

OIML TC 3/SC 5 MEETING

Conformity assessment

Paris

27–29 June 2000

SAM CHAPPELL

Secretariat:..... United States of America + BIML

Chairman:..... Sam Chappell

Participation: ... Thirty-six delegates representing fifteen OIML Member States, one Corresponding Member, the OIML Development Council, one liaison organization and the BIML (see below)

P-members: Austria, Belgium, Brazil, P.R. of China, Finland, France, Germany, Japan, Netherlands, Poland, Russia, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, USA

O-members:..... Yugoslavia

OIML Corresponding Member: ... Albania

Liaison institution:..... CECIP

OIML Development Council:..... Tunisia

Discussion topics reported on:

- 1 Means for establishing mutual confidence
- 2 Sixth Draft OIML document *Mutual Acceptance Agreement on OIML Pattern Evaluation (MAA)*
- 3 Reports on ongoing projects
- 4 Resolutions of the meeting

Objective: To discuss the sixth draft OIML document *Mutual Acceptance Agreement on OIML Pattern Evaluation* and to review the state of progress of the work of OIML TC 3/SC 5 *Conformity Assessment*

1 Discussion of the means for establishing mutual confidence

Two application documents were reviewed that address the subject *How to acquire confidence in organisms responsible for type approval and laboratories in charge of testing measuring instruments*:

Part 1 *Adaptation of ISO/IEC Guide 65 “General requirements for bodies operating product certification systems” to type approval activities*; and

Part 2 *Adaptation of ISO/IEC 17025 “General requirements for the competence of testing and calibration laboratories” to testing laboratory activities*.

A third application document addresses peer review: *OIML procedure for reviewing laboratories to enable the mutual acceptance of test results and OIML certificates*.

Drafts of these documents were distributed for comment by the Secretariat in April and are based on ISO/IEC Guides 65 and 68, ISO/IEC 17025 and on EA-2/02 in which the issuing authorities and testing laboratories could be assessed using equivalent principles for accreditation or peer review.

Although not discussed in detail, it was agreed that Messrs. Lagauterie (France) and Engler (Netherlands) would continue to develop the work on the application (interpretation) documents for assessing the competence of participants.

The discussions began by addressing the means by which a declaration of mutual confidence might be achieved under the OIML document *Mutual Acceptance Agreement on OIML Pattern Evaluation (MAA)*. The 6th draft of this document proposed that such means could be either accreditation or peer review.

Participants were polled to determine the extent to which accreditation is used in their countries to assess the competence of legal metrology activities and the value of accreditation. Six of the member states present indicated that accredited laboratories were employed. Nevertheless, it became evident that the value of any accreditation depends on the basis of its assessment. For example, assessment of testing laboratories might be carried out, in some cases, by a third party and in other cases by a governmental body. The assessment team for some accreditations might include legal metrology experts whereas others might not. Often the assessment does not include an expert for testing the specific category of measuring instrument being addressed. Some existing accreditations, therefore, might require additional assessments.

It appeared from the comments received in writing and from the discussions at this (and previous) meetings that most collaborators in the work preferred

accreditation to peer review as a means of establishing mutual confidence. Two member states disagreed and both suggested that “self declaration” followed by peer review, if necessary, should be sufficient.

It was also pointed out that self declaration was a means adopted in the MRA for the Meter Convention. In particular, it was observed that this MRA would not be practical as a model for the MAA because different infrastructures support that MRA than those proposed for MAA. For example, participants in the MRA under the Meter Convention must participate in key comparisons of basic and derived standards for realization of SI units of measurement. Regional Metrology Organizations (RMO’s) along with the Joint Committee of Regional Bodies (JCRB) implement rules to judge equivalence and establish a mechanism for carrying out peer review when warranted.

Intercomparisons of type testing have been considered as a means for establishing mutual confidence; however, because of the associated time, effort and costs, they were not considered to be practical, necessary, or without ambiguity.

The Chair, on behalf of the US Delegation, then introduced a proposed procedure aimed at simplifying such means and, hence, minimizing the cost and effort of establishing mutual confidence. Instead of a complete accreditation or peer review, the proposal was for a procedure involving self assessment for determining the competence of participants. This self assessment would include completing “check lists” for the specific category of instruments to be covered by a *Declaration of Mutual Confidence*. The check lists would be developed to be consistent with the requirements for determining the competence of issuing authorities according to ISO/IEC Guide 65 and with those requirements for testing laboratories according to ISO/IEC 17025. These check lists and the required *Questionnaire on National Capabilities* would be completed and submitted by applicants for participation in a declaration of mutual confidence. These application documents would be peer reviewed by expert representatives of potential participants. An agreed upon follow-up assessment by experts may be carried out, if necessary and justifiable, to determine competence of an applicant in specific areas to supplement the documentation received. When compared with the other means considered, this procedure for establishing mutual confidence has the advantage and potential of concentrating resources on verifying competence or identifying and making the changes and adjustments necessary to achieve the required competence within reasonable time and cost limits. This procedure also incorporates the appropriate international principles of accreditation and peer review. Participants agreed that the Secretariat should revise the 6th draft MAA to reflect this approach.

