

# TNI PT Program Executive Committee Meeting Summary

June 20, 2019

## 1. Roll call, approval of minutes and overview:

Chair, Maria Friedman, called the TNI PT Program Executive Committee (PTPEC) meeting to order at 1:01pm Eastern on June 20, 2019. Attendance is recorded in Attachment A – there were 5 members present. Associate members in attendance: Reggie, Rob Knake, Sennett Kim, Nicole Cairns, Tim Miller, Mike Blades, Craig Huff (1:20pm Eastern) and Jennifer Best (1:20pm Eastern).

Maria confirmed that everyone received the meeting information she sent on 6/17/19.

The meeting minutes from May 16, 2019 were distributed by email. Eric made a motion to accept the 5/16/19 meeting minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Jennifer Mullins.

Vote:

Eric - For

Jennifer Mullins – For

Carl – For

Maria – For

Patrick - For

The vote will be completed by email.

*(Addition: Email Vote*

*Dixie – For (7/14/19)*

*Fred – For (7/15/19)*

*Rachel – For (7/16/19)*

*Scott – For (7/18/19)*

*Jennifer Duhon – For (7/18/19)*

*The motion passed and the minutes were approved.)*

## 2. Update

- ARA on isomeric compounds – Aaren is checking back with the NELAP AC to see if the Total still needs to remain on the FoPT tables. PTPEC would like to leave the Total Isomers. The NELAP AC agrees.

- Implementation of Volume 3 – Maria got some feedback from Jerry Parr. He agreed to let the PTPAs decide when to implement Volume 3 except for the requirement to have the calculation implemented by 1-31-20.

After discussion, the PTPEC agreed to notify the PTPAs that they can let PT Providers implement the 2016 Standard whenever they choose to, but the scoring implementation still needs to be implemented on 1/31/2020.

Rob noted that TNI should issue some sort of memo with a transition plan with an end date. End date 1/31/2021? It would help to have some sort of an equivalency statement. No quorum today, but will be discussed in July. The Committee will consider developing some sort of a transition memo that will also discuss the equivalency of the 2009 and 2016 Standards.

- Analyte Code Question – New Hampshire. No update yet. Maria is waiting for more detailed information on problem method codes from Bill Hall.

### 3. Old Business

- SOP 4-102 (Appeals/Complaints SOP)

The SOP subcommittee looked at the comments received from the Policy Committee, NEFAP's complaint SOP and SOP 7-101 (Combined Evaluation). They have now submitted SOP 4-102 for review and finalization by the PTPEC.

Maria reviewed all the changes that were made to the SOP.

Definition of PTPA Approval was removed. The recognition committee deals with PTPA approval, so removed from this SOP.

Section 6.5.1 is related to SOP 7-101. Maria had a suggestion to make it easier to read – don't use the whole title for the reference because it is already included in the SOP.

9.0 – SOP 7-101 was added.

Eric asked if the comments should be left in the SOP. Maria thinks they should be removed and the Policy Committee should review it as a new document. Eric noted that a track changes/redline copy and a clean copy are normally sent to Policy. Both versions should have the comments removed.

Vote: No quorum.

Eric motioned to approve DRAFT SOP 4-102 Rev 2 reviewed today. The motion was seconded by Jennifer Mullins.

Roll call vote: All For

Maria - For  
Carl - For  
Patrick - For  
Jennifer Mullins - For  
Eric - For  
Scott - For

The vote will need to be completed by email.

*(Addition: The vote was not completed and a quorum was not reached. The SOP was further discussed and re-voted on at the July meeting.)*

#### 4. New Business

The Breakdown Analyte Subcommittee Committee had their first meeting last Monday. They took a preliminary look through the data provided through William and noted there is still a lot of data missing. They have some of the SCM data for Endrin, but need NPW data too. Also need data from DDT and its breakdown products for both SCM and NPW. Andy discussed this with William Daystrom by email.

There were questions on the inconsistency between number of data points versus number of participants. They also reviewed the previous work done by the complaint committee.

