

Electro-Mechanical Advisory Committee (EMAC) Meeting

Saturday, April 4, 2009, 8:00 a.m.

Benoit Nadeau: - Committee Chairman
Robert Miller - A2LA Recording Secretary

SUMMARY

Attendees: Please reference attendance list located at end of meeting summary.

1. Introductions (Benoit Nadeau):

B. Nadeau welcomed all members and participants to the annual meeting of the A2LA Electro-Mechanical Advisory Committee (EMAC). He stated that the meeting would follow *Robert's Rules of Order*.

2. Agenda - Review/Approve:

Motion #1 made by C. Gortakowski: 2009 agenda to be accepted as submitted.
Seconded by M. Bosley.
All in favor by voice vote.

3. Membership

R. Miller presented a roster of current members of the EMAC committee so that all in attendance could review their membership and voting status. Discussion ensued regarding sections 3.4 – 3.6 of the current EMAC bylaws, specifically with respect to voting privileges. Apparently, the interpretation of the bylaws was misunderstood in previous years, and members were required to be a committee member for at least two years before being granted voting status. Upon discussion by the committee, the decision was reached that these interpretations were incorrect. Moving forward, once a member is voted into the EMAC committee, they will immediately attain voting status.

Upon review of the roster of EMAC members, and introductions of all individuals in attendance at the meeting, the following additions/deletions were made to the roster with no objections:

ADD: John Fuhrman, Andreas Eberhard, Nee Salam, R.K Varma, and Mike Bosley.

REMOVE: Ray Adams

Motion #2 made by B. Nadeau: remove/add old and new members as identified by the EMAC committee (above names).

Seconded by J. Press.

All in favor by voice vote.

ACTION ITEM #1: R.Miller to add 5 new members and remove one old member on the EMAC member list, and also ensure all current members are properly coded in the A2LA database. To be completed by *May 31, 2009*.

4. Approval of Last Meeting Minutes

R. Miller presented all action items stemming from the 2008 annual EMAC committee meeting, held during the 2008 A2LA conclave. Due to the departure of an A2LA staff member who was responsible for the majority of the Action Items, a number of them were never 'formally' completed and closed out. Therefore, discussion was held on each of the action items, resulting in the following outcome:

Items 1 – 5: The committee agreed that all could be closed at the present time.

Item 6: This previous action item was deemed to be irrelevant at the present time, and therefore was dropped and considered a closed issue.

Item 7: Still OPEN... This item was assigned to an EMAC committee member who recently took a job with another accreditation body, thus producing a conflict of interest in attending the A2LA conclave. A new member of the EMAC committee, J. Fuhrman, indicated that he could contact the previous individual responsible for this action item and then provide an update back to the committee.

ACTION ITEM #2: J. Fuhrman to follow up with T.Rasinski on status of action item #7 from 2008 EMAC meeting, and report back to the committee. *To be completed by May 31, 2009.*

To clarify, Action Item #7 from 2008 reads as:

“Action item #7: T. Rasinski to review the IEC EE-CTL/153/INF document for product safety testing and report the results back to B. Hackett so this may be included in the Annex if needed, and forwarded to the EMAC for review. Completion date: May 15, 2008”

Item 8: The committee agreed to close this item at the present time.

Item 9: The committee agreed that since (in 2008) “A motion was made to accept the consensus of the group that IEC 61000-4-3 uniform field is not considered a calibration and T9 is not required when utilizing properly calibrated equipment.” there was no need to ballot the CC, as long as all EMAC members applied the requirement the same, and had equal understandings. Therefore the action item was considered closed. Further discussion ensued on this topic, and the committee felt that it would be a good idea to formulate a reference document where important technical decisions reached by the committee could be located.

Motion #3 made by D. Kramer: develop a working group to compile an EMAC decision document entitled “Summary of EMAC Decisions”, which will serve as a living document that the committee can update as they see fit.

Seconded by D.Waite

All in favor by voice vote.

Volunteers for the EMAC working group were: Doug Kramer ‘Chair of WG’, David Waite, Benoit Nadeau, and Thomas Dickten,

ACTION ITEM #3: R. Miller to compile a summary of important EMAC decisions from previous EMAC meetings and provide to the working group in order to develop a

formal reference document to be utilized by assessors and laboratories. *To be completed by June 30, 2009.*

ACTION ITEM #4: EMAC working group to develop a reference document on a “Summary of Important EMAC Decisions”, to be balloted by the A2LA Criteria Council for approval. *To be completed by January 1, 2010.*

Item 10 – 12: The committee agreed that all could be closed at the present time.

