

Field Activities Committee Meeting Summary July 13, 2009

1. Roll call and approval of minutes:

Chair Marlene Moore called the FAC meeting to order on July 13, 2009, at 1:00 PM EST. Attendance is recorded in Attachment A. Associate members Scott Evans, Carl Kircher and Cheryl filling in for Myra Zabec were also in attendance. The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 PM EST.

Minutes from the May 26, 2009 meeting were distributed to FAC members for review and comment. Motion to approve the minutes: Mike Miller Second: David Speis Unanimously approved. Marlene will forward the minutes to Ilona for posting on the website.

2. Vote Regarding Accreditation Oversight

The committee reviewed the information in Attachment B and an e-mail vote was taken. The result of the vote is below.

David Speis and Ilona Taunton provided information about the committee's decision to the TNI Board. The information in Attachment B and a copy of the accreditation summary prepared by Marlene were given to the Board. The Board was supportive of moving forward and next steps need to include working on a budget and outlining the accreditation process with a little more detail. Approximate implementation time frames should also be examined.

Field Activities Committee - Vote Regarding Accreditation Oversight

Motion made by: Bob Di Rienzo Second by: Michael Miller

The options for voting are:

1. Work within the TNI process to develop an accreditation oversight program.
2. Work within the NACLA process to develop an accreditation oversight program.
3. Work within the ILAC process to develop an accreditation oversight program.
4. Abstain

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
|---|--------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Other | Eychaner, Jim | | | | x |
| 2 | Other | Wren, Dane C. | | | | |
| 3 | Other | Moore, Marlene (Chair) | x | | | |
| 4 | FSMO | Moorman, John | x | | | |
| 5 | Accred. Lab. | Speis, David | x | | | |

7/6/2009
No Vote

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------------|--------------------|---|--|--|--|--------|
| 6 | Other | Wilson, Jan | x | | | | |
| 7 | Accred. Lab. | Jo Ann Boyd | x | | | | |
| 8 | Accred. Lab. | Perry, Michael | x | | | | |
| 9 | Accred. Lab. | Sorbet, Elaine | x | | | | |
| 10 | Other | Michael Miller | x | | | | Second |
| 11 | AB | Brian Conner | x | | | | |
| 12 | AB | Robert P. DiRienzo | x | | | | Motion |
| 13 | FSMO | Justin B. Brown | x | | | | |

Total Votes:

| | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|----|---|---|---|

The decision made by the Field Activities Committee is to work within the TNI process to develop an accreditation oversight program.

Finalized - 7/2/09 (An additional vote was added on 7/6/09.)

3. San Antonio Meeting

A presentation will be made in San Antonio by Marlene Moore, Mike Miller, Scott Evans, Dane Wren, David Spies and Justin Brown. We will want to present the summary document prepared for the vote and the accreditation summary originally prepared by Marlene. The accreditation summary may need a little work to make it more specific to NEFAP. Marlene will look into this.

Presentation Assignments:

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|
| Intro and Background about NEFAP | Marlene |
| FSMO's Responsibility | Justin and Dane |
| AB's Responsibility | Scott and Mike |
| TNI Board Role | David |

Consider the following thoughts:

- Discuss why we shouldn't make states ILAC signatories. The door is not closed to TNI.
- If a state becomes part of the program, they will need to be able to accept third party ABs.
- We need more involvement from state ABs with jurisdiction in this area. They are needed to help establish the accreditation process. New Jersey is an example.
- NEFAP Board needs to be formed.
- What is the TNI Board looking for?
- In ILAC, ABs are reviewed by ABs. In the TNI process this will be done by stakeholders? This allows the technical experts to perform audits.

- Marlene will talk to Ed Hartzog to get a better understanding of his concerns to build NEFAP through TNI. Perhaps it may be appropriate to ask Ed or Jordan if they could give a presentation on what they would like to see.
- Ilona will distribute TNI PowerPoint slides for preparation of the presentation.
- Mike Miller has a flight on Thursday evening, so he will need to be on the earlier end of the agenda for the meeting.

4. Rotation of Members

Rotations generally match with face to face meetings. Generally, new members start in January.

Marlene will contact the November 2006 members and see if they want to rotate or drop off the committee.