The number of data points is higher than the number of labs participating. This can be caused by the labs running multiple methods/techniques.

Maria directed the Committee attention to the document provided by email – Attachment D. She reviewed the information and then discussed the options included in the Attachment.

Eric commented that he does not think it is a good idea to assume that a laboratory reported a single value for multiple results. He leans toward status quo or having providers utilize all results.

Nicole does not think the intent of the request was to ask PT Providers to dump data points. Their concern was the definition of data points vs lab participants. If there is one lab that reports 3 results, it should still be 1 lab ... not 3 labs. We don't want to ask PT Providers to make any assumptions and drop anything. Make sure information from each provider is consistent in the upload. Each provider is defining data points and lab participants the same. Nicole asked if the data is even needed.

Tim commented that in the summary, all you have is a mean and a number of labs. You can't assume the extra points are identical points. A single lab can report 4 different unique values. There is nothing in the summary that indicates that. He asked how the data is being used.

Mike Blades commented that when you are looking at summary data, it would be important if you have 20 data points and you know that the data points were generated by a fairly small group of labs ... you may want to weight that information differently than if you had 20 data points generated by 18 labs. You don't know what was duplicate, but you know how many participants were generating those results. Nicole commented that she would weight them differently too because the data is more robust with more participants.

Scott noted that there could be instances where 1 participant generates 10 different results with 10 different analysts. That still seems significant. This is an unknown. You'd need more information and you shouldn't make assumptions.

Carl commented that it was thought that for FoPT review you should have 20 valid data points. The FoPT subcommittee now gets the assigned value, participant mean, and participant standard deviation. They don't get the date of the study, the PT Provider or the number of participants anymore. Maria commented that the data that are now being shared are based on the list from the 2016 TNI Standard and number of participant labs is shared. Eric noted that the current limit SOP (4-101) does not talk about number of participants. It only talks about data points. This should be taken into consideration when updating the limit SOP (4-101). Eric looked again and saw that the number of participants should be provided, but it does not look like this information is used.

Carl noted that perhaps the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee could do some comparisons to see if the limits calculate differently if they only use data above certain numbers.

Nicole asked about the conclusion – will a definition be developed for data points verses lab participants? If not, the data being received between PT Providers will continue to be inconsistent. Eric agrees it needs to be consistent.

Nicole agrees with option 2. Data points are all the results and labs are the individual labs that reported results. This helps with evaluating results.

Mike Blades doesn't want anyone to remove data. He wants to know how many participants generated the data. He also prefers Option 2.

A decision will not be made today, but Maria appreciated the initial input. Maria will send the information to all the PTPEC members for more input by email since there was no quorum today.

## 5. Subcommittee Reports

### Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee

Carl Kircher is still working with Radiochemistry Expert Committee representatives to determine the best way to develop the Radiochemistry limits moving forward. The

PTPEC also provided direction on priorities for the Subcommittee and requested that comments on SOP 4-101 (Limits Update) be made the first priority so that this SOP can get done. Maria will be sending the Subcommittee information to begin looking at the Isomer ARA sent by Aaren Alger.

#### SOP Subcommittee

They completed their update of SOP 4-102 (Appeals/Complaints SOP) and SOP 4-107 (FoPT Tables) and have sent these for PTPEC review. The Subcommittee is waiting for comments from the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee on SOP 4-101 (Limits Update). They will begin working on the Conflict of Interest SOP.

#### Microbiology FoPT Subcommittee

Jennifer Best reported that Michella will file a complaint about the ACs decision on approving the updated Microbiology FoPT table. She has been out, but hopefully this will be done by the end of July.

#### FoPT Table Update Subcommittee

Rami needs more time to look at the options. Maria has not heard anything back from ELAB and Craig is also waiting to hear from Dan Hickman.

#### Breakdown Analytes Subcommittee

See discussion in #4 above.

### 6. New Business.

None.

### 7. Action Items

The action items can be found in Attachment B. Updates were made directly into the table.

### 8. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be on 7/18/19, Thursday, at 1pm Eastern by teleconference.

Action Items are included in Attachment B and Attachment C includes a listing of reminders.

