

**IAF Technical Committee
Frankfurt Wednesday 23rd October to Thursday 24th October 2019
Record of Meeting**

Item #	Subject	Background / Discussion	Decisions	Actions
01	Welcomes, Apologies and Introductions with voting member identification, Proxies (Keeling)	The IAF TC Chair (Steve Keeling) welcomed the members and introduced the acting IAF TC Secretary. The IAF TC Chair reviewed housekeeping matters and led a round of self-introductions. The IAF TC Chair reported that three proxies were received (JACB, RusAccreditation, CONFORMA)		
02	IAF TC Terms of Reference (Gignac)	The IAF TC Vice Chair (Guillaume Gignac) reviewed the Terms of Reference for the IAF Technical Committee (TC) as a refresher for members. The IAF TC Vice-Chair explained the function of Working Groups (WG) and Task Forces (TF) and voting procedures.		
03	Agenda and Objectives of Meeting (Keeling)	The draft agenda for the Frankfurt 2019 TC meeting was adopted with the addition of Item 09.06 – Documentation Update.	Agenda Approved	
04	Minutes of Meeting held on 06–07 April 2019 in Mexico City (TC Secretary)	The IAF TC Secretary presented the draft minutes of the TC meeting in Mexico City April 2019.	Minutes Approved	Post Final Minutes – TC Secretary
04.1	Log of Key IAF TC Decisions (TC Secretary)	The TC consensus responses from the Mexico City April 2019 decision papers were presented for endorsement.	Approved	Post Decision Log – TC Secretary
04.2	Action Item from Mexico City 2019 (Keeling)	The IAF TC Chair reviewed the action items from the Mexico City 2019 TC meeting. All actions have been completed or included in the agenda for this meeting.		
05	Working Groups / Task Force / Progress Reports			
05.1	Working Groups (Keeling)			
05.1.01	WG Management System Certification (ISO/IEC 17021) (Gillespie / Gignac)	Lori Gillespie provided a presentation on the 21 October 2019 Management System Certification (MSC) WG meeting and highlighted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation of the current terms of reference • Participation at the meeting • Activities since the April 2019 meeting • Meeting outcomes: 		

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting

23rd – 24th October 2019

Page 2 of 35

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Agreement to include Energy Management Systems (EnMS) in the scope of the MSC WG ○ Agreement on actions to update IAF MD 11:2019 – IAF Mandatory Document for the Application of ISO-IEC 17021-1 for Audits of Integrated Management Systems ○ Development of recommendations for the TC’s consideration ○ Review of discussion papers. <p>Ms. Gillespie reviewed the findings of IAF MD 3 – Advanced Surveillance and Recertification Procedures (ASRP) survey. Based on the survey findings, the MSC WG recommended that the TC withdraw IAF MD 3:2008 – Advanced Surveillance and Recertification Procedures immediately.</p> <p>The MSC WG recommended that the TC approve the establishment of a TF to review and consider revisions to IAF MD 12:2018 – Accreditation Assessment of Conformity Assessment Bodies with Activities in Multiple Countries. Wayne Terry (ABCB) and Wolfgang Breidenstein (DAkKS) volunteered to serve as Co-Convenors. Members were invited to contact the convenors if they wish to volunteer.</p> <p>The MSC WG recommended that the TC approve the establishment of a TF to develop transition for ISO 50003 Energy Management Systems – Requirements for Bodies Providing Audit and Certification of Energy Management Systems. Tina Garner (ANAB) and Leonardo Omodeo-Zorini (IIOC) volunteered to serve as Co-Convenors. Members were invited to contact the convenors if they wish to volunteer.</p> <p>Discussion ensued on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Suggestion that a warning be placed on the IAF website to raise awareness of the pending revision of IAF MD 11: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Suggestion to utilize all IAF communication channels to raise awareness of the pending revision to IAF MD 11. 	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Approved</p> <p>Approved</p>	<p>Take resolution to IAF EC and IAF GA for approval – IAF TC Chair</p> <p><i>Secretariat Note: Approved as Resolution 2019-16 during the GA.</i></p> <p>Utilize all applicable IAF communication channels to raise awareness of the pending revision to IAF MD 11 – IAF Secretary</p>
05.1.02	WG Product Certification Accreditation (ISO/IEC 17065) (Moliski / Xinbo)	<p>Reinaldo Figueiredo and Shi Xinbo led the review of a presentation on the 22 October 2019 Product Certification Accreditation WG meeting and noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Confirmation of current terms of reference ● Participation at the meeting ● Meeting outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Agreement to move forward with the Joint IAF-OIML Assessment Procedure (draft 4) in the Field of Legal Metrology ○ Expert panel under IAF TF for competence of assessors (IAF MD 20) to formulate the specific competencies for AB’s assessors involved in the accreditation process for Product CB (ISO/IEC 17065) 	<p>Approved</p>	<p>Forward document package to TC Chair for sign off for 30-day ballot – WG Co-Convenors</p>

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting

23rd – 24th October 2019

Page 3 of 35

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Workshop on impartiality to be held in Beijing 2020 ○ Review of discussion papers. <p>Discussion ensued on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Request that Workshop on impartiality be detached from the Product Certification Accreditation WG meeting to allow for broader participation from TC members ● Request that the workshop on impartiality not conflict with the four main WGs (Products, Persons, Management Systems and Validation and Verification (V&V)). 		Follow up on the arrangements for the workshop on impartiality – WG Co-Convenors
05.1.03	WG Person Certification (ISO/IEC 17024) (Woodley / Sheehan)	<p>Cynthia Woodley reported on the 21 October 2019 Person Certification WG meeting and highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Confirmation of the terms of reference ● Participation at the meeting ● Meeting outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review and finalization of list of knowledge, skills and attributes (KSAs) for AB Assessors who assess CBs for Persons and identification of next steps ○ Review of discussion papers ● Issues considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Several ABs reported the decline in the quality of CB applicants – need for more education/training for CBs regarding the requirements in ISO/IEC 17024 ○ Problem with Regulatory requirements sometimes conflicting with what ABs are trying to do (overlapping directives) – need to better coordinate with regulatory bodies ○ Increase in ABs with at least one or two accredited CBs. <p>During discussion, it was noted that the decline in the quality of CB applicants is not specific to any region.</p>		
05.1.04	WG Forests (Berger / Howard)	<p>Ann Howard provided the report on the 21 October 2019 Forests WG meeting and highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Confirmation of current terms of reference ● Participation at the meeting ● Meeting outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review of changes to the Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC) Chain of Custody (CoC) and Certification Bodies for Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) standards and trademark requirements 		

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting

23rd – 24th October 2019

Page 5 of 35

		<p>The WG Medical Devices requested that IAF MD 8 proceed to balloting.</p> <p>When ready, the MD 9 with proposed revisions, when agreed at the TF level to be forwarded to the TC Chair for approval of next steps.</p> <p>The need to ensure the process utilized for balloting and obtaining TC comments conform with the TC standards was noted.</p>	<p>Approved</p>	<p>Forward document package to TC Chair for sign off for 30-day ballot – WG Co-Convenors Forward proposed revisions to MD 9 (when agreed by the WG) to TC Chair for approval of next steps – WG Co-Convenors</p>
<p>05.1.07</p>	<p>WG Validation and Verification (V&V) (Makino / Howard)</p>	<p>Ann Howard led the review of a presentation on the 22 October 2019 Verification and Validation (V&V) WG meeting and highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of terms of reference that are generic to greenhouse gas (GHG) validation and verification processes • Participation at the meeting • Meeting outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development of recommendations for the TC’s consideration. <p>It was suggested that the terms of reference be amended to include a requirement to liaise with other WGs to address potential overlaps with ISO/IEC 17029 and ISO/IEC 17065 and others, particularly environmental standards.</p> <p>The V&V WG recommended the transition arrangement for the revision of ISO 14064-3 shall be four years from 30 April 2019. Any GHG validation and verification engagements commenced after 30 April 2023 shall be performed to ISO 14064-3:2019. As part of the transition, it is recommended that IAF MD 6 be edited to accommodate use of the new standard. The V&V WG noted the concerns expressed regarding the use of agreed upon procedures (AUP) as a conformity assessment activity.</p> <p>The V&V WG further recommended transition to ISO 14065 in three years from the date of publication of ISO 14065:202X.</p> <p>Extensive discussion ensued and the following comments were offered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expectation that the use of the standard will increase with the increased focus on climate change • The need for agreement on the transition to the new standard • It is the responsibility of ABs, not scheme owners, to determine if the GHG validation and verification standard will be utilized 	<p>Approved</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Amend terms of reference for presentation to the TC in Beijing – V&V WG</p> <p>Take resolution to IAF EC and IAF GA for approval – IAF TC Chair</p> <p><i>Secretariat Note: Approved as Resolution 2019-18 during the GA.</i></p> <p>Take resolution to IAF EC and IAF GA for approval – IAF TC Chair</p> <p><i>Secretariat Note: Approved as Resolution 2019-19 during the GA.</i></p>