5. Open Action Items

None.

6. New Items

Bob mentioned that it might make sense to invite Erik Winchester, Associate Chief (acting) from the EPA Program Assessment and Outreach Branch, National Program Chemicals Division, Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics to discuss the lead program and the status of field equipment for lead analysis. There are many people out there with an XRF that want to do lead measurements, but they need an accreditation program. This could be a dinner meeting or a conference call.

7. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the FAC will be Thursday, August 13, 2009, at 1:30pm EST in San Antonio, TX.

Action Items are included in Attachment C and Attachment D includes a listing of reminders.

The meeting was adjourned.

.

Attachment A

Participants TNI Field Activities Committee

| Members | Affiliation | Balance | Contact Information | |
|--|---|--------------|------------------------|--|
| Marlene Moore (Chair) Present | Advancd Systems, Inc | Other | (302)368-1211 | mmoore@advancedsys.com |
| Dane Wren Present | Wren Engineering, P.A. | Other | (407)833-0061 | dwren47@aol.com |
| Jim Eychaner Present | USGS, Water Resources, Western Region | Other | (916)278-9555 | eychaner@usgs.gov |
| John Moorman Absent | Water Quality Monitoring Division, South Florida Water Management District | FSMO | (561)753-2400 x4654 | jmoorma@sfwmd.gov |
| David Speis Present | Accutest Laboratories | Accred. Lab. | (732)329-0200 | davids@accutest.com |
| Jan Wilson Absent | CAMMIA Environmental | Other | (360)904-8416 | WQL@aol.com |
| Jo Ann Boyd Absent | Southwest Research Institute | Accred. Lab. | (210)522-2169 | joann.boyd@swri.org |
| Michael Perry Absent | Southern Nevada Water Authority, | Accred. Lab. | (702)856-3513 | michael.perry@snwa.com |
| Elaine Sorbet Absent | Louisiana Dept. of Environmental Quality E44(DEQ) | Accred. Lab. | (225)219-9800 | elaine.sorbet@la.gov |
| Michael Miller Present | Consultant | Other | (908)233-9624 | mwmilleranaly@yahoo.com |
| Brian Conner Present | A2LA | AB | (301)644 3216 | bconner@a2la.org |
| Robert P. DiRienzo Present | AIHA (ALS) | AB | (801)266-7700 | dirienzo@datachem.com |
| Justin B. Brown Present | EMT | FSMO | (847)324 3350 | jbrown@emt.com |
| Ilona Taunton (Program Administrator) Present | The NELAC Institute | | (828)712-9242 | tauntoni@msn.com |

Attachment B

June 25, 2009

**INFORMATION FOR EVALUATION OF
OPTIONS FOR RECOGNITION AND OVERSIGHT OF
THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL FIELD
ACCREDITATION PROGRAM (NEFAP)**

Document 1: DRAFT – TNI / NACLA / ILAC COMPARISON

Document 2: DRAFT – TNI/NEFAP Consideration

Document 3: NACLA FLOW CHARTS FOR AB EVALUATION PROCESS

DOCUMENT 1

TNI / NACLA / ILAC COMPARISON

Documents/Tools Used In Review:

NACLA AB Evaluation Procedure

NACLA QA Manual

NACLA website

TNI Standard

TNI AB Evaluation SOP

TNI Website

E-mail correspondence from Field Committee Members.

(Note: ILAC evaluation provided by Brian Conner. It does not provide a criteria specific review, but information is included to present an overview of what is available.)

| | | TNI - NEFAP | NACLA <i>(NACLA comments in blue.)</i> | ILAC | Comments |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------|
| 1 | Experience with Consensus Standards | ANSI recognized Consensus standards developer. The TNI Field Activities Standard was developed using the consensus standard process. | Not a standards developer. Uses ISO/IEC 17011 and ISO/IEC 17025 as the basis for the programs. Have furthered consensus standard acceptance for the United States. | Not a standards developer. Uses ISO/IEC 17011 and ISO/IEC 17025. Worldwide recognition arrangement of laboratory accreditation bodies. | |

