

## TNI Board of Directors Meeting Summary November 9, 2016

---

### 1. Roll Call

Directors	Present
Jordan Adelson (Alyssa Wingard)	X
Aaren Alger	X
Steve Arms	X
Justin Brown	X
Scot Cocanour	X
George Detsis	X
Jack Farrell	X
Keith Greenaway	
Myron Gunsalus	X
Daniel Lashbrook	X
Judy Morgan	X
Lara Phelps	X
Patsy Root	X
Scott Siders	X
Alfredo Sotomayor	X
Dave Speis	X
Past President	
Sharon Mertens	
Staff	
Lynn Bradley	X
Carol Batterton	X
Ken Jackson	X
Jerry Parr	X
Ilona Taunton	X
Janice Wlodarski	X
Bob Wyeth – Guest	
Valerie Slavin – Guest	X

### 2. Approval of September and October Minutes

#### Approval of September 2016 Minutes

**Motion to Approve:** Steve Arms  
**Second:** Judy Morgan  
**Abstain:** Dave Speis  
**Approved:** Approved

#### Approval of October 2016 Minutes

**Motion to Approve:** Dave Speis  
**Second:** Scot Cocanour  
**Approved:** Unanimous

#### 4. 2017 Board Election

Last year, we started a new process, moving the election up one month so voting could occur during the winter meeting. Assuming we continue that process, this is the proposed schedule:

- November 9 to December 31, 2016 – Nominations accepted
- January 1-16, 2017 – Nomination Committee will review the nominations and prepare a slate of candidates.
- January 16 – Voting opens with the announcement of the slate of candidates on the TNI website
- January 23-26 – Forum on Laboratory Accreditation, Houston, TX – Candidates Meet and Greet
- February 13 – Voting closes
- March 8 – Newly elected Directors assume office

Current Directors, whose terms expire in March 2017, are: Aaren Alger, Justin Brown, Scot Cocanour, Keith Greenaway, and Patsy Root. These individuals are eligible to serve additional terms.

The process is open on the website. We wanted to have this open before the newsletter comes out.

#### 6. 2016 Laboratory Standard

The Proficiency Testing (PT) and Chemistry Expert Committees have made draft editorial changes to their 2016 standards to present to the Accreditation Council (AC). The AC had rejected the PT standard with 4 specific objections, and the committee believes they can be satisfactorily addressed through editorial changes that will not change the sense of the standard. The Chemistry Committee is also attempting to address 4 objections. The committee believes 3 of them can be addressed editorially, but not the fourth one. This would involve adding specific quantitative criteria for the on-going validation of the Limit of Quantitation. The committee has presented a document explaining its rationale for not including those criteria in the standard, and will present that at a meeting of the AC. In discussions of the Consensus Standards Development Executive Committee and the two Expert Committees, serious concerns have been expressed over the low turnout of accreditation bodies throughout the voting process, and that none of the new AC concerns had been raised by anyone who voted. The 2016 standard is final, having passed the consensus voting process, and if the AC is not now prepared to adopt the standard with only editorial changes, the only recourse for the Expert Committees will be to embark on a new standard.

