ACCRÉDITATION SANS FRONTIÈRES

ASF Management Review Procedure

How ASF's leadership steps back, at least once a year, to ask whether the whole system is actually working

Version 2 · 2026
Paris · Geneva · Tbilisi

ASF-MGMTREVIEW-001-v2 · Published Paris, 12 September 2026 · Next review 12 September 2029

Document Control

Document Title	ASF Management Review Procedure
Document Reference	ASF-MGMTREVIEW-001-v2
Version / Edition	Version 2
Status	Published
Date of Publication	12 September 2026
Place of Publication	Paris, France
Issuing Authority	ASF International Standards Council, Accréditation Sans Frontières
Language of Origin	English
Effective Date	12 September 2026
Next Scheduled Review	12 September 2029
Supersedes	Version 1

Table of Contents

Foreword

An internal audit, under the ASF Internal Audit Procedure, checks whether a specific process was followed correctly. It does not ask a bigger question: taken together, is the whole system actually working, improving, and adequately resourced? That is what management review is for — a distinct, mandatory function under both ISO 9001 Clause 9.3 and the management-system requirements of ISO/IEC 17011, and one ASF has not, until this document, formally committed to on a defined schedule [1–2].

1. Purpose and Frequency

The ASF International Standards Council conducts a formal management review at least once every calendar year, examining ASF's operations as a whole rather than any single process in isolation. This is deliberately more frequent than the three-year standards revision cycle and the internal audit program, because a leadership-level check on whether the system is working should not wait as long as a full technical revision does.

2. Why Genuine Review Matters: The Real Evidence

This procedure is not built on the assumption that holding a meeting called “management review” is itself valuable. Real research on governance effectiveness shows the gap between a genuine review and a procedural one is measurable. McKinsey research on board effectiveness found that fifty-nine percent of directors at top-quartile boards report their organization significantly outperformed its peers, compared with only forty-three percent at bottom-quartile boards — a real, substantial gap tied directly to the quality of governance oversight itself, not merely to the underlying business [3].

More specifically relevant to how this procedure is structured, a large annual survey of C-suite executives found that nine out of ten believe their organization's review and assessment process could be meaningfully improved — and the most commonly cited improvement was using reviews not merely to assess performance, but to drive genuine follow-through and action [4]. The same research found that a significant share of executives specifically wanted clearer follow-through on issues raised during a review, not merely a well-run discussion of them [4]. This is precisely why Section 4 of this procedure treats documented outputs and decisions as the actual point of a management review, not an optional closing formality.

> *A review that produces excellent discussion and no decisions looks identical, from the outside, to a review that never happened at all — the real research on this specific gap between assessment and action is exactly why this procedure was written the way it was.*

3. Review Inputs

Consistent with the real inputs ISO 9001 Clause 9.3 requires a management review to actually consider, not merely acknowledge in passing, each annual review examines [1]:

- The status of actions arising from the previous management review — were they actually completed, not merely recorded as planned
- Findings from every internal audit conducted since the last review, under the ASF Internal Audit Procedure, including any pattern across multiple audits' observations
- The outcome of the most recent external review under Section 7.5 of How ASF Develops and Revises Standards
- Aggregate sentinel event data and trends, under the ASF Sentinel Event Policy's own aggregate learning function
- Public complaint volume, substantiation rate, and response-time compliance, under the ASF Public Complaints & Feedback Policy
- Any nonconformity and corrective action opened under the ASF Internal Nonconformity & Corrective Action Procedure, and whether corrective actions were verified as effective
- Whether ASF's current resources — staff, surveyor capacity, financial position — remain adequate for the volume and complexity of ASF's actual current operations
- Genuine opportunities for improvement identified through any of the above, not limited to problems already formally raised

4. Review Outputs

A management review that produces no decisions has not actually reviewed anything. Consistent with ISO 9001's own requirement that management review produce genuine outputs, not just a record that a meeting occurred [1], each review produces documented decisions on:

- Any opportunity for improvement the Council has decided to act on, and by when
- Any need to change ASF's own management system — including this procedure, the Internal Audit Procedure, or any other governance document — identified through the review
- Any resource need identified as genuinely necessary, with a decision on how it will be addressed

> *Where a review input reveals a real problem and the review output contains no corresponding decision, that gap is itself worth asking about at the next review — a management review that only ever produces reassurance is not doing its job.*

5. Relationship to Other ASF Processes

- Internal audit (ASF Internal Audit Procedure) feeds findings into management review; management review does not replace or repeat the audit itself
- External review (Section 7.5 of How ASF Develops and Revises Standards) feeds its outcome into management review as one input among several, not as a substitute for ASF's own internal reflection
- A specific nonconformity is corrected through the ASF Internal Nonconformity & Corrective Action Procedure; management review examines the pattern those corrections form over time, not the individual correction itself

References

[1] International Organization for Standardization. ISO 9001:2015, Quality Management Systems — Requirements, Clause 9.3 (Management Review). Geneva: ISO; 2015.

[2] International Organization for Standardization. ISO/IEC 17011:2017, Conformity Assessment — Requirements for Accreditation Bodies Accrediting Conformity Assessment Bodies. Geneva: ISO; 2017.

[3] Board Intelligence, citing McKinsey research on board effectiveness and organizational outperformance. How to Effectively Manage a Board of Directors. 2026.

[4] PwC and The Conference Board. Board Effectiveness: A Survey of the C-Suite. Governance Insights Center. 2026.

Annex A — Management Review Record

Completed by the Council at the conclusion of each annual management review.

Review period covered: ______________________________

Date of review: ______________________________

Council members present: ____

Inputs Considered

☐ Status of prior review's actions

☐ Internal audit findings since last review

☐ External review outcome (if applicable this period)

☐ Sentinel event aggregate data

☐ Public complaint data

☐ Nonconformity and corrective action status

☐ Resource adequacy

Decisions and Actions

____

____

Next review scheduled for: ______________________________

Index

This procedure exists so that ASF's leadership examines the whole system at least as often as the system asks organizations it accredits to examine themselves — and produces real decisions when it does, not merely a well-documented conversation.