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**Draft minutes of 41st EA GA meeting – Sofia, 16-17 May 2018**

1. **Opening of the meeting**

Mrs I.Borislavova, the managing director of BAS, welcomed the delegates to the 41st meeting of the EA GA in Sofia. She gave an introductory speech, pointing out that 2018 is a special year for BAS which is celebrating its 20th anniversary.

Mr Lachezar Borisov, Deputy minister, Ministry of Economy gave a welcome speech, highlighting importance of accreditation in the Bulgarian economy and BAS and the Bulgarian authorities” commitment to the infrastructure of accreditation and EA.

Then the acting Chair opened the General Assembly by inviting a roll call. The Chair informed the meeting that apologies had been received from CYS-CYSAB. He confirmed that the quorum existed for the GA to take valid decisions.

1. **Approval of agenda**

The delegates were informed that the EC representative would join the meeting later in the day and therefore related agenda items will be addressed later.

The agenda was approved without any change.

1. **Review and approval of minutes of 40th GA**

It was reported that no comments had been received to the draft minutes.

The minutes were approved as published.

1. **Election of EA officers**
   1. Election of EA Chair

The Executive Secretary reminded the meeting that a call for nominations for the position of EA Chair had been circulated. At the end of the call, only one nomination had been received concerning Ignacio Pina, ENAC.

Ignacio Pina was elected unanimously as the new EA Chair.

Ignacio thanked the members for their confidence.

* 1. Election of EA Vice Chair

The Chair invited the 2 nominees, Maria Papatzikou, ESYD, and Emanuele Riva, ACCREDIA, to introduce themselves.

He then reported that the EX is proposing to change the way results are communicated. In response to requests that were made in a number of occasions, it is proposed to make detailed results available on request to the Secretariat. Results would not be made public.

There were comments from the floor. In general, members objected to the proposal. It was finally agreed to not change anything in the process. Results will be kept confidential by the Secretariat.

The election process continued during the reports.

Finally the Chair announced the result of the election: Maria Papatzikou is the new EA Vice Chair.

* 1. Election of an additional member of EX

The Chair invited the 4 candidates, Miklos Devecz, Martin Sencak, Jesper Hoy and Halil Ibrahim Setin, to introduce themselves. The process continued during the reports. At the end of the 2nd round, Martin Sencak was elected as the new member of the EX.

1. **Chair’s Communication**

Just elected, the EA Chair said that he did not prepare the usual Chair’s communication. However issues and projects ongoing would be reported on during the meeting.

The newly elected Chair said a few words during the vote, insisting on the value and benefits of EA and the European model for accreditation. He pointed out how proud he is of being an accreditor and now the EA Chair. He said he will certainly commit to maintain the EA model at a high level of quality serving the European economy at best.

1. **Policy issues**
   1. EA Strategy 2025

The ES presented a progress report on the work done by the various TFGs and a brief overview of progress with the implementation plan.

The Chair, as the Convenor of TFG1 on EA governance, presented the TFG proposal for a new structure in EA. If approved, a number of documents will have to be aligned. At this point of time, the objective is to get the GA support and agreement for the EX to continue according to the proposed lines and adjust the EA procedures and documents as necessary.

The Chair invited comments.

RVA supported the main direction of the proposal and asked clarification about what is exactly expected from the GA at this meeting. The Chair responded that the GA is asked its green light for the EX to continue the work and align the procedures according to the proposed structure. He said that the GA paper should be seen as the framework for the next steps of the work to be performed. The EX needs to know whether the GA agrees to change to the new structure.

ACCREDIA expressed reservations with regards to splitting the EX scope of responsibilities.

The separation between technical and political and strategic issues and therefore required profiles and expertise does not seem to be necessary and likely to bring real improvement. A majority of issues are both technical and political and do not justify such a separation.

The Chair said that experience shows that it is more and more complicated to get top managers on the EX because they do not want to be take on responsibility as chairs of an EA committee. He also pointed out that discussions in the EX demonstrate that a number of issues are effectively purely technical issues which would be best dealt with in a specific, technical body with decision-making capacity. He added that this would also help concentrate the GA on policy and strategy matters.

