



Institute for  
Interlaboratory Studies

## Results of Proficiency Test Fuel Oil July 2024

**Organized by:** Institute for Interlaboratory Studies  
Spijkenisse, the Netherlands

**Author:** Mrs. E.R. Montenij-Bos  
**Correctors:** Mr. M. Meijer, BSc & Mr. R.J. Starink, BSc  
**Approved by:** Mr. R.J. Starink, BSc

**Report:** iis24F01

October 2024

**CONTENTS**

1	INTRODUCTION .....	3
2	SET UP.....	3
2.1	ACCREDITATION.....	3
2.2	PROTOCOL .....	3
2.3	CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT .....	4
2.4	SAMPLES .....	4
2.5	STABILITY OF THE SAMPLES .....	5
2.6	ANALYZES .....	6
3	RESULTS.....	6
3.1	STATISTICS .....	7
3.2	GRAPHICS .....	7
3.3	Z-SCORES.....	8
4	EVALUATION .....	8
4.1	EVALUATION PER SAMPLE AND PER TEST .....	9
4.2	PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FOR THE GROUP OF LABORATORIES .....	13
4.3	COMPARISON OF THE PROFICIENCY TEST OF JULY 2024 WITH PREVIOUS PTS .....	15

## Appendices:

1.	Data, statistical and graphical results.....	17
2.	Number of participants per country .....	127
3.	Abbreviations and literature .....	128

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Since 1994 the Institute for Interlaboratory Studies (iis) organizes a proficiency scheme for the analysis of Fuel Oil based on the latest version of ISO8217 and ASTM D396. Since 2016 this proficiency scheme has been organized twice per year. During the annual proficiency testing program of 2024 it was decided to continue the round robin for the analysis of Fuel Oil.

In this interlaboratory study registered for participation:

- 178 laboratories in 62 countries for regular analyzes in Fuel Oil iis24F01
- 124 laboratories in 45 countries on the Metal analyzes in Fuel Oil iis24F01M

In total 187 laboratories in 62 countries registered for participation in one or both proficiency tests, see appendix 2 for the number of participants per country. In this report the results of this Fuel Oil proficiency tests are presented and discussed.

## 2 SET UP

The Institute for Interlaboratory Studies (iis) in Spijkennisse, the Netherlands, was the organizer of this proficiency test (PT). Sample analyzes for fit-for-use and homogeneity testing were subcontracted to a laboratory that has performed the tests in accordance with for ISO/IEC17043 relevant requirements of ISO/IEC17025.

In this proficiency test the participants received, depending on the registration, one or two different samples of Fuel Oil, see table below.

Sample ID	PT ID	Quantity	Purpose
#24105	iis24F01	1x 1 L	Regular analyzes
#24106	iis24F01M	1x 100 mL	Metals

Table 1: Fuel Oil samples used in PT iis24F01

Participants were requested to report rounded and unrounded test results. The unrounded test results were preferably used for statistical evaluation.

### 2.1 ACCREDITATION

The Institute for Interlaboratory Studies in Spijkennisse, the Netherlands, is accredited in agreement with ISO/IEC17043:2010 (R007), since January 2000, by the Dutch Accreditation Council (Raad voor Accreditatie). This PT falls under the accredited scope. This ensures strict adherence to protocols for sample preparation and statistical evaluation and 100% confidentiality of participant's data. Feedback from the participants on the reported data is encouraged and customer's satisfaction is measured on regular basis by sending out questionnaires.

### 2.2 PROTOCOL

The protocol followed in the organization of this proficiency test was the one as described for proficiency testing in the report 'iis Interlaboratory Studies: Protocol for the Organisation, Statistics and Evaluation' of June 2018 (iis-protocol, version 3.5). This protocol is electronically available through the iis website site [www.iisnl.com](http://www.iisnl.com), from the FAQ page.

### 2.3 CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT

All data presented in this report must be regarded as confidential and for use by the participating companies only. Disclosure of the information in this report is only allowed by means of the entire report. Use of the contents of this report for third parties is only allowed by written permission of the Institute for Interlaboratory Studies. Disclosure of the identity of one or more of the participating companies will be done only after receipt of a written agreement of the companies involved.

### 2.4 SAMPLES

For the preparation of the sample for the regular analyzes in Fuel Oil a batch of approximately 200 liters of Fuel Oil was obtained from a third party. After heating to 60 °C and homogenization 190 amber glass bottles of 1 L were filled and labelled #24105. The homogeneity of the subsamples was checked by determination of Density at 15 °C in accordance with ISO12185 on 8 stratified randomly selected subsamples.

	Density at 15 °C in kg/m <sup>3</sup>
sample #24105-1	1008.2
sample #24105-2	1008.2
sample #24105-3	1008.2
sample #24105-4	1008.2
sample #24105-5	1008.2
sample #24105-6	1008.2
sample #24105-7	1008.2
sample #24105-8	1008.2

Table 2: homogeneity test results of subsamples #24105

From the above test results the repeatability was calculated and compared with 0.3 times the reproducibility of the reference test method in agreement with the procedure of ISO13528, Annex B2 in the next table.

