TNI PT Program Executive Committee
Meeting Summary

April 19, 2018

1. Roll call, approval of minutes and overview:

    Chair, Maria Friedman, called the TNI PT Program Executive Committee (PTPEC) meeting to order by teleconference on April 19, 2018, at 11am Eastern. Attendance is recorded in Attachment A – there were 8 members present. Associate members present: Jennifer Best, Susan Jackson, Jason Poore and Shawn Kassner. Guests from NELAP AC: Cathy Westerman, Aaren Alger and Michele Potter.

    The meeting minutes from the March meeting were reviewed. A motion was made by Andy to approve the March 15, 2018 minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Gil and unanimously approved.

    Maria confirmed that everyone received the agenda and handouts she sent on April 17, 2018.

2. Footnote 2 (PCB Qualitative ID) in NPW and SCM FoPT Tables

    Aaren, Cathy, and Michele joined the call to discuss the new PCB Qualitative ID footnote on the NPW and SCM FoPT tables. Michele commented that the revision information Maria sent by email does address Michele's concerns, but the NELAP AC still had some concerns when they reviewed it. They would like to see cleaner language to help with implementation. Michele noted alternative language was sent to Maria, but Maria stated she had not received it. It will be resent.

    The main concerns at present are:

    1. When only 1 PCB is spiked and a lab fails to identify it they would have 1 miss. Then the next time a different PCB is spiked and if the lab fails again, they would not lose accreditation with two failures because they are different PCBs. The NELAP AB would like to see this PT looked at as a group instead of 1 PCB. If there is a failure, it would be a failure for all PCBs. They want to be sure all labs are treated equally and all States implement this the same.

    2. The NELAP AC had a problem with the word "should" in the language.

3. Need a Total PCBs PT? Maria thought this would require a change to the PT Expert Standard because there needs to be a change to scoring requirements.

Andy noted that he liked Aaren's language from Pennsylvania. Her state requires that FoPT tables be published that establish what PTs need to be run by Pennsylvania labs. They are virtually identical to what TNI posts, but they did add the footnote about failing all PCBs when one is failed.

Maria will forward the proposed language to the committee when she receives it and it will be further discussed by email and at the next PTPEC meeting.

3. MPN ARA

Maria forwarded an updated FoPT table based on the Microbiology FoPT Subcommittees recommendation regarding MPN. She noted that she is still working with Dan Hickman on method codes and this still needs to be updated. Separate analyte codes are needed for MPN by Multiple Well or MPN by Multiple Tube. There is now one analyte code but it does not specify the technique. The FoPT table change log has not been prepared yet.

Jennifer Best noted that the wastewater table also needs to be updated. The same changes need to be made as presented in the drinking water table, except the wastewater table should also be modified for Fecal Coliforms. You can use the Quanti-Tray for Fecal Coliforms in Wastewater. You can use either multiple tube or well on Wastewater, but not Drinking Water. The Fecal Coliform on the Wastewater table needs to have both multiple tube and multiple well added.

Maria will make the updates and send them to Jennifer for review before she sends the updated tables to the Committee members. Maria will also meet with Dan Hickman to insert the appropriate method codes. Dan is on vacation, but she will meet with him when he gets back.

The subcommittee's conclusion to the ARA was that there is a difference between the multiple well and the multiple tube methods. The results for people using the multiple tube approach were slightly lower. The data supported the change to the tables and the recommendation was sent to Maria (Attachment D).

4. Combined Evaluation SOP (SOP 7-101)

Ilona forwarded the comments from the Policy Committee on the Combined Evaluation SOP. Maria shared the document on Webex and noted that the red text includes additional comments made by Ilona (Attachment E). The Committee reviewed the comments and there were no concerns expressed. Shawn noted that he will be getting together with Stacie and Ilona to make the updates to the Combined Evaluation SOP now that both Expert Committees have reviewed the suggestions.

5. Complaint #27 – DDT to DDD

   The Complaint Subcommittee provided two recommendations during the last meeting. There was agreement with the first recommendation that the PTPEC cannot change the result of a PT evaluation. The complainant needs to discuss this with their AB. The second recommendation dealt with spiking degradation products in PTs. The subcommittee recommended that analytes designated as chromatography degradation products always be spiked in PT samples that include them for PT evaluation/scoring.