IPAC commented. Changing always creates anxiety and therefore full clarify is necessary. The financial consequences of the change are not fully clear. The question is: Will the proposed changes create additional costs for additional meetings for instance?

The ES responded. The objective is to limit the number of meetings and overall to reduce the efforts provided by EA elected officers. The separation between technical and political is expected to help in this.

IPAC raised another point about whether the EX had considered the option of having the Secretariat chairing the MAC.

The Chair commented that it is not suggested to change the profile and responsibilities of the MAC. He agreed that there is an issue with membership rules on the EX and the proposed “TMB”.

It was agreed that the TFG will consider the possibility to have the Secretariat chairing the MAC. **Action TFG**

DANAK commented. It is recognized that details are needed to develop further the proposal, in terms of the size of the organs and their responsibilities but overall DANAK supports the proposed development.

SA asked about the future of CPC in the new structure.

The Chair responded that it is not the intention in the EX to disband the CPC. However, EA now has a Marketing manager who is reporting to the ES. There are overlapping tasks between the EA Marketing manager and the CPC and this has to be addressed. Communication is a strategic issue and therefore should be a responsibility of the Board. Operational aspects should be with the Secretariat. It means that there should be different terms of reference for CPC in future. Respective responsibilities of CPC and the Marketing manager will have to be clarified shortly.

For ACCREDIA, the proposal will lead to transfer GA decision-making power to the future Board. If this is correct, the Board should have a sufficient number of members to be representative of EA membership.

The Chair replied. The purpose is not to transfer that responsibility but to split decision making power between the EX and TMB. It is for TFG2 to further elaborate on decisions that may be taken by another organ than the GA. TFG2 is elaborating on a new process for decisions to be taken at another level than the GA with a view to improve efficiency of EA and of the GA.

BELAC supported the proposed split between the Board and the TMB. As set out in the paper, the conditions and scope for delegation of power at the Board level should be further detailed. In the present proposal, the composition would not allow for the needed competence to be available to fulfil the tasks.

NAH thanked the TFG for their work. The analysis of the current situation is missing as a starting point for the proposed change. In particular, the following should be addressed with regards to the proposal:

1. Need for a clear frontier between board and TMP responsibilities
2. Control on the Secretariat
3. Limited number of NAB empowered to take decisions: this is undermining the capacity for small and medium sized NAB to take part.

The Chair responded. The reasons for the proposal stem from the mandate given by the GA based on the agreed Strategic plan.

UKAS added that the TFG used the Strategy WG paper as a basis for the TFG proposal. The TFG was completely committed to start from that consensus paper and came up with a consensual position.

Concerning the size of the Board, the Chair confirmed that the point can still be discussed. It is not closed. In his opinion, having a limited number of members does not undermine democracy. Democracy is not related to the number of members.

For AA, it appears that, for this meeting, the only decision to make is to agree to split between technical and other responsibilities/issues based on a structure with the MAC, TMB and Executive Board. AA suggested limiting the discussions to this question.

IIOC commented that the EAAB and all recognized stakeholders remain very much ready to contribute and get involved in any way to the new organs. EA stakeholders are ready to offer a different perspective from the NAB perspective and it is thought that it would benefit the structure.

The Chair said that there is a TFG specifically appointed to look at how best involve the EAAB and the EA recognized stakeholders in the future structure. He also said that, at this stage, it has not been considered to have RS on the TMB or Executive Board.

COFRAC suggested circulating the paper for comments. The TFG would review the comments and come up with a more detailed proposal for discussion at a next meeting of the GA.

SAS shared COFRAC view and would welcome a pros and cons analysis of both the existing and proposed models.

SWEDAC supported the proposal and welcomed clarification made on the future of CPC. SWEDAC also supported to increase the size of the deciding organs, as commented by other members.

Finally, it was decided that the proposal will be circulated for comments for a one-month period. Then the TFG will review the comments and come back to the GA with a revised proposal. **Action Secr/TFG**

AA encouraged the members to consider the Strategic plan in their comments, as it is the driving force for the proposal –and for all the work undertaken by the other TFGs.

RVA pointed out that the objective also is to reduce the time to be put by officers in their responsibilities as EA officers. This can only be made possible with the transfer of a greater number of responsibilities to the Secretariat.

