pr/03.1

GNB-CPR GNB-AG	Coordination of the Group of Notified Bodies for the Construction Products Regulation (EU) No 305/2011	NB-CPR/21/868 **Operational conclusions** Issued 28 April 2021

Draft Operational conclusions of the 49th meeting of the GNB-CPR

23 March 2021, Virtual meeting

Chair: Mr. Marjan Japelj, ZAG - President of the Group of Notified Bodies for the CPR

Attendants:

Full Members

Representatives of the Notified Bodies of:

- Austria (1 representative)
- Bulgaria (1 representative)
- Croatia (1 representative)
- Cyprus (1 representative)
- Czech Republic (1 representative)
- Denmark (1 representative)
- Finland (1 representative)
- France (2 representatives)
- Germany (2 representatives)
- Ireland (1 representative)
- Italy (2 representatives)
- Netherlands (1 representative)
- Norway (1 representative)
- Poland (2 representatives)
- Portugal (1 representative)
- Slovenia (1 representative)
- Spain (1 representative)
- Sweden (1 representative)
- Switzerland (1 representative)
- Turkey (1 representative)

Observers and guests

Representatives of:

- Institute IMS, Serbia (1 observer)
- European Commission Services (2 representatives)
- GNB-CPR TechSec provided by Danish Technological Institute (2 representatives)
- Administrative Secretariat provided by Methods and planning (1 representative)

Notified bodies not represented

Notified bodies of the following countries were not represented in the meeting:

- Belgium
- Croatia
- Estonia
- Greece
- Hungary
- Iceland (No Notified bodies appointed for CPR)
- Latvia

- Liechtenstein (Notified Bodies of Liechtenstein participate in the Swiss Mirror group and may hence be considered represented by the Swiss member
- Lithuania
- Luxemburg
- Malta (No Notified bodies appointed for CPR)
- Slovakia
- Romania

1. Welcome and introduction

The President welcomed the participants.

Due to the COVID-19 situation the meeting was held as a Teams meeting.

Information was provided that the meeting would be recorded for the purpose of supporting the minuting of the meeting.

2. Approval of the draft agenda

The draft agenda, NB-CPR 21/862 was approved.

3. Draft Operational conclusions/Minutes of the 48th GNB Advisory Group meeting

The draft operational conclusions, NB-CPR 20/858r1 was approved without comments.

4. Matters arising from minutes not dealt with on the Agenda and actions still outstanding after the 48th GNB Advisory Group meeting

TechSec informed that the agreed actions for TechSec indicated in Annex 1 of the draft operational conclusions of the 48th meeting had been carried out,

- Regarding item 8: Information to be provided by SG06.
- Regarding item 9: Written proposal has been received from the French notified bodies. TechSec to incorporate the proposal into a draft revised version of the position paper NB-CPR 19/793.

Action:

- TechSec to incorporate the French proposal into a draft revised version of the position paper NB-CPR 19/793.

5. Dates of next meetings.

A 50th meeting

Date: 19 October 2021
Venue: Slovenia

B 51st meeting

Date: 22 March 2022
Venue: Brussels

Action:

Administrative Secretariat and President to arrange for the 50th meeting to be held on 19 October in Slovenia or alternatively as a virtual meeting. The decision on venue will be made in august and communicated on CIRCABC.

6. Work of GNB-CPR

A Effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on the work of GNB-CPR

The president mentioned that written comments had been received regarding two issues:

1: Whether or not initial inspection can be carried out remotely.

2: Whether or not remote surveillance can replace/substitute on-site inspection.

Regarding initial inspection, TechSec confirmed that quite a few questions and comments had been received. It is TechSec's understanding, that CPR Annex V does not allow the initial inspection to be carried out remotely, as it requires the notified certification body to carry out an *initial inspection* of *the manufacturing plant.* Discussions just after the entry into force of the revised annex V (Regulation 568/2014), left the clear impression that Member States would generally understand the wording of Annex V to exclude multisite sampling. Against that background, it seems difficult to understand the same words to allow for inspection by remote means. It was TechSec's impression that that understanding of CPR Annex V was generally shared.

TechSec also recalled that GNB guidance is subordinate to the CPR itself, and that GNB guidance not in line with the CPR would have no validity. Moreover, deviating guidance might cause liabilities, which should be avoided.

