



**Draft Minutes of the 25th Meeting of
REMOTE EA Horizontal Harmonization Committee**

held on 2-3 March 2021

Item	Subject
1	<p>Opening of the meeting</p> <p>The Chair opens the meeting by giving the schedule of the upcoming two days. He reminds the attendants the basic MS Teams tool functions, asking the participants to mute their microphones and to use the function “raise your hand” when they wish to have the floor.</p>
2	<p>Presentation of the participants</p> <p>The Chair introduces the participants with a round call.</p>
3	<p>Approval of the agenda</p> <p>The HHC draft agenda was approved without any addition. A workshop on remote assessments will take place on the first day of the meeting at 14:00.</p>
4	<p>Minutes of HHC 24th meeting</p> <p>The draft Minutes of the HHC 24th meeting were approved without any comment.</p> <p>Action Secretariat</p>
5.1	<p>WG AfN</p> <p>The Chair reminded that a new HHC WG AfN was set up and reported on its activities.</p> <p>A list of the WG Members (mainly compound of TFG EA-2/17 Members) and a List of Tasks, available in the meeting papers, were presented. A web meeting took place on December 17th, 2020, where Terms of Reference were prepared. The Chair went through the WG AfN ToR available in the meeting papers for HHC approval. No comment was raised.</p> <p>HHC approves the WG AfN ToR available in the meeting papers without any change. They will be made available in the HHC “Constitutive Documents” intranet folder. Action Secretariat</p>

5.2	<p>Management of FAQ list: FAQ of JWG A-Series</p> <p>Leopoldo (IPAC) reported on the 24th meeting HHC agreed answer on SA question on suspension of accreditation and the accreditation cycle forwarded to the JWG A-Series.</p> <p>JWG A-Series feedback was not in contradiction with the HHC provided answer but the answer included in the JWG A-Series FAQ was shorter. The reason might be a requirement of ILAC/IAF to make it more more general for publication on ILAC/IAF website.</p> <p>What EA position should be (less or stricter than at international one) was raised. Indeed, stricter rules might be applied by EA as EA does not operate in the same legal framework and keeping the same position as ILAC was questioned.</p> <p>Based on feedback received on SA question sent by EA to JWG A Series FAQ on suspension of accreditation and the accreditation cycle, HHC confirms that the HHC agreed answer is not in contradiction with the JWG A Series one. Nevertheless, the HHC FAQ RG will revisit the answer to consider if it has to be made shorter as the one published by the JWGA. Action FAQ RG</p>
5.3	<p>Use of EA Forum – new structure</p> <p>The Chair showed the new forum structure on the intranet. He reminded that HHC Members can subscribe to the subforums they are interested in to receive alerts when a new topic is posted.</p> <p>Two news topics were created in the "Interpretation of ISO/IEC 17011" section and HHC Members were encouraged to visit the forum.</p> <p>The Chair concluded that the forum structure with the 3 main areas will remain the same for now.</p> <p>Ignacio (ENAC) asked whether it was possible that other NABs colleagues had access to the HHC Forum.</p> <p>It is technically possible but hard to manage from an administrator point of view. HHC Forum is normally dedicated to HHC members, but it would not be problem to add someone in the HHC group on a single basis if access is needed.</p>
5.4	<p>HHC New Task (new EC regulation)</p> <p>The Chair mentioned the following resolution adopted at the EA GA in November 2020 :</p> <p><i>EA Resolution 2020 (46) 09 : The General Assembly, acting upon recommendation from the Executive Committee, agrees that, in case that the European regulator publishes a new legislation, which includes the accreditation of CABs, without defining the applicable harmonized standard for accreditation, the HHC shall define the standard for accreditation, in consultation with the Technical Committees (if needed).EA National Accreditation Bodies should wait with the accreditation of CABs regarding the new European legislation until the HHC has defined the applicable harmonized standard.</i></p> <p>This new task under HHC responsibility to identify the corresponding legislation and to determine the preferred standard for this new legislation will be given to the WG AfN. In case the new legislation is not part of the NLF, the WG will inform the HHC to decide on the next steps.</p>

