

Report Writing Workshop

April 4, 2005

- Problem: Labs (and assessors) feeling the pressure to not repeat items. Can we do this without:
 - Not affecting the integrity and credibility of the report?
 - Can we come to consensus on principles to use when deciding to cite an item more than once?
 - Touch on aspects of the audit software

- Scenario: procedure does not reflect the procedure in the quality manual; there are several discrepancies between documentation and reality
- Would you write 1 requirement or several?

Consensus

- Depends on how important the items are
- Depends on if the procedure is being done at all or there only slight modifications needed or that the words are just wrong
- Keep in mind that the assessment is a snapshot in time
- Consult with the lab as to the intention - do they intend to follow the procedure as documented?
- Is this a systemic problem or not?

- Scenario: One method for 3 appendices - metals in soil, water and vegetation. The method requires a change which is common to all matrices. Is this one or three requirements?

Option 1

- Option 1: One item against one appendix.
 - If there is one balance and 10 appendices, what happens if the lab happens to drop that appendix?
 - Software - can we change the software so that you can add it to one appendix and note it for the others?
 - Doesn't totally solve one of the problems - still may be pressure for add it to the appendix that is not flagged as OSDWA so that it will not show up on the report that is sent to the MOE.

Option 2

- Could we tie it back into an item in CAN-P-1510D (e.g., cite it against 4.2.1)
 - This may depend on the type of change needed - e.g., if it's technical or not?
 - Why set up 2 types of rules - i.e., end up with cases where a unique finding would be cited in the appendix and >2 appendices would be cited in CAN-P-1510D
 - **More technical findings should be left under the appendices (consensus)**

Other Discussion

- Could we have 2 separate types of findings - e.g., unique and those found in many appendices?
- Let's leave it the way we've done it for the last 10 years...why complicate things?
- Break the report into 2 parts
 - Unique findings only
 - Administrative part - list all the appendices involved

Discussion (cont'd)

- Use the “sorted draft report” option for a shorter version (note: right now, it’s not necessarily shorter, but at least groups items by 01.01, 02.01, etc...)
- To sort, items must be worded identically
- Use “R” for repeated items?

- Scenario: Ensure method quality control is adequate and included or referenced in the test method, specifically, for duplicates: applies to appendices 13, 14, 21, 46, 47, 25, 34, 2, 4, and 5.

Discussion

- As a lab representatives, there were two opinions on this...some liked the above scenario, but others like having each item listed separately for delegation to staff and managing the responses - number of findings not necessarily important
- For review of responses, it's better to leave everything as is

Consensus

- Technical findings should be left under the appendix
- Continue to use the “applies to” function in the audit software
- Guiding principle: If one piece of objective is needed, one required item is needed; if more than one piece of objective evidence, item needs to be repeated
- Provide the lab with an “executive summary” which summarizes findings

Questions

- If it can be put in CAN-P-1510D, should it?