APPROVED Minutes of the 37th Meeting of the EA Advisory Board

held on 12 October 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), Christian Priller (CEOC International).
CAB College: Pierre de Ruvo (ETICS), Irashe Visiers (EUROLAB), Bruce McGill (IFIA), Manuela Held (IIOC).
Industry College: Jörg Ed. Hartge (ORGALIME, BDI).
NA College: Ola Brohman (NA, Sweden), Devran Ayik (NA, Turkey).
NMIs: Anneke Van Spronssen (WELMEC).
EC: Zacharias Bilalis (EC)
EFTA: Margrethe ASSERSON (EFTA)
EA: Thomas Facklam (EA Chair), Geir Samuelsen (EA Vice-Chair), Andreas Steinhorst (EA Executive Secretary), Frédérique Laudinet (EAAB Secretariat).

Apologies received from: Andrew Evans (GAMBICA)
Lars Bo Hammer (ORGALIME)
Maureen Maria Logghe (NA, Belgium)
Stephen Russell (ANEC)
Janko Drnovšek (EURAMET)

1. Opening of the meeting

The Chair opened the meeting, thanking EFTA for hosting it. He welcomed the delegates, especially two new members of the Board, i.e. Irashe Visiers from EUROLAB and Bruce McGill from IFIA.

The Chair also voiced the apologies received, whereas M. Stadler reported that the Industry College had been having neither action nor news from Alex Rassmussen from EUROVENT who he would contact; if no feedback was received by M. Stadler, the Board would have to decide what to do in such case.

Finally, C. Priller reported that Roger Brockway, who had retired from IFIA, wished a fruitful future to the Board, to which he had been happy to contribute during the last years.

2. Approval of agenda; Approval of Minutes of 35th Meeting of the EA Advisory Board; Action list (actions not covered elsewhere)

- **Approval of agenda**

The agenda was approved by the Board with, further to the Chair's suggestion, the addition of Item 3.3 - Stakeholders' involvement in EA committees, working and task force groups, etc.

- **Approval of last minutes**

D. Ayik who had sent some comments on the draft minutes of the last meeting, agreed upon the modifications made in the minutes as distributed for the meeting.

Conclusion
The minutes of 36th meeting were approved as distributed and should be published on the EAAB intranet.
Action Secretariat

- **Action List**

M. Stadler enquired why Item 4.6 of the last meeting agenda had been turned into Item 4.1 - Consistency and harmonisation among ABs (Report on results of AfN project & next steps as revision of EA-2/17). C. Priller explained that the main issue is to get better harmonization, without any intention of hindering accreditation. G. Samuelsen added that this item had been agreed at the Board's preparatory meeting to stress the importance of the AfN project's outcome.

P. de Ruvo reported that ETICS had made a survey relating to the consistency issue, which he certainly considered to be a sensitive issue. Apologizing for the delay needed for analysing the outcome of the survey, he proposed to input discussions on the point in order to evaluate whether there could be some ground for improvement.

Decision
The Board:

- agreed that the discussions on the need for consistency and harmonisation among NABs, which should have been supported by a paper drafted by the CAB College at this meeting, should be postponed at a later meeting, acknowledging the continued importance of these issues;

- thanked Pierre de Ruvo who proposed to make the issue progress and improve by feeding the next outcome of a current survey led by ETICS into the future discussions of the Board.
  Action P. de Ruvo

3. EAAB matters

3.1 Reports from the EAAB HHC and MAC observers

In the absence of both A. Evans, the EAAB HHC observer, and M. M. Logghe, the EAAB MAC observer, the Chair informed that their comprehensive reports had been published on the EAAB intranet among the meeting papers and thanked them very much. He called for any comments on the reports.

- **HHC meeting on 20-21 September 2016**

M. Held added that a new TFG had been set up to review the results of the survey on EA-2/13 and come up with a set of recommendations for consideration by the HHC.
A. Steinhorst confirmed that the HHC had notably recognized a need for criteria to be developed for accrediting multi-site laboratories based on EA-2/13: *A Cross Border Accreditation Policy and Procedure for Cross Border Cooperation between EA Members* and the new ISO/IEC 17011.
M. Stadler pointed out that clarifying the meaning of "*legally established*" would not give any conclusion for real improvement; a better solution should be found for the multisite issue.

