1. Roll call, approval of minutes and overview:

Chair, Maria Friedman, called the TNI PT Program Executive Committee (PTPEC) meeting to order in New Orleans, at 1:30pm Central. Attendance is recorded in Attachment A – there were 9 members present.

2. Opening

Maria reviewed the work done by the committee since the last meeting (see Attachment D).

3. PTPA Presentations

ANAB – Presentation – Matt Sica

Matt reviewed the presentation provided in Attachment E.

There were no complaints.

- Failure Rates above 10% - see slides
  - There may have been some studies where participants were at 20.
  - 390 studies and only 13 met >10% failure.
  - Ammonia was a provider issue. Only one provider had the problem and it has been worked through.
  - There does seem to be a problem with the Solids limits. This is a repeat.

Shawn Kassner noted that the failure rate calculation and tracking is something being considered in the setting FoPT Limits SOP. It was commented that the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee can look at problem analytes after finishing up Radiochemistry table updates.

A2LA – Presentation - Shawn Kassner

Shawn reviewed the presentation provided in Attachment E.
Need to be sure nothing is provider specific.

There’s always a small data set from a PT Provider. The failure rates are often higher with these data sets.

There are only 5 analytes where a repeated failure issue is seen.

Carl noted that he thinks based on the presentations, the PT Program is functioning well.

It was asked if a Method Update Rule has impact on PT Data? The appropriate data sets should be shared with the PTPAs to watch it.

Instrumentation has changed in the last year especially in Wet Chemistry. IC’s are now in most labs.

4. Review of PTP/NEFAP Combined Evaluation SOP (SOP 7-101)

Ilona reviewed the changes made to the combined evaluation SOP (7-101) and to the DRAFT response to the Policy Committee. What started out as a simple process to approve these documents turned into a long discussion once the Committee began to review the dispute procedures in Section 6.11. At the last meeting (7/19/18) it was decided to have the PTP SOP Subcommittee work on updating the PTP SOP for disputes, appeals and complaints (SOP 4-102) so that SOP 7-101 can reference it. Once the subcommittee started working on it, they decided it was better not to include the dispute procedures for the recognition process (between the PTPEC and Recognition Committee (RC)) in the PTPEC ‘s dispute SOP, but that it should be placed into the combined evaluation SOP. They provided language for the Committee to look at in SOP 7-101.

Matt prefers to see the dispute procedures stay in the program dispute process (SOP 4-102).

A motion was made by Matt to update SOP 4-102 and not include dispute resolution in the combined evaluation SOP (SOP 7-101). The motion was seconded by Michella.

Comments:

- Stacie would like a procedure to be in place that makes sure this dispute process is handled consistently.

- The issue of concern is what happens if the PTPEC disagrees with the RC’s recommendation and does not want to endorse it. Matt asked if this is appropriate. The PTPEC and NEFAP EC only get the recommendation letter that summarizes what the RC looked at and what’s its conclusion was. This is not enough information to dispute an AB’s recognition. The PTPEC and NEFAP EC are supposed to take the recommendation and endorse it as per SOP 7-101. Matt asked why a dispute
procedure is needed beyond what is already in the PTPEC’s dispute SOP (SOP 4-102) when the RC is the one making the final decision/recommendation. He also noted that he is concerned about the language in SOP 7-101 that does not make it clear that the RC is making the final decision. The executive committee acts upon the recognition and recognizes the AB and provides the actual certificate. They do not vote to approve the AB. Any vote of endorsement is only confirmation that the RC did its job properly - the RC looked at what they were supposed to look at to vote on recognition of the AB.

- The NELAP AC gets to review the actual evaluation documentation – including the Evaluation Team’s report. The PTPEC and NEFAP EC do not see the actual evaluation documentation. The executive committees only see the information summarized in the example recommendation letter in the SOP 7-101 attachments.

  o Matt asked how can the executive committee not accept the recommendation, without access to the reports and all notes. If they have authority to withhold recognition, they would all need access to all documents and records related to the evaluation. He encourages the process to be transparent, where the most important step is the determination and training of the evaluators…the end process should only be a vote to approve the recommendation whatever it may be.

  o Ilona commented that when NEFAP was formed it was decided that the NGAB’s would not vote on each other’s recognition. There were some strong statements made by some of the NGABs that it was a competition issue unique to the US. That is why the Recognition Committee (RC) was developed. There are no NGABs on the RC.