A representative of the Polish notified bodies indicated disagreement with the interpretation of the CPR Annex V as not allowing for remote initial inspections. He explained that currently the situation is that some notified bodies actually do carry out remote initial inspections, which creates unfair competition amongst notified bodies.

He suggested, as an exception during the pandemic, that remote initial inspections should be permitted. Alternatively, if such an exception could not be agreed upon, a clear statement, should be made, preferably by the Commission, to exclude remote initial inspections.

The representative of the Irish Notified bodies informed that numerous companies in Ireland have been caught in a difficult situation as they used to hold certificates issued by notified certification bodies in the UK. Because of the Brexit, these certificates are no longer valid and because of the pandemic it is difficult for them to have the initial inspection carried out by a new notified body. Irish notified bodies also receive applications from UK manufacturers wishing to sell their products on the EU market. Therefore, he considered that the GNB should act. He suggested a risk-based approach where distinction is made between manufacturers not previously visited by any notified body and, on the other hand, well-established manufacturers who have maintained their certificates up to now. In the latter case, he considered that the risks were less than in the first case, and that the exclusion of remote inspections would be a too blunt instrument, particularly in the combined situations of Brexit and Corona.

Representatives of the Italian, Spanish, Czech, and Slovenian notified bodies mentioned that their national notifying authorities have indicated a degree of flexibility in their administrative practices. During the pandemic they would not react against remote initial inspections if certain conditions were met, e.g., if a proper risk assessment has been made and/or if physical inspections have not been possible for some time (6 months) and/or if sufficient knowledge about the manufacturer was available.

Members from Finland, Norway and Bulgaria supported that remote initial inspections should be a possibility on the basis of a risk assessment.

The President summarised that seemingly a majority wished to have remote initial inspections as a possibility, and that some notified bodies already seemed to practise remote initial inspections with a kind of blessing from their notifying authorities. The President asked if there was a wish for the GNB to take any action, or if matters should be settled at national level.

A member suggested that a GuidanceBase item could be drawn up to clarify the matter.

The representative of the Danish Notified bodies asked for the Commission to define "extraordinary situations" for the purpose of allowing exceptions from general rules.

A representative of the Commission explained that the Commission's interpretations in this regard start from the necessity of safeguarding building safety. The Commission cannot support any issuance of certificates that would endanger the safety. He considered it very positive that members contribute to finding solutions and that they also have discussed the matter in the national mirror groups and with their notifying authorities. However, the Commission has not changed its position.

With regard to the possibilities for the Commission to define when a situation is "extraordinary" and when an extraordinary situation is over, the Commission representative said that such definitions would necessitate a lengthy decision-making process, maybe even regulatory actions, including all required consultations. The conclusion of such process might not be available before the pandemic would be over anyway.

An official legal interpretation of the CPR and other available sources regarding the issue of remote initial inspection, as asked for by some members, might also involve a lengthy and complex decision-making. With the current prospects regarding vaccinations etc. it seems unlikely that such legal interpretation would be available before all restrictions would have been lifted anyway, also taking into account that the Commission's legal services are generally rather reluctant to take definitive positions on matters which eventually would be decided by the European court of justice.

The representative of the Commission reminded that all parties operate at their own responsibility, both manufacturers, notified bodies and notifying authorities. If a certificate is considered invalid due to improper initial inspection, the notified body could be held liable.

The President mentioned a draft GuidanceBase item (No. 0280) that was discussed at the 48th meeting. It stated that the conditions were not changed during the pandemic and that initial inspection had to be carried out on-site. Consensus was not reached at the 48th meeting. The President asked if it would be possible to reach consensus now.

TechSec reiterated the necessity of avoiding any guidance potentially deviating from the CPR, as potential liabilities connected with that had to be avoided, also taking into account the absence of legal personality of the GNB.

An Italian representative shared the experience that in Italy it has been possible to carry out on-site inspections most of the time. He also reminded that the risks related to remote initial inspection are higher than the risks related to remote surveillance, as in the latter case the notified body would always have a thorough knowledge of the manufacturing company.

