NOVEMBER 6, 2015

The Committee held a conference call on Friday, November 6, 2015, at 2:00 pm EST. Chair Richard Burrows led the meeting.

1 – Roll call

Richard Burrows, Test America (Lab)	Present
Francoise Chauvin, NYC DEP (Lab)	Absent
Brooke Connor (Other)	Present
Gale Warren, NYSDOH (Accreditation Body)	Present
Colin Wright, Florida DEP (Lab)	Present
Nancy Grams, Advanced Earth Technologists, Inc. (Other)	Absent
Anand Mudambi, USEPA (Other)	Present
John Phillips, Ford Motor Co. (Other)	Absent
Scott Siders, PDC Labs (Lab)	Absent
Valerie Slaven, Teklab (Lab)	Absent
Gary Ward, OR DPH (Accreditation Body)	Absent
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Present

Associate Committee Members present: Tom Dziedzic; Reed Jeffery; Chuck Neslund.

2 – Previous Minutes

In the absence of a quorum, the minutes from October 23, 2015 were not considered for voting.

3 – Future Standards Development

The committee continued its discussions on Demonstration of Capability (DOC), by considering the case of an individual instrument. Considered first was the initial DOC the first time a laboratory performs a method for a single analyte with preparation (e.g., cyanide). Calibration curve verification (not a calibration curve study) would be required, and LOQ/MDL replicates would be added to the existing study. It was decided there would be no need to run prepped samples through the individual instrument, but an ICV/ICB should be added (an ICV/ICB was also added to the previously considered situation when it is the first time the laboratory performs a method). High or mid level LCS replicates or LCS in different matrices would not be required, not would method blanks or blank spikes. All analysts would not be required. Colin said he would do an MDL study on a new instrument, and it was added that more may be required if a new instrument is significantly different from the existing ones. Considering multi-analyte methods, for Method 8082, it was added a single point calibration could be used except for 1016/1260. Method 8270 with 3 separate calibration mixes and a few analytes only occasionally analyzed would have the same requirements as a single analyte. If a new block or microwave digestor, turbovap, CLLE etc. was added, performance should be verified. Anand suggested LCS and method blank may also be needed.

Additional analytes were considered next. For the example of method 8082 that adds 1262, or 8270 adding one analyte there would of course be an SOP and a modification of the calibration curve. An ICV/ICB would be needed. Tom suggested more needed to be done, because adding even just one analyte could affect others. It was agreed, therefore, to add mid-level LCS replicates. It was suggested to just document that LCS validation would not be needed if the analyst knew the additional analyte would not affect others, but Richard thought that would be a difficult requirement to write into a standard. Also required would be method blanks, a blind spike (that could be a PT study). High-level LCS replicates and LCS in different matrices may be required. It was agreed it would not require all analysts or all instruments.

Under the header of modifications or maintenance, it was suggested the whole initial DOC should be run if it was a major modification or there was a reasonable chance of performance being affected. On discussion, it was agreed to state: "If there is a reasonable chance that performance could be degraded, then some replicates, MDL verification. If not CCV serves."

Richard summarized the discussion by saying the committee would next need to look at these proposed requirements compared with what is in the current standard. It should be decided what might be added or changed without overly complicating things.

4 – Proposed Training on Calibration Requirements

Richard said the NELAP Accreditation Council wanted training on calibration requirements of the new standard, especially on the concept and use of Relative Error (RE). This could be done at a TNI meeting and/or through a webinar. He had already drafted a few slides and these were discussed. In particular, the slides would show why RE is needed with examples of where correlation coefficient is misleading. It was suggested the point could be made that RE is a lot simpler than correlation coefficient. Brooke agreed to format and improve the slides.

5 – Next Meeting

This would be November 20, when the committee would have available for discussion any comments received on the detection/quantitation Interim Standard.

6 – Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 pm EST.