- It was noted that the Policy Committee had some concerns about having the Recognition Committee make the final decision on recognition. They felt it was in conflict with the new TNI organization. After much discussion the Policy Committee could accept the concept of an endorsement and this is why the language is written as it is in the SOP. Matt feels the PTPEC should push back on this language and just state that the RC makes the decision and the executive committees implement the decision.

- Matt provided information on what is different with the International recognitions the NGAB’s participate in. He noted that the Regional Authorities recognition council typically have access to the evaluation documents. So the council can ask targeted questions of the evaluated AB and evaluation team to clarify points before acting on the recommendation.

- Carl commented that the only way to deal with the NGAB issue is to leave the decision to the Recognition Committee.

- Matt summarized his thoughts on a dispute procedure between the executive committee and the RC: That would bring the entire TNI process into disrepute. If the recognition committee is compromised, then TNI as an organization has failed to vet
or properly train the members of the process. The recognition committee has to have the tools, access to docs and records and experience to thoroughly evaluate the AB and to provide conclusions and recommendation on the status. The process needs to be transparent to ensure it is followed. If the executive committee is not part of the actual evaluation process, what is the for cause situation that they can state the process is not followed. The corrective action process of the evaluation and subsequent appeals process are the two dispute points….those are between the RC and the AB…The executive committee has noting to do with it and should not stop the process without access to the entire file.

- There were a number of committee members and conference attendees that agreed the language in SOP 7-101 should be updated to accurately reflect the process.

- Given time constraints of the meeting, it was decided that a small group of people representing PTPEC, NEFAP EC and the Combined Evaluation SOP Subcommittee should meet with Alfredo and Jerry to discuss their concerns and reach a conclusion on the wording of the SOP. The SOP will then be brought back to each executive committee for review of the updated language and voting. Ilona will reach out to Jerry and Alfredo.

- Matt and Michella withdrew their motion and second until further discussion can happen.

5. Subcommittee Reports

Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee – Bob Shannon and Keith McCroan are working on a new procedure for Radiochemistry FoPT calculations. Current limits are based on the original EPA procedures. The subcommittee will begin meeting again once Bob and Keith have a proposal to present.

SOP Subcommittee – The subcommittee has completed its recommendation on dispute procedures. They are still working on the FoPT SOP – 4-101. This may take a year to complete – at least.

FoPT Table Format Subcommittee – The subcommittee has worked on all the FoPT tables at this point. The IT Committee is reviewing an SOP on how analyte and method codes will be implemented. Once this is done, they will be able to finish up.

Microbiology FoPT Subcommittee – The subcommittee is continuing to work on the ARA.
6. Future Plans

See slides in Attachment D.

- Matt – They can look at failure rate and see 100% success rate on most analytes. Is this really helpful? What is the purpose of the PTs? Carl noted that there are regulatory acceptance limits. Is it OK that labs pass their PTs? They all have great quality systems now. Is the challenge adequate?

- Andy asked about experimental PTs. Will they be brought back?

- It was mentioned that labs need to run PTs for each method. They can’t report the same PT for multiple methods under the same technology. This could be an SIR. PT providers don’t want to see the same number reported twice.
  - Maria thinks this may be a California issue. Regulations that are more stringent trump.
  - DW does require the lab must run a PT for each method 1x per year.
  - If you choose to report all methods under on technology – if you fail one ... you fail all.


- None.

8. Action Items

The action items can be found in Attachment B. The action items will be reviewed at the next meeting.

9. Next Meeting

The next meeting will be on 9/20/18 by teleconference at 1pm Eastern. There will not be a call on the third Thursday in August.

