Non-Governmental Accreditation Body Working Group  
April 8, 2013

1. Roll Call

Alfredo Sotomayor called the Non-Governmental Accreditation Body (NGAB) Working Group meeting to order at 10:00 am CDT on April 8, 2013. The following members were present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alfredo Sotomayor, Chair</td>
<td>TNI Board member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlene Moore</td>
<td>NEFAP</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Brown</td>
<td>NELAP AB</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Todaro</td>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Morton</td>
<td>Non-governmental accreditation body</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Arms</td>
<td>Chair, TNI Advocacy Committee</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Batterton</td>
<td>TNI staff support</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Parr</td>
<td>TNI Executive Director</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Approval of Minutes

Steve Arms moved approval of minutes from the March 25, 2013, meeting. Krisitin Brown seconded. All present voted in favor.

3. Review of Denver NGAB stakeholder meeting

Alfredo reviewed the summary of the Denver stakeholder meeting on Non-Governmental Accreditation Bodies (NGAB). He noted that participants expressed some concerns about the process, but they were not insurmountable. Alfredo stated that the working group would be using the stakeholder comments and the concept paper to guide deliberations.

4. Recognition Process Spreadsheet

Alfredo introduced the Recognition Process spreadsheet that he developed to help guide the working group and help us to deliver our report in San Antonio. He suggested that the group
review the topics to make sure that the spreadsheet was complete and any issues that needed
discussion were included. Discussion on each topic is listed below:

**Application**
- NELAP and NEFAP have standard forms, but forms differ slightly. NEFAP is a fill-able PDF.
- Should NGABs have to complete two forms or should we develop one form for both
  NELAP and NEFAP?
- Consensus seemed to be to have one comprehensive form. NGAB can check which
  program it wants to be accredited to. NEFAP form could work for NELAP with different
  attachments.
- Add “Fee” to list of topics
- “Review” means completeness and technical. NEFAP requires that deficiencies on
  technical application be resolved before onsite scheduled. SOP should include language
  to delay onsite until technical deficiencies resolved. NELAP language says onsite “may”
  be delayed. It may be acceptable to proceed in some circumstances.

**Onsite Evaluation**
- If NGAB is an ILAC signatory, NEFAP doesn’t conduct an onsite. Retains option to
  observe ILAC evaluation. ABs have to notify NEFAP when ILAC evaluation occurs. We
  need to compare NELAP AB requirements with ISO 17011. If there are too many
  additional requirements, additional onsite may be necessary. It is unlikely that an NGAB
  would not be evaluated onsite for conformance with the TNI Standards. NELAP ABs
  would want the NGABs to be evaluated onsite in the same way that the NELAP ABs are.
- Checklists should be electronic. NEFAP not as detailed as NELAP. May not be possible to
  combine checklists.
- NEFAP evaluation includes observation of AB performing accreditation, similar to
  NELAP.
- In NELAP, the number of labs observed depends on the size of the AB program.
  Sometimes observations occur at a different time. Not always possible to schedule at
  the same time as AB evaluation.
- Since NEFAP is a new program, evaluation team observes accreditation of first applicant.
- Cost of performing the onsite can be paid in application fee or applicant can pay travel
  directly to evaluators. NEFAP has no labor costs. All evaluators are volunteers. AB pays
  travel.

**Evaluation Report**
- Each program has a standard evaluation report detailed in the Evaluation SOP.
- Confidentiality is major issue in the reports. Need to make sure that is covered in SOP.
  AB to AB review is acceptable, but we will have more than AB to AB interaction, and we
  should address that.

**Post-evaluation**
- Need to address in SOP
- Who makes recommendation to grant recognition?
Granting Recommendation

- SOP should cover how Recognition Committee qualifications and how they get appointed. Recognition Committee should make final decision on NGAB recognition and inform the Board.
- My need to have NELAP AC or LASEC involved in selecting Recognition Committee. (May not be possible for NELAP AC). Also, need to be aware of public information laws that affect public agency employees.
- Who will issue the certificate?
- Add conditions for recognition approval/denial to SOP.

Other

- Add contract, MOA or MOU
- Add renewal fee

6. Next Steps

Jerry will update the NELAP/NEFAP evaluation SOP comparison document to reflect current versions of the SOPs.

7. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be Monday, April 22 at 10:00 am CDT.