Item 13: OPEN... The committee could not confirm that this could be considered a closed issue.

ACTION ITEM #5: R. Miller to follow up on action item #13 (ANSI C63 Bore sighting requirements) from 2008 EMAC meeting and report back to the committee. *To be completed by May 31, 2009.*

Item 14: The committee considered this item closed and indicted that it would be a decision to be reached by the A2LA MAC (measurement advisory committee).

Motion #4 made by C. Gortakowski: to approve the 2008 EMAC minutes per this year’s review and discussion.

Seconded by N. Belsher.

All in favor by voice vote.

5. Discussion on updating the Annex to the A2LA Policy on Measurement Uncertainty for Electro-Mechanical Testing Labs. (R. Miller)

R. Miller presented a copy A2LA’s MU Annex and asked if there were any changes requested by the committee at the present time. No individuals expressed any interest in making any revisions to the copy that was presented.

J. Fuhrman noted that CISPR 22 was recently revised to require an expression of measurement uncertainty on test reports, and asked a general question to the committee to inquire if they felt that other CISPR methods would be revised to make this same requirement. B. Nadeau indicated that it is a possibility in the future, but does not expect other CISPR changes to this effect in the near future. It was also noted that each year, the EMAC committee would revisit the A2LA MU Annex to determine if any changes were necessary. In effect, this would be a good way for laboratories to keep apprised of MU requirements.

R. Miller also pointed to page 10 of the MU Annex, and pointed out that the Product Safety note was to be confirmed by J. Fuhrman per action item #2 above.

Motion #5 made by W. Peverill: Approve the Annex to the A2LA Policy on Measurement Uncertainty for Electro-Mechanical Testing labs with no changes.

Seconded by J. Press.

All in favor by voice vote.

6. Discussion of the A2LA Proficiency testing policy for the electrical field of testing. (A. Gouker)

a. R103 and R103a.

A. Gouker presented to the committee a copy of the current A2LA Proficiency Testing Requirements, “R103”, and the Proficiency Testing Annex, “R103a”. The focus of discussion centered around recent confusion on how to apply the requirements for an electrical testing lab to have a “documented four year plan” for proficiency testing. All were in agreement and felt the need for a lab to have a four year plan, but exactly what was to be included therein was a difficult issue to interpret. Members of the committee stated that because there are no commercially available proficiency testing programs for electrical testing, nearly all of the requirements outlined in R103 do not apply.

A. Gouker stated that per PT5 of this document, they are still required to have a plan to illustrate what they intend to do for the testing on their scope. The plan does not necessarily need to lay out 4 individual years, but at a minimum the plan needs to document what they will do in lieu of participation in a commercial program.

Following these statements, a few members of the committee pointed to section PT7, and cited their frustration over the wording of this section. The wording “this shall be included in the plan” is the biggest area of confusion, and the committee asked that this section be further clarified to explicitly state what A2LA expects to see documented in the plan when there are no commercial PT programs available. B. Nadeau also suggested starting a new paragraph in the R103 document at section PT7 to make reading the document easier. C. Gortakowski also noted L. Gradin’s document on the A2LA website, “G105”, that is a great reference to assist with ideas for conducting quality control activities when no formal PT programs exist.

Motion #6 made by K. Williams: A2LA to revise its Proficiency Testing Requirements document, “R103”, to more clearly capture what is required to be included in lab’s PT plan when no commercial PT services exist.

Seconded by D. Kramer.

All in favor by voice vote.

ACTION ITEM #6: T. McInturff to revise section PT7 of R103 – A2LA Proficiency Testing Requirements, to more accurately reflect the requirements for a laboratory’s document proficiency testing plan (when commercial programs are not available). To be completed by *June 30, 2009*.

