



<b>For IEC use only</b>	<b>CAB/653/R</b>
	<b>2007-04-21</b>

**INTERNATIONAL ELECTROTECHNICAL COMMISSION**

<b>CONFORMITY ASSESSMENT BOARD (CAB)</b>
--

<b>Meeting 21, Sydney, 2007-05-31</b>
---------------------------------------

<b>SUBJECT</b>
----------------

<b>Agenda item 9.3.1</b>
--------------------------

Report on the meeting of the CAB/ILAC Technical Panel held in February 2007
---

<b>ACTION</b>
---------------

This is for information.
--------------------------



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

## **CAB/ILAC Technical Panel**

### **SUBJECT**

Report from the CAB/ILAC Technical Panel meeting held in Geneva, Switzerland, 19<sup>th</sup> February 2007

### **BACKGROUND**

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

### **ACTION**

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



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

**Members:**

**Pierre DE RUVO**

**Joe GRYN**

**Chris AGIUS**

**Chris BESTWICK**

**Norbert MÜLLER**

**Shigeo NONAKA**

**IECEE Executive Secretary**

**CSA**

**IECQ and IECEX Secretary**

**UKAS**

**EA**

**JAB**

**Special Observers:**

**Donald MADER**

**Richard PESCATORE**

**Gösta FREDRIKSSON**

**Ron SINCLAIR**

**Stan SALOT**

**Toshiyuki KAJIYA**

**Kozo SAKAMOTO**

**Bill BRYANS**

**Katherine PEARSON**

**UL Inc**

**USNC/IECEE**

**IECEE Chairman**

**Baseefa, UK**

**BQPM**

**Matasushita**

**METI**

**IBM**

**IEC**



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

## **1 APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIRMAN AND THE SECRETARY**

Norbert Müller, in his capacity as acting Chairman, welcomed everyone to the meeting. The CAB/ILAC TP agreed to appoint Mr. Bestwick as Acting Secretary for this meeting.

### **DECISION 01/2007:**

The CAB/ILAC TP agreed to appoint Mr. Bestwick as acting Secretary for this meeting.

## **2 OPENING OF THE MEETING**

The Chairman welcomed members, observers and the special guests of the fifth CAB/ILAC Technical Panel meeting and introductions were made. The Chairman highlighted that significant progress has been made since these cooperation meetings first started. He thanked Mr. de Ruvo for his chairmanship of the Technical Panel in the last year.

Mr. Agius apologized in advance to the meeting that he might have to absence himself for part of the meetings duration; however, Mr. Sinclair and Mr. Salot would be able to cover for him.



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

### **3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

**CAB/ILAC-TP/65/DA - REV**

The CAB/ILAC TP approved the agenda with the addition of the item as listed below in 3.1

#### **3.1 UNCERTAINTY OF MEASUREMENT STATEMENTS ON CALIBRATION CERTIFICATES.**

Mr. Gryn asked for an additional item to be included relating to Uncertainty of Measurement statements on calibration certificates which had resulted in a particular controversial issue in North America. The meeting agreed that this would be discussed under item 7, Joint understanding of ISO/IEC 17025.

#### **DECISION 02/2007:**

The agenda was approved, along with the additional discussion item.

### **4. FOLLOW UP ACTION FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

**CAB/ILAC-TP/61/INF**

The CAB/ILAC TP noted the content of document CAB/ILAC-TP/61/INF and that all actions except the first one had now been completed.

Mr. de Ruvo reconfirmed the willingness of the IECEE to provide ILAC with access to the IECEE assessor database. At the moment there is no official protocol for doing this. It was noted that a procedure might be required for using common assessors. Mr. de Ruvo stated that access to the IECEE assessor database would be by means of providing information, in the form of selected fields, to ILAC rather than providing direct access to the database.

Mr. Agius commented that experience had shown that the relevant Accreditation Body did not always accept the choice of IEC assessors. In general discussion, it was concluded that this might be because the AB's felt the assessors were being imposed on them rather than them having a choice.



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

Mr. de Ruvo stated that to date 45 joint assessments had been carried out with a high degree of satisfaction; however, there were various reasons why joint assessments had not occurred.

The chairman expressed a personal opinion that in Austria, he had always pushed for joint assessments but had found that he always had to make the first contact with IECEE assessors. This gives the impression that the process on starting the planning and preparation of joint assessments should be improved, in particular it should be made clear which party takes the first initiative.

It was agreed that there is a need for ILAC to announce the cooperation and promote it amongst its members e.g. via its web site. It was also noted that within ILAC the information about who is and isn't taking part in joint assessments is not centrally available and indeed official information from AB's was not always available. It was agreed that the IECEE would feed back information on which AB's are and aren't participating in joint assessment to Mr. Müller as ILAC contact.

**DECISION 03/2007:**

ILAC will look at announcing the cooperation and promoting it amongst its members e.g. via its web site.

**DECISION 04/2007:**

The IECEE secretariat would feed back information on which AB's are and aren't participating in joint assessment to Mr. Müller as ILAC contact.

Mr. Agius asked how many assessments were joint assessments as opposed to common assessments. Mr. de Ruvo commented that on average there were currently 82 reassessments due every year. Less than 50% were common assessments and of these less than 30% may actually be classed as joint assessments.



