



AMIS_Documents

Doc: ADOC_074

Originator:

Quality
Specialist

Approver:
Management Rep

Revision No: 012

Revision Date:02.03.2022

Issued By: Management Rep

Certificate

AMIS0853

Certified Reference Material

Tails, Great Dyke PGM, Zimbabwe

Certificate of Analysis

AMIS

A: 11 Avalon Road, West Lake View, Ext 11, Modderfontein, 1609, South Africa

P: PO Box 856, Isando, 1600, Gauteng, South Africa

T: +27 (0) 11 923 0800

W: www.amis.co.za



Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
List of Tables	3
List of Appendices	3
Summary Statistics	4
1. Certified Concentrations and Uncertainties	5
2. Uncertified element statistics	6
3. Statistical Comparison of Means	8
4. Intended Use	8
5. Abbreviations and Symbols	9
6. Uncertified Concentration Values	10
7. Units	10
8. Analytical and Physical Methods	10
9. Origin of Material	10
10. Approximate Mineral and Chemical Composition	10
11. Quantitative Analysis by X-Ray Diffraction	10
12. Health and Safety	11
13. Method of Preparation	11
14. Particle Size Determination	12
15. Handling	12
16. Storage information	12
17. Methods of Analysis Requested	12
18. Information Requested of Participating Laboratories	13
19. Certification of Mean and Estimation of Measurement Uncertainty	13
20. Two Standard Deviations	13
21. Confidence Interval	13
22. Expanded Uncertainty	14
23. Confidence Interval and Expanded Uncertainty	14
24. Participating Laboratories	15
25. Accepted Assay Data	16
26. Reported Values	19
27. Validation of Accuracy (Trueness)	19
28. Limit of Detection and Limit of Quantitation in Gravimetric Fire Assay	19
29. Metrological Traceability	19
30. Period of Validity	19
31. Minimum Sample Size	19
32. Availability	19
33. Recommended use in Quality Control	19
34. Legal Notice	20
References	21
Appendices	22
End of certificate	30

List of Tables

Table 1. Certified concentrations, two standard deviations, combined and expanded uncertainty.	5
Table 2. Certified major oxides concentrations, two standard deviations, combined and expanded uncertainty.....	5
Table 3. Uncertified element concentrations statistics (Before the removal of outliers).	6
Table 4. The results of a two-sample equal or unequal variance t-test (two-tailed) data sets in which different analytical methods /instrumentation were used.....	8
Table 5. Comparison of the mean values for Copper in which three different analytical methods are used to determine their concentration.....	8
Table 6. Abbreviations, symbols, and descriptions.	9
Table 7. Results of XRD analysis.	11
Table 8. Particle Size Determination by laser diffraction.	12
Table 9. Example of replicate assay data in which the <i>CI</i> , <i>2s</i> and <i>U</i> are shown.....	14
Table 10. Data used to calculate the certified values after removal of outliers.	16
Table 11. A single-factor ANOVA table showing key elements. Where <i>P</i> is the total number of groups, or laboratories. <i>P</i> -1 is 1 less than number of laboratories, <i>P</i> (<i>n</i> -1) is the number of data values minus number of groups (equals degrees of freedom for each group added together), and <i>P</i> -1 + <i>P</i> (<i>n</i> -1) is 1 less than the number of data points. <i>MS</i> is the mean squares of between laboratories and within laboratories. After Ellison <i>et al.</i> , (2009), Table 6.2, page 61.....	25
Table 12. CRM certified value, quoted expanded uncertainty <i>U</i> , the coverage factor for the CRM, <i>k</i> =2.25 and mean for <i>n</i> =9 replicates and corresponding standard deviation for the replicate data.	26
Table 13. Mass of assay sample and corresponding limit of detection and limit of quantitation for an assay microbalance capability of smallest prill mass of 1µg or 0.001mg.	29
Table 14. Recommended reporting scheme for LOD and LOQ in fire assay.....	29
Table 15. T-distribution table for t-critical values (t crit.) for a two-tailed t-test at a 95% level of confidence.	30

List of Appendices

Appendix 1. Certification of Reference Material and Estimation of Measurement Uncertainty.....	22
Appendix 2. Example: Comparison of Mean and Certified Value for Validation of Accuracy	26
Appendix 3. Two-standard Deviations	27
Appendix 4. Confidence Interval.....	27
Appendix 5. Using the CRM in Quality Control.....	27
Appendix 6. Conversion to Air-dry Basis	28
Appendix 7. Example of Determination of LOD and LOQ in Fire Assay	29
Appendix 8. T-distribution table	30

Summary Statistics

Recommended Concentrations and Limits (at two Standard Deviations) Certified Concentrations

Analyte	Method	⁸ (μ)	¹⁰ (2s) ±	Unit
Au	¹ NiS	0.122	0.022	g/t
Au	² Pb Collection	0.121	0.015	g/t
Ir	NiS	0.034	0.027	g/t
Pd	NiS	0.397	0.075	g/t
Pd	Pb Collection	0.390	0.042	g/t
Pt	NiS	0.516	0.079	g/t
Pt	Pb Collection	0.498	0.044	g/t
Rh	NiS	0.052	0.011	g/t
Rh	Pb Collection	0.042	0.0059	g/t
Ru	NiS	0.056	0.015	g/t
SG	³ SG	3.16	0.12	Dimensionless
Co	⁴ 2A_MICP	19	0.6	ppm
Co	⁵ FUS	82	23	ppm
Cu	2A_MICP	264	6	ppm
Cu	FUS	308	81	ppm
Cu	XRF	292	59	ppm
Ni	2A_MICP	334	15	ppm
Ni	FUS	790	174	ppm
Fe	FUS	7.62	0.21	%
Li	⁶ 4A_MICP	32	1	ppm

Calculated 4E (Pb Collection) = Gold + Palladium + Platinum + Rhodium = 1.051 g/t

Calculated 6E (NiS) = Gold + Iridium + Palladium + Platinum + Rhodium + Ruthenium = 1.177 g/t

Major Oxides Certified Concentrations (at two Standard Deviations)

Analyte	Method	⁸ (μ)	¹⁰ (2s) ±	Unit
CaO	⁷ XRF	4.76	0.22	%
Cr ₂ O ₃	FUS	0.41	0.06	%
Cr ₂ O ₃	XRF	0.39	0.07	%
SiO ₂	XRF	51.84	4.4	%
Fe ₂ O ₃	XRF	10.85	0.53	%
Na ₂ O	XRF	0.54	0.02	%
P ₂ O ₅	XRF	0.023	0.001	%

Uncertified Concentrations (at two Standard Deviation) on Table 3

Analyte	Method	(Mean)	± (2s)	Unit
MgO	FUS	19.6	11.4	%
MgO	XRF	22.1	3.6	%
S	2A_MICP	0.2	0.004	%
S	4A_MICP	0.2	0.0008	%
S	Combustion/LECO	0.2	0.02	%
S	FUS	0.2	0.04	%
S	XRF	0.2	0.06	%
FeO	FUS	9.5	1.6	%
FeO	XRF	11.2	1.4	%

1. Certified Concentrations and Uncertainties

AMIS0853 is a new standard material, developed and certified in October 2022. Table 1 gives the certified concentrations, confidence interval, combined and expanded uncertainty for the certified reference material. Table 2 shows the certified major oxides concentrations, two standard deviations, confidence interval, combined and expanded uncertainty.

Table 1. Certified concentrations, two standard deviations, combined and expanded uncertainty.

Analyte	Method	⁸ (μ)	N	n	k	% RSD	⁹ (u_c)	¹⁰ (2s) \pm	¹¹ (CI) 95%	¹² (U) \pm	Unit
Au	¹ NiS	0.122	7	53	2.447	9	0.011	0.022	0.010	0.03	g/t
Au	² Pb Collection	0.121	4	29	3.182	6	0.0076	0.015	0.012	0.02	g/t
Ir	NiS	0.034	6	43	2.571	41	0.014	0.027	0.014	¹³ #0.04	g/t
Pd	NiS	0.397	8	60	2.365	9	0.038	0.075	0.029	0.09	g/t
Pd	Pb Collection	0.390	5	37	2.776	5	0.021	0.042	0.021	0.06	g/t
Pt	NiS	0.516	6	45	2.571	8	0.039	0.079	0.044	0.1	g/t
Pt	Pb Collection	0.498	4	31	3.182	4	0.022	0.044	0.030	0.07	g/t
Rh	NiS	0.052	6	45	2.571	11	0.0057	0.011	0.0050	0.01	g/t
Rh	Pb Collection	0.042	3	23	4.303	7	0.0029	0.0059	0.0070	0.01	g/t
Ru	NiS	0.056	6	45	2.571	13	0.0074	0.015	0.0080	0.02	g/t
SG	³ SG	3.16	4	26	3.182	2	0.058	0.12	0.068	0.2	Dimensionless
Co	⁴ 2A_MICP	19	2	16	12.706	2	0.3	0.6	1	4	ppm
Co	⁵ FUS	82	5	37	2.776	14	11	23	16	31	ppm
Cu	2A_MICP	264	2	16	12.706	1	3	6	0.6	36	ppm
Cu	FUS	308	6	47	2.571	13	40	81	41	104	ppm
Cu	XRF	292	4	32	3.182	10	30	59	46	94	ppm
Ni	2A_MICP	334	3	23	4.303	2	7	15	12	32	ppm
Ni	FUS	790	6	47	2.571	11	87	174	89	223	ppm
Fe	FUS	7.62	3	23	4.303	1	0.11	0.21	0.16	0.5	%
Li	⁶ 4A_MICP	32	2	15	12.706	2	0.5	1	2	7	ppm

Table 2. Certified major oxides concentrations, two standard deviations, combined and expanded uncertainty.