M. Stadler also wondered how EA-1/22: *EA Procedure and Criteria for the Evaluation of Conformity Assessment Schemes by EA Accreditation Body Members* could be revised and

currently balloted before being subject to new discussions again. He notably was not satisfied with the issue of handling situations where other NABs do not agree with the homeAB of the scheme owner. He asked whether such cases of different opinions are solved in balloted EA-1/22.
C. Priller and P. de Ruvo as well were somewhat confused about the lack of clarity of the process, which rely on several evaluation teams (homeAB, TFG, etc.). For them, NABs should agree on which standards to apply.
A. Steinhorst explained that the revised document covers schemes coming from the EC, such as the ERA scheme as well now. Such schemes are considered by a TFG of the Executive Committee in cooperation with the EC. The HHC is not involved in the evaluation of EC-owned schemes.
T. Facklam replied that the EAAB's feedback had been asked during the revision process, and is still requested, to know whether the process and the wording of EA-1/22 should be changed to improve clarity. The process does still need further feedback based on new experiences. The question of whether a further revision of EA-1/22 is needed is still relevant.
A. Steinhorst asserted that stakeholders had been involved in the revision process led by the HHC. He added that the balloted EA-1/22 should be endorsed at the EA General Assembly in November, because a document is needed now. EA will see how to include new experiences later on.

About HHC meetings, J. Hartge noticed that the classroom configuration of the meeting room does not facilitate discussions. A. Steinhorst replied that the point was being discussed at the HHC.

- **MAC meeting on 5-6 October 2016**

Further to a question by M. Stadler, T. Facklam confirmed that a trust-building process to be included into the peer-evaluation system should allow specific stakeholders to observe EA peer evaluations. This was discussed at the last Executive Committee's meeting and in the MAC. There could be a need to define guidelines for stakeholders' observation.

In light of M. M. Logghe's report and her proposed action for the EAAB under Point 7, page 4, the Chair asked EA how the MAC could make decisions slightly more rapidly.
A. Steinhorst replied that MAC decisions were certainly not based on black-and-white issues. Some cases need long and complex discussions, in particular if the implementation of corrective actions is related to national legislations. The revision of national legislations needs some time.
T. Facklam recognised that the MAC should adopt a more flexible approach for NABs to react on their own side. The point is to avoid any negative impact. He reported that the question of how to make swifter decisions was being considered in the MAC.
For M. Stadler, the major concern was that the MAC decision-making process which is essential for the credibility of the peer evaluation system should be swift enough and decisions taken should be properly enforced. Failure to implement decisions taken could undermine the peer-evaluation system.
G. Samuelsen asserted that the EA Strategy 2025 project was considering the issue as well.
Z. Bilalis confirmed that the system worked quite well. The intention is only to make the current good system work even better.

Finally, M. Stadler asked EA to provide further information on the issue addressed in section 5.d of the MAC report, saying that "*the peer-evaluation plan could be jeopardised unless MAC members commit to/provide the necessary resources to the system. (…) Economic consequences should be considered (e.g. pay more)*".
A. Steinhorst clarified that there is an obligation for EA Members to provide enough evaluator resources. If they do not provide them, they do not comply with EA requirements. EA will discuss on a policy in this regard, considering consequences for those EA Members that do not providing enough resources for the peer evaluation system, etc.

- **Meeting-related costs incurred by the EAAB HHC and MAC observers**

M. Stadler reported on the difficulties EAAB observers have repeatedly experienced in justifying the costs incurred by attending HHC meetings. The meeting-related costs should be borne by EA and not by the EAAB observers who attend the HHC and MAC meetings as these observers exercise a function on behalf of the entire Board. This function is essential for allowing the Board to properly perform its tasks referred to in Regulation (EU) 765/2008. The observers are not HHC or MAC members. It should be acceptable for EA to assume the meeting-related costs for the EAAB observers (i.e., not the travel or accommodation costs).

