

## ISSUE 04 – DEBRIEFING OF ASSESSMENT TEAMS BY WITNESS EVALUATORS

### **APAC Lead Evaluator Training Objectives:**

Discuss the requirements to provide formal (or informal) feedback to assessment teams subsequent to the witness of an assessment

### **ILAC Finding: Observation #4, NC-01 and APLAC Response**

ITEM	CONSIDERATION
DM CM # 2	No feedback was provided to the assessment team or to AB staff who accompanied us on the witness. APLAC might consider providing additional guidance to its evaluators as to whether providing feedback is appropriate and what the debriefing should include or should not include.
Date	Response from the Region
2018-03-28	Informal feedback was provided to AB staff throughout the entire evaluation and more formally during the meeting and discussion held before the final report was agreed. With regard to formal feedback to assessors, APLAC does not do this because feedback to assessors is the responsibility of the AB.
Date	Reaction from the IAF / ILAC evaluation team
2018-10-15	Noted

### **IAF/ILAC A2:2014 & ISO/IEC 17011:2004 and Current Requirement from 17011 and IAF/ILAC A Series Documents**

There are currently no requirements in any revision of any evaluation requirements document for the provision of feedback to an assessment team by evaluators. The following are the considerations that may be reviewed by evaluators in determining the suitability of such action:

#### **Perception of Consulting**

Providing specific examples for improvement, as provided in the definition of such a finding, may be considered by the evaluated AB as providing evaluator opinions to assessment teams that may differ from the culture of the assessment programs being evaluated. Such opinions and ideas may be considered consulting – so as to have the program better meet the views of the evaluator.

#### **Ownership of the Accreditation Program**

Opinions provided directly to assessment teams bypasses the accreditation body which is the designated recipient of the evaluation report. It is the accreditation body's decision to determine which suggestions are appropriate for implementation and which may not be possible given national, economic, or cultural requirements with may exist in the economy of the accreditation body. Evaluation teams which short circuit this ownership of the accreditation program by providing their views to the assessors may be considered threats to the impartiality of the evaluation program, depending on the economy of the accreditation body. There is real possibility of demonstrating a lack of respect to the AB by not allowing them to determine the suitability of evaluator comments.

As well, APAC does not accept responses to Comments from assessors - only accreditation bodies.

#### **Informal versus Formal Comments**

It is possible that informal comments, based on the judgement of the evaluator regarding how such comments may be perceived, both culturally and ethically, may be considered appropriate. It is clear that formal provision of comments to assessment teams by evaluators is not appropriate unless it is done during the appropriate venue, such as an evaluation closing meeting. However, outside of such circumstances, informal discussion of assessment processes may often be useful.

**Acceptable / Possible solutions**

If the foregoing causes confusion to evaluators, it may be that these considerations are needed in APAC evaluation procedures.