| | | TNI - NEFAP | NACLA <i>(NACLA comments in blue.)</i> | ILAC | Comments |
|---|----------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| 2 | Experience in Recognition of ABs | Procedures on evaluation of ABs and recognition exist, but must be modified for third party ABs. | Written procedures in place to recognize ABs. Have recognized AB's with an MRA process and now a vertical recognition process. Regulators and specifiers make up the recognition council. | 36 signatories to the ILAC MRA signed in November 2000. | All organizations have experience with laboratory AB recognition. The development of the recognition process for ABs must ensure that the specific requirements for field activities are understood and addressed by the recognition process. The experience from all these organizations is presented. The individuals developing the standard and organization performing field activities have the experience and therefore must have input into the recognition process. |

| | | TNI - NEFAP | NACLA <i>(NACLA comments in blue.)</i> | ILAC | Comments |
|---|--------------|--|--|---|-----------------|
| 3 | Track Record | <p>Good track record in delivering and following through on requirements.</p> <p>Diverse and loyal group of volunteers with record of developing new programs and implementing new requirements.</p> | <p>Concerns have been raised about past performance in following through on requirements. Many updates and changes have been made to the organization, so past performance may not determine future performance. <i>Have now established a vertical recognition process recognized by NIST, DoD, DHS, FWHA, AIAG, and DoE. NACLA is established as a national program. NACLA accepts ILAC as the recognition authority for the international acceptance of data. NACLA is only for US purposes of cooperation of all stakeholders and the recognition of AB's in the US for domestic purposes. Concerns come from those that may think NACLA competes with ILAC. That is not the case.</i></p> | <p>Exemplary. Since inception, roll in ensuring international confidence and acceptance of accredited laboratory data has only increased.</p> | |

| | | TNI - NEFAP | NACLA <i>(NACLA comments in blue.)</i> | ILAC | Comments |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| 4 | Use of ISO/IEC 17011 | Yes. | Yes. <i>NACLA uses ISO/IEC 17011 as the basis of their evaluation process. The United States denotes a more robust system of cooperation of stakeholders and a vertical recognition process to accommodate regulators, specifiers and laboratories as part of the process.</i> | Yes. It is the basis for MRA signatory status. | TNI standard requires adherence to the implementation of ISO/IEC 17011. Initial and on-going evaluation of the implementation of the recognized standards must be accepted by all parties. Parties must implement the recommendation of the evaluation team or provide reasons the requirement is not applicable. Past concerns have been raised regarding NACLA's adherence to the requirements. |
| 5 | Use of ISO/IEC 17025 for evaluation of Conformity Assessment Bodies (e.g. laboratories) | Yes | Yes | Yes. | |
| 6 | Procedures for Evaluation of Technical | - Evaluation of the AB includes observing the AB during the | - Evaluation of the AB includes observing the AB during the | IAF/ILAC A2 (APLAC MR001) | |

| | | TNI - NEFAP | NACLA <i>(NACLA comments in blue.)</i> | ILAC | Comments |
|--|------------|--|--|-------------|-----------------|
| | Competence | <p>assessment of one lab.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are specific minimum qualifications for the lead evaluator and audit team that is evaluating an AB. - TNI procedures are developed for NELAP and require revision to assure a uniform recognition of third party accreditation bodies and government accreditation bodies. - TNI tracking of performance of the AB requires development. <p>From currently written procedure: 7.3.1. The NELAP Board appoints the team. The team will usually include one member from the EPA Region in which the AB is located. The EPA Region can propose additional EPA</p> | <p>assessment of more than one lab/facility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are specific minimum qualifications for the team leader and audit team that is evaluating an AB. - Evaluation includes a determination of whether the AB's assessment team is competent to evaluate a laboratory following ISO 17011 and 17025 and whether observed laboratories are indeed competent. <p>From currently written procedure: The Evaluation Coordinator in coordination with the chair of the Recognition Committee appoints the team leader for each evaluation or re-evaluation. The team</p> | | |

