

# KANSAS QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN

## Purpose

The Kansas Quality Assurance Plan (KQAP) will ensure that the conservation planning process is being used to provide assistance that is technically sound and in compliance with program requirements, environmental laws, and authorities. All reviews of the technical and financial assistance (FA) provided by the agency will begin with a review of the conservation planning process. The quality assurance review (QAR) process needs to consider the effectiveness of the activities of field offices (FOs), management units, area offices (AOs), and the state office (SO) and their compliance with policy.

## Responsibility

The state conservationist (STC) is responsible for all quality assurance activities in the state. The conservation planning process will be used as the basis for all quality assurance activities, which include Food Security Act (FSA) reviews, conservation program reviews, management and administrative reviews, spot-checks of applied conservation practices (CPs), and conservation planning reviews.

These responsibilities are delegated to the assistant state conservationists for field operations (ASTCs-FO), the ASTC for programs, the ASTC for water resources (WR), the state resource conservationist (SRC), the state conservation engineer (SCE), and the state soil scientist (SSS) to provide leadership and coordination at the state level.

The ASTCs-FO are responsible for implementation of all quality assurance activities in their administrative area, with the exception of Technical Service Providers' (TSPs) reviews, and will ensure that reviews are carried out timely and correctly. The state TSP coordinator will be responsible for coordinating the review of work done by TSPs. AO staff will be asked to assist in reviewing the work of TSPs. Field application of the conservation planning process, practice application, and associated program activities will be reviewed by AO and/or SO staffs. This process will include completion of the Quality Assurance Summary (Attachment 1).

A Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) employee is required to notify his/her supervisor when the employee requests assistance through the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) program(s) administered by the NRCS. The ASTCs-FO are responsible for reviews of employee program applications, contracts, and associated activities. Any NRCS employee making application through an NRCS FA program **will not be** involved with the ranking and processing of other applications they are competing against during that ranking period.

Each supervisory district conservationist (SDC) is responsible for the quality of work completed in their management unit (MU) and will cooperate fully with the quality assurance team. The SDCs are also responsible for ensuring correction of any deficiencies found and reporting corrective action taken to their respective ASTC-FO.

## KANSAS QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN

### Selection

The General Manual (GM), Title 180, Conservation Planning and Application, Section 409.1(d) states, "Conservation plans are the basis for all assistance NRCS provides to clients . . . ." This section outlines the process and approach to the conservation plan selection to fulfill the requirements of national and state policy as it relates to quality assurance for conservation planning and implementation, conservation programs, and CP spot-checks. This entire process and approach will focus on the principle of the conservation plan and on-site assistance being the basis for all NRCS assistance provided to our clients.

The reviewing team will make a selection of folders from a list of plans that reflect new plans or applied conservation systems completed by FO/MU staff since the last review. This selection should be targeted to include activities in conservation planning, practice application occurring in applicable programs, highly erodible land (HEL), and wetland conservation activities. This is to include practice application as reported in the Performance Results System (PRS).

The reviewing team should select at least five plans to review. Additional plans may be needed to adequately review all activities in a given FO/MU. Based on the findings of the quality review process, the ASTCs-FO or the STC may request additional targeted review of activities in a FO/MU. These reviews may be used to further study exemplary accomplishments and unique solutions, or to further investigate concerns identified during the quality review.

The reviews will include a field visit with the planner and any other individuals involved in providing assistance. The purpose of the field visit is to view resource conditions, evaluate alternatives considered, review the effectiveness of the planned system to address the concerns, and meet standard and specification requirements in Section IV of the electronic Field Office Technical Guide (eFOTG). This field visit with the FO staff and the QAR team will be the key element of the review process. If possible, the case file review will also occur in the field. During the quality review, any program activities or HEL/wetland conservation activities will be examined to determine agreement with state and national policy and procedure.

The National Food Security Act Manual (NFSAM), Section 519.2c (vii), states that reviews will be conducted to "include all new activity on NRCS employee-owned and/or employee-operated land having current year activity, including positive and/or negative determinations." These will be completed by the supervisor, and this activity is subject to management reviews.

