

**TNI Policy Committee Meeting Summary
Friday April 4, 2014**

1. Welcome, Roll Call and Announcements

The meeting was called to order by Alfredo at 11 am Eastern. He noted that minutes of the February 21, 2014, meeting were distributed, and any comments should be provided within a week. Attendance is recorded in Attachment 1.

2. NEFAP SIR SOP 5-106

Conclusion of this review awaits feedback from John about the rationale for the dispute resolution process. Bob noted that he has separately reviewed this SOP and will send his markup to Alfredo. Bob's additional comments are captured below and will be included in the eventual transmittal to NEFAP EC, since this review is not yet finalized.

§1.3 – delete the last sentence “Most questions will be directed”

§3 – add SOP 5-102 as a Related Document.

§5.1.1.2 – add the parenthetical phrase “(if applicable)” at the end.

§5.1.1.5 – replace with “Specific identification of the interpretation relative to the Standard (standard, module, section, and paragraph.) This section must be completed or the request will be sent back to the inquirer.”

§5.1.1.6 – replace with “A detailed description of the issue.”

§5.1.1.7 – delete.

§5.2.1 – replace “consensus” with “agreement” in the first sentence, and clarify the participants in the process to resolve non-agreement in the last sentence.

§5.2.4 – delete the second sentence about taking §5.3 into consideration.

§5.2.5.1 – at the end of the paragraph, replace “resolution” with “further consideration.”

§5.4 – in the second sentence, add the phrase “as soon as possible” between the words “implemented” and “by.” Delete the last sentence.

5. NEFAP Nominating SOP 5-103

Review of this SOP was begun during the March 21 meeting, and resumed at §5.4.2. The following comments were agreed upon:

The SOP might appropriately be renamed to be “Nominating Committee Operations and Procedure” since it only minimally addresses procedure for the committee’s functioning.

§5.4.2 – balanced representation is not a “goal” but a requirement.

Distinguishing between NEFAP-recognized and non-recognized ABs is inconsistent with TNI’s definitions of stakeholders in its Bylaws. This section ought to refer only to ABs, FSMOs and Others. Non-recognized ABs are not appropriately a sub-category of “other.”

The criteria set forth in 5.4.2.1 and 5.4.2.2 (minimum and maximum numbers of stakeholder representatives) might be better worded as saying that the requirement is a minimum of 3 stakeholders of each category.

§5.4.2.3 – federal and state agency representatives are elected to the NEFAP EC just like other members, rather than appointed by their agency (as are ex officio members of the TNI Board) and with the latest revision of TNI Bylaws, there is no longer provision for non-voting agency representatives, either.

This section would be better rewritten by eliminating the second bullet and making it a paragraph that includes the likely sectors that “other” members will represent, while setting overall numerical goals for the “other” stakeholder category (e.g., minimum of 3 and maximum of 6.) Please note that TNI members are not allowed to alter their designated stakeholder category based on the point of view they expect to represent on a committee. For instance, an AB employee may not

opt to be an “other” simply because that AB does not perform FSMO accreditations. NOTE: John offered to check this status for the EC member in question.

If the NEFAP EC believes that other stakeholder categories need to be identified to ensure balance of interests, it should petition the TNI Board for such new stakeholder categories to be applied to the NEFAP.

If these revisions (requested for §5) will create balance problems for the current NEFAP EC, please consult the TNI Executive Director and the TNI Board of Directors about how to proceed.

§5.5.1 – wording is awkward but the process is acceptable.

§5.5.4 – this requirement is covered in §5.4 and thus this item should be deleted.

§5.5.5 – please remove the word “future” from this item. Per Robert’s Rules (see “Nominations to the TNI Board of Directors,” TNI SOP 1-108, §7.0 (d) for the quotation), Nominating Committee members are eligible to run for any office at any time.

§5.7 – after the initial election, are all terms three years? If so, this section should be revised to remove reference to shorter terms. Otherwise, §6.1 conflicts with the second sentence of this section. Please clarify, and if terms shorter than three years now applies only to special elections to replace members departing before their elected term is complete, then address that in §6.2. Member term expiration dates should be recorded, generally in the committee charter at least. Also, this SOP does not indicate a maximum number of terms (normally two, for TNI committees), but the draft charter appears to indicate with an asterisk those members whose terms are not renewable. If there is a maximum number of terms, that limit needs to be documented.

