

Non-Governmental Accreditation Body Working Group  
 TNI Non-Governmental Accreditation Body Recognition Committee  
 December 14, 2015

1. Roll Call

Alfredo Sotomayor called the Non-Governmental Accreditation Body (NGAB) Working Group and the TNRC meeting to order at 9:00 am CDT on December 14, 2015. The following members were present:

**Non-Governmental Accreditation Body (NGAB) Working Group:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Stakeholder Group</b>	<b>Present</b>
Alfredo Sotomayor, Chair	TNI Board member	✓
Kristin Brown	NELAP AB	✓
Jim Todaro	Laboratory	<b>Absent</b>
Cheryl Morton (Geneva Bowman)	Non-governmental accreditation body	✓
Steve Arms	Chair, TNI Advocacy Committee	✓
Dave Speis	Chair, TNI Finance Committee	✓
Carol Batterton	TNI staff support	✓
Jerry Parr	TNI Executive Director	✓

**TNI Non-governmental Accreditation Body Recognition Committee (TNRC):**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Stakeholder group</b>	<b>Present</b>
Kim Watson	Accredited FSMO, NEFAP EC	✓
Judy Morgan	Laboratory, LASEC Chair	✓
Daniel Lashbrook	Laboratory	✓
Yumi Creason	State Accreditation Body	✓
Marlene Moore	Other, NEFAP Recognition Comm.	<b>Absent</b>
Ilona Taunton	Evaluation Coordinator and lead Evaluator	<b>Absent</b>

Alfredo asked members to review minutes of the previous meeting and send any corrections to Carol.

2. Update on applications

Alfredo reported that all evaluation teams have been formed and approved by the TNRC. There will be one NELAP AB on each team. All evaluations will be conducted after the Tulsa meeting.

### 3. NGABs and LAMs

Ilona had asked whether or not the recognized NGABs will be required to enter information about their accredited labs into LAMs. Jerry commented that it is do-able. We will need to make sure that the recognized ABs inform their clients that an NGAB accreditation may not be acceptable in all states. We should consider putting some type of disclaimer about this in LAMs. The disclaimer should advise NGAB accredited labs to confer with their clients to make sure data will be acceptable. It was noted that the requirement to use LAMs is not in the standard, and not all NELAP states have entered their labs into LAMs. The standard does require the states to make their accredited labs known. We should be sure to allow the same discretion to NGABs that we allow to NELAP states.

### 4. Concept paper – options for TNRC

Steve Arms reported that he had spoken with Gary Ward (OR) about the option for locating the TNRC under the LASEC umbrella but separate from the NELAP AC. Gary indicated that this approach was acceptable to Oregon as long as the TNRC was not directly involved with the NELAP AC. Steve will run this concept past the NELAP AC at their next meeting on January 4, 2016.

The group also considered whether or not the LASEC would be comfortable with this additional workload. Judy commented that she did not think it would be an issue. Some might see a conflict with Judy being chair of LASEC and the TNRC. We can develop procedural ways to deal with conflicts if they arise. The potential for conflicts should not be an impediment to this organizational arrangement.

Alfredo asked Carol to prepare a document for the Board's consideration recommending this approach. The fall back position would be to leave the TNRC where it is, reporting to the Board. The goal is to have this proposal ready for the Board's consideration on January 13, 2016. Carol will get a draft out before the TNRC and NGAB working group's next meeting.

### 5. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the NGAB Working Group and TNRC will be **Monday, January 11, 2016 at 9:00 am CENTRAL**. Potential agenda items include:

Progress on applications  
Recommendation for placement of the TNRC