

PD CEN/TS 16800:2015



BSI Standards Publication

Guideline for the validation of physico-chemical analytical methods

bsi.

...making excellence a habit.
AVA Documents™
Document Sharing Hub

National foreword

This British Standard is the UK implementation of CEN/TS 16800:2015.

The UK participation in its preparation was entrusted to Technical Committee EH/3/2, Water analysis.

A list of organizations represented on this committee can be obtained on request to its secretary.

This publication does not purport to include all the necessary provisions of a contract. Users are responsible for its correct application.

© The British Standards Institution 2015.

Published by BSI Standards Limited 2015

ISBN 978 0 580 87777 3

ICS 13.060.50

Compliance with a British Standard cannot confer immunity from legal obligations.

This British Standard was published under the authority of the Standards Policy and Strategy Committee on 31 December 2015.

Amendments/corrigenda issued since publication

Date	Text affected
------	---------------

English Version

Guideline for the validation of physico-chemical analytical methods

Lignes directrices pour la validation des méthodes
d'analyse physico-chimiques

Anleitung zur Validierung physikalisch-chemischer
Analyseverfahren

This Technical Specification (CEN/TS) was approved by CEN on 14 March 2015 for provisional application.

The period of validity of this CEN/TS is limited initially to three years. After two years the members of CEN will be requested to submit their comments, particularly on the question whether the CEN/TS can be converted into a European Standard.

CEN members are required to announce the existence of this CEN/TS in the same way as for an EN and to make the CEN/TS available promptly at national level in an appropriate form. It is permissible to keep conflicting national standards in force (in parallel to the CEN/TS) until the final decision about the possible conversion of the CEN/TS into an EN is reached.

CEN members are the national standards bodies of Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and United Kingdom.



EUROPEAN COMMITTEE FOR STANDARDIZATION
COMITÉ EUROPÉEN DE NORMALISATION
EUROPÄISCHES KOMITEE FÜR NORMUNG

CEN-CENELEC Management Centre: Avenue Marnix 17, B-1000 Brussels

Contents

Page

European foreword.....	4
Introduction	5
1 Scope	6
2 Normative references	6
3 Terms and definitions	6
4 Concept	13
4.1 The concept of two validation levels.....	13
4.2 First level - Validation 1 (V1).....	13
4.3 Second level - Validation 2 (V2).....	13
4.4 Method validation using a modular approach.....	13
4.4.1 Validation modules.....	13
4.4.2 Module A: Test method definition, documentation and general requirements.....	13
4.4.3 Module B: Applicability domain and pre-validation	14
4.4.4 Module C: Intra-laboratory performance.....	14
4.4.5 Module D: Inter-laboratory performance	14
4.5 Method classification	15
5 Documentation of the validation process	16
6 Validation 1 (V1): Intra-Laboratory Validation	17
6.1 General.....	17
6.2 Module A: Test method definition, documentation and general requirements.....	17
6.3 Module B: Applicability domain and pre-validation	18
6.4 Module C: Intra-laboratory performance.....	18
6.4.1 General.....	18
6.4.2 Bias	18
6.4.3 Precision.....	19
6.4.4 Calibration data and function.....	20
6.4.5 Limits and application range	21
6.4.6 Selectivity.....	22
6.4.7 Robustness.....	23
6.4.8 Measurement uncertainty	23
7 Validation 2 (V2): Inter-Laboratory Validation	23
7.1 General.....	23
7.2 Method definition and description	24
7.3 Module C: Intra-laboratory performance.....	24
7.4 Module D: Inter-laboratory performance	24
7.4.1 General.....	24
7.4.2 General set-up of the inter-laboratory study.....	25
7.4.3 The inter-laboratory study	26
7.4.4 Statistical analysis and calculation of the results.....	27
7.4.5 Evaluation of the fitness for purpose	28
7.5 Documentation, publication and standardization	31
Annex A (normative) Module A: Test method definition, documentation and general requirements.....	32

Annex B (normative) Module B: Applicability domain and pre-validation.....	34
Annex C (normative) Module C: Intra-laboratory performance.....	35
Annex D (normative) Module D: Requirements for an inter-laboratory validation study	37
Annex E (informative) Structure and content of the documentation for a validation study (V2)	39
Annex F (informative) Robustness testing by systematic variation of influencing factors	44
Bibliography	46

European foreword

This document (CEN/TS 16800:2015) has been prepared by Technical Committee CEN/TC 230 “Water analysis”, the secretariat of which is held by DIN.

