

## Quality Management System Expert Committee (QMS) Meeting Summary

April 8, 2024

### 1. Roll Call/Minutes Approval:

Debbie Bond, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1pm Eastern by teleconference on April 8, 2024. Attendance is recorded in Attachment A – there were 7 voting members present. Associate members present: Kathi Gumper, Amanda Grande, Alma McCammond, Brian Eichelberger, Debra Zeller, Kathleen Lloyd, Lynn Boysen, Megan Rothgerber, Matt Sica, Earl Hansen, Rebecca Pierrot, Ryan McMullin, Stephanie Drier, Tina Buttermore and Ty Atkins.

There were no changes to the agenda and it was approved by unanimous consent.

There is not a quorum today, so no official business could be done. Debbie decided to continue to review the comments since these will not be reviewed for agreement until the entire review is complete.

### 2. Technical Specialist Comments

The Committee continued its review of the comments received from the NELAP AC. The meeting was spent reviewing these comments and placing notes in the last column of the table.

Debbie asked if there would be support to come up with one set of requirements for Module 2 and any additional module specific items should be included within the modules. This means the review will not focus on the specific module related comments, but instead focus on the general requirements. The comments that are module specific will be labeled as: REMOVE - if general TS requirements are included that list these options, this section is not needed.

The Committee began its review at row 20.

The Committee decided to continue it's review on April 22, 2024 at 1pm Eastern. The version of the comments table on April 22, 2024 will be placed in Attachment B to these minutes for final review at the next regular meeting in May.

*(Addition: Available Committee members met on the April 22, 2024 at 1pm Eastern to complete the review of the comments received from the NELAP AC. The following people were in attendance: Amande Grande, Catie Van Sciver, Carla McCord, Carol Barrick, Carol Gebhart, Cindy Redmond, Debbie Bond, Debra Zeller, Doug Kablik, Fida Kased, Jordan Adelson, Kathleen Lloyd, Linda O'Donnell, Lynn Boyson, Michael Desmarais, Michelle Wade, Matt Sica, Nic, Paul Junio, Sean Hayes, Tony Francis, Thomas Fritz, Tammy Kreutzer and Zaneta Popovska. The comments table was placed into Attachment B. The meeting adjourned at 2:14pm Eastern.)*

### 3. New Business

None.

### 4. Action Items

A summary of Action Items can be found in Attachment C.

### 5. Next Meeting and Close

The next meeting will be by teleconference/webinar on May 13, 2024 at 1pm Eastern. There will also be an informal working meeting on April 22, 2024 by teleconference/webinar to continue work on the comments table at 1pm Eastern.

Debbie adjourned the meeting at 2:33 pm Eastern.

**Attachment A  
Participants  
Quality Systems Expert Committee (QS)**

Member	Organization	Expiration	Representation	Email
Debbie Bond (Chair) <b>Present</b>	Alabama Power	2026	Lab	dbond@southernco.com
Carla McCord  <b>Present</b>	Virginia	2025*	AB	carla.mccord@dgs.virginia.gov
Nicole Cairns  <b>Present</b>	NYSDOH	2027	Lab	nicole.cairns@health.ny.gov
Michael Demarais  <b>Present</b>	SVL Analytical	2026	Lab	michael@svl.net
Tony Francis  <b>Absent</b>	SAW Environmental	2026	Other	tfrancis@sawenviro.com
Carol Gebhart  <b>Absent</b>	ALS Global	2027*	Lab	Carol.gebhart@alsglobal.com
Stephanie Atkins  <b>Absent</b>	Pace Analytical	2027	Lab	stephanie.atkins@pacelabs.com
Jordan Adelson  <b>Present</b>	DoD - Navy	2024*	Other	jordan.m.adelson.civ@us.navy.mil
Nicholas Slawson  <b>Absent</b>	A2LA	2026	Accrediting Body	nslawson@a2la.org
Joann Slavin  <b>Present</b>	Wadsworth Center/Environmental Laboratory Approval Program	2027*	Accrediting Body	joann.slavin@health.ny.gov
Caitie Van Sciver  <b>Absent</b>	NJDEP	2027*	Accrediting Body	Caitie.vansciver@dep.nj.gov
Zaneta Popovska  <b>Absent</b>	ANAB	2025*	AB	zpopovska@anab.org
Sean Hayes  <b>Absent</b>	ORELAP	2026*	AB	sean.hayes@oha.oregon.gov
Amy Schreader  <b>Present</b>	UC Laboratory	2027	Lab	amy@uclaboratory.net
Ashley Larssen  <b>Absent</b>	KC Water	2027	Lab	ashley.larssen@kcmo.org
Ilona Taunton (Program Admin) <b>Present</b>	The NELAC Institute	n/a	n/a	Ilona.taunton@nelac-institute.org

Attachment B: Review of Technical Specialist Comments – 4/22/24

	Citation	Comment	Comment made by	Proposal	Committee Decision
1	4.1.7.2 If a technical specialist is unable to fulfill responsibilities for a period of time exceeding fifteen (15) consecutive calendar days, the laboratory shall designate another staff member meeting the qualifications of the technical specialist to temporarily perform this function. If a technical specialist is unable to fulfill responsibilities for a period of time exceeding thirty-five (35) consecutive calendar days, the laboratory shall notify the primary accreditation body in writing of the staff member who assumed the technical specialist responsibilities	1. Does the replacement have to meet and be approved as a Technical Specialist to meet the technical specialist's responsibilities/requirements or just assume the duties? It says to appoint another staff member. Does the temporary person need to have been approved by the primary AB to meet the qualifications?	MNELAP	Include in 4.1.7.2 who (the lab, the AB) determines that the temporary staff member meets the qualifications of the technical specialist or delineate if they can be any member of the staff who do not have to meet the technical specialist requirements.	Changes below will be clear on responsibility. Consider if the TS filling in can have minimum set of requirements. This could be for 15 or 35 days. Maybe once a new person must be hired, that person should meet full requirements. When notifying the AB of the TS absence, consider stating that the lab must notify the AB of the plan to cover the absence. Change language that limits to one person covering an absent TS.