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

Mr. Bestwick emphasized the need for early distribution of the IEC reassessment plan due to long lead times that some AB's have for planning visits, typically a 6 month notification would be advantageous. Mr. Müller undertook to ensure early distribution of the IEC reassessment plan to ILAC members in future. Mr. Bestwick also said that currently ILAC does not receive a reassessment plan for the IECEx laboratories. Mr. Agius intimated that an IECEx plan could be provided to ILAC. He told the meeting that the IECEx and IECQ Schemes also take into account third-party accreditation, the reassessment cycle for IECEx Testing Laboratories is every five years if they hold an acceptable accreditation; however, if a IECEx Testing Laboratory does not hold an acceptable accreditation, it is subjected to yearly reassessments.

Mr. de Ruvo asked the CAB/ILAC TP to note that the IECEE Management committee had adopted a resolution to undergo joint assessments and that this resolution had achieved 98% acceptance.

Mr. de Ruvo also asked the CAB/ILAC TP to note that the IECEE had kept to its commitment to supply the reassessment plan to ILAC in August each year. It was also noted that only five of the IECEE CB Testing Laboratories do not hold an accreditation and these are subject to annual reassessment visits.

The Chairman outlined the difference between Assessors and Technical Experts to the CAB/ILAC TP and it was noted that whilst the IEC have a pool of assessors, ILAC does not a "single pool" of assessors and there is no formal agreement for one AB to recognize another AB's assessors.

The Chairman also outlined that if ILAC takes a decision then all its members must implement this decision; however, generally the decisions were a minimum requirement and members could improve on these if necessary. As ILAC is organized in a different way to the IECEE, the decision making process in ILAC is more complicated and naturally takes longer.

**DECISION 05/2007:**

IEC will provide ILAC members with access to its assessor database by means of providing a list of names, expertise area and contact details. However this action would need to be formally cleared with the relevant IECEE and IECEx management groups before being implemented. Mr. de Ruvo and Mr. Agius agreed to take this forward to the relevant management groups.



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

The ILAC delegation welcomed this decision. Accreditation bodies would be invited to use the IEC assessors however it was noted that they would have to make their own arrangements with the assessors directly. Whilst in principal this only applies for the joint reassessments there is no reason why AB's could not use them for their own surveillance visits. It was felt working with IEC assessors in the team might well improve cooperation.

There was a discussion about the role the EA is likely to play in future with the EU Commission and also about the situation with respect to world trade and the chairman briefed the participants on the actual situation.

Mr. Fredriksson mentioned that to avoid duplication it would be best to concentrate on using IEC assessors on a global basis and that he thought it would be difficult to make use of ILAC assessors because of the possible liabilities involved particularly because the IEC schemes rely on mutual acceptance of testing results. Mr. de Ruvo reminded the CAB/ILAC TP that in 2004 it had agreed to use a common pool of assessors. Mr. Bestwick highlighted the issue of cost for ILAC members in flying in IEC assessors from abroad, as opposed to using its own assessors that usually come from its own country. Therefore the use of ILAC assessors by the IEC should also be explored and encouraged. Mr. Müller agreed that the system must be open in both directions and it must be made clear to AB's that there is a need for specific training in relation to the IEC schemes.

Mr. Müller also stated that AB's are themselves assessed by Peer Evaluation and this could be considered to be at the level above accepting test reports. ILAC and IAF generally work in the voluntary sector and the acceptance of the Accreditation Bodies mark is down to the individual customer in the same way that the individual IEC CB marks are or are not accepted in a particular country as the case may be. It was noted that ILAC might need to put forward appropriate assessors to the IEC and Mr. Müller commented that if specific training was needed then this should not be a problem as the need for training for specific schemes is already recognized within ILAC.

In summary it was agreed that in accordance with the above decision the IEC will make available information on its pool of assessors and invite the ILAC members to use them for technical assessments. This will not influence for the moment the process of setting up teams for the joint assessment process.

Mr. Sinclair asked for clarification of the scope of the joint cooperation agreement and whether or not it included IECEX. Mr. Salot asked if it also included the IECQ. Mr. Agius confirmed that the agreement included both IECEE and IECEX. Mr. Müller confirmed that there was nothing stopping the IECQ coming to the table but notification of this should be given in advance.





**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

*(Secretary's note the signed ILAC – IEC MOU includes the IECEE, IECEx, IECQ and 32 Accreditation Bodies).*

Mr. Agius confirmed that the IECEx carries out reviews of AB's websites, etc. to find relevant information about the accreditation of its members but there is a commitment by the IEC Schemes to accept accreditation.

Mr. Agius also asked the CAB/ILAC TP to note items 13.2 and 13.3 from the 2005 agenda. With regard to item 13.2, this is important to the IECEx because of the reassessment program. He highlighted that it continues to be a problem with some accreditation bodies that either incomplete (i.e. the information on the scope is not detailed enough as standards may not be mentioned or no information about accredited organizations is available on their websites. He indicated to the meeting that the IECEx is still pursuing this matter with individual AB's but it is difficult to make progress. He asked if the ILAC delegation could take this back to the ILAC community to ensure that this information is made available for stakeholders, users and customers such as the IECEx. Mr. Müller said this was not easy to do as there is no obligation for an AB to have detailed information on its website however the information should be available directly from the AB or from the testing Laboratory. He asked Mr. Agius to bring any cases of where this was not available to his attention.

