

---

Eleventh International Conference  
of Legal Metrology

London (United Kingdom)

9–13 October 2000

## **MINUTES**

---



ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE  
DE MÉTROLOGIE LÉGALE

---

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION  
OF LEGAL METROLOGY

---

***OIML Secretariat:***

Bureau International de Métrologie Légale  
11, rue Turgot - 75009 Paris - France

Telephone: 33 (0)1 48 78 12 82 and 42 85 27 11  
Fax: 33 (0)1 42 82 17 27  
E-mail: [biml@oiml.org](mailto:biml@oiml.org)  
Internet: [www.oiml.org](http://www.oiml.org)

---

Eleventh International Conference  
of Legal Metrology

London (United Kingdom)

9–13 October 2000

## **MINUTES**

---



ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE  
DE MÉTROLOGIE LÉGALE

---

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION  
OF LEGAL METROLOGY

## CONTENTS

General information .....	4
Summons and invitations .....	5
Attendance .....	6
Agenda .....	12
<b>1 Organization of the meeting .....</b>	<b>15</b>
1.1 Opening of the Conference	
1.2 Roll-call - Verification of credentials - Quorum	
1.3 Voting procedures during Conference sessions	
1.4 Election of the President and Vice-Presidents of the Conference	
1.5 Adoption of the agenda	
1.6 Constitution of working commissions	
1.7 Establishment of the schedule	
1.8 Approval of the minutes of the Tenth Conference	
1.9 Report on activities by the President of the International Committee of Legal Metrology	
1.10 Miscellaneous information	
<b>2 Member States and Corresponding Members .....</b>	<b>23</b>
2.1 New Members - Expected accessions	
2.2 The situation of certain Members	
<b>3 Long-term Policy .....</b>	<b>27</b>
3.1 Report on actions carried out since the Tenth Conference	
3.2 Guidelines for the period 2001–2004	
<b>4 Liaisons with international and regional institutions .....</b>	<b>31</b>
4.1 Report on liaisons	
4.2 Addresses by Representatives of Institutions	
4.3 Discussions and conclusions	
<b>5 Work of OIML Technical Committees and Subcommittees .....</b>	<b>53</b>
5.1 Work undertaken - State of progress	
5.2 Implementation of Recommendations by OIML Members	
5.3 Formal sanction of Recommendations already approved by the Committee in 1997, 1998 and 1999	
5.4 Draft Recommendations directly presented for sanctioning by the Conference	

---

<b>6</b>	<b>OIML Certificate System for Measuring Instruments</b> .....	63
6.1	Report on the situation of the System	
6.2	Report on the setting up of a recognition agreement for OIML type evaluations	
6.3	Guidelines for future developments	
<b>7</b>	<b>Developing countries</b> .....	71
7.1	Report on activities for the period 1997–2000	
7.2	Guidelines for future activity	
<b>8</b>	<b>Administrative and financial matters</b> .....	75
8.1	Examination of the management of the budget from 1996 to 1999 and the estimates for 2000	
8.2	Bureau staff and retirement scheme	
8.3	Credits for the financial period 2001–2004 and Member State contributions for the same period	
<b>9</b>	<b>Other business</b> .....	83
<b>10</b>	<b>Closure</b> .....	87
10.1	Adoption of decisions and resolutions of the Conference	
10.2	Date and place of the next Conference	
	<b>Decisions and Resolutions</b> .....	91
	<b>Minutes of the Round Table on Mutual Recognition</b> .....	99

## GENERAL INFORMATION

### **Date and place of the Eleventh Conference**

In accordance with the provisions of Article X of the *Convention Establishing the International Organization of Legal Metrology*, the Conference shall meet at least every six years on the summons of the President of the International Committee of Legal Metrology.

In 1998, the Committee received an invitation from the United Kingdom to hold the Eleventh Conference in London in 2000.

Consequently, the President of the International Committee of Legal Metrology convoked the Eleventh Conference which was held from 9 to 13 October 2000 at the Queen Elizabeth II Conference Centre in London.

### **Organization of the Conference**

The Conference was organized by the National Weights and Measures Laboratory, Department of Trade and Industry of the United Kingdom, and the International Bureau of Legal Metrology.

### **Secretariat - Interpretation**

Secretariat services were provided by the National Weights and Measures Laboratory and the International Bureau of Legal Metrology.

Discussions were held in English, French and Russian with simultaneous interpretation.

### **Festivities outside Conference hours**

The Participants at the Conference were invited to attend a reception given by the UK Government, a concert and reception given by the OIML, and a technical visit to NPL and NWML organized for a limited number of participants. A sightseeing tour was also organized for accompanying persons.

## SUMMONS AND INVITATIONS

The President of the International Committee of Legal Metrology summoned the Member States of the Organization to the Conference, and invited Corresponding Members and certain International and Regional Institutions to attend; lists of those invited are given below.

### Member States

ALGERIA	GERMANY	PAKISTAN
AUSTRALIA	GREECE	POLAND
AUSTRIA	HUNGARY	PORTUGAL
BELARUS	INDIA	ROMANIA
BELGIUM	INDONESIA	RUSSIAN FEDERATION
BRAZIL	ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN	SAUDI ARABIA
BULGARIA	IRELAND	SLOVAKIA
CAMEROON	ISRAEL	SLOVENIA
CANADA	ITALY	SOUTH AFRICA
P. REP. OF CHINA	JAPAN	SPAIN
CROATIA	KAZAKHSTAN	SRI LANKA
CUBA	KENYA	SWEDEN
CYPRUS	DEM. P. REPUBLIC OF KOREA	SWITZERLAND
CZECH REPUBLIC	REP. OF KOREA	TANZANIA
DENMARK	MACEDONIA	TUNISIA
EGYPT	MONACO	UNITED KINGDOM
ETHIOPIA	MOROCCO	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FINLAND	NETHERLANDS	YUGOSLAVIA
FRANCE	NORWAY	ZAMBIA

### Corresponding Members

Albania	Iceland	Oman
Argentina	Jordan	Panama
Bahrain	Kuwait	Papua New Guinea
Bangladesh	Latvia	Paraguay
Barbados	Luxemburg	Peru
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Madagascar	Seychelles
Botswana	Malawi	Singapore
Burkina Faso	Malaysia	Syria
Colombia	Mauritius	Chinese Taipei
Costa Rica	Mexico	Thailand
Ecuador	Moldova	Trinidad and Tobago
Estonia	Mongolia	Turkey
Fiji	Mozambique	Ukraine
Ghana	Nepal	Uruguay
Guatemala	New Zealand	Vietnam
Hong Kong China		

### International and Regional Institutions

BIPM, FAO, IAEA, IAF, ICC, IEC, IFCC, ILAC, IMEKO, ISO, ITC, UNESCO, UNIDO, WHO, WTO

APLMF, ARSO, CEN, CENELEC, CECIP, CECOD, CIMET, COLAMEL, COOMET, EMLMF,  
EU Commission, IOLMF, SADCMEI, SEEC-QSM, SIM, UN-ECE, WELMEC

## Attendance

### *President of the Conference*

Dr. Foster, Director of Innovation Services, DTI, United Kingdom

### *Member State Delegations*

#### **ALGERIA**

N. Boudissa	CIML Member, Directeur, Office National de Métrologie Légale
Nadira Hamiham (Mrs.)	Office National de Métrologie Légale
Mohamed Bellebna	Office National de Métrologie Légale

#### **AUSTRALIA**

Judith Bennett (Mrs.)	Executive Director, National Standards Commission
John Birch	CIML Member, National Standards Commission

#### **AUSTRIA**

Reinhard Dittler	Federal Ministry of Economic Affairs
Arnold Leitner	CIML Member, Director of Metrology Services, Bundesamt für Eich- und Vermessungswesen

#### **BELARUS**

Mikalai Zhagora	Director, Minsk's Center for Standardization and Metrology, Belstandart
Lidzya Astafyeva (Mrs.)	Belstandart

#### **BELGIUM**

Romain Eggermont	CIML Member, Chef de la Division de Métrologie Légale, Service de la Métrologie
------------------	---

#### **BRAZIL**

Mariante Carvalho	President, INMETRO
Cesar Luis Leal Moreira da Silva	INMETRO

#### **BULGARIA**

Olga Manafova (Mrs.)	State Agency for Standardization and Metrology
Ani Todorova (Mrs.)	National Center for Metrology

#### **CAMEROON**

Oumar Liman	Directeur des Prix et de la Métrologie
Hans Ela Essi	CIML Member, Sous-Direction de la Métrologie

#### **CANADA**

Alan Johnston	CIML Member, President, Measurement Canada
Gilles Vinet	Measurement Canada

#### **PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA**

Wanmin Chen	CSBTS
Xiaokang Kong (Mrs.)	CSBTS
Jianping Han	CSBTS



**CROATIA**

Jakša Topić  
Antun Bencić

President, State Office for Standardization and Metrology  
State Office for Standardization and Metrology

**CUBA**

Martín Antunez Ramírez

CIML Member, Director of Metrology, National Bureau of Standards

**CYPRUS**

Georgios Tsiartzázis

CIML Member, Controller of Weights and Measures

**CZECH REPUBLIC**

Pavel Klenovský  
Alexander Šafařík-Pštroz

CIML Member, Director General, Czech Metrology Institute  
Czech Office for Standards, Metrology and Testing

**DENMARK**

Claudi Johansen

CIML Member, Assistant Head, Secretariat for Metrology

**FINLAND**

Tuomo Valkeapää  
Veli Viitala

CIML Member, Chief Engineer, TUKES  
Technology Department

**FRANCE**

Jean-François Magaña  
Gérard Lagauterie  
Serge Miraucourt

CIML Member, Sous-Directeur de la Métrologie  
Sous-Direction de la Métrologie  
LNE

**GERMANY**

Manfred Kochsiek  
Thomas Ernst  
Wolfhard Gögge  
Hartmut Apel

CIML First Vice-President, Vice-President, PTB  
Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology  
Eichdirektor Rheinland-Pfalz  
PTB

**GREECE**

Athanasios Dessis

CIML Member, Technical Officer, Metrology Department, Ministry of  
Development

**HUNGARY**

Péter Pákay  
Károly Schmalhofer

CIML Member, President, OMH  
OMH

**INDIA**

Abhay Thakur

First Secretary, High Commission of India, London

**INDONESIA**

Gunaryo  
Rasben Simanullang

CIML Member, Director, Direktorat Metrologi  
Direktorat Metrologi

**IRELAND**

Patrick Farragher

CIML Member, Director, Legal Metrology Service

**ISRAEL**

Timor Zarin  
Michael Harel

CIML Member, Director, Legal Metrology  
Legal Metrology Service

**ITALY**

Oswaldo Lombardi  
Giovanni Previti

Ufficio Centrale Metrico  
Ministero Tesoro

**JAPAN**

Hidetaka Imai  
Toru Kojima  
Hoshiu Sakurai

CIML Member, Director General, NRLM  
NRLM  
MITI

**KAZAKHSTAN**

Marat Rysbekov  
Zatbek Abdirassilov  
Alma Kasymova (Mrs.)

CIML Member, Chairman, KAZMEMST  
KAZMEMST  
KAZMEMST

**DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA**

Gwang-Ho Kim  
Chang-Jin Choe  
Chol-Jin Kim

CIML Member, Director of Metrology, Metrology and Quality Control  
Bureau  
Metrology and Quality Control Bureau  
Metrology and Quality Control Bureau

**REPUBLIC OF KOREA**

Chun Haeng Cho  
Hong Kim  
Myung Sik Kim

CIML Member, Director, Metrology Division, ATS  
Metrology Division, ATS  
CAS

**MACEDONIA**

Zoran Grkov  
Risto Josifovski

CIML Member, Assistant to the Minister, Bureau of Standardization and  
Metrology  
Bureau of Standardization and Metrology

**MONACO**

André Veglia

CIML Member, Responsable, Service des Risques et Nuisances, Direction de  
l'Environnement, de l'Urbanisme et de la Construction

**MOROCCO**

Ahmed Laamoumri

Service de Métrologie Légale

**NETHERLANDS**

Gerard Faber  
Gep Engler  
Anneke van Spronssen (Mrs.)

CIML President  
NMI  
Ministry of Economic Affairs

**NORWAY**

Helge Kildal

CIML Member, Director General, Metrology and Accreditation Service

**POLAND**

Krzysztof Mordziński  
Barbara Lisowska (Mrs.)

CIML Member, President, GUM  
GUM

**ROMANIA**

Fănel Iacobescu  
Valentin Patasanu  
Dan Stoichitoiu

CIML Member, Director General, BRML  
BRML  
Romanian Accreditation Association

**RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

Lev Issaev	CIML Second Vice-President, Deputy Director, VNIIMS
P. Pranov	Gosstandart
M. Tkachenko	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Alexander Astashenkov	VNIIMS
Vasily Mardin	VNIIMS

**SLOVAKIA**

Jozef Orlovský	CIML Member, Director, Department of Metrology, Office of Standards, Metrology and Testing
František Gábriš	Slovak Institute of Metrology

**SLOVENIA**

Vasja Hrovat	CIML Member, Adviser to the Director, Office for Standardization and Metrology
--------------	--

**SOUTH AFRICA**

Brian Beard	CIML Member, Director, Trade Metrology, SABS
Stuart Carstens	SABS

**SPAIN**

García San Román	CIML Member, Director, CEM
José Ángel Robles Carbonell	CEM

**SWEDEN**

Ingolf Berg	Ministry of Industry
Kari Björkqvist	CIML Member, Legal Adviser, SWEDAC

**SWITZERLAND**

Bruno Vaucher	CIML Member, Deputy Director, OFMET
---------------	-------------------------------------

**TANZANIA**

Ali Tukai	CIML Member, Commissioner, Weights and Measures Office
-----------	--

**TUNISIA**

Belgacem Nafti	Directeur du Cabinet, Ministère du Commerce
Mohsen Laroui	Directeur Général, Ministère du Commerce
Ghaïet-El-Mouna Annabi (Mrs.)	CIML Member, Ministère du Commerce

**UNITED KINGDOM**

Seton Bennett	CIML Member, Executive Director, NWML
Martin Birdseye	NWML

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

Richard Kayser	Director, NIST
Chuck Ehrlich	CIML Member, NIST
James Williamson	Department of State
Samuel Chappell	NIST, CIML Honorary Member
Tina Butcher (Mrs.)	NIST
Ross Andersen	New York State Bureau of Weights and Measures

**YUGOSLAVIA**

Mile Pešaljević	Director, Federal Bureau of Measures
Zoran Marković	CIML Member, Federal Bureau of Measures

## ***Corresponding Members***

### **ALBANIA**

Leon Këllezi NDMC

### **ARGENTINA**

Ignacio Peist Director Nacional de Comercio Interior  
Horracio Ferrandez Direccion de Lealtad Comercial  
Joaquin Valdés INTI

### **BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA**

Zijad Džemić Institute for Standardization and Metrology  
Esad Tuzović Institute for Standardization and Metrology

### **BURKINA FASO**

Oumarou Yankine Ministry of Commerce

### **ICELAND**

Gísli Fridgeirsson Bureau of Legal Metrology

### **LATVIA**

Maris Davis National Metrology Center  
Dragune Brigita (Mrs.) National Metrology Center

### **LUXEMBURG**

John Kirchen Service de Métrologie

### **MALAYSIA**

Md. Nor Md. Chik SIRIM

### **MOLDAVIA**

Ion Maxian Department of Standardization and Metrology

### **NEW ZEALAND**

Mary Waller (Mrs.) Trade Measurement

### **PANAMA**

Silverio Henriquez SENACYT/COPANIT

### **CHINESE TAIPEI**

Jay-San Chen MOEA  
Hsing-Ming Lin MOEA

### **URUGUAY**

Luis Garcia y Santos LATU

***Liaison Institutions***

APLMF	John Birch
BIPM	Terry Quinn, Director
South East European Cooperation in Quality, Standardization and Metrology	Zoran Grkov
CEC	Daniel Hanekuyk
CECIP	John Anthony Martin Stoll
CECOD	Klaus Brandts Wim Klein
COOMET	Alexander Astashenkov
EMLMF	Ghaïet-El-Mouna Annabi (Mrs.) Jean-François Magaña
ILAC/IAF	Alan Squirrell
IOLMF	John Birch
SADCMEL	Brian Beard
SIM	Mariante Carvalho Cesar Luis Leal Moreira da Silva
WELMEC	Seton Bennett

***CIML Immediate Past-President***

Knut Birkeland	CIML Honorary Member
----------------	----------------------

***BIML***

Bernard Athané	Director
Attila Szilvássy	Assistant Director
Ian Dunmill	Assistant Director
Chris Pulham	Editor

# AGENDA

## 1 – ORGANIZATION OF THE MEETING

- 1.1 Opening
- 1.2 Roll-call - Verification of credentials - Quorum
- 1.3 Voting procedures during Conference sessions
- 1.4 Election of the President and Vice-Presidents of the Conference
- 1.5 Adoption of the agenda
- 1.6 Constitution of working commissions
- 1.7 Establishment of the schedule
- 1.8 Approval of the minutes of the Tenth Conference
- 1.9 Report on activities by the President of the International Committee of Legal Metrology
- 1.10 Miscellaneous information

## 2 – MEMBER STATES AND CORRESPONDING MEMBERS

- 2.1 New members - Expected accessions
- 2.2 The situation of certain Members

## 3 – LONG-TERM POLICY

- 3.1 Report on actions carried out since the Tenth Conference
- 3.2 Guidelines for the period 2001–2004

## 4 – LIAISONS WITH INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS

- 4.1 Report on liaisons
- 4.2 Addresses by Representatives of Institutions
- 4.3 Discussions and conclusions

## 5 – WORK OF OIML TECHNICAL COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES

- 5.1 Work undertaken - State of progress
- 5.2 Implementation of Recommendations by OIML Members
- 5.3 Formal sanction of Recommendations already approved by the Committee in 1997, 1998 and 1999
- 5.4 Draft Recommendations directly presented for sanctioning by the Conference

## 6 – OIML CERTIFICATE SYSTEM FOR MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

- 6.1 Report on the situation of the System
- 6.2 Report on the setting up of a recognition agreement for OIML type evaluations
- 6.3 Guidelines for future developments

## 7 – DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

- 7.1 Report on activities for the period 1997–2000
- 7.2 Guidelines for future activity

## 8 – ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL MATTERS

- 8.1 Examination of the management of the budget from 1996 to 1999 and the estimates for 2000
- 8.2 Bureau staff and retirement scheme
- 8.3 Credits for the financial period 2001–2004 and Member State contributions for the same period

## 9 – OTHER BUSINESS

## 10 – CLOSURE

- 10.1 Adoption of decisions and resolutions of the Conference
- 10.2 Date and place of the next Conference

## DECISIONS AND RESOLUTIONS





## **1 – ORGANIZATION OF THE MEETING**



## 1.1 Opening of the Conference

Mr. Faber, CIML President, introduced Dr. Kim Howells MP, Minister for Consumers and Corporate Affairs of the United Kingdom, who delivered the following opening and welcome address.

Dr. Faber, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am delighted to welcome you to London - to the Queen Elizabeth II Conference Centre - and to the Eleventh International Conference of Legal Metrology.

Since taking up my current ministerial responsibilities, I have become increasingly aware how important measurement is in nearly all aspects of our lives. The Olympic Games, which finished last week in Sydney, highlighted over and over again how important, and how precious, a few thousandths of a second or a fraction of a centimetre can be. The measurements with which OIML, and therefore this Conference, are concerned are of far greater significance, because they affect all our lives in so many ways. Fair trade, personal health and safety, and the protection of the environment all depend on our ability to measure accurately and on our confidence in the results.

In this country, as in so many others, the Government has a long record of taking the necessary steps to guarantee the integrity of measurement. In 1215, King John's Magna Carta included an instruction that there should be consistent standards for the measurement of grain, beer, and cloth throughout the country and from the thirteenth century onwards there were frequent Acts of Parliament to improve and develop the regulation of measurement. In the twenty-first century this development is still continuing, reflecting new technologies and a growing awareness of the contribution quality systems and accreditation can make to the reliability of products and the accuracy of measurements. Today it is not only the measurement of food and drink which is of interest to consumers and governments. Recent events in Europe have drawn attention to the measurement of vehicle fuels, where high prices increase consumer concern and provide greater incentive for fraud. Outside the area of trade, medical diagnosis and treatment, for instance, depend on reliable assessment of symptoms and accurate measurement of doses, whether of medicine or of radiation.

Today in many countries, legislation is largely based on Recommendations prepared by you in the OIML. In the UK, we have aligned our requirements for trade measuring instruments with OIML specifications. Thus collaboration at the international level not only facilitates the sharing of best practice, it is also helping to remove barriers to trade which had grown up as nations developed their national laws.

Here in Europe, the European Commission has just published its proposals for a measuring instruments Directive, which will ensure common regulatory requirements for a wide range of measuring instruments throughout the European Union. One of the unusual features of this Directive is the inclusion of references to OIML Recommendations for the performance requirements for measuring instruments. The UK will work with its partners in Europe, and with you in OIML, so that our legislation is consistent with that in the rest of the world. OIML has an important task here, ensuring that the necessary specifications are available and up-to-date, to form the basis for this new European regime.

It is of course essential to ensure that access to these modern markets and the benefits of good metrological regulation are equally available to developing countries. I see that developing countries are well represented at this Conference and I am interested to learn that your own Development Council will meet here on Wednesday morning. By providing information, advice, and training to developing countries, as well as by listening to their particular concerns, you can facilitate their access to markets and contribute to the removal of technical barriers which discriminate against those countries which are still in a state of industrial development.

By hosting this Conference, my government has indicated its continuing support for international collaboration in the field of metrology. UK representatives play an active role in OIML and in the work of other international bodies with an interest in metrology. My officials at the National Weights and Measures Laboratory participate in OIML in various ways, and they have been instrumental in establishing WELMEC as the European regional cooperation in legal metrology. There are now no fewer than nine similar regional groups, and the meeting on Saturday morning will offer them the opportunity to compare notes with a view to dissolving barriers which may still exist between them.