Analyte	Method	⁸ (μ)	N	n	k	% RSD	⁹ (u_c)	¹⁰ (2s) \pm	¹¹ (CI) 95%	¹² (U) \pm	Unit
CaO	⁷ XRF	4.76	6	42	2.571	2	0.11	0.22	0.12	0.3	%
Cr ₂ O ₃	FUS	0.41	5	39	2.776	8	0.03	0.06	0.04	0.09	%
Cr ₂ O ₃	XRF	0.39	5	34	2.776	9	0.03	0.07	0.04	0.1	%
SiO ₂	XRF	51.84	4	32	3.182	4	2.2	4.4	3.0	7	%
Fe ₂ O ₃	XRF	10.85	3	24	4.303	2	0.27	0.53	0.65	1	%
Na ₂ O	XRF	0.54	2	16	12.706	2	0.01	0.02	0.08	0.1	%
P ₂ O ₅	XRF	0.023	2	16	12.706	3	0.0006	0.001	0.003	0.007	%

- NiS is Nickel Sulphide with either ICPOES/ICPMS/AAS finish
- Pb collection is Fire Assay Pb Collection - ICPOES/ICPMS/AAS Finish
- SG is Specific Gravity
- 2A_MICP is a Two-acid digestion with either ICPOES/ICPMS/AAS finish
- FUS is Fusion digestion with either ICPOES/ICPMS/AAS finish
- 4A_MICP is a Four-acid digestion with either ICPOES/ICPMS/AAS finish
- XRF is X-ray Fluorescence
- The certified value μ , is an unweighted grand mean of the means of N accepted sets of data from different laboratories and n number of test sample replicates. The certified value is traceable to SI units and is reported on a dry basis.
- The combined uncertainty of the certified value is the within-laboratory reproducibility standard deviation derived from the analysis of variance of results from N number of laboratories and n number of sample replicates. (u_c)
- Two standard deviations (2s)
- Confidence interval at 95% level of confidence.
- Expanded uncertainty (U) at a confidence level of 95% is determined by multiplication of the combined uncertainty (u_c) with a coverage factor (k) found from N-1 degrees of freedom (see Appendix 7 for t-distribution table). Example: $U = 2.36 \times 0.23 = 0.5\%$
- # denotes $U > \mu$. AMIS advises that U should not be used in laboratory.

2. Uncertified element statistics

Uncertified element statistics are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Uncertified element concentrations statistics (Before the removal of outliers).

Element	Generic Method	n	Mean	SD	RSD %	Unit
4E	¹⁴ FA_GRAV	8	1.1	0.1	10	g/t
4E	NiS	8	1.3	0.1	11	g/t
4E	Pb Collection	6	1.0	0.09	10	g/t
6E	NiS	8	1.5	0.2	12	ppm
Ag	2A_MICP	16	0.3	0.02	6	ppm
Ag	4A_MICP	8	0.3	0.01	4	ppm
Al	2A_MICP	8	12391.0	130.4	1	ppm
Al	4A_MICP	8	23495.5	117.3	0.5	ppm
Al	FUS	8	23337.5	256.0	1	ppm
Al	XRF	8	21262.5	459.6	2	ppm
Al ₂ O ₃	FUS	8	4.4	0.04	0.9	%
Al ₂ O ₃	XRF	27	4.4	0.4	9	%
As	2A_MICP	8	0.5	0.06	13	ppm
As	4A_MICP	8	0.8	0.1	16	ppm
Au	2A_MICP	16	0.1	0.02	15	g/t
Ba	2A_MICP	8	26.4	0.5	2	ppm
Ba	4A_MICP	16	50.6	0.8	2	ppm
Ba	FUS	8	50.5	0.5	1	ppm
BaO	XRF	8	0.004	0.001	27	%
Be	2A_MICP	8	0.08	0.006	8	ppm
Be	4A_MICP	16	0.2	0.02	8	ppm
Bi	2A_MICP	16	0.8	0.02	2	ppm
Bi	4A_MICP	16	0.8	0.05	6	ppm
Bi	FUS	8	0.9	0.05	6	ppm
C	¹⁵ Combustion/LECO	8	1625.0	46.3	3	ppm
Ca	2A_MICP	8	10062.5	106.1	1	ppm
Ca	4A_MICP	8	35190.5	156.1	0.4	ppm
Ca	FUS	16	36766.9	1889.5	5	ppm
Ca	XRF	8	33437.5	333.5	1	ppm
CaO	FUS	24	5.9	1.8	30	%
Cd	2A_MICP	16	0.05	0.01	23	ppm
Cd	4A_MICP	16	0.1	0.01	15	ppm
Ce	2A_MICP	8	2.5	0.04	1	ppm
Ce	4A_MICP	16	4.9	0.2	4	ppm
Co	4A_MICP	16	85.6	3.6	4	ppm
Co	XRF	27	232.9	197.6	85	ppm
CO ₂	Combustion/LECO	8	0.6	0.006	1	%
Cr	2A_MICP	8	488.4	5.9	1	ppm
Cr	4A_MICP	16	2570.0	258.4	10	ppm
Cr	FUS	16	2842.0	57.1	2	ppm
Cs	2A_MICP	8	0.8	0.01	2	ppm
Cs	4A_MICP	16	0.9	0.04	4	ppm
Cs	FUS	8	0.9	0.05	6	ppm

Element	Generic Method	n	Mean	SD	RSD %	Unit
Cu	4A_MICP	16	266.2	5.4	2	ppm
Dy	4A_MICP	16	0.7	0.04	5	ppm
Er	4A_MICP	16	0.5	0.03	6	ppm
Eu	4A_MICP	16	0.2	0.01	8	ppm
Fe	2A_MICP	8	17325.0	198.2	1	ppm
Fe	4A_MICP	8	78150.0	338.1	0.4	ppm
Fe	XRF	8	73825.0	471.3	0.6	ppm
FeO	FUS	24	9.5	0.8	8	%
FeO	XRF	16	11.2	0.7	7	%
Ga	2A_MICP	8	2.6	0.07	3	ppm
Ga	4A_MICP	16	5.9	0.2	4	ppm
Ga	FUS	8	5.6	0.5	9	ppm
Gd	4A_MICP	16	0.6	0.05	7	ppm
Ge	4A_MICP	8	1.3	0.09	7	ppm
Ge	FUS	8	1.5	0.5	36	ppm
Hf	2A_MICP	8	0.05	0.005	10	ppm
Hf	4A_MICP	16	0.5	0.05	10	ppm
Hg	2A_MICP	7	0.02	0.005	28	ppm
Ho	4A_MICP	16	0.2	0.01	7	ppm
In	2A_MICP	8	0.007	0.0008	12	ppm
In	4A_MICP	16	0.03	0.003	12	ppm
Ir	2A_MICP	8	0.003	0.001	34	g/t
K	2A_MICP	8	1174.6	9.5	0.8	ppm
K	4A_MICP	8	1895.4	10.2	0.5	ppm
K	FUS	8	1887.5	83.5	4	ppm
K	XRF	8	1912.5	83.5	4	ppm
K ₂ O	XRF	27	0.2	0.03	13	%
La	2A_MICP	8	1.3	0.03	2	ppm
La	4A_MICP	16	2.4	0.1	4	ppm
Li	2A_MICP	8	3.9	0.09	2	ppm
Li	FUS	8	31.4	0.5	2	ppm
LOI	¹⁶ LOI	16	1.3	0.2	12	%
Lu	4A_MICP	16	0.08	0.006	7	ppm
Mg	2A_MICP	8	21825.0	296.4	1	ppm
Mg	4A_MICP	8	141684.1	865.6	0.6	ppm
Mg	FUS	16	139838.8	2793.7	2	ppm
MgO	FUS	24	19.6	5.7	29	%
MgO	XRF	35	22.1	1.8	8	%
Mn	2A_MICP	8	264.0	2.3	0.9	ppm
Mn	4A_MICP	8	1534.6	8.1	0.5	ppm
Mn	FUS	8	1511.8	18.8	1	ppm
MnO	XRF	19	0.2	0.03	15	%
Mo	2A_MICP	16	0.5	0.05	11	ppm

* denotes that the results were exactly the same and SD and RSD% could not be calculated

Table 3 (Continued)

Element	Generic Method	n	Mean	SD	RSD %	Unit
Mo	4A_MICP	16	0.5	0.04	8	ppm
Mo	FUS	2	1.0	*	*	ppm
Moisture	LOI	8	0.4	0.02	4	%
Moisture	¹⁷ Moisture	8	0.3	0.03	11	%
Na	2A_MICP	8	1700.0	*	*	ppm
Na	4A_MICP	8	3872.3	19.1	0.5	ppm
Nb	4A_MICP	16	1.2	0.3	26	ppm
Nd	4A_MICP	16	2.4	0.1	5	ppm
Ni	4A_MICP	16	782.6	38.3	5	ppm
Ni	XRF	27	918.1	144.6	16	ppm
Os	NiS	8	0.005	0.0009	17	g/t
P	2A_MICP	8	78.3	1.0	1	ppm
P	4A_MICP	8	89.8	1.3	1	ppm
Pb	2A_MICP	16	3.0	0.08	3	ppm
Pb	4A_MICP	16	4.0	0.1	3	ppm
Pb	XRF	8	5.1	1.7	34	ppm
Pd	2A_MICP	16	0.4	0.02	4	g/t
Pr	4A_MICP	16	0.6	0.04	6	ppm
Pt	2A_MICP	16	0.2	0.03	11	g/t
Rb	2A_MICP	8	7.4	0.05	0.6	ppm
Rb	4A_MICP	16	9.8	0.6	6	ppm
Rb	FUS	8	10.1	0.2	2	ppm
Rb	XRF	8	11.1	1.4	12	ppm
Re	2A_MICP	8	0.003	0.0005	14	ppm
Re	4A_MICP	8	0.003	0.0005	18	ppm
S	2A_MICP	8	0.2	0.002	1	%
S	4A_MICP	8	0.2	0.0004	0.3	%
S	Combustion/LECO	16	0.2	0.009	5	%
S	FUS	24	0.2	0.02	12	%
S	XRF	16	0.2	0.03	20	%
Sb	2A_MICP	16	0.2	0.03	15	ppm
Sb	4A_MICP	16	0.2	0.02	9	ppm
Sb	FUS	1	0.6	*	*	ppm
Sc	2A_MICP	8	4.5	0.08	2	ppm
Sc	4A_MICP	16	28.5	1.3	5	ppm
Sc	FUS	8	27.3	0.9	3	ppm
Se	2A_MICP	8	0.7	0.08	11	ppm
Se	4A_MICP	8	0.9	0.1	13	ppm
Si	FUS	16	255941.9	2907.8	1	ppm
SiO ₂	FUS	32	40.4	23.7	59	%
Sm	4A_MICP	16	0.6	0.04	7	ppm
Sn	2A_MICP	16	0.3	0.01	3	ppm
Sn	4A_MICP	16	0.8	0.03	4	ppm

