TNI Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee
Meeting Summary
September 8, 2009

1. Roll call and Meeting Minutes:

   Co-Chair Carl Kircher called the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee to order on September 8, 2009, at 12pm EST. Attendance is recorded in Attachment A.

   Minutes from the August 25, 2009 meeting were previously reviewed. A motion was made by Eric to approve the minutes with the addition of "mean" where the term +/- standard deviation is used. The motion was seconded by Jeff. The minutes were unanimously approved and will be provided to the webmaster for posting.

   There was some confusion on the July 28, 2009 minutes. Not all subcommittee members received the minutes for review. These will be re-distributed to the entire group and approved at the September 22, 2009 meeting.

2. PT Acceptance Limit SOP

   There was some discussion to make sure everyone was working from the same document. Carl asked each of the individuals who sent e-mails regarding the SOP to provide their comments on this call.

   Comment E-mailed by Jeff:

   Subcommittee Members,

   The words "guidelines" and "guidance" are being taken out of the SOP with this revision. This puts other decisions we make as a subcommittee outside of the SOP even more visible. Lately, we've not followed the SOP when accepting fixed limits for many of our drinking water analytes. Perhaps we should suggest a change in the SOP such that we can follow it and make these sensible technical decisions. Also, I would think we as a subcommittee would like to look over studies with the number of data points below n=10 (Chloral hydrate comes to mind), when making decisions about accreditation analytes where we don't have enough data to satisfy the SOP. Perhaps something like "all the available data should be considered when making a technical judgment".

   These are just a few observations about the present SOP and our implementation of it.
   Jeff

   Comment E-mailed by Stephen:

   All,

Fixed limits around the traceable gravimetric value should be the goal if we are to be inline with ISO and IUPAC. Assigned values via study means are the least desirable as they are not traceable nor do they measure performance to national standards. Study means are for round robin samples and not performance tests. Round robin values are good for micros or where no chance of traceability exists. In chemistry, we can manufacture a gravimetric value and a resulting concentration (mass and volume. Next is to determine what is an acceptable range of performance that is based upon routine available technology (fit for use). Let's stick to chemistry and mathematics and leave the dodgy statistics for micros, rads, and other round robin samples.

Here is a link to the presentation I gave at NEMC in 2008 for performance methods/ performance tests. While it was standing room only, it was Monday and many of you had not arrived or had other engagements.
http://gallery.me.com/absolutestandards#100000

Dan and Carl also gave excellent presentations. Dan's was supportive of the ISO-IUPAC approach of traceability and fixed limits. While Car's was a solid review of the current sop. Do you have link's?
Both Dan and Carl are involived in the PT standards process for ISO and should now exactly what I mean. The rest of us who are not familiar with the text, should read the ISO documents.

Keep in mind that the NELAC-TNI is an ANSI approved program. ANSI looks for the adoption of ISO/IUPAC logic as part of approval process. Thus, our SOP, by default, must apply gravimetric/fixed limits for PT's. Round robin samples can go via study means.

Sincerely,

Stephen

Chuck added the following comments to Steve's message above via e-mail:

Thank you for your input regarding setting limits. I wanted to reassure you that I understand your belief that using study statistics to set limits for a PT study is inherently incorrect because the results from the participating laboratories should not be used to set limits used to evaluate their own data. But I think the point you are missing is as follows.

1. Acceptance limits, including fixed limits, should be based on data.

2. Once data have been gathered acceptance limits can be either a) fixed limits if the method performance is essentially identical across the concentration range or b) set using a regression equations if the method performance changes across the concentration range.

3. The purpose of the PT FoT Subcommittee is to complete steps 1 and 2.

4. Once we have made a recommendation on acceptance limits based on the data our recommendation is passed along to the policy makers. Whether to accept that recommendation or to modify it is a policy decision made by the program specifiers (i.e., the states, TNI PT Board, NELAP Board, EPA, etc....). In some cases specifiers made

decide that the data derived limits are tighter than what they need to implement their programs and in other cases they made decide the limits are too broad.

The Subcommittee is currently trying to decide how to best set limits now that another policy decision, to eliminate the experimental tables, has been made by the program specifiers. Until such time as we have sufficient data to derive limits do we set fixed limits based on professional judgment? Or do we use study by study statistics? Although neither option is without fault based on our experience study by study statistics provide better limits than arbitrary fixed limits .

Jeff was able to pull up the SOP on Share Plus to facilitate finalizing this SOP on this call.

Most of the discussion in reviewing this SOP centered on ensuring that the changes made at the last meeting were incorporated into the SOP and a continued discussion on the acceptability of using the mean +/- 2 or 3 standard deviations for determining limits for the experimental analytes.

