

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

**JUNE 7, 2013**

The Committee met by teleconference on Friday, June 7, 2013, at 11:00 am EST. Shawn Kassner led the meeting.

**1 – Roll call**

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

Associate Committee Members present: Audrey Cornell, ERA; Bob O'Brien, Sigma-Aldrich; 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.*

With this change to the May 10 minutes, it was moved by Virgene and seconded by Scott to approve the May 10 and the May 24 minutes. All were in favor and the minutes were approved.

**3 – Volume 3 and ISO**

Shawn announced the topic of this meeting would be to discuss whether to use ISO 17043 (Conformity assessment — General requirements for proficiency testing), and ISO Guide 34 (General requirements for the competence of reference material providers) in Volume 3 of the standard (General Requirements for Environmental Proficiency Test Providers). He asked the committee to consider if these ISO documents should be incorporated or referenced, pointing out it would represent a major change to Volume 3. The following opinions were expressed.

Fred had no strong opinion at this time. Scott questioned what would be gained, because the providers would still have to be assessed to the NELAP part of the standard. He wondered which option would be better for consistency between providers. Jim had no real objection, though ISO incorporation might be confusing. Shawn asked the committee to note it could mean a big change in PT verification, since both ISO documents allow more flexibility, emphasizing that the product needs to be “fit for use”. He added, however, the present Volume 3 has some flexibility by not specifying how to meet the criteria. Lisa expressed concern over this and preferred TNI’s specific requirements for assessing homogeneity, stability and target verification. Bob and Kareen were both ambivalent at this time. Yumi said the TNI standard is more rigorous than ISO, so the providers should have to meet it, since the laboratories are already required to meet a more rigorous TNI accreditation standard. Stacie was strongly in favor of moving to ISO, saying it is tedious to inspect to the additional TNI requirement. She felt it was already complicated having two PTPAs, and would favor reciprocity with other organizations. Virgene questioned how this would compare with laboratories’ accreditation to the quality system requirements. They are not required to be accredited to ISO 17025, but TNI uses that as its basis for accreditation. If ISO is to be used in Volume 3, she would favor doing it in a similar way. Audrey pointed out that ISO Guide 34 states it is not meant to be used for accreditation, and TNI needs to retain its specific requirements. She would favor a standard analogous to the quality systems general requirements that incorporates ISO 17025 with TNI requirements added. Scott thought this might be complicated, because the two ISO documents would have to be merged together in the standard before adding the TNI requirements.

At the conclusion of this discussion, Shawn asked those present to now consider the following three options for Volume 3:

- (i) retain the volume as it is now, without any inclusion of ISO 17043 or Guide 34;
- (ii) incorporate the language of ISO 17043 and Guide 34 with TNI requirements added (analogous to the quality systems general requirements module that incorporates ISO 17025);
- (iii) require all providers to be accredited to ISO 17043 and Guide 34 (as they are now), and have a relatively small Volume 3 with just the additional TNI requirements for providers to also be accredited to.

In commenting on these options, Stacie favored option (iii), but felt some of the existing content of Volume 3 is not meaningful and should be removed. Brian wanted to discuss what would be dropped from Volume 3 before he would decide. Ken pointed out that option (i) would not allow the committee to incorporate any ISO requirements without the danger of copyright infringement (even if derivative language was used). He thought option (ii) would be too complicated in light of Scott's comment that both ISO 17043 and Guide 34 would have to be merged before adding the extra TNI requirements. Ken thought option (iii) should be preferred, and it should be TNI policy to use ISO standards whenever they are available and appropriate.

A straw poll was conducted with 2 people favoring option (i), 3 favoring option (ii), 4 favoring option (iii), and 2 people being undecided. (the remainder had left the call at this point).

Shawn said the three options would again be presented at the next meeting for a committee vote.

#### **4 – Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 pm EST. The next meeting was scheduled for June 21, 2013, at 11:00 am EDT.