NELAP Executive Committee Meeting Minutes
September 24, 2026
1:30pm Eastern

1 Call to Order

Shari Pfalmer, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:30pm Eastern. There were 7 voting members present and 2 associate members at the start of the meeting. One additional voting member joined in at 2:07pm Eastern. A quorum was met. Attachment A includes an attendance table.

No changes were made to the agenda, and it was approved by unanimous consent.

Action Items can be found in Attachment B.

The August 2026 meeting minutes were reviewed. A motion was made by Tracy to approve the August 27, 2026, minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Taryn and unanimously approved.

2 Review of Draft Standards – Volume 1 Module 2 - QMS

The Committee reviewed the consolidated comments prepared for submission on Module 2, Quality Management Systems. Shari asked whether any additional issues needed to be addressed before the document was finalized.

One comment required clarification. Gretchen had previously noted that New York has a separate written-notification requirement involving a 65-day timeframe. She clarified that this was provided for informational purposes and was not intended to request a change to the proposed standard. The Committee agreed to remove this informational comment from the final submission.

The Committee also addressed editorial issues, including incorrect section numbering and providing a title. Because the numbering issue would be resolved as the standard was revised, the Committee agreed that the unnecessary editorial material should be removed from the final document.

A motion was made by Taryn and seconded by Tracy to approve submission of the Module 2 comments as distributed by email, with the informational comment regarding New York deleted.

A roll-call vote was conducted. All seven voting members — Scott, Taryn, Silky, Harold, Tracy, Gretchen, and Shari —voted in favor. No votes against or abstentions were recorded.

There was not a super-majority, so the vote will need to be completed by email. *(Addition: The vote was not completed within two weeks, so it was repeated during the October 2026 meeting.)*

3 Review of Draft Standards – Volume 1 Module 5 – Microbiology

The Committee began reviewing proposed changes to Module 5, Microbiology. Given the time spent finalizing Module 2 and the amount of material requiring review, members agreed that a 30-day extension to review the draft Module 5 standard should be requested from the Microbiology Expert Committee.

Ilona had previously circulated links to the revised standard, the summary of changes and justifications, and a document for tracking comments. Committee members should use the comment document to submit any comments for the Committee to review.

The Committee reviewed the summary of changes alongside the revised Module 5 document. Many of the proposed revisions involved clarification, reorganization, or editorial improvements. Technical specialist requirements had been moved to Module 2, and much of the substantive review focused on Sections 6 and 7.

Initial Demonstration of Capability (DOC)

Taryn identified a potential conflict between Section 6.2, which requires an initial DOC before a method is used, and Section 6.1.1, which addresses supervised training. The concern was that the wording could be interpreted to require the initial DOC before training or supervised practice could occur, even though personnel would ordinarily receive training before completing their initial DOC.

Taryn reported that this concern, along with suggested language, had already been submitted to the Microbiology Expert Committee as part of Oklahoma's comments. Ilona noted that, if the Committee agreed with the concern, it could communicate its support for the existing submission rather than duplicate the comment unnecessarily.

The Committee also identified a possible incorrect cross-reference in Section 6.2.1. The revised text referred to Section 6.2.2(c), which addresses concurrent analysis of aliquots. It was noted that the corresponding provision in the earlier standard appeared to refer to a broader set of requirements. The group agreed that the reference likely should be to Section 6.2.2(d). This issue was identified for inclusion in the Committee's comment-tracking document.

Ongoing DOC requirements and wording

During the review of ongoing DOC provisions, Taryn raised concerns about the phrase “demonstrated procedure.” The previous version used “documented procedure,” which she considered more familiar and clearer. She suggested that “demonstrated” might be unnecessary and could be removed, particularly because a procedure is already understood to be documented.

She also identified wording in Section 6 concerning results evaluated against established criteria. The Committee discussed the possibility that the existing language was missing a word and could be revised to state that results must be “evaluated against

established criteria.” This would make the intended requirement clearer and reduce the risk of inconsistent interpretation.