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

Maria adjourned the meeting at 4:56 Central. (Motion: Matt  Second: Fred Unanimously approved.)
## Attachment A

### Participants

**TNI Proficiency Testing Program Executive Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Rep</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maria Friedman (2020) (Chair) Present</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>California Water Board</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Maria.Friedman@waterboards.ca.gov">Maria.Friedman@waterboards.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Marlin (2018*) (Vice-Chair) Absent</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Marlin Quality Management, LLC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marlinquality@gmail.com">marlinquality@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilona Taunton, Program Administrator Present</td>
<td></td>
<td>TNI</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tauntoni@msn.com">tauntoni@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Smith (2019) Absent</td>
<td>Lab</td>
<td>ALS Environmental</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eric.smith@alsglobal.com">eric.smith@alsglobal.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Kircher (2021*) Present</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Florida Department of Health</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Carl.Kircher@flhealth.gov">Carl.Kircher@flhealth.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Valkenburg (2021*) Present</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>Energy Laboratories</td>
<td><a href="mailto:avalkenburg@energylab.com">avalkenburg@energylab.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Duhon (2019*) Present</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Millipore Sigma</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jennifer.duhon@sial.com">jennifer.duhon@sial.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Sica (2020) Present</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>ANAB, ANSI-ASQ National Accreditation Board</td>
<td><a href="mailto:msica@anab.org">msica@anab.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gil Dichter (2018*) Absent</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>IDEXX Water</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gil-dichter@idexx.com">gil-dichter@idexx.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Garrity (2019*) Present</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Kentucky DEP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:patrick.garrity@ky.gov">patrick.garrity@ky.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michella Karapondo (2019*) Present</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>USEPA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karapondo.michella@epa.gov">karapondo.michella@epa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Anderson (2020*) Present</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Advanced Analytical Solutions, LLC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Fred@advancedqc.com">Fred@advancedqc.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Mullins (2020*) Present</td>
<td>Lab</td>
<td>Upper Occoquan Service Authority</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jennifer.mullins@uosa.org">jennifer.mullins@uosa.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Haas (2020*) Absent</td>
<td>FSMO</td>
<td>Environmental Testing, Inc.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:shaas@etilab.com">shaas@etilab.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment B

### Action Items – TNI PT Executive Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Date Added</th>
<th>Expected Completion</th>
<th>Actual Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>Shawn</td>
<td>2/20/14</td>
<td>New Date: 8/31/18</td>
<td>In Progress (will use 2009 TNI Standards and current SSAS Standards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ilona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(originally discussed 8/6/13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>4/20/17</td>
<td>4/25/17</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2/28/18 – For WET?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2018 for all tables.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New target date: 7/15/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2/20/14</td>
<td>TBD (see #350)</td>
<td>In Progress – Update of SOP 4-101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>350: Prepare formal request to SOP Subcommittee regarding updating FoPT tables and applicable backburner items.</td>
<td>6/21/18: Gil noted that this SOP will be worked on again at the next meeting. An expected completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>date will be given at July meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Item</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Date Added</td>
<td>Expected Completion</td>
<td>Actual Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>moved to the Action Items table (#352, 353)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353 Discuss possible procedural changes to how limits are updated. Maria talk to SOP Subcommittee. (Need to look at PT database implications.)</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>In Progress – Update of SOP 4-101 Maria will send a copy to close this item.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358 Send request to SOP subcommittee to consider what happens when ARA’s are rescinded. There is no formal process.</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>6-29-17</td>
<td>7/19/17</td>
<td>Maria will resend to Gil and this item will be closed. 3/15/18: Still in progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361 Analyte Code changes needed in LAMS. (TKN)</td>
<td>Maria Dan Hickman</td>
<td>7/20/17</td>
<td>9/30/17</td>
<td>Still need to look into TKN issue. 2/22/18 – Maria will confirm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/31/17</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368 Forward Jerry’s question to Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee. (Analyte</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>8/24/17</td>
<td>9/1/17</td>
<td>Maria will resend to Carl. 6/21/18 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Item</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Date Added</td>
<td>Expected Completion</td>
<td>Actual Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>code change for the non-polar extractable materials.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maria will send to Ilona.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373 Carl will notify the PTPEC when Bob and Keith complete their comparison table to the Radiochemistry FoPT work the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee has already prepared.</td>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>12-21-17</td>
<td>3-31-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>4/19/18</td>
<td>5/15/18</td>
<td>Still in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385 Send Micro DW and WW tables to PTPEC for review and vote at next meeting.</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>4/19/18</td>
<td>5/15/18</td>
<td>Still in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389 Present recommended LAMS updates to Dan Hickman.</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>5/17/18</td>
<td>5/20/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390 Update SOP 7-101 with PTPEC and NEFAP EC comments. Send to committees for final review.</td>
<td>Ilona/Stacie</td>
<td>7/19/18</td>
<td>8/6/18</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391 Setup meeting with Jerry and Alfredo to discuss combined evaluation process.</td>
<td>Ilona</td>
<td>8/6/18</td>
<td>9/20/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Backburner / Reminders – TNI PT Executive Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Meeting Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3/4/10</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5-19-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ongoing 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6-29-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Add the Field PT Subcommittee to the limit update SOP during its next update.

