Standard Practice for Performance-Based Qualification of Spectroscopic Analyzer Systems

This practice is under the jurisdiction of ASTM Committee D02 on Petroleum Products, Liquid Fuels, and Lubricants and is the direct responsibility of Subcommittee D02.25 on Performance Assessment and Validation of Process Stream Analyzer Systems.


1. Scope*

1.1 This practice covers requirements for establishing performance-based qualification of vibrational spectroscopic analyzer systems intended to be used to predict the test result of a material that would be produced by a Primary Test Method (PTM) if the same material is tested by the PTM.

1.1.1 This practice provides methodology to establish the lower/upper prediction limits associated with the Predicted Primary Test Method Result (PPTMR) in 1.1 with a specified degree of confidence that would contain the PTM result (if tested by the PTM).

1.1.2 The prediction limits in 1.1.1 can be used to establish the confidence that product released using the analyzer system based on a PPTMR that meets PTM-based specification limits will meet PTM-based specification limits when tested by a PTM.

1.2 The practice covers the qualification of on-line, at-line, or laboratory infrared or Raman analyzers used to predict physical, chemical, or performance properties of liquid petroleum products and fuels. Infrared analyzers can operate in the near-infrared (NIR) region, mid-infrared (MIR) region, or both.

1.2.1 This practice applies to all analyzer systems that can meet the performance requirements defined within.

1.2.2 This practice is not limited to analyzers designed by any specific instrument manufacturer.

1.2.3 This practice allows for multiple calibration techniques to create a multivariate model which relates the spectra produced by the analyzer to the corresponding property determined by a PTM. Spectra can be used to predict multiple properties, but the analyzer system performance of each predicted property is qualified individually.

1.3 The practice describes procedures for establishing performance requirements for analyzer system applications. The user of this practice must establish written protocols to confirm the procedures are being followed.

1.4 This practice makes use of standard practices, guides, and methods already established in ASTM. Additional requirements are listed within this practice.

1.5 Any multivariate model that meets performance requirements and detects when the spectrum of a sample is an outlier (analysis that represents an extrapolation of the model) or a nearest neighbor distance inlier (a spectrum residing in a gap in the multivariate space) can be used.

1.6 This practice can be used with methods for determining properties of biofuel blends. Three alternative procedures can be used. In all three cases, the qualification of the predicted values for the blend are established and monitored as part of a continual program by application of Practice D6122 or by combined application of Practices D6122 and D3764 (see definition in section 3.2.3).

1.6.1 If the analyzer is used to directly predict a property of the biofuel blend, and both the Primary Test Method Result (PTMR) and Predicted Primary Test Method Result (PPTMR)

*A Summary of Changes section appears at the end of this standard

are measured on the same material, then the analyzer is validated using Practice D6122.

1.6.2 If the analyzer is used to directly predict a property of a blend stock to which a fixed level of biofuel material is added prior to measurement by the PTM, and if the multivariate model correlates the spectrum of the blend stock to the PTMR for the fixed level blend, then the analyzer is validated using Practice D6122.

1.6.3 If the analyzer directly predicts a property of a blend stock to which some amount of biofuel material is later added, then Practice D6122 is used to validate the analyzer performance. If the PTMR produced by the analyzer is input into a second model to predict the property value for the final blend, based on the PTMR for the blend stock and the blend level for the biofuel material, then the performance of this second model is validated using Practice D3764.

1.7 Disclaimer of Liability as to Patented Inventions—Neither ASTM International nor an ASTM committee shall be responsible for identifying all patents under which a license is required in using this document. ASTM International takes no position respecting the validity of any patent rights asserted in connection with any item mentioned in this standard. Users of this standard are expressly advised that determination of the validity of any such patent rights, and the risk of infringement of such rights, are entirely their own responsibility.

1.8 This standard does not purport to address all of the safety concerns, if any, associated with its use. It is the responsibility of the user of this standard to establish appropriate safety, health, and environmental practices and determine the applicability of regulatory limitations prior to use.

1.9 This international standard was developed in accordance with internationally recognized principles on standardization established in the Decision on Principles for the Development of International Standards, Guides and Recommendations issued by the World Trade Organization Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) Committee.

