APPROVED Minutes of the 46th Meeting of the EA Advisory Board
held online on Wednesday 10 November 2021

Participants:

**EAAB Chair:** Miruna Dobre (NA, Belgium).

**EAAB Vice-Chair:** Martin Stadler (BUSINESSEUROPE), Bruce McGill (TIC Council).

**CAB College:** Ivan Savov (EFAC), Benny De Blaere (EUROCER Building), Alexander Safarik-Pstrosz (EUROLAB), Alex Stoichitoiu (IQNet).

**Industry College:** Andrew Evans (CAPIEL), Lars Bo Hammer (Danish Industries), Franziska Wirths (ORGALIM).

**NA College:** Natalia Kolibová (NA, Czech Republic), Michael Ottmann (NA, Germany), Sezen Leventoglu (NA, Turkey).

**Consumers:** Libor Dupal (ANEC).

**European Standardisation Organisations:** Enda McDonnell (CEN-CENELEC).

**Metrology Stakeholders:** Maria Luisa Rastello (EURAMET).

**EC:** Zacharias Bilalis (EC).

**EFTA:** Gudrun Rognvaldaradottir (EFTA).

**EA:** Maureen Logghe (EA President), Andreas Steinhorst (EA Executive Secretary), Frédérique Laudinet (EAAB Secretariat).

After the meeting, apologies were received from Marc Wouters from WELMEC.

**1. Opening of the meeting - Introduction of Members and Guests (roll call)**

Renewal of the EAAB Membership: nomination results and election of Chair and Vice-Chairs

Appointment of EAAB observers to MAC/HHC

As the previous Chair, M. Dobre opened the meeting and welcomed the delegates to this fourth shortened online meeting owing to the Covid-19 pandemic. She invited EAAB Members to a roll call, especially to address a special welcome to those new members that had been nominated by 4 October 2021 as a result of the renewal of the Board for the next 3-year term, i.e. Alex Stoichitoiu from IQNet, Franziska Wirths from ORGALIM, Michael Ottmann from German NA and Libor Dupal from ANEC, and for all members to introduce themselves.

It was announced that A. Stoichitoiu attended his first and last meeting and would be soon replaced by Marcus Long from IIOC.

It was announced that the elections within the colleges had resulted in the reappointment of Bruce McGill, Martin Stadler and Miruna Dobre as the Chairs of the CAB, Industry and NA Colleges, respectively, for the next three years.

The Board unanimously reappointed Bruce McGill and Martin Stadler as the EAAB Vice-Chairs, who fully supported having Miruna Dobre as the EAAB Chair.

Finally Miruna Dobre was unanimously re-elected as the Chair of the EAAB and was congratulated with acclamation.

The three newly reappointed EAAB Chairs and Vice-Chairs took office with effect from the beginning of this meeting.
Then the Chair communicated that Sezen Leventoglu would continue to be the EAAB MAC Observer; and that Benny De Blaere had accepted to be the EAAB HHC Observer. The Board unanimously agreed on both (re)appointments.

The Board:

- agreed unanimously to the re-election of Miruna Dobre as the Chair of the EAAB and Martin Stadler and Bruce McGill as reappointed Vice-Chairs of the EAAB;
- appointed Sezen Leventoglu as the EAAB MAC observer and Benny de Blaere as the EAAB HHC observer;
- asked the EAAB Secretariat to include into the new LIST OF EAAB MEMBERSHIP the change mentioned by the CAB College (A. Stoichitoiu from IQNET to be replaced by M. Long from IIOC), as well as the names of the 5th members from the Industry and NA Colleges once the seats are filled. **Action EAAB Secretariat, further to Action Industry and NA Colleges**

**Action EAAB Secretariat to revise the EAAB Members as listed in EA-INF/02: Contact Persons of EA Full and Associate Members, Recognized Stakeholders and Observers in the light of the EAAB Membership List.**

2. Approval of agenda

   - List of conclusions and resolutions
   - Approval of Draft Minutes of 45th Meeting of the EAAB
   - Action list (actions not covered elsewhere)

   ▪ Approval of agenda

   The agenda was adopted as distributed for the meeting.

   ▪ Approval of previous Minutes

   There was no comment on the draft minutes, which were approved as distributed for the meeting.