5.5	<p>EA new structure January 2021 - Revision of HHC ToR</p> <p>The Chair informed about the new EA structure starting from January 2021. The revised EA-1/17 EA Rules of Procedures were published.</p> <p>He highlighted that now under clause 10.13, Associate Members have a vote at the committee's level.</p> <p>The new TMB (Technical Management Board) had its first meeting early 2021 and TC Chairs looked forward to work together on technical issues.</p> <p>The Chair informed that the HHC ToR would need to be revised according to the new RoP and some updates were needed as some clauses do not exist anymore.</p> <p>HHC agrees to revise the HHC ToR according to the revised Rules of Procedures published in January 2021 with the EA new structure. In addition, some general updates are needed. A revised draft will be presented to the HHC in due time when having a clear picture of the EA membership structure and taking into account the Secretariat TCs ToR template under development. Action Chair/Secretariat</p>
5.6	<p>New Vice-Chair</p> <p>The Chair reminded that Sjaak would retire this year in summer from his position of HHC Vice-Chair.</p> <p>He invited HHC Members to candidate, pointing out the need of having a Vice Chair, which is around 2h-3h time spent per week.</p> <p>Further to the retirement of the HHC Vice Chair this year, a call for nominations for election of a new HHC Vice Chair will be circulated for 30 days within the HHC. Then an electronic ballot will be organized. Action Secretariat</p>
6.1	<p>Implementation plan 3.6.1 Develop a process for the management of existing accreditation areas and schemes.</p> <p>The Chair gave an update on EA ExB activities with regards to "One Voice".</p> <p>He reminded that from the HHC survey to identify level 3 and 4 standards to have a closer look at, 10 areas were identified.</p> <p>The TMB has started to review them.</p> <p>Comments were raised on how to proceed in this task and who will be the decisions makers.</p> <p>The Chair explained that "One Voice" approach is under the HHC as neutral but not limited to one committee. Decision will be under TMB in cooperation with TCs according to the area. But he emphasized that final decisions will be definitely taken at GA level especially in case of a binding standard.</p> <p>In order to clarify the decision process laid down in EA-1/23 on the preferred standard concerning the topics where differences on level 3 and 4 standards were identified, HHC agrees this issue will be added to the next TMB meeting agenda. Action Cecilie</p>

7.1	<p>Workshop on the subject “Remote assessments”</p> <p>Rob (UKAS) gave a comprehensive presentation on remote assessments, also based on the HHC survey launched in preparation of this workshop. The presentation and the results of the survey are available in the meeting papers.</p> <p>CC, IC and LC Chairs were invited to take part to this HHC workshop as a horizontal matter.</p> <p>After the presentation, participants were divided in 12 groups to exchange on their experiences of conducting remote assessments based on a 3 sections questionnaire:</p> <p>Section 1: Applicability/Limitations</p> <p>Section 2: Lessons Learned/ Best practice</p> <p>Section 3: Remote Assessments in the future</p> <p>After an hour of exchanges in small group, feedbacks were given and HHC discussed about the outcome of this workshop.</p> <p>It was commented that at ILAC level no formal document was published on remote assessments and some regions and stakeholders like EFAC are very active in this field. Thus, it would be good to have a paper at EA level to be prepared for discussions at international level when it happens.</p> <p>The Chair suggested either to develop an EA members procedural guidance document or to have a report based on the workshop and the survey to be published on EA website.</p> <p>Based on the outcome of the survey and feedbacks of the remote assessments workshop, HHC decides to create a report for publication on EA website. Survey and workshop materials will be provided to the EA Secretariat Communications Manager to prepare a report in cooperation with the HHC Chair, Vice Chair and Rob (UKAS). Action HHC Chair/Vice/Chair/Rob/Secretariat</p> <p>In a second stage, an HHC guidance members’ procedural document will be developed based on the report and potential international and stakeholders’ inputs.</p> <p>For this purpose, HHC decides to establish a TFG.</p> <p>Martin Sençak (SNAS) as the TFG Convenor, Mariagrazia Lanzanova (ACCREDIA), Karine Vincent (COFRAC), Ignacio Pina (ENAC), Andriana Lekakou (ESYD), Yakir Jaoui (ISRAC), Fredrik Langmead (SWEDAC), Claudio Boffa (NAB-MALTA) and Rob Bettinson (UKAS) volunteer to be members of the TFG on remote assessments.</p> <p>The Secretariat will prepare the NWIP for the next meeting of the TMB. Action Secretariat</p>
8.1	<p>EA-3/01 – TFG Report</p> <p><u>EA-3/01 S1 EA MLA Mark Rules</u></p> <p>Leopoldo (TFG Convenor) reported that the EA-3/01 supplement on EA MLA Mark Rules was finalized and adopted last October 2020.</p> <p>It is not yet published as it needs to be registered to EUIPO European agency. This step is dealt with Martine at the Secretariat in cooperation with the lawyer.</p> <p>Leopoldo mentioned Ignacio’s (ENAC) clarification request on clause 5 on sanctions which reads:</p>

