1. *Welcome, Roll Call and Announcements*

The meeting was called to order by Susan, the Vice Chair, at 11 am Eastern. Attendance is recorded in Appendix A. The minutes from June 7, 2013, were approved unanimously after a motion by Bob, seconded by Mei Beth. Alfredo had requested that the committee be informed of the Board’s request for a review of the TNI Bylaws to see whether the stakeholder interest categories need to be updated. This request came from discussion during the Board's consideration (and approval) of Policy 1-122, Determining Stakeholder Category of Committee Members. No one present participated in that Board meeting, so this issue will be addressed further at the next policy Committee meeting. Also, Jerry noted that there is an updated ruling from the Department of Justice that allows federal Ex Officio members of non-profit boards to vote on all matters before their boards and this should be discussed, as well.

2. *POS-1204, Small Laboratory Quality Systems*

This position statement was returned to the Policy Committee by the Advocacy Committee, after addressing comments sent to them after Policy Committee review. The changes made were considered satisfactory, and Jerry agreed to clean up the Reference section which does not presently include complete citations, prior to submitting this first Position Statement to the TNI Board for adoption. Participants also recommended that the Board request Advocacy Committee to create an implementation plan for its third recommendation, “create a document based on the Small Laboratory Handbook that emphasizes quality systems but without references to the TNI Standard or TNI laboratory accreditation.

Pat moved and Silky seconded that this position statement be accepted with edits and the request for an implementation plan, and forwarded to the TNI Board. The motion received unanimous approval.

3. *SOP 5-103, NEFAP Nominating Committee Procedure*

Jerry had presented our concerns from the June 7 meeting to the NEFAP Executive Committee Chair, and the NEFAP EC discussed them on June 12, but may have further discussion. Jerry recommended, and participants agreed, that further review of this SOP should be placed “on hold” until we receive feedback from the NEFAP EC. John then checked the draft minutes from that NEFAP EC meeting and remarked that the discussion concluded with a decision to withdraw, revise and resubmit the SOP. Assuming that the NEFAP EC minutes are approved with this decision as documented in the draft version, Policy Committee will consider the SOP withdrawn until further notice.

4. *SOP 5-101, NEFAP EC General Operating Procedures*

Much of this SOP refers to committee composition and procedures documented in SOP 5-103. In addition, section 5 permits “alternate members” to be appointed by the organization/employer of duly elected EC members, but there is confusion about these “alternates” – both about their qualifications and whether they may actually vote or simply serve as a “stand-in” for informational purposes. Checking SOP 5-102, NEFAP EC Voting, showed that section 6.1 of that SOP does give “alternates” permission to vote in the EC.
This issue of “alternates” voting may be problematic in an elected committee, and is not permitted in any other elected committee. Absent members may ask someone to attend as a guest or associate member for information purposes at any time, but if committee members are routinely absent, then both SOP 1-101 (Committee Operations) and 2-101 (Expert Committee Operations) have provisions for removing members who repeatedly miss meetings. The NELAP AC permits alternates, but the state representatives comprising the AC are appointed by their states as are the alternates – they are not elected in any way but are employees of the state, managing or working in the accreditation program. Thus, the NELAP model seems inappropriate for the elected-by-full-membership NEFAP EC.

John indicated that, as a NEFAP EC member, he will recommend that this SOP 5-101 be withdrawn for revision along with 5-103. He explained that all of the NEFAP SOPs were initially approved early in the program’s implementation, in May of 2010, and these current revisions were made to update procedures that were found problematic. Susan noted that the table in section 7 should be updated with the reason and types of revisions, prior to resubmission.

To clarify for the record, the NEFAP Voting SOP (5-102) was taken out of the queue for Policy Committee review informally, several months ago.

5. **SOP 5-106, NEFAP Standard Interpretation SOP**

This is the sole remaining NEFAP SOP awaiting review, and was begun in the time remaining. Sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 produced no comments. Comments on section 5 of this SOP are listed below. The review stopped at section 5.2.4.1.