All in all, you have a full and busy week ahead of you. I wish you a successful Conference and hope that the resolutions at your final session on Friday morning will reflect fruitful discussion and set the agenda for the success of OIML in the coming years. I look forward to hearing a report of your progress from Dr. Bennett and to meeting you all again at the reception on Thursday evening.

Have a good week!

Mr. Faber thanked Dr. Howells for his opening speech and highlighted the encouraging words he had expressed concerning the role of the OIML and the continuing support from and participation of the United Kingdom in OIML work.

## **1.2 Roll-call - Verification of credentials - Quorum**

At the request of Mr. Faber, Mr. Athané proceeded with the roll-call of delegates. The credentials of the Member State delegations had been verified by the BIML. It was noted that 48\* Member States (out of 57) were present; the statutory quorum of two thirds was therefore found to be reached.

*Note:* Mr. Williamson, from the USA Delegation, had requested that the roll-call of Delegates and especially the verification of credentials of Member State Delegations be postponed until the Tuesday morning. Mr. Faber and Mr. Athané said that it was not possible for the Conference to start its work without first proceeding with the roll-call, the verification of credentials and the verification that the quorum was reached. It was also noted that no other Delegation supported the USA's request. Mr. Williamson then made the following declaration: "With regard to the credentials and participation of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, I am required to make the following statement: 'It is the United States Government's position that the claim by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to automatically continue the membership of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in the United Nations and other International Organizations and Conferences cannot be accepted and this has been confirmed by the Security Council and General Assembly of the United Nations which are the appropriate bodies for making this determination'."

## **1.3 Voting procedures**

Mr. Athané gave the Conference explanations concerning voting procedures and approval of decisions and resolutions.

## **1.4 Election of the President and Vice-Presidents of the Conference**

Mr. Faber indicated that the International Committee of Legal Metrology had decided to nominate:

- as President of the Conference Dr. Foster, Director of Innovation Services at the Department of Trade and Industry of the United Kingdom;
- as Vice-Presidents Mr. Beard, CIML Member, South Africa, and Dr. Pákay, CIML Member, Hungary.

The Conference accepted these proposals unanimously. Dr. Foster informed the Conference that he would not be able to attend the whole Conference owing to professional obligations but that he had asked Dr. Bennett, CIML Member, United Kingdom, to replace him when absent.

## **1.5 Adoption of the agenda**

The proposed agenda was approved.

## **1.6 Constitutions of working commissions**

As proposed by Mr. Athané the Conference decided to establish two working commissions: one for examining the Recommendations and draft Recommendations submitted for sanction by the Conference under items 5.3 and 5.4 of the agenda, and one for examining the financial papers under item 8.

---

\* On some occasions and especially during the formal votes under items 5.3, 5.4, 8.1 and 8.3, only 47 Member States were present due to the absence of the Delegate from India.

## **1.7 Establishment of the schedule**

The proposed schedule was approved with some minor changes in order to make it possible for the Committee to hold additional brief meetings during the week.

## **1.8 Approval of the minutes of the Tenth Conference**

The minutes of the Tenth Conference were approved without modification.

## **1.9 Report on activities by the President of the International Committee of Legal Metrology**

Mr. Faber presented the following report on the activities of the Organization from 1997 to 2000:

Mr. President,  
Dear Delegates,  
Dear Colleagues,

As you are aware, it is the responsibility of the President of the International Committee of Legal Metrology to present a report on the situation and activities of the OIML.

The purpose of this report is to enable the Conference to determine how former decisions have been implemented and which present and future objectives it will be necessary to focus on in order to set the guidelines to be followed by the OIML in its strategy over the forthcoming years.

I will begin by describing the OIML's present situation and indicating to you some items for comparison with the situation we had four years ago at the Tenth Conference in Vancouver. After this, on the basis of discussions which were held within our International Committee and Presidential Council, I will indicate which objectives the OIML should focus on in order to fulfill its role within an international community affected by the ever-increasing globalization trend.

I would first like to describe the current OIML situation in terms of audience. I indeed think that the value of an organization like ours is mainly expressed by the interest gained from outside, by the fact that the OIML does not just operate as a closed circuit but on the contrary externalizes its work and seeks to increase its connections and hence its audience.

First there is the audience gained from countries, which is essential to an inter-governmental organization since its human and financial resources come from its member countries. Since our last Conference, the number of OIML members has steadily increased - from ninety-six to a hundred and five, counting fifty-seven Member States and forty-eight Corresponding Members. This progression is satisfactory as a whole, even if it would have been better that the number of Member States increased more quickly than that of Corresponding Members. We should however accept that any country or economy showing an interest in OIML work but which cannot, for different reasons, become a Member State, can become a Corresponding Member. The workload resulting from a high number of Corresponding Members must be balanced by an equivalent financial contribution from these countries and an increase in their lump-sum subscription fees is consequently being submitted for approval by the Conference.

There is also the audience from the numerous international and regional organizations whose activities are related to ours. In the context of globalization which we are familiar with and confronted with the obligation to gain the maximum profit out of the limited resources - both human and material - which we have, it is in fact essential that the various international and regional organizations pursuing similar activities closely co-operate and consult each other in order to avoid double work and discrepancies.

From this point of view I think that the last four years have been extremely profitable for the OIML. In particular, its capacity as Observer at the WTO Committee on Technical Barriers to Trade now enables us to participate in certain activities of this Committee, in particular in seminars and workshops concerning the implementation of international standards with a view to eliminating technical barriers. OIML representatives are in contact with their counterparts from the major international organizations who are active in the fields of economy, commerce, development and standardization.

Cooperation between the OIML and certain of these worldwide organizations is also progressing bilaterally. I should mention in particular ISO and IEC with which joint projects are being developed. Concerning the Metre Convention, after it had come to light that at present no merger was possible, efforts towards increased cooperation were deployed.

This led to the joint organization by the BIPM, the OIML, IMEKO and the German Federal Metrology Organization, the PTB, of an important Seminar on the economic and social role of metrology, about which I will go into in more depth later on. Other meetings ensued, mainly annual ones, which enabled the representatives from the Metre Convention, from the OIML and now from ILAC, to identify the subjects of common interest to at least two of these organizations.

At the same as we are experiencing cooperation at the worldwide level, we have also experienced and continue to experience an increased and extremely promising cooperation at the regional level. At present, many parts of the globe are covered by regional legal metrology organizations ("RLMOs" is the abbreviation in English), either independent or operating within a wider framework, for example that of development and economic cooperation. The CIML's policy concerning this is clear: to encourage appropriate development of regional cooperation by observing RLMOs' activities and by informing them of the corresponding OIML activities, by ensuring that these regional activities are not in conflict with or do not duplicate international activities, by ensuring that regional needs that may be satisfied at international level are quickly and appropriately satisfied, and, finally, by enabling RLMOs to become acquainted amongst themselves and establish the contacts which they deem appropriate. I am sure that this strategy is the best adapted and that it should continue - and I note with satisfaction that for the second consecutive year OIML meetings give an opportunity for representatives of regional legal metrology organizations to meet each other.

I do not wish to dwell on this important subject any longer as tomorrow, a specific item of this Conference's Agenda will enable Representatives of regional and international organizations to give their views about their relationships with OIML. It is obviously unfortunate that, for various reasons, certain of these organizations were unable to attend our meeting. Indeed, some organizations such as ISO, IMEKO and the UNESCO hold their Annual General Meetings at a time of the year which prevents them from attending our meeting, and, likewise, the OIML was unable to be represented at these organizations' meetings.

In addition to countries and international and regional organizations, there is a third category of bodies which are extremely interested in our work and whose cooperation with the OIML may be essential: these are the manufacturers and users of measuring instruments, including consumers which we can consider as users in a larger sense since, for a great part, the conditions in which they live, whether economic, social or environmental, are dependent on measurements.

For a long time, manufacturers of measuring instruments may have been associated with OIML work but such a possibility has now developed into a more systematic approach of international and regional manufacturer associations. My recent participation at an Annual General Meeting of one of these associations proved to me that the OIML's strategy was globally appreciated. Concerning professional users and in particular organizations connected with water, electricity or gas distribution, efforts have been made to make OIML activities better known. Concerning consumers, I must admit that we have not yet had tangible proof of success as it is difficult to identify international and regional consumer institutions who effectively take an interest in legal metrology; maybe it would be more useful if appropriate actions were carried out at the national level within our Member States?

However, one of the OIML's activities which is quickly gaining ground and which is at the same time of interest to legal metrology departments and also to manufacturers and users of measuring instruments is our certificates of conformity system.

At our last Conference I announced that after four years of implementation of this system, more than two hundred certificates had been issued. During the following four years, over four hundred other certificates were issued and the total number of certificates is nearing or will exceed seven hundred before the end of the year. This is an extremely positive aspect of our activity which is to be discussed again during this week.

These, Ladies and Gentlemen, are the several points that have been significant in the OIML's development over the last four years. On which Long-term Policy and strategy elements are these developments based?

While expressing its satisfaction concerning the Long-term Policy document published in 1995, the Tenth Conference instructed the Committee to take on the responsibility of working on a certain number of subjects that include:

- activities in favor of developing countries;
- closer cooperation between the OIML and the measuring instruments industry;
- the development of documents covering various aspects of metrology, not restricted to the field of legal metrology;
- thoughts on accreditation in legal metrology; and
- reconsideration of the OIML's communication policy.

A report on the Development Council indicating encouraging prospects for its activity under Mrs. Annabi's Chairmanship will be given to you later in the week.

I have already mentioned an increase in contacts existing between the OIML and industry, and, in addition, we notice that cooperation with international accreditation bodies is developing.

The development of documents covering the various aspects of metrology has not yet effectively got off the ground; actually, this project would need the assistance of other metrology and standardization organizations, as the OIML alone cannot deal with such topics which are not its sole responsibility.

Finally, the use of Internet combined with the Bureau's efforts has greatly improved our organization's communication strategy.

Moreover, two decisive elements have helped to determine and finalize the objectives laid down at the Conference:

First of all, the International Seminar which took place in June 1998 in Braunschweig, organized with the close cooperation of the Metre Convention, IMEKO, the Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt and the OIML, helped to bring to light a certain number of fundamental aspects of metrology and its role in society's economic and social development.

Moreover, at the Organization's request, my predecessor as CIML President, Knut Birkeland, prepared a report on "*Legal Metrology at the Dawn of the Twenty-first Century*" the final version of which was presented to the Committee in October 1998 in Seoul.

In addition to all this, numerous thoughts and discussions developed within the Committee and its Presidential Council.

So that is the basis on which the Bureau and the Presidential Council were able to draw up a list of actions aimed at progressively satisfying the needs which were identified, specific persons or organizations being designated to carry out these actions according to a specific time schedule.

A broad outline of this list of actions was accepted by our Committee last year in Tunis and, after a final adjustment made by the Presidential Council, the "*1999-2002 Action Plan*" was distributed last April. It is to be hoped that this Conference will recognize that the decisions taken four years ago were effectively implemented whenever possible and that it will encourage all the OIML bodies concerned to follow this plan through and even prolong it by new actions leading up to the next Conference.

Of course, six months after publishing this Plan, it appears that we were rather optimistic, since certain actions which should already have been started or even finalized have been delayed, often due to lack of time. But, by and large, as you may notice, many of the scheduled objectives are being carried out in an appropriate manner.

This "*Action Plan*" which covers the two forthcoming years, now leads me to deal with the last part of my report: the part in which I will try to give an outline of future concerns.

Among the actions which I consider to be top priority for the OIML, I will first talk about establishing a mutual recognition agreement concerning the testing of measuring instruments covered by OIML Recommendations.

One of our Sub-committees has already worked on this at length and, even if all the obstacles have not yet been overcome, they have for a large part been identified. This project is so important that it has been decided that, in the context of this Conference, a Round Table will be held on this subject in order to enable the parties concerned to air their views.

A second top priority action concerns OIML assistance to countries which are currently developing their metrological infrastructure.

The OIML cannot be held solely responsible for such action; other organizations, and my thoughts go especially to the Bureau International des Poids et Mesures, are concerned by this topic and the OIML is, of course, ready to cooperate with them. But, scientific and technical aspects put aside, for this type of action nothing of significance can be set up without the active participation of national, regional and international organizations to settle the financial, material and administrative aspects of this aid.

Top priority should also be given to pursuing and developing cooperation between the OIML and the international and regional institutions having similar objectives.

Finally, the OIML will have to face up to sometimes profound changes occurring within the national legal metrology organizations of certain of its members. These changes may take on different aspects but they will, more often than not, result in a decrease in the human and financial resources that our Member States may put at the OIML's disposal. The privatization of certain fields of activity, already effective or envisaged in a certain number of countries, is often accompanied by eagerness to gain immediate profitability and international cooperation sometimes no longer becomes a priority. In addition, many administrations see their budgets stagnate or diminish. This also results in a decrease in our work capacity.

The OIML will thus have to cope with such evolutions which seem unavoidable, even if they may seem regrettable.

Better adaptability for facing up to external evolutions, greater use of the work projects of other international and regional organizations, and concentrating on top priority projects, seem to me to be the methods that should enable the OIML to continue to carry out the role it has been assigned by its Member States.

Mr. President,  
Dear Delegates,  
Dear Colleagues,

The Eleventh International Legal Metrology Conference should mark a key stepping-stone in the life of our Organization.

Entering the twenty-first century would only be purely symbolic if it was not for the fact we can already sense that this new century is likely, up to a certain point, to be very different to what we have experienced so far.

We are living in a world where many kinds of developments seem to be more influenced by financial considerations than by well thought out policy decisions. This results in a lowering of the influence our governments may exert over certain essential aspects of the life of our societies and in a tendency towards deregulation. At the same time there is a tendency to consider metrology as one of the numerous technical aspects of free trade instead of recognizing that in fact it plays an essential role in improving the quality of trade, health, the environment and other aspects of our activities. It is now up to you to make the decisions which will allow us to anticipate such events and to adapt the OIML's strategy to their repercussions.

Thank you for your attention.



## **2 – MEMBER STATES AND CORRESPONDING MEMBERS**



## **2.1 New members - Expected accessions**

Mr. Athané reminded the participants that most of the information related to new Members had already been given by the CIML President in his report on activities. Concerning expected accessions, he indicated that a number of Corresponding Members were seriously considering the possibility of becoming full Member States and that a number of other countries or economies had contacted the Bureau requesting information on how to become Corresponding Members (or on how to be relisted as Corresponding Members for certain countries that had been delisted for not having paid their annual subscriptions).

## **2.2 The situation of certain Members**

Mr. Athané said that three Corresponding Members would be delisted by the end of the year if their arrears were not paid rapidly. He also said that the situation of two Member States would first have to be examined by the Finance Commission before any draft Resolution was submitted for approval by the Conference under Item 8.1.



## **3 – LONG-TERM POLICY**



### 3.1 Report on actions carried out since the Tenth Conference

Mr. Faber said that most of the key points concerning actions carried out since the last Conference in connection with the OIML Long-term Policy were in fact included in the report on activities he had delivered at the opening of the Conference. Unless Delegates had any questions, he considered that it was not necessary to further develop this point.

### 3.2 Guidelines for the period 2001–2004

Mr. Faber reminded participants that the *1999–2002 Action Plan* had been adopted by the CIML and that some minor adjustments had then been necessary to adapt the time schedule to the current possibilities of the Organization. He asked participants whether they had any comments or proposals concerning this *Action Plan*, especially with a view to extending it up to the next Conference.

Mr. Birch asked which actions had been carried out in order to involve consumer associations in OIML work.

Mr. Athané replied that on several occasions the BIML had tried to establish contacts with international or regional consumer associations. Following the International Seminar held in June 1998 in Braunschweig, certain consumer associations had been identified but no replies had been received to the letters sent to them. An international body, "International Consumers" had been contacted following information received from New Zealand but here again no reaction had ensued. Concerning national associations of consumers, it was of course the responsibility of national legal metrology services to establish the necessary contacts but as far as the BIML was aware, these contacts were practically inexistent in most countries. Mr. Athané added that when participating in European work on legal metrology, he had noted that certain officials from the European Commission were concerned about the fact that it was very difficult to associate consumer associations in the work on the MID.

Mr. da Silva said that in Brazil the national working group on legal metrology was very supportive of the necessity to revise OIML D 1 on the *Law on Metrology* as soon as possible. Mr. Magaña said that he had tried to make a personal contribution to this TC 3/SC 5 activity by developing a working paper which had been sent to Dr. Chappell, Secretary of this SC. In addition, Mr. Magaña had consulted the French CIPM Member, Prof. Kovalevsky (also CIPM President) and discussed the matter with Dr. Quinn (BIPM Director) and Dr. Ehrlich (US CIML Member) and it seemed that it would be possible to develop a *Law on Metrology* through a joint cooperation between the Meter Convention and the OIML. Dr. Ehrlich added that the US Secretariat was working on the basis of several proposals, including that received from Mr. Magaña, and that a first draft was expected to be circulated by the end of the year.

Mr. da Silva also pointed out the importance of developing general papers about the various aspects of metrology, especially the questions of verification and of calibration, notably to clarify the differences between them.

Mr. Faber said that note had been duly taken of these comments and added that the urgent need to review OIML D 1 had been stressed on various occasions, including during a recent APLMF meeting in Taipei.

Noting that there were no other comments, the President concluded that the Conference could be considered as having endorsed this *Action Plan* and requested the CIML to monitor its implementation and to extend it as far as necessary in order to cover the period 2002–2004. Mr. Faber expressed his satisfaction for this conclusion which was in fact a real mark of appreciation for the work developed over the past three years, with the participation of the CIML Immediate Past President Knut Birkeland, of the Presidential Council, of the BIML and of the CIML. It was now no longer appropriate to merely discuss this *Action Plan* - priority should be given to continue implementing it.





## **4 – LIAISONS WITH INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS**



## 4.1 Report on liaisons

The following report was presented by the BIML.

The OIML enjoys liaisons with over one hundred international and regional organizations and the aim of this report is to give brief information on certain of these liaisons.

### 1 Worldwide organizations

#### 1.1 BIPM and the Meter Convention

As indicated by Mr. Faber in his report on activities, a merger between the two inter-governmental metrological organizations is currently not possible, but it was decided to examine the possibility of cooperating more closely. In addition to the June 1998 Braunschweig International Seminar, this cooperation could include coordinated aid to countries which develop their own national metrology systems, as well as perhaps the development of texts that could serve as bases for national metrology laws.

For the moment, this cooperation takes the form of annual meetings (generally held in February), in which the Presidents and Vice-Presidents/Secretary of the two Committees (CIPM and CIML) participate as well as the Directors of the two Bureaus (BIPM and BIML), possibly accompanied by other Representatives. As of February 2000, ILAC has been invited to participate in these meetings. A report on the February 2000 meeting and on those Meter Convention activities that are of interest to the OIML will be given by Dr. Quinn, BIPM Director.

#### 1.2 ISO and IEC

Cooperation with these two worldwide standardization bodies is developing in a globally satisfactory manner. The OIML is participating more and more actively in ISO CASCO and DEVCO work; on the technical front, ISO asked the OIML to transform Recommendation R 99 on vehicle exhaust gas emissions into an international standard and it was decided to produce a joint document ISO 3930/OIML R 99, which has just been printed. As far as the IEC is concerned, international standards on sound level meters and other instruments used in acoustics should be recognized as OIML Recommendations (R 58, R 88, etc.) but it has not yet been decided in which form; in fact producing joint documents can be quite heavy going and it can be more efficient for one organization to simply adopt a document that has already been published by another, with neither a new nor a joint publication being produced.

As far as relations between certain OIML TCs/SCs and ISO are concerned, cooperation is either very good (for example water meters) or problematic: for example ISO/TC 28 on petroleum products complained about the lack of cooperation on the part of the OIML. A somewhat similar case exists with IEC/TC 62 on medical instruments, but the appropriate information has been given to this TC's secretariat.

#### 1.3 JCGM

This *Joint Committee for Guides in Metrology*, under the presidency of the BIPM Director with a combined BIPM/BIML secretariat, allows eight organizations (BIPM, IEC, IFCC, ILAC, ISO, IUPAC, IUPAP and OIML) to jointly develop guides on metrology; two such guides have to date been published and are being re-examined: the VIM and the GUM. Meetings on these guides will take place at the BIPM in November 2000.

#### 1.4 WTO

The OIML - generally the BIML - participates in the Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) Committee meetings and seminars alongside ISO, IEC, ITU, OECD, FAO, WHO, etc. A regional (Mediterranean) seminar on metrology is soon to be organized by Mr. Magaña at the WTO's request and will include BIML participation; it is envisaged that the CIPM President will hold a conference on scientific metrology on that occasion.

## **1.5 UNIDO**

Cooperation between UNIDO, the PTB and the OIML in favor of certain least developed African countries is underway.

## **1.6 ILAC/IAF**

Cooperation with these worldwide accreditation organizations is developing. The BIML will participate in the next ILAC General Assembly and this will be an occasion to establish new contacts with the IAF secretariat, which will hold its own General Assembly some days later, though the BIML will not be able to be present at this meeting.

## **1.7 IMEKO**

Cooperation is good in all fields of common interest and should develop shortly in the field of software.

## **2 Regional organizations**

### **2.1 RLMOs**

Regional Legal Metrology Organizations are developing and, as indicated by Mr. Faber in his report on activities, the OIML is closely following these developments which it encourages, whilst endeavoring to ensure that activities at international and regional levels are accomplished without there being any contradiction between them, nor any overlap in scope. OIML/RLMO cooperation is at the same time very satisfying, very useful and highly promising for the future (see the CIML President's report on activities). The OIML has made efforts to participate in all the main RLMO meetings either via CIML Members or BIML Staff, and has most often contributed to seminars, workshops, etc. by the participation of experts, supplying OIML documents, etc. Furthermore, the BIML is making a point of being better aware of the results of the work of certain RLMOs and letting other regions benefit from this work (for example, videos developed by the APLMF).

