

Non-Governmental Accreditation Body Working Group
June 14, 2013

1. Roll Call

Alfredo Sotomayor called the Non-Governmental Accreditation Body (NGAB) Working Group meeting to order at 10:00 am CDT on June 14, 2013. The following members were present:

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

2. Approval of Minutes

Jim Todaro moved approval of minutes from the May 13, 2013, meeting. Steve Arms seconded. All present voted in favor.

3. Review of side by side document

Alfredo introduced the side by side comparison of evaluation SOP's that Jerry prepared comparing the NELAP and NEFAP SOP's.

Note: Following the meeting, Marlene sent an email with the following comments on the side by side comparison document:

SOP # is 5-105

Also request: ILAC evaluation report and MRA, if applicable

*Schedule on-site only if not ILAC signatory or no MRA
If ILAC recognized only need to complete TNI FSMO additions to 17011.
Evaluation report specified in SOP
Confidentiality mandatory and not shared outside Recognition subcommittee and TNI EC*

*Three types of findings, Non conformance, comments and concerns only nonconformance requires corrective action... This is done at document review and at final report.
Granting recognition by committee that has no COIs, confidential and is voted on by Exec committee to be representative of all stakeholders.
Preliminary recognition after document review and until witnessed of an FSMO (non ILAC need office visit). Review by EC and lead evaluator preliminary letter by lead to exec comm - or recognition subcommittee. Final acceptance must be reviewed by recognition committee*

There is more that is in the SOP that is not in the table, but I will not be able to fill this in until next week - hopefully - just wanted to let folks know there is more in the NEFAP SOP than listed in the table.

4. Who, How, When, Where: Drafting Documents

Alfredo asked for ideas and suggestion about how to begin drafting an evaluation SOP. It was suggested that we compare the outlines of SOPs side by side to determine the preferred structure. Then, we can fill in the content from the spreadsheet. Jerry and Carol will come up with the outline and others can volunteer to write sections.

Review of outline:

1.0 Purpose and applicability (can be 1 or 2 sections)

2.0 Summary with bullet points

3.0 Related Documents

4.0 Definitions – This section is more concise in the NEFAP SOP, more extensive in the NELAP SOP. There was agreement that this section should contain only those terms not already defined in the standard or in ISO.

5.0 Personnel Qualifications and Responsibilities – Who are the players and what do they do. NELAP has conflict of interest in this section (5.3 in NELAP SOP). It is stated differently in NEFAP, but in this same section also.

6.0 Procedures – Frequency of evaluation will need clarity. Initial and renewal evaluations stated differently. SOPs also use different terms for “completeness” review versus “administrative” review. SOPS differ with respect to technical review. In NEFAP, evaluation can’t forward until application technically complete. In NELAP, can go forward and resolve during onsite.

Also noted that requirements for witnessing the evaluation may need to be addressed separately because the observation may not always occur at the same time as the onsite evaluation. The working group will also need to write a section on the recognition committee which will be appointed by the TNI Board, specifying terms, qualifications, standards of operation.

7.0 Criteria, Checklists, and Standards

8.0 Records Management

9.0 Quality Control

10.0 References

11.0 SOP Approved Changes

Appendices – These need to be compared in a table. Both SOPs have a Conflict of Interest affidavit. Two of the NELAP appendices are draft. Will need something similar to the NEFAP Appendix F for recognizing ABs who already have national or international recognition.

5. Next Steps

The existing NELAP and NEFAP SOPs need to be combined using the best of both. Alfredo asked Carol to insert section numbers in the side by side document that Jerry prepared NEFAP-NELAP compare 40813 and then we can begin making assignments to draft the new sections.

Alfredo suggested that we highlight the differences and offer our proposed solutions in San Antonio to generate discussion and get comments. The working group can give monthly updates to the affected program areas as we are developing the SOP.

6. Next Meeting

The next meeting was tentatively set for Friday, June 14, at 10:00 am CDT. Carol will poll members for availability.

The NELAC Institute
Non-Government Accreditation Body Task Force
May 13, 2013

- 10:00 Welcome, Roll Call, Announcements, Approval of Minutes
- 10:10 Review of Side by Side Evaluation SOP Document
- 10:20 Who, How, When, Where: Drafting Documents
- 11:2 Next Steps/Future Assignments
- 11:25 Adjourn