* 1. Revision of EA governance and policy documents

The ES introduced the issue and presented the EX proposed 2 options to address the case of UKAS membership status in EA in the context of BREXIT.

The EX recommends adopting option 2 which is to maintain UKAS full membership until the end of the transition period provided by the withdrawal agreement on BREXIT. This will give time to further consider the issues, consequences and options of the BREXIT.

The ES pointed out that there will be another resolution to deal with the case where the transitional agreement would not be ratified.

AA commented. AA does not support option 2. Revision of articles should in any case be anticipated to ensure continuation of UKAS membership. With the proposed option 2, we are effectively changing the membership criteria and therefore there is a reason to change the articles without delay. AA supports option 1 and to start revising the AoA immediately.

It is clear that EA is keen to keep UKAS in EA.

UKAS thanked AA for the comments. UKAS welcomes option 2 as it gives room to adjust in future. There is uncertainty at political level in the UK and UKAS welcome the openness to European Union.

The EAAB Chair reported that there was a lot of discussions at the last meeting of the EAAB. It was supported that because the uncertainty linked to the signature of the withdrawal agreement, option 2 should be implemented.

The ES pointed out that the new article 7 is anyhow needed in the AoA.

DANAK supported to endorse the proposed resolution. It is needed in order to be able to address the applications received by CABs accredited by UKAS.

COFRAC and RvA supported the EX proposal. It is important that EA has time to think about how open EA as a region wishes to be in future.

NAH highlighted the consensual support showed by the GA to keep UKAS in the EA community. NAH also supported option 2. There is uncertainty and it gives the necessary flexibility. This was shared by IPAC and DAkkS.

Finally, the Chair noted the GA support to the EX proposal.

* 1. Peer evaluations in third countries with security problems

The ES reported. The issue arose in the MAC. Who is liable for EA peer evaluators assigned for a PE, notably in countries where there is an identified security problem.

It is recognized that the NAB are responsible for the staff assigned as team members. The other issue is what to do in case of a problem and how responsibilities will be shared.

The EX decided to seek legal advice. The advisor’s report was received very recently and the EX could not discuss it yet. The approach will be to formalize the distribution of responsibilities and liabilities between EA and the NABs. The details of how to do this remain to be considered with the EX.

A firm proposal will be submitted to the GA in November.

* 1. BAM/DAkkS benchmarking project

At the last GA meeting, it was agreed that the EX should consider how to continue the project. The EX raised a number of questions to BAM to identify the conditions for EA members to participate to the project in future. BAM attended the EX meeting the day before the GA. It was a fruitful discussion which resulted in the following:

* Option 1. Continue with the project, with a second round inviting 2 or more EA NABs. BAM confirmed they can run the 2nd run for an estimated cost of 150 000 euros.
* Option 2. BAM will provide advice to the EA Secretariat and EA will run the project by itself. It gives EA room to decide on the size and practicalities of the new project. The person in charge should however have a considerable experience in statistics and accreditation, which means a significant cost as well. Based on this, the EX concluded it could not support option 2.
* The EA NAB may decide to participate to the 2nd round at their own initiative and costs.

The EX proposal is to circulate a call for interest, prepared by BAM. BAM is ready to run the project with a minimum of 5 NABs ready to take part. **Action BAM/Secretariat**

UKAS commented that some of the output of the project would be useful for TFG 5.

The ES informed that BAM is finalizing the final report on the project and confirmed that the intention remains for EA to collect and use information from the project.

The Chair pointed out that it is important in particular to focus on the points where it appears that harmonization can be improved.

IPAC commented. The project is an interesting project. This is benchmarking activity and it could be given to CPC for continuation. The study does not cover all members and therefore extrapolating conclusions from a limited number of participants from EA members could be risky.

The Chair commented. Running benchmarking activities is under the HHC in principle and HHC proved unable to manage such an exercise.

DAkks commented. The results are certainly very useful for the participating NABs. Considering the results from an EA perspective is for HHC and HHC may elaborate on this.

AA suggested surveying the members on their willingness to participate in the 2nd round and for what cost at a maximum.

ENAC recommended clarifying what will be the scope of the new round, based on the feedback collected after the end of the 1st round. SWEDAC supported ENAC point. Being clear on the scope will also help NABs estimate the amount of time needed to be put in the exercise.

