



GENERAL PROTOCOL

for EU Proficiency Tests on Pesticide Residues

in Food and Feed

Introduction

This protocol contains general procedures valid for all European Union Proficiency Tests (EUPTs) organised on behalf of the European Commission, DG-SANCO¹ by the four European Union Reference Laboratories (EURLs) responsible for pesticide residues in food and feed. These EUPTs are directed at laboratories belonging to the Network² of National Reference Laboratories (NRLs) and Official Laboratories (OfLs) of the EU Member States. OfLs from EFTA countries and EU-Candidate countries are also welcome to participate in the EUPTs. OfLs from Third countries may be permitted to participate on a case-by-case basis.

The following four EURLs for pesticide residues were appointed by DG-SANCO based on regulation 882/2004/EC³:

- EURL for Fruits and Vegetables (EURL-FV),
- EURL for Cereals and Feedingstuffs (EURL-CF),
- EURL for Food of Animal Origin and Commodities with High Fat Content (EURL-AO) and
- EURL for pesticides requiring Single Residue Methods (EURL-SRM).

The aim of these EUPTs is to obtain information regarding the quality, accuracy and comparability of pesticide residue data in food and feed reported to the European Union within the framework of the national control programmes and the EU multiannual co-ordinated control programme⁴. Participating laboratories will be provided with an assessment of their analytical performance that

¹ DG-SANCO = European Commission, Health and Consumer Protection Directorate-General

² For more information about the EURL/NRL/OfL-Network please refer to the EURL-Web-portal under:
<http://www.eurl-pesticides.eu>

³ Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules. Published at OJ of the EU L191 of 28.05.2004

⁴ European Commission Proficiency Tests for Pesticide Residues in Fruits and Vegetables, Trends in Analytical Chemistry, 2010, 29 (1), 70 – 83.

they can use to demonstrate their analytical performance and compare themselves with other participating laboratories.

EUPT-Organisers and Scientific Committee

EUPTs are organised by individual EURLs, or by more than one EURL, in joint collaboration.

An **Organising Team** is appointed by the EURL(s) in charge. This team is responsible for all administrative and technical matters concerning the organisation of the PT, e.g. the PT-announcement, production of Test Item and Blank Material, the undertaking of homogeneity and stability tests, packing and shipment of the Test Item and Blank Material, handling and evaluation of the results and method information submitted by the participants and the drafting of the preliminary and final reports.

To complement the internal expertise of the EURLs, a group of external consultants that form the **EUPT-Scientific Committee (EUPT-SC)**⁵ has been established and approved by DG SANCO. The EUPT-SC consists of expert scientists with many years of experience in PTs and/or pesticide residue analysis. The actual composition of the EUPT-SC, the affiliation of each member is shown on the EURL-Website. The members of the EUPT-SC will also be listed in the Specific Protocol and the Final Report of each EUPT.

The EUPT-SC is made up of the following two subgroups:

- a) An independent **Quality Control Group (EUPT-QCG)** and
- b) An **Advisory Group (EUPT-AG)**.


The EUPT-SC's role is to help the Organisers make decisions regarding the EUPT design: the selection of the commodity, the selection of pesticides to be included in the Target Pesticide List (see below), the establishment of the Minimum Required Reporting Levels (MRRLs), the statistical treatment and evaluation of participants results (in anonymous form), and the drafting and updating of documents such as the General and Specific PT Protocols and the Final EUPT-Reports.

The EUPT-QCG has the additional function of supervising the quality of EUPTs and of assisting the EURLs in confidential aspects such as the choice of the pesticides to be present in the Test Item and the concentrations at which they should be present.

⁵ Link to the List of current members of the EUPT Scientific Committee:
<http://www.eurl-pesticides.eu/library/docs/allcrl/EUPT-SC.pdf>

The EUPT-SC typically meets once a year, after the EUPTs of all four pesticide EURLs have been conducted, to discuss the evaluation of the EUPT-results and to consult with the EURLs in their decision making. Upcoming EUPTs are also planned during these meetings.

The EUPT-Organising Team and the EUPT-SC together form the **EUPT-Panel**.



The decisions of the EUPT-Panel will be documented.

This present EUPT General Protocol was jointly drafted by the EUPT-SC and the EURLs and was approved by DG-SANCO.

