



AMERICAN NATIONAL STANDARD

# **Performance Criteria for Systems that Estimate the Attenuation of Passive Hearing Protectors for Individual Users**

**Secretariat:**

**Acoustical Society of America**

**Approved on May 7, 2018:**

**American National Standards Institute, Inc.**

## **Abstract**

This standard pertains to systems intended to estimate the attenuation of hearing protection devices (HPDs) obtained by individual wearers in actual practice. Such systems are designated field attenuation estimation systems (FAESs). This standard provides a classification of FAESs and specifies performance criteria. It also details the evaluation methodology and statistical calculations to be performed on such systems in order to state the uncertainty associated with the individual attenuation estimates that they provide, and specifies a method for computing a personal attenuation rating (PAR). FAES-derived data do not replace the attenuation values from ANSI/ASA S12.6 or the insertion-loss data from ANSI/ASA S12.42, nor are such data suitable for labeling the attenuation of HPDs.

---

---

---

AMERICAN NATIONAL STANDARD

**Performance Criteria for Systems that Estimate the  
Attenuation of Passive Hearing Protectors for Individual  
Users**

---

---

---

ANSI/ASA S12.71-2018

Accredited Standards Committee S12, Noise

---

Standards Secretariat  
Acoustical Society of America  
1305 Walt Whitman Road, Suite 300  
Melville, NY 11747

The American National Standards Institute, Inc. (ANSI) is the national coordinator of voluntary standards development and the clearinghouse in the U.S.A. for information on national and international standards.

The Acoustical Society of America (ASA) is an organization of scientists and engineers formed in 1929 to increase and diffuse the knowledge of acoustics and to promote its practical applications.



AMERICAN NATIONAL STANDARD  
**Performance Criteria for Systems that Estimate the  
Attenuation of Passive Hearing Protectors for  
Individual Users**

**Secretariat:**

**Acoustical Society of America**

**Approved on May 7, 2018 by:**

**American National Standards Institute, Inc.**

**Abstract**

This standard pertains to systems intended to estimate the attenuation of hearing protection devices (HPDs) obtained by individual wearers in actual practice. Such systems are designated field attenuation estimation systems (FAESs). This standard provides a classification of FAESs and specifies performance criteria. It also details the evaluation methodology and statistical calculations to be performed on such systems in order to state the uncertainty associated with the individual attenuation estimates that they provide, and specifies a method for computing a personal attenuation rating (PAR). FAES-derived data do not replace the attenuation values from ANSI/ASA S12.6 or the insertion-loss data from ANSI/ASA S12.42, nor are such data suitable for labeling the attenuation of HPDs.

## AMERICAN NATIONAL STANDARDS ON NOISE

The Acoustical Society of America (ASA) provides the Secretariat for Accredited Standards Committees S1 on Acoustics, S2 on Mechanical Vibration and Shock, S3 on Bioacoustics, S3/SC 1 on Animal Bioacoustics, and S12 on Noise. These committees have wide representation from the technical community (manufacturers, consumers, trade associations, organizations with a general interest, and government representatives). The standards are published by the Acoustical Society of America as American National Standards after approval by their respective Standards Committees and the American National Standards Institute (ANSI).

These standards are developed and published as a public service to provide standards useful to the public, industry, and consumers, and to Federal, State, and local governments.

Each of the Accredited Standards Committees (operating in accordance with procedures approved by ANSI) is responsible for developing, voting upon, and maintaining or revising its own Standards. The ASA Standards Secretariat administers Committee organization and activity and provides liaison between the Accredited Standards Committees and ANSI. After the Standards have been produced and adopted by the Accredited Standards Committees, and approved as American National Standards by ANSI, the ASA Standards Secretariat arranges for their publication and distribution.

An American National Standard implies a consensus of those substantially concerned with its scope and provisions. Consensus is established when, in the judgment of the ANSI Board of Standards Review, substantial agreement has been reached by directly and materially affected interests. Substantial agreement means much more than a simple majority, but not necessarily unanimity. Consensus requires that all views and objections be considered and that a concerted effort be made towards their resolution.

The use of an American National Standard is completely voluntary. Their existence does not in any respect preclude anyone, whether he or she has approved the Standards or not, from manufacturing, marketing, purchasing, or using products, processes, or procedures not conforming to the Standards.