### **2.2 European Union**

Special mention should be made of the European Union in view of the development of a European Directive on Measuring Instruments (MID) which will cover nearly all the measuring instruments that are subject to legal metrology controls in the EU and EFTA countries, as well as in those countries that are candidates to become EU members, which represents a total of about 25–30 countries, all of whom are Member States or Corresponding Members of the OIML (it is possible that nonautomatic weighing instruments will continue to fall under a separate Directive; moreover, other measuring instruments in the medical and transport fields, etc., are covered by specific Directives).

The MID text has been approved by the European Commission and must now be approved by the European Council and Parliament. Its actual putting into application could be accomplished in four years and it is quite possible that between now and then certain metrological requirements will have been modified.

Given the fact that the format of the MID is noticeably different to that of OIML Recommendations, only the aspect of compatibility between MID and Recommendation requirements has been assured: basically, the aim is for instruments that conform to OIML requirements to be recognized as conforming to the MID.

For this to happen, and thanks to the action of European experts and WELMEC, this aspect was managed in such a way that the major metrological requirements of the MID do not contradict those of the OIML. Moreover, senior Commission staff recognized that it was appropriate that the "presumption of conformity" chapter in the MID should refer not only to European standards (CEN/CENELEC) but

also to the “normative documents” developed by the OIML which are recognized as giving a presumption of conformity to the requirements of the MID. In this way, manufacturers of measuring instruments will generally have the choice between directly applying the requirements of the MID, following European standards or following OIML Recommendations, this third possibility giving them the assurance that they will more readily be able to offer their instruments for sale outside Europe.

These developments at the European level have, moreover, led the BIML to reopen discussions on cooperation with CEN and CENELEC.

More detailed information may be given during the Conference by the Representatives of the Commission and of WELMEC, and by the BIML.

### **2.3 Other regional organizations**

The BIML cooperates whenever necessary with regional organizations, a part of whose work is directed towards metrology, in particular ARSO.

## **3 Manufacturers’ and users’ associations**

Over the last two years, the BIML has tried to identify such associations that are likely to participate in OIML work. Mainly European associations have been contacted, but in some cases worldwide associations are also concerned (distribution of electricity, vehicles that function on natural gas, etc.).

## **4.2 Addresses by Representatives of Institutions and**

## **4.3 Discussions and conclusions**

### **a) Worldwide organizations**

#### **Dr. T.J. Quinn, BIPM Director**

First of all thank you for giving me the opportunity of speaking this afternoon and I would like to begin by simply sending greetings from the BIPM and the CIPM to your Conference and to wish you every success in your work. In talking earlier with the CIML President and Mr. Athané, it seemed to me that there were two points that it would be useful for me to mention. The first one would be the common activities that have been taking place between the BIPM, CIPM, OIML and ILAC; some of these have already been mentioned in the speech of your President but I think perhaps these would merit being said twice. The second one are the recent activities that have taken place within the Meter Convention; some of them may be of interest for the Conference.

Since the relation and common activities between the BIPM and the OIML have already been mentioned, I will start with these. As your President said, we now have established regular meetings which take place on an annual basis, usually in February, to which we have joined Representatives of ILAC, where we discuss a number of important matters that should be treated on a multilateral basis.

When I talk about the BIPM activities, one of the points I should mention will be the report on national and international needs for metrology that was adopted by our General Conference and it was said very clearly in this report that it is the responsibility of the BIPM to make sure that we do have ongoing discussions with other international intergovernmental organizations on matters related to metrology because one cannot in some ways separate the activities of our organizations. They overlap, they interlink, and of course metrology is a whole and one cannot split it up into different areas just because the users do not recognize these differences. Metrology is part of the infrastructure of today’s world and we must all work together to make it so.

One of the very successful activities, as your President has mentioned, was the meeting that took place in the PTB related to the role of metrology in the economic and social developments. An outcome of our joint meeting that took

place at the BIPM in February of this year was a proposal that a second of these meetings take place and I was asked on behalf of the three organizations to contact the NIST to ask whether in principle it would be possible for the NIST to organize a meeting in 2001. And I should say I got a very favorable response and I am hoping that we can now proceed with the organization of the second of these meetings.

Another point which came up after the February meeting was the question of traceability. Traceability is a word that has become very fashionable in recent years and I think it is true to say that we do not always precisely know what is meant by traceability. We have agreed that we should collaborate together, OIML, BIPM and ILAC, in trying to work towards a common definition of the term traceability and I think this will be one of the points that would come up in our meeting next February to see how we should do this in more detail. It is not something that we can do too quickly because the ideas on traceability are developing and are crystallizing so we do not want to go too fast but it is sure that in due course we must do something together.

Another point which came up was the economic and social benefits of metrology with perhaps the emphasis on the economic. This is a matter which is often discussed within national metrology institutes, within all of those organizations that spend money on metrology because these days, when we spend money on metrology, we have to persuade the persons or the organizations that are giving us money that it is money well spent. Many studies have been made in recent years as to the economic benefits of metrology. We all have our own stories about this. It seems to us that it would be worthwhile to see whether we could not perhaps coordinate these and bring together a common platform as to why it is necessary that governments worldwide should spend money on metrology. We are all convinced of this but I think we have to try to put a more common front forward to persuade governments that this is important. This is another matter that we should be talking about and it is indeed on the agenda of the meeting of directors of national metrology institutes that will take place in Sèvres next week.

Another joint activity we carry out with others is the Joint Committee for Guides in Metrology. This was the forum within which we developed some years ago the Guide to the expression of uncertainty in measurement (GUM) and also the International vocabulary of basic and general terms in metrology (VIM). We now have eight organizations concerned with this and we are continuing working in two directions: one is to update and perhaps broaden the VIM and the other one is to see how we need to develop complementary documents to the GUM. I have to say that the work on the revision of the VIM in some areas is going more slowly than I would have hoped. Vocabularies are very difficult documents to revise and particularly the more basic and the more general are the terms, the more wide are the philosophical differences and we are having some difficulties in coming to some sort of convergence in how we should revise the Vocabulary. As regards uncertainties I am much more optimistic that we should have something very soon because the expression of uncertainty in measurement is something of increasing importance partly because of the activities under the mutual recognition arrangement.

So Mr. President these are some of the activities that we are carrying out jointly and now I will say a few words on recent BIPM and CIPM activities in so far as they may be of interest for this Conference. Many of you here were in fact present at the 21<sup>st</sup> General Conference of Weights and Measures that took place in Paris last October. Among the important decisions of the Conference first of all was the acceptance of the report by the CIPM on the needs for national and international activities in metrology, a report that was stimulated by decision of the 20<sup>th</sup> CGPM in 1995. In drawing up this report we consulted widely with OIML, with ISO, with IEC and of course with all national metrology institutes. This now provides the strategy document for the short and medium term future of activities to be carried out under the Meter Convention. As I said it includes a clear mandate for us to cooperate at the higher level with your organization. It includes also the decision that the work of our Consultative Committees should be broadened as necessary so it takes into account all activities of metrology in so far as they are concerns of the national metrology institutes. In this respect, the work of Consultative Committees has now broadened to include work on viscosity, hardness, fluid flow and of course, we have done this previously, metrology in chemistry. In so far as the work on hardness, fluid flow and viscosity is concerned, we are well aware that there are some OIML activities in these areas, and also ISO and IEC, and we are making quite sure that our technical activities are complementary to that which are taking place within the other organizations. This document, as well as other CGPM documents, is available on the BIPM web page but if some of you want a copy I will be very happy to send it to you.

Another important decision of the General Conference was the creation of a new category of associate states and economies of the General Conference. I have to say that we were very much inspired by the OIML Convention in this; the reason for creating associates is clearly so that we can bring into the activities of the Meter Convention and more particularly to bring into the activities under the Mutual Recognition Arrangement those states and economies that are not yet members of the Meter Convention. The main advantage of course is that the cost of becoming an associate state or economy can be, for the smallest states, only one tenth of the minimum cost of becoming a member of the Meter Convention.

There was also a resolution concerned with the use of SI in large programs related to the environment; there were resolutions related to metrology in chemistry and biotechnology and I am sure you are well aware that the importance

of accurate measurements in all areas of biochemistry and biotechnology is something that has become very clear within the five past years and in that respect, we have recently started a new section on metrology in chemistry at the BIPM.

Coming now to the Mutual Recognition Arrangement, another important event that took place was the signing by the Directors of the national metrology institutes of essentially all the industrialized states in the world of the MRA of national measurement standards and of calibration and measurement certificates issued by national metrology institutes. Mr. Athané asked me to say a few words about precisely what is meant by the mutual recognition of national measurement standards in our MRA. I think that I cannot do better than read a few of the words from the document itself because we have on page 28 the essential points. This Mutual Recognition Arrangement has been drawn up by the CIPM under the authority given to it by the Meter Convention for signature by directors of the national metrology institutes of member states of the Convention. The first thing to say is that this is a document that is signed by the directors of the national metrology institutes, but if you look deeper into the document you will see that the directors need to have the authority of the governmental or appropriate official authorities in the countries for that signature. There are three objectives of the MRA: first to establish the degree of equivalence of national measurement standards maintained by the NMIs; second to provide for the mutual recognition of calibration and measurement certificates issued by the NMIs; and thirdly thereby to provide governments and other parties with the secured technical foundation for wider agreements related to international trade, commerce and regulatory affairs.

So let me say one or two words about these three objectives. First of all, to establish the degree of equivalence of national measurement standards maintained by the NMIs. It is recognized by everyone of course that depending upon the economic and technical level of the country, the needs for metrology differ. For some countries it is necessary to work at the highest technical level in all areas, for others it is not necessary to do this. But nevertheless, for the purposes of the MRA, we are looking to establish what may be called the degree of equivalence. This does not mean that we say all of the national measurement standards are equivalent; we must be very clear and use the words very carefully: the degree of equivalence, that is to say, by means of our key comparisons, we establish by how much and with what uncertainty the national measurement standards differ. On the basis of that the users of the MRA can then decide whether this agreement is sufficient for the purposes or whether it is not. We are not saying that certain laboratories are equivalent and some are not: we are giving the differences between the national measurement standards with their uncertainties and it is up to the users to decide whether or not this is adequate.

The second objective is to provide for the mutual recognition of calibration and measurement certificates issued by NMIs. On the BIPM database, we should have the calibration and measurement capabilities of the participating NMIs with the uncertainty of all of their services. It is these uncertainties that are essentially guaranteed by the MRA and it is the recognition of these uncertainties that is established by the mutual recognition arrangement. And then, whether these uncertainties are adequate or not for the purpose, that is the task of the user. What we are trying to say is that the uncertainties that are given on the BIPM web page having been through all the process of the MRA should be considered reliable and then you make what ever use you want.

And finally to provide governments and other parties with secured technical foundations. This is not a legally binding agreement; for that reason it is called an arrangement. It is to provide a secured technical foundation for all of the legally binding intergovernmental interregional agreements related to trade and regulatory affairs that need a secured technical foundation. We are trying to provide the secured technical foundation and it is up to other bodies, governments, to sign the legally binding agreements but what we hope to do is to provide this secured technical foundation. So the technical documents are signed by directors of NMIs but we think and we hope it will have very far reaching consequences because we hope it will allow these other agreements to have a secured technical foundation.

Mr. President, I think I have covered the points that I wished to cover. I am very happy of course if there are any questions to respond to them.

The Conference President thanked Dr. Quinn and gave the floor to Mr. Athané for a few comments. In fact, what had been said by Dr. Quinn showed that there would be a number of matters to be studied jointly by the Meter Convention, ILAC and the OIML. Traceability was obviously one of these matters since in certain countries the capabilities of the NMI may not be sufficient for the needs of testing laboratories which might have then to ensure their traceability to an NMI in another country. It should also be appropriate to clarify the extent of mutual recognition of calibration and measurement certificates issued by NMIs. In fact in certain countries NMIs may restrict their activities to the highest level in metrology whereas in other countries NMIs may be responsible for a wide range of measurements including, for example, legal metrology testing. Is the Meter Convention MRA applicable to all kinds of calibrations and measurements carried out by NMIs?

Dr. Quinn agreed that there were some NMIs whose capabilities are lower than that of other NMIs. What should be put in the BIPM database on measurement capabilities? The examples of length and electricity measurements where things were most advanced could give an answer. In these two fields there were a very large number of services and it had been possible to achieve a worldwide agreement among NMIs as to the names of these services and there were now unified lists of names of services in electricity and length measurements. Certain of these services were more related to testing than to high level metrology but they were all there and a question that was put only very recently was what about a NMI that had a lot of high level services and did not mention some of the lower level services whereas these lower level services might in fact be the higher level services for smaller laboratories. What was decided was simply to put a note in the database in so far as it concerns those laboratories with a wide range that if a service is not listed, this implies that other institutes in that country are capable of providing that service. But there will be a large number of services listed from the very top, highest technology level down to the level that is in fact delivered by the smallest laboratories with their uncertainties. We think this is a great advantage for the smaller laboratories: their services will be there with their uncertainties recognized.

Mr. Faber gave some additional information concerning the BIPM/ILAC/OIML meeting held in February 2000 at the BIPM. The OIML Delegation included the CIML President and Vice-Presidents, Mr. Birch and the BIML Director. ILAC was represented by its Chairperson and the Meter Convention by the CIPM Vice-Presidents, the CIPM Secretary and Secretary elect, and by the BIPM Director. One of the main items was to exchange information about current activities of interest for the other organizations. The OIML also presented a list of activities which might be undertaken jointly with the Meter Convention and/or ILAC including a model law on metrology, traceability matters, a study on the economic and social benefits of metrology and the establishment of a common database of experts in metrology and of metrology training facilities. It was concluded that it would be better for certain of these questions to be the responsibilities of regional bodies. The testing of software in instrumentation was also discussed and it was concluded that it could be further dealt with within an IMEKO TC in close cooperation with OIML TC 5/SC 2. Applications of accreditation to legal metrology were also mentioned, which should be dealt with within a bilateral cooperation between the OIML and ILAC. As a conclusion Mr. Faber said that although practical cooperation between the three organizations was not very effective, there were signals that things were progressing and this February 2000 meeting was surely the most productive one since the beginning of the cooperation.

### **Mr. Squirrel, ILAC and IAF Representative**

It gives me great pleasure to bring you greetings from various parts of the world and to give you a brief report on ILAC, the International Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation and IAF, the International Accreditation Forum incorporated. I would like very much to thank the organizers and particularly Bernard for allowing me this opportunity: this was a fairly late decision and everybody has made me very welcome when I arrived here about two hours ago.

So I would like to give you a very brief report. The first one would be from ILAC and Belinda Collins who is the Chairman of ILAC has produced a report giving a summary of the recent activities within ILAC and I think that now the copies have been made and they are right on the table and I do not intend to read this because I am sure you can do that at your own leisure but I would like to just go through it very briefly and highlight some of the key points.

Similarly, Dr. Ohtsubo, the Chairman of IAF has also prepared a two page report and that also, if you have not got it in front of you, is out on the desk outside for you to look at at your leisure.

First of all then, from ILAC, perhaps Bernard if we can just show a slide of the current structure of ILAC which you can have a look at while I am saying a few words. First of all, Belinda stresses the very important close relationship we have had between ILAC and the OIML over many years and in her first paragraph she recognizes this with the work from technical committees; we attend each others' General Assemblies and Conferences and she very much looks forward to even closer cooperation in the twenty-first century. I think there has been recognition in ILAC recently that it is absolutely essential that the accreditation process is linked to metrology. Indeed if it is not, one wonders if it has any value at all. Both our organizations are very interested in formal recognition of technical competence in organizations producing accurate measurement results which are what they purport to be, which then can be used for various important decisions making such as health, trade, and in your area in the legal center. So we both have very common aims and objectives and I think in this report you will perhaps see that there is a flavor within ILAC now that we must get more technical: we must provide added value so that our own agreements and arrangements can be used by governments and that they have meaning when it comes particularly to trade purposes. And I think you will see when she talks about the sort of activity which we are undertaking, that they have very much



a technical basis. I am not trying to devalue the importance of systems and quality manuals that are an essential part of the process, but there are some of us who perhaps think that we may readdress the balance and focus more on objective outcomes of competence.

One of the things that ILAC is trying to do and we hope in three weeks' time there will be a big celebration amongst all the members of ILAC because we intend to sign an MRA (a mutual recognition agreement). I hear this morning that you have got MAAs and TAAs and MRAs - we all have all these acronyms, but that in ILAC stands for "Mutual Recognition Arrangement" and I do not think there is any point in arguing about the words, I think we all know what it means. It is a formal recognition that the accreditation bodies represented in the ILAC fraternity who have been evaluated and assessed themselves against prescribed ISO requirements (ISO Guide 58 at the moment) recognize each other as equivalent bodies; we trust each other and we accept the calibration and testing results provided by the conformity assessment bodies, in this case laboratories which are accredited. So Belinda says: "Please come to Washington 28<sup>th</sup> of October to 3<sup>rd</sup> November - some of you might be there anyway - there is a lot of activity happening in the next two or three weeks; there is an APLAC meeting which is the Regional Asia-Pacific accreditation meeting in Los Angeles; that is the week before, and from the 28<sup>th</sup> of October through the 3<sup>rd</sup> November in Washington, there is the bi-annual ILAC General Assembly and Conference. The IAF meeting is in the week afterwards, so some people will have a fairly busy three weeks, I suggest.

The format for this General Assembly is that we are going to have a lot of seminars, and symposiums in the first three days, and if you look at Belinda's second paragraph, I think you can see that flavor; we are talking about proficiency testing and objective - one of the few objective measures whether the accreditation process is working. We like to think it works, I do because it gives me a job, but we have to demonstrate to the outside world that accredited laboratories do provide accurate measurements. And proficiency testing, traceability, measurement uncertainty, things that you have known about - we have all known about for years - but they really are taking on a hold now, particularly with the testing laboratories. I think physical measurements, the calibration area, traceability, measurement uncertainty, well, I am not saying will solve all the problems, but it has been around for years and years.

Metrology has been around for years and years in the testing area as well, but it's just that some people perhaps have not really given it the attention it must get, and the new standard ISO 17025 which talks about the requirements for conformity assessment for laboratories, very much re-emphasizes the importance of traceability and the associated measurement uncertainty. And may I say that some of our accredited testing laboratories are getting a little bit nervous about this thing called "measurement uncertainty". They have been producing lovely absolute numbers for years and now someone has told them that perhaps they are not as absolute as they thought, so we're having a bit of a task convincing our laboratories that this is an essential part of the process and equally as important we have to convince the regulators, the customers, the recipients of these results, which all of a sudden apparently have become uncertain that really they are getting much better value. This is a task which is not going to happen overnight.

Also at ILAC 2000 there will be the normal active social programs, which some of you may have been to and I am sure that you are having such things this week in London. There is a business meeting after the General Assembly where we hope forty odd accreditation bodies right around the globe, particularly the members of EA (European Accreditation) and APLAC (the Asia-Pacific) they are the two main existing regional bodies. There are other developing bodies in South America, in Africa, also in North America. We are hoping very much to have a big party. But before we have the big party, we have to sign and we have to trust each other, and in a moment perhaps as I know that you are talking about this yourselves tomorrow afternoon, I think, Bernard, there is a round table discussion on mutual recognition, if I could perhaps give you a little bit of a flavor of some of the things that ILAC have done over the last five years. This has not happened overnight and dare I say there are still some little loose ends perhaps: not everybody does everything the same. What is important is that you have equivalence of outcomes and EA and APLAC perhaps have in the past done things slightly different. But we have spent a lot of time now trying to look at each others' processes and outcomes; and we believe they are equivalent and we look forward to the signing ceremony in two weeks' time.

Belinda says a little bit about the structure of ILAC, which was re-structured a couple of years ago. Basically, we have four committees which do the work; they are listed on the bottom line there, and they feed into the General Assembly, which basically is the 60 or 70 members representing the laboratory accreditation bodies around the world. May I say the laboratory liaison committee (I know this is very important with OIML) we really do need to listen to our stakeholders, our customers; this is the only reason accreditors are around: because of the customers. And I know that you also value very much your links with industry, and your user bodies. So that laboratory liaison committee is a very important part now of the ILAC structure. The public affairs committee produces papers, many of them in association with bodies like yourselves, and operates the web site, and I do recommend the web site which is now up and running - the web address is on the second page and it gives very useful and user-friendly information. Even I can work it on the Internet so it must work, and it gives you more information should you require it. And this on the right hand side as I am looking at it, the arrangement management committee, is a small group of about seven people: Vice-Chairman

of ILAC, leaders Chairmen of the regional cooperations like EA and APLAC including representation from our stakeholders who are having the duty of managing day to day the ILAC MRA. And that involves of course a lot of evaluations. And if you are thinking about an MRA, as I know you are, one of the things you have got to be careful of is that you do not spend more time evaluating each other than the other people you are supposed to be evaluating. So the advantage of ILAC is that we can then put in multi-national teams, EA, APLAC, South America, South Africa go in and we do not have to duplicate and repeat that performance, assuming that we have the necessary trust and confidence in each others' practices.

On the second page, Belinda says a little bit about what our current work program is (I think it will be best for you to have a look at that yourselves). You notice there that we have ongoing discussions with groups like the IEC, very much focusing on what the new 17025 standard means. We are trying to take ILAC into the new century in a positive and a value-added way, and she mentions that she has very fruitful discussions between BIPM, because the BIPM itself has established an MRA, recognizing the importance of mutual recognition and OIML and there is some discussion there particularly through the Vice-Chairman Mike Peet who has been working very closely with the IEC. Finally, and I'll mention this in my next talk in a moment, we are looking very forward to even closer cooperation with IAF.

Finally Belinda says I look forward to seeing you all in Washington as I conclude my ten years as ILAC Chair. Those of you who know Belinda will probably realize that her two years are up. It is two year period, so there will be an election in Washington in three weeks for a new ILAC Chair. The current Vice-Chair is Mike Peet from South Africa.

