

Non-Governmental Accreditation Body Working Group  
August 7, 2014

1. Roll Call

Alfredo Sotomayor called the Non-Governmental Accreditation Body (NGAB) Working Group meeting to order at 9:00 am EDT on August 7, 2014, in Washington, D.C. The following members were present:

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

2. Powerpoint Presentation

Alfredo presented a powerpoint on the accomplishments of NGAB since the Louisville meeting. The agenda included:

- Background and Overview
- Status report on appointment of TNRC members and discussion of roles
- Review of highlights of Evaluation SOP
  - Solicit feedback on selected topics
- Steps to initial implementation

A key item in the presentation was the announcement of the election of members to the TNRC.

Members included:

- Joe Aiello, (New Jersey DEP) – NELAP ABs, NELAP Accreditation Council, TNI Board of Directors
- Daniel Lashbrook (Energy Laboratories, Inc.) – Laboratories
- Marlene Moore (Advanced Systems, Inc.) – Other, NEFAP Recognition Committee
- Judy Morgan (Environmental Science Corporation) – Laboratories, TNI Board of Directors, LASEC
- Kim Watson (Stone Environmental, Inc.) – Laboratories, FSMOs, NEFAP Executive Committee

During the review of the Evaluation SOP, Alfredo presented several questions for comment by attendees. Questions are listed below along with attendee comments.

Does the Evaluation Coordinator (EC) have any interaction with the TNRC? (Section 5.4) comments included:

- The EC should be the point of contact with the TNRC all the way through, the EC is a neutral party.
- In conformity assessment, there needs to be a coordination layer.
- In NELAP, the EC is the point of contact until the LE is assigned. The EC is just copied after that. The EC steps back in after the recommendation is made.
- The EC has an important role to assure that everyone is treated the same and all evaluations are done consistently.

Consensus seemed to be that the EC should interact with the TNRC as needed and required with no constraints.

A change to Section 5.6.5 requires that at least one member of the evaluation team be from a NELAP AB. Is everyone comfortable with that? Comments included:

- Having a NELAP evaluator provides a consistency factor.
- How will having a NELAP evaluator hinder reciprocity later? It's not about reciprocity; it's about the skill set.
- This will expose the state evaluators to another process.

Attendees agreed it was acceptable to require a NELAP evaluator to be a part of the team.

Section 6.5.2.7 requires that part of the NGAB program evaluation include interviews of assessors to evaluate the assessors training and knowledge. Participants were asked to comment on the number of interviews? On what medium? What is kept for the record? Comments included:

- Possible avenues for interviews include Skype, phone, or in-person.
- Texas does phone interviews of contract assessors, there is precedent.
- Louisiana does phone interviews set up like a conference call with multiple participants.
- Should be able to get at least one face to face during the onsite evaluation.

Participants agreed that it was not critical to specify how (what medium) the interview is conducted in the SOP.

### 3. Implementation

Alfredo asked participants for input on several issues related to implementation. The first question involved activities related to administration of the NGAB program that had not been specifically assigned to the TNRC. Consensus was that for now these duties should be assigned to staff.

With regard to the budget and fees for NGABs, Alfredo and David Speis noted that the program should be at least break-even for TNI. Alfredo noted that there will be separate application, evaluation, and renewal fees.

### 4. Next Steps

In response to questions about start date for the program, Alfredo indicated that early 2015 was the best guess at a start date for the program.

Participants suggested that TNI should be very careful to make sure we distinguish between a TNI approved laboratory (accredited by an NGAB) versus a NELAP approved laboratory (accredited by a NELAP recognized state).

Participants also suggested that TNI update the table listing which states would be able to accept a lab accreditation from an NGAB. Also, there was a request to review all documents related to handling of confidential business information.

#### 6. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be scheduled based on working group and TNRC members' availability.