**CONFIRMED MINUTES**

**FEBRUARY 22-25, 2016**

**MADRID, SPAIN**

**These minutes are not final until confirmed by the Task Group in writing or by vote at a subsequent meeting. Information herein does not constitute a communication or recommendation from the Task Group and shall not be considered as such by any agency.**

**MONDAY, FEBRUARY 22 to THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 25**

# OPENING COMMENTS – CLOSED/OPEN

## Call to Order / Quorum Check

The Materials Testing Laboratories (MTL) Task Group was called to order at 9:00 a.m., 22-Feb-2016.

It was verified that only SUBSCRIBER MEMBERS were in attendance during the closed portion of the meeting.

A quorum was established with the following representatives in attendance:

***Subscriber Members/Participants Present (\* Indicates Voting Member)***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NAME |  | COMPANY NAME |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Randy | Armstrong | Raytheon Company |  |
| \* | David | Bale | Pratt and Whitney | Proxy for Dan Graves |
|  | Craig | Barnthson | Bell Helicopter Textron |  |
|  | Melanie | Bouvier | Airbus |  |
| \* | Christine | Brassine | SAFRAN Group |  |
|  | David | Day | GE Aviation |  |
| \* | Claudia | Granados Torres | Honeywell Aerospace |  |
|  | Stephane | Lesueur | SAFRAN Group |  |
| \* | Muriel | Malhomme | Airbus | Proxy for Amanda Rickman |
| \* | Jennifer | McKeegan | Cessna Aircraft Company |  |
|  | Angela | Nabo | GKN Aerospace Sweden AB |  |
|  | Raul | Olmo Mora | Airbus |  |
|  | Daniel | Sanchez Vivat | Airbus Defense & Space |  |
| \* | Christian | Schwaminger | MTU Aero Engines AG |  |
| \* | Fabrice | Trebeden | Airbus Helicopters |  |
|  | Barbara | Waller | Raytheon Company |  |
| \* | Gary | Winters | Northrop Grumman Corporation |  |
|  | DongYu | Yang | COMAC |  |

***Other Members/Participants Present (\* Indicates Voting Member)***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | NAME |  | COMPANY NAME |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| \* | Pedro | Astola González | TITANIA, Ensayos y Proyectos Industriales S.L. |  |
|  | Lei | Bao | NCS Testing Technology Co., LTD. |  |
| \* | Umberto | Baratta | Bytest SRL |  |
|  | Pierre | Barbaza | ECCI |  |
| \* | Corwyn | Berger | Exova, Inc. |  |
|  | Marya | Black | Great Lakes Calibration |  |
|  | James | Bolter | Alcoa, Inc. |  |
|  | Chiara | Boran | RTM BREDA S.r.l. |  |
|  | Helene | Bussat | Bureau Veritas Laboratoires |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Hugh | Casper | MTS Systems Corporation |  |
|  | Julien | Corato | Exova, Inc. |  |
|  | Niall | Dodds | Exova PLC |  |
| \* | Kay | Fisher | Bohler Edelstahl GmbH & Co KG |  |
|  | Luis | Guelbenzu | Applus Laboratories |  |
| \* | Robert | Haldane | Alcoa, Inc. |  |
|  | Chris | Harwood | Exova, Inc. |  |
| \* | Don | Huffman | Lisi Aerospace |  |
| \* | Steve | Keck | Carpenter Technology Corporation |  |
|  | Ashfaq | Khan | Timet |  |
| \* | Jens | Kiehn | Otto Fuchs KG |  |
|  | Shelly | Lawless | Meyer Tool, Inc. |  |
| \* | Tao | Liu | NCS Testing Technology Co., LTD. |  |
|  | Khinlay | Maung | Air Industries Company |  |
|  | Ralph | Mast | VDM Metals GmbH |  |
|  | Diana | Morera Valdera | TEAMS |  |
|  | Roger | Ng | Oerlikon Metco (Canada), Inc. |  |
| \* | Sharon | Norton | Atlas Testing Laboratories, Inc. |  |
|  | Rocio | Ocana | TEAMS |  |
| \* | Annette | O’Connell | Haynes International, Inc. |  |
|  | Owen | O’Grady | Exova |  |
| \* | Bob | Olevson | Element Materials Technology |  |
|  | Matthais | Otter | VDM Metals GmbH |  |
|  | Silvia | Pedrazzi | AQM srl |  |
|  | Juan | Rodriguez | Exova de Mexico |  |
|  | Norman | Sado | SGS Institut Fresenius GmbH |  |
|  | Antonia | Sanchez | Canagrosa |  |
|  | Peter | Schmidt | SGS Institut Fresenius GmbH |  |
|  | Benedetto | Scotti | AQM srl |  |
| \* | Peter | Scrimshire | Special Metals Wiggin Ltd - IncoTest |  |
|  | Derek | Sicotte | Dirats Laboratories |  |
|  | Hannah | Smith | Alcoa, Inc. |  |
|  | Francecs | Tort | Instron |  |
| \* | Donna | Warner | Heartland Precision Fasteners, Inc. |  |
| \* | Margaret | Willis | ATI Specialty Materials Monroe Operations |  |
|  | Samantha | Withers | Exova (UK) Limited |  |
| \* | Jason | Wright | Metals Technology, Inc. | Proxy for Deena Crossmore |