With regard to item 13.3., this continues to be something of an issue. Mr. Müller confirmed that much of the intrinsic safety assessment strictly speaking was an inspection issue but to insist on an inspection accreditation may put an unnecessary burden on an organization. Mr. Agius commented it is a problem with many standards. It was agreed that item should be tabled for discussion at the IEC- IAF meeting scheduled for the following day. Mr. Agius stated that intrinsic safety assessment took into account assessing a) what components provide the intrinsic safety, b) their ratings and ensuring they operate within prescribed ratings and c) compliance with performance curves given in the specifications. He asked if IECEx members could have confidence in the accreditation covering these areas, as some testing laboratories seemed to focus only on the ability to carry out the actual tests. Mr. Müller replied that they could have confidence in the accreditation and if the laboratory did not have the ability to carryout the intrinsic safety assessment then it must be listed as exclusion on the scope for that laboratory. If any deficiencies are found they should be brought to the attention of the relevant AB. Mr. Müller also agreed that if any deficiencies were found by the IECEx and not resolved they should be passed to him and he would bring them to the attention of the ILAC **Accreditation Issues Committee (AIC)**.



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

**DECISION 06/2007:**

Mr. Agius was asked to bring any instances of where these cases cannot be resolved with the local AB to the attention of Mr. Müller for passing to the ILAC AIC.

**4.1**

**PROGRESS REPORT ON JOINT ASSESSMENTS**

**CAB/ILAC-TP/63/INF**

The CAB/ILAC TP reviewed the progress on joint assessments being carried out by ILAC in cooperation with the IECEE. It was noted that so far there are currently 7 joint reassessments scheduled for 2007.

**5. TO REVIEW THE RESULTS OF THE APPRECIATION QUESTIONNAIRE FROM THE TESTING LABORATORIES ON JOINT ASSESSMENTS**

**CAB/ILAC-TP/64/INF\_REV1**

The CAB/ILAC TP noted the content of document CAB/ILAC-TP/64/INF\_REV1. In summary Mr. de Ruvo stated that overall the feedback was very positive and that the feedback was not regarded as being confidential. Mr. Müller agreed to inform SAS about the general feedback and to submit it to the full ILAC community.

**DECISION 07/2007:**

Mr. Müller to bring the feedback received to date to the attention of the full ILAC community.

It was noted that it is not possible for AB assessors to access information on the IECEE web site possibly because he had several passwords for different areas of the website. In general information can be received by an AB only via the NCB. Mr. de Ruvo commented that he was not aware of information being passed from accreditation bodies to IEC assessors. It was accepted that there is a need to share basic information such as scopes of accreditation. Mr. Müller suggested that there might be a need for a procedure on using the IEC web site in the joint assessment guidelines document.



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

**DECISION 08/2007:**

Any instances where the scope of accreditation is not available are to be brought to the attention of Mr. Müller for referring to the ILAC AIC.

To improve and support the provision of all the necessary information, Mr. Gryn suggested that the development of common forms might aid the information flow but it was noted that in many cases the AB's working documentation would be in its local language. This is not the same for the IEC Schemes where English is the chosen working language. Mr. Agius commented that the IECEx always places the responsibility for translation on the assessed organizations and this would also address any confidentiality issues.

**DECISION 09/2007:**

It was agreed that the table on page 9 of document CAB/ILAC-TP/64/INF\_REV1 would be presented by Mr. Müller to ILAC AIC.

## **6. TO REVIEW THE RESULTS OF THE APPRECIATION QUESTIONNAIRE FROM THE AUDITORS ON JOINT ASSESSMENTS**

**CAB/ILAC-TP/65/INF\_REV1**

The CAB/ILAC TP reviewed the results of the Appreciation Questionnaires completed by IEC auditors who had recently participated in joint Assessments. The consensus of the meeting was that more work was needed in the preparation stage of joint visits. Mr. Gryn suggested that it might be possible to hold a joint assessment workshop for assessors. Mr. Müller asked if it could be done on a regional basis and it was generally agreed that some time would be needed for preparing such a workshop.

Mr. Mader suggested that there was a need to redraft the joint assessment guidelines document, possibly by including a flow chart for the process. Mr. Müller commented that he would prefer to see the document improved rather than replaced, because it is in the moment in the final phase for adoption in ILAC and a bigger change would need a new commenting phase.

In summary, the CAB/ILAC TP agreed that the results of the questionnaire show that the joint assessments should continue and that they provide added value although there are areas for improvement as mentioned in the responses. The meeting felt that the title of the proposed workshop should be



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

positive and reflect on the progress made. A possible title was suggested “Workshop on Progress of Cooperation of ILAC – IEC and the Possibilities of Improving Joint Assessments”.

The CAB/ILAC TP agreed that the workshop should focus on the benefits of having joint assessments and possible topics were suggested which included:

Outcome on Feedback  
IEC Schemes – How does accreditation fit in with the IEC Schemes  
Improvements

**DECISION 10/2007:**

It was agreed that the idea for holding a Joint Workshop would be floated to the relevant ILAC and IEC management committees by Mr. Müller and Mr. de Ruvo respectively, with a view to holding the workshop in the first half of 2008.

The CAB/ILAC TP also reviewed the results of the Appreciation Questionnaires completed by ILAC auditors who had recently participated in joint Assessments. It was noted that the main issues raised concerned communications between the ILAC and IEC teams prior to the visits. Mr. Mader commented that we do not want to put the assessed organizations in a position of acting as a go between for the two parties. It was agreed that communication issues should be fed back to the IEC Secretariat who will attempt to facilitate. Mr. Müller stated that although he didn't have the same level of support available to him as the IEC Secretariat does, if any difficulties are made known to him, he will seek to offer his support and pass the problems to the ILAC Secretariat for help.