Element	Generic Method	n	Mean	SD	RSD %	Unit
SO ₃	XRF	11	0.4	0.08	17	%
Sr	2A_MICP	8	25.5	0.3	1	ppm
Sr	4A_MICP	16	39.2	0.7	2	ppm
Sr	FUS	8	44.6	1.1	2	ppm
Sr	XRF	16	42.3	2.4	6	ppm
Ta	4A_MICP	16	0.6	0.08	13	ppm
Ta	FUS	8	0.7	0.05	8	ppm
Tb	4A_MICP	16	0.1	0.006	6	ppm
Te	2A_MICP	16	0.5	0.05	10	ppm
Te	4A_MICP	8	0.5	0.07	15	ppm
Th	2A_MICP	8	0.7	0.01	1	ppm
Th	4A_MICP	16	1.0	0.05	5	ppm
Th	FUS	8	1.0	0.08	8	ppm
Ti	2A_MICP	8	280.3	5.2	2	ppm
Ti	4A_MICP	16	1198.0	43.4	4	ppm
Ti	FUS	8	1212.5	35.4	3	ppm
Ti	XRF	8	1187.5	64.1	5	ppm
TiO ₂	XRF	27	0.2	0.04	24	%
Tl	2A_MICP	16	0.08	0.001	2	ppm
Tl	4A_MICP	16	0.09	0.006	6	ppm
Tm	4A_MICP	16	0.08	0.005	6	ppm
U	2A_MICP	8	0.2	0.008	4	ppm
U	4A_MICP	16	0.4	0.02	6	ppm
U	FUS	8	0.4	0.05	13	ppm
V	2A_MICP	8	28.1	0.4	1	ppm
V	4A_MICP	16	135.2	5.7	4	ppm
V	FUS	8	137.1	3.1	2	ppm
V	XRF	8	130.9	3.1	2	ppm
V ₂ O ₅	XRF	3	0.06	0.006	9	%
W	2A_MICP	8	0.2	0.02	9	ppm
W	4A_MICP	16	0.5	0.09	17	ppm
W	FUS	1	6.0	*	*	ppm
Y	2A_MICP	8	0.9	0.02	2	ppm
Y	4A_MICP	16	4.0	0.2	5	ppm
Y	FUS	8	3.8	0.05	1	ppm
Yb	4A_MICP	16	0.5	0.03	5	ppm
Zn	2A_MICP	16	13.4	0.7	5	ppm
Zn	4A_MICP	16	68.2	1.9	3	ppm
Zn	FUS	8	68.6	3.0	4	ppm
Zn	XRF	8	65.6	0.6	1	ppm
Zr	2A_MICP	8	2.1	0.1	5	ppm
Zr	4A_MICP	16	16.1	1.7	10	ppm
Zr	XRF	8	16.5	0.6	4	ppm

* denotes that the results were exactly the same and SD and RSD% could not be calculated

- 14. FA_GRAV is Pb Collection (Fire Assay) with Gravimetry finish
- 15. Combustion/LECO
- 16. LOI is Loss on Ignition
- 17. Moisture is residual moisture content

3. Statistical Comparison of Means

A comparison of means for replicate data for the same element concentration determined by different analytical methods is done equating the variances between the two data sets; if the variances are found to be equal (F-test, p -value >0.05), then an equal variance t-test is applied. Should the variances be statistically significant, i.e., $p<0.05$, then an unequal variance t-test is performed. For either t-test, if the obtained p -value ≥ 0.05 , the null hypothesis that the means (certified values) are equal is accepted (Table 4 and 5). This gives the analyst confidence in the certified values reported by different analytical methods on the same analyte.

Table 4. The results of a two-sample equal or unequal variance t-test (two-tailed) data sets in which different analytical methods /instrumentation were used.

Method	Certified value	Method	Certified value	F-Test Outcome	p -value (t-test)	t-test Outcome
Au NiS	0.122 g/t	Au Pb Collection	0.121 g/t	Equal Variance ($p=0.271$)	0.804	Accept H_0 ; certified values are equal
Pd NiS	0.397 g/t	Pd Pb Collection	0.390 g/t	Equal Variance ($p=0.094$)	0.699	Accept H_0 ; certified values are equal
Pt NiS	0.516 g/t	Pt Pb Collection	0.498 g/t	Equal Variance ($p=0.112$)	0.447	Accept H_0 ; certified values are equal
Rh NiS	0.052 g/t	Rh Pb Collection	0.042 g/t	Equal Variance ($p=0.245$)	0.022	Reject H_0 ; certified values are <i>not</i> equal
Co 2A_MICP	0.002 %	Co FUS	0.008 %	Unequal Variance ($p=0.007$)	<0.001	Reject H_0 ; certified values are <i>not</i> equal
Ni 2A_MICP	0.033 %	Ni FUS	0.079 %	Unequal Variance ($p=0.003$)	<0.001	Reject H_0 ; certified values are <i>not</i> equal
Cr ₂ O ₃ XRF	0.390 %	Cr ₂ O ₃ FUS	0.407 %	Equal Variance ($p=0.434$)	0.421	Accept H_0 ; certified values are equal

Table 5. Comparison of the mean values for Copper in which three different analytical methods are used to determine their concentration.

Method	Certified value	Method	Certified value	Method	Certified value	F-ANOVA p -value	F ANOVA Outcome
Cu 2A_MICP	0.026 %	Cu FUS	0.031 %	Cu XRF	0.029 %	0.318	Accept H_0 , certified values are equal

4. Intended Use

AMIS0853 is a matrix matched Certified Reference Material, fit for use as a control sample in routine assay laboratory quality control when inserted within runs of test samples and measured in parallel to test samples. This material can also be used for method development, use as independent calibration verification check standard (i.e., if not used as a calibration standard in an instrument calibration), or for validation of accuracy in a method validation exercise (see Appendix 2). The recommend procedure for the use of this CRM as a control standard in laboratory quality control is to develop a Shewhart chart, where a mean value and corresponding 1, 2 and 3 standard deviations are derived from replicate measurements of the CRM (see Appendix 5). This CRM can also be used to assess inter-laboratory or instrument bias and establish within-laboratory precision and within-laboratory reproducibility. The certified concentrations and expanded uncertainty for this material are property values based on an inter-laboratory measurement campaign and reflect consensus results from the laboratories that took part in the exercise.

5. Abbreviations and Symbols

Abbreviations and symbols used in this document are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Abbreviations, symbols, and descriptions.

Abbreviation/Symbol	Description
Alpha (α)	Significance level (denoted by alpha, ' α ') of 0.05 or 5%
ANOVA	Analysis of variance by statistical means
Bq	The becquerel is the SI derived unit of radioactivity.
BIF	Banded iron formation
CRM	Certified reference material
df	Degrees of freedom, typically, $n-1$, or $N-1$
F_{calc}	Calculated F statistic from ANOVA or Fisher's test
F-critical or F_{crit}	F-critical value from F-distribution table
GOI	Gain on ignition
H_0	Null hypothesis
H_1	Alternate hypothesis
g/t	Grams per tonne
k	Coverage factor, e.g., $k=2$ for 95% level of confidence
LOC	Level of confidence or confidence level
LOD	Limit of detection
LOQ	Limit of quantitation
LOI	Loss on ignition
MS	Mean squares (ANOVA)
MSb	Mean squares between (ANOVA)
MSw	Mean squares within (ANOVA)
N	Number of labs
n	Number of replicates
μ	Property or certified value of a CRM
p	' p -value' a measure of the strength of evidence against H_0
P	Total number of data points in ANOVA
ppm	Parts per million. Equivalent to g/t
RSD	Relative standard deviation usually expressed as % at a 68% LOC
Replicates	Replication is the repetition of an experimental condition so that the variability associated with an analysis can be estimated (ASTM E1847)
s	Standard deviation
s_r	Within laboratory repeatability as derived from ANOVA
s_s	Between laboratory standard deviation as derived from ANOVA
SS	Sum of squares in ANOVA
SST	Total variation in ANOVA
SSB	Between group (laboratory) variance
SSW	Within group (laboratory) variance
2s	Two times standard deviation
SI	Standard International system of units

Abbreviation/Symbol	Description
t_{calc}	Calculated t statistic from a one-sample, two-tailed t-test
t-critical or t_{crit}	t-critical value at given alpha and degrees of freedom
Tonne	A metric ton, is a unit of mass equaling 1000 kilograms
=TINV (5%, <i>df</i>)	MS Excel function for t-critical value at LOC 95% and <i>df</i>
U	Expanded uncertainty at a given k
u	Standard uncertainty at $k=1$
u_c	Combined standard uncertainty at $k=1$
μm	Micron, is an SI derived unit of length equaling 1×10^{-6} of a meter

6. Uncertified Concentration Values

Table 3 gives uncertified concentrations for other elements present in the CRM.