At its November 7 meeting, the AC planned to review responses from both PT and Chemistry Expert Committees, to determine whether the several objections to both V1M1 and V1M4 are satisfactorily addressed with the technical clarifications provided.

~~~

The PT and Chemistry Module went through the CSDP procedure, as approved by TNI and endorsed by ANSI. They passed and became final standards. After being “final”, we cannot make substantive changes, only editorial. After approval, some AC members raised objections. Many of the objections can be resolved editorially – the problem is the 8<sup>th</sup> objection regarding the ongoing verification of the LOQ. The Chemistry EC considered the objection and could not see any way to fix it editorially. The AC met on Monday with the Chemistry EC, who discussed and explained the rationale for what they did and said that they couldn’t change it. Unfortunately, the AC said no, we cannot let it go – it must be changed. Now, we must start with a new standard – 2017 Standard.

What are the repercussions of this action? We have a 2016 Standard which will not be used. The only way forward is a new Standard. There is a process that needs to be followed – although there is a way to fast track it – but only if things are going to go smoothly:

1. The Chemistry EC goes through an initial process, puts out a notification of proposed standards activity, and leaves it up for 30 days.
2. At the same time, they put in a notice to ANSI, Project Initiation Notification, for 30 days.
3. Upon hearing no objections, they reach out to stakeholders and groups, including the AC, wait 30 days, and hopefully get some good input.
4. Then the Chemistry EC puts out a draft standard, for 30 days.
5. At this point, they discuss the draft with the stakeholders and reach some agreement on what the standard should be.
6. At this point, if they've done the job properly, they put together a voting draft standard.
7. And if they've REALLY done the job properly, the VDS will not be contentious and will be approved.
8. If approved without persuasive comments, it will become the final standard. If not, the review and approval process will go on longer.

It could take up to a year to get this job done.

ANSI has approved Volume 1 as a whole, so we will have to hold the entire volume until this is done.

Side issue: There are two other committees poised to revise two other pieces of the standard, including Volume 1, Module 7. Will revising other modules slow down the revision of the Chemistry module? Not revising all modules at the same time may slow down the revision of Module 2.

Implications: CA has announced they are moving forward with the 2016 Standard. This Standard is available for anyone to use (NELAP will not be moving forward with it). This might be an issue with FL, as they plan to have a final rule by the end of the year and they want to use the 2016 Standard. This may not be realistic for Florida. How can a NELAP AB move forward without the AC approval?

What are the issues? What is the real significance of the object? They don't like that there are no numeric criteria in the ongoing verification of the LOQ? This is not the issue. The issue that the AC has (Aaren's reason for voting no) – the LOQ must be 3x the MDL requirement. When she spoke to her lab there, and a couple of other labs, they all agreed that would be virtually impossible to meet for drinking water and she could not vote yes to that. In that Monday's meeting, the only issue they discussed was the quantification verification of an LOQ issue. The AC didn't want the committee to come up with numerical limits. The concern was that there was a standard to be analyzed, an LOQ check, and a qualification of something greater than 0 was needed to be acceptable. This does not make a better standard. In Chicago, Aaren specifically stated that she wanted the word to be "quantitative", not "qualitative". That was Aaren's intention of the information that was to go back to the Chemistry Committee.

It does not seem like the Chemistry EC and the AB are on the same page with what the issues are and what can be resolved editorially and what are substantial changes. It seems like there has been a lot of miscommunication.

Proposed Next Steps:

The AC and Chemistry EC should meet and

- 1) decide what needs to be changed, which items are editorial and which are substantial changes (game changers),
- 2) work out the editorial changes,
- 3) work out the substantial changes, then
- 4) discuss adopting the standard now with a later implementation date, and

5) the module be changed and approved within one year in time for implementation.

Should there be a separate AC/CEC meeting (from regular Chemistry or AC meetings)? The next Chemistry meeting is on the 18<sup>th</sup>. Valerie and Aaren will discuss and then set up a meeting, including AC representation, for the 18<sup>th</sup>. Everyone that voted no should be part of the process, especially if we don't know why they voted no. A progress report will be provided at the next Board meeting.

### 3. SOP 3-106, Review of Standards for Suitability

This SOP was provided in October, but due to no quorum is being presented again. The SOP details the steps in the review process and the elements that must be considered for an accreditation standard to be recommended for adoption by TNI NELAP Accreditation Council (AC) and its component Accreditation Bodies (ABs). As such, this SOP is considered one of the key SOPs in TNI process for implementing laboratory accreditation standards and is being presented to the Board for endorsement.

#### **Motion to Endorse SOP 3-106, Review of Standards for Suitability**

**Motion to Endorse:** Myron Gunsalus  
**Second:** Daniel Lashbrook  
**Approved:** Unanimous

### 5. SOP 3-102 (Rev 4.0) Evaluation of Accreditation Bodies

This SOP describes the procedures used by the NELAP Accreditation Council (AC) to evaluate Accreditation Bodies (ABs) for initial or continuing recognition. The current revision of this document builds upon previous revisions developed by the EPA Evaluation Workgroup under NELAC, used during the years of the 2003 NELAC Standard, and used in the initial evaluation cycles under the 2009 TNI Standard. This revision further streamlines the evaluation process by maximizing opportunities for off-site review and video or teleconferencing, in an effort to minimize travel expenses associated with on-site review.

#### **Motion to Endorse SOP 3-102 (Rev 4.0), Evaluation of Accreditation Bodies**

**Motion to Endorse:** Jack Farrell  
**Second:** Scott Siders  
**Approved:** Unanimous

### 2. NEFAP Letter (Attachment 1)

This is also a holdover from October. This is one of the strategic planning initiatives and it got handed off to NEFAP. One of the struggles they have with this is that is crossed over between the programs so much that getting people involved and taking it seriously has been a challenge. The committee felt like the subcommittee had pulled a lot of good information together so there's lots of information about what the state programs are like and where some of the differences are. A comprehensive comparison of the programs was also completed. The committee now feels that the information collected should be handled at the TNI Board level because of that crossover between programs. Perhaps putting together a task force or ad hoc group with people from both the NELAP and NEFAP sides would be appropriate and get task would be completed a lot quicker than the progress that they've made.