   Andy reviewed the subcommittee's recommendation and responded to questions. He also commented that degradation products are going to be in real world samples and feels a footnote should be added to the FoPT tables. Susan also noted there was a significant difference in failure rates when the degradation products were not spiked.

   The Committee discussed possible ways to handle this recommendation and decided that it needs more input before a decision can be made. Maria will plan to meet with the PT Providers and PTPAs to discuss the data and results found by the Complaint Subcommittee. She will plan to discuss the option of requiring spiking of degradation products as noted above and ask for their feedback.

   Maria will respond to the complainant with the conclusion of the first recommendation and let him know the PTPEC is continuing to research PT design as a solution to deal with failure rates. She will prepare a DRAFT response and share it with the committee by email.

   This agenda item will be further discussed in June.

6. Subcommittee Updates

   Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee – There is no report. The subcommittee is waiting for results from Bob Shannon and Keith McCroan so it can be determined whether the calculations for Radiochemistry FoPTs need to be updated. They expect to see something in June.

   SOP Subcommittee – The subcommittee has nothing new to report. The subcommittee will be meeting next week.

   FoPT Table Format Subcommittee – The tables have been completed and they are being voted on by the subcommittee. The PTPEC will have the tables to review during their next meeting.

   Microbiology FoPT Subcommittee – See information in MPN ARA report above (Item #3).

7. New Business.

    - None.

8. Action Items

    The action items can be found in Attachment B. The action items were reviewed during the meeting and updates have been placed into the table.

9. Next Meeting

    The next meeting will be on 5/17/18 at 1pm Eastern by teleconference.

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

    Maria adjourned the meeting at 12:10 Eastern.   (Motion: Fred   Second: Jennifer Duhon Unanimously approved.)

Attachment A

Participants
TNI
Proficiency Testing Program Executive Committee

Members	Rep	Affiliation	Contact Information
Maria Friedman (2020) (Chair) **Present**	AB	California Water Board	Maria.Friedman@waterboards.ca.gov
Dixie Marlin (2018*) (Vice-Chair) **Absent**	Other	Marlin Quality Management, LLC	marlinquality@gmail.com
Ilona Taunton, Program Administrator **Absent – Call Recorded**		TNI	tauntoni@msn.com
Eric Smith (2019) **Absent**	Lab	ALS Environmental	eric.smith@alsglobal.com
Carl Kircher (2021*) **Absent**	AB	Florida Department of Health	Carl.Kircher@flhealth.gov
Andy Valkenburg (2021*) **Present**	LAB	Energy Laboratories	avalkenburg@energylab.com
Jennifer Duhon (2019*) **Present**	Other	Millipore Sigma	jennifer.duhon@sial.com
Matt Sica (2020) **Absent**	AB	ANAB, ANSI-ASQ National Accreditation Board	msica@anab.org
Gil Dichter (2018*) **Present**	Other	IDEXX Water	gil-dichter@idexx.com
Patrick Garrity (2019*) **Present**	AB	Kentucky DEP	patrick.garrity@ky.gov
Michella Karapondo (2019*) **Present**	Other	USEPA	karapondo.michella@epa.gov
Fred Anderson (2020*) **Present (Joined 1:30p)**	Other	Advanced Analytical Solutions, LLC	Fred@advancedqc.com
Jennifer Mullins (2020*) **Present**	Lab	Upper Occoquan Service Authority	jennifer.mulllins@uosa.org
Scott Haas (2020*) **Absent**	FSMO	Environmental Testing, Inc.	shaas@etilab.com

Attachment B

Action Items – TNI PT Executive Committee

	Action Item	Who	Date Added	Expected Completion	Actual Completion
295	Moved from Backburner: PTPA Evaluation Checklist needs to be updated prior to next round of evaluations. (Originally discussed 8/6/13)	Shawn Ilona		New Date: 3/31/18	In Progress (will use 2009 TNI Standards and current SSAS Standards)
349	Review LAMS/FoPT Table Differences document. Provide comments by email and next meeting.	ALL	4/20/17	4/25/17 2/28/18 – For WET? June 2018 for all tables.	In Progress WET is still being reviewed. Update 1/23/18: Subcommittee expects to have updated FoPT tables with CAS #'s and LAMS changes by 3/15/18. 2/22/19: Still in progress.
352	Moved from Backburner (originally discussed 2/20/14) : When new limits are established for the FoPTs, what is considered to be a statistically significant change to the old rates? At what point is it appropriate to question new limits? This lends to the TSS discussion a few months ago. Patrick commented that it would make sense to look at changes to pass/fail rates 6 months after new limits are effective. This possible	All	2/20/14	TBD ~~(see #350)~~ ~~350: Prepare formal request to SOP Subcommittee regarding updating FoPT tables and applicable backburner items just moved to the Action Items table (#352, 353)~~	In Progress – Update of SOP 4-101

