

Summary of the Laboratory Accreditation Body Expert Committee Meeting  
Tuesday, May 19, 2020 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 April 21 were approved unanimously.

2. Continuing Discussion of Remaining Comments

The first item addressed was a quick review of the incorporation of language from §3.6.2, second paragraph, of the 2003 NELAC standard into §7.6.4.1, as agreed upon at the March meetings. With this language included in the newest draft, participants agreed that §7.6.4.2 should be deleted. One participant noted that any non-conformance to the standard is technically a violation of the state's regulation governing accreditation.

Then the discussion moved to Aaren's submitted draft revision for §6.1.2.9 (see Attachment 2 below). Aaren explained that she sought to write the standard language in such a way that anticipated new assessor training (developed through the new TNI Training Committee's efforts) could be required once it is available, with appropriate grandfathering for existing assessors but not for those in newly recognized Accreditation Bodies (ABs). NOTE: a few of the changes agreed upon during the March meeting are not reflected in this document, since the revised draft had not yet been prepared and distributed, but those do not impact the substance of the changes proposed.

One participant noted that there is no TNI approved quality management training now, but that individual ABs approve training for their assessors, and suggested that the draft revision await actual approval of such new training by the Training Committee. Lynn noted that it is highly unlikely that the brand new Training Committee will accomplish that development and approval of training in the timeframe for finalizing V2M1, and thus if it is not addressed this year, it would need to await the next revision, more than 5 years into the future.

Specific discussion points were as follows:

- §6.1.2.9.2 – setting a passing score in the standard itself would simply mean that trainers write the exam to meet the score. Participants agreed that no specific “passing score” should be named in the standard, but rather should be defined by the trainer who develops the course and the examination. Participants also agreed that an online version of the exam would qualify as “written exam”.
- §6.1.2.9.2, 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet – the complex issue of what constitutes “technical disciplines” was revisited. The note from the 2009/2016 V2 that broke out several sub-disciplines for chemistry was removed, but some believe those should be restored to ensure that assessors understand all aspects of “chemistry”, but eventually, participants agreed that the training should be focused on the modular structure of the standard itself, recognizing that the assessor would need to be able to assess all types of methods within that discipline.
- §6.1.2.9.3, 1<sup>st</sup> sentence – add “or contracted” after “an assessor who is employed...”.
- §6.1.2.9.3, 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence – specify when the 12 months should start, and probably make one bullet for new ABs and another for existing recognized ABs.
- §6.1.2.9.3, 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence – is an implementation date needed? What about rolling implementation for the TNI-mandated training? Lynn noted that, historically, the NELAP AC has agreed that implementation of V2M1/V2M3 could be done by all ABs at the same time, since the AB operations are not governed by regulation as are the Volume 1 requirements, so that rolling implementation ought not to be an issue.

- §7.6.6.b.3 – start the section with “If the report is not issued by the AB itself, the AB shall...”
- §7.6.7.1 – add to the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence “and explain why the amended report is being issued.” Add to the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence “for the portions of the report that are not amended”. While specific language was not proposed, there was general agreement that the lab should be given 30 days to respond with corrective action to the amended items, and that the AB must establish a timeline for review of reports that were not AB-approved prior to issuance (i.e., issued by contract assessor directly to the lab and submitted to the AB separately).

Aaren agreed to re-work the §6.1.2.9.2 portion of her draft, and requested Mei Beth’s help with reviewing her product. Marlene had to depart the call early, but offered to send Aaren some “not really substantive” notes on the first draft. This re-work will have V1M1-M2 as the assessor training for management systems and V1M3-M7 as technical discipline training, noting that any additional modules that might be developed would be included, in the future.

Carl agreed to re-work the grandfather portion, §6.1.2.9.3, and Aaren volunteered to send him her notes on that section (done shortly after the meeting).

At that point, time for the meeting was expired, and discussion will resume at the June meeting.