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting

23rd – 24th October 2019

Page 7 of 35

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need for consistency in the time permitted for parties to transition to a new standard: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The timeframe should be based on risk and the significance of the changes A minimum of six months is required if transition assessments are required The need to communicate the transition to parties Suggestion to include the rationale for the time permitted for the transition of ISO 22301:2019 to occur The application of the Procedure for Transitions to ISO 22301 will result in a significant delay. 		<p><i>Secretariat Note: Approved as Resolution 2019-17 during the GA.</i></p>
05.1.11	WG Auditing Practices Group (APG) and Accreditation Auditing Practices Group (AAPG) (ISO 9001) (Yang / dos Guimaraes)	<p>Fei Yang and Joanna dos Guimaraes led the review of a presentation on discussions during the 22 October 2019 APG / AAPG WG meeting regarding findings and conclusion from the survey of Accreditation bodies, Accredited Certification Bodies (ABs), Nations Standards Bodies (NSBs) and Auditors Training and Certification organizations (ATCs) regarding APG papers.</p> <p>It was noted that the APG / AAPG WG will work with NSBs on the translation of APG papers.</p> <p>The name of the WG will be changed to WG Business Management Practice WG.</p>		
05.1.12	WG Auditing Practices Group (APG) (ISO 14001) (van Erp / Williams)	<p>Casper van Erp provided a presentation on the 21 October 2019 ISO 14001 Auditing Practices Group (APG) WG meeting and highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmation of the current terms of reference New APG EMS webpage has been developed with papers on six topics posted to the page; a further nine topics have been identified to be addressed The need for additional WG members to liaise with TC 207. <p>Nigel Leehane was proposed as the new Co-Convenor to replace Steve Williams.</p>	Approved	
05.2	Task Forces (Gignac)			
05.2.01	TF Competence of AB Assessors & Experts (Krishna / Yadav)	<p>Vijay Krishna provided a presentation on the 21 October 2019 Competence of AB Assessors and Experts TF meeting and highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmation of current terms of reference Activities since the 05 April 2019 meeting held in Mexico City 2019 Agreement that the TF will develop IAF MD 20: Generic Competence of AB Assessors and Experts for all main scope standards and facilitate a process for expert panels to develop specific competency profiles for AB's assessors for Product and Management System sub-scopes by October 2020 	Approved	Provide names of volunteers for expert panel volunteers to TC Secretary – TF Co-Convenors

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting

23rd – 24th October 2019

Page 8 of 35

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to convene two one-day expert panel meetings prior to commencement of the Beijing 2020 Mid-Term meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One room on 28 March 2020 (maximum 20 people) Two rooms on 29 March 2020 (maximum 20 people/room). <p>Discussion ensued on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestion to include validation and verification in the competency framework, despite the pending transition The need for the completed competency profiles to be approved through the IAF process. 	<p>Approved</p> <p>Approved</p>	<p>Include request for meeting rooms in the requirements for Beijing 2020 – TC Secretary</p>
05.2.02	TF Conformity Assessment Schemes (CAS) (Jauhri / Geneiatakis)	<p>Anil Jauhri provided a presentation on the discussions at the 22 October 2019 Conformity Assessment Schemes (CAS) TF meeting regarding the modifications to the CAS document following the 60-day comment period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues of continuing concern: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the document should be an MD or ID Whether to limit the scope to IAF MLA Endorsement or to expand the scope to Regions and individual ABs Next steps. <p>The CAS TF recommended that a second 60-day IAF member comment period on the nature and scope be initiated on the revision to IAF TC MD – Criteria for the evaluation of Conformity Assessment Schemes before balloting.</p> <p>Discussion ensued on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreement that a further 60-day comment period should be initiated to allow members to consider the changes to the nature and scope of the document Proposal that an IAF member vote be taken on the options for the nature and scope of the document Request that the unresolved comments from the initial 60-day comment period be considered in the second 60-day comment period. 	<p>Approved</p>	<p>The draft document to be provided to TC Chair to be sent to all IAF members for a second 60-day comment period – TF Co-Convenors</p>
05.2.03	TF Principles for Determining Duration of AB Assessments (Garner / Sagala)	<p>Tina Garner reported on the 22 October 2019 Principles for Determining Duration of AB Assessments TF meeting and highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmation of the current terms of reference Meeting outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resolution of comments received on the draft document and creation of a revised draft document Identification of next steps to finalize the document. 		

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting

23rd – 24th October 2019

Page 9 of 35

05.2.04	TF Transitions (Gillespie / Omodeo-Zorini)	<p>Lori Gillespie provided a report on the 22 October 2019 Transitions TF meeting and highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective to draft a document to support a “generic” transition process for normative documents • Activities since the April 2019 Transition Workshop • Meeting outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Confirmed Procedure Document (PR) ○ Detailed review on simplified transition and timeline annexes ○ Review of all other Annexes ○ Finalization of package to be sent to the TC Chair • Next steps. <p>Discussion ensued on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The simplified annex calls for the CAB to provide a declaration • The simplified annex will apply to Levels 3 through 5 normative documents • The TF considered migration vs. transition. 		
05.2.05	TF Fraudulent Behaviour (Croft / Sabaratnam)	<p>In the absence of Nigel Croft, Wayne Terry led the review of presentation on the 22 October 2019 Fraudulent Behaviour TF and highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TF mandate • Participation at the meeting • Key decisions / outcomes from Mexico City 2019 meetings • Meeting outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Decisions on how to address comments on the MD7 document ○ Agreement on next steps • Forecasted publication in May 2020. <p>It was noted that there were discussions during the TF meeting regarding whether the proposed document content is suitable to be IAF MD 7.</p>		
05.2.06	TF Audit Time (Belson / Omodeo-Zorini)	<p>Kevin Belson reported on the 21 October 2019 Audit Time TF meeting and noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TF mandate • Progress to date • Summary of recent discussions • Recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Create two documents to provide clear, unambiguous guidance for developers and users ○ Parallel work to reduce the number of guidance tables as the methodologies become harmonised. 		

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting

23rd – 24th October 2019

Page 10 of 35

		<p>Discussion ensued on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to improve the existing document which, in itself, can create confusion • The recommendation will require two parallel workstreams • The creation of the two documents can be completed by the Beijing 2020 meetings, after which the focus will shift to the parallel work • The learnings from the TF work will be applied to ISO documents that include audit time calculations • Suggestion that the Audit Time TF consider the work of the APG in its work • The need for a regulatory framework in a competitive environment. <p>It was recommended that the scope of the Audit Time TF be expanded to improve the existing document to incorporate the findings of the feasibility study.</p>	Approved	
05.2.07	JTF Counterfeit Certificates (Savov / Murthy)	<p>No report was provided.</p> <p>It was suggested that the Counterfeit Certificates JTF be merged with the Fraudulent Behaviour TF. During discussion, concern regarding the potential merger was expressed as the issues addressed by the two TFs are different. It was further noted that a merger would require the approval of IAF and ILAC Joint Executive Committee (JEC).</p>		Contact Nigel Croft regarding the suggestion to merge the Fraudulent Behaviour TF and the Counterfeit Certificates JTF – IAF TC Chair
06	Sector Liaison Reports (Gignac)			
06.01	IAF User Advisory Committee – UAC (Jeffries)	<p>Sheronda Jeffries provided a presentation on the UAC and highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms of reference • Breadth of IRIS (railway) certifications • Areas of discussion • Documented support provided for IAF CertSearch • Industry “roadshow” events to promote the IAF and listen to a larger user and industry audience: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Feedback received from the Automotive Industry Action Group (AIAG) roadshow event. <p>During discussion, it was suggested that the UAC work with the newly created TF to work with the GFSI on the presentation to the GFSI industry.</p> <p>The regions were encouraged to engage with the UAC as the focus is currently North American-centric.</p>		
06.02	TIA – Telecoms (Jeffries)	The report from TIA – Telecoms was noted with appreciation.		

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting

23rd – 24th October 2019

Page 11 of 35

06.03	PEFC – Forestry (Berger)	No report.		
06.04	IAQG – Aerospace (Geer)	The report from IAQG was noted with appreciation.		
06.05	GFSI - Food Safety (Greenaway)	No report.		
06.06	GlobalG.A.P. – Food Safety (Fekete)	No report.		
06.07	IATF – Automotive (Bruin)	The report from IATF was noted with appreciation.		
06.08	Railway (Kaufman)	The report from Railway was noted with appreciation.		
07	Liaison Reports (Keeling)			
07.01	ISO TC 176 – QMS (Pinatton) (Jeffries)	The report on TC 176 was noted with appreciation.		
07.02	ISO TC 207/SC1 – EMS (Zgavc) (Makino)	No report.		
07.03	ISO/TC 207/SC 7 – GHG (Met Liu) (Makino)	No report.		
07.04	ISO/IEC JTC1/ SC27 WG1 – ISMS (Passia) (Takeshi)	The report from the JTC1/SC27 WG1 secretary was noted with appreciation.		
07.05	ISO/CASCO WG 49 – ISO/IEC 17000 (MacCurtain) (Houla / Salzle)	<i>Secretariat Note: The report was provided at the 26 October 2019 Joint Executive Committee (JEC) meeting.</i>		
07.06	ISO/CASCO WG 23 – Common Elements (MacCurtain)	<i>Secretariat Note: The report was provided at the 26 October 2019 Joint Executive Committee (JEC) meeting.</i>		
07.07	ISO/CASCO WG 55 – ISO/IEC 17030 – Third-Party Marks of Conformity (MacCurtain)	No report.		

