MEETING MINUTES
Board of Directors Meeting
The American Society for Nondestructive Testing
Charleston Convention Center, Charleston, SC, Room 6 & 7
Sunday, October 26, 2014, 1:00 PM - 5:00 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER
Morasse called meeting to order at 1:15 p.m.

2. ATTENDANCE

2.1. Quorum
A quorum was established. Members present:

Raymond Morasse, Chairperson of the Board
Roger Engelbart, President
L. Terry Clausing, Vice President
Kevin D. Smith, Secretary/Treasurer
Betsy Blazar, Interim Executive Director
Marwan Basrawi
N. David Campbell
Scott Cargill
Philip Chu
Brenda Collins
Cindy Finley
Jerry Fulin
David Hall
John Iman
Doron Kishoni
David Mandina
William Plumstead, Jr.
David Savoy

Staff: Mike Boggs, Heather Cowles, Jim Houf, Garra Liming, Mary Potter, Chris Schnitzer, Michelle Thomas

Guests: Flynn Spears, John Turner, David Bajula

2.2. Conflict of Interest
The directors present were asked individually to declare any conflicts of interest with regard to the items on the agenda:

Raymond Morasse Chairperson of the Board
Roger Engelbart, President
L. Terry Clausing, Vice President
Kevin D. Smith, Secretary/Treasurer
Betsy Blazar, Interim Executive Director
Marwan Basrawi
N. David Campbell, Jr.
Scott Cargill
Philip Chu
Brenda Collins
Cindy Finley
Jerry Fulin
No Conflict of Interest
No Conflict of Interest
No Conflict of Interest
No Conflict of Interest
No Conflict of Interest
No Conflict of Interest
No Conflict of Interest
No Conflict of Interest
No Conflict of Interest
No Conflict of Interest
3. ANNOUNCEMENTS  

3.1. Amendments to the Agenda

Moved Item 8 Charge: 13-177: ED Ad-Hoc Search Committee to report status/progress at the 2014 Annual Conference in Charleston, to Item 4 and move the other items in order.

There were no objections.

Motion: Clausing moved to go into Executive Session.

Bajula seconded the motion.

Executive Session initiated at 1:21 p.m.
Executive Session ended at 3:18 p.m.

Meeting resumed at 3:44 p.m.
Motion: Smith moved to close 11-168. Cargill seconded the motion.  
MOTION PASSED

5.2.2. Charge 12-172: Research Council to revise the Student Travel Grant Program policy to allow for the selection of alternates.

Motion: Smith moved that Charge 12-172 be closed. Hall seconded the motion.  
MOTION PASSED

5.2.3. Charge 12-173: Governance Committee to review Joint Council Committee Rules of Conduct.

Thomas confirmed that this was in the Policy Manual.

Motion: Smith moved that Charge 12-173 be closed. Kishoni seconded the motion.  
MOTION PASSED

5.2.4. Charge 13-182: HQ to work with CMC to draft letter of complaint to US Department of Commerce for trade barrier agreement being violated in Europe.

Blazar said that the letter had been done and sent ASNT had not yet had a response back. Houf added that headquarters had received an acknowledgement that the letter was received. Blazar explained that there was a process that Houf went through online when a letter is submitted and that at this point, they would have to wait and see if a response is given and if not, Headquarters would ask again. For now they are requesting that the charge be closed.

Motion: Smith moved that Charge 13-182 be closed. Engelbart seconded the motion.  
MOTION PASSED

5.2.5. Charge 13-186: Governance Committee to review the SOC draft Rules of Conduct in preparation for BOD approval.

Motion: Smith moved that Charge 13-186 be closed. Basrawi seconded the motion.  
MOTION PASSED

5.2.6. Charge 13-187: Governance to modify B&F Policy J-5.10E, Paragraph 4 to include the date when service starts. It should be January 1.

Thomas confirmed that this was in the Policy Manual.

Motion: Smith moved that Charge 13-187 be closed. Kishoni seconded the motion.
5.2.7. Charge 13-180: Morasse to provide a recommendation to the board regarding the “spokesperson” for the society prior to 2013 Annual Conference in Las Vegas, NV.

Morasse said that there had been a teleconference on the matter and that it was the decision of the board to drop it. This charge should be closed.

