APPROVED Minutes of the 42nd Meeting of the EA Advisory Board
held on 7 November 2019
at the EFTA Secretariat, 12-16 rue Joseph II, B-1000 Brussels

Participants:
**EAAB Chair:** Miruna Dobre (NA, Belgium).
**EAAB Vice-Chair:** Martin Stadler (BUSINESSEUROPE).
**CAB College:** Alister Dalrymple (IQNet) acting, in C. Priller’s absence, as the EAAB vice-chair representing the CAB College, Benny De Blaere (EUROCER Building), Alexander Safarik-Pstrosz (EUROLAB), Bruce McGill (TIC Council). Bence Thurnay (ETICS) was an observer.
**Industry College:** Andrew Evans (CAPIEL), Lars Bo Hammer (DI), Jörg Ed. Hartge (ORGALIM).
**NA College:** Natalia Ducsayova (NA, Czech Republic), Michael Nitsche (NA, Germany), Anda Fuior (NA, Romania), Sezen Leventoglu (NA, Turkey).
**Consumers:** Francis Farrugia (ANEC).
**NMIs:** Maguelonne Chambon (EURAMET), Tuomo Valkeapää (WELMEC).
**EFTA:** Gudrun Rognvaldardottir (EFTA).
**EA:** Maria Papatzikou (EA Vice-Chair), Andreas Steinhorst (EA Executive Secretary), Frédérique Laudinet (EAAB Secretariat).

Apologies received from Christian Priller (CEOC International), Maria Luisa Rastello (EURAMET) replaced by Maguelonne Chambon, Zacharias Bilalis (EC), and Ignacio Pina (EA Chair) replaced by Maria Papatzikou.

The signed attendance list is published on the EAAB intranet.

1. **Opening of the meeting**

The Chair opened the meeting, thanking EFTA for hosting it and welcoming the delegates. She invited EAAB Members to a roll call and took note of the apologies received.

2. **Approval of agenda**

   List of conclusions and resolutions and Minutes of 41st Meeting of the EAAB
   Action list (actions not covered elsewhere)

   ▪ Approval of agenda

   The agenda was adopted with this couple of modifications:
   - shift Agenda Item 7.1: Commission implementing decision on a standardization request to CEN and CENELEC in the area of accreditation and conformity assessment, which was put forward by ANEC, to Agenda Item 4.5 under Section 4 related to EAAB matters;
   - add Agenda Item 5.8: Inadequate accreditation in Iceland, put forward by EFTA, under Section 5 related to EA matters.

   ▪ Confirmed approval of last List of conclusions and resolutions and Minutes

   There was no further comment on both documents. The minutes were definitively approved with the comments previously made by Michael Nitsche on Page 10.
Conclusion
The minutes of 41st meeting were approved with M. Nitsche’s corrections, and should be published onto the EAAB intranet.

Action Secretariat

- **Action List**

The Chair notably highlighted that the National Authorities’ College had appointed Sezen Leventoglu as the EAAB MAC observer. Natalia Ducsayova had replaced her to attend the last EA MAC meeting on 2-3 October 2019.

M. Stadler pointed out that the CAB College had been invited to nominate one of its members to serve as EAAB observer to the HHC meetings. A. Dalrymple reported that, while it was currently very busy with reorganizing itself to reflect the merger of CEOC and IFIA into TIC Council, the CAB College agreed to appoint one person to act as EAAB HHC observer and to report back to the Board on relevant matters.

Decision
The Board:

- thanked the CAB College for agreeing to nominate a candidate from among its constituency to act as EAAB HHC observer; **Action CAB College**

- appreciated that Ed Wieles had agreed to join the EAAB meeting in April 2020, in advance of which the draft document elaborated on by TFG 6 implementing Section 2.1 of EA Strategy 2025 (Close cooperation with regulators and stakeholders / Develop the EA stakeholder policy… Evaluate the size and composition of the EAAB) should be distributed to EAAB Members. **Action EA**

3. **Key topics for discussion**

3.1 **Update of EA Stakeholders’ Expectations towards Accreditation and EA**

The Chair recalled that the *EA Stakeholders’ Expectations towards Accreditation and EA* document had been re-submitted to a review by the EAAB Colleges and Members, specifically to 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.