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting

23rd – 24th October 2019

Page 12 of 35

07.08	ISO CASCO JWG 46 ISO/IEC 17029 Validation and Verification (MacCurtain) (Howard)	No report.		
07.09	ISO/CASCO JWG 36 Revision of ISO/TS 22003 (MacCurtain) (Sheehan)	The report from the JWG 36 ISO/CASCO/TC34/SC17 was noted with appreciation.		
07.10	ISO/TMB JTCG TF 14 (Croft)	Receipt of the ISO/TMBG/JTCG/TF 14 communiqué was noted with appreciation.		
07.11	Interpol - Counterfeit Certificates (Savov)	No report.		
08	Regional Accreditation Group Liaison Reports (Keeling)			
08.01	EA (Belson)	The report from the EA was noted with appreciation.		
08.02	APAC (Lockyer)	The report from the APAC was noted with appreciation.		
08.03	IAAC (Melo)	The report from the IAAC was noted with appreciation.		
08.04	ARAC (Barrak)	The report from the ARAC was noted with appreciation.		
08.05	AFRAC (Phaloane) Mllgo	No report from AFRAC was provided. Secretariat Note: The TC Repr has been rep by Phaloane		
08.06	SADCA (Masunga)	No report from SADCA was provided.		
09	Any Other Business (Keeling)			
09.01	ISO 21001 – is a stand- alone Management Systems standard (Riva)	Emanuele Riva reported that he has been requested to raise the concern that, in some instances, ISO 21001, is not being used as a stand-alone standard. During discussion, it was confirmed that ISO 21001 is not an application of ISO 9000.		
09.02	Problems with TC Discussion Paper Process (Keeling and Long)	Marcus Long reviewed the discussion paper to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the discussion paper process and highlighted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant problems with the discussion paper process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Six month interval between opportunities to raise issues 		

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting

23rd – 24th October 2019

Page 14 of 35

09.03	IAF PL3 – Updates and move to 60 day IAF Comment (Keeling)	The IAF TC Chair reported that IAF PL 3 has been amended by the Executive Committee and recommended that the 30-day TC comment period be waived and the IAF PL 3 move directly to 60-day member comment. During discussion, it was noted that there is a need to reduce the administrative burden of the MLA private sector scheme scope extension process.	Approved	Distribute IAF PL 3 for 60-day IAF member comment – IAF Secretary
09.04	ISO/IEC 17065 for Organic Certification (Crucifix)	This item was discussed in agenda item 05.1.05.		
09.05	Harmonised Action on Withdrawn CABs (JAS-ANZ)	James Galloway reviewed the discussion paper and recommended that the scope of the Fraudulent Behaviour TF be expanded to develop harmonised action on withdrawn CABs by reworking IAF MD 7 or including a discrete normative annex to IAF MD 7. The program outline will be submitted to the TC meeting in Beijing 2020. Discussion ensued on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the complaints process is the source of the issue • Concern that the rationale for the CAB's withdrawal cannot be shared with other ABs due to confidentiality • Potential for the CB to change its name and location and achieve accreditation from another AB. 	Approved	Develop a program outline for review at the TC meeting in Beijing 2020 – TF Fraudulent Behaviour Co-Convenors
09.06	Documentation Update (Keeling)	The IAF TC Chair noted that several IAF MDs and IDs are quite outdated and WGs will be requested to review and amend documents. In addition, the IAF documents must be updated to reflect the transitions to ISO/IEC 17011:2017, ISO/IEC 17021-1:2015 and ISO/IEC 17065:2012. It was confirmed that WGs can review and propose amendments to documents without the need to strike a TF.		
10	Meeting Conclusion and Results (Keeling)			
10.01	Update of the Work Program (TC Secretary)	Working Groups: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IAF Working Group on Management System Certification (ISO/IEC 17021) (Gillespie / Gignac) • IAF Working Group on Product Certification Accreditation (ISO/IEC 17065) (Moliski / Xinbo) • IAF Working Group on Person Certification (ISO/IEC 17024) (Woodley / Sheehan) • IAF Working Group on Forests (Berger / Howard) • IAF Working Group on Food (Sheehan / Greenaway) 		

- IAF Working Group on Validation and Verification (V&V) (ISO 14065) (Makino / Howard)
- IAF Working Group on Medical Devices (ISO 13485) (Ramaley / Bissel)
- IAF Working Group on Information Technology Management Systems (ITMS) (ISO 20000) (Takeshi / Stoichoitu)
- IAF Working Group on Information Security Management System (ISMS) MLA Scope (ISO 27001) (**Takeshi** / Stoichituiu)
- IAF Working Group on Business Continuity Management Systems (BCMS) (Garner / Savov)
- Business Management Practices (formerly ISO 9001 Auditing Practices Group and Accreditation Auditing Practices Group (APG / AAPG)) (Yang / dos Guimaraes)
- ISO 14001 Auditing Practices Group (APG) (van Erp / **Leehane**)

New Working Groups:

- None

Working Groups Terminated:

- None

Task Force Projects:

- IAF Task Force Competence of Accreditation Assessors and Experts (Krishna / Yadav)
- IAF TF Conformity Assessment Schemes (CAS) (Jauhri / Geneiatakis)
- IAF Task Force Principles for determining Duration of AB Assessments (Sagala / Garner)
- IAF TF Transitions (Gillespie / Omodeo-Zorini)
- IAF TF Fraudulent Behaviour (Croft / Sabaratnam)
- IAF TF Audit time (Belson / Omodeo-Zorini)
- IAF/ILAC Joint Task Force Counterfeit Certificates (Savov / Murthy)

New Task Forces:

- TF to review and consider revisions to IAF MD 12:2018 (Terry / Breidenstein)
- TF to develop transition for ISO 50003 – Energy Management Systems – Requirements for Bodies Providing Audit and Certification of Energy Management Systems (Garner / Omodeo-Zorini)
- TF to work with GFSI (Christmas)
- TF to explore the development of a guidance document for Organics (Hartmann)

Task Forces Terminated:

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None <p>(BOLD = New Convenors)</p>		
10.2	IAF TC Resolutions for the IAF General Assembly (Keeling)	<p>Withdrawal of IAF MD 3:2008 – Advanced Surveillance and Recertification Procedures</p> <p>The General Assembly, acting on the recommendation of the Technical Committee, resolved to immediately withdraw IAF MD 3:2008 Advanced Surveillance and Recertification Procedures (ASRP), <i>Issue 1, Version 2, issued on 01 February 2008</i>. Certification bodies will have 1-year following withdrawal, to transition its certified organizations away from IAF MD 3.</p> <p>Transitional Arrangements for ISO 22301:2019</p> <p>The General Assembly, acting on the recommendation of the Technical Committee, resolved that the Transitional Arrangement for the Revision of ISO 22301 Societal security – Business continuity management systems – Requirements be three years from last day of the month of publication of the revised standard.</p> <p>All ISO 22301:2012 certifications shall expire or be withdrawn at the end of the transition period.</p> <p>Within this transition timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ABs shall be ready to carry out transition assessments for ISO 22301:2019 within six months from the last day of the month of publication of the revised standard • CABs shall complete the transition with ABs for ISO 22301:2019 within 18 months from the last day of the month of publication of the revised standard • CABs shall cease conducting initial and recertification audits to ISO 22301:2012 18 months from the last day of the month of publication of the revised standard. <p>Transitional Arrangements for ISO 14064-3:2019</p> <p>The General Assembly, acting on the recommendation of the Technical Committee, resolved that the transition arrangement for the revision of ISO 14064-3 shall be four years from 30 April 2019. Any GHG validation and verification engagements commenced after 30 April 2023 shall be performed to ISO 14064-3:2019.</p> <p>Within this transition timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ABs shall be ready to carry out ISO 14065 assessments using 14064-3: 2019 for conformity assessment schemes that reference ISO 14064-3 within 18 months from 30 April 2019 	<p>See agenda item 05.1.01</p> <p>See agenda item 05.1.10</p> <p>See agenda item 05.1.07</p>	