### 3. Next Meeting

The next teleconference meeting will be Tuesday, June 16, 2020, at 1:00 pm Eastern. 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 <a href="mailto:Aaren.s.alger@gmail.com">Aaren.s.alger@gmail.com</a>	12/31/2022	Other – Alger Consulting & Training	Yes
Socorro Baldonado <a href="mailto:sbaldonado@mwdh2o.com">sbaldonado@mwdh2o.com</a>	12/31/2022 (1 <sup>st</sup> term)	Lab – Metropolitan Water District, La Verne, CA	Yes
William Batschelet <a href="mailto:wbatsche@aol.com">wbatsche@aol.com</a>	12/31/2021 (2 <sup>nd</sup> term)	Other – Retired from US EPA R8	Yes
Nilda Cox <a href="mailto:nildacox@eurofinsus.com">nildacox@eurofinsus.com</a>	12/31/2021 (1 <sup>st</sup> term)	Lab – Eurofins Eaton Analytical LLC	Yes
Catherine Katsikis <a href="mailto:catherinekatsikis@gmail.com">catherinekatsikis@gmail.com</a>	12/31/2021 (2 <sup>nd</sup> term)	Other – Laboratory Data Consultants	Yes
Carl Kircher, Chair <a href="mailto:carl_kircher@flhealth.gov">carl_kircher@flhealth.gov</a>	12/31/2021 (3 <sup>rd</sup> term, extended)	AB – Florida Department of Health	Yes
Marlene Moore <a href="mailto:mmoore@advancedsys.com">mmoore@advancedsys.com</a>	12/31/2021 (2 <sup>nd</sup> term)	Other – Advanced Systems, Inc., Newark, DE	Yes
Michael Perry <a href="mailto:michael.perry@lvvwd.com">michael.perry@lvvwd.com</a>	12/31/2022 (1 <sup>st</sup> term)	Lab – Southern Nevada Water Authority	No
Zaneta Popovska <a href="mailto:zpopovska@anab.org">zpopovska@anab.org</a>	12/31/2021 (1st term)	AB – ANAB	Yes
Alia Rauf <a href="mailto:arauf@utah.gov">arauf@utah.gov</a>	12/31/2020 (1st term)	AB – Utah Department of Health	Yes
Mei Beth Shepherd, Vice Chair <a href="mailto:mbshep@sheptechserv.com">mbshep@sheptechserv.com</a>	12/31/2021 (2 <sup>nd</sup> term)	Other – Shepherd Technical Services	Yes
Nicholas Slawson <a href="mailto:nslawson@a2la.org">nslawson@a2la.org</a>	12/31/2021 (1st term)	AB – A2LA	No
Program Administrator: Lynn Bradley <a href="mailto:Lynn.Bradley@nelac-institute.org">Lynn.Bradley@nelac-institute.org</a>	N/A		Yes
Associate Members:			
Yumi Creason <a href="mailto:ycreason@pa.gov">ycreason@pa.gov</a>		AB – Pennsylvania	Yes
Scott Haas <a href="mailto:shaas@etilab.com">shaas@etilab.com</a>		Lab – Environmental Testing, Inc., and Chair, FAC	No
Bill Ray <a href="mailto:bill_ray@williamrayllc.com">bill_ray@williamrayllc.com</a>		Other – William Ray Consulting, LLC	No
Aurora Shields <a href="mailto:Aurora.Shields@kcmo.org">Aurora.Shields@kcmo.org</a>		Lab – KC Water	No
Ilona Taunton <a href="mailto:Ilona.taunton@nelac-institute.org">Ilona.taunton@nelac-institute.org</a>		Other – TNI Program Administrator	No

## Attachment 2

### 6.1.2.9 ISO/IEC 17011:2017(E) Clause 6.1.2.9

*Where additional specific competence criteria have been established for a specific accreditation scheme, these shall be applied.*

6.1.2.9.1 An assessor shall hold at least a Bachelor's degree in a scientific discipline or have commensurate experience acquired by having performed verified assessments of environmental CABs (see 6.1.3.2.1). [from V2M3, 4.2.3]. An AB that chooses to evaluate an assessor's educational qualifications using the "commensurate experience" allowance shall have documented procedures for evaluating what constitutes "commensurate experience" and these procedures must define how this practice is applied within the organization and shall document the decision-making process used to approve the assessor.

6.1.2.9.2 An assessor shall have completed and pass assessor training courses that include obtaining a passing score on the examination at the conclusion of the course. A score of greater than 75% correct answers will be considered passing. The training courses include, but are not limited to:

- TNI-approved assessment of TNI quality management systems training (aka Basic Assessor Training) and attained a passing score on the written examination.
- TNI-approved technical discipline training (aka technical training), as applicable for the technical areas of assessment for which the assessor seeks to obtain approval. of courses approved by the employing accreditation body on assessing quality management systems and all applicable technical disciplines comprising a technology or combination of method and technology that the assessor will assess. Until 12 months after TNI develops and makes available applicable TNI-approved technical discipline training, an assessor who completes an appropriate AB-approved technical discipline training course (as defined by the employing AB), which includes achieving a passing score of >75% on a written examination, may be substituted for completing and passing the TNI-approved technical training.

NOTE: The Accreditation Body may choose to require additional training for assessors.

~~NOTE: Technical disciplines applicable to the environmental sector include microbiology, toxicity testing, inorganic non-metals, metals, organics, asbestos, and radiochemistry, and field activities. [from V2M3, 4.2.4]~~

NOTE: Written examinations may not be required for ongoing (refresher) training of assessors. The AB may choose to require a written examination to demonstrate ongoing (refresher) training of assessors.

### 6.1.2.9.3 Grandfathering Provisions for Assessors

- An assessor who is employed by a NELAP-recognized or TNI-recognized Accreditation Body and meets the training requirements of the 2009 TNI Standard shall be considered grandfathered and is not required to meet the requirements of clause 6.1.2.9.2 to maintain qualification as a TNI/NELAP qualified assessor. ~~does not meet the education credential requirements but possesses the requisite experience of clause 6.1.2.9.1 shall have been an assessor for the accreditation body for at least twelve (12) months prior to the date that the accreditation body applies for recognition under this Standard and thus elects to become subject to the requirements of this Standard. The assessor shall be considered competent only for assessing management systems and applicable technical disciplines for which he/she has been an assessor for that accreditation body for the previous twelve (12) months or more. Assessors who have been qualified less than 12 months before the implementation of the new requirements will be required to meet the requirements of the new standard within 12~~