Attention is drawn to the possibility that some of the elements of this document may be the subject of patent rights. CEN [and/or CENELEC] shall not be held responsible for identifying any or all such patent rights.

According to the CEN-CENELEC Internal Regulations, the national standards organizations of the following countries are bound to announce this Technical Specification: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

Introduction

Environmental monitoring of chemical substances is increasingly carried out within a European framework, and there is concern about the comparability of data at the European level. In particular methods used for the monitoring of substances with recent interest have often not been properly validated either in-house (i.e. within a single laboratory) or at the international level.

These issues may be addressed by adopting a harmonized approach towards method development and validation. The main objective of this document is to provide a common European approach to the validation of chemical methods for the respective monitoring of chemical substances in a broad range of matrices. Although the development of this approach was triggered by the needs for monitoring of emerging pollutants, it is of general nature and can be applied to the measurement of a wide range of substances in a variety of matrices.

This guidance takes into account the different requirements for the level of method maturity and validation at different stages of the investigation or regulation of chemical substances.

In the case of a specific monitoring task, this protocol will guide the user through the following steps:

- classification of existing methods with respect to their status of validation, and the selection of the appropriate validation approach;
- development of a method so as to extend its application; for example, if a method for determining a required target compound in a particular matrix is available, but is not suitable for the same compound in a different matrix of interest;
- the validation procedures to be carried out in order to effectively demonstrate the validation status of a selected method according to the two approaches adopted.

Many (national and international) standards currently contain in their scope a statement like “this method is applicable from a concentration level of xx µg/l or yy mg/kg dry matter”, without any statement how this concentration level was established. When the limit of quantification (LOQ) is evaluated using the procedure of this Technical Specification, there is a possibility that it does not meet the lower limit of the claimed range.

1 Scope

This Technical Specification describes an approach for the validation of physico-chemical analytical methods for environmental matrices.

The guidance in this document addresses two different validation approaches, in increasing order of complexity. These are:

- a) method development and validation at the level of single laboratories (intra-laboratory validation);
- b) method validation at the level of several laboratories (between-laboratory or inter-laboratory validation), with a focus on methods that are sufficiently mature and robust to be applied not only by a few expert laboratories but by laboratories operating at the routine level.

The concept of these two approaches is strictly hierarchical, i.e. a method shall fulfil all criteria of the first level before it can enter the validation protocol of the second level.

This Technical Specification is applicable to the validation of a broad range of quantitative physico-chemical analytical methods for the analysis of water (including surface water, groundwater, waste water, and sediment). Analytical methods for other environmental matrices, like soil, sludge, waste, and biota can be validated in the same way. It is intended either for analytical methods aiming at substances that have recently become of interest or for test methods applying recently developed technologies.

The minimal requirements that are indispensable for the characterization of the fitness for purpose of an analytical method are: selectivity, precision, bias and measurement uncertainty. The aim of validation is to prove that these requirements are met.

2 Normative references

The following documents, in whole or in part, are normatively referenced in this document and are indispensable for its application. For dated references, only the edition cited applies. For undated references, the latest edition of the referenced document (including any amendments) applies.

ISO 78-2, *Chemistry — Layouts for standards — Part 2: Methods of chemical analysis*

ISO 5725, *Chemistry — Layouts for standards — Part 2: Methods of chemical analysis*

ISO 11352:2012, *Water quality — Estimation of measurement uncertainty based on validation and quality control data*

ISO 21748:2010, *Guidance for the use of repeatability, reproducibility and trueness estimates in measurement uncertainty estimation*

ISO/IEC Guide 99:2007, *International vocabulary of metrology — Basic and general concepts and associated terms (VIM)*

3 Terms and definitions

For the purposes of this document, the terms and definitions given in ISO/IEC Guide 99:2007 (VIM) and the following apply.

