APPROVED Minutes of the 41st Meeting of the EA Advisory Board
held on 14 May 2019
at BELAC, 16 boulevard du Roi Albert II, B-1000 Brussels

Participants:
**EAAB Chair:** Miruna Dobre (NA, Belgium).
**EAAB Vice-Chairs:** Martin Stadler (BUSINESSEUROPE).
**CAB College:** Giancarlo Zappa (ETICS), Benny De Blaere (EUROCER Building), Alexander Safarik-Pstrosz (EUROLAB), Alister Dalrymple (IQNet).
**Industry College:** Andrew Evans (CAPIEL), Lars Bo Hammer (DI).
**NA College:** Natalia Ducsayova (Czech Republic), Michael Nitsche (NA, Germany), Anda Fuior (NA, Romania), Sezen Leventoglu (NA, Turkey).
**NMIs:** Duncan Jarvis (EURAMET)
**EC:** Zacharias Bilalis (EC)
**EFTA:** Gudrun Rognvaldardottir (EFTA)
**EA:** Ignacio Pina (EA Chair), Andreas Steinhorst (EA Executive Secretary), Frédérique Laudinet (EAAB Secretariat).

Apologies received from Christian Priller (CEOC International), Bruce McGill (IFIA), Jörg Ed. Hartge (ORGALIM), Francis Farrugia (ANEC), Maria Luisa Rastello (EURAMET) replaced by Duncan Jarvis, and Tuomo Valkeapää (WELMEC).

The signed attendance list is published on the EAAB intranet.

1. **Opening of the meeting**
   Changes in National Authorities’ College - Election of new Chair
   Appointment of new EAAB observers to MAC and HHC

Martin Stadler, the only attending EAAB Vice-Chair, hereafter called the Vice-Chair, chaired the meeting because the new Chair elected at the last meeting in October 2018, Maureen Maria Logghe, had to step down from the Board since then.

The Vice-Chair opened the meeting, thanking BELAC for hosting it on short notice due to a sudden logistical problem at the EFTA Secretariat, and welcoming the delegates. He especially welcomed three new Members of the NA College, i.e. Miruna Dobre from Belgium, Anda Fuior from Romania and Sezen Leventoglu from Turkey, who had been appointed in March 2019 further to resignations.

The Chair invited EAAB Members to a roll call and took note of the apologies received. He went through the EAAB Membership List, on which a few corrections or changes in details of some Members were noticed.

Action EAAB Secretariat to modify and republish the EAAB Membership List onto the EAAB intranet

- Changes in National Authorities’ College - Election of new Chair

Due to the resignation of M. M. Logghe who had belonged to the NA College, a new Chair had to be elected. The eligibility rules were recalled: the EAAB Chair and the two Vice-Chairs had to be elected among the CAB, Industry and NA Colleges.
Further to the discussions held at the online preparatory meeting, M. Dobre accepted to replace M. M. Logghe and to stand for the EAAB Chairmanship. Then the Board unanimously elected M. Dobre as the new EAAB Chair, and members expressed their wishes for good and constructive collaboration.

The Vice-Chair agreed to continue to chair the meeting in order to support M. Dobre during her first EAAB meeting.

- **Appointment of new EAAB observer to MAC**

Because M. M. Logghe had also been responsible for reporting on meetings of the EA Multilateral Agreement Council (MAC), a new observer had to be appointed among the NA College.

M. Nitsche reported from the NA College’s preparatory meeting on the day before, that there was still no candidate and that the appointment should be postponed until the next EAAB meeting in November 2019.

A. Steinhorst drew the Board’s attention to the date of the next MAC meeting to be held on 2-3 October 2019 in Vilnius, which would mean that there would be no EAAB observer at this meeting.

Stressing the importance for the Board to be represented by an observer to MAC meetings, the Vice-Chair urged the NA College to appoint one candidate in advance of the next MAC meeting.

- **Appointment of new EAAB observer to HHC**

The Vice-Chair and A. Steinhorst reminded the Board of EA’s decision not to compensate the meeting-related fees incurred by the EAAB observer to HHC meetings. Due to Emmanuel Geneiatakis’ resignation from the Board, a new observer to the EA Horizontal Harmonisation Committee (HHC) should be appointed.

No-one volunteered. The Vice-Chair emphasized the important role played by the EAAB HHC observer for the Board and suggested that the CAB College should consider appointing a candidate, given their regular attendance of HHC meetings.

