INSPEC

56 LESLIE HOUGH WAY • SALFORD • GREATER MANCHESTER • M6 6AJ • UNITED KINGDOM
Email: testing@inspec-international.com Website: www.inspec-international.com
Tel: +44 (0)16 1737 0699 Fax: +44 (0)16 1736 0101

Test Report

AS/NZS 1716 : 2012

Respiratory protective devices

Report no: 1.18.03.12

Client: Healthy Breath Ltd
4D Pacific Rise
Mt Wellington
Auckland 1060
New Zealand

Client order: PO-0009

Order(s) received: 31 January to 15 February 2018

Model(s): MEO Lite

Date(s) of tests: 15 February to 8 March 2018

Signed: H M Webb. **Issued:** 12 March 2018

Heather Webb, Laboratory Supervisor

Conditions

This report may be reproduced and distributed to your clients, provided that it is reproduced and distributed in full.

Unless stated otherwise, the testing is accredited under the laboratory's ISO/IEC 17025 accreditation issued by ANSI-ASQ National Accreditation Board. Refer to certificate and scope of accreditation AT-1933.

Tests marked ☒ are not included in our ISO/IEC 17025 accreditation.

Opinions, comments and interpretations expressed in this report are shown in italics.

Copies of INSPEC interpretations referenced in this report are available upon request.

Specimens will be disposed of four weeks from the date of this report, unless otherwise instructed.

This report has been provided in accordance with our standard Terms of Business, which can be viewed at, and printed from:

http://inspec-international.com/ToB.pdf

If you have difficulty accessing the Terms of Business, you may contact us for a copy.

Product characteristics

Property	Characteristic
Model	MEO Lite
Device type	Filtering half mask
Filter class claimed	Not specified

Submission details

Product	Quantity	Date received	INSPEC specimen no. (1F0084 +)
MEO Lite filtering half mask	3	29 January 2018	23 to 25

Procedures

Specimens were selected at random from the submission(s) detailed above.

Testing was performed in accordance with AS/NZS 1716: 2012, unless otherwise specified below. Reference should be made to the standard when reading this report.

Unless stated otherwise, specimens were tested in the condition as received by INSPEC.

The Client requested testing to clause 4.3.3, Simulated wear treatment, 4.3.4, Inhalation resistance, and 4.3.5, Filtering efficiency, only. No other clauses were assessed.

4.3.3 Pre-conditioning was conducted as defined in E5.6 of Appendix E.

4.3.4 Testing was conducted to the method given in Appendix G.

4.3.5 Testing was conducted to the method given in Appendix I.

Result details

4.3 PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS

4.3.1 General

Evaluation of the performance requirements is as detailed below. Testing was conducted in the listed sequence.

4.3.3 Simulated wear treatment

Specimens 23, 24 and 25 were tested.

None of the specimens tested suffered from strap breakage.

4.3.4 Inhalation resistance **Pass**

The device was designated as Type G, see 5.4.4 for inhalation resistance.

Specimen	Inhalation resistance (Pa)	
	at 30 l/min	at 95 l/min
23	24	87
24	30	109
25	30	71
Maximum permitted for P1	**110**	**340**
Maximum permitted for P2	**70**	**240**

4.3.5 Test of filter efficiency **Pass**

Specimen	Pre-conditioning	Penetration (%)
23	**4.3.3**	4.42
24		2.57
25		2.35
Maximum permitted for P1		**20.0**
Maximum permitted for P2		**6.0**

Estimates of the uncertainty of measurement

Clause	Test	Uncertainty
2.1.1	Assembled respirators	-
2.1.2	Materials	-
2.1.4	Shelf life	-
2.1.8	Avoidance of frictional sparks	-
2.1.9	Protection from flame	See Note 1
2.2.2	Total inward leakage	± 4.8%
3.1.1	General	-
3.2.1	Facial fit	-
3.2.4.2	Leakage	± 3.9 ml/min
3.2.5	Exhalation resistance	± 2.0%
3.2.6	Security of attachments	See Note 1
4.1	Design and construction	-
4.2	Classes	-
4.3.3	Simulated wear	-
4.3.4	Inhalation resistance	± 4.9%
4.3.5	Filtering efficiency	± 4.8%
5.4.4	Inhalation resistance - Gas and vapour filters	± 4.9%
5.4.5	Filter capacity (Type G)	± 5.5%

Note 1 The acceptance criterion for this test is a straightforward “Pass/Fail”, rather than a numerical value. Consequently, as there is no value to be reported, uncertainty has not been reported either.

Note 2 The uncertainty value is based on a standard uncertainty multiplied by a coverage factor k = 2, which provides for a confidence level of approximately 95%. Values expressed as a percentage (%) are relative.

Note 3 It should be noted that the above values have not been taken into account when making assessment to the pass/fail criteria.

END OF REPORT