3.1

accepted reference value

value that serves as an agreed-upon reference for comparison, and which is derived as:

- a) a theoretical or established value, based on scientific principles;

- b) an assigned or certified value, based on experimental work of some national or international organization;
- c) a consensus or certified value, based on collaborative experimental work under the auspices of a scientific or engineering group;
- d) when a), b) and c) are not available, the expectation of the (measurable) quantity, i.e. the mean of a specified population of measurements

[SOURCE: ISO 3534-2:2006, definition 3.2.7]

3.2

accuracy

closeness of agreement between a test result and the accepted reference value

[SOURCE: ISO 3534-2:2006, definition 3.3.1]

Note 1 to entry: The term accuracy, when applied to a set of test results, involves a combination of random components (usually expressed by a precision measure) and a common systematic error or bias component (usually expressed by a measure for trueness).

Note 2 to entry: The technical term "accuracy" should not be confused with the term 'trueness' (see definition of "trueness").

3.3

analyte

substance to be analysed (chemical species or physical parameter)

Note 1 to entry: The quantity of an analyte is the measurand (3.15).

3.4

bias

difference between the expectation of a test result or measurement result and a true value

Note 1 to entry: Bias is the total systematic error as contrasted to random error. There may be one or more systematic error components contributing to the bias. A larger systematic difference from the accepted reference value is reflected by a larger bias value.

Note 2 to entry: The bias of a measuring instrument is normally estimated by averaging the error of indication over an appropriate number of repeated measurements. The error of indication is the: "indication of a measuring instrument minus a true value of the corresponding input quantity".

Note 3 to entry: In practice, accepted reference value is substituted for the true value.

[SOURCE: ISO 3534-2:2006, definition 3.3.2]

3.5

blank

sample or test scheme without the analyte known to produce the measured signal

Note 1 to entry: Use of various types of blanks enable assessment of which proportion of the measured signal is attributable to the measurand and which proportion to other causes. Various types of blank are available (see definition of reagent blank and blank sample).

3.6 **calibration**

operation that, under specified conditions, in a first step, establishes a relation between the quantity values with measurement uncertainties provided by measurement standards and corresponding indications with associated measurement uncertainties and, in a second step, uses this information to establish a relation for obtaining a measurement result from an indication

Note 1 to entry: A calibration may be expressed by a statement, calibration function, calibration diagram, calibration curve, or calibration table. In some cases, it may consist of an additive or multiplicative correction of the indication with associated measurement uncertainty.

Note 2 to entry: Calibration should not be confused with adjustment of a measuring system, often mistakenly called "self-calibration", nor with verification of calibration.

[SOURCE: ISO/IEC Guide 99:2007, definition 2.39]

3.7 **certified reference material** **CRM**

reference material, accompanied by documentation issued by an authoritative body and providing one or more specified property values with associated uncertainties and traceabilities, using valid procedures

[SOURCE: ISO/IEC Guide 99:2007, definition 5.14]

3.8 **fitness for purpose**

degree to which data produced by a measurement process enables a user to make technically and administratively correct decisions for a stated purpose

3.9 **intermediate precision**

precision under intermediate precision conditions

[SOURCE: ISO 3534-2:2006, definition 3.3.15]

3.10 **intermediate precision conditions**

conditions where test results or measurement results are obtained with the same method, on identical test/measurement items in the same test or measurement facility, under some different operating conditions

Note 1 to entry: There are four elements to the operating condition: time, calibration, operator and equipment.

[SOURCE: ISO 3534-2:2006, definition 3.3.16 and ISO 11352:2012, definition 3.10]

3.11 **limit of detection**

measured quantity value, obtained by a given measurement procedure, for which the probability of falsely claiming the absence of a component in a material is β , given a probability α of falsely claiming its presence

Note 1 to entry: IUPAC recommends default values for α and β equal to 0,05.

