

Non-Governmental Accreditation Body Working Group  
July 8, 2013

1. Roll Call

Alfredo Sotomayor called the Non-Governmental Accreditation Body (NGAB) Working Group meeting to order at 1:30 pm CDT on July 8, 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	<b>Absent</b>
Kristin Brown	NELAP AB	<b>Absent</b>
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	<b>Present</b>

2. Approval of Minutes

Cheryl Morton moved approval of minutes from the June 14, 2013, meeting. Steve Arms seconded. All present voted in favor. Carol will ask William to create a tab on the TNI Board page to post the minutes.

3. Review of draft SOP sections

The committee reviewed the draft of Section 5.0 prepared by Steve Arms. Steve noted that he used both existing Evaluation SOPs and used parts from each that made sense. He noted that we should keep in mind building an SOP that the current NELAP ABs could use. He also noted that more detailed numbering like the NEFAP SOP is needed. Questions and comments on the draft of Section 5.0 included:

- Does there need to be an Evaluation Coordinator (EC)? Jerry indicated that he thinks so. It will likely be a staff person. Duties may not be as extensive as currently for the NELAP

AC. The Lead Evaluator (LE) could assume some of the EC duties. We should review notes from the Denver stakeholder meeting on this topic for ideas.

- Does there need to be a Quality Assurance Officer (QAO)? Jerry reported that the NELAP AC was considering a contract LE, a state person, and an EPA person, if desired, on the evaluation team. If there are multiple 3<sup>rd</sup> party evaluators, we will benefit from limited QAO support. We could combine the QAO and EC positions with some flexibility. The QAO could participate in at least one evaluation with each LE to be consistent with NELAP.
- Jerry noted that the current NELAP QAO spends on average 90 hours per AB evaluation, or 630 hours per year. Average travel is \$1200 per AB. It is possible for one person to handle this workload, but we should consider having an alternate in case there are conflicts of interest.

Steve will re-write Section 5.0 and redistribute the duties of the EC, LE, and QAO.

The committee also reviewed the draft of Section 7.0 that Carol prepared. Carol noted that the NEFAP SOP required that the checklists be in order of the standards, but the NELAP SOP did not have a similar requirement. It was noted that the ILAC convention was to have checklists follow the order of the standards; others commented that it seems more important for the report to follow the order of the standards.

In Section 8.0, work group members suggested that we get input in San Antonio for 8.1, regarding handling of records and confidentiality of records. Members also suggested deleting the second sentence in 8.4 regarding evaluation team members retaining copies of evaluation files.

#### 4. Draft slide presentation for San Antonio.

Alfredo presented a draft outline of a presentation for the San Antonio NGAB work group meeting. Carol will review minutes of past meetings to make sure that all differences have been included for discussion. We will also add a section about preferred funding mechanisms. Carol will prepare a skeleton powerpoint for the next meeting.

#### 7. Next Meeting

The next meeting was set for July 22 at 1:30 CDT. We will continue reviewing draft SOPs and review the draft powerpoint.