Summary of the Laboratory Accreditation Body Expert Committee Meeting

Friday, March 20, 2026
1:00 pm Eastern

1. Welcome and Roll Call

Aaren Alger, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1pm Eastern and welcomed everyone to the meeting. Attendance is recorded in Attachment 1 – 7 Voting Members and 3 Associate members. A quorum was met.

The Module 2 request will be added to the agenda. There were no other changes to the agenda, and it was approved by unanimous consent.

2. Membership

A motion was made by Millie and seconded by Ryan to extend three voting memberships to a third term: Aaren, Michael and Socorro. The motion was unanimously approved. The extension will now need to be approved by the CSDP Executive Committee. Ilona will send the request.

(Addition: This extension was approved by the CSDP EC.)

A motion was made by Millie and seconded by Michael to have Aaren and Amy continue as Chair and Vice-Chair. The motion was unanimously approved.

3. Volume 1 Module 2 Request

Debbie presented feedback from Module 2 regarding whether language related to denial, suspension, and revocation of accreditation should be included in Volume 1. The discussion focused on balancing clarity for laboratories with maintaining the intended scope of Module 2 as a quality management systems standard.

Members expressed differing perspectives. Some felt that listing specific causes for denial or suspension could be unnecessary. Others emphasized transparency, noting that laboratories benefit from understanding potential consequences of noncompliance. Concerns were also raised about where to place it in Module 2.

The group discussed alternatives, including adding a concise overarching statement (e.g., failure to meet requirements may result in denial, suspension, or revocation) rather than detailed lists, and potentially including such language as a note rather than a requirement to avoid audit implications. There was general support for a simplified statement with flexible wording (“may” vs. “must”). Debbie will take this feedback back to the Module 2 committee for further consideration. Ilona may try to DRAFT some language before the next Module 2 meeting.

4. Assessor Qualifications/Training Language

Aaren presented updates to the DRAFT Standard and a structured framework for assessor training and qualification, emphasizing that the Standard should define AB responsibilities rather than prescribe strict processes.

Aaren commented that part of the motivation for strengthening the language stems from variability in assessor capabilities, and a desire to ensure more consistent minimum expectations without causing issues with existing programs. The group acknowledged that while many ABs already maintain rigorous training programs, clearer baseline expectations could improve consistency across all programs.

The proposed framework outlined AB responsibilities, including defining acceptable training, qualifications, technical disciplines, determining who is authorized to act as an qualified assessor, observation requirements, and documentation. Discussion highlighted the need to balance flexibility with sufficient structure to ensure assessor competency.

There was support for the general structure as a strong foundation that provides meaningful guidance beyond vague requirements such as “being trained.” There was agreement that defining a “qualified assessor” at a high level—without excessive detail—would be valuable.

The Committee reviewed DRAFT language distinguishing “candidate assessors” and “qualified assessors,” along with proposed notes clarifying that assessment activities include interviews, data and document review, witnessing, and equipment verification. Including observation (both observing and being observed) as part of training was supported.

A key discussion was how to handle varying levels of prior experience:

- New assessors with no experience would require multiple observed assessments.
- Assessors with some prior experience would require fewer observations.
- Assessors previously qualified by another AB could be accepted more readily but would still require observation within a defined timeframe (e.g., within one year).

The Committee generally supported a tiered approach based on experience, along with a requirement that ABs confirm competency through observation, while allowing flexibility in implementation. Consideration was also given to practical constraints, such as staffing shortages, cost, and the use of third-party assessors.

Remote observation was discussed as a potential option, with general agreement that standards should allow flexibility for ABs to define and justify their processes rather than mandate only in-person observation.

The Committee worked through draft wording in detail, especially terms such as “qualified,” “deemed,” and “considered,” preferred something like “determine when a candidate assessor becomes a qualified assessor.” The Committee also emphasized avoiding ambiguity and ensuring expectations are explicitly stated.

Additional changes included:

- Clarifying that assessments should be conducted in accordance with the Standard.
- Reorganizing the section to focus on AB responsibilities rather than prescriptive steps.
- Including expectations for initial observation within a defined timeframe and periodic reassessment thereafter.

- Ensuring documentation requirements are clearly tied to AB responsibility.

Changes were made into the Standard as they were discussed and there was general agreement that the section is just about complete.

Ilona will distribute the language to the Committee and resend the work Amy has done on the Response to Comments Document. Committee members are asked to review this information in detail before the next meeting. Aaren also discussed the option of meeting an additional time before the next regular meeting on April 17th. Ilona will follow-up on this by email.

5. New Business

None.

6. Next Meeting

The next planned teleconference meeting will be April 17, 2026, at 1pm Eastern.

Aaren adjourned the meeting at 2:18 pm Eastern.

Attachment 1 LAB Expert Committee Roster

Name/Email	Affiliation	Present 8/10 - Quorum
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	No
Jody Koehler Jody.koehler@tceq.texas.gov	AB – TCEQ	No
Ryan Lerch Ryan.lerch@deq.ok.gov	AB – OK DEQ	Yes
Michael Perry mperry@labworks.com	Other - Labworks, Inc.	Yes
Millie Rose Millie.Rose@illinois.gov	AB – IL EPA	Yes
Amy Steuerwald amy.steuerwald@health.ny.gov	AB – NY DOH	Yes
Program Administrator: Ilona Taunton Ilona.taunton@nelac-institute.org	TNI	Yes
Paul Bergeron Paul.bergeron@la.gov	AB – LDEQ	No
Debbie Bond dbond@southernco.com	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@mjreider.com	M J Reider Associates	Yes
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	AB - Florida	No
Cathy Westerman cathy.westerman@dgs.virginia.gov	AB – VA DCLS	Yes