Note 2 to entry: The abbreviation LOD is sometimes used.

Note 3 to entry: The term “sensitivity” is discouraged for ‘detection limit’.

[SOURCE: ISO/IEC Guide 99:2007, definition 4.18]

Note 4 to entry: The LOD is the lowest concentration of measurand in a sample that can be detected, but not necessarily quantitated under the stated conditions of the test.

3.12

limit of quantitation

lowest concentration of a measurand that can be determined with acceptable precision under the stated conditions of the test

3.13

reporting limit

specific concentration at or above the limit of quantification that is reported to the client with a certain degree of confidence

Note 1 to entry: The reporting limit is often defined on a project-specific basis. If the reporting limit is set below the limit of quantification by the client, method modification is required.

[SOURCE: ISO/TS 13530:2009, 4.4.7]

3.14

linearity

ability of the method to obtain test results proportional to the concentration of measurand

Note 1 to entry: The linear range is by inference the range of measurand concentrations over which the method gives test results proportional to the concentration of the measurand.

[SOURCE: EURACHEM Guide]

3.15

measurand

quantity intended to be measured

Note 1 to entry: The specification of a measurand requires knowledge of the kind of quantity, description of the state of the phenomenon, body, or substance carrying the quantity, including any relevant component, and the chemical entities involved.

Note 2 to entry: In chemistry, “analyte”, or the name of a substance or compound, are terms sometimes used for “measurand”. This usage is erroneous because these terms do not refer to quantities.

[SOURCE: ISO/IEC Guide 99:2007, definition 2.3]

3.16

measurement

process of experimentally obtaining one or more quantity values that can reasonably be attributed to a quantity

[SOURCE: ISO/IEC Guide 99:2007, definition 2.1]

3.17

measurement uncertainty

non-negative parameter characterizing the dispersion of the quantity values being attributed to a measurand, based on the information used

[SOURCE: ISO/IEC Guide 99:2007, definition 2.26].

3.18

outlier

member of a set of values which is inconsistent with the other members of that set

Note 1 to entry: ISO 5725-2 specifies the statistical tests and the significance level to be used to identify outliers in trueness and precision experiments.

[SOURCE: ISO 5725-1:1994, definition 3.21]

3.19

precision

closeness of agreement between independent test results obtained under stipulated conditions

Note 1 to entry: Precision depends only on the distribution of random errors and does not relate to the true value or the specified value.

Note 2 to entry: The measure of precision is usually expressed in terms of imprecision and computed as a standard deviation of the test results. Less precision is reflected by a larger standard deviation.

[SOURCE: ISO 3534-2:2006, definition 3.3.4]

Note 3 to entry: „Independent test results“ means results obtained in a manner not influenced by any previous result on the same or similar test object. Quantitative measures of precision depend critically on the stipulated conditions. Repeatability and reproducibility conditions are particular sets of extreme conditions.

3.20

proficiency testing

evaluation of participant performance against pre-established criteria by means of interlaboratory comparisons

[SOURCE: EN ISO/IEC 17043:2010, definition 3.7]

3.21

quality assurance

part of quality management focused on providing confidence that quality requirements will be fulfilled

[SOURCE: EN ISO 9000:2015, definition 3.3.6]

Note 1 to entry: A major part of quality assurance is quality control.

3.22

quality control

part of quality management focused on fulfilling quality requirements

[SOURCE: EN ISO 9000:2015, definition 3.3.7]

3.23

quantity

property of a phenomenon, body, or substance, where the property has a magnitude that can be expressed as a number and a reference

[SOURCE: ISO/IEC Guide 99:2007, definition 1.1]

3.24

working range

interval, being experimentally established and statistically proved by the calibration of the method, between the lowest and highest quantity possibly measured by the method

Note 1 to entry: The lowest possible limit of a working range is the limit of quantification of an analytical method.