	<p><i>“EA shall sanction NABs for their misuse of the EA MLA Mark and its variants, as well as for CAB’s misuses not being properly resolved by NABs:</i></p> <p><i>- a first warning to the NAB will be formally issued by the EA Secretariat, followed by a suspension from the EA MLA if the NAB fails to solve the misuse within the timeframe given, which will be no longer than two months after the first warning; if the misuse is not solved within the given timeframe, a withdrawal from EA MLA will be applied; ultimately a withdrawal from the EA membership can be applied;”</i></p> <p>Leopoldo commented that modifying the document at this stage would be very complicated, as in registration process.</p> <p>He put forward the use of common sense to deal with the issue and if any problem, it should be brought to the Secretariat. Indeed, if a NAB is doing everything but cannot succeed because of the legislation, a solution would be found.</p> <p>The issue was discussed raising some comments on who is taking the decision of suspension as the clause does not state it and does not clearly define how to proceed.</p> <p>Leopoldo pointed out that even if not stated in this supplement it is stated elsewhere in the EA RoP. If a misuse is similar to a “complaint” it should be dealt in the same way.</p> <p>Further the comment raised on clause 5 on “sanctions”, HHC decides to elaborate a proposal on how to proceed with sanctions in case of misuse of the MLA mark, to be presented at the next HHC in September 2021. Action TFG/Chair/Secretariat</p> <p><u>Revision of EA-3/01 – ILAC P8</u></p> <p>Leopoldo reported that it was noticed that EA-3/01 was not in line with ILAC P8 regarding how the accredited CAB can use the accreditation symbol.</p> <p>Members were informed and a NWIP (available in the meeting papers) was approved to start this light revision to align the EA rules to ILAC’s rules. The HHC commenting round was reduced to 30 days.</p> <p>Leopoldo suggested 2 options regarding the revision and open the floor for comments:</p> <p>a) a separate approach IAF/ILAC, with distinct requirements.</p> <p>b) the same and unified approach, using the tougher ILAC requirements.</p> <p>HHC supported the stricter option b.</p> <p>HHC agrees that a revised draft to comply with ILAC P8 (with the same and unified approach, using the tougher ILAC requirements) be circulated within HHC for 30 days commenting round. Action TFG Convenor / Secretariat</p>
8.2	<p>TFG Foreign Accreditation Activities in EA Territory</p> <p>Torben (DAkKS) as TFG Convenor reported that no progress was made. An update will be given at the next HHC September meeting.</p>
8.3	<p>BAM benchmarking project – Follow up</p> <p>The Chair reminded that at the last HHC, a BAM presentation took place and HHC discussed the outcome of the results of the benchmarking project. The idea to go for harmonization on processes and scopes was suggested and HHC decided that a detailed proposal will be presented at the next meeting.</p> <p>This proposal is summarized in a memo available in the meeting papers.</p>

	<p>The Chair went through the memo and concluded with a recommendation to establish a TFG on that harmonization issue. HHC was invited for views:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a mandatory status should be necessary to reach harmonization but is not possible in that field - the NAB resources also influence the results - instead of a mandatory document, identifying and understanding the gap differences between NABs should be taken as a first step. - Recommendation to start with a focus on differences on man-days was given - Stakeholders' involvement would be needed - Confidentiality issue was highlighted - Option of collecting information from the EA Secretariat upcoming surveys was put forward <p>HHC supported to focus on the reasons of these differences starting from the man-day's gaps.</p> <p>HHC discussed the memo on the accreditation processes and accreditation deliverables based on the 2nd round of BAM benchmarking project, available in the meeting papers.</p> <p>HHC decides to establish a TFG to develop first a feasibility study focusing on the reasons of the differences between NABs and especially the assessments man-days gaps.</p> <p>Martin Sençak (SNAS) as the TFG Convenor, DAKKS (Andreas Hönnerscheid), DANAK, ESYD (Katerina Bouranta), ISRAC (Yakir Jaoui), NA and SWEDAC volunteer to be members of the TFG on evaluation of processes.</p> <p>In parallel, Andreas (Executive Secretary) mentioned that an EA Members survey will be performed this year, giving the opportunity to address some points if needed and collect information. Action Andreas/TFG</p>
9.0	<p>FAQ RG working process</p> <p>The Chair informed that the FAQ RG used the forum for exchanging on the questions and the process worked well.</p> <p>Sections 6) Notification and 8) CAS of the existing FAQ List were revisited. The proposed answers of these 8 revisited questions are available in the meeting papers and would not be discussed unless clarification is needed.</p> <p>Maureen (BELAC) raised comments on question 9.2 (see below item 9.2)</p> <p>At the next HHC, 2) Appeals Q2.1 - 5) NAB status Q5.1 - 20) Others Q20.1 and Q20.2 will be revisited. Action FAQ RG</p> <p>The Chair suggested that regarding the new questions received, only complex ones would be discussed during this meeting unless a request to discuss simple ones is received.</p>
9.1	<p>Revisiting Section 6) – 6.1 Application of EA 2/17, annex B</p> <p>No comment was received, the agreed answer will be updated in the FAQ list. Action Secretariat</p>

