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Summary

A ring test was organized for the detection of animal proteins in animal feed by microscopy in the framework of the annual ring tests of the IAG - International Association for Feeding stuff Analysis, Section Feeding stuff Microscopy. The organizer of the ring test was RIKILT - Wageningen UR, The Netherlands. The aim of the ring study was to provide the participants information on the performance of the local implementation of the detection method for their local quality systems. A further aim was to gather information about the application of the microscopic method.

All four samples used in the ring test were based on an artificial feed with a formulation comparable to that of an average cattle feed. A mix of minerals was included at a level of 1%. The contaminations were: no animal proteins (blank), 2% of fish meal, 0.05% of land animal material, and 0.1% of tricalcium phosphate (TCP). All participants were requested to determine the presence or absence of land animal and/or fish protein material and to indicate the type of material found. In addition, as requested in the new method for microscopic detection effective from 12 February 2013 (Regulation (EC) 51/2013 amending Annex 6 of Regulation (EC) 152/2009), the participants were asked to examine either the flotate or raw material and to report these results as well. Reporting the number of particles was facultative. Other aspects of the new method were not yet implemented. The participants were also asked to report the amount of sediment found (the fraction containing minerals and bones, if present) and to answer questions on a series of parameters of the microscopic method. Reporting the estimated amount of land animal or fish protein was optional for all participants. All fifty-three participants returned results using the microscopic method. The four feed samples were evaluated as a proficiency test in a strict sense (i.e. no “challenger” sample), although the sample with TCP got special attention in the evaluation of the test.

Incorrect positive results (positive deviations) were expressed in a specificity score and incorrect negative results (negative deviations) were expressed in a sensitivity score. An optimal score is 1.0.

Most of the specificity and sensitivity scores were at good levels. The specificity score for incorrect detection of meat and bone meal (MBM) in the blank is acceptable (0.94). The detection of 0.05% of MBM in feed appeared to be perfect (1.0). The TCP, which is a legal ingredient for non-ruminant feeds, was detected in a vast majority of cases as animal proteins in the sense of the legislation. Four participants reported fish in the presence of TCP. For the first time in the ring test of IAG section Microscopy participants were requested to report on their examination of either the flotate or the raw material of the sample. The results show a rather diverse view. The results for the blank were at a reasonable level (0.91). The detection of animal material (0.05%) in either flotate or raw material needs further improvement (0.34). According to the new procedure the results for examination of sediment and of flotate/raw material need to be combined in one result. Therefore, the sensitivity for the examination of flotate or raw material does not have a direct effect on the performance of the method. The share of the sediment used for examination differed between 2% and 100%. This difference showed to have an effect on the sensitivity of the method.

The PCR results covered a total of ten different targets. The results were generally good.

It can be concluded that the microscopic method and the DNA identification method were generally well implemented among the participants. Several aspects need attention, such as the share of sediment material used, and the examination of the flotate or raw material. The way in which the new method needs to be implemented in the IAG ring test for animal proteins in 2014 needs further discussion.
1 Introduction

Member states of the European Union are requested by EU legislation to maintain an active monitoring program for the safety of feed. The monitoring of the presence of animal proteins in the framework of eradication of mad cow disease is an important part of it. A range of official control methods was in 2009 combined in one Regulation (EC) 152/2009. With respect to animal proteins, major changes in the protocols and strategy for detection are effective from 12 February 2013 (Regulation (EC) 51/2013 amending Annex 6 of Regulation (EC) 152/2009: EC, 2013a, and its corrigendum EC, 2013b). The changes imply a more detailed procedure for the microscopic detection and the official implementation of DNA identification by means of PCR. The modification of the microscopic method is due to the situation that the reproducibility is insufficient at low contamination levels (e.g. Veys et al., 2010). Therefore, a Limit of Detection (LOD) of five particles in a portion (sample for a single analysis) is set. The PCR method is now part of Annex 6 as well. The primary goal is to identify material of ruminant origin, in order to support the lifting of the ban on the use of animal proteins. As of 1 June 2013 non-ruminant material is allowed as ingredient in aquafeed (Regulation (EC) 56/2013 amending Annex 4 of Regulation (EC) 999/2001). Ruminant material remains prohibited, which needs a more specific monitoring in the view of the relaxation of the ban.

The European Commission stimulates testing laboratories to include a lot of procedural details in Standard Operational Procedures (SOPs) instead of a full methodological description in Regulations in order to enhance flexibility. In the area of the monitoring of animal proteins the European Union Reference Laboratory (EURL) is responsible for the development of methods and for the public availability of these SOPs. Intended SOPs will include details of the microscopic and PCR procedures, and the strategy for the combination of these two methods. At the time of writing these SOPs have been published at the website of the EURL Animal Proteins.

The IAG - International Association for Feeding stuff Analysis, Section Feeding stuff Microscopy organises annually a ring test for animal proteins in feeds for all their members. RIKILT – Wageningen UR organises this ring test on behalf of the IAG section Microscopy. At the beginning of the organisation of the current ring test (early January 2013), a new version of Regulation (EC) 51/2013 was published. The SOPs, however, were only available in draft. The organisers of the current ring study were involved in the development of these SOPs as external advisers, and, hence, had knowledge of the parameters of the new method. It was, however, not possible to request all the participants to follow the new procedures. Official publication of the SOPs was achieved in late March and early April. Therefore, certain aspects of the new procedures were implemented in this ring test, especially the examination of the flotation or raw sample material, but a full implementation of the method was not required.

In this report the ring test for animal proteins is presented, which was organised by RIKILT in 2013 on behalf of the IAG Section Feeding stuff Microscopy. For this year a sample was designed containing tricalcium phosphate in order to assess whether this material is erroneously recognised as animal proteins.
2 Methods

2.1 Materials

The ring test 2013 was chosen to be based on a compound feed completely produced by RIKILT, in a composition that mimics an average cattle feed. The feed was composed of citrus (20%), wheat (20%), maize (30%), beet pulp (10%), rapeseed (9.5%), palm expeller (9.5%), mineral mix (1%). The ingredients were ground with a mesh size of 2 mm and thoroughly mixed. The mineral mix consisted of limestone, sodium chloride salt, dicalciumphosphate and copper sulphate in equal shares.