3.25

reagent blank

all reagents used during the analytical process (including solvents used for extraction or dissolution) are analysed in isolation in order to check whether they contribute to the measurement signal

Note 1 to entry: The measurement signal arising from the measurand can then be corrected accordingly.

3.26

recovery

extent to which a known, added quantity of determinant in a sample can be measured by an analytical system

Note 1 to entry: It is calculated from the difference between results obtained from spiked and unspiked aliquots of sample, and is usually expressed as a percentage.

[SOURCE: ISO 6107-8:1993/Amd 1:2001-12]

3.27

reference material

RM

material, sufficiently homogeneous and stable with respect to one or more specified properties, which has been established to be fit for its intended use in a measurement process

[SOURCE: ISO Guide 30:2015, definition 2.1.1, modified – Notes to entry have not been included.]

3.28

repeatability

precision under repeatability conditions, i.e. conditions where independent test results are obtained with the same method on identical test items in the same laboratory by the same operator using the same equipment within short intervals of time

[SOURCE: ISO 3534-2:2006, definition 3.3.5 and 3.3.6 , modified – These definitions were combined.]

3.29

reproducibility

precision under reproducibility conditions, i.e. conditions where test results are obtained with the same method on identical test items in different laboratories with different operators using different equipment

[SOURCE: ISO 3534-2:2006, definition 3.3.10 and 3.3.11, modified – These definitions were combined.]

3.30

residual

difference between the observed response and that predicted by a calibration function

3.31

robustness

measure of capacity of a procedure to remain unaffected by small, but deliberate variations in method parameters and provides an indication of its reliability during normal usage

3.32

sample

totality of a homogeneous analysis material with an identical composition or quality (similar to term batch)

[SOURCE: ISO/TS 20612:2007, definition 3.3]

3.33

blank sample

matrix with no measurand

Note 1 to entry: They are difficult to obtain but such materials are necessary to give a realistic estimate of interferences that would be encountered in the analysis of test samples.

3.34

selectivity

ability of a method to determine accurately and specifically the measurand of interest in the presence of other components in a sample matrix under the stated conditions of the test

3.35

sensitivity

change in the response of a measurand divided by the corresponding change in the stimulus

3.36

traceability

property of a measurement result whereby the result can be related to a reference through a documented unbroken chain of calibrations, each contributing to the measurement uncertainty

[SOURCE: ISO/IEC Guide 99:2007, definition 2.41]

3.37

trueness

closeness of agreement between the average value obtained from a large series of test results and an accepted reference value

Note 1 to entry: In the present document, trueness will be expressed in terms of bias.

Note 2 to entry: Trueness should not be confused with the term 'accuracy' (see definition of "accuracy").

3.38

validation

verification, where the specified requirements are adequate for an intended use

[SOURCE: ISO/IEC Guide 99:2007, definition 2.45]

Note 1 to entry: This process is used to assess that a method is fit for its intended purpose. It includes:

- establishing the performance characteristics, advantages and limitations of a method and the identification of the influences which may change these characteristics, and the extent of such changes;

- a comprehensive evaluation of the outcome of this process with respect to the fitness for purpose of the method.

4 Concept

4.1 The concept of two validation levels

The requirements for methods used for monitoring of chemical measurands depend on:

- the extent of the intended or requested monitoring activity; and
- the potential of the available methods that may be used for monitoring a specific substance (group).

In some cases, fully developed methods used by routine laboratories may already exist. More frequently, in the case of new substances or newly developing methods there will be a lack of information on the extent to which the methods have been fully developed and validated. In order to cover most eventualities, two distinct (and hierarchical) levels of method validation are described in this document.

4.2 First level - Validation 1 (V1)

Validation 1 addresses method development (new development or extension of an existing method application to new matrices) and method validation at the intra-laboratory level. The endpoint of Validation 1 is a method with a complete internal validation for the intended purpose at the level of a single laboratory. The endpoint of Validation 1 is identical with the starting point of Validation 2.