In summary Mr. Müller stated that the IEC reassessment plan would be distributed to ILAC members as soon as it was received from the IEC and that the intent to take part must be received from the laboratory in question.

It was agreed that outside of the meeting, Mr. de Ruvo would draft a half page document on the proposed workshop and what we want to achieve; and, accordingly this document would be appended to these minutes. It was also agreed that the workshop could, in addition be discussed at the CAB / IAF TP meeting the next day.



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

Mr. De Ruvo asked the CAB/ILAC TP whether it felt that the CAB /ILAC and CAB /IAF meetings still need to be separate events. Mr. Müller replied that he thought that they should continue as separate events at least for next year. It was generally agreed that the experience gained in working with ILAC would be useful to the IAF discussions. Mr. Bryans suggested that future events could overlap and include some time for discussion of common topics.

**DECISION 10/2007:**

Communication issues should be fed back to the IEC Secretariat who will attempt to facilitate. Mr. Müller will offer his support and pass any problems to the ILAC Secretariat for help.

**DECISION 11/2007:**

Mr. de Ruvo will draft a half page document on the proposed workshop and what we want to achieve; and, this document would be appended to these minutes. (*Secretary's note – Please see Annex 1*).

## **7. ILAC MEMBER COMMENTS ON THE CAB/ILAC DOCUMENTS**

### **7.1**

#### **JOINT UNDERSTANDING OF ISO/IEC 17025**

**CAB/ILAC-TP/66/INF**

The CAB/ILAC TP reviewed the comments received from ILAC members and noted that most of the comments were editorial. It was also agreed that the document should be rearranged so that the clauses were in chronological order. Mr. Gryn and Mr. de Ruvo agreed to undertake the work of editing the document outside of the meeting and to prepare a new draft for circulation to the CAB/ILAC TP.

**DECISION 12/2007:**

Mr. Gryn and Mr. de Ruvo to undertake the work of editing the "Common Understanding of ISO/IEC 17025" document and to prepare a new draft for circulation to the CAB/ILAC TP.



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

Mr. Gryn introduced the additional agenda item concerning Uncertainty of Measurement statements on calibration certificates. In particular Mr. Gryn reported that some ILAC members in North America were not including Uncertainty of Measurement values on calibration certificates. Mr. Müller and Mr. Bestwick confirmed that the calibration certificates should comply with Sub-clause 5.10.4.1 b) of ISO/IEC 17025. Mr. Gryn was asked to provide a short written statement on the situation so that Mr. Müller could bring the situation to the attention of the ILAC AIC. Should the matter persist then it could be tabled for inclusion in the "Common understanding of ISO/IEC 17025" in the future

**DECISION 13/2007:**

Mr. Gryn to provide a short written statement on calibration certificates without uncertainty of measurement statements for passing to Mr. Müller so that he can bring the situation to the attention of the ILAC AIC.

**7.2 PLANNING OF JOINT ASSESSMENTS**

**CAB/ILAC-TP/68/INF**

The tabled document was found to unfortunately contain only the names of those people that had commented on the document, not the actual comments of those people. In the absence of the comments, Mr. Müller gave an overview of the comments received. Mr. Müller agreed to send the missing comments to the IEC secretariat (*Secretary's note – already done, please see Annex 2*) and in conjunction with Mr. de Ruvo would try to give a comment on the comments. These would then be circulated to the CAB/ILAC TP for review. Mr. Müller asked that comments should be submitted to him in time for him to circulate them to the AIC Secretariat for inclusion on the agenda of the ILAC AIC meeting to be held on 9 – 10<sup>th</sup> May 2007.

**DECISION 14/2007:**

Mr. Müller to send the missing comments to the IEC secretariat for review in conjunction with Mr. de Ruvo. These are to be circulated to the CAB/ILAC TP for review and replies to go to Mr. Müller by the end of April 2007. (*Secretary's note – Please see Annex 2*).



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

## **8. FEEDBACK FROM THE IEC ASSESSOR TRAINING ON THE USE OF ISO/IEC 17025.**

**AAG/ 697/INF**

Mr. de Ruvo presented the results of the feedback to the CAB/ILAC TP noting that the satisfaction level was extremely high and that no negative comments had been received (this also included comments that had been made by the ILAC delegates). Mr. de Ruvo also reported that the next IEC Lead Assessor course was scheduled for 2008 and again ILAC delegates would be invited to attend. The possibility of combining this in conjunction with the workshop (See Agenda Item 6.) was discussed but it was concluded that this would depend upon the agreed objectives.

## **9. USE OF ISO/IEC 17020 IN THE IECEE SYSTEM**

**CAB/ILAC-TP/70/INF  
CAB/ILAC-TP/75/INF**

Mr. Nonaka presented his document to the CAB/ILAC TP which was received with interest.

Mr. Agius asked whether this was really within the scope of the CAB/ILAC TP's current scope of activity. He confirmed that the IEC is involved in these areas of activity although it is usually considered under the IECQ scheme, which would come under the IAF. Historically within the IEC scheme, and going back to the days of ISO/IEC Guide 25, the inspection of components has been dealt with within the IECQ Scheme. He also remarked that the majority of specifications in the IECQ scheme are industry standards rather than standard specifications.

Mr. Müller confirmed there is a joint ILAC Working Group with the IAF looking at Inspection activities. Mr. de Ruvo also commented that this issue was on the agenda for discussion during the CAB/IAF TP meeting the next day and the topic had also been passed to the IEC Working Group 2 "Business Development" for future discussion at their 2007-03-05 & 06 in Frankfurt.

