

Summary of the Laboratory Accreditation Body Expert Committee Meeting

June 15, 2026
10:30pm Eastern

1. Welcome and Roll Call

Aaren Alger, Chair, called the meeting to order at 11am Eastern and welcomed everyone to the meeting. Attendance is recorded in Attachment 1 – 5 Voting Members and 3 Associate members. A quorum was met.

The minutes were moved to the end of the agenda and no change in content was made. The agenda was approved by unanimous consent.

The May meeting minutes were sent with the agenda for Committee review. The Committee did not get a chance to review these at the end of the meeting so they will be reviewed during the July meeting for approval.

2. Response to Comments

Amy described the work she did on the Response to Comments table. She divided it up and sent parts to Ryan, Carole, Aaren and Ilona to look at. Not all assignments were completed.

Amy emphasized that the edits made in the table were suggestions rather than final decisions. Ryan provided valuable feedback, including identifying overlooked items and recommending that Committee responses include more explanation of the rationale behind decisions.

Amy's goal was to ensure that every change identified in the Response to Comments Summary that was Persuasive is actually reflected in the revised Draft Standard before the Standard is finalized for posting.

The Committee agreed that a simpler approach, such as indicating whether a comment resulted in a change or no change, might better communicate the Committee's actions and reduce inconsistencies, although that would require further discussion outside the Committee.

There was agreement that the Committee should stop introducing new changes, except for verifying that all changes documented in the Response to Comments Summary have been incorporated into the Standard.

More work is needed to complete the Summary, but it would be helpful to have the review of the Draft Standard complete in order to finish the Response to Comments Summary.

3. Volume 1 Module 2 Language Review

Ilona took the last Draft the Committee worked on and added any received comments and updated Section 1 through 3. She also added a table to input any ISO/IEC language removed from the Standard and to include the reason why it was removed.

Aaren continued looking through changes in the Standard and reviewing comments in the document.

The committee began by discussing whether to retain an explanatory note related to organizational structure and potential conflicts of interest. The note had previously been considered for deletion because similar language had been incorporated into Section 4.4.14. Aaren questioned whether the note was still necessary but acknowledged that retaining it could help Accreditation Bodies (ABs) better understand the intent of the requirement and avoid future confusion. The Committee agreed to retain it.

Editorial changes were discussed:

- Ilona clarified that the correct terminology is "testing modules." She noted that this change should apply only where the document is referring to the formal module names and should not be made as a blanket replacement because "technical" remains appropriate in other contexts (e.g., technical discipline assessment training).
- Amy also identified several inconsistencies in references to the Environmental Laboratory Sector standards, including incorrect use of "ELS" instead of "EL" and variations in how Volume 1 was referenced throughout the document.
- Various additional edits were made to remove words like "formal" and "carefully".
- The committee reviewed language describing notification responsibilities between primary and secondary Accreditation Bodies. Amy commented that the existing wording could be interpreted as requiring the primary AB to notify the secondary AB, when the intent was actually that the laboratory provides the notification.

Aaren explained that the section was written from the perspective of the Accreditation Body, describing how each AB should respond once it receives notification from the laboratory. To improve clarity, the committee revised the wording to explicitly state that the response is to the laboratory and clarified that the requirement for the laboratory to provide notification belongs in Volume 1 rather than Volume 2. This comment will need to be made as a comment to the Volume 1 Module 2 Standard that is currently open for comment.

- The committee then discussed proposed requirements regarding the information included in assessment reports. Amy expressed concern that the draft language appeared to require ABs to include matrices, test methods, and other assessment details within the report itself. She explained that while her AB maintains this information within assessment records and can provide it upon request, it is not currently included in the report provided to laboratories. Aaren noted that including the scope of the assessment within the report provides

valuable context for laboratories, secondary ABs, and evaluators reviewing accreditation decisions.

Recognizing that accreditation bodies have differing practices, the Committee agreed that this topic warranted a broader discussion when more AB representatives are present.

- The committee discussed language requiring laboratories to provide certain information during the assessment process. Members agreed that the intent was not to require the request to occur at a specific point during the assessment, but rather that each individual assessment must have its own request associated with it. Aaren explained that a request made years earlier should not automatically satisfy future assessments.

The committee discussed possible wording such as "for each assessment" or "with each assessment" and agreed additional wording refinement would be helpful. They also agreed that an explanatory note would help prevent the requirement from being interpreted as applying only during the on-site visit.

- The committee then reviewed language requiring accreditation decisions to be made "without undue delay." Members agreed that while the phrase comes from ISO language, it is difficult to assess objectively because "undue delay" is not defined.

Aaren suggested the committee consider establishing a specific timeframe, such as 30 or 45 days, after all information has been provided to the decision maker. Amy noted that many accreditation decisions depend on laboratories completing corrective actions or submitting additional documentation, meaning the timeline should begin only after the application or assessment process is complete.

Ryan raised a practical concern about enforcement actions. Amy suggested creating language that distinguishes routine accreditation decisions from enforcement actions, allowing routine approvals, renewals, and reinstatements to occur within a defined timeframe while recognizing that suspensions, denials, and revocations may require additional legal review. In addition, ABs need to maintain documented procedures describing how enforcement actions are managed.

- The Committee also agreed that that ABs should maintain records describing their enforcement processes. This would be a different process for every AB.
- The committee reviewed language stating that reasons to deny an initial application **"must include"** a listed set of conditions. Amy expressed concern that the wording could be interpreted to mean **all** listed conditions would need to be present before an application could be denied.

The committee agreed this was not the intended meaning. Instead, the listed items represent examples or qualifying reasons for denial rather than a mandatory checklist requiring every condition to exist simultaneously. The

wording will be revised to better communicate that the list is not exhaustive and that any applicable condition may justify denial.

- The committee also discussed language distinguishing between a laboratory's failure to respond and failure to submit requested information. Aaren explained that this distinction was intentional because laboratories may provide a response that is incomplete or unacceptable, which differs from providing no response at all.

Members agreed that these situations warrant different treatment and that the revised language more accurately reflects how Accreditation Bodies manage corrective action processes.

Aaren will provide an updated Draft to the Committee prior to the next meeting on July 17th.

4. New Business

Aaren reminded people to register for the upcoming conference during the first week of August in Houston, TX.

5. Next Meeting

The next planned teleconference meeting will be July 17, 2026, at 1pm Eastern to accommodate the holiday. *(Addition: The meeting was rescheduled to July 24, 2026, at 11:30am Eastern.)*

Aaren adjourned the meeting at 12:03pm Eastern.

Attachment 1 LAB Expert Committee Roster

Name/Email		Affiliation	Present 7/9 - Quorum
Aaren Alger, Chair Aaren.s.alger@gmail.com		Other – Alger Consulting & Training	Yes
Socorro Baldonado sbaldonado@mwdeh2o.com		Lab – Metropolitan Water District, La Verne, CA	No
Kathryn Chang Kathryn.chang@et.eurofins.us		LAB – Eurofins	No
Sviatlana Haubner Sviatlana.Haubner@cincinnati-oh.gov		LAB – Cincinnati Metropolitan Sewer District	Yes
Michella Karapondo Karapondo.michella@epa.gov		Other – EPA OGWDW TSC/Cincinnati	No
Ryan Lerch Ryan.lerch@deq.ok.gov		AB – OK DEQ	Yes
Michael Perry mperry@labworks.com		Other - Labworks, Inc.	Yes
Millie Rose Mille.Rose@illinois.gov		AB – IL EPA	No
Amy Steuerwald amy.steuerswald@health.ny.gov		AB – NY DOH	Yes
Program Administrator: Ilona Taunton Ilona.taunton@nelac-institute.org	N/A	TNI	Yes
Associate Members:			
Paul Bergeron Paul.bergeron@la.gov		AB – LDEQ	No
Debbie Bond dbond@southernco.com		LAB – Alabama Power	No
Nilda Cox nilda.cox@et.eurofinsus.com		Lab – Eurofins Eaton Analytical LLC	No
Yumi Creason ycreason@pa.gov		Other	No
Taryn Hurley taryn.hurley@deq.ok.gov		AB – OK DEQ	No
Paul Junio paul.junio@pacelabs.com		LAB – Pace Labs, Inc.	No
LeeAnn Kline lkline@mjureider.com		M J Reider Associates	No
Jasmina Kuljanac Jasmina.Kuljanac@stpete.org	X	City of St. Petersburg Water Resources Department (Florida)	Yes
Marlene Moore mmore@advancedsys.com		Other – Advanced Systems, Inc., Newark, DE	No
Zaneta Popovska zpopovska@anab.org		AB – ANAB	No

Mei Beth Shepherd mbshep@sheptechserv.com		Other – Shepherd Technical Services	No
Nicholas Slawson nslawson@a2la.org		AB – A2LA	No
Carl Kircher	X	AB - Florida	Yes
Cathy Westerman cathy.westerman@dgs.virginia.gov	X	AB – VA DCLS	Yes
Carol Gebhart carol.gebhart@alsglobal.com		ALS	No