

MINUTES

COMPTE RENDU

Thirty-Sixth Meeting of the International Committee of Legal Metrology: Moscow, 25–27 September 2001

Trente-Sixième Réunion du Comité International de Métrologie Légale:
Moscou, 25–27 septembre 2001



ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE
DE MÉTROLOGIE LÉGALE

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION
OF LEGAL METROLOGY



International Organization of Legal Metrology

Secretariat:

BUREAU INTERNATIONAL DE MÉTROLOGIE LÉGALE (BIML)
11, RUE TURGOT - 75009 PARIS - FRANCE

TEL: 33 (0)1 48 78 12 82 or 33 (0)1 42 85 27 11

FAX: 33 (0)1 42 82 17 27

E-MAIL: biml@oiml.org

INTERNET: www.oiml.org

THIRTY-SIXTH MEETING
of the
INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF LEGAL METROLOGY
25–27 September 2001 - Moscow

The International Committee of Legal Metrology was convened by its President, Mr. Gerard J. Faber, and met from 25th through 27th September 2001 in the conference room of the Intourist Hotel, Moscow.



Contents

Attendance	5
Opening addresses	9
Roll-Call - Quorum	14
Approval of the agenda	14
1 Approval of the minutes of the 35 th CIML Meeting	18
2 Implementation of the decisions and resolutions of the Eleventh Conference	18
3 Reexamination of the 1999–2002 Action Plan and its extension to cover the period 2003–2004	18
4 Member States and Corresponding Members	19
4.1 New Members - Expected accessions	
4.2 Situation of certain Members	
5 Financial matters	20
5.1 Adoption of the Auditor's report for 2000	
5.2 Examination of the financial situation for 2001 and 2002	
6 Presidential Council activities	20
7 The situation at the BIML	21
7.1 BIML Staff - General situation - Renewal of the contract of Mr. Szilvássy	
7.2 BIML activities	
8 Technical activities	22
8.1 Work program of TCs/SCs	
8.2 Examination of the situation of certain TCs/SCs, if appropriate	
8.3 Approval of draft Recommendations	
8.4 Future developments in TC/SC working methods and use of modern communication means	
9 OIML Certificate System for Measuring Instruments	26
9.1 General information	
9.2 New Recommendations applicable within the System	
9.3 Plans for future developments (see also MAA below)	
10 Mutual Acceptance Arrangement (MAA)	28
11 IQ mark for prepackaged goods	32
12 Report on the Development Council meeting of 24 September	32
13 Liaisons with international and regional institutions	33
13.1 Regional Legal Metrology Organizations (RLMOs)	
13.2 Other institutions	
14 Appointment of Honorary Members of the Committee	37
15 Future meetings	38
15.1 37 th CIML Meeting (2002)	
15.2 38 th CIML Meeting (2003)	
15.3 Further meetings	
16 Other matters	38
17 Adoption of decisions	38
18 Closure	39
Decisions and Resolutions	40
<i>Annex:</i> Minutes of the meeting of Regional Legal Metrology Organizations of Tuesday 25 September 2001 (morning)	47

Attendance

Member States

Algeria	Mr. Boudissa Mr. Hocine	CIML Member
Australia	Mrs. Bennett	CIML Member
Austria	Mr. Leitner	CIML Member
Belarus	Mr. Zhagora Mrs. Astafyeva	
Belgium	Mr. Eggermont	CIML Member
Brazil	Mr. Moreira da Silva	
Bulgaria	Mr. Stratschimirov Mrs. Petkova	
Cameroon	Mr. Ela Essi Mr. Liman Oumar	CIML Member
Canada	Mr. Johnston Mr. Vinet	CIML Member
P.R. of China	Mr. Li Chuanqing Mr. Song Wei Mrs. Kong Xiaokang Mr. Han Jianping Mr. Xu Xinjian	CIML Member
Croatia	Mr. Benčić	
Cuba	Mr. Ramirez	CIML Member
Cyprus	Mr. Tsiartzazis	CIML Member
Czech Republic	Mr. Klenovský	CIML Member
Denmark	Mr. Johansen	CIML Member
Egypt	Mr. El Sayed	
Finland	Mr. Valkeapää	CIML Member
France	Mr. Lagauterie	CIML Member
Germany	Mr. Kochsiek Mr. Velfe	CIML Vice-President
Hungary	Mr. Pákay Mr. Schmalhofer	CIML Member
Indonesia	Mr. Gunaryo	CIML Member
Ireland	Mr. Farragher	CIML Member

Israel	Mr. Zarin Mr. Harel	CIML Member
Japan	Mr. Tanaka Mr. Sasaki Mr. Yano Mr. Kojima Mrs. Sakai Mr. Ooiwa	CIML Member
Kazakhstan	Mr. Primkulov Mr. Abdirasilov	
Rep. of Korea	Mr. Cho Chun-Haeng Mr. Kim Hong Mr. Lee Yeon-jae Mr. Park Il-hwan Mr. Yeum Kou-sul	CIML Member
D.P.R. of Korea	Mr. Ri Man Ho Mr. Choe Chang Jin	
Macedonia	Mr. Grkov Mr. Josifovski	CIML Member
Monaco	Proxy to Mr. Lagauterie, France	
Netherlands	Mr. Faber Mr. Charité Mr. Engler Mrs. van Spronsen	CIML President
Norway	Mr. Kildal	CIML Member
Poland	Mr. Mordziński Mrs. Lisowska	CIML Member
Portugal	Mr. Cartaxo Reis	CIML Member
Romania	Mr. Iacobescu	CIML Member
Russian Federation	Mr. Krutikov Mr. Issaev Mr. Lakhov Mr. Astachenkov Mr. Mardin and Mr./Mrs. Ragulin, Kozlyakova, Belobragin, Korobkin, Bouyevich, Vichenkov and Nemchinov	CIML Vice-President
Saudi Arabia	Mr. Al-Gossair	
Slovakia	Mr. Orlovský	CIML Member
South Africa	Mr. Beard	CIML Member
Spain	Proxy to Mr. Cartaxo Reis, Portugal	
Sweden	Mr. Björkqvist	CIML Member

Switzerland	Mr. Vaucher	CIML Member
Tanzania	Mr. Tukai	CIML Member
Tunisia	Mrs. Annabi	CIML Member
United Kingdom	Mr. Bennett Mr. Birdseye	CIML Member New CIML Member
USA	Mr. Ehrlich	CIML Member
Yugoslavia	Mr. Marković Mr. Milosević	CIML Member
Zambia	Mr. Sinyangwe Mr. Kapembwa	CIML Member

Corresponding Members

Albania	Mr. Progri Mr. Laci Mr. Dervish Mr. Hoxha
Latvia	Mr. Davis
Lithuania	Mr. Staugaitis
Malaysia	Mr. Chen
Moldavia	Mr. Baban
Chinese Taipei	Mr. Lin Neng-Jong Mr. Lin Hsing-Min
Ukraine	Mr. Sidorenko Mr. Markov
Uruguay	Mr. Garcia y Santos
Uzbekistan	Mr. Jebrovskiy

RLMOs

APLMF	Mr. Birch and Mr. Ooiwa
COOMET	Mr. Zhagora
EMLMF	Mrs. Annabi and Mr. Lagauterie
IOLMF	Mr. Birch
SADCMEL	Messrs. Beard and Tukai
SEESMC (Balkan Cooperation)	Mr. Grkov
SIM	Messrs. Ehrlich and Moreira da Silva
WELMEC	Mr. Bennett

BIML

Mr. Athané	Director (up to this CIML Meeting)
Mr. Magaña	Director (from this CIML Meeting on)
Mr. Szilvássy	Assistant Director
Mr. Dunmill	Assistant Director
Mr. Pulham	Editor

– Opening addresses –

**Opening address by Mr. V. Hristenko -
Deputy Prime Minister of the Government
of the Russian Federation**

**(Speech delivered by Mr. Podufalov, Director,
Department of Culture, Education and Science,
Government of the Russian Federation)**



Ladies and Gentlemen,

On behalf of the Government of the Russian Federation I am delighted to be able to personally welcome you to this CIML Meeting, which is taking place in Russia for the very first time.

We consider the fact that you have chosen our country to hold this year's meeting of your distinguished organization - the International Organization of Legal Metrology - firstly as a sign of Russia's role and achievements in contributing to the founding and development of the OIML, and secondly as the stimulus for future activity on the part of Russia in the field of legal metrology.

Russian legal metrology has its origins in the tenth century. Today, Russia is on the way towards full integration in the world economy, is experiencing a transition to free market mechanisms and has the objective to join the WTO; we are paying particular attention to developing and strengthening international cooperation, including cooperation in the framework of international and regional organizations.

