

**Summary of the  
Laboratory Accreditation Systems Committee Meeting  
June 12, 2009**

1. Roll call: Attendance is recorded in Attachment A.

The meeting of the TNI Laboratory Accreditation Systems Committee (LASC) was called to order by June Flowers, Chair, on June 12, 2009 at 11 AM EDT. The meeting was adjourned before 1:00 PM.

2. Minutes

The minutes from the May 8, 2009 meeting were not available for review and will be reviewed at the next meeting.

3. TNI Standard Finalization

Attachment B contains the comments discussed at this meeting.

- a. A meeting with the CSDB was called by June and Ilona to verify that all editorial changes had been implemented. On June 3, 2009, a conference call with Ken Jackson, Bob Wyeth, Jerry Parr, Carol Batterton, Ilona and June determined that indeed, several files had inadvertently not been emailed to LASC on March 26, 2009. The TNI standards have now been distributed and LASC members reviewed and approved that the editorial recommendations were addressed.
- b. Remaining TIA's will be forwarded to LASC upon completion – expected before the July meeting.
- c. TIA discussion  
TIA #6 may not address 40 CFR Part 141 scoring definitions for drinking water PT's. There were suggestions to contact Greg Carroll of EPA and await further discussion in San Antonio where EPA will be represented.  
TIA #5 will be addressed by Editorial change #15.

4. Standards Interpretation Requests (SIRs)

There was no discussion pertaining to the SIR process.

5. Next Meeting

The LASC will meet via conference call on July 10, 2009 at 11am EST.

The meeting was adjourned.

**Attachment A****PARTICIPANTS****TNI LABORATORY ACCREDITATION COMMITTEE**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Contact Information</b>
Ann Marie Allen - present	Massachusetts, Non-nelap AB	T: 978-682-5237 x333 E: <a href="mailto:ann.marie.allen@state.ma.us">ann.marie.allen@state.ma.us</a>
Jo Ann Boyd – absent	Southwest Research Institute, Lab	T: 210-522-2169 E: <a href="mailto:iboyn@swri.org">iboyn@swri.org</a>
Lance Boynton - present	Absolute Standards, Inc., PT	T: 203-281-2917 E: <a href="mailto:lanceboynnton@mac.com">lanceboynnton@mac.com</a>
Carol Barrick - absent	FCC Environmental	T: 813-361-6911 E: <a href="mailto:cabarrick@msn.com">cabarrick@msn.com</a>
Brooke Connor – present	USGS	T: 303-236-1877 E: <a href="mailto:bfconnor@usgs.gov">bfconnor@usgs.gov</a>
Lewis Denny - absent	Florida DOH, AB	T: 904-791-1587 E: <a href="mailto:lew_denny@doh.state.fl.us">lew_denny@doh.state.fl.us</a>
George Detsis - present	Department of Energy, Government	T: 301-903-1488 E: <a href="mailto:george.detsis@eh.doe.gov">george.detsis@eh.doe.gov</a>
Dan Dickinson - present	New York DOH, AB	T: (518) 485-5570 E: <a href="mailto:dmd15@health.state.ny.us">dmd15@health.state.ny.us</a>
June Flowers – Chairperson present	Flowers Chemical Laboratories, Inc., Lab	T: (407) 339-5984 x212 E: <a href="mailto:june@flowerslabs.com">june@flowerslabs.com</a>
Terri Grimes - present	Pinellas County Utilities, Municipal Lab	T: 727-5822302 E: <a href="mailto:tgrimes@co.pinellas.fl.us">tgrimes@co.pinellas.fl.us</a>
Dan Hickman - absent	Oregon DEQ, AB	T: 503-693-5777 E: <a href="mailto:hickman.dan@deq.state.or.us">hickman.dan@deq.state.or.us</a>
Marvelyn Humphrey – present	USEPA Region 6, EPA	T: 281-983-2140 E: <a href="mailto:humphrey.marvelyn@epa.gov">humphrey.marvelyn@epa.gov</a>
Roger Kenton - present	Eastman Chemical Company,	T: 903-237-6882 E: <a href="mailto:rogerk@eastman.com">rogerk@eastman.com</a>
Judy Morgan - present	Environmental Science Corporation, Lab	T: 615-773-9657 E: <a href="mailto:jmorgn@envsci.com">jmorgn@envsci.com</a>
Dale Piechocki- absent	Underwriters Laboratories, Inc., Lab	T: (574-472-5523 E: <a href="mailto:dale.r.piechocki@us.ul.com">dale.r.piechocki@us.ul.com</a>
Ilona Taunton – present	TNI Program Administrator	T: 828-894-3019/828-712-9242 E: <a href="mailto:tauntoni@msn.com">tauntoni@msn.com</a>

