel meeting highlighting the important role this Technical Panel will have to enhance the collaboration between the IAF Member Accreditation Bodies and the IEC Schemes.

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

CAB/IAF-TP/001/DA_REV2

The CAB/IAF TP approved the agenda with an additional item to be dealt with under “Any Other Business”.

DECISION: The agenda was approved as distributed including the additional item.

4. TO AGREE ON THE TERMS OF REFERENCE

CAB/IAF-TP/002/INF

The CAB/IAF TP agreed that the objective of the CAB/IAF Technical Panel is to pursue close cooperation between the IAF and the IEC Conformity Assessment Schemes that caters to the needs of their respective members and stakeholders.

Towards this objective, the CAB/IAF TP will develop and facilitate the implementation of the following elements of collaboration (Terms of Reference):

- Common understanding of the requirements laid down in ISO/IEC Guide 65 applicable to the Electrotechnical Sector



- Practical utilization of ISO/IEC Guide 65 assessments in the IAF and IEC CA Schemes' programs. This may include, but will not be limited to, the following:
 - Harmonized assessment report form
 - Harmonized checklist
 - Harmonized assessment preparation guidelines
 - Joint assessments of certification bodies (that are participating in the programs of both parties) - on a trial basis
 - Inclusion of the IEC CA Schemes' requirements in IAF assessments
- Use of each other's qualified assessors

DECISION: The CAB/IAF TP agreed to the Terms of Reference as in Annex 1 of this Report.

5. TO CONSIDER STARTING JOINT RE-ASSESSMENTS

CAB/IAF-TP/003/INF

The TP noted the IECEE Reassessment Plan as presented by the Chairman who reported the figures related to the joint assessments carried out with ILAC Member Accreditation Bodies. The TP agreed with the Chairman to start a pilot joint assessment programme on a voluntary basis.

DECISION:

- a) IEC Schemes to provide the Head of the IAF delegation with their re-assessment plans.
- b) IEC Schemes and IAF to start a pilot joint assessment programme on the same basis as with ILAC.
- c) Upon completion of joint assessment IAF ABs and IEC Schemes to report feedback from both the assessed Certification Bodies and the Assessment Teams.



**6. TO DECIDE ON THE SETTING OF A CAB/IAF JWG “COMMON UNDERSTANDING OF ISO/IEC GUIDE 65”
APPLICABLE TO THE ELECTROTECHNICAL SECTOR**

CAB/IAF-TP/004/INF, CAB/IAF-TP/010/INF

The TP agreed that, if necessary, it will handle ISO/IEC Guide 65 issues to reach a common understanding for consistent application during the assessments. The TP also agreed that discussion related to the common understanding of ISO/IEC Guide 65 would be dealt with by the Members of the Technical Panel as part of their regular agenda.

With reference to the existing IAF Guidance to ISO/IEC Guide 65 the CAB Delegation was of the opinion that if a Guidance is needed the overall stakeholders should be involved and that the IEC Schemes would be interested in participating in the review process of the IAF Guidance document with the understanding that there should be in the field of this collaboration a sectorial approach that focuses on the Electrotechnical sector.

The IAF Delegation agreed in principle to explore the concept of having a sectorial approach and informed that if so decided by the ISO Members any revision to ISO/IEC Guide 65 into the 17000 series will be more inclusive so that a detailed IAF Guidance would therefore not be necessary.

The IAF Delegation also informed that the IAF Guidance will be taken into account by the CASCO WG when it will be decided to revise ISO/IEC Guide 65.

In the interest of practical cooperation, the meeting further agreed that industry or technology specific issues, that may relate at the IEC Scheme level, may be raised directly between IEC Schemes and IAF.