11. Evaluate how labs are accredited for analytes that co-elute.

13. Charter needs to be updated in November.

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.
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Agenda
- Review of PTPEC Mission / Purpose
- Review of PTPEC Activities
- PTPEA Presentations
  - ANAB, ANSI-ASQ National Accreditation Board – PT Program Update (Matt Sica)
  - A2LA – PT Program Update (Shawn Kassner)
- Committee Business
- Acknowledgments
- Public Comments

Mission
The purpose of the Proficiency Testing Program Executive Committee (PTPEC) is to establish and maintain certain elements of a national PT Program to support TNI’s Accreditation Programs and other TNI activities. Those elements include:
- Fields of Proficiency Testing (FoPT), consisting of analytes, concentrations, matrices, and acceptance limits, that are appropriate for the scope of environmental monitoring performed in the United States
- A listing of PT Provider Accreditors (PTPAs) that are TNI recognized
- A listing of organizations that are accredited by TNI’s recognized PTPAs as competent to provide PT samples to laboratories

PTPEC Meetings
- Conference calls the third Thursday of the month from 1:00-2:30 Eastern
- Face-to-Face with attendee participation at annual Environmental Measurement Symposium and Forum on Environmental Accreditation Conferences

Review of PTPEC Activities
February – August 2018

PTPEC Activities
- Analyte Request Application (ARA) Closed
  - ARA requested addition of qualitative PCB analysis to Non-Potable Water (NPW) and Solid and Chemical Materials (SCM) Fields of Proficiency Testing (FoPT) Tables
  - Subcommittee appointed to investigate the issue
  - Numerous discussions held involving PTPEC, members of NELAP Accreditation Council, and PT Providers
  - No consensus reached on how to meet the ARA applicant’s request given language in the TNI Standards
  - Issue referred to TNI PT Expert Committee for consideration during next revision of the TNI Standard
PTPEC Activities

- Response to Complaint Approved
  - Issue raised of potential degradation of 4,4'-DDT into 4,4'-DDD affecting a lab's PT score; requested PTPEC overturn an “unacceptable” PT score and publish a technical solution.
  - TNI cannot overturn a PT score; AB can evaluate a PT score differently than it was scored, based on technical merit of the lab's complaint.
  - PTPEC investigation into this matter ongoing; discussion to resume in PTPEC’s meeting in September 2018.
  - Issue may not be completely resolved until future standards are reviewed and adopted.

- Other Activities
  - Question about PTRL for ammonia and how lab should handle samples with analyte concentrations below the sensitivity of an approved test.
    - Discussed by PTPEC.
    - Issue forwarded to NELAP Accreditation Council.

PTPEC Activities

- SOP Activity
  - Approved SOP 4-102 (Dispute Resolution Procedure), forwarded to TNI Policy Committee.
  - Reviewed SOP 7-101 (TNI AB Evaluation and Recognition Procedure used by PTPEC and NEFAP EC), in progress.
  - Retired SOP 4-104 (PTPA Evaluation); replaced by SOP 7-101.

PTPEC Activities

- Drinking Water (DW) FoPT Table Updates
  - Updated footnote to clarify “Cyanide” includes all forms of Cyanide.
  - Approved by PTPEC, forwarded to NELAP AC for consideration.