~~~

*Summary:* One of the initiatives that came out of the Strategic Planning meeting was for NEFAP to look at the status of the mobile laboratory industry, where they fall within the programs, and how they are being addressed by different state agencies. The goal is to hopefully, at some point, harmonize how they are addressed from an accreditation standpoint. NEFAP had a subcommittee that did a lot

of investigative work about how mobile laboratories were addressed and they found the information pretty much all over the place. The subcommittee made a recommendation to NEFAP, who concurred with them, that the issue is now bigger than what the NEFAP Executive Committee can deal with. What it is requesting of the Board is to consider creating an ad hoc committee or a strategic committee of some sort, that would combine with the NELAP and NEFAP sides to try to address the issue of harmonizing how we're going to deal with mobile laboratories in the future.

*Questions/Discussion:*

Item #3 of Letter – the need for a consistent definition: Item #3 indicates there is a definition above but it does not appear there. *The definition is in another document.*

The requested action for the Board is to approve the formation of an ad hoc committee or task force to deal with the issue of mobile laboratories, and that the ad hoc committee or task force should be composed of members of NELAP and NEFAP. Do you have a recommendation as to who should be leading that task force? *There is no recommendation right now. They don't think it matters who leads it as long as there is adequate representation on both sides.*

How many people should be involved in this? 4 & 4? 5 & 5? *NEFAP EC has not fleshed this out any further. It probably does not need to be a very large committee and at this point, a smaller committee may work better. The NEFAP EC did talk a little bit about this and were thinking perhaps a minimum of 6 – 7 people, because in addition to NELAP ABs, there may be other states that have a lot of field work that may have helpful information. The group is also considering the addition of representation from mobile laboratories.*

The coordination of mobile laboratories is a great thought, but there are laws that would need to be changed, so what could the plan actually entail? Is this a worthwhile endeavor? Much of this will be driven by state law and regulation.

Do we have a feel for how many mobile labs there are? This has been a question for some time and do we know how big a problem is it really? *Since it was in the Strategic Plan, it is not so much a question of whether it's a big or small problem, it seems to be something that has been unresolved*

*The Strategic Plan initiative says: "Develop and implement a plan for treatment of mobile labs amongst ABs and between NELAP and NEFAP." Part of what the group did was to look at the Standard, they talked to different states, and probably what they thought the outcome would be is that it would be clearly defined as to when a mobile lab would need NELAP or when NEFAP is okay. Some of it would be understanding what the other's rules and standards are and trying to make that clear to the community. Right now, it seems to be a bit overlapped and people are confused. There are questions about when mobile labs cross over the state line, i.e., do they have to be accredited already? There's a lot of confusion and it seems that that is what this committee would be addressing.*

Perhaps it would be best if there are two options for them. If they want to be NELAP-accredited, fine; otherwise they would be NEFAP-accredited. Maybe NEFAP would be for laboratories, for instance, air and stack testers. Maybe certain laboratories would benefit more from NEFAP accreditation than NELAP. Jack's organization does audits for air and stack testing laboratories under NELAP and sometimes it's a bit of a stretch. So maybe there's an option when which accreditation (NEFAP vs NELAP) is better for what kind of laboratory.