Four samples were produced, based on the artificially produced feed.

The composition of the four samples is listed in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-A</td>
<td>Blank feed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-B</td>
<td>Feed with 2% fish meal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-C</td>
<td>Feed with 0.05% MBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-D</td>
<td>Feed with 0.1% TCP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fish meal was composed by mixing several samples from practice which were examined in the RIKILT regular control program and all found to be negative for terrestrial animal material.

The meat and bone meal was produced in Uruguay and collected after export to China. It was declared as ruminant MBM.

The tricalciumphosphate was obtained from a local supplier.

All materials were checked on purity (absence of any contamination) and identity, and were all found to be fit for application.

2.2 Procedure for production

In order to avoid any cross contamination, the samples were produced in a strict order: 2013-A - 2013-C - 2013-B - 2013-D. All samples were prepared in a laboratory which is located at a distance from the RIKILT microscopy laboratory.

The production scheme is presented in Figure 1.

Jars for sample 2013-A and for sample 2013-C were filled with 40 grams of the pure feed, closed and set aside. Every jar for sample 2013-C was individually spiked with 20 mg of MBM. The jars of samples 2013-A and 2013-C were wrapped and set aside before the fish meal and the TCP entered the laboratory.

Sample 2013-B was produced by thoroughly mixing 60 g of fish meal in 2.94 kg of feed. This resulted in an concentration of approximately 2% fish meal. The jars of sample 2013-B were set aside and the fish meal was removed before producing sample 2013-D.
Sample 2013-D was produced according to the method of stepwise dilution. 2.8 g of TCP was used to prepare 2.8 kg of contaminated feed as follows. The initial 2.8 g of TCP was mixed in 2.8 g of feed and stirred for one minute. In nine subsequent steps the remaining amount of feed was added stepwise by mixing according to a fixed scheme.

**Figure 1** Overview of the production scheme for the four samples of the IAG ring test animal proteins 2013.

### 2.3 Homogeneity study

Two RIKILT microscopists examined independently five jars of all four samples. In all cases a correct result was obtained (Table 2). All materials were also investigated by PCR for three targets: ruminant, pig and fish. The results, as listed in Table 2, are also correct in all cases.

The microscopy research group and the PCR research group of RIKILT did not participate in the further laboratory analysis of this ring trial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Sediment amount</th>
<th>Microscopy</th>
<th>PCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n= 5)</td>
<td>MBM Fish</td>
<td>Rum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-A</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>6.9 – 9.5 mg/g</td>
<td>Neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-B</td>
<td>2% fish meal</td>
<td>12.1 – 14.8 mg/g</td>
<td>Neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-C</td>
<td>0.05% MBM</td>
<td>9.5 – 12.7 mg/g</td>
<td>Pos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-D</td>
<td>0.1% TCP</td>
<td>10.4 – 12.4 mg/g</td>
<td>Pos *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of the homogeneity study. Sediment amounts are based on 10 grams. The number of portions is indicated for microscopy. PCR results were based on two repetitions. Green cells indicate the correct positive findings. Rum: ruminant target. *: the positive results for sample 2013-D were related to the presence of TCP.
2.4 Organization of the ring trial

All IAG members, all NRLs, and a series of putative interesting laboratories were informed about the ring test for 2013. In all cases an invitation letter, a participation form and an invoice were distributed. Until the beginning of March a total of 53 participants were listed. The sets of four samples with an accompanying letter (see Annex 1) were sent to all participants on the Tuesday 5th of March 2013. On Wednesday March 6th an E-mail message was sent to all participants, together with a file containing a sheet with instructions (see Annex 2) and the electronic report forms (see Annex 3 and 4), and the request to confirm the receipt of the package.

The closing date for reporting results was fixed at April 5th. Several requests were received to extent the period for analysis with one week. This request was granted and the closing date was set at April 12th. In several cases participants appeared not to be able to submit their results even within the extended period. However, all sets of results were received during April. Since the analysis of the results was carried out early May, all results were considered valid and taken into consideration.

Participants outside Europe were informed to be aware of possible problems with custom regulations. In one occasion the package with samples was kept by customs. Finally a second package arrived safely at the participant’s laboratory. In addition to the 53 sets of microscopic results, seven participants reported their results of PCR analysis. The draft report was finalised at May 27th.

The new Regulation (EC) 152/2009 as amended by Regulation (EC) 51/2013 came into force at February 12th. Officially the new procedures should have been applied by all participants for the analysis of the four samples. However, the supporting Standard Operational Procedures (SOPs) belonging to this Regulation were not officially published at the time of the analysis by the participants (March), but came available in April 2013. Therefore, the choice has been made to follow the basic procedure as laid down in the operational schemes of Regulation (EC) 152/2009, which includes the mandatory examination of both the sediment and either the flotate or the raw material. The report form has been extended accordingly. For the reporting, which now includes a distinction between results based on 1-5 particles or on 6 particles or more, it has been chosen to ask the participants to report “absence” or “presence”. The further instructions to the participants send on March 12th and March 18th are included in Annex 5.

2.5 Participants

The 53 participants originated from 23 countries: 16 member states of the European Union, and five other countries (China, Norway, Peru, Thailand and Switzerland). The list of participants is presented in Annex 6. Five member states have been involved with three or more participating laboratories: Germany (17 labs), Italy (6), Belgium (5), France (3) and the Netherlands (3). These figures are comparable to those of the ring test of last year (van Raamsdonk et al., 2012a).

2.6 Analysis of results

For binary results (yes/no, positive/negative, etc.) standard statistics are accuracy, sensitivity and specificity. The accuracy is the fraction of correct results, either positive or negative. The sensitivity is the ability of the method used, to detect the contaminant when it is present, whereas the specificity is the ability to not detect the contaminant when it is absent. The following equations have been used to calculate the statistics:

\[
\text{Accuracy } AC = \frac{PA + NA}{PA + ND + PD + NA}
\]

\[
\text{Sensitivity } SE = \frac{PA}{PA + ND}
\]

\[
\text{Specificity } SP = \frac{NA}{PD + NA}
\]
where PA is the number of correct positive identifications (positive agreements), NA the number of correct negative identifications (negative agreements), PD the number of false positives (positive deviations) and ND the number of false negatives (negative deviations). The statistics are presented as fractions. Accuracy (specificity or sensitivity) has been calculated for each sample type.