2. Referenced Documents

2.1 ASTM Standards:

D86 Test Method for Distillation of Petroleum Products and Liquid Fuels at Atmospheric Pressure
D1265 Practice for Sampling Liquefied Petroleum (LP) Gases, Manual Method
D2699 Test Method for Research Octane Number of Spark-Ignition Engine Fuel
D2700 Test Method for Motor Octane Number of Spark-Ignition Engine Fuel
D3764 Practice for Validation of the Performance of Process Stream Analyzer Systems
D4057 Practice for Manual Sampling of Petroleum and Petroleum Products
D4177 Practice for Automatic Sampling of Petroleum and Petroleum Products
D6122 Practice for Validation of the Performance of Multivariate Online, At-Line, Field and Laboratory Infrared Spectrophotometer, and Raman Spectrometer Based Analyzer Systems
D6299 Practice for Applying Statistical Quality Assurance and Control Charting Techniques to Evaluate Analytical Measurement System Performance
D6596 Practice for Amplification and Storage of Gasoline and Related Hydrocarbon Materials
D6624 Practice for Determining a Flow-Proportioned Average Property Value (FPAPV) for a Collected Batch of Process Stream Material Using Stream Analyzer Data
D6708 Practice for Statistical Assessment and Improvement of Expected Agreement Between Two Test Methods that Purport to Measure the Same Property of a Material
D6792 Practice for Quality Management Systems in Petroleum Products, Liquid Fuels, and Lubricants Testing Laboratories
D7235 Guide for Establishing a Linear Correlation Relationship Between Analyzer and Primary Test Method Results Using Relevant ASTM Standard Practices
D7453 Practice for Sampling of Petroleum Products for Analysis by Process Stream Analyzers and for Process Stream Analyzer System Validation
D7808 Practice for Determining the Site Precision of a Process Stream Analyzer on Process Stream Material
D7825 Practice for Generating a Process Stream Property Value through Application of a Process Stream Analyzer
D8146 Guide for Evaluating Test Method Capability and Fitness for Use
D8321 Practice for Development and Validation of Multivariate Analyses for Use in Predicting Properties of Petroleum Products, Liquid Fuels, and Lubricants based on Spectroscopic Measurements
E131 Terminology Relating to Molecular Spectroscopy
E1655 Practices for Infrared Multivariate Quantitative Analysis
E1866 Guide for Establishing Spectrophotometer Performance Tests

3. Terminology

3.1 Definitions:

3.1.1 For definitions of terms and symbols relating to IR spectroscopy, refer to Terminology E131.

3.1.2 For definitions of terms and symbols relating to multivariate calibration, refer to Practices E1655 and D8321.

3.1.3 accepted reference value (ARV), n—value that serves as an agreed-upon reference for comparison and that is derived as (1) a theoretical or established value, based on scientific principles, (2) an assigned value, based on experimental work of some national or international organization, such as the U.S. National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), or (3) a consensus value, based on collaborative experimental work under the auspices of a scientific or engineering group. D6596

3.1.4 analysis, n—in the context of this practice, the process of applying the calibration model to a spectrum, preprocessed as required, so as to estimate a component concentration value or property. E1655
3.1.5 analyzer, n— all piping, hardware, computer, software, instrumentation and calibration model required to automatically perform the analysis of a process or product stream.

3.1.6 analyzer system, n—the complete analyzer system inclusive of the sample loop, sample conditioning unit, analyzer unit, readout instrumentation, and excess sample return system (see Fig. 1 from Practice D3764 for example). D3764

3.1.7 calibration samples, n—the set of reference samples used for creating a calibration model. Reference component concentration or property values are known (measured by reference method) for the calibration samples and a calibration model is found which relates these values to the spectra during the calibration.

3.1.8 check sample, n—a single pure compound, or a known, reproducible mixture of compounds whose spectrum is constant over time such that it can be used in a performance test.

3.1.9 control limits, n—limits on a control chart that are used as criteria for signaling the need for action or for judging whether a set of data does or does not indicate a state of statistical control.

3.1.10 estimate, n—the value for a component concentration or property obtained by applying the calibration model for the analysis of an absorption spectrum.

3.1.11 fit for use, n—an expression of the adequacy of a test method to provide a precise estimate of the intended parameter with a desired level of confidence at the level of a corresponding specification, regulatory, or manufacturing limit to support compliance decision.

3.1.11.1 Discussion—Fit for use is the effectiveness of an analytical measurement system to adequately meet the precision requirements for the intended application relative to specific limits.

3.1.12 flow-proportioned average property value (FPAPV), n—average property value of the collected material in the tank or vessel, calculated by using the flow-proportioned average technique described in the practice of all measurements performed on aliquots of the material while it is flowing into the tank or vessel.

3.1.12.1 Discussion—The term property as used in this practice can be the physical, chemical, or performance property measurements as provided by on-line, at-line analyzer systems, or, can be the deviation of such measurements from a desired value.

3.1.13 general validation, n—a comprehensive evaluation of the agreement between the PPTMR and the PTMR done on a set of samples that adequately span the multivariate model composition.

3.1.14 line sample—a process or product sample which is withdrawn from a sample port in accordance with Practices D1265, D4057, D4177, or D7453, whichever is applicable, during a period when the material flowing through the analyzer is of uniform quality and the analyzer result is essentially constant.

3.1.14.1 Discussion—Line Samples are not limited to the sampling practices mentioned in the definition given in Practice D6122.

3.1.15 linearly mixable, adj—property is deemed to be linearly mixable in a mass or volume measurement unit if the property of the mixed material can be calculated from the quantities and properties of the materials used to produce the mixture.

