

**Field Activities Committee (FAC)
Meeting Summary**

January 15, 2013

1. Roll call:

Chair Justin Brown called the FAC meeting to order on January 15, 2013 at 8 am MT in Denver, CO. Attendance is recorded in Attachment A – there were 9 members present.

No comments were received on the December 17th minutes and they were forwarded for posting on the website.

2. General

See Attachment B for meeting slides.

Justin introduced committee members, reviewed the process for developing a standard, summarized the voting results and described the procedure that would be used to review comments on the standard.

3. Volume 1

See Attachment C for a summary of the comments received and the committees' recommendations and comments in response.

General – ISO Comment – No change.

3.9 – Changes in definition: Replace “thing” with “measurand”. Scott Evans recommended using the ISO language.

3.11 – Move PT definition in Volume II to Volume I. Need to consider the definition of PTPA – “doesn’t have to be accredited.

3.12 – Change to be made.

4.2.8 – No change needed. Inclusion of ISO language makes numbering correct.

4.2.8(g) – Change to “review annually” and “updated as needed.”

4.3.2.1 and 4.5 – Will be tabled and considered with Volume II comments.

4.5 – Mike wanted to be sure “this standard” refers to entire standard – not just ISO. Comments apply to front of document, not just this section. Section 1 covers this. Scott Evans noted that a change does not appear to be needed. No change will be made.

4.14.1.1 – Non-persuasive. ABs will define scope.

5.1.3 – Comments persuasive. Changed.

5.4.3 – ISO language – No change.

5.4.3.1 – Non-persuasive. ISO language is sufficient.

5.4.4 - Non-persuasive. It is already covered in another part of the standard.

5.5.3 – Non-persuasive. Felt it was better left as a note.

5.9 – Persuasive. Grammar changes.

5. 9. 1 – Non-persuasive, but be sure to check numbering before finalizing.

5.9.2 – Non-persuasive. ISO language needs to be reformatted and referenced.

5.9.1 (g) – Persuasive. Grammar changes.

5.10.2 – Non-persuasive – ISO issue. (Entry 45)

5.10.2 – Non-persuasive . (Entry 29)

5.10.2(j) – Persuasive. Make change.

5.10.10 – Persuasive. Add “container to language.”

Callers had to leave meeting.

4. Volume 2

See Attachment D for a summary of the comments received and the committees’ recommendations and comments in response.

General – Non-persuasive. ISO language is available in purchased standard.

3.2.9 – Non-persuasive. Definitions left to match definitions of PT within TNI.

3.30 – FOPT added. There was a discussion on whether the PT Provider needs to be accredited. Justin – do they mean PT Provider instead of PTPA? Topic will be tabled for further discussion later. (See Section 5 below).

3.3.3 – Persuasive. Harmonize with Volume 1.

4.1.1 – Persuasive. Editorial.

4.3.2.1 – Persuasive – Accept rewording. No issue on conflict with section 4.5.

4.5.1 – Persuasive. Remove both notes.

5.2 Note – Persuasive. Editorial.

5.3.2 (b) – Persuasive. Substitute NEFAP for accreditation in language.

6.2.6.1- Persuasive. Editorial. Change has already been made in Standard with ISO language.

6.2.6.2 (b) – Issue of TNI training. Needs to be consistent across ABs. Persuasive. After discussion it was decided to make the change. This issue need to be reviewed during the next standard rewrite.

BREAK

7.1.3.2.1 NOTE – Persuasive. Change has already been made to Standard with ISO language. (Entry 30)

7.1.3.2.1 NOTE - Persuasive. Change has already been made to Standard with ISO language. (Entry 29)

7.1.3.2.1 NOTE – Persuasive. Removed reference to specific programs.

7.2.1.1.1(i) – Persuasive.

7.7.3.1 (a) - Non-Persuasive.

7.7.6.2 (c) – Non-Persuasive. Mike noted that NEFAP is not referenced in the standard. Scott felt it could be removed (1st sentence of second paragraph.).

7.9.2.1.2 – Misspelling will be corrected. Agree with including additional letters. Change letter “b” to A-F. Mike noted that F is not actually ISO language, so it would be ISO A-E and F. Remove references to ISO notes and refer to A-F instead.

7.9.2.1.2 (b) – Question about whether note should be part of standard. The word “must is being used in a note. Maggie asked if it is needed at all.

Mike S. noted there is no need for preliminary accreditation. This is only appropriate for ABs that are waiting for an FSMO application so the observation can be scheduled. Mike S. has issues with the whole section. If this is left in, Mike S. agrees it should not be a note. It should be part of the standard. The committee agreed it should not be a note.

