1. Welcome, Roll Call and Announcements

The meeting was called to order by Alfredo at 11 am Eastern. Attendance is recorded in Attachment 1. Alfredo noted that any corrections to the minutes from June 2 should be submitted within the next week.

2. Evaluation SOP for Non-Governmental ABs, SOP Number TBD

Alfredo had just obtained approval from the NGAB Task Force the previous day, so distributed this document separately from the agenda. The version submitted to Policy Committee for review already incorporated comments from conference in Louisville (January 2014) and from other individuals who took the time to read and offer comments on the earlier draft. Additional comments will be solicited at conference in Washington, DC, before it is finalized.

Specific comments were as follows:

§5.1.5 – determination of what constitutes TNI-recognized training remains to be specified.

§5.2.2 – the maintenance and storage of official records would be better with a single identified individual rather than assigned to a Board-appointed committee. This should be addressed in the next round of revision.

§5.4 – the QAO role is not specifically identified, but several QA functions are specifically assigned to the Evaluation Coordinator (EC.) The rationale for the EC’s participation in multiple site visits and observations should be clarified. If it’s only for oversight of the Lead Evaluators, that may still require the EC to accompany each team, depending on how the “lead” role is assigned. Add bullet to the second item of the bulleted series (at least w years of career….)

§5.5 – break §5.5.12 into two parts or renumber the following items. The first, to monitor timelines and the second, to ensure (or assure – determine which is appropriate) consistent adherence to the SOP.

§5.8.1 – rephrase to read “the EC selects the ET for approval by the TNRS and acceptance by the NGAB.”

§6.1 – in the last sentence of the note, remove “re-“ so that the text reads “…these areas may not need to be evaluated with equal rigor…..”

§6.2 – remove the term “highest ranking NGAB individual.” The highest ranking individual in the organization may actually have no authority over the activities for which TNI recognition is sought.

§6.3-6.4 – examine and revise as needed the term “completeness” in these sections. The “completeness review” is about whether the essential documents are provided; the Technical Review (aka Compliance Checklist) is about whether all required documents are provided and adequate to meet the requirements of the standard, or if they need to be verified on-site.

§6.5 – the meeting agenda for the opening meeting (and also the closing meeting, §6.8) were moved into the body of the document when other attachments (from the NELAP Evaluation SOP) were deleted. Consider whether these two items would be better as attachments. Also, specify that the agenda being distributed as the first item is the agenda for the meeting itself, not the agenda for the overall evaluation, since that should have been provided prior to arrival of the team on-site.
§6.8 – see §6.5 about possibly moving to an attachment. Also, the seven bullets following “discuss list of next steps” should be subordinate to that list, and thus bullets 7-13 should be numbered or further indented, for clarity, regardless of where the information resides.

§6.9 – for initial evaluations, it may not be possible to observe a laboratory assessment for the purpose of a TNI-recognized accreditation to the NELAP standard. Acceptable alternatives should be discussed in the SOP – it would also be appropriate to incorporate the information in §6.19.2 into this section.

§6.9 – the results of the team’s observation should be transmitted to the LE within 15 days after completion of the observation (not the evaluation, as presently written) since those events may occur at different times.

§6.12 – consider whether and how to address a re-application in the event that the initial evaluation does not result in TNI recognition. Possibly a waiting time period, or a statement that “TNI may not accept repeat applications …” with conditions attached.

At this point, the meeting time had expired. Review of this SOP will resume at the July 18th committee meeting.

3. **Next Meeting**

Policy Committee will meet again on Friday July 18, 2014, at 11 am Eastern, since the regular date of July 4 is a holiday. Teleconference information and an agenda will be circulated in advance of the meeting, to include the confirmation of a new Vice Chair for Policy Committee.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Affiliation</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Alfredo Sotomayor, Chair  
Wisconsin Dept. of Natural Resources, Madison, WI  
alfredo.sotomayor@Wisconsin.gov | TNI Board | Yes |
| JoAnn Boyd  
Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, TX  
jboyd@swri.org | Lab and FSMO | No |
| Patrick Brumfield  
Sigma-Aldrich RTC, Laramie, WY  
patrick.brumfield@sial.com | PT Executive Committee | Yes |
| Silky Labie  
Env. Lab. Consulting & Technology, LLC, Tallahassee, FL  
elcatllc@centurylink.net | | Yes |
| John Moorman  
South Florida Water Management District  
West Palm Beach, FL  
jmoorma@sfwmd.gov | NEFAP Executive Committee | No |
| Mei Beth Shepherd  
mbshep@sheptechserv.com | | No |
| Bob Wyeth  
Retired  
rfwyeth@yahoo.com | CSD Executive Committee | No |
| Jerry Parr (ex-officio)  
Executive Director, TNI  
Jerry.Parr@nelac-institute.org | | Yes |
| Lynn Bradley, Program Administrator  
The NELAC Institute (Staunton, VA)  
lynn.brady@nelac-institute.org | | Yes |
## Attachment B

### Action Items – TNI Policy Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Expected Completion</th>
<th>Comments/Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Review NELAC chapter 6 for needed policies and SOPs, applicable to the AC</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Summer 2014?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Prepare formal comments on SOP 5-106 for return to NEFAP EC, after John returns results of research into rationale for deferring SIR appeals to CSD PEC</td>
<td>John, then Lynn/Alfredo</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Send request for review of POL 5-100 to NEFAP EC</td>
<td>Alfredo</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Prepare formal comments on SOP 5-103 for return to NEFAP EC, incorporating concerns about the permanent and elected membership dichotomy</td>
<td>Alfredo</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Send formal comments on SOP 3-106 to LAS EC</td>
<td>Alfredo</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Meeting Reference</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3/20/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>10/5/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>10/22/12</td>
<td>SOP 1-102 discusses various options and situations where one might work better than others, but SOP 1-101 refers to 1-102 as if it sets a default.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>9/20/13</td>
<td>Charter format to be upgraded to address committee annual budgets later this year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>2/21/14</td>
<td>Committees may add an additional stakeholder category with approval of TNI Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>2/21/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>