**Decision**
The Board:

- further to Maureen Maria Logghe’s resignation from the EAAB, unanimously elected Miruna Dobre as the new Chair of the EAAB;

- regretted not to be able to appoint a new EAAB MAC observer for the time being, and asked the National Authorities’ College, if possible, to inform the EAAB Secretariat of the appointment of a new candidate by September so as for him/her to be able to attend the next EA MAC meeting on 2-3 October 2019;

  **Action NA College**

- further to Emmanuel Geneiatakis’ resignation from the Board, regretted not to be able to appoint a new EAAB HHC observer for the time being, and would appreciate any expression of interest, especially from the CAB College which was invited to nominate one of its members to serve as EAAB observer to the HHC and to inform the EAAB Secretariat consequently.

  **Action CAB College**
2. Approval of agenda; Draft Minutes of 40th Meeting of the EA Advisory Board; Action list (actions not covered elsewhere)

- Approval of agenda

The agenda was adopted with this couple of modifications:
- shift Agenda Item 3.4, which was given for information only on the revision of EA-2/17, to Agenda Item 5.7 under Section 5 related to EA matters;
- add the last revision of cross-border policy under Agenda Item 5.8.

- Approval of last minutes

The Vice-Chair thanked Diana Popa from CEOC for with the preparation of the Conclusions and Resolutions List and the minutes of the last meeting in October 2018, which Frédérique Laudin et had been unable to attend.

Conclusion
The minutes of 40th meeting were approved with those few corrections, and should be published onto the EAAB intranet.

Action Secretariat

- Action List

There was no comment.

3. Key topics for discussion

3.1 Revised work program and expectations from Members

The Vice-Chair recalled that the Board’s Members should review the EAAB Work Program and the EA Stakeholders’ Expectations towards Accreditation and EA document to send any comments to the EAAB Secretariat.

- EAAB Work Program

No comment had been received on the work program.

The Vice-Chair noted that the key topic “Consistency and harmonisation among ABs” (EAAB M35) duplicated “Harmonisation and consistency of accreditation requirements and practices across Europe” (EAAB M40). It was agreed to remove the key topic indicated at EAAB M35, and that the CAB College, responsible for the action, should present a paper for discussion at the next meeting.

- EA Stakeholders’ Expectations towards Accreditation and EA

Only the Industry College had sent a revised document with a number of purely editorial improvements.

During the discussion, I. Pina and A. Steinhorst stated that they did not agree to mix end-users with indirect customers who, according to them, have interests that differ from each other. Manufacturers’ customers would be the most part of people relying on accreditation, though they have no relation with conformity assessment bodies (a patient and a laboratory, e.g.).

M. Nitsche pointed out that the Industry College had a “Janus role”, having relations with both CABs and customers. This was the reason why, the Vice-Chair added, there was actually no difference between indirect customers and end-users. He pointed out that customers of manufacturers are also indirect customers of accreditation, and added that the role of accreditation
is to ensure confidence in the technical competence of conformity assessment bodies, but not directly to ensure product safety.

A. Evans suggested asking for ANEC’s input on this point.

For I. Pina, the document had to emphasize more that confidence should be given by CABs to the marketplace. The Vice-Chair replied that this was already clearly mentioned in the document, which should not be understood as an exhaustive list of roles and expectations.

G. Rognvalardottir asked the Board to replace “EU” with “European” throughout the document so as to cover the countries not strictly belonging to the European Union. This was agreed.

**Action Secretariat**

**Decision**

The Board:

- decided to remove the duplicate key topic “Consistency and harmonisation among ABs” (EAAB M35, which duplicates EAAB M40) from the current EAAB Work Program, and asked the CAB College, if possible, to come up with a paper to support the discussion on the issue at the next meeting;

**Action EAAB Secretariat; CAB College**

- took note of EA’s proposal to distinguish between indirect customers of accreditation and end-users of products and services in order to emphasize the important role that accreditation is expected to play to increase confidence in the marketplace;

**Action EAAB Colleges and Members; EAAB Secretariat**

- agreed to re-submit the “Stakeholders’ expectations” document to a review by the EAAB Colleges and Members, and to specifically invite the Board members representing the European consumers, the European metrology institutions and the European standardization organizations to formulate their expectations of accreditation, for inclusion into the document.