| | | TNI - NEFAP | NACLA <i>(NACLA comments in blue.)</i> | ILAC | Comments |
|--|--|--|--|-------------|-----------------|
| | | <p>team members to the NELAP Board. The evaluation team will also include a representative of another AB.</p> <p>The evaluation team shall agree on one of their members being designated Lead Evaluator, and shall submit that person's name to the NELAP Board for approval. All team members will work under the direction of the Lead Evaluator.</p> <p>7.3.2. At least one member of the team shall have completed the evaluator training course.</p> | <p>leader is selected from the list of team leaders compiled by the Training Committee and approved by the Recognition Committee. Team members are chosen by the team leader from the list of team members maintained by the Evaluation Coordinator.</p> | | |

| | | TNI - NEFAP | NACLA <i>(NACLA comments in blue.)</i> | ILAC | Comments |
|---|--------------------|---|---|---|--|
| 7 | Evaluator Training | The lead evaluator (and preferably all team members) must successfully complete the NELAP accreditation body evaluator training course. There is no discussion of what this course covers and requirements for continuing education could not be found. The TNI requirements for Evaluation must be further developed to ensure evaluator understanding and knowledge related to the implementation of ISO/IEC 17011. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appendix C of the NACLA Evaluation Procedure covers the requirements. - There is a requirement that assessment team members must participate in a relevant training course(s), but no detail is included. - Specific experience is also required. There is no discussion on renewal requirements. - The NACLA training committee appoints and renews team leaders for a period of three years. | Significant experience and successful participation in a training course (held by either ILAC or a regional group) are required to be an evaluator (see #8) | Evaluators to include all stakeholders and not just AB members as in the current practice for TNI and ILAC. The need for training and uniform understanding is critical. |

| | | TNI - NEFAP | NACLA <i>(NACLA comments in blue.)</i> | ILAC | Comments |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 8 | Evaluator Competence | There are requirements, but there is no mention on how adherence to these requirements is evaluated. A minimum of one evaluator on the team must have taken a training course, but there is no requirement that all evaluators must be trained. Requires policy and procedure development for NEFAP. | There are requirements and renewal is required every 3 years. There is no discussion on how it is determined whether the requirements have been met. . All team members must have taken a training course(s). There is no mention of continuous training courses, though there are meeting with other assessors to help with uniformity. | On-going at a regional level through Evaluator training and feedback from Lead Evaluators on Evaluations. Approved on a regional level in a 3-year review basis. | |
| 9 | Accreditation Tracking Procedures | Needs to be developed, but template exists from NELAP. TNI standard requirements part of the evaluation of ABs to ensure tracking is performed by AB. | Need to confirm, but will likely need to be customized to meet Field. <i>Further NACLA scopes of recognition for AB's have the ability to be sector specific to meet regulator and specifier program requirements.</i> | Policies and procedures for recognition of AB and listing of recognized ABs provided on website. | ISO/IEC 17011 requires procedures for listing accredited CABs. This is part of the evaluation of the AB. |

| | | TNI - NEFAP | NACLA <i>(NACLA comments in blue.)</i> | ILAC | Comments |
|----|---|---|---|---|-----------------|
| 10 | Procedures for Renewal of ABs | Yes. Re-evaluations occur at a minimum of every 3 years. TNI standard requirements are part of the evaluation of ABs. Specific procedures for evaluations of ABs for field activities must be updated. | Yes. Re-evaluations occur at a minimum of every 4 years. | Yes. Peer review via regional bodies (APLAC, EA, IAAC) conducted at a maximum interval of four years. | |
| 11 | Impartiality and Confidentiality Procedures | Yes. Written procedures are in place. A form must be signed by all members of the evaluation team. May need extension to NEFAP Board. TNI standard requirements part of the evaluation of ABs. | Yes. Written procedures are in place. A form must be signed by all members of the evaluation team. | ISO/IEC 17011, 4.3 and 4.4 requirement for AB's. | |
| 12 | Assessment Planning | Yes. There is a specific order that things must be done and successful completion of a step leads to the next step. TNI standard requirements part of the evaluation of ABs. | Yes. There is a specific order that things must be done and successful completion of a step leads to the next step. | ISO/IEC 17011, section 7 requirement for AB's. | |