   **Action Secretariat to publish the minutes on the relevant EAAB intranet and internet pages**

   ▪ Action List

   The Chair went through the action list which raised no comment.

   Regarding the action under previous Agenda Item 3.3 on Brexit and EA, she highlighted that no example about non-recognition of conformity assessment results accredited by EA MLA signatories by the Member States’ public authorities, in accordance with Article 11 of Regulation 765, had been sent to the Secretariat.

3. Topics for discussion

3.1 Stakeholders’ representation in EA; interaction between EAAB and EA

The Chair recalled that the CAB and Industry Colleges intended in April meeting to have a joint meeting in advance of this meeting in order to achieve some common positions on these two questions, already discussed at the previous two meetings:
1/ How to improve the interaction between EA and the EAAB?
2/ What do stakeholders consider to be the EAAB’s role in the future?
B. McGill and M. Stadler confirmed that their Colleges had met and reached some common positions which had been consolidated on Page 7 in Document EAAB(21)13, and were detailed as follows by the former:

1) Membership of the EA Executive Board should be revised and extended to include one additional seat to be reserved for the EAAB Chair in an observatory and advisory capacity. This would ensure that the views and positions taken by stakeholders are properly represented at the steering level of EA (as is the case in IAF). It should also be possible to provide for an EAAB representative to participate as an observer on the EA Technical Management Board (TMB).

2) About direct feedback to EAAB positions and resolutions, EA through the Executive Board should respond directly and provide specific, timely feedback to any positions and resolutions adopted by the EAAB, as per points 4.6 & 4.8 of the EAAB Terms of Reference.

3) The EA TMB and GA Chair should give the EAAB regular feedback on success levels related to EU accreditation policy implementation.

4) EA should provide financial support for the EAAB HHC Observer (by taking on the meeting-related fees) through the EC grant to EA, because the role of EAAB HHC Observer is directly linked to fulfilment of the EAAB role as defined in Art. 4(11) of Regulation 765/2008/EU.

M. Stadler added that these four main positions were not newly expressed in the Board and were already included in some papers showing the positions of the EAAB Colleges.

The Chair asked what the expectations of the CAB and Industry Colleges were with the 1st position. M. Stadler stressed two objectives:
- for the EAAB to have a direct partner to represent recognised stakeholders on the Executive Board;
- for the EAAB Chair to have a higher profile in EA.

The overall objective is to increase the interaction and direct feedback between the EAAB and EA.

M. Logghe maintained the EA position not to include the EAAB into the Executive Board. She explained that, contrary to the IAF Executive Committee, the EA Executive Board worked at a steering level only, preparing and discussing the policy items and coming GA meetings. It is not for the EA Executive Board but for EA members to make decisions. She added that recognised stakeholders are always invited to give their opinions which are listened to.

The Chair confirmed that information was well distributed to stakeholders and that all voices were echoed. But she wondered about the reality of a direct link between the EAAB and EA.

M. Logghe stressed that EA always asked for all opinions when needed on specific topics. A. Steinhorst added that any issue discussed at the Executive Board was forwarded to the EAAB as the appropriate platform for discussion with stakeholders.

M. Stadler regretted the not very constructive decision made by EA. He did not agree that the EAAB had always been very involved in policy issues.

M. Logghe reiterated that EA was always opened to and involved in discussions, although it was not for the Executive Board to take position as it was the case in IAF.

Regarding the 2nd and 3rd common positions, further to the Chair’s request for some clarification, B. McGill welcomed EA to continue its feedback in a timely manner on resolutions / policies adopted by the EAAB in accordance with the EAAB ToR, to include any success with outcomes of said implementation from the TMB and GA Chair.

Then the Chair asked how to proceed further with this document.
M. Stadler suggested that all Colleges and members should look at EAAB(21)13, Page 7, carefully and decide whether they could agree on these four common positions or not. If yes, the document would become an EAAB position paper with a formal joint position of the Board. If no, the document would remain as it is and would be put aside to be reconsidered in the future.

Again M. Stadler referred to the need to properly implement an “effective stakeholder involvement within EA” as referred to in Article 4 (11) of Regulation 765/2008/EU. EA is required to provide for an adequate structure for recognised stakeholders’ participation. He was disappointed that EA stuck to its known position, but wondered about the NA College’s and EC’s positions and would like to have a clear statement from them as well. He pointed out that the role of the National Authorities included looking at the fulfilment of the EAAB’s role.

