

Summary of the Laboratory Accreditation Body Expert Committee Meeting
Tuesday, July 20, 2021 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 as presented. The minutes of June 15 were approved with a typo corrected (the “P” for one of the comments in Attachment 3 was in the wrong column after a motion by Nilda and second by Bill. Approval was unanimous with Aaren abstaining due to her absence at that meeting.

2. Agenda for Conference Session

The LAB session will be on Monday morning, August 2, as part of the hybrid conference week. The time will be 9 am PDT until noon PDT (so, starting at noon Eastern), with a mid-morning break. Participants agreed to the following agenda:

Welcome and Roll Call
Approval of Agenda
Approval of July minutes
Discussion of Select Comments on V2M1 Draft Standard
New Business
Adjourn

Carl plans to travel to Bellevue, but Mei Beth and Lynn will participate remotely. Carl intends to identify comments from the most problematic or controversial sections of the Draft Standard – assessor training, timelines and possibly other areas – to present for discussion during the session. Other committee members registered for conference may participate either in person or remotely, depending on their arrangements.

As with previous virtual conference sessions, all participating committee members and associates will be able to speak, as well as participants in the room (both committee members and audience), and someone will be assigned to read comments from the WebEx “chat” as part of the meeting. The chat comments will be captured for further consideration at later committee meetings, as well.

3. Continued Consideration of Comments on Draft Standard V2M1

A complete spreadsheet of all comments submitted, sorted in sequential order to align with the Draft Standard, was distributed to committee members, and this spreadsheet will be where the formal record of how comments were addressed. The portions of the spreadsheet addressed at each meeting will be included as an attachment to the minutes in addition to being recorded in the permanent spreadsheet. This spreadsheet is based on the template provided in the Standards Development SOP 2-100. (See Attachment 3, below.)

As the details of the vote on whether or not a comment is persuasive and how it should be addressed if persuasive are not needed for commenters or the public to consider the actual outcome of the discussion for each comment, those details are not included in the formal Response to Comments spreadsheet, but will be noted in the minutes for the meeting(s) where comments are addressed. NOTE: the comment numbers in the table below refer back to the order of submission, so that when the spreadsheet is sorted by comment number, all comments from each submitter will be clustered, but for addressing the comments, it works best to follow the sequence of the standard itself.

For this July 20 meeting, the items planned for discussion at conference, as selected by Carl, are skipped over. Thus items about assessor qualifications and training, lab assessment report contents, and confidential and publicly available information are postponed for formal action until discussion at conference offers an opportunity for additional input from the TNI community.

<u>Comment Number</u>	<u>Section Number</u>	<u>Proposed Decision</u> (P/NP/editorial as determined)	<u>Motion Made</u>	<u>Motion Seconded</u>	<u>Vote</u>
58	6.1.3.5	Not Persuasive, with note to submitter that an additional comment/justification on the DS Revision 1 when posted will warrant reconsideration	Mei Beth	Aaren	Unanimous
59	6.1.3.7	Persuasive	Mei Beth	Bill	Unanimous with Carl abstaining
17	6.2.2.1.e	Persuasive	Mei Beth	Aaren	Unanimous
66	7.11.1.2	Persuasive, editorial	Bill	Aaren	Unanimous
25	7.11.1.4	Persuasive	Aaren	Mei Beth	Unanimous
26	7.11.1.5	Persuasive	Aaren	Mei Beth	Unanimous

Additionally, committee members noted several sections that should be italicized, as ISO language, in the working draft. These committee-initiated changes were not voted upon, as they are essential for maintaining the integrity of the document and separating the ISO text from the TNI additions.

3. New Business

A brief discussion of conference logistics determined that Aaren will be on-site to assist Carl with the questions submitted by remote attendees, as it's uncertain who else will actually be travelling. Also, Carl stated that he plans to skim through the presentation, highlighting the topics for discussion, and then return to focus on each of the areas separately. The conference session will be for committee discussion and also to receive comment(s) from participants, but voting will not take place until the next teleconference meeting on August 17.

Bill moved and Nilda seconded that the meeting be adjourned at 2:30 pm.

