TNI Stationary Source Audit Sample Expert Committee Teleconference
May 3, 2010

Attendance:

Maria Friedman, Chair	Committee member	present
Michael Klein	Committee member	present
Ray Merrill	Committee member	present
Gregg O'Neal	Committee member	present
Michael Schapira	Committee member	absent
Jim Serne	Committee member	present
Candace Sorrell	Committee member	absent
Richard Swartz, Vice-chair	Committee member	present
Stanley Tong	Committee member	present
Jane Wilson	Program Administrator	absent
Shawn Kassner	Associate member	present
Mike Miller	Associate member	absent
Ty Garber	Associate member	absent
Mike Hayes	Guest	absent
William Daystrom	Guest	present

1) Double-check of documents to be referenced in this teleconference

Maria noted that all documents for this call were sent via email on 4-30-2010. All confirmed receipt of the email.

2) Review and approval of minutes from teleconference on April 19, 2010

Jim asked when the Data Revision Request Form (hereafter, Form) will be used and under what circumstances may a revision be requested. Maria requested to hold off on the questions until after the minutes have been reviewed since the questions were the main topics on this call.

Richard moved to accept as drafted; Michael Klein seconded. All were in favor.

3) Update from SSAS Table subcommittee

Shawn provided the update. The subcommittee requests guidance from the SSAS Expert Committee (hereafter, Expert Committee) on how would new analytes be added to the SSAS Table (hereafter, Table) where no historical data exist. How will the Table be expanded; should there be an experimental table similar to that used for PT studies? Shawn will send via email to Maria the details of the request. Maria added that this will be one of the topics to be discussed in the Expert Committee's next call.

4) Resume discussion re. Data Revision Request Form

In response to Jim's earlier question, Shawn gave some examples of why a revision to an audit sample result, already posted in the SSAS Central Database (hereafter, central database), may be requested: dilution error, method description error, incorrect audit sample result evaluation from the Provider, or data entry error from the Provider. Maria pointed out that, in essence, and as discussed during the 4-19-2010 call, the Form will

be used to request corrections for typos or data entry errors, and not for disputed results. Additionally, the Form is only (at this time) for the Provider's use. Going forward, as the TNI SSAS Program evolves, the Form may be amended for other purposes and other Participants may be involved.

Before proceeding to discuss the assignment (re. Jack's input to the Form) from the Regulatory Agencies, Maria asked the committee to review once more the amended Form emailed to all on 4-3-2010. Michael Klein noted that reference to 'removal' (or other grammatical forms of 'removal', as applicable) had not been replaced with 'revision' (or other grammatical form of 'revision', as applicable), even though the title of the Form now refers to a 'revision'. Maria will amend the Form as noted.

Richard summarized the Regulatory Agencies' discussion regarding their assignment: They agreed that the Form should be used solely for data entry and math errors (and this one may also be on a case-to-case basis, depending on Regulatory Agency's decision). In the case of math errors, Michael Klein provided an example where a dilution could have been applied only to the audit sample results but not on the field sample results.

Shawn pointed out that if an error originated from a Provider, the revision should be approved. Maria noted that as long as the Provider had notified the appropriate Participants, especially the Regulatory Agency, of the request, then there should not be a problem with the approval. By default, the Regulatory Agency must be notified. Stan and Richard also agreed.

Michael Klein noted that there should be confirmation (as also proposed in Jack's email) that the appropriate Participants have been notified. William said he could send an email to the appropriate Regulatory Agency. Maria asked if a return email to William notifying him of the approval is necessary. Perhaps, the 'return receipt' feature in e-mails may be utilized. William did not want to endorse use of that feature since it is unreliable. Michael Klein thought that it is not necessary for William to wait for a response before initiating the revision. If there is ever a concern, the Regulatory Agency (and other involved Participants) would have already notified the Provider of their concern beforehand. Shawn said that he was wary of putting TNI or William in the position of being a gatekeeper, as opposed to serving as administrator of the central database. Richard added that the involved Participants should be able to work the concerns on their own (outside of TNI). Maria noted that, as was previously agreed, William will send to the Expert Committee the first few revision requests so the Expert Committee may evaluate whether the procedures (being proposed) need modification or improvement.

Gregg asked if William will be updating the central database on a regular schedule to know when the most current data will be available. William has not planned on a regular update; revision will be real-time (when request was approved). He also added that old data must be first removed from the central database before new or corrected data may be uploaded. Data removed are also not stored. The Form will document the details of the requested revision. Gregg thought that, perhaps, there should be a separate database where deleted data may be stored and only accessed by the Administrator (i.e., William, at this time). William did not think he would need to go back to review deleted data. If needed, he will be able to query the database of Form submissions to

find out which audit sample data had been revised in the past. Besides, if old data need to be retrieved, the Providers should be able to pull them out from their own databases.

In the case of errors due to the Laboratory, Maria asked whether a response should first be received from the appropriate Participants before the revision to the audit sample results in the central database are made. It was made clear that before the Provider even fills up the Form, they must have already contacted the appropriate Participants. Any disagreement among the Participants would have been resolved prior to the Provider filling up the Form.

Richard asked if the central database already has information on specific contact names from among the Regulatory Agencies. William responded that he would collect e-mail addresses as part of building the valid value lists for the central database. Maria noted that it was previously discussed that the central database subcommittee will help in this regard by screening prospective users who will be requesting access to the central database. Gregg added that they subcommittee can ask the prospective user whether he/she is the audit sample contact in his/her organization.

Jim asked how should the request for revision be handled if the error originated from the Stationary Source Tester (hereafter, Tester). Maria responded that the Tester should first notify their Laboratory since the Laboratory is the one who submitted the audit sample results to the Provider. The revision procedure for Laboratories will then apply.

In summary, the following procedures apply to all Participants and will be added on the Form for information purposes:

a) Provider identifies that a revision to the audit sample results or other information, already uploaded to the central database, is necessary, either due to their own error or due to an error that was brought to their attention as being caused by another Participant.

b) Provider notifies all affected Participants.

c) Provider and all affected Participants resolve amongst themselves any disagreement or concern regarding the revision request, if any.

d) Provider fills up the online Form.

e) William makes the changes to the central database, per the Form.

f) William e-mails affected Regulatory Agency of his receipt of the Form.

Thereafter, William provided an update on his progress on the central database. A new “blank” database has been created using a new schema based on the final fields from the permission matrix approved by the Expert Committee. The focus now is on the programming that will enable upload of EDDs by Providers into the central database. The goal of the upload design is to make the process as simple as possible. William hopes to schedule training for Providers on the new system soon.

Maria will resend to all the Form, to be amended based on the discussions above. The Expert Committee will also be asked to approve/vote on amended Form either by e-mail or during the next call.

Next call is on May 10th, 2:00 PM EDT.