

**Summary of the NELAP Accreditation Council Meeting
Monday, May 2, 2022 1:30 pm Eastern**

1. Welcome and Introductions

Kristin welcomed everyone to the meeting. The minutes of March 7 were approved unanimously. The Council did not meet in April. Attendance is noted in Attachment 1.

2. Recommendations for Renewal of Recognition for KS and PA

Both of the letters from Steve Arms, Lead Evaluator, recommending these renewals were distributed prior to the meeting. Paul Bergeron moved and Millie seconded that both recommendations be accepted. With every AB represented, and a roll call vote taken, approval of the motion was unanimously accepted, with KS abstaining for the KS vote and PA abstaining for the PA vote while voting in favor of the other AB's renewal.

3. Discussion of Supplemental PT Reporting

Minnesota asked that the following questions be discussed by the Council:

1. Can a supplemental PT Study have two different open/close dates for the same laboratory? 2016 TNI Standard V3 5.4.3.4 d) suggests that this should not happen.
2. Are PT vendors allowed to qualify PT results? The 2016 TNI Standard seems silent on qualifying results, but per 2016 TNI Standard V3 5.4.3.6 The closing date of a supplemental PT study shall be no more than forty-five (45) days after the opening date of the study.
3. If the 2016 TNI Standard allows qualified PT results, are you accepting them an "acceptable" for your accredited laboratories? Are you maintaining the qualifiers on the data?

Also, we have concerns on how the accredited laboratory community is to know about the 45 days turnaround time limit for supplemental PT studies? From our review of the 2016 TNI Standard Volume 1, the 45-day turnaround time doesn't appear as a requirement. Will the next Volume 1 revision include the 45-day requirement? Perhaps the timeframes from open to close are included in the supplemental PT sample prep instructions from the PT vendor, however, it would be best to have it included in Volume 1 for the lab community.

Lynn Boysen explained that the qualification is noted only in the pdf report, while MN processes the PT results it receives with an electronic database and thus in normal processing, would never see qualification information. Other ABs noted that even in the pdf report, such qualifiers are easy to miss. As other ABs also use electronic systems for PT results, it would seem that either the databases must be updated or the PT Providers must eliminate qualifiers.

Regarding the 45-day turnaround, that is in Volume 3 only, although the definition in V1M1 does refer to V3. This presents two separate problems. First, the TNI Standard volumes are supposed to be complete, as in everything the lab needs to know is in V1 and a lab should never have to refer to V3. Second, most NELAP ABs use only V1 in their regulations and thus cannot enforce laboratory compliance with requirements in any other

volume of the Standard. The 45-day requirement is apparently a holdover from the 2003 NELAC Standard, and is not treated consistently among NELAP ABs, although at least one AB has that in its regulations. It may be possible to enforce this requirement based on the reference in V1M1 definitions.

Kristin agreed to follow up on previous conversations about a NELAP-PTPEC workgroup to work out several issues about PTs. Lynn Bradley noted that when the PT Expert Committee files its Notice of Intent to Revise the Standard, these issues should be raised, not waiting for the Draft Standard to be actually published. Lynn Boysen will reach out to PTPEC.

4. Recommendation from LASEC Regarding Draft Standard V1M6

Lynn explained the purpose of the Recommendation presented to the Council from LASEC, regarding the Radiological Chemistry Draft Standard. The LASEC Standards Review for Suitability SOP 3-106 requires that LASEC review all new and revised standards and provide such a recommendation to the Council.

5. Request for Input from LAB Expert Committee

The Chair of the Laboratory Accreditation Body Expert Committee (LAB) sent the following request to the Council:

We would like the NELAP AC to provide feedback to the LAB Expert Committee regarding a minimum frequency for an AB to conduct on-site assessments of a laboratory, if any. We are wondering if the AC members have a preference, need, or want for a requirement of the AB (either NELAP or NGAB) to conduct on-site assessments and if so, what would be the maximum allowable timeframe between on-site assessments of a particular laboratory.

Remote assessments have been used by some but not all ABs during the pandemic emergency, and some aspects of the remote assessment are popular and considered more efficient, while other aspects may seem more difficult. No AB has announced plans to continue these indefinitely, but several are contemplating on-going use of remote assessment techniques, particularly in conjunction with risk-based decisions about the need for physical visits. The EPA Drinking Water program has declared that they find remote assessments to be unacceptable (although not in promulgated regulation).

Carl noted that the 2017 revision of ISO/IEC 17011 requires on-site assessments of laboratories every two years with other assessment techniques being used in between site visits (see V2M1 Draft Standard §7.9.3).

The continued use of remote assessments can create complex issues with reciprocal recognitions, where ABs lacking any authorization to use remote assessments may be unable to grant secondary accreditations to labs that were assessed by ABs using remote techniques only.

One suggestion was to add a note stating that some regulatory programs may not accept remote assessments, but it seems clear that there is no consensus on this issue, and in fact, ABs that used remote assessments under pandemic emergency are still deciding whether and how much to retain their use. Consensus was that this topic should be included in an off-agenda meeting at conference, assuming that enough representatives

can attend to make that feasible.

6. Discussion of Method Codes

Florida requested a discussion about method names and method codes, specifically about confusion that arises when trying to compare method names when granting secondary accreditations. Dan Hickman was invited to join the call to help address this, and gave the history of the LAMS database and its reliance on the method code to represent any particular method, regardless of how it is called in the laboratory using it. The purpose of using method codes is to enable clear comparison of what methods a lab is accredited for, reflected on its certificate.

