



STEERING COMMITTEE IEC-ILAC-IAF

Item for discussion

SUBJECT:

Feedback from the trial experience over the one-stop Reassessment model IEC-(CAB)-ILAC-IAF

BACKGROUND:**CAB Report, October 2009**

Mr de Ruvo made a presentation on the results of the meeting held the previous week with the IAF and ILAC officers. On the model for joint re-assessments, the French member asked who would ensure adherence to the Systems' rules if the reassessment team leader was an accreditor and paid attention only to ISO/IEC 17025; the answer was that the other member(s) of the team who were technical and were appointed by the IEC Systems would have this function. The German, French, UK, Swedish, Japanese and Australian members were strongly in support of the proposed model and also of Mr de Ruvo's appointment as Chairman of the Steering Committee, and regarded it as a huge step forward.

Decision 26/18 — Cooperation with ILAC and IAF

The CAB unanimously approves the following items, proposed by Mr de Ruvo as a result of the IEC-CAB/IAF/ILAC meeting held on 2009-10-14 (presentation to be distributed as doc. CAB/863/INF):

- the "new model" for re-assessments (surveillance);
- the "new model of collaboration" involving a single tripartite IECCAB/ILAC/IAF Steering Committee as an extension of the already agreed CAB/IAF Strategy Committee (ref.: Decision 25/18);
- the appointment of Mr de Ruvo (already elected as Leader of the IEC-CAB delegation to the CAB/IAF Strategy Committee) as Chairman of the Steering Committee for three years; and
- the principle of a single, tripartite Memorandum of Understanding among the IEC, ILAC and IAF, with the final text to be developed and approved subsequently.

NOTE - It was later confirmed that the IAF and ILAC Joint General Assemblies had simultaneously approved resolutions corresponding to this CAB decision.

ACTION: The Steering Committee to review the feedback received and determine further actions.

Trial Joint “one stop Re-assessments”

Assessed Organization	NCB	Assessment	Current scope	Lead Assessor	Assessor 1	Assessor 2
NCB LCIE	LCIE	Re-assessment	BATT CABL CONT EMC HOUS HSTS INST LITE MEAS MED OFF POW PROT PV SAFE TOOL TOYS TRON	E. Lillo (COFRAC)	C. Lana (SGS CEBEC)	
CBTL LCIE	LCIE	Re-assessment	CABL CONT EMC HOUS INST LITE MEAS MED OFF POW PROT SAFE TOOL TRON	A. Batel (COFRAC)	Bernt Orderud (Nemko)	
ACTL LCIE SUD EST	LCIE	Re-assessment	EMC MEAS MED OFF	A. Batel (COFRAC)	Bernt Orderud (Nemko)	
NCB OVE	OVE	Re-assessment	CABL CONT EMC HOUS INST LITE MEAS MED OFF POW PROT SAFE TRON	Norbert Mueller (BMWFJ)	Vladimir Filiac (EZU)	M. Hingott (TUV SUD PS)
CBTL OPFZ	OVE	Re-assessment	INST POW PROT	Norbert Mueller (BMWFJ)	Vladimir Filiac (EZU)	M. Hingott (TUV SUD PS)
CBTL TGM-VAEE	OVE	Re-assessment & Scope Extension	CABL CONT EMC HOUS NST LITE OFF POW PROT SAFE TRON	Norbert Mueller (BMWFJ)	Vladimir Filiac (EZU)	W. Kreinberg (TUV SUD PS)
CBTL TUV Osterreich	OVE	Re-assessment	EMC MED OFF TRON	Norbert Mueller (BMWFJ)	Vladimir Filiac (EZU)	W. Kreinberg (TUV SUD PS)
SATL Intertek Milton Keynes	Intertek Testing & Certification Ltd	Initial Assessment	HOUS OFF MEAS TRON	Chris Bestwick (UKAS)	J. Engels (TUV Rh Germany)	B. Pecavar (SIQ)

FEEDBACK

Feedback from Calogero Lana - Registered IECEE LA and TA-SGS BELGIUM

NCB LCIE	LCIE	Re-assessment	BATT CABL CONT EMC HOUS HSTS INST LITE MEAS MED OFF POW PROT PV SAFE TOOL TOYS TRON	E. Lillo (COFRAC)	C. Lana (SGS CEBEC)
-------------	------	---------------	--	----------------------	------------------------

The common assessment with COFRAC, proceeded in a very open and cooperative way. I would certainly recommend this kind of assessment. However, only one day was a bit short for such a large scope, half-a-day additional would have been perfect, but I have managed to do my best.