Over the past few years OIML activities have resulted in the need for international legal metrology cooperation to become more and more efficient. This cooperation, which

was and still is the key component for creating new legislation, affects economic development in a large number of countries all over the world.

The development and implementation of harmonized documents for testing and verifying measuring instruments which are under governmental control and supervision is an extremely important element of the global system of economic cooperation.

Taking into account the significant role of ensuring accurate measurement results for the realization of commercial and scientific relations, Russia is endeavoring to maintain metrological liaisons with as many countries in the world as possible since the consequences of legal metrology are of particular significance for such fields as trade, health, environmental protection and safety.

I am also pleased to confirm that it is of course in the interest of our country to continue to develop and reinforce our efforts aimed at promoting and participating in all OIML activities.

I would like to wish CIML Members and all the participants of the 36th CIML Meeting a very successful meeting, and we look forward to a longstanding fruitful cooperation in the future concerning OIML activities. ■

Opening address by Mr. Voronin, Chairman of Gosstandart of Russia

Dear Participants in the 36th Meeting of the International Committee of Legal Metrology,

Dear representatives of international, regional and national organizations,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is an honor for me to welcome you in the name of the State Committee for Standardization and Metrology of the Russian Federation to this CIML Meeting, which is being held for the first time in our country.

Legal metrology in Russia has a long history, starting out with the Tsar monitoring weights and measures in the X century - in fact the Church had responsibility for carrying out this surveillance. This limited scope of legal metrology gradually gained ground thanks to Peter the Great's reforms in the XVIII century and to the ukases of the Tsar in 1835 and 1842, up to the time of D. Mendeleev. From 1899 on, verification took on importance nationally through a network of verification chambers, one of which gave rise to the current VNIIMS which celebrated its hundredth anniversary last year.

In 1938 a certain ideology was established in the USSR in the field of measurements (units, standards, tests, verification, surveillance). Essential conditions were instigated in order to adopt a systemic approach to this problem. A national metrology service was formed to ensure the uniformity of measurements in the country.

The Gosstandart of Russia was entrusted with certain powers by the Government of the Russian Federation to represent Russia on the CIML. The Gosstandart much appreciates the activities of this international intergovernmental organization and regards cooperation between the OIML and Russian metrological institutions, other bodies, researchers and experts as being of high importance.

The OIML, including the International Committee of Legal Metrology, has done a very creative job and this has caused both the Organization's international standing and prestige to be elevated and also the efficiency of its activities to be increased.

Let me quote a few examples:

- a modern international legal metrology cooperation infrastructure has been established and functions under the aegis of the OIML;
- the organization and the legislation of metrological activities in OIML Member States and in other countries around the world are established on the basis of OIML Documents and Recommendations, thus reflecting the modern tendencies and perspectives of economic and social evolutions. It is not purely fortuitous if the European Union is planning on making reference to OIML Documents and Recommendations in its directives on measuring instruments;
- the OIML Certificate System is becoming more and more widespread, including in Russia, which has led to a reduction in the costs involved in reverifying imported measuring instruments and also a reduction in the time needed for them to be put into use by the national economic authorities.

These aspects, and many others, have allowed OIML activity to reach a remarkable level of success in the fields of industrial product quality, consumer protection and the elimination of technical barriers to trade. This activity therefore constitutes an element of technical regulation in OIML Members States.

As far as Russia is concerned, the Gosstandart of Russia metrological institutes, and first and foremost the All-Russian Scientific Research Institute of Metrological Service (VNIIMS), are participating in OIML activities.

And as you also know, Russian researchers and experts have always played (and continue to play) an active role in the work of key OIML bodies as well as within the CIML and the BIML, including the roles of CIML Vice President and First Vice President. These specialists have participated in finding solutions to OIML policy problems and to the development and setting up of the long term policy. Despite communication difficulties between the managing and legislative bodies in the context of market relations, we have strived to maintain our level of participation in the management of OIML technical bodies at the same level (34 %). As a result, over 15 % of published international Documents and Recommendations include contributions from Russian authors.

Nowadays we are seeing a growing tendency that the scope of legal metrology activities is broadening out at national level due to the emergence of new fields in which state regulation is very present (in analytical chemistry, electromagnetic compatibility, the games market, etc.), as well as at international level given the process of globalization in trade, industry or information.

All of this gives rise to the need for strict requirements as concerns the compatibility of metrological prescriptions, and leads to compatibility in the field of conformity evaluation. This is why we support the idea

of creating a global measurement system that standardizes these measurements.

Mutual confidence in the context of metrological activities is becoming increasingly important and is obtained thanks to accreditation, inter-laboratory comparisons, the creation of quality systems by way of participation in mutual recognition agreements, and more efficient working methods at regional level.

These goals and perspectives are defined by the OIML for the XXI century. The Gosstandart of Russia, its researchers and experts - our colleagues - who are working in the field of industry, science and the economy will actively participate in OIML related matters with a view to resolving a number of legal metrology problems with the ultimate aim of providing solutions to topical questions concerning the economic and social development of the world community.

To conclude my brief speech may I wish all Members of the International Committee of Legal Metrology and all the participants in this distinguished OIML forum a fruitful outcome to their busy work schedule; may I also wish you health and success in your furthering of metrology and international co-operation!

Thank you very much for your attention. ■



Opening address by Mr. Gerard Faber, President of the International Committee of Legal Metrology



Ladies and Gentlemen, Dear Colleagues,

It is indeed my pleasure to welcome you to the opening of this 36th Meeting of our Committee and I thank you in advance for your participation which, I am sure, will be as positive and fruitful as usual.

This CIML Meeting starts in the wake of two other important meetings which many of you have attended: a meeting of the OIML Development Council and a meeting of the Regional Legal Metrology Organizations. Mrs. Annabi, for the Development Council, and myself for the RLMOs, will report on the output of both meetings, which may have significant consequences for the work and the future direction and development of our Organization.

It is now already nearly a year since our Eleventh Conference, and one of our main duties this week will be to look at how the decisions of that Conference have been or are being implemented. In particular, we will have to examine the progress already made in two very important areas, the Mutual Acceptance Arrangement and the international marking of prepacked products, and make sure that they are on the right track and will come to a successful conclusion in due course.

Last but not least, this CIML Meeting takes place at a crucial period in the life of the BIML - and therefore of the OIML as a whole: as you are of course aware, Mr. Magaña is taking over as Director of the BIML from Mr. Athané. On your behalf I have been carefully looking at the situation in order to be sure that this transition is happening in the best possible manner for the benefits of the OIML.

These are, my dear Colleagues, the most important topics that we will have to examine and/or decide upon during this meeting. For some of them I intend to say some introductory words on the occasion of this opening address. However, according to tradition, I would like to start with some words concerning our new Members.

As you know, during the past twelve months the number of OIML Member States has remained unchanged. Concerning the Corresponding Members, there were several changes with the accessions of Benin, Cambodia, Comores, Gabon, Malta and Uzbekistan, and the delisting of Colombia, Ecuador and Malawi, for not having paid their annual subscriptions over a number of years. Therefore, globally, the number of OIML Member States and Corresponding Members has slightly increased since our last meeting.

Concerning the composition of our Committee, a number of changes occurred with the appointment of the following new CIML Members:

- Mrs. Bennett, for Australia,
- Mr. Koreshkov, for Belarus,
- Mr. Lagauterie, for France,
- Mr. Chun Haeng Cho, for the Republic of Korea,
- Mr. Tanaka, for Japan.

It is my pleasure to welcome all these new CIML Members, amongst whom three had already attended our London meetings, and to thank them in advance for their participation in our work.

This week I received a letter from Mr. Li Chuanqing from the People's Republic of China announcing that he will have to leave the CIML because of changes in his responsi-

bilities and that he will be replaced by Mr. Wang Qiping, Vice-Minister of AQSIQ. Furthermore I have been informed that at the end of the month, Mr. Bennett from the United Kingdom will also have to leave the CIML because of his appointment as Deputy Director of the NPL. After his departure, Mr. Birdseye will act as UK CIML Member until such time as an official decision is taken concerning this position. So may I take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Li and Mr. Bennett for their new responsibilities, and to thank them for the role they have played in the OIML and especially their outstanding role in the Presidential Council. It is of course with pleasure that I welcome the new Members, Mr. Wang and, for the time being at least, Mr. Birdseye and I wish them much success in their new role as Committee Members.