A member asked if the CPR Advisory Group or the AdCo had decided on any position with regard to remote initial inspection. A representative of the Commission informed that the CPR Advisory Group had a virtual meeting on 15 March 2021 where the subject was not touched upon. Neither was he aware of any such decisions by AdCo. He also found it unlikely that AdCo would make any such decisions as the value might seem limited.

A representative of the Commission recalled that the horizontal DG Growth Unit B1 in March 2020 had issued a document, which TechSec shared on CIRCABC under document No. NB-CPR/ALL 20/173, which is available in the CIRCABC folder "Communications to all members".

That document seems to open for certain justified "deviations" during the pandemic, if the technical validity would not be jeopardised. It was offered by the Commission representative to clarify if that could be understood as allowing for "deviations" regarding initial inspections. The

Commission representative considered that such clarification would not take as much time as the above-mentioned legal interpretations.

It was agreed to await the outcome of that clarification and then return to the subject. Then, if relevant, one or more GuidanceBase items can be drawn up.

The second topic was discussed, namely whether or not remote auditing can replace/substitute on-site surveillance inspections.

The representative of the Slovenian notified bodies suggested that the position paper NB-CPR 20/852 should be modified to permit remote auditing to replace on-site inspections. The current position paper categorises remote auditing as "additional AVCP activities".

A representative of the French notified bodies indicated that remote auditing could not be considered equivalent to on-site inspections; remote auditing can be applied on the basis of a risk assessment but would not be equivalent.

The President recalled that the position paper was first prepared in April 2020 when the pandemic was expected only to last for a short period of time and that the wording could lead to the understanding that when it becomes possible to visit the manufacturing plant a notified body would have to carry out several consecutive inspections for each manufacturer to catch up on the postponed visits the past year.

The representative of the Danish notified bodies emphasised the importance of keeping the contact with the manufacturers. He also considered that the current position paper would leave sufficient room for the notified bodies to manoeuvre reasonably.

TechSec explained the reasoning behind the term "additional AVCP activities" and the intention behind the statement that additional AVCP cannot replace or substitute on-site inspections.

From the first issue in April 2020, the main intention was to make it clear that when it becomes possible, the notified body should visit the manufacturer, even if remote auditing has been applied. That seems still to be relevant as members seem generally to agree that when restrictions are lifted, the manufacturing plant shall be visited.

Of course, the position paper should not be understood as implying that the notified bodies would have to carry out several consecutive inspections to catch up on postponed inspections; a single inspection would be enough.

Hence, TechSec considered that the practical implications of the statement that additional AVCP activities cannot substitute or replace on-site inspections would be that the notified body will have to visit the manufacturer when it becomes possible.

For the above reasons, TechSec suggested that the main focus should be on the "going back to normal". When restrictions are lifted, notified bodies may have many visits to catch up on, and they cannot be done immediately. Therefore, the prioritization and risks assessments in that regard should be in focus.

The President concluded that there would be no need to modify the position paper, as the current version seems to leave the necessary freedom to the notified bodies.

Action:

The Commission to clarify the understanding of the message given by unit B1 of DG Growth in March 2020. (Found on CIRCABC in document NB-CPR/ALL 20/173.)

B Competence of notified bodies – Status of initiative

TechSec presented a proposal for a training programme for notified bodies, consisting of a series of five webinars.

A test session is planned for the 4 May 2021. Members of the advisory group will be invited to participate.

The question of language was debated, and if the educational material would be available in national languages. TechSec explained that the educational material will be made available for translation and use in all Member States.

A member recalled that the original proposal concerned "training for the trainers". TechSec explained that this will still be a possibility, but with webinars, it will be possible to directly reach a "wider audience" directly. However, TechSec will only conduct webinars in English.

A question was asked regarding how it will be evaluated if the training sessions will be effective, i.e. if participants actually get to understand what they are being taught. A member suggested that interactive tools should be applied. TechSec agreed. Additionally, TechSec mentioned that notifying authorities and accreditation bodies will also be invited. Hence, it would be a possibility for them to follow up with the individual notified bodies and check both that they did participate and that they got the right understanding.

It was also discussed that "breakout sessions" with problem solving in smaller groups would be increase the participant's understanding of the topics.

TechSec thanked for the constructive feedback and will continue the work.