7.9.2.1.2 NOTE 2, 7.9.2.1.3 (f), 7.9.2.1.4(a), 7.9.2.1.4(b)(iii), 7.9.2.1.4 NOTE 1, 7.9.2.1.5(a) – Non-persuasive. Address individually, but with consistent approach. Similar comment.

7.9.2.1.2(b) – Spelling errors will be corrected.

7.15.2 – Persuasive. Editorial change. Hyphen.

7.15.2 – Both copies of the standard need to be reviewed carefully. There are changes that were appropriately made to the ISO version of the standard, but the standard without the ISO language is missing some of the changes.

7.15.2 – Non-persuasive. Committee believes that the "this Standard" is comprised of both Volumes I and II. Committee felt language is appropriate however we will look at adding statement in to Section 1 or preface to clarify use of "this Standard".

Section 8 – Clear in Section 3.10. Non-persuasive.

5. Review of Tabled Items

- PT Provider Issue: The issue is the term “TNI recognized”. Will it limit availability of PTs?
 - o Mike M. commented that any PT Provider should be accredited and they can easily apply to become accredited.
 - o Doug Leonard raised the concern that there are times when there are not enough clients to make a PT. This is something that was different on the lab side of TNI.
 - o The NEFAP ABs each have their list of PT Providers they are OK with using and then it can be made a requirement with the market grows.
 - o John was not comfortable with the phase in idea. There are some PTs that have high enough market and the PT Providers that jump in will receive the market there is while it builds.
 - o Mike S. felt the language is limiting, but can work.
 - o 3.3.1 needs to be fixed. It is not in the NELAP standard.
 - o Doug Leonard commented to carefully look at 17011 and 17025 when looking at this issue down the road. Decide what needs to be in the standard.
 - o Original comment will be considered Persuasive. Whatever language is used in Volume 1, needs to be put in Volume 2 also.

- Discussion will continue on the next conference call in February.

5. Action Items

Action items will be reviewed on the next conference call. The table in Attachment B summarizes all action items.

6. New Business

- None.

7. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be planned by e-mail.

Action Items are included in Attachment E and Attachment F includes a listing of reminders.

The meeting was adjourned at 12pm MT.

Attachment A
Participants
TNI Field Activities Committee


Members	Affiliation	Balance	Contact Information	
Justin B. Brown (Chair) Present	EMT	FSMO	(847)324 3350	jbrown@emt.com
Dane Wren Absent	Wren Engineering, P.A.	Other	(407)833-0061	dwren47@aol.com
John Moorman Present - Phone	Water Quality Monitoring Division, South Florida Water Management District	FSMO	(561)753-2400 x4654	jmoorma@sfwmd.gov
Troy Burrows Absent	Entec Services, Inc.	FSMO	(800)429-8445	TBurrows@entecservices.com
Jan Wilson Absent	CAMMIA Environmental	Other	(360)904-8416	WQL@aol.com
Jo Ann Boyd Present - Phone	Southwest Research Institute	Accred. Lab.	(210)522-2169	joann.boyd@swri.org
Michael Miller Present	Consultant	Other	(908)233-9624	mwmillerenviron@yahoo.com
Lauren Smith Present	A2LA	AB	(301)644 3216	lsmith@a2la.org
Robert P. DiRienzo Absent	AIHA (ALS)	AB	(801)266-7700	Bob.DiRienzo@ALSGlobal.com
Mike Shepherd Present	Laboratory Accreditation Bureau (Shepherd Technical Services)	AB	512-970-6789	mike@sheptechserv.com
Virginia Murray Absent	NYCDEP- Distribution Water Quality Field Operations	FSMO	718-595-6315	Vmurray@dep.nyc.gov
Craig Forbes Present	HRSD-Pretreatment & Pollution Prevention Division	FSMO	(757)460-7043	CFORBES@HRSD.COM
Maggie Cangro Present	Catalyst Air Management, Inc.	FSMO	(813)994-5880	maggie.cangro@catalystair.com
Yoon Cha Present				YoonCha@eurofinsUS.com
Ilona Taunton (Program Administrator)	The NELAC Institute		(828)712-9242	Ilona.taunton@nelac-

Present – Second Half Sharon Mertens – First Half				<u>institute.org</u>
--	--	--	--	---




Field Activities Committee Meeting

The Forum on Laboratory Accreditation
Denver, CO
January 2013


Meeting Agenda

- Introductions
- Voting Draft Standard – Process Overview
- Procedures for Discussion
- Volume I
- Volume II





Committee Members

- Dane Wren
- Mike Shepard
- Maggie Cangro
- Troy Burrows
- Jo Ann Boyd
- Justin Brown
- Jan Wilson
- Yoon Cha
- Bob DiRenzo
- John Moorman
- Lauren Smith
- Virginia Murray
- Justin Brown