Two comments had been received from Natalia Ducsayova as well as from EURAMET and WELMEC.

N. Ducsayova’s comment emphasized the relevance of document EA/INF-07: *Accreditation Body Communication with National Regulators – Best Practice Guide*.

A. Steinhorst informed that the withdrawal of this document was currently discussed and should be decided at the EA General Assembly in November. The fact is that a lot of EA brochures on how to cooperate with NAs are already on the EA website, and actually, it is more for NABs than for EA to decide in this respect.

Surprised, M. Stadler regretted the potential withdrawal of EA-INF/07 because it gives ABs best practice to approach NAs. The document may be still useful and valuable.

A. Safarik-Pistrosz agreed that the document was still very relevant and asked EA not to withdraw it.

A. Steinhorst replied that actually EA-INF/07 was still on the EA website, where there was a lot of information to support accreditation and EA Members. He thanked the Board for its feedback and advice, which it is up to the Executive Committee to consider.

A. Steinhorst added that TFG 6 working within the framework of *EA Strategy 2025* was considering EA’s general policy for recognised stakeholders.
A. Dalrymple would like to include EA-1/15: EA Policy for Relations with Stakeholders into EA Strategy 2025. M. Stadler agreed that the document was important since it set out the relations between EA and stakeholders and could show how EA could improve its interaction with stakeholders.

It was finally agreed that, because it was more a remark than an input, N. Ducsayova’s comment should not be inserted into the EA Stakeholders’ Expectations towards Accreditation and EA document.

Presenting the common comment by EURAMET and WELMEC, M. Chambon stressed the importance to have metrological traceability included into the document. M. Stadler agreed that the document would undoubtedly benefit from the addition of EURAMET’s and WELMEC’s two paragraphs into a fourth chapter focussing on the metrology community.

M. Papatzikou asserted that every point in the EA Stakeholders’ Expectations towards Accreditation and EA document was actually fully covered and met by EA and Strategy 2025.

**Decision**

The Board:

- **recommended** that EA should reconsider the possible withdrawal of EA/INF-07: Accreditation Body Communication with National Regulators – Best Practice Guide to ensure that its content was maintained since it was considered to be still valid and its purpose quite useful;
  **Action EA**

- **agreed** to consolidate the “EA Stakeholders’ Expectations towards Accreditation and EA” document with a fourth chapter dedicated to the metrology community including the two points as follows:
  - Accreditation should support “Metrological Traceability” i.e. that accredited measurement results or calibration certificates are related to a recognised reference, preferably the International System of Units (SI), through a documented unbroken chain of calibrations, each contributing to a stated measurement uncertainty.
  - Accreditation processes should verify the metrological traceability of accredited measurement results by examining that documentation chain, setting requirements on the knowledge and experience of those responsible for the measurements and demonstrating consistency between different providers through comparison exercises.

- **adopted** the “EA Stakeholders’ Expectations towards Accreditation and EA” document with this addition, while deciding to consider later any other input for possible inclusion, and asked the EAAB Secretariat to publish the consolidated document on the EA internet and intranet.
  **Action EAAB Secretariat**

### 3.2 Impact of digitalisation

A. Steinhorst highlighted how important the impact of digitalisation would be on conformity assessment and accreditation – see document EAAB(19)17. He informed that a workshop on this topic would be organised in 2020. Several events by CASCO and TIC Council are also usefully planned in December 2019. A very small EA TFG is dealing with the issue for the moment. The EA event shall not be too technical, but will remain on concrete terms.

The Board’s members agreed on the importance of digitalisation and the need for some activities like the EA workshop on this issue. A. Safarik-Pstrosz said that EUROLAB would be interested in cooperating with EA on this respect. A. Steinhorst was pleased to notice the EAAB’s support on this.
While emphasizing that digitalisation is currently one of the major issues in European industries, M. Stadler and M. Nitsche pointed out that other countries like China were more advanced, and that the European conformity assessment infrastructure had to ready to provide those competent services already offered on the global market.

G. Rognvaldarðottir mentioned the future establishment of formal cooperation between European and Chinese standardisation systems to stress EA’s interest in starting to set up links with China.