We have taken the position not to duplicate the NCRs, so the NCRs have been edited in the COFRAC format (see fiches écarts in attachment).

Overall I believe the visit worked out very well although the reporting of the NCRs should be clarified for the future common assessments.

Feedback from Chris BESTWICK – Registered UKAS LA – UK

SATL Intertek Milton Keynes	Intertek Testing & Certification Ltd	Initial Assessment	HOUS OFF MEAS TRON	Chris Bestwick (UKAS)	J. Engels (TUV Rh Germany)	B. Pecavar (SIQ)
-----------------------------------	--	-----------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------

1) The assessors each produced their own "Improvement Action Report" which is equivalent of the NCR. There are a number of reasons for this, including that we expect the Findings/NCR's to be written up as the visit proceeds so that the lab is clear about what has been raised, and secondly we expect the individual assessors to review and clear the evidence that the lab later send in to clear the NCR. Working this way also reduces the amount of time required to prepare the report in the private meeting. I believe this approach would also be better for larger teams where there are some assessors covering aspects outside of the IEC scope. We also expect labs to supply corrective action evidence for review 1 - 3 months after the visit.

I also note the UKAS form is a lot more compact than the current IEC NCR form, which has benefits for document size and electronic transmission. I realise this is different from the normal IEC practice but would put this forward for consideration as a possible future change.

2) I have started the report with the UKAS front sheet (and second page) and then included the IECEE report in its entirety as page 3 onwards. Under the new concept I think other accreditation bodies would want to do this and trust that is acceptable. (This would also be made easier if the IEC report did not have its page border - can this be removed).

3) In this case there was a slightly different conclusion and therefore a recommendation on accreditation (we don't require a minimum number of reports to be completed prior to accreditation) had to be given that was slightly different from the IEC recommendation. This may often be the case if the IEC and AB scopes are not identical and again is a reason for having a different first/second page for the AB.

Overall I believe the visit worked out very well and would thank Bojan and Josef once again for their help and I look forward to working with them again on future collaborations.

Feedback from Vladimir Filiac - Registered IECEE LA and TA – EZU – Czech Republic.

CBTL TGM-VAEE	OVE	Re- assessment & Scope Extension	CABL CONT EMC HOUS NST LITE OFF POW PROT SAFE TRON	N. Mueller (BMWFJ)	V. Filiac (EZU)	W. Kreinberg (TUV SUD PS)
CBTL TUV Osterreich	OVE	Re- assessment	EMC MED OFF TRON	N. Mueller (BMWFJ)	V. Filiac (EZU)	W. Kreinberg (TUV SUD PS)

I would like to take this opportunity and share with you my personal opinion concerning the CBTL joint assessment we had in OVE in July. The joint assessment was a good experience and I really do recommend to follow the procedure. Nevertheless, there are some things that could be improved, according to my perception.

Now I will be talking about the tasks distribution and management during the assessment. The only thing that was clear before the assessment was that the AB representative was the lead assessor.

The further distribution of tasks was set up before the assessment itself and it looked as follows:

1. The AB representative took care mainly about the 17025 part of the management system.
2. Wolfgang as a technical assessor was responsible for the major part of technical assessment, part of the IECEE management system, and files.
3. And I as a technical assessor gladly took on board reporting, part of technical assessment and a part of the IECEE management system as well.

It is a good practice the assessment team completes and sign its report in the end of the last assessment day. The completion of such a report needs to have competences to manage the assessed organization to submit and carry out everything that is needed. That is why I believe the lead assessor should be the person responsible for the IECEE report.

The proposal is supported by the fact that:

- the 17025 management system part of the assessment report is just a part of the clause 4.1 of the IECEE report,
- the IECEE report contains most of items that are out of the standard accreditation,
- the report contains small addendum covering famous European deltas that are out of the accreditation as well.

My proposal is not based neither on the formal position during the assessment nor on anything like assessment fees we discuss before the assessment.

My proposal is based on my experience with the assessment management.

As I realize the rules cannot be changed during the trial experience I would like to assure you I will continue the following assessment planned for September under the same arrangement like I did in July.

