

[17:03] <MoDo> [04So ... what's the topic?
[17:04] <Jung_Kee> wait, academic 15 min
[17:04] <MoDo> [04Perhaps Jung_Kee should choose?
[17:04] <Doos> clarity grading?
[17:04] <Jung_Kee> wasn't it clarity?
[17:04] <MoDo> [04I believe it was
[17:04] <Jung_Kee> thx anyway :)
[17:04] <Jung_Kee> well, how do you define clarity?
[17:05] <Jung_Kee> among this lot I mean?
[17:05] Anon0366 (~Anon0366@172.210.232.170) joined #go.
[17:05] <MoDo> [04Hi Anon
[17:05] <Jung_Kee> Welcome, Anon!
[17:05] <Anon0366> am I anon?
[17:05] <Anon0366> lol
[17:05] <Doos> yes Anon0366
[17:05] <Jung_Kee> obviously! :D
[17:05] <Jung_Kee> WHO are you, Anon?
[17:06] <Anon0366> It's Frank
[17:06] <Anon0366> AOL is playing up now
[17:06] <MoDo> [04LOL
[17:06] <Jung_Kee> lol
[17:06] <Doos> oh dear
[17:07] <Anon0366> I cant change my name back Doos unless you kick Frank...could you please :)
[17:07] <Doos> clarity grading was a requested topic, so before we start .. are there any questions
[17:07] <Doos> sure, holdon
[17:07] <Jung_Kee> Well, about a thousand! =P
[17:07] Frank (~Frank@172.204.207.85) left irc: Ping Timeout
[17:07] <Jung_Kee> First: Cibjo or GIA grading? Another?
[17:08] <Anon0366> I'm ok with the normal grading procedure but would like to know about the different classes of stones
[17:08] <Anon0366> for example emeralds are graded differently
[17:08] Nick change: Anon0366 -> Frank
[17:08] Frank (~Anon0366@172.210.232.170) left irc: Killed (Doos (bye[]))
[17:08] <Jung_Kee> as are phenomenal stones
[17:08] <Doos> oops
[17:08] Frank (~Frank@172.210.232.170) joined #go.
[17:08] <Frank> Hi again
[17:08] <MoDo> [04wb again Frank
[17:08] <Doos> lol, I was in the process of removing Frank
[17:09] <Jung_Kee> and you loved it, didn't you, doos?
[17:09] <Doos> sst
[17:09] <Frank> I got a message saying doos had kicked Frank when I changed my username...lol
[17:09] <Doos> GIA grading system Jung_Kee
[17:09] <Frank> so lets hope the pute settles down now
[17:09] <Jung_Kee> Why GIA?
[17:10] <Frank> yes...maybe Modo can send me her notes :)
[17:10] <Doos> why not
[17:10] <Jung_Kee> Good point@
[17:10] <MoDo> [04When I get them back from CA I can!
[17:10] <Frank> The gem-A course doesn't really cover all of this in the same way Jung_Kee
[17:10] <Jung_Kee> Have you taken the FGA, MoDo?

[17:10] <Doos> well Frank, with coloured stones there are 3 types of classifications

[17:10] <Frank> ok

[17:10] <MoDo> ☐04No ... still working on the last of GIA

[17:11] <Jung_Kee> Yeah, I've understood that, that was why I asked about why GIA, better?

[17:11] <Frank> GIA covers different things...things to explain to customers

[17:11] <Doos> according to typical appearance, stone fall in either the type I, type II or type III category

[17:12] <Frank> Gem-A doesn't worry about things like future customers

[17:12] <Jung_Kee> They don't have any! :D

[17:12] <Jung_Kee> Well, soprry Doos, plz continue

[17:12] <Doos> stones that occur naturally which are usually not included fall in the type I classification

[17:13] <Frank> this is varieties...not species?

[17:13] <Doos> stones that are usually moderatly included are type II

[17:13] <Doos> those who usually have many inclusions are type III

[17:13] <Doos> can be both Frank

[17:13] <Frank> ok

[17:13] <Doos> for instance corundum is a type II (all colours)

[17:14] <Doos> but beryl is different

[17:14] <Doos> aquamarine is type I and emerald is type III

[17:15] <Frank> are there lists of what goes where?