***PRI Staff Present***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Robert | Hoeth |
| Kevin | Wetzel |

## Safety Information – CLOSED/OPEN

Fire Exits and how to vacate the building were reviewed. Attendees were requested to notify PRI Staff of any emergencies.

## Review Code of Ethics and Meeting Conduct – CLOSED/OPEN

Code of Ethics, Antitrust, and meeting conduct were reviewed with the meeting rules and meeting voting protocol.

## Present the Antitrust Video – CLOSED/OPEN

The Antitrust Video was presented.

## Review Agenda – CLOSED/OPEN

The agenda was reviewed and agreed upon without modification.

All presentations from the meeting are to be posted in [www.eAuditNet.com](http://www.eAuditNet.com) under Resources → Public Documents → Materials Testing Laboratories → Nadcap Meeting Presentations → February 2016.

## Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes – OPEN

The minutes from the October 2015 Nadcap meeting were approved as written.

# REVIEW DELEGATION STATUS – CLOSED

The Metrics tab on the eAuditNet Dashboard and the t-frm-07s for all reviewers were presented. All current delegated reviewers (Kevin Wetzel, Rob Hoeth, Jim Lewis, and Bob Lizewski) continue to meet the requirements defined in OP 1115. After review of all comments addressed in t‑frm‑07s, there were no issues that required additional actions. All reviewers maintained their delegation status.

The t-frm-07 was presented and discussed for Justin Rausch, a non-delegated reviewer. There were no concerns raised with his progress. Justin has been reviewing audits since November, 2015.

K. Wetzel discussed the need for a consultant audit report reviewer. The Task Group agreed with the pursuit of a consultant reviewer.

The schedule developed for Subscriber audit report reviews was reviewed. Subscriber voting members are assigned by month the audits to be reviewed.

# MATTERS OF ACCREDITATION – CLOSED

Audits requiring discussion:

Audit 160136, which is in Risk Mitigation, was discussed and closure of the Risk Mitigation process was agreed after the final open NCR was addressed.

Audit 159432, which is in Risk Mitigation, was discussed and specific NCRs were scrutinized.

Audit 164573 failure ballot was discussed.

Annual Failure Criteria Review:

It was discussed how rounding can be accomplished by two different means for the failure criteria for NCRs per auditor day. Option one is to calculate the failure criteria for a one day audit, round this value up to a whole number, and then multiply by the number of days. Option two is to calculate the failure criteria for a one day audit, multiply by the number of days, and then round these individual numbers each up to a whole number.

The statistical analysis for the 95% and 98% total and major NCRs per auditor day for the previous year was presented as required by OP 1110.

Motion by Muriel Malhomme for MTL to adopt option one for rounding as the standard practice for calculating MTL failure criteria and to accept the 98% threshold with a cap at 5 days for initial audits. Motion seconded by Gary Winters. Motion passed.

This motion leaves the failure criteria for MTL initial audits to remain unchanged at 2 major findings per auditor day and 8 total findings per auditor day up to and including 5 days for a cap. (10 major and 40 total NCRs)

Motion by Jennifer McKeegan for MTL to adopt option one for rounding as the standard practice for calculating MTL failure criteria and to accept the 98% threshold with a cap at 5 days for reaccreditation audits. Motion seconded by David Bale. Motion passed.