## Review of Summary of Action Items/Conditions (NELAP Board Recommendation – Attachment B)

### UPDATE: PROPOSED EDITORIAL CHANGES

**Red** – LASC notes (April 09). **Blue** – Paul Junio’s status update. **Green** –LASC review update based on new sections sent by Ken (6/9/09)

	Reference	Reference to LASC Review	Editorial Change	Status of Change	LASC Assignment To Review Revision
1	V1:M2-M7	QS - 1	Correct inconsistent terms (“mandated method”, “reference method” and “standard method”.)	<p><del>Awaiting revised modules</del></p> <p>PJ: Made change. Clarified terms.</p> <p>“Test” method definition has been stricken and “reference method” replaces the previous “standard method”. added text: (When ISO refers to a standard method, that term is equivalent to reference method). Appears in section 1.4 for V1:M3-M6 as applicable.</p>	June Flowers
2	V1:M3-M7	QS – 2, 2a, 12	ISO language needs to be removed from the non-ISO version of the standard. A reference to this language needs to be added.	<p><del>Awaiting revised modules</del></p> <p>PJ: Decided to leave language in. It is language NELAC was using before ISO. It appeared that it would be difficult to make the change smoothly. Jerry said it would be OK to look at this next standard update period.</p> <p>LASC is in agreement with PJ</p>	June Flowers

	Reference	Reference to LASC Review	Editorial Change	Status of Change	LASC Assignment To Review Revision
				comment.	
3	V1:M2	QS-3	Add the ISO definition for "Validation" to Terms and Definitions.	<del>This has not been addressed</del>  PJ: <del>This has not been done. Felt paragraph where validation is mentioned clarified the term sufficiently. Not a significant enough issue to make a change now.</del>	Ann Marie Allen
4	V1:M4 & V1:M6, 1.5.3.a	QS-4	Remove "... in the quality manual." Error.	<del>I found the removal of "...in the quality manual" from section 1.6.2.2 of EL-V1M7-2008 (Toxicity Testing), but I can not find the other modules and volumes to complete this review.</del>  PJ: It has been changed in the other modules as well.  I verified that the changes were made to #4 on the summary table. All is good.	Brooke Connor
5	V1:M3 – M7 1.6 (third para)	QS-5	State "...the ongoing DOC shall be acceptable as an initial DOC." Change clarifies intent.	<del>Change has not been made.</del>  PJ: Made the change.  Change has been made.	Carol Barrick
6	V1:M4 1.6.1 (last	QS-7	Correct inconsistent terms ("demonstration" and "DOC".)	<del>Missing module.</del>	Dan Dickinson

	Reference	Reference to LASC Review	Editorial Change	Status of Change	LASC Assignment To Review Revision
	para) V1:M5 – M6			PJ: Clarified the use of the terms “demonstration” and “DOC”. They clarified by adding initial or on-going.  I just checked my assignments. They are completed.	
7	V1:M4 1.7.1.1	QS-9	Correct inconsistent use (“... and be appropriate for a given regulation or decision” vs. “... for the intended use.”)	<del>I am unable to locate the updated document for review.</del>  PJ: Changed to “intended use”.  I just checked my assignments. They are completed.	Dan Dickinson
8	V1:M4 1.7.1.1.h.i	QS-10	Add missing word – “standard.”	<del>Missing module.</del>  PJ: Added.  Completed.	Dan Hickman
9	V1:M4 1.7.4.2.a V1:M6 1.7.3.2.c	QS-11	Correct use of “An” to “A.”	<del>Missing module.</del>  PJ: Changed to “An” LCS.  Completed.	George Detsis
10	V2:M2 5.2.2	PT-1	Wording is not applicable and needs to be removed.	<del>Section has not been edited.</del>  PT committee explanation suggests that WET PT may not be available 2X per year....perhaps the reference to WET can be added? We recommend that this	June Flowers