C Review of the GNB-CPR organisation and working methods

A representative of the French notified bodies introduced the topic.

He explained that the current situation with standstill in citations of harmonised standards blocks activities and lowers the motivation for notified bodies to participate in the GNB work.

The French representative considered that the present time when the CPR is under review would be the right time to consider how to raise the level of motivation of the notified bodies and improve the functioning of the GNB.

The work with Q&As was highlighted as an important way to express the thoughts of the group in an efficient manner.

Also, it was stated that the work of the GNB-CPR ought to be made available for a wider audience.

As a significant part of the work is to clarify harmonized specifications, it could be useful to strengthen the cooperation with CEN and EOTA.

It was discussed if notified bodies had been properly included in the review of the CPR and if GNB-CPR should have been more directly involved.

TechSec invited interested parties to give input to a common position from GNB-CPR.

The representatives of the Commissions informed that the public consultations have been closed. The deadline for commenting was passed, meaning that a position should be given quickly if taken into consideration.

Also, it was mentioned, that role of Notified bodies was intact in all defined policy options, except the option concerning withdrawal of the CPR, which seems to be an unlikely turnout.

Action:
Members to submit input to TechSec regarding improvement of the CPR with regard to the work of notified bodies. TechSec to formulate a common position based on input from the Members.

7. Consequences for notified bodies of the Brexit

A Maintenance of certificates to ETAs issued by former TABs of the UK

TechSec introduced the topic by referring to the questions listed in the explanatory notes, document No. NB-CPR 21/863:

1) What information should notified bodies pass on to manufacturers holding ETAs issued by UK TABs?
2) Is a certificate referring to an ETA issued by a UK TAB still valid?
3) If the certificate is still valid, how long can it be maintained?
4) What should the notified body do if the manufacturer does not have the ETA "transferred" to a currently designated TAB?

On the basis of discussions with the President and the Commission representatives, TechSec proposed the below answers:

1) Notified bodies should inform manufacturers that the ETA is no longer valid. Should the manufacturer wish to continue using the ETA, he would need to have it transferred to a currently designated European TAB.
2) Part of the basis for the certificate, namely the ETA, is no longer valid. However, as the performance assessment stated by the ETA may still be correct, maintaining certification would require a new/transferred ETA and a new certificate referring to that new/transferred ETA.
3) A notified body may consider it justified to maintain the certificate for a limited period of time while the manufacturer is obtaining a new/transferred ETA. However, this period of time should not be any longer than necessary.
4) If the manufacturer does not take steps to have a new/transferred ETA, the notified body should inform the manufacturer that the certificate cannot be maintained, as the notified body would have no possibility to verify the constancy of performance without a valid ETA.

A representative of the Commission added that it must be taken into account that part of the basis for the certificate, namely the ETA issued by a former UK TAB, is no longer valid and that a new certificate must be issued with reference to a valid ETA issued by a currently designated TAB.
She also emphasised that if the manufacturer does not take the necessary steps to obtain a new/transferred ETA, it would be necessary to formally withdraw the certificate and inform the notifying authority accordingly.

A member recalled the communication from the Commission in March 2020 regarding the Brexit agreement. According to that communication, any transfer of documents from UK organisations to EU organisations had to be done before the end of 2020. Therefore, he asked if it would still be possible to make such transfers.

The Commission representatives considered that information could always be transferred following the same principles as previously discussed with regard to transfer of certificates. It was emphasised that only *information* can be transferred, not the formal documents issued by UK bodies.

B Subcontracting of work to UK laboratories and certification bodies

In the explanatory note, the following questions were listed.

1) Are there any particular limits to subcontracting of notified body work to laboratories and certification bodies in the UK?
2) What status does a UKAS accreditation have?
3) What status does a "UKCA" body have in the Union?

On the first question, TechSec explained that subcontracting to UK laboratories and certification bodies would be necessary if a notified certification body would base a certificate on evidence provided by a UK laboratory. If the manufacturer is located in the UK it might also be in the interest of the manufacturer to have the continuing surveillance subcontracted to a UK certification body.

No particular rules or conditions have been identified for subcontracting work to UK organisations. Such subcontracting would have to follow the same rules and principles as any other subcontracting in the framework of the CPR, notably CPR Article 45 and the approved position paper NB-CPR 17/744.