7. Units

All results certified for major oxides are reported as oxides in percentages. All results certified for major elements analyses reported in percentages or ppm. Results for Au and the platinum group elements are reported in g/t or ppm. Specific gravity (SG) is the ratio of the density of a substance to the density of a reference substance, *i.e.*, equivalently; it is the ratio of the mass of a substance to the mass of a reference substance for the same given volume. Since specific gravity is a ratio of densities its units are therefore dimensionless.

8. Analytical and Physical Methods

A complete list of analytical and physical methods as generic method codes with a brief description of the methods is available on the AMIS web site www.amis.co.za

9. Origin of Material

The Material was sourced from Mimosa Mine a shallow underground PGM and base metal mining and processing operation located on the Great Dyke of Zimbabwe.

10. Approximate Mineral and Chemical Composition

The mineralisation of the Mimosa platinum mine is made up of ultramafic and an overlying mafic sequence. The ultramafic sequence contains the P1 pyroxenite, which is home to the main sulphide zone (MSZ) containing PG. The mine has a well-balanced profile containing nickel, platinum and palladium at the top, middle, and base, respectively.

11. Quantitative Analysis by X-Ray Diffraction

Both natural and synthetic materials have a specific chemistry and atomic arrangement, known as phases. Phases can be identified and quantified using X-ray diffraction (XRD) which produces a plot of the intensity of X-rays scattered at different angles by crystalline phases in a material. Essentially, an X-ray diffraction pattern is the sum of the diffraction patterns produced by each phase. Simply put, an X-ray diffraction pattern is a fingerprint that allows the identification of what is in a target sample material. Knowledge of the mineral phase composition is useful in method development with techniques

such as ICP-OES and XRF as potential matrix effects and spectral interferences can be recognized and accounted for. X-ray diffraction is effective in such a way that it allows the identification of different phases of compounds that are identical in chemistry, but have distinctly different atoms, e.g., quartz, cristobalite, and glass are all different phases of SiO₂. Where quantitative XRD results do not correspond to results of other analytical techniques, it should be borne in mind that even though the data are quantitative they are meant to be used for indicative purposes in development of other analytical methods. Mineral names may not reflect the actual compositions of minerals identified, but rather the mineral group.

Sample preparation for X-Ray Diffraction

The material submitted was prepared for XRD analysis using a backloading preparation method. It was analysed with a PANalytical Aeris diffractometer with PIXcel detector and fixed slits with Fe filtered Co-K α radiation. The phases were identified using X'Pert Highscore plus software and PAN-ICSD and ICDD PDF4 2016 databases.

The relative phase amounts (weight %) were estimated using the Rietveld method.

Comment

- Mineral names may not reflect the actual compositions of minerals identified, but rather the mineral group. Two mica polytypes may be present.
- Due to preferred orientation and crystallite size effects, results may not be as accurate as shown.
- Traces of additional phases such as kaolinite may be present. Quantities below 0.5% may be unreliable.
- Amorphous phases, if present, were not taken into consideration during quantification.

Table 7. Results of XRD analysis.

Mineral	Unit	Composite
Chalcopyrite	wt%	0.2
Pyrrhotite	wt%	0.4
Pentlandite	wt%	0.3
Enstatite	wt%	59.9
Talc	wt%	21.7
Chlorite	wt%	0.4
Actinolite	wt%	4.6
Diopside	wt%	6.8
Plagioclase	wt%	4.4
Muscovite	wt%	1.4
Total		100.1%

For informational purposes only

12. Health and Safety

The material is a very fine 5Y 7/1 Light Grey coloured powder. Safety precautions for handling fine particulate matter are recommended, such as the use of safety glasses, breathing protection, gloves and a laboratory coat.

13. Method of Preparation

The particle size distribution for this material was shown to have a nominal top size of 54 μ m (96.74% passing 53 μ m and 98.92% passing 63 μ m). The procedure of preparation in brief is as follows: the material was crushed, dry-milled and air-classified to <54 μ m. It was then blended in a bi-conical mixer, systematically divided, and sealed into 1kg Laboratory Packs. Explorer Packs are then subdivided from

the Laboratory Packs as required. Final packaged units were then selected on a random basis and submitted for analysis to an independent laboratory accredited with the ISO17025 standard of general requirements for the competence of testing and calibration laboratories. The results obtained from this laboratory are then evaluated statistically by AMIS for homogeneity.

14. Particle Size Determination

The sample has been analysed using a Malvern Mastersizer 2000. Particles are passed through a focused laser beam that scatter light at an angle inversely proportional to their size. The intensity of light is measured and converted to a volume in particle size distribution. The results for this standard are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Particle Size Determination by laser diffraction.

Size (µm)	Vol. Under %
<38um	94.03
<53um	96.74
<63um	98.92
<75um	99.38
<90um	99.61
<106um	99.74
<150um	99.88

For informational purposes only

15. Handling

The material is packaged in Laboratory Packs and Explorer Packs that must be shaken or otherwise agitated before use. The analyte concentrations are quoted on a dry basis; therefore, the user needs to determine the moisture content to convert any obtained assay values to an air-dry basis (see Appendix 6 for an example calculation).

16. Storage information

The material should be stored in a cool dry place, in such a way that it does not compromise the integrity of the CRM. The material should be stored in conditions which will ensure it does not absorb moisture.

17. Methods of Analysis Requested

The following methods of analysis were requested:

- a) Pt, Pt, Rh, Au, Ir, Ru, Ag & Os: Pb Collection with any finish
- b) Pt, Pt, Rh, Au, Ir, Ru, Ag & Os: Nickel Sulphide (NiS) with any finish
- c) Multi element scan especially Ni, Cu, Co, SiO₂, MgO, S, FeO, Cr₂O₃, CaO: 2 acid digest with any finish
- d) Multi element scan especially Ni, Cu, Co, SiO₂, MgO, S, FeO, Cr₂O₃, CaO: 4 acid digest with any finish
- e) Multi element scan especially Ni, Cu, Co, SiO₂, MgO, S, FeO, Cr₂O₃, CaO: Peroxide Fusion digest with any finish
- f) All oxides and LOI especially Ni, Cu, Co, SiO₂, MgO, S, FeO, Cr₂O₃, CaO: XRF Finish
- g) S and C Combustion/LECO
- h) Specific Gravity (SG)
- i) Moisture

18. Information Requested of Participating Laboratories

The following information was requested of the participating laboratories for the development of this CRM:

- a) All aliquots used for all determinations to be stated.
- b) All results for major elements to be reported as oxides in percentage (%).
- c) All results for multi-element scans and fusion to be reported in parts per million (ppm).
- d) All results for 6E to be reported in grams per ton (g/t).
- e) All QC data to include replicates, blanks and any certified reference material used.
- f) All Round robin samples must be treated the same as routine test samples.
- g) All results must be reported to maximum decimal places i.e., dependent on laboratories capabilities.
- h) Moisture correction factor to be used to calculate and determine the moisture content. The moisture correction factor is to be stipulated when reporting results.
- i) Results to be recorded onto the PT Reporting template provided (Include uncertainty of measurements) together with a copy of the PDF.
- j) Ensure correct PPE is used i.e., gloves, dust masks and protective clothing when handling and analyzing the samples
- k) Storage and analysis shall be conducted under controlled environmental conditions.
- l) Ensure all safety requirements as per your laboratory requirements are adhered to.
- m) Samples shall be retained for 60 days after completion of analysis, prior to being discarded.

19. Certification of Mean and Estimation of Measurement Uncertainty

The samples used in this certification process have been selected in such a way as to represent the entire batch of material and were taken from the final packaged units; therefore, all sources of uncertainty are included in the combined standard uncertainty determination. Initially the data submitted by all the laboratories are subjected to a z-score test, equation [1] to exclude outliers and the remaining data sets examined for their normality in distribution. This is followed by the exclusion of further outliers as defined by the IUPAC Harmonized Protocol of 1995 in which both Cochran and a Grubbs test are applied until all outliers are identified, equations [2] and [3]. A grand mean and standard deviation are re-calculated using all remaining data (Thompson, 2008; Carr, 2011) (see Appendix 2)

20. Two Standard Deviations

AMIS reports two-standard deviations (2s) with all certified values. Two -standard deviations are calculated using the expression:

$$\text{Two standard deviations} = 2 (u_c)$$

Where u_c is the standard combined uncertainty (see Appendix, equation [14]).

21. Confidence Interval

AMIS reports a confidence interval (CI) with all certified values. Confidence interval as used by AMIS is:

$$\text{Confidence Interval (CI)} = \frac{(t_{critical})s}{\sqrt{N}}$$

Where, N is the number of laboratories (accepted laboratory data), $t_{critical}$ is a two-tailed value for $N - 1$ degrees of freedom (df) and s , is the standard deviation of the accepted laboratory means. A two-tailed critical value is found for $N - 1$ degrees of freedom from either a t -distribution table (Appendix 8) or MS Excel as =TINV (5%, df).

22. Expanded Uncertainty

ANOVA gives an estimate of the repeatability and the reproducibility of the data accepted for certification of the candidate reference material (see equations, [15] and [16], in the Appendix). Therefore, random variables (e.g., subsampling, instrument effects, interferences, operators and measurement conditions) that occur during the analysis of the candidate reference material by the various laboratories is considered. This approach does not necessarily quantify each individual source of uncertainty; however, the combined effect of random uncertainties is assessed (Ramsey & Ellison, 2007). A combined standard uncertainty is calculated from equation [14], which when multiplied by the t-critical value for $N-1$ laboratories, gives an *expanded uncertainty* at a 95% level of confidence. The expanded uncertainty is a measure of the doubt around the certified value at a level of 95% confidence. The expanded uncertainty is used in the validation of accuracy (see equation [18]).

