

**NEFAP Executive Committee
Meeting Summary
March 31, 2014**

1. Roll call:

Chair Kim Watson called the NEFAP Executive Committee meeting to order on March 31, 2014 at 11 am ET. Attendance is included in Attachment A. There were 8 committee members present. Associate Members present: Marlene Moore, William Batschelet.

The meeting minutes from January 29, 2014 were reviewed. Cheryl made a motion to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded by Justin and unanimously approved. (*Additional Note: There was no meeting in February.*)

2. Nomination Committee

Cheryl noted that we are behind in the process, but she has started pulling the committee together. It was commented that next year when we post the openings it would make sense to let people know what types of openings are available. Cheryl is contacting Scott to see if he wants to extend his membership. If he does not, Cheryl will ask if he knows candidates that may want to apply. She will also reach out to Maggie Cangro and Troy Burrows.

3. FAC Standard

Tracy sent a comment by email on 3/29/14:
I have one comment to share about Volume II, see below.

*Page 12 Section 5.8.2: Added letter (m) - **Proficiency Testing Program***

I think we should add "as applicable" to this section. Some of us do not offer inter lab programs or accredit PT providers if that's what was meant by this. If I am mistaken by what this means, then we may want to consider rewording this.

Justin responded on 3/30/14:

Thanks for the input, just to clarify what the FAC did (off the top of my head without digging through notes), is that was added to support other areas in V2 that mention PTs to say that if such information is present it needs to be part of the review. The language above says "where available" so the committee interpreted that as saying if you have that information available to you (i.e. you did participate as a PTP, etc...) than you have to use that info during the management review. In essence we believed for this the way it was worded the "where available" covered applicability.

Hope that sheds some light on it a little bit, if we need more clarification I can go back and see what the original recommendation was and what, if any, the discussions were prior to approving – just let me know. Unfortunately Ilona is correct in that we are past the point of making any change be it substantive or for clarity until the next cycle. Any change would need to come through a TIA but I am not sure that would be appropriate here unless this is a significant issue. If it is let us know and we can discuss how to resolve...

Justin believes the question has been addressed, but he has not heard back from Tracy.

Carl asked if there were any changes to the ISO language. Justin responded that the language had not been changed.

Justin emphasized that any requests for non-editorial changes would need to wait until the next Standard update or be handled through a TIA.

There was a brief discussion on evaluation/assessment frequency for FSMOs.

Carl motioned to adopt the FSMO Sector Volume I and II Rev 2.0 standards for use in the NEFAP Accreditation Program. The motion was seconded by Lauren.

Roll Call Vote:

Kim Watson – For
Calista Daigle - For
John Moorman – For
Cheryl Morton – For
Nilda Cox – For
Carl Kircher – For
Lauren Smith - For
Nilda Cox – For
Justin Brown – For

The vote will be completed by email. Committee memberships

(Addition:

E-mail Votes:

Dane Wren – No Vote
Keith Greenaway – For (4/7/14)
Scott Evans – No Vote
Doug Leonard – No Vote
Doug Berg – Tracy – For (4/14/14)
Paul Bergeron – No Vote
Seb Gillette – For (3/31/14)
Jack Farrell – No Vote

The motion passed.)

Justin noted that implementation timing and actions still need to be discussed. There are some FSMO's that will come up for renewal this year.

Lauren noted that a year would be sufficient to have their program and FSMOs up to speed.

There were recommendations to have complete implementation by April 15, 2015.

Carl motioned that April 1, 2015 be the effective/implementation date of the NEFAP EC adopted standards (FSMO Sector Volume I and II Rev 2.0). The motion was seconded by Lauren.

Roll Call Vote:

Kim Watson – For
Calista Daigle - For
John Moorman – For
Cheryl Morton – For
Nilda Cox – For
Carl Kircher – For
Lauren Smith - For
Nilda Cox – For
Justin Brown – For

The vote will be completed by email.

