1. Welcome, Roll Call and Announcements

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 11 am Eastern. Attendance is recorded in Attachment 1. Alfredo noted that any changes to the previous meeting’s minutes should be requested within a week.

2. Review Revised and Updated Standards Development SOP 2-100

Since Bob was uncertain whether he could be present at the beginning of this meeting, Program Administrator Ken Jackson was invited to be a resource for explaining the revisions to the standards development process. Alfredo invited Ken to explain the changes to the document since this committee last reviewed a provisional version, about a year ago.

Ken explained that the process for standards development is being significantly changed, as a result of recent experiences and also the feedback and corrective actions required from the ANSI audit, which is nearing closure. He first recommended looking at the new flowchart, and gave the verbal explanation that the first published version of the revised standard will now be the Voting Draft Standard (VDS) which can move then to a Modified VDS based on comments received, and the expert committee decides when to move the process into the Interim Standard (IS) phase, with the possibility of a Modified IS also.

The expert committee gathers input through what can be an iterative process, up until the committee feels that all feedback has been heard and addressed. Previously, few people (other than committee members) participated in the Working Draft Standard development, and this has been dropped as a formal stage of development.

Ken also noted that Temporary Interim Amendments (TIAs) were deemed unacceptable by ANSI, and so this mechanism is no longer available to resolve overlooked issues with a new standard.

As Ken noted, once the standard reaches the VDS stage, the process becomes more flexible than previously, and if there are few comments, it can proceed quickly to being an approved standard, but if there are many comments, the process will likely be slower than previously. The ultimate goal is to have a standard that state Accreditation Bodies (ABs) are able to implement.

With that background, participants looked at individual sections of the document. Some definitions were added, and some ANSI “boilerplate” was noted as being text that we ought not to seek to revise.

Discussion of the following sections resulted in the committee’s request for changes to the SOP, as noted:

§1.3.6 – should refer to procedure and not policy
§1.3.9 (numerically 1.3.11) – please add information about how the Standards Review Council (SRC) is constituted
§3.3 – eliminate the option of the Chair revising a submission that is indecorous, and make the submitter responsible for either revising the submission or having it discarded. We discussed that it is implied but unwritten that, if the comment has any merit (without the indecorous material,) someone else may submit it with acceptable language
§5.3.1 – while not clearly articulated, the expectation is that the expert committee will somehow resolve any feedback from the SRC; no revision requested
§5.3.8 – discussion about the term “objection” resulted in no request for a change, but Bob may revise to address what happens to an “unresolved objection” from “the public”

§8.0 – new language, discussion noted that existing standards with TIAs must be withdrawn.

The committee endorsed returning this SOP to CSDEC so that the comment can be addressed in an expedited manner, since the approved SOP is needed to close out the corrective actions from the ANSI audit. Bob agreed to make the few requested revisions and have CSDEC vote to approve the revised document, and return it to Policy Committee in time for the April 3 meeting.

3. **Next Meeting**

Policy Committee will meet again on Friday, April 3, 2015, at 11 am Eastern. Documents and teleconference information and an agenda will be circulated in advance of the meeting.

The next item for review is the remaining NEFAP SIR SOP 5-106. Alfredo would like to complete that review and send the package of comments to NEFAP prior to reviewing the now-ready TNI Quality Management Plan.

Action Items are included in Attachment B and Attachment C includes a listing of reminders.
<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  
asotomayor@mmsd.com | TNI Board | Yes |
| JoAnn Boyd  
Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, TX  
Jboyd@swri.org | Lab and FSMO | No |
| Lynn Boysen  
MN ELAP  
Lynn.Boysen@state.mn.us | NELAP AC | Yes |
| Silky Labie, Vice Chair  
Env. Lab. Consulting & Technology, LLC  
Tallahassee, FL  
elcatllc@centurylink.net | | Yes |
| Kim Watson  
kwatson@stone-env.com  
and/or  
Ilona Taunton  
ilona.taunton@nelac-institute.org | NEFAP Executive Committee  
Temporary stand-ins until a suitable and willing committee member can be identified | Ilona |
| Mei Beth Shepherd  
mbshep@sheptechserv.com | | No |
| Eric Smith  
ALS  
eric.smith@alsglobal.com | PTP Executive Committee | No |
| Bob Wyeth  
Retired  
rfwyeth@yahoo.com | CSD Executive Committee | Yes |
| Jerry Parr (ex-officio)  
Executive Director, TNI  
Jerry.Parr@nelac-institute.org | | no |
| Lynn Bradley, Program Administrator  
The NELAC Institute (Staunton, VA)  
lynn.bradley@nelac-institute.org | | Yes |
| Guest:  
Ken Jackson, CSD Program Administrator  
Ken.jackson@nelac-institute.org | | |
## 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>60</td>
<td>Alfredo</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Alfredo</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
<td>Materials sent to AST at his new email for processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>March 30</td>
<td>Return for final Policy Committee approval at 4/3/15 meeting and present to TNI Board for April meeting</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. Look into need to include something about review schedule in all SOPs.</td>
<td>3/20/12</td>
<td></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>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. New Committee Charter format should include listing for Executive Director as ex officio member for all committees (per Bylaws.)</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. Next revision of Pol 1-122 include addition of a sentence addressing the possibility of additional stakeholder categories.</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. When the CSD PEC charter is next updated, it should clarify which committees have added stakeholder categories and note that Board approval is required and was obtained for including those additional representatives in the committee(s.)</td>
<td>2/21/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Revise SOP 1-100 (SOP on SOPs) to address use of bullets and alternative numbering systems</td>
<td>9/5/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Revise Guidance SOP 1-105 to note that a new approval request is required for updates to existing guidance products</td>
<td>10/3/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Create SOP for document review of Policy committee documents (which will automatically require Board review)</td>
<td>10/17/14</td>
<td>Grew out of streamlining the approval process for SOPs and Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Revise how TNI refers to its own training courses, prepared and presented to train individuals for the accreditation and peer review (evaluation) processes. Typically, these are courses required in order to perform a specific function, yet are not referred to as a credential, per se, but are designed and presented under contract to TNI and thus implicitly endorsed by</td>
<td>1/23/15</td>
<td>From discussion about language used in SOP 5-101 (TNI-recognized training) versus usage elsewhere as just “TNI training” (e.g., NELAP Evaluation SOP 3-102)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the organization.