

**Summary of the Laboratory Accreditation Body Expert Committee Meeting
Tuesday, October 15, 2019 1:00 pm Eastern**

1. Welcome and Roll Call

The Chair, Carl Kircher, opened the meeting. Attendance is recorded in Attachment 1. The minutes of September 17 were approved.

2. Vote on New Member Application

Socorro Baldonado applied to join the LAB Expert Committee as a laboratory stakeholder, and was asked to join the call late, after the vote on her membership was completed. Nilda spoke in support of Socorro's application, then Bill Batschelet moved and Nilda seconded that her application be approved. The vote was unanimously in favor of accepting Socorro into the committee, and following this meeting, the Chair of the Consensus Standards Development Executive Committee, Paul Junio, approved her membership. Welcome, Socorro!

3. Response to SIR #362

A new SIR arrived for the LAB Expert Committee, asking

"V2M3, 6.12.2 says, 'The accreditation body or its authorized representative shall present to the CAB within thirty calendar days of the last day of the on-site assessment a final assessment report identifying all confirmed findings.'

If the thirtieth calendar day falls on a weekend or holiday (i.e. a non-business day for the accreditation body), then may the accreditation body issue the assessment report on the next business day and still be in compliance with the standard?"

Two options were suggested, that for a weekend, the closest day should apply (e.g., if the 30th calendar day falls on Saturday, then Friday, or if on Sunday, then Monday), or alternatively, the following business day should apply in all cases. After a brief discussion, consensus formed around the option of the following business day. Mei Beth moved and Bill Batschelet seconded that the response to the SIR should be "yes", and approval was unanimous.

4. Continued Discussion of Comments on Outline of Proposed Changes and Draft of V2M1

The committee continued discussion of these, working from the spreadsheet used at conference. They resumed with section 7.4.4 in the first group of sequentially numbered items, the ones considered to be non-controversial and easily resolved. Carl noted that Marlene's compiled comments will be addressed at the end of the comment consideration process.

The results of the discussions are in the table in Attachment 2, below.

The starting point for the October meeting will be the comment on §7.6.3.3.

3. Next Meeting

The next teleconference meeting will be **Tuesday, November 19, 2019, at 1:00 pm Eastern.** An agenda and documents will be distributed prior to the meeting.

LAB Expert Committee Roster

| Name/Email | Term ends | Affiliation | Present? |
|--|---|--|----------|
| Socorro Baldonado sbaldonado@mwdh2o.com | 12/31/2022 (1 st term) | Lab – Metropolitan Water District, La Verne, CA | Yes |
| William Batschelet Batschelet.william@epa.gov | 12/31/2021 (2 nd term) | Other – Retired from US EPA R8 | Yes |
| Nilda Cox nildacox@eurofinsus.com | 12/31/2021 (1 st term) | Lab – Eurofins Eaton Analytical LLC | Yes |
| Charles Hartke Charles.hartke@sgs.com | 12/31/2020 (1st term) | Lab – SGS Accutest, Dayton, NY | No |
| Catherine Katsikis catherinekatsikis@gmail.com | 12/31/2021 (2 nd term) | Other – Laboratory Data Consultants | No |
| Carl Kircher, Chair carl_kircher@flhealth.gov | 12/31/2021 (3 rd term, extended) | AB – Florida Department of Health | Yes |
| Marlene Moore mmoore@advancedsys.com | 12/31/2021 (2 nd term) | Other – Advanced Systems, Inc., Newark, DE | Yes |
| Zaneta Popovska zpopovska@anab.org | 12/31/2021 (1st term) | Other – ANAB | Yes |
| Alia Rauf arauf@utah.gov | 12/31/2020 (1st term) | AB – Utah Department of Health | Yes |
| Mei Beth Shepherd, Vice Chair mbshep@sheptechserv.com | 12/31/2021 (2 nd term) | Other – Shepherd Technical Services | Yes |
| Nicholas Slawson nslawson@a2la.org | 12/31/2021 (1st term) | AB – A2LA | No |
| Program Administrator: Lynn Bradley Lynn.Bradley@nelac-institute.org | N/A | | Yes |
| Associate Members: | | | |
| Yumi Creason ycreason@pa.gov | | AB – Pennsylvania | Yes |
| Scott Haas shaas@etilab.com | | Lab -- Environmental Testing, Inc., and Chair, FAC | No |
| Bill Ray bill_ray@williamrayllc.com | | Other – William Ray Consulting, LLC | Yes |
| Aurora Shields Aurora.Shields@kcmo.org | | Lab – KC Water | No |
| Ilona Taunton Ilona.taunton@nelac-institute.org | | Other – TNI Program Administrator | No |