As criterion for a good or excellent score a threshold of 0.95 for either sensitivity or specificity was applied.

Significance of quantitative results was tested by using Student's t-test statistics; see, for example, Hand (2009). Grubbs' outlier test was used to identify outliers in the data on sediment amounts, which were removed prior to further analysis. It was explicitly asked to report the amount of sediment obtained before any staining was applied.

Differences in the results after applying different parameters were analysed using Fisher's exact test (Fisher, 1945).

**Figure 2** Top row: two images of TCP particles (100 x). Bottom row: two selections as indicated in the red quadrangles (200 x).
3 Results

Fifty-three packages with four samples were sent to all participants. The same number of fifty-three participants returned results for the microscopic method, seven sets of results were received for PCR analysis. All results were received by E-mail, and in most cases a FAX message was sent as well. The procedure for FAX handling at RIKILT was changed during the reporting period, which makes it currently impossible to provide a figure for FAX response. Two participants submitted a report sheet with the wrong participants number, which could be corrected based on the name and mail address of the participant. Furthermore one participant did not enter the participants number at all. The link with the original E-mail message and sender could be established beyond doubt in all cases; otherwise these reports would have been omitted. In all those cases that a participant send in several versions of the report sheet the most recent version was used. All reports were included.

The report sheet was produced in Office 2010 as in the previous year. The report sheet was transferred to Office 2003 format before distribution. Errors in using this sheet were not reported by the participants. The message upon saving the sheet of Office version violation did not cause any problem.

The full results are presented in the tables of Annex 6, 7 and 8. Sample 2013-D was a challenge to examine a legal ingredient (TCP) which could be mistaken as animal protein. However, the results for sample 2013-D could be fully evaluated (see Figure 2) since approx. 10% of the particles of the TCP appeared to be recognisable as bone fragments of terrestrial animals. This situation implies an effective contamination with recognisable bone fragments of 0.01% (10% of 0.1%).

3.1 Microscopic detection

Most of the specificity and sensitivity scores were at good levels considering the samples for the proficiency test (Table 3; Annex 8). The specificity score for incorrect detection of MBM in the blank is just below the level of 0.95. The TCP, which is a legal ingredient for non-ruminant feeds, was detected in a vast majority of cases. Three participants reported fish in the presence of TCP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>Fish A 0%</th>
<th>B 2%</th>
<th>C 0%</th>
<th>D 0%</th>
<th>MBM A 0%</th>
<th>B 0%</th>
<th>C 0.05%</th>
<th>D 0.1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>specificity</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the first time in the ring test of IAG section Microscopy results were requested for the examination of either the flotate or the raw material of the sample. Targets for this examination could be muscle fibres, hair, feather filaments or cartilage. Presence of fish meal or MBM should imply the presence of animal particles in the flotate. Presence of TCP in the sediment should not result in any animal particles in the flotate. However, examination of the raw material could result in the finding of bone particles.

The results show a rather diverse view (Table 4). Especially the presence of muscle fibres or other light particles was not reported by a number of participants, most notable for sample 2013-C containing 0.05% of MBM. More than two-third of the participants reported animal particles in either the flotate or raw material for sample 2013-D, contaminated with TCP.
Table 4
Sensitivity and specificity scores for the detection of animal proteins in either the flotates or the raw materials of four samples. Abbreviations: n: number of participants. Capitals A to D: sample indication. *: no material in flotate is to be expected for TCP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal materials</th>
<th>Animal materials</th>
<th>Animal materials</th>
<th>Animal materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A no</td>
<td>B yes</td>
<td>C yes</td>
<td>D no*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>specificity</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sensitivity</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results for examination of the flotate or raw material should not be evaluated independently from the results as obtained from examining the sediment. The new procedure of Regulation (EC) 152/2009 combines the results of both examinations in one number of particles. The possible results “absent”, “present with 5 or less particles”, or “present with 6 or more particles” are based on the total number of all examinations.

3.2 Microscopic procedure

An inventory of ten different parameters was added to the report sheet of the actual results of the four samples. These results are shown in Annex 7 and summarised in Table 5. The main purpose of this inventory was to provide benchmark information for the individual participants for comparison with the general application of the method. Although this has to be considered additional information only, a ring test with a random set of participants provides a good opportunity to collect meta-data on the application of the method. The current results provide the opportunity to discuss some parameters of the microscopic method. The frequencies of application of choices for several method parameters are presented in Table 5.

Table 5
Inventory of parameters for microscopic detection and their application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Parameter state</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>amount of material used for</td>
<td>5 grams</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sedimentation of feed</td>
<td>10 grams</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>type of glassware</td>
<td>chemical sedimentation funnel</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conical glass with cock</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>champagne glass</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beaker (flat bottom)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sedimentation agent</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TCE/Petroleumether</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use of staining of sediment</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use of binocular for examination at lower magnifications</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>size of cover glass used</td>
<td>small (e.g. 20 x 20 mm)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>large (e.g. 26 x 50 mm)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>share of the total sediment</td>
<td>minimum</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used for examination</td>
<td>maximum</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>embedding agent</td>
<td>glycerine / glycerol</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>paraffin oil</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>immersion oil</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norland Adhesive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other (water, glycerol:water mixture, mineral oil)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of ARIES</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f-factor for MBM</td>
<td>minimum</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maximum</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none estimated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results as presented in Table 5 show generally a good application of the method. Differences with previous years will be presented in the next chapter (Discussion).

Only a very low share of the participants used the knowledge system ARIES (van Raamsdonk et al., 2004, 2010). The information in this system could support the discrimination between confusing particles of land animals and fish.

Correlations between specificity and method parameters are relevant only if some sort of causal relationship exists in order to avoid the analysis of random fluctuations of results. As far as substantial numbers among the participants have applied different parameters of the method (see Table 5), the correlation between results and the application of some parameters have been calculated. These include the use of glassware, and the amount of sediment analysed. A further analysis of the results after stratification for these two parameters will be presented.

