

**Summary of the Laboratory Accreditation Body Expert Committee Meeting
Tuesday, November 19, 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 October 15 were approved. Carl asked whether any committee memberships are expiring at the end of 2019 (none are) and noted that the annual election of Chair and Vice Chair should be conducted at the December meeting.

2. Vote on New Member Application

Michael Perry applied to join the LAB Expert Committee as a laboratory stakeholder, and was asked to join the call late, after the vote on his membership was completed. Nilda spoke in support of Socorro's application, then Charles moved and Mei Beth seconded that his 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 his membership. Welcome, Michael!

3. 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 7.6.3.3 in the first group of sequentially numbered items, the ones considered to be non-controversial and easily resolved.

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

The starting point for the December meeting will be the comments on §7.12 & 7.13.

4. Next Meeting

The next teleconference meeting will be **Tuesday, December 17, 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	No
Charles Hartke Charles.hartke@sgs.com	12/31/2020 (1 st term)	Lab – SGS Accutest, Dayton, NY	Yes
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	No
Michael Perry michael.perry@lvvwd.com	12/31/2022 (1 st term)	Lab – Southern Nevada Water Authority	Yes
Zaneta Popovska zpopovska@anab.org	12/31/2021 (1 st term)	Other – ANAB	Yes
Alia Rauf arauf@utah.gov	12/31/2020 (1 st term)	AB – Utah Department of Health	No
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 (1 st 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
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
159	7.6.3.3	Section 7.6.3.3 has a lot of concepts within a single paragraph. I would suggest separating ideas out into separate sections. Also, why is it the responsibility of the team leader to report a conflict of interest? This seems overly specific. The requirement to report the conflict is a requirement, who reports it is irrelevant. And, it might not even be appropriate for the individual to report the conflict to anyone other than the AB.	okay as is, no change	previous change replaced "lead assessor" with "team leader" to conform with ISO language
160	7.6.4.1	Section 7.6.4.1 – The last sentence should be deleted. Sometimes there is only one way to fix a problem, to tell an assessor that they are not allowed to tell the lab what will fix it is just going too far.	leave as is	a suggestion is acceptable but a mandate or requirement is not

6/3/1900	7.6.6.a.1 & 7.6.8.1	<p>7.6.6.a.1 and 7.6.8.1 The term findings in 17011 is the observations made during the assessment. The term non-conformity is used when the CAB does not meet the requirements. The term finding as defined in the TNI 2016 standard was a non-conformity. We should be consistent with the use of the term finding with ISO. Therefore in this clause '...determination of findings... should read '... determination of non-conformities...' 'address non-conformities' not findings (this is another example)</p>	7.6.6.a.1 -- the term finding is appropriate; 7.6.8.1 -- replace "findings" with "non-conformities"	
175	7.7.5.1.8	<p>REMOVE. There is no way to objectively judge or define "passing" an on-site assessment. (If not removed, this must be defined.) This requirement cannot be put into our state regulation because it is undefined and subjective, therefore technically a reason to "Veto". (The same outcome can be determined by other related reasons on the list; this reason is not needed to carry out the Standard.)</p>	remove this section and renumber subsequent sections as appropriate	
	7.7.5.1		delete the superfluous header	
176	7.7.5.1.9	<p>TYPO. Move the "and/or" down to 7.7.5.1.10</p>	move the "and/or" to the next to last item after renumbering	

177	7.9.1	<p>“... shall not be longer than 5 years”. This ISO statement needs to be followed with either a note / reference to the added TNI language in 7.9.4.1, or move the TNI language from 7.9.4.1 to this spot. Without an immediate clarification this language is potentially misleading.</p>	okay as is	7.9.1 refers to 7.9.4 explicitly
189	7.7.5.1.8	<p>There is no criteria for what constitutes a “failure to pass” required on-site assessments. As such, this clause is not enforceable.</p>	remove this section and renumber subsequent sections as appropriate	
165	7.9.3	<p>Section 7.9.3 NOTE seems to be the same as Section 3.24</p>	no consensus on change to be made	<p>Carl requests that revised language be submitted for discussion, since there was no agreement among those present. Zaneta submitted the following, after the meeting: My comment to this is that we can delete the note since it is the same as the section 3.24. But if we decide to keep the note my suggestion is below:</p> <p>Note: Other assessment techniques may include, but [are] not limited to, review by the accreditation body of internal audit reports and managerial reviews or continuing demonstration of corrective actions, or proficiency testing performed by the CAB. (from V2M1, 7.7.2)</p>

6/4/1900	7.11.1	<p>7.11.1 deficiencies is no longer used. The correct term is non-conformity. Change the word in this section and do a word search for deficiencies and remove this term. Confuses the CABS.</p>	<p>change "deficiencies" to "non-conformances" and delete "or an area of non-conformities"</p>	
163	7.11.1.1	<p>I do not understand the value of Section 7.11.1.1. I understand that this is in the current standard, but other than making it a "got-cha" for an Evaluation Team during an evaluation, I don't understand. If you want the requirement to be that the AB change a suspension to a revocation, it seems a little heavy handed. Maybe ABs like having this in the standard, but I don't see it as useful.</p>	<p>keep with the edit discussed in 7.11.1 above</p>	
195	7.11.1.2.9	<p>Revised comment: Would like to see this written clearer to include repeat findings from previous reports. Suggested Language: "Failure to complete responses or corrective actions from an accreditation body's current or past assessment reports." <u>Original comment:</u> Suggest including "repeat finding". Failure to complete responses or corrective actions from an accreditation body's current or past assessment reports.</p>	<p>accept the suggested language as presented</p>	

178	7.11.1.3	the requirements are written as CAB requirements, rather than AB requirements. She quotes the old/new text, then says "I wasn't exactly sure how to re-word the revision. I don't know exactly what the expectation of the AB is with regard to ensuring that a CAB does not continue to perform work under an affected scope. "	Revise the language to read "the AB shall inform the suspended CAB that it cannot continue to do work under accreditation auspices for that scope of accreditation"	refer this to Quality Systems Expert committee for inclusion in V1M2. Email sent to J. Jensen 11/27/19.
164	7.11.1.5	7.11.1.5 seems to be something that would be determined by an ABs rules and regulations. The Standard shouldn't say when an application is due. I don't see the value in limiting something that would be a state-specific application requirement.	delete the section and renumber subsequent sections	same comment from two submitters
179	7.11.1.5	the requirements are written as CAB requirements, rather than AB requirements. Again, she quotes the old&new texts but adds no additional comment	delete the section and renumber subsequent sections	same comment from two submitters