PTPA Reports

ANAB, ANSI-ASQ National Accreditation Board
PT Program Update (Matt Sica)

A2LA
PT Program Update (Shawn Kassner)

Committee Business
Subcommittee Reports

Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee
- Working with Radiochemistry Expert Committee regarding alternate approach to updating FoPTs

Microbiology FoPT Subcommittee
- Working on final review of changes to FoPT Tables to accommodate Analyte Request Application for Most Probable Number FoPTs

FoPT Table Format Subcommittee
- Working with Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Expert Committee to obtain guidance on aligning WETT FoPT table with LAMS

SOP Subcommittee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOP Title</th>
<th>SOP #</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation and Calculation of Acceptance Limits for Chemical, Radiochemical, and Microbiological Components of Proficiency Tests</td>
<td>4-101</td>
<td>Being combined with 4-107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNP PT Program Complaint, Appeal, and Dispute Resolution Procedure</td>
<td>4-102</td>
<td>Sent to Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating PT Provider Accreditors</td>
<td>4-104</td>
<td>Retired; replaced by 7-101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT Program Executive Committee Voting Process</td>
<td>4-105</td>
<td>Sent to Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FoPT Table Management</td>
<td>4-107</td>
<td>Being combined with 4-101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future Plans, Tasks Still To Do, Next Priorities
- Update Radiochemistry FoPT Table
- Update WETT FoPT Table
  - Technical criteria
  - Format
- Complete Microbiology ARA
- Update SOP 4-101
- Create/publish guidance/technical solution to the dilemma of analyte breakdown in PT samples
Future Plans, Tasks Still To Do, Next Priorities

- Complete review of FoPT Tables for changes in format
  - DW
  - NPW
  - SCM
  - SSAS
- Complete review of SOP 7-101
- Request and review data for PT analytes with high failure rates

Old Business

Review of SOP 7-101

Old Business

Review of FoPT Tables for Consistency with LAMS

New Business

(To Be Determined)

Public Comments and Questions
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Next Meeting

- September 20, 2018 via teleconference

Adjourn

- Thank you for joining us today!
A2LA PTPA Update Report
TNI August 2018
Shawn Kassner

PT Provider Status
• ERA – Renewal Assessment Pending, Valid through 9/30/18
• Phenova – Renewal Assessment Completed, Valid through 9/30/18
• New York State Department of Health Wadsworth Center – Renewal Assessment Pending, Valid through 11/30/18
• Advanced Analytical – Renewal Assessment Pending, Valid through 1/31/18
• No complaints for any provider

New PTP Portal
• Updated PTP data upload portal for:
  ▪ First implemented ~15 yrs ago.
  ▪ Modernized website.
  ▪ Improved sustainability.
  ▪ Improved ease of use.
  ▪ More efficient.

> 10% Fail Analytes

Criteria to Determine
• Data was reviewed for the following criteria
  ▪ N > 30
  ▪ Multiple providers with the same analyte > 10% fail
• Why apply the criteria?
  ▪ Statistically valid
  ▪ Ensures the analyte is not provider specific

Data Challenges
• All PTPs have small data sets across analytes/studies types
• All small data sets with high failure rates due to:
  ▪ Few laboratory failures
  ▪ Multiple methods reported same data pts
**Data Challenges**

- What do these data sets represent?
  - Initial data is one year’s worth of data
  - Each data point is a study summary for an analyte.
  - 17397 data points across 4 PTPs
  - 5285 data points Failure rates > 10% and n > 30
  - 184 data points met criteria across multiple PTPs.
  - 1.06% of the data produced by PTPs.

**Data Review Steps**

- FR >10% Analytes for One PTP
  - The analyte history was reviewed across PTPs.
  - Study summary statistics
  - VHS data were examined
  - PTPs were contacted as necessary.
  - All instances where studies that had low n’s were data related.

**Solid/Haz Waste**

- Cyanide - Solids
  - % Recovery vs. % Fail Rate

- Silver - Solids
  - % Recovery vs. % Fail Rate

**Solid/Haz Waste**

- VOA - Solids
  - % Recovery vs. % Fail Rate

**Non-Potable Water - Inorganics**

- COD - WP CHEM
  - % Recovery vs. % Fail Rate
Data Conclusions

- PT acceptance limits are data quality objectives for laboratory performance.
- All analytes have been presented historically multiple times.
- No issues with:
  - PT samples
  - Verification, homogeneity, stability data
- SOP Subcommittee considering adding this analysis to the FTOP SOP.

Thank You!

- Our customers, the A2LA accredited proficiency testing providers.
- Our staff, assessors, and the PTPEC and PTEC that support us in the continuous improvement of our accreditation program.