2	4.1.7.2.d	<p>having a technical specialist responsible for accreditation at more than one location is very reasonable, if the technical specialist can devote the required amount of time towards their accreditation duties/responsibilities and be available to the AB. The ILELAP position is clearly in favor of being overly restrictive of this, with no rational for this position given. I believe and AB should have valid reasons for rejecting any such plan and provide a recommendation on what the lab needs to do to be approved. Please be so kind to share this email with others on your committee.</p>	Siders - email	<p>4.1.7.2 The technical specialist may be responsible for accreditation at more than one location provided the laboratory submits a written plan detailing the technical specialist's availability at each location to the primary accrediting body. The accrediting body shall evaluate the plan to determine if approval is to be granted. If approval of the plan is denied the accrediting body shall provide the laboratory, in writing, a response detailing the specific reasons for denial and a recommendation on possible actions that could be taken to obtain approval. The accrediting body shall complete the evaluation and supply any response, within 60 calendar days of receipt of the written plan submitted by the laboratory.</p>	<p>We cannot place requirements on ABs in V1M2.</p>
---	-----------	---	----------------	--	---

3	4.1.7.2 If a technical specialist is unable to fulfill responsibilities for a period of time exceeding fifteen (15) consecutive calendar days, the laboratory shall designate another staff member meeting the qualifications of the technical specialist to temporarily perform this function.	the requirement to appoint a replacement upon a fifteen day absence is not enforceable and needs to be omitted; it is not possible to hire a replacement within two weeks	Comments from AC Minutes from 9/11/27		Lab should have a plan that covers TS absence rather than a statement to have someone fill after 15 days.
4	4.1.7.2 The technical specialist may be responsible for fields of accreditation at more than one location provided the laboratory submits a plan detailing availability at each location to the primary accrediting body. The accrediting body must evaluate the plan to determine if approval is granted.	I have relied on the language in 2016 TNI V1M2 4.1.7.2.d and would like to VERY STRONGLY recommend that those criteria be incorporated here if they will not be elsewhere in the new module.	ORELAP	Include: not be the technical manager(s) of more than one accredited environmental laboratory without authorization from the primary Accreditation Body. Circumstances to be considered in the decision to grant such authorization shall include: i. the extent to which operating hours of the laboratories to be directed overlap, ii adequacy of supervision in each laboratory, and iii the availability of environmental laboratory services in the area served.	SUGGEST V2 include this language. Send language from S. Siders (row 3) to encourage including language that would allow the lab to update a rejected plan by including items identified in rejection by AB. Include in V1M2 what ABs will look at.

5	4.1.7.2 The laboratory shall have technical specialist(s) responsible for every field of accreditation for which the laboratory is accredited or seeks accreditation. Technical specialists however named (e.g., Technical Manager, Technical Director, Technical Expert, Group Leader, Supervisor, Lead Analyst, Department Head) shall:	use only one title for the position of Technical Specialist (for purposes of completing accreditation applications) while clarifying that the job title used in the laboratory need not match the title used in the application itself	Comments from AC Minutes from 9/11/25		Remove examples of roles that could be a TS.
6	4.1.7.2 The laboratory shall have technical specialist(s) responsible for every field of accreditation for which the laboratory is accredited or seeks accreditation. Technical specialists however named (e.g., Technical Manager, Technical Director, Technical Expert, Group Leader, Supervisor, Lead Analyst, Department Head) shall:	If the intention of changing the name to “technical specialist” is to remove the misnomer that the technical specialist must be a person with supervisory capacity, why name only positions with supervisory capacity in the examples given?	Comments from AC Minutes from 9/11/23	Recommend removing the examples altogether and add move the second sentence in 4.1.7.2.a as a second sentence here: 4.1.7.2 The laboratory shall have technical specialist(s) responsible for every field of accreditation for which the laboratory is accredited or seeks accreditation. This individual may have supervisory responsibilities, but this is not required. Technical specialists however named shall:	Remove examples of roles that could be a TS from this section and add only TNI names for this role a examples to the exemption section. Move second sentence in a) to 4.1.7.2.

7	<p>4.1.7.2 The laboratory shall have technical specialist(s) responsible for every field of accreditation for which the laboratory is accredited or seeks accreditation. Technical specialists however named (e.g., Technical Manager, Technical Director, Technical Expert, Group Leader, Supervisor, Lead Analyst, Department Head) shall:</p> <p>a) have a working knowledge of relevant TNI Standard requirements. This individual may have supervisory responsibilities, but this is not required.</p>	<p>If the intention of changing the name to “technical specialist” is to remove the misnomer that the technical specialist must be a person with supervisory capacity, why name only positions with supervisory capacity in the examples given? I recommend removing the examples altogether and to move the second sentence in a)</p>	NHELAP	<p>4.1.7.2 The laboratory shall have technical specialist(s) responsible for every field of accreditation for which the laboratory is accredited or seeks accreditation. <b>This individual may have supervisory responsibilities, but this is not required.</b> Technical specialists however named <del>(e.g., Technical Manager, Technical Director, Technical Expert, Group Leader, Supervisor, Lead Analyst, Department Head)</del> shall:</p> <p>a) have a working knowledge of relevant TNI Standard requirements.</p>	same as above
---	---	--	--------	---	---------------



8	4.1.7.2 The technical specialist may be responsible for fields of accreditation at more than one location provided the laboratory submits a plan detailing availability at each location to the primary accrediting body. The accrediting body shall evaluate the plan to determine if approval is granted.	I feel a disclaimer should be listed here, that this is an exception, by no means the preferred process	ILELAP		It would not add value to include which method is preferred here. Regarding this clause, we need to know if Abs are ok with this clause and along with that find out what their requirements are for evaluating and if an evaluation could be expected in time to help small labs bridge the gap between losing a TS and hiring another one.
9	4.1.7.2 The technical specialist may be responsible for fields of accreditation at more than one location provided the laboratory submits a plan detailing availability at each location to the primary accrediting body. The accrediting body shall evaluate the plan to determine if approval is granted.	Change fields of accreditation to "representative technologies" to reflect language throughout the document. This draft proposes to qualify people by fields of accreditation, areas of responsibility and representative technologies. Please edit document for consistency.	MNELAP	4.1.7.2 The technical specialist may be responsible for <del>fields of accreditation</del> <b>representative technologies</b> at more than one location provided the laboratory submits a plan detailing availability at each location to the primary accrediting body. The accrediting body shall evaluate the plan to determine if approval is granted.	Review the document to see if "representative technologies" would work throughout the sections. (UPDATE - avoid 'representative tech' if possible). We may want to remove this option--this may only help larger labs who have multiple locations and not really provide any help to smaller labs with only one location.