Mr. Gryn commented that generally the IEC Schemes involve evaluating products to IEC standards and that the use of ISO/IEC 17020 in the initial evaluation of products had not occurred to date. Where ISO/IEC 17020 is used tends to be in the regulatory area rather than the product standard area.





**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

**Decision 15/2007:**

The use of ISO/IEC 17020 in the IEC system to be left for discussion at the IEC/IAF TP meeting scheduled for 2007-02-20.

**10. TO DEVELOP A COMMON ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR TESTING LABORATORIES OPERATING IN THE ELECTROTECHNICAL SECTOR**  
**CAB/ILAC-TP/71/INF**

Mr. Müller reported that within ILAC there is no common method of reporting and at the moment it would not be possible to mandate the use of any report format should we agree on one.

Mr. de Ruvo asked if it would be possible to make recommendations either for using the current IEC format or after the development of a common format. Mr. Müller responded that obviously it couldn't be made for general use because of the variety of the ILAC scope of testing which was very different to those of just the IEC sectors. Additionally there may be some problems encountered where AB's would want the report in their own native language. Mr. Bryans noted that it was permitted to convert the IEC report format into another language.

Mr. Bestwick commented that it may be possible to append the report to an AB's own title page as he had done so with regard to the joint visits completed by himself last year. He also told the meeting that if an improvement was made then this should be the way nonconformities are reported. This was supported by Mr. Nonaka who said a separate nonconformity report should be used.

The ILAC delegation was requested to ask if the IEC report format could be used as a tool for preparing assessment reports and it was stated that any comments to improve a joint report format would be welcomed with a view to putting them forward for subsequent endorsement.

Mr. Müller agreed to circulate the IEC report template to the ILAC AIC for consideration. In summary the following documents were to be presented to the ILAC AIC: - a) the minutes of this meeting, b) the feedback on joint assessments, c) the revised "common understanding" document and d) the IECCE report template.





**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

**Decision 16/2007:**

Mr. Müller to circulate the following documents to the ILAC AIC: - a) the minutes of this meeting, b) the feedback on joint assessments, c) the revised “common understanding” document and d) the IECEE assessment report template.

**11. TO DEVELOP A COMMON CHECKLIST BASED ON ISO/IEC 17025:2005**

**CAB/ILAC-TP/72/INF**

Mr. Bestwick informed the meeting that the use of a checklist was not mandatory within ILAC requirements although some AB's may insist upon the use of one. It was noted that the use of the checklist for the IEC schemes is mandatory and that it may be recorded as a nonconformity if the assessed organization has not filled in the checklist prior to the assessment.

The CAB/ILAC TP was asked to note that the checklist is available and to promote the idea that requiring a second one from an AB is not necessary, however Mr. Gryn also said that the assessed organization should be aware of what documentation it is being asked to complete in preparation for assessment and if it had already filled in a checklist for the AB then there was no reason to expect the IEC checklist to be filled in as well. In summary it was agreed that if checklists or guidance documents are available then these will be used by either party in an attempt to avoid duplication of effort, although it was noted that again there could be some language problems.

Mr. Müller concluded that the document on joint assessments was a core documents and needs to be further developed to cover these aspects.

**12. ADDITIONAL ITEMS**

**12.1 RETENTION OF TECHNICAL RECORDS**

**CAB/ILAC-TP/73/INF**

This item was introduced to the CAB/ILAC TP by Mr. Gryn, the main question being what constitutes “original observations, derived data and sufficient information to establish an audit trail” as required by ISO/IEC 17025:2005 Sub-clause 4.13.2.1? Mr. Gryn asked if some guidance could be prepared for the “Common Understanding” document.



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

In general discussion it was confirmed that

- a) There should be sufficient data recorded for an audit trail as per Sub-clause 4.13.2.1
- b) Original data could be regarded as a measurement or the result of a go/no-go gauging test.
- c) Derived data could be regarded as “original observations” for example as that produced from a calculation involving two separate inputs.
- d) A result given as e.g. >XXmm might be ok but this would depend upon how the measurement was made.

Mr. Müller agreed that CAB/ILAC should record such interpretations for future reference and possibly issue them as a list of decisions or FAQ. Mr. Gryn commented that it would not be possible to give a decision on every possible case. And those items could be recorded at the CAB/ILAC TP meeting with a view to updating the “Common Understanding” document once per year.

Mr. de Ruvo commented that 3 years ago the Joint Working group had been set up to discuss technical issues, then it was decided to move this work back into the CAB/ILAC TP, however there is still a need for a forum to discuss technical issues. Mr. Müller concurred with this but apologized that ILAC could not necessarily be expected to provide a bigger technical representation due to the financial issues involved with providing technical experts not employed by the AB. Mr. de Ruvo said he was disappointed to see that the CAB/ILAC cooperation is still not featured on the ILAC website and it was agreed that this should be pushed within ILAC.

Mr. Müller stated that if in future it was found that an AB had a different approach on a matter, then the CAB/ILAC TP could give guidance notes in the meetings minutes. Mr. Gryn suggested that a holding document could be created and that once in a while these could be included into the “Common Understanding” document. In summary the CAB/ILAC TP agreed that a decision list can be created that records relevant decisions and this should be a joint CAB/ILAC document of “interim decisions.” The meeting agreed the title of the document should be “CAB/ILAC current decisions”.

**Decision 17/2007:**

Interpretations agreed during the CAB/ILAC TP meeting to be recorded and published as a list of decisions.