7. Discussion on Scopes.

a. RSS and BETS on Scope (R. Miller)

- Use of the A311a form.

b. Presentation of RRL Notices on Scopes. (A. Gouker)

a.) R. Miller presented a new form to the committee, “A311a”, the RSS and BETS Scope confirmation form. He explained how and why this form is to be used when RSS and/or BETS standards appear on a laboratory’s scope that is testing in support of a Product Certification body. This was made specifically because Telecommunication Certification Bodies (TCBs) require the testing laboratory to submit a list with these standards and the revision date of each that was assessed during their on-site assessment. This was becoming a problem for A2LA staff that had to keep writing letters to the TCBs on the testing lab’s behalf, as verification of what revisions the lab was assessed to. With the use of the new A311a form, it will provide a clear record of what revisions were on hand during the assessment. R. Miller explained that the assessor is to complete the form at the lab, leave a copy there when they leave, and provide another copy to A2LA with their

deliverables. R. Miller also noted that due to some assessor comments on the form in a previous meeting, A2LA would be revising the attestation statement found at the bottom.

b.) A. Gouker provided an update on the current RRL notices required on scopes of accreditation in order to be recognized by Korea. He presented a document from the NIST website entitled “Annex I to Phase I Procedures – List of Technical Regulations for the Republic of Korea”. One of the most notable changes was the fact the “RRL” was now replaced by the acronym “RRA”. Additionally, A. Gouker mentioned that the scope must now contain both the technical requirement references (i.e. KCC notices) and the conformity assessment procedure reference (i.e. RAA Announces). He presented the committee with an example scope of accreditation that was recently accepted for recognition, and asked that anyone with questions on scope formatting please contact him or R. Miller at A2LA.

B. Nadeau asked that, in the future, as soon as A2LA hears of these changes they please email the committee and all concerned parties so that scopes can be updated appropriately. This was taken under good consideration, and staff stated that they would certainly begin to implement this policy whenever possible. Additionally, the committee asked that staff email them a copy of the hyperlink to the Annex I to Phase I Procedures so they could use it as an on-going reference when dealing with Korean specs.

ACTION ITEM #7: A. Gouker to email a hyperlink for the KCC website to all Electrical labs and assessors, in order to provide a reference for the most current revisions of Korean standards expected to appear on Scopes of Accreditation. To be completed by April 30, 2009.

8. FCC Checklist revision status. (R. Miller)

- a. **Completion of the C216 checklist.**
- b. **Citing deficiencies against C216.**

a.) B. Nadeau started this topic’s discussion with a brief introduction on the use of the FCC checklist and background leading to its development (for those committee members not familiar with it). R. Miller also provided an update on A2LA’s recent meeting with the FCC and NIST in March 2008, and said that there were still no updates regarding the EMAC’s requested revisions to the FCC checklist. Apparently the FCC will be providing updates on the EMAC’s concerns in the near future.

R. Miller also discussed the reason for the recent change to A2LA’s FCC checklist, “C216”, which now incorporates a statement for the lab to sign as an indication that they are releasing the checklist to be publicly available on the FCC’s website. A2LA was previously unaware that these checklists were being made available to the public, and were concerned that a potential for a breach of confidentiality could occur.

N. Belsher asked a general question to the committee about scheduling time in the assessment for the completion of the C216 checklist. B. Nadeau responded and said the length of time typically depends on the laboratory. For a responsive lab, typically 1-2 hours is allotted; however for a non-responsive lab 3-4 hours may be required. D. Kramer mentioned that assessors should detail these times for completing the C216 on their agendas, which helps to mitigate any arguments the lab may have for billable hours from the assessor.

b.) With respect to citing deficiencies against items on the FCC checklist, R. Miller explained that assessors should not be doing so. He stated that the assessor should relate the deficiency to a specific requirement in the test method. However, B. Nadeau felt that if an "N" was circled on the checklist, then one would expect that a deficiency should be cited. Sometimes there is not a specific method to trace the FCC's question to, so it is a difficult situation. R. Miller said that in those cases, mark an "N", and then in the comments section of the checklist, provide an explanation for why a deficiency was not cited.

R. Miller further explained that, per A2LA's recent meeting with the FCC, we have a tentative action item to make a column on the checklist which will reference specific test methods where the questions stem from, if the assessors felt it was necessary. He asked the committee if they would like to develop a working group to accomplish this task of revising the FCC checklist. The EMAC committee responded in general agreement that we should not respond to the FCC's action item for A2LA, until they respond to the EMAC comments on the checklist from last year.

On a separate issue, one assessor felt the need to remove the assessor's name from the C309 and C216 checklists for legal reasons. R. Miller stated that A2LA would investigate doing this action.

ACTION ITEM #8: R. Miller to speak with A2LA Management to consider removing the individual assessor's personal identification on the C216 and C309 documents. If it is determined to remove the assessor signature, revise documents accordingly. To be completed by *May 31, 2009*.