On the second question, regarding the status of UKAS accreditation, TechSec explained that accreditation certificates may be used to demonstrate fulfilment of the CPR requirements, but the CPR does not require bodies to be accredited, neither notified bodies nor subcontractors.

If a notified body assesses the competence of a subcontractor in the UK, it may take a UKAS accreditation into account. As UKAS is still a member of the EA, a UKAS accreditation may be assumed to be similar accreditations by any other EA member. However, the UKAS accreditation would not have any formal significance.

On the third question, regarding the status of UKCA bodies in the Union, TechSec explained that UKCA bodies do not have any particular status; they do not benefit from any kind of EU recognition.

On behalf of the French notified bodies, it was mentioned that manufacturers marketing their products both in the EU and in the UK would need both CE marking and UKCA marking on their products. Some UK bodies have in the EU established subsidiaries with notified body status. Thereby, they have enabled themselves to provide their clients with reports and certificates both for the EU and the UK.

The question was raised if the Commission in any way could support notified bodies wishing to provide manufacturers with the basis for both marks.

The representatives of the Commission explained that the Brexit agreement did not include any relevant mutual recognition agreements. Therefore, the Commission Services would be excluded from negotiating any sectoral agreement, e.g. for construction products.

The Commission representatives explained that there are no particular requirements regarding the ownership of notified bodies. The owner of a notified bodies may be established in the EU or in a third country, like the UK. However, the independence requirements must always be complied with and notified bodies need to demonstrate that they have the necessary personnel and equipment.

An Italian representative recalled that CPR certificates must be issued by notified bodies established in the EU and that UKCA certificates must be issued by approved bodies established in the UK. To provide both types of certificates would require the cooperation between an EU notified body and a approved body in the UK; a kind of mutual subcontracting agreement,

The Danish representative asked if the illustrations found in the position paper on rebranding (NB-CPR 19/813) could also be used to illustrate the cooperation between a UE notified body and a UKCA body. The President confirmed that the principles would be similar.

A representative of the Commission informed that construction products can have both a CE-mark and a UKCA mark affixed as long as the two are kept separate. CE-mark will be valid in UK until the end of 2021.

A French representative pointed to the unfortunate competitive situation of "old" notified bodies compared to former UK notified bodies which have established subsidiaries in the Union, as the latter can provide both CPR certificates as UKCA certificates.

A Commission representative recognised that the situation might be as described by the French representative. The reason seemed to be that the UK did not want to enter into any mutual recognition agreements with the EU.

For notified bodies wishing to serve manufacturers selling both in the EU and in the UK, the solution seemed to be either to establish a subsidiary in the UK and try to obtain UKCA approval there or to cooperate with a UKCA body in the UK.

The possibility to establish a notified body in Northern Ireland was also mentioned.

C Validity of assessments of performance in system 3 carried out by former notified laboratories of the UK

In the explanatory note, the following questions were listed:

1) What are the conditions for taking over evidence from a former UK notified laboratory?
2) What information should a notified body give a manufacturer asking if transfer is required?

On the first question, TechSec informed that reports of the assessment of performance from former UK Notified bodies will no longer be valid.

The communication from the Commission in March 2020 regarding the Brexit agreement stated that documents issued by UK organisation would lose their validity by the end of the transition. This also includes test reports. Hence, it is the position of the Commission that as of 1st of January 2021 manufacturers are no longer entitled to base their DoPs on test reports or other evidence of assessment of performance issued by former notified laboratories of the UK.

Notified may be requested by manufacturers to "take over", meaning carry out new assessments of performance of the basis of testing carried out by former UK laboratories.

In these circumstances, notified laboratories may consider evidence provided by UK laboratories as 'historical data' and may enter into agreements with the relevant UK laboratories.

However, it should be clear that notified laboratories are not required to accept such requests; they are free to decline.

Regarding the form of document to issue as proof of assessment of performance carried out on the basis of testing done by a UK laboratory, TechSec informed that for the time being, there's no guidance available. However, the draft position paper, NB-CPR 19/810, which was withdrawn because of insufficient support from the GNB Advisory Group, might serve as inspiration for notified laboratories.

