SUMMARY OF THE
TNI LABORATORY PROFICIENCY TESTING EXPERT COMMITTEE MEETING

APRIL 29, 2016

The Committee met by teleconference on Friday, April 29, 2016, at 11:00 am EDT. Chair Shawn Kassner led the meeting.

1 – Roll call

Fred Anderson, Advanced Analytical Solutions (Other)	Present
Nicole Cairns, NYSDOH (Other)	Present
Rachel Ellis, NJ DEP (AB)	Absent
Patrick Garrity, KYDOW (AB)	Present
Scott Hoatson, Oregon DEQ (AB)	Absent
Craig Huff, ERA (Other)	Present
Shawn Kassner, Neptune (Chair; Other)	Present
Stacie Metzler, Hampton Roads San. Distr. (Lab)	Absent
Mitzi Miller, Dade Moeller Assocs. (Other)	Absent
Tim Miller, Phenova (Other)	Present
Judy Morgan, Pace (Lab)	Present
Joe Pardue P2S (Vice-Chair; Other)	Present
Donna Ruokenen, Microbac (Lab)	Present
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Present

Associate Committee Members present: Mike Blades, ERA; Amy Blum, NY City DEP; Chandra Thekkekalathil Chandrasekhar, FLDEP; Audrey Cornell, ERA.

2 – Previous Minutes

It was moved by Fred and seconded by Craig to approve the minutes of April 1, 2016. All were in favor.

3 – Committee Charter

The revised charter was reviewed, with no further comments. It was moved by Fred and seconded by Judy to approve the 2016 charter. All were in favor.

Shawn noted there was room for two new members. Joe and Shawn would rotate off in 2016. Shawn suggested the committee should look at committee membership at the Summer meeting.

4 – Volume 3 and Volume 4

Voting on these Interim Standards would not close until May 4, but William had provided the comments received to date, so the committee could begin to consider them.

V3, 5.9.3.2.1. "*This section of the TNI NELAP PT Interim Standard is in conflict with NYS Rules and Regulations, specifically, Title 10, Subpart 55-2.8. We will not be able to implement it. The use of the term 'or' at the end of clause a) is in conflict with our regulation. If an 'and' is used, then it will be meet NYS Rules and Regulations for proficiency testing."* A similar comment had been

submitted on the Voting Draft Standard, and had been ruled Non-Persuasive. On discussion, Committee Members remained un-swayed to rule the comment Persuasive. Nicole added that changing this would raise a conflict with Volumes 1 and 2. However, it came from an Accreditation Body and might be a "show-stopper". Shawn volunteered to talk with the commenter.

V3, 3.22 and 5.6.1.4. *"The term defined in this section does not add anything that is not already covered in 3.20 other than "manufactured by PT Provider", which is not excluded in the definition of RM in 3.20. Suggest dropping term and definition. If removed, reference to ISO Guide 34 materials should also be dropped from 5.6.1.4."* Shawn commented this was added because PT Providers were creating their own reference materials. Tim said PT Providers can make their own reference materials, and Guide 30 provides that reference, so the Guide 34 definition is not required. Other PT Providers on the call agreed with Tim. Therefore, it was moved by Judy and seconded by Donna to remove the term and also drop it from Section 5.6.1.4. All were in favor.

V3, 5.4.3.4. *"An issue has arisen in the NELAP Accreditation Council regarding PCBs in supplemental PT samples. Currently, if the laboratory mis-identifies the Aroclor and quantitates the wrong PCB, the laboratory would pass 5 "non-detect" Aroclors and fail the other 2 Aroclors (the one that was not correctly identified and the one that was quantitated in error). As the Standards are worded now, the supplemental PT would have to contain the 2 failed PCBs in non-zero Assigned Values. While the quantitative effort is accommodated, the identification portion of the PT study effort is not imposed on the laboratory. Thus, one NELAP Accreditation Body is proposing that if a laboratory fails one of the 7 Aroclors in the PCB analyte group, the laboratory must participate in a supplemental PT for ALL SEVEN PCBs in that analyte group. The supplemental PT must contain only one randomly-selected PCB at a randomly-selected Assigned Value, and the laboratory will report and receive a PT grade for all 7 PCBs. The NELAP AB is proposing that >80% of the PCBs must be scored acceptable, for two out of three study attempts, for the laboratory to be accredited for all PCBs by the matrix and technology. The description for Analyte Group Supplemental PT in clause 5.4.3.3 does not seem to address this situation for the PCB analyte group. Does the PT Expert Committee have any comments on this proposal? Is this within the purview of the Consensus Standard Development process? Or is this issue better addressed by the PT Program Executive Committee with the FoPT Tables (i.e., the FoPT is based on the PCB analyte group instead of each Aroclor as an individual FoPT?)?".* This comment led to a protracted discussion. Donna felt the commenter made a good point, but she disagreed with the 80% rule, as did others. Judy said if the laboratory missed identifying an Aroclor, it should be able to prove it can do so. However, she questioned if there has been a problem with the way the scoring is done now; i.e., if there was significant risk. Judy added she thought the question was an over-analysis of something that has not become a problem. Shawn said he would draft a response for the committee to consider.

V3. General. *"My comment is directional in nature. Several International Standards Organization (ISO) documents are referenced in Volume 3. ISO requires that Normative standards refer to the most recent version, unless a specific dated version is required. To follow is the general ISO statement that precludes each Normative section in ISO Standards:*
"The following documents, in whole or in part, are normatively referenced in this document and are indispensable for its application. For dated references, only the edition cited applies. For undated references, the latest edition of the referenced document (including any amendments) applies."
Since ISO consistently applies the use of the 'most recent version', I strongly encourage the same be adopted by TNI. Whenever an ISO Standard is referenced in the TNI volume it should contain the ISO standard number, undated, for reference. Adding a statement at the beginning of the volume to

indicate only the most recent version of the ISO standard is acceptable would better serve TNI/ISO users. PT providers and laboratories that use ISO standards must use the most recent version. They are not allowed to use multiple or outdated versions of ISO standards. TNI would do well, and better serve laboratories, to universally adopt the ISO practice of using only referencing the most recent version of ISO standards as references." This comment had been made at the Voting Draft Standard stage and had been ruled Non-Persuasive. Ken said there would be a number of difficulties in doing this. First, there is a precedent throughout the standard to cite specific ISO standards. Second, he cited Volume 1 Module 2, in which ISO 17025:2005 is not only cited specifically, but is reproduced verbatim. Then there are supplemental TNI clauses to add more detailed requirements. If the ISO language was removed and just the most recent version was cited, many of those supplemental clauses might have to be changed to reflect changed requirements in ISO 17025. Finally, some Accreditation Bodies have to cite specific standards in their regulations and would not be permitted to just cite the most recent version. There was no further discussion, so Ken volunteered to draft a response to the comment for the committee to consider.

V4. 5.3.1. There was one comment on this section, but this could not be considered, because the section had passed at the Voting Draft Standard stage.

5 – Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 pm EDT.