3.1.15.1 Discussion—The general equations describing this linearly mixable attribute are as follows:

\[
P_{\text{mixed}} = \frac{A_1 P_1 + A_2 P_2 + \cdots + A_N P_N}{A_1 + A_2 + \cdots + A_N}
\]

\[
A_{\text{mixed}} = A_1 + A_2 + \cdots + A_N
\]

where:

- \( A_N \) = quantity of material, \( N \),
- \( P_N \) = property of material, \( N \),
- \( P_{\text{mixed}} \) = property of mixed material,
- \( A_{\text{mixed}} \) = quantity of mixed material.

3.1.15.2 Discussion—The material being mixed can be from the same process stream over time.

3.1.16 local validation, n—an evaluation of the agreement between the PPTMR and PTMR done on a set of samples that do not necessarily span the compositional space of the multivariate model so as to demonstrate that the agreement is consistent with expectations based on the multivariate model.

3.1.17 multivariate calibration, n—an analyzer calibration that relates the spectrum at multiple wavelengths or frequencies to the physical, chemical, or quality parameters.

3.1.18 multivariate model, n—the mathematical expression or the set of mathematical operations that relates component concentrations or properties to spectra for a set of calibration samples.

3.1.19 outlier detection methods, n—statistical tests which are conducted to determine if the analysis of a spectrum using a multivariate model represents an interpolation of the model.

3.1.20 post-processing, v—performing a mathematical operation on an intermediate analyzer result to produce the final result, including correcting for temperature effects, adding a mean property value of the analyzer calibration, and converting into appropriate units for reporting purposes.

3.1.21 pre-processing, v—performing mathematical operations on raw spectral data prior to multivariate analysis or model development, such as selecting wave length regions, correcting for baseline, smoothing, mean centering, and assigning weights to certain spectral positions.

3.1.22 primary test method (PTM), n—the analytical procedure used to generate the reference values against which the analyzer is both calibrated and validated.

3.1.23 primary test method result (PTMR), n—test result produced from an ASTM or other established standard test method that is accepted as the reference measure of a property.

D6122
3.1.24 predicted primary test method result (PPTMR), \(n\)—result from the analyzer system, after application of any necessary correlation, that is interpreted as predictions of what the primary test method results would have been, if it was conducted on the same material.

3.1.25 validation, \(n\)—statistically quantified judgment that the analyzer system or subsystem being assessed can produce predicted PTM results with acceptable precision and bias performance when compared to actual results from a primary test method measurement system for common materials.

3.2 Definitions of Terms Specific to This Standard:

3.2.1 calibration, \(n\)—the practice of creating a univariate or multivariate linear relationship between one or more wavelengths (or wavenumbers) from a set of spectra and a physical, chemical, or a performance property.

3.2.2 chemical property, \(n\)—the concentration of a select component per unit volume or unit mass of a sample.

3.2.2.1 Discussion—Example: volume percent total aromatics in gasoline.

3.2.3 liquid petroleum product and fuels, \(n\)—for the purposes of this standard, any single-phase liquid material that is produced at a facility in the petroleum and petrochemical industries and will be in whole or in part of a petroleum product; it is inclusive of biofuels, renewable fuels, blendstocks, alternative blendstocks, and additives.

3.2.4 performance property, \(n\)—a rating value determined by a test method for a specified characteristic related to the intended use of the sample being tested.

3.2.4.1 Discussion—Example: octane ratings of gasoline.

3.2.5 physical property, \(n\)—a measurable property that relates a condition of the sample.

3.2.5.1 Discussion—Example: relative density of diesel fuel.

3.3 Acronyms:

3.3.1 ARV—accepted reference value

3.3.2 Mid-IR or MIR—mid-infrared

3.3.3 MLR—multiple linear regression

3.3.4 NIR—near-infrared

3.3.5 PCR—principle component regression

3.3.6 PLS—partial least squares regression

3.3.7 PPTMR(s)—predicted primary test method result(s)

3.3.8 PTM—primary test method

3.3.9 PTMR(s)—primary test method result(s)

3.3.10 SEC—standard error of calibration

3.3.11 SQC—statistical quality control

3.3.12 VRM—validation reference material

3.4 Symbols:

3.4.1 \(h\)—leverage statistic

3.4.2 SEC—standard error of calibration; \(SEC(m)\) indicates \(SEC\) at property level \(m\).

3.4.3 \(t(p, dof)\)—student’s T-value at probability \(p\) for \(dof\) degrees of freedom.

4. Summary of Practice

4.1 Procedures in existing ASTM standard practices and additional prescriptive requirements are combined, allowing the user to qualify the use of vibrational spectroscopic-based analyzers to predict property values of applicable materials within a specified confidence.

4.1.1 The spectroscopic measurements covered by this practice are not limited to those in standardized test methods.

4.2 The primary purpose of the qualification is to show at a specified confidence that the results from the analyzer system will be within limits when tested by the PTM.