A little bit perhaps about the MRA. Perhaps if you can just put the second slide on Bernard, I'll run through this very quickly. It is just a little bit of the history, and I'll do this very quickly but I would like to focus that whenever you build on an MRA, and arrangement signed - "question mark" - we are hoping it is going to be October 2000, we thought maybe a little bit earlier, we did a lot of work, evaluating each other, going out to each others' laboratories, lots of proficiency testing and inter-laboratory comparisons between the two main regional groups, which represent about 90 % of ILAC. And we really tried to focus on where there are differences and build enough confidence, we hope will get to the stage where we can sign this agreement in three weeks' time.

This is a bit about how we are going to do this and we are very conscious of the fact that the world is not just EA and APLAC in terms of laboratory accreditation and we have to look very much at unaffiliated bodies. There are many accreditation bodies in the Americas, particularly in South America, South Africa and of course in Eastern Europe which hopefully will be joining in the EA arrangement and the ILAC MRA is going to be opened to those accreditation bodies which are not at present covered by a regional group. The ILAC MRA also allows for new regional groups, the APMP, EUROMET type at the metrology level, in our case it's the laboratory accreditation bodies like EA and APLAC, and there will be perhaps two or three applications from other regional bodies in the near future. We hope to sign in 2000.

I do not want to put you off, but there is an awful lot of paperwork going along with this ILAC MRA. It's built on existing documentation particularly with the EA and APLAC, but you can see there that we you've got to be very careful with the words: "Arrangement", well I will not go into that, but we use the word "arrangement", it used to be agreement, but agreement does sometimes to some countries mean things in terms of government to government treaties. So "arrangement" is another word which most people are comfortable with until you'll come up with your own words at the time; that's just some of the documents which have gone through to all ILAC members and had to be voted on.

One of the key points of this and perhaps this is a message which maybe I can leave, this was a seminar: what we decided in ILAC is that our own evaluations, the evaluations of our accreditation bodies, must be effective. We must focus on the principal points, and this is where metrology is so important. So, we have spent a lot of time saying: "Let's not just get a warm feeling where everybody is fine, the paperwork is fine, we must see if our accredited laboratories do produce accurate measurements." And we have a lot of seminars on the people who actually evaluate accreditation bodies. And this involves of course looking at who actually goes out to laboratories and does the assessments there. They must be competent, and we have come up with some KPI's - another acronym - key performance issues. And I can tell you that traceability, uncertainty and inter-laboratory comparisons are right on the top of that list, because we feel that they are essential and if we did nothing else during an evaluation, but gave a lot of emphasis to those, you could do a lot worse. And perhaps not get so tired and bogged down in paperwork.

So that was a little bit about the ILAC MRA, now I must say a little bit about IAF. I am sorry, I am not so familiar with IAF, but I do bring you greetings from Dr. Ohtsubo who has also produced a two page report which you have in front of you. Dr. Ohtsubo is giving you an overview of the fact that IAF is incorporated. ILAC is thinking about that by the way, becoming a separate legal entity. It talks about developments within IAF, in terms of policies and procedures again to try and strengthen their position, be more open, to make their process more effective for their stakeholders, and of course here we are talking about the accrediting bodies who look at quality systems, product certification, personnel certification, environmental management systems. It is talking about the need for confidence, the need for

people to use the MRA which IAF also has, and it talks about the fact that their own MRA is expanding, and that they will in the future encompass other areas as well as quality management, so as well as ISO 9000, they intend to extend it ISO 14001 and also at a later date product certification.

Dr. Ohtsubo has also mentioned the importance of worldwide acceptance of their activities and again stresses the need for close links with other organizations who have similar interests. I think the message here is to cooperate rather than to duplicate. He talks indeed about the ongoing discussions between IAF and ILAC. We have not merged as yet, it is on the table, many of you will be aware that within Europe the EAL and the old EAC merged and formed EA. A similar thing has not happened to APLAC yet, but that is very much on the drawing board and there are lots more discussions and forward planning going on to try and improve the communication between the two bodies. Again Dr. Ohtsubo stresses the importance to keep your stakeholders involved, and feel that they are part of the process, and that the whole process must have added value otherwise some of those may be looking for a new job. He also mentions that the next IAF meeting is in Washington the week after ILAC, and those of you perhaps who would like to go to Kyoto in 2001 when the next meeting next October is, you are very welcome there.

Mr. Athané said that if accreditation would need metrology, legal metrology would need accreditation as well since testing and certification bodies working in the field of legal metrology could quite well be accredited, this accreditation being based on ILAC/IAF general principles with adaptation to legal metrology based on papers being developed by the OIML. The trilateral BIPM/ILAC/OIML cooperation was therefore supplemented by a bilateral ILAC/OIML cooperation (revision of OIML D 10, application of ISO 17025 to legal metrology, etc.) and an IAF/OIML cooperation was now starting.

Mr. Klenovský noted that Mr. Squirrell had said that accreditation was a service to customers, to laboratories, and asked whether there were any developments to create a fully competitive environment in the accreditation field. Mr. Squirrell replied that this was a very interesting subject of discussions. Some people thought that it was necessary to put more emphasis on that, whereas others thought that this would not be the most effective way. ILAC was very conscious of criticisms concerning monopoly situations in certain countries and that these countries should be opened to competitiveness; however, if there were too many accreditation bodies in a given country, this might have a counter effect. This was currently a very emotional problem which was to be discussed in depth within ILAC. However, certain governments had already established their own rules and would perhaps not be ready to change rapidly just because ILAC was asking to do so. The views of stakeholders also had to be carefully considered.

Mr. Birch noted that Annex 1 of ISO 17025 allowed for specialist documents to be prepared as complements to 17025 for application to particular sectors. One was being developed for application to legal metrology. Mr. Birch was aware of national documents being prepared but not of any international document which could be used in the accreditation process as part of the MRA. He asked Mr. Squirrell whether he was aware of such documents. Mr. Squirrell replied that the ILAC Technical Committee was developing an annex on traceability (including in legal metrology) mainly based on an EA draft but with the input of many other organizations - this paper was going to be discussed soon and would be distributed for comments to a number of organizations (including the OIML), stakeholders, etc.

## **b) Regional Legal Metrology Organizations**

### **Mr. Birch, APLMF Convener**

The APLMF held their Seventh Forum Meeting in Taipei last week and in the three days of the meeting we discussed a very wide range of technical issues covering training, intercomparisons, prepacked goods, utility meters, rice moisture measurements, medical measurements, taximeters, mutual recognition, modernization and harmonization of legislation and the economic and social benefits of metrology. I will be saving up most of that report for our discussions at the Development Council and the meetings of Regional Legal Metrology Organizations. What I would like to make some comments on here is basically the relationship between the APLMF and the OIML, i.e. the liaison between us. The first thing I have to say is that it has been an excellent relationship. We have been delighted by the support we have received from the Bureau and the OIML (and in particular Mr. Athané) who has attended all our meetings except this most recent one because it was so close to the Conference, but Mr. Magaña was able to attend as well as Mr. Faber; so we again had a very good relationship with the Organization.

The next thing I would like to say is that in the Asia-Pacific, both the APLMF and the regional standardization organizations have a general policy of not developing any regional standards. We are interested in the work which is occurring in Europe; we believe some excellent work is being done there and particularly in a number of areas which we are interested in. But we see our work as being the implementation of OIML Recommendations and we are always very reliant in many areas on the modernization of OIML Recommendations so that we can then work on them. And ones which we have brought up (and there is work going on in many of them) which we are particularly interested in are electricity meters, taximeters, statistical sampling as applied to both prepacked goods and verification of utility meters, the review of R 87 on *Prepacked Goods* (which we certainly strongly support) and the *Law on Metrology* which (as has also been mentioned already) has been defined as an important area, most of the members of the APLMF seem to be modernizing their legislation at present. So they are all important areas for us and our relationship with the Organization; we need those Recommendations to be able to then look towards harmonizing the requirements in the region and developing mutual recognition agreements on testing as covered by those particular Recommendations.

Training has been mentioned a few times already as being an important area; one of the important aspects for us now is to both extend the training as far as possible to as many people as possible and to achieve a greater degree of international coherence in the development of those training courses. One of the proposals we put forward (and there was an article in the OIML Bulletin recently) was on international accreditation of training courses. Now it is a concept at this stage, but what we are looking at is to achieve a greater degree of coherence in the courses, so that there is an acceptance and confidence that these training courses meet the OIML requirements. And I expect we will have very useful discussions on that during the Development Council and the meeting of the Regional Legal Metrology Organizations.

Mutual recognition is another area of great importance for us. Any OIML mutual recognition agreement will I think be dependent upon it being spread down through the Regional Legal Metrology Organizations through regional mutual recognition agreements which are complementary to the OIML mutual recognition agreement; and we are certainly taking a great deal of interest in the work being done in the OIML committee on mutual acceptance of test reports and we are proposing fairly soon to start tightening up our development of a regional mutual acceptance agreement which will support the OIML requirements.

The only other matter I would mention here is that we did have some discussion on the rapid changes which are occurring in the region and particularly as they relate to new technologies and globalization, globalization being experienced in terms of major pipeline projects to link up all of East Asia and South-East Asia: electricity grids similarly do the same. All these will create major new measurement needs in the region and particularly when competition policy comes into utilities, this will also create major measurement needs. And I would suggest that could be one of the themes of the proposed conference next year at NIST on these changes in the market place and in technologies and globalization and the effect it has upon increased demand for measurement and how that can be met in many of these regions. So these are the only points I think I would like to make at this stage.

The other mention I would make is that we have finalized our inter-comparison on nonautomatic weighing instruments and we are in the process of finalizing it on load cells and we would be looking forward to publishing those in the OIML Bulletin as soon as possible.

## Mr. Grkov, South East European (Balkan) Cooperation

The Second Conference for Balkan Cooperation was held in April this year in Macedonia. First I would like to say some words on the history of this Conference.

Four years ago the Greek Institute for Standardization organized a Conference for the Balkan Cooperation on standardization and related activities. Six countries participated: Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, Macedonia, Romania and Yugoslavia, but without the decision to follow it up with another one. Two years ago the Greek Institute for Metrology also organized a conference for the Balkan Cooperation on quality and six countries participated: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Greece, Macedonia and Romania.

One of the decisions was that this Conference would be followed up by another one. The idea of this Conference is to be traditionally organized every year and to act like a forum for cooperation, development of confidence and mutual recognition between all the responsible institutions for standardization, metrology, accreditation and conformity assessment in this region.

Ten countries were invited to the Second Conference: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, Macedonia, Slovenia, Turkey and Yugoslavia. These ten countries cover the territory of about one and a half million square kilometers and about one hundred and fifty million inhabitants. Four lecturers were invited: for standardization a representative from the European Organization for Standardization CEN, Mr. Thomas Kaizer. For metrology, the representative from the OIML, Mr. Bernard Athané. For accreditation, the representative from the European Accreditation, Mr. Robert Kaarls, and for Trade, the representative from the World Trade Organization, Mrs. Sindelar. The following decisions were made at this Conference:

- To set up a working group for preparing a regional database for a responsible organization certification body, test calibration laboratory, national measurement standards.
- To set up a working group for organizing the regional inter-laboratory comparison.
- To set up a working group responsible for organizing the seminars, workshops, development of a program for learning at distance, and so on.
- To set up a working group for preparing a regional memorandum of understanding, for Hungary to be invited to the Third Conference, and once again Romania, since this country did not participate in the Second Conference, and to change the name "Balkan" to "South-East European Cooperation on Quality", because the word "Balkan" is associated with conflicts.

I would like to inform you that the Third Conference for South-East European Cooperation on Quality will be held in April 2001 in Macedonia. Thank you.

## Mr. Astashenkov, COOMET Representative

I would like to remind you that COOMET, (the Regional Metrology Organization of Central and Eastern-European Countries) was established in 1991. I have to note that COOMET technical policy has been (and is) in line with that of the CIML and the BIPM. I wish to inform you about the main events of COOMET since the 34<sup>th</sup> CIML Meeting in Tunis:

- First of all a Working Group on Legal Metrology was established and started its activity under the chairmanship of Mr. H. Apel (PTB, Germany). The first meeting of this WG, held at the PTB (Braunschweig) in May 2000 prepared a strategy document for the development of basic normative documents for our Organization and established the plan of concrete actions.
- The Tenth COOMET Meeting was held in Almaty (Kazakhstan). In order to save time I will not go into details, since you can find an account of this meeting in the October 2000 issue of the OIML Bulletin, copies of which are available here for everyone.
- There is an ongoing activity at COOMET in connection with the BIPM agreement on *Mutual recognition of national measurement standards and calibration certificates issued by national metrology institutes* signed in October 1999. This is a very important task, since regional metrology organizations have to play a leading role in its realization.
- This year COOMET has started a number of original projects in the fields of fundamental and legal metrology.
- Finally, last week the COOMET Presidential Council meeting was held in Moscow where concrete actions to be taken in the near future were discussed and decided.

In addition, reports on COOMET activities are regularly published in the OIML Bulletin and in national scientific, technical and metrology journals.

To conclude my brief report, I would like to note that our organization shares the opinion of the CIML President expressed yesterday in his report to the Conference on the role of regional metrology organizations.

The next COOMET meeting will be held in Moldavia where I think my colleague (here present) will have pleasure in inviting those participants in the Conference who are interested in attending.

### **Mr. Magaña, EMLMF Co-Convener**

The Euro-Mediterranean Legal Metrology Forum is quite a new organization which met for the first time last year in Tunis. Its objective is to develop common actions in the field of legal metrology within Mediterranean and European countries.

During the Tunis meeting it was decided to establish four working groups. The first one deals with mutual information and its first objective will be to develop a Directory on legal metrology for the countries that participate in the cooperation, similar to the WELMEC Directory. This working group has started its activities with the development of a questionnaire which will soon be sent to relevant countries.

The second working group deals with training. This group is already active mainly through its German representative, Dr. Wallerus from DAM. A questionnaire aimed at identifying the needs in the field of training is being developed. It is quite a comprehensive questionnaire with many connections with work on training at the OIML level; last Sunday we examined this questionnaire and the best possible orientations in order to receive rapid, efficient and simple replies.

The third working group deals with mutual recognition. This is a very specific topic for the Mediterranean region owing to the fact that a number of countries in the region do not possess type approval test means, which obliges them to recognize type approvals delivered in other countries. Ways in which these unilateral recognitions of type approval and connected needs of information concerning approved types constitute a very important task which is carried out by the working group. Due consideration is of course taken of OIML work on acceptance of test results; however the field of application is wider since Mediterranean countries need not only to recognize instruments that have received OIML certificates but also instruments which have been marketed prior to the establishment of OIML certificates and for which information is also necessary. Therefore this working group has actively started its work.

The last working group, dealing with technical assistance, is not active simply because the French secretariat does not yet have the necessary resources. However, work should start soon.

The second Forum meeting was held last Sunday afternoon. It was a short meeting and I consider that the next meeting should be longer owing to the rather busy agenda we have. We have received reports from other regional bodies and we have noted numerous topics of common interest for the various cooperations. We have mainly discussed the development of the activities within the working groups of our Forum and most conclusions are mainly for the attention of the Forum. However, a number of points may be drawn to the attention of the OIML.

Firstly, a modular approach should be applied in the OIML Certificate System in order to have the possibility to certify sub-assemblies. This already exists for load cells but this is an important approach.

Secondly, the use of e-mail and internet is very important to facilitate work within the regional cooperation. We have opened a web site for this regional cooperation as a basis and a support for the working groups and cooperation activities. However it is really necessary to promote the use of e-mail and internet in all countries and I think that the OIML should encourage all countries that do not yet use them to develop these communication means within their legal metrology services.

There is a last point which I deem to be of interest to the OIML and especially concerning the thoughts on mutual recognition. We have identified three steps in the work on mutual recognition that we will carry out at the regional level. I consider that these three steps should be considered by the OIML as well. The first step deals with information concerning type approvals. Obviously OIML certificates and test reports give information; however, it is necessary for countries that recognize type approvals to obtain additional technical information about the instruments, information which should be available from the type approval services. Information contained in OIML certificates and test reports are not always sufficient for those countries that will have to make use of these papers.

The second step, following recognition of an approval, is to be able to clearly identify individual instruments in relation with the approved types and the types described in the approval certificates or OIML test reports. The identification of individual instruments with types is an important matter for countries which recognize type approvals. In addition, a type approval recognition system must be associated with a market surveillance as we understand this term in Europe (being noted that market surveillance has also been discussed during an Asia-Pacific meeting). This means that what enters the market following the recognition of an approval must be under control; it is also necessary to establish an alarm system between countries that cooperate together so that the attention of colleagues working in other countries may be drawn to the different technical problems that may be faced.

These are our conclusions. I would also like to mention that Dr. Ugur attended our meeting as MENAMET representative, i.e. the Regional Cooperation in the field of Scientific Metrology, and it has been agreed that a close cooperation should exist between legal metrology and metrology cooperations in the Euro-Mediterranean and the Mediterranean regions. In particular any topic related to traceability should be examined together with MENAMET and, if possible, our next meeting could be held at the same place and during the same period as the MENAMET meeting. We are waiting for information from MENAMET concerning this.

### **Mrs. Annabi, EMLMF Co-Convener**

Mr. Magaña has given a general overview of this new Forum which was established last year in Tunis. My objective is now to focus on certain aspects or to give more details on a few others. Unfortunately participation in this year's meeting was not that good, since only eleven countries were present - we hope to have better participation at our next meetings. Nevertheless, the items on the agenda were very important but the time allocated was too short. I would like to insist on an important point: the Forum objective is mainly to bring the countries situated north and south of the Mediterranean sea closer together in order to eliminate technical barriers to trade. To this end we have requested that as great an exchange of information as possible exists between these countries, mainly through the BIML. Therefore we have spoken about OIML certificates which constitute a very important instrument for countries especially south of the Mediterranean sea; however I would like to request all European countries to participate in this information exchange especially in connection with the exchange of measuring instruments.

Mr. Magaña has evoked the development of communication means, a subject which has been much discussed during our meeting. He has mentioned the internet site which now exists under the management of the *Sous-Direction de la Métrologie* within the French Ministry of Industry. It operates in two languages, French and English. The Arabic language should be added shortly and this site is also open to other languages.

The last item I would like to mention is the draft MoU which has been drawn up but which has not yet been examined owing to a lack of available time. It has been distributed to all participants and we will probably establish a deadline though letters which we will send to Members so that they may make their opinions known before a thorough examination at the next meeting.

### **Mr. Birch, IOLMF Convener**

I would just like to briefly report on activities in the Indian Ocean on Regional Cooperation. And I believe the report is useful for highlighting the relationship between Government and legal metrology and the importance of Government commitment to get things done. The Indian Ocean Legal Metrology Forum was established in March 1998 by Australia and drawing mainly on our experience in the Asia-Pacific Legal Metrology Forum. And it was stimulated by the establishment in the Indian Ocean of an Inter-Governmental group, the Indian Ocean rim association for regional cooperation which had similar objectives to APEC of facilitating trade. And it was felt that

legal metrology could contribute to the work of that Inter-Governmental group. We published a Directory of legal metrology in the Indian Ocean early in 1998 and then we were asked by the Inter-Governmental group to facilitate a workshop in Sri Lanka to identify the areas that legal metrology could facilitate trade in the area. That workshop was held and a report sent along to the Indian Ocean Inter-Governmental group, which still has to actually finalize a consideration of that report. This is nearly two years later.

And the problem is that the Indian Ocean Governmental group have yet to work out what they wish to do in the region. And so there is a lack of strong commitment at this stage to any particular programs. I think it will change but it does highlight that a major impediment to establishing a regional legal metrology group is if Governments themselves do not have a strong commitment to regional cooperation. So legal metrology can support Government activities in facilitating trade at a regional level, but only if the Governments themselves have made that commitment. If they have not made the commitment, I think it is extremely difficult. I would hope that that commitment will be made more clear in the next few months. I know there are meetings coming up and that they will also see legal metrology as being an important part of their program, I think that is likely too. But I think it does highlight that if you want to have a regional legal metrology activity working well, you need a strong regional commitment by Government to trade.

### **Mr. Beard, SADCMEI Secretariat**

I would first of all just like to thank the OIML and President Faber for the invitation and our opportunity to participate in this Conference for the first time. So I will give a short preview of our activities and where we stand in the whole legal metrology situation.

SADCMEI was formed in 1996 and consists of 14 African countries more or less south of the Equator, which include Mauritius and the Seychelles. We are one of four organizations in the fields of standards quality, assurance, accreditation and metrology - the other three are SADCMET, which is a cooperation of the national metrology laboratories; SADCSTAN, a cooperation of the national standards laboratories, and SADC, a cooperation of the national accreditation bodies.

So, we have strong links with these bodies and therefore support all the areas that we have been talking about in the last day and a half, in as far as accreditation goes and harmonization or dealings with other standards bodies, etc.

Our association consists of one member of each country; we have various technical working groups for the sale of goods, that is the labeling requirements and pack sizes for the sale of goods for instruments. We have one for training, and one for rules of procedure. The aims of SADCMEI are to harmonize legal metrology requirements in our region. These include again requirements for packaged goods, including pack sizes, requirements for instruments, including the type approval and testing verification; also verification techniques. We intend instituting a uniform training program to promote the exchange of legal metrology related information among our members and to perform inter-comparisons. With regard to the cooperation with international and regional bodies, it is the intention of SADCMEI to cooperate closely with the OIML and other regional metrology bodies in an effort to ensure international harmonization and have any unique SADCMEI requirements covered in OIML Recommendations as far as possible.

To this end I would like to thank the OIML for the encouragement and support that we have actually received up until now.

SADCMEI members who are also OIML Members will serve on the OIML Technical Committees wherever possible and to this end we are already giving input into several Technical Committees via South African representatives.

We do have a SADC web site from which more information can be obtained, and if anybody is interested in getting the address, I will give it to them afterwards. I believe this will appear in the OIML Bulletin soon.

As far as our work program goes, priority has been given to the drafting of harmonized legislation for the packaging of goods as diversities in this area have the biggest potential of creating barriers to trade.

Presently we are awaiting the finalized redrafting of R 87, as well as more international consensus on the marking requirements as we found big discrepancies around the world, and we really are not sure which way to go as far as legislating for the marking of packages at this stage is concerned.