EUPT Participants

Within the European Union all NRLs operating in the same area as the organising EURL, as well as all OfLs whose scope overlaps with that of the EUPT, are legally obliged to participate in EUPTs. The legal obligation of NRLs and OfLs to participate in EUPTs arises from:

- Art. 28 of Reg. 396/2005/EC⁶ (for all OfLs analysing for pesticide residues within the framework of official controls⁷ of food or feed)
- Art. 33 of Reg. 882/2004/EC (for all NRLs)

The four EURLs will annually issue and distribute, via the EURL-website, a joint list of all OfLs that must participate in each of the EUPTs to be conducted within a given year. The list of obliged labs

⁶ Regulation (EC) No 396/2005, published at OJ of the EU L70 of 16.03.2005, as last amended by Regulation 839/2008 published at OJ of the EU L234 of 30.08.2008.

⁷ Official controls in the sense of Reg. 882/2004/EC This includes labs involved in controls within the framework of national and/or EU-controlled programmes as well as labs involved in import controls according to Regulation 669/2009/EC.

will be updated every year to take account of any changes in the lab profiles. Interim updates will be issued to eliminate any possible errors.

NRLs are responsible for checking whether all relevant OfLs within their network are included in the list of obligated laboratories and whether the contact information and commodity-scopes are correct.

OfLs are furthermore urged to keep their own profiles within the EURL-DataPool up-to-date, especially their commodity and pesticide scopes and their contact information.

Labs that are obliged to participate in a given EUPT, and that are not able to participate, must provide the reasons for their non-participation without prejudice of any legal action taken against them for not participating. This also applies to any participating laboratories that then fail to report results.

Confidentiality and Communication

The proprietor of all EUPT data is DG-SANCO and as such has access to all information.

For each EUPT, the laboratories are given a unique code (lab code), initially only known to themselves and the Organisers. In the final EUPT-Report, the names of participating laboratories will not be linked to their laboratory codes. It should be noted, however, that the Organisers, at the request by DG-SANCO, may present the EUPT-results on a country-by-country basis. It may therefore be possible that a link between codes and laboratories could be made, especially for those countries where only one laboratory has participated. Furthermore, the EURLs reserve the right to share EUPT results and codes amongst themselves: for example, for the purpose of evaluating overall lab or country performance as requested by DG-SANCO.

As laid down in Regulation 882/2004, NRLs are responsible for evaluating and improving their own OfL-Network. On request from the NRLs, the EURLs will provide them with the PT-codes of the participating OfLs belonging to their OfL-Network. This will allow NRLs to follow the participation and performance of the laboratories within their network.

Communication between participating laboratories during the test on matters concerning a PT exercise is not permitted from the start of the PT exercise until the distribution of the preliminary report.

For each EUPT the organising EURL prepares a specific EUPT-Website where all relevant documents in their latest version are linked.

The official language used in all EUPTs is English.

Announcement / Invitation Letter

At least 3 months before the Test Item of a given EUPT is distributed to the laboratories the EURLs will publish an Announcement/Invitation letter on the EURL-web-portal and distribute it via e-mail to the NRL/OfL mailing list available to the EURLs. This letter will inform about the commodity to be used as Test Item, as well as links to the tentative EUPT-Target Pesticide List and the tentative EUPT-Calendar.

Target Pesticide List

This list contains all analytes (pesticides and metabolites) to be sought, along with the Minimum Required Reporting Levels (MRRLs) valid for the specific EUPT. The MRRLs are typically based upon the lowest MRLs found either in Regulation 396/2005/EC or Commission Directive 2006/125/EC (Baby Food Directive).

Labs must express their results as stated in the Target Pesticides List.

Specific Protocol

For each EUPT the organizing EURL will publish a Specific Protocol at least 2 weeks before the Test Item is distributed to the participating laboratories. The Specific Protocol will contain all the information previously included in the Invitation Letter but in its final version, information on payment and delivery, instructions on how to handle the Test Item upon receipt and on how to submit results, as well as any other relevant information.

Homogeneity of the Test Item

The Test Item will be tested for homogeneity typically before distribution to participants. The homogeneity tests involve the analysis of two replicate analytical portions, taken from at least ten randomly chosen units of treated Test Item. Both, sample preparation and measurements should be conducted in random order.

The homogeneity test data are statistically evaluated according to the International Harmonized Protocols published by ISO and IUPAC. The acceptance criterion for the Test Items to be sufficiently homogeneous for the Proficiency Test is that s_{sam}^2 is less than c with s_{sam} being the between-bottle sampling standard deviation and $c = F_1 \times \sigma_{all}^2 + F_2 \times s_{an}^2$. F_1 and F_2 are constants,

with values of 1.88 and 1.01, respectively, if 10 samples are used. $\sigma_{all}^2 = 0.3 \times \text{FFP-RSD}^8$ (25%) \times the analytical sampling mean for all pesticides, and s_{an} is the estimate of the analytical standard deviation.