Standard Process

- Put a draft Standard out for informal suggestions late 2011
- Received over 90 suggestions to aide committee review of Standard
- Published Working Draft Standard – August 2012
- Received approximately 65 comments





Voting Draft Standard


- Published on November 28, 2012
- Voting Commenced December 14, 2012
- Voting Close January 12th, 2012
- Received total of 43 votes

Voting Draft Standard



<u>Volume I</u>	<u>Volume II</u>
□ Abstain – 5	□ Abstain – 4
□ Affirmative - 30	□ Affirmative - 31
□ Affirmative w/comment - 7	□ Affirmative w/comment - 6
□ Negative - 0	□ Negative - 0
□ Negative with comment - 1	□ Negative with comment - 2







Meeting Procedures

- All comments will be discussed
- Maximum initial time limit of 10 minutes per comment
- Ruled Persuasive or Non-persuasive by 2/3 members present



Meeting Procedures

- Persuasive changes may be made to Standard
- Published along with responses
- Members have 15 days to change vote



Volume I Comments



Volume II Comments



Volume I -Comments and Recommendations - 1-15-2013

<u>Entry #</u>	<u>Standard Section</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Resolution</u>	<u>Comments</u>
5	General	As an assessor, the fact that ISO 17025 clauses are only referenced but not in the Standard makes my job almost impossible to perform since I now must have two sets of documents before me and be able to correlate the two sets of documents to properly evaluate the laboratory. Each ISO 17025 reference must be spelled out.	Non-persuasive	The Standard is available with ISO language on the TNI website for purchase. We cannot post Standard with ISO language for review on website.
Recommended Language: N/A				
29	3.9*	In the definition of Measurement, suggest changing "by comparison to a standard unit" to "by comparison to a standard, where available a National Standard". Consider adding a note similar to that in 8.2.2 of volume 2. NOTE: Traceability of measurement results should be referenced to National or International Standards where applicable. Further, this definition seems to be imprecise. The definition reads: "... the dimensions, quantity, capacity, or other characteristic of a thing or event." Suggest replacing "thing or event" with the term "measurand".	Persuasive	Committee agreed to look at the definition and revise. Preference would be to use ISO/IEC definition if available.
Recommended Language: See above				
40	3.9*	Reason: Thing is a very non scientific term. Thing = inanimate object. Air, water, soil, microbes, molecules, atoms are not usually considered things.	Persuasive	Committee agreed to look at the definition and revise. Preference would be to use ISO/IEC definition if available.
Recommended Language: Replace "Thing" "Substance" Substance= a species of matter				

the definition of proficiency testing is too limiting (refers only to laboratory tests and under controlled conditions) and is not the same as the definition provided in proposed Vol II.

Non-Persuasive (1st part) / Persuasive II
Definition changed to match current definition in Volume II

Proficiency Testing: A means to evaluate an organization's performance relative to a given set of criteria, through testing and/or measurement of unknown samples provided by a Proficiency Testing Provider.

Recommended Language:

The definition of PTs is very sparse. The definition references "analysis of unknown samples". This is not really correct. The sample is unknown to the laboratory only but the actual values are well documented by the PT provider (as required by TNI Standards). The definition of PTs should incorporate this. Additionally, the definition only mentions a third party as the source of the "unknown samples" when it should reference the PT provider and provide further definition of the PT provider.

5 3.11*

Persuasive
Changed definition to match VII

Recommended Language: N/A

Section 3.11 includes a definition of Proficiency Test. The definition is not consistent with Volume 2 General Requirements for Accreditation Bodies Accrediting Field Sampling and Measurement Organizations. Recommend the definitions used in 3.29, 3.30, and 3.31 from Volume 2 be used in Volume 1.

22 3.11*

Persuasive
Changed definition to match VII

Recommended Language:

40 3.11* Match definition in Vol. 2

Recommend the definitions used in 3.29, 3.30, and 3.31 from Volume 2 be used in Volume 1.

Persuasive
Changed definition to match VII

Recommended Language:

The proposed definition for "Chain of Custody" includes sample receipt at the laboratory, but the box in Clause 1 says that the Standard user should substitute FSMO for the term "laboratory."

24 3.12

Persuasive
Changed as suggested

Chain of Custody Form: Record that documents the possession of the samples from the time of collection by a FSMO to receipt in a testing laboratory. The record generally includes ...