| | | TNI - NEFAP | NACLA <i>(NACLA comments in blue.)</i> | ILAC | Comments |
|----|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| 13 | Assessment Team Selection Procedures | TNI Field Activities standards define assessment team selection. NELAP has evaluation procedures that must be updated to address all stakeholder and third party input. | Part of NACLA evaluation of the implementation of ISO/IEC 17011. | ISO/IEC 17011 sections 6 and 7 requirements for AB's (covers recruitment, criteria, qualifications, etc.) | Consistency of interpretation and review of laboratories by assessors through a uniform training and oversight process among all ABs is not part of the evaluation process. |
| 14 | Consistency in Program Implementation | Comprehensive checklists are developed for use in the evaluations. The current NELAP process is presented and requires updating for NEFAP. A Quality Assurance Officer is selected by the NELAP Board who participates on all AB assessments during an assessment cycle, performing a quality assurance function, and acting as a liaison between the NELAP Board and the evaluation team. The QAO reports directly to the NELAP | Checklists for evaluations were not seen or mentioned in the documentation reviewed. <i>NACLA has a checklist for evaluations.</i> The NACLA Training Committee arranges periodic meetings for team leaders in order to improve and maintain the harmonization of the evaluations. The current documentation does not present all functions uniformly. The recent changes to the structure | Confirmed through ISO/IEC 17011 peer evaluations. | TNI has procedures in place to build consistency in the AB Evaluation process, but TNI continues to hear complaints from users that there is inconsistency in how ABs keep the program consistent with their accredited labs or organizations. This should be part of the AB evaluation process. What is being done within the AB's organization to maintain consistency with other ABs and within the labs and organizations they |

| | | TNI - NEFAP | NACLA <i>(NACLA comments in blue.)</i> | ILAC | Comments |
|--|--|---|---|-------------|------------------|
| | | <p>Board.</p> <p>The QAO will inform the NELAP Board of any unresolved consistency problems as they occur and will provide a report to the NELAP Board at the completion of each AB evaluation.</p> <p>In the event that the team encounters an unexpected or unusual circumstance, the lead assessor should seek guidance from the QAO and the NELAP Board. This will help insure consistency in how such circumstances are handled.</p> | <p>and operation are not consistently presented in the documentation.</p> | | <p>accredit?</p> |

| | | TNI - NEFAP | NACLA <i>(NACLA comments in blue.)</i> | ILAC | Comments |
|----|---------------------|--|---|---|---|
| 15 | Recognition Process | Yes. Written procedures are in place. The NELAP Board receives a written recommendation from the evaluation team and if they are in agreement, a Certificate of Recognition is awarded. The recommendation includes a summary of the evaluation and inclusion of the following documents: 1) evaluation team's technical report, 2) AB's technical report corrective action response, 3) evaluation team's on-site evaluation report, and 4) AB's on-site evaluation corrective action plan. | Yes. Written procedures are in place. The team leader provides a written recommendation on whether the AB fulfills the NACLA requirements together with the evaluation report and the response(s) from the AB to the AB and the Evaluation Coordinator. The Recognition Council reviews the recommendations and evaluation reports submitted by the NACLA Evaluation Teams and grants recognition to applicant ABs found to be in compliance with NACLA requirements. | Usually starts with MRA signatory status to a regional arrangement (APLAC, EA, IAAC) and then progresses to ILAC. | The model of laboratory accreditation and other accreditation recognitions schemes (International Accreditation Forum) must be reviewed and incorporated as applicable for field activities. This is to help ensure that NEFAP is not a laboratory accreditation program, but a field activities program. |

| | | TNI - NEFAP | NACLA <i>(NACLA comments in blue.)</i> | ILAC | Comments |
|----|----------------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------|
| 16 | Appeals and Complaint Procedures | There is mention of the TNI Dispute Resolution Process, but this process is still in development. A corrective action process is described in the AB evaluation process, but specific information on an appeals process is not included. | Yes. Procedures are in place for laboratory, AB, Assessor and NACLA member complaints. Many of these procedures involve the NACLA Executive Committee and NACLA Board of Directors. | ISO/IEC 17011 sections 5.9 (complaints) and 7.10 (appeals) requirements for AB's. ILAC (and regional bodies also have process for complaints on AB's). | |

Additional Notes:

TNI

- The NELAC Institute's **mission** is to foster the generation of environmental data of known and documented quality through an open, inclusive, and transparent process that is responsive to the needs of the community. To accomplish this mission, TNI:
 - develops and adopts for use into its programs [consensus standards](#) for accreditation of environmental testing laboratories and other organizations directly involved in the environmental measurement process;
 - implements a [national program](#) for the accreditation of environmental laboratories;
 - develops and maintains a national [proficiency test program](#);
 - develops and maintains a [national database](#) of accredited laboratories; and
 - provides training and [technical support](#) to facilitate the implementation of a national accreditation program by accreditors (e.g., state agencies) and those entities pursuing accreditation (e.g., environmental laboratories).