10	<p>4.1.7.2 The technical specialist may be responsible for fields of accreditation at more than one location provided the laboratory submits a plan detailing availability at each location to the primary accrediting body. The accrediting body shall evaluate the plan to determine if approval is granted.</p>	<p>Minnesota doesn't have the database capacity or the bandwidth to track technical specialist to the FOT/FOA. Currently, we track areas of responsibility and ensure they cover the scope/technologies of the laboratory. For example we use responsibility areas: volatile organic compounds, other organic compounds, inorganic chemistry, metal, Air, etc. We will not be tracking a technical specials for each FOT/FOA.</p>	MNELAP	<p>4.1.7.2 The technical specialist may be responsible for <del>fields of accreditation</del> <b>representative technologies</b> at more than one location provided the laboratory submits a plan detailing availability at each location to the primary accrediting body. The accrediting body shall evaluate the plan to determine if approval is granted.</p>	same as above
----	--	---	--------	--	---------------

11	5.2.6.1 ...Where “equivalent” coursework, college education or scientific disciplines are allowed, the laboratory must provide records to demonstrate equivalency.	VELAP has concerns with this statement: (1) The way it reads, the laboratory is the one making the determination on “equivalency” (not the AB); (2) How does anyone (lab or AB) determine “equivalency” to a college course? How will AB’s know when/how to accept this? How can/will AB’s treat labs consistently? More information / conversations / etc. need to happen before this can be part of a standard, as it’s currently too vague to implement. See related comments under radiochemistry for some possible ideas/starting points on that particular use of it.	VELAP	SUGGESTION: Maybe the “equivalent coursework” phrases need to <u>all be moved</u> to the “Exceptions” paragraph, so they fall under the options for a lab to “ <u>seek an educational waiver</u> ” – add some examples there to communicate the expectation that instead of substituting experience, the lab presents information on coursework which the requesting lab believes would provide <b><u>substantial relevant education</u></b> outside of a college/university setting. “Equivalent” degrees could be evaluated this way too ... so that the coursework is looked at as an Exception and justified to and evaluated by the AB, and the lab knows going into the request that it may be denied, instead of reading the standard and deciding for themselves that they have something “equivalent”.	UPDATE 4/26: SIMPLIFIED TS quals may take care of this. Try to move all references to "equivalent coursework/scientific discipline" to exceptions area. Consider whittling down to the minimum requirements for education so that the use of the term "equivalent" is not necessary. UPDATE 4/26: If we move to the simplified TS qual requirements, this is not necessary.
12	5.2.6.1 a) i. 2) successful completion of a course in the use of the instrument ; and	What instrument? TEM or microscope? Or any instrument?	MNELAP	Define/Clarify "instrument" in 5.2.6.1 a) i. 2)	MODULE SPECIFIC Change "instrument" to TEM.

13	5.2.6.1 a) i.1) an earned bachelor's degree in a scientific discipline ;	What if you have a degree in English, but have a minor in a scientific discipline that would still qualify you for the role? I think it should say bachelor's degree and exclude the type.	MNELAP	5.2.6.1 a) i.1) an earned bachelor's degree <del>in a scientific discipline ;</del>	MODULE SPECIFIC We need to be specific about scientific discipline here. We can make it consistent for all modules that as experience increases, the education can be lessened.
14	5.2.6.1 a) i.3) one (1) year of experience in the use of the instrument with an experienced analyst available to review observations and trouble-shoot as needed. Such experience shall include the identification of minerals. <b>Experienced support can be available through contractual arrangements</b>	Do these need to be in person or can it be remote contractors?	MNELAP	Clarify in 5.2.6.1 a)i. 3) if the reviewer/contractor is allowed to review/support through remote access.	MODULE SPECIFIC In general this section makes it more difficult to qualify for TS vs. current standard. We should look at simplifying. Remote access is ok. Include in the statement.
15	5.2.6.1 a) i.3) one (1) year of experience in the use of the instrument with <b>an experienced analyst</b> available to review observations and trouble-shoot as needed. Such experience shall include the identification of minerals. Experienced support can be available through contractual arrangements	How will the AB evaluate if the new person was overseen by an experienced analyst? Will they need to review the "experience"? Will the AB need to review records that the training included oversight, observation review and troubleshooting? Are ABs being asked to maintain records of education but not training/oversite?	MNELAP	Please clarify 5.2.6.1 a) i.3) based on comments.	MODULE SPECIFIC See above for simplifying. Try to remove "experienced analyst" and say what is expected. Or better, simplify to 1 year of experience as qualified analyst.

16	5.2.6.1 b) i. 2) two (2) years of experience in <b>representative technologies</b> for which the technical specialist will be responsible. An earned master's or doctoral degree in one of the above disciplines may be substituted for one (1) year of experience.	Define "representative technologies" Is GC/ECD representative of GC/MS	MNELAP	Is there another way to define areas for the technical specialist. As stated above MNELAP uses "categories/ areas of responsibility" volatile organic compounds, other organic compounds, inorganic chemistry, metal, air in which we approve our technical managers/specialists	Technology WG is trying to define this.
17	5.2.6.1 b) ii. 2) one (1) year of experience in representative technologies for which the technical specialist will be responsible. An earned bachelor's, master's, or doctoral degree in one of the above disciplines may be substituted for six (6) months of experience	Since b)ii. Criteria is an associates degree the person probably does not have an advanced degree because if they did they would qualify under b)i. Do we need "An earned bachelor's, masters...of experience" if the criteria is for an "associate's degree" Same comment for C)Microbiological Testing ii. 1)	MNELAP	Delete 5.2.6.1 b) ii 2)	MODULE SPECIFIC Consider changing 5.2.6.1b)ii.1) to an associates degree or two years of successful college education in the degrees listed. 2) can stay the same since it's adding education to reduce experience.
18	5.2.6.1 c) ii. 1) an earned associate's degree, or equivalent college education, in an appropriate field of the sciences or applied sciences;	What does appropriate field of the science or applied sciences mean? Propose to use the same language as chemistry module to define equivalent.	MNELAP	An earned associate's degree, or equivalent college education, in chemistry, environmental sciences, biological sciences, physical sciences, chemical engineering, or equivalent scientific discipline	MODULE SPECIFIC Remove 5.2.6.1 c) ii 1) and update 3) to reference the disciplines listed in i.