The results of all homogeneity tests are presented to the EUPT-SC. In special cases where the above homogeneity test criteria are not met, the EUPT-SC considering all relevant aspects (e.g. the homogeneity results of other pesticides spiked at the same time, the overall distribution the participants' results, the analytical difficulties faced during the test, knowledge of the analytical behaviour of the pesticide question) may decide to overrule the test. The reasons of this overruling have to be transparently explained in the Final EUPT-Report.

Stability of the analytes contained in the Test Item

The Test Items will also be tested for stability - according to ISO 13528, Annex B. The time delay between the first and the last stability test must exceed the period of the EUPT-exercise. Typically the first analysis is carried out shortly before the shipment of the Test Items and the last one shortly after the deadline for submission of results. To better recognise trends and gain additional certainty one or more additional tests may be conducted by the Organisers. At least 6 sub-samples (analytical portions) should be analysed on each test day (e.g. 2 analytical portions withdrawn from three randomly chosen containers OR 6 portions withdrawn from a single container). In principle all pesticides contained in the Test Item should be checked for stability. However, in individual cases, where sufficient knowledge exists that the stability of a certain analyte is very unlikely to be significantly affected during storage (e.g. based on experience from past stability tests or knowledge of its physicochemical properties), the Organisers, after consultation with the EUPT-QCG, may decide to omit a specific stability test. The EUPT-SC will finally decide whether analytes for which the stability test was not undertaken will be included in the final report, considering all relevant aspects such as the distribution of the participant's results (Qn-RSD).

A pesticide is considered to be adequately stable if $|x_1 - y_i| \leq 0.3 \times \sigma$, where x_1 is the mean value of the first stability test, y_i the mean value of the last stability test and σ the standard deviation used for proficiency assessment (typically 25% of the assigned value).

The results of all stability tests are presented to the EUPT-SC. In special cases where the above stability test criteria are not met, the EUPT-SC considering all relevant aspects (e.g. the past experience with the stability of the compound, the overall distribution the participants' results, the

⁸ FFP-RSD = fit for purpose relative standard deviation, see also p. 11.

analytical difficulties faced during the test, knowledge about the analytical behaviour of the pesticide question) may decide to overrule the test. The reasons of this overruling will be transparently explained in the Final EUPT-Report.

The Organisers may also decide to conduct additional stability tests at different storage conditions than those recommended to the participants e.g. at ambient temperature.

Considering knowledge about the expected susceptibility of pesticides in the Test Item to possible losses, the Organisers will choose the shipment conditions to be such that pesticide losses are minimised (e.g. shipment of frozen samples, addition of dry ice). As shipment time can differ between labs/countries it is recommended that the Organisers conduct additional stability tests at conditions simulating shipment. Should critical losses be detected for certain pesticides the EUPT-SC will be informed (or the EUPT-QCG before or during the test). Case-by-case decisions may be taken considering all relevant aspects including the shipment time of the samples to each laboratory.

Methodologies to be used by the participants

Participating laboratories are instructed to use the analytical procedure(s) that they would routinely employ in official control activities (monitoring etc.). Where an analytical method has not yet been established routinely this should be stated.

General procedures for reporting results

Participating laboratories are responsible for reporting their own quantitative results to the Organiser within the stipulated deadline. Any pesticide that was targeted by a participating laboratory should be reported as “analysed”. Each laboratory will be able to report only one result for each analyte detected in the Test Item. The concentrations of the pesticides detected should be expressed in ‘mg/ kg’ unless indicated otherwise in the specific protocol.

The Test Item is intentionally treated with pesticides whereas the Blank Material is analysed to ensure that it does not contain any of the pesticides in the Target Pesticides List, at or above, the specified MRLs. Both the Test Item and Blank Material have to be analysed by the participating laboratories and any pesticide detected in them must be reported.

