

**SUMMARY OF THE  
TNI LABORATORY PROFICIENCY TESTING EXPERT COMMITTEE  
MEETING**

**FEBRUARY 1, 2013**

The Committee met by teleconference on Friday, February 1, 2013, at 11:00 am EST. Chair Mitzi Miller led the meeting.

**1 – Roll call**

Fred Anderson, Advanced Analytical Solutions (Other)	Present
Stephen Arpie, Absolute Standards (Other)	Present
Kareen Baker, Veolia Water N. American (Other)	Present
Yumi Creason, PA DEP (AB)	Absent
Rachel Ellis, NJ DEP (AB)	Present
Scott Hoatson, Oregon DEQ (AB)	Present
Shawn Kassner, Phenova (Other)	Present
Roger Kenton, Eastman Chemical Co. (Lab)	Absent
Stacie Metzler, Hampton Roads San. Distr. (Lab)	Present
Mitzi Miller, Dade Moeller Assocs. (Chair; Other)	Present
Judy Morgan, Env. Science Corp. (Lab)	Present
Virgene Mulligan, Amrad (Lab)	Present
Joe Pardue, P2S (Other)	Present
Jim Todaro, Alpha Analytical (Lab)	Absent
Lisa Touet, MA DEP (AB)	Present
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Present

Associate Committee Members present: Susan Butts, SC DHEC; Audrey Cornell, ERA; Bob O'Brien, Sigma-Aldrich; Brian Stringer, ERA.

**2 – Previous Minutes**

It was moved by Fred and seconded by Shawn to approve the minutes of January 15, 2013. All Committee members were in favor.

**3 – Consideration of Comments on the WDS**

**Group14**

Stacie presented her recommendations on the disposition of the comments in this group. She recommended **Cairns41** to be persuasive, and it has already been remedied in the revised draft standard. She will edit the response form by copying and pasting the new wording from the standard. Stacie will then send it to Mitzi (copied to Ken). **Cairns43** and **Cairns44** were recommended to be persuasive. Brian suggested replacing the last word “samples” with “studies”. Stacie recommended **Cairns45** to be persuasive. In

**Cairns46**, the commenter had suggested changing reference to opening date to closing date. This was persuasive, since the new draft standard uses closing date.

It was moved by Judy and seconded by Joe to accept the above recommendations on Cairns41, Cairns43, Cairns44, Cairns45, and Cairns46. All were in favor and the motion passed.

#### **Group 4**

Comment **Alger4** had previously been addressed by Kirstin Daigle. Scott suggested Kirstin's responses to V1M1 1.3.2 and V1M2 1.3.2 should be accepted (persuasive). He said V1M1 5.1.1 b is persuasive and has now been addressed in Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.4. Scott will cut and paste that language on to the response form. The language in V1M1 7.1 has now been removed from the standard, so this comment is persuasive.

Comment **Alger8** concerned definitions. It was agreed the comment should stand that TNI needs to produce a global set of definitions. Scott made recommendations on the comments on the following sections:

Section 3.2 - persuasive, since the committee already decided to remove the word "accreditation" in this case.

Section 3.3 - non-persuasive, since this is a definition carried over from NELAC.

Section 3.4 - non-persuasive.

Section 3.7 – non-persuasive.

Section 3.16 – non-persuasive, since they are redefined under "Study".

Section 3.17 – non-persuasive.

Section 3.18 – non-persuasive.

Section V2M2 3.19 – non-persuasive.

Section V1M1 3.19 and Section V2M2 Section 3.20 – persuasive, since it was previously agreed to refer readers to the website for committee names/definitions (see discussion on Group 17 in the January 15 minutes).

It was recommended that **Wyatt2** is persuasive.

There was a long discussion on **Wyatt6**, which asked for a justification of each item's change in order to satisfy a state's requirement that all changes must result in an improvement in the standard. It was generally agreed this could be an insurmountable task if implemented throughout the standard, and it was questioned if it had been required in other volumes and modules. The committee decided to leave this comment pending until Mitzi had referred the matter back to the CSD Executive Committee.

It was recommended **Westerman5** is persuasive, since the 5-month rule has been removed. This is now addressed in Section 4.3.6 b of the re-drafted standard. However, it was agreed this issue is not yet resolved and the comment would remain pending until the committee had considered it further.

It was moved by Scott and seconded by Shawn to accept the above recommendations on Alger4, Alger8, and Wyatt2. All were in favor and the motion passed.

### **Group 5**

It was agreed that **Alger5, Westerman13, and Cairns17** (all similar comments) are persuasive. There was a suggestion that the QS General Requirements module in V1 should require a laboratory to notify its secondary ABs if its accreditation is revoked. However, it was pointed out the NELAP ABs already require this of laboratories, and since it is a NELAP-specific requirement it does not belong in the standard. These comments will remain pending until Ken has edited the response. The committee will then vote on them during the next conference call.

### **Group 8**

It was proposed **Alger10** is persuasive. Ken will insert the new text from V2M2 5.1 that addresses this issue. It was also proposed **Alger11** is persuasive, since the note has been removed from the standard. Ken will amend the response form. **Alger12** was ruled persuasive. The criterion has been changed to 60 days in the new Section 4.1.2.

It was moved by Fred and seconded by Judy to approve Alger10, Alger11, and Alger12. All were in favor and the motion passed.

### **4 – Next Steps**

Scott, Judy and Shawn will work through the re-written standard to assure all agreed changes have been made, and to perform QA on the document.

All committee members were asked to make comments on V3.

Mitzi will ask Randy Querry, Matt Sica, and Doug Leonard to work on a subcommittee for V4.

### **5 – Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 pm EST. The next meeting will be February 15, 2013.