

## **APPROVED Minutes of the 36<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the EA Advisory Board**

held on 29 April 2016

at the EFTA Secretariat, 12-16 Rue Joseph II, B-1000 Brussels

### Participants:

**EAAB Chair:** Michael Nitsche (NA, Germany)

**EAAB Vice-Chairs:** Martin Stadler (BUSINESSEUROPE).

**CAB College:** Pierre de Ruvo (EEPCA), Peter Blinksbjerg (EUROLAB), Roger Brockway (IFIA), Manuela Held (IIOC).

**Industry College:** Jörg Ed. Hartge (ORGALIME, BDI).

**NA College:** Maureen Maria Logghe (NA, Belgium), Ola Brohman (NA, Sweden), Devran Ayik (NA, Turkey).

**NMIs:** Janko Drnovšek (EURAMET), Anneke Van Spronssen (WELMEC).

**EA:** Geir Samuelsen (EA Vice-Chair), Andreas Steinhorst (EA Executive Secretary), Peter Strömback (SWEDAC), Frédérique Laudinet (EAAB Secretariat).

Apologies received from:

- Christian Priller (CEOC International)
- Andrew Evans (GAMBICA)
- Lars Bo Hammer (ORGALIME)
- Domagoj Validžić (NA, Croatia)
- Stephen Russell (ANEC)
- Pambos Kammas (CEN/CENELEC)
- Zacharias Bilalis (EC)
- Margrethe ASSERSON (EFTA)
- Thomas Facklam (EA Chair)

## **1. Opening of the meeting**

The Chair opened the meeting, thanking EFTA for hosting it. He welcomed the delegates, informing them that Peter Strömback from SWEDAC, the Swedish national accreditation body (NAB), would make a presentation of the *EA Strategy 2025* project during a specific session under Agenda Item 3.2.

## **2. Approval of agenda; Approval of Minutes of 35<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the EA Advisory Board; Action list (actions not covered elsewhere)**

### **▪ Approval of agenda**

The agenda was approved by the Board with no amendment.

### **▪ Approval of last minutes**

The Chair gave the floor to D. Ayik who had sent some comments on the draft minutes of the last meeting, asking some clarification about the statement reported from N. Bönner on Page 11 regarding the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) protocol negotiated between the EU and Canada and the reported obligation for Turkey to recognize CABs recognized in Canada in accordance with the BCA.

D. Ayik mentioned that according to Article 7 of the Decision No. 1/2006 of the EC-Turkey Association Council, agreements on conformity assessment concluded by either party with a third party shall not result in an obligation upon the other party to accept the results of conformity assessment procedures carried out in that third country. Therefore, D. Ayik objected the statement reported from N. Bönner that imposes a one way duty for Turkey to recognize Canadian CABs and asked for the removal of the sentence from the minutes.

The Board agreed with D. Ayik that the statement could be misleading and asked the EAAB Secretariat to remove it from the minutes.

**Action Secretariat**

### Conclusion

The minutes of 35<sup>th</sup> meeting were approved with this deletion and should be published on the EAAB intranet.

**Action Secretariat**

### ▪ Action List

No comment was voiced on the action list.

## 3. Key topic for discussion

### 3.1 Review of role of EAAB and interaction with EA (updated draft of EAAB document *Role of the EAAB and Interaction with EA*)

The Chair recalled that the previous document should partly be rewritten to reflect better its purpose as a kind of management review and, for this purpose, each EAAB College should provide the EAAB Secretariat with written comments and proposals for improvement in a tracked-change version. He went through the consolidated version and called for last oral comments before it could be approved at this meeting.

The Board's members discussed some points to be still improved, quickly agreeing upon, them.

Further to comments made by P. de Ruvo, R. Brockway and J. Drnovšek on "*smaller countries*" mentioned in a written comment (not aimed at being printed) on Page 5, it was reminded that the issue of resources in small ABs had been considered by the Board several times in past meetings: all ABs should have equivalent competences. It was suggested to stress the point under Agenda Item 3.2 when discussing the *EA Strategy 2025* project.