The issue is not the type of testing, it's the purpose of the testing that's important, so it's going to depend on the regulatory agency the lab is doing it for and what the contractual agreements are. So, for example, any combined testing for Pennsylvania DEP must be done by an accredited laboratory, either NELAP or the state program. Or someone can write into a contract that they need NELAP accreditation. So, again, it's not the type of testing that's important, it's the purpose of the testing.

This would be something that the laboratory organization would need to decide – what they need. Maybe they need both and then that way, they can comply with the regulatory requirements and it keeps it flexible.

This is correct, but maybe an ad hoc group from TNI won't be able to decide this – it will be the laboratory's decision. But the ad hoc group can help facilitate that information being provided and let everybody know what are the rules. We, as an institution, can provide an understanding of why nothing can be done to harmonize this.

Other countries that use 17025 don't treat mobile laboratories, that do compliance data reporting, any differently than any other lab that has 17025. They must have a quality manual. If they are on their own, they must be part of a quality system or a parent organization, and they are accredited just like any other laboratory. Given this, why do we have to do something separate?

There is a lot of overlap and a lot of confusion when labs are trying to figure out what they should be using. We're trying to make sure they have the information they need so they can put something together and have it reviewed by others, but they're having a tough time even putting something together from the start.

It seems more confusing than it needs to be.

What NEFAP is asking for is a group to provide clarity so that NELAP as an organization has a clear path for which to choose depending on what the situation is. NEFAP EC didn't feel comfortable doing this on its own, they wanted collaboration with the laboratory side as well so TNI as an organization has a clear path.

This discussion today makes it clear that clarity is needed.

After hearing today's discussion, the Board is interested in moving forward with this, but there is not enough detail to act today. NEFAP EC needs to come back to the Board with a draft charter, more information on what the issue is and what the goals are, and a proposal for who the committee members would be.

Ilona and Justin will take this back to their groups and they will work on a recommendation.

## **10. Program Reports (Attachment 2)**

---

**Attachment 1**  
**NEFAP Memo: Next Steps for Mobile Laboratories and Accreditations**

---

October 11, 2016

To: TNI Board of Directors

From: NEFAP EC

Subject: Next Steps for Mobile Laboratories and Accreditations

Based on the 2014 charter of the NEFAP EC, the Mobile Laboratory Subcommittee has concluded its charge from the EC has been completed, and has submitted its recommendations for the next steps to the NEFAP EC and NELAP AC.

Based on the NEFAP EC Mobile Laboratory Subcommittees work, the NEFAP EC recommends that the TNI – Board of Directors form an ad hoc committee to work on developing a plan on addressing mobile laboratories.

The TNI Strategic Plan initiative established that TNI; “Develop and implement a plan for treatment of mobile labs among NELAP ABs and between NELAP and NEFAP.” Based on the NEFAP EC Mobile Laboratory Subcommittees work, the NEFAP EC recommends that the TNI – Board of Directors form an ad hoc committee to work on consistent mobile laboratory policies for NELAP and to better define mobile laboratory procedures between NELAP and NEFAP so it is clear when each accreditation is appropriate and to ensure the two programs are both operating within their scope. This topic crosses over program lines and handling this at the TNI Board level seems more appropriate than completing this strategic initiative within NEFAP.