(Addition:

E-mail Votes:

Dane Wren – No Vote
Keith Greenaway – Against (4/7/14)
Scott Evans – No Vote
Doug Leonard – No Vote
Doug Berg – Tracy – For (4/14/14)
Paul Bergeron – No Vote
Seb Gillette – For (3/31/14)
Jack Farrell – No Vote

The motion did not pass. A new motion was made by email:

Keith Greenaway moved to have an implementation period of 2-years from the date of adoption of the FSMO Vol. I and II Rev. 2.0 standards by the NEFAP Executive Committee. The motion was seconded by Paul Bergeron.

Roll Call Vote:

Kim Watson – For (4/16/14)

Calista Daigle - For (4/16/14)
John Moorman – For (4/16/14)
Cheryl Morton – For (4/16/14)
Nilda Cox – For (4/17/14)
Carl Kircher – For (4/17/14)
Lauren Smith – For (4/16/14)
Justin Brown – For (4/16/14)
Dane Wren – For (4/17/14)
Keith Greenaway – For (4/16/14)
Scott Evans – For (4/16/14)
Doug Leonard – For (4/16/14)
Doug Berg – For (4/17/14)
Paul Bergeron – For (4/16/14)
Seb Gillette – For (4/16/14)
Jack Farrell – (4/16/14)

The motion passed for a two year implementation.)

4. Evaluation SOP

The SOP being updated is SOP 5-105 Rev1 8-6-12.

Marlene commented that the group should look at a 3 year evaluation cycle because NGAP is also looking at 3 years. Kim thinks a 4 year cycle is fine for the NEFAP ABs.

Marlene thinks TNI should prepare a white paper on accreditation. She feels that the NEFAP EC should contact the TNI Board and Advocacy regarding this.

Concerns about PTs were expressed. Kim asked to table this comment for a discussion outside of the review of the Evaluation SOP.

Cheryl commented that NGAB will start with a 3 year cycle and then NGAB will look at 4 years down the road. They will work towards changing it to 4.

Don't need 6.2.1.3? Agreement.

6.4.1 – No.

Marlene will look at the language to make sure it is clear that TNI does not need to attend the ILAC evaluation. TNI specific requirements will be assessed during the document review.

Appendix H needs to be carefully reviewed.

Marlene will give language for the two sections she was concerned about.

An updated SOP will be distributed to the committee for review at the next meeting.

5. Mobile Laboratories

Paul distributed the Mobile Lab Subcommittee report. Kim reviewed the report. A copy of the report can be found in Attachment D.

The NEFAP EC needs to review the scope/mission of the committee and come to an agreement.

6. Meeting Times

Kim asked if anyone would like to see a set meeting time. Starting in in May, the committee will begin meeting the third Monday of every month at 11am. A doodle will be distributed for April.

7. New Items

- Add the Scope issue to the next agenda. Kim will talk to Doug to see if some of the ABs were able to look at other program scopes and see if there was something helpful. This will be discussed at the next meeting.
- There was correspondence with Jerry. IT is concerned about how they will post scopes because they are so different. Justin is taking this on as a action item. Is it valuable to do? Kim thinks scopes from NEFAP should be on the website. She does not think they will look like the labs. IT has tabled this issue until they hear back from NEFAP EC.

8. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the NEFAP Executive Committee will be in April by teleconference. The meeting will be planned by email.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 12:50 pm EST. (Motion: Carl Second: Cheryl Unanimously approved.)