4.3 Statistical tests shall be applied to spectra to detect outliers (samples that are outside the dataset used to create the multivariate model, that is, when samples extrapolate the multivariate model by having compositions outside the calibration range, by having new unmodeled components, or a spectrum is collected at significantly different temperature), and to detect nearest neighbor distance inliers (samples whose spectra are in voids in the multivariate calibration space). PPTMRs for leverage and spectral outliers and nearest neighbor inliers are considered invalid and not included in the performance evaluation. A limit on the amount of invalid results is set. Practice D6624 requires valid PPTMRs for at least 90% of the material collected during the batch/blend, and gives direction for estimating property values for the balance of the volume (up to 10%) that did not have valid data.

4.4 Validation via Practice D6122 is required to show the degree of agreement between the Primary Test Method Results (PTMR) and Predicted Primary Test Method Result (PPTMR) is consistent with the expectations based on the multivariate model Standard Error of Calibration (SEC).

4.4.1 Validation is required before initial use and as part of a continual program.

5. Significance and Use

5.1 This practice is intended for use by parties interested in releasing product by use of vibrational spectroscopic analyzer systems. It is expected to meet the industry need for a written practical reference describing a scientifically systematic approach to show the degree of confidence and degree of uncertainty in analyzer predicted values in relation to the PTM.

5.2 This is a performance-based practice that relies on the demonstrated quality of the test result and on strict adherence to the referenced standards and the additional requirements in this practice.

5.3 As part of demonstrating performance, this practice incorporates by reference other ASTM standardized practices as key steps in the process.

5.4 There are prescriptive requirements included for this practice.

5.4.1 The practice requires sample temperature to be carefully controlled in analyzer system hardware or that effects of temperature change be compensated in modeling or software.

5.4.2 Outlier detection capability is required for demonstrating the multivariate calibration model is applicable for the analysis of the sample spectrum, that is, that the analysis
interpolates the model, that the sample does not contain a statistically significant amount of unmodeled components above a certain limit based on spectral residual statistic and that the sample spectrum does not fall within gap in the multivariate calibration space.

5.5 In order to follow this practice, all criteria must be met.

5.5.1 The user shall investigate the cause of not meeting the practice requirements.

5.5.2 For any nonconformities noticed, the user shall make corrections to the analyzer system or procedures to conform to the requirements of this practice.

6. Apparatus and Considerations for Spectroscopy Measurements

6.1 This practice is applicable to:

6.1.1 Spectroscopic analyzers measuring molecular vibrations by infrared absorption (NIR or mid-IR, or both) and Raman scattering.

6.1.2 Dispersive or Fourier-transform analyzers.

6.2 Analyzer spectral resolution and signal-to-noise (S/N) affect multivariate model performance, and the user needs to consider these in determining the analyzer requirements based on the intended use. The analyzer resolution and S/N must be sufficient to produce PPTMR with adequate precision and accuracy to pass the validation requirements.

6.3 The analyzer shall include a means of demonstrating that it is operating within the vendor’s specification.

6.3.1 The analyzer shall incorporate instrument performance tests to demonstrate that it is operating within historically expected limits.

6.3.2 The analyzer shall have a means of validating wavelength/frequency precision and accuracy relative to the calibration analyzer.

6.3.2.1 The wavelength/frequency precision must be sufficient to allow spectra to be collected and used in creating a multivariate model that meets or exceeds user’s specifications.

6.3.2.2 The wavelength/frequency precision of the analyzer used for calibration and the between analyzer wavelength frequency relative accuracy and reproducibility for any analyzer the model is transferred to must be sufficient to allow analyzers to be validated by Practice D6122.

6.3.3 Ambient temperature changes may affect some spectroscopic measurements. Users may need to maintain constant environments around some analyzers.

6.4 Sample system requirements for on-line and at-line analyzers are as follows.

6.4.1 The sample system shall be designed to provide a representative sample to the analyzer system.

6.4.2 Sample lag time/sample delivery system should be considered if lab sample station and analyzer have a significant lag difference. Practice D7453 is suggested for guidance.

6.4.3 The sample system shall be designed to maintain the sample stream at a single phase and sufficient fluid velocity to make it through the sample system with a reasonable lag time. Practice D7453 is suggested for guidance.

6.4.4 The optical system of the analyzer can be either of a cell or probe type.

NOTE 1—Some analyzers may not have an associated sample system.

6.5 Sample temperature is critical to vibrational spectroscopic analyzer performance and shall be addressed by one of the following options. Changes in temperature can affect the measured spectral intensities, resulting in changes to property values predicted. Some intensity changes may be compensated for in modeling.

6.5.1 The user needs to establish the effects of temperature for their application. The sample stream is conditioned to within the determined acceptable temperature difference limits from the user-defined specified temperature for the application, according to user-defined accessories for the test. Some analyzer systems or applications, or both, may require tighter temperature control in order to pass Practice D6122 validation.

6.5.1.1 A mathematical correction can be developed to correct spectra or PPTMRs for temperature deviations from a specified temperature. For that sort of correction being applied to the calibration spectra used during model development, the same temperature correction is applied to spectra of samples being analyzed. Corrections can be applied to spectra or PPTMRs when using a model developed using spectra of samples collected at a specified temperature.