1. **Relations with EC and Stakeholder organisations**
   1. Relations with the EC
      1. *WP 2017 – Final report*

The ES reported. The final report was distributed with the meeting papers. It shows the results achieved in the various activities that were planned. The report will have to be endorsed by the GA even if it has already been submitted to the EC before end of April as specified by the FPA.

* + 1. *WP 2019*

The WP is based on the individual WP prepared by the EA committees/Council.

The ES stressed one activity planned for 2019: it concerns the Accreditation for Notification (AfN) project. New legislations have to be reviewed in the light of EA-2/17 which is also due for revision.

The GA will be invited to endorse the WP which has to be submitted to the EC by the end of September 2018. However the ES pointed out that the WP might be revised in the next months, as necessary, under the EX monitoring.

* + 1. *FPA 2018-2021 – Progress report and EA Action Plan 2018-2021*

The existing FPA is in force until summer 2018. A new FPA is therefore needed by that time. EA provided an action plan for the next 4 years period, as requested by the EC.

The EC representative confirmed that the draft is under preparation. It is expected to sign the new FPA before the end of the summer.

* 1. Relations with Stakeholder organisations
     1. *IFS – Application for EA RS status*

The EX revised the application and recommends accepting IFS as a new RS.

There were no objections.

* + 1. *EA position on “Consultancy” – Letter from Stakeholders regarding “Consultancy”*

A letter signed by 6 stakeholders expressing disagreement on the EA HHC position about Consultancy and NBs was received and considered in the EX. The signatories suggested a meeting to exchange views. The EX resolved that HHC should take the lead to solve this. The HHC Chair took action by setting up a TFG and organizing a meeting between EA and the letter signatories. The Chair invited the stakeholders present in the meeting to contact the HHC Chair who is in charge of arranging the meeting.

1. **Operational issues**
   1. Ratification of ballots

The ES indicated that the GA will be invited on day 2 of the meeting to ratify the results of the ballot on EA-1/17 S3. There is an ongoing ballot on EA-2/02 to be closed on 19 May whose result will have to be ratified in November.

* 1. New accreditation areas and legal regulations – GDPR, Cybersecurity Act – Proposed regulation on fertilizing products, ESCO

The Chair welcomed Claudia F. Martinez, deputy head of unit of Unit in charge of accreditation and Hans Ingels deputy, and invited her to introduce herself. Claudia said she is looking forward to getting familiar with EA and the ongoing projects.

As requested by the Strategic implementation plan, all EA Committees should have a permanent agenda item covering New developments. The ES presented an overview of ongoing discussions and projects.

* GDPR

There is an issue with ISO/IEC 17065 that is not solved yet.

The Member States are looking at how assessments of CBs shall be performed.

Working Party 29 conducted a survey asking Member States to tell which route they would retain: accreditation, assessment by the national authorities or a combination of the 2 options. Feedback by the Member states is that accreditation is the preferred route in an increasing number of Member States.

* Certification schemes.

EA was approached by an organization which developed a scheme. They asked EA to look at compliance with EA-1/22. A presentation was made in the CC. The EX decided not to evaluate.

* National agencies for data protection need information on how to apply the new regulation.

A few EA NABs will start assessing schemes.

For the Chair, to be used a scheme needs to receive some endorsement by the authorities. Be it at national or EC level, this is needed before the NAB can start assessment.

AA commented about mutual recognition. Currently the situation is that there is no mutual recognition of accreditation in that field. Such a development is creating an issue. The situation is that there is a lack of a common set of requirements for accreditation.

Endorsement by the NA is provided by the Regulation.

There are other areas with national requirements applicable only for national purposes which operate outside of the MLA by definition and this is not a problem.

Accreditation according to the regulation can start when there are criteria. This is stipulated in the regulation. In other words, if criteria are not available, then, there cannot be any accreditation (RE article 43). But accreditation on a voluntary basis remains possible.

IIOC commented. Companies have invested a lot to comply with the regulation. Certification against private schemes must be allowed.

* Cybersecurity Act and ENISA

Discussions are ongoing about certifying products in this field.

IPAC commented that the discussion is currently focusing on whether certification shall be made mandatory. EA members are encouraged to support certification and accreditation in the field.