3.2.1 Use of glassware

Basically four different types of glassware have been used. These are: chemical sedimentation funnel, conical glass with cock, champagne glass, and beaker (flat bottom). The first two types have a separate way to release the flotate (on top) and the sediment (at the bottom). In this way there is a secure and 100% separated collection of both fractions. The procedure for using the latter two types include the removal of the flotate at first, after which the sediment can be collected from the bottom. Only two participants used a deviating type of glassware: a beaker with a conical bottom, and a mensur. The first one was included in the analyses, the results obtained using the mensur were ignored. The two main categories are indicated by the phrases “release on top” and “release at bottom”, referring to the position of release of the sediment.

The results are shown in Tables 6 and 7. There is no significant difference in terms of accuracy after examination of the sediment obtained by any of the types of glassware. The differences in accuracy based on the examination of the flotate or raw material are larger, although not significant according to Fisher’s exact test. A main complication is the circumstance that no question to differentiate the use of either the flotate or the raw material was included in the questionnaire. The difference between the results based on a flotate or on the raw material is especially important for the examination of the addition of TCP, since no animal particles are to be expected in the flotate.

Table 6
Sensitivity/specificity scores for the detection of animal proteins in the sediment of four samples, separate for the use of different types of glassware. The results of one participant were excluded for the use of a deviating type. Abbreviations: n: number of participants per group. Capitals A to D: sample indication. P: probability of a significant difference according to Fisher’s exact test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of glassware</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Fish</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>MBM</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A 0%</td>
<td>B 2%</td>
<td>C 0%</td>
<td>D 0%</td>
<td>A 0%</td>
<td>B 0%</td>
<td>C 0.05%</td>
<td>D 0.1%</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release on top</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>specificity</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release at bottom</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>specificity</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7
Sensitivity/specificity scores for the detection of animal proteins in the flotate or raw material of four samples, separated for the use of different types of glassware. Abbreviations: n: number of participants per group. Capitals A to D: sample indication. P: probability of a significant difference according to Fisher’s exact test. *: no material of TCP is to be expected in the flotate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of glassware</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Animal material</th>
<th>A no</th>
<th>B yes</th>
<th>C yes</th>
<th>D no*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Release on top</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>specificity</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release at bottom</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>specificity</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2 Amount of sediment used

The amount of sediment used for examination differs from 1% to 100%. Since it is to be expected that a lower number of animal particles can be found when using a limited amount of sediment, it seems important to analyse the relation between the parameter Amount of sediment used and the result in terms of accuracy. Thirty-eight out of 53 participants reported their estimation of the amount of sediment used. The results are presented in Table 8.

In those cases that the accuracy expresses the specificity (target absent, indication of false positives), the amount of material examined is not relevant. Absence of material remains the same in all different amounts of material that can possibly be examined. In this respect, the difference between the two classes (less than 50%, 50% or more used) for detection of fish in sample 2013-C (fish absent) is remarkable. The main interesting result is the indication of presence of MBM in sample 2013-D. The indication of 0.1% of TCP in this sample applies to the TCP in general. The share of particles which is still recognisable as bone particles is far less, resulting in an effective contamination level of approx. 0.01%. At such low levels of contamination a difference related to the examined portion is to be expected. The different scores (0.88 vs. 1.0) indicate this dependence although not at an significant level (p = 0.146).

Table 8
Sensitivity/specificity scores for the detection of animal proteins in the sediment of four samples, separate for the amount of sediment used. Abbreviations: n: number of participants per group. Capitals A to D: sample indication. P: probability of a significant difference according to Fisher’s exact test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of sediment used</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Fish</th>
<th>A 0%</th>
<th>B 2%</th>
<th>C 0%</th>
<th>D 0%</th>
<th>MBM</th>
<th>A 0%</th>
<th>B 0%</th>
<th>C 0.05%</th>
<th>D 0.1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 50%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>specificity</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;= 50%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>specificity</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Quantification of the sediment

The starting amount of material for sedimentation will obviously influence the results of quantification. Contrary to the previous years, the amount of sediment in the current study was calculated per gram of material used. Outliers were identified using the Grubb test, applied two sided (confidence interval 0.025 – 0.975, G = 1.93). The large variation in sediment amounts resulted in rejecting 14 results. The results as expressed in mg/g in Table 9 are based on the results of 34 participants.
For all samples the resulting amount of sediment per gram of raw material is larger than established in the homogeneity study (Table 2). In some cases (samples 2013-A and 2013-C) the difference is significant. The sediment amounts as obtained by glassware with a sediment release at the top is higher for all samples compared to the amounts as obtained by the other glassware (Table 10).

Table 9
**Resulting amounts of sediment (in mg/g) for samples A-D. For every result the average (in normal) and standard deviation (in italics) is given. Calculations were based on data after removal of outliers. Five participants did not report sediment quantities.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>amount of sediment (mg/g)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.29 (2.02)</td>
<td>16.24 (2.31)</td>
<td>13.60 (2.19)</td>
<td>13.45 (2.50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actual average</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>14.02</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-test</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.23 b</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>6.39 a</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a: $p < 0.05$; b: $p < 0.025$.