23. Confidence Interval and Expanded Uncertainty

A combined standard uncertainty will be greater than a combined *CI*. This is because ANOVA considers the within-lab repeatability (that is repeatability within each lab group) as well as the repeatability between each lab data set. This attends to random variables that contribute to the measurement of uncertainty, during the analysis of the test sample at the participating laboratories. The within-lab repeatability and the between lab repeatability is combined as the square root of the sum of squares of these two values giving a combined standard uncertainty, at a 68% confidence level. Multiplying the combined standard uncertainty by the t-critical value for $N-1$, gives the expanded uncertainty at 95% level of confidence. It is recommended that the procedure described in Appendix 5, “*Using the CRM in Quality Control*” be used, in setting the limits of the CRM. Table 9 below shows mean gold values obtained by fire assay lead collection, for nine different laboratories, the confidence interval, two-standard deviations and expanded uncertainty.

Table 9. Example of replicate assay data in which the *CI*, *2s* and *U* are shown.

Lab No.	Mean Au (g/t)
1	0.268
2	0.273
3	0.270
4	0.288
5	0.274
6	0.256
7	0.263
8	0.258
9	0.288

CI	0.0088
2s	0.031
U	0.04

24. Participating Laboratories

The laboratories that provided timeous results are:

1. Anglo American-Unki Mines
2. Anglo Platinum - Eastern Bushveld Regional Laboratory
3. Anglo Platinum - Mogalakwena Analytical Laboratory (MPL)
4. Antech Zimbabwe
5. Bindura Nickel Corporation Limited
6. Compass Green Worldwide SARL - Lubumbashi
7. Geoscience Laboratories (GEO LABS) CA
8. Impala Mineral Processes Laboratory
9. Intertek Perth
10. Mimoso Mine Laboratory Zimbabwe
11. Northam Booyseindal North
12. Northam Booyseindal South
13. Northam Zondereinde
14. SGS Rustenburg
15. Sibanye Stillwater
16. Tharisa Mine

25. Accepted Assay Data

Data from the 16 laboratories used for certification are set out in Table 10.

Table 10. Data used to calculate the certified values after removal of outliers.

NiS Au g/t	Pb Collection Au g/t	NiS Ir g/t	NiS Pd g/t	Pb Collection Pd g/t	NiS Pt g/t	Pb Collection Pt g/t	NiS Rh g/t	Pb Collection Rh g/t	NiS Ru g/t
0.11	0.12	0.025	0.39	0.39	0.49	0.52	0.049	0.045	0.051
0.12	0.13	0.024	0.40	0.41	0.49	0.53	0.049	0.044	0.051
0.11	0.12	0.024	0.40	0.39	0.51	0.51	0.047	0.044	0.048
0.12	0.12	0.026	0.40	0.39	0.50	0.51	0.048	0.047	0.051
0.11	0.12	0.026	0.39	0.38	0.50	0.50	0.048	0.046	0.050
0.12	0.12	0.025	0.40	0.41	0.51	0.53	0.048	0.046	0.053
0.12	0.12	0.027	0.41	0.39	0.52	0.50	0.051	0.045	0.055
0.12	0.12	0.025	0.41	0.38	0.51	0.50	0.048	0.045	0.052
0.13	0.11	0.059	0.30	0.35	0.50	0.50	0.060	0.040	0.050
0.13	0.11	0.057	0.34	0.36	0.50	0.47	0.050	0.040	0.040
0.13	0.11	0.049	0.41	0.38	0.52	0.51	0.060	0.040	0.050
0.13	0.11	0.061	0.40	0.36	0.52	0.48	0.060	0.040	0.050
0.13	0.11	0.055	0.37	0.36	0.52	0.49	0.060	0.040	0.050
0.13	0.11	0.054	0.36	0.35	0.56	0.46	0.060	0.040	0.060
0.13	0.11	0.024	0.37	0.36	0.51	0.47	0.050	0.040	0.050
0.15	0.11	0.025	0.40	0.36	0.55	0.48	0.060	0.043	0.050
0.14	0.13	0.025	0.38	0.39	0.56	0.51	0.058	0.042	0.058
0.13	0.12	0.024	0.41	0.39	0.57	0.50	0.065	0.041	0.053
0.13	0.13	0.026	0.42	0.41	0.55	0.53	0.056	0.041	0.055
0.14	0.13	0.022	0.41	0.40	0.55	0.51	0.054	0.040	0.052
0.13	0.13	0.025	0.43	0.41	0.57	0.53	0.057	0.041	0.055
0.14	0.13	0.024	0.40	0.41	0.56	0.53	0.056	0.040	0.054
0.14	0.12	0.029	0.43	0.38	0.57	0.51	0.057	0.042	0.056
0.14	0.12	0.024	0.41	0.41	0.56	0.49	0.058		0.055
0.12	0.12	0.025	0.41	0.40	0.52	0.48	0.047		0.051
0.12	0.12	0.021	0.37	0.38	0.52	0.49	0.047		0.052
0.12	0.12	0.022	0.39	0.41	0.52	0.48	0.047		0.053
0.12	0.12	0.027	0.40	0.40	0.53	0.48	0.047		0.051
0.12	0.12	0.027	0.38	0.37	0.53	0.48	0.048		0.052
0.12		0.027	0.42	0.38	0.53	0.48	0.047		0.049
0.12		0.028	0.38	0.43	0.53	0.48	0.048		0.052
0.12		0.027	0.41	0.42	0.53		0.048		0.052
0.10		0.027	0.41	0.41	0.47		0.051		0.076
0.09		0.028	0.41	0.39	0.42		0.044		0.066
0.11		0.027	0.41	0.41	0.48		0.049		0.070
0.10		0.058	0.41	0.39	0.40		0.041		0.063
0.11		0.051	0.41	0.41	0.44		0.044		0.065
0.12		0.039	0.41		0.54		0.053		0.064
0.12		0.049	0.41		0.54		0.052		0.064
0.12		0.054	0.34		0.54		0.052		0.064
0.12		0.040	0.31		0.54		0.054		0.063
0.12		0.037	0.36		0.54		0.053		0.064
0.13		0.039	0.30		0.54		0.053		0.062
0.12			0.34		0.54		0.053		0.061
0.13			0.43		0.53		0.052		0.062
0.13			0.43						
0.12			0.42						
0.12			0.43						
0.13			0.43						
0.13			0.43						
0.13			0.43						
0.12			0.43						
0.11			0.46						
			0.47						
			0.42						
			0.45						
			0.48						
			0.44						
			0.39						
			0.39						

Assay Data (Continued)

SG	2A_MICP	FUS	2A_MICP	FUS	XRF	2A_MICP	FUS
SG	Co	Co	Cu	Cu	Cu	Ni	Ni
Dimensionless	ppm	ppm	ppm	ppm	ppm	ppm	ppm
3.25	18.70	84.00	267.00	272.00	278.00	328.50	817.00
3.25	18.50	86.00	264.00	277.00	275.00	325.50	832.00
3.10	18.70	83.00	262.30	270.00	281.00	326.00	813.00
3.19	18.40	84.00	260.80	273.00	282.00	322.40	823.00
3.19	18.90	84.00	265.30	273.00	280.00	336.40	816.00
3.22	18.40	84.00	262.90	270.00	278.00	325.80	796.00
3.14	18.60	84.00	264.10	266.00	279.00	331.80	781.00
3.18	18.80	84.00	265.70	263.00	276.00	331.00	772.00
3.14	17.87	90.00	260.17	300.00	310.00	330.00	800.00
3.14	17.90	90.00	260.30	300.00	310.00	330.00	800.00
3.15	18.32	90.00	263.62	300.00	300.00	330.00	800.00
3.16	18.68	90.00	267.00	300.00	320.00	340.00	800.00
3.13	18.78	100.00	261.42	300.00	310.00	340.00	800.00
3.12	18.68	90.00	265.30	300.00	320.00	340.00	800.00
3.13	18.81	100.00	268.99	300.00	320.00	340.00	800.00
3.13	18.67	90.00	264.59	300.00	300.00	323.17	800.00
3.09		88.76		340.00	330.00	335.26	890.00
3.09		90.51		300.00	320.00	335.61	870.00
3.18		87.84		330.00	320.00	341.17	890.00
3.02		88.42		380.00	320.00	336.44	960.00
3.15		89.03		320.00	320.00	348.29	840.00
3.15		88.65		310.00	320.00	344.49	840.00
3.04		90.17		360.00	320.00	337.59	890.00
3.10		88.75		265.29	320.00		819.73
3.20		60.00		268.67	255.90		825.04
3.18		60.00		261.16	268.22		797.03
		60.00		264.36	256.34		796.72
		60.00		267.48	255.62		806.82
		60.00		262.06	250.09		797.86
		85.88		261.69	253.20		842.64
		84.65		263.89	275.58		833.06
		83.73		380.00	253.58		660.00
		84.15		370.00			640.00
		84.75		360.00			610.00
		84.88		380.00			660.00
		83.55		370.00			630.00
		84.55		360.00			610.00
				350.00			610.00
				360.00			610.00
				312.00			811.50
				308.50			806.33
				317.33			796.00
				307.25			802.67
				308.50			807.25
				313.25			822.00
				306.00			811.00
				304.75			818.33

Assay Data (Continued)