9.2	<p>Revisiting Section 6) 6.2 Scopes in the Voluntary Field Following a comment, the answer was slightly modified replacing “accreditation purpose” by “notification purpose”. The agreed answer will be updated in the FAQ list. Action Secretariat</p>
9.3	<p>Revisiting Section 6) 6.3 Selection of HS for accreditation for notification purposes. The answer was slightly modified for clarification purposes:“(and not the CAB)” in the first sentence and ““within the boundaries of 2/17” were added. The agreed answer will be updated in the FAQ list. Action Secretariat</p>
9.4	<p>Revisiting Section 6) 6.4 CAB seeking accreditation on the same scope than notification No comment was received, the agreed answer will be updated in the FAQ list. Action Secretariat</p>
9.5	<p>Revisiting Section 8) 8.1 Interpretation of EA-1/22, 4.1. requirement No comment was received, the agreed answer will be updated in the FAQ list. Action Secretariat</p>
9.6	<p>Revisiting Section 8) 8.2 Recognition of schemes managed in other European States ex EA 1/22 and relationship with EA-INF 04 No comment was received, the agreed answer will be updated in the FAQ list. Action Secretariat</p>
9.7	<p>Revisiting Section 8) 8.3 The Scheme owner of certification scheme in regulatory field No comment was received, the agreed answer will be updated in the FAQ list. Action Secretariat</p>
9.8	<p>Revisiting Section 8) 8.4 EA-1/22 Policy for CA schemes No comment was received, the agreed answer will be updated in the FAQ list. Action Secretariat</p>
9.9	<p>BELAC 1 This complex question was lengthy discussed and commented especially by ESYD, NAB-MALTA, COFRAC, IPAC and BELAC. No consensus was reached. HHC agrees to withdraw the proposed answer to BELAC1 for a more in-depth analysis of the question how new (electronic) reporting tools should/can be used by CABs including its implications on the transparency principle laid down in EA-3/01. A new answer will be proposed to the 26th HHC in September 2021. Action FAQ RG In addition, the Chair informed that a question on the same topic was recently posted in the forum by Sinead (INAB) in the “Interpretation of ISO/IEC 17011” subforum and invited HHC Members to consult it.</p>
9.10	<p>BELAC 2 No comment was received, the agreed answer will be added in the FAQ list. Action Secretariat</p>

9.11	<p>COFRAC</p> <p>The answer was discussed, and modifications were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Addition to show that “not only 17025” is concerned in the first sentence - Remove the subcontractor paragraph “Where the CAB...” - Q 3: remove “17025” and replace “identify” by “identity” in the first sentence and remove second part of the last sentence from the “but” <p>The modified answer was agreed and will be added in the FAQ List. Action Secretariat</p>
9.12	<p>HAA 1</p> <p>The first sentence of the proposed answer was deleted.</p> <p>The slightly modified answer was approved will added in the FAQ List. Action Secretariat</p>
9.13	<p>HAA 2</p> <p>No comment was received, the agreed answer will be added in the FAQ list. Action Secretariat</p>
9.14	<p>HAA 3</p> <p>The question was discussed and modifications on the proposed answer were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the 1st paragraph adding “in this case it is recommended...” - 2nd paragraph was deleted <p>The modified approved answer will include in the FAQ List. Action Secretariat</p>
9.15	<p>RvA 1</p> <p>This complex question was discussed. Clarification was needed and it was decided to redraft the answer based on the discussions.</p> <p>The redrafted answer was approved and will include in the FAQ List. Action Secretariat</p>
9.16	<p>RvA 2</p> <p>This complex question was discussed and approved with some modifications.</p> <p>The modified approved answer will include in the FAQ List. Action Secretariat</p>
10.1	<p>Management of CA schemes</p> <p>The Vice-Chair reported that there were a lot of activities in the scheme area : new schemes under evaluation and updated version of the schemes ongoing.</p> <p>He went through the list of successfully evaluated schemes available in the meeting papers mentioning that :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>A link to IAF schemes</u> was added on the top of the list - <u>A new column (in yellow)</u> with the schemes documents to be mentioned in the accreditation information was added to give better information on the nature of the scheme and the related document. Some schemes are very complex.