[17:15] <Jung_Kee> Why is that, due to different origin or usual appearance?

[17:15] <Doos> because aquamarine usually has few inclusions, while emerald almost always is full of them

[17:15] <Jung_Kee> OK

[17:15] <Doos> I have a small list, but not a complete one

[17:15] <Jung_Kee> Can one find one somewhere?

[17:15] <Frank> Modo...did the GIA give you a list?

[17:16] <MoDo> ☐04GIA has it in the Colored Stones course

[17:16] <Frank> is it extensive?

[17:16] <MoDo> ☐04I believe it covers the typical gems

[17:16] <Doos> I will give a small list here:

[17:16] <MoDo> ☐04I'll have to check when I get back to Tucson next month

[17:17] <Frank> ok Doos...Thanks Modo

[17:17] <Doos> type I: amethyst, aquamarine, blue topaz, citrine, kunzite, tanzanite, heliodor, chrysoberyl (yellow)

[17:18] Crystal (~Crystal@216.98.174.107) joined #go.

[17:18] <Jung_Kee> Welcome Crystal!

[17:18] <MoDo> ☐04Hi Crystal

[17:18] <Doos> type 2: alexandrite, andalusite, iolite, peridot, rhodolite, corundum, spinel, tourmaline, tsavorite

[17:18] <Frank> Hi Crystal

[17:19] <Doos> type 3: emerald, red beryl, rubellite

[17:19] <Doos> small list, but that are the most common ones

[17:19] <Doos> hi Crystal

[17:19] <Frank> does each type have different rules for grading?

[17:20] <Doos> yes

[17:20] <Jung_Kee> According to who? GIA again?

[17:20] <Doos> the grading is much more forgiving for type II and type III stones

[17:20] <Doos> yes this is the GIA system

[17:21] <Doos> this really is quite different than grading diamonds

[17:21] <Jung_Kee> OK, is there a percentage of increased acceptance?

[17:21] <Doos> none that I know of
[17:21] <Jung_Kee> OK, just something you've to learn how to differentiate for each class then?
[17:21] <Doos> for instance to be top quality aquamarine .. you should almost be flawless under the 10x loupe
[17:22] <Jung_Kee> Yes
[17:22] <Doos> but an emerald can be top quality when it is slightly included under 10x magnification
[17:22] <Doos> so the system is forgiven for those stones with a natural handicap
[17:23] <Doos> much like the handicaps in golf
[17:23] <Frank> do they use the VVS-I3 designations
[17:23] <Doos> yes, that still applies
[17:24] <Jung_Kee> at the same criterias?
[17:24] <Doos> but you will hardly ever see or hear about a vvs1 emerald
[17:24] <Jung_Kee> ok
[17:24] Crystal (~Crystal@216.98.174.107) left irc: Ping Timeout
[17:24] <Doos> yes almost the same criteria as for diamonds
[17:24] <Jung_Kee> almost?
[17:26] <Doos> yes, most coloured stones are usually graded with the naked eye, unless you are trying to use reference charts etc
[17:26] <Doos> diamonds are always strictly graded
[17:27] <Doos> when you work with charts as The Guide, you will need to be very strict
[17:27] <Jung_Kee> Okay, is that because coloured stones usually have eye visible inclusions?
[17:27] <Doos> otherwise the charts don't work, but usually it is not as strict as the plotting in diamond
[17:27] <Jung_Kee> ok
[17:27] <Frank> So an emerald with a vs1 grading would be equal to a vvs1 aqua?
[17:27] <Doos> that and coloured stones have colour, which masks some of the inclusions
[17:28] <Doos> yes Frank, but still higher in price of course (if some other criteria are met)
[17:28] <Frank> 'm trying to get my head rounf this
[17:28] <Jung_Kee> equal in valuation you mean, or in definite grading?
[17:28] <Jung_Kee> me too
[17:29] <Doos> there is no definate clarity grading with coloured stones .. it is all relative
[17:29] <Doos> the key here is quality grading
[17:30] <Frank> quality including cut, colour etc etc
[17:31] <Doos> most emeralds are heavily included and of low commercial value, so if you find an emerald that is SI .. it is a pretty to great quality stone
[17:31] <Doos> yes Frank
[17:31] <Jung_Kee> Yes Doos
[17:31] <Doos> so the SI stone is "relatively" great (because usually they are heavily included and you cant get better than that)
[17:32] <Doos> however if it was an SI aquamarine, it would be a good stone instead of top quality
[17:33] <Doos> anyone have the The Guide reference?
[17:33] <MoDo> [04In Tucson :-(
[17:33] <Jung_Kee> Not here
[17:34] <Frank> only the diamond part...til Modo renews her subscription :)
[17:34] <MoDo> [04I haven't forgotten, Frank! LOL
[17:34] <Doos> The Guide shows charts as 8-10, 6-8, 4-6 and 1-4 qualities

