Appeal Report

Appeal Sr. No. →2025/01			Date →30-Jun-2025	
Receipt of Appeal	Date	30-Jun-2025	Received By →Technical Manager	
	Time	14:35		
Mode of Receipt → Email				
Raised by (Participant Name)		Independent Laboratories L.L.C, Dubai		
Against the decision on (PT Scheme Code)		JPTPS/E6-001-100625		
Decision communicated vide		PT Report Ref. JPTPS/E6-001-100625 dated 10-Jun-2025		

Description of Appeals →

The participant appealed their "Questionable" performance result (z = 2.45), claiming their laboratory result was valid and consistent with their internal QC data. They requested verification of the assigned value and z-score calculation.

Report of Impartiality committee on the Appeal

The impartiality committee reviewed the PT round dataset, including:

The consensus (robust mean) assigned value of 142.72 lux.

Standard deviation for proficiency assessment, (SDPA) σ_p= 3.032 lux

The participant's reported result of 135.3 lux.

Recalculation of the z-score:

$$z = \left|\frac{x_{lab} - x_{pt}}{\sigma_p}\right| = \left|\frac{135.3 - 142.72}{3.032}\right| = 2.45$$

The calculation was verified as correct and consistent with ISO 13528.

Hearing done on and details communicated by participant during hearing

Date: 30-Jun-2025

The participant explained that their result was influenced by an instrument calibration drift discovered during routine maintenance.

Conclusion on appeal by Impartiality committee

The appeal was rejected. The participant's z-score calculation was confirmed accurate, and the assigned value/σ_p were correctly derived. The original "Questionable" performance rating stands. The participant's explanation has been noted for record.

Decision on appeal communicated to PT Coordinator for necessary action	**By**	**Shaira Mae Talisay**
	Date	**01-Jul-2025**
Decision on appeal communicated to participant	**By**	**PT Coordinator**
	Date	**02-Jul-2025**

Analyzed By **Nerissa Sarah Mei Manuel** **QA Manager**	**Closed By** **Jacob Joy** **Chairman – Impartiality committee**