	Reference	Reference to LASC Review	Editorial Change	Status of Change	LASC Assignment To Review Revision
				be done in the next standard update, but this is not a show stopper now.	
11	V2:M2 4.1.4 5.1.2 5.2.1 c) 7.3 d) - V1:M1 4.1.2	PT-4 -	Correct inconsistent language between sections.	<del>Editorial changes have not been made. (TIA still being reviewed.)</del>  Item 11 has still not been corrected. The V2M2 and V1M1 are inconsistent with PTPA accredited and non-PTPA-accredited.  THIS HAS BEEN CONSIDERED AS A TIA (TIA#3) AND SHOULD BE REMOVED FROM THIS TABLE.	JoAnn Boyd
12	V2:M2 5.1.4	PT-5	Correct grammar.	It has been corrected as expected.	Judy Morgan
13	V2:M2 5.2.1 a)	PT-6	Wording should read: The laboratories “participate in at least 2 TNI compliant PT samples per year ...”	<del>I did not find any evidence that either item #13 nor item #18 was addressed. The reference I used was the 03/27/2009 email sent by Hona titled “Status of Editorial Changes and TIAs”.</del>  Completed. The word “successfully” has been removed.	Lance Boynton
14	V2:M2 7.3 a)	PT-8	The clause must be changed to read: “when the result reported by the laboratory is scored not acceptable by the PT Provider”. -	<del>This is what is still there: (the result reported by the laboratory for a sample is not within the established acceptance limits for that FoPT (i.e., “Not Acceptable” evaluation from PT provider); this is what should be</del>	Low Denny

	Reference	Reference to LASC Review	Editorial Change	Status of Change	LASC Assignment To Review Revision
				<p><del>there: (when the result reported by the laboratory is scored not acceptable by the PT Provider). Doesn't looked like its been corrected. (Confirm this has been changed to a TIA. Expert committee is voting on this and then TIA will be made available.)</del></p> <p>V2.M2 7.3(a) still is not correct!</p> <p>THIS IS BEING ADDRESSED THROUGH TIA #6.</p>	
15	V1:M1 6	PT-11	Text in V2:M2 and V3 needs to be added to V1:M1 to ensure lab is knowledgeable about requirements for corrective action PTs. Most labs will only be reading Volume 1.	<p><del>The edited V1M1 is not one of the volume/modules forwarded in Ilona's 3/27 email, nor is it one of the V/M's that Ken J. indicated that he's waiting to receive language for. This volume is needed in order to complete the review.</del></p> <p>V1:M1, Sec. 6 is not correct. Language indicating that "The lab shall notify the PT provider that the PT is for corrective action ..." as indicated in V2:M2 and V3 has not been added.</p>	Marvelyn Humphrey
16	V3 2	PT-18	Add missing reference.	<p><del>I did not see Volume 3 in the 3-27-09 e-mail that contained the list of modules from the CDSB. Need Volume 3 to complete review.</del></p>	Roger Kenton

	Reference	Reference to LASC Review	Editorial Change	Status of Change	LASC Assignment To Review Revision
				The reference to ASTM E178 Standard Practice for Dealing With Outlying Observations has been added to Volume 3 Section 2.0. This change is in response to PT-18 (item 16 in table).	
17	V4 4.3.2-b	PT-21	Include "assigned value" in listing.	Change was made.  V4, 4.3.2b checked on 6/4/09. Change made and re-numbered accordingly.	Terri Grimes
18	V 4 6.5.2	PT-23	Correct term. Should be "withdraw", not "revoke."	<del>I did not find any evidence that either item #13 nor item #18 was addressed. The reference I used was the 03/27/2009 email sent by Hona titled "Status of Editorial Changes and TIAs".</del>  Completed.	Lance Boynton



