

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

MAY 20, 2016

The Committee met by teleconference on Friday, May 20, 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) | Absent |
| 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) | Absent |
| Judy Morgan, Pace (Lab) | Absent* |
| Joe Pardue P2S (Vice-Chair; Other) | Present |
| Donna Ruokenen, Microbac (Lab) | Absent* |
| Ken Jackson, Program Administrator | Present |

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

2 – Previous Minutes

It was moved by Fred and seconded by Scott to approve the minutes of April 29, 2016. All were in favor.

3 – Volume 3 and Volume 4

Voting on these Interim Standards closed on May 4, and Shawn presented the vote tallies, showing that both standards had easily passed. However, there were voters' comments to be considered. Some comments had been discussed during the previous call, and this was continued.

V3, 1.1. This was an editorial correction.

V3, 5.5.1. *“Do both subclauses (a) and (b) need to be met, or is either (a) or (b) okay? My opinion: Add the word “and” to the end on subclause (a), and add a period to the end of subclause (b).”*. Scott said “and” is understood and he did not support making the suggested change. The committee agreed, since this style is used throughout the TNI standard. This was an editorial decision.

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 was discussed during the previous call, and Ken had volunteered to draft a response. It was moved by Nicole and seconded by Fred to rule the comment Non-persuasive and to accept Ken's proposed response language.

V3, 5.9.2.8.1 *"It is unclear why numbering was removed. The paragraph next to this number seems to belong as a subsection of 5.9.2.8. Suggest merging this paragraph with the preceding paragraph under 5.9.2.8, for clarity."* The committee considered this a Non-Persuasive editorial comment. On Nicole's suggestion it was agreed to merge the two sentences into one paragraph.

V3, 5.9.1.2 *"The sentence as presented is awkward. It would be more clear to me if an extra "if" were inserted as follows: "If a multi-modal distribution is found related to analytical method and if acceptance criteria are calculated using robust statistical analysis of participant data, results shall be evaluated on a method-specific basis.""* The committee ruled this editorial comment Non-persuasive.

V3, 5.9.3.2.1/5.9.3.2.2 *"So, if the Assigned Value for a PT is <0.5 ug/L and the laboratory reports <5%, the result is scored acceptable? To correct for this possible problem, I would word clause 5.9.3.2.2(a) as follows: "the numeric value reported is greater than or equal to the PTRL, whether or not a less than (<) sign is included; or"."* Scott commented that any "<" value is acceptable as long as it is reported according to the PT Provider's instructions on units. It was suggested, for clause 5.9.3.2.2, the commenter should be referred to clause 5.9.3.3. Shawn said he would ask the commenter for clarification on his comment before the committee made a decision.

V3, 5.10.4.3 *"Several possible correction may be needed in this clause: - Make sure the section number is "5.10.4.3" - Not make the "technology ID" optional if the PT Program Executive Committee really wants to have method-specific FoPTs. - Add "Test method number" to the bulleted list (again, if the PT Program Executive Committee really wants to have method-specific FoPTs). - Add "sample preparation method ID or technology, if applicable and if available" (if the PT Program Executive Committee is really serious about FoPTs based on more than matrix-analyte, then the most disparities in PT results would show up in different sample preparation techniques rather than in analytical technologies)." Nicole remarked that technology id was made optional because not all PT Providers would be able to provide it. Mike said the standard only requires summary data, and PT Providers may not agree to provide individual data points to the PT Program Executive Committee (PTPEC). Shawn said the PTPEC had already discussed and said what they wanted. However, they would be meeting the next week, and Shawn and Nicole volunteered to again raise the issue with them.*

V3, General *“Please note that issues for the evaluation of radiochemistry samples should be added to issues to be addressed in the next revision.”* This request was duly noted. It was moved by Nicole and seconded by Fred to put this in the parking lot for the next revision. All were in favor.

4 – Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:20 pm EDT.