NOTICE: This American National Standard may be revised or withdrawn at any time. The procedures of the American National Standards Institute require that action be taken periodically to reaffirm, revise, or withdraw this Standard.



Acoustical Society of America  
Standards Secretariat  
1305 Walt Whitman Road, Suite 300  
Melville, New York 11747  
Telephone: 1 (631) 390-0215  
Fax: 1 (631) 923-2875  
E-mail: [asastds@acousticalsociety.org](mailto:asastds@acousticalsociety.org)

© 2018 by Acoustical Society of America. This standard may not be reproduced in whole or in part in any form for sale, promotion, or any commercial purpose, or any purpose not falling within the provisions of the U.S. Copyright Act of 1976, without prior written permission of the publisher. For permission, address a request to the Standards Secretariat of the Acoustical Society of America.

## Contents

1	Scope .....	1
2	Normative references .....	1
3	Terms and definitions .....	2
4	Types of field attenuation estimation systems .....	3
5	Performance characteristics for FAESs that report a PAR .....	4
5.1	Verification and calibration .....	4
5.2	Maximum permissible ambient noise levels (MPANLs) .....	4
5.3	Maximum test signal exposure levels .....	5
5.4	Assessment of bias and nonlinearity .....	6
5.5	Maximum and minimum measurable attenuation values .....	6
6	Performance characteristics for FAESs that report only pass/fail indicators .....	6
6.1	Verification and calibration .....	6
6.2	Maximum permissible ambient noise levels (MPANLs) .....	6
6.3	Maximum test signal exposure levels .....	7
6.4	Measurement uncertainty for systems that report only pass/fail results .....	7
7	Computation of A-weighted attenuation, $REAT_A$ and $FAESA$ .....	8
7.1	$REAT_A$ .....	8
7.2	$FAESA$ .....	9
8	Computation of PAR and its associated uncertainty .....	9
8.1	$PAR_x$ .....	10
8.2	Computation of the principal sources of uncertainty .....	10
9	Experimental data collection for specification of system performance .....	12
9.1	Procedure for FAESs using standard HPDs .....	12
9.2	Procedure for FAESs using surrogate HPDs .....	13
9.3	Procedure for FAESs that report only pass/fail results .....	15
10	Surrogate error for FAESs using surrogate HPDs .....	15
10.1	Computation of surrogate error .....	15
10.2	Statistical test for the surrogate error .....	15
11	Information to be included in user instructions for FAESs .....	16
	Annex A (normative) FAES performance statement .....	17
	Annex B (informative) Equivalence testing to determine MPANLs .....	19
	Annex C (informative) Example assessment of bias and nonlinearity .....	21

Annex D (informative) Example graphical computation of minimum and maximum attenuation values ....	22
Annex E (informative) Example of the computation of measurement uncertainty for a pass/fail FAES.....	24
Annex F (informative) Example of the computation of composite PAR.....	27
F.1 Computation including audiometric data .....	27
F.2 Computation in absence of audiometric data .....	27
F.3 Simplified computation based on lowest-ear PAR .....	28
Annex G (informative) Example of the computation of PAR and its associated uncertainty .....	29
G.1 Computation of PAR and its associated uncertainty .....	29
G.2 Example cases to be used for validation of the computation of PAR and its associated uncertainty .....	32
Annex H (normative) Laboratory-determined values of fitting and spectrum uncertainty .....	34
Bibliography .....	36

## Figures

Figure C.1 – Bland-Altman scatter plot. Each point represents one measurement for a given fit of an HPD using both REAT and a FAES. ....	21
Figure D.1 – Prediction error scatter plot for a physical FAES used to establish the measurable attenuation range. Each point represents one measurement for a given fit of an HPD using both REAT and a FAES. ....	23
Figure E.1 – Pass/fail FAES measurement data and fitted logistic regression function describing the measurement uncertainty. ....	26
Figure F.1 – Example of left and right attenuation as well as the resulting composite attenuation.....	28