For easement program activities, WR Staff will process the data for the QARs when the list is distributed by the STC secretary. The needed data will primarily be any FO activity concerning on-site compliance reviews, land-owner restoration contracts, and compatible use agreements completed within the last three years. The data will be sent to the respective ASTC-FO. At least one easement agreement will be reviewed per FO with FO involvement.

## KANSAS QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN

### Conducting

The QAR will be conducted using an interdisciplinary team approach involving the AO staffs. Where possible, multiple disciplines should review plans. A SO QAR Team will participate and assist in a minimum of one review per area per year to assist the ASTCs-FO with the quality assurance process. A designated member of the AO staff participating in the review will be responsible for leading the review and coordinating with the SO QAR team leader.

The QAR shall be conducted any time during the year and will be completed by the end of the calendar year. Each FO/MU will be subject to a quality review every third year at a minimum. More frequent reviews may be conducted in a FO/MU at the discretion of the STC or ASTC-FO. Wetland determinations completed by AO staff will be reviewed annually by the SO Wetland Team. A minimum of one determination per wetland type, such as riverine, for each agency expert will be reviewed.

The SDC will be informed by the ASTC-FO 30-work days prior to the QAR event. This memo will give the time and location of the opening conference with a list of attendees. When the SO QAR Team is participating, the AO team leader will coordinate with the SO at least 15-work days prior. The ASTC-FO will inform the MU staff of plans and contracts to be reviewed at the opening conference or no more than one day prior. The ASTC-FO will utilize all record keeping tools to select plans and contracts, i.e., Program Contracts System (ProTracts), PRS, Integrated Data for Enterprise Analysis (IDEA), and National Easement Staging Tool (NEST) for the easement programs. All team members and MU staff members will maintain flexibility in the actual timing and locations of reviews after the opening conference. It is estimated most QARs will take 3-4 days.

The quality review will take place in the FO/MU and will include visiting the field, meeting with clients, and reviewing the application of practices. If needed or feasible, an off-site location may be used for the opening conference. A minimum of four planning sites will be visited per FO. The meeting of clients is normally accomplished through producer interview(s) conducted by the area and/or SO staff. The interview(s) should be conducted in a way to determine: the quality of program and conservation technical assistance producers are receiving from the FO staff; the interviewee's general knowledge of NRCS programs and any thoughts related to specific program strong points or areas they would like to see improved/revised; thoughts about overall NRCS assistance/programs; and where they may see a need for a shift in agency/program focus or improvement. An effort will be made to interview at least two clients per MU. If needed, the client interview may be done over the telephone. At least one interview will be conducted in the MU.

## KANSAS QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN

### **Spot-checking activities conducted during the QAR are secondary to QAR process.**

The QAR may constitute all or only a portion of the spot-checking required by GM, Title 450, Technology, Part 407. The AO specialists may be required to spot-check additional practices, as necessary, to meet spot-checking requirements. It should be noted that according to GM, Title 450, Technology, Section 407.20C (1) all spot-checking will be conducted on a fiscal year (FY) basis.

### **Documentation**

An entry should be made by the review team in each folder on Form NRCS-CPA-6, Conservation Assistance Notes (CPA-6 Notes), which lists the items reviewed, CPs spot-checked, and programs involved.

Trip reports will be prepared by the ASTCs-FO to document all types of reviews. All team members participating in the review shall provide written input to the official report within 10 days of the completion of the QAR. The SO QAR team leader will coordinate the reports from the SO members and forward to the AO team leader. When the SO QAR Team participates in a QAR, the draft report shall be forwarded for review and comments to the SO QAR team leader as well as AO members. A final trip report will be ready for the ASTC-FO within 45 days of the completion of the QAR. A courtesy copy of the final trip report will be provided to the STC.

### **Quality Assurance Activities**

#### **I. Conservation Planning Process Reviews**

##### **The QARs will focus on the conservation planning process.**

The review will also encompass program activity reviews and CP spot-checks completed as a part of the review of the planning process. The Checklist for Reviewing Conservation Plans (Attachment 2) is contained in the KQAP. This checklist will be used in documenting the conservation planning review for all conservation plan reviews not associated with a program. For those plans associated with a program, the information contained in this checklist is included in the program review checklist.

