Assessor evaluation - Case Study 04

Name: - *Improvement*

Category: - *Lead Assessor – Testing etc.*

A laboratory was found to have developed a process and associated procedures for tracking non-conformances, potential non-conformances, and opportunities for improvement in the same tracking log.

The laboratory procedures included addressing these circumstances depending on three questions:

- Does the condition affect the technical validity of our results?
- Does the condition create unacceptable risk to the company?
- Is it less effort to permanently address the condition than to repeatedly correct it?

Any positive response to these three questions required full corrective or preventive action by the laboratory. If all were negative – only correction or prevention was deemed acceptable.

The current procedure stipulated that non-conformances requiring permanent resolution were to be handled through corrective action. Any potential non-conformances and opportunities for improvement were to be handled through preventive action.

The procedure further stipulated that corrective and preventive actions were to follow the same six steps:

- Root cause analysis
- Determine a range of potential solutions
- Select one
- Implement the selected solution
- Document the implementation
- Monitor the implemented solution for effectiveness

The laboratory procedure required that this approach be used for all non-conformances, potential non-conformances, and opportunities for improvement identified within any aspect of the operation of the laboratory. The laboratory named this approach: “Continual Improvement Program.”

Would you have rated this discovery a non-conformance? Yes? No?
If No – Why?

_____
_____
_____

If yes - What ISO/IEC 17025 clause/s is/are applicable and why?

_____
_____
_____
_____

If yes – What AB Policy/ies is/are applicable and why?

_____
_____
_____
_____

If yes - What corrective action would you expect?

_____
_____
_____
_____