The Chair replied that she would ask the National Authorities at the next IMP meeting, while adding that neither complaint nor criticism have been expressed on the EAAB’s role so far.

A. Safarik-Pstrosz noticed that all recommendations included in the document aimed to improve the interaction between the EAAB and EA. This is the same story for long years, and he confirmed that there was certainly a room for improvement, especially in advance of the General Assemblies.

A. Steinhorst was somewhat surprised at the discussions. He reaffirmed the excellence and transparency of EA’s relationships with the EAAB. In case any issues were not tackled with the EAAB, EA would be very pleased to improve and share them specifically with the Board. But he repeated that the EAAB Chair could not have a seat on the Executive Board.

The Chair concluded that a clear process for interaction between the EAAB and EA was strongly needed, and suggested considering the point with the EAAB Secretariat.

M. Stadler confirmed that EA had been responsive to the Board’s resolutions and meetings in the past. But he regretted that there were no clear communication routes in between the EAAB meetings. EAAB members miss direct and clear interaction between the Board’s meetings, as well as between the EAAB and Executive level.

B. McGill confirmed that a 6-month period between meetings was too long, and stressed the need to improve the visibility of actions in between.

M. Logghe replied that in case two half-yearly meetings were not enough, EA would be pleased to answer questions and have discussions in additional video conferences. According to the EAAB Terms of Reference, EA should report on the recommendations made by the Board. If something were missing, EA should and would improve this. She engaged that EA would pay more attention to this and wanted to increase interaction with the EAAB. But again, no link between the EAAB and the Executive Board is possible.

**Decision**

With regard to the written contributions, based on Document “Interactions between EA and EAAB: potential for improvement” (EAAB(20)03), sent by the CAB, Industry and NA Colleges as well as by the European representation of Metrology Stakeholders (EAAB(20)18rev) on the following questions:

1/ How to improve the interaction between EA and the EAAB?
2/ What do stakeholders consider to be the EAAB’s role in the future?

The Board:

- took note of the CAB and Industry Colleges’ common positions as added in revised Document EAAB(21)13, Page 7, advocating that:
the membership of the EA Executive Board should include one additional seat to be reserved for the EAAB Chair in an observatory and advisory capacity;
EA, through the Executive Board, should respond directly and provide specific, timely feedback to any positions and resolutions adopted by the EAAB;
feedback on success levels related to EU accreditation policy implementation should be given on a regular basis to the EAAB;
EA should provide financial support for the EAAB HHC observer (by taking on the meeting-related fees) through the EC grant to EA in view to fulfilment of EAAB role as defined in Art. 4(11) of Regulation 765.

- took note of EA's answer that the EA Executive Board, unlike the IAF one, was rather a steering committee which made no decision and took no position (EA decisions are made by EA Members during the General Assemblies), that recognised stakeholders were always listened to and consulted during the decision process and every decision made in the Executive Board had been previously forwarded to the EAAB as the appropriate platform for discussion with stakeholders;

- took note that the NA College would raise the question of whether the EAAB role was fulfilled with the Member States’ national authorities and the EU Commission at the next IMP meeting;

**Action NA College at IMP meeting on 18 November 2021**

- agreed that so far EA had generally been responsive to EAAB resolutions and positions taken during the Board’s meetings, while acknowledging the lack of communication routes in between the meetings and the need for improvement in direct and clear interaction between the EAAB and EA's Executive level;

- agreed to set up a small TFG (composed of M. Dobre, M. Logghe, M. Stadler and B. McGill) to consider possible ways of how to improve the communication and interaction between the EAAB and EA, especially between the Board’s meetings, and how to organise an increased feedback from EA on EAAB recommendations.

**Action TFG to meet and draft a proposal for improvement, to be forwarded to EAAB Members for further discussion**

### 3.2 Evaluation of the New Legislative Framework (NLF): update and exchange of views

Z. Bilalis informed that the public consultation designed to perform an evaluation of where the NLF stood now was intended to be launched by the EC by end of November 2021. He reiterated that the purpose was not a revision, but a whole evaluation of the NLF during the last six years based on an exhaustive questionnaire. He encouraged stakeholders to take part in the evaluation and give their positions.