## Tables

Table 1 – Types of FAESs .....	4
Table 2 – Octave-band values of the MPANLs corresponding to the lowest FAES test frequency, for earcups with an attenuation of 0 dB. ....	5
Table 3 – Values of $\alpha$ for various protection performance values, $x$ .....	10
Table 4 – Experimental procedure to collect data for FAESs that test standard HPDs .....	13
Table 5 – Experimental procedure to collect data for FAESs that test surrogate HPDs .....	14
Table A.1 – Example performance statement for a FAES that reports a PAR.....	17
Table A.2 – Example performance statement for a FAES that reports a pass/fail rating .....	18
Table B.1 – Illustrative data for a physical FAES.....	19

Table E.1 – REAT<sub>A</sub> (dB) and corresponding FAES<sub>B</sub> outputs for a pass/fail FAES, sorted by increasing values of REAT<sub>A</sub>. The criterion level CRIT for these data is 15.0 dB. Rows containing erroneous measurements are shaded (shading in one row appears inconsistent due to rounding)..... 24

Table H.1 – Generic laboratory-determined values of fitting uncertainty ( $u_{fit}$ ), values in dB..... 34

Table H.2 – Generic laboratory-determined values of spectrum uncertainty ( $u_{spectrum}$ ), values in dB..... 35

## Foreword

[This Foreword is for information only and is not a part of the American National Standard ANSI/ASA S12.71-2018 American National Standard Performance Criteria for Systems that Estimate the Attenuation of Passive Hearing Protectors for Individual Users. As such, this Foreword may contain material that has not been subjected to public review or a consensus process. In addition, it does not contain requirements necessary for conformance to the standard.]

This standard comprises a part of a group of definitions, standards, and specifications for use in noise. It was developed and approved by Accredited Standards Committee S12 Noise, under its approved operating procedures. Those procedures have been accredited by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI). The Scope of Accredited Standards Committee S12 is as follows:

*Standards, specifications, and terminology in the field of acoustical noise pertaining to methods of measurement, evaluation, and control, including biological safety, tolerance, and comfort, and physical acoustics as related to environmental and occupational noise.*

This is a new American National Standard, and it is not comparable to any existing ISO Standard.

At the time this Standard was submitted to Accredited Standards Committee S12, Noise, for approval, the membership was as follows:

S.J. Lind, *Chair*  
D.F. Winker, *Vice-Chair*  
  
N.B. Stremmel, *Secretary*

<b>3M Personal Safety Division</b> .....	E.H. Berger
<b>Acoustical Society of America</b> .....	R.D. Hellweg D. Lubman (Alt.)
<b>Air-Conditioning, Heating and Refrigeration Institute</b> .....	S.J. Lind L. Bulookbashi (Alt.)
<b>American Academy of Audiology</b> .....	T. Ricketts C. Schweitzer (Alt.)
<b>American Academy of Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery</b> .....	R.A. Dobie A. Kim (Alt.)
<b>American Industrial Hygiene Association</b> .....	D. Driscoll M. Kram (Alt.)
<b>American Speech-Language-Hearing Association</b> .....	L.A. Wilber N. DiSarno (Alt.)
<b>Boeing Commercial Airplanes, Noise, Vibration and Emissions</b> .....	K. Lai M. Kosanchick (Alt.)
<b>Caterpillar, Inc.</b> .....	K.G. Meitl C. Crowell (Alt.)
<b>Compressed Air and Gas Institute</b> .....	R.C. Johnson D.R. Bookshar (Alt.)