TNI's vision for the future is a true national accreditation program, whereby all entities involved in the generation of environmental measurement data within the United States are accredited to one uniform, rigorous, and robust program that has been implemented

consistently nationwide and focuses on the technical competence of the entity pursuing accreditation. TNI believes such a program will improve the quality and reliability of environmental data used by federal and state agencies.

NACLA

1. 2.1 PURPOSE OF NACLA:

To provide coordination and focus for laboratory accreditation in the United States of America by:

- Developing evaluation procedures and requirements that are in accordance with international standards and guidelines and that are accepted by all NACLA members and stakeholders.
- Administering NACLA evaluation procedures with impartiality and integrity.
- Recognizing accreditation bodies (ABs) for compliance with the NACLA requirements.
- Coordinating the development of sector specific technical requirements and associated programs that meet industry specifier or government/regulatory agency requirements for use by all accreditation bodies and testing or calibration laboratories.
- Reducing redundant AB evaluations through the acceptance of NACLA and/or International Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation (ILAC) recognition.
- Promoting the acceptance of NACLA and ILAC recognition.
- Working with industry specifiers and government/regulatory agencies in the United States to coordinate the development of sector specific technical requirements beyond those included in international guidelines used for AB recognition and laboratory accreditation.

2.2 VISION OF NACLA

The NACLA vision is to establish national and international stakeholder confidence in the competence of Accreditation Bodies (ABs) and their accredited laboratories (technical confidence in the results contained in reports and certificates issued by these laboratories).

This NACLA vision achieves the following:

- For NACLA recognized accreditation bodies, a NACLA scope of recognition to a common international model, and, where applicable, NACLA Quality Manual with fields of recognition specific to sector specific technical programs that meet specifier and/or regulator requirements.
- For ILAC recognized accreditation bodies, a NACLA scope of recognition utilizing the ILAC recognition as the basis for meeting the international model, and, where applicable, with NACLA approval of each field of recognition to sector specific technical programs that meet specifier and/or regulator requirements.
- For testing and calibration laboratories, a single accreditation in a given field(s) of testing and/or calibration, based on International requirements for purposes of acceptance by specifiers and/or regulators (users of accreditation).
- For specifiers and regulators, confidence that an accredited test or calibration is performed by a competent laboratory that meets the specifiers' or regulators' requirements.

2.3 OBJECTIVES OF NACLA

- NACLA's first objective is to increase stakeholder (specifiers, regulators and laboratories) confidence in the laboratory accreditation system within the United States. Increased confidence by stakeholders will assure that comparable, safe and reliable data produced by accredited laboratories will reduce the cost to re-accredit, re-test and re-sample laboratories and the outcome of their work in the laboratory community.
- NACLA's second objective is to assure the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), through its MoU, of its continued dedication to impartiality and integrity and the use of accepted international standards and sector specific technical requirements that meet relevant government and specifier requirements.
- NACLA's third objective is to coordinate the efforts of accreditation bodies, laboratories, specifiers, and regulators in the United States through the use of the international model of accreditation in order to

develop programs that meet the needs of all stakeholders. Where the international model does not fully meet the needs of the stakeholders, to coordinate the development of sector specific technical requirements that meet all stakeholders needs.

2. The minimum amount of appropriate proficiency testing required per laboratory is:
 - 5.3.1.1 One activity prior to gaining accreditation;
 - 5.3.1.2 One activity relating to each major sub-area of major disciplines of a laboratory's scope of accreditation at least every four years.

Note 1: Appropriate proficiency testing activity includes international or national inter-laboratory comparisons or measurement audits run or approved by the AB itself.

