

Summary of the Laboratory Accreditation Body Expert Committee Meeting
Tuesday, June 16, 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 May 19 were approved unanimously, with the edit to change Bill Batschelet's email address.

The meeting agenda is contained in Attachment 2. There were no changes to the proposed agenda, except that the assessor training discussion was postponed until Aaren is present.

2. Continuing Discussion of Remaining Comments

The outcomes for all items discussed are presented in Attachment 3, below, highlighted in red. Black text is from previous meetings, and blue text was preliminary recommendations from the Chair, to inform the discussion at this meeting.

The discussion did consider the past standard material (2003 NELAC and 2009/2016 V2M1 and V2M3) and decided that AB approved assessment plans, contractual arrangements, and SOPs as required in the current draft are adequate.

At that point, time for the meeting was expired, and discussion will resume at the July meeting to address assessor training. Time permitting, the recommendations of the Field Activities Task Force will also be considered in July or possibly in August.

3. Next Meeting

The next teleconference meeting will be Tuesday, July 21, 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 Aaren.s.alger@gmail.com	12/31/2022	Other – Alger Consulting & Training	No
Socorro Baldonado sbaldonado@mwdh2o.com	12/31/2022 (1 st term)	Lab – Metropolitan Water District, La Verne, CA	Yes
William Batschelet wbatsche@aol.com	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
Catherine Katsikis catherinekatsikis@gmail.com	12/31/2021 (2 nd term)	Other – Laboratory Data Consultants	Yes
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
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 (1st term)	AB – ANAB	Yes
Alia Rauf arauf@utah.gov	12/31/2020 (1st 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 (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	No
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 – LAB Expert Committee Meeting Agenda, June 16, 2020

- Welcome and Roll Call
- Approval of Minutes (May 19 minutes attached)
- Continued Discussion of Comments (latest draft V2M1 attached)
 - Assessor Training and Qualifications, Grandfathering (see 2003 NELAC Standard and the two “on-site” files attached as resource material, with Aaren’s draft language also attached)
 - Remaining Comments (see attached spreadsheet and pdf of Carl’s email)
- New Business, if any
- Adjourn

Attachment 3

Comments submitted on the outline of proposed changes and the draft module for V2M1, April 16-June 16, 2019

Outcome of comments discussed during June 16 meeting are in red text.

Disclaimer: The NELAC Institute (TNI) accepts no liability for the content of any comment on a standard.

Any views or opinions on a standard are solely those of the commenter and do not necessarily reflect those of TNI.

		Section/ clause	Comment	Committee action	Committee comment	Carl Recommendation per May 22 email to Mei Beth and Lynn
		6.1.2.9.2 note	holdover from previous discussion	Remove the 1st note.		carry this issue into the assessor training discussion at the next meeting
120		7.4.2.1	Preferred language would be “ABs are allowed to conduct...” and the text about “initial assessments shall be announced” conflicts with at least one AB’s regulations (<i>either PA or VA, notes are unclear</i>) and must be removed. The Chair requested proposed wording for both the note and normative language; the issue was not resolved in the session.	Remove 7.4.2.3 and reword 7.4.2.1 to omit the initial phrase, “ABs have authority to conduct unannounced or announced assessments”.	if a risk assessment determines that initial assessment should be unannounced, the assessment plan should justify that decision	
126		7.6.7.1	The proposed deleted language about report sharing brought comments that TX needs it but it violates PA and FL law/regulations. ABs may need to share for purposes of mutual recognition but there may also be other reasons. ABs might be satisfied with exception language, saying “unless superseded by state regulations”. (<i>Aaren Alger agreed to submit draft language.</i>) Also, a cross-reference with §8.1 may provide adequate exception.	The deletion stands as previously decided. Section 8.1 should address TX concerns	section 8.1 essentially states that all information submitted is public	CCK Proposed Action: Discuss during the June teleconference. However, my opinion is that the new ISO/IEC language and the proposed deletion of V2M3, 6.12.6 results in not precluding the option or possibility of sharing on-site assessment reports among ABs. However, see Sec. 8.1.1. The Primary AB is obligated to inform the laboratory up front that these reports will be public information in that case.