- New schemes : BRC Global Standard Storage and Distribution Issue 4 with hAB UKAS in December 2020 and VinylPlus® Product Label with hAB ACCREDIA in November 2020
- Updated version of schemes: GMP+ Feed – Module Feed Safety Assurance - 2021 in December 2020 and Food Store Quality Standard (FSQS) version 2 in February 2021

The Vice- Chair also presented the list of schemes under evaluation. For some of them, there were no progress.

In addition, the Vice-Chair brought to the HHC attention that currently there were a lot of cases of schemes with additional requirements to ISO/IEC 17011. Indeed, EA-1/22 process tries to prevent them by requiring these additional requirements to be endorsed by the GA.

Now 4 schemes are concerned:

- GlobalG.A.P Chain of Custody scheme V6 (for HHC endorsement and then GA Ballot)
- IFS Logistics v2.2 (for HHC endorsement and then GA Ballot)
- IFS Food V7 (positive GA ballot in February 2021)
- TE scheme (negative GA ballot in February 2021)

The Chair commented that there are a lot of discussions with Scheme Owners and the schemes are often under time pressure as already in place on the market. Therefore, long lasting process do not fit.

He raised the issue of TE scheme not passing the GA ballot, after a lot of work and time spent from the hAB to discuss with the scheme owner. COFRAC as TE scheme hAB confirmed that a lot of time was spent for discussions and that the Scheme Owner was waiting for the result for a while. This scheme is accreditable, and if not accepted by EA under EA-1/22, it will be accredited by others and with bilateral approach from COFRAC.

The EA-1/22 process was questioned whether it is adapted to the practice.

Moreover, the voting procedure shows not being suitable for decision on additional requirements as Members who are not involved in schemes abstain and 2/3 of the vote cast (including abstains) should be in favor to pass. That is the reason why TE scheme failed with a lot of abstentions.

The floor was opened for comments on what should be done in this regard:

- EA-1/22 should suit the practice to have the largest numbers of schemes to be evaluated at EA level.
- Members should be made aware of the voting rules and more explanations should be given during a meeting rather than by email
- EA-1/22 process is to be promoted but failed considering the TE scheme case

HHC agrees that the HHC Chair will present the additional requirements of GlobalG.A.P Chain of Custody V6 and IFS Logistics v2.2 for GA endorsement during the EA GA meeting in May 2021. This will enable to give more explanations to EA Members on the process and the voting rules. **Action Chair**

In addition, the outcome of the GA ballot on TE scheme will be also brought to the attention of the next GA meeting in May 2021; the objective will be to ask the GA to not confirm the result but to repeat the ballot. **Action Chair**

	<p>In parallel, EA-1/22 general concept and approach on additional requirements will be reviewed whether it still fits to its (initial) purpose. For this, HHC decides to establish a TFG.</p> <p>Ignacio Pina (ENAC) as the TFG Convenor, Norman Brunner (AA), Karine Vincent (COFRAC), Cecile Laake (NA), Fredrik Langmead (SWEDAC), Rob Bettinson (UKAS) volunteer to be members of the TFG EA-1/22 process</p> <p>Furthermore, following HHC discussions 3 additional tasks were given to the TFG EA-1/22 process:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where to make available the list of successfully and under evaluation schemes to make it more visible to all on the intranet. Who should have access to it should be considered. Currently the list is available in the intranet folder “CA schemes”, with access HHC Members and some others members dealing with schemes (under request). 2. Following Norman’s proposal, consider whether competence requirements in the schemes should be listed for information in the same way as additional requirements. 3. Consider whether “scoping” should be part of the EA-1/22 process. <p>Action TFG</p>
10.2	<p>Communication and participation of Scheme owners</p> <p>Further the discussions with PEFC in June 2020, it was brought to the HHC meeting in September 2020 that more communication with schemes owners was needed.</p> <p>On that purpose, a draft letter was prepared by Kevin (UKAS -CC Chair), with the idea to open the way to communication with Scheme Owners. This letter template could be sent by NABs to SOs if necessary.</p> <p>Further the HHC 24th meeting decision to try to improve the communication on the process towards Scheme Owners, a letter template available in the meeting papers intended for Schemes owners to be made aware of EA-1/22 process was presented. HHC agreed on the letter with small changes.</p> <p>It will be made available in the intranet folder “CA Schemes” for the use of the NABs. Members will additionally be made aware of the template by the secretariat. Action Secretariat</p> <p>Harmonization of the description of schemes and scheme documents in the accreditation information</p> <p>The table of successfully evaluated schemes was improved with a new column on description of scope information.</p> <p>Moreover, considering whether “scoping” should be part of the EA-1/22 process will be addressed in the new TFG EA-1/22 on process. Action TFG EA-1/22 process</p> <p>Swedac request – List of schemes publicly available</p> <p>Further SWEDAC request to make the list of schemes publicly available, it was reminded that the list is reflecting evaluation with common approach by hABs but is not an EA evaluation. This list should be for use of NABs only and not publicly available, as an internal technical tool.</p> <p>Nevertheless, where to make it available internally and who should have access to it was discussed.</p>

