

**On-Site Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**December 10, 2008**  
**1:00 PM – 2:30 PM EST**

**Attendance**

Committee Members

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

**Meeting Minutes**

Discussion of minutes from November 19, 2008 meeting. The minutes were approved with edits.

**Standard Updates**

Below is the issue raised by the LASC and the OSA Committee’s official response. The LASC is meeting on Friday, December 12, 2008 to discuss the responses from the expert committees. Ms. Rice will keep the committee updated. A proposal for a TIA may need to be done via e-mail. There is a 15 day comment period that must be honored before the Committee can vote on 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		X			

Std Ref.	10-24-08-v0  Comment/Question	LASC Review Category				
		Clarification Needed	Implementation Issue	Editorial	Inconsistent / Conflict	Error or Omission
	<p>put in a guidance document?</p> <p><b>Response:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Guidance is not enforceable; this would need to be an amendment to the standard.</li> <li>2) The committee thinks that a procedure for informing the respective parties of lateness is not the solution to the issue raised and informing parties can be handled through a variety of professional avenues.</li> <li>3) The committee is willing to extend the time in section 6.12.2 to 45 calendar days provided LASC can give specific examples of why 30 days is not sufficient.</li> <li>4) The committee does not agree that 30 days is not enough time for a CAB to prepare a response to the report of findings and will not extend the time frame of section 6.12.4.               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Since only a <i>plan</i> of corrective action is required of the CAB, not <i>implementation</i>, 30 days should be sufficient.</li> <li>b) During the closing conference of the assessment the CAB receives a good idea of what issues need to be corrected and can be working on a plan of corrective action during the 30-45 days that the AB is working on the official report.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>					

Ms. Rice explained the LASC history and what was discussed at the chairs meeting. Mr. Gumpper asked why the ABs would need more than 30 days. Mr. Gumpper mentioned that if the time for issuing the report is extended then the accreditation period should also be extended. Ms. Cox said the +/- 6 months for the assessment stated in the standard should cover this scenario. Mr. Gumpper said that might cover it but a mechanism for it would still be needed should it occur. Mr. Gumpper mentioned A2LA gives their report to the lab at the end of the assessment before leaving the lab. It is a luxury to have 30

days. He sees no need for the time period to be extended routinely. If we have a guidance document for procedures to follow when there will be a delay, it gives them license to use more time. In lieu of, we could put in if AB, for reasons beyond their control, they can't make it, they will inform the lab within the 30 days and ensure the delay shall not affect the accreditation status of the CAB. Mr. Getman said if we acquiesce to the muscling, we should keep this on the back burner. Ms. Rice clarified that the response was sent and we will evaluate LASC response and then vote on it.

### **Basic Assessor Training Guidance Document Development Discussion**

The History of TNI and the Standard Development Process and Fundamentals and Structure of TNI and ISO outline was discussed. The discussion was led by Mr. Gumper. The committee felt it should have a bit more detail since it is the only outline that doesn't have a standard attached to it. Mr. Gumper will resubmit with our suggestions and more detail

Mr. Mensik led the discussion of V1M1 and V3, Proficiency Testing. It was decided that V3 should be an overview section of the V1M1. Mr. Cassano wants an example of how to process the sample the same as normal included. It should cover things like confirmation analysis. There are so many deficiencies on this topic of processing PT samples as routine samples. Ms. Rice wants something in the outline about how to assess this area; how to determine if the lab is processing the samples normally. Mr. Mensik wanted help on calibration ranges. Mr. Cassano suggested using the TNI ranges on TNI website. Mr. Mensik will include applicable bits from V1M2 for corrective action.

### **The OSA Session at the Miami Conference in January**

John Gumper, Don Cassano and Denise Rice will be attending the conference. The other committee members will not be able to attend. At the conference we will give an update on LASC review/process and present the draft Basic Assessor Training outlines for comment.

**Next Meeting: January 13, 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM in Miami**