<b>Council for Accreditation in Occupational Hearing Conservation</b> .....	C. Moritz
.....	C. Achutan (Alt.)
<b>Cummins, Inc.</b> .....	S. More
<b>Custom Protect Ear, Inc.</b> .....	J. Goldberg
.....	A. Bobyrev (Alt.)
<b>Emerson Electric – Copeland Corporation</b> .....	A.T. Herfat
.....	M. Strand (Alt.)
<b>Engineering Dynamics</b> .....	S. McGregor
<b>ESI Group</b> .....	C. Musser
.....	B. Gardner (Alt.)
<b>ETS – Lindgren Acoustic Systems</b> .....	D.F. Winker
.....	M. Black (Alt.)
<b>ExxonMobil</b> .....	B. Moulton
.....	N. Hart (Alt.)
<b>G.R.A.S. Sound &amp; Vibration</b> .....	R. O’Neil
<b>GE Aviation</b> .....	R. Majjigi
.....	R. Babbitt (Alt.)
<b>General Motors</b> .....	D.B. Moore
<b>Honeywell Safety Products</b> .....	R. Ghent
.....	T. Schulz (Alt.)
<b>Information Technology Industry Council</b> .....	W.M. Beltman
.....	J. Rosenberg (Alt.)
<b>Institute of Noise Control Engineering</b> .....	B.A. Cooper
.....	R.O. Rasmussen (Alt.)
<b>International Safety Equipment Association</b> .....	J. Birkner
.....	C.Z. Fargo (Alt.)
<b>John Deere</b> .....	S. Suh
<b>National Council of Acoustical Consultants</b> .....	B.M. Brooks
.....	G.E. Winzer (Alt.)
<b>National Hearing Conservation Association</b> .....	L. Wells
<b>National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health</b> .....	W.J. Murphy
.....	E.L. Zechmann (Alt.)
<b>National Institute of Standards and Technology – National Voluntary Laboratory Accreditation Program</b> .....	K. Harper
<b>National Park Service</b> .....	M. McKenna
.....	K. Fristrup (Alt.)
<b>Nexteer Automotive</b> .....	R. Taub
<b>Noise Control Engineering, Inc.</b> .....	R. Fischer
.....	A. Beaudry (Alt.)

<b>Noise Pollution Clearinghouse</b> .....	L. Blomberg
<b>Owens Corning</b> .....	K. Herreman
<b>Power Tool Institute, Inc.</b> .....	W.D. Spencer
.....	M. Hickok (Alt.)
<b>Schomer and Associates, Inc.</b> .....	P.D. Schomer
<b>U.S. Air Force</b> .....	R.L. McKinley
.....	H. Gallagher (Alt.)
<b>U.S. Army Aeromedical Research Laboratory</b> .....	W.A. Ahroon
<b>U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratory</b> .....	M.J. White
.....	M. Swearingen (Alt.)
<b>U.S. Army Public Health Command</b> .....	C. Stewart
.....	M. Robinette (Alt.)
.....	C. Jokel (Alt.)
<b>U.S. Army Research Laboratory, Human Research and Engineering Directorate</b> .....	A.A. Scharine
.....	P. Fedele (Alt.)
<b>U.S. Department of Transportation</b> .....	J. Broehm
.....	C. Roof (Alt.)
<b>U.S. Naval Surface Warfare Center - Carderock</b> .....	A. Titovich
.....	D. Gilmer (Alt.)
<b>Université du Québec ETS</b> .....	J. Voix
.....	R. Bouserhal (Alt.)

Individual Experts of Accredited Standards Committee S12, Noise, were:

B.M. Brooks	S.J. Lind	J.G. Schmitt
A.J. Campanella	D. Lubman	P.D. Schomer
L.S. Finegold	D. Michaud	W.R. Thornton
R.D. Hellweg	M.A. Nobile	L.A. Wilber
A. Konheim	R.J. Peppin	G.E. Winzer

Working Group S12/WG 11, Hearing Protector Attenuation and Performance, which assisted Accredited Standards Committee S12, Noise, in the development of this standard, had the following membership.

E. H. Berger, Chair

W.A. Ahroon	C.J. Fackler	K. Michael
A. Behar	H. Gallagher	W.J. Murphy
J. Birkner	D. Gauger	A. Scharine
A. Bobyrev	R. Ghent	J. Schmitt
J.G. Casali	C. Giguere	J. Voix
	R.L. McKinley	

Suggestions for improvements of this standard will be welcomed. They should be sent to Accredited Standards Committee S12, Noise, in care of the Standards Secretariat of the Acoustical Society of America, 1305 Walt Whitman Road, Suite 300, Melville, New York 11747. Telephone: 631-390-0215; FAX: 631-923-2875; E-mail: [asastds@acousticalsociety.org](mailto:asastds@acousticalsociety.org).

## Introduction

### Background

For many years a standard has existed for measuring the hearing protector attenuation achieved by groups of test subjects in a laboratory setting, the most recent embodiment of which is ANSI/ASA S12.6. Data from that method have been commonly used for rating and labeling the noise attenuation of hearing protection devices (HPDs). However, the laboratory method does not address a key question, namely, “What amount of protection can, or is, a given individual actually getting from his/her HPD?” To do so, manufacturers have developed a variety of field attenuation estimation systems (FAESs), colloquially referred to as “fit test systems,” that can be used for measurements at the workplace. What has been lacking is a national standard that provides guidance on standardizing important performance aspects and data outputs from the various FAESs in order to facilitate selection of systems and application of the test results.