Slightly under a year ago the Eleventh Conference made a number of important decisions concerning the OIML Long Term Policy, technical activities, liaisons with other international and regional institutions, and of course the budget for the next four years and other financial matters. During our CIML Meeting all these points will be carefully examined under the various items of our agenda. I do not intend to elaborate on these immediately. I would just like to assure you that all your discussions and suggestions will be carefully examined by the Presidential Council and by the Bureau and will serve as a basis for directing - or even on some occasions re-directing - the relevant OIML activities. I may predict, for example, that the relationship between the OIML and certain European bodies will give rise to very interesting discussions. Please feel free to express your views and possibly your criticisms!

The situation within the BIML will also be covered by an item on our agenda and you will have the possibility to ask your questions on this occasion. Just as an introduction let me say that I have considered it to be of the highest priority for me to carefully monitor the transition between Mr. Athané and Mr. Magaña. I can report to you that I consider that Mr. Magaña has so far been able to devote most of his time to policy matters and to external liaisons. In parallel, Mr. Athané has continued to exercise his responsibilities

as Director while making sure that his successor was informed step by step of all the aspects of the BIML life. I have multiplied the contacts with the BIML by e-mail or telephone, but also through frequent visits during which I had the opportunity to discuss either with Messrs. Athané and Magaña together, or only with one of them and more particularly with Mr. Magaña in order to exchange with him views concerning the future developments of the OIML and its Bureau. I must say that I am fully satisfied with the way the transition is taking place but I will of course be ready to listen to your own views. The transition period will end tomorrow on the occasion of the OIML reception and on Thursday morning, for the closing session of our meeting, Mr. Magaña will sit at this table as the new BIML Director.

These are, my dear Colleagues, the introductory remarks that I wanted to make on this occasion. However, before closing my opening address, I think it is appropriate to look a little more towards the future. As you know, during the London CIML Meeting, I was re-elected President of the CIML for a limited three year additional term. Therefore a new President will have to be elected on the occasion of the 38th CIML meeting, within two years' time. Such an election has to be prepared well in advance in order to identify possible candidates, to inform the CIML about these candidacies and to decide about the election procedure. As current CIML President I have of course a strong responsibility in preparing the election of my successor and I will ask the Presidential Council to assist me in this respect. It is clear however that you are all also deeply concerned and therefore I invite all those of you who may have proposals to offer to contact me privately before the 37th CIML meeting next year so that, during the meeting, I can already give some relevant information. Be sure that I will consider very seriously any suggestions I receive.

So, at the end of my opening address, may I ask the BIML Director to proceed with the roll-call of participants before we embark on the various items on our agenda.

Thank you for your attention, and may I wish you a very successful meeting. ■

– Roll-call - Quorum –

The roll of Delegates was called. It was found that 47 CIML Members (out of 57) were present or represented and that the statutory quorum of three-quarters was therefore reached.

– Approval of the Agenda –

The Committee approved the following agenda:

Opening addresses

Roll-Call - Quorum

Approval of the agenda

- 1 Approval of the minutes of the 35th CIML Meeting
- 2 Implementation of the decisions and resolutions of the Eleventh Conference
- 3 Reexamination of the 1999–2002 Action Plan and its extension to cover the period 2003–2004
- 4 Member States and Corresponding Members
 - 4.1 New Members - Expected accessions
 - 4.2 Situation of certain Members
- 5 Financial matters
 - 5.1 Adoption of the Auditor's report for 2000
 - 5.2 Examination of the financial situation for 2001 and 2002
- 6 Presidential Council activities
- 7 The situation at the BIML
 - 7.1 BIML Staff - General situation - Renewal of the contract of Mr. Szilvássy
 - 7.2 BIML activities

- 8 Technical activities
 - 8.1 Work program of TCs/SCs
 - 8.2 Examination of the situation of certain TCs/SCs, if appropriate
 - 8.3 Approval of draft Recommendations
 - 8.4 Future developments in TC/SC working methods and use of modern communication means

- 9 OIML Certificate System for Measuring Instruments
 - 9.1 General information
 - 9.2 New Recommendations applicable within the System
 - 9.3 Plans for future developments (see also MAA below)

- 10 Mutual Acceptance Arrangement (MAA)

- 11 IQ mark for prepackaged goods

- 12 Report on the Development Council meeting of 24 September

- 13 Liaisons with international and regional institutions
 - 13.1 Regional Legal Metrology Organizations (RLMOs)
 - 13.2 Other institutions

- 14 Appointment of Honorary Members of the Committee

- 15 Future meetings
 - 15.1 37th CIML Meeting (2002)
 - 15.2 38th CIML Meeting (2003)
 - 15.3 Further meetings

- 16 Other matters

- 17 Adoption of decisions

- 18 Closure

Note: Item 15.3 “Further meetings” did not appear on the agenda as approved by the Committee; it was subsequently added as a result of the discussions under item 15.

Thirty-Sixth Meeting

of the

International Committee of Legal Metrology

– Minutes –

**Thirty-Sixth Meeting
of the
International Committee of Legal Metrology**

- Minutes -

1 Approval of the minutes of the 35th CIML Meeting

The minutes of the 35th CIML Meeting were approved without modification.

2 Implementation of the decisions and resolutions of the Eleventh Conference

Mr. Athané reminded the participants of the dates on which the *Decisions and Resolutions* of the Eleventh Conference and then the complete Minutes had been distributed to OIML Members.

Mr. Faber reviewed these *Decisions and Resolutions* and indicated for each one either what had already been done with a view to their implementation, or which actions the Committee still had to carry out, especially on the occasion of this 36th Meeting. Following this review the Committee expressed its satisfaction for the manner in which these *Decisions and Resolutions* had already been or were being implemented.

3 Reexamination of the 1999–2002 Action Plan and its extension to cover the period 2003–2004

Mr. Athané reminded the participants of the process that had been followed to review the 1999–2002 Action Plan and to start its extension to cover the period 2003–2004 according to the decision of the Eleventh Conference. This process had involved the Bureau, the Presidential Council and all CIML Members and had resulted in a final draft Action Plan being submitted to this 36th CIML Meeting for comments, together with a draft Resolution submitted for approval by the CIML.

Mr. Ehrlich requested that action D.5.7 dealing with cooperation with European bodies (especially the European standardization bodies CEN and CENELEC) be reviewed in order to reflect further discussions that had recently taken place within the Presidential Council. It was decided that this matter would first be discussed under item 13.2 and that the wording of this action would then be changed.

To conclude this item the Committee approved the following Resolution:

The International Committee of Legal Metrology

CONSIDERING the decision of the Eleventh Conference concerning the OIML long-term policy;

CONSIDERING the draft revision 2 of the *1999–2002 Action Plan with preliminary extension to 2003–2004*;

CONSIDERING the comments expressed by certain CIML Members;

INSTRUCTS the BIML, under the supervision of the CIML President, to publish this new *Action Plan* taking into account the comments received and to distribute it to all OIML bodies concerned, for implementation, and to interested international and regional institutions, for information;

INSTRUCTS the CIML President to report on the implementation of this *Action Plan* at future CIML Meetings;

INSTRUCTS the CIML President and his Council to reflect about any necessary extension of this *Action Plan* so as to fully cover the period 2003–2004, and to prepare a draft with a view to its approval by the CIML at its 37th Meeting.

4 Member States and Corresponding Members

4.1 New Members - Expected accessions

Mr. Athané reminded the participants that complete information concerning the OIML membership had been given by the CIML President in his opening address.

Concerning expected accessions Mr. Magaña said that Malaysia and Vietnam had each informed the Bureau that they were considering upgrading their membership from Corresponding Member to Member State but that no final decisions had been made in this respect. Certain other Corresponding Members were also reflecting about the same possibility but it was currently too early to give more precise information about this.

4.2 Situation of certain Members

a) Member States having been granted extra time to pay their arrears

Mr. Athané reminded the participants of the decision that had been made concerning the D.P.R. of Korea and Zambia. He added that the D.P.R. of Korea had not only paid its 2000 and 2001 contributions on time but had also paid a part of its 1996–1999 arrears, for which the Committee expressed its satisfaction. Concerning Zambia, Mr. Athané commented that only a part of the 2000 contribution had been paid. The Committee fixed at 2002.06.30 the final deadline for this country to pay its 2000 and 2001 contributions in full and requested the BIML to report back on the situation at the 37th CIML Meeting.

b) Other Member States that are very late in the payment of their contributions

Mr. Athané reported that three Member States, namely the Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy and Kazakhstan were now very late in the payment of their contributions and that Article XXIX of the OIML Convention would have to be applied if no payment was received within a reasonable time. He also said that the Bureau had received information from the Italian Authorities concerning an imminent payment of the arrears, and that the Kazakh Authorities had also indicated their willingness to pay their arrears as soon as possible. The Committee fixed at 2002.06.30 the final deadline for these three countries to pay their arrears and requested the BIML to report back on the situation at its 37th Meeting.

