

General principles for the compliance/audit assessment of Inspection Bodies (IBs) by the Amusement Device Inspection Procedures Scheme (ADIPS)

1 Introduction

- 1.1 One of The Amusement Device Inspection Procedures Scheme (ADIPS) functions is to assess and register Inspection Bodies (IBs) to carry out inspection of amusement devices and subsequently to ensure that the standards and requirements defined in the ADIPS scheme document are maintained. Each applicant to join the ADIPS register provides information on its organisation, personnel and technical activities during the application process. Assessment of an IBs Quality Management Systems (QMS), competence and inspection procedures is carried out during visits to the IBs office, on-site assessment of inspection work and desktop reviews of documentation
- 1.2 ADIPS engages external consultants with the relevant specialist knowledge to assess the suitability and adequacy of the QMS and the competence of the IB to perform the inspections for which registration is sought. The external consultant is limited to assessing the IBs activities for compliance with the requirements of the scheme document and relevant Standards and reporting their findings to ADIPS.
- 1.3 This document outlines how ADIPS plans and conducts compliance/audit assessments and the requirements for IB's to be accepted onto and to maintain their position on the ADIPS register. It also refers to the assessment techniques normally used.

2. Assessment process – General detail

- 2.1 Compliance/audit assessments assess an IB against the requirements of *BS EN ISO/IEC 17020:2012“Conformity Assessment – Requirements for the operation of various types of bodies performing inspection (ISO17020)* and the inspection requirements of *HSG 175: Fairgrounds and amusement parks – Guidance on safe practice (HSG175)*.
- 2.2 IBs who have been successfully assessed by a National Accreditation Body (who is a signatory to the IAF-MLA) to the requirements of ISO17020, for a scope of inspection activities equivalent to ADIPS pre-use inspection and/or in-service annual inspection, shall not be subject to proactive compliance/audit assessment of the inspection activities covered by the scope of its accreditation.

2.3 ISO 17020

- 2.3.1 Compliance/audit assessments use the six key headings suggested in UKAS document GEN 2 when carrying out auditing, these being:-
- Scope
 - Organisation
 - Management
 - Inspection Processes
 - Technical Competence
 - Impartiality and Independence
- 2.3.2 While it will always remain an overriding aspiration to move all IBs towards full compliance with ISO17020, when assessing IBs ADIPS will take into consideration the size and type of the organisation and the difficulties some smaller organisations could have in achieving 100% compliance against certain key headings and particular clauses of ISO17020.

- 2.3.3 However, assessments shall seek to establish that IBs are achieving compliance levels at, or approaching, 100% compliance with ISO17020 in the pertinent areas of 'technical competence' and 'inspection processes'.
- 2.3.4 This approach of separating two key areas and scoring them separately allows other key areas (e.g. organisation and management), where compliance may be more difficult, to be lower while still achieving the required compliance level overall. For example, if inspection processes and competence are 100% compliant, management and organisation could be as low as 60% and overall compliance would still be 80%.

3 Compliance/audit assessment techniques

- 3.1 The team for assessment will typically comprise 1 auditor for the office based assessment and may include multiple auditors for the on-site or desktop review assessment to ensure the necessary expertise is available to assess the breadth of the IB's scope.
- 3.2 Compliance/audit assessments will utilise a number of assessment techniques, split into three main categories:-

3.3 Central office assessment (QMS)

- 3.3.1 The assessment will seek to discover through a variety of techniques whether:-
- a. the QMS is suitable and sufficient for the IBs needs, organisations arrangements and methods of operation, including the number of inspectors;
 - b. all of the requirements of ISO/IEC 17020 have been considered and documented;
 - c. where possible, the IB has implemented all the requirements of the QMS effectively; and
 - d. the operational, administrative and technical procedures used to support the QMS and inspection activities are complete, technically valid and appropriate.
- 3.3.2 All types and disciplines of inspection will be subject to an office assessment and technical review. The team will assess the technical competence of inspectors conducting each main type or discipline of inspection within the ADIPS scope of registration. Where appropriate this will be done through:
- a. the examination of the records outlined above;
 - b. discussions with managers/supervisors/inspectors;
 - c. assessment of the performance of the staff whilst conducting scheduled Inspections (See 3.5 and 3.6)

3.4 Central office assessment (Diligence audit)

- 3.4.1 The assessment will seek to discover through a variety of techniques whether:-
- a. the volume of inspection work performed is appropriate to the IBs resources, organisations arrangements and methods of operation, including number of inspectors; and

b. the inspection work has been undertaken in a diligent and proper manner, by competent inspectors including a check that the IB has spent enough time completing the inspection work.