Dan allows any stakeholder to request a method code. Some ABs insist that their labs request codes. Dan offered to demonstrate for Florida how to compare method codes when secondary accreditations are requested – a time-saving procedure that may leave only a very few methods needing additional information to be accepted as accredited by the primary AB. Other ABs that have been comparing method names can use this same procedure once their electronic codes are updated to the TNI Method Code numbers.

Some discussion of including method codes as well as method names in client reports led to a request to include this topic in the Council's off-agenda session at conference.

7. Preliminary Discussion of Conference Attendance

Kristin asked for a preliminary head count of who would be attending conference in Crystal City. Six ABs will definitely be represented, with three as "maybe" and four "unlikely". One AB had departed the call before this question was presented.

8. Next Meeting

The next scheduled teleconference meeting of the NELAP AC is scheduled for Monday, June 6, 2022, at 1:30 pm Eastern. An agenda and documents will be provided in advance.

The NELAP AC session at conference in Crystal City will take place Thursday morning, August 4. The session time is not specified on the preliminary program, but it will begin at either 9 am EDT or 11 am EDT, with LASEC having the other time slot. To register for either in-person attendance or viewing the recorded sessions, go to <https://envirosymposium.group/index.php>. It is likely that NELAP AB representatives unable to travel will be allowed to join this one session using WebEx.

Attachment 1

STATE	REPRESENTATIVE	PRESENT
FL	Carl Kircher E: carl.kircher@flhealth.gov	Yes
	Alternate: Vanessa Soto E: Vanessa.sotocontreras@flhealth.gov	Yes
IL	Millie Rose T: 217-557-0220 E: mildred.rose@illinois.gov	Yes
	For information purposes: Dave Reed E: Dave.Reed@Illinois.gov	No
	For information purposes: John South E: john.south@illinois.gov	Yes
	For information purposes: Shirlene South E: shirlene.south@illinois.gov	No
KS	Carissa Robertson Carissa.Robertson@ks.gov (785) 291-3162	Yes
	Alternate: Paul Harrison paul.harrison@ks.gov (785) 296-1656	Yes
	For information purposes: N. Myron Gunsalus 785-291-3162 E: myron.gunsalus@ks.gov	No
	For information purposes: Amy Suggitt Amy.Suggitt@ks.gov	No
LA DEQ	Paul Bergeron E: paul.bergeron@la.gov 225-219-3247	Yes
	Alternate: Elizabeth West E: elizabeth.west@la.gov	Yes
MN	Lynn Boysen E: lynn.boysen@state.mn.us	Yes
	Alternate: Stephanie Drier T: 651-201-5326 E: stephanie.drier@state.mn.us	Yes

NH	Brian Lamarsh (603) 271-2998 F: (603) 271-5171 Brian.M.Lamarsh@des.nh.gov	Yes
	Alternate: Bill Hall T: (603) 271-2998 E: george.hall@des.nh.gov	No
NJ	Michele Potter T: (609) 984-3870 F: (609) 777-1774 E: michele.potter@dep.nj.gov	Yes
	Alternate : Rachel Ellis E: rachel.ellis@dep.nj.gov	No
NY	Amy Steuerwald 518-473-0748 E: amy.steuerwald@health.ny.gov	Yes
	Alternate: Derek Symula derek.symula@health.ny.gov	Yes
OK	David Caldwell (405) 702-1000 E: David.Caldwell@deq.ok.gov	Yes
	Alternate: Ryan Lerch Ryan.Lerch@deq.ok.gov (405) 702-1020	Yes
OR	Travis Bartholomew T: 503-693-4122 E: travis.j.bartholomew@dhsosha.state.or.us	Yes
	Alternate: Lizbeth Garcia 971 865 0443 E: Lizbeth.garcia@dhsosha.state.or.us	No
	Included for information purposes: Ryan Pangelinan E: Ryan.pangelinan@dhsosha.state.or.us	No
	Included for information purposes: Sara Krepps Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (503) 693-5704 E: sara.krepps@state.or.us	No
PA	Annmarie Beach	Yes

	E: anbeach@pa.gov T: 717-346-8212	
	Alternate: Amber Ross ambross@pa.gov	No
	Included for information purposes: Dana Marshall dmarshall@pa.gov	No
TX	Steve Gibson (512) 239-1316 Steve.Gibson@tceq.texas.gov	Yes
	Jody Koehler (512) 239-1990 Jody.Koehler@tceq.texas.gov	No
UT	Kristin Brown T: (801) 965-2540 F: (801) 965-2544 E: kristinbrown@utah.gov	Yes
VA	Cathy Westerman T: 804-648-4480 ext.391 E: cathy.westerman@dgs.virginia.gov	No
	Alternate: Shane Wyatt shane.wyatt@dgs.virginia.gov	No
NELAP AC PA and EC	Lynn Bradley T: 540-885-5736 E: lynn.bradley@nelac-institute.org	Yes
EPA Liaison	TBD	
CA	Christine Sotelo Christine.Sotelo@waterboards.ca.gov	No
NV	Michael Antoine mantoine@ndep.nv.gov	No
NV	Dan LaFara dlafara@ndep.nv.gov	No
Guest	Dan Hickman, TNI Database Administrator Dan.hickman@nelac-institute.org	Yes