XRF	FUS	XRF	XRF	XRF	XRF	XRF	FUS	4A MICP
CaO	Cr ₂ O ₃	Cr ₂ O ₃	SiO ₂	Fe ₂ O ₃	Na ₂ O	P ₂ O ₅	Fe	Li
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	ppm	ppm
4.57	0.42	0.40	53.31	10.47	0.54	0.023	76000.00	31.40
4.69	0.41	0.40	53.37	10.46	0.53	0.023	76600.00	31.90
4.67	0.41	0.40	53.53	10.66	0.53	0.022	75800.00	32.10
4.69	0.38	0.40	53.44	10.61	0.53	0.022	75500.00	32.00
4.69	0.40	0.40	53.48	10.57	0.53	0.023	75900.00	31.40
4.69	0.43	0.40	53.49	10.56	0.53	0.022	76000.00	32.40
4.68	0.41	0.40	53.36	10.56	0.53	0.023	73900.00	31.60
4.74	0.40	0.40	53.48	10.53	0.53	0.022	74400.00	31.10
4.84	0.37	0.44	49.03	10.96	0.55	0.023	74200.00	32.11
4.84	0.38	0.45	49.24	10.94	0.54	0.022	77000.00	32.29
4.86	0.37	0.45	48.82	11.00	0.54	0.023	76000.00	31.56
4.84	0.37	0.44	49.01	10.95	0.54	0.023	77200.00	32.59
4.85	0.38	0.44	49.06	10.97	0.55	0.023	76600.00	31.25
4.83	0.38	0.44	49.29	10.93	0.54	0.023	76300.00	31.46
4.83	0.36	0.43	49.10	10.92	0.54	0.023	77900.00	32.59
4.86	0.39	0.43	48.85	10.99	0.55	0.023	76410.00	
4.58	0.39	0.38	50.93	11.09			77710.00	
4.61	0.39	0.35	51.05	11.05			76300.00	
4.56	0.39	0.38	50.99	11.03			77520.00	
4.58	0.39	0.35	51.13	11.02			76730.00	
4.57	0.39	0.35	51.47	11.10			76390.00	
4.60	0.39	0.34	51.13	11.01			76530.00	
4.61	0.39	0.36	51.35	11.02			76400.00	
4.57	0.43	0.34	51.49	11.06				
4.79	0.40	0.37	53.79					
4.79	0.42	0.37	53.75					
4.77	0.42	0.38	53.66					
4.80	0.42	0.39	53.51					
4.79	0.42	0.38	53.80					
4.78	0.41	0.38	53.68					
4.79	0.43	0.38	53.62					
4.79	0.44	0.38	53.69					
4.87	0.45	0.38						
4.87	0.45	0.38						
4.82	0.45							
4.81	0.46							
4.82	0.45							
4.80	0.46							
4.82	0.45							
4.82								
4.82								
4.83								

26. Reported Values

The certified values listed in this certificate fulfil the AMIS statistical criteria (see section 19) regarding agreement for certification and have been independently validated by Allan Fraser.

27. Validation of Accuracy (Trueness)

This CRM can be used to validate accuracy (trueness) as required in method validation as stated in the ISO17025 standard. See Appendix 2 for an example on the validation of accuracy using replicate data derived from the analysis of a CRM.

28. Limit of Detection and Limit of Quantitation in Gravimetric Fire Assay

In the determination of limit of detection (LOD) and limit of quantitation (LOQ) in gravimetric fire assay (*i.e.* lead collection and weighing of resulting gold prill), the minimum mass that an assay microbalance is capable of weighing and the original test sample mass determines the LOD and the LOQ in the assay (Fraser, 2015), (see Appendix 7 for an example of the calculation LOD and LOQ and Table 14 for a recommend reporting scheme for LOD and LOQ values).

29. Metrological Traceability

The values quoted herein are based on the consensus values derived from statistical analysis of the data from an inter-laboratory measurement program. Traceability to SI units is via the standards used by the individual laboratories the majority of which are accredited to the ISO17025 general requirements for the competence of testing and calibration laboratories and who have maintained measurement traceability during the analytical process.

30. Period of Validity

The certified values are valid for this product, while still sealed in its original packaging, until notification to the contrary. The stability of the material will be subject to continuous testing for the duration of the inventory. Should product stability become an issue, all customers will be notified and notification to that effect will be placed on the www.amis.co.za website.

31. Minimum Sample Size

Most of the laboratories reporting, used a 0.5g sample size for the ICP-OES and a 30g sample size for the fire assay. These are the recommended minimum sample sizes for the use of this material.

32. Availability

This product is available in Laboratory Packs containing 1kg of material and Explorer Packs containing custom weights (from 30g to 250g) of material. The Laboratory Packs are sealed bottles delivered in sealed foil pouches. The Explorer Packs contain material in standard geochem envelopes, nitrogen flushed, and vacuum sealed in foil pouches.

33. Recommended use in Quality Control

Users should set their own limits *i.e.*, 1, 2 and 3 standard deviations from an obtained mean value based on at least 10 replicate analyses using this CRM (see Appendix 5 for detail on the use of this CRM in quality control).

34. Legal Notice

This certificate and the reference material described in it have been prepared with due care and attention. However, AMIS, Melesha Gopi Mungaroo and Allan Fraser; accept no liability for any decisions or actions taken following the use of the reference material.

Date of Version 000: 12 October 2022


Version: 000

Approving Officer:

African Mineral Standards: _____

Melesha Gopi Mungaroo (Senior Quality Specialist)

Certifying Officer:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'A. Fraser', written over a horizontal line.

Geochemist: _____

Allan Fraser

M.Sc. (Geology), N.D. (Analytical Chem.),
Pr.Sci.Nat. Pr.Chem.SA

References

- Abzalov, M. (2011). Sampling Errors and Control of Assay Data Quality in Exploration and Mining Geology, Applications and Experiences of Quality Control. Ivanov, O., (Ed.), InTech, DOI: 10.5772/14965. Available from: <http://www.intechopen.com/books/applications-and-experiences-of-quality-control/sampling-errors-and-control-of-assay-data-quality-in-exploration-and-mining-geology>. Accessed 25th September, 2016.
- ASTM E122-09e1, Standard Practice for Calculating Sample Size to Estimate, With Specified Precision, the Average for a Characteristic of a Lot or Process, ASTM International, West Conshohocken, PA, 2011, www.astm.org
- Barwick V.J., Pritchard E. (Eds). (2011). Eurachem Guide; Terminology in Analytical Measurement – Introduction to VIM 3 (2011). ISBN 978-0-948926-29-7.
- Carr R.H. (2011). Estimating errors using graphs and taking good data. California State University Los Angeles. March 2011. 14. <http://web.calstatela.edu/faculty/kaniol/Err-Gph-Meas-IBooklet.pdf>. Retrieved: 29 August, 2016.
- Cochran, W.G. (1950). The Comparison of Percentages in Matched Samples. *Biometrika*, 37, 256-66.
- Ellison, S., Barwick, V., Duguid Farrant, T. (2009). *Practical statistics for the analytical scientist, a bench guide. 2nd Edition*. RSC Publishing. 25-172.
- ERM Application Note 1. (2005). Comparison of a measurement value with a certified value. European Commission – Joint Research Centre Institute for Reference Materials and Measurements (IRMM). 1-2.
- EURACHEM / CITAC Guide CG 4. (2012). Quantifying uncertainty in analytical measurement. 3rd Edition. Editors: Ellison, S. L. R., Williams, A. 4-121.
- EuroLab Technical Report No.1/2007. (2007). Measurement uncertainty revisited: Alternative approaches to uncertainty evaluation. European Federation of National Associations of Measurement, Testing and Laboratories. 43-46.
- Fraser, A.W. (2015). Minimising uncertainty in measurement and improving limit of detection in gold bearing ores from concentrations predicted by linear regression in atomic absorption spectrometry. M.Sc. thesis (unpublished), University of Johannesburg: 199 pages.
- Grubbs, F.E. (1969). Procedures for detecting outlying observations in samples. *Technometrics*, 11, 1969. 1-21.
- Horwitz, W., Albert, R. (2006). The Horwitz Ratio (HorRat): A useful index of method performance with respect to precision, *Journal of Association of Official Analytical Chemists International*, 89: 1095-1109.
- ISO/IEC 17025:2005(E).(2005). *General requirements for the competence of testing and calibration laboratories*. 2nd Edition: 14-59.
- ISO Guide 35 (2017). Certification of reference materials — General and Statistical principles, 4th edition. ISO/REMCO WG 1.
- ISO 5725-2:1994. Accuracy (trueness and precision) of measurement methods and results -- Part 2: Basic method for the determination of repeatability and reproducibility of a standard measurement method.
- Long, J., Winefordner, J. (1983). Limit of detection - a closer look at the IUPAC definition. *Analytical Chemistry* 55: 712A - 724A.
- Miller, J., Miller, J. (2010). *Statistics for analytical chemistry*. 6th Edition. New York: Ellis Horwood.36-126.
- Nelsen T.C., Wehling P. (2008). Collaborative studies for quantitative chemical analytical methods. AACC International Report. *Cereal Foods World*. September – October 2008, Vol. 53, No. 5. 285-288.
- Skoog, D., West, D. (1982). *Fundamentals of analytical chemistry*. 4th Edition. CBS College Publishing. Holt Saunders International Editions:39-73.
- Thompson, M. (Ed.) (2008). Test for 'sufficient homogeneity' in a reference material. Analytical Methods Committee, AMCTB 17A, ISSN 1757-5958.
- Thompson, M. (Ed.) (2010). Internal quality control in routine analysis. AMC Technical Brief. Analytical Methods Committee. AMCTB No.46. 2010. Issn 1757-5958.
- Thompson, M., Lowthian, P. (2011). *Notes on statistics and data quality for analytical chemists*. Imperial College Press: 15-115.

Appendices

Appendix 1 through 8, prepared by Allan Fraser.

Appendix 1. Certification of Reference Material and Estimation of Measurement Uncertainty

In the establishment of a consensus value for the CRM, outlier tests are carried out followed by performance statistics and the estimation of the measurement uncertainty. In practice, it is highly likely that data generated by multiple laboratories as an inter-laboratory comparison of material for certification, will contain erroneous as well as extreme measurements (outliers). The influence of outliers on summary statistics needs to be minimised by the application of procedures for outlier identification on raw data. The use of z-scoring, Cochran's test for suspect repeatability variances, along with Grubbs test for suspect measurement values allows for the detection of outliers (IUPAC, 2006). Method performance in terms of precision as relative standard deviation is judged by the application of the Horwitz ratio, which gives an indication of whether the observed relative standard deviation at the concentration levels of analyte determined are acceptable (Horwitz & Albert, 2006).