Steve expressed some concern that some of the changes made to the SOP make these studies a round robin instead of a PT study.

Jeff made the changes needed in the SOP directly into the document in Share Plus. A motion was made by Eric to approve the Limit Update SOP as amended today. This was seconded by Steve. It was unanimously approved and will be forwarded to the PT Board for final approval and distribution to the Policy Committee and NELAP Board. Ilona will forward the SOP to the PT Board.

3. New Items

Eric sent a copy of the language he is proposing to send the NELAP Board via e-mail (confirmation of understanding to eliminate Experimental Tables, move those analytes to accreditation tables, and use of mean +/- 3 standard deviations as default until technical review can be performed). Please review this information and send your comments back to Eric before the PT Board meeting on 9-17-09. The PT Board will review the final language and then it will be forwarded to the NELAP Board.

4. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee will be September 22 2009, at 12PM EST.

Action Items are included in Attachment B and Attachment C includes a listing of reminders.

.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:34 PM EST. (Motion: Steve Second: Eric Unanimously approved.)

Attachment A

Participants
TNI
Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee

Members	Affiliation	Contact Information
Carl Kircher, Co-Chair **Present**	Florida DOH	904-791-1574 carl_kircher@doh.state.fl.us
Brian Boling, Co-Chai **Absent**	Oregon DEQ	Boling.Brian@deq.state.or.us
Amy Doupe **Present**	Lancaster Laboratories, Inc.	717-656-2300 x1812 aldoupe@lancasterlabs.com
Jeff Lowry **Present**	ERA	303-431-8454 jlowry@eraqc.com
Chuck Wibby **Present**	Wibby Environmental	303-940 -0033 cwibby@wibby.com
Eric Smith **Present**	TestAmerica	615-726-0177 x1238 eric.smith@testamericainc.com
Dan Tholen **Absent**	A2LA	231-929-1721 Tholen.dan@gmail.com
Stephen Arpie **Present**	Absolute Standards, Inc.	203-281-2917 stephenarpie@mac.com
Dan Dickinson **Present**	New York, DOH	518-485-5570 dmd15@health.state.ny.us
Stacey Fry **Absent**	E.S. BABCOCK & Sons, Inc.	951-653-3351 x238 sfry@babcocklabs.com
Jim **Absent**		mousejr@nu.com
Ilona Taunton, Program Administrator **Present**	TNI	828-712-9242 tauntoni@msn.com

Attachment B

Action Items – Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee

	Action Item	Who	Expected Completion	Actual Completion
13.	Prepare letter to ABs to find out their needs on analytes that may be under consideration for deletion. *(3/24/09 – It was determined that these tables are used by more than just ABs. This needs to be reconsidered.)*	TBD	TBD	
19.	Request the final revision of the SOP #4-001 Guidelines for Calculation of Acceptance Limits from the TNI PT Board.	Eric/Carl	5/5/09	Delayed due to exp PT tables.
22.	Prepare for upcoming meetings by reviewing evaluation files that Jeff will send every 2 weeks.	All	Ongoing	
25.	Carl will distribute an updated copy of the Limit Update SOP for final review. It will be discussed at the 9/8 meeting.	Carl	9/1/09	Completed
26.	Carl will distribute the list of potential problem analytes for the group to review and comment on. What should be removed from the table and a reason for why it should be removed. Ilona will compile any comments received.	Carl Ilona	9/22/09	No comments were received. Will postpone to next meeting.
27	Prepare communication to NELAP Board regarding potential changes to Limit Update SOP.	Eric	9/8/09	Draft language distributed.
28	Eric clarified that the PT Board wants +/- 3 standard deviations for WS for the experimental analytes being moved over to the accreditation tables. Jeff asked that this be put in writing to the subcommittee.	Eric	9/22/09	9/21/09
29	Distribute Final Limit Update SOP to PT Board.	Ilona	9/14/09	Complete

	Action Item	Who	Expected Completion	Actual Completion
30	Comment on Eric's draft language in the letter to the NELAP Board.	All	9/16/09	Complete

Attachment C

Backburner / Reminders – Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee

	Item	Meeting Reference	Comments
1	Review summary data to see if it supports a change in the acceptance criteria for DW analytes (For example, VOA, 30% instead of 20%). If data is supportive, Jeff Lowry will approach ELAB.	10-30-08	3/10/09 - Jeff has approached ELAB. They would be happy to put it in a work group – and pass it along with a letter to EPA. We need to provide them with the data.
3	Consider changing the lower limit for Vanadium on WP to 50 ug/L.	6-30-09	
4			
5			