### Decision

The Board:

- agreed upon the following final comments made at the meeting:
  - ⇒ **Composition of the Board**, 2<sup>nd</sup> §: delete "*market surveillance*"
  - ⇒ **Management of the Board**: add "*meetings*" at the end of the title
  - ⇒ **Management of the Board meetings**, 2<sup>nd</sup> §: reformulate the sentence into: "*It is an EA responsibility to ensure that the appropriate strategic issues are tabled. It is the EAAB Chair's responsibility to ensure that the necessary time for discussion is allocated..*"
  - ⇒ **Management of the Board meetings**, 4<sup>th</sup> §, last bullet point: delete last sentence beginning with "*Nevertheless the RoP...*".
- asked the Secretariat to modify the document accordingly, to clean it and to publish it on the EAAB internet page.

**Action EAAB Secretariat**

### 3.2 Project on *EA Strategy 2025*

The Chair introduced Peter Strömback who took the floor to make a thorough presentation of the *EA Strategy 2025* project, of which he was the manager. In light of a working document dated 8 April 2016, published as EAAB(16)05, P. Strömback outlined the project's structure and responsibilities, its purpose and objectives, as well as the requested/proposed outcome expected to be achieved by autumn 2016 when it would be submitted to the EA General Assembly for approval.

A preliminary SWOT analysis, based on a large EA survey involving stakeholders, led to identifying ten main related and dependent areas as the basis for important and critical routing points for the development of EA towards 2025: Regulation (EC) 765/2008; Cooperation – Harmonisation; Internal Work – Organisation; Competence; Peer-evaluation; Stakeholders; International; New Areas – Development; Marketing and Communication; and Funding.

P. Strömback called for input from the Board.

J. Drnovšek opened the debate, wondering about the great number of issues and timespan covered by the project: is it not too ambitious and too long since drastic changes may occur during 10 years? He reported that EURAMET was focussing its strategy on 2020, and it may be better for EA to align itself with other structures. He asked whether the Strategy should allow for important changes to come. J. Drnovšek also confirmed that the project was very well structured, and that the EAAB should play a strong role in its elaboration. EURAMET is very eager to contribute to the project, whose long timespan however does not easily allow for concrete steps and actions.

P. de Ruvo asked EA whether the SWOT analysis had taken account of stakeholders' input given in the EA survey.

P. Strömback confirmed it had, while A. Steinhorst reminded that the EA survey conducted in January 2016 had been distributed, in addition to all EA members, to EAAB members, EA Recognized Stakeholders not participating in the EAAB and relevant DGs of the EC.

M. Stadler mentioned that regulators were stakeholders to be, as such, directly involved amongst stakeholders. But the most important point for him is to improve the relationship and interaction between EA committees and the whole of stakeholders. He confirmed that this was an ongoing process which had already been improved and would need further consideration.

For M. M. Logghe, the project as progressed so far was a good starting point and had a lot of potential. She agreed that Regulation (EC) 765/2008 should be revised with regard to market surveillance. She thought however that the project should not be limited to the focus of ABs as stakeholders; target groups should be broadened, for instance to DG GROW and more specifically the member states authorities. In general terms, she called for more transparency.

A. Steinhorst replied that DG GROW had been requested to take part in the EA survey. It was clearly asserted that EA was trying and involving all stakeholders as much as possible.

For R. Brockway, there was a need for EA to centralize and consolidate the European accreditation network based on Regulation (EC) 765/2008. As direct customers of accreditation, CABs want to identify more clearly *one* place for accreditation in Europe, and to have the Regulation revised in that way. EA should be responsible for this network.

M. M. Logghe confirmed that multinational CBs owning different branches have to address local NABs, so different NABs, which is a real concern for CBs. This issue could be further considered during a necessary revision of Regulation (EC) 765/2008. R. Brockway insisted how the situation of CABs having to resorting to different legal entities in several countries was absurd.