It is also our intention to adopt OIML Recommendations for all instruments and then redraft legislation for instruments not covered by OIML documentation.

With regard to training, all the member countries of SADCMELE require training of all types. We would really like to start off with the interpretation of a lot of the OIML Recommendations. We seem to interpret them differently or when we make inquiries in different parts of the world, we obtain different interpretations on the same document. And to set ourselves on the right track, first we need to be able to interpret them properly.

To date we have held courses on Recommendations R 87 and R 76 which is the nonautomatic instruments regulation with lecturers (at some cost) being funded by the PTB of Germany, to whom we are also very thankful. Together with our sister organization SADCMELE we are in the process of founding the SADC resource center for metrology education and we hope to present various courses through this organization later.

To date, again the PTB has been very supportive and funded attendance of courses in Germany on the understanding that attendees will develop local courses to be offered by the resource center. This will ensure capacity building in our whole region.

I think this has been a brief summary of our activities, and I hope I have gone through in enough detail for you.

### **Mr. Bennett, WELMEC Chairman**

WELMEC was created in 1990 as a cooperation between the countries of Europe in the area of legal metrology. There are now 18 members in WELMEC who have signed the Memorandum of Understanding and a further ten associate members. We have a committee which meets now annually; we will meet again in the Summer of next year in Dublin, in Ireland. Most of the work as in many organizations is done in the working groups, and there are seven working groups covering a wide range of topics.

As has been mentioned, we have our own mutual recognition agreement. It is not actually called a mutual recognition agreement; it is called a type approval agreement: it is slightly different to other mutual recognition agreements and for those who are interested in it there is a publication which describes that agreement. That is one of 16 publications which include a number of guides, a booklet of information about WELMEC, a directory of legal metrology in Europe, and some other subjects particularly concerned with packaged goods. The majority of those publications are available on our web site and if you have not done so before, I urge you to visit our web site. The address is [www.welmec.org](http://www.welmec.org); an easy address to remember, and I urge you to visit that, and if you visit that now the home page will show you a photograph of the WELMEC committee (which is perhaps not the interesting information about WELMEC!).

The important issues which are being discussed in WELMEC at the moment include the Measuring Instruments Directive (you have heard that mentioned today) and we shall hear some more about that this afternoon from Mr. Hanekuyk. And WELMEC will have a key role in trying to make sure that it is a good Directive for the European countries, but also that it fully reflects the link with the OIML - that has been referred to several times this week already including the speech by the Minister yesterday.

Also the question of quality standards and the way in which they are applied to bodies involved in type approval, in verification, and in the assessment of manufacturers, and in the production and testing systems of manufacturers themselves. And that is a discussion which is going on not only in WELMEC but in OIML and elsewhere.

The third issue which is stretching us at the moment is the question of market surveillance, or market supervision, which seems to mean different things to different people. But it covers the whole question of checking that instruments that are placed on the market do comply with the regulations and then that they are controlled and supervised in use - this in a group of countries which have very different traditions and practices.

The question of metrology software: we have a special group working on that (they have already produced a publication) and once again I know that is a topic of interest to the OIML and to the other regional groups as well.

The question of prepackages is something else which is of common interest, it has been mentioned several times already; and finally the question of the WELMEC membership: we tried to establish some clear rules for membership of WELMEC; several of you here have approached me about the possibility of extending membership to other countries, and that is something which WELMEC no doubt will return to again without making it open to all, to try to make sure that those who have an interest in the development of legal metrology in Western Europe and in the European Union can participate in this important organization.

I think those are the main issues which concern us. In the case of the Measuring Instruments Directive, our particular interest from now on and will be in the technical requirements for the 11 categories of instruments which are included in that Directive, and the working group under the Chairman of Mr. Magaña will be looking at those to make sure that they are correct and will stand the test of time as essential requirements. I guess that Measuring Instruments Directive, Mr. Hanekuyk may have a better guess than I have this afternoon, but I guess it is probably two years away from adoption and then there will be a further period of a year or eighteen months for the member states to put it into their legislation. So I suppose we may be four years away from an introduction of a new regime in Europe but that is focusing our minds in WELMEC: four years sounds a long time, but I think it will go very quickly and that is going to be probably the main item on our agenda in the coming few years.

That is a very short summary of what is going on in WELMEC at the moment. If you have specific questions or you want some more information, do speak to me or to another of the WELMEC committee members or as I have said visit our web site; you will find a lot of information there.

## **c) European bodies**

### **Mr. Hanekuyk, European Commission Representative**

Before coming to the main topic of my presentation, that is the MID, I would like to give some information concerning other activities that we have achieved this year. The Directive on units of measurement was maintained for ten years, which authorizes non-SI units on labeling to be maintained; however it is hoped that within ten years it will be possible to use SI units only.

The prepackages legislation has been reviewed and the conclusion is that the legislation should be made mandatory and flexible.

The MID is certainly of a mandatory and flexible type. The draft is available on the internet and a comprehensive web page containing all the relevant metrology information is expected to be produced soon.

The Directive consists of a number of articles of a new approach legislative nature and a number of annexes. The first annex contains the essential requirements. Other annexes contain tests, conformity assessment with various possibilities, one being based on a quality assurance system, and finally specific essential requirements per instrument.

Information provided by the BIML in the papers for this Conference are, for the most part, correct. I have however a comment concerning nonautomatic weighing instruments: these are covered by a separate Directive and all is going well so the Commission is not going to touch that. Automatic weighing instruments are part of the new legislation and certain speakers will perhaps later give their views concerning this.

A specific aspect of this new legislation is that it will make a reference to the OIML Recommendations. In the past we have not done that because basically ISO and the IEC are responsible for developing international standards and European standardization bodies receive mandates to develop European standards based on these international standards. In the case of legal metrology, the situation is a bit different because of the existence of the OIML; this is why the option of normative documents has been introduced. Basically the idea is that the Recommendations of the OIML would suffice, where they represent the translation of the essential requirements. How this will be determined? This is not finally fixed but it could be the responsibility of a committee which would determine whether the Recommendations sufficiently cover the essential requirements.

In the new approach the essential requirements are basically what should always be adhered to. There is here a responsibility for the sole manufacturer. Therefore any standard which would give presumption of conformity with the essential requirements cannot dilute these essential requirements which remain the basis of the responsibility of the manufacturer. This being kept in mind, there will be a standard giving presumption of conformity; that standard could be a European standard "or" it could be an OIML Recommendation via a normative document. It is not our idea to make competing standards; therefore the "or" should be interpreted as meaning "and/or" in the sense that

when there is a Recommendation that covers the essential requirements we use that, where there isn't, we will look at the possibility of covering that with a standard that could be a European standard. So there could be a bit of creative work left there, but given the possibility of cooperation which was outlined yesterday by Mr. Athané, I think that we are on the right track.

Concerning the expectation that we have for the timetable, we have fixed 1 July 2002 as the date for implementation of this Directive, i.e. the transposition done by the Member States. This means that the MID should be finalized at the Council and Parliament levels by 1 July 2001.

That summarizes the key points I wanted to bring up.

### **Mr. Anthony, CECIP Representative**

Mr. President, thank you for giving me the opportunity of speaking to this Conference today. I last had the opportunity of addressing such a gathering in Vancouver in 1996, and I said to you then that I appreciated the way you were moving towards performance based standards for your Recommendations. We are pleased that has continued.

Can I say that for CECIP, we have been very conscious over the last four years of the involvement that you have allowed us in the OIML working groups. I support and endorsed what Mr. Athané said this morning. CECIP has been made very welcome at all the OIML working groups that it has attended. Our views have been listened to, we have been given recognition for the expertise that we have, and we thank you for that. It is an example in a world that is not always so wonderful, of the cooperation between industry and legislators. And I think the OIML is to be congratulated on the involvement that it allows industry to do. We still do not have the right to vote in your meetings: we are working on that, but I think it will be a long time before you will allow us that particular privilege.

Can I also endorse something that was said by an earlier speaker, this morning, Mr. Magaña. We have an OIML Certificate System that allows the concept of modularity, certainly as far as load cells go. For measuring instrument manufacturers in general, and for the weighing machine industry in particular, we now need to take that further. We need modularity for indicators, for load bearing systems, and I am sure that I cannot speak for CECOD or any other members of industry, but I am sure they will take the same view. We need now a modularity system. Manufacturers are in a world that is based on modularity. The time has long gone when a manufacturer of a measuring instrument did all the work himself. All the design, every component, every mechanical section, every electrical section. We now buy in many things and we need a modular approach to do that. You have started down that route with R 60, we urge you to continue with that. And if I talk about R 60, I am drawn to the view of certificates of conformity. In certificates of conformity, we have a system that in principle allows manufacturers to go anywhere in the world with a piece of paper which is meaningful to the type approval organizations. Sadly I have to say Mr. President, that the OIML Certificates System, while widely recognized and accepted in many Member States of OIML, is sadly neglected and discounted in other Member States. I fail to see why, CECIP fails to see why. You have a OIML certificate of conformity scheme. You are all professional organizations. You all have skills, technical knowledge, technical expertise. For the weighing machine industry, we fail to see why you do not trust each other. I accept, we accept that for some of you, there may be legislative difficulties, in simply accepting OIML certificates. But from CECIP's point of view, we urge you to overcome those difficulties. Certificates of conformity to OIML documents and OIML Recommendations are a valuable tool for manufacturers if they are accepted by all Member States of OIML. If you do not accept them, then we are wasting our time, and you are wasting your efforts in granting such certificates. You are competent professionals, trust each other. I know that might be a radical view point, but you are professionals and we urge you to take note of what you are capable of, what your colleagues in other Member States are capable of, and accept each others' word and competence.

Mr. President, there are some things that the OIML can do, and has done, in the development of technical and performance standards and Recommendations. There are other things that the OIML seems to us to be a little bit lacking in. One of the problems we have as manufacturers, and it is not just CECIP - we have talked to our colleagues in America, the SMA, and to the Japanese, the Japanese Measuring Instruments Federation - one of the problems that we see concerns market surveillance. Type approval and initial verification means little, unless there is adequate and professional market surveillance. The effect and the efficiency and the competence that the OIML, and the national metrological authorities, and the enforcement officials, dealing with legal metrology demonstrate in ensuring that legal metrology system works, is not recognized by the citizens of the Member States of the OIML. They accept that when they go into to a shop, when they visit a garage, when they buy something, the quantity will be right. That is an unwritten testament to the work that you do. But unfortunately, now, you are losing resources. You have said I think,

Mr. President, in document 5.1, that there is now difficulty in moving OIML forward, in gaining, or in taking things forward because of lack of resources for the metrological authorities and the Member States.

I think (CECIP thinks), you now need to look at the way you organize those resources, and should you be concentrating on type approval and initial verification, or should you be concentrating on what goes on in the market place. Maybe I am talking at the wrong forum, maybe I am saying things at the wrong system. But the whole thing, the whole legal metrology edifice is one unity, as far as the citizens and the manufacturers, and the users of equipment are concerned, and you have an unwritten duty to do that.

And going back to what we said in 5.1: there is a difficulty you say in finding the resources. Can I urge you Mr. President, and the Director, to take advantage of the opportunities that the participation of industry in OIML can present to you. We are willing to be more involved. We are willing to put in the effort. Successful and professional, and competent OIML Recommendations and Documents, are not just useful for the citizens of your countries and for metrological authorities - they are valuable for manufacturers. We are willing to put in more effort. We have the expertise, we have the knowledge, and in some cases, we have more of the time available to do that work. Use the resource that is there for you.

Mr. President, I am very grateful, despite the message that might have come across, and CECIP is very grateful for the role you have enabled us to play. The OIML has, over the last twenty years certainly (during which time I have been involved with it) come a long way down the road. You have a long journey to complete, but we look forward to going on that journey with you, in partnership. Thank you.

### **Mr. Klein, CECOD Representative**

Thank you. I am pleased to be here in the name of CECOD representing the European Manufacturers of Liquid Measuring Equipment and special filling station equipment and related apparatus.

I think this is the first time someone from CECOD has spoken at an OIML Conference, and I am very happy to do so. CECOD already has long-standing connections with the OIML related to Recommendations R 117 and R 118. Coming back to what Mr. Anthony said on modularity, we also had some problems in that different components delivered from a variety of manufacturers can often be found in one single measuring system, but an OIML certificate cannot be granted for each individual component. So, some years ago, a small group began updating R 118; this project is underway but has yet to be finalized - it will allow for more possibilities, and we are very happy to be able to participate in that work.

This is a good way of working because, similar to manufacturers in the weighing machine industry (as Mr. Anthony has already said) in our field too we work on components of measuring systems and it is very important to participate in these groups to contribute our experience and knowledge in a practical way to the institutes working in these commissions. However, in the end we have neither voting rights nor the right to make the final decisions.

An important new element to take into consideration here in Europe is the Measuring Instruments Directive and as a result of this, will have much work to accomplish in order to update R 117 and R 118. The MID requirements will be taken into account by means of a normative document in the same way as a standard. So I think some requirements will have to be changed in these documents and it will be useful for us to have construction requirements laid down, though we are talking about what will happen in two to three years from now.

In the short term, revising these existing OIML Recommendations is possible, but in the long run I feel that Recommendations should be drawn up taking into account the requirements of the MID. We are very happy to continue working on this in conjunction with the OIML.

Our experience of the OIML Certificate System as far as the test report formats for the existing R 117 and R 118 are concerned is that they have been taken into account by many countries, but still different interpretations are possible. So our experience has to date been positive, but much negotiation and clarification is still needed.

Mr. Magaña (convener of WELMEC Working Group 8 on the MID) pointed out that the October issue of the OIML Bulletin contained a paper by Dr. Apel concerning this Directive and he invited all interested persons to read what he felt was a very pertinent article. Concerning the interaction between the MID and OIML Recommendations, he pointed out that WELMEC WG 8 had actively participated in the development of the technical annexes to the MID. Annex I specified the metrological requirements applicable to all measuring instruments covered by the MID and these requirements were developed as a sort of synthesis of the provisions contained in the relevant OIML Recommendations. This work should be of interest for all OIML TCs/SCs. Concerning the annexes specific to the various categories of measuring instruments, metrological requirements were also taken from OIML Recommendations whenever possible. From these annexes it was easy to identify those OIML Recommendations which were out-dated and should therefore be revised rapidly, with the possibility to easily develop normative documents based on these revised Recommendations.

Concerning the activities of WELMEC WG 8, Mr. Magaña added that an examination of the technical annexes to the MID should start soon in close cooperation with the European Federations of manufacturers and users.

Mr. Birch expressed his thanks to Mr. Anthony for his remarks particularly in view of the discussions that would take place the following day during the Round Table on mutual recognition. In his opinion the problem was to establish a global system which would have similar qualities to those existing in the current national systems. The establishment of an OIML recognition agreement would be based on the establishment of that degree of trust, one of the components of which would be a document on the capabilities of legal metrology authorities. In the APLMF meeting one week ago there had been discussions on production conforming to type and concerns were expressed that not all manufacturers always had the facilities to ensure this. It would therefore be of great interest to learn from manufacturers about their global capabilities to ensure that production does match type.

Mr. Anthony replied that it was difficult for manufacturers to obtain statistics and information on how well each manufacturer individually meets the requirements of production matching type, or market surveillance. What could be said was that many manufacturers were accredited to the International Standards ISO 9000 for the design, manufacture, inspection, installation, verification and servicing of their equipment. There were many mutual recognition agreements between the assessment bodies that were giving accreditation to ISO 9000 and there were probably no manufacturers accredited to ISO 9000 which would not be willing to subject themselves to assessment, product sampling or testing of ongoing products to ensure that production did match type. There were of course certain manufacturers of weighing instruments whose types submitted for approval were excellent, whereas production did not follow suit. This was why CECIP, together with the US, Japanese and other manufacturers' associations agreed to say that efforts now should be concentrated on market surveillance. Type approval was very easy for any manufacturer to achieve; the hard part was making sure that the production itself met the requirements. Legal metrology authorities all around the world and the OIML should apply their efforts so that, in addition to type approval and initial verification, market surveillance or ongoing verification be effective. Market surveillance was now the key to making sure that the legal metrology field was properly regulated and that users and consumers could be confident in the correct operation of measuring instruments.

Messrs. Faber and Birch thanked Mr. Anthony for his very clear declaration and although it was not possible to discuss it immediately, this would certainly be a basis for further thoughts and discussions within the OIML.

Mrs. Bennett noted that the testing of conformity to type was an expensive process; however in certain countries no fees were charged for this type of activity. She understood from the report on WELMEC that there were plans to jointly organize the allocation of conformity assessment and the sharing of results. Mrs. Bennett was wondering whether the OIML should not consider this concept with a view to alleviating the workload.

Mr. Bennett said that for the time being there was no systematic approach nor a coordinated program concerning this matter, although there had been a tentative and some discussions. This should be discussed within the CIML.

Mr. Apel said that the MID had been developed according to a pattern which was more than ten years old whereas in the field of standards new approaches were considered. He asked the European Commission Representative whether there were some thoughts to adapt European work to these new developments. Concerning nonautomatic weighing instruments that were covered by an independent Directive and not by

the MID, Mr. Apel asked whether the type approval procedures provided for in the MID and in the Directive on nonautomatic weighing instruments would be harmonized, taking into consideration the results of an inquiry currently being carried out by the Commission concerning type approval of nonautomatic weighing instruments. Mr. Hanekuyk replied to the first question by saying that the new approach had been designed to make it possible to cope with technical progress provided that the essential requirements were actually performance and not design requirements. Concerning the second question, Mr. Hanekuyk noted that the type approval procedures for nonautomatic weighing instruments were a bit "old-fashioned" but that they were working correctly. The Commission was now looking at market surveillance aspects of the nonautomatic weighing instruments Directive and it could be that the conformity assessment module be introduced. Mr. Bennett added that the quality assurance module should surely be considered by the OIML.

Mr. Vaucher said that the main problem concerning market surveillance was how to finance it. As long as the instrument was meeting the requirements, it was neither the manufacturer, nor the company which put the instrument on the market, nor the user, nor the customer who would pay for market surveillance - but more and more governments were refusing to undertake new duties. One solution could perhaps be to offer a package consisting of market surveillance, enforcement and reverification, such reverification being paid by the user which would finance the package.

Mr. Bennett agreed that it was difficult to persuade governments to introduce new legislation e.g. for reverification if it involved charging users, many of these being small companies and small traders.

## **5 – WORK OF OIML TECHNICAL COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES**





## 5.1 Work undertaken - State of progress

The BIML presented the following report.

### 1 General situation since the Tenth Conference

#### 1.1 Decrease in TC/SC activity

Since the Tenth Conference there has been an overall decrease in OIML technical activities, despite the Conference's decision *to encourage the OIML TC's and SC's to accelerate and improve their activity*. This is particularly highlighted by the declining number of technical body meetings - predominantly held in Europe - and by the decrease in the number of Recommendations produced (15, compared to 25 during the previous 4-year period).

Among the objective reasons for this decline, as a general trend it was recognized that most matters of "classical" legal metrology have already been dealt with and that OIML activity is developing in fields for which most national legal metrology services have no responsibility or competence (e.g. the environment, health). Another reason is the tendency towards staff reductions in line with deregulation; the lack of additional resources (i.e. staff and/or financing) for OIML activities is also a problem.

There were of course subjective reasons such as the low number of P-members in some SC's, inactive P-members in several TC's and SC's (not even participating in activities by correspondence) and the relatively high number of non-active ("sleeping") technical bodies.

This problem has been discussed several times by the Presidential Council and addressed during CIML Meetings: the results are taken into account in the *1999-2002 Action Plan*.

Despite the general decrease observed over the first two years following the Tenth Conference, several TC's and SC's did become more active during 1999 and 2000 and significantly more technical meetings were held to reach, in 2000, the mean of the period before that Conference.

#### 1.2 Main results of the technical work

##### 1.2.1 Approved Recommendations and Documents

As a result of the activity of OIML technical bodies since the Tenth Conference:

- 12 draft Recommendations (7 revised and 5 new) were approved by the 32<sup>nd</sup> to 34<sup>th</sup> CIML Meetings;
- 3 new drafts are to be directly presented for sanctioning by the 11<sup>th</sup> Conference (Item 5.4);
- 3 draft annexes (Test report formats), 3 new International Documents and the VIML were approved by the CIML (by postal vote), and
- the OIML Certificate System was extended by 14 new categories of measuring instruments.

As a result of close cooperation, *Instruments for measuring vehicle exhaust emissions* (approved by the 32<sup>nd</sup> CIML Meeting) has just been published as a joint ISO 3930/OIML R 99 standard.

##### 1.2.2 Technical meetings held

Since the Tenth Conference a total of 25 technical meetings (7 TC and 18 SC) were held (6 in 1997, 4 in 1998, 7 in 1999 and 8 in 2000).

Compared with the total of 33 meetings during the previous 4-year period (i.e. about 8 per year) the 25 meetings held since the Tenth Conference is a clear sign of the overall decrease in technical activity.

### 1.3 Actions taken to encourage and facilitate improvements in technical activities

During the last period several activities and actions - initiated by the Presidential Council or by the BIML - were carried out in order to encourage and facilitate improvements in technical activities and to furnish CIML Members (and the technical bodies) with necessary up-to-date information including:

- The revision and publication of the *Guide for CIML Members*;
- Actions for important strategy issues and technical activities addressed by the CIML and included in the *1999–2002 Action Plan*;
- Regular updating and inclusion on the OIML web site of the series of documents on *OIML Technical Committees* including the document on *External liaisons*;
- Summaries of OIML TC/SC technical activities based on the Annual Reports published every year in the April issue of the OIML Bulletin;
- In addition to the monitoring of technical activities, updating documents and regular distribution of information on OIML technical work, regular contacts with the Secretariats of TC's and SC's by BIML staff in order to identify difficulties and to try to find appropriate solutions to problems;
- Increased checking of OIML R's and D's by BIML staff prior to publication for both editorial and technical content.