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting

23rd – 24th October 2019

Page 17 of 35

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where local legislation/regulation requires accredited validation/verification referencing ISO 14064-3:2006 and has not been amended to reference ISO 14064-3:2019, the use of ISO 14064-3:2006 in accredited validation/verification may be extended. <p>Transitional Arrangements for ISO 14065:202x</p> <p>The General Assembly, acting on the recommendation of the Technical Committee, resolved that the transition arrangement for the revision of ISO 14065 shall be three years from date of publication of ISO 14065:202x.</p> <p>Within this transition timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ABs shall be ready to carry out transition assessment for ISO 14065 within 12 months from the date of publication All accreditation against the new version of ISO 14065 shall require accreditation to ISO/IEC 17029 Where local legislation/regulation requires accredited validation/verification referencing ISO 14065:2013 and has not been amended to reference the new version of ISO 14065, the use of ISO 14065:2013 in accredited validation/verification may be extended. 	See agenda item 05.1.07	
11	Next Meetings (Keeling)			
11.1	Dates/Location	30 March 2020 to 06 April 2020 – Beijing, China		
11.2	Draft IAF TC Program for the Next Meeting (TC Secretary)	The IAF TC Secretary indicated that the draft schedule of the Beijing 2020 meeting had been circulated 30 days before the meeting. Conveners were reminded to ensure they review this schedule in the next 24-48 hours and convey their requests for changes before the schedule is discussed at the 26 October 2019 JEC meeting.		
12	Discussion papers for Action by the TC (Gignac)			
12.01	Sub clause 5.2.3 of IAF MD 9:2017 point iii) – ACCREDIA –WG MDMS Reply	<p>Statement of the issue:</p> <p>IAF MD 9: 2017 contains a list of examples to ascertain whether impartiality might be compromised. In particular, point 5.2.3 iii) refers to the case in which the auditor is “a member of staff from research or medical institute or a consultant having a commercial contract or equivalent interest with the manufacturer or manufacturers of similar medical devices”.</p>		Add to Decision Log – TC Secretary

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting

23rd – 24th October 2019

Page 18 of 35

		<p>The TC was requested to clarify whether this requirement is applicable only to “manufacturers of medical devices” or also to “marketing, installation, maintenance, servicing or supply of the medical device, or any associated parts and services”?</p> <p>Consensus of the IAF TC:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This was only given as an example. There could be other types of examples as defined by IAF MD 9, clause 5.2.3. 2. The intent was to be limited to the organization being audited. <p>Note: In the current revision process of IAF MD 9, the removal of the examples is being considered.</p>		
12.02	AB Consistency – ABCB	<p>Statement of the issue:</p> <p>ABCB has received several questions from a multinational CAB in relation to being assessed by different AB's in different locations and the lack of consistency in the application of standards.</p> <p>Consensus of the IAF TC:</p> <p>MSC WG – Recommendation to create a task force to revise IAF MD 12:</p> <p>Considering the new ISO/IEC 17011:2017:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is IAF MD 12 still needed? • If IAF MD 12 is still needed; then revise to accommodate the changes in ISO/IEC 17011:2017. • If IAF MD 12 is not needed; recommend a withdrawal of IAF MD 12, with a transition period for ABs to revise processes in accordance with ISO/IEC 17011:2017. <p>Note: IAF MD 12 refers to A5 which also refers to ISO/IEC 17011:2004 and key activities (for the JWG).</p>		Add to Decision Log – TC Secretary
12.03	Use of Agent's Marks on Certificates – JAS-ANZ	<p>Statement of the issue:</p> <p>Use of a certification body's agent's logo on an accredited certificate.</p> <p>Consensus of the IAF TC:</p> <p>It is agreed that the certificate shall not include an agent's logo, as it would be considered misleading and in violation of ISO/IEC 17021-1 8.2.2.</p>		Add to Decision Log – TC Secretary
12.04	IAF MD 2 – EFAC	<p>Statement of the issue:</p>		Add to Decision Log – TC Secretary

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting

23rd – 24th October 2019

Page 19 of 35

		<p>Request for confirmation that it is sufficient for an accepting AB to be provided the documentation from a transferring client as long as the issuing CB confirms that there are open Issues (nonconformity, complaints etc.) exist.</p> <p>Consensus of the IAF TC:</p> <p>Transfer documentation required in IAF MD 2, should be provided by the issuing CB. In accordance with IAF MD 2, section 2.4 Cooperation Between the Issuing and Accepting Certification Bodies.</p> <p>When reviewing section 2.4.1; “When requested”, does not mean “if requested”, it means the timing of when the accepting CB requests the information to be provided by the issuing CB. The accepting CB must contact the issuing CB for the documentation, it is not an option.</p>		
12.05	IAF MD 2 Communications between CBs for transfers – IIOC	<p>Statement of the issue: Request for clarification regarding communication between original and accepting CB for transferring certificate.</p> <p>Consensus of the IAF TC: Transfer documentation required in IAF MD 2, should be provided by the issuing CB. In accordance with IAF MD 2, section 2.4 Cooperation Between the Issuing and Accepting Certification Bodies. When reviewing section 2.4.1; “When requested”, does not mean “if requested”, it means the timing of when the accepting CB requests the information to be provided by the issuing CB. The accepting CB must contact the issuing CB for the documentation, it is not an option.</p>		Add to Decision Log – TC Secretary
12.06	Sector Applications of ISO 9001 – ISOTC176 TG02	<p>Statement of the issue and consensus of the IAF TC (indicated in bold font following the question):</p> <p>Request for clarification about the accreditation criteria for sector-specific applications of ISO 9001 (and potentially other standards) that are not subject to specific sector schemes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For sector-specific standards that provide guidance on the application of ISO 9001 (for example, ISO 18091:2019 - Quality Management Systems - Guidelines for the Application of ISO 9001 in Local Government): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is accreditation covered by the CB’s “normal” accreditation for QMS, considering the relevant scope to cover local government? We understand that certification can only be to ISO 9001 (since ISO 18091 contains no requirements). No, also see the definition of conformity assessment in ISO/IEC 17000. 		Add to Decision Log – TC Secretary

		<p>b. Is it acceptable for the certificate to mention the guidance standard (in this case ISO 18091) in addition to ISO 9001? No it is not.</p> <p>2. For sector-specific standards that provide requirements in addition to those in ISO 9001 (for example ISO/TS 29001, “Petroleum, petrochemical and natural gas industries - Sector-specific quality management systems - Requirements for product and service supply organizations” and ISO 54001 “Quality management systems - Particular requirements for the application of ISO 9001:2015 for electoral organizations at all levels of government”):</p> <p>a. Is accreditation covered by the CB’s “normal” accreditation for QMS, considering the relevant scope(s)? No, because the sector-specific standards are different certification schemes, assuming “QMS” is accreditation for certification to ISO 9001. An AB may choose to offer accreditation for the ISO 54001 standard; however, it would be managed by the AB and “in addition” to the accreditation for ISO 9001.</p> <p>b. If the accreditation scope does not specifically mention these standards, is it acceptable for CBs to issue unaccredited certificates? Yes, if the CB is not accredited for the sector specific standard then they can issue unaccredited certifications.</p> <p>3. We are seeing a tendency for the development and publication of “XXX Management System” standards that are not ISO 9001-based, but are “aligned with ISO 9001” (for example, ISO 21001:2018 “Educational organizations - Management systems for educational organizations - Requirements with guidance for use”):</p> <p>a. Is a separate accreditation required for certification to such standards? Yes.</p> <p>b. If the accreditation scope does not specifically mention these standards, is it acceptable for CBs to issue unaccredited certificates? Yes, if the CB is not accredited for the sector specific standard then they can issue unaccredited certifications.</p>		
12.07	Unaccredited Certificates REV1 - ISO TC176 TG02	<p>Statement of the issue:</p> <p>Request for clarification whether or not it is acceptable for a CB that is accredited for scopes with limited economic sectors / activities and / or geographical regions to issue unaccredited certificates to organizations that are outside these scopes.</p> <p>Consensus of the IAF TC (indicated in bold font following the question):</p> <p>1. is it acceptable to issue unaccredited certificates to the same standard for those economic sectors that are outside its accreditation? (IAF ID1:2014 refers). Yes, as economic sectors (e.g. scopes) are part of the scope of accreditation. See the definition for scope of accreditation definition in IAF MD 17 (1.3).</p>		Add to Decision Log – TC Secretary

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting

23rd – 24th October 2019

Page 21 of 35

		<p>2. is it acceptable to issue unaccredited certificates to the same standard for those geographical regions that are outside its accreditation? (IAF ID1:2014 refers). If the AB includes geographical regions limitation within the scope of accreditation, then the CB can issue unaccredited certificates in the geographic regions that are outside of their scope of accreditation. If the AB does not include geographical region limitations within the scope of accreditation, then the CB cannot issue unaccredited certificates in a specific geographic region, because they are considered accredited for all geographical regions.</p>		
12.08	ISO 45001 – End of Migration Period - IIOC	<p>Statement of the issue: Is the formal the end of the period for the migration to ISO 45001 31 March 2021?</p> <p>Consensus of the TC: The end of the ISO 45001 migration period is 31 March 2021. If needed, ABs are requested to revise their migration process and communicate to CBs that BS OHSAS 18001 certifications will expire on 31 March 2021, instead of 12 March 2021.</p>		Add to Decision Log – TC Secretary
12.09	Maintaining OHSMS Certification history – IIOC	<p>Statement of the issue: Request for confirmation of the requirements for maintaining OHSMS Certification history.</p> <p>Consensus of the TC: The initial certification date, including a statement as to what the initial certification was for, can be maintained on certification documents when an accredited certification has been migrated from BS OHSAS 18001 to ISO 45001.</p>		Add to Decision Log – TC Secretary
12.10	IAF MD 1 – EFAC	<p>Statement of the issue and consensus of the IAF TC (indicated in bold font following the question):</p> <p>1. IAF MD 1 Point 5: a. It is necessary that all contracts with client must be made via the “Central Function IAF MD1 2.5” or is it possible that the Site (IAF MD 1 Point 2.2 and 2.3) has the right to have direct contacts with clients? This is outside of the scope of IAF MD 1. IAF MD 1 does not specify requirements about contracts between the organization and their clients.</p>		Add to Decision Log – TC Secretary

