ECONWELD PROJECT: TESTING FUME CAPTURE EFFICIENCY OF GMAW ASPIRING TORCH

Mario Marconi, Plasma Team Snc (Italy)
Albano Bravaccini, Aspirmig Srl (Italy)
Section 1 – Econweld Project: the Aspiring Torch
Section 2 – Testing Capture Efficiency: Welding Trials
Section 3 – Fume Capture Efficiency: Analysis of the Results
Conclusions
SECTION 1
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ECONWELD Project - Testing Fume Capture Efficiency of GMAW Aspiring Torch – Marconi M., Bravaccini A. (Italy)
The Project in a Nutshell

- **Reduction of welding costs** by:
  - tailored combinations of welding data;
  - different mixtures of shielding gases;
  - new developed filler materials;
  - increasing welding speed;
  - applying alternative welding techniques;
  - increasing automation in welding.

- **Reduction of sick leave among welders** by:
  - improving both the welding tool and welder’s ergonomics;
  - reducing welding fumes at the source and in the workplace.

- **Reduction of exposure to welding fumes**.

  - To assure welder’s comfort and adhere to workplace safety and environmental regulations, the SME Partner Aspirmig designed, built and tested an integral fume extraction torch with improved and innovative concept, supported by a CFD model.
  - The new device incorporates fume capture capability, reducing the need for separate local exhaust equipments (LEV) or the use of personal respirators (RPE) by welders.

Workers are more productive (no need to transport and reposition LEV hoods). In addition, the Econweld torch improves the workplace environment (high capture efficiency) and can be used for extended periods of time owing to its lightweight (ergonomics).
The Project: Priority Needs & Tasks

1. Absence of a harmful environment
2. Adequate training of the operators
3. Absence of operative defects
4. Absence of metallurgical defects
5. Welding productivity (kg/hr)
6. Change to automation/robotization
7. Weld cost (equipments/consumables)
8. Friendly use of welding equipments
9. Weight of welding torch (ergonomics)

WP1: Welding costs
WP2: Welding fumes
WP3: Sick leave welders
WP4: Virtual Welding
WP5: Dissemination/validation
WP6: Training/implementation
ECONWELD Aspiring Torch - Definitions

FUME ASPIRING TORCH Definitions - Characteristics

- Suction Field Velocity
- Capture Range Flow
- Exhaust Device Tool
- Definitions
- Exhaust Field
- Shielding gas $Q(sh)$
- Exhaust flow $Q(ex)$
- Nozzle OD
- INDIRECT capture (6-8 cm)
- DIRECT capture (2-3 cm)
- Exhaust port
- Radial
- Axial
- Direct
- Indirect
- Inverse
- Integral
- Add-on

ECONWELD / ASPIRMIG TORCH
Indirect Integral Extraction Torch
Air/Water Cooled - Radial Exhaust
Aspiring Torch – Fume Collector

The ECONWELD Aspiring torch uses High Vacuum – Low Volume technology, i.e. High Velocity and Low air Volumes to extract the fumes.

- Airflow = 80 - 120 cu.m/hr
- Air velocity = 40-50 m/s at suction openings
- Pressure differential = 15 kPa

- The suction flow is connected through a flexible conduit to the extraction system (exhaust unit or aspirator), able to supply the required extraction flow rate, at a constant pressure.
- The exhaust unit is provided with start-stop devices enslaved to the arc ignition and stop, thus assuring the extraction flow only when required.
- The protection of cable and pipes connecting the torch handle to the aspirator is guaranteed by antiwear materials.
- Cooling of the conduit and fumes include mixing sufficient ambient air with the welding fumes. This ambient air, in combination with the positioning of the fumes extracting orifices far away from the area of the weld allows the temperature of the handle to be maintained within acceptable limits.
A CFD modelling of the Aspiring Torch was performed, using the program Fluent, which is able to assess the dynamic characteristics of the motion of many fluids.

A set of fundamental operational parameters (pressure, velocity, flow of the gas, etc.) was properly assumed.

The results of such a model (supplied by an expert Partner) showed that the hydraulic behaviour of the suction openings works in a satisfactory manner, capturing the bulk of fumes produced in welding.

DATA USED FOR CFD MODELLING

Shielding gas: Ar 100% - Gas flow: 12 l/min – Exhaust static pressure: 9.5 kPa - Exhaust flow rate: 28 l/s=100.8 cu.m/hr - Radiative model: Rosseland
The CFD Model in the Figure represents the concentrations of the shielding gas in the space around the tip of the torch.

