



Attendees:

Sue Burbeck	Adams Environmental,	(SB, Chair)
John Abbiss	UKAS	(JA – AFLA Section Head)
Louise Wainwright	UKAS	(LW, Secretary)
Helen Ratcliffe,	Health & Safety Executive, Asbestos Policy Unit (HR)	
Arran Cobley	Hampshire County Council	(AC)
John Richards	Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (JR - RICS)	
Jonathan Grant	NORAC (New Association - representing some accredited IBs and Testing labs) (JG)	
Laurie Davies	Health & Safety Laboratory/ Independent technical assessor	(LSTD)
Gerald Hudd	Independent Technical Assessor	(GAH)
Steve Platkiw	ATaC	(SP)

Apologies

Martin Gibson	Health & Safety Executive, HM Principal Specialist Inspector	(MG)
Garry Burdett	Health & Safety Laboratory	
Craig Bell	Health & Safety Executive	
Colette Willoughby	British Occupational Hygiene Society (BOHS)/Independent Technical Assessor	(CW)
Rob Blackburn	Asbestos Removal Contractors Association	(RB - ARCA)

Agenda item – Summary

1 Welcome and Apologies

Welcome and apologises given by Chair.

2 Minutes of the last meeting

Further comments provided by some members for inclusion in final copy. Revised copy to be circulated.

3 Aim and Purpose of TAC:

TAC Purpose

The TAC is there to provide Technical support and input to UKAS in determining policy and approach and is further explained within the current Terms of Reference. As such the TAC should have representation from a number of different backgrounds.

Committee Membership

With the constitution in mind a review of the committee membership was discussed with representation provided considered. In some cases, members could be seen to represent different perspectives of similar areas, but in general most relevant aspects are thought to be covered.

End Users of Accredited Services

In order to further support this (relevant representation) UKAS are now entering into how they can also hold further dialogue with end users of accredited services, such as Building Duty Holders.

There is now a new specific group dealing with looking at guidance and requirements for Housing Associations and this could be an avenue to pursue where direct discussion with Duty holders if required. It may be however, that the Associations discussions may be more relevant to the HSE.

There are also other bodies which may be able to explore and discuss issues arising and any industry concerns with this Duty Holders group such as ATaC and NORAC whose members will be accredited IBs and Testing labs and who are providing services direct to Duty Holders. Such groups will have a part to play in the education of

end users – an area which is not within UKAS remit as an accreditation body.

Report content – Surveys

Discussion over poor reporting by IBs has been touched upon in many previous TAC meetings, as this is an aspect where Duty Holders could be directly affected.

Some issues may be down to end users being unfamiliar with reporting requirements and there being a varied approach if using different IBs where reporting templates vary.

Reports are not standardised, making it difficult for some end users. There is no standard reporting template - there is a reluctance by IBs to have a uniform approach as many wish to have their own 'style'. So long as Reports contain the relevant sections giving compliance with HSG264 then there is no requirement for Reports to all look the same.

Technical Qualifications – who 'approves' these?

Discussion was held over who is responsible for approving qualifications. UKAS have clarified that they are not responsible for approving or validating qualifications.

A further question was also raised to query If there is a need for a stated 'Approval Body' to agree on acceptance/suitability of (asbestos) qualifications, and if so then who would confer this authority on the Approval Body?

A number of options were discussed but despite this there is still a question and a potential gap in terms of what qualifications may be deemed suitable in the future if new ones are developed and are then on offer. There may be the need for a new sub-committee group specifically set up to look at qualifications.

UKAS noted that when LAB30/RG8 are revised these will need to acknowledge possible other qualifications and the current wording amended appropriately. However, removing the current details relating to available qualifications could, at this stage, have a detrimental effect and could lead to increased assessment time where qualifications which did not fit into these defined routes were in use. This could lead to inconsistency.

It was agreed that whilst this cannot be resolved during this meeting it is a valid agenda item – that there may be future qualification options and that these may require TAC discussion/ input to UKAS.