		<p>b. Is it necessary that the central function as per IAF MD 1 3.5 has the organizational Authority to employ and dismiss Personnel? This is outside of the scope of IAF MD 1. IAF MD 1 does not specify requirements that the central function must have the authority to employ and dismiss employees.</p> <p>2. IAF MD 1: Is the Central Function as per IAF MD 1 identical with the Top Management as defined within ISO 9000 Point 3.1.1? IAF MD 1 does not specify that the central function and the top management has to be identical.</p> <p>3. IAF MD 1 Point 3.3: Is it possible to audit and certify a Multisite Franchise organization? Yes, as long as the organization meets the definition of a multi-site organization and eligibility criteria in IAF MD 1.</p> <p>4. 7.5 Initial Audit: Stage 1: Is it necessary to perform at all sites a Stage 1 Audit? It is not required to perform a Stage 1 at every selected site; however, it depends on the scope of activity at each site and what may need to be audited to meet the stage 1 objectives. Per ISO/IEC17021-1, 9.1.5 a sampling programme must be developed by the CB.</p> <p>5. IAF MD 1 Point 7.1: Is it required by the CAB to have in addition with the central function a contract for certification with all sites (Permanent, Temporary, Virtual) in case the organization is not a unique legal entity as per IAF MD 1 3.1.1? It is not required for the CB to have a contract with each site. However, the contract should cover all of the sites per ISO/IEC 17021-1, 5.1.2.</p>		
12.11	IAF MD 5 _Surveillance – EFAC	<p>Statement of the issue: Request for confirmation that the meaning of audit duration (MD 5 2019) means the total time inclusive offsite activities.</p> <p>Consensus of the IAF TC: Request the TC to revise IAF MD 5, as an editorial revision only, to add “duration” to the note to section 6. We believe this is an error and should be corrected.</p>		<p>Add to Decision Log – TC Secretary</p> <p>Revise IAF MD 5, Note to section 6 – IAF TC Chair</p>
12.12	Transfer of Persons Certification Under ISO/IEC 17024 – EA	<p>Statement of the issue: Is transfer of persons certification a possibility and should IAF define rules for transfer of certification for persons under ISO/IEC 17024?</p> <p>Consensus of the IAF TC:</p>		<p>Add to Decision Log – TC Secretary</p>

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting

23rd – 24th October 2019

Page 24 of 35

		The number of legal entities should not matter when calculating the number of employees. The CB would use the total number of employees per IAF MD 5, because the people are functioning as one organization (with three legal entity names).		
12.16	Sampling of Temporary Sites in accordance with IAF MD 1 – EACC	<p>Statement of the issue: Request for clarification of how temporary sites are included in sampling activities.</p> <p>Consensus of the IAF TC: It is the responsibility of the CB to demonstrate the effectiveness of its process of auditing temporary sites and including the sites in the scope of certification. The CB must determine their process; based on the organization and temporary sites and also taking into account the risk and other factors to consider. In some situations, square root may apply, in others it may not.</p>		Add to Decision Log – TC Secretary
13	Improvement for TC activities (Keeling)			
13.01	Improvement Activities	<p>The following improvement activities were noted during the TC meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvement of discussion paper process • Review of outdated documents. <p>See agenda Items 9.02 and 9.06 above.</p>		
13.02	Closure	The Chair and Vice Chair thanked all participant for their participation.		

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting
List of Participants

23rd to 24th October 2019

Page 25 of 35

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	EMAIL	ECONOMY
Achmad	Kukuh S	National Standardization Agency of Indonesia	kukuh@bsn.go.id	Indonesia
Adeya	Catherine Elizabeth Awino	Kenya Accreditation Service (KENAS)	n_awino@hotmail.com	Kenya
Alfaro	Seidy	ECA	s.alfaro@eca.or.cr	Costa Rica
Alloisio	Andrea	CONFORMA	andrea.alloisio@rina.org	Italy
Alsowailem	Mohamed Abdulruhman A	GCC Accreditation Centre	malsowailem@gac.org.ca	Saudi Arabia
Alves	Pedro	IQNet Association	headoffice@iqnet.ch	Switzerland
Anastasopoulos	Georgios	IAS	ganas@iasonline.org	United States
Andrade Castro	Mario	EMA	mario_andrade@ema.org.mx	Mexico
Archila	Carlos	OGA	carchila@oga.org.gt	Guatemala
Barrillas	Dubesy	OGA	dbarillas@oga.org.gt	Guatemala
Barrak	Moslem	Arab Accreditation Cooperation ARAC	m.barrak@arabarac.org	Morocco (Arab Region_
Bednárová	Martina	Czech Accreditation Institute (CAI)	bednarovam@cai.cz	Czech Republic
Belov	Matvey	STC-IS	belovm74@mail.ru	Russian Federation
Belson	Kevin	UKAS	kevin.belson@ukas.com	United Kingdom
Bhang	Youngsun	KOLAS/KAS	ysdiane@korea.kr	Korea, Republic of
Bissell	Brenda	ANAB	bbissell@anab.org	United States
Boboige	Terry	Perry Johnson Registrars	tboboige@pjr.com	United States

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting
List of Participants

23rd to 24th October 2019

Page 26 of 35

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	EMAIL	ECONOMY
Boughalmi	Moez	TUNAC AFRAC	moez.boughalmi@tunac.tn	Tunisia
Brandon	Lisa	DQS Inc.	lisa.brandon@dqsus.com	United States
Breidenstein	Wolfgang	Deutsche Akkreditierungsstelle GmbH (DAkKS)	wolfgang.breidenstein@dakks.de	Germany
Bruin	James	International Automotive Oversight Bureau	james.bruin@iaob.org	United States
Brunner	Norman	Akkreditierung Austria / BMDW	norman.brunner@oesterreich.gv.at	Austria
Calestam	Mikael	Swedac	mikael.calestam@swedac.se	Sweden
Chang	Kwei Fern	Singapore Accreditation Council	lim_lee_fang@enterprisesg.gov.sg	Singapore
Chapaev	Zhanybek	Kyrgyz Center of Accreditation	chapaevjanybek@kca.gov.kg	Kyrgyzstan
Chaparro	Ferney	ONAC	secretariat@iaac.org.mx	Colombia
Chartrand	Patricia	Standards Council of Canada	patricia.chartrand@scc.ca	Canada
Chen	Cynthia	Taiwan Accreditation Foundation (TAF)	yuanchen@taftw.org.tw	Chinese Taipei
Chesire	Martin Kimulai	Kenya Accreditation Service (KENAS)	chesire@kenyaaccreditation.org	Kenya
Choi	Youngcheol	KOLAS/KAS	ycchoi81@korea.kr	Korea, Republic of
Christmas	Colin	Eagle Certification Group	colin.christmas@eaglecertificationgroup.com	United States
Cortez	Leopoldo	IPAC Portuguese Accreditation Institute	lcortez@ipac.pt	Portugal
Crucefix	David	IOAS Inc.	crucifix@ioas.org	United States
Dalrymple	Alister	IQNet	alister.dalrymple@afnor.org	Switzerland

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting
List of Participants

23rd to 24th October 2019

Page 27 of 35

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	EMAIL	ECONOMY
Devecz	Miklos	NAH	miklos.devecz@nah.gov.hu	Hungary
Dokka	Tove Kristin	Norwegian Accreditation	tkd@akkreditert.no	Norway
Dos Guimarães Sá	Joana	APCER Portuguese Association for certification	Joana.sa@apcer.pt	Puerto Rico
Echeverria	Carlos	SAE	cecheverria@accreditacion.gob.ec	Ecuador
Eggat	Rosnieh	Department of Standards Malaysia, Ministry of International Trade & Industry	rosnieh@gmail.com	Malaysia
Ekberg	Emma	Swedac	emma.ekberg@swedac.se	Sweden
El Qudah	Lina	LMQ Management System Solutions FZ LLC	lina@lina-qudah.com	Jordan
Erhabor	Tosan	Medical Laboratory Science Council of Nigeria	tosanmelody@yahoo.com	Nigeria
Fei	Yang	CNAS	feiy@cnas.org.cn	China
Figueiredo	Reinaldo	ANAB	rfigueir@ansi.org	United States
Fweinke	Stephan	Deutsche Akkreditierungsstelle GmbH	simone.schmob@dakks.de	Germany
Fredriksson	Cecilia	Stockholm School of Economics	cecilia.fredriksson@phdstudent.hhs.se	Sweden
Gago	Edelio	ENAC	egago@enac.es	Spain
Galloway	James	Joint Accreditation System of Australia & New Zealand (JAS-ANZ)	james.galloway@jas-anz.org	Australia
Garner	Tina	ANAB	tgarner@anab.org	United States
Geer	Brian	International Aerospace Quality Group	brian.geer@imco.com	United States
Gehrke	Stephan	Swiss Accreditation Service SAS	stephan.gehrke@sas.ch	Switzerland

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting
List of Participants

23rd to 24th October 2019
Page 28 of 35

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	EMAIL	ECONOMY
Gignac	Guillaume	IIOC	guillaume.gignac@intertek.com	Worldwide
Gillespie	Lori	ANAB	lgillespie@anab.org	United States
Giraldo Lopez	Alejandro	National Accreditation Body of Colombia (ONAC)	alejandro.giraldo@cnac.org.co	Colombia
Gorytskyy	Viktor	National Accreditation Agency of Ukraine	v.koveshnikov@naau.org.ua	Ukraine
Greenaway	Albert Skip	EAGLE Certification Group	skip.greenaway@eaglecertgroup.com	United States
Haimi-Ilvonen	Sanna	Finnish Accreditation Service (FINAS)	sanna.haimi-ilvonen@finas.fi	Finland
Hartmann	Wolfram	Deutsche Akkreditierungsstelle GmbH	wolfram.hartmann@dakks.de	Germany
Held	Manuela	IIOC	manuela.held@dekra.com	Worldwide
Herlinawati	Triningsih	National Accreditation Body of Indonesia	triningsih@bsn.go.id	Indonesia
Herrera	Cristina	Instituto Nacional de Normalizaciaon	cristina.herrera@inn.cl	Chile
Hirakawa	Ryuichi	JACB(JQA)	hirakawa-ryuichi@jqa.jp	Japan
Hogg	Geoff	NATIA	geoffhogg@outlook.com	Australia
Howard	Ann	ANAB	ahoward@ansi.org	United States
Hu	Terence	Enterprise Singapore	terence_hu@enterprisesg.gov.sg	Singapore
Ishak	Siti Norehan	Department of Standards Malaysia	rehanishak@gmail.com	Malaysia
Jackson	Nikki	American National Standards Institute (ANSI)	njackson@ansi.org	United States
Jauhri	Anil	National Accreditation Board for Certification Bodies	ceo.nabcb@qcin.org	India

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting
List of Participants

23rd to 24th October 2019

Page 29 of 35

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	EMAIL	ECONOMY
Jeffries	Sheronda	TIA	sjeffrie@cisco.com	United States
Jena	Mrutunjay	National Accreditation Board for Certification Bodies (NABCB)	mjena.NABCB@qcin.org	India
Jovicic Zanic	Natalija	ATS	natalija.jovicic_zanic@ats.rs	Serbia
Kallergis	Georgios	Hellenic Accreditation System (ESYD)	kallergis@esyd.gr	Greece
Kassou	Abdel	Standards Council of Canada	abdel.kassou@scc.ca	Canada
Katsieris	Dimitrios	International Accreditation Services	dimitriosk@iasonline.org	United States
Keeling	Steve	JAS-ANZ	steve.keeling@jas-anz.org	Australia
Khurana	Seema	United Accreditation Foundation	seema.auditor@gmail.com	United States
Kishimoto	Isao	IAJapan	kishimoto-isao@nite.go.jp	Japan
Kizitan	Damia	Turkish Accreditation Agency (TURKAK)	damia.kizitan@turkak.org.tr	Turkey
Knake	Robert	A2LA	rknake@12la.org	United States
Kobayashi	Noriaki	JACB	Koboyashi-isao@nite.go.jp	Japan
Kobayashi	Tomohei	JAB	tomohei@gmail.com	Japan
Komori	Shuji	Japan Accreditation Board	shuji.komori@jab.or.jp	Japan
Krasiuk	Valerii	National Accreditation Agency of Ukraine	v.krasiuk@naau.org.ua	Ukraine
Krishna	Vijay	ANSI National Accreditation Board	vkrishna@ansi.org	United States
Kronvall	Peter	Swedac	peter.kronvall@swedac.se	Sweden

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting
List of Participants

23rd to 24th October 2019

Page 30 of 35

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	EMAIL	ECONOMY
Kwon	Yong Seok	Korea Accreditation Board (KAB)	ys@kab.or.kr	Korea
Lee	Carol	IAF	carol.lee@mosaicwriting.ca	Canada
Lee	Ham Eng	Enterprise Singapore	lee_ham_eng@enterprisesg.gov.sg	Singapore
Lee	Soyeon	Korea Accreditation Board (KAB)	sylee114@kab.or.kr	Korea
Lekakou	Andriana	Hellenic Accreditation System (ESYD)	lekakou@esyd.gr	Greece
Leonard	Douglas	ANAB	dleonard@anab.org	United States
Levi	Slobodan	Standards Council of Canada	slobodan.levi@scc.ca	Canada
Li	Yan	CNAS	phone4u@qq.com	China
Li	Pu-Hsien (Bruce)	Taiwan Accreditation Foundation	phli@taftw.org.tw	Chinese Taipei
Li	Yau	CNAS	liy@cnas.org.cn	China
Lim	Cheol-Soo	NIER	lcs6713@korea.kr	Republic of Korea
Lockyer	Kathryn	JAS-ANZ	kathryrn.lockyer@jas-anz.org	New Zealand
Long	Marcus	IIOC	marcus.long@iioc.org	Worldwide
Lutfi	Dana	ENAS / ESMA	dana.c@enas.gov.ae	United Arab Emirates
MacCurtain	Sean	ISO	maccurtain@iso.org	Switzerland
Mahbuhr	Rahma	Bangladesh Accreditation Board	mahbub@bab.org.bd	Bangladesh
Mahdoui	Sonia	TUNAC	sonia.mahdoui@tunac.tn	Tunisia

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting
List of Participants

23rd to 24th October 2019

Page 31 of 35

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	EMAIL	ECONOMY
Makarenko	Dmitri	RusAccreditation	kolesnikovakj@fsa.gov.ru	Russia Federation
Makino	Chikako	Japan Accreditation Board	chikako.makino@jab.or.jp	Japan
Malebe	Pinkie	SADCAS	pmalebe@sadcas.org	Botswana
Marsico	Maria Paola	OAA - Argentine Accreditation Body	paolamarsico@oaa.org.ar	Argentina
Maskeliuniene	Zita	Lithuania National Accreditation Bureau (LA)	zita.maskeiluniene@nab.lt	Lithuania
Mejia Luna	Martha	EMA	laura.baleras@ema.org.mx	Mexico
Milito	Cynthia	Standards Council of Canada	cynthia.milito@scc.ca	Canada
Miller	Robert	A2LA	rmiller@a2la.org	United States
Moon	Hana	EQA	unimoon@equworld.com	Republic of Korea
Morikawa	Shigeru	JACB (JACO)	morikawa@jaco.co.jp	Japan
Muhammed	Habib	Enterprise Singapore	habib_muhammed@enterprisesg.gov.sg	Singapore
Mutasa	Maureen Primrose	SADCAS	mpmutasa@sadcas.org	Botswana
Nagaoka	Yuki	JACB / PJR	ynagaoka@pjr.com	United States
Ndalamo	John	South African Accreditation System (SANAS)	johnn@sanas.co.za	South Africa
Niero	Christine	Professional Testing, Inc.	cniero@proftesting.com	United States
Nik Mohd Zamri	Nik Mohd Syazwan	Department of Standards Malaysia	syazwankerja@gmail.com	Malaysia
Nonaka	Takeshi	ISMS-AC	nonaka-takeshi@isms.jp	Japan

