

ISSUE 11 – RECORDS OF TECHNICAL COMPETENCE

APAC Lead Evaluator Training Objectives:

Examine appropriate approaches in ensuring sufficient competence records are reviewed, and records of decisions on assessors.

ILAC Finding: NC-01 of AB#1 and APAC Response

ITEM	CONSIDERATION
DM NC #2	<p>IAF/ILAC A2, Clause 2.1.1 An accreditation body shall comply with the provisions of ISO/IEC 17011 requirements and mandatory documents in IAF and ILAC where applicable.</p> <p>The APLAC peer evaluator for the scope of inspection did not consider the following requirements of IAF /ILAC A5 document “Multi-Lateral Mutual Recognition Arrangements Application of ISO/IEC 17011:2004”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>M.6.3.1.1 Personnel to be monitored also includes experts involved in the assessment.</i> - <i>M.7.7.3.1 Inspection body Accreditation</i> <p><i>The choice of inspectors and inspections to be witnessed by the accreditation body shall be made by the accreditation body (not the inspection body), and shall take into account critical factors (e.g. new employees, the risks and the complexity of the inspection activity, physical capabilities of staff). However, it is not intended that every inspector has to be witnessed. The accreditation body should document the analysis and/or rationale used for sampling of inspectors to be witnessed to cover the scope of accreditation. National legal requirements, regulations, standards or other relevant authority may stipulate levels of witnessing. Any such adjustments should be made explicit in scope statements by reference to the relevant law, regulation, etc.</i></p>
Date	Response from the Region
2018-03-28	<p><i>M.6.3.1.1: As part of the pre-evaluation meeting (and post-witnessing meeting), the Team Leader asked the evaluators to examine monitoring records of the assessors. The Team Leader assumed that the evaluators would include the review of technical experts but he did not specifically ask them to review the records for technical experts.</i></p> <p><i>M.7.7.3.1: The Team Leader instructed the AB on how many and what type of assessments to be witnessed but he did not follow up to ensure that the AB were responsible for the selection of the inspections and the inspectors to witness. This was an oversight of the Team Leader and not one that the evaluator would be expected to be responsible for checking.</i></p> <p>All Team Leaders and evaluators will be made aware of these issues by the Evaluator Training Working Group convenor.</p>
Date	Reaction from the IAF / ILAC evaluation team
2018/05/15	The corrective action is accepted, however, please provide evidence.
Date	
2018-08-06	Refer to Case Study 2 attached for Lead Evaluator Training to be delivered in 2019.
Date	Reaction from the IAF / ILAC evaluation team
2018-10-15	Finding closed .

IAF/ILAC A2:2014, 2.1.1 (refers to ISO/IEC 17011:2004 generically) and IAF/ILAC A5, M.6.3.1.1 and M.7.7.3.1 (used during ILAC evaluation)

M.6.3.1.1 *Personnel to be monitored also includes experts involved in the assessment.*

M.7.7.3.1 *Inspection body Accreditation*

The choice of inspectors and inspections to be witnessed by the accreditation body shall be made by the accreditation body (not the inspection body), and shall take into account critical factors (e.g. new employees, the risks and the complexity of the inspection activity, physical capabilities of staff). However, it is not intended that every inspector has to be witnessed.

The accreditation body should document the analysis and/or rationale used for sampling of inspectors to be witnessed to cover the scope of accreditation.

National legal requirements, regulations, standards or other relevant authority may stipulate levels of witnessing. Any such adjustments should be made explicit in scope statements by reference to the relevant law, regulation, etc.;

IAF/ILAC A2:2018, 2.1.2 (refers to ISO/IEC 17011:2017 generically) and IAF/ILAC A5, M.6.3.1.1 and M.7.7.3.1 (current versions = NO CHANGE – See above)

Acceptable / Possible solutions

Records of what was reviewed may now need to be captured on APAC FRMA-012. This may include records of decisions regarding choice of assessors. **See Issue 1.**

Case Study 2 – Determining Conformance to 17011 and related ILAC Requirements

Scenario:

During an evaluation, the peer evaluator for inspection did not appear to consider the following requirements of IAF-ILAC A5- “Multi-Lateral Mutual Recognition Arrangements Application of ISO/IEC 17011:2004,” specifically:

- M.6.3.1.1 Personnel to be monitored also includes experts involved in the assessment.
- M.7.7.3.1 Inspection body Accreditation

As part of the pre-evaluation meeting (and post-witnessing meeting), the Team Leader asked the evaluators to examine monitoring records of the assessors. The Team Leader assumed that the evaluators would include the review of technical experts, but they did not specifically ask them to review the records for technical experts.

As well, the Team Leader instructed the AB on how many and what type of assessments to be witnessed but they did not follow up to ensure that the AB were responsible for the selection of the inspections and the inspectors to witness. This was an oversight of the Team Leader and not one that the evaluator would be expecting to be responsible for checking.

Questions to Lead Evaluators:

- Does this circumstance/condition conform to evaluation requirements?
- Which member of the evaluation team is responsible for ensuring that sufficient assessment personnel records are examined to provide evidence of conformance by the AB?
- At which planning or execution points, could communication have been used to avoid these two conditions? Who would be expected to participate in this communication?