In the absence of an extensive uncertainty budget, measurement uncertainty is estimated from the reproducibility standard deviation from inter-laboratory data and reported as an expanded uncertainty at a level of confidence of 95% (Miller & Miller, 2010).

The steps below give detail on the establishment of a consensus value through the elimination of outliers, method performance and estimation of measurement uncertainty using standard uncertainties and the analysis of variance.

Z-Score

A z-score is calculated using equation [1]:

$$z = \frac{x - x_a}{s_p} \quad [1]$$

Where, x is the result of a submitted sample, x_a is the mean and s_p is the standard deviation of the submitted results from all the participating laboratories. Z-Scores are interpreted as follows:

$|z| \leq 2$ satisfactory performance
 $2 < |z| \leq 3$ questionable performance
 $|z| > 3$ unsatisfactory performance

(Thompson & Lowthian, 2011)

Data with z-scores exceeding two are discarded and are not included for further assessment.

Cochran's Test

The test of Cochran (1950) as shown in equation [2] is applied to any suspect repeatability variances:

$$C_{calc} = \frac{s_{max}^2}{\sum_{i=1}^l s_i^2} \quad [2]$$

Where, C_{calc} , s_{max}^2 and $\sum_{i=1}^l s_i^2$, are the calculated values for Cochran's test, data set with the maximum variance and the sum of the variances of all of the participating, l laboratory datasets. The C_{calc} value is compared with a critical value, C_{crit} at a level of confidence of 95% and an alpha of 0.05% (see Ellison, *et al.*, 2009, Appendix A, Table A.3a, page 209 for a table of critical values for the test of Cochran at LOC 95%).

According to ISO 5725-2 (1999), results from a laboratory with a suspect repeatability variance can be excluded if it is shown by the Cochran test to be an outlier. Therefore, if $C_{calc} > C_{crit}$, the laboratory with the maximum variance is removed. The data found to be excluded should not be $>2/9$, or 22% of the total data.

Grubbs Test

The test of Grubbs (1969) calculates a test statistic, G_{calc} and in the detection of a single outlier, G_1 is found by using

$$G_{1\,calc} = \frac{|Suspect\ value - \bar{x}|}{s} \quad [3]$$

Where, the sample mean and standard deviation, \bar{x} and s , are calculated with the suspect value included. The $G_{1\,calc}$ statistic is compared to a critical value for N measurements. See Ellison, *et al.*, 2009, Appendix A, Table A.2, page 208 for a table of critical values for the test of Cochran at LOC 95%.

Method Performance

The Horwitz function is used to assess the performance of the data under consideration, with respect to precision (Horwitz & Albert, 2006). A calculated %RSD is found using the Horwitz expression

$$\%RSD = \pm 2^{(1-0.5\log C)} \quad [4]$$

where, C is the analyte concentration in percent divided by 100 and \log is the natural logarithm. The observed %RSD is calculated as

$$Observed\ \%RSD = \frac{s}{Mean} \times 100 \quad [5]$$

where s is the standard deviation of n replicates.

The ratio of the observed %RSD and the calculated %RSD gives the Horwitz ratio (HorRat):

$$HorRat = \frac{\%RSD\ Observed}{\%RSD\ Calculated} \quad [6]$$

A HorRat <2 indicates that the method is of adequate precision. Should the HorRat be >2 the overall data are discarded, and the candidate material considered not suitable for certification as the precision is excessive for the concentration of the analyte being determined (Nelsen & Wehling, 2008).

Grand Mean

The grand mean ($\bar{\bar{x}}$) *i.e.* the certified value of a dataset is the total of all the data values divided by the total sample size (n):

$$\bar{\bar{x}} = \sum \frac{x}{n} \quad [7]$$

Certified Value

From ANOVA as per the description in section 19, an 'appropriate precision' as shown in [8] is calculated for sufficient homogeneity (Thompson, 2008):

$$s_r \leq 0.3u_c \quad [8]$$

Where, s_r is the within laboratory repeatability, as determined from [14]. Once [8] is satisfied, a grand mean [7] is calculated and this is taken to be the certified value.

Total Variation (SST)

The total variation (not the variance) comprises the sum of the squares of the differences of each mean with the grand mean.

$$SST = \sum (x - \bar{x})^2 \quad [9]$$

Between Group Variation (SSB)

The *variation* due to the between the laboratories is denoted SSB or Sum of Squares Between laboratories and given by [10]. If the laboratory means are close to each other (and therefore the Grand Mean) SSB will be a small value. There are P samples involved with one datum value for each sample (the sample mean), so there are P-1 degrees of freedom.

$$SSB = \sum n(\bar{x} - \bar{\bar{x}})^2 \quad [10]$$

The *variance* due to the interaction between the laboratories is denoted MSB for Mean Square Between groups and is the SSB divided by its degrees of freedom.

$$MS = \frac{SSB}{n - 1} \quad [11]$$

Within Group Variation (SSW)

The variation due to differences within individual samples is denoted SSW for Sum of Squares Within laboratories. The degrees of freedom are equal to the sum of the individual degrees of freedom for each sample. Since each sample has degrees of freedom (*df*) equal to one less than their sample sizes, and there are k samples, the total degrees of freedom is P less than the total sample size: $df = n - P$.

$$SSW = \sum df \cdot s^2 \quad [12]$$

The variance due to the differences within individual samples is denoted MSW for Mean Square Within groups. This is the within group variation divided by its degrees of freedom:

$$MSW = \frac{SSW}{P - n} \quad [13]$$

From equations [9] through [13], the ANOVA table as shown in Table 11 is developed.

Table 11. A single-factor ANOVA table showing key elements. Where P is the total number of groups, or laboratories. P-1 is 1 less than number of laboratories, P (n-1) is the number of data values minus number of groups (equals degrees of freedom for each group added together), and P-1 + P(n-1) is 1 less than the number of data points. MS is the mean squares of between laboratories and within laboratories. After Ellison *et al.*, (2009), Table 6.2, page 61.

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Sum of Squares	F	p	F _{crit}
Between Laboratories	SSB	P-1	MSB=SSB/df	MSB/MSW	=FDIST(x,df,df)	F-table
Within Laboratories	SSW	P(n-1)	MSW=SSW/df	–	–	–
Total	SSB+SSW	P-1 + P(n-1)	–	–	–	–

Combined Standard Uncertainty

The combined standard uncertainty (u_c) represents the effects of random events such as days, instruments, and analysts on the precision of the analytical procedures of all accepted data of the participating laboratories. Using the output from ANOVA, the combined standard uncertainty (u_c) is determined from the square root of the sum of squares of the variances of the within laboratory repeatability, s_r , and the between laboratory precision, s_s :

$$u_c = \sqrt{s_r^2 + s_s^2} \quad [14]$$

Within laboratory repeatability is determined as

$$s_r = \sqrt{MSB} \quad [15]$$

and, the between laboratory precision as

$$s_s = \sqrt{\frac{(MSW - MSB)}{n}} \quad [16]$$

where MSW is the mean squares of the within laboratory variance, MSB is the mean squares for the between laboratories and n in this case, is the number of replicates in a group of the accepted data (Thompson & Lowthian, 2011).

Expanded Uncertainty

The expanded uncertainty (U) at a confidence level of 95% is determined by multiplication of the combined uncertainty (u_c) by a coverage factor (k) found from $N-1$ degrees of freedom (df), where N is the number of laboratory means accepted in the establishment of the certified value. The t-critical value for 5% significance can be found in a t-critical table (see Appendix 8, or from MS Excel as =TINV (5%, df)).

Uncertainty Statement

Typically, an uncertainty statement is presented as follows: Au =0.77±0.04 g/t, where the number following the symbol ± is the numerical value of an expanded uncertainty, $U = ku_c$, with U determined from a combined standard uncertainty multiplied by a coverage factor $k = 2$ or, a t-critical value for $N-1$ accepted laboratories. Since it can be assumed that the possible estimated values of the standard are approximately normally distributed with standard uncertainty, u_c , the certified value of the CRM is believed to lie in the interval defined by U with a level of confidence of approximately 95 %, e.g. a mean value of 0.77±0.04g/t will have intervals of: 0.73≤0.77≤0.81 g/t.

Appendix 2. Example: Comparison of Mean and Certified Value for Validation of Accuracy

According to ERM (2005); Eurolab (2007); Abzalov (2011) and Carr (2011), the validation of accuracy for a given mean and certified value requires the inclusion of the measurement uncertainty of the CRM in a t-test for statistical significance. The classical Student's t-test as shown in [17], does not consider the measurement uncertainty of the CRM. To compensate for this, Eurolab Technical Report No.1/2007 recommends equation [18] for the validation of CRMs with stated measurement uncertainties.

$$t_{calc} = \frac{|\bar{x} - \mu|}{\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}} \quad [17]$$

$$t_{calc} = \frac{|\bar{x} - \mu|}{\sqrt{(u_{\mu})^2 + \frac{s^2}{n}}} \quad [18]$$

Where, t_{calc} is the calculated t-statistic, \bar{x} the mean of n replicates with a standard deviation of s for a CRM of μ certified value. The standard uncertainty u is the stated expanded uncertainty (U) of the CRM divided by the coverage factor (k) as stated on the certificate of analysis. Note that the $| \quad |$ bars indicate that the absolute value between the mean and the certified value is to be used, *i.e.* ignore the sign.

An example in which [18] is used for validation of accuracy is given below.

Example

A CRM is independently replicated nine times for Al_2O_3 concentration by XRF analysis, *i.e.* 9 individual fused glass beads were prepared. The observed mean and standard deviation of the replicate data are shown with the certified value and expanded uncertainty in Table 12. In validation of accuracy, the hypothesis question is: Is the difference between the observed mean and the certified value statistically significant at a level of confidence of 95%? Alternatively put, is there sufficient evidence to conclude that the data *i.e.* replicates generated, are inaccurate?