Recommended Language:

45	4.2.8	Change to be 4.2.1	Non-ISO version published does not list reference to ISO clauses 4.2.1-4.2.7, however they do exist. Updated Non-ISO version to reflect this	Non-persuasive
Recommended Language: See above				
45	4.2.8 (g)	Add to sentence: '... the data integrity procedures shall be annually reviewed and updated by management, as needed.'	Changed with slight modification to punctuation as suggested	Persuasive
Recommended Language: as needed.'				
33	4.3.2.1 and 4.5 (of Volume 2)	Section 4.3.2.1 and 4.5 talk about governmental bodies and non governmental bodies. However 4.3.2.1 might be in conflict with 4.5 on non-governmental bodies.	Committee could not find where the two sections conflict with each other, agreed to leave as written	Non-persuasive
Recommended Language: N/A				
40	4.5	The ISO Language only requires the sub contractor to follow ISO STD		
Recommended Language: A competent subcontractor is one that, for example, complies with this TNI Standard for the work in question				
45	4.14.1.1	Needs a reference to types of 'scope of accreditations' available.	Committee felt that it will ultimately be the ABs who will define "scope" and should not be listed here in Standard. Section 7.1.3.2.2 of V2 addresses this as well.	Non-persuasive
Recommended Language: N/A				

“Field samples and measurements shall be representative of the environment, setting or process sampled or measured. The FSMO shall select and document each sampling or measurement location and time that represents the identified subject.” (‘Identified subject’ is not clear in this context. Needs a definition or different phrase.)

45 5.1.3

Persuasive
Changed - See comment below**Recommended Language: N/A**

This requirement is imprecisely worded. In the worst case, it could be taken as a blessing of problematic sampling or field measurements. Specifically, location, time, and other environmental conditions all affect measurements and sampling activities. They need to be monitored and documented to ensure that conditions are consistent with known, documented limitations of the sampling or measurement process in question (as defined in the governing SOP). Perhaps it would be more accurately expressed as:

29 5.1.3

Persuasive
Changed similar to recommended (but removed word "guarantee"

"The FSMO shall select and document sampling or measurement location, time and conditions that will guarantee that measurements or samples obtained are representative of the identified subject."

Recommended Language:

29 5.1.3 Grammar Issue

Persuasive
Changed as suggested**Recommended Language: Change "represents" to "represent"**

5.3.1 includes a note which states "field personnel should document sampling and measurement conditions that may affect the quality of results..." This appears to be in conflict with 5.10.10 which states "all relevant information, including special conditions...must be retained in the sampling records." If the "special conditions" documented in 5.10.10 are the same as "sampling and measurement conditions" in 5.3.1, I recommend that "Note" be removed and to make this part of the standard to be consistent with 5.10.10.

22 5.3.1

Persuasive
Non-persuasive
Committee felt that these two sections address separate items. 5.3.1 is documentation in the field of special conditions, etc... 5.10 is reporting of info, they may overlap but are not the same. ISO language also**Recommended Language: See above**

covers requirement of what should be documented that note supports, agreed to leave as written

45	5.4.3	Laboratory-Developed Methods (Should it be 'FMSO-Developed Methods'?)	Section header is from ISO, we do not want to change the terminology here. Refer to table at beginning regarding substituting "FSMO"
		Recommended Language: 'FMSO-Developed Methods'	Non-persuasive
40	5.4.3.1	There is no language that focuses on environmental field sampling and measurement needs. The FMSO developed methods shall contain procedures for the following activities: selection and documentation of field sampling and measurement points, collection, preservation, and transportation of samples; and operation of measurement instruments under variable conditions in the field environment. Records shall be maintained for these activities. Field measurement method calibration, calibration verification and quality control steps shall be performed and recorded. Program specific regulations, project specific procedures and client-specified data quality objectives shall be respected.	Committee felt ISO language is sufficient and several of the suggested wording is already covered in other sections of the Standard.
		Recommended Language:	Non-persuasive

40	5.4.4 NOTE	There is no language that focuses on environmental field sampling and measurement needs.	Committee felt that recommended letter (l) is already covered in another section of Standard and recommended (m) is implied already in Standard and does not need to be specified here
Recommended Language:	l) the field measurement instrument calibration, calibration verification, and quality control procedures acceptance limits, m) the sample result shall meet the customers data quality objectives.	Non-persuasive	
22	5.5.3	5.5.3 includes a note. The language in the note sounds like language that should be part of the scope.	Note refers to applicability of Standard and not a requirement. Committee felt better left as a note.
Recommended Language:	See above	Non-persuasive	
24	5.9	The proposed language for clause 5.9.1(f) is a phrase, which matches the listings for 5.9.1(a) through (e) in the ISO Standard. Clauses 5.9.1(a) through (e) are a list of items that the required monitoring of validity of tests and calibrations MAY include but not be limited to. However, clause 5.9.1(g) is a complete sentence that appears to specify a requirement (rather than a list of possible monitoring method inclusions). Also, please make the editorial change to remove the apostrophe in the second-to-last word. Recommended wording: Re-number the proposed Section 5.9.1(g) to be a separate clause 5.9.2, as follows: 5.9.2 The FSMO shall establish a proficiency testing program that is applicable to its scope.	Added as 5.9.2 and moved existing 5.9.2 to new 5.9.3
Recommended Language:	FSMO shall establish a proficiency testing program that is applicable to its scope.	Persuasive	