3.5 On-site assessment of inspection work

3.5.1 When deciding on the number of on-site assessments of inspections needed the following aspects, at least, will be considered by ADIPS:

- a. the IBs technical scope;
- b. the IBs procedures for selecting, training, authorising and monitoring inspectors, having regard to the qualifications and experience required for different inspection types and disciplines;
- c. the extent to which inspectors are required to exercise professional judgement;
- d. the number of inspectors; and
- e. the number of inspections performed by the IB;

3.5.2 As a minimum, one inspector carrying out inspections will be assessed on-site for the types and disciplines of inspection in the IBs technical scope.

3.5.3 When deciding on which inspectors will be assessed account will be taken of:

- a. new recruits or new authorisations;
- b. Inspectors assessed during previous audits;
- c. training, education, qualifications and experience (i.e. competence) of inspectors; and
- d. the extent to which inspectors are required to exercise professional judgement.

3.5.4 If none of the inspectors can cover the entire scope then more than one inspector will be assessed.

3.6 Desktop review assessment (Pre-use inspection)

3.6.1 The assessment will seek to discover through a variety of techniques whether:-

- a. all the pre-use inspection (PUI) requirements of HSG 175 have been addressed;
- b. the operational, administrative and technical procedures used to support the inspection activities are complete, technically valid and appropriate; and
- c. the IB has implemented its procedures effectively.

3.6.2 As a minimum, one complete PUI will be assessed for the types and disciplines of inspection within the IBs technical scope.

4 Compliance/audit assessment cycle

4.1 Application for registration

- 4.1.1 Within its application, the IB must furnish ADIPS with a list of inspectors and the proposed technical scope of inspection. Any new application to join the ADIPS register or an IB applying for an extension to technical scope is assessed by an ADIPS Registration Panel. A Registration Panel may recommend an IB is subject to an initial competency assessment.

4.2 Initial competency assessment

- 4.2.1 The nature of the initial assessment will be dependent upon the technical scope under consideration. However, the following elements will need to be covered:
- a. An on-site witness of inspection covering the proposed scope;
 - b. An examination of inspection equipment and documentation such as inspection procedures and instructions, records and reports.
- 4.2.2 Following the assessment a report will be produced for the Registration Panel advising whether, in the opinion of the assessor, the IB is competent to perform the scope of inspection activities and/or whether additional assessment and/or monitoring is required.

4.3 Submission of Quality Management (QMS) Documentation

- 4.3.1 The IB must furnish ADIPS with its QMS documentation within the first 6 months of registration.
- 4.3.2 IBs that have no system in place will be offered the generic QMS as a framework from which to develop their QMS.

4.4 Compliance/audit assessment (in-service)

- 4.4.1 An IB will normally be subject to an initial compliance/audit assessment within the first 12 months of registration. This will normally comprise:-
- a. Central office assessment
 - b. An on-site witness of inspection
- 4.4.2 The initial central office assessment audit seeks to assess the IB's QMS to establish a suitable benchmark. A **target compliance level of 60%** across the six key headings is the minimum requirement for IB's (see 4.8).
- 4.4.3 Future audit will add additional rigour to encourage continuous improvement and ensure broader compliance with the requirements of ISO17020 as the IB becomes more established.
- 4.4.4 During subsequent assessments a **target compliance level of 75%** across the six key headings is the minimum requirement for IB's (see 4.8).

4.5 Compliance/audit assessment (PUI)

- 4.5.1 An IB will normally be subject to an initial compliance/audit assessment within the first 12 months of registration. This will normally comprise:-
- a. Central office assessment (if the IBs technical scope does not include in-service annual inspection)
 - b. A desktop review of at least one completed PUI.