On the second question, TechSec said that the responsibility for holding a valid assessment of performance lies solely with the manufacturer, who will be responsible to the competent market surveillance authority. The notified bodies have no authority in that regard.

However, on request notified bodies should inform manufacturers about the necessity of having a valid assessment of performance by a currently notified laboratory. It may also, if relevant, inform manufacturers about possibilities of avoiding repetition of testing.

The representative of the Commission explained that the cessation of validity of test reports issued by UK laboratories follows the same logic that applies to all systems of AVCP.
In all systems of AVCP, it may be possible to transfer some information, but the formal documents, i.e. test reports and certificates, cannot be transferred. Regarding transfer of information in systems 1+, 1, and 2+, the not approved position paper, NB-CPR 19/812 may serve as inspiration.

A member recalled that normally, a test report is considered a "snapshot", and that manufacturers would have the right to use the test report until either the product or the harmonised specification changes.
A Commission representative explained that at the *time of placing the product on the market*, the assessment of performance must be valid. It was recalled that products are placed on the market individually. This means that for all products being sold after the 1st of January 2021, a UK test report cannot serve as basis for the DoP.

A question was raised as to the difference between the situation where a laboratory ceases to be a notified laboratory because of the Brexit, and the situation where the notified laboratory status is ceased for other reasons. In the latter situation, the assessment of performance would not lose its validity.

On behalf of the Commission, it was explained that one difference is that the mechanism in CPR Article 50(2) is not functional in the Brexit situation, as the Member State is the subject of the obligations in CPR Article 50(2). In the Brexit situation, there is no longer any member state.

8. SG matters - General update including state of play of GNB documents.

No items on the agenda.

9 National Mirror Group matters - Opportunity for National Mirror Group Representatives to report on key issues.

No items on the agenda

10. Report on SCC, Commission, and other matters

The representatives of the Commission gave a short briefing on the current situation.

- On 15 March 2021, a virtual meeting was held with the CPR Advisory Group. Amongst the topics on the agenda were:
  - Draft delegated acts on resistance to fire, reaction to fire, AVCP for sandwich panels,
  - Information about the on-going work on the CPR technical acquis
  - Standardisation request regarding solid fuel appliances.
  - There have been no citations of harmonized standards since March 2019.

The Commission has reviewed the criteria for citation of harmonised standards and communicated this to CEN. It seems that interventions by the German and Portuguese presidencies have been beneficial for the cooperation between CEN and the Commission. It seems likely new citations will take place in a not so far future.

ANNEX 1: LIST OF AGREED ACTIONS

By whom	Agenda item	Status	Action and/or conclusion
TechSec	4		TechSec to incorporate the French proposal into a draft revised version of the position paper NB-CPR 19/793
Administrative Secretariat and President	5		Administrative Secretariat and President to arrange for the 49th meeting to be held on 19 October 2021 in Slovenia (or alternatively as a virtual meeting).
Commission	6A		The Commission to clarify the understanding of the message given by unit B1 of DG Growth in March 2020. (Found on CIRCABC in document NB-CPR/ALL 20/173.)
Members and TechSec	6C		Members to submit input to TechSec regarding improvement of the CPR with regard to the work of notified bodies. TechSec to formulate a common position based on input from Members.

- A package of 16 new EADs is expected to be cited before the summer break.

Regarding the review of the CPR, the Commission representatives provided the following information:

- To support the impact assessment of potential policy options regarding the revision of the CPR, both a company survey and an open public consultation have been conducted.
- The impact assessment is expected to be finalised in second quarter of 2021.
- The Commission is expected to present a proposal for revision fourth quarter of 2021.

A question was raised regarding when a revised CPR could be expected. The Commission representatives indicated that based on the experience from the transition from CPD to CPR, a revised CPR might be adopted before the parliamentary election in 2024; maybe even in 2023. After the adoption, a transition period may follow.

Finally, the Commission representatives informed that the construction unit was being reorganised. Up to now, construction products have been dealt with by Grow Unit C1. As of now, construction products will be dealt with by a separate unit, unit H1.

One of the Commission representatives who has been cooperating with the GNB Advisory Group since 2008 informed, that he will soon retire from the Commission Services soon and that the present meeting might be his last meeting in this forum.

Big (remote) applause was given by the members.