Decision
The Board:

- thanked Andrew Evans and Maureen Maria Logghe for their comprehensive written reports on, respectively, the last EA HHC and MAC meetings held on 20-21 September and 5-6 October 2016, and took note of the various issues addressed in them;

- took note in particular of the CAB and Industry Colleges' concern about the lack of clarity of the process for the evaluation of conformity assessment schemes by EA-member NABs, especially when other ABs disagree on the "home AB" recommendation, and welcomed EA's reassurance that the revised and currently balloted EA-1/22: *EA Procedure and Criteria for the Evaluation of Conformity Assessment Schemes by EA Accreditation Body Members* should clarify a number of points, notably regarding schemes owned by the European Commission, and EA's will to include further feedback on new experiences into a later revision of the document, if needed;

- appreciated that EA is open, and the EA MAC will discuss how, to give specific stakeholders, mainly national authorities, some opportunities to observe peer evaluations as a trust-building process, provided that EA and the NAB in question agree, as well as provided that these skateholders' area of activity is covered and they are able to demonstrate a justified interest in observing a specific peer evaluation, and that any participation of third parties needs the consent of the parties involved;

- took note that the EA MAC was discussing how to adopt a more effective approach with respect to reactions on non-conformities with NABs, in order to achieve MAC decisions more rapidly and to ensure proper enforcement of these decisions, while asking EA to make sure that the MAC's decision-making process is such that it does not undermine the peer-evaluation system with respect to a timely decision and reinforce its credibility;

- agreed that, in their specific roles, EAAB observers at the HHC and MAC meetings carry out a function on behalf of the entire Board to ensure that it can effectively perform the tasks of the stakeholder structure as referred to in Regulation (EC) 765/2008 and in the Framework Partnership Agreement between the EC and EA, and that therefore the meeting-related costs (fees for meeting rooms, etc.) incurred by the EAAB observers should be borne by EA.
  Action EA

3.2 EAAB Work Programme

The Chair called for comments on the updated EAAB WP.

M. Stadler was confused about the mention of "*smaller ABs*" on Page 1, EAAB M26 + M29.
For the Chair, the topic had been closed at the last meeting.
P. de Ruvo pointed out that even small ABs should follow EA's rules; they are serious rules which cannot be tailored.
T. Facklam agreed, while recognizing that EA has also to ensure that even smaller ABs have all competencies and technical experts.

The Chair said that this discussion was in a continuous loop. The question is whether the action/topic should be kept as an ongoing issue or closed.
Several comments were voiced (by M. Held, C. Priller) to keep it on the work programme, before M. Held suggested keeping the issue of smaller ABs in the framework of the discussions on the peer-evaluation system.

Decision
The Board agreed to close the topic entitled "*Adaptability of the rules and conditions relating to EA membership and EA MLA signatory status for smaller ABs*" mentioned on Page 1, on the understanding that EA makes sure that the peer-evaluation system continues to pay due attention to ABs in terms of technical competencies (concerning both the technical competencies in the AB itself to decide on accreditations and the technical competencies of experts who perform the assessments).
Action EAAB Secretariat to classify the topic as closed on the WP

3.3 Stakeholders' involvement in EA committees, working and task force groups, etc.

The Chair asked whether this was an issue to be focused on and improved by this Board.

In P. de Ruvo's view, this is correlated most certainly. He asserted that participation of stakeholders in EA committees, namely their technical WGs and TFGs, was satisfactory.
M. Stadler confirmed that there was no issue actually. The EAAB should be at a more political level, and has not to be involved in the technical discussions held within the committees, working and task force groups, etc.
C. Priller and M. Held pointed out that it was each stakeholder's responsibility to contribute to EA's technical discussions and work.

T. Facklam confirmed that it was up to stakeholders to take part in EA committees. A. Steinhorst added that EA had actually no very detailed information about real contribution of stakeholders to technical WGs and TFGs.

Conclusion
The Board:

- thanked EA for reminding stakeholders that it was up to themselves to actively contribute to committees' discussions, especially the technical ones, and for urging them to do so;

- confirmed its interest and incentive role in stakeholders' involvement in EA committees and WGs/TFGs, supporting each college and stakeholder organisation to join relevant EA structures.

4. EA matters

4.1 Consistency and harmonisation among ABs
Changed into to 4.1 - Report on results of AfN project & next steps as revision of EA-2/17

After the Chair informed that the item had been reworded at the Board's Preparatory meeting, T. Facklam pinpointed that actually the AfN project was directly linked to the consistency issue since it is aimed at increasing harmonisation between accreditation bodies when accrediting conformity assessment bodies for the purposes of notification against EU Directives. The project which called on expertise from across the EA has resulted in the creation of a list of Preferred Conformity Assessment Standards for each Regulation/Directive and Module.
A. Steinhorst added that the report on the AfN project had been adopted in May 2016 and is now published. The HHC has further revised EA-2/17: *EA Document on Accreditation for Notification Purposes* in light of the AfN project's results, by notably including the final list of recommended

standards into the document, and transfer its status from an informative to a mandatory document. EA-2/17 has been sent out for ballot within EA and should be adopted by the EA General Assembly in November.

J. Hartge wondered why module H of ISO/IEC 17021 relating to quality assurance was not selected for medical devices under Directive 93/42/EEC.
M. Stadler as well questioned the justification for the differences in the preferred standards for the quality assurance (QA) modules D and E (and its variants) as opposed to modules H and H1. Since all QA modules were defined to ensure product conformity, using QA techniques, albeit to a varying extent, why make a distinction between the preferred standards?
C. Priller thanked EA for the huge work achieved, though not most perfect. The project results are on a very right way.

A. Steinhorst explained that the AfN project was finalized this year, whereas the EC *Blue Guide* had been revised end 2015 to include ISO/IEC 17065 for certain modules. The main objective of the AfN project was to identify the *preferred* conformity assessment standard. At the end, it is up to the EC how to proceed with the *Blue Guide*.

Z. Bilalis said that the *Blue Guide*'s table was shorter and more general than the detailed results of the AfN project. The table gives no rule. The intention is not to revise the *Blue Guide* now, but to include the AfN results into the next revision of it, when revised, with reference to the respective EA document.

D. Ayik asked whether the results of the AfN project were already used by NABs and if there was a transition period with a clear implementation date. T. Facklam answered in the negative with respect to a (mandatory) implementation date. It is up to national agencies to implement standards as indicated in the *Blue Guide*'s table. NABs have only an incentive, convincing role, which is supported by EA. For new legislations it is advisable to agree on one harmonized standard to be used for the accreditation of notified bodies and EA is ready to support the related work.

Decision
The Board:

- thanked EA for the comprehensive work achieved with the AfN (Accreditation for Notification) project, especially for the resulting Annex that lists the *Directory of Preferred Harmonized Standards per EC Directive/Regulation and module*;

- noted that the Industry College questions the justification for the differences in the preferred standards for the quality assurance modules D and E (and its variants) as opposed to modules H and H1, as in the view of the Industry College, all these quality assurance modules have been conceived to ensure product conformity in the same way, using quality management techniques (albeit to a varying extent).

4.2 Project on EA Strategy 2025 (follow-up)

G. Samuelsen reported that the latest version (5.0) of the Strategy was available since September. The last version should be adopted at the EA General Assembly in November. He added that Peter Strömbäck, the project manager, had been very satisfied with the response from the Board following his presentation of the project at the Board's previous meeting.
The Strategy outlines EA's course to achieve its vision and a desired position. Three strategic objectives translate the Strategy and set out the plan to achieve the vision:
- good governance to deliver consistent and sustainable results;
- close cooperation with regulators and stakeholders to strengthen accreditation at the European and international level;
- continuation of development of accreditation to support innovation and growth in existing and new areas.

The Chair called for comments from the Board.

C. Priller and M. Stadler offered EA their congratulations on the huge project just about to be finalized, hoping that it would now be swiftly put into practice. G. Samuelsen confirmed that EA would have to closely follow up the implementation of the Strategy.

Conclusion
The Board:

- appreciated the work as progressed so far by EA;

- strongly supported the strategic objectives defined in the project report, and was looking forward to their implementation.

4.3 Relations with stakeholders: no new applications for Recognized Stakeholder status

The absence of new application for RS status was noted.

4.4 New EA projects and work items

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

Decision
The Board endorsed the proposed new work items for:

- revision of EA-0/07: *EA Procedure for application for EA membership and application form;*
- revision of EA-1/06: *EA Multilateral Agreement. Criteria for signing. Policy and procedures for development;*
- revision of EA-1/17: *EA Rules of Procedure;*
- revision of EA-1/17 S4: *Proxy Procedure;*
- review/revision of EA-2/14: *Procedure for Regional Calibration ILCs in Support of the EA MLA;*
- elaboration of informative document on *Joint EA - EDQM Communication regarding cooperation when carrying out joint audits/assessments in Official Medicines Control Laboratories*.