NOTE: It appears from the draft charter that “recognized” AB members of the NEFAP EC do not have expiration dates on their terms and thus may be, in effect, permanent members of the committee. This practice is not documented in any NEFAP SOP, and if it is desired, it needs to be documented and there needs to be some provision for addressing the lack of balance that could occur in the future as additional ABs are recognized. Two other complications were identified by Policy Committee: 1) this practice would create a situation where there are two-tiers of committee member status and 2) if such permanent membership is desired, the documentation should address how the representatives of those ABs are identified or selected if not by periodic election. John will clarify with the NEFAP EC and report back to the Policy Committee on whether this is actual practice,

Once John returns with clarifications from the NEFAP EC, as noted above, the Policy Committee comments on the full SOP will be consolidated and returned to the NEFAP EC Chair.

6. Next Steps

Finalizing the review of NEFAP SIR SOP 5-106 awaits John’s feedback on the rationale for the dispute resolution process.

Finalizing the review of NEFAP Nominating SOP 5-103 awaits John’s feedback on the actual practices of populating the committee, as highlighted above.

Alfredo to send request for review of POL 5-100 to NEFAP EC.

Amend the Committee Operations SOP 1-101 to address bringing in committee chairs who have not been on the committee for a year (as has happened twice, recently.)

7. Next Meeting

Policy Committee will meet again on Friday April 18, 2014, at 11 am Eastern. Teleconference information and an agenda will be circulated in advance of the meeting.

Action Items are included in Attachment B and Attachment C includes a listing of reminders.

Attachment A

Name/Affiliation	Representing	Present
Alfredo Sotomayor, Chair Wisconsin Dept. of Natural Resources, Madison, WI alfredo.sotomayor@Wisconsin.gov	TNI Board	Yes
JoAnn Boyd Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, TX jboyd@swri.org	Lab and FSMO	Yes
Patrick Brumfield Sigma-Aldrich RTC, Laramie, WY patrick.brumfield@sial.com	PT Executive Committee	No
Silky Labie Env. Lab. Consulting & Technology, LLC Tallahassee, FL elcatllc@centurylink.net		Yes
John Moorman South Florida Water Management District West Palm Beach, FL jmoorma@sfwmd.gov	NEFAP Executive Committee	Yes
Mei Beth Shepherd mbshep@sheptechserv.com		Yes
Susan Wyatt, Vice Chair Minnesota DOH, St. Paul, MN susan.wyatt@state.mn.us	NELAP AC	No
Bob Wyeth Retired rfwyeth@yahoo.com	CSD Executive Committee	Yes
Jerry Parr (ex-officio) Executive Director, TNI Jerry.Parr@nelac-institute.org		Yes
Lynn Bradley, Program Administrator The NELAC Institute (Staunton, VA) lynn.bradley@nelac-institute.org		Yes

Attachment B

Action Items – TNI Policy Committee

	Action Item	Who	Expected Completion	Comments/Completion
34	Review NELAC chapter 6 for needed policies and SOPs, applicable to the AC	Susan	3/15/13	Pending with AC – initial discussions occurred October 7
48	Review SOPs 1-101 and 2-101 for possible edits to assign responsibility to chairs for addressing committee member changes in stakeholder categories	Alfredo	6/5/13	Wrapped up at 2/21/14 meeting
58	Prepare formal comments on SOP 3-102 for return to NELAP AC	Lynn/Alfredo	3/7/14	
59	Prepare formal comments on SOP 5-106 for return to NEFAP EC, after John returns results of research into rationale for deferring SIR appeals to CSD PEC	John, then Lynn/Alfredo	April 2014	
60	Send request for review of POL 5-100 to NEFAP EC	Alfredo	April 2014	
61	Clarify practices of NEFAP EC	John	April 2014	
62				

Attachment C

Backburner / Reminders – TNI Policy Committee

	Item	Meeting Reference	Comments
1.	Look into need to include something about review schedule in all SOPs.	3/20/12	
2	Include mention of abstentions in SOP 1-102 revision (or elsewhere,) to ensure that intentional choice of appropriate wording is made in committee decision making choices	10/5/12	
3	In SOP 1-101, "Committee Operations," or else SOP 1-102, "Decision Making...", some mention of "default" decision making rules would be beneficial, since most committees do not have documentation of their decision processes.	10/22/12	SOP 1-102 discusses various options and situations where one might work better than others, but SOP 1-101 refers to 1-102 as if it sets a default.
6	New Committee Charter format should include listing for Executive Director as ex officio member for all committees (per Bylaws.)	9/20/13	Charter format to be upgraded to address committee annual budgets later this year
7	Next revision of Pol 1-122 include addition of a sentence addressing the possibility of additional stakeholder categories.	2/21/14	Committees may add an additional stakeholder category with approval of TNI Board
8	When the CSD PEC charter is next updated, it should clarify which committees have added stakeholder categories and note that Board approval is required and was obtained for including those additional representatives in the committee(s.)	2/21/14	