Correction of results for recovery

According to the Method Validation and Quality Control Procedures for Pesticide Residues Analysis in Food and Feed⁹, it is common practice that pesticide analysis results are not corrected for recovery, but may be corrected if the average recovery is significantly different from 100 % (typically if outside the 70 – 120 % range, but also exhibiting good precision). Other approaches for recovery correction explicitly allowed in the SANCO document are the use of stable isotope labelled analogues of the target analytes used as Internal Standards (ISTDs), the 'procedural calibration' approach as well as the approach of 'standard addition' with additions of analyte(s) being made to analytical portions. Where reported residue data have been automatically adjusted for recovery by the method, or have subsequently been adjusted using a recovery factor, this must be indicated on the specific field of the 'Result Submission Form'. Results may be corrected for recovery only in cases where this correction is applied in routine practice (including cases of MRL-violations). Laboratories are required to report whether their results were adjusted for recovery and, if a recovery factor was used, the recovery (in percentage) must also be reported. No recovery data are required where correction for recovery is automatic by using the 'standard addition approach, or isotopically-labelled internal standards (in both cases with spiking of the Test Item at the beginning of the extraction procedures). In these cases, the laboratories should report the actual approach that was followed.

Methodology information

All laboratories are requested to provide information on the analytical method(s) they have used. A compilation of the methodology information submitted by all participants is presented in an Annex of the final report or in a separate report. Where necessary the methods are evaluated and discussed, especially in those cases where the result distribution is not unimodal or very broad (e.g. $Q_n\text{-RSD} > 35\%$). If no sufficient information on the methodology used is provided, the Organiser reserves the right not to accept the analytical results reported by the participants concerned.

Results evaluation

The procedures used for the treatment and assessment of results are described below.

⁹ Document N° SANCO/12571/2013; Method Validation and Quality Control Procedures for Pesticide Residues Analysis in Food and Feed

– ***False Positive results***

These are results of pesticides from the Target Pesticides List, that are reported, at or above, their respective MRRL although they were: (i) not detected by the Organiser, even after repeated analyses, and/or (ii) not detected by the overwhelming majority (e.g. > 95 %) of the participating laboratories that had targeted the specific pesticides. In certain instances, case-by-case decisions by the EUPT-Panel may be necessary.

Any results reported lower than the MRRL will not be considered as false positives, even though these results should not have been reported.

– ***False Negative results***

These are results for pesticides reported by the laboratories as 'analysed' but without reporting numerical values although they were: a) used by the Organiser to treat the Test Item and b) detected by the Organiser as well as the majority of the participants that had targeted these specific pesticides at or above the respective MRRLs. Results reported as '< RL' (RL= Reporting Limit of the laboratory) will be considered as not detected and will be judged as false negatives. In certain instances, case-by-case decisions by the EUPT-Panel may be necessary.

In cases of the assigned value being less than a factor of 4 times the MRRL, false negatives will typically not be assigned. The EUPT-Panel may decide to take case-by-case decisions in this respect after considering all relevant factors such as the result distribution and the reporting limits of the affected labs.

– ***Estimation of the assigned value (μ)***

In order to minimise the influence of out-lying results on the statistical evaluation, the assigned value (= consensus concentration) will typically be estimated using robust statistics as described in ISO 13528:2009-01¹⁰. In special justifiable cases, the EUPT-Panel may decide to eliminate certain results traceably associated with gross errors (see "Omission or Exclusion of results" below) or to

¹⁰ DIN ISO 13528:2009-01, Statistical methods for use in proficiency testing by interlaboratory comparisons, International Organization for Standardization. Therein a specific robust method for determination of the consensus mean and standard deviation without the need for removal of deviating results is described (Algorithm A in Annex C).

use only the results of a subgroup consisting of laboratories that have repeatedly demonstrated good performance for the specific compound in the past.

– ***Omission or Exclusion of results***

Before estimating the assigned value results associated with obvious mistakes have to be examined to decide whether they should be removed from the population. Such gross errors may include incorrect recording (e.g. due to transcription errors by the participant, decimal point faults or transposed digits, incorrect unit), calculation errors (e.g. missing factors), analysis of a wrong sample/extract (e.g. a spiked blank), use of wrong concentrations of standard solutions, incorrect data processing (e.g. integration of wrong peak), major deviations from the analytical procedure, inappropriate storage or transport conditions (in case of susceptible compounds), and the use of inappropriate procedures that demonstrably lead to significantly biased results (e.g. due to degradation or incomplete extraction). Where the Organisers (e.g. after the publication of the preliminary report) receive information of such gross errors, having a significant impact on a generated result, the affected results will be examined on a case-by-case basis to decide whether, or not, they should be excluded from the population used for robust statistics. Even results that cannot be specifically identified as outliers might be excluded. All decisions to omit/exclude results will be discussed with the EUPT-SC and the reasoning for the omission of each result clearly stated in the final EUPT-Report. However, z-scores will be calculated for all results irrespective of the fact that they were omitted from the calculation of the assigned value.