IQnet asked EA to consider avoiding focusing only on a product-oriented approach. The ES said that nothing is closed. Starting with products makes sense but the discussions remain open.

* Fertilizing regulation

We may expect that the regulation will be published by the beginning of next year.

* ESCO

E. Riva made a short presentation of the scheme and the ongoing project.

Emanuele is the EA representative involved in the discussions with the EC on the scheme.

The critical point is that the database will have data on accredited certificates but also from private, non-accredited bodies such as Microsoft or Amazon. EA is pushing for the EC to create a filter to identify what is accredited.

The Chair commented that the project is very important in that it will promote personnel certification with clear support of the EC in that specific field. It also raises accreditation profile in that field. Then the Chair thanked ACCREDIA for their support in this project pointing out that ACCREDIA was the first EA NAB to spot the project and its importance for accreditation. It was confirmed that the scheme would be transferred to the EA CC for the Committee to address the technical aspects of it in due course.

* 1. CETA protocol – Implementation

The ES presented his report on progress with the implementation of the agreement. He reminded the meeting that monitoring of the project is made closely by EA and SCC. There is a meeting with SCC every 2 weeks.

To conclude his report, the ES said that it is important to get the GA support on the proposed approach and way to proceed.

PCA reported that they received 2 applications from 2 Canadian CABs for accreditation for ATEX. Actually it was said that the CABs also approached other EA NABs.   
They should be recommended to contact SCC.

COFRAC raised questions on the new role of the steering group. The implementation of the scheme provides for a decision based on level 4 of the MLA, which is a first and therefore this should be given due consideration.

The ES clarified that the steering group exists because it is a requirement of the agreement. The agreement requires also a maintenance group for the next steps. The EX discussed which profile the SG members should have. It was then agreed to have the MAC and CC Chairs on board, in addition to the ES for all operational issues. The objective is to establish a simple process for the NABs. Concerning the start of the mutual recognition process, the ES reported that SCC started to assess the CABs for ATEX but without any formal recognition yet. Designation to the other party (EC or Canada) is based on recognition of the NAB. However accreditation can be granted before the NAB is formally recognized.

What is the process for recognition appeared to be not fully clear. The ES said that this is for the SG to consider and determine the criteria for recognition. The ES pointed out that SCC accepted the process set up by EA with the SG and its role.

DAkkS shared COFRAC concern about the extended role given to the SG on a more permanent basis. This should be discussed further and agreed by the GA at some point.

The Chair recognized that the SG approach was appropriate in the starting phase of the implementation and agreed that the EX should reconsider the EA and SG process in the light of the new phase of the implementation. It is likely that the SG changes into a more permanent organ, empowered with some decision-making on behalf of the GA.

* 1. EC initiative on Breast Cancer – EA – JRC project

Jan van der Poel reported as Convenor of the project steering group.

The project has been suspended on request of JRC because they need time to align all the medical professionals involved to ensure a sound certification scheme for all disciplines concerned. Which standard shall be used for pathology and for imaging for instance remains to be solved.

In early February, the Secretariat circulated a call for interest in the project. On JRC side, there was a change in the project leader. In the mid-term, it is expected to discuss the conditions and a new timeframe for the continuation of the project.

1. **Financial issues**
   1. Accounts 2017
      1. *Financial audit report, certificate of eligible expenses claimed under the OG*
      2. *Report of the FOC and response of EX*
      3. *Adoption of EA accounts 2017*

The ES reported on the accounts 2017 and presented the final result.

He reviewed the proposed resolutions on the accounts 2017.

Then the Chair of the FOC presented the FOC report. He thanked the FOC members for their work.

The Chair of the FOC announced that his was his last meeting as he is to retire by the end of August. Repeating Ignacio’s words, Paul Stennett paid tribute to the excellence of EA and its members.

Paul emphasized that UKAS board is firmly committed to maintain close relations with EA and continue to be an active contributor and supporter of EA activities.

The EA Chair expressed EA’s best wishes and thanks to Paul for his commitment in EA, on behalf of the GA.

* 1. Budget 2018
     1. *Revised activity-based budget 2018 and forecast*

The ES reminded the meeting that a new financial reporting system is now in place. The Secretariat is preparing a report on the accounts every 3 months. It is intended for the EX for the monitoring of the EA finances and for information of the GA.