M. Stadler commented that the conformity assessment system as designed in the NLF should continue to be based on international standards. Additional European requirements would carry the risk of inconsistencies with international practice and hence of questioning the acceptability of accredited conformity assessment results.

B. McGill reported that the CAB College warned that the NLF review should not impact the agreed principles underlined from the ISO 17000 series accreditation standards adopted

**Decision**
The Board took note that the EC’s public consultation aimed to provide assessment of the NLF would be launched by end of November 2021, and agreed to wait for the publication of the consultation before reacting and elaborating any EAAB position.
3.3 IAF CertSearch database; IAF DMC proposal for further development

The Chair left the floor to A. Steinhorst who summarised the issue. The IAF CertSearch online database, managed by an IAF Database Management Committee (DMC), includes accredited management system certificates issued by CABs with the purpose to check whether any certificate is delivered under accreditation or not. It is mandatory for NABs to feed the accreditations they issue to a database, but so far CABs have to input a database with their accreditation only on a voluntary basis. Owing to financial issues, IAF has proposed another option to run the CertSearch database which would make it mandatory for all accredited CBs. Besides every user of the database should pay for it in the future.

A. Steinhorst declared that EA was quite reluctant to this option because CABs cannot be obliged to put their data on a database. This is an important issue for EA which will be subject to a dedicated meeting in February 2022. A. Steinhorst asked for the EAAB Colleges’ position, especially the NA College’s one, on the mandatory aspect of the issue.

M. Logghe confirmed that the EAAB position would be very useful and appreciated on the point that CBs would be obliged to feed their data into the database. It will be important in the discussions with National Authorities to make the distinction that the database focused on management system certification only. The IAF DMC have been holding several specific webinars and consultations, and the CAB College’s position is very much requested on this issue.

B. McGill voiced some fear from the CAB College that, if the database were progressing that way with management system certification, IAF could apply the same principle as a resolution to product certification in a next step as a reference is made to Product Certification in the Database Contract Agreement, albeit in the definitions under “Certification”. The CAB College opposes such a direction by IAF if undertaken.

M. Stadler echoed the fears and concerns of the CAB College on the issue which had been discussed at different levels of the industry sector. Both the Industry College and Industry associations will come up with clear positions later on. As initial comments, M. Stadler declared that, as end-users of accredited certification, the Industry College and the constituencies it represents did not see a clear market demand for such a database. Indeed, there are already a number of databases managed by CABs and NABs which prove to be quite sufficient for the Industry’s and users’ needs. He also questioned the need at the international level, where the database would be unpractical for him. The database should therefore remain strictly voluntary and its coverage limited to management system certification. The industry college would reject other options such as a mandatory use and an extended coverage. M. Stadler added that there are strong concerns about not only security aspects, also addressed in IAF papers, but also maintenance of business secrecy in particular if the database should be extended to product certification.

B. De Blaere pinpointed that, if uploading information might be dangerous, it would be better and safer to make it available easily, which would be another possibility. He did not completely oppose the database, but was paying a careful attention to the development of the system.

M. Logghe pointed out that EA did not have a vote in IAF; only those EA members that are IAF members can vote. Consequently she asked the CAB and Industry Colleges to put forward their opinions to IAF, because it was rumoured that some CABs and users would be in favour of the database.

B. McGill noted the point and said that the CAB college through its associated memberships would continue to monitor at IAF committee levels.

The Chair reported the NA College’s position that there was no need for the database for National Authorities.
**Decision**

The Board:

- took note that, to solve a financial issue, the IAF CertSearch, an IAF-managed online database containing a large international collection of accredited management system certificates with the aim to validate the legitimacy of an accredited certification, would be made mandatory for all accredited CBs with a new voluntary “user pays” funding model and a contractual link between CBs and IAF;

- acknowledged the utmost importance of the issue for EA which was quite reluctant to oblige CBs to put their data on the CertSearch database, and which asked for the EAAB position on this matter before the issue was extensively discussed at a specific EA meeting on 3 February 2022;

- acknowledged the fears and concerns expressed by the Industry College which strongly opposed such a mandatory database as well as the idea of its extension to product certification, and which – like the NA College – questioned the need for it at the international level;

- acknowledged that the CAB College membership position was of a 50/50 split consensus, with those for, putting forward the benefits of such a system, those against, voicing the same concerns as the other colleges. A concern as a point of consensus of the EAAB was raised in particular with regard to data security and protection as well as business secrecy;

- agreed that each EAAB college and member should send a written contribution on the issue, which will be consolidated into a single paper identifying the positions of all colleges before being forwarded to EA as an input for EA discussions on 3 February 2022.