**Decision**

The Board:

- agreed that digitalisation is a major issue and presented both challenges and opportunities for standardisation and conformity assessment, including accreditation;

- greatly welcomed EA’s intention to organise a workshop/event to clearly describe the issues at stake and generate ideas on how to address them, and recommended that EA and its member NABs should concentrate their efforts on analysis and concrete steps to prepare themselves for this challenge;

- advocated that EA should closely follow the related developments in other regions at the global level.

**3.3 Consultancy by conformity assessment bodies**

A. Dalrymple reported that the CAB College was somewhat surprised that no document was attached to this agenda item and wondered what they should talk about.

A. Steinhorst reminded the Board of the EA resolution related to document CERTIF 2015-02 rev.3 on consultancy in notified bodies. He reported that, during the last EA General Assembly in May 2019, the HHC TFG in charge had been tasked to finalize the document developed on this issue. A commenting period was started among HHC members resulting in a large number of controversial comments, which are currently analysed by the TFG. The HHC will try to rework the document until early December and start a second round of comments. In parallel the draft will be presented to the IMP meeting in December 2019. The activity aims at putting the IMP into a position to decide on the need to revise CERTIF 2015-02 rev.3.

M. Stadler asked for the EAAB to be involved in the call for comments on the draft. A. Steinhorst replied that the EAAB should have representatives in the HHC to comment on the draft. For M. Stadler, the EAAB was faced with a political issue since it was important that the Board could comment on every draft elaborated on by EA. He recalled the EAAB resolution adopted at the 40th meeting of the Board held on 17 October 2018, where the “EAAB calls upon EA to suspend the implementation of the EA Resolution 2017 (40) 13 regarding consultancy until further consensus on the interpretation of the CERTIF 2015-02 rev 03 document has been reached”. Besides M. Stadler wondered about the interest of those discussions because the CERTIF document resulted from a common consensus and the issue had been discussed for three years with no significant results. Again he asked EA to involve the Board as early as possible on such issues.

For M. Nitsche, it was an ongoing issue. He asked whether risks related to CAB’s operation could be linked to this issue since they were also related to consultancy. A. Steinhorst agreed that the key issue is what is covered by consultancy, which should be answered by the HHC paper. Actually technical points should be dealt with by the HHC.

A. Steinhorst will ask the HHC Chair.

A. Safarik-Pstrosz pointed out that EA-2/17: EA Document on Accreditation for Notification Purposes was an additional issue related to consultancy: the EAAB should be involved as well into the process.
Decision
The Board:
- reminded EA of its Resolution on the issue, adopted at the 40th meeting of the Board held on 17 October 2018;
- highlighted the political importance of the consultancy issue, on which the EAAB should be able to comment, and urged EA to involve the Board on such matters as early as possible;
- noted that EA should check its policy for comments on EA documents. Action EA

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

Recalling that EA should have a harmonised approach, M. Stadler asked whether any progress had been made on the issue at the IAF meetings in Frankfurt last month. A. Steinhorst informed that the issue of harmonisation of scopes had been put forward to the EA Certification Committee which was taking it on board. Furthermore, EA-2/17 will include provisions on the expression of scopes for notified bodies.

A. Dalrymple said that he supported the resolution, while stressing the need for harmonisation and for rewording it.
M. Stadler agreed on the wrong wording, and asked for a clarification of the note. He requested EA to take into account the need for a common understanding of what is covered by the note.

A. Steinhorst said that a clear message had been given by national authorities. He did not see the need to reopen the issue.

M. Nitsche reminded that the issue came up at the IMP meeting last year, when NAs had no time to go further into the issue which concerned the regulated area. He asked the CAB and Industry Colleges for their input in this respect.
M. Stadler explained that the IEC conformity assessment systems are not regulatory schemes and that IAF had not considered its Memorandum of Understanding with IEC. He will send the Industry College’s input to the NA College.

A. Steinhorst noted that EA does not agree to accept the IECEE scheme(s) as an exception.

For A. Safarik-Pistrosz, the problem concerned the non-harmonised schemes. Regulation (EC) 765/2008 also covered the non-regulated area.

