

8th PT/EQA Workshop Berlin 2014

Working Group 2 **User perspective of PT/EQA**

▪ **Convenors:**

– Ulla Tiikkainen
(Labquality, Finland)

– Kees van Putten
(DUCARES B.V, The Netherlands)



Eurachem

A Focus for Analytical Chemistry in Europe

Timetable

- 13:30 – 13:40 Welcome and introductions
- 13:40 – 14:20 Discussions in 4 small groups
- 14:20 – 15:00 Outcome and General Discussion based on the group works



Eurachem

A Focus for Analytical Chemistry in Europe

Working group 2

- 41 Participants
- 80% PT provider
- 18% Laboratory
- 2% Accreditation body
- Discussion 4 main questions and several sub questions



Observations

- In every group there was lively discussion.
- Everyone forgot the time



How does your PT/EQA provider interact with you to collect your views on its services or how do you as a PT/EQA provider collect feedback on your services?

- Meeting after PT
- Survey
 - Response surveys are often low
 - Two kind of surveys: general and specific
 - Survey once a year
 - Results user group seminar/webinar



How does your PT/EQA provider interact with you to collect your views on its services or how do you as a PT/EQA provider collect feedback on your services? (Part 2)

- Wishlist on website
- Difficulties of briefing customers over the world
- User group meetings (environmental)
- Small company/schemes direct feedback
- Big companies/schemes need survey



From the discussions around Question 1, what are the main issues being fed back?

- **Costs**
- **Turnaround time**
- Transport extra costs
- Customs declaration
- Technical problems matrices → expert
- Technical support (support method/report)
- Service and logistics
- Participants want very quick report
- Sample amount (mostly to little)
- New parameters more work
- Strict timing samples
- Late response different approaches
 - Some PTP strict, other sometimes flexible
- Reminders before due-date helps



Can the PT/EQA provider's service be improved to assist laboratories quality work? Give examples.

- There was a wild variety of PT
- More stimulating the participants by providing document and expertise
- Most participant (80%) look only on z-scores
- PT provider could emphasis to use also other information in reports
- PT provider could help to analyse the “non-conformatives



Can the PT/EQA provider's service be improved to assist laboratories quality work? Give examples (part 2)

- Help with meeting, go through all steps of the PT (e.g. homogeneity/stability) then final report.
- PTP could give more notes and observations in reports
- Educational aspects e.g. unusual analytes or concentrations
- Methods comparability



Should it be mandatory for PT/EQA participants to report measurement uncertainty, where relevant?

- Participants don't have expertise in uncertainty for all parameters
- PT reports can be used for uncertainty calculations
- PTP could help participants to calculate and report uncertainty



Should it be mandatory for PT/EQA participants to report measurement uncertainty, where relevant? (part 2)

- If laboratories/methods are not accredited, there could be no harmonisation of uncertainty values be possible
- Not relevant
- Depends
- Cannot be forced

**Thank you for your fruitful
contribution to this working group**