M. Held shared the same view: EA should be trusted to harmonise national accreditations for foreign branches.

A. Steinhorst replied that there were good reasons, why foreign CABs should be assessed by their local NABs. The local NABs are aware of the national market, national legislations, complaints and problems in specific fields. However a lot of discussions had already been taking place to improve

things, as demonstrated by the EA cross-frontier policy. The key issue is the cooperation between NABs.

R. Brockway complained that the EA cross-frontier policy was not that perfect, however, and was “not quite right”.

J. Drnovšek agreed that legislation has to adapt to reality - and not the contrary. Which structure, if not EA, can instigate changes to make things better? He said that EA should be more proactive, arguing that EURAMET was keen to increase its cooperation with EA, both at the EA LC and strategic levels, to this end. J. Drnovšek requested that the EAAB's input in the *EA Strategy 2025* project should be increased at a more horizontal level and in a more direct/active and flexible way.

G. Samuelsen assured that he was more and more convinced of the EAAB's interest in the project's discussions. But he reminded the Board that the process had already implied all stakeholders, including EAAB members. Besides he warned: the outcome of revising Regulation (EC) 765/2008 is not predictable, and EA shall *not* be proactive for its revision.

M. Nitsche noted that discussions were very much linked to Agenda Item 4.6 on “*Consistency and harmonisation among ABs*”, which shows how relevant the issue and need are. He also noticed that the EAAB was missing in the description of EA's basic structure on Page 5 of EAAB(16)05, and asked the project team to add the Board into the list. For M. Nitsche, one of the core issues to face is the development of a structure for internal and external training for assessors, like an “EA Academy”, to meet training needs with a longer view to build better consistency and harmonisation of assessments of NABs in Europe.

P. de Ruvo asked for confirmation that the SWOT analysis had enabled to demonstrate that EA does want to influence ILAC/IAF, and to reveal opportunities and tracks for the EA model to influence the ILAC/IAF one.

P. Strömback replied that this issue is very similar to the one on the revision of the Regulation. EA cannot impose its model. There are conflicting elements between a wish for national or European consolidation and a wish for international influence and unification.

P. de Ruvo recognised that a SWOT analysis always led to different elements that need to be balanced.

G. Samuelsen summarized that EA should take the most accomplished and relevant parts of the European model to enhance its influence at the international level. He also confirmed the importance of EA remaining relevant for its members and stakeholders.

## Decision

The Board:

- thanked Peter Strömback from SWEDAC for his presentation of the *EA Strategy 2025* project, to be published on the EAAB intranet by the Secretariat (done);
- agreed that the project as progressed so far is an excellent starting point for the next stages of the work. There was consensus within the Board that EA should be as proactive as possible to further consolidate the European accreditation network based on Regulation (EC) 765/2008 in order to improve consistency and harmonisation at the European level;
- asked EA to actively involve the EAAB in the further development of the Strategy, notably to ensure that the Board can send written comments on the current, next and final drafts of the Strategy. **Action EA**

## 4. EAAB matters

### 4.1 Reports from the EAAB HHC and MAC observers

#### ▪ HHC meeting on 12-13 April 2016

In the absence of A. Evans, the EAAB HHC observer, the Chair informed that his report had been published on the EAAB intranet among the meeting papers.

M. Stadler briefly summarized the report prepared by A. Evans. He said that the Industry College was very interested in the clarification of the consequences of NAB's closing down.

No comment was made by the CAB College.

#### ▪ MAC meeting on 20-21 April 2016

The Chair gave the floor to M. M. Logghe, the EAAB MAC observer, who reported orally on the last EA MAC meeting, informing that she would send a written report later on for distribution by the EAAB Secretariat.

M. M. Logghe enumerated the highlights of the meeting, which had been her first MAC meeting:

- This was the first meeting chaired by Paulo Tavares from IPAC together with his vice-chair, Daniela Ionescu from RENAR. Cecilie Laake from NA was elected as a new member of the EA MAC Management Group.
- The EA MAC also welcomed NAH, the new Hungarian NAB, which attended the meeting for the first time; NAH applied for peer-evaluation.
- The EA MAC considered that there was no clear evidence that the effectiveness of the EA MLA could be monitored by the so-called **highlighted ILCs** (EA-1/06, clause 5(i)), and agreed that those highlighted ILCs shall not be considered under the framework of the peer-evaluation process. EA-1/06 should be revised accordingly.