	<p>HHC agrees to give the following task to the new TFG EA-1/22 process: where to make available the list of successfully and under evaluation schemes to make it more visible to all on the intranet. Who should have access to it should be considered. Currently the list is available in the intranet folder “CA schemes”, with access HHC Members and some others members dealing with schemes (under request). Action TFG EA-1/22 process</p> <p>AA issue on competences requirements</p> <p>Norman (AA) raised the issue that the current EA-1/22 process was not advantaging small NABs, reference to competences requirements of the NABs in the schemes should be listed for information as the additional requirements to ISO/IEC 17011.</p> <p>The Vice Chair commented that EA-1/22 prevents additional requirements to protect small NABs and suggested that this task be taken onboard by the new TFG on EA-1/22 process.</p> <p>HHC agrees that the TFG will consider whether competence requirements in the schemes should be listed for information in the same way as additional requirements. Action TFG</p> <p>In addition, the Chair reminded that a table listing successfully evaluated schemes additional requirements (dated 2018) is available in the intranet CA schemes folder. This table will need to be updated with the new schemes and potential additional requirements. The Secretariat will circulate the table for review to the hABs. Action Secretariat</p>
10.3	<p>REMOTE “Evaluation of Schemes” Training on (7th October 2020) - Feedback</p> <p>The Vice-Chair reported on this joint CC HHC workshop held remotely in October 2020 gathering around 80 participants and which received good feedbacks.</p>
10.4	<p>New accreditation and conformity assessment developments - Executive Secretary report</p> <p>Andreas gave an update on the Cybersecurity Act.</p> <p>Currently two certification schemes are in process under the Cybersecurity Act:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. EUCC scheme which is a certification scheme related to the common criteria. It covers all ICT products 2. EU Cybersecurity certification Cloud scheme related to cloud services <p>Both schemes will be published as EU legislation. Publication of the EUCC is expected mid-2021 and the Certification scheme on cloud services in autumn 2021.</p> <p>An important issue is that ENISA (European Union Agency for Cybersecurity) is preparing a guidance paper on accreditation requirements for testing laboratories activities. This guideline is under development in a task force group where EA is represented. This covers some guidance on assessors’ competences of the experts involved in the evaluation activities but also impartiality and confidentiality issues.</p> <p>Andreas referred to the Union’s rolling work programme for European cybersecurity certification which includes a survey with future IT sectors to be covered under the cybersecurity act. In addition, 5G area should be the next certification scheme.</p> <p>A lot of existing legislations are under public consultation or coming up with new drafts. Andreas mentioned some issues regarding the revision of the organic</p>