6.5.1.2 Effects of temperature fluctuations may be compensated for in the modeling.

6.5.1.3 A study may be conducted to generate data to demonstrate no significant temperature dependence above a user-defined limit.

6.5.2 Proof of the ability to compensate for temperature fluctuations is that Practice D6122 validation passes.

NOTE 2—Temperature differences may affect molar ratios in sample path for infrared or affect the Raman shift.

NOTE 3—Temperature affects both band position and absorptivity for vibrational spectroscopy of condensed material owing to changes in the interactions among the components of the material and due to expansion and contraction (density changes of the assayed volume by the equipment).

NOTE 4—Small temperature differences affect the amount of sample in the IR cell or Raman scattering volume (volumetric expansion/contraction). Large temperature changes cause spectral bandwidth changes and can cause sample phase changes.

NOTE 5—For temperature effect on vibrational spectrum, the density effect can be relatively easily compensated for. But there are other significant effects such as conformational equilibrium (determined by Boltzmann distribution and degeneracy) and hydrogen bonding (consider spectra collected with ethanol, avgas with significant amount of aniline, etc.), which are virtually impossible to compensate for in a fundamental way.

7. Expected Agreement

7.1 The spectroscopic test method precision qualification must be conducted in the form of reproducibility for agreement between the PTMR and PPTMRs.

7.1.1 For analyzers qualified by Practice D6122 general validation, the between-method limits used for comparisons shall be within user-specified agreement to the PTM reproducibility.

7.1.2 For analyzers qualified by Practice D6122 local validation, the uncertainty in the predicted value would have to be within user-specified agreement to the PTM reproducibility.

7.2 Demonstrate performance by meeting Practice D6122 requirements.
7.2.1 For initial validation, the local validation and general validation are both acceptable options.

7.2.1.1 For the local validation, the examples in Practice D6122 Annex A4 is to guide the users in performing preliminary validation, as well as continuing validation.

7.2.1.2 The use of $t = \frac{SEc(m)}{\sqrt{1 + h}}$ for local validation is scientifically and statistically sound manner of defining the acceptable limits when comparing results from the spectroscopic method and the PTMR. See Practice D6122 for information on $C_{\text{min}}$ for validation.

7.2.2 For Practice D6708, site precision for “fit for use” methods can be determined by interlaboratory exchange sample results (example: Test Method D2699).

7.2.2.1 Use the differences from the interlaboratory exchange ARV for a given location calculate the site precision value.

7.2.2.2 Practice D6708 will identify if sufficient variation exists in the general validation sample set.

7.2.3 Analyzer precision is established per Practice D7808 for on-line process analyzers. For laboratory or at-line analyzers, precision would be established by Practice D6299 methodologies. Analyzer precision can be input into Practice D6708 for establishing linear relationship between the PTM and analyzer system.

7.2.3.1 If a bias correction is made due to improve the linear relationship, the validation process starts over.

7.2.4 Practice D7825 provides the workflow related to generating a property value from the process analyzer.

7.2.5 Practice D6122 requires periodic line samples or validation reference materials (VRM) representative of current production to be analyzed for continual validation of the system.

7.2.6 Retained VRMs can be used for initial validation.

7.3 Acceptance:

7.3.1 If a user can demonstrate that the performance of the analyzer system and procedures meet the preliminary and continual validation requirements of Practice D6122 in an acceptable manner, and the differences between the PPTMR and the PTMR are within acceptable limits as required, the performance is deemed satisfactory.

7.3.2 If the performance and procedures do not meet the preliminary and continual validation requirements of Practice D6122, or the results are outside the acceptable limits, the performance is not satisfactory.

7.3.2.1 The user shall investigate and bring the system back into control with acceptable performance.

7.3.3 Records of performance shall be maintained and readily available.

7.3.4 Records of testing pertaining to temperature effects demonstrated or no temperature effects is to be maintained and readily available.

Note 6—Practice D6792 Section 7 has been suggested for guidance on records.

Note 7—See Practice D6122 spreadsheet for an example on local validation.

Note 8—See Practice D6708 for an example on general validation.

8. Multivariate Models

8.1 Calibration is the process of developing a multivariate model relating a material’s spectral information to the primary test data.

8.1.1 Calibration includes the use of a set of samples to create a model for use with the analyzer system. The size of the sample set is dependent upon the complexity of the sample matrix. See Practice D8321 for guidance on the number of samples needed for the calibration.

8.1.1.1 The user shall validate the performance of the analyzer system for each property per Practice D6122.

8.1.2 Recalibration typically includes the use of a smaller set of samples needed to adjust an analyzer after maintenance has been performed.

8.1.2.1 Recalibration is not the same for each analyzer system. For some, it may add a smaller set of samples to the initial calibration set to expand upon the range of the multivariate model. For others, it can be a model adjustment that does not require the model to be developed again.

