

IAF CABAC

30 March 2020

Minutes

COVID-19 reaction

• IAF/ABs

- IAF CABAC members reported a very positive level of cooperation between ABs and CBs to enable the optimum use of remote techniques to support certified organisations.
- IAF ID 3:2011 and IAF MD 4:2018 seem to be standing up to some very robust use which has helped in the above cooperation. Whilst not advocating that these two documents *need* to be revised, given the thorough examination they are receiving, **Action – All to note any potential improvements to these documents for future consideration.**

IAF CABAC recommendation to IAF Executive Committee: at some future point IAF collates these from all users and carries out some kind of review/workshop to learn from the current crisis

- The IAF COVID-19 FAQ process is a very positive support mechanism and the speed of items being posted has helped
 - One issue has been raised concerning differences in approaches to risk evaluations. At extremes, some ABs need to see risk evaluations for every single certified organisation, whilst others need to see the generic risk assessment process used by the CB. This needs to be harmonised. **Action AD to prepare FAQ for submission to the IAF COVID-19 FAQ Task Force**
- ##### • Aerospace
- With IAQG's positive acceptance of remote techniques and use of IAF ID 3 and IAF MD4, aerospace remote auditing is set up to work well. This positive response also includes moving from an original limit of 30% of audit activity to 100%.
 - IAQG have provided good guidance and are also producing FAQs like IAF.
 - A risk plan must be approved by the AB before the CB can progress with remote techniques, including how different levels of risk are to be managed.

• GFSI

- GFSI are just allowing extensions to certifications or withdrawal, no remote activities. Two of the GFSI Certification Programme Owners (CPOs) did allow this but this has been stopped by GFSI.
- As the three CB associations invited to meet with the GFSI Board on 24 February 2020, IIOC, IQNet and TIC Council produced a paper on remote techniques which was submitted to GFSI Director Erica Sheward on 27 March 2020. **Action All IAF CABAC member associations to confirm if they support this paper by 31 March 2020. ML then to confirm this to GFSI**
- GFSI have quoted IAF ID 3 as a tool to use, but not IAF MD 4 given their opposition to remote techniques.

IAF CABAC recommendation to IAF Executive Committee that IAF contacts GFSI to propose use of remote techniques for GFSI certification programmes.

IAF CABAC recommendation to IAF Executive Committee that in light of 30 March 2020 GFSI statement, 'GFSI will facilitate a forum specifically for the purpose of exploring options for non-standard auditing (remote, virtual) that it could recognise if the COVID-19 crisis continues indefinitely', IAF contacts GFSI to support this and confirm its desire to be involved via the IAF GFSI Task Force.

A number of governments have classified food safety as an essential industry, for example:

[New Zealand](#) – 'The following services are considered essential. That means businesses carrying out these functions can remain open, including any critical suppliers in their supply chains, eg a firm repairing IT and data infrastructure for an essential service is okay to remain in operation.' Including, 'Primary industries, including food and beverage production and processing', within which is, 'Any entity involved in relevant support services, such as food safety and verification, inspection or associated laboratory services, food safety and biosecurity functions'.

Action All to provide examples of governments (national, state, etc.) who have confirmed the essential role of any conformity assessment activity

- **IATF**

The automotive sector is currently not using remote activities for IATF 16949. However, this approach by IATF is currently being reviewed and both IATF and a some of the oversight bodies are gathering views from a range of their stakeholders on the subject.

Action All to share their interactions with IATF and oversight bodies

- **PEFC**

IS confirmed the positive use by PEFC of the IAF CABAC paper on remote techniques.

Other

- **IAF MD 11**

PA confirmed status of the MD 11 work. The MD 11 Task Force (TF) stresses that the original Working Group had to act according to the mandate given by the IAF Technical Committee (TC) and that the outcome of this new discussion forum does not question in any way their judgment, fairness or competence.

Nevertheless, it is acknowledged that the revised MD 11 has flaws that will most probably limit its effective implementation (e.g. audit team competence criteria, rationale and clear differentiation of EEA approach, assumptions for additional audit duration reduction, etc.).

The TF feels that there is the need to further discuss previous revision dispositions and go beyond its scope. The TF work will be conducted remotely hoping to present and agree in the October 2020 TC meeting in Montreal what type of actions should be taken (developing of training materials, issuance of case studies or guidance papers, revisiting the document content, etc.).

Next meeting

It was agreed that during the current COVID-19 crisis that IAF CABAC should meet very two weeks to keep in touch, share experiences of working with ABs, etc. The meeting will be scheduled for fortnightly Mondays at 13:00 CET one hour maximum.

Action ML to send invite and link for 13 April 2020 meeting

Action ML to record future meeting to share with IAF CABAC colleagues unable to attend

Attendees

Alex Stoichitoiu	IQNet
Alister Dalrymple	IQNet
Anni Koubek	EOQ
Guillaume Gignac	IIOC
Hanane Taidi	IFIA
Ivan Savov	EFAC
Jeanette Preston	IAAR
Leo Omodeo-Zorini	IIOC
Manuela Held	IIOC
Marcus Long	IIOC
Paulo	CONFORMA
Pedro Alves	IQNet
Wayne Terry	ABCB