Attachment 2 – Comments Received from Posting of Outline and Draft, with Summary of Discussion

| Vote | Section/ clause | Comment | Committee action | Committee comment |
|------|--------------------|---|--|----------------------|
| | 7.4.8 | <p>The requirement for an AB to confirm the dates of the assessment with the laboratory implies both parties have to agree on a date. This can cause problems when the laboratory wants to delay an assessment, but the AB is required to perform the assessment within a certain timeframe. The way the requirement is written, the obligation is on the AB to get confirmation and allows the laboratory to delay assessments indefinitely by not confirming the date. Either the word “confirm” needs to be clarified or require that the AB make reasonable attempts to confirm the date.</p> | <p>cannot write this into the standard -- no clarification can be made to this ISO language, but §7.11.1 applies</p> | |

| | | | | |
|--|---------|--|---|--|
| | 7.6.3 | <p>The requirement that the assessment team conduct the assessment based on the assessment plan does not allow the assessment team necessary flexibility during the onsite assessment. The assessment team may have to modify what is being assessed if issues are found in one area. There needs to be an allowance for deviation from the assessment plan.</p> | <p>add language to say that if the assessment plan is not followed, the report shall document changes and include justification for those changes</p> | |
| | 7.6.2.1 | <p>NOTE for Section 7.6.2.1 – I do not see value in this note. It seems more like something that would be valuable for a training manual for a new AB, not a standard.</p> | <p>delete the note</p> | |

| | | | | |
|--|---------|--|---|--|
| | 7.6.3.1 | 7.6.3.1 and note: should be moved to section 7.6.4. 7.6.3.1 relates to finding of the assessor and is not part of the preparation of the assessment plan. | move as suggested, make 7.6.3.1 & note into 7.6.4.2; renumber as needed | |
|--|---------|--|---|--|

| | | | | |
|--|-----------|---|--|---|
| | 7.6.3.2.a | <p>7.6.3.2.a – I disagree that the AB is responsible for providing a confidentiality notice to a laboratory. In government, at least PA, nothing is confidential unless certified by a court. A lab can mark anything confidential, but it doesn't make it so. If a laboratory wants to mark things confidential, then they have this right regardless of whether or not an AB tells them they do. However, to make it the AB's responsibility to tell the lab that they have the right to do so or to imply that the lab could expect confidentiality is ridiculous and onerous on the AB. This section should be removed from the standard.</p> | <p>Remove 7.6.3.2.a, this is covered in Clause 8 of the standard. Make c into a, and keep b as is. Remove the header line as not needed or appropriate</p> | <p>the AB just have assessors keep confidential items so, but the AB is not required to do so</p> |
| | 7.6.3.2.a | <p>Section 7.6.3.2.a seems to be covered already in Section 8.1.1 (and in a more reasonable way, see comment 8 below)</p> | <p>ditto</p> | |

| | | | | |
|--|---------------|--|---|---|
| | 7.6.3.2 b) | Why is the committee proposing to delete 7.6.3.2 b) regarding the submittal of checklists used? Is it because not all ABs use checklists, or that ABs do not want the information in the checklists provided to the labs, or that labs do not want to receive them? I'm Ok with keeping or deleting, but was just curious about the reasoning. | not needed to require of all ABs, since not all ABs provide a checklist to the lab in advance | at §7.14, include checklists in "records" |
|--|---------------|--|---|---|