Omitted results might be interesting as they might give indications about possible source(s) of errors. The Organisers will thus ask the relevant lab(s) to provide feedback on possible sources of errors (see also “follow-up activities”).

Any exclusion of results from the population is to be discussed within the EUPT-SC and the reasoning behind is to be revealed in the EUPT-final report.

Uncertainty of the assigned value

The uncertainty of the assigned values μ_i is calculated according to ISO 13528:2009-01 as:

$$\mu_i = 1.25 * \frac{Qn SD}{\bar{n}}$$

where $Qn SD$ is the robust standard deviation and n is the number of results.

In certain cases and considering all relevant factors (e.g. the result distribution, multimodality), the number of submitted results, information regarding analyte homogeneity/stability, information regarding the use of methodologies that might produce a bias that were used by the participants), the EUPT-Panel may consider the assigned value of a specific analyte to be too uncertain and decide that the results should not be evaluated, or only evaluated for informative purposes. The provisions of ISO 13528:2009-01 concerning the uncertainty of the assigned value will be taken into account.

– **Standard deviation of the assigned value (target standard deviation)**

The target standard deviation (δ) of the assigned value will be calculated using a Fit-For-Purpose Relative Standard Deviation (FFP-RSD) approach, as follows:

$$\delta_i = b * \mu_i \quad \text{with } b = 0.25 \text{ (25 \% FFP-RSD)}$$

The percentage FFP-RSD is set at 25% based on experience from results of previous EUPTs¹¹. The EUPT-Panel reserves the right to also employ other approaches on a case-by-case basis considering analytical difficulties and experience gained from previous proficiency tests.

For informative purposes the robust relative standard deviation (Qn-RSD) is calculated according to ISO 13528:2009-01; Chapter 5.6 (Consensus value from participants) following Algorithm A in Annex C.

– **z-scores**

This parameter is calculated using the following formula:

$$z_i = (x_i - \mu_i) / \delta_i$$

where x_i is the value reported by the laboratory, μ_i the assigned value, and δ_i the standard deviation for each pesticide (i). Z-scores will be rounded to one decimal place. For the calculation of combined z-scores (see below) the original z-scores will be used and rounded to one decimal place after calculation.

¹¹ Comparative Study of the Main Top-down Approaches for the Estimation of Measurement Uncertainty in Multiresidue Analysis of Pesticides in Fruits and Vegetables. J. Agric. Food Chem., 2011, 59(14), 7609-7619.

Any z-scores > 5 will be typically reported as '> 5' and a value of '5' will be used to calculate combined z-scores (see below).

Z-scores will be interpreted in the following way:

$ z \leq 2.0$	Acceptable
$2.0 < z \leq 3.0$	Questionable
$ z > 3.0$	Unacceptable

For results considered as false negatives, z-scores will be calculated using the MRRL or RL (the laboratory's Reporting Limit) if the RL < MRRL. The EUPT-Panel will decide whether, or not, these values should appear in the z-score histograms.

– **Category A and B classification**

The EUPT-Panel will decide if and how to classify the laboratories into two categories - A or B. Currently, laboratories that have detected and quantified a sufficiently high percentage of the pesticides present in the Test Item (e.g. at least 90 %) and reported no false positives will have demonstrated 'sufficient scope' and can therefore be classified into Category A. The 90 % criterion will be applied following Table 1.

Table 1. No. of pesticides needed to be detected to have sufficient scope.

No. of Pesticides Present in the Test Item (N)	90 %	No. of Pesticides needed to be reported to have sufficient scope (n)	n
3	2.7	3	N
4	3.6	4	
5	4.5	4	
6	5.4	5	N - 1
7	6.3	6	
8	7.2	7	
9	8.1	8	
10	9.0	9	
11	9.9	10	
12	10.8	11	
13	11.7	12	
14	12.6	13	
15	13.5	13	
16	14.4	14	N - 2
17	15.3	15	
18	16.2	16	
19	17.1	17	
20	18.0	18	