This motion changes the failure criteria for MTL reaccreditation audits to 2 major findings per auditor day and 5 total findings per auditor day up to and including 5 days for a cap. (10 major and 25 total NCRs)

Motion by Gary Winters to keep the current failure criteria for MTL reaccreditation audits at 2 major findings per auditor day and 6 total findings per auditor day up to and including 5 days for a cap. (10 major and 30 total NCRs). Motion seconded by Jennifer McKeegan. Motion failed.

ACTION ITEM: Kevin Wetzel to provide MTL failure criteria for OP 1110 update. (Due Date: 14-Mar-2016)

Scope exception 541 for table 1 in AC7101/3 was dropped by Rolls Royce for tensile testing.

Kevin Wetzel stated that he would like to become an auditor for the MTL TG and requested that the T1 training audit be waived and also to waive the interview.

Motion by Muriel Malhomme that Kevin Wetzel go directly to a T2 with the interview waived. Seconded by Christian Schwaminger. Kevin provided details on his background during a short discussion. Motion passed.

# AUDITOR CONSISTENCY (OP 1117) – CLOSED

The MTL Task Group, in an effort to redefine the method for compliance to OP 1117 with Subscriber members comprising the team, presented and modified working instructions for this path. Areas of discussion were as follows which will be addressed in the draft work instructions:

* Auditor Consistency Data Review
* Auditor Consistency Team Requirements
  + Auditor Training
  + Audit Observations
  + Auditor Communication and Feedback
  + Proficiency Assessments
  + Measures of Success
  + Maintenance of Standard Data

ACTION ITEM: Rob Hoeth to distribute the Auditor Consistency MTL Work Instructions to the Task Group for comments (Due Date: 31-Mar-2016)

# REVIEW MEMBERSHIP STATUS – OPEN

Confirm Any New Voting Member Applications

Subscriber Members:

Christine Brassine of Techspace Aero – SAFRAN Group was proposed as a Subscriber Voting Member.

Motion made and seconded to accept Christine Brassine as a Subscriber Voting Member. Subscriber meets the background requirements of OP 1114 Appendix MTL. Motion Passed. The Voting Member was confirmed by the Chairperson.

Fabrice Trebeden of Airbus Helicopter was proposed as a Subscriber Voting Member.

Motion made and seconded to accept Fabrice Trebeden as a Subscriber Voting Member. Subscriber meets the background requirements of OP 1114 Appendix MTL. Motion Passed. The Voting Member was confirmed by the Chairperson.

Supplier Members:

Tao Liu of National Analysis Center – Iron & Steel was proposed as an Alternate Supplier Voting Member.

Motion made and seconded to accept Tao Liu as an Alternate Supplier Voting Member. Motion Passed. The Voting Member was confirmed by the Chairperson.

Review Compliance with Voting Requirements of Present Voting Members

Voting Member responsibilities and adherence, meeting attendance, and ballot participation were reviewed.

Supplier Members not meeting Voting Membership requirements were reviewed. Jim Rossi’s voting membership will be continued as there was no balloting since the October 2015 meeting when it was last confirmed by the Chairperson to continue his membership. All others met requirements.

The Task Group would like to acknowledge Frank Lennert – The Boeing Company and Doug Deaton – General Electric for their years of service to the MTL Task Group and wish them well in retirement.

# mtl nadcap – OPEN

## MTL Tutorial

An MTL Task Group Tutorial was presented. No further discussion followed.

## SSC Presentations

A presentation concerning the Supplier Support Committee (SSC) and its function was provided by Sharon Norton, the MTL TG SSC representative.

# Activity reports – OPEN

Previous meeting feedback – Only five responses were submitted for the previous meeting feedback. There were two (2) requests for a more detailed agenda.

Activity since last meeting – AC7101/7 completed NMC ballot and was released for audits conducted on or after May 15, 2016

Checklist status –

AC7101/1 F is used on audits conducted on or after September 14, 2015

AC7101/2 D is used on audits conducted on or after March 22, 2015

AC7101/3 D is being sent to the Task Group for affirmation ballot

AC7101/4 F is in comment resolution from the NMC ballot

AC7101/5 D is used on audits conducted on or after March 22, 2015

AC7101/6 D is in the revision process. No ballot has yet been conducted.