**Action EAAB colleges/members to send contributions to Secretariat by 15 January 2022**

**Action EAAB Chair to consolidate a final paper to be sent to EA before 3 February 2022**

**POST-MEETING NOTES:**

- As agreed at the EA GA meeting on 24-25 November, the EA meeting (for EA Members only) initially planned on 3 February 2022 has been brought forward to 17 December 2021.

- An extraordinary meeting of EAAB was held on 19 January 2022. For a complete overview of the points of view expressed by EAAB members on IAF proposal, please consult the minutes of the extraordinary meeting and the written position paper issued after the meeting.

### 4. Topics for information

#### EAAB Matters

4.1 Report from the EAAB MAC observer: 6-7 October 2021 meeting  
Report from the EAAB HHC observer: 7-8 September 2021 meeting

- A report on the last MAC meeting held remotely on 6-7 October 2021 had been drafted by S. Leventoglu, the EAAB MAC observer, and distributed among the papers.

There was neither comment nor question.

- A report on the last HHC meeting held remotely on 7-8 September 2021 had been drafted by Benny De Blaere, the new EAAB HHC observer, and distributed among the papers.

B. De Blaere highlighted some points of a specific relevance for the EAAB, especially the following question considered by HHC WG AfN (Accreditation for Notification): would a Notified Body and a UK approved body be allowed to sign a cooperation agreement whereby they recognize the validity of each other’s certification systems, and only one assessment would be required on the basis of
which two certificates would be issued? He reported that the HHC had decided to wait for further development of the EC Blue Guide in order to answer the question.

M. Stadler thanked B. De Blaere for his excellent report. He emphasized that the AfN issue was not limited to the CPR area, and could be included into the EAAB Work Programme. But he was surprised because the Blue Guide should not be expected to come up with new requirements.

A. Steinhorst replied that EA-2/17 had been revised to incorporate the CPR area and improve harmonisation in this area with regards to accreditation of Notified Bodies. The HHC will also soon launch a survey on the implementation of EA-2/17 in EA.

The Board took note of the information contained in both reports published as EAAB(21)08 and EAAB(21)14, and thanked the observers for their excellent reports.

4.2 Brexit and problems encountered by businesses and CABs (if any)

A. Steinhorst introduced Document EAAB(21)17 which raises the question of how to use the results produced by UKAS-accredited CABs. The issue which was discussed in the HHC is summarised in the document, which also indicates further explanation received from the EC.

EA supports that the results produced by a UKAS-accredited CAB may be used by a Notified Body on the basis of the equivalence of the EA MLA, and it would be up to the NB to check if essential requirements are met and a CE Marking can be authorised.

The EC has replied that tests done in the UK by UKAS-accredited CABs do not have any legal effect in the EU and cannot be accepted/used by anybody as demonstration of the product compliance to the applicable EU legislation. The Notified Bodies cannot accept attestations from UKAS-accredited CABs to issue their attestations.

The issue is still open with the EC. Results should be considered but the full responsibility remains with Notified Bodies themselves.

M. Stadler advocated that the EA MLA signatory status of UKAS should be taken into account by EA members and the notified bodies accredited by them to facilitate acceptance of results produced by CABs established within the UK and accredited by UKAS, in order to avoid duplication of assessments.

For B. McGill, the issue results from miseducation and misunderstanding of the market place. M. Stadler noticed however that the industry associations had disseminated a lot of information on the Brexit in due time; all information is still available for the market, which has to read it and learn. M. Logghe pointed out that manufacturers still used and relied on UKAS accreditation. She agreed with B. McGill that manufacturers would still ignore Brexit and the resulting changes. There is still a real need for education of the market place.

For B. De Blaere, the problem does not lie in accreditation, but in scopes mentioned on certificates which are different from one country to another one. This is rather a technical issue to be solved with the Blue Guide.