**Decision 18/2007:**



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

Mr. Müller to contact the ILAC Secretariat with a view to publicizing the CAB/ILAC cooperation on the ILAC web site.

**Decision 19/2007:**

CAB/ILAC should record required interpretations for future reference and guidance. The decision list would be in the form of a separate document entitled “CAB/ILAC Current Decisions”.

**12.2 TECHNICAL RECORDS AND THOSE ANALYSES NEEDED AS “QUALITY CONTROL DATA” IN CLAUSE 5.9.2 OF ISO/IEC 17025:2005 CAB/ILAC-TP/74/INF**

Mr. Nonaka introduced this item to the CAB/ILAC TP and presented a short PowerPoint® presentation to the meeting which was received with interest. Mr. de Ruvo thanked Mr. Nonaka for making the presentation and suggested that it should be presented to the IECEE CTL meeting for discussion. Mr. Gryn, as CTL Chairman, confirmed this invitation and said that it should be discussed at a technical level and if necessary progressed upwards and that in general the Quality Control Data required needed to be looked at in terms of need and added value.

**Decision 20/2007:**

Mr. Nonaka to be invited to make his presentation to the next IEC CTL meeting.

**13. INSPECTION ACTIVITIES IN ELECTRICAL SAFETY TESTING FIELD**

**CAB/ILAC-TP/75/INF**

Previously covered under item 9 of the CAB/ILAC meeting.



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

## **14. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

### **14.1 DATE AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

Mr. Sinclair offered to hold the next meeting at his organizations offices in Buxton, Derbyshire, United Kingdom at about the same time next year. The exact dates could be confirmed in a day or 2 as it was wished to organize the meeting adjacent to the next Hazex meeting so that IECEx delegates could attend both events.

*Secretary's note subsequent to the meeting the following correspondence has been received:-*

*The organisers have confirmed the dates for 2008 as being 27 and 28 Feb 2008. Therefore Mr Sinclair has confirmed that he would offer to host the meetings for Monday 25 and Tuesday 26 Feb 2008*

*CAB-ILAC TP => 25 February 2008 in BUXTON - UK*

*CAB-IAF TP => 26 February 2008 in BUXTON - UK*

## **15. CLOSE OF THE MEETING**

Mr. Müller closed the meeting and thanked Mr. Bestwick for taking the minutes.



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

## **Annex 1 to CAB/ILAC TP Minutes 2007-02-19**

### **Objectives of a Joint ILAC/IEC Schemes' Workshop**

1. To inform the participants about the IEC Schemes (IECEE, IECEX and IECQ) and about ILAC.
2. To report on the progress made to date by the CAB/ILAC TP (in particular issues related to joint assessments).
3. To present the process to optimize the scheduling of and preparation for Joint Assessments (prior to the on-site assessment) e.g. between the IECEE and IECEX Schemes' Lead Assessors and the ILAC Lead Assessor(s) to have an efficient and successful on-site joint assessment (at both the lead level and the technical level).
4. To inform the participants about issues associated with joint assessments and how to achieve better cooperation based on the joint assessments already carried out.

To inform the participants about the ILAC Guidance Document, its applicability to the IEC Schemes and the Common Understandings



CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM

2007-02-19

## Annex 2 to CAB/ILAC TP Minutes 2007-02-19

ILAC-AIC Template for comments – ILAC-AIC (06) 021 Joint Assessment Guidelines DAM-IECEE					Date: 3 November 2006	Document: ILAC-AIC(06)055 re Document ID ILAC-AIC(06)021
1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Part, Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex/Figure/ Table (e.g. 3.1, Table 2)	Paragraph/ List item/ Note (e.g. Note 2)	Type of com- ment 2	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
EGAC	3.2		ge	An example of such a confidentiality agreement form is attached in Annex A.	We found no such attachment!	
EGAC	3.4	The table	ed	The table had the number 4 in the common areas	Did you mean a (check mark)?	
EGAC	4.4	Last statement	ed	Care does need to be taken though to ensure that elements of either report that do not relate to common aspects of the testing scope <b>are not be</b> included in the other party's considerations or reports.	We think it should be:  Care does need to be taken though to ensure that elements of either report that do not relate to common aspects of the testing scope <b>are not being</b> included in the other party's considerations or reports.	
JAB	3.2 and 5	2 <sup>nd</sup> line of paragraph 2, and 1 <sup>st</sup> line of	te	In general, AB uses the wording "nonconformity" in place of "non-conformance".	This will be partially important where there may be a need for both parties to exchange information on past assessment history	



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

ILAC-AIC Template for comments – ILAC-AIC (06) 021 Joint Assessment Guidelines DAM-IECEE					Date: <b>3 November 2006</b>	Document: <b>ILAC-AIC(06)055</b> re Document ID <b>ILAC-AIC(06)021</b>
1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Part, Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex/Figure/ Table (e.g. 3.1, Table 2)	Paragraph/ List item/ Note (e.g. Note 2)	Type of com- ment 2	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
		paragraph 1			including <u>nonconformities</u> and corrective actions.  The closing out of <u>nonconformities</u> common to both parties should, if possible, be a coordinated activity.	
<b>JAB</b>	3.2	3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph	ed	A “confidentiality agreement form” is not attached in this document.	<b>Attach Annex B</b>	
<b>JAB</b>	3.3	1st sentence of paragraph 1	ed	There is not a blank between “Annex” and “B”.	A sample task allocation may be found in Annex B.	
<b>JAB</b>	3.3	2nd sentence of paragraph 1	ed	A comma before “but” should be deleted.	This particular example is designed around a full reassessment where there are overlapping but non-identical scopes and assumes that the AB lead assessor will focus on the section four requirements of 17025 while the IEC lead assessor will primarily focus on the IEC Scheme specific requirements.	
<b>JAB</b>	3.3	2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence of iv)	ed	A comma should be added before “which”.	Some of these may be of a type, which are within the capabilities of the technical assessors but others may require additional expertise.	