MM	#####	6.2.9.2	<p>6.2.9.2 = Allows each AB to create its own training course(s). This includes the NGABs. The original NELAC standard required the training to be the same among all ABs. Do we want to have the same training for all ABs?(2) similar training, or (3) an approve TNI course(s) or (4) anyone create a basic assessor class and the technical training classes without oversight?</p>	unresolved	<p>Marlene noted that her Basic Assessor Training course was the original standard for AB assessors but when the NELAC standard shifted to ISO 17025, the concept shifted and ABs now do not have standardized training. One AB participant noted that the Drinking Water Certification Officer course is not "assessor training" even though it is sometimes used as such. Another AB noted that flexibility and accessibility for training are important to ABs -- training should be consistently offered or else "on-demand" and available to all ABs. Yet another AB was content to leave the language as is. Another party noted that TNI's training program does have the potential to meet this need, and asked that there be some time delay written into the standard to allow for expansions of TNI's training to address assessor needs</p>	<p>CCK Proposed Action: Agree to roll this comment into the current, continuing discussions of assessor training requirements in clauses 6.1.2.9.1-6.1.2.9.4 with Aaren's and Carl's proposed languages.</p>
----	-------	---------	---	------------	---	--

MM	6/26/19	item 46	Who agreed to this (how many on the committee agreed? This should be presented in the table. I would like to see this in the standard and indicate assessors can be shared as long as they are deemed competent by the individuals primary AB	carry this discussion into assessor training, at the next meeting	There is nothing in the standard now about "shared" assessors; there needs to be some assurance to the sharing AB that assessors are competent.	
MM	6/26/19	item 54	We must ensure the language for the credentials of assessors is clear. What other groups are discussing this? Is a member from LAB in those groups? Are NGABs represented?	not addressed	roll this issue into the assessor training discussion, but separately as a competency issue rather than training	CCK Background: The original comment from the DC Meeting was that we needed a policy outlining the qualifications and credentials needed for all AB assessors and contract assessors. This issue was never addressed after the removal of Chapter 3 of the 2003-version NELAC Standards. <u>CCK Proposed Action:</u> Agree to roll this comment into the current, continuing discussions of assessor training requirements in clauses 6.1.2.9.1-6.1.2.9.4 with Aaren's and Carl's proposed languages.

MM	6/26/19	item 55	Is this FOPT fields or Fields of accreditation? The field of accreditation or scope of accreditation requires consistent definition within TNI (matrix, technology/method. analyte) Volume 2 must address these terms and ensure all ABs use the same scope	Use the term "scope of accreditation" throughout the document; do not refer to "fields of accreditation at all.		CCK Background: The scope of accreditation in NELAP is definitely defined in the 2003-version NELAC Standard. Under TNI it is not so clear; is it matrix – method (technology?) – analyte (or analyte group? Or not at all)? The original issue was the variability in how PTs are handled among different NELAP ABs. The 2003 NELAC Standards give the AB the choice to track PTs by technology or by test method, and indeed some ABs track by method and others by technology. TNI may not have any description for what the AB should or shall do in this manner. These issues were never addressed after the removal from the 2003-version NELAC Standard. <u>CCK Proposed Action:</u> Discuss this during the June teleconference.
MM	#####	7.6.6.c	How long after the closing meeting must the AB provide additional Nonconformities? Draft Language now reads in 7.6.6.c item 1: <u>(1) If additional nonconformities are identified after the on-site portion of the assessment is concluded, these nonconformities shall be communicated to the laboratory in writing.</u>	remove clause 7.6.6.c.1	The phrase "without undue delay" addresses the time for providing additional non-conformities after the closing meeting. Any non-conformities actually identified after the assessment is concluded would necessarily become part of a different assessment process	CCK Proposed Action: Discuss during the June teleconference. However, my opinion is not to put any time limit on the AB for notifying laboratories of non-conformities when they are discovered. In fact, FL-DOH ELCP can and will notify laboratories of non-conformities that must be corrected even if they are discovered outside the scope of laboratory assessments.

MM	#####		Where is the definition for finding? (It was in V1 M2 are we using the same definition?) The new glossary does not include finding. The definition for finding that was in the standard indicated this was to be a nonconformance to the standard. The definition for finding is not presented in the glossary TNI published last week.	not addressed	Ed. -- until the glossary is included in the standard itself, ABs will not be able to rely upon those definitions, per the NELAP AC	unable to resolve without creating definition of finding for this volume
	new issue 4/21/20	7.6.4.2		A new issue arose about 7.6.4.2 dealing with discovery of regulatory violations during an on-site assessment. The Committee elected to bring in relevant language from Section 3.6.2, second paragraph, of the 2003 NELAC Standards into V2M1 to resolve this issue.		addressed with language from 2003 NELAC