	Density at 15 °C in kg/m <sup>3</sup>
r (observed)	0.0
reference test method	ISO12185:24
0.3 x R (reference test method)	0.5

Table 3: evaluation of the repeatability of subsamples #24105

The calculated repeatability is in agreement with 0.3 times the reproducibility of the reference test method. Therefore, homogeneity of the subsamples was assumed.

For the preparation of the sample for the analyzes of Metals in Fuel Oil a batch of approximately 25 L of Fuel Oil containing metals was obtained from a third party. After heating to 60 °C and homogenization 135 PE bottles of 0.1 L were filled and labelled #24106. The homogeneity of the subsamples was checked by the determination of Nickel in accordance with IP501 on 8 stratified randomly selected subsamples.

	Nickel in mg/kg
sample #24106-1	42.9
sample #24106-2	38.6
sample #24106-3	43.3
sample #24106-4	41.7
sample #24106-5	42.1
sample #24106-6	42.7
sample #24106-7	41.1
sample #24106-8	43.2

Table 4: homogeneity test results of subsamples #24106

From the above test results the repeatability was calculated and compared with 0.3 times the reproducibility of the reference test method in agreement with the procedure of ISO13528, Annex B2 in the next table.

	Nickel in mg/kg
r (observed)	4.3
reference test method	IP470:05
0.3 x R (reference test method)	5.5

Table 5: evaluation of the repeatability of subsamples #24106

The calculated repeatability is in agreement with 0.3 times the reproducibility of the reference test method. Therefore, homogeneity of the subsamples was assumed.

Depending on the registration of the participant the appropriate set of PT samples was sent on June 12, 2024. An SDS was added to the sample package.

## 2.5 STABILITY OF THE SAMPLES

The stability of Fuel Oil packed in the amber glass and PE bottles was checked. The material was found to be sufficiently stable for the period of the proficiency test.

## 2.6 ANALYZES

The participants were requested to determine on sample #24105: Total Acid Number, API Gravity, Ash Content, Asphaltenes, Calculated Carbon Aromaticity Index, Carbon Residue micro method, Conradson Carbon Residue, Density at 15 °C, Flash Point PMcc, Heat of Combustion (Gross and Net), Hydrogen Sulfide, Kinematic Viscosity (at 50 °C and 100 °C), Kinematic Viscosity Stabinger (at 50 °C and 100 °C), Nitrogen, Pour Point (Lower, Upper and Automated 3 °C interval), Sediment by Extraction, Total Sediment (Existent (TSE), Accelerated (TSA) and Potential (TSP)), Total Sulfur, Water by distillation, Water and Sediment, Vacuum Distillation at 10 mmHg but reported as AET (IBP, 5%, 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, 50% recovered and FBP), Total Carbon, Total Hydrogen and Total Nitrogen (CHN-analysis).

Also, some extra information was requested about the determination of Total Acid Number. On sample #24106 it was requested to determine: Aluminum as Al, Silicon as Si, Sum Aluminum and Silicon, Iron as Fe, Nickel as Ni, Sodium as Na, Vanadium as V, Calcium as Ca, Phosphorus as P and Zinc as Zn.

It was explicitly requested to treat the samples as if they were routine samples and to report the test results using the indicated units on the report form and not to round the test results, but report as much significant figures as possible. It was also requested not to report 'less than' test results, which are above the detection limit, because such test results cannot be used for meaningful statistical evaluations.

To get comparable test results a detailed report form and a letter of instructions are prepared. On the report form the reporting units are given as well as the reference test methods (when applicable) that will be used during the evaluation. The detailed report form and the letter of instructions are both made available on the data entry portal [www.kpmd.co.uk/sgs-iis/](http://www.kpmd.co.uk/sgs-iis/). The participating laboratories are also requested to confirm the sample receipt on this data entry portal. The letter of instructions can also be downloaded from the iis website [www.iisnl.com](http://www.iisnl.com).

## 3 RESULTS

During five weeks after sample dispatch, the test results of the individual laboratories were gathered via the data entry portal [www.kpmd.co.uk/sgs-iis/](http://www.kpmd.co.uk/sgs-iis/). The reported test results are tabulated per determination in appendix 1 of this report. The laboratories are presented by their code numbers.

Directly after the deadline, a reminder was sent to those laboratories that had not reported test results at that moment. Shortly after the deadline, the available test results were screened for suspect data. A test result was called suspect in case the Huber Elimination Rule (a robust outlier test) found it to be an outlier. The laboratories that produced these suspect data were asked to check the reported test results (no reanalyzes). Additional or corrected test results are used for data analysis and the original test results are placed under 'Remarks' in the result tables in appendix 1. Test results that came in after the deadline were not taken into account in this screening for suspect data and thus these participants were not requested for checks.