The President expressed his hope that members will have the opportunity to express their gratitude in a physical meeting later.

11. Any other business

In capacity of liaison between the GNB-CPR and the EA, a representative of the French notified bodies informed that she had been asked to assist the EA in its training of accreditation bodies for the new EA2/17, as it was recognised by EA that accreditation bodies had to be aware of the specificities of the CPR:

Moreover, she informed about a letter from the chair of the EA laboratory committee regarding reissuance of certificates. The laboratory committee recognised the viewpoints of the GNB-CPR and invites to a dialog.

A representative of the Italian notified bodies informed that Italy will begin to use accreditation as basis for the assessment of notified bodies.

12. Closing of the meeting

The meeting ended at 13:30.

The president thanked the participants and would be looking forward to the next meeting to take place in Slovenia.

GNB-CPR GNB-AG	Co-ordination of the Group of Notified Bodies for the Construction Products Regulation Regulation (EU) No. 305/2011	NB-CPR/21/875r1 Issued: 14 October 2021 Draft Agenda

Revised **Draft Agenda for the 50th Meeting of the Advisory Group of Notified Bodies for the CPR**

Tuesday 19 October 2021, Starting 09:00, ending 15:30

Hotel Ljubljana (Austria Trend Premium), Dunajska cesta 154, 1000 Ljubljana , Slovenia

Remote participation will be possible

CHAIR: Mr. Marjan Japelj

Please notice that documents for the meeting are found at: *GNB Advisory Group/AG Documents (See LINK)*
Monitoring reports are found at: *Library/GNB Monitoring Reports (See LINK)*
Explanatory notes on some of the agenda items are found in the document *NB-CPR 21/876r1*

1.	Welcome and introduction		*President*	
2.	Approval of the draft Agenda		*President*	***NB-CPR/21/875r1***
3.	Draft Operational conclusions/Minutes of 49th GNB Advisory Group meeting		*President*	**To agree** **NB-CPR 21/868**
4.	Matters arising from minutes not dealt with on the Agenda and actions still outstanding after 49th GNB Advisory Group meeting		*TechSec*	**NB-CPR 21/868**
5.	Dates of next meetings.			
	A	51st meeting, 22 March 2022 in Brussels	*President*	**To confirm**
	B	52nd meeting, 18 October 2022 in Slovenia	*President*	**To Agree**
6.	Work of GNB-CPR			
	A	Effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on the work of GNB-CPR	*President / TechSec*	**Oral**
	B	Competence of notified bodies – Status of initiative	*TechSec*	**Oral**
	C	Interaction between notification and accreditation	*TechSec*	**Oral**
7.	Development of AG guidance and agreed viewpoint			***NB-CPR 21/881***
	A	Initial inspections during the COVID-19 pandemic	*TechSec*	**NB-CPR 21/872r1** **NB-CPR 21/874**
	B	Minor revision of position paper on use of historical data	*TechSec*	**NB-CPR 19/792r3**
	C	Minor revision of position paper on the Use of facilities outside the testing laboratory of the notified body	*TechSec*	**NB-CPR 14/594r3**
	D	GNB-CPR Guidance Base – New items	*TechSec*	***NB-CPR 21/882*** **Guidance Base – PROPOSED ITEMS**

8.	SG matters		*TechSec*	
	General update including state of play of GNB documents.			**To note**
9.	National Mirror Group matters			
	Opportunity for National Mirror Group Representatives to report on key issues		*NMGs to report as relevant*	**To note**
10.	Report on SCC, Commission and other matters Reporting on SCC and CPR-AG, Progress on the implementation of the CPR, expected citations of standards and EADs in OJEU, Review of CPR		*Commission representative*	**To note**
11.	Reports from observers			
	A	AdCo-CPR Group on Market Surveillance	*AdCo representative*	**Oral report**
	B	CEN	*CEN representative*	**Oral report**
	C	Construction Products Europe (CPE)	*CPE representative*	**Oral report**
	D	EOTA	*EOTA representative*	**Oral report**
	E	European Accreditation (EA)	*EA representative*	**Oral report**
	F	Small Business Standards (SBS)	*SBS representative*	**Oral report**
12.	Any other business		*President*	
13.	Closing of the meeting		*President*	