**UPDATE: PROPOSED POLICY/SOP/GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS**

	<b>Reference</b>	<b>Reference to LASC Review</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date</b>
1	V1:M4 1.6.3	QS-8	Guidance document needed to clarify need for on-going DOCs.	Prior to implementation of standard.
2	V2:M3 6.12.2 6.12.4	On-Site - 1	Guidance document needed to encourage ABs to communicate delays and new due dates.	Prior to implementation of standard.
3	V2:M2 7.3 c)	PT-9	Guidance document needs to be prepared to provide clarification to help with implementation.	Prior to implementation of standard.
4	V1:M1 V2:M1 V3	PT-2	Prepare guidance document for implementation of the change from PTRL to LOQ reporting.	Prior to implementation of standard.
5	V2:M1 7.7.3	AB-4	Policy needed to establish timelines.	Prior to implementation of standard.
6	V2:M1 7.7.1	AB-5	Policy or guidance document needs to be established to define "Surveillance on-site assessments".	Prior to implementation of standard.

**UPDATE: PROPOSED TENTATIVE INTERIM AMENDMENTS (See RoadMap table below.)**

	Reference	Reference to LASC Review	Proposal	Estimated Completion Date	Comments During 4/17/09 LASC Call
1	V3 10.3	PT-2	The PT committee will propose a TIA for V3. The language in section 10.3 needs to be revised to make the change implementable.	Prior to implementation of standard.	(TIA - #1) Need to see if there is any impact on this TIA based on the new TIA that is being prepared. Should wait to post TIA #1 until the new TIA is prepared.  All TIAs should be reviewed one last time for wording/grammatical issues prior to posting. There are some issues.
2	V1:M1 7.2	PT-3	A TIA is needed. The PT Expert Committee needs to reconsider “appeals process” language and rewrite this paragraph to be consistent with their intent.	Prior to implementation of standard.	(TIA - #2) Agree.
3	V2	PT-4, 7, 10, 12	The PT committee will propose TIA for V2 to make the language consistent with V1 (non-PTPA accredited PTs.)	Prior to implementation of standard.	(TIA - #3) LASC needs to review further for consistency.
4	V3 6.3.5 / 7.1.11/ 7.3.5/ 8.4.2/ 10.3/ 10.3.1.1	PT-16	The PT committee will propose a grammatical change or a tentative interim amendment to ensure V3 is consistent with V1 and implementable with the change from PTRL to LOQ reporting.	Prior to implementation of standard.	TIA is being worked on, but TIA has not been submitted yet. When this is completed, check for any conflicts with TIA - #1. There is a potential for some language conflict.
5	V3 8.4.2	PT-17	The exception for PCBs is no longer applicable. Additionally, the committee strongly believes that laboratories should not be required to specify which analytes a corrective action PT sample includes. To demonstrate proficiency, the laboratory must	Prior to implementation of standard.	(TIA – ??)  This has not been written into one of the TIAs that Ken forwarded. LASC is not aware that a TIA is in progress.

			be able to accurately quantify and identify target analytes when present and not report false positives. The committee believes the inclusion of the clause in 8.4.2 and 8.4.3 by which the laboratory must specify the analyte to be spiked into a corrective action PT should be removed.		
6	V3 10.3	PT-19	The PT committee will propose a grammatical change or a tentative interim amendment to ensure V3 is consistent with V1.	Prior to implementation of standard.	(TIA – 1 and the TIA that is still being prepared.)
7	V2:M1 4.3.5 5.7.3 b	AB-2	The AB committee has proposed 2 tentative interim amendments to address this issue.	Prior to implementation of standard.	<p>Dan said that NELAP Board agreed that this concern is no longer a concern. Recommends that this recommendation be eliminated. The NELAP Board had a conversation with Marlene Moore and agreed that a wording change is not needed, because the ISO language does not conflict with current AB practices.</p> <p>LASC discussed this on the 4/17/09 conference call and is in agreement with the NELAP Board for the reasons stated above.</p> <p>No TIA needed.</p>

