



Proficiency Testing Expert Committee

- Expert committees develop standards consistent with TNI's mission, using a consensus process
- Committee has PTP, State AB, Labs, Consultants



PT Disclaimer

- Working on PT standard for NELAP
- NEFAP PTs not part of discussion





One Nation Under PT

- The PT Standard is unique
 - The most “National” of the National Accreditation Program
 - Affect on States and Federal programs – NELAP or not
 - PT is every Module





SINCE JANUARY

- Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) TIA

- Standard Interpretation Requests (SIR)

- WDS Development
 - Volume 1 – Out for comment
 - Volume 2 – Out for comment
 - Volume 3- Expect to be out of committee by Sept 2012
 - Volume 4 – Under development- Expect to be out of committee by Oct 2012



TIA SOP 2-100

- Tentative Interim Amendment — an amendment to a standard resulting from an emergency need, and remaining in effect for a maximum of two (2) years from the date of its adoption.



WET TESTING

- 2003 – Was fine
 - Followed Requirement of DMRQA

- 2009



- Had the same requirements for WET as Chemistry and Micro
 - ✦ 2 per year
 - ✦ Pass two of three etc





V1M1 – 4.2.1.d&e V2M2 – 5.2.1.e & f

- Whole Effluent Toxicity testing laboratories shall analyze at least one (1) TNI-compliant PT sample per calendar year for each accredited FoPT for which the laboratory holds accreditation with the primary AB. The primary AB shall require corrective action when a PT study has been failed. Corrective action shall include:...



Yes SIR, That's my Baby

SIR 1

V1M1 6.1 b) vs V2M2 8.2 c)

There is a discrepancy between these two sections.
V1M1 6.1 b) says 15 days between analysis dates for successive PTs for corrective action.

V2M2 8.2 c) still uses the closing date of the previous study

By the way...SIR = Standard Interpretation Request



SIR 1 Response

- Response: There was an apparent oversight in the V2M2 section 8.2(c) requirements. Section V2M2 5.1.4 refers to time between analysis dates for Initial Accreditation and Section V2M2 5.2.1 refers to time between analysis dates for Continuing Accreditation. Both of these are consistent with the requirements in V1M1. Additionally, there is no reason why the requirement should be any different for PTs used for corrective action.



Committee Position

- It is our opinion that the language that is in V1M1 6.1b was the intended requirement and should be utilized by the ABs as the requirement for V2M2 section 8.2(c).
- Status of response: Sent to AC for their vote



To SIR with Love

- **SIR 2**
- V1M1 4.2.1.a , V2M2 5.2.1.a
- When labs use the same technology for different methods (e.g., Aroclors in oil & 8082), is a lab required to participate in separate studies or is one sufficient?





Committee Position

- Both matrices have separate FOPTs, & ABs accredit to both matrices; labs are required to analyze both an oil & a soil.



Truth or Consequences

Truths

- “Nothing” is perfect
- The 2009 standard is better than “Nothing”

Obvious Conclusion

- **The 2009 Standard is BETTER THAN PERFECT**
- **No Need to change anything?**



Is it WDS or WMD?

- The Working Draft Standard (WDS)
 - LOQ vs PTRL Reporting
 - Analyzed Dates
 - Consistency between V1M1 and V2M2
 - WET
 - Corrective Action PTs
 - What is Technology? (instrument vs instrument+prep)



LOQ vs PTRL

- Intent to have lab report like always

- Current update
 - Move back to PTRL
 - Lab may report to LOQ if lower than PTRL without penalty.





Analyzed Dates

- Harder to track
- Will move back to closing dates





Corrective Action PTS

- Effort to eliminate sending to CA PTS to the AB.
 - Labs still are required to perform corrective action.
 - They don't really help the lab with 2 of 3 requirement.
 - Costs more
 - Hard for ABs to keep track



Best Laid Plans

- Labs want to have the option to run them and report them
- Some ABs require them



What is Technology?

- Currently = Determinative method
- Problem: some labs run PTs per extraction method to test all of the methods they run.
 - If analyte fails for one method it fails for both but they are not necessarily reflective of each other.
 - Labs penalized for extra effort



Technology - deux

- Trying to find wording that will allow for exceptions to rule when multiple preps are allowed without increasing the PT requirement.
- We welcome comments
- May have to stay with current rule but are reluctant to penalize labs for running additional PTs.



Other stuff

- Consistency between Volumes
 - Where same remove from Volume 2 (keep in Volume 1.
- Reorganize: Put all common requirements in beginning and separate out the exceptions
- Revise or remove “Notes” that are prescriptive



Volume 3 PTPs

- Unanswered Question:
- Do we continue to write criteria for stability and homogeneity tests? or
- Follow adopt the “fit for use” concept in ISO 17043. PT providers are all accredited to 17043 and Calibration standards CRM and SRM already made to meet ISO standards?.



What's Next

- Comment period open for 15 days
- Committee to respond to all comments
- Finalize WDS and put out for vote.



- Send comments to WDS to:
- Mitzi Miller - PT Committee Chair
- Mitzi.miller@moellerinc.com



