# **AAFCO Proficiency Testing Program**

# **Proficiency Testing/Quality Reference Material Failure Investigation**

#### **Common Questions**

### 1. Proficiency Testing Results

- a. My Z-Score Failed
  - i. My Z-Score failed the Method Proficiency but passed Analyte Proficiency
  - ii. My Z-Score failed the Analyte Proficiency but passed the Method Proficiency
  - iii. My Z-Score failed both reports
- b. My data was rejected
  - i. Duplicate were too far apart
  - ii. Result rejected as Outlier

### 2. Quality Reference Material (QRM)

a. Results do not fall within the Robust Standard Deviation

### What to investigate

#### 1) Clerical

- a) Was there a transcription error? Was the value entered incorrectly? e.g. 2.3 ppm instead of 3.2 ppm.
- b) Was the incorrect method/instrument code entered?
- c) Were the wrong units entered, e.g. ppb instead of ppm? e.g. 0.0054 instead of 5.4.
- d) Was the decimal place shifted? e.g. 9.8 instead of 0.98.
- e) Entered results online but not submitted by participant?
- f) Forgot to submit results by due date?

#### 2) Calculations

- a) Were the calculations checked and verified prior to entering data?
- b) Was the test solution diluted? Was the dilution factor applied in the calculation?
- c) Was the test portion weight transcribed into the calculation correctly?

#### 3) Method/Procedure

- a) Was the correct method used for the matrix?
- b) Was the method being followed as written?
- c) If the method is an AOAC/ISO method, is it being followed exactly or has the method been modified? If the method was modified, was it verified and or validated?
- d) Are the correct chemicals/solvents being used?
- e) Were chemicals (solvents etc.) used in the method recycled/reused?
- f) Were reagents and solutions prepared correctly?

Page 1 of 2 06 April 2017

# **AAFCO Proficiency Testing Program**

# **Proficiency Testing/Quality Reference Material Failure Investigation**

- g) Were the standards valid e.g. not expired, and or a second source used?
- h) Calibration stable, persistent bias, within measuring range, instrument maintenance/ problems, QC and calibration review?
- i) Was equipment calibrated and did it pass calibration?
- j) Has there been changes to equipment? Has new equipment been verified/validated?
- k) Have there been changes to personnel? Have personnel been trained and approved to run the test?
- I) Has a method been modified to use different test portions and or reagents? If so, has the modification(s) been validated?
- m) If the test portion mass has been reduced, is it still representative of the analyte/concentration? For example, the original test portion was 1.0 gram and it has been reduced to a 0.10 gram. Did this reduction impact precision, accuracy and or quantification?

### 4) Test Item Handling

- a) Did you report results on an "as received" moisture basis?
- b) Did you grind the test item on receipt?
- c) Did you dry the test item upon receipt?

#### 5) PT / QRM Material

- a) Was the material received in good condition?
- b) Was the bag or box damaged?
- c) Is the PT/QRM item stored in the original container or transferred to a secondary container?
- d) What temperature is the item stored?
- i) Is storage appropriate for the analyte of interest?
- e) Are humidity levels a potential problem?
- f) Is the QRM over 2 years old?
- g) Have any trends been observed with time? Are trends high or low on control charts?

© 2017 Association of American Feed Control Officials (AAFCO) 1800 S. Oak Street, Suite 100, Champaign, IL 61820-6974 http://www.aafco.org/

06 April 2017