21	18.9	19	
22	19.8	20	
23	20.7	21	
24	21.6	22	
25	22.5	22	
26	23.4	23	N - 3

– **Overall performance of laboratories - combined z-scores**

For evaluation of the overall performance of laboratories within Category A, the Average of the Squared z-Score (AZ^2)^{12,13} (see below) will be used. The AZ^2 is calculated as follows:

$$AZ^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i^2}{n}$$

Where n is the number of z-scores to be considered in the calculation. In the calculation of the AZ^2 , z-scores higher than 5 will be classified as 5. Based on the AZ^2 achieved, the laboratories are classified as follows:

$AZ^2 \leq 2.0$	Good
$2.0 < AZ^2 \leq 3.0$	Satisfactory
$AZ^2 > 3.0$	Unsatisfactory

Combined z-scores are considered to be of lesser importance than the individual z-scores. The EUPT-Panel retains the right not to calculate AZ^2 if it is considered as not being useful or if the number of results reported by any participant is considered to be too low.

In the case of EUPT-SRMs, where only a few results per lab may be available, the Average of the Absolute z-scores (AAZ) may be calculated for informative purposes, but only for labs that have reported enough results to obtain 5 or more z-scores. For the calculation of the AAZ, z-scores higher than 5 will also be classified as 5.

Laboratories within Category B will be ranked according to the total number of pesticides that they correctly reported to be present in the Test Item. The number of acceptable z-scores achieved will

¹² Formerly named “Sum of squared z-scores (SZ^2)”

¹³ Laboratory assessment by combined z-score values in proficiency tests: experience gained through the EUPT for pesticide residues in fruits and vegetables. Anal. Bioanal. Chem., 2010, 397, 3061–3070.

be presented, too. The EURL-Panel retains the right to calculate combined z-scores (see above) also for labs within Category B, e.g. for informative purposes, provided that a minimum number of results (z-scores) are have been reported.

Publication of results

The EURLs will publish a preliminary report, containing tentative medians and z-score values for all pesticides present in the Test Item, within 2 months of the deadline for result submission.

The Final EUPT Report will be published after the EUPT-Panel has discussed the results. Taking into account that the EUPT-Panel meets normally only once a year (typically in late summer or autumn) to discuss the results of all EUPTs organised annually by the EURLs in the following year, the final report may be published up to 10 months after the deadline for results submission.

Certificates of participation

Together with the Final EUPT-Report, the EURL Organiser will deliver a Certificate of Participation to each participating laboratory showing the z-scores achieved for each individual pesticide, the combined z-scores calculated (if any), and the classification into Category A or B.

Feedback

At any time before, during or after the PT participants have the possibility to contact the Organisers and make suggestions or indicate errors. After the distribution of the Final EUPT-Report, participating laboratories will be given the opportunity to give their feedback to the Organisers and make suggestions for future improvements.

Correction of errors

Should errors be discovered in any of the documents issued prior to the EUPT (Calendar, Target Pesticides List, Specific Protocol, General Protocol) the corrected documents will be uploaded onto the website and in the case of substantial errors the participants will be informed. **Before starting the exercise participants should make sure to download the latest version of these documents.**

If substantial errors are discovered in the Preliminary EUPT-Report the Organisers will distribute a new corrected version, where it will be stated that the previous version is no longer valid.

Where substantial errors are discovered in the Final EUPT-Report the EUPT-Panel will decide whether a corrigendum will be issued and how this should look. The online version of the final report will be replaced by the new one and all affected labs will be contacted.

Where errors are discovered in EUPT-Certificates the relevant laboratories will be sent new corrected ones. Where necessary the laboratories will be asked to return the old ones.

Follow-up activities

Laboratories are expected to undertake follow-up activities to trace back the sources of erroneous or strongly deviating results (typically those with $|z| > 2.0$) - including all false positives and false negatives. Even results within $|z| < 2.0$ may have to be checked if there is indications of a significant positive or negative bias.

Upon request, the laboratory's corresponding NRL and EURL are to be informed of the outcome of any investigative activities for false positives, false negatives and for results with $|z| > 3.0$. Concerning z-scores between 2.0 and 3.0 the communication of the outcome of traceability activities is optional but highly encouraged where the source of deviation could be identified and could be of interest to other labs.

According to instructions from DG-SANCO, the "Protocol for management of underperformance in comparative testing and/or lack of collaboration of National Reference Laboratories (NRLs) with EU Reference Laboratories (EURLs) activities" is to be followed.

Disclaimer

The EUPT-Panel retains the right to change any parts of this EUPT – General Protocol based on new scientific or technical information. Any changes will be communicated in due course.