The NEFAP Mobile Laboratory Subcommittee has summarized its activities below which lead to their recommendations:

1. The differences between the NELAP and NEFAP were presented at the 2014 Washington DC FAC meeting. At the FAC meeting via telecast, Paul Bergeron presented in a power point the differences.
2. Two different Mobile Laboratory surveys were conducted to acquire information regarding the differences in accreditations and what the mobile laboratories were experiencing in their accreditation process. Changes have occurred since the survey and states have started to accept secondary accreditation for mobile laboratories. However, states such as NY and NJ still accredit to the VIN unless associated with a fixed facility. Still a large set of differences exist between states. It is beyond this subcommittee to address.
3. From the survey it was clear that a consistent definition for mobile laboratory was important to the stakeholders and that TNI/NELAP and NEFAP should all be using the same definition. Therefore, the committee came up with the definition noted above which should be further vetted with other stakeholders.

As noted above, the remaining question to the committee was the TNI Strategic Plan initiative. “From the TNI Strategic Plan: Develop and implement a plan for treatment of mobile labs among NELAP ABs and between NELAP and NEFAP.” The subcommittee agreed that this was not within the charge of the subcommittee and that a recommendation should be made to both the

NELAP AC and NEFAP EC to form another subcommittee or an ad hoc committee to come to a consensus and document that work to address the treatment of mobile laboratories. Paul Bergeron introduced this topic during the NELAP AC teleconference on October 3, 2016, and made this recommendation.

The subcommittee would like to see language within each states' accreditation process that would address mobile laboratories with a consistent definition and a consistent accreditation process.

In addition, it proposes that the ad hoc committee work on developing a plan on addressing mobile laboratories and address field sampling: specifically, work out the issues of NELAP and NEFAP overlap and help to streamline the NELAP/NEFAP process so not all FSMOs have to have dual accreditations.

Respectfully,

NEFAP EC Chair  
Kim B. Watson



---

## Attachment 2 PROGRAM REPORTS

---

### CONSENSUS STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT

- The Proficiency Testing (PT) and Chemistry Expert Committees have made draft changes to their 2016 standards to present to the Accreditation Council (AC). The AC had rejected the PT standard with 4 specific objections, and the committee believes they can be satisfactorily addressed through editorial changes that will not change the sense of the standard. The Chemistry Committee is also attempting to address 4 objections. The committee believes 3 of them can be addressed editorially, but not the fourth one. This would involve adding specific quantitative criteria for the on-going validation of the Limit of Quantitation. The committee has presented a document explaining its rationale for not including those criteria in the standard, and will present that at a meeting of the AC. In discussions of the Consensus Standards Development Executive Committee and the two Expert Committees, serious concerns have been expressed over the low turnout of accreditation bodies throughout the voting process, and that none of the new AC concerns had been raised by anyone who voted. The 2016 standard is final, having passed the consensus voting process, and if the AC is not now prepared to adopt the standard with only editorial changes, the only recourse for the Expert Committees will be to embark on a new standard.
- The four volumes of the 2016 Environmental Sector standard are now in their final stage of ANSI approval as American National Standards, and that approval is anticipated with the next few weeks.
- The Stationary Source Audit Sample Committee is considering a problem being faced by the audit sample providers. Approximately 75-80% of audit samples are being requested at the low end of the concentration ranges in the tables, and there are even a lot of requests for samples at concentrations below the low end. This is presenting a tremendous burden on the providers, and the committee is working on adjusting the concentration ranges.
- The Radiochemistry committee discussed the potential impact of EPA's updates of the 900 series methods on the TNI Standard. These are old methods and the committee wants to ensure that the QC in the updates do not conflict with the Standard. Bob is reaching out to EPA. The radiochemistry chapter in the Small Laboratory Handbook has been updated to incorporate committee comments. They are working on more examples and hope to have the chapter sent to Quality Systems Expert Committee in December. The 2016 Assessor Checklist is continuing to be worked on. There are questions about how to track methods being reviewed.
- The Microbiology committee did not meet in October but is continuing work on the Small Lab Handbook.
- The Quality Systems committee is now reviewing completed chapters and detailed outlines for the Handbook. Completed chapters will be given to Ilona to incorporate into one document. The committee hopes to be able to share portions of the Handbook in Houston and have a product ready for final editing and production in March 2017.
- The Laboratory Accreditation Body Committee (LAB) continues its review of a draft document combining Modules 1 and 3 of Volume 2 of the TNI Standard. This complete draft will form the starting point for the upcoming revision of Volume 2, when that can begin. Committee membership stands at ten members, with several associate members not interested in becoming full members. Additional volunteers would be welcome, up to a full roster of fifteen individuals.
- The Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) committee is gearing up to revise its module (V1M7) of the TNI ELSS as soon as the 2016 Standard is completed. Volunteers lined up to lead the efforts for particular issues within the module. In addition, they are responding to several questions related to WET laboratory procedures from outside sources, being very careful not to expand upon the standard or the methods but rather to offer best professional opinions in response to the questions asked. Committee members

