TECRID: checkable laboratory evidence

Karen Pendergrass · ORCID 0000-0002-2348-7259 · 2026-09-15

Karen Pendergrass. "TECRID: checkable laboratory evidence".
https://heavymetalcertified.com/ecosystem/tecrid. Retrieved 2026-09-15.

You have the COA. Can you check the result?

You asked for evidence that an ingredient meets your purchasing requirements. The supplier sent a certificate of analysis. There is a laboratory name. There are results. There may be a conclusion that appears to answer your question.

Your team still needs to determine whether the result can be checked to the issuing laboratory, whether the document reflects the current version, and whether the evidence actually supports the purchasing decision in front of you.

The file arrived. The decision is not necessarily complete. That distinction is where COA/PDF theater begins: treating possession of the document as resolution of questions it has not answered.

Check the issuer, content, version, and status

Receiving a document from a supplier establishes that the supplier provided that document. It does not, by itself, settle the relationship between the document and the issuing laboratory's result.

TECRID is the authenticated lab-evidence spine. A result can be checked to its issuing laboratory, structured measurands, version history, and current status. Measurands identify what was measured.

This makes the evidence review more specific. Instead of stopping at "we have the COA," the reviewer can examine the issuer, what was measured, the version being used, and the result's status.

The core trust layer is intentionally not a tax on credibility. Checking laboratory evidence is a foundational trust function. TECRID's core evidence trust is free.

Give the attachment a defined job

A PDF can contain useful, accurate laboratory evidence. Changing its format does not automatically make that evidence more trustworthy. The problem is asking the attachment to perform several different jobs without distinguishing them.

One question concerns the result: who issued it, what was measured, which version is being reviewed, and what is its current status? Another concerns the purchase: which bounded lot and quantity are being evaluated, and against which requirements?

A third concerns sampling: what does the sampled material allow you to conclude about the quantity being purchased? A fourth concerns the finished product: is there a certification decision against published numeric standards, and what claim does it support?

These are connected questions. A file can be genuine without answering all of them.

Keep authentication within its scope

TECRID does not certify products, prove representative sampling, or replace ISO 17025. An authenticated result is still a result with a defined scope. Authentication should make that scope easier to examine, without encouraging broader conclusions than the evidence supports.

A result concerns the material tested. Whether that material supports a conclusion about the bounded quantity depends on sampling, not simply on whether the result was genuinely issued.

VLE's sequence therefore includes sampling as an explicit step between the frozen Compliance Profile and the evidence-backed qualification decision. It is not enough to attach a genuine report to an undefined quantity and call the quantity qualified. The question remains: what does this evidence support about this lot?

Connect the result to the next decision

For VLE, a bounded ingredient or product lot is nominated. A Compliance Profile is frozen. Sampling and TECRID-backed evidence follow. QUALIFIED applies only to that bounded quantity and profile before reservation or trade.

For HMTc, finished-product certification is a separate determination against published numeric standards. An authenticated laboratory result is not product certification. A QUALIFIED ingredient lot is not finished-product certification. A certification decision is not automatic authorization to use the mark.

Laboratories can keep their issued results distinct from claims made about a product. Brands and buyers can distinguish evidence used to purchase an ingredient from evidence supporting a finished-product claim. Retailer QA teams can examine which evidence version and current status support the decision under review.

Ask what remains unresolved

When the next COA arrives, identify the evidence needed for the decision. Can the result be checked to its issuing laboratory? Are the measurands, version history, and current status clear? Which bounded quantity and frozen Compliance Profile govern the purchasing decision? What does the sampling support?

An additional attachment may answer a missing question. It may also repeat information you already have. The objective is to identify the evidence needed for a defined decision and keep the conclusion within that evidence's scope.

Explore TECRID for laboratory-evidence authentication, or read how the network fits together.