The concentration of shielding gas (Ar) is expressed as a mass fraction (non-dimensional) of Ar, i.e. the ratio between the argon mass flow and the total mass (Ar and air flow).

In the Figure only a fraction (up to 5%) of the argon mass is shown, in order to get a higher resolution of the field, showing in greater detail the distribution of shielding gas around the aspiration zone (skirt inlet).
Indirect Aspiring Torch: Working Principle
SECTION 2

TESTING CAPTURE EFFICIENCY: WELDING TRIALS
## Planning of Welding Trial Execution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Material</th>
<th>Filler metal</th>
<th>Shielding gas</th>
<th>Current waveform</th>
<th>Welding torch</th>
<th>Executor</th>
<th>Test condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-Mn Steel S 355 JR (Fe510)</td>
<td>Normal wire</td>
<td>82% Ar-18% CO₂</td>
<td>Without pulsing</td>
<td>With aspiration (by Aspirmig)</td>
<td>IIS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green wire</td>
<td>82% Ar-18% CO₂</td>
<td>Without pulsing</td>
<td>Normal type (without aspiration)</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normal wire</td>
<td>Ternary mixture</td>
<td>Pulsed</td>
<td>Normal type (without aspiration)</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green wire</td>
<td>Ternary mixture</td>
<td>Without pulsing</td>
<td>Normal type (without aspiration)</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stainless Steel AISI 316L</td>
<td>Normal wire</td>
<td>Ternary mixture</td>
<td>Without pulsing</td>
<td>Normal type (without aspiration)</td>
<td>IST</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normal wire</td>
<td>Ternary mixture</td>
<td>Pulsed</td>
<td>Normal type (without aspiration)</td>
<td>IST</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normal wire</td>
<td>99% Ar-1% O₂</td>
<td>Pulsed</td>
<td>Normal type (without aspiration)</td>
<td>IIS</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normal wire</td>
<td>97,5% Ar-2,5% CO₂</td>
<td>Pulsed</td>
<td>With aspiration (by Aspirmig)</td>
<td>IST</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normal wire</td>
<td>97,5% Ar-2,5% CO₂</td>
<td>Pulsed</td>
<td>With aspiration (by Aspirmig)</td>
<td>IIS</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminium Alloy EN AW 5354</td>
<td>Normal wire</td>
<td>99,99% Ar</td>
<td>Pulsed</td>
<td>Normal type (without aspiration)</td>
<td>IIS</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normal wire</td>
<td>99,99% Ar</td>
<td>Without pulsing</td>
<td>With aspiration (by Aspirmig)</td>
<td>IIS</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminium Alloy EN AW 6061</td>
<td>Normal wire</td>
<td>99,99% Ar</td>
<td>Pulsed</td>
<td>Normal type (without aspiration)</td>
<td>IIS</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normal wire</td>
<td>99,99% Ar</td>
<td>Without pulsing</td>
<td>With aspiration (by Aspirmig)</td>
<td>IIS</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Tests divided among IIS-IS-IST;
- Innovative methods / tools to reduce fume emissions at source i.e. “green wires”, ternary gas mixtures, pulsed waveforms (CDP);
- N. 5 trials on aspiring torch (capture efficiency) performed by IIS;
- N. 13 different test conditions for total 105 welding trials.
Fume Box for Welding Trial Execution

Modified Fume Box at Italian Institute of Welding

Internal CFD Optimisation - Improved View Accessibility
The total particulate fume emitted is collected on filters by isokinetic sampling in the fume box, first powering on the extraction system and then switching off the aspirator. This method is relatively simple and widely used.

- **Isokinetic sampling**
- **Filter with NON captured fumes**
- **Exhaust hood for NON captured fumes**
- **To the aspirator**

**CAPTURE EFFICIENCY**

Method used at IIS

**Total particulate fume**

Clean Filter (left) – The same filter after sampling fumes (right).
The fume emissions produced during welding had been tested by different partners (IIS, IST and IS) within fume boxes, in accordance with the European Standards → EN ISO 15011-1/2.
**Fume Emission Testing – Operative Steps**

1. Performing Manual GMA Welding (PA position) with / without Aspiring Torch
2. Checking Welding Time = 60 s
3. Each Filter removed from Fume Box
4. Filter weighed before and after test, fume emission rate calculated, measurements in mg/s (then converted to mg/min)
Factors Affecting the Fume Emission Rate