8.1.2.2 The user shall validate the performance of each model after recalibration per Practice D6122.

8.1.3 Validation of the analyzer performance for each model after calibration/recalibration shall follow Practice D6122 guidance.

8.1.4 The user should define a period of time for retain samples used for calibration or recalibration, or both. Retained samples shall be stored in a manner to maintain sample integrity to sustain the property of interest. In addition, they should be stored to meet requirements of regulatory bodies.

8.2 Multivariate models can be as a linear regression.

8.2.1 Examples of linear regression include multivariate techniques of multiple linear regression (MLR), partial least squares regression (PLS), and principal component regression (PCR) which develop correlations between spectral data and PTM data.

8.2.2 The multivariate model can be that of a standardized test method, a user/vendor-created global multivariate model, or a user-created site-specific multivariate model.

8.2.2.1 A global multivariate model is one developed by use of samples and data that may represent materials produced at multipule facilities or locations.

Note 9—Some locations may start with a global model and add site-specific sample to it.

8.2.2.2 A site-specific multivariate model is one developed by use of samples and data that is limited to a single facility or location.

8.3 Techniques typically applied to developing models can be found in Practice D8321. Alternate techniques that yield results meeting the performance criteria (agreement with PTM and outlier detection) set forth in this practice may also be used.

8.4 All pre- and post-processing steps are considered to be part of the model. The same pre- and post-processing steps must be applied to both the calibration and the analysis spectra.

8.5 Multivariate regression may utilize the complete set of spectra and data. Cross validation can allow for assessing
model performance. Cross validation includes options of leave-one-out and leaving multiple spectra out. Cross validation is not a substitution for the validations in Practice D6122.

8.6 Model Updates:
8.6.1 Model update frequency is dependent upon model performance.
8.6.1.1 The passing validation procedure is one measure of performance.
8.6.1.2 The frequency of outliers is also a limiting factor, as a maximum of 10 % is allowed as pointed out in 13.3.
8.6.2 When a model update occurs, the validation starts over.

9. Outlier Statistics
9.1 Identification and handling of outliers is important to the success of meeting this performance-based practice. See Practice D8321 for information on outliers, as outliers are to be considered for elimination from the calibration set, and in Practice D6122 where outliers are not used in analyzer validation.

9.2 Spectral Outliers:
9.2.1 A spectral outlier is recognized as a sample whose spectrum differs from the spectra of samples in the calibration set by certain criteria. (for example, leverage, spectral residuals, nearest neighbor).
9.2.2 The spectra of the calibration samples define a set of variables that are used in the multivariate model. If, when unknown samples are analyzed, the variables calculated from the spectrum of the unknown sample lie within the range of the variables for the calibration, the estimated value for the unknown sample is obtained by interpolation of the model. If any variable for the unknown sample is outside the range of the variables in the calibration model, the estimate represents an extrapolation of the model. Various related statistics are used to determine whether the spectrum of the unknown sample interpolates or extrapolates the model. These statistics include leverage, Mahalanobis Distance and Hoteling’s T-Squared. Outlier limits are set based on the chosen statistic for the calibration set such that any spectrum that exceeds this limit is considered a spectral outlier.
9.2.3 If the spectrum of the sample under test contains spectral features that were not present in the spectra of the calibration samples, then these features represent variables that were not included in the calibration, and the analysis of the sample spectrum represents an extrapolation of the model. Various related spectral residual statistics are in common use. A spectral residuals outlier limit is based on the statistics for the calibration set such that any spectrum that exceeds this limit is considered a spectral outlier.
9.2.4 In some instances, the calibration samples may not be uniformly distributed across the variable space of the model. The calibration may include clusters of samples in variable space as well as voids where there are no samples. A nearest neighbor distance statistic is used to determine if a spectrum being analyzed falls within the clusters or voids in the calibration variable space. Outlier limits are based on the nearest neighbor distance statistic for the calibration set such that any analysis that exceeds this limit is considered a spectral outlier.

9.3 It is permissible for the identification and handling of outliers to be performed by the same software used for generating PPTMR from spectra, if the capabilities are present.

9.4 It is permissible for the identification and handling of outliers to be performed by a separate software package than that used for applying the model to unknown spectra for generation of PPTMRs.

9.5 For analysis of a sample (grab or process on-line) for the purposes of determining property values, the software shall indicate whether the spectrum is identified as an outlier, based on the criteria set by the user. The sample analysis may indicate that expected performance is not reached for a sample identified as an outlier.

NOTE 10—For on-line analyzers, when material is identified as an outlier, locations may want to consider collecting a sample that can be used to learn information on why it is an outlier or for inclusion into a model update.

10. Analytical Approach
10.1 For the lab, all sample handling, testing procedures, and tests must be conducted using good laboratory practices. Practice D6792 is suggested as a guide. Some locations may be familiar with ISO 9000 and use that as a guide.

