

codex alimentarius commission



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE
ORGANIZATION
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD
HEALTH
ORGANIZATION



JOINT OFFICE: Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 ROME Tel: 39 06 57051 www.codexalimentarius.net Email: codex@fao.org Facsimile: 39 06 5705 4593

Agenda Item 5

CX/MAS 02/6-Add.1

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME
CODEX COMMITTEE ON METHODS OF ANALYSIS AND SAMPLING
Twenty-fourth Session
Budapest, Hungary, 18-22 November 2002
PROPOSED DRAFT GUIDELINES ON MEASUREMENT UNCERTAINTY
GOVERNMENT COMMENTS AT STEP 3¹
(New Zealand, Spain, Thailand)

NEW ZEALAND

General

New Zealand supports the development of the Guidelines on Measurement Uncertainty. However, we are concerned about the possible misuse of the Guidelines by extrapolation beyond their true scope. To avoid this, we suggest that the Guidelines should explicitly recognise the framework within which the document will be used: conformance testing of imported food at the national level. We suggest that the Guidelines should include a statement, possibly in the Introduction section, noting that any single analytical test result relates only to the single sample, and that a statistically valid sampling plan must be utilised to obtain values representative of a larger quantity of a food product. Any proposed action contemplated by an importing country should be in context of both the analytical result and the sampling plan, together with results of all previous analytical tests for that substance.

Introduction

New Zealand notes that the third sentence states that collaboratively tested methods should be used when available. Although we note the difficulty of performing inter-laboratory studies in some instances, we note that single laboratory validation does not provide estimates of reproducibility, an essential and usually major component of measurement uncertainty. We suggest the addition of a note that where inter-laboratory studies are not possible, then a satisfactory surrogate for reproducibility such as the intra-laboratory reproducibility, or an approximation such as the Horwitz criterion, must be found.

Recommendations

Recommendation 2

New Zealand suggests that the following text be added to recommendation 2: “Where an estimate of the uncertainty is made available to the user of the results, the basis by which it was derived should be included” (e.g. single lab validation, collaborative study).

New recommendations

New Zealand suggests adding a new recommendation on the use of recovery information, following from recommendation 2. While correcting for recovery should not be a mandatory requirement for reporting a result, analytical results should be reported as either corrected or uncorrected and annotated accordingly. In both cases, the estimation of the recovery factor that applies should be appended. The source of this factor

¹ in reply to CL 2001/5-MAS, ALINORM 01/23

should be noted, i.e. whether it is from the method validation document supporting the method or from data obtained at the same time the sample set was analysed.

New Zealand also suggests adding guidance on bias that is not part of dispersion.

SPAIN

English version

In the Section on Terminology

- Replace the definition of "uncertainty of measurement" by a new text (Spanish version only).
- We do not agree with the expression "measurement reliability" that appears in the second paragraph of Note 3 of the "Terminology" Section and in points 1, 2 and 3 of the "Recommendations" section, as it has negative associations in Spanish and consequently should not be used, and we propose to use only the term "measurement uncertainty".

Versión española

Se efectúan las siguientes observaciones a la versión en español:

A la sección Terminología:

- *Sustituir la definición de “incertidumbre en la medición”, por la siguiente: “Parámetro, asociado con el resultado de una medición que caracteriza la dispersión de los valores que podrían atribuirse razonablemente a lo que se mide”*
- *No estamos de acuerdo con la expresión “confiabilidad de la medición”, que aparece en el segundo párrafo de la nota 3ª de la sección “Terminología” y en los puntos 1º, 2º y 3º de la sección “Recomendaciones”, por estimar que tiene connotaciones negativas en español y por lo tanto no se debería utilizar, por lo que se propone que se utilice únicamente la expresión “incertidumbre en la medición”.*

THAILAND

1.1 Thailand agrees in principle to establish Proposed Draft Guidelines on Measurement Uncertainty for Codex Work on the interpretation of the result and the assessment of compliance.

1.2 However, Thailand feels that the issue of terminology has not been addressed the definition of measurement reliability. Therefore, it does not clear that how it is equivalent to measurement uncertainty and also how to interpret of the result with this term.