THE MAIN FACTORS INFLUENCING THE FER

- Type of shielding gas if applicable to the process
- Welding current / Welding voltage
- Arc length / Arc Polarity
- Current density
- Humidity
- Base material
- Electrode angle / Type / Formulation
- Torch (conventional or Aspiring Torch)

With Aspiring Torch the Fume Emissions are greatly reduced (well below 30 mg/min).
SECTION 3

FUME CAPTURE EFFICIENCY: ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS
## FER (mg/min) – Test Results of Normal vs. Aspiring Torch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Material</th>
<th>Wire type</th>
<th>Shielding gas type</th>
<th>Test N.</th>
<th>FER, mg/min</th>
<th>Torch efficiency, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WITHOUT aspiration</td>
<td>WITH aspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild Steel (C-Mn)</td>
<td>Solid wire EN 440G2Si Dia=1.2 mm</td>
<td>82%Ar+18% CO₂</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>180,00</td>
<td>9,40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S355 JR (Fe510)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>294,00</td>
<td>19,40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>486,00</td>
<td>18,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stainless Steel</td>
<td>Solid wire EN 10072 G19 12 3 (AISI 316L) Dia=1.2 mm</td>
<td>98%Ar+2% O₂</td>
<td>7/1</td>
<td>69,60</td>
<td>16,40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AISI 316L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/2</td>
<td>102,60</td>
<td>27,40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/3</td>
<td>238,60</td>
<td>16,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminium Alloy</td>
<td>Solid wire EN 18237 S Al 5356 Dia=1.2 mm</td>
<td>97.5%Ar+2.5% O₂</td>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>70,80</td>
<td>16,60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN AW 5354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/2</td>
<td>123,60</td>
<td>17,40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/3</td>
<td>183,00</td>
<td>22,40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminium Alloy</td>
<td>Solid wire EN 18237 S Al 5356 Dia=1.2 mm</td>
<td>99.99%Ar</td>
<td>11/1</td>
<td>699,60</td>
<td>21,40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN AW 6061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/2</td>
<td>1.194,00</td>
<td>93,40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13/1</td>
<td>839,40</td>
<td>49,40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13/2</td>
<td>1.479,00</td>
<td>57,60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Welding Parameters - Tests using Normal / Aspiring Torch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Sub test</th>
<th>φ (wire), mm</th>
<th>Current, A</th>
<th>Voltage, V</th>
<th>Wire speed, cm/min</th>
<th>Shield gas, l/min</th>
<th>Weld Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. 1-7-9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. 11-13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Bead on plate (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ECONWELD - FER of Nomal GMAW torch vs. Aspiring Torch

Comparison Graph of Normal vs. Aspiring Torch

Test

1/1 1/2 1/3 7/1 7/2 7/3 9/1 9/2 9/3 11/1 11/2 13/1 13/2

Fume Emission Rate [mg/min]

