

Lab GLP Refresher

Sherita's Top 10 Findings

National Education Conference
Orlando, FL
March 1, 2017
Sherita Normington
Western Region
Assistant QA Coordinator



Seeing the Forest for the GLPs

A Lab GLP Refresher



GLP – The Forest

- ✗Reliable data
- ✗Preserved data
- ✗Reconstructable studies
- ✗Good science



GLP Study

- ✗ Any study that supports or is intended to support applications for research or marketing permits for pesticide products.
- ✗ A “study” does not include basic exploratory studies to determine if a test method is useful.
 - ✗ Method development



Facility Documents

× Floor Plan

- × Shows where things are
 - × Archives
 - × Sample storage
 - × Reference substance storage
- × Dated
- × Archive historic versions

× Organizational Chart

- × Reporting Structure
 - × Personnel conducting study
 - × Study Director
 - × Test Facility Management
 - × Quality Assurance
- × Use position titles not university titles
- × Need all positions
- × Dated
- × Archive historic copies

× Master Schedule

- × Include Non-GLP and Non-IR-4 studies

Raw Data

Worksheets, memos, notes, or exact copies that are results of original observations and activities of a study and are necessary to reconstruct or evaluate the report for the study.





Raw Data

- × Record accurately, promptly, legibly
- × Permanent ink
- × Who and when
- × How procedure was done
 - × SOPs
 - × Working Method
- × Changes to data
 - × Who, when and why
 - × Need to see original entry
- × Explain unusual circumstances
 - × Data not used
- × Organized for easy and logical review



GLP Raw Data

VS.

Books and Records

- ×GLPs allow exact copies of data
- ×Books and Records (40 CFR 169) require registrant to maintain
 - ×All underlying raw data
 - ×Original raw data



Electronic Raw Data

- ✗ Unique password for each user or SOP that describes process to ensure identity
- ✗ Electronic signal is the raw data
- ✗ Backup and archive
- ✗ Software version



Study Director

Single point of control in the study with overall responsibility for technical conduct, interpretation and reporting of results.



Study Director

- ✗ Issues protocol and amendments
 - Amendments are permanent changes to the study
- ✗ Approves protocol deviations and assesses impact on the study
 - Lab generates deviations
 - Can't just say "final impact not known until analysis"



Personnel

- ✗ Education, training, and/or experience
 - ✗ CV
 - ✗ Training records
 - ✗ Job description
 - ✗ Review regularly
- Archive
- Performance reviews in separate file



Quality Assurance is your friend!

- ✗ Separate and independent from study
- ✗ Should be able to reconstruct study from raw data
- ✗ QA audit findings are not for EPA to see without court order
- ✗ Audit each study at least once



Protocol

- ✗ Study initiation date – date Study Director signs
- ✗ Signed before start
- ✗ Supersedes SOPs
- ✗ Note out-of-the-ordinary
 - ✗ Analyze TRT 03 first
 - ✗ Residues as parent equivalent or total



Protocol Changes

- × Reference methods
 - × Need amendment to change
- × LLMV
 - × Need amendment to make higher
- × Stability Study
 - × Need amendment or deviation if covers $< 90\%$



SOPs

- × Routine procedures
 - × Everyone doing the same way
 - × Reconstruct study
 - × Training tool
 - × Build in flexibility
- × Don't have to write step-by-step procedure each time you do something
- × Review on regular basis
- × Archive historic copies
 - × If user manuals are referenced, need to archive those as well

Equipment

Equipment used in the generation, measurement, or assessment of data shall be adequately tested, calibrated, and/or standardized.





Equipment

- × Balances
- × Calibrated weights
 - × Check full range of weights annually
- × Thermometers
- × NIST certified/traceable temperature devices
- × Analytical instruments



Equipment

×SOPs

- ×Maintenance and calibration
- ×Remedial action in case of failure or malfunction
- ×Person responsible for each operation

Equipment

- ✘ Written records of all inspections, maintenance, testing, calibrating, and/or standardizing operations





Equipment

- × Use forms with prompts
 - × Dates of operation
 - × Routine – followed the SOP
 - × Non-routine (result of failure or mal-function)
 - × Nature of defect
 - × How and when discovered
 - × Remedial action
- × Archive periodically



Reference Substances

- ×GLP characterized
- ×Certificate of analysis
- ×SOPs for receipt, identification, storage, handling, and mixing
 - ×Temperature monitored storage
 - ×Freezer
 - ×Refrigerated
 - ×Ambient
 - ×Limited access



Reference Substances

×Label

- ×Name, code or CAS #

- ×Batch or lot #

- ×Expiration date

- ×Storage conditions

×Stability of reference substance in mixture

- ×Solvents

- ×Storage conditions



Reference Substances

- × Non-GLP reference substance
 - × Test Facility Management must approve the use
 - × Include on Statement of Compliance



Samples

- × Maintain integrity
- × Identify the crop fraction per the protocol
- × SOPs for identification, transfer, and storage
 - × Labeling
 - × Chain of custody
 - × Temperature controlled and monitored
 - × Maintenance and calibration logs for temperature monitoring devices and freezers
 - × Limited Access

Samples

- × Sample identification maintained from time samples are generated in field to time residue results are reported
 - × Includes intermediate steps in the extraction procedure





Freezer alarm

× SOP

- × What is the system
- × How tested
- × How often
- × Who tests
- × Testing Documentation



Reagents

- × Proper labeling
 - × Identity
 - × Concentration
 - × Storage
 - × Expiration date



Analytical Method


- × Reference method from protocol
- × Allow flexibility – typically, generally, approximately
 - × Elution pattern
 - × Gradient
 - × Standard preparation
- × Need Study Director approval of method and changes



Analytical Data

×SOP

- × % Deviation between duplicate injections
- × Back calculation of standards to curve
 - × Acceptance criteria
 - × Just because R-squared good doesn't mean curve is good
- × Acceptable retention time variation
- × Data in spreadsheets needs to match chromatograms



Analytical Summary Report

- ✗ Experimental start date is date when test substance is applied to test system
 - ✗ Could be date stability or method validation samples fortified
- ✗ Experimental termination date
 - ✗ Last data collected –overnight run
- ✗ Correction for parent equivalence or total reported residue



Archiving Data

- × SOP

- × What is archived

- × Index

- × Study records

- × Facility data

- × Archivist identified on Org Chart

GLP Forest

- ×Reliable data
- ×Preserved data
- ×Reconstructable studies
- ×Good science



Sherita's



Findings

10. List of Personnel in ASR incomplete
9. Off-Scale chromatograms
8. Non-routine maintenance not properly recorded
 - Nature of defect
 - How and when discovered
 - Remedial action
7. Missing entries from instrument logs
 - Maintenance
 - Column changes

6. Working method doesn't match what the lab is doing or did
 - Diverter program
 - Gradient
 - Temperature program
 - Preparation of standards
 - Use typically or generally or approximately
5. Incomplete documentation of unusual circumstances
 - Can't reconstruct what happened from the notes
4. Data reported doesn't match chromatograms

3. Reagents

- Expired
- Solutions prepared by ex-employee
- Missing label requirements on reagent labels
 - Name
 - Concentration
 - Storage
 - expiration

2. Protocol amendments not issued when ASR submitted to QA



**Missing dates
and initials from raw data**



Questions?

smnormington@ucdavis.edu

Phone: (530)752-9493