AC7101/7 D will be used on audits starting on or after May 15, 2016

AC7101/9 C is in the revision process. No ballot has yet been conducted.

AC7101/11 C is used on audits conducted on or after October 25, 2015

# breakout sessions – oPEN

A breakout session for AC7101/9, led by Steve Keck, was held which covered the following:

* Review of updates
* Handbook Supplement
* Prepare for TG ballot

A breakout session for AC7101/1, led by Kay Fisher and Muriel Malhomme, was held which covered the following:

* General revisions
* Proficiency Testing Program/Internal Round Robin additions

An AC7101/11 breakout session, led by Don Huffman, was held which covered the following:

* Handbook Guidance discussed based on Technical Advisory Group (TAG) enquiries

# task group issues – OPEN

TAG issues:

Lack of support is occasionally an issue as three subscriber voting members are currently required. Proposals can be addressed at meeting with TAGs presenting recommendations for concurrence, but this hinders the process.

A proposed TAG enquiry tracking form was presented and agreed upon.

ACTION ITEM: Kevin Wetzel to distribute the TAG enquiry tracking form to the TAG Chairs (Due Date: 31-Mar-2016)

TAG 1 raised a concern on AC7101/1 Rev F paragraph 8.4, “Procedures are used to ensure use of ASTM E 29 for rounding unless the method is otherwise stated in the certificate of test/test report,” as ISO 80000-1 may also be able to be used.

ACTION ITEM: Christian Schwaminger and Bob Haldane to compare ASTM E29 and ISO 80000-1 for rounding of numbers to determine equivalency and report out in June meeting (Due Date: 31-May-2016)

Sharon Norton raised a concern to TAG 1 on AC7101/1 Rev F paragraph 9.1.1 which states: “Calibration cycle extension: When calibration cycles are extended, procedures are used in accordance with NCSL (National Conference of Standard Laboratories), recommended Practice 1, or other recognized statistical review process to support the extended time interval. Any calibration cycle extensions are in accordance with standard methods or customer requirements.” The Subscribers were asked if this paragraph refers to only permanent extensions, which it was agreed that is the intent of the criteria.

Motion by Kay Fisher for Hand Book Guidance to be adopted for AC7101/1 Rev F paragraph 9.1.1 “This criteria pertains to permanent calibration extensions.” Motion seconded. Motion passed.

Motion by Kay Fisher for Hand Book Guidance to be adopted for AC7101/1 Rev F paragraph 9.1.1 “If calibration expires during a test, an NCR is not to be written as long as no additional specimens are tested prior to calibration.” Motion seconded. Motion passed.

ACTION ITEM: Derek Sicotte to add Handbook Guidance for AC7101/1 Rev F paragraph 9.1.1 “This criteria pertains to permanent calibration extensions. If a calibration expires during a test, an NCR is not to be written as long as no additional specimens are tested prior to calibration.” (Due Date: 11-Mar-2016)

ACTION ITEM: Bob Haldane to investigate if extensions are referenced in an AMS specification or any other industry specification and report out at the June meeting (Due Date: 31-May-2016)

Margaret Willis requested a clarification for AC7101/2 paragraph 8.3.6 and 10.4. “The issue is the requirement that ‘drift correction uses reference materials’. ASTM E305 specifically discourages the use of celebrants (reference materials) as drift monitors.”

Motion by Margaret Willis for Hand Book Guidance to be adopted for AC7101/2 Rev D paragraph 8.3.6 and 10.4 “For drift correction only, allow guidance given in ASTM E305 para. 7.2.2” Motion seconded. Motion passed.

ACTION ITEM: Derek Sicotte to add Handbook Guidance for AC7101/2 Rev D paragraph 8.3.6 and 10.4 “For drift correction only, allow guidance given in ASTM E305 para 7.2.2.” (Due Date: 11-Mar-2016)

Denise Kluge requested a clarification for AC7101/2 paragraph 6.1, “Procedures are used to ensure the numeric expression of test results (data) are recorded using at least the number of significant digits shown in the precision data presented in Figure 1.”. “  
I am having a hard time interpreting what is meant in checklist AC7101/2, 6.1 about the number of significant digits that are recorded. Depending on the concentration level of an element, our OES equipment is set to measure from 3 to 5 significant digits, but on our certification, we follow the Aluminum Association rules which is 1 to 4 digits. On the chemistry matrix (Figure 1) I have 4 to 5 digits in my precision low and high columns which appears to be in violation of 6.1. I need help understanding what this requirement is all about.”