DECISION:

The TP agreed that it will handle ISO/IEC Guide 65 issues to reach a common understanding as part of the CAB/IAF TP Agenda as opposed to establishing a separate JWG. IEC Scheme specific issues may be raised directly between IEC Schemes and IAF Members



7. TO CONSIDER THE COMMENTS ON THE IAF GUIDE G.4.5 AND G.4.6, G.4.32 CAB IAF-TP/005/INF

The Chairman introduced the meeting document and explained the rationale behind the concern of the IEC Schemes pertaining to the wording of IAF Guidance to ISO/IEC Guide 65 under G4.5 and G4.6 whereby the IEC Schemes do not believe that for a multinational Certification Body the parent Group need not be assessed (and accredited) separately since accreditation of the Certification Body as part of the overall legal entity should be sufficient.

The IAF Delegation explained that during the IAF/TC meeting in Auckland, Sept 2005, a Task Force was set to clarify this issue and that whilst awaiting the outcome of the IAF TC Task Force the guidance should be understood as referring to operational structure/control as opposed to legal entities and that only those parts or structures of a large legal entity that operates the certification body activity within the scope of the accreditation should be assessed. The CAB Delegation agreed with this clarification of the Guidance.

The TP recognized that ISO/IEC Guide 65 is developed by a consensus process with various interests involved and therefore, in future, any changes in interpretation of ISO/IEC Guide 65 should be agreed and developed by the parties that are involved with the application of ISO/IEC Guide 65. It was agreed that the IEC Schemes and IAF should strengthen their collaboration in having, whenever necessary, a uniform understanding of the requirements of ISO/IEC Guide 65 and any future ISO/IEC Standards that will be used for the assessment of Certification Bodys operating third-party product certification.

DECISION: The CAB/IAF TP agreed that the IAF Guidance should be understood as referring to operational structure/control of the Certification Body as opposed to legal entities and that only those parts or structures of a large legal entity that operates the Certification Body activity within the scope of the accreditation should be assessed and accredited.



**8. TO REACH A COMMON UNDERSTANDING OF SUB-CLAUSE 4.2 OF ISO/IEC GUIDE 65 AND
CORRELATED G.4.25 CLAUSE 4.2.F)**

CAB IAF-TP/006/INF

The Chairman introduced the meeting document and explained the rationale behind the concern of the IEC Schemes pertaining to the wording of the IAF Guidance under G4.25 referring to clause 4.2 f) of ISO/IEC Guide 65. He explained that the wording of the Guidance in this particular case was felt as a change of the Guide 65 whereby non-accredited testing laboratories would also be subjected to assessments by the Accreditation Body as part of the assessment of the relevant Certification Bodies. The CAB Delegation explained that the spirit of ISO/IEC Guide 65 is such that it should be sufficient that the Certification Body can demonstrate by providing objective evidence that it has assessed the competence of the testing laboratory and its compliance with ISO/IEC 17025 on an on-going basis.

The IAF Delegation mentioned that the Accreditation Body has the duty to evaluate non-accredited laboratories to make sure that the responsible Certification Bodies are in control (or not) of the sub-contracted testing activities as opposed to only reviewing the records maintained by the Certification Bodies as well as the most recent IEC Scheme re-assessment Reports.

The Chairman offered to provide the IAF Delegation with a PowerPoint® presentation describing the IECEE's reassessment programme as a reliable means to ensure the competence of Testing Laboratories (and Certification Bodies) and their full compliance with ISO/IEC 17025. The IAF Delegation suggested that a three-way discussion among the IEC Schemes, IAF, and ILAC occur to address this issue and that the Schemes should provide the IAF Delegation the process they use to assess their member Certification Bodies and Testing Laboratories and a proposal with due rationale.

DECISION:

- a) The TP agreed that a three-way discussion (IEC Schemes/IAF/ILAC) occur to address this issue.**
- b) The IEC Schemes to provide the IAF Delegation the process they use to assess their member Certification Bodies and Testing Laboratories and a proposal with due rationale**



9. TO CONSIDER DRAFTING A COMMON ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR ASSESSMENTS OF CERTIFICATION BODIES

CAB IAF-TP/007/INF

The IAF Delegation mentioned that IAF does not mandate a specific report format and that each Accreditation Body uses a reporting format that meets its individual needs and therefore it would be very difficult to develop a common report format. It was mentioned that constant training is necessary to promote consistency on what to report and how to report it. The TP noted that some ABs are already using/accepting the IECEE Certification Body Assessment Report Form OD-CB 2004.