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

ILAC-AIC Template for comments – ILAC-AIC (06) 021 Joint Assessment Guidelines DAM-IECEE					Date: <b>3 November 2006</b>	Document: <b>ILAC-AIC(06)055</b> re Document ID <b>ILAC-AIC(06)021</b>
1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
<b>MB<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Part, Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex/Figure/ Table</b> (e.g. 3.1, Table 2)	<b>Paragraph/ List item/ Note</b> (e.g. Note 2)	<b>Type of com- ment 2</b>	<b>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</b>	<b>Proposed change by the MB</b>	<b>Secretariat observations on each comment submitted</b>
<b>JAB</b>	3.3	3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence of iv)	ed	There are a couple of blanks between “may” and “best”.	Such expertise may best be sourced from the AB.	
<b>JAB</b>	Page 10 of 12		ed	The word of “Annex A” is missing.	Add the word “Annex A”. to the title of Annex A.	
<b>UKAS</b>	3.1	1	Ge	Additional contact would be useful at an early stage to see if any common assessor resources can be utilised. This should be before any other team member are appointed.	The appointed AB and IEC Lead Assessors should make contact before any further team members are appointed	
<b>UKAS</b>	3.4	Table	ED	A minor typographical comment is that the ticks in the table of 3.4 have become the number “4” instead	Replace “4”s with ‘Yes’ or ‘no’	
<b>FINAS</b>	3.4	Table in the end of 3.4	te	The table summarises the documentation that might be collated prior to an assessment and issued to the assessment teams (IEC Scheme- and Accreditation Body assessment teams). Documentation concerning claims of capability and information on subcontracted test are also essential information for accreditation process not only for IEC Scheme assessment team.	Items (Documentation concerning the claims of capability and information on subcontracted tests) should be added to provide also to AB.	





**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

ILAC-AIC Template for comments – ILAC-AIC (06) 021 Joint Assessment Guidelines DAM-IECEE					Date: <b>3 November 2006</b>	Document: <b>ILAC-AIC(06)055</b> re Document ID <b>ILAC-AIC(06)021</b>
1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
<b>MB<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Part, Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex/Figure/ Table</b> (e.g. 3.1, Table 2)	<b>Paragraph/ List item/ Note</b> (e.g. Note 2)	<b>Type of com- ment 2</b>	<b>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</b>	<b>Proposed change by the MB</b>	<b>Secretariat observations on each comment submitted</b>
<b>FINAS</b>	Annex B	Task allocation for AB Scope greater than IEC Scope	te	A sample task allocation is found in Annex B. Items to be handled in the Initial meeting: Recent developments should be assessed as an evidence of continuous improvement by AB. Therefore AB role should be more than observer.	In the Annex B, items to be handled in the Initial meeting, the task of AB Lead assessor and technical assessor should be changed from observer to “Yes”.	
<b>FINAS</b>	Annex B	Task allocation for AB Scope greater than IEC Scope	te	A sample task allocation is found in Annex B. Items to be handled in the assessment of the Quality management system: Improvement should be also assessed by AB.	In the Annex B, items to be handled in the assessment of the Quality management system, the task of AB Lead assessor should be added to “Yes”.	
<b>HKAS</b>	3.2	Paragraph 3	ed	Annex A (example of confidentiality agreement form) is not included in this draft (27 Jan 2006)	To include Annex A for review	
<b>HKAS</b>	3.4	Table summarising documents collated prior to an assessment	te	The laboratory’s evaluation of measurement uncertainty has to be assessed prior to an assessment.	To include appropriate copies, e.g. 4 as shown in the table, of evaluation of measurement uncertainty for the tests assessed under the column of “Accreditation Body”	



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

ILAC-AIC Template for comments – ILAC-AIC (06) 021 Joint Assessment Guidelines DAM-IECEE					Date: <b>3 November 2006</b>	Document: <b>ILAC-AIC(06)055</b> re Document ID <b>ILAC-AIC(06)021</b>
1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Part, Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex/Figure/ Table (e.g. 3.1, Table 2)	Paragraph/ List item/ Note (e.g. Note 2)	Type of com- ment 2	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
HKAS	Annex B	“Quality Management System” Section	ge	Old terminologies which have been changed in ISO/IEC 17025 are shown	To change “quality system” to “management system” (Clause 4.2) and “client” to “customer” (Clause 4.7)	
HKAS	Annex B	“Quality Management System” Section	ge	Responsibility for “Improvement (Clause 4.10)” must be evaluated.	To include this item under the column of “AB Lead Assessor” and “IEC Lead Assessor” as appropriate	
HKAS	Annex B	“Technical Requirements” Section	ge	“Acceptance of components” under Clause 5.4 must be assessed by the AB	To change the entry for this item under “AB Technical Assessor” from “Optional” to “Yes”	
HAA	all		ge	No comments. All agree.		