10.2 For on-line analyzers, the associated sample system and sample conditioning system shall provide a representative sample to the analyzer. Practice D7453 is suggested as a guide.

10.3 For on-line analyzers, the line sample must be representative of the material being analyzed by the online analyzer. Sampling and handling shall follow specific practices that maintain the integrity of the sample and the properties of interest in order to allow for proper assessment of analyzer performance.

11. User Requirements
11.1 The user is expected to maintain documentation and carry out testing to measure properties of petroleum products and meet with the following requirements.

11.2 Qualification Criteria for Spectroscopic Test Method:
11.2.1 Spectroscopic test method documentation must be maintained by the user, which should include a description of the technology, analyzer hardware/software, any sampling system design/functionality, other instrumentation used, and procedures/practices that allow the method to work. The documentation should also list the PTMs to which the spectroscopic method was correlated and against which it is being compared.

11.2.2 Information that demonstrates the spectroscopic test method meets the applicable precision and accuracy information for the property of interest of the sample material shall be maintained by the user.

11.2.3 Information that demonstrates the spectroscopic test method has been evaluated using the validation requirements set forth in Practice D6122 shall be maintained by the user.
11.2.4 The validation can be either that of a local validation or a general validation.

11.2.5 A local validation utilizes the SEC to calculate a measure of how well the PTMRs and PPTMRs agree. For local validation, the uncertainty serves the same purpose as the global validation between method reproducibility. Both the local validation uncertainty and the global validation between method reproducibility allow the user to use the PPTMR to determine that the product meets the defined target limits. If, in addition, the local validation uncertainty or global validation between methods is less than or equal to the PTM reproducibility, the spectroscopic measurement can be used as an acceptable alternative method.

11.2.6 A general validation utilizes Practice D6708 to assess the agreement between the PTMRs and the PPTMRs.

11.2.6.1 If bias, slope, or slope and bias corrections can improve performance, these are allowed.

11.2.6.2 Practice D6122 validation shall start over following such adjustments.

11.2.7 If the Practice D6122 general validation reveals the spectroscopic test method has sample-specific biases due to matrix effects that cannot be determined as random, the user shall document the extent of these effects. The method shall not be used when such matrix effects are present and leads to results outside acceptable limits. Spectroscopic outlier determinations may be able to identify such samples.

11.2.8 The spectroscopic test method precision qualification must be conducted in the form of the uncertainty on the PPTMR (Practice D6122 local validation) or on the between-method reproducibility for agreement between the PTMR and PPTMRs (Practice D6122 general validation). The uncertainty on the PPTMR and the between-method reproducibility used for comparisons shall meet PTM reproducibility requirements for each property used in this practice, unless otherwise agreed upon between all parties involved.

Note 11—The PTMR could be a calculated value using results from multiple different PTMs. For example, the PTMR for AKI would be a calculated value from two PTMs, Test Methods D2699 and D2700. The uncertainty for AKI is expected to be less than the uncertainties for each of Test Methods D2699 and D2700, due to averaging and less probability that the individual uncertainties of both Test Methods D2699 and D2700 would be at their extremes.

Note 12—Another example would be for Driveability Index, where again the uncertainty associated with each individual PTM result from Test Method D86 used in the calculation is larger than the uncertainty when correlating to driveability index individually.

11.2.9 If it is determined that the spectroscopic test method can be qualified on a narrow range of material while still meeting the data requirements for variability, then the materials on which the qualification was achieved and for which the method is to be accepted must be specified in the description of the spectroscopic test method. Any limitation on the range of materials for which the spectroscopic test method is to be used must be documented. If the spectroscopic test method is discovered to have minimal matrix effects, this must be documented.

11.2.10 The user should define a period of time for retain of samples used for accuracy determinations and validation. Retained samples shall be stored in a manner to maintain sample integrity to sustain the property of interest. In addition, they should be stored to meet requirements of regulatory bodies.

11.2.11 If validation is acceptable, the user shall keep track of subsequent PTM and PPTM for agreement. It is important to note that validation is a continuous process.

11.2.11.1 The differences between the PTMRs and PPTMRs shall be control charted, with constant upper and lower limits. This is the scaled difference between PPTMR and PTMR where the scaling is divided by $\frac{1}{\sqrt{1+h}}$.

11.2.11.2 Any differences outside the upper or lower limits shall be investigated. It is important to investigate both the PTM and the spectroscopic test method.

11.2.11.3 In monitoring the differences between the PTMR and the PPTMR, conform to requirements in Practice D6122, including the data point results used in the validation. If not meeting this requirement, validation shall be revoked and process started again to reach a state of being in control.

11.2.11.4 The difference between the PTMRs and PPTMRs shall be compared at a frequency that is representative of the whole sample population and adequate to provide confidence on the blends/batches to agree within reproducibility of PTM data at 95% confidence level (contractual agreement), with a minimum of once per week or every five batches/blends, whichever is the more frequent. This applies to each property being validated, and applies to times when material is actually being produced.