Decision
The Board:
- requested EA to acknowledge the need for clarification and a harmonised understanding of what was covered by the note in IAF Resolution 2018-13 on non-accredited product certification where the CAB was accredited for the same scope;
- noted that the NA College asked the CAB and Industry Colleges for their input on the issue, which both Colleges agreed to provide; Action Industry and CAB Colleges
- noted that there is no harmonised understanding in the field of product certification of the notion of the “scope of accreditation”, thereby creating confusion as to what is “inside” or “outside” the scope;
- acknowledged that the concerns raised related to schemes in the non-regulated area and, given the Memorandum of Understanding between IAF and IEC, invited EA to adopt clear rules of
implementation of the note in such a way as to accept a general exception for the conformity assessment schemes operated under the IEC conformity assessment systems.

4. **EAAB matters**

4.1 Future of the seat allocated to European private scheme owners

F. Laudinet reported that, further to the withdrawal letter co-sent by FAMI-QS, BRC Global Standards, FSSC 22000, GLOBALG.A.P., GMP+ International and IFS, the EAAB Secretariat had sent an invitation on 3 July to those *other* European private scheme owners that were also EA Recognised Stakeholders, i.e. EOQ and PEFC, to appoint one representative as a member of the Board. PEFC did not answered, whereas EOQ replied that they were currently restructuring their management functions and needed some more time to make a decision.

**Conclusion**

The Board:
- thanked the EAAB Secretariat for the efforts made to address the issue;
- took note of the possible nomination by EOQ of one representative for European private scheme owners.

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

M. Stadler wondered why this topic was on the agenda upon EA’s request, and asked whether there was a need for any discussions.

A. Steinhorst replied that the issue would be considered as part of the discussions of TFG 6 on EA Strategy 2025. The only issue is why EAAB Members are automatically EA Recognised Stakeholders without signing any formal agreement like any recognised stakeholders.

M. Stadler remembered that he had taken part in drafting EA-1/15 with Lorenzo Thione, the EA Chair in 2010. He asserted that EAAB Members were EA Recognised Stakeholders *of right* in light of the EAAB Terms of Reference.

**Decision**

The Board:
- noted that the point would be discussed as part of the report by TFG 6 on *EA Strategy 2025*, and that the only issue for EA was that EAAB Members, as such, were not required to sign an EA Recognised Stakeholder agreement according to EA-1/15;
- confirmed that EAAB Members were considered as EA Recognised Stakeholders *of right*, on the basis of the EAAB Terms of Reference and the commitments set out therein.

4.3 Reports from the EAAB MAC and HHC Observers

- **MAC meeting on 2-3 October 2019**

N. Ducsayova, who had replaced the EAAB MAC observer at the last EA MAC meeting, presented her written report.

Further to a question by the Chair, A. Steinhorst informed that the outcome of the re-engineering project of the EA Peer Evaluation system was expected by the next meeting of the MAC, which should submit several proposals to the EA General Assembly in May 2020.
There was no other comment on the report.

- **HHC meeting on 17-18 September 2019**

In absence of an EAAB HHC observer, the HHC Decision List arising from the last meeting had been distributed among meeting papers.

M. Stadler was pleased to see the progress made with the consultancy issue, asking again EA for the Board and Recognised Stakeholders to be involved into the commenting process.

**Decision**

The Board:

- thanked Natalia Ducsayova for her comprehensive written report and took note of the various issues addressed in it, notably the nearing conclusion of the re-engineering project of the EA Peer Evaluation system;
- welcomed the progress made on the consultancy issue and asked EA again to involve the Board and Recognised Stakeholders into the process as early as possible – see Agenda Item 3.3.

**4.4 EAAB Work Program matters**

The fact that “Cross-border issues” (EAAB M7) were still an ongoing topic was questioned, because the policy had been published in 2012. It was then recalled that P. de Ruvo from ETICS had raised the issue again in May 2018 to tackle a paper and survey about consistency.

**Decision**

The Board decided to remove the item “Cross-border issues” (EAAB M7) to be considered as “closed” unless the CAB College comes across a relevant reason to reopen the issue.

**Action EAAB Secretariat**

**4.5 Commission implementing decision on a standardization request to CEN and CENELEC in the area of accreditation and conformity assessment**

For M. Nitsche, it was actually an EC issue. He wondered why it had been put on the agenda, whereas no representative of CEN/CENELEC attended the meeting.