45	5.9.1	Numbering system should be corrected. Add to sentence: 'Verification of a measurement calibration using a second source, where applicable.' Indicate the minimum frequency for the verifications and PT testing. The various scopes of testing programs should be defined.	Non-persuasive	Numbering is correct, the non-ISO version does not have the first few ISO letters. The ISO language states this list "includes, but is not limited to" so therefore the committee felt the language did not need to be changed. The committee, as in other sections, did not feel scope should be further specified in this section.
----	-------	--	----------------	--

Recommended Language: See above

40	5.9.2	ISO section is missing from Standard		Section is in VII as written in ISO, reference to section not contained in Non-ISO version. I added reference to ISO/IEC 5.9.2 in version
		5.9.2 Quality control data shall be analysed and, where they are found to be outside pre-defined criteria, planned action shall be taken to correct the problem and to prevent incorrect results from being reported.	Persuasive	Changed as suggested
29	5.9.1(g)	Grammar Issue	Persuasive	

Recommended Language: change "it's" to "its"

45	5.10.2	Correct numbering system. It appears that words are missing at the beginning of each of the three subsections of 5.10.2.	Numbering is correct, the non-ISO version is missing several letters that are ISO language. The words missing at beginning are also ISO language
		Recommended Language: See above	Non-persuasive
29	5.10.2	This requirement seems to assume that the test will use blanks, spikes and duplicate samples. While this covers many tests, it does not apply to all. ...results for any quality controls, such as field blanks,....	Reworded section slightly
		Recommended Language:	Persuasive
24	5.10.2(j)	The additional phrase is confusing. including phone number of the person authorizing the report.	Changed as suggested
		Recommended Language:	Persuasive
29	5.10.10	In the QS committee, we talked about the need to identify each container separately since a sample may be split between containers, preserved differently for different tests. Does this need address here? N/A	Change made to refer identifier to each sample container
		Recommended Language:	Persuasive

Volume II -Comments and Recommendations - 1-15-2013

<u>Entry #</u>	<u>Standard Section</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Resolution</u>	<u>Comments</u>
5	General	As an assessor, the fact that ISO 17025 clauses are only referenced but not in the Standard makes my job almost impossible to perform since I now must have two sets of documents before me and be able to correlate the two sets of documents to properly evaluate the laboratory. Each ISO 17025 reference must be spelled out.	Non-persuasive	The Standard is available with ISO language on the TNI website for purchase. We cannot post Standard with ISO language for review on website.
Recommended Language: N/A				
30	3.29	This definition is too restricting for FSMO in that it refers to "performance under controlled conditions". I suggest the following revised definition (similar to definition in Section 3.11 of Vol I: Proficiency Testing: A means to evaluate an organization's performance relative to a set of criteria, through testing or measurement of unknown samples provided by a Proficiency Testing Provider.	Non-persuasive	Definition left to match other definitions of PT within TNI
Recommended Language:				
24	3.30	The definition for "Proficiency Testing Provider" contains poor English language wording, and it introduces a new acronym (FOPT) that has not been defined within the FSMO or NEFAP program. Also, since the acronym PTP appears later in Clause 7.15.2, PTP should be added to the definition here. 3.31: Proficiency Testing Provider (PTP): Any private party or government entity accredited by a TNI recognized PTPA that meets the stringent criteria to produce and distribute PT samples,	Persuasive	Changes made as recommended
Recommended Language:				

evaluate study results against published performance criteria, and report the results to FSMOs, ABs, and its PTPA.