Note by the BIML: At the time of compiling these minutes, Italy has paid the totality of its arrears, including its 2001 contribution, and Kazakhstan had paid a part of its arrears.

5 Financial matters

5.1 Adoption of the Auditor's report for 2000

The Committee adopted the Auditor's report for 2000 and instructed its President and the BIML Director to submit it to the Twelfth Conference.

5.2 Examination of the financial situation for 2001 and 2002

Mr. Athané reported that the financial situation of the Organization was safe and that 2001 expenses and receipts would quite probably be in line with the decisions of the Eleventh Conference and the estimates made at the end of 2000.

Mr. Magaña then gave information concerning future developments for 2002 and the following years, including:

- the changeover to the Euro;
- a new presentation of BIML accounts in order to better estimate the operational costs of the various bodies constituting the OIML and those of the various products and services provided by the Bureau (web site, publications, etc.);
- a new pricing policy concerning the sale of OIML publications and services;
- the possibility, from next year on, to purchase OIML publications through on-line payment by credit card and automatic downloading from the OIML web site.

6 Presidential Council activities

Mr. Faber reminded the participants (and especially recently appointed CIML Members) that the Presidential Council is not a formal part of the Organization since it is not provided for in the OIML Convention; however it is a very useful and effective body to prepare discussions at the CIML level, it being understood that the Presidential Council does not make any decisions by itself. In 2001, the Presidential Council met in February and then in September just prior to the 36th CIML Meeting in order to review the output of the Eleventh Conference and 35th CIML Meeting and to prepare the decisions which might be made during the 36th CIML Meeting. In fact the items discussed by the Presidential Council were very close to those to be discussed during this 36th CIML Meeting.

Answering Mr. Kildal, Mr. Faber reiterated the fact that the Presidential Council included:

- himself as CIML President,
- the two Vice-Presidents (Messrs. Kochsiek and Issaev),
- the Chairperson of the Development Council (Mrs. Annabi),
- a limited number of CIML Members appointed by the President on the basis of a number of criteria including their personal interest and role in OIML activities with the aim of ensuring an effective representation of the majority of the regions of the world (these other members were currently Messrs. Beard, Ehrlich and Johnston), and
- the BIML Director as Secretary.

Mr. Faber added that Messrs Imai and Li Chuanqing, who had left or were soon to leave their position as CIML Members, were therefore no longer Members of the Presidential Council and that he would wait before considering the possibility of appointing new Council Members to replace them.

7 The situation at the BIML

7.1 BIML Staff - General situation - Renewal of the contract of Mr. Szilvássy

a) BIML Staff - General situation

Mr. Athané reminded the participants that the BIML currently comprised ten persons, including the new and the former Directors, two Assistant Directors, one Engineer, one Editor, one Administrator, two Secretaries and one Office Clerk. A second Office Clerk had retired in August 2000 but had not yet been replaced in order to allow Mr. Magaña to reconsider the BIML staff globally and to possibly appoint a new staff member when necessary and to fulfill appropriate responsibilities.

Mr. Magaña added that he was currently considering the global missions of the BIML and would draw conclusions concerning the BIML staff and its qualifications following this 36th CIML Meeting. For the time being he had made no decision concerning the position which was vacant since August 2000. However, he was progressively re-qualifying the responsibilities of the two Secretaries in order to free up more time for the technical staff so that they could focus on more strategic tasks. He noted that there was presently a need, which would increase in the future, to acquire more expertise in the field of computers and the internet. For the time being, experts would be hired to carry out specific tasks over fixed periods of time before defining the permanent needs of the Bureau.

Mr. Eggermont asked whether assistance should not be given by the Bureau to TCs/SCs, owing to their essential role in the development of OIML Recommendations and to increasing difficulties faced by national civil servants to fulfill their international responsibilities, as a result of shortages in human and financial resources, privatization, etc.

Mr. Magaña replied that he was well aware of the problem since less than one year ago he was responsible for a national legal metrology service actively involved in OIML work. He said that the Bureau will do its best to assist TCs/SCs in their responsibilities, for example through establishing electronic and internet facilities that would facilitate their technical work. More direct assistance could also be offered to given TC/SCs in case of necessity. However the BIML would be unable to replace national experts whose participation is essential for the activity of TCs/SCs. Therefore the BIML could not take on more than a role of secretarial and logistic assistance.

Mr. Klenovský supported Mr. Eggermont's views and expressed the view that the role of the BIML should be the technical work, which is the core of OIML and national legal metrology services business. Subcontracting this technical work was an approach which should be developed and funds should be released to hire experts that would facilitate and accelerate the OIML work, especially on strategic issues.

Mr. Magaña said that he would consider these comments seriously and would present proposals to the Presidential Council.

Mr. Lagauterie said that in the framework of the development of the European Measuring Instruments Directive, difficulties had resulted from the lack of coherence between the various applicable OIML Recommendations as far as electromagnetic disturbances are concerned. He invited the BIML to look at the necessary harmonization of OIML Recommendations.

Mr. Magaña agreed that there was a need to ensure such harmonization. He added that the concept of "horizontal papers" had been discussed at the level of the Presidential Council and should be further discussed in the near future. Such horizontal papers would deal with matters that are common to a number of Recommendations (e.g. electronic devices already covered by D 11, or software to be covered by a paper currently under consideration); the latter would then

just refer to the appropriate horizontal papers. Whenever necessary, horizontal papers would be reviewed without the need to individually review the relevant Recommendations.

Mr. Faber concluded that all these comments would have to be carefully considered by the Presidential Council.

b) Renewal of the contract of Mr. Szilvássy

Mr. Faber reminded the participants that this contract renewal, made in accordance with the relevant provisions of the *Convention*, was strongly supported by himself, by the Presidential Council and by both Directors and that there was no other candidate. Following a secret ballot, the Committee unanimously renewed Mr. Szilvássy's contract for five years as Assistant Director, starting from September 2002. Mr. Faber congratulated Mr. Szilvássy who expressed his gratitude to the Committee for its decision and affirmed his willingness to continue to serve the OIML in the best possible way.

c) Additional information concerning the transition between the two Directors

During a special session restricted to CIML Members or their representatives (discussions not taped) the Committee took note of information delivered by its President concerning the conditions under which the transition from the former to the new Directors had happened.

7.2 BIML activities

A written report describing the BIML activities from October 2000 through September 2001 was distributed to participants. The Committee took note of this report and requested the Bureau to publish it in an appropriate format in the January issue of the OIML Bulletin.

8 Technical activities

8.1 Work program of TCs/SCs and

8.2 Examination of the situation of certain TCs/SCs, if appropriate

A written report prepared by the BIML was distributed to participants and presented by Mr. Issaev, who is responsible for following OIML technical activities as CIML Vice-President.

Mr. Issaev began with some statistics concerning the activity of TCs/SCs (status of the various work projects, meetings held, etc.) which demonstrated an increase in the global volume of OIML technical activities compared with previous years. Concerning the establishment of priorities in TCs/SCs work, Mr. Issaev summarized the situation and said that Mr. Szilvássy would give more detailed information before requesting the Committee to endorse the final list of high priority and priority projects.

Mr. Issaev then evoked the situation of certain TCs/SCs, including those which, for the time being, had no secretariat (vacant TCs/SCs), those for which the number of P-members was below the minimum specified by the *Directives for the Technical Work*, and finally those which were facing temporary difficulties in their work. Mr. Issaev concluded his presentation by asking Mr. Szilvássy to give additional information that would facilitate the identification of appropriate decisions to be made by the Committee.

Mr. Szilvássy said that thirty-two Committee Drafts had been developed since October 2000, which was much more than during any other preceding years; in addition, a number of TCs/SCs

had been reactivated over the past eighteen months. All these elements proved that OIML technical activity was improving.

Mr. Szilvássy explained the process that had been followed in order to develop the list of priority and high priority projects and also reported about their state of progress. Concerning horizontal papers that had already been mentioned by Mr. Magaña, Mr. Szilvássy said that a number of comments had been received by the Bureau, pointing out the necessity to accelerate the work on e.g. the revision of D 1 (*Law on metrology*) and that of D 11 (*Electronic instruments*), and the development of papers on measurement uncertainty, software and the statistical methods to be used in legal metrology controls. As a conclusion, Mr. Szilvássy suggested that the list of high priority and priority projects should be endorsed by the Committee before being published and posted on the OIML web site.