Note 2: Four years is the maximum interval. Accreditation bodies are encouraged to shorten that interval where there are significant changes to a laboratory's staff or scope of accreditation.

Note 3: An AB should use proficiency testing programs which comply with the operational procedures detailed in ISO/IEC Guide 43-1 (1997).
3.
 - 6.1 ABs will pay expenses for pre-evaluations, evaluations, follow up evaluations, surveillances, and re-evaluations, and travel associated with observations of on-site assessments of laboratories by the AB. The AB being evaluated shall pay the expenses for each member of the evaluation team engaged in travel related to the evaluation, including lodging, all transportation, and per diem or meals and expenses. Transportation expenses include airfare, taxis, privately owned vehicles, train fare, or other means of conveyance.
 - 6.2 Applicants will pay NACLA a fee for the services of the Lead Evaluator (time to be billed includes preparatory and follow-up work as well as pre-evaluation and evaluation visits, see NACLA Fee Schedule). Other team members donate their time at no charge to the AB.
4. 15.6.1 The AB's policies and procedures for selecting, training, contracting, and appointing internal and external assessors shall be examined. Checks shall be made to ensure that up-to-date records detailing the qualifications, experience, expertise, training and performance monitoring of assessors are maintained. The

evaluation team shall ensure that each assessment conducted by the AB is conducted by personnel familiar with the quality system and technical requirements of the accreditation system and trained in the techniques of assessment.

15.6.2 Where ABs use a staff member as leader or part of the team the same requirements apply.

15.6.3 Witnessing of assessments conducted by the AB provide the most effective means of evaluating assessor competence. The task of the evaluation team during witnessed assessments is to evaluate the effectiveness of the AB's assessment team by observing:

- a) The implementation of the AB's requirements and procedures for assessment;
- b) That ISO/IEC 17025 requirements are completely satisfied;
- c) That verification of the technical competence of the laboratories is appropriate for the scope of accreditation.

5. 28.2 All elements of ISO/IEC 17011 shall be evaluated at least every four years as part of a re-evaluation.

28.3 Other monitoring may take place at an earlier date should there be due cause such as notification of significant changes in administration, finances, operational practices or a reduction/extension in the scope of accreditation available to laboratories. The Decision Making Body may also require additional monitoring or surveillance visits as a condition for initial or renewal recognition.

DOCUMENT 2

TNI/NEFAP Consideration

| Function | TNI Responsibility | NEFAP Responsibility | Functional Elements |
|---|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Expert Committees and Consensus Standards Development | √ | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See TNI Policies for Standards Development ▪ Develop new standards ▪ Provide technical assistance ▪ Provide speaker's bureau ▪ Provide clarification / interpretation |
| Evaluation and Selection of ABs | | √ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Approve ABs through MRA process ▪ Recognize organizations ▪ Periodically review all NEFAP-recognized ABs to ensure their conformance to the requirements established by this organization. |
| Website | √ | | Structure |
| Development of Operational Policies and Procedures | | √ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adopt standards for use in program ▪ Decide what committees are needed ▪ Establish qualifications for assessors ▪ Develop procedure to respond to appeals on accreditation decisions ▪ Define the Stakeholders for the consensus process (Standards Development) ▪ Maintenance of ABs ▪ Website pages - content and information |
| Outreach | √ | | Advocate national program |
| Approval of NEFAP Board | √ | | Select Board - initial members |
| NEFAP Board | | √ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ongoing members and elections ▪ Receive complaints and direct to proper body for action. |
| Administrative Support and Finance | √ | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annually review progress towards goals ▪ Approve budget ▪ Set accreditation fees for ABs |

| | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|
| NEFAP Strategic Planning | √ | √ | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Business Model▪ Strategic Planning |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|

DOCUMENT 3

NACLA FLOW CHARTS FOR AB EVALUATION PROCESS

Open the following link and view pages 36-40 of the NACLA AB Evaluation Procedure:

<http://www.nacla.net/Pdf/Evaluation%20Procedure%20RevB.pdf>

Attachment D

Backburner / Reminders – FAC

| | Item | Meeting Reference | Comments |
|---|-------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| 1 | | | |
| 2 | | | |
| 3 | | | |
| 4 | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |