

Summary of the Laboratory Accreditation Body Expert Committee Meeting

July 24, 2026
11:30pm 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 – 8 Voting Members and 2 Associate members. A quorum was met.

The agenda was approved by unanimous consent.

The May and June meeting minutes were sent with the agenda for Committee review. A motion was made by Michael to approve the June 15th and May 26th meeting minutes as written with a date correction to the May minutes. The motion was seconded by Millie and unanimously approved.

2. Response to Comments

Amy, Aaren, Carol and Ilona met the previous week to review the table and work on some initial edits.

The Committee reviewed the table against the June 14th Draft Standard. Several changes previously discussed and approved by the Committee had not been incorporated into the Draft. The Committee agreed to update the Draft to reflect those prior decisions rather than reopen the discussion on each comment.

There was also agreement that some items currently classified as Committee Comments should instead be reflected in the Committee Action column and that editorial changes can be made as needed.

The goal is to complete the known corrections, finalize formatting, and circulate the document for full committee review and vote. Ilona can help with the formatting and column changes as needed.

The table included some items highlighted in green. These items need to be updated in the Draft Standard.

36	7.6.4.1	What does 'carefully' mean? Proposal: The information must be collected, organized, identified and clearly documented by the team.	Changed text.	3/21/2025	Removed "carefully" and changed "documented" to recorded.
----	---------	---	---------------	-----------	---

Change made in Draft Standard

9	P	Y	6.1.2.11	Comment 40 in the Response to Comments document was ruled persuasive, but two of the changes in what was then 6.1.2.9.2 (now 6.1.2.11) were not made. The reference to TNI ELS Volume 1 should be TNI EL Volume 1. This change was made in 6.1.2.9.3 (that numbering isn't correct, it likely should be 6.1.2.12).	Text changed.	10/20/2023	
---	---	---	----------	--	---------------	------------	--

Just need to correct reference which is already planned as an editorial change.

11	P	N	7.9.3	Comment 81 is noted as 'not yet determined'?	Addressed by the committee.	9/19/2025	The comment is related to the response to comments regarding remote assessments (posted 3/30/23). Clarifying language added to 7.9.3.1 that initial and re-assessments may only be conducted if a state of emergency restricting travel is declared.
----	---	---	-------	--	-----------------------------	-----------	--

See Aaren's action item below.

12	P	Y	9.7.2.1	Comment 90 resulted in a typo in the Draft Standard Revision 1. 9.7.2.1 should refer to an internal audit occurring once per year, not once a year.	Text changed.	1/16/2024	A year ...
----	---	---	---------	---	---------------	-----------	------------

The group confirmed that the committee had previously agreed to change "once a year" to "once per year."

22	P	Y	4.2 a) NOTE	The NOTE ...says use processes described in 8.2.3 in lieu of requesting agreement .. seems to add confusion to the 4.2 a).	Text deleted.	11/22/2024	
----	---	---	-------------	--	---------------	------------	--

				Proposal: Remove V2M1 - 4.2 a) NOTE			
--	--	--	--	-------------------------------------	--	--	--

The Committee discussed the relationship between the laboratory's agreement to comply with changing accreditation requirements and the accreditation body's responsibility to notify laboratories of changes. There was agreement that these are separate responsibilities and that the note associated with Section 4.2A was unnecessary and potentially confusing. The Committee had previously voted to remove the note, and Aaren removed it.

43	P	Y	1	Table of Contents has " <i>1.0 Introduction, Scope, and Applicability</i> " Content has " <i>1.0 Scope</i> ". Proposal: Make consistent naming between table of contents and scope heading.	Change made.	10/20/2023	Consistent with action for comment 55.
----	---	---	---	---	--------------	------------	--

Ilona is making this change.

55	P	Y	1	The title noted does not match the title in the Table of Contents. Suggested text: Update to reflect the same name as in table of contents.	Change made.	10/20/2023	Consistent with action for comment 43.
----	---	---	---	---	--------------	------------	--

Ilona is making this change as part of final review.

62	P	N	7.7.5.1.10	The statement about "prior to the assessment" should be removed. This should pertain to any requests made by the accreditation body, either prior to the assessment, during or after. Many times CABs do not provide the documentation during the assessment either, and often not until after it is concluded which extends an ABs timeframe for completing the report. Suggested text: Text should be updated to state "Failure to provide documents requested by the accreditation body for review in a timeframe requested by the accreditation body." This text removes "prior to assessment."	Text revised.	1/16/2024	Section renumbered. Section 7.7.5.1 k) Failure to provide documents requested by the accreditation body for review in a timeframe requested by the accreditation body ~~prior to the assessment.~~
----	---	---	------------	---	---------------	-----------	---

Change accepted and Aaren made the change in the Standard.

64	P	N	7.11.1.2.8	Remove "prior to the assessment" from this sentence. This should apply to any documentation requests and timeframes requested by the AB and should not just apply to submittals related to an assessment. Suggested text: Remove "prior to assessment; and test should state: Failure to provide documents requested by the accreditation body for review in a timeframe requested by the accreditation body.	Text revised.	12/19/2023	Section renumbered. Section 7.11.1.2 h) Failure to provide documents requested by the accreditation body for review in a timeframe requested by the accreditation body ~~prior to the assessment.~~
----	---	---	------------	---	---------------	------------	--

The Committee confirmed that Comment 64 addressed the same underlying issue in a separate section. The corresponding unnecessary language will also be removed.

67	NP	N	Annex A	Is Annex A necessary as part of the actual standard? Suggested text: Should be removed from the standard and instead including as a separate guidance document, or included in another guidance doc.	None at this time.	9/19/2025	Annex A retained as it clearly defines roles and includes references to the Standard.
----	----	---	---------	--	--------------------	-----------	---

This will stay as it is.

3. Volume 1 Module 2 Language Review

The Committee continued its review of the DRAFT Standard.

Failure to Respond vs. Failure to Submit

The Committee reviewed the distinction between a laboratory's failure to respond and failure to submit information. The distinction is intentional: an incomplete or unacceptable response differs from providing no response.

The Committee also revisited the list of reasons for denying an initial application. The list will remain in the Standard but will be identified as non-exhaustive.

The agreed wording is: "Reasons to deny an initial application include but are not limited to:".

This avoids implying that an accreditation body is required to deny an application whenever one of the listed circumstances occurs.

“Without Undue Delay” – Notification of Decisions

The Committee discussed whether “without undue delay” should be replaced with a specific timeframe, such as 30 days, for notifying a laboratory of an accreditation decision.

Although a defined timeframe could provide greater clarity, concerns were raised about conflicts with other requirements and the administrative burden of tracking an additional deadline. The group agreed that “without undue delay” should remain unchanged and that unreasonable delays could be addressed through evaluation of the accreditation body’s performance.

“May” vs. “Must” – Denial Language

The Committee confirmed that accreditation may be denied under the specified circumstances rather than **must** be denied. The revised “may be denied” language was considered clear and will remain.

Section H – Primary and Secondary Accreditation Bodies

The Committee discussed requirements for identifying a laboratory’s primary and secondary accreditation bodies when multiple accreditations exist.

The intent is to ensure that the primary accreditation body and applicable fields of accreditation can be clearly identified without requiring the information to appear in a prescribed format or on every FOA entry. Possible approaches include identifying the information on the FOA list, in an attachment, in a separate letter, or through another clear method.

The group agreed that the standard should require clear identification of the primary accreditation body and applicable fields of accreditation without prescribing a single format.

The provision was not fully reviewed before the meeting ended and may require additional discussion.

Action items

- Aaren: Incorporate the Comment 81 text, make agreed draft corrections, save the updated spreadsheet using the meeting date, and distribute it.
- Amy: Provide Aaren with the original Comment 81 text.

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 August 21, 2026, at 1pm Eastern.
There will also be an in person meeting in Houston, TX on Monday, August 3, 2026.

Aaren adjourned the meeting at 1:00pm Eastern.

Attachment 1 LAB Expert Committee Roster

Name/Email		Affiliation	Present
Aaren Alger, Chair Aaren.s.alger@gmail.com		Other – Alger Consulting & Training	Yes
Socorro Baldonado sbaldonado@mwdh2o.com		Lab – Metropolitan Water District, La Verne, CA	Yes
Kathryn Chang Kathryn.chang@et.eurofins.us		LAB – Eurofins	Yes
Sviatlana Haubner Sviatlana.Haubner@cincinnati-oh.gov		LAB – Cincinnati Metropolitan Sewer District	No
Michella Karapondo Karapondo.michella@epa.gov		Other – EPA OGWDW TSC/Cincinnati	Yes
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	Yes
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	X	LAB – Alabama Power	Yes
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		City of St. Petersburg Water Resources Department (Florida)	No
Marlene Moore mmoore@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		AB – VA DCLS	No
Carol Gebhart carol.gebhart@alsglobal.com		ALS	No