Concerning the situation of certain TCs/SCs, Mr. Szilvássy pointed out that it was most critical to find a Member State volunteering to undertake the responsibility of TC 13 on acoustics and vibration owing in particular to the rapid progress in the development or revision of IEC Standards. Concerning TC 5, the situation was less critical because this TC had no activity by itself, the two Subcommittees working independently on the projects (electronic instruments and software) they were responsible for. Similarly, there was no urgency to immediately have a secretariat for TC 8/SC 2 since Russia had taken on responsibility for developing a test report format for R 125. Mr. Szilvássy also said that certain progress had been made concerning the number of P-members for certain TCs/SCs which, for the time being, suffered from too low a participation. Information was also given concerning the development of certain projects (adaptation of R 49 to updated IEC provisions, way of endorsing IEC work on acoustics, revision of D 10 in cooperation with an ILAC working group). Finally, Mr. Szilvássy indicated that all information on OIML activities was now available on the OIML web site in the form of a database, in addition to the paper version which would continue to be available from the BIML.

Mr. Kildal said that it was now difficult to distinguish between automatic and nonautomatic weighing instruments because it was very often just a matter of how the software was configured. He suggested therefore that the two Subcommittees responsible for these two kinds of instruments should work in very close cooperation. Concerning uncertainty in legal metrology, he was concerned about the fact that a working document had been under consideration for a long time but, for the time being, no committee draft had been circulated even though this was a high priority project.

Concerning the first comment, Mr. Szilvássy said that the two Subcommittees will receive the appropriate information. Concerning the second comment, Mr. Ehrlich replied that considerable progress had been made by a small working group of the Subcommittee and that a draft was being developed and would be circulated within approximately six months.

To conclude these two items the Committee endorsed the list of high priority and priority projects and requested the Bureau to publish it and to distribute it to all interested persons and bodies both inside and outside the OIML. The Bureau was also instructed to inform the relevant TCs/SCs about the output of the discussions with a view to implementing them in their work.

8.3 Approval of draft Recommendations

The Committee approved the four draft Recommendations that had been prepared to this effect with the voting results as indicated below.

Non-invasive sphygmomanometers (Revision of R 16)

Part 1: Mechanical; Part 2: Automated

No comments received
Abstentions: None
No-votes: Finland

Liquid-in-glass thermometers (R 133)

No comments received
Abstentions: None
No-votes: Germany

Water meters intended for the metering of cold potable water (R 49-2)

Part 2: Test methods

Comments: Mr. Lagauterie, while expressing his appreciation for the excellent work carried out by the Secretariat, pointed out the risk of difficulties which might appear if the indicating-computing device or the measuring transducer were to be individually subjected to OIML certification, because of ambiguities as to which requirements were to be applied (see items 6, 7 and 8.3 of the Recommendation). This problem could be solved by introducing the appropriate additional information either in this text or in Part 3 (Test report format) of the Recommendation.

Abstentions: Brazil, Canada, Switzerland
No-votes: USA

Heat meters (Revision of R 75)

Part 1: General requirements; Part 2: Pattern approval and initial verification tests

Comments: Mr. Ehrlich asked whether a test report format for type approval and not just for initial and subsequent verification would be developed. Mr. Szilvássy replied that in addition to Part 1 dealing with general requirements and Part 2 dealing with type approval and verification, a Part 3 was being developed by the Secretariat to cover the test report format for type approval.

Abstentions: Cuba, USA
No-votes: None

8.4 Future development in TC/SC working methods and use of modern communication means

Mr. Magaña said that the Bureau was developing a number of tools and activities connected with information technology and electronic means and would apply them as much as possible in OIML work. This would accelerate OIML technical work, facilitate the participation of all Members therein, facilitate the preparation of meetings (it being understood that electronic means will not supersede meetings) and save money by reducing paper consumption, telephone usage, etc.

As a first step all circulars from the BIML would shortly be distributed by electronic mail; however postal mailing would continue as long as necessary. Electronic addresses of CIML Members are already available from the OIML web site. The use of electronic mail by TCs/SCs would be encouraged as long as all P-members of a given TC/SC accept this communication means. If

certain members did not have access to electronic mail they would of course continue to receive paper copies.

Mr. Magaña added that an increasing number of OIML Publications were already available from the OIML web site including all those related to the *Certificate System*. Within a few months all OIML Publications would be available as PDF files as well as under an appropriate word processing format with a view to facilitating their future review. As already mentioned an electronic on-line purchasing system using credit cards was being developed on the OIML web site. Concerning TCs/SCs, Mr. Magaña commented that experimentation had started on the use of web sites in their work. The Bureau will make models of such web sites available to the interested TCs/SCs and will assist them in their use and TC/SC web sites could possibly be hosted by the general OIML web site. Also under study was the possibility to use chat forums with a view to facilitating technical discussions amongst the experts participating in a given TC/SC. The last possibility was the use of video-conferences in OIML work, the appropriate technical means being available from the OIML web site. This project is still at an early stage of development.

Mr. Kildal mentioned the ISO/CASCO web site which was very useful and which was operating quite satisfactorily. The proposals from Mr. Magaña were quite similar (with the exception of video-conferences, not used within CASCO). In practice, the mailing of papers had been eliminated and this had created no problems for CASCO members. Therefore the OIML should go in this direction very quickly.

Mr. Eggermont said that it would be advisable to ask each country to inform the Bureau as to the format (paper or e-mail) in which they wished to receive OIML documents so as to avoid duplicate distribution.

Mr. Magaña agreed with this proposal and added that check lists of papers distributed would regularly be made available on the OIML web site in order to allow CIML Members to check whether they had correctly received the relevant documents.

Mr. Szilvássy said that amongst the TC/SC papers he had already mentioned, one gave the references of contact persons for each TC/SC, including their electronic addresses.

Mr. Kochsiek said that the PTB had just started establishing a video-conference facility. There were however several systems available all over the world for this kind of facility. Therefore OIML Members should be informed as soon as possible about the system which will be used by the BIML in order to avoid any kind of non-compatibility in the future. Mr. Magaña commented that for the time being the Bureau was at a very experimental stage, using simple and inexpensive facilities for internal use only.

Mr. Ehrlich asked for more information concerning the use of electronic communication means by TCs/SCs in their technical work.

Mr. Magaña replied that in his opinion each TC/SC secretariat could use a web site from which the working papers would be available. Comments from members of the TC/SC would be sent to the site directly and would be immediately available to the secretariat and the other members. In addition chat forums would be at the disposal of members to facilitate technical discussions on the basis of which the secretariat would develop further drafts. However, in most cases, this system would not eliminate the need for meetings.

Mr. Dunmill mentioned the revision of the *Directives for the Technical Work* which was being drawn up by the Bureau. The existing *Directives* had been in place since 1993 and many working methods had changed with the introduction of electronic working facilities. The revision had also been made necessary by the output of the WTO/TBT Agreement, the changes in the relationship between TCs and connected SCs, and evolutions in the kind of papers developed by TCs/SCs. The various forms which were currently at the end of the *Directives* would soon be made available in electronic format to make their use easier by TCs/SCs (for example when drawing up their annual

reports) and to standardize their format. It was also necessary to take into consideration the changes that had occurred since 1993 in the corresponding ISO/IEC working methods while considerably simplifying these methods in order to make their implementation by OIML TCs/SCs easier.

Mr. Boudissa suggested that for the transmission of large quantities of information, CD-ROMS could be used by the Bureau since this was a means which was easily accessible to all countries, whether developed or developing.

Mr. Magaña agreed with this proposition, since CD-ROMS were in fact very useful to transmit documents whenever the capacity of diskettes was not sufficient.

9 OIML Certificate System for Measuring Instruments

A written report prepared by the BIML was distributed to participants and was presented by Mr. Kochsiek, who is responsible for following OIML certification activities as CIML Vice-President.

9.1 General information

Mr. Kochsiek began with a reminder concerning the establishment of the *System* some eleven or twelve years ago, at a time when a number of CIML Members were reluctant about its setting up and questioned its usefulness. After nearly ten years of operation much progress had been made and many manufacturers in various fields of measurement were eager to use the *System*.

After a number of years of operation within an ad-hoc technical advisory group, the *System* was now under the responsibility of TC 3/SC 5 (with the USA and the BIML acting as co-secretariats) the objectives of which are to provide for the further developments of the *System* and to establish rules and procedures for fostering mutual confidence in the results of testing measuring instruments under legal metrology controls among OIML Member States.

Mr. Kochsiek also reminded the participants about the inquiries that were regularly carried out by the Bureau in order to ascertain the views of all parties concerned by the *System*, including Issuing Authorities, Applicants (manufacturers or their representatives) and National Legal Metrology Authorities that were requested to use the OIML certificates to accelerate and simplify the granting of national or regional type approvals.