**Motion:** Smith moved that Charge 13-180 be closed.
Basrawi seconded the motion.

**MOTION PASSED**

6. **STRATEGIC PLAN APPROVAL (Attachment 5)**

Engelbart/Blazar

This plan has been two years in the making. The first portion of the plan lays out the plan itself and the plan is the result of the work that the Board did with Glenn Tecker; a Board Trainer who develops strategic plans with Boards of Directors, specifically non-profit Board of Directors. Some of the current Board member met with Tecker in 2012 to begin the process and in 2013 and 2012 the Board got to the point of strategic objectives. Then the Board of Directors met again in February 2014 at the Board Training in San Antonio where Tecker showed members how to prepare action plans for the goals. At that time the plans were not finalized because the members had to learn the process. After that meeting in February, the Senior Staff worked on them and then the Ex-Com met during the summer and put them into shape where we could actually call them action plans that the Board is now being asked to consider. The document contains tables for each of those action plans that reflect how we want to address particular objectives, strategies and objectives. The dates are there only to show the periods of time but they do not reflect the actual dates because the Board will need to choose the actual dates to be used once the Board approves the strategic plan. The Board needs to review the current document and be prepared to vote on it at the winter Board meeting. The new communities will allow members to work on and review the document with online collaboration and then be able to vote at the winter Board meeting.

Engelbart added that the action plans have a couple columns; one says Line Item and the other says Resources. The Line Item column is for the acquisition of anything that might be necessary to complete or move along that action plan. That could be an object or item or maybe some capability that the society will need in order to go forward. The Board needs to be clear on the cost and investment in each action plan. This morning the Operations Committee was given a copy of the strategic plan (with the understanding that the Board would see it today and that the plan was not approved) for their review and input. The strategic plan was given to them because it specifically identifies individuals, committees, and councils that would own the steps of the actions plans. They are to bring their comments back to the Operations meeting on Thursday, October 30, 2014. Normally the Board would have seen the plan first, but the officers thought it was fair to give to the Operations Committee since they have an investment in it and that they see it in the same time frame.

Question was raised about if the Board was to approve it right now and Engelbart made it clear that the plan is for discussion only at this point.
Chu asked if there was a Strategic Planning Committee? Engelbart said that there was a committee and that the committee had not met since the process started. Once the Board approves this plan, they will need to decide to own the plan and be involved personally in the review and updates of the plan, or do they want that done by a Strategic Planning Committee. That is why no action has been done by that committee. The officers want that decision to be the Boards’ so that they know how to go forward with that committee or not. The Board does own the plan regardless and the purpose of the committee would be to support the Board. Engelbart did not appoint members to the committee in the spring because he knew this plan was coming and the Board could decide this later.

7. CHARGE 05-108: SDC TO PREPARE A DRAFT DOCUMENT FOR A PERFORMANCE BASED TESTING STANDARD FOR SUBMITTAL TO ANSI. McDaniel

This is a nine year old charge that was originally developed because ISO was developing their ISO standard 9774 which was the performance based standard for some of the NDT Test methods. It was not all inclusive. Basically the SDC was waiting to see what ISO came up with before they pushed ahead with the ASNT version. ANSI voted it down, SDC brought it back as an ISO/GR11/774, which is technical report and that is where it sits at this time. The ISO can be used as a requirement for three years then they have to vote to either withdraw reissue for three years or move it back up to standards. In 2017 they will have to either let it drop or they will have to drop it, or they will have to move it back up to an ISO standard and go through the process again. A lot of the urge to do that went away when ASME started their ND Program. Our ACCP Program is already the performance demonstration program. CP106 is being central certification adoption 9712. Once it passed the CMC brings the CP016 is in full compliance then I don’t see a need for it. Houf suggested that this charge be closed because they are building something else in the CP106 which is a performance based centralized certification standard.

Sharon Vukelich has been the chair and not sure where she is with this. SDC is meeting today so maybe before the charge is closed, Vukelich should be consulted and then close the charge at the end of the week. Morasse said that the last time he talked to Vukelich that she had something ready to submit to the group. Morasse would like to defer this until the winter Board meeting and in the meantime have Engelbart talk to Vukelich; and report to the Board at that time. Morasse said to leave the charge open.

8. CHARGE 08-149: OPS TO REVIEW EXISTING POLICIES AND RULES OF CONDUCT FOR ROBERT B. OLIVER SCHOLARSHIP AND DETERMINE IF THEY ARE SATISFACTORY. Clauing

This is in T&E and Smith was speaking with the current chair and there is some work being done in Governance relative to the Rules of Conduct for T&E. Smith expected it to be resolved this week, so the charge should remain open.
9. CHARGE 13-179: HQ TO CONDUCT A SURVEY (INITIALLY TO CORP. Blazar/Liming MEMBERS) TO DETERMINE THE VALUE OF A CERTIFICATION FORMAT COMPLIANT WITH ISO 9712. (Attachment 6)

The purpose for doing this is the information and the status of ISO and its impact to us as we talk about ACCP and third party certification and keep it in mind and we need to do further marketing data.