19	5.2.6.1 Technical Specialist Qualifications	Propose adding an overview paragraph/statement on how technical specialist qualifications can be met. From my review it seems they can be met by 1. Education/experience 2. Exception, 3. The NELAC Institute Credentialling 4. New Technology	MNELAP	Technical Specialist qualifications are based on the following options, education, experience, exception, TNI Credentialing, technology scope expansion and Accreditation Body (AB) approval (proposed in future comment).	Include an introductory statement that says something similar to what is proposed. NOTE: Check on the AB approval suggestion.
20	5.2.6.1 The laboratory must maintain records that demonstrate the technical specialist(s) meet(s) the qualifications defined below. Where coursework is required, the laboratory must provide supporting records that show courses were successfully completed (e.g., certificate, letter, transcript). Where “equivalent” coursework, college education or scientific disciplines are allowed, the laboratory must provide records to demonstrate equivalency.	The lab has to maintain records. Does the AB need to maintain records as well? Does the AB have to review and approve and maintain documentation? Or is this requirement on the laboratory? Who must the laboratory provide supporting records to? AB, TNI, Assessor, or is it only upon request?	MNELAP	Clarify in 5.2.6.1 who is responsible for reviewing the records to ensure compliance. Who does the lab supply the records/documents to? When does the lab supply the documents? Who maintains them?	Change the term "provide records" to "retain records" or something similar so we don't question who labs provide to. Consider including a longer time-line to retain records of "equivalency".

21	5.2.6.1.a. Asbestos Testing (Module 3)	Gentle nudge, I feel this section could be consolidated more. I think associate's degree should be enough for TEM if they have also completed a course and have 1 year experience. Why specify NIOSH 582 for PCM? This was not in the 2016 TNI Standard. What is the need for it now?	ORELAP		MODULE SPECIFIC
22	5.2.6.1.a.ii.1 an earned associate degree or two (2) years of college study in a scientific discipline;	Is the intention for the associate degree to be in a scientific discipline? Not clear.	VELAP		MODULE SPECIFIC
23	5.2.6.1.a.iii.1 an earned associate degree or two (2) years of college study in a scientific discipline;	Is the intention for the associate degree to be in a scientific discipline? Not clear.	VELAP		MODULE SPECIFIC
24	5.2.6.1.b.i.2 ... An earned master's or doctoral degree in one of the above disciplines may be substituted for one (1) year of experience.	Clarify, can I use a combination of degrees to eliminate the experience requirement?	ORELAP		MODULE SPECIFIC

25	<p>5.2.6.1.b.ii ii. Any technical specialist with responsibilities limited to inorganic, non-metals chemical testing, shall be a person with:</p> <p>1) an earned associate’s degree, or equivalent college education, in chemistry, environmental sciences, biological sciences, physical sciences, chemical engineering, or equivalent scientific discipline; and</p> <p>2) one (1) year of experience in representative technologies for which the technical specialist will be responsible. An earned bachelor’s, master’s, or doctoral degree in one of the above disciplines may be substituted for six (6) months of experience.</p>	<p>please clarify “appropriate field” as associate’s degrees are typically not specialized, and clarify whether 2 years of a 4-year program is acceptable.</p>	<p>Comments from AC Minutes from 9/11/31</p>		<p>MODULE SPECIFIC</p> <p>In general, see if we can avoid statements like "equivalent college education".</p>
26	<p>5.2.6.1.b.ii.1 an earned associate’s degree, or equivalent college education, in chemistry, environmental sciences, biological sciences, physical sciences, chemical engineering, or equivalent scientific discipline; and</p>	<p>Is the intention for “equivalent college education” to be “two years of college study in a scientific discipline” as stated in the asbestos section? Consider using the same wording or defining how “equivalent college education” will be determined. Not clear. THIS NOTE APPLIES TO THIS PHRASE THROUGHOUT THE DOCUMENT</p>	<p>VELAP</p>		<p>In general, see if we can avoid statements like "equivalent college education".</p>



27	5.2.6.1.b.ii.2 ... An earned bachelor's, master's, or doctoral degree in one of the above disciplines may be substituted for six (6) months of experience.	Clarify, can I use a combination of degrees to eliminate the experience requirement?	ORELAP		No; clarify language so this isn't a possibility.
28	5.2.6.1.b.ii.2. one (1) year of experience in representative technologies for which the technical specialist will be responsible. An earned bachelor's, master's, or doctoral degree in one of the above disciplines may be substituted for six (6) months of experience.	could you clarify that 1 year of experience is needed for the "earned" associate's degree while only 6 months is needed for bachelor's/master's/doctoral degrees? This is confusing as written.	Comments from AC Minutes from 9/11/28		Be clear on education/ experience combination of requirements.
29	5.2.6.1.c	microbiology is now more specific than chemistry – was this the committee's intent?	Comments from AC Minutes from 9/11/29		MODULE SPECIFIC
30	5.2.6.1.c) i. Any technical specialist responsible for microbiological testing, with the exception of that noted in 5.2.6.1 c) ii., shall be a person with: 2) successful completion of one (1) college-level microbiology course; and	from my experience reviewing TM's transcripts, having a full course in microbiology is not "the general rule" in people's education, inclusive of biology majors. Rather, in many cases, microbiology is part of other biological science courses taken.	Cwesterman email 1/23/24		MODULE SPECIFIC If Micro module requires micro course, we'll need to revisit this.

31	<p>5.2.6.1.c.i i. Any technical specialist responsible for microbiological testing, with the exception of that noted in 5.2.6.1 c) ii., shall be a person with:</p> <p>1) an earned bachelor’s degree in microbiological sciences, biological sciences, chemistry, environmental sciences, physical sciences, biochemical engineering, molecular biology engineering, or equivalent scientific discipline;</p> <p>2) successful completion of one (1) college-level microbiology course; and</p> <p>3) two (2) years of experience in representative technologies for which the technical specialist will be responsible. An earned master’s or doctoral degree in one of the above disciplines may be substituted for one (1) year of experience.</p>	<p>please clarify “appropriate field” as associate’s degrees are typically not specialized, and clarify whether 2 years of a 4-year program is acceptable.</p>	<p>Comments from AC Minutes from 9/11/30</p>		<p>See row 26.</p>
32	<p>5.2.6.1.c.i.3 ... An earned master’s or doctoral degree in one of the above disciplines may be substituted for one (1) year of experience.</p>	<p>Clarify, can I use a combination of degrees to eliminate the experience requirement?</p>	<p>ORELAP</p>		<p>No, see above</p>
33	<p>5.2.6.1.c.ii.3 ... An earned bachelor’s, master’s, or doctoral degree in one of the above disciplines may be substituted for six (6) months of experience.</p>	<p>Clarify, can I use a combination of degrees to eliminate the experience requirement?</p>	<p>ORELAP</p>		<p>No, see above</p>

34	5.2.6.1.d	this radiochemistry section is far too prescriptive, with eight college courses (or equivalent) and an additional course for each technology (up to 4) is excessive. It's not clear why the requirement that one year of experience must be devoted to a single technology is imposed – again this seems overly prescriptive	Comments from AC Minutes from 9/11/32		MODULE SPECIFIC
35	5.2.6.1.d.i	I find it unacceptable that radiochemical testing is the only discipline without a degree requirement.	ORELAP		MODULE SPECIFIC