C-Mn Steel SS AISI 316 L Al Alloy

I=150 A I=220 A I=300 A I=150 A I=220 A I=300 A I=140 A I=240 A I=140 A I=240 A

180,0 294,0 486,0 69,6 102,6 238,6 70,8 123,6 183,0 699,6 1,194,0 839,4 1,479,0

9,4 19,4 18,1 16,4 27,4 16,2 16,6 17,4 22,4 21,4 93,4 49,4 57,6

FER - Comparison Graph of Normal vs. Aspiring Torch
## Test Results of Normal vs. Aspiring Torch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Material</th>
<th>Wire type</th>
<th>Shielding gas type</th>
<th>Test N.</th>
<th>FGR, mg/kg WITHOUT aspiration</th>
<th>FGR, mg/kg WITH aspiration</th>
<th>Torch efficiency, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mild Steel (C-Mn) S355 JR (Fe510)</strong></td>
<td>Solid wire EN 440 G2Si Dia=1.2 mm</td>
<td>82%Ar+18%CO₂</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>5.031.00</td>
<td>262.73</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>5.056.80</td>
<td>333.68</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>4.971.70</td>
<td>185.16</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stainless Steel AISI 316L</strong></td>
<td>Solid wire EN 10072 G19 12 3 (AISI 316L) Dia=1.2 mm</td>
<td>98%Ar+2%O₂</td>
<td>7/1</td>
<td>992.24</td>
<td>240.48</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/2</td>
<td>987.32</td>
<td>281.25</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/3</td>
<td>1.732.87</td>
<td>116.56</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97.5%Ar+2.5%O₂</td>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>1.009.35</td>
<td>243.40</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/2</td>
<td>1.189.41</td>
<td>178.60</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/3</td>
<td>1.329.07</td>
<td>161.20</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aluminium Alloy EN AW 5354</strong></td>
<td>Solid wire EN 18237 S Al 5356 (AISI 316L) Dia=1.2 mm</td>
<td>99.99%Ar</td>
<td>11/1</td>
<td>28.257.01</td>
<td>3.546.10</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/2</td>
<td>25.416.36</td>
<td>2.081.97</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aluminium Alloy EN AW 6061</strong></td>
<td>Solid wire EN 18237 S Al 5356 (AISI 316L) Dia=1.2 mm</td>
<td>99.99%Ar</td>
<td>13/1</td>
<td>38.278.44</td>
<td>1.838.17</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13/2</td>
<td>44.634.41</td>
<td>1.283.95</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Welding Parameters - Tests using Normal / Aspiring Torch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Sub test</th>
<th>φ (wire), mm</th>
<th>Current, A</th>
<th>Voltage, V</th>
<th>Wire speed, cm/min</th>
<th>Shield gas, l/min</th>
<th>Weld Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N. 1-7-9</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N. 11-13</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Bead on plate (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FGR - Comparison Graph of Normal vs. Aspiring Torch

ECONWELD - FGR [mg/kg] of Nomal GMAW torch vs. Aspiring Torch

C-Mn Steel

SS AISI 316 L

TESTS WITH ASPIRING TORCH

Fume Generation Rate [mg/kg]

- Test 1/1: 5.031
- Test 1/2: 5.057
- Test 1/3: 4.972
- Test 7/1: 992
- Test 7/2: 987
- Test 7/3: 1.733
- Test 9/1: 1.009
- Test 9/2: 1.189
- Test 9/3: 1.329
- Test 11/1: 28.257
- Test 11/2: 25.416
- Test 11/3: 38.278
- Test 13/1: 44.634
- Test 13/2: 39.782

- Test C-Mn Steel (I=150 A): 185
- Test C-Mn Steel (I=220 A): 240
- Test C-Mn Steel (I=300 A): 281

- Test SS AISI 316 L (I=150 A): 179
- Test SS AISI 316 L (I=220 A): 243
- Test SS AISI 316 L (I=300 A): 161

- Test Al Alloy (I=140 A): 3.546
- Test Al Alloy (I=240 A): 2.082
- Test Al Alloy (I=240 A): 1.838
- Test Al Alloy (I=240 A): 1.284

ECONWELD Project - Testing Fume Capture Efficiency of GMAW Aspiring Torch – Marconi M., Bravaccini A. (Italy)
Fume Capture Efficiency Graph of Aspiring Torch

ECONWELD - Capture Efficiency of Aspiring Torch produced by ASPIRMIG

FCE(min) → C-Mn Steel = 93%  
AISI 316 L = 73%  
Al Alloy = 92%

FCE(max) → C-Mn Steel= 96%  
AISI 316 L = 93%  
Al Alloy = 97%
Fume Emission Classes for Normal GMAW Torch

With Normal Torch medium (trials 7/1, 7/2, 9/1 on SS al low currents) and high emission rates (all C-Mn and Al trials) are obtained, with fume concentrations greatly exceeding the recommended PEL of 3 mg/m³.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission Classes</th>
<th>Emission rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Low emissions rates</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Medium emission rates</td>
<td>1 - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 High emission rates</td>
<td>2 - 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Very High emission rates</td>
<td>&gt; 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BGR 220 - Welding fumes