	Action Item	Who	Date Added	Expected Completion	Actual Completion
	addition to procedures should be evaluated when updating the limit acceptance SOP.				
353	Discuss possible procedural changes to how limits are updated. Maria talk to SOP Subcommittee. (Need to look at PT database implications.)	All		TBD	In Progress – Update of SOP 4-101
358	Send request to SOP subcommittee to consider what happens when ARA's are rescinded. There is no formal process.	Maria	6-29-17	7/19/17	Maria will resend to Gil and this item will be closed. 3/15/18: Still in progress.
361	Analyte Code changes needed in LAMS. (TKN)	Maria Dan Hickman	7/20/17	9/30/17	Still need to look into TKN issue. 2/22/18 – Maria will confirm.
363	Discuss procedural change in how changes are made to LAMS. Consider notifying PTPEC before relevant changes are made and provide a summary of changes at some frequency.			1/31/17	Will talk to IT about getting this in an SOP. 12/21/17: Maria will follow-up on this. 3/20/18: Maria will check this week.
368	Forward Jerry's question to Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee. (Analyte code change for the non-polar extractable materials.)	Maria	8/24/17	9/1/17	Maria will resend to Carl.
373	Carl will notify the PTPEC when Bob and Keith complete their comparison table to the Radiochemistry FoPT work the Chemistry	Carl	12-21-17	3-31-18	

	Action Item	Who	Date Added	Expected Completion	Actual Completion
	FoPT Subcommittee has already prepared.				
381	Complete vote on deletion of SOP 4-104 by email.	Ilona	3/15/18	4/18/18	
382	Forward Sean Jenkins email to the NELAP AC (Aaren Alger and Lynn Bradley).	Maria	3/15/18	4/18/18	
383	Forward NELAP AC proposed language for PCB footnote.	Maria	4/19/18	5/15/18	
384	Meet with Dan Hickman to get Method Codes and then prepare final DRAFT of Micro DW and WW tables. Send to Jennifer for review.	Maria	4/19/18	5/15/18	
385	Send Micro DW and WW tables to PTPEC for review and vote at next meeting.	Maria	4/19/18	5/15/18	
386	Prepare DRAFT letter to Complaint #27 and send to PTPEC for review. Send final to Complainant.	Maria	4/19/18	5/15/18	
387	Meet with PT Providers and PTPAs to discuss degration product issue.	Maria	4/19/18	5/15/18	

Attachment C

Backburner / Reminders – TNI PT Executive Committee

	Item	Meeting Reference	Comments
7	Add the Field PT Subcommittee to the limit update SOP during its next update.	3/4/10	In Progress
11	Evaluate how labs are accredited for analytes that co-elute.	5-19-11	
13	Charter needs to be updated in November.	Ongoing 2017	
18	Shawn noted that PTPEC should have some specific measurements. This should be passed along to the PTP SOP Subcommittee. Nicole noted that we need to determine which items to measure.	6-29-17	

RE: PTPEC micro subcommittee

Best, Jennifer <Best.Jennifer@epa.gov> Tue, Apr 3, 2018 at 12:20 PM To: Maria Friedman <qamfriedman@gmail.com>☐Cc: Ilona Taunton <ilona.taunton@nelac-institute.org>

Hi Maria,

The Micro Expert Committee met via teleconference on 2/14/18 to discuss the PTP data received and analyses performed by EPA statisticians under the ARA submitted by EPA on. The subcommittee voted and agreed to recommend to the PTPEC that the change to FoPT as requested in the ARA be implemented.

The micro subcommittee recommends that the PT Program Executive Committee approve the FoPT Tables as presented and forward them to the NELAP Accreditation Council for ratification in the NELAP Program.

With this recommendation, the concerns expressed in the ARA submitted by EPA would be adequately addressed.

Thanks, Jennifer Best

Chair☐Microbiology Subcommittee to the PTPEC

Attachment E.

**Policy Committee Review of Combined PTPEC and NEFAP Evaluation SOP 7-101
Completed March 2, 2019**

Several revisions were made to this document during the review process, which took four meetings. Please consider these comments and submit the revised version for final approval at your earliest convenience.