	farming regulation, requiring now double accreditation in those tasks. EA is in contact with the relevant DGs to find a solution and Members are kept informed.
10.5	<p>List of EC-Schemes not based on legislation</p> <p>The Chair went through the list of EC-Schemes which is available in the meeting papers, mentioning the new ERA ECM schemes adopted at the last EA GA in November 2020.</p>
11.1	<p>Remote Training EA-2/17 (3rd December 2020) – Feedback</p> <p>The Chair reported on the “Trained the trainer” training on EA-2/17 which received good feedbacks.</p> <p>This training showed that some points needed clarifications and it was also decided as a follow-up to provide in the future such EA-2/17 trainings on a regular basis.</p>
11.2	<p>DG GROW request to strive for more harmonisation on witnessing for new scope</p> <p>The Chair reported that a request was received from DG Grow following the report on the functioning of accreditation in Europe, where a big gap was identified with significant variation of months in the way scopes are witnessed.</p> <p>HHC Members were invited to decide if this issue should be taken onboard by the WG AfN.</p> <p>In the Chair’s opinion, it is not just a question of comparing the numbers which does not give a clear picture, as depending on the cases and situations.</p> <p>It was commented that in the survey simple questions were asked and so simple answers were given resulting in not giving an appropriate full picture.</p> <p>This question is raised now by the EC but was raised also in the IMP few years ago.</p> <p>HHC supported that an answer should be given to DG GROW, giving the task to the WG AfN.</p> <p>Further DG GROW request to strive for more harmonisation on witnessing for new scope as significant variation of months until a certain scope would be witnessed was noticed, HHC agrees that this issue be dealt with in the WG AfN.</p> <p>An answer to the Commission will be drafted. Action WG AfN</p>
11.3	<p>DG.GROW.C1 request to strive for more harmonization in the area of the CPR</p> <p>The Chair informed HHC of the Letter sent by DG GROW to notified bodies in CPR, available in meeting paper.</p> <p>Regarding this important political issue, the idea would not be to draft an HHC mandatory document but to develop a paper providing some indicators on the issue. The legal framework inherent to CPR will have to be considered.</p> <p>Further DG.GROW.C1 request to strive for more harmonization in the area of the CPR, HHC decides that the WG AfN will develop a paper to provide indicators on this issue. DG.GROW will be invited to participate in this work. Action WG AfN</p>
12.1	<p>Review of HHC document list including ILAC/IAF HHC owned document + Level 3/4/5 standards (permanent agenda item)</p> <p>The Chair informed that a link to EA-INF/01 was available on the agenda. Nothing was reported.</p>

12.2	<p>Feedback on HHC proposal to implement the ISO 20387 and ISO/IEC17029 new standards in EA-1/06 under suitable level 2 activity in EA MLA structure.</p> <p>The Chair reported that revised EA-1/06 was published including ISO/IEC 17029 new standard.</p> <p>During the ballot, some comments were received to be taken onboard at next revision. Action Chair/Secretariat</p> <p>Further a question on the state of play of the registration as harmonized standard of ISO 20387 Biobanking standard, Andreas (Executive Secretary) informed that a new draft of the Commission implementing decision on the standardization request covering Biobanking was received in January 2021.</p> <p>Zacharias (EC) informed that the internal consultation step has been finalized, last minutes comments were received from stakeholders and now EC was finalizing the Commission text with the legal services that will be submitted to the Committee of Standards. Zacharias could not give an exact date of publication, but it would not be before one or two months.</p>
13.1	<p>Progress report 2020</p> <p>The HHC progress report for the year 2020 is available in the meeting papers for information.</p>
13.2	<p>Work Program 2021</p> <p>The HHC WP 2021 is available in the meeting papers for information. All actions are currently taken onboard.</p>
13.3	<p>Draft WP 2022</p> <p>The HHC Draft WP 2022 was presented for comments and endorsement.</p> <p>HHC approves the HHC WP 2022 draft available in the meeting papers without any change. Action Secretariat</p>
14.1	<p>IC liaison</p> <p>Dejan Stojkovski (IARNM) was not attending the meeting. Nothing was reported</p>
14.2	<p>MAC liaison</p> <p>Rob (UKAS) reported on the MAC, activities mentioning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the new MAC Chair: Maria Papatzikou (ESYD) replacing Paolo Tavares (IPAC), - Peer evaluation decisions have been taken remotely - Couple of documents out for comments on remote decisions for peer evaluations and EA evaluation process <p>Maria Papatzikou (ESYD - MAC Chair) was appointed as new HHC MAC liaison person to replace Rob (UKAS) who is no longer part of the MAC MG.</p>
14.3	<p>LC liaison</p> <p>Claudio (NAB-MALTA) reported on the LC activities with discussions ongoing on rapid PTs, a lot of questions received on technical matters and documents under revision.</p>