4. Next Meeting

The next LAB meeting will be the "hybrid" session at conference in Bellevue, WA, at 10:30 am PDT (1:30 pm Eastern). Any committee member (including associates) may participate virtually so long as they are registered for the TNI "track" of the conference, and all in-person registrants are invited to be present with Carl, in the meeting room.

The next teleconference meeting will be **Tuesday, August 17, 2021, 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	1/30/2023	Other – Alger Consulting & Training	yes
Socorro Baldonado sbaldonado@mwdh2o.com	1/30/2023 (1 st term)	Lab – Metropolitan Water District, La Verne, CA	No
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	Yes
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	No
Scott Haas shaas@etilab.com		Lab – Environmental Testing, Inc., and Chair, FAC	No
Sviatlana Haubner Sviatlana.Haubner@cincinnati-oh.gov		LAB – Cincinnati Metropolitan Sewer District	No
Paul Junio paulj@nslab.com		LAB – Northern Lake Services	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 – LAB Expert Committee Meeting Agenda, July 20, 2021

- Welcome and Roll Call
- Approval of Agenda
- Approval of Minutes (June minutes attached)
- Continue Review of Comments on Draft Standard (comments spreadsheet sorted sequentially and cleaned-up Draft Standard attached)
- New Business, if any
- Adjourn

Attachment 3 – Committee Decisions on Comments for July 20, 2021

Title -- V2M1 comments on Draft Standard, 12/1/2020 thru 3/30/2021

Comment Number	Vote & Justification (Persuasive/non-persuasive)	Editorial (Y/N)	Section/Clause	Comment	Committee Action	Date Addressed	Committee Comment
58	NP		6.1.3.5	<p>6.1.3.5 A note should be added stating that observation of assessors from a remote location meets the requirement.</p> <p>Suggested language: NOTE: It is permissible for monitoring from a remote location to meet the on-site evaluation requirement.</p> <p>Justification: Remote observation of assessors for the purposes or training and/or evaluation is an effective tool which needs to be specifically allowed so the allowance not subject to interpretation.</p>	no action taken	7/20/2021	submitter is invited to review the committee's response and comment again on the Draft Standard Version 1 when published

59	P		6.1.3.7	6.1.3.7 Unnecessary; removal suggested. Justification: See 6.3.	section removed	7/20/2021	
17	P		6.2.2.1.e	6.2.2.1 e – To clarify solicitations or gifts, I suggest adding a statement to the effect that items provided at a trade show or conference that are available to any attendees at such a show or conference are allowed for assessors to accept.	wording changed to state "not solicit or accept any gift or other item of monetary value from any CAB, which would compromise the impartiality or objectivity of the accreditation process ;"		
66	P	x	7.11.1.2	7.11.1.2 Edit: consistently capitalize (or, don't capitalize) the first letter of subparts. Justification: Consistency	all will be capitalized	7/20/2021	

25	P		7.11.1.4	7.11.1.4 A timeframe should be included in this requirement in which the AB shall change a lab's status from suspended to accredited. This should be done as soon as possible or even immediately when the demonstration of compliance has been made.	text revised to state "The accreditation body shall change the CAB's accreditation status from suspended to accredited within 30 calendar days after when the CAB demonstrates to the accreditation body that it complies with the relevant requirements."	7/20/2021	
26	P		7.11.1.5	7.11.1.5 'and the CAB is required to reapply for accreditation.' should be part of a new sentence. If the laboratory chose to continue operations with withdrawn or reduced accreditation, this statement as written would require them to reapply. I assume that this is not the intent, but it is what the Standard says. Rather, it should say '...the accreditation body shall withdraw or reduce the CAB's accreditation for those Fields of Accreditation for which the laboratory has failed to correct the causes of the suspension. If the	text revised to state "If the CAB fails to correct the causes of suspension within six months after the effective date of the suspension or by the end of the period of accreditation (whichever comes first), the accreditation body shall withdraw or reduce the CAB's accreditation for the Scope of Accreditation for which the CAB has failed to correct the causes of the suspension. If the CAB wishes to	7/20/2021	

				laboratory wishes to subsequently be accredited for such Fields of Accreditation, it is required to reapply for accreditation.'	subsequently be accredited for the withdrawn or reduced Scope, the accreditation body shall require and the CAB is required to reapply for accreditation."		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--