SUMMARY
TNI CHEMISTRY EXPERT COMMITTEE MEETING

January 8, 2020

The Chemistry Expert Committee (CEC) met by teleconference at 10:00 AM ET on January 8, 2020. This meeting was re-scheduled from the original date of January 1, 2020 to accommodate the New Year holiday. Chair Valerie Slaven was unavailable for the call. Chad Stoike as Vice-Chair led the meeting.

Roll Call

Valerie Slaven, Consulting Services (Lab) - Chair	Absent
Jay Armstrong, VA DGS (AB)	Absent
Paula Blaze, NJ DEP (AB)	Present
Eric Davis, Horizon (Other)	Present
Deb Gaynor, Independent Consultant (Other)	Absent
Shawn Kassner, Pace (Lab)	Absent
Max Patterson, UT DOH (AB)	Absent
Charles Neslund, Eurofins (Lab)	Absent
Colin Wright, Florida DEP (Lab)	Present
Calista Daigle, Quality Consulting (Other)	Present
Chad Stoike, ALS Global (Lab) – Vice Chair)	Present
Robert Wyeth, Program Administrator	Present

Kevin Yuen and Gail Warren, associate committee members, were also present. The agenda for the meeting is presented in Attachment 1. Bob added two items to the agenda: Internal Audit status and membership. With no quorum present the meeting proceeded but only with continuing discussion of DOC and announcements to e-mail ballot the December minutes and presentation by e-mail of committee applicants.

December Meeting Minutes

The December 4, 2019 minutes were presented for committee approval. No corrections were made by the members present but as no quorum was present, the December minutes will be distributed for e-mail ballot. After e-mail ballot distribution Collin reported he was absent for the December meeting and the minutes were modified accordingly. E-mail ballot results have approved these minutes. Minutes will be forwarded to William for posting on the website.

Internal Audit Status

Bob reported that the Internal Audit of the committee had been completed and reviewed by Valerie. The results of the audits of all committees will be presented at the Newport Beach meeting.

Committee Membership

Previously the committee was deemed as out of balance with the laboratory interest category being dominant. Recent changes in interest categories by committee members and a number of applicants to the committee will not only rectify the situation but may move membership to the maximum of 15 full committee members. Bob will distribute a table of members and their respective affiliations along with resumes of candidates for full and/or associate membership.

DOC

General discussion in the absence of a quorum regarding both individual and lab initial and on-going DOC was accomplished for information purposes and future concept development. Chad led the discussion and asked to break down discussion by Lab and Individual and then further subdivided by initial and on-going DOC as was begun last month.

He further reviewed those elements presented previously for the laboratory including DL, LOQ, DOC in the method, PT method validation as contained in the standard, accuracy and precision requirements as presented in the standard. Beginning with the initial Laboratory DOC…in addition to what is in standard, how to access accuracy and precision and what are the criteria (hard numbers will be difficult)? Are these elements critical for a laboratory DOC? General consensus was that they should. Any individual or group of individuals can demonstrate acceptable performance this would suffice for the laboratory. Group decision was these previously discussed elements are all that should be required for initial laboratory DOC.

For on-going laboratory DOC should be process based; if elements (DL, LOQ and PT results) can demonstrate acceptable performance regardless of which individuals participate on-going DOC should be verifiable. How do you assure accuracy and precision for on-going…PTs should show accuracy but lacking a precision measure. Is precision relevant to on-going lab DOC? Consensus was a debatable yes; but how to measure? PTs are probably not enough. Could DL/LOQ verification along with PT performance be sufficient; could calculate precision?

Suggestion of the on-going individual actually performing the on-going lab requirement; then do we need on-going lab requirements at all? Maybe laboratory DOC is just initial?

Began some discussion of individual or analyst Initial and on-going DOC which is more complex and may need to take multiple paths. Current standard is questionable as to actually showing analyst capabilities. What are the appropriate criteria; precision, accuracy, sensitivity, selectivity, DL/LOQ verification, etc?

Individuals can perform different tasks in a process not all of the steps, do we want to define DOC for a particular task? Should be determining competence; if the "answer" is acceptable competence is shown.

Why is analyst competency even an issue? Does it need to be in the standard? We are not accrediting analysts. Analysts are not liable for the labs performance. What is the history of this requirement? Analyst DOC could only be applicable to single analyst tasks? If you add a new analyst in the process do you have to do a new DL or any other element? They would simply be included in overall performance and subsequently show competence.

The meeting of the committee concluded at 11:00 AM ET. The next scheduled meeting of the committee will be Wednesday, February 5, 2020 during the TNI Newport Beach Environmental Forum. The next scheduled conference call for the committee is Wednesday March 4, 2020 at 2:00 PM ET.

Attachment 1

CEC call January 8th

Agenda

1) Review of December Minutes
2) Internal Audit Status
3) Committee membership
4) Continue DOC discussion
    a. Does the Laboratory need to demonstrate competency (method validation?, ongoing?)
        i. If so what should be required? (list review)
            1. Initial
            2. Ongoing
    b. What is required for an analyst to demonstrate competency? (list review)
        i. Initial
        ii. Ongoing