

l

Customising the assessment of inspection bodies

JAR WERSHOW HELECTRONICOUSTINATION

CONTENTS

| 1. | PURPOSE | 3 |
|----|---|-----|
| 2. | REFERENCES AND DEFINITIONS | . 3 |
| | 2.1. References | 3 |
| | 2.2. Abbreviations and definitions | 3 |
| 3. | FIELD OF APPLICATION | . 3 |
| 4. | IMPLEMENTING RULES | . 3 |
| 5. | MODIFICATIONS MADE TO THE PREVIOUS EDITION | . 3 |
| 6. | CUSTOMISING THE ASSESSMENT OF INSPECTION BODIES | . 4 |
| | WERSION ELLECTRONNOUTE FAM. | |

۲

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to define the factors taken into account when customising the assessment of inspection bodies

REFERENCES AND DEFINITIONS 2.

2.1. References

This document supplements the provisions of document INS REF 05: Accreditation regulations. JE FAIT FO

Abbreviations and definitions 2.2.

The following abbreviations are used:

- EQ: Quality assessor
- ET: Technical assessor •
- RE: Lead assessor

FIELD OF APPLICATION 3.

This procedure is applicable by the inspection section for organising the assessment of inspection bodies.

4. **IMPLEMENTING RULES**

AVER

This document is applicable as from 1st January 2019.

MODIFICATIONS MADE TO THE PREVIOUS EDITION 5.

Since this is the first edition of the document, there are no revision marks.

6. CUSTOMISING THE ASSESSMENT OF INSPECTION BODIES

In line with Appendix 2 of the accreditation regulations (INS REF 05) which defines the general framework for sizing the assessments, Cofrac may have to adjust the duration of the assessments and the composition of the teams according to customisation factors defined in line with the 3 categories presented below:

- Factors linked intrinsically to the accreditation candidate or accredited body (factor A organisation mode)
- Factors linked to the nature and extent of the inspections conducted by the body or for which additional requirements are to be considered (factor B extent of accreditation scope)
- Factors linked to Cofrac's knowledge of the stability and performance of the body, demonstrated in previous accreditation assessments (factor C accreditation history)

ation history)

0



| Category of customisation factors | Adjustment of the assessment duration | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| | Customisation factors | Purpose | Scaled up (conditions and duration) | Scaled down (conditions and duration) |
| A - Organisation mode | Number of qualified inspectors per basic competence Use of personnel not salaried by the body | Assess the performance of a body on a representative sample of the activities in its accreditation scope Examine the contractual provisions defined between | From 50 inspectors or more, per RE + ET concerned: 0.5 days per tranche of 50 inspectors up to a limit of 14 days for RE and 12 days for ET For RE, upon initial assessment and once | / |
| | AVERSION | the personnel and the body. Special attention to compliance with requirements in matters of impartiality, independence, confidentiality, organisation and management, management of the skills of non-salaried personnel (training, qualification, surveillance) and responsibilities in terms of the planning of inspections (availability of not salaried inspectors) | per cycle (preferably for re-assessment): 0.5 to 1 day depending on the number of persons concerned | |
| | Network organisation (according to Cofrac procedure GEN PROC 10) | Examine the contractual provisions defined between the network head and its members Check the work carried out by the network head for | For RE + ET: + 0.5 days for 1/12 of the total number of members (to see 1/3 of the members in initial assessment | / |

| | Pooling of resources (according to Cofrac procedure GEN PROC 10) Presence of fixed installations | managing and monitoring the activity of its members Check the application of the management system and the services provided by the various members Assess the management of pooled resources and compliance with applicable accreditation requirements | responsible for pooled resources: 0.5 to 1 day for the RE or ET concerned, depending on the nature of these resources | For the entities using the pooled resources: 0.5 to 1 day for the RE or ET depending on the nature of these resources |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | dedicated to inspection (e.g., workshop for periodic inspections of digital tachographs, vehicle technical control centre) | Assess the appropriateness of the resources needed for inspections and their management | 1/12 of the total number of sites per assessment (to inspect 1/3 of the initial assessment then over one cycle) | / |
| B – Extent of the accreditation scope | Presence of installations with a significant influence on the inspection (e.g. internal metrology service, tasting room) | Assess the appropriateness of the resources needed for inspections and their management | For RE or ET: +0.5 to 2 days per cycle and per type of installation | / |
| | Examination of the specific requirements with regard to checking regulated measurement instruments (Legal Metrology) | Assess the specific applicable regulatory knowledge | From 10 inspectors or more, for the ET: +0.5 days per tranche of 10 inspectors and +0.5 days per activity witnessing (to see the entire body over a cycle) | |

| | Organisation of activity witnessing | Allow relevant and adequate witnessing of an inspection activity | From 50 inspectors or more, for the RE: +0.5 days per tranche of 50 inspectors (to see the entire body over one cycle) For ET: +0.5 days in the event of a long inspection or significant travel time | |
|------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | Size of the assessment team | Allow efficient management of the team | ETs and more: + 0.5 days per tranche of 4 ETs | |
| C - Accreditation history | Applicable from the 2 nd cycle: Performance and stability of the body, items deriving from the body's accreditation management. | Take into account of the performance and stability of the body via information known by or brought to the attention of Cofrac | | In the case of the use of ET/RE for structures whose total number of inspectors is less than or equal to 10, if decision made after the last assessment in the cycle is favourable without condition, and if the body has demonstrated since this last assessment: - stability in its organisation |
| | | | | absence of any events questioning the performance of the body and the |

