

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

MARCH 2, 2018

The Committee met by teleconference on Friday, March 2, 2018, at 11:00 am EST. Chair Nicole Cairns led the meeting.

1 – Roll call

Fred Anderson, Advanced Analytical Solutions (PT Provider)	Present
Jim Brownfield, ESC (Laboratory)	Present
Nicole Cairns, NYSDOH (Chair; Laboratory)	Present
Rachel Ellis, NJ DEP (AB)	Present
Patrick Garrity, KYDOW (AB)	Absent
Craig Huff, ERA (PT Provider)	Present
Susan Jackson, SC DHEC (AB)	Present
Tim Miller, Phenova (PT Provider)	Absent
Reggie Morgan, Hampton Roads San. Distr. (Lab)	Present
Donna Ruokonen, Microbac (Lab)	Absent
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Absent

Associate Committee Members present: Thekkekalathil Chandrasekhar, FLDEP; Audrey Cornell, ERA; Stacie Crandall, Hampton Roads San. Distr.; Amanda Grande, Phenova.

2 – Previous Minutes

It was moved by Jim and seconded by Fred to approve the minutes of February 16, 2018. All were in favor and the minutes were approved.

3 – Proposal for Developing Guidance

The committee had been asked to develop guidance on Proficiency Testing Reporting Limit (PTRL) to be used with the 2016 standard. The first task was to complete a form to justify the proposed policy, and the committee considered a draft of this form that had been completed by Jim. The following language was developed for the section in the form on the purpose: “The proposed guidance is intended to provide guidance to laboratories in regard to PT reporting limits and the PT scoring rules of the 2016 standard to clarify and minimize confusion as laboratories transition to the new standard. This guidance document will also inform laboratories of the actions they can take if a PTRL is below the laboratory’s routine LOQ”. It was moved by Fred and seconded by Craig to approve the form as revised. All were in favor. Nicole asked Jim to finalize the form and submit it to the Policy Committee.

4 – 2016 vs 2009 Standard Comparison

The committee had been requested to provide a comparison and explanation of why the 2016 standard was better than the 2009 standard. Nicole said the request had asked for 250 words or less, but this was not possible. She shared the document that she and Craig had put together. There was some discussion whether to pare it down, but it was decided to not do so. The committee worked

through the document and a few editorial changes were agreed. It was then moved by Fred and seconded by Craig to accept the amended document. All were in favor.

5 – Standard Interpretation Request PT Summary

This was presented in a spreadsheet document. Nicole had assigned the list of 19 Standard Interpretation Requests (SIR) among the committee members. The task was to go through all SIRs and evaluate whether they were incorporated into the 2016 standard, and whether they were still relevant to the 2003, 2009 or 2016 standards. The spreadsheet had a column for each of the standards, referencing the applicable clause(s). Nicole asked the committee members to check if the clauses were correct, update if necessary, check if they were applicable to each standard, and whether they were addressed in the 2016 standard. She asked the committee members to return the completed spreadsheets to her.

6 – Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:05 pm EST.