4 UKAS Update

Changes

No real company changes since the restructure but internally these continue to evolve.

3 major elements which are affecting UKAS :-

- Brexit – there are good input mechanisms from UKAS to this. It may not affect asbestos sector too much.
- Revised 17025:2017 – 2000 labs (1500 testing/500 Cal) which will need to transition to the revised standard.
- New Management system – the old UKAS system in place since 2011 is now obsolete and requires updating.

Resource

There is focus on succession planning internally.

Some roles have needed to become dedicated which has now driven succession planning for technical and quality structures. This is particularly important as the company has grown.

UKAS will continue to provide updates with regards to Brexit as an when possible. Information is being provided via the UKAS website.

Applications, Resignations and Grants of accreditation

11 applicants over last year.

Generally, the number of applicants is exceeding those who are leaving, many come from small IBs. Not all applicants achieve accreditation and those that do may still drop out quickly, 3 occurred during last

12months.

Resignations and withdrawals – 9 during 2017 (3 withdrawals which could have come from various circumstances and not necessarily related to technical issues)

5 within current 2018 year

5 HSE Update

General Update

- Brexit – this has resulted in significant work load with reviews and potential changes of existing policy.
- Digital communications etc – a focus on digital platforms, especially related to Notification of Licensed work, this project now well underway (with time and cost implications)
- CAR 2012 Review – the medical requirements will stay as they are
- CAR 2012 – R4 – work is underway for an internal review of the Duty to Manage requirements.
- Analyst Project – the formal write up is now under review (the actual work was some years ago). This will confirm that 4SC ‘cleaning’ work should NOT be done by the Analyst.

HSE on-line guidance – policy is that it must be simplified and stripped back (related to volume of information issued).

ALG Notes (NOT HSE Guidance)

These Notes are now hosted on the ARCA website – this confirms their status as NOT being HSE guidance but should be considered as industry generated guidance.
ALG are undertaking some work including Duty Holder guidance.

LARC Handover form

Confirmation that this has now been issued (was located on the Web Communities website). This will serve a guidance once formally referenced but not legally/regulatory requirement.
Hopefully seen as a method for ‘nudging improvement’ within the industry.

A number of Regulations are under review to ensure in the event of a no deal scenario, we continue to have a functioning statute book after Brexit. There is guidance provided on the HSE website.

There is some new IT required to implement these systems as currently this is linked to the EU systems.

Changing HSE CEO with recruitment going on. There is an Acting CEO at present.

The past HSE Analyst Project report has now been drafted and will eventually be published on the HSE website.

6 ATaC:

No organisation changes

Sector feedback

Accreditation costs and assessor consistency

ATaC have received a number of queries from members including aspects regarding both consistency and

costs involved with accreditation, similar to those received by NORAC.

Comments indicate that accredited companies have raised issues with the perceived higher cost of

accreditation over that of other certifications such as 9000.

UKAS can confirm however that there are fundamental differences between Conformity Assessment Bodies who provide the likes of 9001 certification and Accreditation Bodies. Some aspects are mandatory for accreditation.

UKAS costs are similar to other Accreditation Bodies (overseas). There are costs for UKAS in terms of ongoing

requirements and operation costs and factors which determine and control costs set by UKAS.

Daily rates are the same across all sectors and charges have to be transparent and should be justifiable.

UKAS has tried to address the approach via the restructure of the organisation with the creation of different

sections. However, this does not necessarily mean automatically reduced costs.

Feedback received by both ATaC and NORAC has highlighted that some companies would prefer to seek

alternatives to UKAS from overseas Accreditation Bodies where possible as they do not see UKAS costs as

competitive. Discussion regarding Cross frontier agreements and requirements must be considered and will still be in force after Brexit.

Understanding the background to UKAS as government approved accreditation body is vital when considering

costs, many of the costs are associated with the need to meet the International Agreements. The position of

being the National Accreditation Body has cost implications.