4.6 Reassessment

- 4.6.1 Reassessment visits will involve a comprehensive re-examination of the IBs QMS and inspection activities and will be similar in format and content to the initial assessment.
- 4.6.2 Reassessment timescales will depend on the current level of compliance displayed by the IB and whether this can be effectively managed through the Improvement actions and close-out process (See 4.7 and 4.8). Reassessments will be planned to cover the whole scope of registration at least once every three years.
- 4.6.4 For every subsequent reassessment ADIPS will require the IB to demonstrate continuous incremental improvement from one audit to the next, with no evidence of deteriorating standards being identified

4.7 Improvement Actions and Close out

- 4.7.1 A report may be provided to the IB following a compliance/audit assessment. Where improvement action is required by the IB, a maximum of 3 months will normally be allowed for provision of evidence to ADIPS that the action has been carried out. Where non-compliances are associated with Statutory Health and Safety Legislation referred to in HSG175, the period for the provision of evidence to close out the improvement action will reduce to a maximum of 1 month although in such cases, it is imperative that action is taken immediately by the IB to rectify the non-compliance to bring its activities within the requirements of Statute.
- 4.7.2 Recommendations require no close out verification from ADIPS and may be adopted or not by the IB. However, implementation of recommendations is likely to ensure that the IB can demonstrate the incremental improvements required from one assessment period to the next.
- 4.7.3 The generation and close-out of improvement actions will ensure that IBs achieve the compliance levels for each assessment (see 4.4.4 and 4.6.3). Improvement Actions relating to the areas of 'technical competence' and 'inspection processes' will take priority over those relating to one of the other key headings suggested in UKAS document GEN2 (see 2.3.1)
- 4.7.3 In most cases evidence can be provided electronically although there may be situations where additional visits to the IB will be required. ADIPS appointed auditors will review the evidence provided and decide whether it suitably addresses the non-compliance identified.

4.8 Performance Assessment Framework

- 4.8.1 When considering compliance levels the following Performance Assessment Framework shall be used to determine an IBs performance and produce the ongoing assessment or action expectations.
- 4.8.2

ADIPS/ RIB Performance Assessment Framework

Each key heading should be assessed against the following performance criteria to produce an overall compliance score.

Score	<40%	40 – 59%	60 – 74%	75- 89%	90%
Rating	Unacceptable	Poor	Borderline compliant	Compliant	Exemplary
ISO 17020, legal, HSG175 & ADIPS requirements met	Substantially below the relevant minimum ISO 17020, legal, HSG175 & ADIPS requirements	Significantly below the relevant minimum ISO 17020, legal, HSG175 & ADIPS requirements	Meets most of the relevant minimum ISO 17020, legal, HSG175 & ADIPS requirements	Meets the relevant minimum ISO 17020, legal, HSG175, & ADIPS requirements	Exceeds the relevant minimal ISO 17020, legal, HSG175 & ADIPS requirements
Level of compliance	Degree of non-compliance substantial	Degree of non-compliance significant.	Degree of non-compliance minor and easily remediated	Minor issues or areas for improvements only	Minor issues or areas for improvements only
Recognition of the QMS requirements and the drive to continually improve processes and procedures	Failures not recognised with limited commitment to take remedial action.	Limited recognition of the essential components of inspection and ADIPS QMS demonstrate commitment to take remedial action	RIB recognises essential components of inspection and ADIPS QMS requirements. RIB committed to improve standards.	RIB competent and able to demonstrate control of risks. system and inspections robust	RIB competent, enthusiastic, and proactive. Working to 'good practice' or above standard. Actively seek to further improve standards
ADIPS ongoing assessment or action expectation					
Level of action required by ADIPS	Compliance order / suspension. RIB to cease conducting inspection work until they can demonstrate compliance via further review	Evidence of action submitted to ADIPS within 3 months. Further review/ witness 6- 12 months	Evidence of action submitted to ADIPS. Further review/ witness 12-18 months	No further action is necessary Further review/ witness 18-24 months	No further action is necessary Further review/ witness 24-36 months