FAESs generally provide data in terms of a single-number personal attenuation rating (PAR). A PAR is computed for one or more fits of the HPD by an individual in a manner similar to the computation of the hearing-protector manufacturers’ labeled attenuation values that are derived from laboratory test data for groups of subjects. Examples of labeled values are the Noise Reduction Rating (NRR) as required by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (1979) and the Noise Level Reduction Statistic for use with A-weighting (NRS<sub>A</sub>) as specified in ANSI/ASA S12.68. Although the various FAESs have the same purpose and produce attenuation values that are presented in similar ways to one another, the underlying technology used to estimate attenuation and compute PARs can differ dramatically. It can range from psychophysical tests to objective microphone measurements, and from systems that calculate PAR in a manner analogous to the NRS<sub>A</sub> as defined in ANSI/ASA S12.68, to others that simply indicate a pass/fail answer based on achieving a minimum required attenuation value. The various types of FAESs are described and categorized in this standard.

PARs are based on measurements at a single point in time and provide a more direct estimate of the protection that a given individual is expected to receive from her or his HPD than does average data from a group of laboratory subjects. However, PARs are still not based upon *in situ* measurements for actual wearers and the exposures they experience during their work shifts. Thus, PARs reflect what a wearer can achieve and has been shown to achieve, not necessarily what s/he truly achieves on a day-to-day basis.

### Applications for FAESs and the specification of uncertainty

FAESs may be used to train the employee to better fit her or his HPD and also to train the trainer in that process. However, users may also wish to apply FAES results together with an organization’s noise-exposure policies to estimate whether a worker is obtaining adequate protection from existing HPDs, or to assign HPDs based upon noise exposures. Though some FAESs currently exist that can estimate the attenuation provided by earmuffs, the usual focus of FAESs is the measurement of earplug performance. This is not only because correct fit and insertion of most earplugs requires more skill and is more variable than for earmuffs, and therefore more in need of assessment, but also because for most FAESs, personal attenuation can be more readily estimated for earplugs than for earmuffs. Earplug assessments can be accomplished, for example, by using a circumaurally mounted transducer to present a test signal, which of course is not possible when earmuffs are to be tested.

Properly estimating noise attenuation also requires an assessment of uncertainty. Measurement uncertainty may differ between the various systems. For the end user to most accurately apply FAES data an explicit statement of uncertainty should be provided. Good measurement practice (where a measurement is understood to consist of the measurement itself, its margin of error, and the confidence level—that is, the probability that the measurand is within the margin of error) dictates the provision of such

uncertainty estimates. Uncertainty values also facilitate a comparison of the precision and accuracy of differing FAESs.

### **Sources of uncertainty**

Three presumed-independent principal sources of uncertainty are considered in the computation of PAR from measured FAES data (Berger et al., 2011).

- Measurement uncertainty, sometimes called prediction uncertainty, pertains to the difference between the FAES prediction of attenuation and the value that would be measured for the same fit of the HPD by an accepted “gold standard,” such as real-ear attenuation at threshold (REAT) per ANSI/ASA S12.6. Since REAT values contain their own uncertainty, a correction to the computation is included to account for this.
- Fit uncertainty pertains to the variability in the fit of the HPD from one application to the next. It is substantially affected by the experimenter or user’s skill, depending on whether experimenter or user fit is being assessed, and also by the fitting characteristics of the HPD that is being evaluated.
- Spectral uncertainty arises from using a PAR designed for subtraction from A-weighted sound level measurements in noises with different spectral content. There will be a variation between the protection predicted when using an octave-band calculation versus that achieved with a single-number approach (see ANSI/ASA S12.68).

Clause 8 specifies the method of computation of the three principal sources of uncertainty and how to integrate that into the calculation of PAR. For systems that employ a surrogate HPD, an additional source of potential error may be introduced by the use of a surrogate. This is addressed in Clause 10.

### **Features distinguishing FAESs and comparison to the standardized REAT procedure**

This standard describes and categorizes the types of FAESs in Clause 4. Regardless of type, a key performance metric will be comparison of attenuation data estimated via the FAES to the REAT values resulting from ANSI/ASA S12.6. The FAES results may differ from REAT. This is to be assessed and reported in an uncertainty statement. Four additional issues that impact the various types of systems are listed below.