2 Review of the 6th draft OIML document on the MAA

The sixth draft OIML document *Mutual Acceptance Agreement on OIML Pattern Evaluation (MAA)* was reviewed clause by clause. Several editorial recommendations were made that were noted to be included in the 7th draft by the Secretariat including the terms defined under the terminology clause. In particular, the term “arrangement” was recommended to replace “agreement” to be consistent with the terms used by the Meter Convention’s Mutual Recognition Arrangement (MRA) for establishing equivalence of national physical measurement standards. Also the reference to test reports “being accompanied by certificates” will be changed to avoid implying that certificates of conformance would be accepted by participants in a *Declaration of Mutual Confidence*.

Additional points of clarification were agreed upon including clarifying that the supporting role of the BIML should be administrative and not technical and that the participants themselves or the CIML must resolve disputes. As with the OIML Certificate System, under the agreement English or French (or both) would be the language utilized in correspondence and test reports. Generally, the costs associated with establishing mutual confidence shall be borne by the participant receiving a benefit. The Secretariat will incorporate these and other changes in a 7th draft OIML document “MAA” that will be distributed to participating members for review and vote.

3 Reports on ongoing projects

Finally, brief reports were provided about other projects being developed within OIML TC 3/SC 5:

- S. Chappell reported on the status of the task group, having representatives of France, Germany and the USA, on the *Expression of measurement uncertainty as applied to legal metrology activities*. A draft OIML document on this subject is planned for distribution to collaborating members for review and comment by September 2000. A meeting of the task group was to be held at the BIML on June 30.
- A. Szilvássy (BIML) provided a report on the status of the comments received from collaborators on the draft revision of the publication on the *OIML Certificate System for Measuring Instruments* which had been distributed with a deadline for response of June 30.

- A. Szilvássy also gave a preliminary report on the responses to a questionnaire distributed to over 170 manufacturers that have applied for and received OIML certificates for the instruments currently covered by the OIML Certificate System. The responses were, on the whole, positive and encouraging with regard to the System achieving its anticipated goals in operation and effectiveness.

4 Resolutions of the meeting

- 1 The Secretariat will prepare minutes of the meeting and distribute them to collaborators within a month. Any additional comments on the 6th draft OIML document *Mutual Acceptance Arrangement on OIML Type Evaluation* (MAA) should be submitted in writing by August 31, 2000.
- 2 The Secretariat will request suggestions and input from collaborators of OIML TC 3/SC 5 to be used as a basis for presenting information about the MAA at the Round Table discussion on *Mutual Recognition* at the 11th International Conference on Legal Metrology to be held in London in October 2000.
- 3 The Secretariat will prepare a 7th draft OIML document on the MAA according to the comments presented at the meeting and those received in writing by August 31, 2000 and then distribute the draft MAA by mid October 2000 to collaborating members of OIML TC 3/SC 5 for comment and vote.
- 4 The Secretariat will draft "check lists" for self assessing the competence of issuing authorities and testing laboratories of potential participants in a *Declaration of Mutual Confidence* of an MAA according to and compatible with ISO/IEC Guide 65 and ISO/IEC 17025, respectively by November 30, 2000.
- 5 Comments will be accepted by the Secretariat up to August 31, 2000 on the application (interpretation) documents on accreditation and peer review for assessing the competence of potential participants in a *Declaration of Mutual Confidence*. In consideration of the comments received and the discussions at the meeting, the primary authors will prepare first committee drafts on the subjects for distribution by the Secretariat to collaborators for comment in November 2000.
- 6 The Secretariat will consider calling a meeting within the year to discuss the requirements and procedures for establishing and implementing a Declaration of Mutual Confidence based on a category of instruments already covered by the OIML Certificate System. ■

OIML TC 9/SC 2 WG MEETING

Automatic catchweighing instruments: Revision R 51

Teddington, 7–9 June 2000

KEN HANSELL, NWML (TC 9/SC 2 SECRETARIAT)

Attendance: 15 delegates representing Belgium, People's Republic of China, Denmark, France, Germany, Netherlands, Sweden, United Kingdom, BIML and CECIP

Chairman: Martin Birdseye, NWML (International Director)

Main discussion points:

- the practicality and need for a zero-setting test;
- the need to consider two higher accuracy classes;
- the difficulties associated with static weighing (zero and EMC tests);
- the difficulties associated with multiple weighings (rounding errors); and
- the possibility of introducing a new class.

The decision to hold this meeting was made following an extensive consultation, commencing in December 1999. This indicated a range of technical issues which, when resolved, would enhance the effectiveness of OIML R 51.

Opening the meeting, Ian Dunmill (BIML) gave an update on the progress made by the BIML on OIML Normative Documents for the purposes of the EC Measuring Instruments Directive.

Using an LCD projector, the WG actively modified the existing Recommendation on screen, a technique that allowed the group to focus on agreeing the actual wording to be used rather than merely agreeing basic principles. This resulted in consensus that:

- zero setting tests are ineffective on these instruments and should be replaced by a functionality test;

- two higher classes for class X instruments should be introduced and better alignment be made to the classes used in R 76; and
- confirmation that class Y machines used for multiple weighings should be subjected to the requirements of R 51 but with the possibility of dual approval with R 107.

There was also an understanding on the issues of static weighing and associated testing, and rounding error. The debate on the latter focused on the practical question of how to allow for rounding error on instruments without the facility to display to a high resolution in test mode. This issue was clearly understood, although there was no clear agreement. The secretariat was assigned the task of investigating various proposals, producing a 1 CD revision and reporting back to the working group. ■