Further to a question by R. Brockway, A. Steinhorst confirmed that a policy for ILC peer-evaluation had been discussed both in the EA LC and MAC, and it had been concluded in the MAC that there was no need for highlighting ILCs for EA MLA purposes.

M. Stadler asked what had become of the "key indicators" specifically used for peer-evaluation. A. Steinhorst replied that the templates for key indicators, as part of the PE report, had been removed some years ago.

M. M. Logghe added that EA-2/02 should be sent out for ballot within EA in May.

- The management of transition of standards is monitored by the EA Secretariat through surveys aimed at checking that the transition processes in NABs are on a good track.
- UKAS made a presentation considering the covering of **Proficiency Testing (PT) accreditation** (ISO/IEC 17043) by the EA MLA. The EA MAC made a recommendation for the launching of the EA MLA for ISO/IEC 17043 to be approved at the EA General Assembly in May.
- Finally, a workshop on **how to re-engineer the peer-evaluation process** took place.

The Chair called for comments on the oral report.

M. Stadler asked for details about the possible needs for improvement of peer-evaluation process. M. M. Logghe answered that these had to be discussed with National Authorities and the NA College first. But she pointed out that all efforts should be combined.

G. Samuelsen replied that EA was quite aware of the need for improving the peer-evaluation process, which was included in the agenda of the upcoming year and the *EA Strategy 2025* project.

J. Drnovšek recalled the discussions about the need for developing a pool of assessors. The core problem is a financial one: resorting to experts would create costs, and the better experts are, the higher the cost is. This is a sensitive issue which should be considered at the EA LC as well.

R. Brockway remembered quite well those discussions about replacing peer-evaluators by professional experts, whether they are external or internal. He insisted that things have now to move and be progressed.

Referring to ETICS' experience with peer-assessor database, P. de Ruvo asserted that setting up a professional peer-evaluation program, both independent and efficient, is a budgetary issue and needs investment.

A. Steinhorst reaffirmed that current discussions about boosting the peer-evaluation team were going on.

### Conclusion

The Board:

- thanked A. Evans for his detailed written report on the EA HHC meeting held on 12-13 April 2016, and took note of the various issues addressed in it;
- thanked M. M. Logghe for her comprehensive oral report on the EA MAC meeting held on 20-21 April 2016, noting that she will send a written report for circulation to the Board after the meeting.

**Actions M. M. Logghe, then EAAB Secretariat**

## 4.2 Report on the joint EURAMET - EA LC meeting regarding closer future cooperation and coordination

The Chair gave the floor to J. Drnovšek who reported on the last EURAMET - EA LC meeting held on 18 March 2016, emphasizing that most often, the problem is not having competence, but how to demonstrate it.

J. Drnovšek also highlighted how fruitful the cooperation between EURAMET and EA proved to be. Both organisations are satisfied with it and are wishing to have more frequent joint meetings in future.

J. Drnovšek also recalled that technical guides on calibration were no longer managed by EA for about ten years. Technical activities have thus been transferred from EA to EURAMET. He asked whether the situation was still relevant and fine for EA.

Finally J. Drnovšek pointed out that the current revision of ISO/IEC 17025 introduced a distinction between the requirements for testing and calibration.

G. Samuelsen agreed upon the useful cooperation between EA and EURAMET to the great satisfaction of EA.

### Conclusion

The Board thanked J. Drnovšek for presenting the draft minutes of the EURAMET – EA LC meeting held on 18 March 2016, and for demonstrating the mutual benefits of the cooperation between EURAMET and EA, which should be further intensified.