- The ambient noise in the test environment must be low enough to avoid masking psychophysical test signals or contaminating the results from objective systems.
- For systems employing a surrogate HPD, the fitting and usability of the modified HPD must be considered in order to limit its effect on the wearer’s ability to fit the surrogate, as compared to the unmodified HPD.
- For systems requiring a psychophysical response, the hearing ability of those being tested must be sufficient to assure that they can hear the signals after attenuation by the HPD under test.
- The rapidity with which the test can be accomplished is also a factor to be considered since this will affect practical application of the FAES and also the ability to address and potentially ameliorate the problem of fit uncertainty by taking repeat measurements on repeated fits. Objective systems may provide more rapid data acquisition.

### **Application of FAES results – computation of PAR and pass/fail ratings**

Though many FAESs can provide measurement results at one or more frequencies, the preferred output for most end users is a single-number rating, termed in this standard a PAR. The intention is to allow an

end user to take measurements and quickly make recommendations for individual wearers. Since employee exposure data are generally only available as A-weighted values, a single-number output is practical. However, for FAESs that also report personal attenuation data at individual octave-band frequencies, such values may be useful in an octave-band calculation to estimate wearer's protected noise exposure, especially for atypical or steeply sloping spectra.

Numerous single-number ratings have been devised, and indeed the various FAESs have heretofore computed their own single numbers with differing approaches. This standard provides a specified computational method analogous to the  $NRS_A$  per ANSI/ASA S12.68 to allow PARs to be compared across systems that do provide attenuation estimates.

For those systems that do not provide a PAR, but rather a pass/fail indication for use in a specified noise environment, this standard specifies a suitable statistic that shall be reported to provide guidance on the uncertainty associated with the pass/fail determination.

## American National Standard

# Performance Criteria for Systems that Estimate the Attenuation of Passive Hearing Protectors for Individual Users

## 1 Scope

This standard specifies methods of characterizing the performance of systems that estimate the real-ear attenuation provided by hearing protection devices (HPDs) on individual wearers. These systems are designated by this standard as field attenuation estimation systems (FAESs). The quality of the estimates is assessed by comparison of FAES data to those from the standard laboratory real-ear attenuation at threshold (REAT) procedure (ANSI/ASA S12.6) for the same fit of the device on an identical group of test subjects. This standard defines ways to quantify and state uncertainty (see JCGM 100:2008) for FAESs so that measurements can be compared among systems and to the standardized REAT procedure.

The criteria in this standard are intended to provide guidance to manufacturers of FAESs in the development of systems and the specification of their performance in a prescribed manner. A further goal is to assure that FAESs provide data that are both useful for estimates of the attenuation obtained by individual wearers and are comparable between systems. This standard does not apply to systems that measure a physical quantity that cannot be linked to an attenuation value.

This standard also specifies the procedures for computation of a personal attenuation rating (PAR) that provides a simple easy-to-apply single number that may be used together with A-weighted sound level measurements for hearing protector assignment.

FAES-derived data do not replace the attenuation data from ANSI/ASA S12.6 or the insertion-loss data from ANSI/ASA S12.42, nor are such data suitable for hearing-protector labeling purposes. FAESs that comply with this standard are not suitable to estimate attenuation for electronic hearing protectors in their active mode, nor for passive amplitude-sensitive HPDs for sound pressure levels above the point at which their level-dependent characteristics become effective. However, PARs may be used to estimate attenuation for passive and non-level-dependent HPDs for impulsive noises up to at least 170 dB peak sound pressure level.

## 2 Normative references

The following referenced documents are indispensable for the application of this standard. For dated references, only the edition cited applies. For undated references, the latest edition of the reference document (including any amendments) applies.

ANSI/ASA S1.1, *American National Standard Acoustical Terminology*.

ANSI/ASA S1.4/Part 1/IEC 61672-1, *American National Standard Electroacoustics – Sound Level Meters – Part 1: Specifications (a nationally adopted international standard)*.

ANSI/ASA S3.1, *American National Standard Maximum Permissible Ambient Noise Levels for Audiometric Test Rooms*.

ANSI/ASA S3.6, *American National Standard Specification for Audiometers*.