Iman wanted to clarify it the survey was showing that 43% of the people surveyed in the US are saying that we need to be. Blazar said that is what they anticipate.

Question was raised to whether it mattered if it was the US version versus the European version. Fulin said that his company had to subcontract individuals that are 9712 based on where his certification came from. Blazar felt that the needed to be more in depth market analysis so that ASNT could try to understand what the industries are and what their needs are, by ascertaining by industry and by country. This would give a fuller scope of the situation.

Mandina explained that the Europeans went to the ISO level ASME. ASNT has an asterisk behind the ACCP that says we don’t meet the requirements of ISO. What is permitting us from going to ISO standard and saying we feel this is the same or just as acceptable to the standards committee? If you go to the individual standards for example the phaser rays, and have someone there with the people writing the standards. What is it that we don’t like about this? Houf explained that every time that ASNT tries to comply with the European document, they change it. Using Guide 21 which is an ISO guide; we can adopt with modifications; which is what is being done in the US. CEN the European cert body does not have a Guide 21. If you are working to IOS 9712, then CP106 will stand up. If they specifically say ENISO9712, then it may or may not stand up, pending on who says we don’t want you here, so we are going to say look, you have modified and it can’t be modified according to CPN; therefore we can’t accept it in Europe. So once again the rules change.

Mandina wanted to know if they issue a standard in a specific area, why can’t ASNT be in compliance with that specific area; it is not a certification. They say that IOS9712 is an in house certification. Is there a possibility or is it the same guide that we can never get. It may be taken care of with free enterprise because there is just a whole bunch of money involved and getting all the training done, and certification.

Fulin wanted to know if ASNT had ever asked a certification/accreditation body to come in and look at our program and ask what we need to do to get a program in, so that we can issue a certificate that is good for ISO. Houf said the accreditation that we have is for being a certification body. The content of the certification programs are subject matter expert issues and not the auditor’s issues. They determine if ASNT is running the program correctly. Fulin said that we were probably 97% of the way there and wanted to know if someone could come in. Houf said that once the CP106 2015 is approved by ANSI then the CMC can make ACCP match those requirements. ASNT has to have an US adoption to meet the new ISO9712 requirements and this is happening it just takes a while.

Cargill commented that the CMC is working on it and when CP106 gets approved ASNT can tag ISO9712 to the ACCP cert. That would drive the ACCP program and give the domestics the vehicle to get into the 9712 arena. The problem that has already been discussed is that every time ASNT
moves in that direction; they change the rules. So it will be up to the European society. For now ASNT is going in the right direction.

Basrawi is concerned that the problem is because the ACCP is not out there. People go for the other certifications because they are out there. International central certification is the order of the day over there. There industry overseas does not run the standard as it does in America.

Mandina said that ANSI is putting the pressure on everybody and it will be tied to a code.

The timeline for ACCP to be out there is spring of 2015.

Morasse redirected the conversation back to the discussion of the survey and wanted to know what the Board wanted to do with Charge 13-179. It had been suggested by Blazar to expand on the survey. It was suggested to close this charge and consider wording for a new charge to do exactly what Blazar had described in conducting a more in depth analysis.

Morasse wanted to entertain a motion to do that and then go into a Committee as a Whole and discuss the wording for the new charge. Bajula wanted to know what the course of action would be even if we did another survey and Houf said that the course of action is the CMC is planning to upgrade and revise the ACCP to comply with the new version of CP106 2015. The CP106 should be out in 2015 and the course of action would not change.

**Motion:** Clausing moved to close Charge 13-179.
Fulin seconded the motion. No motion sheets.

15 in favor
1 Opposed and Basrawi wanted to be recorded.
1 Abstention

**MOTION PASSED**

10. **CHARGE 13-184 B&F NEEDS TO CORRECT POLICY J-4.4D TO REFLECT THE NEW POLICY WORDING.**

Smith

It is on the Governance Committee agenda for October 29, 2014 and will have more information next week, it was tabled in the B&F Committee.

Morrasse deferred Items 11-14 to the next Board meeting and requested that the agenda be changed to reflect those items.

16. **NEXT MEETING**

Morasse

Thursday, October 30, 2014, 1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m., Charleston, SC
Friday, October 31, 2014, 8:00 a.m. -12:00 p.m. Charleston, SC

17. **ADJOURNMENT**
Motion: Savoy moved to adjourn the meeting

Smith seconded the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 5:16 p.m.

MOTION PASSED

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin D. Smith
ASNT Secretary/Treasurer