**3.2 Withdrawal of FAMI-QS from the seat allocated to European private scheme owners**

The CAB, Industry and NA Colleges voiced their disappointment, all regretting the withdrawal of FAMI-QS from the seat which the Board had allocated to European private scheme owners that are also EA Recognised Stakeholders. All three of them did not understand the reasons of this withdrawal which had been given without background information. All deplored that the decision seemed to be definitive and had been made with no discussion within the Board; no option had been left in the letter addressed to EA by the International Accredited Scheme Round Table (IASRT).

The CAB College disagreed in particular on the sentence in the IASRT letter meaning that scheme owners would have never been invited to contribute to the development of EA-1/22.

A. Steinhorst reported that the IASRT letter had been discussed in the Executive Committee, which regretted that the issue had never been discussed beforehand with this group composed of FAMI-QS, BRC Global Standards, FSSC 22000, GLOBALG.A.P., GMP+ International and IFS. He strongly denied that scheme owners had not been directly involved in the revision of EA-1/22; Emmanuel Geneiatakis as an HHC Member had been invited to comment on the revised document.

Everyone agreed that the situation resulted from some misunderstanding.

The Vice-Chair recalled the Board’s mission to represent a wide constituency of European stakeholders within a political forum with the aim to advise EA on strategic issues and directions.
He highlighted that coordination of views was one of the principles of representation on the Board, to be ensured through membership of European and international associations.

A. Steinhorst said that EA had not yet answered the letter. The Vice-Chair proposed that the Board would be ready to cooperate with EA if EA decided to send a formal reply.

The Vice-Chair also suggested inviting those other European private scheme owners that were also EA Recognised Stakeholders to appoint one representative as a member of the Board, who would have to coordinate their views in order for them to be presented to the Board.

**Decision**

The Board:

- regretted FAMI-QS’ decision to withdraw from the EAAB, and unanimously shared a lack of understanding for having made this decision without any prior discussion;

- left it for EA to consider whether a reply should be given to the withdrawal letter co-sent by FAMI-QS, BRC Global Standards, FSSC 22000, GLOBALG.A.P., GMP+ International and IFS and, if needed, agreed to cooperate with EA to send a formal answer in line with the Board’s mission, which was based on representation of broad stakeholder constituencies, clarifying that the EAAB Terms of Reference in principle also allowed international stakeholder organisations to be represented on the Board provided that they coordinated their views with other recognised stakeholders;

**Action EA/EAAB eventually**

- asked the EAAB Secretariat to extend an invitation to those other European private scheme owners that were also EA Recognised Stakeholders to allow them, within a couple of months, to appoint one representative as a member of the Board, with the ensuing obligation to coordinate and express their views on political issues, as set out in the Board’s Terms of Reference to be enclosed in the invitation.

**Action EAAB Secretariat**

### 3.3 IAF/EA resolutions on non-accredited product certification where the CAB is accredited for the same scope; harmonised approach

A. Steinhorst said that a similar resolution had been adopted for management system and person certification.

A. Dalrymple reported that IQNet supported the resolution and the need for harmonisation. However, the wording of it was found ambiguous and not convenient for the scopes covered by product certification. A distinction should be made between voluntary and regulatory schemes, because the IAF resolution may not be really applicable for those accredited CABs that have additional requirements in some countries. IQNet agreed with the CAB College on the need for rewording the EA resolution.

A. Safarik-Pstrosz was mandated by EUROLAB to clearly fight against the EA resolution, which should be more flexible and whose wording was not acceptable. EUROLAB asked EA to postpone its implementation.

For the Industry College, the issue was similar: the underlying purpose of harmonisation was quite understood, but EA was requested to ensure that EA NABs had effectively harmonised views, in particular regarding the exceptions referred to in the “Note” to the resolution.

The NA College as well understood the final intention of transparency aimed to avoid any mismanagement. But again, it disagreed on the wording and suggested EA to discuss with IAF to achieve a clearer situation.
I. Pina replied that EA had no possibility to change an IAF resolution. Of course, its implementation may be adapted by EA with the support of the Certification Committee. A. Steinhorst added that there was no difference between European and other regions, and emphasised the importance of the way how scopes were expressed in the notification field.

Z. Bilalis maintained that the issue was identical in both regulatory and non-regulatory areas, where accreditation had to be addressed in the same way.