continue discussing how best to transform the WET Assessment Forum session at conference into a webinar, or series of webinars, that can be used for assessor training.

## **NEFAP Executive Committee**

- Kim Watson was voted in to continue as Chair of the Committee and Justin Brown was voted in as Vice-Chair.
- A subcommittee is being formed to work on updating the information currently on the NEFAP website. Work is progressing on the “Why I have FSMO Accreditation” videos.
- The TNI Board started discussion on Mobile Labs last month, but there were not enough Board members on the call to determine next steps. The following information was provided last time: The Mobile Lab Subcommittee sent a formal request to the TNI Board of Directors to form a “Task Force” or special committee to continue work on the following strategic initiative: Develop and implement a plan for treatment of mobile labs among NELAP ABs and between NELAP and NEFAP. The subcommittee has collected data that will be helpful to this new group.
- The Strategic/Marketing Subcommittee has not met this month.
- The committee will delay work on their Charter until they receive information from TNI on the new Charter format.
- Kim and Justin are finalizing a PowerPoint template for presentations on NEFAP. This template can be used as a stand-alone or parts can be added to other presentations.
- Kim plans to pull together an NEMC session on Field Sampling. She is encouraging people to start thinking about Field Sampling abstracts.
- PJLA raised the issue about using the NEFAP Standard for sampling outside of Environmental Field Sampling. She has had clients ask about food and cannabis sampling. This will be the primary topic of November’s meeting. This is an opportunity to expand the use of the Standard and is timely considering FAC’s preparation to begin it’s update of the Standard.
- Ilona will be pulling together a subcommittee to work with the PTP Executive Committee on procedures to combine the evaluation of NGABs.

## **Field Activities Expert Committee (FAC)**

- The committee has contacted Ken Jackson for help to contact ANSI to start the process of updating the Standard. The committee plans to start with the AB Volume and start to discuss topics, such as PTs, that were not completely addressed in the last Standard update.
- Work will begin on additional FSMO tools in November. The committee is looking at preparing a Quality Manual Template and example SOPs/Policies.
- Work on the Scope Guidance document is continuing.

## **NELAP**

### **Accreditation Council**

- Only one evaluation awaits the corrective action response to the site report, and the one remaining provisionally recognized AB is on track to complete its corrective actions by the end of the year. Renewal letters for the first three ABs of the new evaluation cycle will go out later this month.

- Development of the updated training for NELAP evaluators has begun, with training to be offered at conference in Houston with a webinar version of the training to follow shortly thereafter.
- At its November 7 meeting, the AC planned to review responses from both PT and Chemistry Expert Committees, to determine whether the several objections to both V1M1 and V1M4 are satisfactorily addressed with the technical clarifications provided.
- The AC will also be asked to accept final evaluation team assignments and an updated Application Form now that the NELAP Evaluation SOP 3-102 Rv 4.0 is completed. That SOP is provided to the Board with today's agenda.