11.2.12 Data shall be kept for the qualification criteria and the continuing validation of the spectroscopic method. Examples of data and local validation are given in the adjunct spreadsheet.

11.2.13 PTM statistical quality control (SQC) and comparison to accepted reference values (ARV) for material used to validate predicted PTM fit-for-use.

11.2.13.1 The accuracy of the PTM can be assessed by participation in a suitable interlaboratory cross check (proficiency) program or by analyzing a sample with an ARV. Results from cross check program shall be monitored for lab bias, imprecision, and technical compliance, using methodology referenced in Practice D6299.

Note 13—Sample with an ARV must be maintained properly and be within its shelf life to use.

11.2.13.2 The accepted reference value for the standard is to be determined following the guidelines of Practice D6299.

11.2.13.3 Individual results charts are to be created for the PTM, with control lines per Practice D6299.

11.2.13.4 Any instances where PTM results are outside of control limits shall be investigated, and results may not be used in the validation of the alternate spectroscopic method. These samples can be added to the existing multivariate models.

Note 14—One option for introducing quality check material to an on-line analyzer is by use of a system designed to deliver material in place of the stream to the analyzer cell or probe. The system should be designed to store the material and maintain the sample integrity to sustain the property of interest.
12. Flow Diagram and Work Process

12.1 See Fig. 1.

FIG. 1 Flow Diagram and Work Process

Preconditions
1. Have the preconditions of D6122 been satisfied (with allowance of Raman)?
2. Have the preconditions of this practice been satisfied?
   - Analyzer is operating within vendor’s specifications.
   - If on-line analyzer, sample system delivers representative sample to analyzer.
   - Sample temperature requirements fulfilled.
   - Sample handling, testing procedures, tests following good laboratory practices.
3. Is PTM in control?

STOP
Analyzer System does not satisfy requirements.

Are Preconditions satisfied?
YES
Proceed with D6122 initial validation process for property of interest.

Are D6122 initial validation requirements demonstrated and passing?
YES

Begin continual validation, maintaining documentation, SQC Activities

NO

Will a bias adjustment or model update improve performance?
YES
Make adjustment and/or model update. Begin D6122 initial validation.

Continued onto next page

Resolve issues with analyzer system or PTM.

Continued from next page
13. Use with Flow-Proportioned Average Property Value (FPAPV)

13.1 One can use on-line or at-line measurements to generate the property values of a finished product following Practice D6624.

13.2 Regular on-line or at-line measurements are collected during the entire process of a batch/blend being delivered to a tank/vessel or directly into a pipeline. The analyzer results are calculated in association with the total flow at the time of each reading. Upon completion, the total volume and proportioned results are used to generate a value for the batch/blend.

**Note 15**—This practice is about measurements and if they are defendable, which allows for this practice to include material going out by pipeline.
13.2.1 When the tank/vessel contains a heel volume of material, both the properties and volume for the heel are factored into FPAPV value for the complete batch/blend in the tank/vessel.

13.2.2 When the tank/vessel does not have a heel volume of material, then it is assumed the FPAPV values are for the complete batch/blend in the tank/vessel.

13.2.3 If the material in the tank/vessel requires addition of material to modify a property value, it is likely the added material may be a spectral outlier itself and produce results not representative of the material added to the tank/vessel.

13.2.4 The FPAPV value for the complete batch can be used with an automated composite sampler that collects material representative of the batch/blend by practices described in Practices D4177.

13.2.4.1 In cases where analyzer availability is <90 %, final composite sample can be used to obtain PTMRs and PPTMRs.

13.3 As spectral outlier determination occurs during the batch/blend, it is understood that a portion (up to 10 %) of the material collected may not have valid fit-for-use analyzer data for calculating a FPAPV. Practice D6624 allows for an estimate of the property values for the amount of the batch/blend that did not have valid data, and also gives direction on ways to attain such estimate. The maximum error associated with the estimate that is deemed acceptable shall not be more than 2.5 % of the property value.

**NOTE 16**—The requirement/assumption is that the property is linearly mixable for accurate FPAPV calculation. Typically, the narrower the range of property values used for FPAPV, the better the linearly mixable requirement stands, hence smaller blending control swings during blends is preferred over larger swings which also tend to increase outlier rate to >10 % that fails the Practice D6624 requirement for >90 % analyzer availability.

**NOTE 17**—Besides outliers, there are other associated practices with an analyzer that would make the analyzer unavailable, and this would be included in the total analyzer availability.

14. Satisfactory Analyzer System Performance

14.1 For the properties that satisfy the requirements of this practice, the data provided by the analyzer is expected to be within acceptance limits of PTMRs and can be used as an alternate for PTMR values.

15. Keywords
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**SUMMARY OF CHANGES**

Subcommittee D02.25 has identified the location of selected changes to this standard since the last issue (D8340 – 20) that may impact the use of this standard. (Approved Nov. 1, 2020.)

(1) Revised subsections 3.1.2, 8.1.1, 8.3, and 9.1.
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