**Decision**
The Board:
- expressed serious concerns over the IAF resolution on non-accredited product certification, and stressed the need for harmonisation, notably regarding the accompanying “note” according to which an AB might unilaterally accept exceptions to the rule which would then be “considered accredited”;
- noted that EA saw no room for introducing any changes to the IAF resolution;
- invited EA to discuss further within the Certification Committee on how the IAF resolution could be implemented in a harmonised way, and urged EA NABs to come to a harmonised definition of product certification scopes; **Action EA**
- asked EA to keep the EAAB informed about the further developments on the issue both at the EA and IAF levels. **Action EA**

### 4. EAAB matters

#### 4.1 Revised EAAB Terms of Reference: draft by EA

The Vice-Chair called for comments on the EA-revised draft.

Further to A. Dalrymple’s suggestion, it was agreed to remove out GHG after “validation and verification” under § 0.2. **Action Secretariat**

§ 4.8 deleted by EA:

4.8 **The Board shall receive a report from EA on a regular basis. The document shall address to what extent EA has taken into consideration the recommendations from the Board in carrying out its activities.**

The Vice-Chair said that the intention of this clause was to ensure that EA gives feedback to the Board as to how EA has taken into consideration its recommendations, and to reflect EA’s accountability for its activities.

A. Steinhorst said that the action list actually played the role of the mentioned report.

A. Dalrymple and the NA College supported the notion of EA’s accountability which, however, did not need to be subject to a report. They agreed with EA on removing this clause from the ToR.

The Industry College proposed new text for § 4.8, which was agreed by the Board, as follows:

4.8 **The EA shall report on how far recommendations from the Board have been taken into consideration.**
§ 5.5 about EAAB MAC and HHC observers:

The Vice-Chair read a proposal made by the Industry College, which was supported by the CAB and NA Colleges. He highlighted the need to have things clearly set out further to the bad experience previously made by M. M. Logghe who, as the EAAB MAC observer, had faced difficulty asking questions during a MAC meeting.

I. Pina asked for making the text clearer, pointing out that, according to Regulation (EC) 765/2008, EA had to have an EAAB observer in the MAC who was entitled to ask questions on the MAC’s general process, but not on specific cases and peer evaluations. The EAAB observer cannot give recommendations to the MAC, which shall remain independent. As far as the HHC is concerned, it is up to the Board to appoint an EAAB observer or not.

M. Nitsche agreed that no recommendation could be given to the MAC.

The Industry College’s proposal was finally fine-tuned to stress the distinction to be made between the EAAB MAC and HHC observers.

**Decision**

The Board:

- agreed to revise the *EAAB Terms of Reference* under § 4.8 as follows:
  
  *The EA shall report on how far recommendations from the Board have been taken into consideration.*

- agreed to revise the *EAAB Terms of Reference* under § 5.5 as follows:
  
  *The Board shall appoint one of its Members to participate as observer in the meetings of the EA Multilateral Agreement Council (EA MAC), and may appoint one of its Members to participate in the meetings of the EA Horizontal Harmonisation Committee (EA HHC) in order to receive direct information about the EA peer evaluation system and (horizontal) accreditation issues. The EAAB observers may ask questions and provide advice on behalf of the Board. The EAAB MAC observer shall not interfere with the decision-making process. The EA MAC and EA HHC shall facilitate the roles of the EAAB observers. The observers shall report back to the Board in full respect of the confidentiality of the information divulged.*

- asked the EAAB Secretariat to republish the *EAAB Terms of Reference* as approved at the meeting, including the editorial improvements made by EA and the Industry College, onto the EA internet and intranet.

*Action EAAB Secretariat*

### 4.2 EAAB’s implementation of *EA Policy for Relations with Stakeholders* (EA-1/15: 2010)

A. Steinhorst reported that an internal audit in EA had shown that EAAB Members were automatically EA Recognised Stakeholders without signing any formal agreement. The issue is whether there should be a distinction between EAAB Members and EA Recognised Stakeholders. If there were a distinction, either EAAB Members would have to sign an agreement to be EA Recognised Stakeholders, or specific provisions would have to be included into EA-1/15.