Motion by Jennifer McKeegan for Hand Book Guidance to be adopted for AC7101/2 Rev D paragraph 6.1 “Test Report should meet the customer specification and/or the precision data in the chemical matrix. Test Record/Equipment Data shall include minimum significant digits to generate the test report and comply with the precision in the chemical matrix.” Motion seconded. Motion passed.

ACTION ITEM: Derek Sicotte to add Handbook Guidance for AC7101/2 Rev D paragraph 6.1 “Test Report should meet the customer specification and/or the precision data in the chemical matrix. Test Record/Equipment Data shall include minimum significant digits to generate the test report and comply with the precision in the chemical matrix.” (Due Date: 11-Mar-2016)

Francois Morley requested a clarification for AC7101/3 paragraph 16.5.4.1 Code O.“16.5.4.1 ’For elevated temperature testing, sufficient thermocouples are used to assure that the uniformity of the temperature gradient along the reduced section of the test piece conforms to the following: 1% of test temperature or 3 F (2 C), whichever is greater.’ Auditor Note: ’This requirement may be satisfied by a preliminary thermal profile measurement using a representative specimen or by an actual test specimen with sufficient thermocouple coverage to measure the entire gauge section at intervals no greater than 0.125 inches.’

Question: We will use type K thermocouples meeting special tolerances during tests. In order to meet the auditor note for calibration we plan to buy a representative specimen with type K thermocouples welded on it in order to calibrate periodically our furnace. The problem is that this kind of specimen is provided with thermocouples meeting standard tolerances instead of special tolerances. The society cannot provide this specimen with thermocouples meeting special tolerances. Is it the intent of this note that we have to use only thermocouples meeting special tolerances?”

The Task Group determined that as long as the TC wire correction factor has been applied, special tolerance wire is not required. Also, due to exposure temperature, type K TC may be single use.

Bob Olevson submitted a request for clarification for AC7101/3 paragraph 13.7 from Bob Olevson. “In Nadcap AC7101/1 Rev F, Para 13.7 states, ’Test values on the certificate of test/test report are recorded, at a minimum, to the number of digits as defined by the controlling specification(s).’ To me this wording is very clear, however, when it comes to Creep strain I’m finding some Nadcap subscribers feel differently. For example, many Creep specs reference Creep strain to X.X% precision. Let’s assume a specification states max creep of 2.0% at 300 hours. The lab obtains a result of 2.044% at 300 hours. Some subscribers have said they want this rounded in accordance with Nadcap and the lab’s internal rounding procedures. So, 2.044% becomes 2.0% and the material meets specification requirements. Other subscribers have stated when it comes to creep, they want all data used to evaluate conformance. So, 2.044% stays 2.044% and the material does not meet specification requirements. I’m hoping for a consensus on how to handle Creep strain rounding (or not rounding). If not a consensus, then maybe a list of which subscribers want rounding, truncation, or all data used.”

The Supplier accepted that resolution could not be determined during the February meeting. The /1 TAG will review further during rounding discussion.

Philippe Brailly requested to TAG 3 that paragraph 10.2 introduce EN 2002-001 requirement and not just ASTM.  
“Test Certificates/ Reports include mandatory reporting information. YES NO

Test certificates/reports shall include standard/specification and customer required information and applicable items from the following list:

* Results that are required by the customer (typically UTS, 0.2% Yield Strength, %elongation, %creep, life, absorbed energy, lateral expansion, fracture appearance, etc.).
* Specimen identification
* Material identification
* Specified test temperature
* Heat treat condition if applicable
* Specimen type or reference to specimen type (e.g. drawing, ASTM E8, etc.)
* Stress (rupture)
* Uploaded or discontinued tests (rupture)
* Fracture location, if outside of center half of gauge length (tensile, rupture)
* Standard/source of requirements”

The Task Group stated that the Subscriber is welcome to propose revisions for Task Group discussion.

