Summary of the Laboratory Accreditation Body Expert Committee Meeting Tuesday, October 20, 2020 1:00 pm Eastern

1. Welcome and Roll Call

The Chair, Carl Kircher, opened the meeting. Attendance is recorded in Attachment 1. The meeting agenda (Attachment 2) was approved by acclamation and after noting a correction needed in item #4, the minutes of September 15 were approved unanimously, with Aaren and Catherine abstaining since they were absent for that meeting. In item 4, the first edit was to section 3.4, not section 1, to undelete the Note 2. Although the agenda was previously approved, this change was then requested to the agenda and is reflected in Attachment 2, below.

2. Review and Approval of Edits from September 15

All edits as noted in the September 15 minutes were affirmed as an accurate reflection of that meeting's agreement.

3. Approval of Draft Document as Draft Standard

Lynn briefly explained the next steps in creation of the final revised module (see Attachment 3).

No participants suggested that any additional changes need to be made to the draft document distributed after the September 15 meeting. Bill moved and Alia seconded that the draft document be approved as a Draft Standard.

In order to have a permanent electronic record of all committee members' votes, members were asked to vote by email. A message explaining the motion made and requesting votes was sent shortly after the meeting, with the draft document to be approved as an attachment. The closing date for the vote was set as November 3, 2020, allowing two weeks for voting.

As of the writing of these minutes, two affirmative votes have been received, from Bill and Carl.

4. New Business

None. Associate members were requested to depart the call, as a closed session was next.

5. Closed Session

A closed session was needed to discuss membership issues. No action was taken during this part of the meeting.

Bill moved and Michael seconded that the meeting be adjourned at 1:50 pm EDT.

6. Next Meeting

The next teleconference meeting will be <u>Tuesday</u>, <u>November 17, 2020</u>, <u>at 1:00 pm Eastern</u>. An agenda and documents will be distributed prior to the meeting.

Attachment 1

LAB Expert Committee Roster

Name/Email	Term ends	Affiliation	Present?
Aaren Alger Aaren.s.alger@gmail.com	1/30/2023	Other – Alger Consulting & Training	No
Socorro Baldonado sbaldonado@mwdh2o.com	1/30/2023 (1 st term)	Lab – Metropolitan Water District, La Verne, CA	Yes
William Batschelet wbatsche@aol.com	1/30/2022 (2 nd term)	Other – Retired from US EPA R8	Yes
Nilda Cox nildacox@eurofinsus.com	1/30/2022 (1 st term)	Lab – Eurofins Eaton Analytical LLC	Yes
Catherine Katsikis catherinekatsikis@gmail.com	1/30/2022 (2 nd term)	Other – Laboratory Data Consultants	No
Carl Kircher, Chair carl_kircher@flhealth.gov	1/30/2022 (3 rd term, extended)	AB – Florida Department of Health	Yes
Marlene Moore mmoore@advancedsys.com	1/30/2022 (2 nd term)	Other – Advanced Systems, Inc., Newark, DE	No
Michael Perry michael.perry@lvvwd.com	1/30/2023 (1 st term)	Lab – Southern Nevada Water Authority	Yes
Zaneta Popovska zpopovska@anab.org	1/30/2022 (1st term)	AB – ANAB	Yes
Alia Rauf arauf@utah.gov	1/30/2021 (1st term)	AB – Utah Department of Health	Yes
Mei Beth Shepherd, Vice Chair mbshep@sheptechserv.com	1/30/2022 (2 nd term)	Other – Shepherd Technical Services	No
Nicholas Slawson nslawson@a2la.org	1/30/2022 (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	No
Sviatlana Haubner Sviatlana.Haubner@cincinnati-oh.gov		LAB – Cincinnati Metropolitan Sewer District	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 – LAB Expert Committee Meeting Agenda, October 20, 2020