Maria adjourned the meeting at 2:40pm Eastern. (Motion: Eric Second: Scott Unanimously approved.)

## Attachment A

### Participants

#### TNI

#### Proficiency Testing Program Executive Committee

<b>Members</b>	<b>Rep</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Contact Information</b>
Maria Friedman (2020) (Chair) <b>Present</b>	AB	California Water Board	<a href="mailto:Maria.Friedman@waterboards.ca.gov">Maria.Friedman@waterboards.ca.gov</a>
Dixie Marlin (2018*) (Vice-Chair) <b>Absent</b>	Other	Marlin Quality Management, LLC	<a href="mailto:marlinquality@gmail.com">marlinquality@gmail.com</a>
Ilona Taunton, Program Administrator <b>Present after 1:30pm</b>		TNI	<a href="mailto:tauntoni@msn.com">tauntoni@msn.com</a>
Eric Smith (2019)  <b>Present</b>	Lab	ALS Environmental	<a href="mailto:eric.smith@alsglobal.com">eric.smith@alsglobal.com</a>
Carl Kircher (2021*)  <b>Present until 2pm</b>	AB	Florida Department of Health	<a href="mailto:Carl.Kircher@flhealth.gov">Carl.Kircher@flhealth.gov</a>
Andy Valkenburg (2021*) <b>Present (joined at 2:06 pm Eastern)</b>	LAB	Energy Laboratories	<a href="mailto:avalkenburg@energylab.com">avalkenburg@energylab.com</a>
Jennifer Duhon (2019*)  <b>Absent</b>	Other	Millipore Sigma	<a href="mailto:jennifer.duhon@sial.com">jennifer.duhon@sial.com</a>
Matt Sica (2020)  <b>Absent</b>	AB	ANAB, ANSI-ASQ National Accreditation Board	<a href="mailto:msica@anab.org">msica@anab.org</a>
Patrick Garrity (2019*)  <b>Present</b>	AB	Kentucky DEP	<a href="mailto:patrick.garrity@ky.gov">patrick.garrity@ky.gov</a>
Michella Karapondo (2019*)  <b>Absent</b>	Other	USEPA	<a href="mailto:karapondo.michella@epa.gov">karapondo.michella@epa.gov</a>
Fred Anderson (2020*)  <b>Absent</b>	Other	Advanced Analytical Solutions, LLC	<a href="mailto:Fred@advancedqc.com">Fred@advancedqc.com</a>
Jennifer Mullins (2020*)  <b>Present</b>	Lab	Upper Occoquan Service Authority	<a href="mailto:jennifer.mullins@uosa.org">jennifer.mullins@uosa.org</a>
Scott Haas (2020*)  <b>Absent</b>	FSMO	Environmental Testing, Inc.	<a href="mailto:shaas@etilab.com">shaas@etilab.com</a>
Rachel Ellis (2022*)  <b>Absent</b>	AB	New Jersey DEP	<a href="mailto:rachel.ellis@dep.nj.gov">rachel.ellis@dep.nj.gov</a>

## Attachment B

### Action Items – TNI PT Executive Committee

	Action Item	Who	Date Added	Expected Completion	Actual Completion
295	Moved from Backburner: PTPA Evaluation Checklist needs to be updated prior to next round of evaluations. (Originally discussed 8/6/13)	Shawn Ilona		New Date: 5/31/19	In Progress (will use 2016 TNI Standards and current SSAS Standards)
349	Review LAMS/FoPT Table Differences document. Provide comments by email and next meeting.	ALL	4/20/17	4/25/17  2/28/18 – For WET? June 2018 for all tables.  New target date: 4/30/19	In Progress WET is still being reviewed. Update 1/23/18: Subcommittee expects to have updated FoPT tables with CAS #'s and LAMS changes by 3/15/18. 2/22/19: Still in progress. 6/21/18: Still working with Rami. 3/21/19: Stacie asked if the group should be working on this while ELAB is working through this.
352	Moved from Backburner (originally discussed 2/20/14) : When new limits are established for the FoPTs, what is considered to be a statistically significant change to the old rates? At what point is it appropriate to question	All	2/20/14	TBD (see #350)  <i>350: Prepare formal request to SOP Subcommittee regarding updating</i>	In Progress – Update of SOP 4-101  6/21/18: Gil noted that this SOP will be worked on again at the next meeting. An expected