Concerning the budget 2018, there was a first proposal for an option A budget, based on an increase in the operating grants received from the EC and EFTA. That budget option A was approved in May 2017.

In November 2017, in the absence of information from the EC/EFTA, the GA was invited to approve a revised, option B, budget based on an unchanged operating grant. The GA approved the revised option B budget in November 2017.

It is by the end of April 2018 that EA was informed that the EC and EFTA had agreed to give EA an increased OG. It means that option A of the budget can be implemented. It means also that there is an additional amount of OG to be used by the end of 2018. How to use the full OG is outlined in the quarterly report.

A new budget will be prepared very soon to reflect the increase in the OG income and based on the actuals for the 1s 4-5 months of the year.

In response to a question by IPAC, the ES confirmed that the additional expenditures covered by the revised budget 2018 are properly covered in the draft budget 2019.

The ES confirmed that the secretariat has started to investigate the obligations on EA arising from GDPR. This may require that EA takes legal advice. RvA supported this and commented that it is most likely not an obligation for EA to appoint a DPO The ES concluded by saying that the GDPR issue is being duly monitored in the Secretariat.

* 1. Budget 2019
     1. *Draft budget 2019 and membership schedule*

The ES presented the proposed expenditure and income budget.

He reminded the meeting that a NWIP was endorsed for revising the procedure for levying fees. The EX agreed to apply the principle that the 15% ceiling does not apply anymore starting with the budget 2019.

In response to a question by IPAC about the increase in labour costs, in particular from 2017 to 2019, the ES said that in 2017, first, the labour cost budget reflected a decrease in the number of employees, one employee having left the secretariat in the course of the year. Then she was replaced and the Marketing manager was hired. It is only if the strategic plan would require it that the secretariat team would be enlarged, beyond the half time position already covered in the budgets for 2018 and 2019.

1. **Complaints and appeals**
   1. Complaint and appeal procedure

The revised procedure has been published. It is expected that the new procedure will help close findings by the internal auditor. The new process provides that the secretariat should be fully in charge with the obligation to report to the EX and GA.

The revised procedure introduces a new process to allow EA to complain against one of the EA members. This is then under the Chair’s authority.

* 1. Status report

The ENAC/DAkkS complaint is closed and will be removed from the report.

The ES informed the GA that the secretariat now will follow up expressions of dissatisfaction.

There is no appeal ongoing.

1. **EA Management system**
   1. Report

The ES presented an overview of activities related to the EA management system.

He reviewed the internal audit 2017 program and outcome.

The EX performed the annual management review. The ES presented the outcome of the management review. There is a long term project of revision of the EA management system. In particular there are a number of documents and operational procedures used by the secretariat that need to be consolidated in the management to ensure a better control on them.

1. **Reports and proposed resolutions from EA Committees**
   1. *EA Advisory Board*

The EAAB Chair presented his report. He said that the Board decided to extend its membership to accept representatives of scheme owners. This reflects the increase in the number of schemes supported by EA.

* Elections will take place in October.

Compensation of EAAB observers was raised again. Following the presentation of the EAAB Chair, the EA Secretary General informed the GA about the position of the EA executive board: For the time being, it is agreed that the EAAB observer’s costs can be covered for participation to MAC meetings but not to HHC meetings.

* EA position on Consultancy and NBs.

The Board welcome that EA remains open to discuss the issue with all parties involved.

The Board is ready to contribute to the work ongoing on the EA Strategy and expressed concern about the decision to develop an EA MLA mark and the risk that it may create confusion. It was confirmed that the decision to develop an EA MLA mark was made by the GA.

* 1. MLA Council

The MAC Chair presented his report. It did not raise any questions.

It was clarified that the 2nd session of the New comer training would be hosted by NA, the first session being hosted by RvA.

* 1. Horizontal Harmonization Committee

The Chair presented his report. He informed the meeting that, as discussed in the EX, the EA-2/17 WG will be mandated to continue with the next stage of the AfN project, as was announced in the 1st day of the GA.

* 1. Communications & Publications Committee

The Chair presented her CPC report.