7 NORAC:

NORAC have canvassed members and requested feedback on UKAS and assessments. All feedback received

has been provided to UKAS and discussion of these aspects was held during the recent NORAC that UKAS attended. Unfortunately, there were number of specific issues but these can only be discussed in

general terms being outside of the assessment process and to maintain confidentiality.

UKAS are in process of circulating and discussing these matters both internally and at suitable stages with external TAs as required. Technical meetings continue to be held and allow such discussion to take place to aid consistency. The asbestos sector is probably one of the highest frequencies of such internal meetings.

UKAS rotate assessors to try and get another set of eyes on an organisations operation - and at these times

there may be perceived inconsistency. UKAS won't constrain Assessors to assess against defined lists, as per



a formal 'inspection', the assessors are expected to judge if the practice is suitable/correct.

There was acceptance by TAC members that Assessors only see a snap shot but that perceived TA inconsistencies are seen in organisations where systems have not changed and are mature.

UKAS not only assess asbestos industry and note that 'inconsistency' as feedback is an element seen in other sectors however UKAS are willing to look at this and this in part is why we have internal Technical Meetings and meet with external TAs too.

8 BOHS:

There is a New Chief Executive - Simon Festing, joined in November 2017.
FAAM – The since launch in October 2017 it now has approx. 220 members.

9 General Industry Update

HSG248 - At the time of this meeting there is no confirmation of any publication date for HSG248 but it is now with the Publication Governance Group (PGG) and is under active consideration. It is optimistic that this will be moved forward.

10 Update to ISO17025 and LAB30

Details regarding the publication and timelines involved for transition have been issued by UKAS to all Labs

and these details are also available via the UKAS website.

Some of the key changes include:

- Major restructuring of the document and re-clausing
- Allows for use of 9001 basis for management systems
- Clear inclusion of standalone sampling
- Decision making rules – not likely to have a huge effect on asbestos due to the significant amount

of guidance already in place for pass/ fail e.g. fibre counting/air testing. But labs will need to consider these aspects carefully.

- Consideration of risk and opportunities throughout
- Additional details and requirements for independence and impartiality.

Also, some changes in the approach and details such as the removal of the requirement for a named Quality Manager.

There will be some additional charges for Labs to allow for the review of the transition changes and

supporting documentation that will be required and this will be communicated to labs on a case by case basis by Case/Assessment Managers.

The revision of ISO17025:2017 will also prompt review and update of LAB30 to encompass changes and to restructure against the new clauses.

Details regarding the publication and timelines involved for transition have been issued by UKAS to all Labs and these details are also available via the UKAS website. Some of the key changes include:



- Major restructuring of the document and re-clausing
- Allows for use of 9001 basis for management systems
- Clear inclusion of standalone sampling
- Decision making rules – not likely to have a huge effect on asbestos due to the significant amount of guidance already in place for pass/fail e.g. fibre counting /air testing. But labs will need to consider these aspects carefully.
- Consideration of risk and opportu



nities throughout
- Additional details and requirements for independence and impartiality. Also, some changes in the approach and details such as the removal of the requirement for a named Quality Manager.
There will be some additional charges for Labs to allow for the review of the transition changes and supporting documentation that will be required, this may be in



region of 0.5-1day. For larger organisations additional charges will also be necessary and will be determined through contract review prior to visits. The revision of ISO17025:2017 will also prompt review and update of LAB30 to encompass changes and to restructure against the new clauses.

11 Matters Arising

Items now included in relevant topic areas

12 AOB

A session to review the UKAS website following feedback at the time of the last meeting was undertaken. Since the last meeting there has been some considerable revision of the Website and it seems that a



22nd UKAS Asbestos
Technical Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary

10th May 2018

number of difficulties have been rectified. Feedback has been provided during this session and UKAS welcomes any future feedback by users.

13 | Close

Date of next meeting to be agreed – Feb 2019