

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

MAY 24, 2013

The Committee met by teleconference on Friday, May 24, 2013, at 11:00 am EST. Chair Mitzi Miller led the meeting.

1 – Roll call

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

Associate Committee Members present: Susan Butts, SC DHEC; Jeff Lowry, Phenova; Brian Stringer, ERA.

2 – Previous Minutes

In the attachment (SIR 181) to the May 10 minutes, Mitzi proposed modifying the response to :

The term “analysis date” is as defined in the Terms and Definitions. The 5 to 7 month window would be as is described above; using the above example, PTs must be analyzed between August 15, 2011 to October 15, 2011 for evaluation purposes.

Since there was no quorum, she said she would circulate the draft minutes, with the proposed amendment, for e-mail vote.

3 – SIR 184 (attached)

Mitzi explained the question was if it is considered to be a failed PT if the laboratory just failed to run it within the 5 – 7 month window. It was pointed out that the response is incorrect in stating accreditation will be revoked. “Revoked” should be changed to “suspended”, because failure to report results for 2 out of 3 PTs in the specified time-frame results in suspension for the affected analyte(s). Also, the section of the standard this should refer to is 10.1, not 10.3. (Section 10.3 means a laboratory’s accreditation is revoked if it does not participate in a PT program at all.)

Mitzi agreed to make the appropriate changes and send out to the committee for vote.

4 – SIR 193 (attached)

Mitzi agreed to add the response that preparation methods are not addressed in the PT standard, and send out to the committee for vote. However, Judy stressed this is a serious shortfall in the PT requirements, and it should be addressed in the future.

5 – Ground Rules for Communication

Mitzi said she would like to put some ground rules in place to facilitate discussion during conference calls. She planned to draft the rules and send them out to the members for comment.

6 – Next steps

Since everyone now had access to ISO 17034 and Guide 43, it would be discussed during the next call whether to move to them as the standard with TNI specific requirements added.

7 – Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:40 am EST. The next meeting was scheduled for June 7, 2013, at 11:00 am EDT.

Attachment

SIR #184

Standard	2009 TNI Standard
Volume and Module (eg. V1M2)	V1M1
Section (eg. C.4.1.7.4)	4.2.1
Describe the problem:	<p>NELAC 2003 2.7.2 says, "For continuing accreditation, completion dates of successive proficiency rounds for a given field of proficiency testing shall be approximately six months apart. Failure to meet the semiannual schedule is regarded as a failed study." TNI V1M1 4.2.1 says, "The analysis dates of successive PT samples for the same accreditation FOPT shall be at least five months apart and no longer than seven months apart unless the PT sample is being used for corrective action to establish successful history ..." There is no language to describe what happens after 7 months have passed. The sentence is missing from TNI that was in NELAC that directed or allowed the addition of a "failed study" when the semiannual requirement was not met.</p> <p>Is it the intent of the standard for ABs to continue treating a failure to meet the semiannual schedule as a failed study? This is a significant enforcement issue since a potential alternative seems to be in V2M2, 10.3: "The Primary AB shall revoke the accreditation of a laboratory for a FoPT when:(a) the laboratory does not participate in the PT program as required by this Standard." This penalty is too severe and problematic for what could be just a missed deadline.</p>
Comments	<p>The statement is included in V2M2 Section 7.3 part b. "7.3 The accrediting body shall consider the analytical result not acceptable when: b) The laboratory does not report results for an accredited FOPT within the time frames specified in this standard."</p>
Response	<p>If a laboratory fails to report a single proficiency testing result it is evaluated as not acceptable per V2M2 7.3 part b. If the laboratory fails to report results for 2 out of 3 proficiency testing study time frames, then the laboratory's accreditation shall be revoked per V2M2 10.3 for failing to participate in the timeframes specified in the standard. The laboratory's accreditation would only be revoked once they were evaluated as not acceptable for 2 out 3 study timeframes for failing to report results.</p>

SIR #193

Standard	2003 NELAC Standard
Volume and Module (eg. V1M2)	V1M1 4.0, V2M2 5.0
Section (eg. C.4.1.7.4)	2.4.1, 2.5, 2.7.2
Describe the problem:	Several laboratories in our program have asked for a clarification regarding the addition of preparatory methods to the scope of accreditation. So that our program is consistent with the other accreditation bodies, our question is "What are the proficiency testing requirements for the accreditation of preparatory methods?" Your assistance is greatly appreciated.
Comments	
Response	