

**Summary of Minutes of the
UKAS Asbestos Technical Advisory Committee
8th Meeting held on 14 June 2007 at UKAS**

Meeting Attendees

Bill Sanderson (Chair)	(Bureau Veritas Training)
Rob Bettinson	(UKAS)
Wendy Smith (Secretary)	(UKAS)
Rob Blackburn	(ATaC)
Sue Burbeck	(Adams Environmental Ltd)
John Lyons	(BOHS)
Colin Perryman	(Greenwich Analytical Services (Local government))
Bruce Sutherland	(Noble Asbestos Consultancy Ltd)

Apologies/Non Attendees

Barry Tylee	(HSL)
Kevin Walkin	(HSE)
Bob Daunton	(HSE Inspector)
Neil Grabham	(BOHS)
Steve Sadley	(ARCA)
Paul Winstone	(RICS)
Garry Burdett	(HSL)
Peter Bodsworth	Independent technical assessor
Bob Webster	Independent technical assessor

1. Welcome and Apologies

2. Minutes of the last meeting

Overall agreement that the combined meeting with CFM was useful – proposed that holding such meetings every two years would be beneficial.

Minutes of last meeting were approved

3. Update from UKAS

- 6 new applications received in first half of 2007
- Several partial and full suspensions have taken place since the last meeting and also one withdrawal of accreditation.
- UKAS are still rolling out the unannounced visits programme, several have already taken place however these have tended to be due to issues surrounding the organisation rather than random unannounced visits.
- Noted that although organisations had been told on several occasions in the 18 months leading up to the mandatory requirements for analysts to hold P403 / P404, there were still several issues raised with organisations and also noted a high failure rate of analyst, which had not been anticipated.
- Another UKAS Asbestos Technical assessor Meeting was held in April 2007, 13 Assessors attended, useful meeting that has led to several points included on this agenda for further discussion.
- UKAS is now pushing on further with the accreditation awareness campaign, and has set up a specific team to target local authorities and housing associations with respect to asbestos surveys.

4. Update from HSE

No HSE representatives attended the meeting.

RJB highlighted that HSE were starting a program of assessing the duty to manage asbestos and that any irregularities found with duty holders may well result in enforcements – members confirmed that this program had already started.

5. Qualifications

5.1 Implication on changes to P403 (inclusion of sampling)

BOHS representative lead a discussion and outlined the rationale behind the changes: The need to utilise staff on site prior to full authorisation and also to permit experience and knowledge had been highlighted leading to change in P403. General agreement that this was useful but it was also highlighted that to remove all of the sampling aspects from the P404 may not be best way forward. Members agreed the following recommendations to be made to BOHS:

- P404 should remain as the published module
- P403 should also include some sample strategies for simple work to permit a basic understanding of sampling strategies.

UKAS to inform the technical Assessors / Assessment Managers of the issues and the interim measures required to assess these qualifications and the measures laboratories need to undertake prior to staff authorisations for simple air testing / analysis work.

5.2 Lab feedback on P402 requirements

Issues raised at CFM relating to BOHS examination of survey reports were tabled, in particular the claim that BOHS was raising issues with reports that were requirements above and beyond those of UKAS and MDHS 100. BOHS responded and confirmed that they are trying to keep a level playing field with respect to the content of the survey report, they do not ask for additional technical requirements of the report to that of UKAS or MDHS100 but they do need to specifically link the candidate to the produced report and do request any missing drawings, certificates and specifically field notes as evidence of this. Concerns regarding this matter were allayed.

6. Priority Assessment – An accreditable activity?

This issue was recently raised at a UKAS asbestos assessor meeting. UKAS assessors fed back that the current assessment of this activity does not appear be sufficiently stringent and that effective validation of this activity is often lacking. The onus of the validity of the information is clearly that of the duty holder however it sometimes appears that the surveyor is doing this work with little input from the duty holder. UKAS sought feedback from the Committee as to whether this activity should continue to be accredited and whether there was value in doing so. Members agreed there is value in accrediting the activity and agreed it should be accredited – UKAS needs to consider the current effort towards this activity, as more effort is probably required to undertake an effective and comprehensive assessment of this activity. It was suggested a “test” survey example is provide to the organisation to complete.

7. 4SC – Feedback from assessment teams

Also raised at the UKAS asbestos assessor meeting: UKAS outlined to the committee members the trend seen by assessors during assessments that a significant proportion of witnessed 4SC fail at one stage (at least) and yet during those unwitnessed there rarely appears to be any failure. Further more many labs are booking so much work up per analyst that there is little room for failure. UKAS has raised this at CFM meeting and HSE have

confirmed this is in line with their own findings. Committee members discussed in detail and all concurred with the finding. Activities to try and address this were discussed e.g. unannounced visits, although logistical difficulties exist. Agreed UKAS need to raise the profile of the issues and ensure organisations are aware that UKAS are looking into this anomaly. Assessment Managers to continue to raise with lab management during visits. UKAS will write to ATaC to discuss with their members and to also discuss the issue further with HSE.

8. Type 3 surveys: Tightening up UKAS witnessed assessment policy

Currently not a UKAS requirement to specifically witness a type 3 survey for initial assessment or during the annual visit: If one not available then a complex type 2 has been sufficient. After agreement with the assessors at the recent asbestos assessor meeting UKAS put forward a proposal to change this to ensure UKAS witness at least one type 2 and one type 3 survey at initial assessment, and at least one type 3 survey every two years – This proposal was agreed by committee members.

It was highlighted that refresher P402 T1 & T2 and P402 T3 courses were now available however, although the committee recognised the benefits of such courses and welcome their development, it was agreed it should not be a mandatory accreditation requirement for surveyors to have to attend.

9. LAB 30 comments for consideration

UKAS thanked group for comments received on draft LAB 30 although several comments received were policy changes that needed to be considered at this meeting and therefore we not currently included in the draft LAB 30:

Participation in PT schemes – AIMS proposal, a requirements that all analyst must partake in the scheme at least once per year (HSL already looking into this) – agreed by members and will be include in LAB 30

Proposal tabled that more specific detail to be included in the table documenting the experience required for analysts, along the lines of the RG8 requirements - is one competence assessment sufficient? Members agreed no it was not and more detail should be included e.g. types of clearance / range of jobs / type of jobs. Include in LAB 30

10. AOB

Bill Sanderson confirmed his Type 3 Survey guidance paper was with the committee revising MDHS100, hopefully for incorporation. Members expressed an interest in seeing the draft version of this revised MDHS100 (expected to change it's name in the reissue). UKAS to discuss with Martin Gibson as to whether members will be able to see a copy or whether this will be on the HSE website for information / comment.