## 2 Situation and state of progress in 2000

In 2000 a total of 67 OIML technical bodies (18 TC's and 49 SC's) are responsible for 122 work projects.

Two Technical Committees - TC 5 and TC 13 - have been vacant since last year and TC 8/SC 2 became vacant recently.

At present out of the 15 Member States taking responsibility for TC's and SC's, the USA and Russia are responsible for the activities of 33 (nearly 50 %), 5 Member States (DE, GB, FR, AT and NL) for 22 (nearly 33 %) and 8 Member States for 9 TC's and SC's.

- As indicated in the Annual Reports, in 2000 45 TC's and SC's planned to work on 69 projects (including the revision of the existing Recommendations on utility meters);
- 5 TC's and 18 SC's have already developed 3 Draft Recommendations (to be presented to the 11<sup>th</sup> Conference for sanctioning) and 2 Draft Recommendations (to be presented to the 36<sup>th</sup> CIML Meeting for approval), 11 Committee Drafts, 9 Working Documents and 3 documents on proposed combined revisions of Recommendations ;
- 13 TC's and SC's are working on 15 projects intended for the OIML Certificate System;
- 7 technical meetings were already held in February, and one more is planned for November 2000.
- One Annex to a Recommendation (Test report format), the VIML and one International Document - approved by CIML Members by postal ballot - are being edited for publishing;
- Besides the two DR's (Revision of R 16) mentioned above, 7 further projects of revision and one project for a new Recommendation appear to be at an advanced enough stage to be presented to the CIML at its 36<sup>th</sup> Meeting for approval;
- Both parts of the *Directives for the technical work* are being revised with special regard to the implications of the WTO TBT Agreement and its Annex on the *Code of good practice for the preparation, adoption and application of standards*;
- As envisaged in A.1.3 of the *1999–2002 Action Plan* most TC's and SC's have reexamined their working projects giving high priority to the development and/or revision of Recommendations in fields such as utility meters, measuring systems for liquids, weighing instruments, electronic taximeters, etc. The list of the high priority projects has already been prepared. A more detailed list including not only the *high priority* but also the *priority projects* will be prepared and distributed by the Bureau after the Conference.
- Based on the replies received from 45 TC's and SC's and the information available at the BIML a detailed up-to-date document with an indication of tasks for technical bodies (including an indication of reviews that are due, ongoing projects, proposed re-confirmations and withdrawals) is being prepared by the Bureau and will be sent out together with the request for Annual Reports;
- A list of OIML liaison persons and contact persons of Secretariats of TC's/SC's is being prepared by the BIML and will soon be available on the OIML web site.

### 3 Proposals to improve technical activities

In addition to the actions included in A.1 of the *1999–2002 Action Plan*, based on several earlier discussions during CIML Meetings and on other occasions, the following additional proposals can be made:

- In order to achieve a more equal distribution of tasks and workload of TC's and SC's, countries having expertise in specific fields are requested to consider taking on the responsibility for some SC's and/or taking the lead in developing certain projects;
- Some TC's and SC's could join efforts in developing certain projects by establishing joint WG's (as is the case e.g. for TC 10/SC 1 and TC 10/SC 2);
- Based on the positive experience gained by some TC's and SC's (e.g. TC 13, TC 8/SC 5, TC 16/SC 1, etc.) it is advisable that OIML TC's and SC's make efforts to coordinate their activities with other international standardization bodies such as ISO and the IEC in order to better harmonize actions or to develop common documents and to avoid duplication of work.

Mr. Vaucher strongly supported the proposal to improve technical activities through better coordination with other international organizations and, as proposed by the CECIP Representative, by making better use of the resources that industry could offer in order to benefit from their technical knowledge. Then OIML TCs/SCs could concentrate on legal metrology matters.

Mr. Apel noted that the newly approved R 49 on water meters included provisions concerning software, a question which should now be horizontally dealt with by OIML TC 5/SC 2. Mr. Magaña added that this SC was now starting its work and that it was intended to develop a general document (similar to OIML D 11) which would give provisions on how to deal with software in the Recommendations specific to measuring instruments that included such software. For the time being certain Recommendations could include preliminary provisions concerning software, it being understood that such Recommendations would subsequently have to be reviewed to harmonize them with the TC 5/SC 2 general document when available.

Mr. Birch repeated that the APLMF was very interested in the development of a number of OIML Recommendations, including statistical methods under TC 3/SC 4 and asked for information concerning the progress of the work.

Mr. Apel replied that Germany had developed a preliminary paper which, after checking with German experts, would be distributed by the end of the year.

## 5.2 Implementation of Recommendations by OIML Members

The BIML presented the following report.

### 1 Introduction

The *OIML Long-term policy – Assessment of OIML strategies and activities* (BIML, 1995) stipulates that the degree of implementation of OIML Recommendations by OIML Members has to be evaluated every four years.

The last inquiry was carried out in 1996 and two draft documents were prepared and presented to CIML Members:

- *Implementation of OIML Recommendations Nos. 4 to 118*, and
- *OIML International Recommendations Nos. 4 to 118 and corresponding national regulations*.

The conclusions were reported to the Tenth Conference and these two documents were published in January 1997, based on the information supplied by 42 Member States (out of 54 in 1996).

In its resulting decision, the Tenth Conference *urged all OIML Members to implement OIML Recommendations in their national regulations or voluntary standards, to the greatest extent possible*.

This OIML action of regularly reviewing the implementation of OIML Recommendations was reported to (and appreciated by) both the WTO TBT Committee and the UN/ECE (Working party on Technical Harmonization and

Standardization Policies) and is in harmony with the WTO TBT *Principles of good practice for the preparation, adoption and application of standards*.

The latest inquiry was sent to all CIML Members in April 2000 and the provisional BIML report entitled *Implementation of OIML Recommendations Nos. 4 to 127* is based on the replies received so far.

Replies to the current inquiry were received by the BIML from only 33 Member States (out of the present 57). Of the 24 that did not reply, 11 have not updated the information that was published in 1997, and a further 13 (including 2 new ones) did not supply any information at all.

## 2 Preliminary conclusions

Some conclusions can nevertheless be drawn from the available (but incomplete) information, which has been compared with that received previously and published in the document *Implementation of OIML Recommendations Nos. 4 to 118*.

Information received from 31 OIML Member States can be compared with that sent in response to the 1996 inquiry. And the analysis of data concerning 91 OIML Recommendations shows certain tendencies between 1996 and 2000, which can be summarized as follows:

- In the case of 69 Recommendations (out of the 91) there is an overall increase of 24 % in the compatible national regulations of 22 Member States (10 % decrease in non-compatible regulations and a 16 % increase in the indicated number of national regulations). Only 7 Member States indicated a slight decrease in the volume of compatible regulations (mainly due to a decrease in the number of national regulations) and in the case of 2 Member States, no change was indicated.
- The degree of compatibility (i.e. the number of compatible national regulations related to the total number of existing national regulations that correspond to the OIML Recommendations) varies greatly:
  - 100 %: 2 Member States;
  - over 70 %: 18 Member States;
  - from 70 % to 30 %: 11 Member States; and
  - below 20 %: 3 Member States.
- For most of the Recommendations applicable within the OIML Certificate System, the level of compatibility of national regulations (with the exception of R 76 and R 60) is only about 2/3 and - in the case of R 112, R 113, R 123 and R 127 - this is combined with a very low level of implementation (implemented by only 1 or 2 Member States in a compatible manner).
- A number of Recommendations (R 89, R 100, R 112, R 113, R 116, R 121, R 123, R 125 and R 127) suffer from a very low level of implementation, i.e. they are implemented in only 3 or fewer Member States.

In order for the BIML to be able to draw up and publish the fully updated versions of the two documents in question and draw more accurate and well-founded conclusions, it is necessary that those OIML Member States that have not yet replied send their responses to the BIML before the end of November 2000.

## 3 Actions required to improve the degree of implementation of OIML Recommendations

A number of existing differences (and/or additional requirements) in national regulations (especially in OIML Member States) compared to OIML Recommendations need to be eliminated since they create unnecessary barriers to trade and - at the same time - hinder acceptance of OIML type test results/OIML certificates.

Although the necessary measures to be taken are not explicitly included in the *1999–2002 Action Plan* they are formulated in the *OIML Long-term policy – Assessment of OIML strategies and activities* and endorsed by the Tenth Conference in its decision (see Section 1 above). This issue is to be regarded as a permanent task for all OIML Member States.

The moral obligation of Member States to implement the OIML Recommendations in national regulations is also reinforced by the WTO TBT Agreement as an obligation.

In addition there is a proposal from UN/ECE (circulated by the WTO TBT Committee) to develop a global model for implementing *Good regulatory practice for the preparation, adoption and application of technical regulations via the use of international standards*. The acceptance of this proposal and the provisions of such a document will most likely enhance the necessity for internationally harmonized national regulations based on international standards.

The probable approval of the EU Measuring Instrument Directive (MID) in the near future and the development of *Normative Documents* based on OIML Recommendations by joint efforts of EU Member States (that are also OIML Member States) and the BIML will have a positive effect on improving the implementation of OIML Recommendations.

Mr. Kildal remarked that the WTO/TBT Committee had discussed the definition of international standards and asked whether OIML Recommendations were considered as such. Mr. Szilvássy replied that OIML Recommendations were regarded as international standards by the WTO and that the OIML was regarded as an international organization for standardizing in the field of legal metrology.

### **5.3 Formal sanction of Recommendations already approved by the Committee in 1997, 1998 and 1999**

Mr. Johansen, who had chaired the Technical Work Commission meeting, reported on discussions as follows.

The Recommendations which had been approved by the CIML in 1997, 1998 and 1999 (and which, for most of them, had already been printed) were reviewed one by one. Certain Delegations indicated that they would change their votes compared with the votes expressed at the time of approval by the CIML. At the end of this review it was noted that all these Recommendations could be submitted for voting by the Conference, which sanctioned them with the following results (all Member States not mentioned as having voted NO or ABSTENTION being considered as having voted YES).

#### **Recommendations approved in 1997**

##### *Measuring systems for the mass of liquids in tanks (R 125)*

Abstentions: Brazil, Poland

NO votes: Sweden

##### *Automatic level gauges for measuring the level of liquid in fixed storage tanks (R 85)*

Abstentions: Nil

NO votes: Nil

##### *Evidential breath analyzers (R 126)*

Abstentions: Nil

NO votes: Canada

##### *Instruments for measuring vehicle exhaust emissions (R 99)*

Abstentions: Nil

NO votes: Nil

##### *Dynamic measuring devices and systems for cryogenic liquids (R 81)*

Abstentions: Austria, Canada

NO votes: Nil

### **Recommendations approved in 1998**

*Radiochromic film dosimetry system for ionizing radiation processing of materials and products (R 127)*

Abstentions: Denmark, Finland

NO votes: Nil

*Focimeters (R 93)*

Abstentions: Austria

NO votes: Nil

*Ergometers for foot crank work (R 128)*

Abstentions: Czech Republic

NO votes: Nil

### **Recommendations approved in 1999**

*Metrological regulation for load cells (R 60)*

Abstentions: Nil

NO votes: Nil

*Multi-dimensional measuring instruments (R 129)*

Abstentions: Denmark, France, Monaco

NO votes: Canada

*Water meters intended for the metering of cold potable water (R 49)*

Abstentions: Brazil, Canada, Sweden, Switzerland

NO votes: Poland

*Force measuring system of uniaxial material testing machines (R 65)*

Abstentions: Brazil, Spain

NO votes: Nil

### **5.4 Draft Recommendations directly presented for sanctioning by the Conference**

Mr. Johansen reported that the three draft Recommendations presented for sanctioning by the Conference had been reviewed by the Technical Work Commission one by one. At the end of this review it was noted that the three draft Recommendations might be submitted for voting by the Conference, which sanctioned them with the following results (all Member States not mentioned as having voted NO or ABSTENTION being considered as having voted YES).

*Octave and one-third octave band filters*

Abstentions: South Africa

NO votes: Nil

(*Note:* The US Delegation indicated that they would submit written comments to the Secretariat concerned and to the BIML with a view to improving the text before it is issued.)

*Polymethylmethacrylate dosimetry system for ionizing radiation processing of materials and products*

Abstentions: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Ireland, Monaco, Norway

NO votes: Nil

(*Note:* The Austrian Delegation wondered if any country had legal metrology regulations concerning these instruments, as well as those covered by the next draft, and suggested that the OIML should focus its efforts on instruments that are subject to legal control in a larger number of countries and leave other instruments to standardization activities. The Danish and French Delegations supported this opinion.)

*Alanine EPR dosimetry system for ionizing radiation processing of materials and products*

Abstentions: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Ireland, Monaco, Norway

NO votes: Nil





## **6 – OIML CERTIFICATE SYSTEM FOR MEASURING INSTRUMENTS**



## 6.1 Report on the situation of the System

Mr. Kochsiek gave the following report:

### 1 Establishment and evolution of the System - Background

The OIML Certificate System for Measuring Instruments was launched on 1<sup>st</sup> January 1991 with the aim of facilitating, accelerating and harmonizing the work of national or regional bodies that approve patterns of measuring instruments. The first certificate was issued in 1992.

A technical advisory group on certification (TAG<sub>cert</sub>) - established at the 29<sup>th</sup> CIML Meeting - pursued the evolution and prepared proposals for the further development of the System, then the Tenth International Conference of Legal Metrology (1996) formulated further guidelines.

The Conference requested that the relevant TC's/SC's, TAG<sub>cert</sub>, BIML, national and regional metrology services and other bodies concerned pursue their efforts aimed at implementing and developing the System, and distributing information concerning its national implementation, not forgetting the voluntary recognition and acceptance of OIML certificates and test results.

The 34<sup>th</sup> CIML Meeting established a new technical body, TC 3/SC 5 *Conformity assessment* with a view to establishing rules and procedures for fostering mutual confidence in and acceptance of the test results of measuring instruments among OIML Member States, and as such to continue the activities of the former TAG<sub>cert</sub> (information to be given under Item 6.2).

### 2 Developments since the Tenth Conference

Developments and results achieved are indicated in line with the tasks formulated by the Tenth Conference as follows:

- ***Implementation of the structures and procedures of the OIML Certificate System:***

This task has been (and will continue to be) an ongoing activity for all interested parties. The results of inquiries carried out since the Tenth Conference indicate a permanent dissemination of information on and promotion of the System, an increasing number of Issuing Authorities and increasing voluntary acceptance of type evaluation test results.

- ***Development and revision of OIML Recommendations for use within the System:***

As a result of the efforts made by TC's and SC's, the number of new and revised OIML Recommendations applicable within the System has increased from 16 in 1996 to reach the present number of 30.

- ***Extension of the System's application to modules of instruments and to individual instruments:***

Some Recommendations (e.g. R 76, R 60, R 49, etc.) already contain elements and provisions for the modular approach. The ongoing revision of the document *OIML Certificate System for Measuring Instruments*, to be finalized soon, includes provisions for modules and families of measuring instruments.

Since no proposals related to the extension of the System to individual instruments have been received (neither from the 42 OIML Members that replied to the recent *Questionnaire on the implementation and promotion of the OIML Certificate System* nor from the 34 P- and O-members of TC 3/SC 5 that sent back the *Voting form* and comments to the draft revision of the document on *OIML Certificate System for measuring instruments*) this action is to be carried out at a later stage.

- ***To conduct surveys on the implementation and operation of the System:***

Three inquiries among Member States and Corresponding Members were carried out in 1997, 1998 and 2000 and one among manufacturers in 2000.

The main conclusions drawn from these inquiries are:

- the System and the acceptance of certificates (test results) are evolving by themselves on a voluntary basis;
- results achieved and further developments are encouraged both by manufacturers and by OIML Members; and
- actions envisaged in the *1999–2002 Action Plan* are in line with the needs and proposals of manufacturers and OIML Members.

- ***Establishment of criteria for the development of recognition agreements of OIML certificates and test results:***

Projects being developed by TC 3/SC 5 are focusing on the establishment of *Mutual Acceptance Arrangements*, which will provide the framework and criteria for the international acceptance of pattern approval test reports, and on confidence building between the interested parties (information to be given under item 6.2 of the draft Agenda).

- ***To coordinate the development of the OIML Certificate System with relevant activities performed by international and regional organizations concerned with testing, certification, conformity assessment, accreditation and related subjects:***

The OIML has established close contacts and cooperation in this field with International Organizations such as ILAC, IAF, ISO (CASCO), WTO (TBT Committee) and UN/ECE (Working party on Technical Harmonization and Standardization Policies) and with Regional Organizations such as EAL, WELMEC and APLMF.

Developments in conformity assessment, certification and accreditation activities of these international and regional bodies have been followed up and studied by TC 3/SC 5 and by the BIML with a view to their application within the System.

- ***To organize intercomparisons aimed at harmonizing national requirements and pattern evaluation procedures, or making use of intercomparisons carried out within other international or regional bodies, and publishing the results of such intercomparisons:***

This activity is to be pursued as envisaged by provisions in B.3.1 of the *1999–2002 Action Plan*.

- ***To define principles of juridical protection of OIML certificates:***

Since this task was not a high priority, this activity can be pursued as soon as the need is felt, in connection with the MAA.

### **3 Present characteristics of the Certificate System**

- As at 2000-09-15, a cumulative total of 671 certificates have been issued and registered in compliance with the following Recommendations: R 31, R 50, R 51, R 60 (see below), R 61, R 76, R 85, R 106, R 107, R 115 and R 117/118;
- 30 OIML Recommendations are presently applicable within the System (the 3 Draft Recommendations submitted for sanctioning by the Conference are potentially to be included);
- Over 209 applicants and manufacturers of measuring instruments from 31 countries have been granted OIML certificates;
- 23 Issuing Authorities in 20 Member States have been established and 15 of them have already issued certificates;
- Over 190 certificates have been accepted by 10 Member States and 3 Corresponding Members to replace national type evaluations and over 260 certificates have been taken into consideration by 18 Member States and 4 Corresponding Members;
- R 60 (2000) is the first revised Recommendation that has been applicable within the System since its outset. Since its publication earlier in 2000, the transformation requirements of certificates issued against the 1991 edition have been published (*Supplement to OIML R 60 (2000) Metrological regulations for load cells*), and ten Issuing Authorities have already expressed their readiness to issue certificates (9 new certificates have already been issued and registered) according to its requirements;
- 15 projects aimed at developing, revising or completing OIML Recommendations for use in the System are being drafted by 13 OIML technical bodies;
- Regularly updated information on the System can be found on the OIML web site ([www.oiml.org](http://www.oiml.org)). All the Recommendations applicable within the System are available in Adobe Acrobat format and may be downloaded from the OIML web site by Members, and a number of additional Recommendations are also available.

## 6.2 Report on the setting up of a recognition agreement for OIML type evaluations

This item was in fact discussed within the Round Table on mutual recognition, of which a report is given starting on page 99. Mr. Kochsiek, who had chaired the Round Table, read the conclusions:

*After having listened to reports about what is developing in the field of MRA within WTO/OECD, CIPM, ILAC, as well as at the bilateral level, the Round Table received information concerning the state of progress of work within TC 3/SC 5 and TC 6.*

*Views on these activities (especially those within TC 3/SC 5), as expressed by certain participants, varied considerably and opposite opinions were expressed concerning in particular the following:*

*Is TC 3/SC 5 work necessary?*

*Is accreditation necessary?*

*Is self-declaration sufficient?*

*However there was a consensus about the fact that the mutual recognition of test results associated with OIML certificates is a necessary goal but that the way to reach this goal had still to be identified.*

Mr. Ehrlich asked for clarification on what was meant by the last sentence of these conclusions, and in which directions TC 3/SC 5 work should be directed in order to meet the views of the Conference.

Mr. Bennett noted that in fact these were the conclusions of the Round Table but that the Conference's views concerning this topic had still to be defined.

Mr. Kochsiek said that much progress had been made within TC 3/SC 5 but that more progress had still to be made in line with the opinions of the P- and O-members and liaison institutions of TC 3/SC 5 as well as with the views expressed during the Round Table.

Mr. Athané suggested that the Conference should charge the Presidential Council with examining the various directions in which TC 3/SC 5 (and also TC 6) should proceed in order to rapidly develop the multi-lateral arrangement(s) and other features (IQ mark) which would appear necessary or at least advisable in the framework of international legal metrology cooperation.

Mr. Chappell said that it was critical for the US TC 3/SC 5 co-secretariat to know exactly where to go since a large amount of work efforts and resources had already been committed to the project on mutual recognition. If the goal was not achievable in a sense that would permit US participation, the US would have to reconsider its involvement as secretariat for the work and another P-member would have to take over responsibility for the co-secretariat.

Concerning the IQ mark, Mr. da Silva suggested that an inquiry be made amongst P-members of TC 6 in order to ascertain their views concerning the feasibility and aim of such a mark and - if applicable - to stop the work.

Mr. Faber noted that much progress had been made within TC 3/SC 5 and that there were no real reasons for the US to withdraw from its secretariat. He suggested that the TC 3/SC 5 secretariat should examine the discussions at the Round Table and other remarks and use them to improve the work, which had already made considerable progress.

Mr. Bennett recognized the difficulty of the task and agreed with Mr. Faber that the US co-secretariat should be encouraged to continue.

Mr. Athané suggested that the Conference should (i) confirm that the establishment of mutual recognition arrangement(s) of test results associated with OIML certificates was to be considered as a priority goal, (ii) request all OIML Member States to inform the US co-secretariat and the BIML about their views concerning the main aspects of the draft in time for the US co-secretariat and the BIML to report to the Presidential Council in February 2001, and (iii) request the Presidential Council to appropriately direct TC 3/SC 5 work.

Concerning the IQ mark, the Conference should (i) take note of the work already developed within TC 6, (ii) request all OIML Member States to inform the US secretariat and the BIML about their views concerning the feasibility of such a mark in time for the US secretariat and the BIML to report to the Presidential Council in February 2001, and (iii) request the Presidential Council to appropriately direct TC 6 work.

Mr. Kildal said that the document on uncertainty in legal metrology was very important and should be mentioned in the Conference's conclusions.