Table 10
**Resulting amounts of sediment (in mg/g) for samples A-D, stratified for the type of glassware used. For every result the average (in normal) and standard deviation (in italics) is given. Calculations were based on data after removal of outliers. Five participants did not report sediment quantities. According to the t statistic results do not differ between the two groups.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of glassware</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>amount of sediment (mg/g)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release on top</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.74 (2.21)</td>
<td>16.36 (2.42)</td>
<td>14.02 (3.01)</td>
<td>13.51 (2.52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release at bottom</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.08 (1.94)</td>
<td>16.19 (2.30)</td>
<td>13.41 (1.72)</td>
<td>13.41 (2.55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-test</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Detection by other methods

Participations were invited to perform DNA analysis and to submit their results, separated for every single target. Seven participants submitted results covering a total ten different targets. These targets are classified at three hierarchical levels: class (mammal, avian, fish), order (ruminants), genus/species (bovine, sheep, pig, chicken, turkey) and a rest group (other). The results are presented in Table 11. In general the results are a good indication of the actual contents of the samples. In three of the four false positives for species (bovine) the higher hierarchical group (ruminant) shows the opposite results. In samples 2013-C (MBM from Uruguay) and 2013-D (TCP) several positive results for avian and chicken were reported. Although the mentioned contaminants are assumed not to contain these sources of DNA, their absence cannot be proved.
Table 11
Results for DNA analyses (PCR) for four samples and 10 different targets. Seven participants, indicated by their reference number, submitted results. Red cells: false positive or false negative result. Yellow cells: putative false positive result. Mam.: mammal, rumin.: ruminant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mam.</th>
<th>rumin.</th>
<th>bovine</th>
<th>sheep</th>
<th>pig</th>
<th>avian</th>
<th>chicken</th>
<th>turkey</th>
<th>fish</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Discussion

4.1 Method performance

The results as obtained in this most recent version of the annual IAG ring tests for microscopic detection of animal proteins in feed is comparable to the historic record of previous years (Table 12). In several occasions the accuracy was comparable to the level that is usually considered as limit (0.95). The sensitivity of the detection at the level of 0.05% MBM or below could be considered as very good (Regulation (EC) 152/2009: detection limit of 0.1%), also in the view of earlier results (Table 12). The 2013 result for 0.1% of land animal material (0.94 overall, or 0.98 for EU member states only) is very good considering the nature of the material (TCP), which in the current case contained approx. 10% of recognisable fragments.

Table 12
Results for detection of material of terrestrial animals and of fish in feed samples based on sediments of previous ring tests organised by J.S. Jørgensen (Danish Plant Directorate, Lyngby; 2003-2007) and RIKILT (2008-2013) on behalf of the IAG section Microscopy. Results have been communicated in the framework of this Section. Results indicate specificity in the case of the blank, and sensitivity in the case of the other sample types. * TCP used as contaminant for land animal material.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detection of: Content: fish</th>
<th>Land animals</th>
<th>Fish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0% 0% 0.1% 0.05%</td>
<td>0% 0% 0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year (n=29)</td>
<td>0.86 0.93 0.98 0.98</td>
<td>0.96 0.98 0.98 0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.90 0.93 0.95 0.95</td>
<td>0.91 0.94 0.93 0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.93 0.98 0.98 0.98</td>
<td>0.96 0.98 0.96 0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.96 0.98 0.98 0.98</td>
<td>0.98 0.98 0.98 0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.94 0.98 0.98 0.98</td>
<td>0.94 0.96 0.92 0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 (n=53) current study</td>
<td>0.94 0.98 (0.94)* 0.94 0.96</td>
<td>0.96 0.98 0.92 0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The examination of either the flotate or raw material is mandatory in the new method as published in the amended version of Regulation (EC) 152/2009. The results indicate that an improvement of the effectiveness of examination of flotate or raw material is required (Table 4). Especially for samples 2013-B (2% fish) and 2013-C (0.05% MBM) underperformance can be noted. It is, however, not necessary to have a correct result in all cases for the examination of the flotate or raw material, since the new method in Regulation (EC) 152/2009 is based on the total number of particles counted in at most four slides of the sediment and two slides of the flotate or raw material. If a second or third determination is required, the conclusion is based on the average number of particles counted from a multiple of six slides (i.e. 12 slides after a second and 18 slides after a third determination; EC, 2013a). There are several combinations of absence/presence for animal protein particles in sediment versus flotate/raw material (see Annex 8). Since there is no full overview of the number of particles found by all the participants, and considering the complicating factor that muscle fibres cannot be assigned to one the categories fish vs. terrestrial animals without an assignment model, a full discussion is not feasible. Only some specific situations focussing on the combination of a false negative result for the sediment which can be corrected by a correct positive result for flotate or raw material will be discussed. Three participants reported a false negative for the presence of bone fragments in the sediment of sample 2013-D (0.1% TCP), of which one participant did not report results for the examination of flotate or raw material (part. 50). The other two participants (5 and 6) both reported the correct presence of animal material in the flotate or raw material. If using an assignment
model, at least a part of this material could be assigned to the category terrestrial animals, the final result would be correct positive. The same situation was found for the detection of fish in sample 2013-B. Participant 49 did not report fish particles in this sample, which was combined with the observations of animal material in the flotate or raw material. Assignment to the category fish would have corrected this false negative result for the sediment.

The results for DNA detection were improved in comparison with the result of last year (van Raamsdonk et al., 2012a). The results as presented in this study (Table 11) are too erratic for firm conclusions, the total view shows, however, promising results.

4.2 Method parameters

A proficiency test is meant to reveal information on the performance of individual labs. It is not possible to draw conclusions about the validity of the method(s) applied (von Holst et al., 2005). In certain occasions a questionnaire is send around with the samples, which can be used to evaluate the way in which the method is implemented. The current and previous ring tests of IAG are examples of those “extended proficiency tests”. Although method validation is principally impossible, improvements of method implementation and relationships with the results can be discussed (van Raamsdonk et al., 2012b).

As shown in Table 13, a status quo in the shift of method parameters can be found. Still some participants use only 5 grams of material for sedimentation, the use of glassware allowing the release of the sediment at the bottom is slightly increasing, in contrast to the decreasing number of participants that apply staining of the sediment. The use of small cover glasses is increasing, which might indicate that on average a smaller amount of material is mounted on one slide.

The relationship between two parameters and the final results expressed in either specificity or sensitivity is analysed further:

• Type of glassware used: release of the sediment on top (settling beakers, champagne glass) vs. release of sediment at the bottom (sedimentation funnel, special glass with cock). It can be imagined that release of both flotate followed by the sediment could result in mixing a part of the two fractions. Hypothesis: using glassware with “release on top” will result in a larger amount of sediment compared to glassware with “release at bottom” due to remnants of the flotation. An effect can be expected for sensitivity scores only.