### 4.3 Application of Regulation (EC) 765/2008 presumption of conformity – Validity of a certificate after the conditions as defined in Regulation (EC) 765/2008 are not met anymore (i.e. the CB is no longer accredited, the CB does not exist anymore, the AB is no longer signatory to the EA MLA or the AB does not exist anymore)

A. Steinhorst reported that, further to the Hungarian situation with the closing of NAT, the EA Executive Committee had considered the issue of validity of certificates when a NAB does not exist anymore; it had been agreed to put forward the issue of termination of NABs and withdrawal of MLA signatory status to the EA HHC.

Further to a few comments, A. Steinhorst reiterated that, at the end, the final decision about the recognition of certificates has to be made by the authorities.

#### Decision

The Board:

- thanked EA for having given EAAB members background information on how to deal with National Authorities' acceptance of certificates that might no longer be valid, and the consequences for the EA MLA;
- asked EA to seek ways to ensure that, in such cases, CABs were informed as soon as possible.

### 4.4 Transition to new ISO 9001 and ISO 14001

Further to M. Held's and M. Stadler's comments, pointing out that this topic was another example of lack of harmonisation between ABs, A. Steinhorst reminded that EA had already dealt with the issue of inconsistency of transitions and stressed the need for a harmonized approach. But the decision about the transition to the new ISO 9001 and ISO 14001 was taken by IAF.

It was however advocated that EA takes the opportunity of the *EA Strategy 2025* project to investigate how to adopt a more coordinated approach between EA NABs in broader terms.

#### Decision

The Board:

- recognized that EA had responded to the Board' concerns over inconsistency of the procedure of transition and the need for a harmonized approach within EA and globally;
- asked EA, in future, to give early consideration to similar matters coming up in IAF with a view to build up a more coordinated approach between EA NABs, as well as between EA and the international level, to avoid any recurrence.

### 4.5 EAAB Work Programme

The Chair called for comments on the updated EAAB WP.

M. M. Logghe drew the Board's attention on the so-called topic "*Resources and competences of NABs in areas with a limited number of CABs*", which was a reformulation of the topic "Lack of resources in small NABs".

The Chair pointed out that this topic should be considered by the whole EAAB, and not only by the NA College as wrongly indicated on the WP.

Finally, G. Samuelsen advocated removing out the topic from the WP since it was an ongoing issue.

**Decision**

The Board agreed to remove from the WP the item indicated on Page 1 regarding “*Resources and competences of NABs in areas with a limited number of CABs*”.

**Action EAAB Secretariat**

**4.6 Consistency and harmonisation among ABs**

Because of the reiteration of discussions on this issue, P. de Ruvo suggested that the CAB College will concretely demonstrate the actual need for consistency and harmonisation between ABs in a paper to be discussed at the Board’s next meeting.

**Decision**

The Board agreed that the CAB College should draft a paper showing the actual need for consistency and harmonisation between NABs, to be shared and discussed as a key topic at the next EAAB meeting.

**Action CAB College for October 2016 meeting**

**5. EA matters****5.1 Relations with stakeholders**

There was no comment on the draft Recognised Stakeholder agreements to be signed by IFIA and ETICS at the EA General Assembly in May 2016.

**Decision**

The Board took note that:

- IFIA had applied for the EA Recognised Stakeholder status; and
- ETICS’ Recognised Stakeholder agreement was being updated from EEPKA’s one.

**5.2 New EA projects and work items**

There was no comment on the four new work items proposed by EA, all of which were approved.

**Decision**

The Board endorsed the proposed new work items for revision of:

- EA-1/17 Supplement 3 - *EA Procedure for the Investigation and Resolution of Complaints and Appeals*;
- EA-1/17 Supplement 5 - *Levying of Membership Fees*;
- EA-2/17: *EA Document on Accreditation for Notification Purposes*;
- EA-3/01: *EA Conditions for the use of accreditation symbols, text reference to accreditation and reference to EA MLA signatory status*.

**5.3 Revisions of ISO/IEC 17011 and ISO/IEC 17025**

A. Steinhorst reported that there had been a huge number of comments received on ISO/IEC 17011 CD2. Still about 1400 comments should be dealt with at the next (5<sup>th</sup>) ISO CASCO WG 42 meeting at the end of May 2016. The standard is expected to be published in August 2017.