§5 – references to “boards” should be removed, since these no longer exist within TNI

§ 5.2.2 – should either replace “audit” with “assessment” or remove the parenthetical expression entirely

§ 5.2.4 – recommend that the wording be modified to include the option of notifying the Program Administrator if formulation of a response is not possible within 60 days, along with the reasons for the delay and a projected new completion date.

§ 5.2.4.1 – recommend that wording be expanded to note that any electronic discussions about formulating interpretation responses be documented in the minutes of the next (following) meeting, with a disclaimer note that the interpretation is not final until approved by the NEFAP EC. Also, where there is only one single 4-digit paragraph, consider whether it could be incorporated into the 3-digit above it or become a next 3-digit-numbered paragraph.

Review of this SOP will continue with section 5.2.3, probably in August or September. Silky moved and John seconded that the meeting be adjourned.

6. **Action Items**

See Attachment B.

7. **Next Meeting**

Because the scheduled date for the next meeting would be the Friday after a mid-week holiday (July 5,) the next meeting was rescheduled to Friday, July 12, 2013, at 11 am Eastern. The
priority item for that meeting will be the draft guidance about committee member conduct, since this item needs to be completed so that it can be incorporated into the training on the Committee Operations SOP, and then as time permits, addressing the Board’s request to review the Bylaws for possible revisions to the stakeholder interest categories and the issue of ex officio members’ voting rights.

The possibility of a meeting on July 26 should be addressed at the July 12 meeting.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 12:40 pm Eastern.
<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](mailto:alfredo.sotomayor@Wisconsin.gov) | TNI Board | No |
| 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 | Yes |
| Mei Beth Shepherd  
mbshep@sheptechserv.com | | Yes |
| Susan Wyatt, Vice Chair  
Minnesota DOH, St. Paul, MN  
susan.wyatt@state.mn.us | NELAP AC | Yes |
| Bob Wyeth  
Pace Analytical Services, Inc., West Seneca, NY  
bob.wyeth@pacelabs.com | CSD Executive Committee | Yes |
| Jerry Parr (ex-officio)  
Executive Director, TNI  
Jerry.Parr@nelac-institute.org | | Yes |
| Lynn Bradley, Program Administrator  
The NELAC Institute (Staunton, VA)  
lynn.bradley@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 Review NELAC chapter 6 for needed policies and SOPs, applicable to the AC</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>3/15/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Contact Board Chair for additional concerns about Bylaws and relay to Bob</td>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Prepare draft policy concerning stakeholder category verifications at time of committee member application and changes during committee service</td>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>6/5/13</td>
<td>Policy approved for presentation to TNI Board on 6/7; Board approval occurred on 6/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Review SOPs 1-101 and 2-101 for possible edits to assign responsibility to chairs for addressing committee member changes in stakeholder categories</td>
<td>Alfredo</td>
<td>6/5/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Prepare draft guidance concerning committee member conduct</td>
<td>Alfredo/Susan</td>
<td>6/5/13</td>
<td>Needs done NLT 7/12/13 so that training can be prepared for presentation at conference in San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Review Bylaws for possible changes to stakeholder interest categories now that TNI's activities have expanded beyond NELAP and development of lab accreditation standards</td>
<td>Alfredo and possibly full committee</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Meeting Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Look into need to include something about review schedule in all SOPs.</td>
<td>3/20/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Include mention of abstentions in SOP 1-102 revision (or elsewhere,) to ensure that intentional choice of appropriate wording is made in committee decision making choices</td>
<td>10/5/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In SOP 1-101, “Committee Operations,” or else SOP 1-102, “Decision Making…,” some mention of “default” decision making rules would be beneficial, since most committees do not have documentation of their decision processes.</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. --- (placeholder, 4&amp;5 were completed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>