

**SUMMARY OF THE  
TNI LABORATORY PROFICIENCY TESTING EXPERT COMMITTEE MEETING**

**JUNE 1, 2018**

The Committee met by teleconference on Friday, June 1, 2018, at 11:00 am EST. Chair Nicole Cairns led the meeting.

**1 – Roll call**

Fred Anderson, Advanced Analytical Solutions (PT Provider)	Present
Jim Brownfield, ESC (Laboratory)	Present
Nicole Cairns, NYSDOH (Chair; Laboratory)	Present
Rachel Ellis, NJ DEP (AB)	Absent
Patrick Garrity, KYDOW (AB)	Absent
Craig Huff, ERA (PT Provider)	Absent
Susan Jackson, SC DHEC (AB)	Present
Tim Miller, Phenova (PT Provider)	Present
Reggie Morgan, Hampton Roads San. Distr. (Lab)	Absent
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Absent

Associate Committee Members present: Thekkekalathil Chandrasekhar, FLDEP; Stacie Crandall, Hampton Roads San. District; Amanda Grande, Phenova; Jason Poore, A2LA.

**2 – Previous Minutes**

It was moved by Fred and seconded by Tim to approve the minutes of May 4, 2018. All were in favor and the minutes were approved.

**3 – Vice-Chair Vacancy**

Craig had volunteered for the position, and no one on the call expressed interest in running. Nicole decided to withhold the nomination until the next call when Craig would be present.

**4 – Committee Membership**

With Donna's resignation the committee now had 9 Committee Members: 3 PT Providers; 3 Laboratory; and 3 AB. Nicole said there were applications, and she asked if more members should be added. Fred and Rachel would rotate off at the end of the year, and that should be taken into consideration. Nicole would circulate the list of applicants for consideration on the next call.

**5 – PTRL Guidance Document**

This was approved by the Policy Committee, and the LASEC would now be looking at it.

**6 – 2009 - 2016 Standard Comparison Table**

The table of changes from the 2009 to 2016 standard was discussed. This had been prepared by Jerry Parr, who had asked the committees to review and if necessary correct and expand the table.

The first 4 pages pertained to PT. Nicole said she did not want to go through the document during this call, but she asked for volunteers to verify Jerry's input. To be considered was the impact the change would have on a laboratory. The following volunteered: Chandra page 1, Tim page 2, Jim page 3, and Fred page 4. Nicole asked the volunteers to complete their review by the next conference call.

## **7 – Microbiology PTs**

Some PT Providers had raised the issue of laboratories reporting greater-than (>) values for PTs. This was not discussed in the PTRL guidance document because it was not in the PT standard. Nicole had reached out to Robin Cooke, Chair of the Microbiology Expert Committee, for her thoughts. In response, Robin had asked Nicole to find out on which methods the laboratories are reporting > values. Robin believed if laboratories are reporting > values on methods that do not permit this, then they deserve to fail under the 2016 standard. She was also planning to raise this with her committee. Nicole said there was no action the PT Expert Committee needed to take, because it is not in the standard, but it might be appropriate to raise the issue at the upcoming New Orleans meeting. Nicole asked the PT Providers on the committee to report back which methods were affected.

## **8 – SIR Reviews**

Several items on the SIR spreadsheet were discussed. The committee member assigned to each SIR led the discussion on the SIR. For each SIR request, the final response was listed and it was determined if it was applicable to the 2003, 2009, and/or 2016 standard. Also listed was if the SIR had been addressed and clarified in the 2016 standard. Discussed were line items 8, 9, 15, 16, and 17 on the spreadsheet

Item 8 concerned the evaluation of < values. This was relevant to the 2003 standard and not relevant to the 2016 standard. However, it was unclear if it was relevant to the 2009 standard, and so it was placed on hold until this could be checked.

Item 9 was relevant to all 3 standards, but it addressed a specific clause in the 2003 standard that was renumbered in 2009 and 2016. The response would have to be fine-tuned to identify the specific clauses.

## **6 – Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 pm EDT. The next call should be July 6, but due to its proximity to the holiday it was decided to re-schedule to July 13. Nicole would send out a revised annotated spreadsheet, and committee participants were asked to review her comments prior to the call.