

TNI Policy Committee
Meeting Summary
May 1, 2012

1. Attendance

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 1:05 pm EST. The following members were in attendance: Alfredo, Jerry, Gary, JoAnn and Silky.

Alfredo asked everyone to review the minutes from the April 17th meeting and let him know about any changes within the week. If there are no comments, the minutes will be posted on the website.

2. Update on NELAP SOP 3-101

Alfredo had an opportunity to discuss the comments on SOP 3-101 with Lynn. She had expected that only the changes would be reviewed, but Alfredo explained that the SOP had never gone through a comprehensive review by the Policy committee. That is why the committee reviewed the entire SOP. They discussed the questions regarding the veto. Lynn asked Alfredo to attend the NELAP AC meeting when this is discussed. This should happen in June. Alfredo reminded her that it is OK to continue to use the SOP during the review process.

3. Review of SOPs

Ilona commented that the PT Executive Committee has completed the DRAFT of the Complaint resolution SOP. It will be reviewed by the executive committee mid May and will then be forwarded to the Policy Committee. They have a complaint they are working on, so expedited feedback from the Policy Committee would be appreciated.

SOP: NELAP AB Evaluations (SOP 3-102 – Rev3)

The committee continued their review of SOP 3-102:

Jerry commented that there are a lot of differences between the NEFAP and NELAP Evaluation SOPs. This is something that needs to be looked at with the idea of the Policy committee's job to also evaluate conflicts between SOPs. Ilona noted that the NEFAP EC is working on an update to the NEFAP AB Evaluation SOP and the policy committee should hopefully receive it within the month.

6.6 – JoAnn commented that limiting the minimum to three files could be a problem (second bullet). Alfredo felt that the number of files selected needed to reflect the full scope of recognition. It is also not clear whether "significant findings" refers to the lab or the AB.

Paragraph regarding selecting laboratory files to review does not include “if applicable” in (i) when it is used in (ii) and (iii).

6.7 –

6.7.4 – A question that was raised is what happens if there are problems with the documents? Is the accreditation removed? What happens to any labs that have been assessed by the AB? Alfredo was also curious about the additional line about the DW certification.

Gary commented that the driver behind the DW comment is the DW manual. It allows the state to accept a NELAP assessment instead of the state needing to assess. NELAP needs to meet the DW program requirements. There was some concern that the mechanism for making this determination would be on-site assessment reports of laboratories assessed by the a new AB.

Alfredo commented that if in the future there may not be EPA officials on Evaluation Teams, we need to be careful how the relationship with the EPA is addressed in the SOP.

6.8 - None.

6.9 – Same comment about not including URL links.

6.10 – Questions were raised about the second paragraph. What happens if there are issues with the ET member performing the observation? Jerry remembered there was a past issue that made this language necessary, but could not recall the details. There was a sentiment that reviewing the adherence of the assessor to the documented procedures would measure part of the assessor’s competence; however, it should be clear that the evaluation team would not be making a determination of the assessor’s competence. The AB would use the information provided by the evaluation team to make that determination.

6.11 – None.

6.12 – None.

6.13 – Alfredo noted that the LE is the person designated to put the recommendation together to the NELAP AC. He raised a concern about what happens if an Evaluation Team member does not agree with the recommendation. If a recommendation is made to not be accredited, can NELAP AC members request additional information to understand the recommendation?

Alfredo asked everyone to complete their review of this SOP before the next meeting so that the committee can complete the comments and get them to the NELAP AC after the May 15th meeting.

4. Action Items

See Attachment A.

5. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Policy Committee will be May 15, 2012 at 1pm EST.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 2:33pm EST.

Attachment A

Action Items – TNI Policy Committee

	Action Item	Who	Expected Completion	Comments/ Completion
18	Ask Advocacy Committee to help write policy on position papers/statements. Could they write the scope and purpose? Also share some of the Policy Committees concerns discussed on the 3/6/12 call.	Alfredo	3/20/12	Complete
19	Summarize comments on SOP 3-101 and get back to the NELAP AC.	Alfredo	4/3/12 4-17-12 5-1-12	Completed initial review. Alfredo will make corrections, call Lynn and send to NELAP AC. 4/17/12: The comments were sent, but Alfredo still needs to call Lynn. 5/1/12: Complete
21	Talk to PTEC about representation on Policy Committee.	Alfredo	5-1-12	Alfredo talked to Stacie and she will approach some candidates and follow-up with Alfredo. Complete.
22	Complete review of SOP 3-102.	Policy Committee	05-15-2012	

Attachment B

Backburner / Reminders – TNI Policy Committee

	Item	Meeting Reference	Comments
1.	Look into need to include something about review schedule in all SOPs.	3/20/12	