

BS10125:2014+A1:2016 Advice to Industry from



Clarification Note to Industry Re BS 10125 Update.

We have been contacted by a number of members, asking for clarification on certain elements of the BS10125:2014+A1:2016, particularly in relation to qualifications, parts, equipment and sub-contractors and we have endeavoured to provide some clarity and guidance on these subjects below. This clarification note is to be used in conjunction with the standard itself and in no way supersedes or amends the standard as published by BSI.

The Standard itself has undergone a small amendment in order to add clarity, particularly around what is recognised as current competence, this has resulted in an update of the Standard reference to BS 10125:2014+A1:2016.

After consulting with the current UKAS accredited organizations auditing to BS 10125 The National Association of bodyshops, jointly with the VBRA and in association with ABP have together compiled the following information, in order to assist their respective members, and the industry at large, obtain clarity on some of the points causing concerns for bodyshops looking to be certified to BS 10125.

The specific sections that are generating the most questions relating to BS 10125 are:

3.5 Replacement parts and controlled Consumables

3.5.1 Replacement parts

BS 10125 has a requirement for the bodyshop to confirm that any non-OE parts used on certified repairs can be verified as being of matching quality and performance to an equivalent OE part.

The supplier of those parts should not only provide a certificate to the bodyshop to verify this, but the supplier must, (in order for the parts supplied to comply with the requirements of BS 10125), upon request, be able to provide the bodyshop with the supporting 'Technical File' that provides evidence of the full test report including test processes and test results used to confirm the part in question is of quality and performance equivalent to the original part.

We are advised that BS 10125 auditors will **not** be expecting to see the Technical File for every single part used, but will request a Technical File on a random basis as part of their audit routine.

We recommend that bodyshops contact their suppliers and notify them of this need and put in place a service level agreement whereby the supplier guarantees to provide the Technical File within a given time scale. The auditor will allow a set period of time, (as agreed with the certification body), within which they will expect the bodyshop to provide proof that any non OE part used in a repair is supported by an appropriate Technical File, thus verifying that the parts have been properly examined and meet the requirements of BS 10125 .

At the time of audit, the absence of a Technical File will result in an issue of non-conformity, and if this is the only non-conformity found during the audit, will only require remote verification via email.

BS10125:2014+A1:2016 Advice to Industry from



3.4 Equipment and Tools

Bodyshops working to the BS 10125 standard will also need to verify that equipment used in certified repairs meets or exceeds the technical specification required, as set out in the repair method or by the vehicle manufacturer, for the task in hand. The auditor will allow a set period of time, (as agreed with the certification body), within which they will expect the bodyshop to provide proof from the manufacturer or supplier of any such technical specification.

3.4.3 Calibration

With regards to calibration, any equipment that requires calibration should be calibrated at a frequency not less than that recommended by the manufacturer, but may need to be more frequent where either high usage takes place or there are risks associated with a particular piece of equipment being out of calibration. The frequency of any calibration above and beyond that set by the equipment manufacturer shall be at the discretion of the bodyshop.

3.7 Use of Sub-Contractors

Under BS 10125 bodyshops are responsible for ensuring that any sub-contractors utilised in BS 10125 certified repairs are able to prove their current competence and that the sub-contractor is working to researched, published repair methods. We advise that a documented process is established between the bodyshop and their chosen sub-contractors to enable the bodyshop to avoid any non-conformity related to sub-contracted operations, when audited to BS 10125.

3.2 People – Recruitment, competence and responsibilities

Having had communications with the organisations currently UKAS Accredited to certify to BS 10125, we have collectively sought clarification around qualifications and what is considered as current competence.

In response to our requests the general summary with regards to proof of current competence is that a competency qualification is one that is auditable and verifiable, founded on relevant National Occupational Standards (NOS), or their equivalent, accessible to interested parties and capable of supporting individual recognition by means of assessed outcome against industry set current competences and quality assured by an awarding organization or a manufacturer.

We also sought clarification as to the type of organization that would be deemed to be considered suitable for the purpose of awarding proof of current competence for technicians, and we were advised that, organizations that award qualifications by way of an assessed outcome, set by either vehicle, component, materials or equipment manufacturers or recognized by the relevant regulatory authorities, would be considered suitable.

BS10125:2014+A1:2016 Advice to Industry from



This therefore clarifies that training courses developed and delivered by vehicle manufacturers, component manufacturers and equipment and materials manufacturers, which include an assessed outcome (measuring either knowledge and/or skills in accordance with the relevant NOS), should be deemed proof of current competence in the specific task, process or operation.

However, it is important to note that not all manufacturer training programmes have an assessed outcome, for those programmes that do, the repairer should seek written verification of each specific training course that their technicians attend to ensure it meets the requirements of the standard in terms of assessed outcome and reference to the relevant NOS.

Independent training providers can also develop and deliver training programmes that meet the needs of the industry; however, the assessed outcome for such courses must be independently verified.

As more and more hybrid and electric vehicles appear on our roads, it is vital that bodyshops have the knowledge within their business to ensure that their technicians can safely deal with these types of vehicle.

There are currently several options available to bodyshops for ensuring this knowledge is on hand when a hybrid or electric vehicle requires repair. The IMI, through its many approved centres, offer two level two qualifications, a level three qualification and an IMI Accreditation. All of which offer generic information and knowledge in relation to these vehicles, other centre devised training and assessment programmes are also available to the sector via IMI approved centres.

As mentioned above, if the training courses carry a retained knowledge assessed outcome at the end of the programme, these will be accepted as proof of current competence, when applied in line with the published repair methods, for the task being undertaken and aligned to the relevant national occupation standard or their equivalent.