36	5.2.6.1.d.i	<p>The overall impression of the radiochemistry section is that it is complex and hard to read and “absorb”.</p> <p>1) VELAP believes that the blue text [see Proposal] is easier to understand, and in the case of the gray-highlighted phrase, has a different meaning than the draft language above. Specifically, the “one technology/method per year” limitation was intended for a specific situation, and this limitation is not communicated in the 5.2.6.2. final paragraph, last sentence. This needs to be addressed by returning to the original language from the Radiochemistry committee and putting that phrase with the Radiochemistry section.</p> <p>4) Another note is that the submitted text (blue, below) [see Proposal] from the radiochemistry group specified chemistry and physics courses. Not sure what would be other “equivalent” scientific disciplines” for this specialization. Per the above</p>	VELAP	<p>Any technical expert of an accredited environmental laboratory engaged in radiological analysis shall be a person:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. with 8 college and/or equivalent technical courses in any combination of chemistry and/or physics; and</li> <li>2. with 1 college and/or equivalent technical course of radiochemistry for each technology/method used in the laboratory, with a maximum of 4 courses required. For example, the technical manager of a laboratory performing only gas-flow proportional counting (GFPC) would need only 1 course of credit, whereas one at a laboratory performing GFPC, alpha spectrometry, gamma spectrometry, liquid scintillation, alpha scintillation, and ICP-MS would require 4 courses. In the case where a new technology/method is brought online, the total number of Radiochemistry courses is not yet 4, and the technical expert does not</li> </ol>	MODULE SPECIFIC
----	-------------	---	-------	---	-----------------

		<p>notes, maybe this should not 'invite' alternates but the Exceptions section could have an opportunity to "seek a waiver". [And maybe that's where the military training/classes might come in and be justified on a case-by-case basis ... ??].</p>	<p>have a full year of experience in that specific technology/method before accreditation is sought, accreditation for the new technology/method may be given based upon the demonstrated performance of the new method and PT performance (installation documentation, method validation, DOCs, PT performance, etc), with a maximum of one technology/method per year; and</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>3. with two (2) or more years of experience in the radiological analysis of environmental samples.</li><li>4. A master's or doctoral degree in one of the above disciplines may be substituted for one (1) year experience.</li><li>5. 1 year experience working in an environmental radioanalytical laboratory may be substituted for 1 course. Multiple years of substitution may be utilized, but each year substituted must be related to the learning of and proficiency in a different analytical</li></ol>	
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>method/technique or instrumentation type. This will help ensure an increasing level of knowledge in radiochemistry analyses (preparation and/or instrumentation) during that time period. No more than 6 courses total may be substituted – at least 6 courses must be from actual college and/or equivalent technical training sources.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

37	5.2.6.1.d.i	<p>2)In meeting with a member of the Radiochemistry Committee to gain a better understanding of the technology/method-specific courses described in section 2, the committee member was able to describe a number of available options and resources for this. VELAP believes that based on the critical nature as well as the specialization of radiochemistry testing, the Radiochemistry Committee should put together a Guidance Document that lists “good ideas” for this training which can be used as a help to laboratories needing to meet these requirements as well as ABs needing to evaluate them. The list should indicate that other approved options should be similar in nature, based on course content, to examples on the list. This would help this section which seems “very prescriptive” (and perhaps appropriately so) to be less daunting and more usable as a standard for both labs and ABs.</p>	VELAP		MODULE SPECIFIC
----	-------------	--	-------	--	-----------------

38	5.2.6.1.d.i	3)Additionally, in our meeting we discussed the specialization that many veterans have after military service that included work and military-based training in nuclear-based technologies and associated testing. Our standard should make some allowances for experience and coursework gained in this setting.	VELAP		MODULE SPECIFIC - this may be the specificity for radiochem, if it has one
39	5.2.6.1.d.i.2 an additional college, or equivalent technical course, in radiochemistry for each technology for which the technical specialist will be responsible with no more than four (4) technology specific courses required (e.g., the technical specialist responsible for only gas-flow proportional counting (GFPC) would need only one (1) course, whereas a technical specialist responsible for GFPC, alpha spectrometry, gamma spectrometry, liquid scintillation, alpha scintillation, and ICP-MS would require four (4) courses); and	This needs to be redone. Way too complicated to keep track of. Disagree that someone running an ICP-MS needs a course, as ICP-MS does not rely on radioactivity, this is chemistry.	ORELAP		MODULE SPECIFIC



40	5.2.6.1.d.i.3 ... An earned master's or doctoral degree in chemistry, physics, or equivalent scientific discipline may be substituted for one (1) year experience.	Clarify, can I use a combination of degrees to eliminate the experience requirement?	ORELAP		No, see above
41	5.2.6.1.d.i.4 4) Required courses in 1) and 2) may be substituted with additional years of experience working in an environmental radiochemical testing laboratory beyond the two (2) years required in 3). Multiple years of experience may be substituted for courses, but at least six (6) courses must be from actual college or equivalent technical training sources. Each year substituted must be related to the learning of and proficiency in a different technology. One (1) year of experience shall substitute for one (1) course.	Suggest cutting this. Why is radiochemistry getting all these special exceptions?	ORELAP		MODULE SPECIFIC
42	5.2.6.1.e.i.3 ... An earned master's or doctoral degree in one of the above disciplines may be substituted for one (1) year of experience. Additional years of experience working in an environmental toxicity laboratory may be substituted for up to two (2) of the courses specified above. One (1) year of experience shall substitute for one (1) course.	Clarify, can I use a combination of degrees to eliminate the experience requirement?	ORELAP		No, see above

43	5.2.6.2	<p>The Asbestos Committee should weigh in on this suggestion, but VELAP's opinion is that this section needs to be written in a manner that for Asbestos – PLM and Asbestos – PCM:</p> <p>(1) the successful completion of a course in polarized light microscopy and the NIOSH 582 phase contrast course should not be exempted with experience, as those are both 1-week courses which are "industry standards" for this type of work; <u>AND</u> (2) the college requirements for technical specialists for both of these technologies should be completely exempted (vs needing "4 courses" per b ii above) when the person has sufficient experience, because any associate's degree or "4 courses" in general college science are extremely unlikely to have ANY direct relevance to these two technologies. Both of these two technologies are dependent on the optical skill and, in the case of PLM, experience with handling</p>	VELAP		MODULE SPECIFIC
----	---------	--	-------	--	-----------------

		<p>the various sample types and skill in preparing samples for microscopic examination. This expertise is strongly experience-based and VELAP's opinion is that the listed college requirements may be unnecessarily exclusive without justification.</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

44	5.2.6.2	which waiver would substitute for the college level microbiology course? There are other ways to learn micro. It is important to keep the “experience in lieu of education” exception, as qualified people are scarce	Comments from AC Minutes from 9/11/34		Discuss with modules if they choose to add an additional requirement to general TS requirements.
45	5.2.6.2 Exceptions	The committee should consider allowing the Accreditation Body to make or allow an exception.	MNELAP	Minnesota would propose that an exception be added to allow for technical specialists be approved in response to Federal and State emergencies, in geographic areas where residents have few to no convenient options for securing laboratory testing or in laboratory responsibility areas operated by artificial intelligence. The AB would need to use risk based and knowledge driven qualification considerations.	CHECK WITH ABs: Could we add a statement that ABs may grant waivers in certain circumstances?