Mr. Kochsiek then gave information concerning the developments of the *System* over the last twelve months, including the interaction between the *System* and the *Mutual Acceptance Arrangement* which would be discussed under item 10 of the Agenda. He also gave statistics concerning certificates already issued, the categories of instruments to which the *System* applies, Issuing Authorities and Applicants.

To conclude, Mr. Kochsiek reminded the participants that the paper describing the operational rules of the *System* was being revised, with the issuing of new version being expected for mid 2002 following a postal consultation of CIML Members.

Mr. Szilvássy pointed out that the two papers on (i) the operational rules of the *System* and (ii) the *Mutual Acceptance Arrangement*, which were respectively being revised or developed within the same Subcommittee, were connected to a certain extent and that their content and drafting should therefore be carefully coordinated. He also added that the database for the *OIML Certificate System* had already been posted on the OIML web site and that it was possible to find information concerning all registered certificates, Applicants, Issuing Authorities and applicable Recommendations.

Concerning this database and referring to the discussions under item 8.4, Mr. Vaucher pointed out that it would be possible to stop the automatic circulation of registered certificates and to have them available from the web site, paper copies being distributed only to those who specifically requested them. Mr. Magaña agreed with this proposal but said that he would prefer to only stop postal distribution to those having explicitly put in such a request.

9.2 New Recommendations applicable within the System

Following a proposal from Mr. Kochsiek, the Committee decided that two newly approved Recommendations, namely R 16 on sphygmomanometers and R 133 on liquid-in-glass thermometers would become applicable within the *System* as soon as published.

9.3 Plans for future developments (see also MAA below)

Mr. Kochsiek reminded the participants that the revision of the paper *OIML Certificate System for Measuring Instruments* had now reached a well advanced stage and would quite probably be approved and published in 2002. According to this paper the scope of the *System* would be enlarged in two directions: (i) the certification of types of modules and (ii) the certification of types of families (of instruments or of modules). These actions were also foreseen in the *Action Plan* and, if approved, would result in an increasing workload for a number of TCs/SCs with the development of additional test report formats for types of modules and types of families. In addition the revision of the operational rules of the *System* would create a shift in responsibilities from the CIML Members to the Issuing Authorities and also contained new provisions for the identification of the certified types.

Mr. Szilvássy added that the extra workload for TCs/SCs would not be limited to the development of appropriate test report formats but would also include the identification of the types of modules and of families likely to be certified, the specification of their metrological characteristics and the development of appropriate test procedures.

Mr. Kildal asked whether information was available concerning the degree of acceptance of OIML certificates.

Mr. Szilvássy replied that the last inquiry had been carried out before the Eleventh Conference, to which the relevant information had been delivered. As for the near future, further information concerning the acceptance of OIML certificates would result from the developments of the MAA.

Mr. Kildal said that in fact it would be very interesting to obtain information concerning those countries which did not accept OIML certificates.

Mr. Szilvássy, while recognizing the interest of such statistics, said that it was difficult to gain a clear picture owing to the fact that for the time being the acceptance of certificates was voluntary and that any national authority might accept, totally or partly, or not accept a particular certificate.

Mr. Lagauterie mentioned a problem he was facing in the last draft revision of the paper on the *System*. The wording “test report” was still covering both the tests and the examination. Therefore, how should a report giving only test results be denominated? In addition, it was expected that the MAA would cover only test results whereas the reports which would be subject to mutual acceptance would also include results of examination.

Mr. Faber asked Mr. Lagauterie whether this was an editorial or a fundamental problem. Mr. Lagauterie replied that it looked like an editorial problem but that it would develop into a

fundamental one, owing to confusion which will exist as to what will be recognized in the framework of the MAA.

Mr. Magaña said that he was well aware of this difficulty and that the Bureau will examine this point carefully in close cooperation with the US co-secretariat.

Mr. Ehrlich said that certain points will probably be clarified when examining the state of progress of the MAA under item 10. However, it should be kept in mind that the MAA paper was a framework for the development of specific acceptance agreements that would remain of a non-binding nature to a large extent.

Mr. Kildal felt that in that case the MAA would bring no additional benefit compared with the current *Certificate System* and he suggested that this point be discussed further under item 10.

Mr. Ehrlich said that the advantage of the MAA will be to provide for a mechanism for examining testing laboratories at a deeper level than currently existed with the *Certificate System*.

10 Mutual Acceptance Arrangement (MAA)

Under item 2, Mr. Faber had reminded the participants about the decision of the Eleventh Conference to request all CIML Members to express their views concerning the draft MAA with a view to having these views examined by the Presidential Council in February 2001 and the work on the MAA orientated in the most appropriate direction.

As co-secretariat of OIML TC 3/SC 5 on conformity assessment, Mr. Ehrlich started by reviewing the progress and status of the work which had been going on for almost four years to develop an arrangement through which test data obtained in legal metrology testing laboratories in one OIML Member State would be accepted and used by responsible bodies in other OIML Member States, either towards the issuing of national type approval certificates in these other countries or at least towards obtaining some other authorization to market and sell the corresponding instruments in such countries. Such an arrangement would complement the *OIML Certificate System* and would benefit manufacturers of measuring instruments by eliminating the requirements for duplicative tests.

Mr. Ehrlich described both the process and the three types of participants as presented in the eighth committee draft of the MAA. He indicated that if countries B and C (which are supposed to accept and use the OIML certificate issued by country A either to issue a national type approval certificate or to authorize the marketing and sale of the instrument concerned) have national requirements additional to or different from those contained in the relevant OIML Recommendation, the issuing authority for OIML certificates in country A may perform the appropriate additional tests and report about those.

Mr. Ehrlich pointed out that the MAA would be an arrangement among issuing authorities or other national responsible bodies, not among governments nor testing laboratories nor CIML Members.

Mr. Ehrlich continued his presentation by explaining how it would be possible to implement the idea and obtain confidence among the participants in the competence of the various testing laboratories without imposing excessive costs. To this end the eighth committee draft had been supplemented by a checklist (currently at the stage of second committee draft) intended for issuing authorities and testing laboratories carrying out OIML type evaluations. The MAA would serve as the framework for developing a set of signed documents each being referred to as a “declaration of mutual confidence” for a given category of measuring instruments covered by an OIML Recommendation implemented within the *OIML Certificate System*.

As already mentioned the signature of a declaration of mutual confidence would not create any binding obligation with the exception that once a participant had accepted the test data, these data would have the same legal value as if they were emanating from the participant's test laboratories. The process would include a notification to the BIML of the interest of a given country to sign a declaration for a particular type of instruments. The BIML would then notify all CIML Members. An ad-hoc committee on participation review (with the BIML as secretariat) would coordinate the assessment of participating testing laboratories and prepare a report discussing the evaluation of the competences of those laboratories. The BIML would also facilitate the operation of the system including the processing of possible appeals. This committee would comprise experts appointed by and representing issuing authorities or national responsible bodies. Competences would be assessed as follows:

- issuing authorities would perform internal audits of the internal quality management systems and complete that part of the check list pertaining to ISO/IEC Guide 65 as well as the questionnaire of Annex C of the draft MAA;
- testing laboratories would be assessed in one of three ways: (i) accreditation by a team comprising at least one legal metrology expert, the audit being carried out taking into consideration any requirement laid down in the relevant OIML Recommendations; (ii) peer assessment with on-site visit by an expert or experts identified by the ad-hoc committee; or (iii) participation in documented intercomparisons with other potential participants (a mechanism somewhat similar to that used within the Meter Convention). (Note: the notion of self-assessment which appeared in the 7th committee draft was withdrawn upon the request of a number of members).

Mr. Ehrlich pointed out the fact that the process proposed could be implemented without excessive costs for the participating countries, and without creating “clubs” that would exclude certain countries. He also indicated that whilst in a number of OIML Member States the CIML Members have the authority to sign the declarations, in certain other countries the CIML Member could sign only on behalf of the issuing authorities or national responsible bodies.

To conclude, Mr. Ehrlich reminded members of TC 3/SC 5 of the deadline (2001.11.15) for submitting their comments.