### 3.1 STATISTICS

The protocol followed in the organization of this proficiency test was the one as described for proficiency testing in the report 'iis Interlaboratory Studies: Protocol for the Organisation, Statistics and Evaluation' of June 2018 (iis-protocol, version 3.5).

For the statistical evaluation the *unrounded* (when available) figures were used instead of the rounded test results. Test results reported as '<...>' or '>...>' were not used in the statistical evaluation.

First, the normality of the distribution of the various data sets per determination was checked by means of the Lilliefors-test, a variant of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and by the calculation of skewness and kurtosis. Evaluation of the three normality indicators in combination with the visual evaluation of the graphic Kernel density plot, lead to judgement of the normality being either 'unknown', 'OK', 'suspect' or 'not OK'. After removal of outliers, this check was repeated. If a data set does not have a normal distribution, the (results of the) statistical evaluation should be used with due care.

The assigned value is determined by consensus based on the test results of the group of participants after rejection of the statistical outliers and/or suspect data.

According to ISO13528 all (original received or corrected) results per determination were submitted to outlier tests. In the iis procedure for proficiency tests, outliers are detected prior to calculation of the mean, standard deviation and reproducibility. For small data sets, Dixon (up to 20 test results) or Grubbs (up to 40 test results) outlier tests can be used. For larger data sets (above 20 test results) Rosner's outlier test can be used. Outliers are marked by D(0.01) for the Dixon's test, by G(0.01) or DG(0.01) for the Grubbs' test and by R(0.01) for the Rosner's test. Stragglers are marked by D(0.05) for the Dixon's test, by G(0.05) or DG(0.05) for the Grubbs' test and by R(0.05) for the Rosner's test. Both outliers and stragglers were not included in the calculations of averages and standard deviations.

For each assigned value the uncertainty was determined in accordance with ISO13528. Subsequently the calculated uncertainty was evaluated against the respective requirement based on the target reproducibility in accordance with ISO13528. In this PT the criterion of ISO13528, paragraph 9.2.1, was met for all evaluated tests. Therefore, the uncertainty of all assigned values may be negligible and need not be included in the PT report.

Finally, the reproducibilities were calculated from the standard deviations by multiplying them with a factor of 2.8.

### 3.2 GRAPHICS

In order to visualize the data against the reproducibilities from literature, Gauss plots were made, using the sorted data for one determination (see appendix 1). On the Y-axis the reported test results are plotted. The corresponding laboratory numbers are on the X-axis. The straight horizontal line presents the consensus value (a trimmed mean). The four striped lines, parallel to the consensus value line, are the +3s, +2s, -2s and -3s target reproducibility limits of the selected reference test method. Outliers and other data, which were excluded from the calculations, are represented as a cross. Accepted data are represented as a triangle.

Furthermore, Kernel Density Graphs were made. This is a method for producing a smooth density approximation to a set of data that avoids some problems associated with histograms. Also, a normal Gauss curve (dotted line) was projected over the Kernel Density Graph (smooth line) for reference. The Gauss curve is calculated from the consensus value and the corresponding standard deviation.

### 3.3 Z-SCORES

To evaluate the performance of the participating laboratories the z-scores were calculated. As it was decided to evaluate the performance of the participants in this proficiency test (PT) against the literature requirements (derived from e.g. ISO or ASTM test methods), the z-scores were calculated using a target standard deviation. This results in an evaluation independent of the variation in this interlaboratory study.

The target standard deviation was calculated from the literature reproducibility by division with 2.8. In case no literature reproducibility was available, other target values were used, like Horwitz or an estimated a reproducibility based on former iis proficiency tests.

When a laboratory did use a test method with a reproducibility that is significantly different from the reproducibility of the reference test method used in this report, it is strongly advised to recalculate the z-score, while using the reproducibility of the actual test method used, this in order to evaluate whether the reported test result is fit-for-use.

The z-scores were calculated according to:

$$Z_{(\text{target})} = (\text{test result} - \text{average of PT}) / \text{target standard deviation}$$

The  $Z_{(\text{target})}$  scores are listed in the test result tables of appendix 1.

Absolute values for  $z < 2$  are very common and absolute values for  $z > 3$  are very rare.

Therefore, the usual interpretation of z-scores is as follows:

$ z  < 1$	good
$1 <  z  < 2$	satisfactory
$2 <  z  < 3$	questionable
$3 <  z $	unsatisfactory

End of preview of this report, requests to obtain the full report can be sent to [nl.iis@sgs.com](mailto:nl.iis@sgs.com)



Preview

Address: Malledijk 18, P.O. Box 200, 3200 AE Spijkenisse, The Netherlands  
Telephone number: +31 (0)88 214 45 41  
Email address: [nl.iis@sgs.com](mailto:nl.iis@sgs.com)  
Website: [www.iisnl.com](http://www.iisnl.com)

Institute for Interlaboratory Studies is a full member of SGS Nederland B.V. and registered at the Chamber of Commerce under number: 24226722. Unless otherwise agreed, all orders are executed in accordance with the SGS general conditions.