The relevant hypotheses are:

Null hypothesis: H_0 : Mean = Certified value of CRM with stated measurement uncertainty. The acceptance of H_0 means that accuracy is demonstrated; *i.e.* insufficient evidence to reject H_0 ;

Alternate hypothesis: H_1 : Mean \neq Certified value of CRM with stated measurement uncertainty. The acceptance of H_1 means that accuracy is not demonstrated, *i.e.* there is sufficient evidence to accept H_1 ;

Table 12. CRM certified value, quoted expanded uncertainty U , the coverage factor for the CRM, $k=2.25$ and mean for $n=9$ replicates and corresponding standard deviation for the replicate data.

CRM Certified Value	Expanded % (U)	Coverage Factor (k)	Mean ($n=9$)	n	Standard Deviation(s)
4.62%	0.08%	2.25	4.59%	9	0.01015

The standard uncertainty (u) is found by dividing the expanded uncertainty by the coverage factor:

$$u = \frac{0.08}{2.25} = 0.0356 \%$$

Using the observed mean for the replicate data ($n=9$) obtained for the CRM and substituting into [18]:

$$t_{calc} = \frac{|\bar{x} - \mu|}{\sqrt{0.0356^2 + \frac{0.01015^2}{9}}} = \frac{|4.59 - 4.62|}{\sqrt{0.00126 + 0.00001145}} = 0.84$$

Therefore, $t_{calc} = 0.84$ and $t_{crit}(5\%, 8) = 2.31$ (df is 8, therefore, $t_{crit}=2.31$, see Appendix 8, page 30) which is >0.84 . Similarly, the p -value= 0.43 which is >0.05 . This is strong evidence in favour of accepting the null hypothesis that there is no significant statistical difference between the certified value and the observed mean. Therefore, under the conditions that the uncertainty associated with the certified value is known, the accuracy is validated for the CRM tested. If the null hypothesis is accepted that the mean obtained is not statistically different from the certified value, then the principle of traceability has been conformed to.

Appendix 3. Two-standard Deviations

Two-standard deviations are calculated using the expression:

$$Two\ standard\ deviations = 2(u_c) \quad [19]$$

Where, u_c is the standard combined uncertainty (equation [14]).

Appendix 4. Confidence Interval

Confidence interval is calculated as:

$$Confidence\ Interval\ (CI) = \frac{(t_{critical})s}{\sqrt{N}} \quad [20]$$

Where, N is the number of laboratories (accepted laboratory data), $t_{critical}$ is a two-tailed value for $N - 1$ degrees of freedom (df) and s , is the standard deviation of the accepted laboratory means. A two-tailed critical value is found for $N - 1$ degrees of freedom from either a t -distribution table (Appendix 8) or MS Excel as =TINV (5%, df).

Appendix 5. Using the CRM in Quality Control

QC chart control limits should not be determined by the certified value and stated measurement uncertainty of the certified reference material used. These parameters although “certified” will never be known; it is only the corresponding statistical estimates, *i.e.* standard deviation and the mean calculated from replicated results that are known and these should be used in quality control charts. However, should the laboratory choose to use the certified value as the mean then the quoted $2s$, or CI value for the CRM can be used in the quality control chart.

It is recommended that a Shewhart chart be developed for the use if this CRM is to be used as a control sample in laboratory quality control. A Shewhart chart is a plot of sequential assay results obtained from quality control material such as an AMIS CRM. The warning and control limits are based on the standard deviation obtained from the mean of the replicates of a CRM (Ellison, *et al.*, 2009; Thompson, 2010). The procedure in preparing a Shewhart chart is as follows:

1. Analyse 10 to 15 replicates or more of the AMIS CRM.
2. Apply the Grubbs test for outliers.
3. Determine the mean of the replicates after application of the Grubbs test.
4. Determine the standard deviation, using equation [21], of the replicates following Grubbs test.
5. Calculate the standard deviation, s from:

$$s = \sqrt{\frac{\sum(x_i - \bar{x})^2}{n - 1}} \quad [21]$$

where, x_i is an individual measurement in the data set, \bar{x} is the mean of the data set at $n-1$ degrees of freedom (df) and n is the number of replicates. The sample standard deviation can be found using the MS Excel formula “=stdev.s (number1;)”.

6. Verify accuracy of the mean value using equation [18].
7. Once accuracy is verified, calculate $\pm 2s$ and $\pm 3s$, where s is the standard deviation calculated from [21].
8. Construct the Shewhart control chart around the mean of n replicates.
9. Use $\pm 2s$ as the warning limits.
10. Use $\pm 3s$ as the control limits.
11. It is recommended that if 2 to 3 points are outside the warning limits analyse another sample and if it is then within warning limits, continue. If it is outside the warning limits, stop and troubleshoot.
12. It is recommended that if any point is outside control limits, analyse another portion (sample) of the CRM. If it is within control limits, continue. If it is outside control limits, stop and troubleshoot.
13. For reference purposes, the CRM certified value can be plotted on the Shewhart chart alongside the mean value.

On a regular basis the accuracy of the replicates of the CRM should be assessed in terms of the certified value of the CRM using equation [18].

Appendix 6. Conversion to Air-dry Basis (Prepared by Allan Fraser)

Since AMIS certified analyte values are reported on a dry-basis, the user laboratory is required to dry a portion (accurately weigh out 1.0 grams in duplicate) of the CRM material in air at 105°C in a drying oven to constant mass to determine the moisture content. Use a crucible with a flat inner surface with a surface area not smaller than 10 cm² with the CRM material spread evenly over same; this represents a 0.1 gram spread per cm². In correcting the certified value for moisture content, a moisture correction factor is calculated:

$$\text{Moisture correction factor (MCF)} = \frac{100 - \% \text{Moisture at } 105^{\circ}C}{100} \quad [22]$$

$$\text{Air dry basis concentration} = \text{MCF} \times \text{certified value on a dry basis} \quad [23]$$

Example

The moisture content determined at 105°C on a CRM is 0.500%. The certified analyte concentration for the CRM is 12.62±0.52% (dry basis). Calculating the moisture correction factor using [22] gives:

$$\text{Moisture correction factor} = \frac{100 - 0.500}{100} = 0.995$$

Multiplying the factor of 0.995 by the certified value as stated on the certificate of analysis on a dry basis (as in [23]) gives the analyte concentration on an air-dry basis:

$$0.995 \times 12.62\% = 12.56\%$$

The stated measurement uncertainty also needs to be corrected using [22] and [23], e.g. $0.995 \times 0.52 = 0.51_{(7)}$, rounded to 0.52%. The air-dry basis concentration *i.e.* $12.56 \pm 0.52\%$ is to be used as the certified value with its corresponding measurement of uncertainty.

Appendix 7. Example of Determination of LOD and LOQ in Fire Assay

The limit of detection (LOD) is the minimum detectable quantity of the analyte of interest (Skoog & West, 1985). To determine the LOD in fire assay by lead collection, the minimum mass that an assay microbalance is capable of weighing (m in micrograms, and the original test sample mass, $Mass_{assay}$ in grams) determines the LOD. The smallest prill mass most assay microbalances can measure is $1\mu\text{g}$ or 0.001mg . Even with a microscope it may be difficult to locate and pick up a prill weighing ten times that amount (*i.e.* 0.01mg or $10\mu\text{g}$) and weigh it. If an analyst can weigh a prill of $1\mu\text{g}$ then the LOD becomes $1\mu\text{g}$. However, the concentration factor would be 50 times for a 50-gram assay sample and therefore the LOD in g/t becomes $1\mu\text{g}$ divided by the original mass of the sample in grams taken for fire assay [24]. Therefore, the LOD in fire assay is computed as:

$$LOD = \frac{m (\mu\text{g})}{Mass_{assay} (g)} (\text{g/t}) \quad [24]$$

The limit of quantitation (LOQ), is simply the LOD multiplied by 10 (Long & Winefordner, 1983):

$$LOQ = 10 \cdot \frac{m (\mu\text{g})}{Mass_{assay} (g)} (\text{g/t}) \quad [25]$$

Therefore, with a sample mass of 50g taken for fire assay, the limit of detection would be 0.02g/t . *i.e.* $1\mu\text{g} = 1\text{g/t}$, therefore $1\mu\text{g}/50\text{g} = 0.02\text{g/t}$. If no prill was found, then the LOD result would be $<0.02\text{g/t}$ or "not detected". Using a larger assay sample mass improves the LOD and LOQ (Table 12). Table 14 gives a recommended reporting scheme for LOD and LOQ.

Table 13. Mass of assay sample and corresponding limit of detection and limit of quantitation for an assay microbalance capability of smallest prill mass of $1\mu\text{g}$ or 0.001mg .

Mass Assay Sample (g)	LOD (g/t)	LOQ (g/t)
30	0.03	0.3
50	0.02	0.2
100	0.01	0.1

Table 14. Recommended reporting scheme for LOD and LOQ in fire assay.

Data	Report as
$<LOD$	Not detected
$<LOQ$	Detected
$\geq LOQ$	Report assay result

Appendix 8. T-distribution table

Table 15. T-distribution table for t-critical values (t crit.) for a two-tailed t-test at a 95% level of confidence.

<i>df</i>	Two-tailed	<i>df</i>	Two-tailed
1	12.71	23	2.06
2	4.30	24	2.06
3	3.18	25	2.06
4	2.78	26	2.05
5	2.57	27	2.05
6	2.44	28	2.04
7	2.36	29	2.04
8	2.30	30	2.04
9	2.26	35	2.03
10	2.22	40	2.02
11	2.20	45	2.01
12	2.17	50	2.00
13	2.16	55	2.00
14	2.14	60	2.00
15	2.13	70	1.99
16	2.12	80	1.98
17	2.11	90	1.98
18	2.10	100	1.98
19	2.09	120	1.98
20	2.08	Infinity	1.96
21	2.08		
22	2.07		

End of certificate