A. Steinhorst said that the issue, which had been discussed by JTC1 in CEN/CENELEC, raised the point of legal value of standards. The purpose is to make standards more legally applicable. There is no implication for EA.

J. Hartge pointed out that the problem lay in the annexes which were fully mixed and beyond the product standardisation area. He and M. Stadler warned about Annex 2 which set out requirements on the structure of standards. Does it mean that ISO standards cannot be adopted as such in Europe? This would imply the risk that European standards could deviate from international ones and not be in line with ISO standards. This is a critical development which would jeopardise the support given to European industry and business.

While recognising the need for a better legal structure, M. Nitsche agreed on the potential risk.

**Decision**

The Board:

- expressed serious concerns over the draft standardisation mandate, notably referring to the risk emerging from Annex 2 that European standards could deviate from international standards, which would strongly undermine the competitiveness of European industry and business;
- asked the NA College to raise the issue and the critical development it might create at the next IMP (Internal Market of Products) meeting in December 2019; *Action NA College*

- asked National Authorities sitting on the Committee of Standards (CoS) under Regulation (EU) 1025/2012 to raise awareness of the issue.

5. **EA matters**

5.1 **Endorsement of new EA work items**

There was no comment.

**Decision**
The Board endorsed the new work item proposed for the revision of EA-5/02: *EA Guidance on the Application of ISO/IEC 17020 in Periodic Inspection of the Roadworthiness of Motor Vehicles and their Trailers.*

5.2 **Relations with stakeholders**

- **TIC Council’s application for Recognised Stakeholder status**

  A. Steinhorst informed that, as soon as the agreement with TIC Council was signed, the agreements with CEOC and IFIA would be terminated.

- **NB-Rail Association application for Recognised Stakeholder status**

  There was no comment.

**Decision**
The Board endorsed TIC Council’s and NB-Rail’s applications for being granted the EA Recognised Stakeholder status, acknowledging that the final decisions would be made at the EA General Assembly meeting in November 2019.

5.3 **Elaboration of a list of possible risks related to operation of conformity assessment bodies**

The NA, CAB and Industry Colleges said that the draft document was an enumeration of potential risks listed as a reminder for informative purposes. This kind of guidance was considered to be very useful, especially for CABs. There are no other additional elements than the list.

A. Steinhorst explained that the purpose of the document was to provide a list of possible risks related to operation of CABs, that ABs may take into account when preparing assessments, accreditation program or performing process of CAB’s scope extension, as referred in ISO/IEC 17011 clause 7.4, 7.9 and 7.10. Further to EUROLAB’s request for having a mandatory document about risk approach, A. Steinhorst answered that risks are different and have to be assessed case by case. He added that, due to its informative status, the document would not be used in peer evaluations.

**Decision**
The Board acknowledges the informative status of the document listing the potential risks as a helpful guidance.
5.4 Revision of EA-2/17: EA Document on Accreditation for Notification Purposes

A. Steinhorst recalled that the draft EA-2/17 had been sent out for EA comments to recognised stakeholders, the EC and national authorities; everyone had been involved. Comments were reviewed by the ad hoc HHC TFG. The key issue is how the construction area is dealing with EA-2/17, and how to improve the document in regard to construction.

A. Dalrymple agreed that the construction area had serious concerns with current EA-2/17. He requested for consolidated comments. A. Steinhorst said that a consolidated table of answered comments would be circulated together with the final document sent out for ballot.

M. Stadler pointed out some inconsistencies in the Annexes about the “preferred” standards related to the quality assurance modules. The Industry College will provide further comments for the next IMP meeting.

It was reminded that it was up to national authorities to decide finally on the standards used for the assessment of notified bodies.

M. Stadler noted that two “preferred” standards, ISO/IEC 17065 and ISO/IEC 17021-1, were advocated in some cases. A. Steinhorst replied that the HHC had actually developed a document to explain why ISO/IEC 17065 was sometimes the “preferred” standard instead of ISO/IEC 17021-1.

