

**On-Site Assessment Committee Minutes**  
**November 19, 2008**  
**3:00 PM – 4:25 PM EST**

**Attendance**

Committee Members

Nilda Cox, Lab – present  
Don Cassano, other - present  
Myron Getman AB - absent  
John Gumpfer, other - absent  
Mark Mensik, other - absent  
Faust Parker, Lab - present  
Denise Rice, EPA - present

Guests:

Victoria Pretti

**Meeting Minutes**

After a couple of errors were corrected, the minutes from October 15, 2008 meeting were approved.

**Laboratory and Assessor Surveys**

Ms. Rice asked Ms. Cox to obtain a list of NELAC accredited labs from the State of California. Ms. Rice asked Ms. Pretti to obtain New York State's list. Since these are the two biggest AB's, this will give us a much larger sample pool to try to get feed-back from labs.

**Standard Updates**

Nilda Cox attended the 10/24/08 LASC meeting. The LASC discussed the timeframes for reporting. Ms. Rice received an e-mail with the LASC's official request (see below). Ms. Rice stated that guidance is not enforceable and the request would have to be an amendment. Since the timeframe for the reporting and response process was discussed at length during the standard development process, LASC needs to give a compelling reason for the Committee to make this change outside of the consensus process by which this standard was vetted. Mr. Parker said we could change the standard to 30 business days. This gives them six weeks. Ms. Cox commented that if a lab is doing something critically wrong this gives the lab too much time before having to correct the issue. Other Committee members commented that there is a different mechanism for that scenario. Ms. Cox also said that 30 days is standard in most states. Ms. Cox worried that 45 days is a long time for labs with lots of deficiencies. Ms. Cox suggested we define a mechanism that when assessor finds major problems, it is immediately discussed with the lab. It was asked if informing the lab during the closing conference covers this scenario. Mr. Cassano reminded us that everything always goes to the last minute. The AB and

the lab will use all of the time allotted regardless of the duration. There will always be the possibility that someone will want more than the allotted time. Mr. Cassano prefers the AB produce a letter to formally notify the lab that the report will be late.

It was also discussed that the LASC would need to give us compelling reasons to amend the standard. Mr. Parker gave an example of a state that sub-contracts its assessments, such as Texas, taking two weeks to get its report to the AB, and then the AB only has two weeks to get the state’s version of the report to CAB.

It was generally agreed that the Committee is willing to change the timeframe for ABs. However, we do not think the timeframe for CABs responding to the report should not change. The lab does not have to have the corrective action fully implemented or complete when they respond to the report, they just need to have a corrective action plan that includes when the problem will be corrected. Also, during the assessment and closing conference the labs become aware of the deficiencies the assessors have found. They can start preparing a corrective action plan while the AB is preparing the report.

One member suggested that for ABs we give a range of days. Ms. Cox suggested we maintain calendar days because that’s what other standards use. The Committee is amenable to 45 calendar days if ABs can justify the need for it.

### Comments and Questions from LASC on New TNI Standards – On-Site

Std Ref.	10-24-08-v0  Comment/Question	LASC Review Category				
		Clarification Needed	Implementation Issue	Editorial	Inconsistent / Conflict	Error or Omission
V2:M3 6.12.4 6.12.2	Issue with 30 day requirement. ABs have expressed concerns that 30 days is not enough.  Add language that if 30 day time frame can not be met, this must be communicated to the agency or lab to determine a new due date? Would this need to be put in a guidance document?  <b>Response:</b>		X			

Std Ref.	10-24-08-v0  Comment/Question	LASC Review Category				
		Clarification Needed	Implementation Issue	Editorial	Inconsistent / Conflict	Error or Omission

### Basic Assessor Training Guidance Document Development Discussion

- V2M1 – Accrediting Body General Requirements – Cassano
  - When an assessor goes back to AB, he/she would inform them of any things the AB was not doing that they should be doing.
  - Section 4 – We got a comment in Washington: when people are sub contracting or are the secondary AB include what should and should not be covered in the assessment.
  - Misuse of TNI symbols and logos should also be covered – the assessors should check the lab websites
- V2M2 – AB Requirements: PT – Parker
  - Highlighted major items and eliminated some items from the general outline of the standard. This is just an outline. We don't need to write the whole thing. We should try for no more than a page or two.
- V2M3 – On-site Assessment - Rice
  - In 1e –interviewing techniques- Mr. Cassano said this takes a long time to organize and wastes a half day. The instructor could use a video. Ask Mr. Gumpfer about the use of videos since he has put on training.
  - Will redo outline to fit in the extra items and conform to the standard's format.

We discussed what format is the best? Ms. Cox liked Mr. Parker's outline because it follows the organization of the standard. Other members said to keep the explanations in the outlines but do not put them in narrative form, use bullets. Don't use Roman numerals. Ms. Rice will fix the format of all the outlines. She hopes to present what we have at the Miami conference so we can get feedback.

### Next Meeting: December 10, 1PM, EST

Other business – Ms. Rice will ask who is attending the Miami Conference via e-mail.