Mr. Chappell repeated that the USA was not prepared to continue their efforts if in the end the results could not be accepted by OIML Members and by the USA. He mentioned the fact that under item 5.4 two draft Recommendations developed under a US secretariat had been questioned at the last minute by Member States that had never expressed negative views previously. The draft on the multilateral arrangement was expected to eliminate some of the difficulties that had been experienced in the past; however if a multilateral approach did not receive the necessary support from other OIML Member States, then it might be that the USA would have, on behalf of their manufacturers, to consider establishing bilateral arrangements in various regions as an alternative.

Concerning the IQ mark, Mr. Kildal noted that the text had been distributed only at the level of TC 6 members and requested the BIML to distribute it to all OIML Member States in time for them to study it and comment by the middle of January 2001.

Mr. Beard noted that the only text he was aware of was the one which had been studied at the last meeting and asked whether more a recent text had been circulated. Mr. Athané said that the BIML would circulate the most recent one.

As a conclusion, Mr. Bennett said that the suggestions from Mr. Athané could serve as a good basis for the Conference's decisions concerning this item and requested him to formulate them in an appropriate manner in the final "Decisions and Resolutions" of the Conference.

### **6.3 Guidelines for future developments**

Mr. Kochsiek gave the following report.

#### **1 Introductory remarks**

Tasks formulated by the Tenth Conference can be regarded as still being topical and relevant both to the development of the System and to the acceptance of OIML certificates/type test results.

Actions related to this topic are included in the *OIML Long Term Policy: 1999–2002 Action Plan* and stem from a number of recent events, as the subtitle to the *Action Plan* indicates: *Implementation of the Braunschweig International Seminar (June 1998), of the Birkeland Report and of discussions held at the 33<sup>rd</sup> and 34<sup>th</sup> CIML Meetings.*

Two sets of activities are being carried out in parallel:

- the first set is directly related to the promotion and development of the System itself (see point 2 below);
- the second set is related to the promotion of the acceptance of OIML type test results/OIML certificates and to confidence building between the parties concerned (see actions as formulated in B.1–B.3 of the *1999–2002 Action Plan*; this point is developed in point 3, below).

All these actions shall be carried out in an internationally harmonized way based on the related activities of International Organizations such as ILAC, IAF, ISO (CASCO), WTO (TBT Committee) and UN/ECE (Working party on Technical Harmonization and Standardization Policies).

Interested international and regional organizations in liaison with the OIML are to be kept informed about the advantages and development of the Certificate System and about actions aimed at the acceptance of OIML type test results/certificates (e.g. mutual acceptance arrangement (MAA), accreditation or peer-evaluation of testing laboratories, etc.).

#### **2 Guidelines for the promotion and development of the System itself**

It is necessary for the TC's/SC's in general (and TC 3/SC 5 in particular), the BIML and the national and regional legal metrology bodies, to pursue their efforts to ensure widespread implementation and development of the System.

The first four tasks formulated by the Tenth Conference (as cited in Item 6.1) include actions as formulated in A.2 of the *1999–2002 Action Plan*, namely:

- Implementation of the structures and procedures of the OIML Certificate System;
- Development and revision of OIML Recommendations for use within the System (priority is to be given to the revision of Recommendations on utility meters);
- Extension of the System's application to modules and families of instruments and to individual instruments; and
- Conducting surveys on the implementation and operation of the System.

Based on comments and proposals included in replies to questionnaires from OIML Members and manufacturers additional tasks and guidelines, the implementation of which is necessary for the further development of the System, can be summarized as follows:

- Existing differences and/or additional requirements in national regulations (especially in OIML Member States) compared with OIML Recommendations need to be eliminated since they create unnecessary barriers to trade and - at the same time - to the acceptance of OIML type test results/OIML certificates (also refer to the conclusions drawn in the report on Item 5.2);
- It is deemed necessary to develop informational and training materials and to organize training for OIML Members (especially developing countries) wishing to implement the System and for manufacturers and users (possible common actions together with the OIML Development Council).

### **3 Guidelines for promotion of the acceptance of OIML type test results/OIML certificates**

Actions related to the promotion of the acceptance of OIML type test results/OIML certificates and to the necessary measures for confidence building are formulated in B.1–B.3 of the *1999–2002 Action Plan* (see Annex).

Based on comments and proposals included in the replies to questionnaires from OIML Members and manufacturers (see Annexes 2 and 3 to Item 6.1) high priority is to be given to the development and implementation of the MAA and later to the promotion of world-wide acceptance in order to eliminate test repetition.

### **4 A problem submitted for consideration**

Statistics on the evolution of the System clearly show not only that a natural time delay (the “lead” time) exists between the approval and publication of a Recommendation and the issuing of the first OIML certificates, but also that there is a growing gap between the categories of measuring instruments applicable within the System (currently 30) and the categories for which OIML certificates have already been issued (currently only 11).

This situation is more problematic when the distribution of the certificates by categories is taken into account. At least four groups of Recommendations can be distinguished: the “Champions” (R 76 and R 60), the “High performing” (R 51, R 61 and R 117/118), the “Low performing” (R 31, R 50, R 106, R 107 and R 115) and the “Non-performing” (at least partly for the time being) including all the other 22 Recommendations.

The situation is likely to improve taking into account the lead time, the applicability in the near future of the revised Recommendations on utility meters (R 49, R 75, etc.) and the future implications of the *Measuring Instruments Directive* (MID) of the EU.

Nevertheless, Recommendations will exist for categories of measuring instruments for which there is practically no interest for their real application within the System.

*Conclusion:* It is therefore proposed that consideration be given by all interested parties (especially the TC's/SC's responsible for the development of given Recommendations) as to whether it is really worth developing Test Report Formats (which require considerable time and energy to produce) for categories of measuring instruments for which practically no interest can be envisaged for issuing (and accepting) OIML certificates.





## **7 – DEVELOPING COUNTRIES**



## 7.1 Report on activities for the period 1997–2000

and

## 7.2 Guidelines for future activity

Mrs. Annabi summarized the discussions that took place during the meeting of the Development Council held on 11 October, the report of which has been published separately. A report on the activities since the 1999 Development Council meeting was also made available to all Participants in the Conference.

Concerning future activities, the Development Council conclusions were the following:

- the working groups of the Development Council should carry out their work according to the programs defined by the Council;
- activities on legislation and especially the *Law on metrology* were considered as high priority and the TCs/SCs concerned should deal with these urgently;
- the participation of the Development Council in the work of certain TCs/SCs should be increased;
- preference should be given to the development of training courses and the participation of developing countries in such courses; as a second step, the validation of such courses should be envisaged;
- external liaisons, especially those with UNIDO, World Bank, ISO/DEVCO, and WTO should be reinforced; and
- sources for financing activities of interest for developing countries, including international agencies, should be identified.

Mr. Birch said that it had been noted that the involvement of developing countries in Development Council work was unfortunately very limited. It would therefore be necessary to increase this involvement, one way being to allocate chairs or co-chairs of the working groups of the Development Council to developing countries. Mr. Birch confirmed that modernization of laws, including that on prepacked products, was of significant interest for developing countries and should be based on OIML papers which would take into account the specific needs of these countries. To this end, specific working groups of the Development Council should be established with an effective participation of developing countries.



## **8 – ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL MATTERS**



## 8.1 Examination of the management of the budget from 1996 to 1999 and the estimates for 2000

Mr. Birch, who had chaired the Finance Commission meeting, reported on discussions which may be summarized as follows.

Concerning the management of the budget from 1996 to 1999, Mr. Birch noted that the actual expenses were significantly lower than the decisions of the Tenth Conference, this being mainly due to two factors: (i) there were a number of changes in the BIML staff (certain changes resulting in the fact that the BIML had worked with only one Assistant Director during several months) and (ii) the rate of inflation in France had been lower than expected up to mid 1999.

Concerning the estimates for 2000, Mr. Johnston asked whether more accurate figures could be given at this time. Mr. Athané replied that the estimates made in December 1999 should be correct concerning a number of budgetary lines, including staff expenses (although the rate of inflation in France was increasing). However, significant differences could appear between the estimates and the actual expenses concerning (i) travel and (ii) meeting expenses. This would result from (i) an increased number of contacts with OIML Members and attendance at meetings of international and regional organizations by the CIML President and the BIML and (ii) the fact that the OIML's participation in the costs of the Eleventh Conference would be more than expected mainly because the pound had significantly increased compared with the Euro (and therefore the French Franc) over the past twelve months. Concerning printing expenses, it was difficult to make accurate estimates since the printing of a number of new OIML publications had been delayed because more time was needed by the secretariats of the TCs/SCs concerned and by BIML to edit them. Mr. Boudissa supported increased contacts between the CIML President or the BIML and the national authorities - especially those in developing countries, in order to make them sensitive to the need to raise the profile of legal metrology. Mr. Birch approved these views and noted that in the 2001–2004 budget more funds would be allocated to this kind of activity. Mr. Athané added that it had been his policy (of course with the agreement of the Presidential Council and of the CIML) to increase the expenses allocated to the operation of the Development Council and related activities whenever this was possible.

Mrs. Bennett asked how the BIML building and other fixed assets were included in the “actual assets” of the Organization. Mr. Athané replied that the concept of “actual assets” as expressed in the financial papers covered liquid assets only and that the value of the building and other fixed assets was not included. Concerning the building, he added that the budgetary procedures followed by the Organization were such that its value had been depreciated at the time of purchasing and that, since then, the depreciated value had been increased by the costs of maintenance and redecoration work only. This meant that the value of the building, as shown in the Accountant's report, was far lower than the current market value, a reasonable estimate being three million gold-francs. Mr. Birch noted that if the OIML was not owner of the building, the renting costs would probably amount to more than ten percent of the budget.

Concerning the proposed Resolution under Item 8.1, the only comments related to the last paragraph dealing with the situation of two Member States. Mr. Williamson pointed out that when a country was late in paying its contribution, any payment received should be used to cover the oldest unpaid contributions. He asked why this rule would not apply to the two Member States concerned by the Resolution. Mr. Athané explained that the rule mentioned by Mr. Williamson actually applied in general cases but that it could not apply in the case of the two Member States concerned. In fact, the Resolution gave delays to these two Member States for their unpaid 1996–1999 contributions, stating that they would not be struck off the list of Member States for not having paid their contributions that were more than three years overdue provided that the 2000 (and following) contributions were paid on time. If the payments made in 2000 and following years were credited to the unpaid contributions for years 1996, 1997, etc., then these two Member States would permanently be in a position of not having paid three contributive years' contributions and could be struck off the list of the Member States since the delays granted by the Conference applied to the 1996–1999 period. Mr. Williamson expressed his deep concern for the fact that the remaining dues for 1996–1999 would risk being forgotten after a few years if the Resolution was adopted. Mr. Athané said that the Resolution explicitly requested the CIML to monitor the situation and to report back to the next Conference. In fact it was expected that the two Member States would not only be able to pay their 2000, 2001, etc. contributions, but also, step by step, their arrears. The Twelfth Conference would then have to examine the situation and take appropriate decisions in

the case where, at the time, the arrears had not been paid. Mr. Kildal expressed his support for Mr. Williamson's position and suggested editorial changes to the Resolution. Mr. Athané repeated the reasons why he considered that the Resolution should not be modified and asked for a vote on the text as it was. The following Resolution was adopted with the results of vote as indicated below (all Member States not mentioned as having voted NO or ABSTENTION being considered as having voted YES).

*The International Conference of Legal Metrology*

*HAVING EXAMINED the report on the management of the budget for the years 1996, 1997, 1998 and 1999;*

*NOTING that the budget was managed in conformity with the expenses necessary for carrying out the work of the Bureau and that the accuracy of the report has been certified by annual audits;*

*NOTING that the respective functions assigned by the Convention to the President of the International Committee of Legal Metrology and to the Director of the International Bureau of Legal Metrology have been fulfilled;*

*GIVES ITS DEFINITIVE DISCHARGE to the President of the Committee and to the Director of the Bureau for their management of the budget during the years mentioned above;*

*NOTING that a large part of the holdings on December 31, 1999 consisted of debts owed by Member States;*

*URGENTLY REQUESTS that those Member States that are in arrears with their contributions pay their debts as soon as possible;*

*HAVING NOTED a report by the Director of the Bureau on the situation of certain Member States in arrears with their contributions,*

*MAKES the following decisions:*

*In application of Article XXIX of the OIML Convention, delays are granted to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and to Zambia for the payment of their contributions from 1996 to 1999; consequently these two countries will not be struck off the list of OIML Member States provided that their contributions for 2000 and subsequent years are duly paid; the International Committee of Legal Metrology is requested to periodically examine the situation of these two countries as well as that of any other Member State which might become more than three years late in the payment of its contributions and to report back about this at the Twelfth Conference.*

Results of the vote:

Abstentions: Brazil, Canada, Hungary, Macedonia, Poland

NO votes: USA

*Note:*

Before this vote, the US Delegation repeated that in principle they agreed with the last paragraph of this Resolution; however they could not agree that payments from those countries were not credited against the oldest outstanding unpaid contributions. The BIML Director repeated that this Resolution should be understood in the following way: payments received from the two countries in 2000, 2001, etc. will be credited to years 2000, 2001, etc; however, when these countries find additional financial resources to pay the outstanding unpaid contributions, then the payments will of course be credited to those past years.

## **8.2 Bureau staff and retirement scheme**

Mr. Birch reported that very few remarks had been said about this item during the Finance Commission meeting, with the exception of a declaration by the BIML Director that the last reexamination of the salary scales of BIML staff by the CIML dated back to over ten years ago. Some four years ago the Director had suggested that this matter should be reconsidered but no action followed for two reasons: (i) the general economic situation of many countries which would have resulted in a refusal of any increase and (ii) the



possibility for the BIML to merge with the BIPM, which would have automatically resulted in a reexamination of salaries. However, the current situation was different from four years ago and Mr. Athané said that the CIML should now start a reexamination of these salary scales. Mr. Williamson suggested that the BIML should follow the practices of other international organizations (especially those located in France) concerning salary policy.

### 8.3 Credits for the financial period 2001–2004 and Member State contributions for the same period

Mr. Birch reported on discussions which may be summarized as follows.

Mr. Johnston asked why the extra costs resulting from the simultaneous presence of Mr. Athané and Mr. Magaña would have to be paid out of the reserve funds since in fact these were salaries. Mr. Athané replied that this solution had been proposed by the Bureau and endorsed by the Presidential Council for the following reasons. These extra costs resulted from the fact that (i) during the first nine months of 2001 Mr. Magaña would be at the BIML as “Appointed Director” and (ii) up to the end of 2002 Mr. Athané would stay on at the BIML as “Consultant”. This situation was of an exceptional nature and, if the extra costs were to be included in the normal budget, this would result in significant differences in the salary budgets in 2001 and 2002 compared with 2003 and 2004. In addition, it had been noted that the reserve fund now exceeded its optimal value; therefore the extra costs could quite well be paid out of this fund, which would result in the fact that no specific increase in Member State contributions was necessary to cover the extra costs. Quite obviously, the extra costs will clearly be mentioned as being salary expenses to be paid out of the reserve fund, not out of the normal salary budgets. Mr. Athané added that this proposal was in line with the Convention which provides for the possibility to pay exceptional expenses out of the reserve fund.

Mr. Williamson expressed his concern for the fact that this exceptional situation with two persons at Director level should not result in a duplication of all the expenses associated with the Director’s responsibility, especially travel expenses. He also said that the budget for 2001–2004 should be at exactly the same level as during the last four years, without any compensation for inflation or any other increases in expenses, so as to reach an effective zero growth. Mr. Athané replied to the first question by saying that of course the appointed Director and the current Director will avoid any duplication in travel, with the exception of the participation in the next CIML Meeting, at which both will clearly have to be present.

Concerning zero growth, Mr. Athané pointed out that the BIML expenses were inevitably affected by inflation and that it was very difficult - and even impossible in certain cases - to reduce the BIML activity and staff to maintain expenses at the same level. The annual rate of inflation in France was now close to 2 % and an annual increase of the budget of 1.5 % (as was accepted for the BIPM one year ago) was a minimum. If this was not accepted, the reserve fund would have to be used to cover expenses and, at the 2004 Conference, a significant increase (of the order of 6 % to 8 %) in contributions would become necessary, which would perhaps be difficult to accept by OIML Member States.

Mr. Williamson maintained his request to maintain the OIML budget at the same level and mentioned the case of the ILO for which the biennial budget in Swiss Francs had even been decreased. He suggested that the budgetary lines of the proposed OIML budget be examined in order to identify those for which a small decrease would be acceptable without decreasing the global efficiency of the Organization, any unexpected surplus in expenses being covered by the reserve fund.

Mr. Johnston asked the reasons for fluctuations in printing costs. Mr. Birch replied that the printing costs were mainly those of International Recommendations, the number of which fluctuated according to the output of the TCs/SCs. Mr. Johnston also asked the reasons for significant increases in travel as well as in meeting costs. Mr. Athané confirmed that printing costs were not fully controllable by the BIML since they were largely dependent upon the work of TCs/SCs. For example, the issuing of a number of Recommendations had been postponed from 1999 to 2000 because of the time necessary for the secretariats of the TCs/SCs concerned and for the BIML to edit the texts. For these reasons, financial comparisons should not be made between the actual 1997–2000 expenses and the proposed 2001–2004 budget.

The use of the internet was surely a significant step forward in the effort to make OIML publications available to OIML Members more rapidly (new Recommendations are now posted on the OIML web site several weeks before the paper copy is available) but this would not significantly reduce printing costs since for many Members, paper copies would still remain necessary for a number of years to come. The cost of physically printing 750 copies (the current print run for an OIML Recommendation) is only marginally more than the cost of say 350 copies. However, things might change in the future when all OIML Members and purchasers of OIML publications have the technical facilities permitting them to download these publications.

Concerning travel expenses, Mr. Athané explained why he was asking for a 20 % increase in 2001 compared with 2000. However, although the number of trips to be made by BIML staff would probably increase during the coming years, he said that maintaining the travel budget at the level voted by the previous Conference for 2000 would be acceptable, the reserve fund being used if necessary to cover travel expenses exceeding the decisions of the Conference. Concerning the significant increase between the actual travel expenses for the 1996–1999 period and the proposed budget for 2001–2004, Mr. Athané explained that this resulted from the considerable increase in international and, even more so, regional meetings at which the OIML had to be represented, most often by the CIML President or by the BIML Director or Assistant Directors.

Mr. Kildal noted that the 2001–2004 budget contained an endowment of the reserve fund whereas previous discussions had shown that the fund was already too high. Mr. Athané recognized that this endowment was unnecessary and resulted only from a recalculation of the global budget aimed at “smoothing” the increase over the period 2001–2004 and avoiding sudden variations in Member State contributions. Mr. Athané added that however he was prepared to recalculate the global budget so that no credits would be transferred into the reserve fund during the period.

Mr. Johansen said that the BIML participation in meetings of other international and regional organizations should be maintained at the necessary level. Mr. Johnston said that the reserve fund could be used to this end. Mr. Williamson said that all possible savings should be made on travel expenses including a systematic use of economic fares. Mr. Athané noted that the actual travel expenses were most often lower than the Conference authorizations which meant that efforts were systematically made to reduce travel costs without reducing the number of trips. Concerning the systematic use of economy fares, Mr. Athané said that this was the general BIML policy; however, in many cases, business fares were not significantly higher than normal economy fares with the exception of very low fares which were accessible only when spending a weekend abroad. When a meeting took place on e.g. Tuesday and Wednesday, it would be difficult to use these very low fares since the BIML Director would have to be abroad during 5 or 6 days (with increased hotel costs) whereas he could be absent from the BIML during not more than two days when using normal travel fares.

Replying to a question from Mr. Birch, Mr. Athané said that it was not possible for the Conference to decide that such or such “normal” expense would be covered by the reserve fund. In fact, all normal expenses had to be covered by the budget and only exceptional expenses, or necessary expenses which had been provided for in the budget but could not be covered by this budget for example because of insufficient incomes, were to be covered by the reserve fund. Mr. Athané also reminded the participants that the BIML Director was not allowed to use the reserve fund without the authorization of the CIML President.

Mr. Kildal proposed that the 2001 budget be maintained at exactly the same level as for 2000, and then be increased by 1.5 % per year.

Mr. Williamson suggested that the expected surplus for the 1997–2000 period be used to reduce the 2001–2004 Member State contributions and maintain them at the 2000 level. Mr. Athané pointed out that it had already been decided to use 15 % to 20 % of the reserve fund to cover exceptional expenses resulting from the transition period between the current and the new Directors and the appointment of the current Director as Consultant up to the end of 2002. In addition, since no increase in the BIML staff was foreseen for the next four years and since the BIML workload was expected to continue to increase, it could appear necessary to hire experts with a view to carrying out certain urgent tasks which would be beyond the BIML human resources, such experts being paid out of the reserve fund. Therefore, it might be expected that the reserve fund would return to a more acceptable level by the time of the next Conference. However, any decision aiming at using the reserve fund to cover normal expenses would be precarious for the future of the Organization. Mr. Williamson expressed his concern for the fact that experts could be hired by the Director

and paid out of the reserve fund without any control by the Conference. Mr. Athané repeated that the use of the reserve fund was either decided in advance by the Conference (e.g. to cover exceptional expenses resulting from the change of Director and the transition period) or was possible only under the control of the CIML represented by its President (e.g. to hire short-term experts).

Mr. Issaev mentioned that delegates had had enough time before the Conference to send their proposals and comments on this topic, and that he felt that discussion on the question at this late stage was inappropriate.

Secondly, he shared the opinion of the BIML Director on the subject of inflation: the current inflation rate in France is 1.8 % but tomorrow it could rise to 2 % and jeopardize the financial equilibrium of the Organization, which is clearly not a desirable situation.

Thirdly, he was of the opinion that reducing expenditure allocated to external liaisons would negatively affect the image that the Organization portrays, which should also be avoided.

The opinion of the Russian delegation was therefore to leave the present situation unchanged.