Dov Goldman submitted a clarification request for AC7101/4. “Immersion is immersion in the solution not a spot test. If somebody could answer what is swab for a part. Does 1/8 spot test satisfy requirement that parts should be swabbed or immersed? What does swab of a parts mean? Should etchant touch the thread area? Lab puts one small drop about 0.25 ml using small pipette on bolt’s shank only instead. Does this meet the requirement?”

The Task Group determined that this technique does not meet the intent of Swab or immersion.

There was a request for TAG 7 to “provide Handbook Guidance for paragraph 8.1, ‘Low Stress Grinding Parameters: Procedures are used to define the process for which the machine shop will achieve an acceptable low stress grinding operation. Table 2 in the Handbook references a set of parameters for Low Stress Grinding dependent on the source of grinding wheels and machining equipment which may be capable of meeting the required residual stress range. Any combination of grinding wheels and machining equipment may be used that meets the residual stress specification.’ Nothing has been put in the handbook as there is limited support from the /7 TAG. It is suggested we only agree on the editorial change at the meeting and establish a RAIL item to address the addition to the handbook by the /7 TAG.”

ACTION ITEM: Christian Schwaminger and TAG 7 to develop HB Supplement for machining requirements Z1/Z2 for Aluminum alloys (Due Date: 31-May-2016)

Ad-hoc Committees:

The Audit grading ad-hoc report out was provided by Jennifer McKeegan. Audit grading based on the s-frm-16 appears consistent with the required time to perform an adequate audit except that AC7101/11 grading criteria will require development once the AC7101/11 rewrite is complete.

The MTL Audit Reviewers expectations ad-hoc team is on hold till the June meeting.

# NADCAP MEETING REPORTS – OPEN

## 10.1 Supplier Support Committee

Sharon Norton gave an overview of the SSC meeting. For more details, please review the SSC minutes posted on [www.p-r-i.org](http://www.p-r-i.org).

Alan Hambley of Atlas volunteered to be an Alternate SSC representative for MTL

Concerns were discussed on the requirement to upload the self-audit in eAuditNet prior to the Nadcap audit and how this could be used by the auditor to lead them to issues. Corwyn Berger spoke on the NMC requirement and stated that NMC was clear that an NCR will not be raised against items found and corrected prior to the audit.

## 10.2 Planning and Ops

Kevin Wetzel reported on the Planning & Ops meeting. For more details, please review the Planning and Ops minutes posted on [www.p-r-i.org](http://www.p-r-i.org).

# MTL PROGRAM STATUS – OPEN

## 11.1 NMC Metrics

Kevin Wetzel presented a review of the health of the MTL Task Group via the Dashboard in eAuditNet. The NMC metrics were also reviewed by the Task Group. No action was required.

## 11.2 Auditor Capacity

Kevin Wetzel presented a review of Auditor Capacity. Capacity can support the current audit requirements. MTL is always looking for additional Auditor candidates.

# MEETING WRAP UP – OPEN

Handbook changes developed during the meeting were reported out by Derek Sicotte and confirmed.

Action Items created during this meeting were reported out by Rob Hoeth.

The meeting objectives for next meeting will be:

* AC7101/1 Checklist revision working session.
* Auditor Consistency – Closed meeting working session
* Ballot Comment Resolution sessions dependent on AC7101/6 and AC7101/9 status
* Prepare for October 2016 Auditor Conference
* IRR / PT Proposal to be provided at the June meeting

The agenda (open/closed dates and times) for next meeting was developed:

* Same format as Feb 2016 meeting
* 4 Day suggested agenda (M-Th)
* Monday-All Day Closed
* Breakout Rooms requested Tue-Wed (all day)
* Thurs-NMC + Report outs
* 2 Hour closed at end

Motion by Jennifer McKeegan to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded. Motion passed.

ADJOURNMENT – 25-Feb-2016 – Meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Minutes Prepared by: Rob Hoeth rhoeth@p-r-i.org

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| \*\*\*\*\* For PRI Staff use only: \*\*\*\*\*\*  Are procedural/form changes required based on changes/actions approved during this meeting? (select one)  YES\*  NO  \*If yes, the following information is required: | | |
| Documents requiring revision: | Who is responsible: | Due date: |
| OP 1110 | Mike Graham | 14-Mar-2016 |
|  |  |  |