Mrs. Bennett said that Australia was strongly in support of the objective of achieving general agreement amongst OIML issuing authorities for the mutual acceptance of test data and appreciated the work developed under the US secretariat. However, Australia maintained its position that only third party accreditation could be the basis for achieving and maintaining confidence and expressed concerns regarding the introduction of the third option (participation in intercomparisons) since this option is not so simple for trade measuring instruments as it is for artifacts which are subject to BIPM intercomparisons. In addition, she mentioned that Australian industry had developed a strong level of expectation that there would soon be international recognition arrangements in place and this expectation should be addressed. Therefore and owing to the time necessary to develop the OIML MAA, Australia had decided to proceed with bilateral agreements with certain of its trading partners, including the Netherlands (NMI), and the United Kingdom (NWML) concerning load cells (R 60), nonautomatic weighing instruments (R 76) and fuel dispensers (R 117). Further bilateral agreements could be signed in the future, however Australia would continue to participate in TC 3/SC 5 work.

Mr. Ehrlich noted that bilateral agreements could facilitate the development of the OIML MAA.

Mr. Kildal asked for information concerning the degree of cooperation with ILAC and whether a parallel cooperation with IAF already existed or would exist in the future. In fact IAF was establishing an international MRA on product certification which could help the OIML in establishing a system that would be less costly if it benefited from the IAF system.

Mr. Ehrlich replied that there was no direct cooperation between TC 3/SC 5 and ILAC and that no direct interaction of ILAC or IAF in the operation of the OIML MAA was anticipated. He was

convinced that the peer assessment review would be less costly than accreditation and, concerning the BIML, its coordination role should not be too expensive.

Mr. Kildal asked whether or not the implementation of the system would create extra costs for the BIML and therefore for OIML Member States.

Mr. Ehrlich admitted that there would be extra costs for the BIML but that these would be more or less independent of the solution chosen for competence assessment. Therefore a mandatory application of accreditation procedures would not decrease costs for the BIML but, on the contrary, might create unacceptable costs for national issuing authorities and testing laboratories.

Mr. Bennett, referring to the bilateral agreement mentioned by Mrs. Bennett, said that it brought immediate benefits for manufacturers willing to commercialize instruments in Australia and in Europe and that the experience gained would certainly give support to a wider OIML arrangement. Concerning the 8th draft, he expressed his appreciation for the progress made compared with the previous draft.

Mr. Tanaka said that the Japanese delegation shared the same opinion as the Australian delegation. Concerning the three possibilities for assessing issuing authorities and test laboratories, he asked whether it was possible to evaluate to which extent each of them would be used. He also asked what amount of human resources would be necessary to implement the third possibility.

Mr. Ehrlich said that he had no elements allowing him to evaluate choices between the three possibilities; however it was his personal opinion that the third option would be very infrequently used. Round robins such as those organized within the APLMF could serve as a basis for this third option. Under such conditions, Mr. Tanaka said that there was no need to worry about the necessary human resources and withdrew his second question.

Mr. Johansen said that if the arrangement was to be limited to test results, there was no need to have requirements (e.g. application of ISO/IEC 65) for issuing authorities.

Mr. Ehrlich said that there would not be the same degree of requirements for issuing authorities as for test laboratories. The idea was only to make sure that the issuing authorities were capable of reviewing test data and issuing certificates.

Mr. Vaucher said that he was still convinced that the MAA was necessary and urgent. He also appreciated the fact that it was drafted in a much simpler way than before, which would facilitate its implementation at reasonable cost without preventing any country from participating. The third option for establishing confidence was fully appreciated and would be quite acceptable provided that it remained within reasonable limits, e.g. not long-lasting endurance tests, but just tests that were critical to perform and would actually demonstrate the capability of test laboratories. Such tests should be organized by RLMOs with perhaps the participation of one country from another region. He also appreciated the possibility that peer assessment be conducted by a single expert, which would limit the costs and avoid duplication with the first option (accreditation).

He said that he was nevertheless disappointed that the concept of documented self-declaration (not self-assessment) had disappeared because it would be an appropriate solution when the same infrastructures for calibration and testing were in place and when confidence had already been established through the MRA of the Meter Convention. Last but not least he suggested that the scope of the draft should be enlarged so that not only the test reports should be recognized but also the evaluation of these test reports i.e. the OIML certificates or declarations of conformity.

Mr. Ehrlich mentioned the tremendous amount of discussions on self-declaration that had resulted in the rejection of that option. He suggested Mr. Vaucher should develop a very strong argumentation to be re-examined by the working group.

Mr. Boudissa recognized that the proposed system would save a lot of time and money and facilitate commercial transactions between countries by avoiding excessive costs and duplication of tests. However, from the point of view of developing countries there were problems since the system would be accessible only for countries that would possess the necessary test resources and checking facilities as well as the technological expertise. In developing countries these facilities and this knowledge did not yet exist, which could prevent their participation in the system. He therefore suggested that the OIML should organize training seminars on all aspects linked with mutual acceptance so that the future participation of these countries in the system would be on purpose and positive.

Mr. Ehrlich appreciated this proposal and suggested that Mr. Boudissa might like to formulate his view in a written form for easier examination by TC 3/SC 5.

Mr. Sinyangwe said that the topic was very interesting for developing countries that do not manufacture measuring instruments (and therefore do not issue OIML certificates) but have to import such instruments from industrialized countries. How might these developing countries then fit into the system?

Mr. Ehrlich said that in his opinion the MAA would be most useful for countries that possess test facilities. Therefore developing countries that have no facilities to evaluate test data should limit themselves to the acceptance of OIML certificates. However there could be an educational role for example through the participation in the evaluation committee.

Mr. Magaña noted that while the MAA contained a mechanism to build confidence between signatories, it would also bring confidence to the certificates. Therefore a country that had no facilities to issue certificates could nevertheless declare its confidence in the certificates issued by other countries. This would be a kind of “unilateral” declaration.

Mr. Beard asked whether the declarations of acceptance would permit certain limitations or restrictions when a country is not yet capable of carrying out all the tests mentioned in the relevant Recommendation. His second question dealt with the possibility of obtaining the test reports together with the certificates since all identification data were not always contained in such certificates.

Mr. Ehrlich said that the evaluation committee could be requested to examine how it would be possible to have declarations limited to certain characteristics or components but in principle he would not be opposed to Mr. Beard’s proposal.

Concerning Mr. Beard’s second question, Mr. Szilvássy said that it was already specified in the paper dealing with the *OIML Certificate System for Measuring Instruments* that all information concerning identification of software, etc. should be clearly given in the documentation associated with the certificate.

Mr. Engler suggested that the diagrams used by Mr. Ehrlich in his presentation should be used to develop informative annexes to the MAA.

Mr. Birch strongly supported the proposal that certain countries would be recognized for their competences in only some of the tests. If the entry point in the MAA was to be very high, this would drastically limit the number of countries able to participate actively. Concerning the issue of legal liability, Mr. Birch noted that the issuing authorities would take on legal liability for the test data they receive; in the case of the declarations of mutual confidence, the CIML Members, when signing, would take on legal liability for the issuing authorities. It should be noted that differences in legal liability existed between auditing testing laboratories and auditing issuing bodies. This was discussed in great detail within ILAC and a seminar was held in connection with a previous ILAC General Assembly (perhaps that in Amsterdam). It might be useful for TC 3/SC 5 to look at the report of this meeting. Another area it would be appropriate to look at was the impact of this change in legal liability on professional indemnity insurance.

To conclude this discussion, Mr. Faber first congratulated Mr. Ehrlich and TC 3/SC 5 for the work that had been accomplished. He also said that he was convinced of the necessity to rapidly develop the MAA since the acceptance of test data was an obvious necessity. In this the OIML should of course consider ILAC, ISO, etc. general papers but the operation of the MAA should be fully under the responsibility of the OIML. Last but not least, when voting on the MAA, Members should not focus on verifying whether all that which they considered to be necessary from their national point of view was contained in the draft but, knowing quite well that it was not possible to immediately fully satisfy every country, they should examine up to which point they might accept compromises.

11 IQ mark for prepackaged goods

Under item 2 Mr. Faber had reminded the participants that the Eleventh Conference had decided to apply the same process to this matter as for the MAA.

Mr. Ehrlich started with a general review of the status of the revision of R 87 dealing with the net content of packages which initially contained an annex proposing the establishment of an IQ mark. Many comments had been received from TC 6 members concerning the 2nd committee draft revision of R 87 and, based on these comments, a 3rd draft was expected to be distributed by March 2002.

The February 2001 Presidential Council had decided that the IQ mark itself should no longer be a part of R 87 but rather an independent paper which should specify the requirements to be met by packers to have the packages they produce certified for conformity with R 87. This work would start (initially at the level of a small Presidential Council working group) when the revision of R 87 is completed.

Mr. Beard asked whether variable quantities had been taken out of the draft. Mr. Ehrlich said that the expert responsible for TC 6 would look at this question.