An increased emphasis will be placed on reviewing CPA-6 Notes. The National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) documentation recorded on the Form NRCS-CPA-52, Environmental Evaluation Worksheet, and operation and maintenance (O&M) of all CPs installed with NRCS assistance and documentation shall be thorough and complete. They should cover all aspects of the planning and application activities. Assistance notes will be thorough enough that any NRCS employee could pick up the folder and provide continued assistance to the client without interruption.

The NEPA documentation will reflect all resources on the planning unit, options provided, and the level of planned treatment.

## KANSAS QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN

### **II. Peer Reviews of the Conservation Stewardship Program (CStP)/ Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP)/Agricultural Water Enhancement Program (AWEP)/Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP) Approved Applications**

Peer reviews of Farm Bill contracts, including CStP/EQIP/AWEP/WHIP, are to be completed on every approved application prior to contract obligation. These reviews are completed by AO staffs, SO staffs, and surrounding SDCs/district conservationists (DCs). The appropriate program review checklist contained in the KQAP will be utilized when completing this peer review.

A. Peer review checklists completed by the AO or SO staffs may be utilized and counted toward the required number of reviews to be completed for the QAR. Upon completion of the checklists for the peer review, copies will be made and retained by the responsible party for the QAR. A copy will be filed in the corresponding contract folder.

B. During the QAR, previously completed checklists should be reviewed by a member of the QAR Team to ensure any noted deficiencies were corrected prior to final contract approval. Checklists should not be reviewed by the individual who initially completed them.

C. Conservation plans reviewed during the QAR by the AO/SO staffs may be utilized and counted toward recertification or updating employees' conservation planning matrix.

### **III. Annual Spot-Checks of CPs**

These items are to be completed on a FY basis and the review of all current and previous spot-check reports should be included in the QAR.

Form KS-CPA-17, Spot-Check of CPs, can be used to track reviews of CPs, including the Conservation Security Program (CSP 2002) and CStP enhancement activities. All payment documentation should be reviewed for all spot-checked practices or enhancement activities that received FA through EQIP, AWEP, WHIP, CStP or CSP 2002. **Five percent, not to exceed a total of five, unless additional is determined necessary, of program payments will be spot-checked annually. Item 13, Contract Payments, of the QAR section of the Program Checklist will be utilized for reviewing program payments. This spot-check will also ensure that the practice certification documentation matches the payment documentation.**

Reports for the CStP may be generated using the reports tab of ProTracts and running an initiative status summary. CStP CPs cannot be found using the regular search method in ProTracts.

## **KANSAS QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN**

Practices completed by a TSP, are to be included in the practices to be spot-checked. The TSP review completed in Section V is a review of CP codes 910, 911, 912, and 913. If the practice was reviewed under a TSP review, it does not need to be checked again.

### **IV. Conservation Program Reviews**

#### **A. National Food Security Act**

The MU Team designated in the Kansas HEL Conservation Provision Action Plan is responsible for conducting annual FSA compliance reviews and making HEL determinations within the MU. Employees will not handle HEL determinations or FSA compliance reviews in their location county. The HEL determinations and the FSA compliance reviews will be conducted by a certified conservation planner.

FSA compliance reviews will be completed to verify the accuracy of HEL determinations, confirm the technical adequacy of compliance plans and case file content, determine whether compliance plans are being applied or used, and determine whether wetland conservation provisions are being met.

The quality assurance of the FSA county reviews will be completed by the AO staffs or SO QAR Team to review the following FSA activities since the last QAR:

- HEL and Non-HEL determinations
- Compliance plans and revisions
- Compliance plans applied
- Variances approved by SDCs/DCs
- Wetland determinations completed by FO

#### **1. Timing**

The FSA compliance reviews for wind erosion management practices will be conducted from March 1 through April 15. Compliance reviews for water erosion management practices will be conducted from May 1 through June 15.

If the application of scheduled management practices cannot be assessed within these established dates, compliance reviews can be rescheduled to a time when management practices can be best evaluated. All compliance reviews will be completed by November 1.

#### **2. Conducting**

The SDC will be responsible for ensuring completion of compliance reviews in their management unit in accordance with the Kansas HELC Provision Action Plan. The SDC may request AO assistance in completing a compliance review if personal conflicts exist that might prohibit an objective decision. The NFSAM, Sections 518.10 and 518.11, will be referenced for guidance.