Mr. Faber said that reducing travel expenses by 50 kGF per year and reducing to zero the credits to be placed in reserve was acceptable but that was the maximum which might be done in terms of budget reductions. Working with less money than necessary and using a large part of the reserve fund would be extremely dangerous. Mr. Faber also noted that the *Action Plan* which had been adopted, the increase in the number of OIML Members and liaison institutions, the activity of the Development Council, certification workload, etc. all contributed to an increased workload for the BIML without any corresponding increase in its human resources. It was therefore necessary to maintain financial resources at an appropriate level.

Mr. Birch agreed that it was not good management practice to use the reserve fund to cover everyday expenditures.

Mr. Berg requested that for the sake of transparency, balance sheets might be included in the yearly budgets to clarify the total availability or assets of the Organization. Mr. Athané replied that such balance sheets already appeared in the annual Auditor's report but that it was of course possible to improve them according to Member State wishes.

Following these discussions, Mr. Athané accepted to prepare a new draft budget with zero credits to be placed in reserve and a reduction of 50 kGF in travel expenses for each of the years of the 2001–2004 period. However, he expressed his deep concern about the proposal to adopt a strict zero growth budget instead of increasing Member State contributions by 1.5 % per year.

Mr. Birch asked whether there would be a consensus to adopt this new draft budget.

Mr. Williamson declared that "The US must disassociate itself with the consensus requested by the Chairman of the Finance Commission".

Mr. Johnston declared that "Canada cannot accept the budget as presented".

Mr. Kildal suggested that, in the future, better ways of using the reserve fund be adopted in the financial rules of the OIML.

The following Resolution (see page 82) was adopted with the results of vote as indicated below (all Member States not mentioned as having voted NO or ABSTENTION being considered as having voted YES).

*The International Conference of Legal Metrology*

ACCEPTING the budgetary proposals of the Director of the International Bureau of Legal Metrology for the financial period beginning January 1, 2001 and ending December 31, 2004;

FIXES (i) the amount of the annual subscription of Corresponding Members at 2 755 Gold-francs (equivalent to 762 € or 5 000 French-francs) for 2001 and at 3 306 Gold-francs (equivalent to 914 € or 6 000 French-francs) for each of the years 2002, 2003 and 2004 and (ii) the entry due to be paid by any new Corresponding Member at 6 612 Gold-francs (equivalent to 1 828 € or 12 000 French-francs);

FIXES (subject to any change in the number of OIML Member States) the total amount of contributions of these Member States for the entire period from 2001 to 2004 at 16 795 kiloGold-francs distributed as follows:

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
Total annual contributions in kiloGold-francs	4 105	4 165	4 230	4 295

corresponding, for the 57 countries listed as OIML Member States at the beginning of 2000 and representing a total of 96 contributory shares, to the following base contributory shares:

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
Base contributory shares in kiloGold-francs	42.760	43.385	44.060	44.740

i.e. an annual indexation of 1.5 % starting from the 2001 value;

DECIDES that, if membership changes during the 2001–2004 period, the base contributory shares as indicated above will not be affected by these changes;

INSTRUCTS the International Committee of Legal Metrology to take the necessary measures in the event that the inflation rate in France differs in a significant manner from the value used for determining the budget (i.e. 1.5 %) or in the event that other factors render a revision of the accepted budget appropriate;

INSTRUCTS the International Committee of Legal Metrology to periodically review the situation of Member States that benefit from a lower contributory class and request them to reintegrate their normal contributory class as soon as their economic situation permits it.

Results of the vote:

Abstention: Nil

NO votes: Canada, USA

Note:

Before that vote and at the US Delegation's request, Mr. Athané explained that the amount to be paid by new Corresponding Members when joining the OIML (FRF 12 000) was an entry due against which they would receive all existing OIML publications (the value of which being in fact more than this entry due). In addition to this entry due new Corresponding Members had of course to pay the subscription for the year of accession (FRF 5 000 in 2001, FRF 6 000 from 2002 to 2004) followed each year by the annual subscription, for which they will receive any new publications and will benefit from the rights of OIML Corresponding Members. Mr. Athané added that it had been considered appropriate that this annual subscription should be one tenth of the lowest Member State contribution; this would be reached step by step before the end of the next financial period (i.e. 2008).

The US Delegation explained its negative vote by the fact that for the period 2001–2004 the budget was some 5 % in excess of the budget for the previous quadriennium. The method used for compounding growth was unacceptable to the USA in view of their strong budgetary policy favoring zero nominal budget growth. As a further explanation, it was said that the US domestic regulatory agency charged with the matters within OIML responsibility had itself a zero growth budget over the last two years although there was a nominal growth in the US inflation rate.

## **9 – OTHER BUSINESS**



Mr. Faber reminded the participants that four years ago the Conference had for the first time issued awards to certain persons who had significantly contributed to the work of the OIML.

This year it had been found appropriate to continue this recognition of appreciation and two persons had been chosen to receive such awards:

- Prof. Volkmann\* from the German Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt, who had been a leading person in developing OIML Recommendations on weighing instruments,

and

- Mr. Klein, from Schlumberger Netherlands, who was still very active in the field of measuring systems for liquids other than water. The Conference expressed its appreciation for their work within the OIML.

---

\* In the absence of Prof. Volkmann, his award was remitted to Prof. Kochsiek.





## **10 – CLOSURE**



### **10.1 Adoption of decisions and resolutions of the Conference**

The text of the decisions and resolutions of the Conference was read and finally accepted by the Conference.

### **10.2 Date and place of the next Conference**

The Conference noted that for the time being no invitation had been received for the next Conference. It was decided that the Twelfth Conference should be held in 2004 either in an inviting Member State or in France, under the responsibility of the BIML, in the event that no invitation was received. The Conference charged the International Committee of Legal Metrology with making the appropriate decision before the end of 2002.

## **Closure**

The President gave the floor to Mr. Faber for final remarks. Mr. Faber expressed his satisfaction for the global output of the Conference which would constitute a very good basis for the future developments of the OIML. On behalf of all the participants he expressed his sincere thanks to the Delegation of the United Kingdom and to Dr. S. Bennett for the excellent conditions in which the Conference had been organized. He also expressed his thanks to the interpreters, to the BIML and to all delegates for their contributions to the success of the meeting. Finally, Mr. Faber expressed his deep appreciation to Dr. Foster for the way in which he had chaired the meeting.

Dr. Foster said that it had been a pleasure for him to chair this Conference, associated himself with all the thanks expressed by Mr. Faber and declared the Eleventh International Conference of Legal Metrology closed.

---



## **DECISIONS AND RESOLUTIONS**



# ELEVENTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE of LEGAL METROLOGY

London, 9–13 October 2000

## DECISIONS and RESOLUTIONS

### 1 Organization of the Meeting

- The Conference took note of an opening and welcome address delivered by Dr. Kim Howells MP, Minister for Consumers and Corporate Affairs of the United Kingdom.
- The roll of Delegates was called and it was found that 48\* Member States were present out of a total of 57; the statutory quorum of two thirds was therefore reached. The Delegation of the United States of America made a remark concerning the participation of one OIML Member State; this remark will be reproduced in the minutes of the Conference. The Conference also noted the participation of observers from certain OIML Corresponding Members and International and Regional liaison Organizations, the CIML Immediate Past-President and four members of BIML Staff.
- Information concerning voting procedures during Conference sessions was given.
- The Conference unanimously elected Dr. Foster, Director for Innovation Services at the Department of Trade and Industry of the United Kingdom as Conference President with Dr. Bennett (United Kingdom) standing in as and when required, and Mr. Beard (South Africa) and Dr. Pákay (Hungary) as Conference Vice Presidents.
- The Conference adopted the proposed agenda with one modification: Item 6.2 would be dealt with during the Round Table on *Mutual Recognition*.
- The Conference established two working commissions, one for financial matters and one for technical work.
- The Conference adopted the proposed schedule.
- The Conference approved the minutes of the Tenth Conference without modification.
- The Conference took note of a report presented by the President of the International Committee of Legal Metrology describing the activities of the Organization for the period from 1997 to 2000.

### 2 Member States and Corresponding Members

#### 2.1 New Members - Expected accessions

The Conference noted that the number of OIML Members had significantly increased since the Tenth Conference, although a number of Corresponding Members had been delisted for not having paid their subscriptions for over three years. The Conference noted that certain Corresponding Members were envisaging joining as Member States and that a number of countries/economies were expected to join as Corresponding Members.

#### 2.2 The situation of certain Members

The Conference noted that two or three Corresponding Members would probably be delisted by the end of the year for not having paid their subscription for over three years; it was also noted that the situation of two Member States would first be examined by the Finance Commission, which would then report to the Conference under Item 8.1.

---

\* However, on some occasions only 47 Member States were present.

### **3 Long-term policy**

#### **3.1 Report on actions carried out since the Tenth Conference**

#### **3.2 Guidelines for the period 2001–2004**

The Conference noted that most of the information concerning the actions carried out since the Tenth Conference, including the development of an Action Plan for 1999–2002, had been given in the report on activities delivered by the CIML President. The Conference endorsed this Action Plan and requested the CIML to monitor its implementation and to extend it as far as necessary in order to cover the 2002–2004 period.

### **4 Liaisons with international and regional institutions**

#### **4.1 Report on liaisons**

#### **4.2 Addresses by Representatives of Institutions**

#### **4.3 Discussions and conclusions**

The Conference took note of a report presented by the BIML Director concerning the main aspects of the cooperation between the OIML and certain international and regional organizations. The Conference also noted the reports presented by the representatives of a number of international and regional organizations attending the Conference. It was noted that a number of matters should be considered in order to globally improve OIML activities in fields connected with, for example, market surveillance, certification of modules, sharing workload on initial verification, better use of manufacturers' resources, increased use of the work of other international or regional bodies, etc. As a conclusion, the Conference requested the CIML to duly consider all the comments and proposals put forward during the Conference and to take appropriate measures in order to implement those that are considered as most appropriate to improve OIML activities.

### **5 Work of OIML Technical Committees and Subcommittees**

#### **5.1 Work undertaken - State of progress**

The Conference took note of a report concerning the activities of OIML Technical Committees and Subcommittees and requested the CIML to continue to monitor the situation and to find solutions in order to ensure a better distribution of technical responsibilities amongst OIML Member States.

#### **5.2 Implementation of Recommendations by OIML Members**

The Conference took note of a report concerning the implementation of OIML Recommendations in national regulations or voluntary standards. Member States that had not yet replied to the BIML inquiry were requested to do so urgently, in order to allow the BIML to publish a clear and complete picture of the situation at the beginning of 2001.



### **5.3 Formal sanction of Recommendations already approved by the Committee in 1997, 1998 and 1999**

The Conference sanctioned the 12 new or revised Recommendations already approved by the Committee in 1997, 1998 and 1999 (R's 49-1, 60, 65, 81, 85, 93, 99, 125, 126, 127, 128 and 129).

### **5.4 Draft Recommendations directly presented for sanctioning by the Conference**

The Conference sanctioned three draft Recommendations (*Octave and one-third octave band filters, Polymethyl-methacrylate dosimetry systems and Alanine EPR dosimetry systems*).

## **6 OIML Certificate System for Measuring Instruments**

### **6.1 Report on the situation of the System**

The Conference took note of a report describing progress made with this activity since the establishment of the System.

### **6.2 Report on the setting up of a recognition agreement for OIML type evaluation**

### **6.3 Guidelines for future development**

The Conference took note of a report concerning the results of various inquiries carried out by the BIML in order to ascertain the views of issuing authorities, manufacturers and CIML Members concerning advisable developments of the System. The Conference also took note of a report on the Round Table on *Mutual Recognition* held on Wednesday 11 October.

The Conference confirmed the urgency of establishing a system of mutual recognition of test results associated with OIML certificates and requested all Member States, whether or not members of TC 3/SC 5, to send their views concerning the main aspects of the 7<sup>th</sup> draft on *Mutual Acceptance Arrangement* to the USA and to the BIML before 15 January 2001 so that an analysis of the comments could be submitted to the Presidential Council in February 2001. The Conference also noted that the development of papers on uncertainty in legal metrology and other related matters was an urgent necessity. Concerning the establishment of an IQ mark, the Conference requested the TC 6 Secretariat and the BIML to communicate the latest draft to all Member States so that they may express their views concerning the general direction of this project before the Presidential Council meeting. The Conference requested the Presidential Council to orientate the activities of TC 3/SC 5 and those of TC 6 in an appropriate direction and to inform the CIML accordingly.

## **7 Developing Countries**

### **7.1 Report on activities for the period 1997–2000**

### **7.2 Guidelines for future activity**

The Conference took note of a report concerning the Development Council meeting held on Wednesday 11 October and expressed its appreciation to the newly reelected Chairperson for the work accomplished. The Conference noted and endorsed the general directions identified for future activity and requested the Development Council to work according to these guidelines under the supervision of the CIML.

## 8 Administrative and financial matters

### 8.1 Examination of the management of the budget from 1996 to 1999 and the estimates for 2000

The Conference adopted the following Resolution:

*The International Conference of Legal Metrology*

*HAVING EXAMINED the report on the management of the budget for the years 1996, 1997, 1998 and 1999;*

*NOTING that the budget was managed in conformity with the expenses necessary for carrying out the work of the Bureau and that the accuracy of the report has been certified by annual audits;*

*NOTING that the respective functions assigned by the Convention to the President of the International Committee of Legal Metrology and to the Director of the International Bureau of Legal Metrology have been fulfilled;*

*GIVES ITS DEFINITIVE DISCHARGE to the President of the Committee and to the Director of the Bureau for their management of the budget during the years mentioned above;*

*NOTING that a large part of the holdings on December 31, 1999 consisted of debts owed by Member States;*

*URGENTLY REQUESTS that those Member States that are in arrears with their contributions pay their debts as soon as possible;*

*HAVING NOTED a report by the Director of the Bureau on the situation of certain Member States in arrears with their contributions,*

*MAKES the following decisions:*

*In application of Article XXIX of the OIML Convention, delays are granted to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and to Zambia for the payment of their contributions from 1996 to 1999; consequently these two countries will not be struck off the list of OIML Member States provided that their contributions for 2000 and subsequent years are duly paid; the International Committee of Legal Metrology is requested to periodically examine the situation of these two countries as well as that of any other Member State which might become more than three years late in the payment of its contributions and to report back about this at the Twelfth Conference.*

### 8.2 Bureau staff and retirement scheme

The Conference took note of summary information about this.

### 8.3 Credits for the financial period 2001–2004 and Member State contributions for that period

The Conference adopted the following Resolution:

*The International Conference of Legal Metrology*

*ACCEPTING the budgetary proposals of the Director of the International Bureau of Legal Metrology for the financial period beginning January 1, 2001 and ending December 31, 2004;*

*FIXES (i) the amount of the annual subscription of Corresponding Members at 2 755 Gold-francs (equivalent to 762 € or 5 000 French-francs) for 2001 and at 3 306 Gold-francs (equivalent to 914 € or 6 000 French-francs) for each of the years 2002, 2003 and 2004 and (ii) the entry due to be paid by any new Corresponding Member at 6 612 Gold-francs (equivalent to 1 828 € or 12 000 French-francs);*

*FIXES (subject to any change in the number of OIML Member States) the total amount of contributions of these Member States for the entire period from 2001 to 2004 at 16 795 kiloGold-francs distributed as follows:*

<i>Year</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2002</i>	<i>2003</i>	<i>2004</i>
<i>Total annual contributions in kiloGold-francs</i>	<i>4 105</i>	<i>4 165</i>	<i>4 230</i>	<i>4 295</i>

corresponding, for the 57 countries listed as OIML Member States at the beginning of 2000 and representing a total of 96 contributory shares, to the following base contributory shares:

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
Base contributory shares in kiloGold-francs	42.760	43.385	44.060	44.740

*i.e. an annual indexation of 1.5 % starting from the 2001 value;*

*DECIDES that, if membership changes during the 2001–2004 period, the base contributory shares as indicated above will not be affected by these changes;*

*INSTRUCTS the International Committee of Legal Metrology to take the necessary measures in the event that the inflation rate in France differs in a significant manner from the value used for determining the budget (i.e. 1.5 %) or in the event that other factors render a revision of the accepted budget appropriate;*

*INSTRUCTS the International Committee of Legal Metrology to periodically review the situation of Member States that benefit from a lower contributory class and request them to reintegrate their normal contributory class as soon as their economic situation permits it.*

## **9 Other business**

The Conference noted that awards had been delivered by the CIML President to Prof. Volkmann, PTB, Germany, and to Mr. Klein, Schlumberger, The Netherlands, for their active contribution to OIML technical work.

## **10 Closure**

### **10.1 Adoption of decisions and resolutions of the Conference**

The Conference adopted the above-mentioned decisions and resolutions (*Note: the sanctioning of International Recommendations and the adoption of Resolutions 8.1 and 8.3 were made through nominal votes*).

### **10.2 Date and place of the next Conference**

The Conference decided that it would wait for a period of up to two years, i.e. until 2002, to see if any Member State was willing to host the Twelfth Conference in 2004. If no Member State was forthcoming, then the BIML would organize the Conference in France.



## **ROUND TABLE ON MUTUAL RECOGNITION**



## Introduction

In his opening address, Mr. Faber reminded participants that the Round Table was not actually part of the Conference and requested them to express their views not as national representatives, but rather as experts.

Dr. M. Kochsiek, Round Table Chairman, said that the objectives were to inform attendees about activities of other organizations in the field of mutual recognition and to obtain inputs for the development of the OIML Mutual Acceptance Arrangement (MAA) and the proposed OIML IQ mark for prepackages.

## Presentations on the present situation

Mr. Vaucher (Switzerland) gave additional information on the *Convention du Mètre* MRA, which was a prerequisite for other MRAs in the field of metrology. As for the OIML arrangement he said that regulatory bodies had to agree to accept test results; the MAA must be as simple as possible and it should be left to participants to decide to use accreditation or self assessment.

Mr. Hayward (UKAS) gave an outlook on the international situation of laboratory accreditation and gave information on the objectives of the ILAC MRA that had been prepared based on the MRAs of two regional groupings (EA and APLAC).

Mr. Engler (The Netherlands) gave information on the Netherlands' experience on bilateral agreements on recognition of test reports. He said that the NMI supports recognition and that there was no conflict between the NMI bilateral agreements and the proposed OIML MAA. He further added that the MAA should concentrate on the acceptance of the test reports and that priority should be given to accreditation for demonstrating competence.

Dr. Chappell (USA) gave a detailed transparency presentation on the ongoing activities of TC 3/SC 5 to develop the necessary documents for the MAA. In his second presentation he gave an overview on the proposed voluntary OIML International Quantity (IQ) Mark System which is included in the draft of revision of R 87 *Net content in packages*.

## Discussions

Mr. Magana (France) made a general remark that it was necessary for the requirements for evaluating the competence of type testing laboratories to be equivalent to those applied by ILAC (EA and APLAC).

Mr. Lagauterie (France) drew attention to ambiguities in the draft OIML MAA document: the subject of acceptance should be the test reports associated with OIML certificates, and not the type evaluations.

Mr. Johansen (Denmark) said that many points needed to be clarified in the recent MAA draft. He expressed concerns about the real necessity of this document. He explained that the OIML Certificate System was functioning well and there had already been a number of cases of voluntary acceptance. For confidence building, he emphasized, accreditation is needed.

Mr. Stoichitoiu (Romania) reminded delegates of the conclusions to the Round Table on accreditation held in Vancouver in 1996 and said that only accreditation can serve as a basis for mutual confidence and for agreements on mutual recognition.

Mr. Birch (Australia) reminded the participants of the need for a Global Measurement System. Unfortunately for the time being there is no international legal metrology system that can provide support for the Global System. Mr. Birch said that self assessment as proposed by the MAA would not provide the transparency and consistency necessary for international acceptance.

Dr. Issaev (Russia) reminded participants that *self declaration* had already been discussed several times and accepted as a necessary option. Further, he stressed the need for the OIML MAA and the necessity to enable developing countries to participate in the Arrangement.

Dr. Bennett (UK) explained that an agreement shall pass four tests: (i) confidence; (ii) transparency; (iii) accessibility for all those interested; and (iv) benefit for interested parties. The OIML MAA in its present form

does not pass these tests, and much has to be done to improve its transparency and accessibility.

As regards the proposed OIML IQ mark Dr. Bennett expressed doubts on its possible acceptance, and concern over the additional burden that such a mark can cause for small packers.

Mr. Andersson (USA) said that the USA is interested in the MAA and would apply the OIML Certificate System. He mentioned the US experience in raising mutual confidence at national level without obligatory accreditation. He drew attention to the importance of market surveillance and of regular conformity control of measuring instruments in production.

Mr. Faber (The Netherlands) said he believed in the establishment of a Global Measurement System. He felt that the OIML MAA was very important and urgent; it should also be very precise, complete and transparent, and should be developed step by step.

Mr. Kildal (Norway) said that the *Convention du Mètre* MRA was heading along the right lines towards the Global Measurement System. Since the OIML Certificate System itself was functioning well, in order to improve the OIML MAA (if it was found necessary at all) he proposed to take other international documents and existing systems into consideration.

In summarizing the discussions, Dr. Chappell said that he felt encouraged by all the contributions and requested the participants to send in their comments on both the draft MAA and the proposed IQ mark.

## **Conclusion of the discussions**

Mr. Athané (BIML) formulated the conclusions to the Round Table as follows:

After having listened to reports on the subject what is happening in the field of mutual recognition agreements or arrangements within CIPM, ILAC, WTO and also at the bilateral level, the Round Table heard information concerning the state of progress of work in OIML TC 3/SC 5 and TC 6. The points of view on these activities - in particular in relation to TC 3/SC 5 - as expressed by certain participants differed considerably and opposite opinions were expressed particularly concerning the necessity for the work of TC 3/SC 5 and of accreditation, and the sufficiency of self declaration.

However, there was a consensus concerning the fact that the mutual recognition of test results associated with OIML certificates of conformity is a necessary objective to achieve, but the ways to achieve this have still to be identified.

---





*Notes*

A series of 25 horizontal dotted lines for writing notes.



