Questions from implementation

1. Test starts versus valid tests
	* Most PC tests use test starts. Most HD tests use valid tests. How about complete tests? OPEN

*I suggest that we use valid tests since we are setting the guideline as a maximum. If a test type wants to use test starts instead, that is fine and it fits within our maximum. I hope that everybody realizes that we are not setting guidelines for reference frequency. We are setting WORST CASE guidelines. It is my hope that Surveillance Panels reference more frequently than what we write down. Again, we are not setting guidelines. The SP can have whatever guidelines they want (starts, hours, phases of the moon, etc.), as long as what they have fits within our maximum.*

1. Maximum reference intervals
	* The LTMS TF SS has revisited the issue and our consensus is unchanged. CLOSED

*18 tests maximum as long as there is one test every 6 months in a lab was a reluctant maximum on which we reached consensus. Based on experience and analysis, some of us feel that 18 tests are too many to satisfy the objective of level playing field candidate testing. 24 tests between references without an indication or evidence that a stand is ‘spot on’ is a very large risk (it’s a 24 candidate test risk). We can reluctantly tolerate a period of 24 tests if the data from a test stand looks ‘spot on’.*

Hot Issues for Discussion

1. Chance of extending and reducing reference interval should be equal or just drop level 2 versus your test is only as good as your worst (primary) parameter. CLOSED
	1. The LTMS TF SS has revisited the issue and our consensus is unchanged.
	2. Version 2 reference frequencies are intended to obtain the right amount of reference data. If we are unsure where a lab is relative to target, then we need more data. If a lab is very predictable and on target, then we can proceed with less frequent referencing.
2. Are we allowing people to not move toward target? CLOSED
	1. Not really. There are incentives from interval increase and reduction. The best way to avoid Zi level 2 alarm is to be on target no matter what the level 2 limit is. If you want more incentive for being on target, tighten the limit.
	2. A move toward target could result in surpassing an ei limit. This would be appropriate if the lab had a severity adjustment and the new reference indicated that something might have changed at the lab.
3. Should we just use the Sequence III type LTMS for everything? CLOSED
	1. No. We probably shouldn’t use it for Sequence III.
4. ~~K values~~ => limits CLOSED
	1. We have removed the references to K values since they imply invalid probability interpretations. The LTMS TF SS has revisited default limits and our consensus is unchanged.
5. Reference intervals and spacing CLOSED
	1. The LTMS TF SS has revisited the issue and our current consensus is unchanged.
6. Replacement for the term “undue influence”
	1. The LTMS TF SS current consensus is “excessive influence”.
7. Application in the presence of merits
	1. The LTMS TF SS is currently studying this issue.
8. SP determination of a lab too far – can it change? CLOSED
	1. Yes. Setting Zi level 2 limits will be difficult. As with any of the LTMS parameters, improvements should be made when justified.
9. C13 example? CLOSED
	1. The C13 example was shared with the surveillance panel.
10. Racing fastest in HD CLOSED
	1. Other test areas might catch up. The industry is engaged.
11. Critical/Noncritical versus Primary/Secondary
	1. We are now using ei and Zi designations.
12. Incentive for being on target CLOSED
	1. See 2a above
13. Continuous adjustment
	1. The LTMS TF SS has revisited the issue and our current consensus is unchanged in general. One member said if certain approaches were used in merit situations we should consider propagation of error.
14. Plug in for test types CLOSED
	1. Our basic approach is stated as default with decisions appropriate for the surveillance panels designated. We are working with the various groups toward maintaining a common default.
15. Do it in the middle of GF-5?
	1. The LTMS TF SS will discuss further.
16. Industry charting
	1. The LTMS TF SS is currently studying this issue.