## KANSAS QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN

The SDC is responsible for working with their counties to review the compliance review list and making necessary adjustments. The NFSAM, Section 518.3, will be referenced for guidance. Each person associated with a tract selected for a compliance review will be notified by letter of the review and the resulting determination.

If an acceptable conservation system contained in the eFOTG is applied, planned or substitute practices are applied to the extent that erosion has been substantially reduced (75 percent reduction of potential erodibility, not to exceed two times the soil loss tolerance for the predominant HEL map unit in the field), the tract will be considered as “using an approved (UA) system.”

The wetland conservation portion of the compliance review is intended to determine whether wetlands are present on the tract and if a violation has occurred. In the case of a potential wetland violation, follow guidance found in NFSAM, Section 518.12, for notification and completion of Form FSA-569, NRCS Report of HELC and WC Compliance.

### **3. Documentation**

Field conditions observed during a compliance review will be documented in the CPA-6 Notes to support the compliance review determination. The KQAP contains the Kansas FSA/Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act (FACTA) Compliance Review Field Observations Worksheet (Attachment 3), and the Kansas FSA/FACTA Compliance Review Checklist (Attachment 4). This documentation is needed to support compliance review decisions.

A producer or third party with the appropriate training and NRCS approval may certify crop residue levels for compliance review purposes. Records documenting residue levels will be supplied by the producer and added to the compliance review documentation.

The Kansas FSA/FACTA Compliance Review Checklist addresses compliance plan and case file quality. It is required that this checklist be used to review case file content for compliance review tracts. The checklist and compliance review documentation will be reviewed by the AO staff or SO QAR Team during QARs.

Current condition erosion data reported for a compliance review tract will be supported by the appropriate erosion prediction tool, Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE2) and/or Wind Erosion Prediction System (WEPS) documentation in the tract/case file. Erosion data may be documented using reports printed from WEPS and/or RUSLE2. The summary of all forms of soil erosion will be documented on the Kansas FSA/FACTA Compliance Review Checklist.

Copies of correspondence relating to potentially adverse technical determinations will be provided to conservation districts.

## KANSAS QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN

The SDC/DC will enter compliance review results in the Web-based application at the following Web site: <http://ias.nrcs.usda.gov>.

The ASTCs-FO will complete quality assurance checks of FO databases. Any database that requires edits will need to be edited by the SDC by November 15.

FOs shall keep a log of all Form AD-1026s, HELC and WC Certification; and Form AD-569s, NRCS Report of HELC and WC Compliance, requests referred to the NRCS by the Farm Service Agency.

### **B. EQIP/AWEP**

EQIP/AWEP reviews will be conducted as part of the quality assurance process to evaluate the agency's effectiveness in servicing EQIP/AWEP activities. The EQIP/AWEP review process involves all current applications and active contracts. Quantities for review will include five percent or a maximum of five applications and/or contracts (unless a larger sample is determined necessary). The selection of contracts to be reviewed will reflect each of the different resource concerns and initiatives treated, such as Grazing Land Health, Water Quantity, Water Quality, and Cooperative Conservation Partnership Initiative (CCPI). Contracts funded under the national initiatives will be included in the selection process. Many times this will exceed five per FO.

A part of this sample will include all approved contracts that requested:

- \$150,000 or greater amount of EQIP/AWEP FA for CP installation.
- The installation of financially-assisted CP(s) on land owned or operated by NRCS employee(s).

The Program Checklist contained in the KQAP will be used to document the review of EQIP/AWEP applications and contracts. Applications/contracts will be evaluated to determine if case file documentation is complete and consistent with field conditions. Approved, ineligible, and deferred applications should be included in the sample. ProTracts will be used to determine current year program activity and practice application. The review will ensure that the contract information in ProTracts is accurately reflected in the contract case file.

Beginning Farmer or Rancher and/or Limited Resource Farmer or Rancher reviews are completed annually according to guidance in the Conservation Programs Manual (CPM), Conservation Program Contracting (CPC), Section 512.55 (D).