29	3.33*	<p>In the definition of Measurement, suggest changing "by comparison to a standard unit" to "by comparison to a standard, where available a National Standard", Consider adding a note similar to that in 8.2.2 of volume 2. NOTE: Traceability of measurement results should be referenced to National or International Standards where applicable.</p> <p>Further, this definition seems to be imprecise. The definition reads: "... the dimensions, quantity, capacity, or other characteristic of a thing or event." Suggest replacing "thing or event" with the term "measurand".</p>	Persuasive	Committee agreed to look at the definition and revise. Preference would be to use ISO/IEC definition if available.
40	3.33*	<p>Air, water, soil, microbes, molecules, atoms are not usually considered things.</p> <p>Thing = inanimate object Substance= a species of matter</p>	Persuasive	
40	4.1.1	<p>period in middle of sentence, Seek misspelled</p> <p>The accreditation body shall seek.....The NELAC Institute, who</p>	Non-persuasive	Seek is spelled correctly and period is actually a comma which is appropriate
24	4.3.2.1	<p>The proposed changes to this clause are confusing.</p> <p>The accreditation body, within the scope and applicability of its policies and procedures and, for government ABs, its applicable rules and regulations, shall also establish one or more committees for assistance ...</p>	Persuasive	Agreed and change made

22	4.5.1	includes two notes. These notes use the word "shall". If these are to be enforceable requirements, they should not be notes, but be written as part of the standard.	Persuasive	Committee felt that neither note belonged in Standard. Change made to remove both Note 1 and Note 2 from Standard
		Recommended Language: N/A		
47	5.2 NOTE	Language in the note: Reference to ISO/IEC 9001 needs to be amended to just ISO 9001.	Persuasive	Agreed and change made
		Recommended Language: ISO 9001		
40	5.3.2(b)	Add following language: of completion of the review and send documentation to the AB accreditor.	Non-persuasive	Committee believes addition would be redundant as sending to accreditor is implied already
30	6.2.6.1(iv)	There is a missing verb in the qualifying sentence?	Persuasive	Change had already been made to Standard with ISO language. Change did not get copied to non-ISO document posted
		Recommended Language: Be judged proficient by the accreditation body.		
24	6.2.6.2 (b)	The proposed new language refers to a "TNI approved Basic Assessor Training Course." To me knowledge, there are currently no such TNI approved courses. Have the standards for TNI approval of training courses been formulated? Do these standards need to go through the Consensus Standard Development process? " ... This training program requires assessors to participate in an Assessor Basic Training Course, including attainment of a passing score on the written examination for the course."	Persuasive	Change made as recommended
		Recommended Language: Basic Training Course, including attainment of a passing score on the written examination for the course."		
30	7.1.3.2.1 NOTE*	Spelling errors	Persuasive	Change had already been made to Standard with ISO language. Change did not get copied to non-ISO document posted
		Recommended Language: N/A		

29	7.1.3.2.1 NOTE*	Spelling errors	Persuasive	Change had already been made to Standard with ISO language. Change did not get copied to non-ISO document posted
Recommended Language:	"anlayte"			
40	7.1.3.2.1 NOTE	Program list was deleted from 7.1.3.1.	Persuasive	Removed reference to specific programs and insterted term "regulatory" before programs
Recommended Language:	as required by regulatory programs.			
24	7.2.1.1.1(i)	An editorial change is needed to add an apostrophe, since FSMO is used in the possessive case in the proposed new language.	Persuasive	Agreed and change made
Recommended Language:	a description of the FSMO's proficiency testing program, and copies of the results of the proficiency testing performed, if applicable;			
24	7.7.2.1(b)(v)	The proposed change refers to "this Standard." I interpret this Standard to be the Volume 2 document that is being reviewed. However, the FSMO is being assessed against the Volume 1 standard rather than this volume that pertains to the AB.	Non-persuasive	Committee believes that the "this Standard" is comprised of both Volumes I and II. Committee felt language is appropriate however we will look at adding statement in to Section 1 or preface to clarify use of "this Standard"
Recommended Language:	"... concerning the FSMO's accreditation status and conformance to the FSMO Volume 1 Standard."			
24	7.7.3.1(a)	The proposed change refers to "this Standard." I interpret this Standard to be the Volume 2 document that is being reviewed. However, the FSMO is being assessed against the Volume 1 standard rather than this volume that pertains to the AB.	Non-persuasive	Committee believes that the "this Standard" is comprised of both Volumes I and II. Committee felt language is appropriate however we will look at adding statement in to Section 1 or preface to clarify use of "this Standard"
Recommended Language:	"... for determining compliance with the FSMO Volume 1 Standard, either at ..."			

