

Non-Governmental Accreditation Body Working Group
April 1, 2014

1. Roll Call

Alfredo Sotomayor called the Non-Governmental Accreditation Body (NGAB) Working Group meeting to order at 12:00 Noon CST on April 1, 2014. The following members were present:

NAME	Stakeholder Group	PRESENT
Alfredo Sotomayor, Chair	TNI Board member	√
Marlene Moore	NEFAP	Absent
Kristin Brown	NELAP AB	Absent
Jim Todaro	Laboratory	Present
Cheryl Morton	Non-governmental accreditation body	√ (Geneva Bowman)
Steve Arms	Chair, TNI Advocacy Committee	√
Carol Batterton	TNI staff support	√
Jerry Parr	TNI Executive Director	√

2. Approval of Minutes

Minutes from previous meetings were not considered at this meeting.

3. Review of comments received on draft of the Evaluation SOP

The working group continued consideration of comments received from Randy Querry, A2LA, at this meeting, beginning at section 6.10.

- Section 6.12 RQ7 Is there an appeals process in the event that the NGAB does not agree with a finding? There is a NELAP SOP for this (SOP 3-104), but it is out of date. We could revise and update this process and use it. Add this sentence to SOP where appropriate: "Any disputes over findings will be addressed in accordance with SOP XXX."
- Section 6.12 RQ 8 - Include timeline for this action when NGAB does not address findings... All timelines will be included in a Appendix. We need to make sure the timeline is adequate for corrective action and appeals if needed.
- Section 6.14 – delete addition. All timelines will be in an Appendix.
- Section 6.19 – RQ comment: Why consider applications from organizations that don't have experience or authority in making decisions on accreditation matters when there are numerous

qualified organizations that demonstrated this and are available to the industry today? Please clarify. The working group feels this situation is not likely to happen. However, we should leave this section in the SOP because limiting applicants may be considered restraint of trade.

- Section 8.2 - NGAB's approval or rejection of ET members and associated correspondence. Accept language.

The group then considered comments submitted by Cathy Westerman.

- Section 5.1.1 – “Representative groups” should be listed or defined. The working group understands concern, but these groups are defined in the TNI Bylaws. Language will be changed to say “representative stakeholder groups” and will delete “of the programs”
- Section 5.1.4 - INSTEAD OF "FAMILIAR WITH" SUGGEST SOMETHING MORE CONCRETE SUCH AS "HAVE DEMONSTRATED KNOWLEDGE OF". This has already been changed.
- Section 5.2.5 - SUGGEST ADDING TO ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS TO TNI BOARD: "AND A SUMMARY OF ALL ACTIVITIES, INCLUDING EVALUATIONS-IN-PROGRESS, EVALUATIONS COMPLETED, AND A LIST OF ACCREDITATION RECOGNITION GRANTED OR RENEWED" New language will read “summarizing accomplishments and outlining needed revisions to the evaluation SOP”.
- Section 5.3.2 - ASSURES IT IS UNBIASED" MAY NOT BE POSSIBLE. SUGGEST STRIKING THIS PHRASE. Change language to read “reviews the report for lack of bias and a consistent interpretation of the standard and to confirm whether all elements of the standard...”
- Section 5.4 - "ASSURES ITS QUALITY" MAY NOT BE POSSIBLE, ESPECIALLY BY SOMEONE NOT PARTICIPATING ON THE TEAM. SUGGEST SOMETHING MORE CONCRETE LIKE "ASSURES THE PROVISIONS OF THE SOP ARE BEING CARRIED OUT" Accept this change.
- Section 5.4.4 - THE EC IS LARGELY A POSITION OF ADMINISTRATIVE OVERSIGHT, AND IS NOT MAKING TECHNICAL OR BINDING DECISIONS. I THINK THE RIGOR OF THE EXPERIENCE CREDENTIALS ARE TIGHTER THAN REQUIRED. The working group concurs and has already dealt with this change.
- Section 5.6 - IT IS NOT CLEAR WHETHER THE TEAM AS A WHOLE MUST MEET ALL OF THESE REQUIREMENTS OR IF THE TEAM AS A WHOLE MUST MEET AT LEAST ONE OF THESE REQUIREMENTS. SOP says “at least one.....” No change needed.
- Section 6.1 - THE NOTE NEEDS TO BE WRITTEN SO THAT NGABS MUST MEET SAME REVIEW REQUIREMENTS AS THEIR GOVT PARALLELS. THIS DOES NOT LIST NELAP ABS FOR CLARIFICATION, AND IT SHOULD. IN OTHER WORDS, THE NGAB REVIEWS CANNOT GO TO A 4-YEAR CYCLE UNLESS THE STATE AB REVIEWS DO THE SAME [AND I AM NOT RECOMMENDING THAT BE CONSIDERED]. No change. Leave “Note” as is.
- Section 6.12- DOCUMENTED AND REASONABLE PLANS TO ADDRESS..." IS LANGUAGE THAT ALLOWS A SITE VISIT TO BE CLOSED WITHOUT ACTUAL EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION? IS THIS ALLOWED IN TNI / NELAP AB REVIEWS? THIS LANGUAGE IS DANGEROUS; EVEN 'REASONABLE PLANS' CAN END UP NOT BEING CARRIED OUT. Leave as is. No change.
- Section 6.14 - "TWO THIRDS MAJORITY VOTE" BY A COMMITTEE OF 5 MEMBERS IS 4 OF 5. THIS SHOULD BE CLEARLY STATED. Leave language as is.

4. Next steps

Remaining tasks include:

- Final SOP revisions
- Completion of appendices and supporting SOPs
- Compile list of issues yet to be resolved
- Finance Committee needs to develop a budget for the program to determine fees
- Appoint the TNRC (need to be thinking about good candidates)
- Develop training course as described in 5.1.5
- Announce roll out of program at summer meeting

The Nominating Committee will need to solicit nominations for the TNRC and recommend the slate for Board approval. The Board will appoint the chair.

Jerry will work with the finance Committee on the program budget.

5. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be Thursday, April 24, 2014, at 10:00 Central.