Post-meeting note by EAAB Secretariat:
Later on, electronically consulted by 17 November 2016, the Board endorsed an additional new work item consisting for the EA Certification Committee (CC), acting upon recommendation from the EACC WG Food, to revise the mandatory document EA-6/04: EA Guidelines on the Accreditation of Certification of Primary Sector Products by Means of Sampling of Sites.

4.5 Revisions of ISO/IEC 17011 and ISO/IEC 17025

As far as ISO/IEC 17011 is concerned, everybody was already well informed; no specific additional information was shared. It was only reminded that ISO/IEC 17011, which was circulated for comments until 16 November 2016, was at the DIS stage.

Regarding ISO/IEC 17025, C. Priller reported that revision was on a good track. The only issue is about when the outcome will be available since the document is under the umbrella of ILAC P10 implementation. How to implement ILAC P10 is also a concern.

For C. Priller, the latest developments about ISO/IEC 17065 raise crucial points. The IAF survey on the need for guidance on the standard shows that some ABs do need some guidance document. The point is that guidance documents always relate to general topics, without setting out clear

details. Moreover, C. Priller and P. de Ruvo shared the opinion that ISO/IEC 17065 should certainly not be revised in 2017. For them, both questions about the needs for guidance and for revision cannot be simultaneously raised.

A. Steinhorst reported that EA-member NABs were quite aware of the pending revisions of ISO 17000 series standards, which had been discussed at the last technical committees.

Decision
The Board took note that:

- the CAB College did not support the revision of ISO/IEC 17065 in 2017 and the need for guidance on the current standard, and asked EA to support this at e.g. IAF/ILAC TCs and GAs, ISO-IAF-ILAC JSC, etc.;

- EA members were fully aware of the ongoing discussions on the possible postponement of the revision of the ISO-series standards in 2017, which had been considered at the last meetings of EA committees.

4.6 New regulations using accreditation:
- General Data Protection regulation
- Proposed regulation on the approval and market surveillance of motor vehicles

A. Steinhorst reported that Regulation (EU) 2016/679 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, the so-called "General Data Protection Regulation", had been adopted and published in April 2016. Article 43 relates to CBs and their accreditation. EA is in contact with DG GROW and DG JUST to support accreditation for the best solution. Accreditation could also be carried out by national regulators, i.e. national authorities in charge of data protection, which is not in compliance with Regulation (EC) 765/2008.

O. Brohman reported that Sweden generally uses accreditation as the preferred option, but these new legislations are examples of legislation where the use of accreditation is difficult for legal reasons. Swedish NAs would like to invite NAs to try to influence policy makers to adapt new legislation to the existing legal framework for accreditation.

5. Items for information

5.1 Information to the EAAB

- Revision of the EA *Articles of Association*: progress report
- FPA 2018-2021
- Application to ILAC/IAF for PTP and GHG MRA/MLA
- Preparation of the RMP MLA
- Breast Cancer Service project - progress report

A. Steinhorst said a few words on:

- **FPA 2018-2021**: discussions have been starting between EA and DG GROW about the next FPA.

- **Application to ILAC/IAF for PTP and GHG MRA/MLA**: EA's application has been reviewed and the evaluation should be done in 2017.

- **Breast Cancer Service project**: the *European Guidelines for Breast Cancer Screening and Diagnosis* should be underpinned by accreditation. Later on, breast cancer services/units will

have to be certified in accordance with these guidelines. The final outcome of this huge project coordinated by the EC Joint Research Centre (JRC) is expected in 2019.

M. Stadler expressed the concern that product-related breast cancer services may have already been certified under the Medical Devices directive; he asked the project cooperation team to be careful when checking the coverage of these guidelines.
A. Steinhorst replied that, as far as he was aware, the guidelines will be dedicated to healthcare services and not to medical devices.

Decision
The Board:

- thanked EA for the oral reports provided under this item;

- about **Breast Cancer Services (BCS) project**, took note of the Industry College's concerns regarding the coverage of the guidelines for use by BCS, and asked EA to ensure that any duplication of certification of medical devices that may have already been certified under the Medical Devices Directive is avoided.