4.3 Second level - Validation 2 (V2)

Validation 2 addresses method validation at the inter-laboratory level. The main issue is to demonstrate that the method possesses sufficient inter-laboratory performance and is applicable for use at the level of routine laboratories. This also comprises the development and control of key aspects of method documentation and method usability.

NOTE If a method has successfully passed the Validation 2 procedures, it is usually suitable for standardization at the European level.

4.4 Method validation using a modular approach

4.4.1 Validation modules

The goal of any validation activity is to demonstrate the applicability of an analytical method to the intended purpose. Any analytical method ideally provides reliable and comparable data when carried out on similar samples, independent from external modifications of operating conditions, e.g. different laboratories or operators. This fitness-for-purpose shall be demonstrated through experimental, well-documented evidences. This comprises a set of general principles and criteria that are applicable to physico-chemical test methods. These principles and criteria are organized in four modules (A to D).

This Technical Specification follows a hierarchical approach with respect to the two validation levels. This means that for second level validation (V2) all requirements and criteria of the first level validation (V1) shall be fulfilled.

4.4.2 Module A: Test method definition, documentation and general requirements

The aim of Module A is to check before starting experimental investigation, that the laboratory has extensively taken into account all requirements for performance of the intended method. This step is essentially documental.

It is essential that an unambiguous definition of the method, the intended scope of application, its scientific basis, its purpose and a statement about the need for the test method, and criteria for acceptable method performance be documented. This should also include, if known, a description of the relationship (mechanistic or empirical) between the measurand and the response in the investigated system, e.g. electronic signal. Furthermore, a detailed documented protocol for the method should be available. This should include a description of all materials and reagents, a description of what is to be measured, and how this is to be carried out.

The criteria to be fulfilled in Module A at validation level V1 and at level V2 are different. They are presented in Table 1. A detailed description and structure for Module A is given in Annex A.

4.4.3 Module B: Applicability domain and pre-validation

Experimental investigation starts with Module B.

Test methods may be developed, optimized and validated for measuring a substance or an operationally defined parameter within a specified scope. This scope may include restrictions on the sampled media, the matrix, the concentration range of the measurand, and other limits of the scope of application. The suitability of the method drafted according to Module A is investigated on the whole scope in module B.

It implies that, when an extension of the scope of a validated test method is to be investigated, Module B shall entirely be carried out on the additional parts of the new scope. The criteria to be fulfilled in Module B at validation level V1 and at level V2 are identical. They are presented in Table 1. A detailed description and structure for Module B is given in Annex B.

4.4.4 Module C: Intra-laboratory performance

The basic performance characteristics of the test method within one laboratory should be determined in order to evaluate its reliability, relevance and limitations. These performance characteristics may include (among others) parameters such as precision, bias, selectivity and traceability.

Module C is related to validation level V1. A detailed description and structure for Module C is given in Annex C.

4.4.5 Module D: Inter-laboratory performance

Module D is related to validation level V2. Validation level V1 shall be completed before entering validation level V2 investigations.

In order to be applicable for large-scale European-wide purpose, a test method for pollutants shall show sufficient inter-laboratory performance at the level of routine laboratories. Therefore it is essential that a test method has a high degree of robustness and usability. Furthermore, the completeness and clarity of the method description (protocol) are more important than when a method is to be tested within a single laboratory. The protocol shall be accompanied by detailed control procedures and should not be open to misinterpretation.

The principal tool used to evaluate the inter-laboratory performance of a method is an inter-laboratory comparison involving the analysis of identical test items across all participating laboratories. These inter-laboratory studies are usually designed with the aim of sorting the effects of inter- and intra-laboratory variation on the measures used to characterize and evaluate the performance characteristics of the test method. Appropriated tools and procedures to establish the value of measures for inter-laboratory performance criteria can be found in ISO 5725-2, ISO 5725-5 and ISO 13528. Validation studies carried out as a part of European standardization activities are examples of this level of validation.

A detailed description and structure for Module D is given in 7.4 and Annex D.