24	7.7.6.1(g)	<p>The proposed change refers to “this Standard.” I interpret this Standard to be the Volume 2 document that is being reviewed. However, the FSMO is being assessed against the Volume 1 standard rather than this volume that pertains to the AB.</p> <p>(g) “of reasonable duration sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the FSMO Volume 1 Standard, dependent upon a balance of ...”</p>	Non-persuasive	Committee believes that the “this Standard” is comprised of both Volumes I and II. Committee felt language is appropriate however we will look at adding statement in Section 1 or preface to clarify use of “this Standard”
24	7.7.6.2 c)	<p>The proposed change refers to “this Standard.” I interpret this Standard to be the Volume 2 document that is being reviewed. However, the FSMO is being assessed against the Volume 1 standard rather than this volume that pertains to the AB.</p> <p>“responding to knowledge that the FSMO is no longer in compliance with the FSMO Volume 1 Standard.”</p>	Non-persuasive	Committee believes that the “this Standard” is comprised of both Volumes I and II. Committee felt language is appropriate however we will look at adding statement in Section 1 or preface to clarify use of “this Standard”
22	7.8.1.1(a)	<p>7.8.1.1 a) includes a note. This note uses the word “must”. If this is to be an enforceable requirement, it should not be a note, but be written as part of the standard.</p>	Persuasive	Changed “must” to “should” and left as a note
Recommended Language:	N/A	Recommended Language:	N/A	Recommended Language:

The opening 3 paragraphs and NOTE 1 have some incorrect applications of English, which lead to confusion. Also, a new acronym "NEFAP" appears, which has not been defined. Does it need to appear in the standard at all?

24 7.9.2.1.2

Preliminary accreditation is used by newly formed Accreditation Bodies in order to initiate an accreditation program. It is recognized that new ABs <delete comma> may need additional time to establish a full program, and these new accreditation bodies may issue preliminary accreditation status to its applicants. Accreditation Bodies seeking recognition in the applicable TNI Program shall be able to grant a preliminary accreditation status to FSMO's who meet requirements outlined below if an on-site assessment cannot be conducted in a reasonable timeframe as listed below in section c. After two years of operation, the accreditation body must not issue preliminary accreditation since the Accreditation Body's program must be fully established within that timeframe. NOTE 1: The AB is given time with this clause to obtain applicants, perform a document review of the applicant's information and prepare for the on-site assessment.

Persuasive
Removed reference to TNI
NEFAP Program

Recommended Language:

24	7.9.2.1.2 (b)	<p>There is a mis-spelling of “competency” in the proposed new language. In addition, there is a reference to ISO 17025 clauses 5.9.1(a) through (e) but no mention to clauses (f) and (g) that are proposed for addition in the FSMO Volume 1 standard.</p> <p><i>(b) Preliminary accreditation may be granted in the event the FSMO completes all the accreditation requirements, except for the successful demonstration of competency. During the preliminary period, in the absence of available proficiency testing or other means of demonstrating competency, the AB shall verify that the FSMO has conducted the quality control monitoring as detailed in ISO/IEC 17025:2005 5.9.1(a) through (e), and in the FSMO Volume 1 Standard clauses 5.9.1(f) and (g). <and 5.9.2 (as I commented on the Volume 1 ballot)</i></p> <p>Recommended Language:</p>	<p>Persuasive</p> <p>Reworded section to include letters (f) and (g), removed reference to ISO/IEC 17025 and instead referenced Volume I</p>
22	7.9.2.1.2 NOTE 2	<p>This note uses the word “must”. If this is to be an enforceable requirement, it should not be a note, but be written as part of the standard.</p> <p>Recommended Language: N/A</p>	<p>Persuasive</p> <p>Agreed and language a requirement and thus added to section</p>
24	7.9.2.1.3 (f)	<p>This clause refers to Clause 5 of this Standard, meaning the Volume 2 standard. It is the AB and not the FSMOs who have to implement the management system and quality manual requirements in this volume. Should this language be changed to the management system and quality manual requirements in the FSMO Volume 1 standard?</p> <p><i>(f) failure to implement a management system and quality manual as defined in Clause 4 in the FSMO Volume 1 Standard.</i></p> <p>Recommended Language:</p>	<p>Non-persuasive</p> <p>Committee believes that the “this Standard” is comprised of both Volumes I and II. Committee felt language is appropriate however we will look at adding statement in to Section 1 or preface to clarify use of “this Standard”</p>

24	7.9.2.1.4(a)	<p>The proposed change refers to “this Standard.” I interpret this Standard to be the Volume 2 document that is being reviewed. However, the FSMO is being assessed against the Volume 1 standard rather than this volume that pertains to the AB.</p> <p>(a) “ ... retained by the FSMO for those areas where it continues to meet the requirements of the FSMO Volume 1 Standard.”</p>	Non-persuasive	Committee believes that the “this Standard” is comprised of both Volumes I and II. Committee felt language is appropriate however we will look at adding statement in to Section 1 or preface to clarify use of “this Standard”
24	7.9.2.1.4(b) (iii)	<p>The proposed change refers to “this Standard.” I interpret this Standard to be the Volume 2 document that is being reviewed. However, the FSMO is being assessed against the Volume 1 standard rather than this volume that pertains to the AB.</p> <p>“ ... when it demonstrates to the accreditation body that it once again complies with the FSMO Volume 1 Standard; and”</p>	Non-persuasive	Committee believes that the “this Standard” is comprised of both Volumes I and II. Committee felt language is appropriate however we will look at adding statement in to Section 1 or preface to clarify use of “this Standard”
24	7.9.2.1.4 NOTE 1	<p>The proposed change refers to “this Standard.” I interpret this Standard to be the Volume 2 document that is being reviewed. However, the FSMO is being assessed against the Volume 1 standard rather than this volume that pertains to the AB.</p> <p>NOTE 1: “ ... allow a FSMO time to correct deficiencies or an area of non-compliance with the FSMO Volume 1 Standard.”</p>	Non-persuasive	Committee believes that the “this Standard” is comprised of both Volumes I and II. Committee felt language is appropriate however we will look at adding statement in to Section 1 or preface to clarify use of “this Standard”

