

Non-Governmental Accreditation Body Working Group  
August 29, 2013

1. Roll Call

Alfredo Sotomayor called the Non-Governmental Accreditation Body (NGAB) Working Group meeting to order at 2:30 pm CDT on August 29, 2013. The following members were present:

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

2. Approval of Minutes

The group reviewed minutes from the August 7, 2013, meeting in San Antonio. Steve Arms noted that NEFAP is misspelled in a couple of places under section 6. Also, under section 9, evaluation report should be "SOP". All present voted in favor to approve the minutes with these edits.

3. Review of draft SOP sections

The working group reviewed the draft SOP sections in light of comments at the San Antonio meeting and Marlene Moore's suggested revisions provided by email.

Sections 1.0, 2.0, 3.0 and 4.0

- The group agreed to table the discussion about non-NELAP states acceptance of NGAB accreditations until the winter meeting in Louisville

- The comment about references for definitions will be tabled for now as well. This comment may actually refer to the “Related Documents” section.
- The group agreed to use the definition of “finding” that is in the NEFAP SOP:

<b>Comment:</b>	Finding about documents or AB’s practices with a potential of improvement; but still fulfilling the requirements
<b>Concern:</b>	Finding where, in the opinion of the evaluation team, the AB’s practice may develop into a non-conformity. The evaluated AB is not expected to respond to a concern but may do so if it wishes.
<b>Nonconformity:</b>	Finding where the AB does not meet a requirement of the applicable standard (FMSO-v2-2008), its own management system or the Arrangement requirements in a way that discredits its competence or jeopardizes the quality of its work. The evaluated AB is expected to respond to any nonconformity by taking appropriate corrective action and providing the team with evidence of implementation.

- Marlene’s comments on Section 1.0 were accepted
- Change 4<sup>th</sup> bullet under 2.0 to “Observe the AB performing an assessment...”
- Change last bullet under 2.0 to “Provide evaluation report to Recognition Committee.....”
- Marlene’s comments on 4.0: Add language from NEFAP indicating which definitions take precedence if there is a conflict.
- Date of Recognition definition: change to “The date that TNI and the AB enter into or renew a written agreement”
- Accept “evaluator” definition change
- Change “finding’ definition as indicated above
- Accept changes for LE, recognition, and technical review

#### Section 5.0

- The group agreed that the procedures for operation of the Recognition Committee should be added as 5.1.4 and should be no more than half a page.
- Accept Marlene’s change in 5.1.1, 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> bullets
- In 5.1.2, take out reference to NEFAP and delete 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet
- Need to compare 5.1.1 in draft SOP with NEFAP 5.8 for qualifications of Recognition Committee
- In 5.1.3, delete 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet and change wording in 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet as indicated.

#### 4. Next Meeting

The next meeting was set for September 13 at 10:00 am CDT. We will continue reviewing the draft SOP and comments. Carol and Alfredo will discuss how to proceed on Section 6.0.