Attachment A

**Participants
TNI NEFAP Executive Committee**

Members	Affiliation	Balance	Contact Information	
Kim Watson (Chair) Present	Stone Environmental Inc	FSMO	(802)229-2196	kwatson@stone-env.com
Keith Greenaway (Vice-Chair) Absent	ACLASS	AB	(703)836-0025	keith.greenaway@aclasscorp.com
Dane Wren Absent	Wren Engineering, P.A.	FSMO	(407)833-0061	dwren47@aol.com
Calista Daigle Present	Dade Moeller	FSMO	(225)485-2007	calista.daigle@gmail.com calista.daigle@moellerinc.com
Scott Evans Absent	Clean Air Engineering	AB	847-654-4569	sevans@cleanair.com
John Moorman Present	Water Quality Monitoring Division, South Florida Water Mang District	FSMO	(561)753-2400 x4654	jmoorma@sfwmd.gov
Cheryl Morton Present	AIHA	AB	703-846-0789	cmorton@aiha.org
Doug Leonard Absent	LAB	AB	260-637-2705	dleonard@l-a-b.com
Nilda Cox Present	Eurofins Eaton Analytical Inc	Other	626-318-8517	nildacox@eurofinsus.com
Doug Berg Absent	PJ Laboratory Accreditation, Inc.	AB	(248)709-0096	dberg@pjlabs.com douglasberg@gmail.com
Paul Bergeron Absent	LELAP	AB	225-219-3247	Paul.bergeron@la.gov
Carl Kircher Present	Florida DOH	AB	904-791-1574	Carl_kircher@doh.state.fl.us
Lauren Smith Present	A2LA	AB	(301)644 3216	lsmith@a2la.org
Seb Gillette Absent	DOD	Other	(210) 395-8434	john.gillette.1@us.af.mil
Justin B. Brown Present	EMT	FSMO	(847)324 3350	jbrown@emt.com
Jack Farrell Absent	AEX	Other	(407)331-5040	aex@ix.netcom.com

Members	Affiliation	Balance	Contact Information	
Ilona Taunton <i>(Program Administrator)</i> Present	The NELAC Institute		(828)712-9242	tauntoni@msn.com

Attachment B
Action Items – NEFAP Executive Committee

	Action Item	Who	Expected Completion	Actual Completion
27	Forward FSMO names to Ilona.	Justin	3-15-13	
39	Give Alternate name to Ilona.	All	9/30/10	Ongoing
81	Prepare NEFAP Timeline Agenda next moth	Doug L.	4/22/13	4/22/13: It has been distributed and needs to be put on agenda for review.
106	Mobile Lab Issue – Subcommittee to begin work. From Backburner: Evaluate overlap issue with NELAP and DoD ELAP regarding mobile labs. (Originally brought up 8-6-12 meeting.)	Kim, Scott, Doug Berg, John and Marlene. Mike to help through 3/13. 3/28/13: Paul has been added.	TBD	3/28/13: Subcommittee will begin work in April. Questionnaire will go out first. 6/12/13: Survey will go out this week. 10/10/13: Survey will be sent to 2 more lists of people.
110	Complete DRAFT Training SOP for EC review.	Scott, Lauren, Ilona	3/31/13	
116	Update Evaluation SOP and distribute to committee.	Marlene Carl Justin	5/2/13	6/12/13: Still in progress. 7/15/13: Still in progress. 12/17/13: Kim will help with this. 1/29/14: Kim will update language. Ilona will update attachments.
119	Update “Guidance for ABs on the Suggested Content for the Scope of Accreditation” by adding comments received by e-mail to Scope inquiry.	Kim	Next meeting	A guidance document outline will be discussed at the

	Action Item	Who	Expected Completion	Actual Completion
	Distribute to committee.			January meeting.
123	Send Ilona survey that needs to be mailed out.	Mike Miller Kim	10/24/13	
124	Send Presentation slides to committee members.	John	10/15/13	
130	Prepare DRAFT outline for Scope Guidance Document	Kim	1/24/14	
131	Review minutes to find information for Evaluation SOP.	Kim Ilona	1/15/14	Complete
135	Add Mobile Lab issue to charter.	Kim	3/15/14	
136	Look at Survey Monkey and decide how survey should be posted on the TNI website.	Kim Mike	March meeting.	
137	Update Evaluation SOP (Kim – text, Ilona-Attachments)	Kim Ilona	March meeting.	Complete
138	Check on brochure status.	Ilona	March meeting.	Complete
139	Provide update language for Evaluation SOP.	Marlene	4/7/14	
140	Meet and update Evaluation SOP for next meeting.	Ilona / Kim	April Meeting	

