

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

OCTOBER 5, 2012

The Committee met by teleconference on Friday, October 5, 2012, at 2:30 pm EDT.

1 – Previous Minutes

August 7: these minutes passed with 7 affirmative votes and 4 abstentions.

September 7: these minutes had not been voted on, and in the absence of a quorum Ken was asked to distribute them for electronic vote.

September 21: affirmative votes were received from Lisa, Judy, Roger, Mitzi, Scott, Joe, Kareen and Shawn. Ken was asked to distribute them for electronic vote by the remaining Committee Members.

2 – Vote on Motion of Sept. 7

During the September 7 call it had been moved to create a separate interest category for PT Providers. Ken reported that all 13 Committee members had now voted affirmative, so the motion passed.

3 - Discussion of Comments received on the Working Draft Standard

The following reviews were discussed. Mitzi said the completed comment forms will be discussed and agreement may be reached, but in the absence of a quorum there would be no vote. She would send them out later for voting. There was general agreement that the approach should be to address the comments and revise the WDS, but to then go through the revised WDS again.

Alger2. This had been reviewed by Roger, and the review was discussed in his absence. All agreed with Roger's recommendation that notes and standard should be updated as appropriate. It was noted the first specific comment, listed as V2M2: 5.3 should be V2M2: 5.2.3; it was agreed the note should be removed. Scott reported that the next comment (V2M2: 6.0) had been incorporated into his partial re-write of the standard. Comment V2M2: 7.0 had already been moved into the Complaints section of the WDS, so it was recommended to delete the note.

Regarding the comment on V1M1: 7.1 and V2M2: 8.1, Scott said both sections will go away if the 5-month criterion is removed (see the discussion on Westerman5 in the September 21 minutes). Kirstin pointed out it was there to say laboratories could run PTs more frequently than required by the standard, but agreed it can be struck since there is no longer a need for the laboratory to tell the PT provider they are supplemental PTs. However, she wanted to see what it would be replaced with before she could agree, because she could only agree on removal of the part referring to the 5-month requirement. Steve said laboratories should tell PT providers not to report "in-between"

studies to the ABs. Scott reminded everyone that this comment was only whether or not it should be a note, and it can be discussed later what to do with the standard. There was then general agreement to recommend acceptance of the comment and make the note go away.

On the final comment (V2M2: 6.0), it was suggested this was not intended to be a note, and the general sentiment is already in the Complaints section of the WDS.

Westerman13, Alger5, and Cairns17. These similar comments had been reviewed by Susan. Scott disagreed with Susan's comment that, if the Primary AB is keeping the national Database up to date, this should satisfy the notification to the secondary ABs of any accreditation status changes. He said secondary accreditations are not linked in the National database, and even if they were, it would be asking too much for ABs to keep checking every 2 weeks for changes. He added that revocations are not common and when they do occur, an AB will notify the other ABs. In response to a question, Mitzi said this would concern revocation of a single field of proficiency testing and not revocation of the laboratory. Scott pointed out that V2 requires laboratories to notify their ABs if accreditation has been revoked. Therefore, it was agreed this should not be in the PT section of the standard and Section 4.1.1 f can be removed.

Alger10. This had been reviewed by Nicole. The section numbering was corrected, since Nicole's listing of the revised 9.1 should be 9.2. In reference to Section 9.2.3, it was pointed out that the PTP gives a "performance evaluation", and the AB gives an "accreditation evaluation". Therefore, this section was further edited to make it clear the discussion is about accreditation decisions based on PT evaluations, and not on PT evaluations alone. Ken was asked to make these changes and circulate the amended form to everyone.

