

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

AUGUST 22, 2014

The Committee met by teleconference on Friday, August 22, 2014, at 11:00 am EST. Chair Shawn Kassner led the meeting.

1 – Roll call

Fred Anderson, Advanced Analytical Solutions (Other)	Present
Stephen Arpie, Absolute Standards (Other)	Absent
Kareen Baker, Independent (Other)	Present
Yumi Creason, PA DEP (AB)	Present
Rachel Ellis, NJ DEP (AB)	Absent
Scott Hoatson, Oregon DEQ (AB)	Present
Shawn Kassner, Phenova (Chair; Other)	Present
Roger Kenton, Eastman Chemical Co. (Lab)	Present
Stacie Metzler, Hampton Roads San. Distr. (Lab)	Present
Mitzi Miller, Dade Moeller Assocs. (Other)	Absent
Judy Morgan, Env. Science Corp. (Lab)	Present
Virgene Mulligan, Amrad (Lab)	Present
Joe Pardue, P2S (Other)	Present
Jim Todaro, Alpha Analytical (Lab)	Present
Lisa Touet, MA DEP (AB)	Present
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Present

Associate Committee Members present: Susan Butts, SCDEC; Thekkekalathil Chandrasekhar, FLDEP; Audrey Cornell, ERA; Shari Pfalmer, ESC; Brian Stringer, ERA.

2 – Comments on V1M1 and V2M2 Voting Draft Standards

The committee continued working through the voters' comments.

Comment #1, Bob DiRienzo (V1M1 General Comment)

1) Do we somewhere define what acceptable results are for multi-analyte methods. An example would be one outlier in a list of 30 analytes (i.e. 8260) is that a failure? The lab would not be able to change parameters of the method for acceptable results for a specific analyte. Technologies like GC/MS, GC, ICP and ICP/MS need to be scored acceptable based on what or how many parameters must be acceptable for passing. I could not find a description of what is acceptable results and this is the only volume a laboratory needs to have. Why do we leave this up to AB interpretation?

2) If a lab missed two of any particular analyte or PT Matrix/Technology than that requires corrective action based on 4.9.2 of module 1, volume 2 . Why do we restate the obvious? We should reference that section as what is required when an analyte or PT fails more than once. Are you saying that a once in a while failure always requires corrective action when random outliers can and should be present.

3) *The evaluation of PT to the analyte level in multi-analyte methods is unnecessary and time consuming for both ABs and Labs. The matrix/technology is what is important. In the ISO 17025 section 5.9 of the INTERNATIONAL STANDARD it only lists PTs as one of the items that can assure the quality of the testing. The laboratories do many things to prove competency and yet we are going to still evaluate to the analyte level. What is the purpose of this?*

Scott remarked that this suggestion would reflect the EPA 80% requirement, but that is only for drinking water. However, since every analyte is separately accredited, PTs have to be the same. Scott added the concern may be about having to perform a corrective action for a random sporadic failure in a suite of analytes, but he said the laboratory only has to say it is an outlier and a random failure. Shawn added the requirement to pass 2 out of 3 PTs is to allow for sporadic outlier failure. Concern was expressed that consistent failure of the same analyte is no longer random. It was moved by Joe and seconded by Fred that the comment is Non-Persuasive, being inconsistent with the analyte/matrix accreditation established by TNI. All were in favor.

Comment #3, Victoria Pretti (V1M1 General Comment)

When changes are made to Volume 1 and Volume 2 that affect proficiency testing, proposed language for Volume 3 revisions should also be available for review simultaneously.

This is just a policy, and the only alternative would be to release all 4 volumes at the same time. It was moved by Stacie and seconded by Scott that the comment is Non-Persuasive, being just a policy and not a comment concerning the standard. All were in favor.

Comment #101, Victoria Pretti (V2M2 General Comment)

This was identical wording to Comment #3. It was moved by Stacie and seconded by Joe to be Non-persuasive. All were in favor.

Comment #4, Randall Query (V1M1, 1.2)

Section 1.2 Scope includes a struck-out text for "primary" however clause 1.3.1 leaves the term "primary" - is that intentional?

This comment led to a discussion of when “primary” should be used and when it should not. (Aaren Alger’s related comment #116 was already ruled Non-Persuasive). The committee agreed “primary” should not be in the scope and it will also be removed from the scope in V2M2. This is necessary due to the potential use of the standard by Non-NELAP Accreditation Bodies. It was moved by Scott and seconded by Fred that the comment is Non-Persuasive, because omission of “primary” was intentional. All were in favor.

Comment #102, Randall Query (V2M2, 1.1)

Section 1.1 includes the term "primary" however; section 1.3.1 states that V2M2 is applicable to any accreditation body - is that intentional?

It was moved by Scott and seconded by Stacie that the comment is Persuasive and the committee will make sure V2M2 matches V1M1. All were in favor.

Comment #5, Maria Friedman (V1M1, 1.2)

The proposed language for the Scope in V1M1 is not the same as the proposed language for the Scope in V2M2:

“The purpose of the TNI Proficiency Testing program (PT Program) is to provide for a primary AB to evaluate a laboratory’s performance...”

Suggestion: The purpose of the PT Program should be the same in all Volumes that define the scope of the PT Program.

It was moved by Scott and seconded by Stacie that the comment is Persuasive and the committee will make sure V2M2 matches V1M1. All were in favor.

Comment #103, Maria Friedman (V2M2, 1.2)

“The purpose of the TNI Proficiency Testing program (PT Program) is to provide for a primary AB to evaluate a laboratory’s performance...”

Comment: The proposed language for the Scope in V2M2 is not the same as the proposed language for the Scope in V1M1: “The purpose of the TNI PT program is to provide a means for an accreditation body to evaluate a laboratory’s performance...”

Suggestion: The purpose of the PT Program should be the same in all Volumes that define the scope of the PT Program.

This was similar to Maria’s comment #5. It was moved by Scott and seconded by Roger that the comment is Persuasive and the committee will make sure V2M2 matches V1M1. All were in favor.

Next Steps

Shawn said he would assign the remaining comments to specific committee members. He would look for any complementary comments between the two Modules and try to group them to be dealt with together. He asked Virgene and Joe to take all the radiochemistry comments to the subcommittee for proposed language.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:20 pm EDT.