Task Group on Water Quality Testing Devices

Teleconference Meeting Summary DRAFT

June 30, 2022

Participating members:

Town of Flower Mound, Texas	Vyles, Tom
LaMotte Co.	Egan, Jim
NSF International	Schaefer, Kevin

Participating observers:

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention...	Laco, Joe
Oklahoma City-County Health Department	Li, Chris
RAM Consulting Services	Martin, Richard
Solenis	Meyer, Ellen
NSF International	Pattison, Megan
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. Three of the 8 voting members were present (38%) which did not represent a quorum.

The first agenda item was RWF-2020-9 WQTD Accuracy. The group reviewed the 50i173r3 straw ballot which incorporated changes based on the discussion during the group's last call. The group reviewed a comment by J. Egan, which aimed to add three ranges for the L2 and L3 levels. There was general agreement on the additional changes, and the group agreed to send the language to straw ballot.

The group moved on to the RWF-2020-8 Sensor WQTD issue paper. The group had reviewed the 50i172r2 – draft language during the previous call, and K. Schaefer shared revisions made based on those conversations. There was discussion about what the proper temperature testing should be for a device that was floating in a pool. Eventually it was agreed to use 110 ± 5 °F. E. Meyer added that the testing should be at 110 or the maximum storage temperature recommended by the manufacturer. The group agreed to send this updated language to straw ballot.

The next agenda item was RWF-2019-11 – Shelf life. T. Vyles reminded the group that a straw ballot had been sent to the group:

●I feel the standard is sufficient to achieve our goals of determining the accuracy of shelf life statements.	5	55.556%
●The standard is too onerous and needs to be revised, but there needs to be a standard for shelf life.	3	33.333%
●Shelf life has too many variables and should be removed from the standard.	1	11.111%

T. Vyles suggested that based on the Shelf-life straw ballot results, there did not seem to be much interest in removing the shelf life requirements entirely, as the original issue paper suggested. R. Martin noted that the original intent of including the requirements was to help ensure long-term viability of the products, assuming they are stored according to manufacturer's instructions. R. Falk asked if the current procedure needed to be revised to make the test more reasonable. B. Tatineni explained that there were concerns with the stability testing – if a bottle is opened for the testing, it is exposed to moisture which shortens the shelf life. K. Schaefer noted that the standard currently read:

> Approximately one month before the shelf life time has elapsed, follow the manufacturer's instructions to conduct testing with the WTD or test kit for the appropriate product types or parameters. If the WTD or test kit includes reagents (e.g., liquid, powders, dry-phase chemistry) use reagents from an unopened package of the same lot used during the initial testing phase.

R. Martin suggested the group consider how the manufacturer should convey information about opened bottes. R. Falk added that there could be more specificity in how frequently bottles are opened. T. Vyles stated that testing a sealed bottle against an open bottle was not a comparative test. R. Falk offered that the difference was “shelf life before purchase” versus “in-use shelf life”. B. Tatineni offered to draft language with H. Ray and others at ITS to draft language to refine the shelf life testing instead of remove it altogether.

Action items

J. Snider to straw ballot WQTD accuracy levels language including comments discussed (50i173r4).
J. Snider to straw ballot Sensor-based language including comments discussed (50i172r3).
B. Tatineni to work with others at ITS to draft shelf life revisions.
Next teleconference – TBD.