### Laboratory Accreditation System Executive Committee (LAS EC)

- LASEC reviewed the recommended resolutions to the Chemistry and PT modules of Volume 1 of the 2016 standard, as provided by both committees, and its conclusions were presented to the November 7 NELAP AC meeting. LASEC worked with the chairs of both expert committees in order to assist the committees in understanding the specific issues, as well as crafting suitable language for technical clarifications to resolve those issues.
- LASEC's final review of the complete Volume 1 of the 2016 TNI ELSS has been set aside until the issues with the individual modules are resolved.
- The LASEC Review of Standards for Suitability SOP 3-106 is again provided to the Board with today's agenda.
- Quarterly Standards Interpretation Request (SIR) Update:

Total Number	Closed Out	LASEC Review	NELAP AC	Expert Committee
299	267	15	13	3

### PROFICIENCY TESTING

- The committee is continuing its work on the review and approval of Volumes 3 and 4 of the 2016 Standard. Volume 3 will be complete in November and Volume 4 will be complete by December. The committee will then determine an implementation date. The committee is finding some editorial items, that they will have to decide whether or not to submit to the PT Expert Committee. An example is some missing language in V3 Section 5.5.3.4.2 where there is no mention of justification for modification, though this language is used in all other similar sections of the Standard, such as Section 5.7.1.2.
- The analyte code for TPH on the FoPT table has been called into question. The FoPT table should probably be using Code 1853. This is being investigated and will be corrected after further investigation. Dan Hickman and the FoPT Table Format Subcommittee are working on this.
- The committee is continuing its review of all FoPT tables to determine where updates are needed. I got a response from Erik Winchester and he does not believe the Lead tables are being used anymore, but he has passed the request on to the new lead of the lead program (Toiya Goodlow). Data is being requested for the Radiochemistry FoPT table update and the committee will begin on the update early 2017.
- Work on the PTPA checklists will resume after the new Standard Volumes are reviewed and approved.

- The footnotes in the FoPT table are being finalized and the SCM and NPW table updates will soon be ready for review by the NELAP AC.
- Ilona will be pulling together a subcommittee to work with the NEFAP Executive Committee on procedures to combine the evaluation of NGABs.
- No progress was made this month on developing new methods to update FoPT tables.

## **ADMINISTRATION**

### **Non-Governmental Accreditation Bodies**

- The NGAB working group and TNRC are close to finalizing a recommendation for an organizational structure to consolidate TNI's recognition programs. The group is targeting the December Board meeting for presentation of their recommendation.
- The group will also continue to finalize an SOP for a complaints and appeals process.
- All corrective action reports have been responded to. Information for one scope has been requested and a final corrective action update is expected in the next week from another AB. TNRC should receive recognition packages by the end of the month.

### **Advocacy Committee**

- The newsletter is on track for November publication. Robin Cook is the editor.
- The Advocacy Committee finalized a plan for the small laboratory mentor session for Monday afternoon of the Houston meeting. The goal of the session will be to present specific examples of how small labs have met the requirements of the TNI standard. The examples will be shared with the California labs.

### **Policy Committee**

- Distribution of draft checklists for committee self-audits, as mentioned in the TNI QMP, will begin shortly after the upcoming TNI newsletter is published. The individual committees will then be able to review and approve them and request adjustments, if needed, due to SOP modifications for the particular committees. This review should be completed by January, so that the checklists can be in place for the anticipated QMP implementation at the beginning of 2017.
- Policy Committee has approved the revised NELAP Evaluation SOP 3-102 Rv 4.0, and also an additional AB responsibility to be added to the NELAP Mutual Recognition Policy 3-100, to require biweekly (or more often) reporting to LAMS. These documents are provided to the Board for its endorsement at today's meeting, along with the held-over LASEC Standards Review for Suitability SOP 3-106.

### **Training**

- A quiz has been prepared for the Ethics for Professional's training and all CEU related information has been sent to William for posting. This class will now be offered with CEUs in response to requests from potential students.

## **NEMC**

- Session topics and call for abstracts have been posted on the NEMC website.
- Keynote and plenary speakers have been identified. Plenary speakers will also present training sessions on their topics.
- The exhibitor brochure will be final in early December.

## **Membership Report**

- There were 2 new committee applications that has been forwarded to the committee chair and Program Administrator.
- Active Members: 897