Test | Fume Emission Rate [mg/min]
--- | ---------------------------
1/1 | 180 (I=150 A) 294 (I=220 A) 486 (I=300 A)
1/2 | 70 (I=150 A) 103 (I=220 A) 239 (I=300 A)
1/3 | 74 (I=150 A) 124 (I=220 A) 183 (I=300 A)
7/1 | 700 (I=140 A) 1194 (I=240 A) 1479 (I=240 A)
7/2 | 839 (I=140 A)
7/3 | 60 mg/min
9/1 | 120 mg/min
9/2 | 1.500 mg/min
9/3 | 1.000 mg/min
11/1 | 1/1 1/2 1/3 7/1 7/2 7/3 9/1 9/2 9/3 11/1 11/2 13/1 13/2
11/2 | 1/2 1/3 7/1 7/2 7/3 9/1 9/2 9/3 11/1 11/2 13/1 13/2
13/1 | 1/1 1/2 1/3 7/1 7/2 7/3 9/1 9/2 9/3 11/1 11/2 13/1 13/2
13/2 | 1/1 1/2 1/3 7/1 7/2 7/3 9/1 9/2 9/3 11/1 11/2 13/1 13/2

ECONWELD Project - Testing Fume Capture Efficiency of GMAW Aspiring Torch – Marconi M., Bravaccini A. (Italy)
With Aspiring Torch low emission rates are achieved in all the trials (excluding Trial 11/2 on Al). Fume concentrations in the breathing zone are by experience in the range of 3 mg/m³ or well below for emission classes tested below the half (30 mg/m³) of the limit.
Results of Fume Emission Measurements

- General dust limit value (PEL) is the concentration specified for the respirable (lung penetrating) dust fraction, actually 3 mg/m$^3$.
- For low emission rates, concentrations of hazardous substances in the breathing zone of the welder are by experience in the range of 3 mg/m$^3$ or below.
- For processes with medium and high emission rates, exceeding the PEL, the general state of the art is to take ventilation measure (fume capture at the source of emissions). Moreover, additional measures are necessary for the protection of the welder (PPE).
- With Aspiring Torch low emission rates are achieved in all the trials (excluding an Al test). Many trials were below the half (30 mg/min) of the class limit, with fume concentrations in the breathing zone (around 1.5-1.8 mg/m$^3$) lesser than the PEL.
- The bulk of the fumes produced in the trials appeared to be captured by the aspiring torch, with consistent quality of the welding beads, visually checked.

The performance at Charpy V notch impact tests (specimens from C-Mn steel samples) revealed satisfactory results, higher than the minimum values required by the Standard EN 10025-3.
During an 8 hour shift, each welder performs at chief Italian Shipyard 40 m fillet welds and every 40 cm the operator must stop welding for hood repositioning. A time analysis shows:

- N of repositioning in 8-hrs shift: 4000 cm of welding: 40 cm each = 100 repositionings;
- Time required for each repositioning: about 30 s;
- Repositioning time in 8-hrs shift: (100 repositionings x 30 s) : 60 s = 50 min each shift;
- Welder efficiency increases of about (8 hrs x 60) : 50 min = 9,6 %.

Two samplings in personnel breathing zone performed at IVECO-FIAT by a Health Officer showed a fume concentration of:

- 1° welder → 2.36 mg/m³;
- 2° auxiliary → 1.63 mg/m³

- Reducing of shield gas flow rate: 25% thanks to the suction envelope which protects the fusion bath;
- Air consumption: 50% less when compared to a conventional mobile hood for fume capture at the source of emissions.
Introducing Ergonomics: Aspiring Torch - Articulated Arm


**By Nature of Injury**
Sprains account for more than 1/3 of the claims among welders. Some of those can be caused by hazardous WMSD exposures.

**By Body Part**
The back, neck and shoulder together with the arm and hand regions make up more than one half of the injuries among welders.
ECONWELD Project - Testing Fume Capture Efficiency of GMAW Aspiring Torch – Marconi M., Bravaccini A. (Italy)
MAIN CONCLUSIONS

Bead on plate weld. The torch is held overhand and almost at 15° angle, vertically above the weld. In this tested position the fume extraction nozzle is best suited to extract fumes. Capture efficiencies have been measured from 93% to 97% (excluding some trials on SS); for fillet welds the torch efficiency is in the same range, thanks to the indirect suction field capturing the fume plume spreading-out (wall jet effect).

Vertical up-down weld. Where components are in the vertical plane (with angle from 85° to 90°), the capture efficiency of indirect suction torches (from Health Safety Executive - UK tests) is around 90%.

Overhead weld. This position assures the best performance of the capture efficiency of indirect aspiring torch. Capture efficiencies is over 98% (fumes are totally captured by the aspiring torch).

The welding beads, visually checked, showed consistent quality. The performance at Charpy V notch impact tests (specimens from C-Mn steel samples) revealed satisfactory results, higher than the minimum values required by the Standard EN 10025-3.
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