Sterility checks and special considerations for Legionella

The Committee discussed the proposed language concerning sterility checks and whether similarity testing would be an appropriate requirement in every situation. Tracy questioned whether the revised language adequately addressed circumstances in which similarity testing may not be the appropriate measure, including certain Legionella applications.

Silky explained that, in the Legionella context discussed, the media may contain organisms other than the organism of interest. Therefore, the relevant requirement is to demonstrate the absence of the organisms of interest, rather than the absence of all organisms. This distinction helped clarify the intent of the provision.

The discussion highlighted the importance of ensuring that the wording distinguishes between general sterility expectations and requirements specific to the target organism or analytical application.

Reagent water and method blanks

The Committee reviewed the requirements for reagent water in Section 7.2.1.4. Tracy asked whether the requirement applied to water purchased from an outside supplier as well as water prepared within the laboratory.The definition encompasses reagent water from either source and the laboratory is responsible for monitoring the quality of the water it uses. The requirements therefore apply regardless of whether the water is prepared in-house or purchased.

The Committee also discussed wording in Section 7.2.2.1 regarding filtration units. Tracy suggested that the phrase “must have been sterilized prior to the beginning” was awkward and could be simplified to read: “All filtration units in a filtration series must be sterilized prior to beginning the series.” Silky supported the suggested wording. The proposed edit was added to the consolidated comments.

Remaining technical requirements

The Committee continued its review of the remaining sections, including performance checks, test variability and reproducibility, consistent test conditions, autoclaves, temperature-measuring devices, ovens, volumetric equipment, UV instruments, incubators, water baths, laboratory glassware and other labware, and sample handling. Revisions and justifications were reviewed. Most of the changes reviewed were described as clarifications or editorial improvements. No additional major technical concerns were raised, although Committee members were encouraged to continue to review it before the next meeting.

Next steps

The Committee agreed that the review conducted during the meeting would form the basis of a working list of comments, rather than a final approved submission. Shari recorded the issues raised during the discussion.

Ilona will use Shari's notes to prepare a consolidated comment document before the next meeting. Committee members were encouraged to continue to review the draft standard, assess the proposed changes, and submit further comments before the October meeting.

4 Review of Draft SOP 3-106 – Review of Accreditation Standards for Suitability

The Committee discussed progress on revising SOP 3-106, which addresses the standard-review process. She is continuing to refine the language, particularly the provisions distinguishing review of a final standard or module from review of a consolidated standard containing multiple modules.

The proposed structure separates the process into distinct stages:

- Reviewing a final standard or module and making the appropriate recommendation.
- Reviewing a consolidated standard when multiple modules are involved.
- Conducting a general read-through of the consolidated document, revisiting previous comments, and confirming that recommendations have been addressed before submission.

Shari explained that the term "consolidated standard" was being considered to describe the combined document. Shari will circulate the draft to Committee members in advance so they can review it and suggest edits before the meeting.

One suggestion made was to ensure that the procedure adequately addresses documentation and distribution requirements following the different stages of review.

5. New Business

None.

6. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2:53pm Eastern.

The next Committee meeting will be held October 22, 2026, at 1:30pm Eastern.

Attachment A TNI NELAP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ROSTER/ATTENDANCE