[17:35] <Doos> 8-10 being extra fine quality
[17:35] <Doos> 6-8 is fine quality
[17:35] <Doos> 4-6 is good quality
[17:35] <Frank> do the numbers relate roughly to the vvs-I3 system then?
[17:35] <Doos> and 1-4 is commercial quality
[17:35] <Doos> no
[17:35] <Doos> it depends on the stone at hand
[17:36] <Jung_Kee> What factors define the ranking?
[17:36] <Jung_Kee> Overall beauty? Origin? Cut and proportion exactness?
[17:36] <Doos> so an SI emerald will be in the 8-10 range, while an SI aquamarine will fall in the 4-6 range
[17:36] <Jung_Kee> ah ok
[17:37] <Doos> the factor is whether it is a type I, II or III stone
[17:37] <Doos> type I stones need to be almost flawless to be in the 8-10 range
[17:37] <Doos> Type II stones can be very slightly included
[17:38] <Doos> and type III stone may be slightly included
[17:39] <Doos> so an aquamarine needs to be almost free of inclusions under 10x (vvs)
[17:39] <Doos> alexandrite can be vs to still be in the 8-10 range
[17:39] <Doos> and emerald can be SI to be in the 8-10 range
[17:40] <Jung_Kee> Yes, is it only clarity which decides if the stone will fit into the 8-10 section? VVS1 aqua of very pale colour too?
[17:40] <Doos> all must be free of inclusions when viewed with the naked eye
[17:40] <Doos> no Jung_Kee, but that is to focus today .. the end value needs to be calculated with other factors, like colour
[17:41] <Jung_Kee> ok
[17:41] <Doos> so it can be an 8 in clarity and a 4 in colour .. the final will be a 6
[17:42] <Jung_Kee> ok, thx for the clarification :)
[17:42] <Doos> cutting plays a role aswell ofcourse
[17:42] <Doos> but not as much
[17:43] <Jung_Kee> Why not?
[17:43] <Frank> So the guide number is a sort of mean quality for all aspects of the stone?
[17:43] <Doos> The Guide does it somewhat differently, but too extensive to explain now
[17:44] <Jung_Kee> ok
[17:44] <Doos> yes but it is not as simple as my average between 8 and 4
[17:44] <Frank> and that's why they send the second book...to explain the first?
[17:44] <Doos> lol yes
[17:45] <Doos> you can't use The Guide without the manual
[17:45] <MoDo> ☺With colored stones, though, clarity is secondary to color, unlike diamonds
[17:46] <Frank> How have you found the guide MoDo?...helpful?...not really?...it's with your other books...none of the above ?
[17:46] <Doos> but is it clear now that the clarity grade in coloured stones is relative to what it can be .. and not a definite comparing?
[17:46] <Doos> yes MoDo, that is correct
[17:46] <MoDo> ☺Yes, Doos
[17:46] <Jung_Kee> Yes Doos
[17:47] <MoDo> ☺The Guide is helpful ... but, remember it's a price guide
[17:48] <Doos> without it I couldn't have done the chat today, so very helpful
[17:48] <Jung_Kee> That's to say, guide as in the Holy Bible?
[17:48] <MoDo> ☺Goodness no!

