

On-Site Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes
March 11, 2009
1:00 PM – 2:55 PM EST

Attendance

Committee Members

Nilda Cox, Lab – absent, Czrena Truong present in her absence
Don Cassano, other - present
Myron Getman AB - present
John Gumpfer, other - absent
Mark Mensik, other - present
Faust Parker, Lab - present
Denise Rice, EPA - present

Tara Laroche, an Associate Member, was also present

Committee Charter – Discussion and vote on acceptance of charter

Don Cassano asked about how far into the future is the charter supposed to project. Denise Rice answered that she projected out at least a year and included anything projects we've already started. The milestone dates were chosen to coincide with months when the conferences are held. All members present as well as Nilda Cox via e-mail, voted to adopt the charter. It will now be sent to the Consensus Standard Development Board for approval.

Laboratory On-site Assessment Guidance document – Final Draft

Nilda Cox had the following comments of the guidance document.

- 7.5.2** The CAB is required to provide a response to the findings, with corrective actions and timeframes for completion, to the accrediting body. Accreditation bodies require documented responses to on-site assessment reports within specified timeframes. Customarily, a laboratory that does not address all findings satisfactorily within two responses is scheduled for a follow-up evaluation or is subject to administrative procedures that reduce the laboratory's scope of accreditation.

Comment: We should include the 30 calendar days time frame requirement from V2M3 section 6.12.4 - The CAB shall provide to the accreditation body a plan of corrective

action to address findings in the assessment report within thirty calendar days from its receipt.

NOTE: Customarily, a CAB that does not address all findings satisfactorily within two responses is scheduled for a follow-up evaluation or is subject to administrative procedures that deny accreditation to the CAB or that reduce its scope of accreditation.

Committee disposition: Made suggested change by adding within thirty days to the first sentence of the section.

7.5.1 The accreditation body or its authorized representative shall present to the laboratory, within thirty calendar days of the last day of the on-site assessment, a final assessment report identifying all confirmed findings.

Comment: May be changed from within thirty calendar days to 30-45 calendar days depending on the outcome of the LASC review on our response to the request by ABs to extend the 30 calendar days requirement.

Committee disposition: An amendment to the timeframe will not be done. The most that will happen is there will be a guidance document about getting a new due date.

Bibliography

1. ISO/IEC 17011:2004(E), Conformity Assessment – General requirements for accreditation bodies accrediting conformity assessment bodies.
2. Accreditation of Environmental Laboratories and Related Organizations; INELA Interim Standard, August 2004, Unpublished.
3. National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Conference, 2003 NELAC Standard. EPA/600/R-04/003, June 2003

Comment: Suggest remove the above bibliography to be consistent with V2M3.

Committee disposition: The general consensus was no harm no foul to have the bibliography there. It was stated that a guidance document may change a couple of times before a new standard is written and it is nice to know where this came from. The committee did agree that the on-site module reference should be updated to reflect the adopted AB On-sit Assessment Module.

Changes to the SOP will be made and a final vote via e-mail will be done. If passed, the standard will be sent to the policy committee and the TNI Board for review.

Basic Assessor Training Guidance Document Development Discussion

This included a summary of the discussions at the Miami meeting. Basically the people who attended the conference thought the outlines should follow the way the course would

be taught, not the standard modules' order. This means grouping together similar sections like the PT sections. Also they felt Volume 1, Modules 3-7 could be collapsed into one module with the common elements cited. Attendees felt that the technical course outline would cover this in detail. Ms. Rice will re-write the guidance and have it ready for a full discussion at the April meeting.

Next Meeting: April 8, 2009, 2PM EST