	<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>Date Added</b>	<b>Expected Completion</b>	<b>Actual Completion</b>
	<p>new limits? This lends to the TSS discussion a few months ago.</p> <p>Patrick commented that it would make sense to look at changes to pass/fail rates 6 months after new limits are effective. This possible addition to procedures should be evaluated when updating the limit acceptance SOP.</p>			<i>FoPT tables and applicable backburner items just moved to the Action Items table (#352, 353)</i>	completion date will be given at July meeting.
361	Analyte Code changes needed in LAMS. (TKN)	Maria Dan Hickman	7/20/17	9/30/17	Still need to look into TKN issue. 2/22/18 – Maria will confirm. 10/18/18: Maria still needs to confirm. She just got something.
363	Discuss procedural change in how changes are made to LAMS. Consider notifying PTPEC before relevant changes are made and provide a summary of changes at some frequency.			1/31/17	Will talk to IT about getting this in an SOP. 12/21/17: Maria will follow-up on this. 3/20/18: Maria will check this week. 6/21/18 – still being worked on. 2/28/19 – Maria will follow-up.
368	Forward Jerry's question to Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee. (Analyte code change for the non-polar extractable materials.)	Maria	8/24/17	9/1/17	Maria will resend to Carl. 6/21/18 – Maria will send to Ilona. 10/18/18: Maria will send Dan's new info. 11/15/18 – Ilona received the info



	<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>Date Added</b>	<b>Expected Completion</b>	<b>Actual Completion</b>
					and needs to review it. (April PTPEC meeting.)
384	Meet with Dan Hickman to get Analyte Codes and then prepare final DRAFT of Micro DW and WW tables. Send to Jennifer for review.	Maria	4/19/18	5/15/18	Still in Progress
389	Present recommended LAMS updates to Dan Hickman.	Maria	5/17/18	5/20/18	FoPT format subcommittee provided recommendations.
397	Discuss Vol 3 and 4 implementation with NELAP AC.	Maria	10/18/18	11/15/18	In progress.
400	Follow-up on subcommittee reports from WET and the FoPT Table Format Subcommittee.	Maria	11/15/18	12/18/18	In Progress – combine with 349.
410	Review SOPs 4-102 and 7-101 to make sure there are no conflicts in the appeals process.	Eric	2/28/19	TBD	In Progress
411	Follow-up on two preliminary complaints on Hardness.	Maria	2/28/19	3/20/19	3/21/19: Did talk to lab, but waiting for follow-up. Still working with NELAP AC. Lab did not respond, so this is being closed. They need to file a formal complaint. Complete

	<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>Date Added</b>	<b>Expected Completion</b>	<b>Actual Completion</b>
412	Maria will talk to Craig about holding off on more work on the WET FoPT Table until ELAB provides guidance.	Maria	3/21/19	4/17/19	
415	Send formal request to Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee to work on footnote issue raised by Shawn regarding Footnotes 5 and 6.	Maria	3/21/19	4/17/19	Complete, but will resend to Carl.
417	Discuss ARA data issue with the NELAP AC.	Maria	4/18/19	5/16/19	Pending
418	Discuss Analyte Code issue with Bill from New Hampshire.	Maria	4/18/19	5/16/19	
419	Prepare list of items needed in SOPs to accomplish Volume 3 and 4.	Maria, Shawn	5/16/19	TBD	
420	Let Jerry know about possible EPA issue with FoPT tables.	Ilona	5/16/19	6/19/19	
421	Send message to Committee to review information on data points vs participants and provide comment by email.	Maria	6/20/19	6/27/19	
422	Send Isomer ARA data to Carl so Chem FoPT Subcommittee can begin work on this.	Maria	6/20/19	7/17/19	