[17:48] <Frank> lol...I'll write to Richard and tell him how helpful he's been to yrt another chat
[17:48] <MoDo> ☐04lol
[17:48] <Doos> for coloured stones it is not the Bible, but the best on the market
[17:48] <Jung_Kee> WHO's Richard?
[17:49] <Frank> the guide is a price guide issued for diamonds and about 60 coloured stones
[17:49] <Jung_Kee> Okay, I'll have to check it tomorrow at the school then
[17:49] <Frank> Richard Druffus is the man behind the guide...he came and gave us a guest chat one day
[17:49] <Doos> Drucker
[17:49] <MoDo> ☐04Their Gem Market News has great infor
[17:50] <Frank> Drucker...sorry Doos
[17:50] <Jung_Kee> That's a mag?
[17:50] <MoDo> ☐04Yes, it comes out every other month
[17:50] <Doos> brb
[17:50] <Jung_Kee> OK, expensive?
[17:50] <Frank> about 300 dollars/year I think for europeans
[17:50] <MoDo> ☐04You get it with your subscription to The Guide, which is \$195US per year
[17:51] <Jung_Kee> OK, not that bad then
[17:51] <MoDo> ☐04The last two issues featured Vincent Pardieu's info on lead-glass filled rubies
[17:52] <Frank> did you have a question about the foundation course Jung_Kee
[17:52] <Jung_Kee> Nice, he's really one of the best, isn't he?
[17:52] <Doos> back
[17:52] <MoDo> ☐04Yes, he is
[18:09] <Frank> are we done with grading clarity or are there more questions?
[18:09] <MoDo> ☐04What's your hurry, Frank? Got a hot date? LOL
[18:09] <Doos> I'm fine if everyone understands it
[18:10] <Jung_Kee> Hm, well, I read RW:s book yesterday and came across the term "Crystal" any opinion on that?
[18:10] <Jung_Kee> lol what a face!
[18:10] <Doos> it is his invention, the fifth C
[18:10] <Frank> the 5 c's
[18:11] <Frank> no hot dates MODO just like to keep the gold together in the chats as it makes em easier to read...and for doos to edit
[18:11] <Doos> heh thanks .. still need to put up the old logs
[18:11] <Frank> it's been around for a while ...people used to talk about stones of good water
[18:12] <Doos> Jung_Kee, at the frontpage of this website .. there is a chat with RW .. he explained crystal
[18:12] <MoDo> ☐04Richard discussed that in the forum ... there should be a thread about it.
[18:12] <Frank> but RW just really deals in very nice top quality stones
[18:12] <Jung_Kee> Okay, I'll have to read that chat soon then
[18:12] <Jung_Kee> Yes, I've understood that too
[18:12] <Frank> back in five...going to say goodbye to the wretched visitors
[18:12] <Jung_Kee> lucky fella
[18:13] <MoDo> ☐04lol
[18:13] <Doos> it's not easy to understand at first, but it is how deep in the hart of the stone you can look while the view remains crisp
[18:13] <MoDo> ☐04Those stones that you feel you could "swim" in

[18:14] <Jung_Kee> Really? I thought it was applied to misty stones too? Well, must read that chat right after this has ended I think

[18:14] <Doos> yes, misty stones have poor crystal

[18:14] <MoDo> ☐04I think perhaps Jung_Kee is talking about Kashmir sapphire

[18:15] <Jung_Kee> Yes, and blue agate for example

[18:15] <Doos> they have poor crystal aswell .. but that adds to the value in that rare case

[18:15] <Jung_Kee> okay

[18:15] <Doos> in the case of silk that is

[18:16] <Doos> hessonite garnet is a nice example of a gem that usually has poor crystal

[18:17] <MoDo> ☐04Yes, but is valued nonetheless

[18:18] <Jung_Kee> yes, like this?

http://www.fotothing.com/photos/ab0/ab0e86455361a2cb636c3e8df7e52de0_b68.jpg

[18:18] <Doos> very poor indeed

[18:19] <MoDo> ☐04Rats! I can't get it to show!

[18:19] <Doos> open a new window

[18:19] <Jung_Kee> it's pretty big I fear

[18:20] <Jung_Kee> any possibility to post up photos here?

[18:20] <Doos> nice shot though .. yours?

[18:20] <Doos> no

[18:21] <Jung_Kee> yes, every shot at that place are mine

[18:21] <Doos> very good

[18:21] <Jung_Kee> Heavens no! It's beautiful, but not very good! Took it through a very dusty, ancient small stereoscope

[18:23] <MoDo> ☐04All right! I finally figured it out! :-)