

Proficiency Testing (PT) Committee Conference Call
February 10, 2009

The Conference call was called to order at 1:05 PM EST, the call ended at 3:30PM EST. The call was led by the committee vice chair, Shawn Kassner. Enough members were present to constitute a voting majority.

Committee members present:

Steve Arpie (SA)
Amy Doupe (AD)
Shawn Kassner (SK)
Roger Kenton (RK)
Stacy Metzler (SM)
Anand Mudambi (AM)
Dan Tholen (DT)

Associate members present:

Dan Dickinson (DD)
Rachel Ellis (RE)
RaeAnne Haynes (RH)
Jill Henes (JH)
Joe Perdue (JP)
Chuck Wibby (CW)

Agenda Item #1

Review and approve the minutes from the Miami meeting. The minutes were reviewed and approved.

Agenda Item #2

Review and approve the editorial changes and proposed TIA's from the LASC.

LASC Item #15:

The committee reviewed the proposed change and felt that the change requested from the LASC was adding an additional requirement to this section of the standard and was not an editorial change but rather a TIA.

DD questioned that if this requirement already existed in the standard and we were just adding the requirement to the appropriate section of a different volume and modal than this would be an editorial change. After a brief discussion, the committee decided and approved the motion to add this change to the TIA's that we are currently writing.

LASC Item # 10:

The committee's review of this item was that this was not an editorial change, but removal of the section would require a TIA. In the review of this item, it was thought by RH that removal of this section would be short sighted and could prohibit future growth and changes by the PT Board to the FOPT tables. CW reviewed the criteria that had to be met to justify a TIA and that this change was not at that level, nor did leaving this section in the standard have an adverse affect on the standard.

JH reviewed the LASC history and thought that this section was perhaps not the issue at all, but perhaps an inconsistency between V1M1 Section 4.1.2 and V2M2 Section 7.3 The committee agreed that this was indeed the case and the section should remain, with further discussion on the inconsistency above.

LASC Item #11

The item was reviewed and approved by the committee.

LASC Item # 12

The item was reviewed and approved by the committee.

LASC Item # 13

The item was reviewed and approved by the committee.

LASC Item # 14

The LASC language change was as follows

- LASC #14: Page 5, Section 7.3

The Primary AB shall consider the analytical result for a FoPT not acceptable when:

a) ~~the result reported by the laboratory for a sample is not within the established acceptance limits for that FoPT (i.e., "Not Acceptable" evaluation from the PT provider);~~

*Change to: **the laboratory receives a "not acceptable" performance score from the PT provider.***

In reviewing the proposed language above, for this section it came to light from RE that the proposed language would limit her ability to adjust or change the evaluations reported by a PTP. The example that RE brought to the group was she had a PTP that evaluated a result that was within the acceptance limits, but was evaluated as 'Not Acceptable'. The PTP in question was contacted and would not change the evaluation. DD asked if this PTP was the State of New York (NYS), RE affirmed that this was indeed the case.

A very lively discussion ensued concerning the role of NYS as both PTP and AB, and their reporting practice. SA brought to the discussion that all PTP's should be evaluating and reporting data in the same manner, and NYS's reporting was not consistent with the 2003 NELAC standard nor the TNI proposed standard. SA suggested that perhaps a determination by the PT Board may be necessary.

DD clarified the reasons that the reports were issued were to support the NYS accreditation program and that the method description was included in the evaluation criteria. DD's argument was that AB's evaluate the data based on method description as well as evaluation of the reported result. In the example brought up by RE the laboratory was not accredited for this method in NYS.

CW, however, pointed out that the method may not be acceptable to NYS, but could be acceptable to another AB and should be evaluated as 'Acceptable'. CW also noted the specific criterion in the 2003 NELAC standard for PTP's to follow for evaluations. DT pointed out that PTP's could generate alternate reports for specific clients per the 2003 NELAC standard.

The discussion continued with an overall feeling that the standard was being changed to accommodate a single PTP and the proposed language would limit the AB's ability to properly accredit laboratories. The topic was tabled for further discussion after a review of the comments made.

LASC Item # 16

The item was reviewed and approved by the committee.

LASC Item # 17

The item was reviewed and approved by the committee.

LASC Item # 18

The item was reviewed and approved by the committee.

The call was concluded with a review what editorial changes were approved and the comments that were made during the review of LACS Items 15, 10 and 14. SK motioned to adjourn the call and was seconded by AM.