## **KANSAS QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN**

### **C. WHIP**

WHIP reviews will be conducted as a part of the quality assurance process to evaluate the agency's effectiveness in servicing WHIP activities. The service provided by the Kansas Department of Wildlife, Parks and Tourism (KDWPT) employees through the WHIP agreement will be evaluated during the review. The WHIP review process involves all applications and contracts. Quantities for review will include five percent or a maximum of five applications and/or contracts (unless a larger sample is determined necessary).

The Program Checklist contained in the KQAP, will be used to document the review of WHIP applications and contracts. Applications/contracts will be evaluated to determine if case file documentation is complete and consistent with field conditions. Approved, ineligible, and deferred applications should be included in the sample. ProTracts will be used to determine current year program activity and practice application. The review will ensure that the contract information in ProTracts is accurately reflected in the contract case file. Contracts selected for review will reflect all resource concerns treated with WHIP funds, such as, Lesser Prairie-Chicken (LEPC).

Beginning Farmer or Rancher and/or Limited Resource Farmer or Rancher reviews are completed annually according to guidance in the Conservation Programs Manual (CPM), Conservation Program Contracting (CPC), Section 512.55 (D).

### **D. Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP)**

WRP reviews will be conducted as a part of the quality assurance process to evaluate the agency's effectiveness in servicing WRP activities. The WRP review process involves all applications not yet sent to the SO, all acquired easements and compatible use agreements (CUA) since the last QAR. In addition, the review will consider any ten-year restoration agreements since the last QAR. Quantities for review will be a minimum of one easement/CUA per FO/MU (maximum ten percent). In the event there are no new easements/CUAs, then a minimum of one application (maximum ten percent) will be reviewed. The electronic data base in the SO will be utilized to obtain the number of easements and CUAs since the last QAR.

The Checklist for Reviewing WRP Activities contained in the KQAP will be used to document the review of WRP applications, landowner conservation program contracts and CUAs. Applications/agreements will be evaluated to determine if the case file documentation is complete and consistent with field conditions. The reviewer should refer to the CPM, WRP, Part 514, in this evaluation process, if necessary.

If there were no WRP applications on file in the FO/MU, the reviewer should review steps taken at the FO/MU level to inform landowners of the program and actions that could be taken to increase awareness and participation in the program. WRP activities conducted by the AO or SO staff will not be reviewed during the QAR.

## **KANSAS QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN**

### **E. Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)**

The CRP conservation planning activity will be used as part of the quality assurance process to evaluate the agency's effectiveness in providing CRP technical assistance. Quantities for review will include five percent or a maximum of five plans (unless a larger sample is determined necessary). This sample should include general sign-up and continuous sign-up applications, and if applicable, Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) applications. The sample should reflect a variety of the CPs used in the MU.

The Checklist for Reviewing CRP Plans and activities contained in the KQAP will be used to evaluate CRP Conservation Plan of Operations (CPO) and activities to ensure that the official case file documentation is complete and consistent with field conditions. The official case file is a joint file housed with Farm Service Agency per the Kansas Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) dated January 6, 2011.

### **F. CStP**

CStP reviews will be conducted as part of the quality assurance process to evaluate the agency's effectiveness in servicing CStP activities. The CStP review process involves all applications and contracts since the last QAR. Quantities for review will include five percent or a maximum of five applications and/or contracts (unless a larger sample is determined necessary).

The Program Checklist contained in the KQAP will be used to document the review of CStP applications and contracts. Applications/contracts will be evaluated to determine if case file documentation is complete and consistent with field conditions. Approved, ineligible, and deferred applications should be included in the sample. ProTracts will be used to determine current year program activity and practice application. The review will ensure that the contract information in ProTracts is accurately reflected in the contract case file.

### **G. Grassland Reserve Program (GRP)**

GRP reviews will be conducted as a part of the quality assurance process to evaluate the agency's effectiveness in servicing GRP activities. The GRP review process involves all new applications and agreements since the last QAR. Agreements include both easements and rental contracts. Quantities for review will be a minimum of one new agreement per FO/MU (maximum ten percent). In the event there are no new agreements, then a minimum of one new application (maximum ten percent) will be reviewed. If there were no applications or agreements on file, the review should assess what steps have been taken at the FO/MU level to increase the awareness and participation in the program.

