



ABA Impartiality Policy

ABA personnel, at all levels, understand the importance of impartiality, managing conflicts of interest and ensuring the objectivity of its accreditation activities. ABA strives to avoid situations where a risk of impartiality arises, or a potential conflict of interest could exist.

For this reason, ABA is committed to the following principles:

ABA has a process to identify, analyze, evaluate, treat, monitor and document on an ongoing basis the risks to impartiality.

ABA makes the accreditation decisions such as granting, extending, suspending and withdrawing Accreditation, through an independent committee (Accreditation Committee) made up of members representing the relevant interested parties.

ABA's personnel involved in the accreditation process are required to declare that they are free from any undue commercial, financial or other pressures, which could affect their impartiality. Conflict of interest is addressed through binding agreements with personnel, to ensure that all activities are conducted in an independent and objective manner.

ABA is non-discriminatory and accepts applications from Conformity Assessment Bodies operating anywhere in the world that falls within the scope of ABA accreditation activities.

ABA does not provide consultancy or any other service that may affect its impartiality.

ABA guarantees its adherence to the principle of impartiality through internal audits, risk analysis, and the accreditation committee review.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Marieli Monsalve', is written over a horizontal line.

Marieli Monsalve
Executive Director



IMPARTIALITY POLICY

VERSION B
Issued date 05-23-2022

IMPARTIALITY PROCESS	
Process Suppliers	ABA personnel and Organization
Process Inputs	- Impartiality threats
Process Activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ABA Commitment to Impartiality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impartiality Policy Release - Conflict of Interest Analysis - Accreditation Committee Establishment 2. Determine the risks to impartiality 3. Assess the risks to impartiality 4. Implement Safeguards to impartiality 5. Risk Management review.
Process Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impartiality Risk Assessment - Managed impartiality threats
Process Customers	Customers
Who is Responsible for the Process?	Executive Director Accreditation Manager. Accreditation Committee
Process Resources	-Hardware and software -Trained staff.
Process Performance indicators	# threats reduced/ Total threats
Interaction with other processes	Accreditation Process
Risks/ Opportunities	



IMPARTIALITY POLICY

VERSION B
Issued date 05-23-2022

RISK ASSESSMENT MATRIX

Area	Impartiality threats	Description	Likelihood	Impact	Risk	Safeguarding measures	Likelihood	Impact	Residual Risk
Assessors	Self-interest threats	Relationships with clients create an emotional, financial, or other personal interests that may favour, consciously or subconsciously, those self-interests when performing an assessment	3	3	9	Conflict of Interest Agreement it is made mandatory for all auditors to reveal all situations of potential conflict of interests	2	1	2
	Self-review threats	Assessors review judgments and decisions they, or others in their organization, have made	2	2	4	Decision for accreditation, complaint, appeal etc. will be taken by The Accreditation Commite	1	1	1
	Familiarity threats	Assessor being influenced by a particularly close or long-standing personal or professional relationship with an Client	3	3	9	a) Long-standing personal relationship will be eliminated by not including that assessors(s) in assessment team. b) Decision for accreditation, complaint, appeal etc. will be taken by The Accreditation Commite c) No assessor will be assessing a customer more than 3 consecutive times	1	2	2
	Intimidation threats	Assessors are being, or believing that they are being, openly or secretly coerced by clients or by other interested parties.	3	4	12	a) Assessors fees are solely paid by ABA. The customer thus has no direct relation with the assessor and therefore the economic independence is not a threat as there is no economic bond between the assessor and the customer. b) There is no incentive for an assessor to have a customer accredited or not, as the assessor has no influence on the assessment assignments by ABA.	1	2	2
	Advocacy threats	Assessor is acting in support of, or in opposition to, a given auditee, which is at the same time its customer, in the resolution of a dispute or litigation	2	3	6	a) Decision for accreditation, complaint, appeal etc. will be taken by The Accreditation Commite b) Conflict of Interest Agreement it is made mandatory for all auditors to reveal all situations of potential conflict of interests	1	1	1
	Competition threats	Contracted assessor is employed by a direct competitor of the auditee organization	2	3	6	All assessor staff are prohibited from participating in the assessment of any organization to which they have given assistance in document preparation, consultancy, in-house training, internal auditing for a minimum period of 2 years.	1	1	1
Organization	Finantial Pressures by the client	It has a financial relationship with a client such as excessive dependence on fees paid by or fear of losing a client.	3	4	12	Decision for accreditation, complaint, appeal etc. will be taken by The Accreditation Commite	2	1	2
	Self-interest threats	It may offer others services such as consulting to customers	1	1	1	ABA and its staff personnel provide any consultancy services	1	1	1
	Internal Pressure	Pressure of the superiors influence the accreditation decision	3	4	12	Decision for accreditation, complaint, appeal etc. will be taken by The Accreditation Commite	1	2	2
	Internal Pressure	Pressures generated by other organisational units	2	2	4	Decision for accreditation, complaint, appeal etc. will be taken by The Accreditation Commite	1	2	2
Operation	Pressure for Payment	Personnel associated to accreditation process receive commissions for services sales	1	1	1	There is no incentive for personnel associated to accreditation process to have a customer accredited or not, as the personnel has no influence on the assessment assignments by ABA.	1	1	1
	Pressure for related companies	Relationships with companies that compromise the impartiality	1	1	1	ABADoes not have any direct relationship with its client other than third party conformity assessment	1	1	1
	External pressure threats	External assessors are shared with client or with the client's competence	3	4	12	ABA requires its personnel, internal and external, to reveal any potential conflict of interest known to them	2	2	4
	Self-interest threats	Offer tailor made training courses to customers or potential customers	3	4	12	ABA's personnel involved in training courses do not provide any advice, consultancy or recommendation to customers on how to address any deficiencies that may be identified during the assessment.	2	2	4

Risk = Likelihood X Impact

Potential Impact	5	5	10	15	20	25
4	4	8	12	16	20	25
3	3	6	9	12	15	20
2	2	4	6	8	10	15
1	1	2	3	4	5	10
	1	2	3	4	5	

Likelihood of occurrence

Likelihood	Impact
1. Improbable	1. None
2. Remote	2. Negligible
3. Possible	3. Minor
4. Probable	4. Major
5. Certainty	5. Fatal

Level of impartiality risk

No risk	Remote risk	Some risk	High risk	Maximum risk
Compromised objectivity is virtually impossible	Compromised objectivity is very unlikely	Compromised objectivity is possible	Compromised objectivity is probable	Compromised objectivity is virtually certain
Range: 1-2	Range: 3-5	Range: 6-10	Range: 11-19	Range: 20-25



IMPARTIALITY POLICY

VERSION B
Issued date 05-23-2022

DATE	CHANGE	MOST RECENT APPROVAL
01/28/2018	Initial Publication	Marieli Monsalve
05/23/2022	The Corporate Logo update	Gisela Sánchez