SUMMARY OF THE
TNI CHEMISTRY EXPERT COMMITTEE MEETING

SEPTEMBER 25, 2015

The Committee held a conference call on Friday, September 25, 2015, at 2:00 pm EST. Vice-Chair Valerie Slaven led the meeting.

1 – Roll call

Richard Burrows, Test America (Lab)	Present
Francoise Chauvin, NYC DEP (Lab)	Present
Brooke Connor (Other)	Absent
Gale Warren, NYSDOH (Accreditation Body)	Present
Colin Wright, Florida DEP (Lab)	Present
Nancy Grams, Advanced Earth Technologists, Inc. (Other)	Absent
Anand Mudambi, USEPA (Other)	Present
John Phillips, Ford Motor Co. (Other)	Present
Scott Siders, PDC Labs (Lab)	Present
Valerie Slaven, Teklab (Lab)	Present
Gary Ward, OR DPH (Accreditation Body)	Absent
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Absent

Associate Committee Members present: Tom Dziedzic; Reed Jeffery.

2 – Previous Minutes

It was moved by John and seconded by Colin to approve the minutes from August 21, 2015. All were in favor except Anand who abstained.

3 – Future Standards Development

On the previous call, it had been suggested the Committee discuss Demonstration of Capability (DOC). Valerie thought there were important items that were missing. She said, at the Chicago meeting, people had expressed confusion over tests where DOC was not applicable, and what laboratories needed to do. Richard said it could be argued the first time a laboratory does a method, a new analyst starting a method, or a new instrument should not necessarily be the same thing. Valerie questioned if the procedure as written was really sufficient for demonstrating competence. Scott made the distinction that initial DOC was for the method, and on-going DOC was for the capability of the analyst performing that method. Richard said there was confusion over this because the standard says initial DOC shall be performed whenever there is a change in personnel. Valerie said her issue was, although the initial DOC is for the method, it is required for each analyst. She asked if there should be a separate section on what is required to show an analyst is technically competent. Scott said a lot of that is addressed outside the section on DOC; e.g., analyst training. Richard suggested looking at the language in the new 8000D. This separates analyst proficiency from initial demonstration of proficiency for the laboratory, and it might be a good idea to have that kind of separation in the standard. Others agreed it might be useful to

have it separated. Richard said the current DOC for a semi-volatiles mass spectrometry analyst does not make sense, because his performance on the LCS's is primarily determined by the person doing the preparative work. Scott questioned if adding what a laboratory should do when starting as new method (SOP, calibration curve, MDLs etc), or what an analyst should do when getting trained, may encroach on the purview of the Quality Systems committee. At least it might be necessary to coordinate with that committee. John said for a new DOC, having written the method, demonstrated it works, doing MDLs, and calibrations, and an analyst having read and understood the method, gone through training, and been able to perform the complete method, he did not think that overlapped with the routine requirements for quality systems. He thought it could be broken into two separate sections and there may be another component when a new analyte or new instrument is added. Valerie added the committee should also review what is in the general quality systems V1M2. Richard pointed out the vast paperwork needed for a DOC if just one new analyte is added to a list of (say) 150, when there are several instruments, analysts and people doing the preparative work.

Valerie asked if there were issues with on-going DOC. Scott said it varies between laboratories how they do it.

Francoise pointed out an area that is silent in the QC section. If an analyst has a failed sample, but then runs another QC that passes, what should be done about the failed sample? Valerie asked if clarification should be provided on this. Scott said the QC part of the standard has raised the bar and is well established, so the committee should be careful about modifying this section. Valerie suggested providing clarification on the need for surrogates passing the QC requirements.

Richard suggested, before the next call, anyone who thinks something needs to be changed in the module should write a brief summary on what needs to be changed and why. This would provide a basis for the committee to then approach the membership for their input before there is any attempt to draft sections of a new standard. This should be done within the next two weeks in preparation for the next call on October 23.

4 – Guidance Document

Richard reminded the committee he had committed to them providing a guidance document to accompany the revised sections on calibration and detection/quantitation. He thought a suitable format would be to use examples of the process a laboratory might go through for calibration, detection and quantitation limit for specific situations. He suggested he would write it up as a proposal and send it to LASEC for comment.

5 – Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 pm EDT.