Attachment C

Backburner / Reminders – NEFAP Executive Committee

	Item	Meeting Reference	Comments
4	Review Charter.	October 2013	
6	Evaluate how to handle adding additional ABs. Impact on committee size.	8-6-12	
9	Determine need for a policy or statement regarding the assessment of sampling.	4-22-13	
10	Form Nomination Committee to develop new member recommendation for vote in March 2014.	10-10-13	

Attachment D
Mobile Laboratory Subcommittee Report

To: NEFAP Executive Committee From: Mobile Laboratory Subcommittee Members Date: March 31, 2014 Subject: Mobile Laboratory Subcommittee Report

The Mobile Laboratory Subcommittee (the Subcommittee) conducted two teleconferences to determine the work priorities of the subcommittee with the purpose of further understanding and development of the 2009 TNI standard (the Standard) as it applies to mobile laboratories (see Attachment A).

The Subcommittee accomplished the following tasks in each teleconference:

February 21, 2014

- Selected subcommittee chair, assistant chair and secretary
- Initiated discussion on language in the Standard and differences in implementation by NELAP states
- Identified the following action items:
 - Recruit another member of the NELAP Accreditation Council to participate on the subcommittee
 - Obtain from a program administrator the requirements for formalizing the activity of the subcommittee such as recording minutes and developing a charter
 - Develop a mission statement · Agreed to a regular meeting time of the third Friday of the month at 1:00 PM ET.

March 21, 2014

- Discussed the questions (not the replies) of the NELAP Accreditation Council's survey of member's requirements for accreditation of mobile laboratories.
- Discussed the options for the Subcommittee mission (see recommendations)
- Discussed the definition of a mobile laboratory
- Initiated discussion of state regulatory requirements (beyond the Standard) for mobile laboratory accreditation
- Discussed updating the mobile laboratory community survey, updating the respondent list, and updating the definition of "mobile laboratory"
- Identified the following action items:
 - Obtain a copy of the responses to the NELAP Accreditation Council (when the Council's minutes are approved)

- Obtain the previous list of mobile laboratory survey respondents from the NEFAP EC Program Administrator
- Prepare report to the NEFAP EC on the subcommittee's activities and recommendations

The Mobile Laboratory subcommittee provides the following recommendations:

1. Charge the subcommittee with identifying the differences between NEFAP and NELAP implementation of the Standard with regard to mobile laboratory accreditation.
2. Charge the subcommittee with identifying the differences between accreditation based on the TNI standard and accreditation based on the regulations of the states which require such accreditation.
3. Charge the subcommittee with preparing a consensus definition of "mobile laboratories" for use by the NEFAP and other stakeholders

The Subcommittee would also like to provide the NEFAP EC with the following observation:

The definition of a mobile laboratory is changing and differs among the agencies and organizations involved in the accreditation process; for example, a mobile laboratory is "a person/body performing 1) sample collection (no physical structure yet in the field), 2) person/body performing sample testing (no physical structure yet in the field), 3) person/body performing sample collection in a van or enclosure (e.g. non-permanent building or shed), 4) drone/person/body performing sample testing in a trailer or other mobile enclosure, 5) person/body performing sample collection and sample testing (no physical structure yet in the field), 6) person/body performing sample collection and sample testing in a van or enclosure (e.g. non-permanent building or shed), or 7) drone/person/body performing sample collection and sample testing in a trailer or other mobile enclosure. By extension, the accreditation process is also changing and differs among the agencies and organizations which require or are responsible for either primary or secondary accreditation.

Please contact me with any questions you might have regarding these recommendations and the observation.