First Name	Organization	Stakeholder	Term	Email
Shari Pfalmer Chair **Present**	Pace Analytical Services	Lab	2028	shari.pfalmer@pacelabs.com
Patricia Carvajal Vice-Chair **Present- at 2:07pm**	San Antonio River Authority	Lab	2028	pmcarvajal@sariverauthority.org
Scott Giatpaiboon **Present**	Irvine Ranch Water District	Lab	2028*	Giatpaib@iRWD.com
Brian Hulme **Absent**	EPA	Other	2029	hulme.brian@epa.gov
Taryn Hurley **Present**	Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality	AB	2029*	taryn.hurley@deq.ok.gov
Silky Labie **Present**	ELCAT	Other	2029*	elcatllc@centurylink.net
Harold Longbaugh **Present**	City of Houston	Lab	2029*	Harold.Longbaugh@houstontx.gov
Michele Potter **Absent**	New Jersey DEP	AB	2027	Michele.Potter@dep.nj.gov
Matt Sowards **Absent**	ACZ Laboratories, Inc.	Lab	2028*	matts@acz.com
Tracy Szerszen **Present**	Perry Johnson Laboratory Accreditation Inc.	AB	2029*	tszerszen@pjlabs.com
Ilona Taunton **Present**	The NELAC Institute			ilona.taunton@nelac-institute.org
Gretchen Welfinger **Present**	NYS DOH	AB	2029*	gretchen.welfinger@health.ny.gov

Associate Members

X	Debbie Bond	DBOND@southernco.com	Alabama Power	Lab
X	Bill Reeves	william.reeves@et.eurofinsus.com	Eurofins	Lab
	Michael Delaney	Michael.F.Delaney@mass.gov	Mass	
	Nick Straccione	nstraccione@emsl.com	EMSL	Lab
	Carl Kircher	carl.kircher@flhealth.gov	Florida	AB
	Katie Strothman	katie@sanderslabs.net	Sanders Labs	Lab
	Maria Freeman	maria.friedman@waterboards.ca.gov	CA	AB
	Aaren Alger	aaren@alger-consulting.com	Alger Consulting	Other

Attachment B: NELAP EC Action Item Summary – 2026

Item	Task Description	Document Number	Contact	Task Added	Start Date	Complete Date	External Communications	Comments
1	Review of Chemistry Module 4 Standard	Module 4		9/25/25	10/23/25	1/15/26		9/25/25: Requesting notice from CSDP EC regarding Section 4 inclusion. Comments due mid November. 10/23/25: Letter received. LASEC voted to resume review of DRAFT Standards and started the review of Module 4. 12/12/25: Committee members were requested to complete the review of other Committee member comments and send them Ilona for inclusion in the summary of comments being prepared to send to the Chemistry Expert Committee. Maria will work on a recommendation and Ilona will work on the compilation of comments and letter to the Chemistry Expert Committee. 1/15/26: Approved comments were sent to Nicole and Bob Wyeth. COMPLETE.
2	5 year review: SOP 3-103 - NELAP Accreditation Bodies Standards Review and Acceptance	SOP 3-103		9/25/25				
3	5-year review: SOP 3-106 – Review of Accreditation Standards for Suitability	SOP 3-106	Workgroup	9/25/25	3/26/26			3/26/26: Committee started work on SOP. 4/23: Update in progress. 5/28: Workgroup created to finish review and recommend an update to the Committee. 6/25: Revised Draft was reviewed. Additional changes are needed.

Item	Task Description	Document Number	Contact	Task Added	Start Date	Complete Date	External Communications	Comments
4	5 year review: SOP 3-108 – Issuance of Provisional Recognition to NELAP Accreditation Bodies	SOP 3-108		9/25/25				
5	Review SOP 3-114 - Preparation and Approval of Implementation Guidance for the Laboratory Standards	SOP 3-114		9/25/25				
6	Prepare DRAFT SOP 3-105 (Standard Interpretations) for Committee review.	SOP 3-105	Ilona	5/28/26	5/28/26			5/28: Complete by June meeting. 6/25: The SOP was completed and the vote started to approve it.
7	Review of V1M2 – Quality Management Systems Standard.		All		6/25/26			6/25: Review has been started. Reviews are to be placed into Teams document. . 8/27: A draft of comments will be reviewed during the September meeting.
8	Review of V1M5 – Microbiology Standard		All		8/27/26			8/27: The Committee was asked to start looking the DRAFT Standard and preparing comments. 9/24: Draft comments developed. Committee to finalize next month.