The TP agreed with the Chairman's suggestion that the best the CAB/IAF TP could achieve is a common report format for the Electrotechnical sector in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of work during Joint Assessments.

The Chairman invited IAF to name some experts to join the IECEE WG responsible for developing Assessment Report Forms and associated Guidelines and Procedures.

DECISION:

- a) The ABs should provide the IEC CA Schemes with the assessment information they need.**
- b) IAF to name some experts to join the IECEE WG responsible for developing Certification Body Assessment Report Forms**
- c) The IAF Delegation will consult with the IAF members to seek their opinion about using a common sectorial form for joint assessments.**



10. TO CONSIDER DRAFTING A COMMON CHECKLIST FOR ASSESSMENTS OF CERTIFICATION BODIES CAB IAF-TP/008/INF

The Chairman explained that the IEC Schemes have two reasons for using a checklist, those being (1) for the laboratory to do a self check before the assessment and (2) for reference of the Lead Assessor so the areas of possible concern can be more closely investigated.

The IAF Delegation reported that ABs do not specify a requirement for mandatory use of a check list although some ABs use similar checklists as a tool for their assessments.

The IAF Delegation recognized that the use of a checklist has merit and in the field of the Joint Assessments suggested that any future agreed “Common Understandings” should be integrated into the checklist.

DECISION:

The TP agreed that any future agreed “Common Understandings” should be integrated into the checklist.

11. ITEMS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS FOR CONSIDERATION AND FURTHER DECISION

11.1 CONSISTENCY OF QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AUDITS BY ISO 9001 CERTIFIERS, ACCREDITED BY IAF MEMBERS CAB/IAF-TP/009/INF

The IECEx Secretary presented information regarding the organization and management of the IECEx Scheme and explained that the IEC Schemes operating type-5 certification systems have quality system requirements with initial pre-certification auditing and on-going surveillance audits as a mandatory requirement of their Schemes.

He explained that IECEx uses the Operational Document, OD 005 in conjunction with ISO 9001 and follows the same Clause numbering of ISO 9001, with the inclusion of additional Management System Requirements, over and above those generic requirements of ISO 9001, that are specific to the manufacturing of Explosion Protected Equipment (Ex Equipment).



He added that since IECEx attempt to take full account of ISO 9001 Certification by Bodies accredited by IAF Members it is of utmost importance that IECEx Certification Bodies (ExCBs) have full confidence in the ISO 9001 Certification Body carrying out the ISO 9001 assessments in a credible and reliable manner as ExCBs pay attention to some very important aspect related to the Explosion Protected Equipment (Ex Equipment) and concluded adding that IECEx auditors have been reporting back findings that fundamental QMS requirements of ISO 9001 are being overlooked which should have been picked up by the relevant ISO 9001 Certification Body carrying out the ISO 9001 assessments.

Under general discussion the CAB/IAF TP noted that there is a widened variety of approaches to ISO 9001 assessments and audits, by ISO 9001 Certification and Registration Bodies and that specific areas such as Ex mean a more robust approach to the Quality management system assessment and audit is necessary. The IECEx Secretary displayed an example of a common problem found during IECEx assessments, relating to traceability of measurements.

The IAF Delegation mentioned that an audit is a sampling exercise and not all aspects can be covered; so, it is likely another auditor looking into other aspects might detect non-conformities that the first auditor did not include in the assessment.

The IAF Delegation also suggested that the IECEx Secretariat could use the “complaint process” (first to the CB and if the answer is not sufficient then to the AB, and if still unsatisfied, to IAF) for issues they see as being serious.