	<p>At the last LC September meeting, interesting presentation were given from ENFSI (European Network of Forensic Science Institutes) on crime scene investigation and EPPO (European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization).</p>
14.4	<p>CC liaison</p> <p>Elias (ISAC) reported on the CC activities mentioning the activities in progress: ToR, 2/17 training and questions.</p> <p>He suggested to find another CC liaison.</p> <p>Nobody volunteered during the meeting. The Chair invited HHC Members to think about it for the next HHC. Action HHC</p>
14.5	<p>Liaison with ILAC/IAF</p> <p>Norman (AA) informed of the next MLA committee meeting to be held 29 April 2021, where the 17029 MLA issue and the requirements of transfer of the current 14065 to 17029 will be discussed. There is a proposal that 14065 would be at level 4.</p> <p>This issue might have an impact at HHC level to define the boundaries from 17029 to Inspection, as the two fields might be overlapping. Norman recommended to add this issue at the next HHC September meeting. Action Chair/Secretariat</p> <p>Leopoldo (IPAC) reported that the IAF TC decided to set up a new working group for 17011 issues convened by Kevin (UKAS). The terms of reference were discussed during this first meeting. Even if the JWGA is already taking care of 17011 issues, some are escaping and will be dealt with in this new WG.</p> <p>Andreas (Executive Secretary) informed that there was no ILAC ARC meeting since autumn 2019. A meeting is scheduled on 20th April 2021. He also gave an update on the “Cooperation between ABs” issue, which is now discussed with Dutch lawyers, and progressing well.</p> <p>Fredrik (SWEDAC) reported on ILAC AIC activities: a remote meeting took place in December 2020 with a lot of updates on documents, (the revised ILAC P9 will be soon published, ILAC G17 has been published in January 2021, a lot of critical issues remained to be solved for ILAC G18 (scope), ILAC G19 (Forensic) is under comments). 15189 and 17043 standards are under revision. Sampling and measurement uncertainty is a big issue with the new 17025 with a position paper in progress. Regarding Biobanking standard, a task force group is working on the border line between 17034 and 20387 for clarification, in view of extending MRA which in progress. The VIM is under revision</p>
14.6	<p>Draft IAF Document on Developing Competence Requirements for Main Scope Standards (new IAF document on competence assessors’ requirements based on level 4 criteria)</p> <p>The Chair reported that he did not have too much news on this. He received the information that the TFG on assessors met on February 24th, 2021. HHC will follow-up this issue as not in favour of defining assessors’ competences requirements at that level.</p> <p>IAF MDX Criteria for evaluation of CAS (under ballot January 2021)</p> <p>The Chair informed that there was a ballot on this document. Members received recommendation to vote against as chapter 5 was unacceptable and not in line with EA-1/22. This document was rejected.</p> <p>An analysis with a comparison with EA-1/22 and the IAF document was made by the Vice Chair and is available in the meeting papers.</p>

	<p>Norman informed that the next step for this document will be discussed at the next TC in May 2021.</p> <p>An email will be sent to EA Members as an update and with recommendation to continue the development of this document without clause 5 Action Andreas</p>
15.	<p>Impact of the EU – UK TCA regarding accreditation and mutual recognition</p> <p>Andreas (Executive Secretary) gave an update on the impact of the EU – UK TCA regarding accreditation and mutual recognition.</p> <p>End of 2020, UK concluded the trading cooperation agreement which includes the chapter on technical barriers to trade.</p> <p>But this agreement does not include any mutual recognition of conformity assessment provisions</p> <p>It is to be considered also the Northern Ireland protocol with specific provisions in regards with the NLF.</p> <p>He also informed that a communication was published on EA website on the impact of this trade agreement and especially UKAS accreditation.</p>
15.1	<p>Wish List review</p> <p>The HHC wish list is available for information in the meeting papers.</p> <p>The Chair asked the HHC if the item “March 2017 wish on CC survey on schemes not based on legislation” could be remove from the wish list.</p> <p>HHC agreed to delete the item. The wish list will be updated accordingly Action secretariat</p>
15.2	<p>Actions list review</p> <p>The HHC Actions List follow-up document on HHC activities is available for information in the meeting papers.</p>
15.3	<p>Review of decisions and actions agreed at the meeting – Proposed resolutions for the GA in May 2021</p> <p>The Chair went through the HHC 25th meeting Decisions approved on March 3rd, 2021, to be uploaded in the Minutes and Arising intranet meeting folder. Action Secretariat</p>
16	<p>Next meetings</p> <p>The Chair hoped that he next HHC September (7-8) 2021 will be face-to-face. This will be decided by the Executive Board in due time.</p> <p>HHC confirms the HHC meetings dates for 2022 as followed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1-2 March 2022 • 13-14 September 2022
	<p>The Chair thanks the participants for their patience online and this fruitful meeting.</p> <p>The Chair thanks very much Sjaak for his great contribution to the HHC as a Vice Chair being “Mr. Workshop” and taking care of all the schemes issues, wishing him a nice future!</p>