5.2 CETA - Implementation of the Bilateral Cooperation Agreement with Canada/SCC - Progress report

A. Steinhorst reported that, in June 2016, EA and the Standards Council of Canada (SCC) had signed a bilateral cooperation agreement (BCA) aimed to support the Canada and European Union (EU) Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA). The BCA is a key element for the implementation of CETA and its protocol on the mutual acceptance of the results of conformity assessment. An action plan has been agreed, and a high-level steering group has been set up in the EA Executive Committee to implement a pilot programme consisting of pilot assessments to be reported in summer 2017. The aim is to build confidence between Europe and Canada so as to enhance trade agreements and free movement of goods and services at a global level.

The Board thanked EA for this oral report.

5.3 Report on complaints and appeals

G. Samuelsen went through the report as revised in August 2016 and distributed among the meeting papers. There was no comment.

The Board thanked EA for the written and oral reports.

5.4 IAF/ILAC Annual meetings on 26 Oct. - 4 Nov. 2016

T. Facklam highlighted the main points to be concluded in New Delhi meetings:

- the IAF database for accredited management system certificates should be presented, based on business cases.

- accredited management system certificates shall be granted in the accredited scope only from November 2016 onwards (one-year transition).

  M. Held pointed out that this decision was a perfect example of inconsistency between EA ABs for implementation of IAF decisions. Some EA ABs have already implemented the decision; others not. IIOC would appreciate clear communication from EA about such points and clear guidance for implementation by EA ABs.

T. Facklam replied that he should check the relevant EA resolution and whether another resolution was needed.

- Merih Malmqvist Nilsson from SWEDAC will become the new ILAC Chair. EA is quite well represented in IAF/ILAC.

- PAC and APLAC will form a unified region, which EA supports. If that is concluded, the formation of a unified world accreditation organisation might be possible.

- Additional requirements in MDs – request from ANSI (American National Standards Institute), to be discussed at the ISO-IAF-ILAC JSC.
  Further to a question by C. Priller, T. Facklam confirmed that EA agreed that a clarification was needed, but there was certainly no need for new requirements under the standards.

- Revision of IAF/ILAC A1, A2 and A3: the activities needed to enlarge the scope of a region/AB to level 3 and level 4/5 will be discussed, and therefore there might be another round of comments instead of a voting. A3 (report template for peer evaluations of ABs) is out for comments; it is assumed that A3 will be accepted without significant changes, and it is strongly recommended that EA uses this template and provide additional information as needed in a separate annex. The reporting of significant additional requirements applied by the AB has been introduced.
  T. Facklam pointed out that this was also a way to foster consistency.

Decision
The Board:

- thanked EA for its oral report;

- about **granting of accredited management system certificates in the accredited scope only**, further to IIOC's demonstrating this as a perfect illustration of inconsistency between EA ABs having already or not implemented the IAF decision, would appreciate a clear communication from EA and a clear guidance on implementation by EA members.
  Action EA

5.5 Draft Agenda of the 38th EA General Assembly on 23-24 November 2016 in Boras, Sweden

Because the agenda was not available yet, A. Steinhorst made a short oral recap, indicating that there was nothing new or special to be highlighted in addition to the agenda items already covered at this meeting. He only emphasized that ARMNAB, the national accreditation body of Armenia, was going to become a new Associate Member of EA.

The Board thanked EA for this oral report, before the Chair asked whether he should attend the EA General Assembly and report any specific issue to be focussed on. G. Samuelsen confirmed that the EAAB's participation in General Assembly meetings was most useful and value-adding both for the Board itself and EA ABs.

6. Any other business

No other issue was discussed.

7. Selection of dates and places of next meetings

The Board confirmed the next EAAB meeting on **Friday 28 April 2017** at 10 a.m. at the EFTA Secretariat, which was warmly thanked.

The Board also agreed to meet on **Thursday 12 October 2017**.

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

°°°°°°°°°°°°

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
FPA: Framework Partnership Agreement
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
RS: Recognized Stakeholder
SS: sector scheme
SO: scheme owner
TFG: task force group
ToR: Terms of Reference
WG: working group
WP: work programme