**Decision**

The Board:

- took note that the key issue of the revision was how to improve EA-2/17 with regards to the construction area;

- acknowledged that the Industry College highlighted some inconsistencies in the Annexes related to the preferred standards in support of the quality assurance modules and, since it was up to the national authorities of the Member States to decide how to implement the document, that the Industry College would provide further comments for the next IMP meeting.

**Action Industry College**

5.5 Implementation of EA Strategy 2025, including close cooperation with regulators and stakeholders; development of the EA Stakeholder Policy; evaluation of the size and composition of the EAAB

The Chair read a mail from Zacharias Bilalis (EC) stressing the close bilateral relation between the EA and the EAAB, according to which the EAAB should give more detailed advice to EA, and EA should be more responsive and show more formal reaction to the EAAB’s advice.

M. Stadler noted that this EC reaction was very interesting and emphasised the EAAB Terms of Reference.

A. Steinhorst reported that EA Strategy 2025 would give more power to EA committees while reinforcing EA positions through the “one-voice approach”. The new management structure will make absolutely no change for EA Recognised Stakeholders.

A. Dalrymple complained that sometimes the CAB College faced with some difficulty to know on what to advise on behalf of the Board. For instance, he would like to have more information about the new management structure. The CAB College asked for closer relationships between EA and the EAAB.

A. Steinhorst replied that TFG 6 implemented the EA Articles of Association and Rules of Procedure which had been circulated twice. The revised documents are still out of comments until the end of November. He will circulate an updated implementation plan of EA Strategy 2025.

**Action EA**
The Chair asked whether the EAAB should have a more central position. A. Steinhorst answered that the EA Strategy would imply no change on the flow of information received by the EAAB. He added that informative documents could be adopted by EA committees in the future, but actually there would be no real big changes.

**Decision**  
The Board:

- acknowledged receipt of the mail from Zacharias Bilalis (EC), apologized, stressing the close bilateral relation between the EAAB, which should give more detailed advice to EA, and EA which should demonstrate more formal responsiveness;

- asked the Secretariat to file Zacharias Bilalis’ mail into the EAAB papers (in PDF format with reference number) and to circulate it among EAAB Members; **Action EAAB Secretariat**

- wished to have further discussions on this topic with the EC representative at the next meeting of the Board;

- took note that the new management structure in EA would imply no change for recognised stakeholders and would not impact the flow of information towards the EAAB;

- acknowledged the CAB and Industry Colleges’ formal request to have closer relationships between EA and EAAB;

- asked the Secretariat to refer to, and update, the document on “Interactions between EA and EAAB: potential for improvement” in order to discuss the table set out therein at the next meeting of the Board; **Action EAAB Secretariat**

- decided to have a general discussion about EA Strategy 2025, and a specific one about recognised stakeholders together with Ed Wieles, at the next meeting of the Board - see Agenda Item 2.

**5.6 Use of accreditation by the European Commission - Current developments**

A. Steinhorst updated on the latest developments made about the new regulation on drones. He also informed that EA is negotiating a new Memorandum of Understanding with Mercosur countries accreditation bodies, and a new Trade Agreement between the EU and the United States is in preparation.

**Conclusion**  
The Board:

- thanked EA for the update on the current developments and efforts to promote accreditation as the best option to demonstrate competence of conformity assessment bodies;

- welcomed the MoU between EA and Mercosur countries accreditation bodies.

**5.7 Brexit and EA - Progress report**

A. Steinhorst said that, since the United Kingdom was still in the European Union, UKAS still remained in EA. If UK should leave the EU in January, the application of Article 6 clause 7 in the **EA Articles of Association** 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 May 2020.
5.8 Inadequate accreditation in Iceland

G. Rognvaldardottir distributed a hard paper indicating that, in 2018, the Icelandic Minister for Foreign Affairs had received a request from the Icelandic Parliament for a report on the advantages and disadvantages of Iceland’s membership of the EEA agreement and the impact of the latter in Iceland. The 300-page report was issued in September 2019. The report’s chapter on free movement of goods starts with a text entitled “Inadequate accreditation”, which stipulates that “ISAC has not yet undergone peer review and is therefore not a signatory of the EA MLA”. As a result, “accreditation certificates issued by ISAC do not meet the requirements of EEA rules and are therefore generally not valid in the EEA”.