The most important issues are about:

- definition of accreditation;



- management system requirements;
- provision of proficiency testing by ABs;
- conflict of interest (impartiality);
- accreditation cycle – maximum duration of 5 years, maximum duration between on-site audits of 2 years;
- accreditation decisions, clause 7.8;
- scopes of accreditation, clause 7.3.

There was no comment from the Board, which thanked A. Steinhorst for his update.

#### **5.4 Update on latest developments in Hungary further to cessation of NAT's activities end of 2015: Application from NAH**

A. Steinhorst reported that NAH had sent its application for EA Full Membership. After an administrative check by the EA Secretariat, the application was thoroughly reviewed by the EA MAC Management Group (MG), which unanimously considered that NAH's application to EA membership met all the applicable requirements and recommended that NAH was accepted as an EA Full Member. In light of the MAC MG's recommendation, the EA Executive Committee decided to accept NAH's application. According to the mandate given by the EA General Assembly in November 2015, EA Full Members were requested to endorse the decision made by the EA Executive Committee through an electronic ballot. The ballot's outcome was positive, and EA was pleased to welcome NAH as an EA Full Member with effect from 1 April 2016.

A. Steinhorst added that NAH had also applied for the EA MLA signatory status. Based on the recommendation of the EA Secretariat, the MAC MG accepted the application and the peer-evaluation of NAH will be conducted according to EA-2/02.

There was no comment from the Board, which thanked A. Steinhorst for his update.

#### **5.5 Use of highlighted ILCs for the purpose of appraising the functioning of the EA MLA**

The issue was already considered during M. M. Logghe's report on the last EA MAC meeting under Agenda Item 4.1.

#### **5.6 Certificates issued to European CABs by non-European ABs**

A. Steinhorst reported that EA-INF/04: *Statement on acceptance and recognition of activities under the EA MLA* had been reviewed in light of IAF's dissatisfied comments and updated in order to more adequately promote the recognition and acceptance of accredited services provided by other EA MLA signatories and accredited CABs. Since then, further comments have been made. A. Steinhorst added that, because of its political nature, this information document, which should normally be only endorsed by the Executive Committee, should be approved at the next EA General Assembly.

#### **5.7 Credibility of accreditation – How to deal with specific crises?**

Referring to the "Volkswagen" recent case in Germany or the "breast implants" scandal in France, A. Steinhorst explained that the point was to investigate how to deal with such crises without undermining the confidence in the whole accreditation system. It was discussed to elaborate a document at ILAC/IAF level to describe the expected reaction of CABs and ABs (in the cases where the standard does not) and the role of Regions and ILAC/IAF. It should be clear in this document that ABs shall react when crisis is at the national level, Regions shall react only if crisis is at the regional level and ILAC/IAF only if it affects confidence at the global level.

G. Samuelsen added that EA-1/17 Supplement 3 - *EA Procedure for the Investigation and Resolution of Complaints and Appeals* should also be revised in that sense, entitling EA to lodge a complaint in such cases.

The Board thanked EA for the information.

## 6. Items for information

### 6.1 Information to the EAAB

- **Revision of the EA Articles of Association: progress**
- **Update on the “Accreditation for Notification” project**
- **Guidance on the choice between ISO/IEC 17021 and 17065 as the standard used for accreditation for a specific scheme or scope**
- **EA-ERA cooperation project: accreditation scheme for Inter-Operability Directive (IOD)**
- **State of play of EA Directive Networks (DNs)**
- **ABs from countries of the EA Neighbourhood policy: update**
- **CETA – Protocol about mutual acceptance of the results of conformity assessment update**
- **Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP)**

Due to lack of remaining time, A. Steinhorst said only a few words on:

- Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP);
- CETA – Protocol about mutual acceptance of the results of conformity assessment: the bilateral agreement should be signed in June;
- Guidance on the choice between ISO/IEC 17021 and 17065 as the standard used for accreditation for a specific scheme or scope: A. Steinhorst explained that the guidance, which should be elaborated on by a TFG of the EA CC, will specify which harmonized standard (17021 or 17065) shall be used for which purposes.