Alger11. This had been reviewed by Nicole. She re-iterated Aaron's concerns about giving ABs the right to overturn a score that was not scored per V3 without first contacting the PTP. In some cases, due to issues that arose with the PT sample itself, the V3 scoring does not make sense. It could actually be detrimental to the laboratories if the PTPs are forced to stick to V3, even when the PT has evidence that supports an alternate scoring is more appropriate. If the AB makes the decision to overturn an evaluation just because it doesn't fit V3, without first contacting the PTP and the PTP's PTPA to determine if appropriate scoring was in fact used, they will be unfairly penalizing the laboratory. Scott agreed an AB should not be able to change the PT provider's score. The PT provider should do it. Kirstin said this language is already in the Standard. It was added as a TIA in response to an ABs need to be given the immediate authority to overturn PT scores that were not scored per V3. The proposed language removes this provision for the AB. She spoke of a specific situation where that action had been necessary. Nicole will follow up with the PTEC, because this comment needs to be looked at again.

Alger 12. Kirstin had said the time-frames were discussed at length during standards development. It was decided by the committee that this review needs to occur within a

short time-frame. A 60 day allowance for review of PT reports means a laboratory can have 2 out of 3 failures for a FoPT for 60 or more days before any action is taken by the AB because the AB might not be aware of the PT failures. She said 15 days may be too short, but questioned if 60 days is too long. Nicole, in her review of this comment, believed a time-frame should be chosen that is reasonable for both the ABs and the laboratories. A compromise will have to be made, but whatever is decided it needs to be consistent with Section 7.0 on Assessment of Final Evaluation Reports. She acknowledged that a shorter time frame is desired in section 8.0 by the laboratories, because they want to have their accreditation re-instated quickly. Conversely, if section 7.0 is allowed to remain a longer period, then it might not be determined quickly that a laboratory has failed 2 of 3 PTs and so the lab would get to keep their accreditation longer until the AB completed their review. Kirstin added it was the original intent for all PT reports to be reviewed within 15 days. Shawn suggested allowing 45 days for the ABs, because that is the time the laboratories are given. However, Scott cautioned that could mean States having to change their rules.

4 – Next Steps

Mitzi reported she is working with the ABs on some of Aaron's comments, and she said Scott's edited comments would be discussed on the next call.

5 – Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 pm EDT. The next meeting will be October 19, 2012 at 11:00 am EDT.

TNI Proficiency Testing Committee			10/5/12
Committee Members 2012			
Member	Affiliation	Email	
Stephen Arpie	Absolute Standards, Inc.	stephenarpie@absolutestandar ds.com	X
Stacie Metzler	Hampton Roads Sanitation District	smetzler@hrsd.com	
Shawn Kassner	ERA-A Waters Company	skassner@era.gc.com	X
Scott Hoatson	Oregon DEQ	hoatson.scott@deq.state.or.us	X
Roger Kenton	Eastman Chemical Company	rogerk@eastman.com	
Mitzi Miller (Chair	Dade Moeller & Associates	mitzi.miller@moellerinc.com	X
Lisa Touet	Massachusetts DEP	lisa.touet@state.ma.us	
Kirstin Daigle (Past Chair)	TestAmerica, Inc.	Kirstin.daigle@testamericainc.com	X
Judy Morgan	Environmental Science Corp	Jmorgan@esclabsciences.com	
Jim Todaro	Alpha	j.todaro@comcast.net	
Rachel Ellis	New Jersey DEP	Rachel.ellis@dep.state.nj.us	
Joe Pardue	P2S - DOE Subcontractor	parduegjir@oro.doe.gov	X
Kareen Baker	Veolia Environnement (NYSE: VE)	kareen.baker@veoliawaterna.com	X
Associate non-voting members			
Bob O'Brien	Sigma-Aldrich	Bob.OBrien@sial.com	X
Carol Smith	SC DHEC	smithcf@dhec.sc.gov	X
Susan Butts	SC DHEC	buttsse@dhec.sc.gov	X
Nicole Cairns	NY	nlc02@health.state.ny.us	X
Jeff Lowry	Wibby	jlowry@wibby.com	
Keith Ward	Wibby	kward@wibby.com	
Aaron Alger	PA DEP	aaalger@pa.gov	
K. Black			
Ken Jackson	TNI Program Administrator	ken.jackson@nelac-institute.org	X