## **KANSAS QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN**

The GRP is administered jointly by the NRCS and the Farm Service Agency. All applications should have been entered into the Farm Service Agency System 36, or their replacement system, which generated an application number and determined landowner eligibility. The NRCS is responsible for accepting applications, ranking applications, and notifying unapproved/ineligible applicants. The NRCS is responsible for developing GRP Management Plans on all approved applications and administering the easement program. The Farm Service Agency is taking the lead on rental contracts.

The Checklist for Reviewing GRP Plans contained in the KQAP will be used to document the review of GRP applications and agreements. Applications/agreements will be evaluated to determine if the case file documentation is complete and consistent with field conditions. Approved, disapproved, and deferred applications should be included in the sample.

### **IV. Technical Programs and Procedures**

The following technical programs and procedures will be addressed in the QAR process: engineering, plant materials, soil survey, watershed operations, Global Positioning System (GPS), Geographic Information System (GIS), Customer Service Toolkit (CST), and cultural resources activities. The Checklist for Reviewing Technical Programs and Procedures contained in the KQAP will be used in reviewing the programs and procedures.

### **V. TSP Reviews**

This plan applies only to those TSPs hired by the landowner or client for whom the client is usually reimbursed through a program contract via CP codes 910, 911, 912, or 913. The technical work of each certified TSP shall be spot-checked. A qualified NRCS employee will check the first practice or project (job) completed and five percent of the additional jobs completed by each individual TSP. Additional spot-checks will be completed as deemed necessary. The NRCS will spot-check each phase of the project or function of the TSP: planning, design, installation, and checkout. A qualified NRCS person is one who has CP approval for the scope of the CPs involved and the appropriate technical function (planning, design, and construction/application). The spot-check activities may be conducted by staff from all levels of the NRCS organization (FO, MU, AO, and SO). It is anticipated that AO personnel will conduct the majority of the spot-check activities with assistance from the FO/MU in which the project is located. It is also anticipated that the SO Engineering Staff will assist with the more complex projects such as the design of manure and wastewater handling and storage facilities.

The state TSP coordinator is responsible for coordinating the spot-checking and tracking completion. This shall be accomplished as follows:

## KANSAS QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN

- A. When a payment for CP codes 910, 911, 912, or 913 is certified on Form NRCS-CPA-1245, the individual certifying payment shall put a note in the "Performance Report" section of Form NRCS-CPA-1245, noting the name of the TSP. If the TSP is part of a business, the individual certifying or approving the work must be named with the business.
- B. When the SO Financial Management Staff receives Form NRCS-CPA-1245 for CP codes 910, 911, 912, or 913, it shall be copied and filed in a TSP working folder.
- C. The folder will be provided to the state TSP coordinator upon request.
- D. The state TSP coordinator will be responsible for tracking the number of jobs by each TSP and for providing this list to the Engineering or Resource Conservation Staffs, as appropriate, for spot-checking purposes.
- E. The appropriate section shall make arrangements to spot-check the initial job and five percent of the total jobs thereafter, for each TSP.
- F. Completion of spot-checking shall be documented using the appropriate checklists/forms and coordinated with the state TSP coordinator. The spot-check review will follow the Checklist for Review of TSPs (Attachments 12 and 13) of this document. The person performing the review will also refer to the Statements of Work (SOW), practice standards, and appropriate technical references to guide the review process.

## KANSAS QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN

### Attachments

<b>Number</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Date</b>
1.	Quality Assurance Summary	October 2012
2.	Checklist for Reviewing Conservation Plans	October 2012
3.	Kansas FSA/FACTA Compliance Review Field Observations	October 2012
4.	Kansas FSA/FACTA Compliance Review Checklist	October 2012
5.	Program Checklist for Ranking and Peer Review, QAR of EQIP, WHIP, CStP Plans	October 2012
6.	Checklist for Reviewing WRP Plans	October 2012
7.	Checklist for Reviewing CRP Plans	October 2012
8.	Checklist for Reviewing GRP Plans	October 2012
9.	Checklist for Reviewing Technical Programs and Procedures	October 2012
10.	Checklist for Review of TSPs	October 2012
11.	TSPs Information for Spot-Checks	October 2012