Decision
The Board:
- took note that EA was considering and still discussing with the EC details regarding the use of the UKCA marking and its equivalence to the CE marking, acknowledging that the responsibility for the acceptance of conformity assessment results (or parts thereof) produced by bodies established within the UK remained with the notified bodies;
- acknowledged the Industry College’s position that the EA MLA signatory status of UKAS needs to be taken into consideration by EA members and the notified bodies accredited by them to facilitate acceptance of conformity assessment results (or parts thereof) produced by bodies established within the UK and accredited by UKAS, in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of assessments;

- acknowledged the CAB College’s position that parts of the issue resulted from misunderstanding and lack of education of the market place which, however, had been largely informed of the Brexit issue and its consequences in due time;

- agreed to further discuss the issue at the next Board meeting in April 2022.

**Action to next agenda**

4.3 Confidentiality of proprietary information in the case of acquisition of notified bodies by non-EEA based organisations

M. Stadler reported that the issue had come up in industry associations and was also discussed in a number of fora in the conformity assessment sector in order to consider how to reinforce the protection of confidentiality of proprietary information in the case of acquisition of notified bodies by non-EEA based organisations or public authorities. The issue is important for both NBs and CBs. Because the issue was emerging, he suggested discussing it rather at one of the following Board meetings.

B. McGill pointed out that this issue concerning notified bodies, i.e. public bodies, was to be considered by the EU Member States. He proposed to send a written contribution as a basis for formal discussion at the next meeting.

**Decision**

The Board:

- took note that the issue has come up in industry associations and was being discussed in a number of fora in the conformity assessment sector with a view to identifying ways of reinforcing the protection of confidentiality of proprietary information in the case of acquisition of notified bodies by non-EEA based organisations;

- welcomed the CAB College’s announcement to send a written contribution for formal and more substantial discussion at the next Board meeting in April 2022.

**Action CAB College by 1 April 2022**

**EA Matters**

4.4 Endorsement of new EA work items

- Revision of EA-1/22: *EA Procedure and Criteria for the Evaluation of Conformity Assessment Schemes by EA Accreditation Body Members*

A. Steinhorst explained that this new revision of EA-1/22 should improve the management of additional requirements and provide a common understanding on scoping. The aim is to streamline the process.

- Revision of EA governance documents

A. Steinhorst explained that the documents concerned were EA-1/06, -1/13, -1/14, -1/17, -1/17 S1, -1/17 S3, -1/17 S4 and -1/19. Only editorial changes will be made in order to:
  - implement the new membership categories as defined in the *Articles of Association (AoA)*;
- remove Bilateral Agreements because in practice there is no difference between MLA and BLA signatories. In future, all members successfully peer evaluated by EA shall be MLA signatories;
- introduce ISO 20387 for biobanking as a new MLA level 2 activity and level 3 standard, as recommended by the HHC, in EA-1/06.

He added that this NWIP shall come into force regarding the membership categories and the BLA when the revised AoA would have been endorsed by the General Assembly at its November 2021 meeting.

- **Revision of EA-6/03: EA Document for Recognition of Verifiers under the EU ETS Directive**


There was no comment on the new work items proposed by EA.

**Decision**

The Board endorsed the new work items proposed for:

- ✔ Revision of EA governance documents
- ✔ Revision of EA-6/03: EA Document for Recognition of Verifiers under the EU ETS Directive according to the rationales for revision set out respectively in Documents EAAB(21)07, EAAB(21)09 and EAAB(21)15.

4.5 **Revision of the EC Blue Guide (update on EC challenges to notification)**

Z. Bilalis reported that no date of publication had been planned yet, but the revised Guide was expected to be published by the end of the year.

When M. Stadler asked for the reasons of this delay, Z. Bilalis replied that this kind of text needed to be double-checked from both a legal and linguistic point of view. But he assured that no addition had been made to the text since last summer.

**Decision**

The Board took note that the revision of the EC Blue Guide, which shall be still double-checked for linguistic and legal purposes, is nearing completion and should be published by the end of 2021.