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting
List of Participants

23rd to 24th October 2019

Page 32 of 35

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	EMAIL	ECONOMY
Oh	Chang-Hoon	NIER	changhoon.oh.icmt@gmail.com	Republic of Korea
Omodeo-Zorini	Leonardo	IIOC (Representative of DNV GL Business Assurance)	leonardo.omodeo.zorini@dnvgl.com	Italy
Palada	Fiorina	ISTA	fiorina.palada@ista.ch	Switzerland
Park	Jong-Il	Korea Accreditation Board (KAB)	jjpark@kab.or.kr	Republic of Korea
Park	Young Jae	Korea Accreditation Board (KAB)	quality@kab.or.kr	Republic of Korea
Pelechova	Gizela	SNAS	gizela.pelechova@snas.sk	Slovakia
Phaloane	Mpho	SANAS	mphop@sanas.co.za	South Africa
Pojang	Patcharaporn	Thai Industria Standards Institute	pojongp@yahoo.com	Thailand
Pospiech	Michael	EFAC	m.pospiech@vaz-ev.de	Germany
Prakarnkamanant	Apisit	National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards	papisit@hotmail.com	Thailand
Premati	Esti	National Accreditation Body of Indonesia	esti@bsn.go.id	Indonesia
Preston	Jeanette	IAAR / Smithers Quality Assessments	jpreston@smithers.com	United States
Qasim	Al-Shamsi	Emirates International Accreditation Centre	qasim.alshamsi@eiac.gov.ae	United Arab Emirates
Qualano	Gianluca Slavatore	ACCREDIA	milano@accredia.it	Italy
Quentin	Marie-Claude	Consumer Goods Forum / GFSI	mc.quentin@theconsumergoodsforum.com	France
Ramaley	Grant	DTA	gramaley@aseptico.com	Unite States
Rantanen	Varpu	FINAS	varpu.rantanen@finas.fi	Finland

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting
List of Participants

23rd to 24th October 2019

Page 33 of 35

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	EMAIL	ECONOMY
Reda	Carmine	ENEL	Carmine.reda@enel.com	Italy
Riva	Emanuele	Accredia	e.riva@accredia.it	Italy
Roshi	Aiwl Auiul	Standards Malaysia	aiulaziul@gmail.com	Malaysia
Ronksley	Ian	UKAS	ian.ronksley@ukas.com	United Kingdom
Sadana	Parveen	United Accreditation Foundation UAF	parveen@uafaccreditation.org	United States
Saelim	Bussaba	TISI	bussaba.saelim@gmail.com	Thailand
Saelzle	Uwe	EFAC / ICG Zerifizierung GmbH	u.saelzle@empus.de	Germany
Salle	Pierre	IAAR	pierre.salle@gmail.com	United States
Saveant	Nathalie	COFRAC	nathalie.saveant@cofrac.fr	France
Sheehan	Kylie	JAS-ANZ	kylie.sheehan@jas-anz.org	Australia
Shi	Xinbo	CNAS	phone4u@qq.com	China
Shu	Brian	Taiwan Accreditation Foundation	brianshu@tafta.org.tw	Chinese Taipei
Shum	Wai Leung	Hong Kong Accreditation Service	wlshum@itc.gov.hk	Hong Kong (China)
Somma	Liliane	OUA	lilianesomma@yahoo.es	Uruguay
Stapleton	James	INAB	james.stapleton@inab.ie	Ireland
Stoichitoiu	Alexandru	IQNet	alexmsto@hotmail.com	Romania
Straub	Rolf	Swiss Accreditation Service SAS	rolf.straub@sas.ch	Switzerland

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting
List of Participants

23rd to 24th October 2019

Page 34 of 35

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	EMAIL	ECONOMY
Taipemelak	Getnet	ENAO	getnet@emao-eth.org	Ethiopia
Terry	Wayne	ABCB	wayne.terry@abcb.org.uk	United Kingdom
Thawornwong	Nawakorn	National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards	n_xiuxiu@hotmail.com	Thailand
Tilakaraine	Chandrika	Sri Lanka Accreditation Board	director@slab.lk	Sri Lanka
Tølløse	Karsten	DANAK	kat@danak.dk	Denmark
Tominaga-Higashi	Noriko	ISMS-AC	tominaga-noriko@isms.jp	Japan
Tsalkani	Kanella	United Accreditation Foundation	t_tsalkani@yahoo.gr	United States
Tsigemelak	Getnet	ENAO	getnet@emao-eth.org	Ethiopia
Vacha	Dusan	Czech Accreditation Institute (CAI)	vachad@cai.cz	Czech Republic
Van Erp	Casper	Dutch Accreditation Council (RvA)	casper.van.erp@rva.nl	Netherlands
Vehring	Stefanie	VdTUEV	stefanie.vehring@vdtuev.de	Germany
Vesel Tratnik	Natasa	Slovenian Accreditation	natasa.vesel-tratnik@slo-akreditacija.si	Slovenia
Wang	Wilson (Pengyu)	Taiwan Accreditation Foundation	pywang@taftw.org.tw	Chinese Taipei
Wasmer	René	IQNet	rene.wasmer@sqz.ch	Switzerland
Woodley	Cynthia	Professional Testing Inc.	cdwoodley@proftesting.com	United States
Xiao	Jianhua	CNAS	xiaojh6@foxmail.com	China
Xuan Thuy	Vu	Bureau of Accreditation (BoA)	vuthuy@boa.gov.vn	Viet Nam

IAF Technical Committee Record of Meeting
List of Participants

23rd to 24th October 2019
Page 35 of 35

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	EMAIL	ECONOMY
Yamamoto	Yuichiro	JACB	yamamoto-yuichirou@jqa.jp	Japan
Yang	Zhe	CNAS	yangz@cnas.org.cn	China
Yeh	Melissa	Taiwan Accreditation Foundation (TAF)	melissa.yeh@taftw.org.tw	Chinese Taipei
Yoneoka	Yuko	Japan Accreditation Board	yuko.yoneoka@jab.or.jp	Japan
Yuksel	Salih	TURKAK	sayuksei@gmail.com	Turkey
Zengel	Barbara	Polish Centre for Accreditation	b.zengel@pca.gov.pl	Poland

DRAFT



IAF-TC-12.08-19-2

International Accreditation Forum
Technical Committee Discussion Paper

Name of party submitting issue for discussion (optional): IIOC

Statement of the issue: ISO 45001: End of migration period

Discussion:

ABs took different positions regarding the end of the migration period for ISO 45001

- Some are using “Three years from the date of publication of the document” , i.e. migration period ending on 12 March 2021
- Some ABs set the end of the migration period on 31 March 2021 based IAF’s decision 18/10/04.

Decision 18/10/04 reads as follows:

The TC recommends, through a resolution, to endorse the start date and end date of all future IAF Transition periods be the last (end) day of the month of publication, as outlined on the ISO standard.

Note: Decision 18/10/04 was made after the publication of ISO 45001:2018

Requested action by the IAF TC:

Is the formal the end of the period for the migration to ISO 45001 31 March 2021?

Consensus of the IAF TC (also to be documented in the meeting summary):

MSC WG – Recommends to the TC to take the following decision:

The end of the ISO 45001 migration period is 31 March 2021.

If needed, ABs are requested to revise their migration process and communicate to CBs that BS OHSAS 18001 certifications will expire on 31 March 2021, instead of 12 March 2021.

Further detail

We recognize the resolution was after the ISO 45001 migration and it was to be applied to future transitions. We also understand this is a migration. However, for consistency, we believe the resolution should be applied and ABs should adjust their processes to accommodate the end of transition on 31 March 2021.



IAF-TC-12.09-19-2

International Accreditation Forum
Technical Committee Discussion Paper

Name of party submitting issue for discussion (optional): IIOC

Statement of the issue: Maintaining OHSMS Certification history

Discussion:

Although it does not seem to be documented anywhere, ABs have different points of view as it relates to the maintenance of OHS Management systems certification history when certified clients migrate from accredited OHSAS 18001:2007 to ISO 45001:2018.

This relates to situations where the “initial certification date” is indicated on the certificate.

Here are various positions taken by different ABs:

- The initial certification date can be maintained, without any “disclaimer/statement”
- The initial certification date can be maintained with a “statement/disclaimer “ to the effect that the management system was originally certified against the requirements of OHSAS 18001:2007
- The initial certification date cannot be maintained and a new initial certification date is to be set based on the decision date for the ISO 45001 certification.

Requested action by the IAF TC:

- a) Can the initial certification date be maintained, without any “disclaimer/statement”?
- b) If no, should the initial certification date be maintained with a “statement/disclaimer “ to the effect that the management system was originally certified against the requirements of OHSAS 18001:2007?
- c) If the initial certification date cannot be maintained, should a new initial certification date be set based on the decision date for the ISO 45001 certification?

Consensus of the IAF TC (also to be documented in the meeting summary):

MSC WG – Recommends to the TC to take the following decision:

The initial certification date, including a statement as to what the initial certification was for, can be maintained on certification documents when an accredited certification has been migrated from BS OHSAS 18001 to ISO 45001.



IAF-TC-12.09-19-2

More Detail

There was some discussion as it related to allowing the date or not and if a statement was necessary seeing that IAF is allowing a migration and both standards are OHSMS standards. It is still an OHSMS standard, which is why IAF allowed a migration. Why could the initial date not be maintained, as an OHSMS certification?

It is not the same standard, but we recognize they are both OHSMS standards.

The initial certification date can be maintained, with a statement to be clear what the initial certification was for.