The IAF Delegation commented that the IEC Scheme CBs can be considered a “customer” of accredited certification, and that this feedback from IEC CBs to IAF accredited CBs will be communicated to the members of the IAF Technical Committee.

During further discussions, both delegates representing IECEx and IECQ gave further explanations in support of the concerns raised by the IECEx Secretary.

The IECEx Secretary stressed that the purpose in raising these issues was an attempt to explore collaboration on the issues with the IAF Delegation in full support.

The Chairman suggested that IECEx in particular and the IEC Schemes in General provide IAF with their “particular requirements” that they consider essential requirements during the assessments as well as to organize and invited IAF auditors to attend any of the Schemes’ trainings and workshops. In closing, the IAF Delegation mentioned that there would be no objection to using the TP as the conduit.

DECISION:

a) The issues raised by IECEx is an example of a Scheme specific matter that may be raised directly with IAF, noting that in general the IEC Schemes may provide IAF with their “particular requirements” that they consider “essential requirements” during the assessments.



- b) The IEC Schemes to invite IAF Assessors to attend any of the Schemes' training courses and workshops
- c) The ABs, through the IAF Delegation, to invite IEC Scheme Assessors to attend any of the IAF and/or ABs training courses and workshops

12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Common understanding of ISO/IEC Guide 65, Sub-clause 4.2 f)

Common understanding of ISO/IEC Guide 65, Sub-clause 4.2 f)

The IAF Delegation noted that if the Technical Reviewer at a Certification Body meeting for making certification decisions is in fact only an Advisor related to technical matters, then this should be acceptable since the Reviewer is not involved in making the certification decision. The IAF Delegation also mentioned that IAF has no common opinion on the technical competency of the person or body making the certification decision. So, accordingly, the TP came to a common understanding of this situation.

Making reference to IAF Guidance G.4.25 Clause 4.2.f) of ISO/IEC Guide 65 whereby it is required that each decision on certification is taken by a person(s) different from those who carried out the evaluation. testing and inspection, the Chairman said that in organizations where Certification Bodies and Testing Laboratories are under the same entity and within the same physical location, it is common that the Laboratory's Senior staff acting as e.g. Reviewer of the TEST REPORTS is also part of the Certification Committee as Technical Advisor.

The IAF Delegation noted that if the Reviewer is in fact only an Advisor related to technical matters, then this should be acceptable since the Reviewer is not involved in making the certification decision. The IAF Delegation also mentioned that IAF has no common opinion on the technical competency of the person or body making the certification decision. So, accordingly, the TP came to a common understanding of this situation as well.

DECISION: The CAB/IAF TP agreed that as long as e.g. a Laboratory staff is not involved in making the certification decision, it is acceptable that Certification Body may seek advice from them for the sake of making their Certification Decision.



13. CLOSE OF THE MEETING

The provisional date for the next CAB/IAF TP is Tuesday, February 20, 2007 at the IEC Central Office in Geneva.

The Chairman thanked the USNC/IECEE, UL and HP as the Hosting Organizations for the overall arrangements, the Members and the Observers for their contributions to have professional and focused discussions on the various issues and adjourned the meeting.



Annex 1 – CAB/IAF TP Terms of Reference

The objective of the CAB/IAF Technical Panel is to pursue close cooperation between the IAF and the IEC Conformity Assessment Schemes that caters to the needs of their respective members and stakeholders.

Towards this objective, the CAB/IAF TP will develop and facilitate the implementation of the following elements of collaboration:

- Common understanding of the requirements laid down in ISO/IEC Guide 65 applicable to the Electrotechnical Sector
- Practical utilization of ISO/IEC Guide 65 assessments in the IAF and IEC CA Schemes' programs. This may include, but will not be limited to, the following:
 - Harmonized assessment report form
 - Harmonized checklist
 - Harmonized assessment preparation guidelines
 - Joint assessments of certification bodies (that are participating in the programs of both parties) - on a trial basis
 - Inclusion of the IEC CA Schemes' requirements in IAF assessments
- Use of each other's qualified assessors