Questions?
Thanks!

Shawn Kassner
skassner@neptuneinc.org
ANAB TNI PTP Review AUGUST 2018

Who is ANAB?
• Non-governmental organization that provides accreditation services to public-sector and private-sector organizations
• Multilateral recognition arrangements signatory of the
  • International Accreditation Forum (IAF)
  • International Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation (ILAC)
• Jointly owned by ANSI and ASQ

PT Provider Assessment Update
• Absolute Standards
  • Surveillance Activity
    • Conducted February, 2018
  • NSI Lab Solutions, Inc.
    • Reassessment Activity
    • Conducted July, 2018
• Sigma Aldrich RTC
  • Reassessment Activity
    • Conducted May, 2018

Report of PTP Complaints to PTPA
• None

Review of Analytes w/ Failure Rates of >10%
• Reviewed all analytes
  • DW, NIPW, SCM
**FoPT Tables**

- Effective tables found of TNI Website:
  - DW FoPT (11_03_2017)
  - NPW FoPT (Dec2016)
  - SCM FoPT (Dec2016)
- No additional considerations due to FoPT changes

**Data Selection Criteria (agreed by PTPAs)**

- Analytes had to have one or more failures in 6 month period
  - One or multiple PTPs
  - Number of participants >30

---

**Data Analysis**

- 390 (study type/analyte) combos >10% Failure before criteria applied
- 13 (study type/analyte) combos after criteria
- Then Reviewed
  - Median % Failure
  - Range of % Failures

**Data Considerations**

- Six Months of Data Limiting
  - Very little significance
- Frequency of Studies
  - 2 out of 3 ANAB accredited PTPs
  - Quarterly studies
- To adopt consistent approach PTPs agreed on N>30
  - Most quarterly studies OK
  - Many smaller studies data does not meet criteria

---

**2017 Analytes that met criteria**

- WPCHEM Total Suspended Solids (TSS): max % fail 12.3%
- WPCHEM Total Dissolved Solids (TDS): max % fail 19.4%
- WPCHEM Total Phosphorus: max % fail 18.4%
- WPCHEM Nitrite as N
- WPCHEM Ammonia as N

**WP Iron**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median %</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>4 of 8 studies n&lt;20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>1 study met criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
### WP Total Solids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Analyte</th>
<th>2017 MAX</th>
<th>2018 MAX</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>Total Solids</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPCHEM</td>
<td>Total Solids</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **WP:** 5 of 6 studies n<20
- **WPCHEM:** 1 study met criteria. 1 study failed criteria.

- **WP:** 84% Pass, N=7
- **WPCHEM:** 86% Pass, N=15

### WP TDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Analyte</th>
<th>2017 MAX</th>
<th>2018 MAX</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPCHEM</td>
<td>Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **WP:** 3 of 8 studies n<20
- **WPCHEM:** 1 study met criteria. 1 study failed criteria.

- **WP:** 88% Pass, N=7
- **WPCHEM:** 86% Pass, N=9

### WP TSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Analyte</th>
<th>2017 MAX</th>
<th>2018 MAX</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>Total Suspended Solids (TSS)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPCHEM</td>
<td>Total Suspended Solids (TSS)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **WP:** 1 of 9 studies n<20
- **WPCHEM:** 6 studies met criteria. 3 providers.

- **WP:** 87% Pass, N=9
- **WPCHEM:** 87% Pass, N=17

### WPCEM Turbidity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Analyte</th>
<th>2017 MAX</th>
<th>2018 MAX</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>Turbidity</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPCHEM</td>
<td>Turbidity</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **WP:** 6 of 9 studies n<20
- **WPCHEM:** 1 study met criteria. 1 study failed criteria.

- **WP:** 88% Pass, N=13
- **WPCHEM:** 85% Pass, N=17

### Repeated Analytes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Analyte</th>
<th>2017 MAX</th>
<th>2018 MAX</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPCHEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Questions?

Matthew Sica  
Accreditation Manager, RMP, PT & Medical  
ANSI-ASQ National Accreditation Board (ANAB)  
Direct: 414-501-5356 | Main: 414-501-5494  
msica@anab.org  
www.anab.org