Because the Board had been meeting no problem with EA-1/15 so far, the Vice-Chair suggested leaving it for EA to see whether the issue needs further attention.
Decision
The Board:

- took note that an internal audit in EA had raised the issue that, according to EA-1/15, EAAB Members were by definition EA Recognised Stakeholders whereas no formal agreement was signed;
- suggested that EA should consider whether and how to address the issue and to come up with proposals for relevant provisions to be included into EA-1/15, for further decision at the next EAAB meeting.

Action EA

4.3 Reports from the EAAB MAC and HHC Observers

The Chair left the floor to A. Steinhorst who went through the HHC Decision List as well as the MAC report written by M. M. Logghe, who was greatly thanked by the Board.

▪ HHC meeting on 12-13 March 2019

A. Steinhorst updated the Board mainly on:

- the new work item to elaborate an informative document enclosing a list of risks related to operation of conformity assessment bodies resulting from, for instance, clauses 7.4, 7.9, 7.10, 9.6 and 9.10 in ISO/IEC 17011:2017 (see Agenda Item 5.1);
- the revision of both EA-2/13: EA Cross-Border Accreditation Policy and Procedure for Cross-Border Cooperation between EA Members and EA-2/15: EA Requirements for the Accreditation of Flexible Scopes, has been completed and the revised documents have been adopted in April 2019;
- the CERTIF document on consultancy in notified bodies: a document on the definition of consultancy in notified bodies will be developed by the established TFG, which will start with reminding stakeholders to provide their comments (see Agenda Item 5.4);
- the revised draft of EA-2/17: EA Document on Accreditation for Notification Purposes has been sent out for comments within the HHC by 15 May 2019. An exceptional second round of comments will be launched among EA Members afterwards (see Agenda Item 5.7).
- the revised draft of EA-1/22: EA Procedure and Criteria for the Evaluation of Conformity Assessment Schemes by EA Accreditation Body Members has been sent out for comments within the HHC; the scheme owners' representatives of the EA-accepted schemes and schemes under current review have also been invited to comment. The HHC also reminded NABs of the EA-1/22 process which asked home ABs to inform the EA Secretariat when they were approached by scheme owners before starting the evaluation of the schemes.

▪ MAC meeting on 8-9 May 2019

A. Steinhorst updated the Board mainly on:

- the EA MLA for Reference Material Producers (EN ISO 17034) which could now be launched since, as provided for by EA Resolution 2017 (39) 19, at least three members were successfully peer-evaluated by May 2019;
- the reengineering of the EA peer-evaluation process, which had made a good step forward based on very constructive proposals. The most important change is that witnessing will take
place before the head office visit, and discussions on interpretation should be dealt with in advance with the relevant committees, prior to MAC discussions.

The Vice-Chair wondered about the flexibility given to the number of witnessing to be performed during a peer evaluation. A. Steinhorst clarified that the new versions of ILAC A 2 and EA-2/02 allowed for witnessing one single activity, provided that this activity was representative.

**Conclusion**
The Board thanked Maureen Maria Logghe for her comprehensive written report and took note of the various issues addressed in it, notably the good step forward made by the proposals for re-engineering of the EA Peer Evaluation.

### 5. EA matters

#### 5.1 Endorsement of new EA work items

**Decision**
The Board:

- endorsed the new work items proposed for:
  - the elaboration of a list of risks related to operation of conformity assessment bodies;
  - the revision of EA-4/18: *Guidance on the Level and Frequency of Proficiency Testing Participation*;
  - the elaboration of a guidance document on anti-bribery management systems (ABMS);

- invited the CAB College to send the Board any issue relating to "risks" raised by CAB associations for discussion at the next EAAB meeting;

**Action CAB College**

- took note that the CAB and Industry Colleges recommended that EA should first seek the elaboration of guidance on ABMS at the international (IAF) level rather than start work at the European level.

#### 5.2 Relations with stakeholders

- **BRC Global Standards’ application for Recognised Stakeholder status**

Further to M. Nitsche’s mail in November 2018 noticing that BRC Global Standards was part of LGC Group which was a life sciences measurement and testing company and, as a result, advocating to discuss the application of such a CAB at the EAAB meeting, A. Steinhorst explained that the issue had been discussed by the Executive Committee, which had not made any decision yet and been waiting for the EAAB recommendation. He added that no clear statement was provided in EA-1/15, and argued that EA should not allocate the EA Recognised Stakeholder status to a single or part of a CAB.