- Welcome and Roll Call
- Approval of Agenda and Minutes (September minutes attached)
- Review and approve final edits (section 6.1.2.9.3 post-meeting plus the edits agreed upon in the September meeting – 6.1.2.9.2, 6.1.2.9.3 and 7.6.6.d -- and the FATF-recommended edits – Note 2 of 3.4, Note 2 of 7.2.1 and 7.3 -- final draft attached)
- Consider entire module for approval as a Draft Standard (electronic vote required from all members)
- Next Steps (outline of next steps plus entire Standards Development SOP 2-100 attached, Response-to-Comments file attached)
- New Business, if any
- Closed Session (associate members will be asked to depart)
- Adjourn

Attachment 3

Expert Committee Steps to Develop a New/Revised Standard (from SOP 2-100, §5)

- 5.1 Decide whether partial or full revision
- 5.2 Publish Notification of Intent (NOI) to establish/modify a standard

Include (a) an explanation of the need for the standard; (b) how the standard is an improvement over the previous version where applicable; (c) identification of stakeholders (e.g. laboratories, Accreditation Bodies, FSMOs, engineering firms, PT Providers, PT Provider Accreditors, etc.) likely to be impacted by the standard; (d) any potential auditability, enforceability and/or implementation issues that may be encountered; and (e) potential economic impacts on any of the stakeholders. NOI requires CSDEC approval prior to publication. Invites input from the public within 30 days, which goes to CSDEC Program Administrator (PA).

5.3 Prepare Draft Standard

Include these things if standard is a revision: all submitted comments from all stages of the most recent previous standards development activity, complete with the Expert Committee's written deliberations and disposition of those comments; all comments previously placed on hold that remain on hold; and all pertinent Standard Interpretation Request responses.

When complete, PA may enter it into PowerDMS, and committee votes to approve the Draft Standard. ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS MUST VOTE and votes must be electronic (or else recorded by name in the minutes) so that they may be archived. Vote options are Affirmative, Affirmative with comment, Negative with comment or Abstain. Negative votes must be accompanied by written comments, with proposed alternate language. Unresolved negative votes must be documented in writing, with voter having right modify their vote or to appeal. The overall vote must be 2/3 affirmative to proceed.

Prepare summary of changes with justification for those changes. Post summary along with Draft Standard to the TNI website for stakeholder comments, and contact the people listed in the SOP (interested parties who signed up for a standards activity listserve, individuals on an applicable email contact list, TNI committee chairs and the members of the NELAP Accreditation Council and other parties expected to have an interest in the DS and summary of changes.)

The comment period for the initial Draft Standard is 90 days, with 30-day extension available upon request by an executive committee or the NELAP Accreditation Council. Comments are submitted to the Committee Chair and PA and recorded in Response-to-Comments (R2C) spreadsheet. Verbal comments shall be captured as possible during any public meeting/sessions the committee may hold, without attribution; commenters desiring a direct response must submit the comment in writing.

5.4 Response to Comments

All comments must be reviewed and ruled either persuasive or non-persuasive by majority vote of the expert committee, and the decision (w/ action if persuasive) recorded in the R2C spreadsheet, along with any justification for the persuasive/non determination. When all comments are addressed, the R2C file will be posted to the TNI website and archived, with notification to same parties as described above. Each commenter shall be individually notified in writing of the disposition of his/her/their submitted comments, along with notice of appeal rights. Additionally, any person may appeal any comment's handling.

Comments may be placed on hold until the next revision cycle under the following conditions:

- The comment would introduce a new concept to the proposed standard that had not been subject to public review;
- The comment's proposed language would change the overall intent of the standard as being proposed by the Expert Committee; or
- The comment would propose something that could not be handled properly within the time frame for processing the changes.

5.5 Draft Standard Revisions

If/When no comments are persuasive (and after any appeals are settled), the Draft Standard becomes final upon 2/3 vote of the committee (again, all committee members must vote and votes must be documented). If any comments are persuasive, resulting in a change to the standard, a revised Draft Standard must be published and the process repeated (with slightly shorter comment period). The process repeats until there are no more persuasive comments. However, repeated comments need not be re-considered unless new information is included.

Upon approval of the final Draft Standard (with no more persuasive comments), a final posting of the R2C file for a 30 day comment period is required, and if no further comments, the process proceeds to completion and the standard is considered final and available for purchase, adoption and implementation.