CBTL OFPZ	OVE	Re-assessment	INST POW PROT	N. Mueller (BMWFJ)	V. Filiac (EZU)	M. Hingott (TUV SUD PS)
-----------	-----	---------------	---------------	--------------------	-----------------	-------------------------

I would like to continue my reporting concerning the joint assessment in CBTL OFPT Arsenal and NCB OVE in Austria.

The distribution of responsibilities in the NCB was as follows:

- AB Lead auditor - accreditation body: Management system relevant to EN 45011
- Technical auditor - M. Hingott: Files review and CTL and OSM(E.U.) decisions
- Technical auditor - V. Filiac: IECEE and ECS management system and reporting

I must say my personal perception concerning the management the assessment in NCB is the same as it was in the cases of CBTLs assessments.

Feedback from Wolfgang Kreinberg - Registered IECEE LA and TA-TUV SUD-GERMANY:

CBTL TGM-VAEE	OVE	Re-assessment & Scope Extension	CABL CONT EMC HOUS NST LITE OFF POW PROT SAFE TRON	N. Mueller (BMWFJ)	V. Filiac (EZU)	W. Kreinberg (TUV SUD PS)
CBTL TUV Osterreich	OVE	Re-assessment	EMC MED OFF TRON	N. Mueller (BMWFJ)	V. Filiac (EZU)	W. Kreinberg (TUV SUD PS)

I agree with Vladimir that it needs more preparation to have these assessments. We were lucky because Norbert was involved in many common activities like Lead Assessor Training etc.

Though the OD CB 2004 / 2005 is well known for the IECEE lead assessors, we need to glue together findings and comments by the Lead Assessor (-> Accreditation Body) and the technical assessors from IECEE. This will need common formats for easy cut and paste.

Some ISO / IEC 17025 bullet points in clause 4.1 have special CB features which have to be covered by the Lead Assessor as well or – see above – have a common format for cut and paste.

The task allocations shall clearly cover as well the attachments for

- Measurement uncertainty
- Power supply
- Impartiality

For this particular assessment at ÖVE we were lucky because Norbert was involved in many common activities, so we were able to compile and finish on time.

Feedback from Alain Batel –Registered COFRAC Lead Assessor - FRANCE:

CBTL LCIE	LCIE	Re-assessment	CABL CONT EMC HOUS INST LITE MEAS MED OFF POW PROT SAFE TOOL TRON	A. Batel (COFRAC)	B. Orderud (Nemko)
--------------	------	---------------	---	----------------------	-----------------------

It was indeed an interesting experience of assessment, especially with two different practices of evaluation. The drafting of the report was not easy, for Cofrac we try to have detailed an enough text whereas your report is more synthetic.

But overall the assessment occurred very well. The technical experts were very well qualified and the laboratory took part very actively.

I hope that this one stop assessment will be useful for the two organizations.

Feedback from Bernt Orderud – Registered IECEE LA and TA – NEMKO - NORWAY

CBTL LCIE	LCIE	Re-assessment	CABL CONT EMC HOUS INST LITE MEAS MED OFF POW PROT SAFE TOOL TRON	A. Batel (COFRAC)	B. Orderud (Nemko)
--------------	------	---------------	---	----------------------	-----------------------

Cooperation:

The technical cooperation with the assessors from COFRAC functioned well. The understanding of the work and experience was at a high level. There was no language problem as English was the main language during the assessment.

As there are additional requirements for the CB scheme, not normally used by ILAC organizations, those additional requirements were not well known by the COFRAC assessors, and was to be taken care of by the IECEE assessor only.

Assessment:

The scope of the assessment was different between COFRAC and the IECEE. The COFRAC scope to be part of the assessment was greater than the IECEE. The COFRAC scope was covered by the lead assessor and 2 technical assessors, the IECEE scope was covered only by one technical assessor. The COFRAC assessment is annually and the IECEE assessment is only every third year.

Reporting:

The IECEE assessor had to concentrate on both technical assessment and to fulfil the complete IECEE and ESC delta assessment reports. That means the technical assessment part of the IECEE scope was limited. In addition the IECEE assessor had to fill in the COFRAC report for the IECEE assessors part of the common COFRAC and IECEE scope, which means some double work.

Challenges for the cooperation IECEE and ILAC:

- To deal with (sometime) a different scope during the assessment, in which case there should be a balanced number of Technical Assessors from each organization.
- To have common accepted assessment reports, or at least there should not be necessary for the IECEE assessor to fill in same information into two reports.

Generally my opinion is that this cooperation should continue and be improved and developed further for the future.