Asbestos in Materials Individual Results: Round 058 : 058 AIMS Round: Main

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Your Result</th>
<th>Assigned Result</th>
<th>Sample Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chrysotile,</td>
<td>Chrysotile,</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chrysotile, Actinolite,</td>
<td>Actinolite,</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No Asbestos,</td>
<td>No Asbestos,</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Crocidolite,</td>
<td>Crocidolite,</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Round 58 Sample Details

All samples were prepared for circulation following our normal validation process & were scanned using stereo-zoom microscopy to assess homogeneity & suitability for the round. 10% of all samples prepared for the round were analysed & validated by 14 independent laboratories using PLM analytical techniques. All validation labs identified all asbestos components present in the samples. No additional asbestos components were found in the 10% of samples were validated. The majority of errors were obtained for sample 2 & sample 4 with analysts misidentifying the asbestos type present. Sample 2 was a manufactured plaster sample containing actinolite. Actinolite is one of the rarer types of asbestos & analysts will seldom see it as part of their day to day activities. Sample 4 was a manufactured grout sample containing crocidolite. The types of samples in R58 highlight the need for labs to carefully examine all asbestiform fibres observed during analysis. All six asbestos types should always be considered & compared to the reference materials as necessary.

1. Type Of Errors Obtained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Validation Number</th>
<th>Product Type</th>
<th>Target Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>String (Commercial)</td>
<td>Chrysotile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>Plaster (Manufactured)</td>
<td>Actinolite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>Debris (Manufactured)</td>
<td>No Asbestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>Grout (Manufactured)</td>
<td>Crocidolite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

False Negative = Component has been missed. False Positive = Component has been incorrectly identified as present.

2. Round Scores

Chart 2 illustrates the distribution of scores for all participating laboratories. 300 (89%) laboratories obtained a score of zero in this round, indicating that these laboratories had not made any errors. The distribution of scores obtained by UK (United Kingdom) and Non-UK laboratories is also compared; 175 (96%) UK laboratories and 125 (81%) Non-UK laboratories obtained a score of zero for the round.
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Chart 3 shows the percentage distribution of cumulative three round scores for all UK and Non-UK laboratories. 28 laboratories (8%) in total had not yet completed 3 rounds and therefore did not accumulate a score. Following this round, 281 laboratories (81%) obtained a good cumulative score (0 – 7 penalty points cumulatively). 27 laboratories (8%) obtained an acceptable cumulative score (8 – 32 penalty points cumulatively) and 9 laboratories (3%) obtained an unsatisfactory cumulative score (33 or more penalty points cumulatively).

In R58 participants were asked to choose which method they used for analysing AIMS samples. As it wasn’t a mandatory field, only 60% of participants entered the method details. 130 labs (64%) who entered a method used PLM with DSO, 30 labs (15%) used SEM with EDX, 4 labs (2%) used FTIR.

Total errors across all four samples were highest for SEM with EDX (10 errors, 7 of which were for sample 2). The least errors were associated with PLM & TEM methods.

From R59 the method field will be compulsory to enable the PT Team to gather information and present the results within the group report.

Please ensure your 2016/17 AIMS subscription forms are returned promptly - the next round will be despatched week commencing 2nd May 2016.

The results from the latest feedback gathering exercise can be found on our website: http://www.hsl.gov.uk/proficiency-testing-schemes/participant-feedback

Email: proficiency.testing@hsl.gsi.gov.uk

Delia Lomas-Fletcher

Telephone: +44 (0)1298 218553
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