The amount of sediment achieved is larger after using the glassware with “release on top”, although there is no significant difference with the result obtained after applying glassware with “release at bottom” for all samples (Table 10). There are no significant differences between the sensitivity scores related to the two types of glassware (Table 6). Lower sensitivity scores after using glassware with release of sediment on top were reported in the IAG ring test 2010 (van Raamsdonk et al., 2010). Comparable results were achieved in a STRATFEED proficiency test (Figure 5.2 in van Raamsdonk et al., 2012b based on data extracted from von Holst et al., 2005). In this figure the indication “open” meant a settlement beaker, and the indication “closed” meant a (closed) sedimentation funnel. In a DG-SANCO proficiency test (Boix et al., 2004; van Raamsdonk et al., 2007) difference was made between an “Austrian method” and the official method according to Directive 2003/126/EC, applied by new member states. In both methods both types of glassware have been used, which prohibits to draw further conclusions.

• The amount of sediment used for examination: less than 50% of the achieved sediment vs. 50% or more sediment material examined. A relationship might exist between the amount of sediment examined and the number of particles found. Hypothesis: a smaller amount of sediment material examined will result in a smaller number of particles found. An effect can be expected for sensitivity scores only, especially for those samples with a low contamination level.

In the framework of the restriction to consider only the sensitivity scores for samples with low levels of contamination, only the sensitivity for MBM in sample 2013-D applies: the share of recognisable bone fragments in TCP is much below the amount of material used for contamination (0.1%). The difference between using less than 50% of the sediment (0.81) and using 50% or more of the sediment (1.0) is near to being significant (p=0.146; Table 8).
Table 13
Comparison between parameters distribution in the IAG ring studies between 2008 and 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter choice</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>amount of material used for sedimentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 grams</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 grams</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>type of glassware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chemical sedimentation funnel</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beaker (flat bottom)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>champagne glass</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conical glass with cock</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use of staining of sediment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use of binocular for examination at lower magnifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of slides used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maximum</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>size of cover glass used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small (e.g. 20 x 20 mm)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large (e.g. 26 x 50 mm)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>share of the total sediment used for examination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimum</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maximum</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>embedding agent for sediment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paraffin oil</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immersion oil</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glycerine / glycerol</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norland Adhesive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chloral hydrate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other (e.g. Depar 3000, water)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 General conclusions and recommendations

5.1 Conclusions

In certain occasions reporting errors were noticed. These problems mainly apply to inconsistent reporting (wrong or missing unique laboratory number: two occasions), and late reporting (several occasions). Some problems with the custom procedures of certain countries were encountered.

The proficiency test showed generally good results. The situation that TCP as legal feed ingredient for non-ruminant feeds still can contain recognisable bone fragments is a matter of concern.

The method as published in Regulation (EC) 152/2009, amended by Regulation(EC) 51/2013, includes several steps for examination additional to the old method, and several repetitions in order to establish the number of particles as accurate as possible. One extra evaluation step involves the examination of either the flotate or raw material. The first results as obtained in the current ring test are in need of improvement. The share of the sediment that is used for examination will influence the number of particles to be found, which will have its effect on reaching the Level of Detection. A certain effect on the sensitivity scores was shown in this study.

5.2 Recommendations

- The examination of the flotate or raw material needs considerable improvement. Training of microscopists remains important.
- Evaluation of the full implementation of the method (e.g. examination of sample or flotate, use of binocular) is desired. In terms of ring test management it is required to include the type of material used (flotate or raw material) in the evaluation of the results.
- It is recommended to evaluate further the effect of several method parameters (e.g. amount of sediment used for examination) because of large variation of application, which violates further harmonization.
- The implementation of the new method in the IAG ring test for animal proteins in 2014 needs further attention.
- The nature of TCP as currently on the market has to be explored further for the possible presence of recognisable bone fragments.
Acknowledgements

The board of IAG section Feeding Stuff Microscopy (dr. I. Paradies-Severin (LUFA, Hameln),
dr. G. Frick (ALP, Posieux) and ir. J. Vancutsem (FAVV, Tervuren), dr. R. Weiss (AGES, Vienna))
supported this study as advisory board for communication with the scientists and laboratories working
in this research field, and in the final report activities. Their contributions are greatly acknowledged.
References


Dear colleague, Dear IAG member,

The IAG section Feeding stuff Microscopy organizes annually a ring test for the detection of animal proteins in animal feeds. As in previous years, the presidium of the IAG section Feeding stuff Microscopy and RIKILT have agreed to organize together the 2013 ring test for animal proteins under certain conditions.

On behalf of the IAG section Feeding stuff Microscopy, RIKILT will invite you for participation in this next ring test. The share in the costs of the 2013 ring test as asked from every participant will be a fee of € 200, which is the same as in the previous years.

Three or four samples will be send around late February or early March 2013. Also a questionnaire will be sent by E-mail. A time slot of four weeks is planned for the analyses of the samples by every participants This means that late March or early April all results are expected to be returned to RIKILT. Pooling and evaluation of the results will take place during April and May, and a preliminary report will be presented during the annual IAG meeting in Vienna (Austria) in June. After that, a final report will be made depending on the outcome of the discussions during the meeting. All communications of the evaluation will be fully anonymous.

If you are interested to participate in the ring test 2013 for animal proteins, please return the application form and make a payment of € 200 to RIKILT. For smoothing the administrative procedure, an invoice is already included with this letter. In case of participation, please hand this invoice over to your financial department, and make sure that the reference number, your name and your institute’s name is mentioned. This information is necessary to avoid loss of payments that can not be linked to participating institutes.

We are looking forward to have a nice cooperation for the next ring test and to have results which will support your laboratory quality system.

On behalf of the IAG section Microscopy and the RIKILT organizing team,

L.W.D. van Raamsdonk
Annex 2 Basic instructions for the test procedure

IAG ring test 2013 animal proteins

Instructions for the IAG ring test

1. You have received a box with an introduction letter and four vials containing 40 grams of possibly contaminated animal feed. Please report the receipt of your package as soon as possible by E-mail to the address mentioned below.

2. The samples have to be analysed according to Annex 6I of Regulation (EC) 152/2009 from the European Union, modified by (EC) 51/2013. Comparable procedures can be found in the module Methods of the computer program ARIES. Take care to homogenise the content of each vial before taking the amount for analysis.