Review began with a "provisional" SOP, approved by both executive committees. There was confusion about the group referred to as TNRC in this SOP, since the SOP is referring to a different group than The Non-governmental AB Recognition Committee that was appointed by the TNI Board of Directors to manage the recognition of NGABs to accredit labs to the NELAP standard. After conference, Ilona provided a revised version where "technical edits" were made to replace TNRC with RC (recognition committee), and review continued with this document, even though it had not been reviewed by the full executive committees. (Executive Committee Chairs agreed they were editorial changes and did not require further review – IT)

Then, in reviewing the language describing where the actual decision about granting recognition, the document seemed to defer the complete recognition decision to the RC, while the TELAP scheme adopted by the TNI Board (March 8, 2017) indicated that the RC would make a recommendation and the executive committees would grant the recognition. Informally, Ilona went back to the drafting group and provided some draft language for sections 6.11 and 6.12, seeking to clarify the processes to be used by PTPEC and NEFAP. This draft language was reviewed in place of the language in the provisional version of the SOP, so that the draft language can be revised to address any comments and inserted in the document along with other requested revisions, when the final version is presented to the two executive committees for approval. If the executive committees have questions about which version of the document was reviewed for which comments, please contact Lynn Bradley for clarification. (This was the DRAFT language each Executive Committee reviewed and had the opportunity to comment on. There were no negative comments, so the language was shared with the Policy Committee and will be inserted in the updated version of the SOP that will be sent back to Policy after both Executive Committees have voted on the revisions. - IT)

Policy Committee was also concerned about the planned continued existence of individual program evaluation SOPs, since it would seem that as much detail as possible should be incorporated into the combination SOP, even if additional procedural information were needed for especially complicated outcomes for a specific program. (Each of the Executive Committees has now decided to retire their original evaluation SOPs and just use SOP 7-101. - IT)

The following comments are offered by Policy Committee for consideration by PTPEC and NEFAP's Executive Committee:

Title – suggest rewording to reflect "TNI AB Evaluation Procedure used by …"
§1 – define AB in either §1 or 2, or else refer to §4 in §1
§2 – after an extended discussion of the AB recognition scheme adopted by the Board in February 2017, it's not clear that the role of TNRC in this SOP is consistent with that scheme. Ilona and Jerry should explore this further and the SOP should be adapted, if necessary (adapted through editorial changes.)
§3 – spell out FSMO, add SOP 1-104, and decide whether ISO 17011 is a related document or a reference. Also add documents mentioned anywhere later in the SOP
§4 – spell out ISO/IEC, ILAC, and consider whether APLAC should be added. Ensure consistency with TNI glossary, probably refer to it depending on when the glossary is initially published
§5.1.7.1 – change NELAC to TNI, replace "bios" with full word, biographies

§5.2 – delete reference to volunteer lead evaluators. If necessary, an exception can be made (with appropriate approvals) but the SOP is based upon a TNI staff person being the lead

§5.2.2.1 – delete the word "documentation"

§5.2.2.9 – specify to whom this reporting is done, and describe what a "consistency problem" is intended to mean

§5.3.3.10 – add something like "when activities are underway" so that reporting need not be done when no evaluations are taking place

§5.4.1 – the phrase "formulates the TNRC" is problematic, since under currently approved process, the TNRC is appointed by the TNI Board of Directors. This is part of what needs to be clarified in the exploration mentioned in §2, above (after further conversation it was clarified that this SOP is not the final procedure that will include NELAP, NEFAP and PTP. The TNI Board will appoint the TNRC, but the PTP and NEFAP will appoint the Recognition Committee (RC). – IT)

§5.3.10 – fix typo in spelling of "activities"

§5.4.1 – delete the second sentence if only one SOP is going to exist

§5.5 – make "interest" plural

§5.5.1.2 – participants questioned the rationale for excluding recognized PTPEC/NEFAP ABs from the Recognition Committee. Apparently, this is a "business conflict" for the ABs in their TNI activities, even though similar circumstances are acceptable in ILAC, where strong ABs provide technical assistance to ABs needing additional assistance to attain recognition. Participants noted that, when this combination SOP is eventually expanded to encompass recognition to accredit to the NELAP standard, that exclusion may not hold