**Attachment C**

**Backburner / Reminders – TNI PT Executive Committee**

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Meeting Reference</b>	<b>Comments</b>
7	Add the Field PT Subcommittee to the limit update SOP during its next update.	3/4/10	In Progress
11	Evaluate how labs are accredited for analytes that co-elute.	5-19-11	
13	Charter needs to be reviewed/updated in November.	Ongoing	
18	Shawn noted that PTPEC should have some specific measurements. This should be passed along to the PTP SOP Subcommittee. Nicole noted that we need to determine which items to measure.	6-29-17	

## Attachment D: TNI PT Database: Data Points and Lab Participants

The Analyte Breakdown subcommittee began to review recently submitted PT data and raised a question about how PT Providers are interpreting the requirement to supply data for “Data Points” (defined as “Number of data points in the PT Study”) and for “Lab Participants” (defined as “Number of laboratory participants in the PT Study”).

From the data submitted, the subcommittee noted that some samples have the same value for both “Lab Participants” and “Data Points,” while other samples have values for “Data Points” that are greater than “Lab Participants” for the same sample.

Providers who had submitted data recently were asked how their organization calculated “Data Points” versus “Lab Participants” in their uploads to the TNI PT Database. This is how they responded:

PT Provider	Response to Question About Data Points and Lab Participants Calculation
#1	The values will match in our case. If a lab enters for multiple methods, we treat each data point and entry as independent entries - 1:1.
#2	Number of Laboratory Participants': How many laboratories were evaluated in this study for the given analyte.  'Number of Data Points': How many measurements were evaluated in this study for the given analyte. Because laboratories can submit multiple measurements per study per analyte this number can be higher than the 'Number of Laboratory Participants'.
#3	The data that we reported for Lab Participants is the sum of all customers enrolled for that product that are eligible to report a result into that dataset. The data for Data Points is the sum number of results actually reported.
#4	The N for participants and data are equal. We have no way to determine if, when a laboratory reports multiple results, they actually ran them independently or as a single analysis. I have witnessed cases where completely independent labs reported identical results to 3 sigfig. A lab may even run the same method by different analysts for their own DOC purposes. I believe that Analyst is not a required reported parameter.  If the PTPEC wishes for all individual data points, that is not what was requested. And since laboratory identification is not reported, I believe it is unwise to assume that any duplicate results are necessarily one lab’s single analysis. And in summary format, I believe it is unwise to assume that a single LabID reporting multiple results did not in fact report multiple distinct results.
#5	We report each data results reported by the participating laboratory as reported. A number of our customers report multiple data points per sample using different methods and different analysts. We do not modify reported values. We include all results reported. It is common for the number of participating laboratories to be less than the number of data points.

To maximize the comparability of the summary PT data, data should be sourced using equivalent methodology from all Providers. It is therefore important that the PTPEC establish precisely what was intended to be reported by Providers when submitting “Data Points” and “Lab Participants” with summary PT data.

It must be noted that this issue is not limited to analyte breakdown: the “Data Points” and “Lab Participants” values are a part of the routine data submission that will be required from Providers when they implement the 2016 TNI Standard. Consensus should be reached now, before those routine data submissions begin, so that this issue need not arise again.

Options:

1. 1) Request all Providers to report data points vs lab participants as done by Providers #1 and #4. In this case, the values in both fields would always match, meaning that one of the fields would be redundant.
2. 2) Request all Providers to report data points vs lab participants as done by Providers #2, #3, and #5. In this case, the separate fields may or may not be equal, depending on the results reported by labs and whether those labs reported multiple results for a given sample. The PTPEC must decide whether the value of having this information (i.e., seeing that the number of data points is greater than lab participants for a given sample) outweighs its potential to mislead, given the uncertainty of whether data points represent actual separate measurements or the same values reported for multiple methods (or a combination of the two).
3. 3) Maintain the status quo. Providers will continue to report data points vs lab participants according to their current methodologies.
4. 4) Other (to be determined).