3. Reporting consists of the following steps:

3a. Please fill in the questionnaire on the page "Procedure". Depending on your chosen method, different questions will show up. Most of the cells contain a drop-down list. These lists can be used to select an answer as follows. When clicking on a cell, the cursor changes into a hand. A second click will open the drop-down list. Your unique lab number is mentioned in the introduction letter. All the fields with a drop-down list have to be completed.

3b. Please enter your results in the fields at page "Results". Your unique lab number automatically shows up after you have entered it at the page Procedure. Enter yourself the four unique labels of the vials. There are separate fields for your examination of the sediment and of the flotation/raw material. Select "yes" from the drop-down list if fish or land animal material is detected, or "no" if the respective type of material is absent. You are free to give an estimation of the amount of material found. Please indicate the type of the materials found. More than one indication can apply, e.g. "bone and muscle". All fields with a drop-down list have to be completed. Please add the exact sediment weight in milligrams, without a decimal sign.

4. After completing the two forms "Procedure" and "Results", they have to be sent to the organisers in two ways:

4a. A print out of both forms have to be sent by Fax to RIKILT, Wageningen, the Netherlands. The FAX number will appear in the forms as soon as they are completed.

4b. The forms have to be sent by E-mail as well. Save the Excel file by using "Save as …", add your unique lab code to the end of name (just before ".xls") and send the file to leo.vanraamsdonk@wur.nl.

4c. Results will be included in the final analyses and report only if both forms are send in by FAX as well as by electronic mail, and after the proper receipt of the requested fee.

5. Direct any questions to leo.vanraamsdonk@wur.nl

6. Closing date is April 5th, 2013.

RIKILT Institute of food safety, Wageningen, the Netherlands
### Report form for procedure details

**Please complete at least all the cells with a drop down list that apply to your procedure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IAG ring test 2013 animal proteins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please select your unique lab number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you read the ring test instructions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which detection method do you use?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please skip this line**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please continue here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate your starting amount of material for sedimentation of FEED material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate your glassware for sedimentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe your sedimentation agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you apply staining of the sediment (e.g. alizarin staining) as standard procedure?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you examine at lower magnifications (using a binocular)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate the size of cover glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please estimate the amount of sediment you have used for preparing the slide(s) (in %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please describe your embedding agent for the sediment material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you use the expert system ARIES for identification of particles?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When estimating amounts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>please indicate the f-factor used for fish meal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>please indicate the f-factor used for terrestrial animal meal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4  Report form

Please complete at least all the cells with the presence of fish material and land animal material in both sediment and flotation/raw material for every sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IAG ring test 2013 animal proteins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lab number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sample number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weight of sediment (in mg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of fish material in sediment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If present, estimated amount (in %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If present, please indicate type of material (e.g. fish bone, scale, gill, cartilage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of material of land animals in sediment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If present, estimated amount (in %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If present, please indicate type of material (e.g. bone, cartilage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of material of vertebrates in flotation or in raw sample material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If present, estimated amount (in %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If present, please indicate type of material (e.g. muscle fibre, hair, feather, blood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment, if necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Mail send on March 12th 2013

Dear participant,

As communicated to you last week, analyses have to be carried out according to Regulation (EC) 152/2009, which is recently amended by Regulation (EC) 51/2013, effective of February 12th 2013. This Regulation can be found at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:020:0033:0043:EN:PDF.

The current procedure is renewed and more detailed than the previous version. Especially the application of a limit of detection (5 particles) is a new element. The implications for our new daily routine are yet not completely clear. In Chapter 1 of Annex 6 of Regulation (EC) 152/2009 as amended by Regulation (EC) 51/2013 reference is made to Standard Operational Procedures. These are only available in draft at this moment.

It is, however, clear that every (positive) result should be reported to the competent authority. Chapter 2.1.5 of the mentioned Annex provides texts for reporting the different amounts of particles found in a sample. There are separate texts for the situation that 1-5 particles, or more than 5 particles are found, distinctive for fish and terrestrial animals. Since RIKILT can be considered to be the “competent authority” for the samples of this ring test, we ask you to report any particle found. In order to avoid any confusion, the report form asks about the “presence” or “absence” instead of the judgment “positive” or “negative”.

You are free to indicate the number of particles found in the free cells of the report form. Be aware that when using less than 100% of the sediment the chance to found particles of animal origin will decrease accordingly. It could be considered to discuss these issues further during the IAG annual meeting in Vienna, if implications are expected for our daily work.

If any question arise please do not hesitate to contact me.

All the best with the analyses.

Kind regards,

Leo van Raamsdonk
Dear participant,

As communicated to you previously, analyses have to be carried out according to Regulation (EC) 152/2009, which is recently amended by Regulation (EC) 51/2013, effective of February 12th 2013. This Regulation can be found at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:020:0033:0043:EN:PDF.

The existence of two Regulations (152/2009 and 51/2013) could be complicated. Reference to 152/2009 could suggest an indication to the old method. The official situation is that reference to Regulation (EC) 51/2013 is not correct, since this Regulation is only an amendment to Annex 6 of Regulation (EC) 152/2009 and not a replacement of the entire regulation. A replacement is not possible in this way, since 152/2009 consists of much more than only Annex 6. This means that the “old version” of 152/2009 does not formally exist anymore after February 12th. Reference to 152/2009 is a reference to the new procedure. This is extremely important for both legal as well as practical reasons. The Commission publishes Consolidated versions of Regulations that are amended regularly. The new Consolidated version of (EC) 152/2009 has yet to come.

So, there is only one procedure: the new one. This new procedure has to be followed in the examination of the IAG samples, EXCEPT FOR THE REPORTING. The organisers of the IAG ring test want to know any amount of particles: one particle is “present”. As already stated, you are requested to indicate the number of particles and the nature of it in the comment cells of the report sheet.

We realise that the procedure is new to you and might be complicated. So, we grant you an extra week for the examinations. The final date for submission of your results is therefore April 12, 2013.

If any question arise please do not hesitate to contact me.