46	5.2.6.2 a) A person who is admitted as a technical specialist under these conditions, and leaves the laboratory, will be eligible for hire as a technical specialist for the same fields of accreditation in another accredited laboratory, pending approval from the AB.	What 'conditions'? Or do you mean under requirements or exceptions per previous Standards? Fields of accreditation or responsibility areas? We need to check for consistency throughout the document. Minnesota will not be tracking down to the field of accreditation (FOA) level.	MNELAP	Suggested Language: A person who was previously approved as a technical specialist (however named) and leaves a laboratory role (for any length of time) may seek hire as a technical specialist for the same responsibility areas for which they previously held AB approval. The person must seek Technical Specialist approval from the current and future accreditation bodies for which they wish to seek a technical specialist role.	REVISE: Stating person is qualified is almost contradicted by stating the person must be approved by AB. Consider removing. Clarify 5.2.6.2a) with wording from proposal (see row 58)
----	---	--	--------	---	---

47	5.2.6.2 a) Any person who is approved as technical specialist (or however named) based on requirements or exceptions in previous revisions of this standard is considered to continue approved to be technical specialist for the same areas of responsibility for the current ABs. A person who is admitted as a technical specialist under these conditions, and leaves the laboratory, will be eligible for hire as a technical specialist for the same fields of accreditation in another accredited laboratory, pending approval from the AB.	Who is going to track or what system will be used to track those already approved under previous standards and how does an AB evaluate the current AB? Current as of when? Current ABs in which they hold this technical specialist designation or the current ABs in TNI system and currently functioning as NELAP recognized ABs? NGABs? The second sentence makes it seem like they will be admitted as a technical specialist for new/different ABs pending approval. So then would "current" in previous statement apply? Seems like they could add to the ABs they work for in this sentence and go beyond the "current" ABs.	MNELAP	Suggested Language: 5.2.6.2 Technical Specialist Qualification Exceptions, one criterion must be met in order to receive the waiver. a) Any person who is approved as technical specialist (or however named) based on requirements or exceptions in previous Standard revisions is considered approved to be technical specialist for the same areas of responsibility.	REVISE: The person who leaves the laboratory may have difficulty showing eligibility. Is the second sentence even possible or necessary? Can we revise the first sentence to make it a little more flexible (remove "for the current Abs")?
48	5.2.6.2 b) The laboratory may seek an educational waiver and apply to primary and secondary AB through which the laboratory is accredited for the waiver if the proposed technical specialist meets one of the following criteria:	The laboratory seeks an education waiver or does the specific person seeking the technical specialist role? Is the waiver lab wide or the person? Who do they seek the education waiver from? This sentence is confusing. Who is issuing accreditation for waivers?	MNELAP	Suggested Language: b) The person may seek an educational waiver and apply from an AB by meeting one of the following criteria:	REVISE: Lab may seek educational waiver for a proposed TS... This section may need to be completely changed or removed based on the generic TS requirements.

49	5.2.6.2 b)The laboratory may seek an educational waiver and apply to primary and secondary AB through which the laboratory is accredited for the waiver if the proposed technical specialist meets one of the following criteria	MNELAP doesn't have authority to issue educational waivers. If required of ABs, would ABs issues emails or certificates? Who would track these from AB to AB?	MNELAP	Propose this draft moves to the person stating why they meet this exception and for the lab to maintain records of exception. For example: The applicant technical specialist (however named) meets the following criteria for education:	REVISE: see row 49.
50	5.2.6.2 d) In lieu of the educational requirements in 5.2.6.1, an individual who has been credentialed by The NELAC Institute (TNI) shall be considered to possess the requisite qualifications.	Can someone who is seeking the technical specials role by exception also seek credentialling by the NELAC Institute or the TNI Credentialling only in lieu of education?	MNELAP		REVISE or REMOVE: if in generic TS requirements
51	5.2.6.2 If a laboratory seeks accreditation for a new technology, a technical specialist may be assigned responsibility for the new technology based on demonstrating performance of the new method (installation documentation, method validation or verification, DOC, PT performance, etc.). In radiochemistry, a maximum of one (1) new technology per year per technical specialist is permitted	What does "new technology" mean? Does it mean a new technology to the laboratory, for example they are adding a GC/MS technology to their scope? Or does new technology mean it's a new technology to the TNI lists of technology? Does the technical specialist assigned need to meet the other requirements of the technical specialist section? If the lab is adding GC/MS does the technical specialist need to meet the chemistry requirements set forth in 5.2.6.1 b)?	MNELAP	Strike this from the standard or better define new technology.	REMOVE - if we're going to work with analytical disciplines, this is no longer necessary.

52	5.2.6.2 If a laboratory seeks accreditation for a new technology, a technical specialist may be assigned responsibility for the new technology based on demonstrating performance of the new method (installation documentation, method validation or verification, DOC, PT performance, etc.). In radiochemistry, a maximum of one (1) new technology per year per technical specialist is permitted	Why is only one technology per year allowed in radiochemistry?	MNELAP	Strike this from the standard unless there is a good reason to only allow one radiochemistry technology/year.	REMOVE - if we're going to work with analytical disciplines, this is no longer necessary.
53	5.2.6.2 If a laboratory seeks accreditation for a new technology, a technical specialist may be assigned responsibility for the new technology based on demonstrating performance of the new method (installation documentation, method validation or verification, DOC, PT performance, etc.). In radiochemistry, a maximum of one (1) new technology per year per technical specialist is permitted	Is this based on FOA, technology/method or area of responsibility? Should this be a separate item e) under the list of other exception items?	MNELAP	The formatting of the paragraph under 5.2.6.2 seems odd and the author should consider adding it the list of items for exception.	REMOVE - if we're going to work with analytical disciplines, this is no longer necessary.