24	7.9.2.1.5(a)	<p>The proposed change refers to “this Standard.” I interpret this Standard to be the Volume 2 document that is being reviewed. However, the FSMO is being assessed against the Volume 1 standard rather than this volume that pertains to the AB.</p> <p>(a) “ ... or measurement / analytical methods where it continues to meet the requirements of the FSMO Volume 1 Standard.”</p>	Non-persuasive	Committee believes that the "this Standard" is comprised of both Volumes I and II. Committee felt language is appropriate however we will look at adding statement in to Section 1 or preface to clarify use of "this Standard"
Recommended Language:				
30	7.9.2.1.2(b)	Spelling errors	Recommended Language: N/A	Spelling of two words was already corrected in ISO version, change had not been made in Non-ISO version
29	7.15.2*	orthography - remove extraneous hyphen from accrediting	Recommended Language: See above	Change had already been made to Standard with ISO language. Change did not get copied to non-ISO document posted
47	7.15.2*	spelling correction suggestion- "accrediting"	Recommended Language: The accreditation body providing accreditation...	Change had already been made to Standard with ISO language. Change did not get copied to non-ISO document posted
24	7.15.2	<p>The proposed change refers to “this Standard.” I interpret this Standard to be the Volume 2 document that is being reviewed. However, the FSMO is being assessed against the Volume 1 standard rather than this volume that pertains to the AB. Also, a spelling correction is recommended.</p>	Non-persuasive	Committee believes that the "this Standard" is comprised of both Volumes I and II. Committee felt language is appropriate however we will look at adding statement in to Section 1 or preface to clarify use of "this Standard"

*The accreditation body accrediting to the
TNI FSMO Volume 1 Standard shall use a
TNI PTPA approved PTP for applicable
and available PT samples.*

Recommended Language:



Attachment E

Action Items – FAC

	Action Item	Who	Expected Completion	Actual Completion
45	Get on FEM agenda.	Marlene	May 26 Justin will follow-up with Marlene by 3/2/12 1/31/13	7/28: Marlene has not heard anything. 8/18: Still waiting to hear back. 10/12/11, 11/21/11: Marlene is still waiting to hear back.
47	Update Presentation Summary and distribute before meetings. (Prepare table of speaking engagements. This will be added to minutes and website. Follow-up with Scott Hoatson, Jan and other committee members to find out about other speaking engagements to add to the summary table being prepared.)	JoAnn	Each Meeting	Ongoing 1-15-13: Ilona meeting with William to set this up to add to website.
61	Update presentation and distribute for review. (General presentation people can use when attending conferences.)	Justin JoAnn	March 5, 2012 Needs to be updated by 1/31/13 for John.	Presentation was done, but not reviewed yet. Probably needs more updating at this point.
77	Work on flow chart.	Justin Marlene	Next Scope Subcommittee Meeting	Ilona will review minutes to determine what this was. Note as not needed if it is not clear.
78	Continue work on Training SOP. Justin and Marlene will talk about procedure for doing this.	Justin Marlene	November 2012 Change to 1/31/13	

	Action Item	Who	Expected Completion	Actual Completion
84	Check with Bob on using the database to track the voting comments. Can Bob use William's updates to begin populating this database?	Justin	12/28/12	
85	Update membership on charter and forward to CSDP EC.	Justin	12/28/12	Complete
86	Review and update white paper. Distribute to NEFAP EC and FAC for comment.	Justin JoAnn	1/31/13	The original white paper was completed, but needs review again.
87	Justin will incorporate changes decided on in meeting and forward new copies of the standards to the committee to review before the February meeting.	Justin All	2/21/13	
88	Review both versions of each standard and look for consistency (ISO language included vs. not included.)	TBD	3/1/13	

Attachment F

Backburner / Reminders – FAC

	Item	Meeting Reference	Comments
2	Update charter in October 2013	2/2/11	
3			
4			