All the best with the analyses.

Kind regards,

Leo van Raamsdonk
## Annex 6  List of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austrian Agency for Health and Food Safety-AGES</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRA-W</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLVVT</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFSAL</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oleotest N.V.</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratorium ECCA nv</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China Agricultural University</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Veterinary Institute</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Veterinary and Food Administration</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C.L. Laboratoire de Rennes</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAC</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPL Atlantique</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESSLING GmbH</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agri Q-service GmbH</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universität Hohenheim, LA Chemie (710)</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staatliche Betriebsgesellschaft für Umwelt und Landwirtschaft, GB6-Labore Landwirtschaft / LUFA, FB62</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVUA-RRW</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landesbetrieb Hessisches Landeslabor, Landwirtschaft und Umwelt</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayerisches Landesamt fur Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTZ Augustenberg</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUFA-Speyer</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thüringer Landesanstalt für Landwirtschaft</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLFG Landesanstalt für Landwirtschaft</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landesuntersuchungsamt für Chemie, Hygiene und Veterinämedizin</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUFA Rostock</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landeslabor Berlin-Brandenburg</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGS Germany GmbH</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futtermittelinstitut Stade (LAVES)</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUFA Nord-West</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Backweston Agri Laboratories</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equine Centre</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst. Zooprofilattico Sperimentale delle Venezie</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst. Zooprofilattico Sperimentale della Sardegna</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale Abruzzo &amp; Molise “G. Caporale”</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ist. Zooprofilattico Sperimentale delle Lombardia e dell’Emilia Romagna</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istituto Zooprofilattico della Sicilia</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IZS PLV Torino - CReAA</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCL - Nutricontrol</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurofins Food Testing</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MasterlabBV</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nofima Ingredients</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Analytical Services SAC</td>
<td>Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cargill Poland</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instytut Zootechniki PIB, Pracownia w Szczecinie</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab. Regional de Veterinária</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratório Nacional de Investigação Veterinária INRB, IP</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Ljubljana, Veterinary Faculty, Natl. Veterinary Institute, Unit for Pathology of Animal Nutrition and Environmental Hygiene</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trouw nutrition España</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirección General de Produccion Agropecuaria, Laboratorio Agrario Regional</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVA</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agroscope (ALP), Swiss Research Station</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPP(Thailand) Public Company Limited</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 7  Details of procedures applied, microscopic method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lab nr</th>
<th>Amount Fed</th>
<th>Glassware</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Staining</th>
<th>Binoocular</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Sed. used</th>
<th>Embedding</th>
<th>ARIES</th>
<th>F-factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>conical glass with cock</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>paraffin oil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>conical glass with cock</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>chloroform</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>paraffin oil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>conical glass with cock</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>glycerin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>immersion oil</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>conical champagne glass</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>60-80%</td>
<td>glycerin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>beaker (flat bottom)</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>immersion oil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>conical glass with cock</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>immersion oil</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>glycerin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>conical glass with cock</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>immersion oil</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Norland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>paraffin oil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>paraffin oil</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>glycerin</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Norland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>glycerin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>conical champagne glass</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>glycerin</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>glycerin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>conical champagne glass</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>paraffin oil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>glycerin</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Norland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>glycerin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>conical glass with cock</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>immersion oil</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Norland</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>glycerin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>beaker (flat bottom)</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>glycerin</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>conical glass with cock</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>paraffin oil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>glycerin</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>immersion oil</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>paraffin oil</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>conical champagne glass</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>glycerin</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>conical champagne glass</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>glycerin</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>paraffin oil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab nr</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>Glassware</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Staining</td>
<td>Bincocular</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Sed. used</td>
<td>Embedding</td>
<td>ARIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>glycerin</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>conical champagne glass</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>50-100%</td>
<td>paraffin oil</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>glycerin</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>conical champagne glass</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>immersion oil</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>conical glass with cock</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>paraffin oil</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>immersion oil</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>beaker (flat bottom)</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>immersion oil</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>mensur</td>
<td></td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>mineral oil</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>9-38%</td>
<td>paraffin oil</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>paraffin oil</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>beaker (flat bottom)</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>paraffin oil</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>beaker (conical bottom)</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>paraffin oil</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>paraffin oil</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>beaker (flat bottom)</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>aceton</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>paraffin oil</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>conical glass with cock</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>glycerin</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>glycerin</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>immersion oil</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>glycerin</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>glycerin</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>chem.sed.funnel</td>
<td>top/bottom</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>immersion oil</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 8

Results: presence of animal proteins in sediment and in flotable or raw material, microscopic or raw detection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lab nr</th>
<th>Sample numbers</th>
<th>Fish A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>MBM A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Flotation A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>51 97 203 04</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>141 222 88 299</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>91 137 208 39</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>296 282 163 254</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>46 142 33 249</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>216 27 248 104</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>241 177 43 259</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>56 32 218 74</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11 17 243 24</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>266 92 128 174</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>291 07 258 34</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>191 12 23 239</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>221 37 283 179</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>01 57 253 29</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>161 172 118 224</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>166 62 28 269</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>131 202 78 289</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>86 147 93 119</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>16 192 08 194</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>206 102 263 19</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>236 22 68 124</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>36 247 73 209</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>196 127 288 169</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>246 132 213 264</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>201 167 18 59</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>26 252 198 14</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31 272 158 54</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>156 67 153 149</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>96 257 143 09</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>81 47 123 279</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>76 112 108 84</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>171 107 223 164</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>176 152 98 199</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>41 277 13 144</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>126 52 113 139</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>116 292 83 189</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>211 227 38 109</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>151 42 228 294</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>71 02 188 214</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>06 197 63 154</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>101 287 58 99</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>286 72 273 69</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>66 162 183 244</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>261 87 233 129</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>21 187 193 79</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>281 157 138 114</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>111 297 48 159</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>276 77 53 204</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>106 122 173 184</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>146 117 03 64</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>271 82 148 49</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>121 217 103 229</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>256 212 168 134</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Annex 9  Results: sediment and quantification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lab nr</th>
<th>Amount of sediment (mg)</th>
<th>Sediment (mg/g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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