SUMMARY OF THE
TNI CHEMISTRY EXPERT COMMITTEE MEETING

DECEMBER 18, 2015

The Committee held a conference call on Friday, December 18, 2015, at 2:00 pm EST. Chair Richard Burrows 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
Anand Mudambi, USEPA (Other)	Present
John Phillips, Ford Motor Co. (Other)	Absent
Scott Siders, PDC Labs (Lab)	Absent
Valerie Slaven, Teklab (Lab)	Present
Gary Ward, OR DPH (Accreditation Body)	Absent
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Absent

Associate Committee Members present: Eric Davis; Arthur Denny; Reed Jeffery

2 – Previous Minutes

It was moved by Francoise and seconded by Anand to approve the minutes of November 20, 2015. All were in favor.

3 – Interim Standard on Detection and Quantitation

During the previous call, the committee had not reached a decision on a comment that raised an issue that could cause one of the Accreditation Bodies to reject the standard. In the interim, Richard had discussed that comment extensively with the commenter.

1.5.2.3 *"The current requirement to verify the LOD or the LOQ for each matrix, method, and analyte annually is the only standard left in the Volume 1, Module 4 Chemistry section that explicitly specifies any kind of requirement and frequency for the accredited laboratory to prove to the Primary NELAP Accreditation Body that it can achieve accuracy, precision, sensitivity, and selectivity for EACH accredited analyte, method, and matrix on some defensible basis. Laboratories may never get a sample for certain oddball, rarely-analyzed analytes (and matrices in some cases), and the laboratory usually never agrees to relinquish accreditation voluntarily for such analytes. Therefore, I cannot approve of the proposed Section 1.5.2.3 as presented without any concurrent change to the Demonstration of Capability section to require a continuing demonstration of capability for EACH accredited matrix, method, and analyte for the laboratory on an on-going annual (or biannual?) basis. The Expert Committee apparently did not "take the hint" when I proposed the 1.6.2.2.1(e) and 1.6.2.2.2(e) sections during the Voting Draft Standard voting stage. Proposed change that would prompt me to change my* *vote to "Affirmative": Section 1.5.2.3: If no analyses for an accredited matrix-method-analyte Field of Accreditation were performed in a given calendar year, then the verification of the MDL/LOQ shall be performed for that Field of Accreditation within the calendar year (annually) employing all sample processing steps (e.g., digestion, dilution, distillation, extraction, cleanup, and analysis on at least one instrument) needed for the matrix-method-analyte. Alternatively, I would change my vote to "Affirmative" if the Expert Committee made the following IMMEDIATE addition to the Continuing Demonstration of Capability language in section 1.6.3.1, as an additional new last sentence (but I doubt that the Chemistry Expert Committee will be able to change this section at this time): Section 1.6.3.1 new last sentence: At a minimum, to prove on-going capability when no analyses are performed for a given accredited matrix-method-analyte Field of Accreditation in a given calendar year, at least one analyst in the laboratory (or as many analysts as needed) shall perform a Continuing DOC for that Field of Accreditation within the calendar year (annually) employing all sample processing steps (e.g., digestion, dilution, distillation, extraction, cleanup, and analysis on at least one instrument) needed for the matrix-method-analyte."* The commenter had agreed it would be satisfactory if the committee would provide an interpretation of the standard that the Initial Demonstration of Capability was specific to each matrix-technology-analyte. Accordingly, Standard Interpretation request (SIR) 297 had since been submitted:

"Are the DOC requirements in V1M4 sections 1.6.2 and 1.6.3 specific to each Matrix-Method-Analyte combination for which a laboratory seeks or maintains accreditation? The language implies that they are, and because laboratories are accredited by Matrix-Method-Analyte, should be, but it is not explicit enough to preclude another interpretation."

Richard said Section 1.6.2 is specific to the matrix-method-analyte combination as illustrated by the references to analytes in 1.6.2.2 (a) and "all parameters" in 1.6.2.2 (d). Therefore, if no other analysis is performed for a matrix-method-analyte combination within a 12 month period, a new IDOC would be required per the last sentence in 1.6.2. The committee agreed with this interpretation. Arthur asked if the twice-yearly PT was not sufficient, but Richard said that would not show proficiency in those obscure analytes that are not normally present in PT samples. A lengthy discussion followed. The laboratory representatives on the call were unanimous that, in their laboratories, the IDOC was done for every analyte-matrix combination. It was agreed Section 1.6.2 (IDOC) is specific to each matrix-method-analyte combination, but Section 1.6.3 is not necessarily specific to each matrix-method-analyte combination.

It was moved by Anand and seconded by Valerie that the IDOC requirements in Section 1.6.2 are specific to each analyte-matrix combination, and as a result the last sentence in 1.6.2 requires that each analyte-matrix combination receive an IDOC within a 12-month period in the event that the laboratory has not performed any analysis for that analyte. All were in favor. Accordingly, Richard said he would prepare a response to the SIR, and circulate it to the committee.

4 - Planning for the January Tulsa Meeting

The committee had originally planned to work through the Detection/Quantitation Interim Standard comments, but they were few and this would not be needed. Richard suggested the committee present training on the new parts of V1M4. This would be in the form of short PowerPoint presentations that would be used to get feedback from the audience on the effectiveness of the training, and what changes should be made to finalize those presentations to get the requirements of the standard over more effectively. Colin volunteered to handle Calibration sections 1.7.1.1 (e) (removal and replacement of calibration standards), and 1.7.1.1 (f) (minimum number of standards); and Francoise said she would deal with 1.7.1.1 (k) & (o) (single point calibration methods and methods with a linear range standard. Valerie and Eric agreed to do 1.7.2 (f) (continuing calibration). Richard would deal with 1.7.1.1 (j) (relative error). In the detection/quantitation sections, Richard would modify slides he already had for the determination of MDL and LOQ, and sections 1.5.2.1.2/1.5.2.2.2 (on-going verification of the MDL and LOQ).

The second half of the day would be IDOC and on-going DOC for the next version of the standard, and the audience would be asked for suggestions on other parts of the chemistry standard that might benefit from being updated.

The volunteers would have their slides ready for discussion during the next meeting on January15.

5 – Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm EST.