9. ANSI C63.4 section 4.4.3 discussion on LISN's. (B. Nadeau)

B. Nadeau presented current requirements for LISN impedance and insertion loss verifications as they are used to test a product (with on-site AC filters or receptacle extensions) according to ANSI C63.4 (2003) sections 4.4.3 and 5.2.3.1. He said that a deficiency cannot currently be cited if the laboratory did not verify the impedance and insertion loss of the LISN following the intent of these sections, because C63.4 (2003) is not clearly requiring it. However, a deficiency could occur if the lab has not at least calibrated its LISNs, according to section 4.1.2 of C63.4.

Apparently, the 2008 revision of C63.4 will be more specific about the impedance and insertion losses when LISNs are used in conjunction with AC filters and receptacle extensions, but this edition has not yet been published. As it is now 2009, the committee wondered when this newest revision would be published. They asked that someone investigate the release of this latest revision and report back to the committee. For the time being, the committee's consensus was that a deficiency should not be cited for impedance and insertion loss calibration of a laboratory's LISN.

ACTION ITEM #9: K. Williams to email the ANSI secretary responsible for C63.4 and ask about the current status of the release of the 2008 revision of the standard, and then report back to the committee. To be completed by *May 31, 2009*.

10. Discussion on status of task group in regards to defining calibration, verification, characterization. (B. Nadeau)

R. Miller indicated that a couple key members of the EMAC committee were in a separate morning meeting and asked for this agenda item to be moved to the afternoon session to accommodate their schedules.

Motion #7 made by N. Belsher: Move agenda item number 10 to the afternoon EMAC meeting session.

Seconded by D. Kramer.

Majority vote in favor by raise of hands.

11. AEMCLRP

a. Checklist requirements. (Cite deficiencies based on content of checklist even if it is known the committee will accept a deviation.) (R. Miller)

b. Revision 5 update (R. Miller)

a.) R. Miller stated that a deficiency should not be cited against the AEMCLRP checklist. A deficiency should always be cited against a specific test method.

K. Williams also added that by February 2010, the AEMCLRP committee should have revision 5 of the AEMCLRP requirements ready to be published. He said they will have training at that time also.

b.) R. Miller indicated that per his discussion with members of the AEMCLRP committee, there is no update on the status of Rev. 5 of the AEMCLRP requirements. The committee is still working on revising the document.

10.(revisited) Discussion on status of task group in regards to defining calibration, verification, characterization. (B. Nadeau)

Since there was still ample time left in the morning session of the meeting, the committee decided that agenda item #10 should not be put off until the afternoon meeting.

B. Nadeau provided a recap of events from 2008 on the topics of equipment calibration, verification, and characterization. He said the intent of the new Criteria Council (CC) working group is to determine what type of records are required for these three types of processes. He said their goal is also to provide definitions for these three terms. The definitions must then be voted on by the CC, and then the individual advisory committees may develop lists of equipment that must be calibrated, verified, or characterized.

B. Nadeau noted that the working group is comprised of individuals from different fields of testing, in an effort to maintain an assortment of different views. He also mentioned that defining these terms is difficult, because we are not simply defining them as A2LA views the terms. We must keep in mind our obligations with our international MRA partners and how they define the terms.

On further discussion of calibration, N. Belsher asked a general question to the committee about calibration of Surge Generators, inquiring as to how other assessors handle these calibration requirements. B. Nadeau pointed out that, in IEC 61000-4-5(2005), there are specific requirements for the calibration of a generator (section 6.1.2) and another requirement for the verification (section 8.2). You need to ask the lab for proof that the equipment meets all the specs. It is up to the assessor because the periodicity of the calibration isn't defined by the test method. N. Belsher asked what

happens if the lab disputes a deficiency? B. Nadeau responded by stating that the package goes to the accreditation council, where A2LA relies on the technical competence and expertise of the AC panel to make the final decision (A2LA also has a formal appeals process for further disputes past the initial AC panel).

12. Old/New Business

Discussion Item #1: R. Miller asked about how assessors are assessing the requirements for a lab to perform quality control activities for 'every' test on their scope of accreditation per section 5.9.1 of ISO 17025. He asked: For very simple tests, such as dropping a battery on the floor, is it worthwhile to make the lab go through the rigor of performing QC activities? C. Gortakowski explained that there should be quality control conducted for every test, no matter how simple it may seem (could be as simple as a visual check). 5.9.1 of 17025 mandates the check to be performed, but does not necessarily mandate trending of the data. Trending would only be required 'where practicable'. L. Gradin's document, "G105", was also discussed again as a reference to example of QC/PT. A few assessors indicated that they were under the impression that QC was not applicable if you couldn't record the data, but now they further understood the requirements.