A. Dalrymple agreed with A. Steinhorst and I. Pina not to go ahead with the application of BRC Global Standards, which seemed to be a CAB rather than an association.

**Decision**
The Board:

- recommended that EA should take a prudent approach to BRC Global Standards’ request since they had been acquired by the LGC Group as a single CAB and were not an association, and should not engage in a Recognised Stakeholder agreement with them;
- advocated that EA should consider the need to specify further in EA-1/15 the criteria for organisations to be eligible to sign the Recognised Stakeholder agreement.

Action EA

5.3 Implementation of EA Strategy 2025 – Progress report

A. Steinhorst reported that several TFGs’ work had much progressed or was now closed. The outcome of both TFG 1 about the new EA management structure and TFG2 about the decision-making process should now be introduced into the EA Rules of Procedure in order to be implemented in early 2020.

TFG 4 about the best location for EA concluded that the EA Secretariat should stay in Paris although many activities take place in Brussels. Whether to relocate the Secretariat inside Paris should now be considered.

Finally, the first paper by TFG 6 about EA’s policy for stakeholders should be ready in autumn 2019. The Vice-Chair suggested inviting Ed Wieles from RvA who convened TFG 6 to discuss the issue as a key topic at the next EAAB meeting.

Decision
The Board:
- welcomed the progress made in implementing the EA Strategy;
- took note that the first paper drafted by TFG 6 under Section 2 (Close cooperation with regulators and stakeholders…) of the Strategy, Section 2.1 (Develop the EA stakeholder policy… Evaluate the size and composition of the EAAB), should be available in autumn, and decided to discuss the issue as a key topic at the next EAAB meeting in November 2019, in which Ed Wieles is invited to participate as TFG 6 convener.

Action EAAB Secretariat to invite Ed Wieles to the next EAAB meeting

5.4 EA TFG “Consultancy”

A. Steinhorst reported that there was no document that could be presented to the Board for the time being. In September a meeting with stakeholders had taken place during which a first draft of two working documents was developed; stakeholders were asked to provide EA with their comments on the documents, but no feedback has been received. The next meeting of the HHC TFG will be on 16 May.

M. Nitsche said that there were two kinds of interests in how to cope with the issue consultancy, i.e. interests related to management system certification and interests for product certification. He asked EA whether the HHC could come up with proposals to be discussed with stakeholders. He suggested the EAAB to input the HHC work.

A. Steinhorst replied that this was exactly the case. A letter has been received from six CAB organisations (CEOC International, EFAC, IFIA, IIOC, IQNet and EUROLAB), which have been invited to give their feedback. He added that the EC was open to discuss the consultancy issue; the HHC should provide some input to the Internal Market Product expert group.

Decision
The Board:
- took note of the current situation of the issue, which was addressed by an EA HHC TFG, and supported the view that EA should go ahead in their discussions with the EU-Commission;
invited the CAB and Industry Colleges to provide further input to the work made by the HHC, and recommended that the HHC should consider involving additional stakeholders in the HHC TFG work.

5.5 Use of accreditation by the European Commission - Current developments

A. Steinhorst updated on the latest developments made about the Cybersecurity Act, the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the new regulation on drones.

Conclusion
The Board thanked EA for the update on the current developments and efforts in supporting accreditation as the best option to demonstrate competence of conformity assessment bodies.

5.6 Brexit and EA - Progress report

A. Steinhorst explained that there was no need for EA to apply Article 6 clause 7 in the EA Articles of Association until the United Kingdom remained in the European Union. If there were a hard Brexit and the UK should leave the EU in autumn, the application of Article 6 clause 7 allowing the UK to remain an EA Member for a period of time no longer than two years would have to be endorsed at the EA General Assembly in November 2019.

I. Pina highlighted the importance of keeping UKAS in EA.

Conclusion
The Board:
- took note that if the United Kingdom were to leave the European Union in autumn, the application of article 6 clause 7 in EA Articles of Association should be approved at the EA General Assembly in November 2019;
- welcomed EA’s efforts to keep UKAS among the EA Members.

5.7 EA-2/17: Revision of EA-2/17 and the Accreditation for Notification (AfN) project Part II

As already mentioned under Agenda Item 4.3, A. Steinhorst reported that EA-2/17: EA Document on Accreditation for Notification Purposes was revised and currently out for comments within the HHC including stakeholders by 15 May 2019. The document, which will now be mandatory, will cover the second part of the AfN project on the preferred harmonized standards. It will also address how to formulate accreditation scopes. An exceptional second round of comments on the second draft will be launched among all EA Members including EAAB Members and other stakeholders.

