

Task Group on Water Quality Testing Devices

Teleconference Meeting Summary **DRAFT**

March 11, 2021

This document is the property of NSF International (NSF) and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it shall not be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.

Participating members:

Town of Flower Mound	Vyles, Tom
Industrial Test Systems, Inc.	Bailey, George
Consultant - Public Health/Regulatory	Campbell, Suzie
LaMotte Co.	Egan, Jim
Richard Falk	Falk, Richard
NSF International	Pattison, Megan
NSF International	Schaefer, Kevin

Participating observers:

NSF International	Choe, Sung
Neptune-Benson, Inc.	George, Ron
Taylor Technologies	Ivusich, Wayne
LaMotte Chemical	Klebon, Bryan
LaMotte Chemical	Maisano, Joe
RAM Consulting Services	Martin, Richard
Sigura	Meyer, Ellen
ChlorKing Incorporated	Pearce, Steve
NSF International	Ramankutty, Nidhin
Industrial Test Systems, Inc.	Tatineni, Balaji
NSF International	Snider, Jason

Discussion

T. Vyles welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. J. Snider took roll and read the anti-trust statement. Seven of the 10 voting members were present (70%) which did represent a quorum.

The group began with the issue paper [RWF-2020-8 Sensor WQTD](#). S. Choe explained that the issue paper was submitted to incorporate language addressing sensor-based water quality testing devices. He added that the devices are similar to those used in automated controllers, and that the language proposed borrowed heavily from the Automated Controllers section. E. Meyer asked for clarity regarding the chemical resistance test. S. Choe explained that since the sensor would not require a shelf life test like a reagent would, the device would undergo an accuracy test before and after the 100 days of testing as in Section N-10.1.2. J. Egan asked for clarification on the test, and if the sensors would be stored in solution for the 100 days of the test. S. Choe confirmed it would and asked the group if there were any other requirements from the Automated Controllers language would need to be removed. J. Egan asked if the group should consider adding a definition for “sensor-based WQTD”. There was some discussion around what would be considered a sensor-based WQTD, and whether that would include items that utilize reagents. The group eventually agreed on the definition:

3.XX Sensor-based Water Quality Testing Device (WQTD): a water quality testing device that measures water quality in situ but does not have any control capability.

The group also discussed whether the sensor-based devices would have the same pass-fail criteria levels, with the consensus being that it should. K. Schaefer noted that a handheld pH probe could qualify as a sensor-based WQTD. He added that anything that uses reagents was already covered by the current scope. R. Falk noted that a handheld pH meter would fall under the current scope as well, as a “analytical probe”. S. Choe stated that there was a product current listed under a deviation. The group reviewed the listing, and S. Choe offered to share the deviation with the group. S. Choe offered to take the initially proposed language and make revisions based on the discussion during the call.

The group moved on to [RWF-2020-9 WQTD Accuracy](#). R. Falk asked the group for background on the accuracy levels currently in the standard, noting that typically accuracy ranges are given as a proportional value and an absolute value, whereas in the current standard only one is given. K. Schaefer answered that the chart had been improved in recent years, and that there always was room for improvement.

Task Group on Water Quality Testing Devices

Teleconference Meeting Summary **DRAFT**

March 11, 2021

This document is the property of NSF International (NSF) and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it shall not be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.

J. Egan stated that he liked the approach proposed in the issue paper, adding that the current chart proved difficult when addressing the transition points. R. Falk explained that the proposed revision intended to maintain the current L1, L2, L3 levels. R. Martin noted that the language had been drafted before many manufacturers were tested, and now that the problem areas could be identified, this language made sense. J. Egan suggested the numbers in the cyanuric acid test may need to be revised. T. Vyles suggested the language be straw balloted, and any comments received could be discussed on the next call.

Action items

S. Choe to revise sensor-based WQTD language based on discussion and present to group at next teleconference.

J. Snider to prepare straw ballot of WQTD accuracy language and send to group.

Next teleconference date April 22, 2021.