

**SUMMARY OF THE
TNI LABORATORY PROFICIENCY TESTING EXPERT COMMITTEE MEETING
DECEMBER 5, 2014**

The Committee met by teleconference on Friday, December 5, 2014, at 11:00 am EDT. Chair Shawn Kassner led the meeting.

1 – Roll call

Fred Anderson, Advanced Analytical Solutions (Other)	Present
Stephen Arpie, Absolute Standards (Other)	Present
Kareen Baker, Independent (Other)	Present
Yumi Creason, PA DEP (AB)	Absent
Rachel Ellis, NJ DEP (AB)	Absent
Scott Hoatson, Oregon DEQ (AB)	Absent
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)	Present
Judy Morgan, Env. Science Corp. (Lab)	Present
Virgene Mulligan, Amrad (Lab)	Absent
Joe Pardue, P2S (Other)	Present
Jim Todaro, Alpha Analytical (Lab)	Absent
Lisa Touet, MA DEP (AB)	Present
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Absent

Associate Committee Members present: Aaren Alger, PADEP; Nicole Cairns, NYSDOH; Thekkekalathil Chandrasekhar, FLDEP; Shari Pfallmer, ESC.

2 – Previous Minutes

It was moved by Mitzi and seconded by Judy to approve the minutes of November 21. All were in favor.

3 – V1M1 and V2M2 VDS Voters' Comments

Shari's assigned comments were discussed.

Nicole Cairns, V1M1 3.2. This was no longer applicable, because the committee had already decided to remove this section from the standard.

Nicole Cairns, V1M1 7. The commenter had recommended adding a Section 7.2 regarding how to submit questions/complaints about an AB's evaluation of PT data. Shari suggested this was persuasive and a section should be added. Roger disagreed, feeling there was little value added by requiring laboratories to generate another procedure. Others supported Roger's position. Nicole said she had submitted the comment because an AB can overturn a PT provider's recommendation, and laboratories need to know what types of questions/complaints should be submitted to the AB vs. the PT Provider. However, she was not suggesting laboratories would need a procedure for this. On Shawn's suggestion it was agreed to add a section 7.2 saying that laboratories shall submit questions

to their AB in regards to the AB's PT evaluation if necessary. This was moved by Roger and seconded by Judy. All were in favor.

Nicole Cairns, V2M2 3. This was a suggestion to add the year to the ISO standard reference. It was agreed this is necessary, because ISO 17025 is being revised and the new version may be different. This was moved by Judy and seconded by Roger. All were in favor.

Nicole's assigned comments were next discussed.

Steve Arms, V1M1 3.12. This was merely an editorial suggestion. It was move by Stacie and seconded by Judy to accept the proposed change as persuasive. All were in favor.

Dan Tholen, V1M1 3.15. It was moved by Mitzi and seconded by Roger to re-word the definition as suggested by the commenter. All were in favor.

Steve Arms, and Randy Querry V1M1, 3.16. Both commenters suggested removing the 6-month time limit for suspension, since ABs might have different requirements in regulation and there are other reasons than PT failure for suspending a laboratory. It was moved by Judy and seconded by Lisa that the comment was persuasive and the language would be removed. All were in favor.

Carl Kircher, V1M1 4.3.6. Carl suggested adding the acronym "AB" to the definition of Accreditation Body in Clause 3.1, and Nicole concurred. She added the same thing should be done in V2M2 for consistency. It was moved by Judy and seconded by Lisa to do so. All were in favor.

Aaren Alger, V1M1 4.3.6. The commenter said this is a record retention requirement and should be included in section 4.4. However, a very similar statement is already part of section 4.4.1. Nicole considered it persuasive and suggested removing 4.3.6 under reporting requirements. This was moved by Kareen and seconded by Mitzi. All were in favor.

Roger Kenton's assigned comments were next.

Patricia Carvajal, V1M1 4.3.7 (c). The commenter disagreed with the note indicating that "In the case where a laboratory LOQ is greater than the PTRL: If the laboratory chooses to report a value of <LOQ and the analyte is present above the PTRL, the result will be scored as "Not Acceptable" by the PT Provider." Roger felt this was non-persuasive, because the Committee had decided to provide flexibility in 4.3.7 (including the note in 4.3.7) as an option to any laboratory that did not want to change their normal procedures to report to the PTRL. There was general agreement, and this was moved by Fred and seconded by Judy. All were in favor.

Connie Dunn, V1M1 4.3. It was commented that Sections 4.2 and 4.3 indirectly mandate that all labs must report to or below the PTRL. This contradicts the requirement that labs manage samples in the same manner as routine samples and places an undue burden on laboratories. Roger provided some alternate language.

Aaren Alger, V1M1 4.3.7. Aaren thought the language was confusing. Roger agreed and suggested alternative language. It was moved by Fred and seconded by Mitzi to accept Roger's language to satisfy this comment as well as the Connie Dunn comment above. All were in favor.

Carl Kircher, V1M1 4.3.7 (a). The committee agreed with Carl's suggestion to spell out "V1M1". This comment had now gone away with Roger's new language (above).

Valerie Slaven and Tony Lynn, V1M1 4.3.7 (a) and V1M1 4.3.7 (c). These four comments all concerned the same issue and were dealt with together. All the comments dealt with results outside the calibration range being estimates. Roger said it was non-persuasive, because the committee had decided to provide flexibility in 4.3.7 (including the note in 4.3.7) as an option to any laboratory that did not want to change their normal procedures to report to the PTRL. The commenters should be referred to the alternate language. It was moved by Fred and seconded by Judy that the alternate language takes care of these comments and that they were non-persuasive. All were in favor.

Karen's assigned comments were discussed

Valerie Slaven and Tony Lynn, V1M1 4.2.4 (a). These identical comments expressed disagreement on allowing laboratories to re-scale their calibration curves to allow determination of PT samples below their normal calibration range. It was moved by Karen and seconded by Lisa to rule the comments Non-Persuasive and confirm Karen's response.

Valerie Slavin V1M1 4.2.4 (b). On discussion, it was generally felt this should be Non-Persuasive, because the committee had discussed the issue extensively and decided a laboratory should have the option to report to the PTRL if it did not want to change its normal procedures. Roger's language (discussed above) was adopted for this response. It was so moved by Karen and seconded by Fred. All were in favor.

4 – Next Meeting

Membership on the committee would be discussed, since some members would have to rotate off. Shawn said he would send out the charter before then.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 pm EDT.