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

ILAC-AIC Template for comments – ILAC-AIC (06) 021 Joint Assessment Guidelines DAM-IECEE					Date: <b>3 November 2006</b>	Document: <b>ILAC-AIC(06)055</b> re Document ID <b>ILAC-AIC(06)021</b>
1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Part, Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex/Figure/ Table (e.g. 3.1, Table 2)	Paragraph/ List item/ Note (e.g. Note 2)	Type of com- ment 2	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
DANAK				<p><b>From: Vagn Andersen</b> Manager of International Affairs</p> <p>DANAK has no specific comments to the draft document "Common understanding" nor for the "Guidelines for .....".</p> <p>However, if and when the documents are published in the ILAC G-series, ILAC has to make it very clear that the documents are being applied only when assessments of laboratories under the IECEE CB scheme are performed.</p> <p>I am not aware if the "common understanding" in the "Common understanding" document are used by AB in all situations, and if the interpretation will be used by ABs during all assessments, any reference to the IECEE CB scheme should be avoided.</p> <p>To conclude, ILAC has to be careful when the wording of the Foreword or the Introduction is completed.</p>		not relevant for a document on joint assessments



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

<b>ILAC-AIC Template for comments – ILAC-AIC (06) 021 Joint Assessment Guidelines DAM-IECEE</b>					Date: <b>3 November 2006</b>	Document: <b>ILAC-AIC(06)055</b> re Document ID <b>ILAC-AIC(06)021</b>
1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
<b>MB<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Part, Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex/Figure/ Table</b> (e.g. 3.1, Table 2)	<b>Paragraph/ List item/ Note</b> (e.g. Note 2)	<b>Type of com- ment 2</b>	<b>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</b>	<b>Proposed change by the MB</b>	<b>Secretariat observations on each comment submitted</b>
<b>NAT</b>				<b>From: Dr Rozsa Ring</b> Director  NAT has already performed one joint assessment with IECEE and based on this experience we do not have any comments to the document. Congratulations to the authors!		



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

## **Annex 3 to CAB/ILAC TP Minutes 2007-02-19**

### **Summary of Decisions made**

**DECISION 01/2007:**

The CAB/ILAC TP agreed to appoint Mr. Bestwick as acting Secretary for this meeting.

**DECISION 02/2007:**

The agenda was approved, along with the additional discussion item.

**DECISION 03/2007:**

ILAC will look at announcing the cooperation and promoting it amongst its members e.g. via its web site.

**DECISION 04/2007:**

The IECEE secretariat would feed back information on which AB's are and aren't participating in joint assessment to Mr. Müller as ILAC contact.

**DECISION 05/2007:**

IEC will provide ILAC members with access to its assessor database by means of providing a list of names, expertise area and contact details. However this action would need to be formally cleared with the relevant IECEE and IECEx management groups before being implemented. Mr. de Ruvo and Mr. Agius agreed to take this forward to the relevant management groups.

**DECISION 06/2007:**

Mr. Agius was asked to bring any instances of where these cases cannot be resolved with the local AB to the attention of Mr. Müller for passing to the ILAC AIC.



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

**DECISION 07/2007:**

Mr. Müller to bring the feedback received to date to the attention of the full ILAC community.

**DECISION 08/2007:**

Any instances where the scope of accreditation is not available are to be brought to the attention of Mr. Müller for referring to the ILAC AIC.

**DECISION 09/2007:**

It was agreed that the table on page 9 of document CAB/ILAC-TP/64/INF\_REV1 would be presented by Mr. Müller to ILAC AIC.

**DECISION 10/2007:**

It was agreed that the idea for holding a Joint Workshop would be floated to the relevant ILAC and IEC management committees by Mr. Müller and Mr. de Ruvo respectively, with a view to holding the workshop in the first half of 2008.

**DECISION 11/2007:**

Mr. de Ruvo will draft a half page document on the proposed workshop and what we want to achieve; and, this document would be appended to these minutes. (*Secretary's note – Please see Annex 1*).

**DECISION 12/2007:**

Mr. Gryn and Mr. de Ruvo to undertake the work of editing the "Common Understanding of ISO/IEC 17025" document and to prepare a new draft for circulation to the CAB/ILAC TP.

**DECISION 13/2007:**

Mr. Gryn to provide a short written statement on calibration certificates without uncertainty of measurement statements for passing to Mr. Müller so that he can bring the situation to the attention of the ILAC AIC.



**CAB/ILAC-TP/076/RM**

**2007-02-19**

**DECISION 14/2007:**

Mr. Müller to send the missing comments to the IEC secretariat for review in conjunction with Mr. de Ruvo. These are to be circulated to the CAB/ILAC TP for review and replies to go to Mr. Müller by the end of April 2007. *(Secretary's note – Please see Annex 2).*

**Decision 15/2007:**

The use of ISO/IEC 17020 in the IEC system to be left for discussion at the IEC/IAF TP meeting scheduled for 2007-02-20.

**Decision 16/2007:**

Mr. Müller to circulate the following documents to the ILAC AIC: - a) the minutes of this meeting, b) the feedback on joint assessments, c) the revised “common understanding” document and d) the IECEE assessment report template.

**Decision 17/2007:**

Interpretations agreed during the CAB/ILAC TP meeting to be recorded and published as a list of decisions.

**Decision 18/2007:**

Mr. Müller to contact the ILAC Secretariat with a view to publicizing the CAB/ILAC cooperation on the ILAC web site.

**Decision 19/2007:**

CAB/ILAC should record required interpretations for future reference and guidance. The decision list would be in the form of a separate document entitled “CAB/ILAC Current Decisions”.

**Decision 20/2007:**

Mr. Nonaka to be invited to make his presentation to the next IEC CTL meeting.