

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

NOVEMBER 7, 2014

The Committee met by teleconference on Friday, November 7, 2014, at 11:00 am EDT. Chair Shawn Kassner led the meeting.

1 – Roll call

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

Associate Committee Members present: Nicole Cairns, NYSDOH; Thekkekalathil Chandrasekhar, FLDEP; Shari Pfalmer, ESC; Brian Stringer, ERA

2 – Previous Minutes

It was moved by Scott and seconded by Fred to approve the minutes of October 24. All were in favor.

3 – V1M1 and V2M2 VDS Voters' Comments

Lisa presented her proposed action and response on the comments assigned to her.

Larry Penfold, V1M1 4.3.3. The commenter had requested clarification of the phrase “and criterion that identifies the laboratory for the Field of Accreditation for which the PT sample was analyzed”; i.e., if it referred to method codes and similar designations used by the ABs. This generated a protracted discussion, leading to Nicole’s suggestion of “The laboratory shall report results in such a way that there is a specific match between the analytical result for the FoPT and the corresponding Field of Accreditation for which the PT sample was analyzed.” It was moved by Scott and seconded by Rachel to rule the comment Persuasive and to accept Nicole’s language. All were in favor.

Aaren Alger, V2M2 4.2.3. Aaren argued that any AB is allowed to impose additional requirements on laboratories as their own state rules and regulations allow. Scott said it needed to be made clear this was limited to PTs that are in the standard, and he said the intent needed to be clarified. It was moved by Scott and seconded by Rachel to rule the comment Persuasive and to modify the language to read “The Secondary AB shall not impose additional proficiency testing requirements for FOPT’s covered by the Standard as a requisite for initial or continued NELAP accreditation.” All were in favor.

Maria Friedman, V2M2 4.2.3. The concern here was an apparent contradiction with **V1M1 4.1.7** (“When a regulatory program requires more stringent requirements than the requirements of this module, the laboratory shall follow the more stringent requirements.”). This led to a discussion of whether **V1M1 4.1.7** should be struck or modified. The committee was divided over whether accreditation that is not NELAP should be in the standard. Ken pointed out that **V1M1 4.1.7** cannot be taken out because no one commented on it during the voting process (i.e., it passed the voting). It was agreed, however, that it can be edited for clarity provided the sense is not changed. There was discussion, but not agreement on appropriate language, and Nicole reminded everyone that **V1M1 4.1.7** addresses all ABs while **V2M2 4.2.3** is for secondary ABs only. Shawn decided to table the issue, and asked conference call participants to think about appropriate language for discussion on the next call.

Patrick Brumfield, V2M2, 5.1.3. This is the section prohibiting a PT Provider from issuing QC samples specifically to help a laboratory pass a particular PT. There was general agreement that this clause has been in the standard for a long time, and has not generated questions or complaints in the past. It was proposed by Roger and seconded by Stacie to rule the comment Non-Persuasive with Lisa’s proposed language explaining the intent of the standard clause. All were in favor.

Steve wanted it made clear that this would not preclude a PT Provider from issuing QC samples to help a laboratory become proficient in a particular FoPT prior to the laboratory participating in a PT; i.e., as long as the QC samples are not linked to a specific PT sample.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 pm EDT.