

ISSUE 10 – MANAGEMENT OF LARGE EVALUATION TEAMS

APAC Lead Evaluator Training Objectives:

Examine appropriate approaches in managing large evaluation teams.

ILAC Finding: NC-06 of AB#3 and APAC Response

ITEM	CONSIDERATION
Number	Requirements and description of the non-conformity
DM NC #06	The timetable prepared by the RG Team did not contain sufficient detail to ensure that the office evaluation covered all the relevant requirements and accessed the relevant AB staff in a coordinated and efficient way. [IAF/ILAC A2:2014, §2.1.2 & APLAC MR011, §3.3.i]
Date	Response from the Region
2018/03/30	Each team member was given a list of clauses and documents to review. It would not have been practicable to schedule activities in a more detailed way before the office visit as the JAB staff members dealing with each aspect were unknown and particularly with two evaluation teams looking at similar issues with a limited number of JAB personnel I do not believe this could have been organised any better.
Date	Reaction from the IAF / ILAC evaluation team
2018/05/15	The ILAC TM acknowledges that there were coordination difficulties with the peer-evaluation from the other RG - nevertheless, this doesn't diminishes the need for detailed planning as foreseen in APLAC MR011, in fact it could be argued that it increases the need for it. No corrective action or evidence, or sufficient clarification is presented, and the finding cannot be closed.
Date	Response from the Region
2018/08/06	APLAC Lead Evaluator Training will highlight the need to better coordinate the conduct of concurrent evaluations with teams from other regions. See Case Study 6 attached.
Date	Reaction from the IAF / ILAC evaluation team
2018/10/26	Corrective action accepted and finding can be closed.

IAF/ILAC A2:2014, 2.1.2 (refers to ISO/IEC 17011:2004 generically) and APLAC MR 011:2013, 3.3 (i) – Checklist for TLs, Prior to the Evaluation (used during ILAC evaluation)

3.3 *Prior to the Evaluation*

- (i) *Prepare a detailed timetable for the visit and have it endorsed by AB;*
- *match team member assignments to AB staff to be interviewed and/or to act as escorts;*
 - *include a half-day team meeting prior to start of evaluation;*
 - *allow for team meetings (including by telephone) each evening, if necessary;*
 - *allow extra time for team leader in AB office, usually first or last day of assessment witnessing, i.e. day 2 or penultimate day;*
 - *advise AB of days that are not convenient for any formal hospitality function, e.g. evening of day 1, evening prior to last day;*

IAF/ILAC A2:2018, 2.1.2 (refers to ISO/IEC 17011:2017 generically) and APAC MR 006:2019, 3.3 (i) – Checklist for TLs, Prior to the Evaluation (current versions)

3.3 Prior to the Evaluation

- (i) *Prepare a detailed timetable for the visit and have it endorsed by the AB;*
- *match Team Member assignments to AB staff to be interviewed and/or to act as escorts;*
 - *include a half-day team meeting prior to start of evaluation;*
 - *allow for team meetings (including by telephone) each evening, if necessary;*
 - *allow extra time for Team Leader in AB office, usually first or last day of assessment witnessing, i.e. day 2 or penultimate day;*
 - *advise AB of days that are not convenient for any formal hospitality function, e.g. evening of day 1, evening prior to last day;*

Acceptable / Possible solutions

Examine options in leading large teams or having our team work concurrently with another regional team.

AND/OR

Appointing a TL without a scope for witnessing / review so they can focus of the management system and managing the team during the evaluation – including picking up issues as they develop without interrupting the team's own workflow. At least two APAC trainers have seen this in action while witnessing an EA evaluation of an AB with a large MLA scope.

Case Study 6 – Working with other Evaluation Teams operating concurrently

Scenario:

During a re-evaluation, the timetable prepared by the Team did not contain sufficient detail to ensure that the office evaluation covered all the relevant requirements and accessed the relevant AB staff in a coordinated and efficient way, which was occurring at the same time as another evaluation team from another region was present and conducting their own.

Each team member was given a list of clauses and documents to review. It would have been difficult to provide more detail in the schedule so far before the office visit as the AB staff members dealing with each aspect were unknown. With two evaluation teams looking at similar issues and a limited number of AB personnel this was difficult to coordinate.

The peer-evaluation from the other region provided significant challenges to coordination.

Questions to Lead Evaluators:

- Does this circumstance/condition conform to evaluation requirements?
- Does the presence of another evaluation team onsite at the same time enhance the need for detailed planning as foreseen in APAC MR006?
- What steps can be taken to ensure that the work of the two teams is sufficiently coordinated to ensure the success of the APAC, if not both, evaluations, with a minimum of difficulty caused to the AB staff?