ACCREDIA raised a point about the EA MLA mark. It was confirmed that the future mark is not meant to substitute the IAF or ILAC MLA/MRA mark. It will be the EA MLA mark.

In response to a question, it was confirmed that the new website is planned to be launched in November 2018.

* 1. Inspection Committee

The Chair presented his IC report. It did not raise any questions.

* 1. Certification Committee

The Chair presented his CC report.

He informed the meeting that the next CC meeting in Warsaw will be the last meeting of Varpu Rantanen as CC Vice Chair. A new Vice Chair was elected in March.

In response to a question raised by IIOC, the CC Chair confirmed that the Cybersecurity Act will be tabled on the agenda for the next 2018 CC meeting.

* 1. Laboratory Committee

The Chair presented his LC report. It did not raise any questions.

1. **International issues**
   1. ILAC/IAF mid-term meetings – ILAC AoA, MoU with IHAF

The ES reported briefly.

Revision of ILAC Articles is ongoing. The EA members have been kept informed regularly. A new draft will be circulated soon. There is an EA position and the ES advocated that EA ILAC members should support the EA position.

There is an ongoing discussion about the proposed MoU between IAF and IHAF.

The IHAF vice chair informed that the draft MoU is still under consideration at international level.

COFRAC commented on the IHAF question. There is a clear risk for competition developing in future between IHAF, ILAC and IAF. Besides, the scheme is based on religious requirements and this does not comply with European fundamental principles.

Notwithstanding national positions, for COFRAC, it is crucial that EA should commit to protect the interests of ILAC and IAF and preserve the EA agreement and regional consensus. This is a highly political issue.

The ES said that he is seating on the IAF EX as EA representative. He informed the Joint EX that EA does not support the draft MoU. This is the current EA position on the issue at IAF and ILAC level. Ultimately, the final draft MoU by the joint EX will be distributed to the ILAC IAF EX members. Then it may be the appropriate time to consolidate an EA common position, as was done in the discussions about the revision of ILAC Articles of Association.

DAkkS shared COFRAC position that there might be a risk to *not* discuss before the draft is out for global comments. There would real merit in knowing whether there is a general support to the MoU or not.

E.Riva informed the GA that in case EA would wish to submit new comments, the process is open and comments would be duly considered. The process is in principle closed but comments may still be submitted.

The Chair pointed out that the majority of the JEC are in favour of the MoU. He advocated that the strategy should be for EA to try to get as much of the EA position as possible in the final draft.

At the end, there were no objections to the approach proposed by the Chair and the EX on the current work on the MoU at JEC level.

* 1. ILAC/IAF (re-)evaluation of EA – Extension for GHG and PTP, Application for IAF sub-scopes, re-evaluation of EA 2018-1019

The point was covered by the MAC Chair during his MAC report.

* 1. Adoption of ILAC/IAF documents

See below under item 16 Adoption of resolutions.

1. **Cooperation with international and regional organisations**
   1. IAF
   2. ILAC
   3. AFRAC
   4. APLAC
   5. IAAC
   6. PAC
   7. SADCA

Reports received were published with the meeting papers.

1. **Reports from Stakeholder organisations**
   1. EOQ
   2. GLOBALG.A.P
   3. IFIA
   4. IIOC
   5. IQNet
   6. UILI

Reports received were published with the meeting papers.

1. **Resolutions – Quorum, approval of resolutions**

The ES reviewed the proposed resolutions.

They were adopted unanimously except Resolution EA Resolution 2018 (41) 05 adopted with one abstention.

It was agreed to adopt the following documents:

* ILAC/IAF A3 -01/2018 even if the contents of it has been entirely transferred in the revised EA-2/02 currently under comments in EA. An additional resolution was submitted and approved by the GA unanimously.
* Concerning IAF MD23 *Control of entities operated on behalf of accredited management systems certification bodies*, an additional resolution was submitted and approved by the GA unanimously.

1. **Next meetings of the EA GA**

21-22 November 2018 in Bucharest, Romania

22-23 May 2019 in Rome, Italy

20-21 November 2019 in Budapest, Hungary

13-14 May 2020 in Luxemburg

25-26 November 2020 in Zagreb, Croatia

The Chair thanked the members for their active and positive contribution to the discussions and closed the meeting.