4.6 **New relevant EU legislations**

A. Steinhorst made a brief update on the new and revised legislations relevant for EA, highlighting in particular the following ones:

- Proposed Regulation laying down harmonised rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act)
- Evaluation and review of EU energy efficiency directive (EED)
- Review of General Product Safety Directive
- Vehicle safety – data collection rules for vehicle checks (market surveillance)
- Potential regulation on Ecodesign requirements for photovoltaic modules, inverters and systems
- Sustainable products policy initiative, including a revision of the Ecodesign Directive
- Revision of the EU Emissions Trading System (ETS), including maritime, aviation and CORSIA as well as a proposal for ETS as own resource
- Air quality - revision of EU rules
- Proposal for a Regulation concerning batteries and waste batteries
- Revision of the Machinery Directive
- Evaluation of the Electromagnetic Compatibility Directive
- Revision of the Construction Products Regulation

There was no comment.

4.7 Report on EA Extraordinary General Assembly meeting on 10 September 2021

M. Logghe reported that the Extraordinary General Assembly meeting held in September had been dedicated to the revision of EA Articles of Association and Rules of Procedure, which had given rise to intense discussions. The Articles have been double-checked with the Notary. Both documents are finalised now and will be sent out for EA ballot provided the agreement of the General Assembly in a couple of week. If the General Assembly disagreed, there would be no ballot and the Articles would not change.

This Extraordinary General Assembly meeting had also aimed to inform EA members on the merger between ILAC and IAF, as well as the IAF CertSearch database. There will be further discussions in February 2022.

**Decision**
The Board took note that this Extraordinary General Assembly had been dedicated to:

- ✓ the revision of EA Articles of Association and Rules of Procedure aiming to allow UKAS to remain a member of EA beyond 2022: the Articles and Rules have been finalised and, if agreed, will be sent out for ballot further to the upcoming General Assembly on 24-25 November 2021;
- ✓ the merger between ILAC and IAF, as well as the IAF CertSearch database: both topics will be further discussed at the EA meeting on 3 February 2022.

**POST-MEETING NOTE:** as agreed at the EA GA meeting on 24-25 November, the EA meeting (for EA Members only) initially planned on 3 February 2022 has been brought forward to 17 December 2021. The 3 February date is tentatively kept in case another EA meeting would be needed.

4.8 CETA – Implementation of the Bilateral Cooperation Agreement with Canada/SCC: new momentum with EU recognition of SCC; news about the guidelines for implementation of the new protocol

A. Steinhorst reported that EA still needed recognition under the CETA protocol: so far there is only one application from EA members for being recognised. But he hastened to add that the key issue was solved now: the EC has published the guidelines on the implementation of the CETA protocol in the EU Official Journal. He thanked very much the EC, saying that these guidelines would clarify the responsibilities and hopefully facilitate and boost the process.

**Decision**
The Board took note that the EC had published the Implementation Guide for the Protocol to the CETA Agreement between Canada, the European Union and its Member States regarding the mutual acceptance of the results of conformity assessment in the Official Journal of the European Union on 1 September 2021, which was expected to help to promote mutual recognition and streamline the process.

4.9 Report from EA on various issues

It was agreed that all current issues in EA had already been tackled during this meeting.
4.10 Single international accreditation organisation: update

M. Logghe reminded that, since the merger had been agreed, a Steering Committee had been set up with Thomas Facklam as the project manager, and Andreas Steinhorst as the EA representative. Because IAF and ILAC are two different structures, it has been decided to pick up the most relevant parts in each of them to build up the single international accreditation organisation; a questionnaire has been sent out through the Steering Committee to define those most appropriate parts. A TFG composed of NABs’ CEOs has been created in EA in order to follow up and progress the issue. At the ILAC/IAF General Assembly held the week before, it was intended that the merger should be finalised in 2024.

**Decision**
The Board took note that the *ad hoc* Steering Committee had sent out a questionnaire to consider which elements in ILAC and IAF should be kept for the setting-up of the new common organisation, and that the merger was intended to be finalised in 2024.

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

4.11 Relations with stakeholders

There was no new application so far.

5. Any other business

None.

6. Selection of date and place of next meeting

The Board agrees to meet on **Tuesday 26 April 2022** and thanks EFTA for offering to host the meeting, if needed a hybrid meeting half physical half virtual, at EFTA’s new offices in Brussels, with the provision that there are no travel or health restrictions due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

The Chair thanked the Board’s Members for their valuable participation and closed the remote 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
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