54	5.2.6.2 If a laboratory seeks accreditation for a new technology, a technical specialist may be assigned responsibility for the new technology based on demonstrating performance of the new method (installation documentation, method validation or verification, DOC, PT performance, etc). In radiochemistry, a maximum of one (1) new technology per year per technical specialist is permitted.	This doesn't make any sense, we don't do technical directors by technology, most of us, but maybe not all, use loose categories like "micro", "organics", "metals", "inorganics". I don't find this paragraph practical or useful.	ORELAP	Remove	REMOVE - if we're going to work with analytical disciplines, this is no longer necessary.
55	5.2.6.2 If a laboratory seeks accreditation for a new technology, a technical specialist may be assigned responsibility for the new technology based on demonstrating performance of the new method (installation documentation, method validation or verification, DOC, PT performance, etc.). In radiochemistry, a maximum of one (1) new technology per year per technical specialist is permitted.	the “new technology” was confusing, people did not consistently read this as an “emerging technology” and instead thought that the person overseeing the area where the new technology was added should be assigned. Probably should clarify that this section is about more than just adding a different detector to an existing GC, for example.	Comments from AC Minutes from 9/11/33		REMOVE - if we're going to work with analytical disciplines, this is no longer necessary.
56	5.2.6.2 Technical Specialist Qualifications Exceptions	Does one need to meet all these criteria to be considered for exception? Or just one of the items on the list a) or b) or a) and b) etc.?	MNELAP	Add a statement at the start regarding the number of criteria below that need to meet in order to qualify/apply.	REVISE: This section will need to be simplified significantly if some of the exceptions are included in the generic TS requirements.

57	5.2.6.2.a a) Any person who is approved as technical specialist (or however named) based on requirements or exceptions in previous revisions of this standard is considered to continue approved to be technical specialist for the same areas of responsibility for the current ABs.		ORELAP	Any person who was formally recognized as a technical specialist (or however named) based on requirements or exceptions in previous revisions of this standard will continue to be recognized for the same areas of responsibilities.	Clarify 5.2.6.2a) with wording from proposal (see row 47) -- consider including that this is specific to the current AB (like in column A).
58	5.2.6.2.b b) The laboratory may seek an educational waiver and apply to primary and secondary AB through which the laboratory is accredited for the waiver if the proposed technical specialist meets one of the following criteria:	So only existing laboratories can do this, not new labs? Not sure I like this as written. Why can't we allow any person to apply for this waiver if they meet the criteria?	ORELAP	5.2.6.2.b b) The laboratory may seek an educational waiver and apply to primary and secondary AB through which the laboratory is accredited or plans to seek accreditation for the waiver if the proposed technical specialist meets one of the following criteria:	REMOVE - if general TS requirements are included that list these options, this section is not needed.
59	5.2.6.2.b.i i. A technical specialist with an earned associate degree or equivalent coursework in the allowed disciplines instead of the requisite bachelor's degree shall have at least four (4) years of experience in representative technologies for which the technical specialist will be responsible.	Does this put onus on AB to determine what is equivalent to an associate's degree? Don't like this as written.	ORELAP	See 5.2.6.1 ... Where "equivalent" coursework, college education or scientific disciplines are allowed, the laboratory must provide records to demonstrate equivalency. Does this clarify?	REMOVE - if general TS requirements are included that list these options, this section is not needed.

60	5.2.6.2.b.ii and 5.2.6.1.d.4	a. Under 5.2.6.2.b.ii, a TS with 4 courses and 5 years can be a TS. Per the Radiochemistry section 5.6.2.1.d.4, multiple years of experience can be substituted for the courses but "at least 6 courses are to be from actual college or equivalent training sources".	VELAP		No need to review; new TS language may not include technical module-specific requirements in general TS requirements.
61	5.2.6.2.d In lieu of the educational requirements in 5.2.6.1, an individual who has been credentialed by The NELAC Institute (TNI) shall be considered to possess the requisite qualifications.	I do not agree with including this. The credentialing program does not yet exist, so we are putting the cart before the horse here. I could not vote to approve or adopt the Standard with this included right now. I think this could be a conflict of interest.	ORELAP	Remove	Will keep this language since credentialing is in process of being created now.
62	5.6.2.b) ii. ii. A technical specialist with four (4) courses from a college or university in the allowed scientific disciplines shall have at least five (5) years of experience in representative technologies areas of responsibility for which the technical specialist will be responsible.	What are the allowed disciplines?	MNELAP	Suggested Language. ii. A technical specialist with four (4) courses from a college or university in the scientific disciplines shall have at least five (5) years of experience in areas of responsibility for which the technical specialist will be responsible.	REVISE: If this is in the generic TS requirements, we need to try to avoid statements like "allowed disciplines"

63	Overall	Some explanation of how to account for the difference in course hours between quarter and semester terms must be included.	Comments from AC Minutes from 9/11/24		Course seems to be the best term we have to describe education without a degree. Not a significant difference between quarter and semester.
64	Overall	4.1.7.2 states that a TS (not necessarily the same person) must be responsible for every "field of accreditation" in the lab, but later (in 5.2.6.1 and 5.2.6.2) the phrase "representative technologies" is used – consistent nomenclature is important for clarity. Additionally, if used, the term "representative technologies" needs to be defined, as without clear definition, its use may vary with different ABs.	Comments from AC Minutes from 9/11/26		We're moving towards using the term "analytical disciplines" which is defined.

65	Overall	The revised standard is adding rigor which history has shown us is not the only educational path for success as a micro technical manager. As such, I ask that this language will be modified before a draft of TM language moves forward. I'd like to suggest a conversation with the AC, at a future AC meeting, to involve all of the AC if needed – I'm not trying to speak for everyone but wanted to initiate this conversation.	Cwesterman email 1/23/2024		
----	---------	--	----------------------------------	--	--

Row	Citation	Comment	Comment made by	Proposal	Committee Decision
15	5.2.6.1 a) i.3) one (1) year of experience in the use of the instrument with an experienced analyst available to review observations and trouble-shoot as needed. Such experience shall include the identification of minerals. <b>Experienced support can be available through contractual arrangements</b>	Do these need to be in person or can it be remote contractors?	MNELAP	Clarify in 5.2.6.1 a)i. 3) if the reviewer/contractor is allowed to review/support through remote access.	In general this section makes it more difficult to qualify for TS vs. current standard. We should look at simplifying. Remote access is ok. Include in the statement.