The Vice-Chair noticed that there would be two informative annexes in the mandatory document.

Decision
The Board:
- advised EAAB Members to study carefully the revised document to be sent out for comments;
- asked EA to circulate the finalised version of EA-2/17 to the Board among the papers for the next EAAB meeting. Action EAAB Secretariat
5.8 Last revision of cross-border policy

This item was finally not covered.

6. Items for information

6.1 Information to the EAAB

A. Steinhorst said a few words on:

- **FPA 2019-2022**
  
The renewed Framework Partnership Agreement has been signed in December 2018 for the period 2019-2022; it is the 3rd FPA signed by EA with the EC and EFTA.

- **IAF/ILAC evaluation of EA – Regular re-evaluation of EA**
  
EA is now waiting for the re-evaluation report which should be ready at the IAF/ILAC annual meetings in autumn. Neither findings nor comments have been noticed so far.

6.2 CETA - Implementation of the Bilateral Cooperation Agreement with Standards Council of Canada (SCC) - Progress report

A. Steinhorst reported on the progress made. The CETA protocol is now implemented with the recognition of European NABs in three sectors, i.e. ATEX, construction and electrical equipment, and should be in place for the machinery sector very soon. The only problem is that SCC has not yet been recognized, which it should be soon however.

M. Nitsche asked whether national authorities had been involved in the project. A. Steinhorst's answer was negative, but he added that the Notified Bodies Group and the EC had been consulted and provided input.

**Conclusion**

The Board invited the EC and EA to ensure a swift conclusion and implementation of the Bilateral Cooperation Agreement in all the four sectors concerned.

6.3 Report on complaints and appeals

A. Steinhorst went through the report (EAAB(19)11rev). There was no comment.

6.4 IAF/ILAC Mid-Term Meetings in Mexico City on 4-11 April 2019

A. Steinhorst reported that:

- PAC and APLAC had merged into APAC, the Asia Pacific Accreditation Cooperation. He added that, further to a survey conducted by APAC, IAF and ILAC would agree to set up one single accreditation organisation at the global level in November 2019 in Frankfurt;

- the problem in the IAF database on certification had been solved and only MLA signatories could fill it in. The Vice-Chair added that only ABs had to feed into the database which was not mandatory for CABs.
6.5 Draft Agenda of the 43rd EA General Assembly on 22-23 May 2019 in Rome, Italy

The CAB College said that G. Zappa would attend the EA General Assembly on behalf of the Board.

A. Steinhorst highlighted Agenda Item 5.4 dedicated to digitalisation of testing, inspection and certification; he welcomed the Board’s support for the issue. The Vice-Chair proposed to add a key topic about digitalisation into the EAAB Work Program, and to discuss the issue at a next meeting.

About the “Survey 2019 on the functioning of accreditation in Europe” (Agenda Item 5.5), A. Steinhorst informed that the survey would be made annually for comparison purposes.

Decision

The Board:

- decided to include “Impact of digitalisation” as an additional key topic into the EAAB Work Program. **Action EAAB Secretariat**
- agreed to discuss the issue as a key topic at one of the next EAAB meetings, and asked the EAAB Colleges for their input. **Action EA Colleges**

The Board thanked EA for the oral and written reports provided under these items.

7. Any other business

None.

8. Confirmation and selection of dates and places of next meetings

Decision

The Board:

- confirmed to meet on **Thursday 7 November 2019**
  **Action EAAB Secretariat to confirm the location in Brussels with ETFA**
- agreed to meet on **Tuesday 28 April and Tuesday 10 November 2020**.

The Vice-Chair thanked the Board’s Members for their valuable contributions and the fruitful discussions, and closed the meeting.
List of the abbreviations taken for granted in the minutes

AB: accreditation body
APAC: Asia Pacific Accreditation Cooperation
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
EFTA: European Free Trade Association
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
NBs: notified bodies
NoBos: Group of Notified Bodies
NLF: New Legislative Framework
NWI: new work item
RoP: Rules of Procedure
RS: Recognised Stakeholder
SS: sector scheme
SO: scheme owner
TFG: task force group
ToR: Terms of Reference
WG: working group
WP: work programme