§5.5.1.9 – clean up references to other evaluation SOPs

§5.5.1.9.2 – this section raised concerns, as its wording indicates that the Recognition Committee votes on the actual recognition of an AB rather than creating and approving a recommendation to each of the executive committees, per the procedure approved by TNI's Board of Directors (Board minutes of March 8, 2017 – the recognition committee will be "responsible for conducting evaluations for the NGAB recognition to accredit to the NELAP standard, as well as for PT Provider Accreditors and NEFAP ABs, making recommendations to the program executive committees (LASEC, PTPEC and NEFAP). For all recognition activities other than NELAP, the relevant executive committee will make the final decision and grant the recognition.") Ilona indicated that NEFAP does not think that it can follow that process, and that the only reason for NEFAP's Executive Committee to reject the Recognition Committee's decision on recognition of an AB would be for failure to follow the documented process (This is where the new language reviewed in the Executive Committees is relevant. This is now more clearly defined and the Executive Committees endorse the recommendation. – IT)

§6.2.3 and 6.2.4 (and other places, as well) – consider making this "business days" instead of "calendar days"

§6.3, 6.4 and 6.5 – clarify which items are needed for the evaluation whether or not the ET physically visits the site, and which only apply if an actual physical visit is warranted

§6.4.2.1 – clarify that "technical staff" includes both contract and employee assessors

§6.5.3 thru 6.9 – clarify/specify which report is due after the "site evaluation" versus the witness/observation, and when the timing (countdown) for completion of report and its delivery starts. Consider whether a flow chart or timeline might be helpful (Consider something like what Doug Leonard drafted (a flowchart). We decided back then that it would go on the website instead of the SOP and we could do the same thing now. – IT)

§6.6.1 – clarify that the evaluation team is not to talk with the assessor during the witness/observation (unless the assessor is the AB-employed staff designated as contact point)

§6.6.3 – the possibility of more than one witness/observation is discussed, but how that determination is made is not documented in this SOP. Do all parties find that acceptable?

§6.7 – include the application and technical checklist as "related documents"

§6.9.2 – since two reports are being prepared and delivered, is the AB allowed to respond to the site evaluation report, or must all corrective actions be addressed in the final report? Also, specify in this section that "receipt of the report" refers to the post-witness report, if that is the case

§6.10 – a comment about the short turnaround times for the evaluation team showed that the AB will likely have had most findings available to them from the draft report after the "site evaluation"

but that the final report and corrective action submissions take place after the observation (witness of an assessment) is completed. Please determine whether this is what was intended

§6.10.1 -- the phrase "and evidence of correction" should be inserted after "proposed corrective actions." Ilona explained that all corrective actions are to be completed, not just planned, before recognition or renewal is granted. This is consistent with NELAP but not with ISO and ILAC procedures, which only require a plan for correction to be provided

§6.10.4.7 – it's unclear why the requirement for a copy of the ISO recognition documentation is included; consider removing this requirement

§6.10.4.8 – Ilona stated this will be deleted with the new recognition language

§6.11 – this is the new, not yet "provisional," draft language that is intended to clarify the recognition process

§6.11.3 – omit reference to "decision" and state that the RC provides a recommendation letter

§6.11.4 – omit decision; state "the recommendation letter is submitted" and then add "as appropriate" at the end of the sentence. If it's the same one letter to all groups, then clarify that, instead.

§6.11.5 – all documents referenced herein must be included in §3, "Related Documents." This section should also have some language about what happens if an endorsement fails. Participants noted that §10.1 of the NELAP Evaluation SOP 3-102 has some language that might be useful; presumably, the recommendation would return to the RC for some negotiation

§6.12 – reviewers had questions about whether the Evaluation Coordinator or the Executive Committee is charged with issuing the Certificate of Recognition. Please verify that the acronym EC is used consistently to represent (as described) the Evaluation Coordinator, and that some other acronym/wording is used for executive committee throughout the document

§8.4 – ensure that "confidential" is the word that triggers no release per the TNI Document Control SOP 1-104; some thought that it should be "classified" instead. Need absolute clarity for this matter, and the language must be consistent with other TNI documents in order to avoid potential future issues if/when evaluation documents are requested

§10 – should reference the 2004 version of ISO 17011 and the 2005 version of ISO 17025, but could eliminate the ISO references completely since it is the TNI standard being used and not the actual ISO documents

The appendices were not reviewed, since they are considered examples or "templates" and not actual documents.