

Questions:

It appears that different laboratories have different methods for analysing PFAS samples that can produce vastly different results.

Our laboratory (Eurofins) used a modified US EPA method, whereas it appears AECOM's laboratory (ALS) used an "in house" method.

a) how did AECOM go about deciding which lab it would use to analyse its PFAS samples? Did Defence have any input on this decision?

b) Was consideration given to the methods each lab was using? What evidence can you provide to show that the ALS method is the more accurate method?

c) If you can not provide evidence to show the ALS method is more accurate, how can you be certain that any of the results you have provided for the investigation area are not much lower than the 'real' result?

Response:

Defence requires its contractors to engage laboratories which are accredited through the National Association of Testing Authorities (NATA). Defence understands that both Australian Laboratory Service (ALS) and Eurofins are accredited through NATA for PFAS analysis.

Defence further understands that ALS and Eurofins both use a modified US EPA methodology. Advice from commercial laboratories is that Defence is the first client to request all PFAS analysis be conducted using the modified US EPA methodology.