Sincerely,

Paul Bergeron Chair, NEFAP Mobile Laboratory Subcommittee



Attachment A: Mobile Laboratory Language in the 2009 TNI Standard

Field Sampling and Measurement Organization (FMSO) Sector, Volume 1, (2007, Revision 0.1), Section 4.1.3: The management system shall cover work carried out in the laboratory's permanent facilities, at sites away from its permanent facilities, or in associated temporary or mobile facilities.

FMSO Sector, Volume 2, (2007, Revision 0.1), Section 7.1.1.2.c: The accreditation body shall determine whether a FSMO qualifies for an umbrella accreditation or for an individual accreditation, taking into account the presence or absence of a common management system, ownership/management, technical oversight, and scope of accreditation as detailed in the FSMO accreditation application.

NOTE 1: FSMO activities, whether from a fixed or mobile base, that encompass multiple field sampling and measurement locations, do not require separate accreditations.

NOTE 2: A mobile sampling and measurement unit, operating under the FSMO management system, does not require a separate accreditation.

FMSO Sector, Volume 2, (2007, Revision 0.1), Section 7.2.1.1: An accreditation body shall require a FSMO seeking accreditation to complete and submit a formal application package to the accreditation body to include

g: a description of the FMSO type (for example....mobile...)

j: a summary of mobile units, listed by function, that are integral to field sampling and measurement activities and are employed by the FSMO facilities being considered for accreditation

Environmental Laboratory Sector, Volume 1, Module 2, Section 3.1: Additional Terms and Definitions

Mobile Laboratory: A portable enclosed structure with necessary and appropriate accommodation and environmental conditions for a laboratory, within which testing is performed by analysts. Examples include but are not limited to trailers, vans, and skid-mounted structures configured to house testing equipment and personnel.

Environmental Laboratory Sector, Volume 1, Module 2, Section 4.1.3: The management system shall cover work carried out in the laboratory's permanent facilities, at sites away from its permanent facilities, or in associated temporary or mobile facilities.

Environmental Laboratory Sector, Volume 2, Module 1, Section 3.10: Terms and Definitions:

Conformity Assessment Body (CAB): Body that performs conformity assessment services and that can be the object of accreditation.

NOTE: This module is concerned with conformity assessment bodies (CAB) commonly known as laboratories providing services in a fixed or mobile setting.

Environmental Laboratory Sector, Volume 2, Module 3, Section 3.10: Terms and Definitions:

Conformity Assessment Body (CAB): Body that performs conformity assessment services and that can be the object of accreditation.

NOTE: This module is concerned with conformity assessment bodies (CAB) commonly known as laboratories providing services in a fixed or mobile setting. The onsite assessment of field sampling and measurement organizations is detailed in “TNI Field Sampling and Measurement Organization Sector, Volume 2”

Environmental Laboratory Sector, Volume 2, Module 3, Section 6.3.6: For initial assessments, in addition to visiting the main or head office, visits shall be made to all other premises of the CAB from which one or more key activities are performed and which are covered by the scope of accreditation.

NOTE 2: Each fixed-base branch or subsidiary of a CAB with multiple locations is customarily accredited separately by accreditation bodies and requires separate initial assessments. Mobile facilities of fixed-base CABs or mobile facilities not directed by or attached to a fixed-base CAB may be required to maintain distinct accreditations by different accreditation bodies and may require separate initial assessments.

Environmental Laboratory Sector, Volume 2, Module 3, Section 6.3.7: For surveillance and reassessment, where the CAB works from various premises, the accreditation body shall establish procedures for sampling to ensure proper assessment. All premises from which one or more key activities are performed should be assessed within a defined timeframe.

NOTE: Each fixed-base branch or subsidiary of a CAB with multiple locations is customarily accredited separately by accreditation bodies and requires separate surveillance and reassessments. Mobile facilities of fixed-base CABs or mobile facilities not directed by or attached to a fixed-base CAB may be required to maintain distinct accreditations by different accreditation bodies and may require separate surveillance and reassessments