16	5.2.6.1 a) i.3) one (1) year of experience in the use of the instrument with an <b>experienced analyst</b> available to review observations and trouble-shoot as needed. Such experience shall include the identification of minerals. Experienced support can be available through contractual arrangements	How will the AB evaluate if the new person was overseen by an experienced analyst? Will they need to review the "experience"? Will the AB need to review records that the training included oversight, observation review and troubleshooting? Are ABs are being asked to maintain records of education but not training/oversite?	MNELAP	Please clarify 5.2.6.1 a) i.3) based on comments.	See above for simplifying. Try to remove "experienced analyst" and say what is expected. Or better, simplify to 1 year of experience as qualified analyst.
17	5.2.6.1 b) i. 2) two (2) years of experience in <b>representative technologies</b> for which the technical specialist will be responsible. An earned master's or doctoral degree in one of the above disciplines may be substituted for one (1) year of experience.	Define "representative technologies" Is GC/ECD representative of GC/MS	MNELAP	Is there another way to define areas for the technical specialist. As stated above MNELAP uses "categories/ areas of responsibility" volatile organic compounds, other organic compounds, inorganic chemistry, metal, air in which we approve our technical managers/specialists	Technology WG is trying to define this.

18	5.2.6.1 b) ii. 2) one (1) year of experience in representative technologies for which the technical specialist will be responsible. An earned bachelor's, master's, or doctoral degree in one of the above disciplines may be substituted for six (6) months of experience	Since b)ii. Criteria is an associates degree the person probably does not have an advanced degree because if they did they would qualify under b)i. Do we need "An earned bachelor's, masters...of experience" if the criteria is for an "associate's degree" Same comment for C)Microbiological Testing ii. 1)	MNELAP	Delete 5.2.6.1 b) ii 2)	Consider changing 5.2.6.1b)ii.1) to an associates degree or two years of successful college education in the degrees listed. 2) can stay the same since it's adding education to reduce experience.
19	5.2.6.1 c) ii. 1) an earned associate's degree, or equivalent college education, in an appropriate field of the sciences or applied sciences;	What does appropriate field of the science or applied sciences mean? Propose to use the same language as chemistry module to define equivalent.	MNELAP	An earned associate's degree, or equivalent college education, in chemistry, environmental sciences, biological sciences, physical sciences, chemical engineering, or equivalent scientific discipline	Remove 5.2.6.1 c) ii 1) and update 3) to reference the disciplines listed in i.

Attachment C: QSM Action Item Summary – 2024

Item	Task Description	Document Number	Contact	Task Added	Start Date	Complete Date	External Communications	Comments
1	Update V1M2	V1M2		Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing		See #6 – Review SIRs See #2 – Workgroups See #3 – Technical Specialist 12/10/23: Reviewing the DRAFT Standard and working on finalizing language that was inserted from work done by the various language workgroups and making sure language is properly placed in the new format. Additional language editing is being done through this review. The Summary of Changes/Justification document will be updated through this review process. The Committee is looking at changing the Quality Manager title to Quality Specialist. 1/8/23: Edited Data Integrity Section.
2	Develop Workgroups to work on language in specific section of the Standard.	V1M2		Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing		Language Workgroup tasks: – Internal Audits – Document/Record Retention – Quality Manual – Define “Appropriate QC” in Section 7.7 (ISO/IEC 17025:2017) – Consistent use of Procedure and Policy - Clarification of unique ID 2/6/23: Working on defining Technology. Will work with PTPEC, Chemistry and LAMS to further this work. 3/6/23: Working on records retention language.



Item	Task Description	Document Number	Contact	Task Added	Start Date	Complete Date	External Communications	Comments
								<p>4/11/23: Committee sending ideas for records retention language to Workgroup for consideration.</p> <p>7/10/23: Language formulated is now being added to the DRAFT Standard.</p> <p>8/11/23: The Definitions Workgroup presented information on definitions and there was a lot of discussion surrounding duplicate, replicate, records, policies and procedures (written).</p> <p>9/11/23: A number of new workgroups have been formed to continue work on the standard. Workgroups now include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Definitions (presenting 9/11/23)</li> <li>- Language (present Oct) – on Oct agenda</li> <li>- Data Integrity (present Oct) – delayed to Nov</li> <li>- Subcontracted Work (present Dec)</li> <li>- Measurement Traceability (present Dec)</li> <li>- Calibration Requirements (not started)</li> <li>- Handling Test Items (not started)</li> </ul> <p>9/13/23: The Definitions WG has completed their task to evaluate ~12 terms and compose definitions, if needed, and review full V1M2 Draft for correct use of the term ‘Procedure.’ The update included the final items that no definitions for duplicate or replicate will make it into V1M2, and defining Procedure as “written” is not in conflict with any ISO 17025:2017 usage of procedure.</p>

Item	Task Description	Document Number	Contact	Task Added	Start Date	Complete Date	External Communications	Comments
								<p>11/15/23: The WG for Subcontracting Work (V1M2 4.5.5) completed its task and the draft language is incorporated into Draft V1M2. Data Integrity WG (V1M2 4.2.8.1 &amp; 5.2.7) is almost done but will need to review the most recently proposed additions to match up with QSM 6.0 V1M2. Workgroups Measurement Traceability (5.6), Calibration Requirements (5.5), and Handling Test Items (5.8) just launched this month and will begin tackling suggested edits to these sections.</p> <p>12/11: Continued updates can be found above in the work for the Standard update since the Committee is now focused on reviewing language in the DRAFT Standard.</p>

Item	Task Description	Document Number	Contact	Task Added	Start Date	Complete Date	External Communications	Comments
3	Technical Specialist Language	V1M2		Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing		<p>1/11/23: Worked on Exceptions.</p> <p>2/13/23: Made updates based on conference comments. Working on language to make it clear current technical managers may continue as technical specialists for same areas of responsibility.</p> <p>8/7/23: Technical Specialist status was reviewed at the Conference and comments ranged from concern that it still won't work for smaller labs to concern that the differing requirements between the Expert Committees makes it confusing.</p> <p>12/10/23: Received a batch of recommended changes from NELAP AC. Debbie plans to talk to the NELAP AC about the changes.</p> <p>2/12/24: The Committee started going through the table of recommended changes from the NELAP AC and included Committee Decisions that will be voted on after the table review is complete.</p>
4	Defining Technology	Various TNI Standards	Paul Junio Tony Francis Debbie Bond	January 2023	12/11/23			<p>1/11/23: Will work with Paul Junio's group to define Technology. PT, AB, QSM, etc.</p> <p>12/11/23: Paul has started email communication on this topic, but the Workgroup has not met yet.</p>