**TENTATIVE INTERIM AMENDMENTS – Roadmap Prepared to Track TIAs In Progress (J Parr)**

	Reference		Recommendation	TIA Status
1	V3 10.3		This section, with respect to “<”, is not consistent with V1:M1 Section 5.2	TIA - #1
2	V1:M1 7.2		A TIA is needed. The PT Expert Committee needs to reconsider “appeals process” language and rewrite this paragraph to be consistent with their intent.	TIA - #2 Clause was removed.
3	V2		The PT committee will propose TIA for V2 to make the language consistent with V1 (non-PTPA accredited PTs.)	TIA - #3, Sections 5.1.2, 5.2.1, 7.3 TIA 4, 4.2.1 TIA 5, Section 6.1 All allow for non-approved providers
4	V3 6.3.5 / 7.1.11/ 7.3.5/ 8.4.2/ 10.3/ 10.3.1.1		PT sample reporting requirements may be difficult to implement. Issues with: - less than reporting, - tracking lowest calibrations. - reporting PT results to the lowest calibration standard for multi-point calibrations or the LOQ for single point calibrations (conflicts with V1:M4 1.7.1.1. (f).)  Inconsistent with V3 sections: 6.3.5 / 7.1.11/ 7.3.5/ 8.4.2/ 10.3.1.1. (PTRL language)	TIA - #1. Changes in section 10.3 as TIA. It appears PTRL still exists in Volume 3 for PT providers, but not labs. This appears acceptable.  <i>Yes, PTRL is only for PTP – not applicable to labs so there does not need to be any mention of PTRL in V1.</i>
5	V3 8.4.2		The exception for PCBs is no longer applicable. Additionally, the committee strongly believes that laboratories should not be required to specify which analytes a corrective action PT sample includes. To demonstrate proficiency, the laboratory must be able to accurately quantify and identify target analytes when present and not report false positives. The committee believes the inclusion of the clause in 8.4.2 and 8.4.3 by which the laboratory must specify the analyte to be	This has not been written into one of the TIAs. LASC is not aware that a TIA is in progress.  <i>A TIA is not in progress – the committee did not agree with the LASC regarding the PCB exception. We intentionally removed the PCB exception and have no intent to add it back. The clauses cited here may be removed in the next revision but we did not believe this change needs to be made now or is of emergency</i>

			spiked into a corrective action PT should be removed.	<i>nature. .</i>
6	V3 10.3		The PT committee will propose a grammatical change or a tentative interim amendment to ensure V3 is consistent with V1.	TIA – 1
7	V2:M1 4.3.5 5.7.3 b		The AB committee has proposed 2 tentative interim amendments to address this issue.	<p>Dan said that NELAP Board agreed that this concern is no longer a concern. Recommends that this recommendation be eliminated. The NELAP Board had a conversation with Marlene Moore and agreed that a wording change is not needed, because the ISO language does not conflict with current AB practices.</p> <p>LASC discussed this on the 4/17/09 conference call and is in agreement with the NELAP Board for the reasons stated above.</p> <p>No TIA needed.</p>
	V2M2 7.3		Scoring of PT results	<p>TIA 6 This came from NELAP Board discussions.</p> <p><i>The committee is aiming for June 9<sup>th</sup> to finalize and approve all of the TIA for our modules – however just this week I received a TIA comment from Dr. Kircher that the scoring requirements in Section 10.3 for V3 is in conflict with 40CFR Part 141 and this section must be removed from the standard in its entirety. If this language is removed, the change from PTRL to LOQ reporting cannot be implemented – in fact, Carl’s comment implies that this entire reporting scheme is in conflict with federal regulation- this is the first time in the entire standards development process that such a concern has been raised and if this concern is valid – we have a problem. The committee now needs to conduct research and determine if his concern is valid and this could cause delay in committee approval of at least 2 of the TIA.</i></p>