J. Fuhrman asked about requirements for frequency of conducting QC activities, and whether or not there were specific requirements for how often to conduct the QC. R. Miller let him know that it is left to the lab to determine the intervals; A2LA does not impose these requirements.

Discussion Item #2: All assessors were notified that, per the Assessor Instruction Manual, they are required to discuss the estimated costs of the assessment upon making initial contact with a laboratory. This is especially important for foreign laboratories, where up to 32 hours of travel time can be charged. There was a recent assessment where a lab noted that they were uninformed of these costs and ended up getting surprised at the exit meeting. As a standing requirement, assessors were asked to please clearly note these costs to the labs upon initial contact.

Discussion Item #3: R. Miller stated that a deficiency report recently came into the office with a deficiency for equipment that was not calibrated to the manufacturer's specifications (and it was also a 'limited' calibration). The lab disputed the deficiency, and said that a full scale calibration to the manufacturer's specification was unnecessary because they only used the equipment in a certain range. Most members of the committee were in agreement that a limited calibration on the equipment was acceptable, but some argued that you must put the issue into context, and ask what it is being used for along with what the test methods requirements are. R. Miller thanked the committee for their input and indicated that the MAC was going to address the issue of 'limited' calibrations and calibrating to the manufacturer's specification.

Discussion Item #4: One assessor indicated that in some instances he was not being notified by the AcO when an assessment was formally assigned to him. He said that he received an email asking if he could do the work, but nothing was ever followed up to confirm that he was assigned. He asked if A2LA could develop a mechanism to automatically email the assessor at the time of assignment.

ACTION ITEM #10: D. Valentine to modify A2LA database so that assessors are automatically alerted via email when an assessment has been formally assigned to them. To be completed by *May 31, 2009*.

Discussion Item #5: D. Waitt asked about calibration of CDMA test sets, where no A2LA recognized calibration could be attained. If the lab adequately requested a waiver to the A2LA Traceability Policy during their previous renewal assessment process, should another deficiency be cited at the present renewal assessment for this equipment? R. Miller said that the labs are required to request an exception to the Traceability Policy for *every* renewal assessment. They are provided with the exception form by A2LA when they are mailed their renewal paperwork and, if they do not complete the form and have an exception granted, then a deficiency should be cited.

Discussion Item #6: The topic of the FCC checklist comments was revisited, and the committee felt that if members of the FCC were present at the EMAC meeting, perhaps these questions could be more easily resolved. The committee asked that A2LA request members of the FCC to attend the next EMAC meeting.

ACTION ITEM #11: A. Gouker to contact the FCC about having one of their employees attend the 2010 EMAC meeting so questions about the FCC requirements can be more adequately addressed. To be completed by *December 31, 2009*.

Motion #8 made by J. Press: to adjourn the current EMAC meeting in lieu of Motion #7, since all agenda items were covered and there were no additional topics for discussion.

Seconded by D. Waitt.

All in favor by voice vote.

13. Next meeting

The next scheduled meeting of the EMAC meeting was set to be at the 2010 A2LA annual conclave. Specifics on date, time, and location to be provided at a later time.

Adjournment 12:00 pm

EMAC summary prepared by Adam Gouker, A2LA Senior Accreditation Officer

Attendees of the 2009 EMAC meeting were as follows:

Name:	Affiliation:	Name:	Affiliation:
Nathan Belsher	A2LA Assessor	Kimball Williams	Denso
David Waitt	A2LA Assessor	RK Varma	A2LA Assessor in training
Dan Sigouin	A2LA Assessor	James Press	NTS
Chuck Gortakowski	A2LA Assessor	Michael Bosley	A2LA Assessor/Visteon
Thomas Dickten	A2LA Assessor	David Fischer	Fischer Custom Comm.
Allan McCall	Fischer Custom Comm.	Andreas Eberhard	PSL
John Fuhrman	Met Laboraotries	Robert Miller	A2LA Staff
Benoit Nadeau	A2LA Assessor/Matrox	Adam Gouker	A2LA Staff
William Peverill	A2LA Assessor	Kim Watson	A2LA Staff
Nee Salam	A2LA Assessor	Diana Gavin	A2LA Staff
Douglas Kramer	A2LA Assessor/ACIL		

Total number of attendees: 21