

Case Study 4

Non-submittal of results for earth resistance test.

History: The lab has been CTF3 since 2015.

Laboratory participated in 5 programs in the last 3 years, 2 during 2018.

In addition to Earth resistance test, they received outliers (causes/root causes in brackets), in other programs as follows:

- Creepage and clearance in 2015 (outliers received, no response received and referred for GNCR.)
- Ball Pressure Test in 2015, (equipment used was not compliant, lab made corrections)
- Heating in Switches (3 outliers, no response received.)
- Touch Current, 6 outliers (lab does not know this yet)

Analysis

The laboratory stated they enrolled in the PTP, but decided not to participate because the PTP included testing at 10 A, 25 A and 32 A, but the lab's equipment could only test 25 A and 40 A.

The lab purchased a different set of equipment, apparently only for the purpose of generating results for the PTP.

The lab submitted results AFTER the due date for follow up. These results cannot be included as a participation because the expected results were publically available before the lab submitted their results.

IFM asked the lab why they enrolled in a PTP for which they did not have equipment.

The lab stated: *"At the time we didn't know what the parameters of the test would be. We assumed our ground bond tester would be sufficient. Unfortunately it only tested at 25 and 40 Amps and was limited to 100 m Ohms. We purchased the Chroma on the advice of our NCB."*

Questions for workshop:

1. Please look at ISO/IEC 17025:2017. Identify as many clauses as possible that the lab has not complied with.
2. Given the lab's history, do you have suggestions to make for the lab?
3. Given the lab's history, what advice do you have for the NCB?