### Decision

The Board thanked EA for the oral reports provided under this item and agreed to reconsider the bullet points under this item to the next EAAB meeting if they are still relevant.

**Action EAAB Secretariat for agenda planning**

### 6.2 Report on complaints and appeals

G. Samuelsen made an oral report focussing on:

- the long-lasting complaint lodged against DAkkS: a German laboratory located in Spain, ENAC reopened the complaint, while DAkkS remained reluctant to provide documents. The EA Executive Committee asked the EA MAC to peer-evaluate DAkkS for the cross-frontier policy as an extraordinary peer-evaluation.
- the appeal from DAkkS to a MAC decision from October 2015 on its MLA status: according to the procedure, EA-1/17 Supplement 3 - *EA Procedure for the Investigation and Resolution of Complaints and Appeals*, the EA MAC has reconsidered and confirmed its decision. The procedure is now at Stage 2, which means that an Appeal Review Panel (ARP) has been appointed to review the appeal.

The Board thanked G. Samuelsen for his oral report.

### 6.3 Accreditation at the international level

- **IAF Database project on Management System certificates**

A. Steinhorst mentioned the distributed paper identifying the principles to be achieved with an IAF Database of Accredited MS Certifications.

- **IAF/ILAC mid-year Frankfurt meetings (agendas and crucial issues, if any)**

A. Steinhorst reported that IAF discussed whether they should get rid of sub-scopes in their MLA or not. These discussions might demonstrate the influence that EA can have at the international level, at least to stir up routes for reflexion.

The Board thanked EA for the oral and written report provided under this item.

### 6.4 Draft Agenda of the 37<sup>th</sup> EA General Assembly on 25-26 May 2016 in Windsor, UK

There was no comment from the Board.

## 7. Any other business

No other issue was discussed.

## 8. Selection of dates and places of next meetings

The Board confirmed the next EAAB meeting on **Wednesday 12 October 2016** at 10 a.m. at the EFTA Secretariat.

Due to the low number of attendants at the end of the meeting for transport reasons, it was agreed to ask EAAB members electronically after the meeting whether the Spring 2017 meeting, initially set on 25 or 26 April 2017 when the EA MAC meeting had just been confirmed, could be moved to 25 or 28 April 2017.

**Action EAAB Secretariat**

*[Post-meeting note by EAAB Secretariat: in light of the outcome of the survey, the Spring 2017 meeting of the Board will be held on **Friday 28 April 2017.**]*

The EAAB Chair thanked EFTA for the meeting arrangements and the delegates for their valuable contributions. He closed the meeting.

oooooooooooo

**List of the abbreviations taken for granted in these minutes**

**AB:** accreditation body  
**ARAC:** Arab Accreditation Cooperation  
**CAB:** conformity assessment body  
**CAS:** conformity assessment scheme  
**CB:** certification body  
**CD:** committee draft  
**CCMC :** CEN-CENELEC Management Centre  
**EA BLA:** EA Bilateral Agreement  
**(EA) CC:** EA Certification Committee  
**(EA) CPC:** EA Communications and Publications Committee  
**(EA) HHC:** EA Horizontal Harmonisation Committee  
**(EA) LC:** EA Laboratory Committee  
**(EA) MAC:** EA Multilateral Agreement Council  
**EA MLA:** EA Multilateral Agreement  
**EC:** European Commission  
**ECOS:** Environmental Council of the States  
**ENP:** EU Neighbourhood Policy  
**EU ETS:** European Union Emissions Trading System  
**IAF:** International Accreditation Forum  
**ILAC:** International Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation  
**IMP expert group:** Internal Market of Products expert group  
**NAs:** national authorities  
**NAB:** national accreditation body  
**NWI:** new work item  
**RoP:** Rules of Procedure  
**SS:** sector scheme  
**SO:** scheme owner  
**TFG:** task force group  
**ToR:** Terms of Reference  
**WG:** working group  
**WP:** work programme