IAF-TC-12.10-19-2

International Accreditation Forum
 Technical Committee Discussion Paper

Name of party submitting issue for discussion (optional):
 EFAC

#	Statement of the issue:	Discussion:	Requested action by the IAF TC:	Consensus of the IAF TC (also to be documented in the meeting summary):
1a	IAF MD 1 Point 5 (ELIGIBILITY OF A MULTI-SITE ORGANIZATION FOR CERTIFICATION)	It is necessary that all contracts with client must made via the “Central Function IAF MD1 2.5” or is it possible that the Site (IAF MD 1 Point 2.2 and 2.3) has the right to have direct contacts with clients.	IAF TC is kindly requested to confirm that a site can make contract with clients to sell product or services	MSC WG - This is outside of the scope of IAF MD 1. IAF MD 1 does not specify requirements about contracts between the organization and their clients.
1b		Is it necessary that the central function as per IAF MD 1 3.5 has the organizational Authority to employee and dismiss Personnel	IAF is requested to advise that it is not necessary that the central Function has the organizational Authority to employ and dismiss Personnel.	MSC WG - This is outside of the scope of IAF MD 1. IAF MD 1 does not specify requirements that the central function must have the authority to employ & dismiss employees.
2	IAF MD1 Point 2.5 (Central Function) Point 2.8 (Top Management) Point 5.2 The organization shall identify its central function. The central function is part of the organization and shall not be	Is the Central Function as per IAF MD 1 identical with the Top Management as defined within ISO 9000 Point 3.1.1?	IAF is requested to advise that it is not a requirement of MD1 that central function is identical to Top Management as defined in ISO 9000 3.1.1	MSC WG - This is outside of the scope of IAF MD 1. IAF MD 1 does not specify that the central function and



IAF-TC-12.10-19-2

	subcontracted to an external organization. ISO 9000 3.1.1: person or group of people who directs and controls an organization (3.2.1) at the highest level			the top management has to be identical.
3	IAF MD 1 Point 3.3.1 a multi-site organization need not be a unique legal entity, but all sites shall have a legal or contractual link with the central function of the organization and be subject to a single management system, which is laid down, established and subject to continuous surveillance and internal audits by the central function.	Is it possible to audit and certify a Multisite Franchise organization	IAF TC is requested to confirm that a Franchise organization which fulfills the Requirement of MD1 point 5 is eligible to be audited and certified using MD1	MSC WG - Yes, as long as the organization meets the definition of a multi-site organization and eligibility criteria in IAF MD 1.
4	7.5 Initial Audit: Stage 1 During Stage 1, the audit team shall complete the information to: <input type="checkbox"/> confirm the audit program; <input type="checkbox"/> plan Stage 2, taking into account the processes/activities to be audited in each site; and <input type="checkbox"/> confirm that the Stage 2 audit team has the required competence.	Is it necessary to perform at all sites a Stage 1 Audit?	IAF is requested to confirm that it may be necessary to perform a stage 1 at site, but this is not a mandatory requirement for all Multi site organization which are audited and certified under MD1	MSC WG - It is not required to perform a Stage 1 at every selected site; however, it depends on the scope of activity at each site and what may need to be audited to meet the stage 1 objectives. Per 17021 9.1.5 a sampling programme must be developed by the CB.
5	IAF MD 1 Point 7.1 Application and Application Review	Is it required by the CAB to have in addition with the central function a contract for certification with all sites (Permanent, Temporary, Virtual) in case the organization is not a unique legal entity as per IAF MD1 3.1.1	IAF TC is requested to confirm that it is necessary for the CAB to review the contractual link between the different entities to verify that the defined central function has the organizational authority as described within IAF MD 5. A Contract between CAB to all sites is not necessary	MSC WG - It is not required for the CB to have a contract with each site. However, the contract should cover all of the sites per 17021 5.1.2.



International Accreditation Forum, Inc.

IAF-TC-12.10-19-2

April 2017



International Accreditation Forum
Technical Committee Discussion Paper

Name of party submitting issue for discussion (optional): EFAC

Statement of the issue:

IAF MD 5:2019, no. 5 SURVEILLANCE

(...) the total amount of time spent annually on surveillance is about 1/3 of the audit time spent on the initial certification audit, (...)

Note: It is unlikely that a surveillance audit duration will be less than one (1) audit day.

IAF MD 5:2019, no. 6 RECERTIFICATION

(...) the total amount of time spent annually on surveillance is about 2/3 of the audit time that would be required for an initial certification audit (Stage 1 + Stage2) of the organization (...)

Note: It is unlikely that a recertification audit will be less than one (1) audit day.

Discussion:

The wording of both notes is unclear and irregular.

Is audit duration the audit time with offsite activities or only the time onsite? (see 2.1.2 MD5:2019)

Requested action by the IAF TC:

Please confirm that the meaning of audit duration (MD5 2019) means the total time inclusive offsite activities.

Consensus of the IAF TC (also to be documented in the meeting summary):

MSC WG – Request the TC to revise IAF MD 5, as an editorial revision only, to add “duration” to the note to section 6.

We believe this is an error and should be corrected.



International Accreditation Forum
Technical Committee Discussion Paper

Name of party submitting issue for discussion (optional):
EFAC

Statement of the issue:

MD-5 1.2
Client organization
Entity or defined part of an entity operating a management system

ISO 9000:2015 3.2.1 Note 1

The concept of organization includes, but is not limited to, sole-trader, company, corporation, firm, enterprise, authority, partnership, association (3.2.8), charity or institution, or part or combination thereof, whether incorporated or not, public or private.

Discussion:

One organization consisting (for tax and/or other business reason) of several legal entities is asking for certification issued to all involved legal entities.

The Personnel is either employed with one legal entity or the employment is spread over the involved legal entities.

The applied scope for certification is for all involved legal entities absolute identical

The organization has one management system which is applicable to all legal entities.

All legal entities are working at the same site the same office / workshop / storage department etc. Only one site is involved so that no MD 1 is applicable.

There is no difference on the task or management system working for one or the other legal entity. The same forms, the same software, the same wor is used.

Question: is it possible to calculate the Audit time considering the total number of employees employed with the organization or has the Audit time to be calculated for each legal entity. even in reality it is only one organization

Requested action by the IAF TC:

IAF is kindly requested to confirm that under such circumstances the audit time must calculated based on the number of all employees working for the organization independent how many legal entities are involved.



Consensus of the IAF TC (also to be documented in the meeting summary):

MSC WG – Consensus may not have been reached.

The number of legal entities should not matter when calculating the number of employees. The CB would use the total number of employees per IAF MD 5, because the people are functioning as one organization (with three legal entity names).

The CB is responsible for making sure the management system was audited effectively.

Further detail

If employees are separated by legal entity the CB could consider the days separately, the outcome may be similar, but it will depend on how the employees are separated (but they are not fully separated in this paper).

IAF MD 1 does not apply, seeing it is not a multi-site organization and is a single management system.



International Accreditation Forum
Technical Committee Discussion Paper

Name of party submitting issue for discussion (optional):
Kevin Belson EA Certification Committee

Statement of the issue:

Sampling of Temporary Sites in accordance with IAF MD 1.

Clarity of how temporary sites are included in sampling activities.

Discussion:

IAF MD1 - 3.2.1: Temporary sites that are covered by the organization's management system shall be subject to audit on a sample basis to provide evidence of the operation and effectiveness of the management system. They may, however be included within the scope of a multi-site certification and included on the certification document, subject to agreement between the Certification Body and the client organization. When temporary sites are shown on the certification documents, such sites shall be identified as temporary.

- a) Is it mandatory to apply the sampling methodology of MD 1 for temporary sites if it is appropriate to sample (i.e. if sampling rules apply), or is the use of other sampling methodology acceptable?
- b) Considering the above, would it be a valid approach to calculate the effective number of personnel individually for each for each sampled temporary site?
- c) I Does the inclusion of Temporary Sites on certificates affect the above, i.e. are the sampling requirements different if the temporary site is included on the certificate??

This was discussed within the EACC, but no consensus was reached, especially with regard to the effect of including temporary sites on certificates.

Requested action by the IAF TC:

To reach an early consensus regarding the above point

Consensus of the IAF TC (also to be documented in the meeting summary):

MSC WG 21 Oct 2019 – It is the responsibility of the CB to demonstrate the effectiveness of its process of auditing temporary sites and including the sites in the scope of certification. The CB must determine their process; based on the organization and temporary sites and also taking into account the risk and other factors to consider. In some situations, square root may apply, in others it may not.



Further detail

MSC Discussion from April 2019 (and not on the TC agenda)

MSC WG - Discussion included the following; but there was not consensus:

the methodology in MD 1 would need to be used. Since “other methods” would cause inconsistency. OR The temporary sites may change frequently so the square root method may not be appropriate. It depends on the scope, the length of the projects/temporary sites, etc.

Guidance on how to select temp sites can also be found in IAF MD 5

However, these various considerations are also relevant in perm sites and does not differ much from the original methods; except the length of the project/temp sites. And because of the length is the sampling appropriate, including when.

If the temp site is considered important, no matter its length, if it is important enough to be part of the mgmt. systems, then the time does not matter and it should be considered in the normal sampling methods; when the temp sites are being requested to be part of the certification.

EACC will consider the consistency forum to seek other input outside of Europe