G. Rognvaldardottir asked why the EAAB (and EA) had been for years not reacting to the fact that ISAC had not been peer-evaluated and could not therefore be a signatory of the EA MLA, the only EEA/EFTA state for which this was the case.

M. Stadler acknowledged the Board’s lack of awareness of the fact. He was surprised that, notably, EFTA had never reported on this issue at the EAAB.

A. Steinhorst said that EA had been approached, stressing that, actually, it was up to the AB, and not to EA, to decide to be ready for peer evaluation. Regulation (EC) 765/2008 is quite clear on that. If the AB has not signed the EA MLA, the certificates issued by their accredited CABs cannot be recognized.

A. Safarik-Pstrosz pointed out that it was not to the EAAB and EA to react to this issue.

**Decision**
The Board:

- expressed its lack of awareness of the fact, reported by EFTA, that ISAC, the Icelandic national accreditation body, had never been peer-evaluated by EA and never applied for the EA MLA signatory status;

- took note that EFTA might table again the issue with further information at the next meeting of the Board. *Action EFTA*

6. Items for information

6.1 Information to the EAAB

A. Steinhorst said a few words on:

- **FPA 2019-2022**

  The 3rd Framework Partnership Agreements have been signed with the EC and EFTA for the period 2019-2022.

- **IAF/ILAC evaluation of EA - Regular re-evaluation of EA**

  The re-evaluation report by IAF/ILAC is fine and confirmed that neither non-conformities nor concerns have been noticed.

  The Board congratulated EA for this excellent result.
6.2 CETA - Implementation of the Bilateral Cooperation Agreement with Standards Council of Canada (SCC) - Progress report

A. Steinhorst reported that cooperation, at the technical level, proved very good. However the problem of SCC’s European recognition, which slows down cooperation, has still to be solved.

**Decision**

The Board:

- expressed its concern about the delay in the operationalisation of the CETA agreement, which was stopped due to the lack of European recognition of SCC;

- urged the EC and Canadian authorities to make progress, in particular to agree on a recognising party for SCC from the EC’s part;

- asked the representative of the EC to raise awareness on the situation and to take further action, which the Board should be kept informed of; **Action Z. Bilalis**

- asked the Chair to report on the issue at the next IMP meeting. **Action EAAB Chair**

6.3 Report on complaints and appeals

A. Steinhorst explained that the petition, still ongoing, related to the composition of the assessor team. A “petition” is launched by the complainant disagreeing on the outcome of the EA process for dealing with complaints.

6.4 IAF/ILAC annual Meetings in Frankfurt on 21-31 October 2019

A. Steinhorst reported that:

- Both IAF and ILAC resolved to establish one single global accreditation organisation. The outcome is still open; a steering group is looking at the process for now.

- The new **ILAC Articles of Association** have been adopted. One vote is now granted to every AB (instead of every country). EA has disagreed on this change which favours those important countries that include several ABs.

- Two new standards ISO/IEC 17029 and ISO 20387 have been issued and are expected to be soon published in the OJEU.

**Conclusion**

The Board asked CEN/CENELEC to follow up the publication of ISO/IEC 17029: *Conformity Assessment - General Principles and Requirements for Validation and Verification Bodies* and ISO 20387: *Biotechnology - Biobanking – General Requirements for Biobanking* in the EU Official Journal in order for EA to apply both new standards. **Action CEN/CENELEC**

6.5 Draft Agenda of the 44th EA General Assembly on 20-21 November 2019 in Budapest, Hungary

The Chair said that she would attend the EA General Assembly on behalf of the Board.
Conclusion
The Board took note that the Chair would ask for feedback on the GDPR implementation in certification at the EA General Assembly in November. **Action EAAB Chair**

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

7. **Any other business**
None.

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

**Decision**
The Board:
- confirmed to meet on **Tuesdays 28 April and 10 November 2020**;
- thanked EFTA for offering to host both meetings, the second of which should be held at EFTA’s new offices next door.

The 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
EA 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
TIC industry: testing, inspection and certification industry
SS: sector scheme
SO: scheme owner
TFG: task force group
ToR: Terms of Reference
WG: working group
WP: work programme