Mr. Zhagora pointed out that “IQ” was already used as the abbreviation for “intelligence quotient”. Mr. Ehrlich said that he would examine whether this might create confusion and if so he would try to find another abbreviation for the OIML mark.

Mr. da Silva mentioned that within Mercosur small samples (under 150 units) were to be examined and asked that TC 6 examine this possibility and give guidance.

Mr. Birch said that he was disappointed by the delay in establishing the IQ mark since it would respond to a clear demand from manufacturers. He asked to what extent industry had been requested to comment on the draft in addition to national legal authorities.

Mr. Ehrlich replied that as far as he knew, comments received emanated from CIML Members but he did not know to what extent these CIML Members had consulted their national manufacturers.

12 Report on the Development Council meeting of 24 September

Mrs. Annabi reported on the Development Council meeting which had taken place in Moscow on Monday 24 September 2001. The following recommendations resulted from discussions:

- The activities of the three working groups (*Training, Information and Equipment*) were reviewed and priorities were established; the Bureau was also requested to contact all Member States with a view to updating participation in these working groups. Switzerland will closely cooperate with Russia concerning equipment; the activity of the three working groups will develop under the control of the Chairperson of the Council and with the support of the Bureau; meetings of the three working groups are planned before the next Council meeting.
- The three working groups were invited to take into consideration the work performed by Regional Legal Metrology Organizations in order to ensure the necessary complementarity.
- The Chairperson of the Council was requested to contact those bodies that might be in a position to fund legal metrology activities in developing countries, especially the World Bank, the Islamic Bank of Development and the European Commission.
- The Council recommended that its Chairperson and the Bureau develop cooperation with the WTO and UNIDO on projects connected with legal metrology.
- The Council requested Regional Legal Metrology Organizations to appoint their representatives with a view to establishing an advisory group to the Chairperson of the Council.
- The Council requested its Chairperson and the Bureau to facilitate the participation of developing countries in the activities of OIML TCs/SCs.
- The Council requested its members to update the information contained on the Council web site concerning experts and training.
- The Council requested the Bureau to continue developing the Council web site.
- The Council underlined the importance for developing countries to have access to the Internet.

13 Liaisons with international and regional institutions

13.1 Regional Legal Metrology Organizations (RLMOs)

Mr. Faber reported on a meeting of RLMOs which had been organized in connection with, but not as a part of, the 36th CIML Meeting. The complete report of the RLMO meeting is annexed to these minutes. The conclusions of the RLMO meeting were presented to the Committee which, after some minor amendments, considered them as an acceptable basis for the development of an OIML policy paper. The final conclusions are as follows:

Exchange of information concerning RLMOs

Each RLMO presented the main aspects of its activities. The following issues were highlighted:

- Need to improve the mutual information and coordination between RLMOs concerning the development of training materials.
- Need to identify those skills and facilities which are present in only a few countries.
- Interest of trying to associate consumers in the work of RLMOs.
- Need to make funding organizations aware of the work of RLMOs.
- Need that each OIML Member be a member of at least one RLMO.

Participation of RLMOs in OIML work

- How could RLMOs associate non-OIML Members in OIML technical work?

- How should the specific needs of a region be represented and taken into account in the work of TCs/SCs?
- It was concluded that RLMOs might be - and should be - listed as organizations in liaison in the different TCs/SCs. This would allow their needs to be expressed as such and not merely as comments from one country, and would give them the possibility to be represented by a non-OIML member should they so wish.
- It was also concluded that RLMOs could facilitate the implementation of OIML Recommendations and should probably play an important role in the implementation of the future MAAs.

Relations between RLMOs

- It was noted that there was a strong need to improve communication between RLMOs in order to coordinate actions, avoid duplication of work, avoid deviations in the interpretation of OIML Recommendations and share experience.
- A meeting should be organized each year with the Chairpersons and/or nominated representatives of RLMOs, the CIML President, the Chairperson of the Development Council and the BIML Director acting as facilitator.
- The BIML should distribute all relevant information among the different RLMOs and provide means for facilitating mutual information.

Relations between RLMOs and the Development Council

- The RLMOs and the Development Council should have close interconnections in order to avoid overlapping of work (in particular in the field of training) and to ensure good coordination and complementarity of the actions carried out.

RLMOs and training issues

- This matter had already been dealt with in connection with the various items above.

Conclusion

- The BIML was instructed to prepare a policy paper concerning the position of RLMOs in the OIML, this paper being examined by the CIML President and the Presidential Council in time for the next CIML Meeting.

13.2 Other institutions

a) Meter Convention/ILAC/OIML

Mr. Faber evoked the joint meeting that had been held at the BIML in February 2001, with 14 persons representing the three organizations. The activities carried out within each organization and within the *Joint Committee for Guides in Metrology* over the last twelve months were reviewed with a view to identifying those activities that might influence, or be influenced by, the activities of one or both of the other organizations: CIPM MRA, ILAC MRA, CIPM/ILAC MoU, OIML MAA, accreditation of laboratories that perform legal metrology evaluations and tests, development of a model law on metrology (for which a joint working group was established), assistance to developing countries in the establishment of sound metrology, legal metrology and accreditation bodies (identified as a priority action for which ILAC and the OIML would establish a joint working group with, in the future, BIPM participation expected), organization of an international seminar to follow up on the 1998 Braunschweig seminar, coordinated input to ISO 17011 in order to make this standard acceptable to national metrology institutes. It was finally decided that the next Meter Convention/ILAC/OIML meeting would be held at the BIPM in February 2002.

Mr. Vaucher asked for more information concerning ISO 17011. Mr. Athané said that following the letter sent by the BIPM Director to the ISO Secretary General with a view to reacting to the fact that it would be impossible to have accreditation and metrology under the same national roof, Mr. Magaña and he had also written to ISO to strongly support the BIPM views. In order to have the OIML views better known by ISO/CASCO a category A liaison had been established with this ISO body.

Mr. Klenovský said that the problem resulted from the fact that in ISO 17011, calibration was considered as a part of conformity assessment activities, together with testing. Just by referring to the VIM, VIML and ISO Guide 2 it was possible to demonstrate that this was not the case and therefore to redefine the scope of application of ISO 17011 more correctly.

b) WTO

Mr. Magaña mentioned the numerous contacts with the WTO/TBT Committee which included:

- An active participation (which started some five years ago) in the meetings of the TBT Committee, including the seminars on the occasion of which the so-called “international standard-setting organizations” (i.e. ten international bodies having been granted Observer status by the WTO, including ISO, IEC, WHO, OECD, UN-ECE, etc. and the OIML) explained their objectives, demonstrated how they fulfill the relevant WTO rules and develop mutual information; in addition special attention was drawn to developing countries in order to facilitate their participation in the preparation of international standards.
- A more recent and more specific cooperation in the assistance to developing countries in the field of metrology and legal metrology, with a regional seminar held in Paris at the end of year 2000 (in close cooperation with UNIDO), and a paper being prepared for the attention of the WTO which now seemed to be quite conscious of the role of metrology in trade and willing to support the OIML initiatives with a view to promoting metrology with various international and regional funding bodies.

In reply to a question from Mr. Zhagora, Mr. Magaña said that there was no official list of international standardizing bodies nor of international standards. It was because of its observer status granted by the WTO/TBT Committee that the OIML was listed as one of the “international standard-setting organizations”.

c) European Union bodies

Mr. Magaña reminded the participants that at the 35th CIML Meeting information had been given concerning the development of the European Measuring Instruments Directive (MID) and what were envisaged at that time as OIML Normative Documents to give presumption of conformity with the essential requirement of the MID. Mr. Magaña then gave some information concerning the current status of the draft MID.

Concerning the presumption of conformity, Mr. Magaña said that on the occasion of a meeting in Brussels also attended by Dr. Bennett as WELMEC Chairman, the EU Commission Representatives had clearly indicated that it would be given by the OIML Recommendations themselves without any need for additional papers to be prepared by the OIML.

Concerning CEN and CENELEC, Mr. Magaña explained that contacts resulted from the fact that the MID provided for two kinds of presumption of conformity: OIML Recommendations and European harmonized standards to be developed by CEN/CENELEC following mandates delivered by the EU Commission. It should therefore be appropriate to make sure that this would not result in too much competition between the OIML and CEN/CENELEC. All this had been discussed by the Presidential Council and a written note had been distributed to all participants in this 36th CIML Meeting.

Mr. Faber confirmed that the Presidential Council had examined to what extent the OIML, as an international legal metrology body, should pay attention to the activity of regional standardization bodies and what should be the role of the Bureau in this connection. The paper distributed by Mr. Magaña gave a clear picture of the current situation concerning the developments in legal metrology at European level. Of course whenever in a region the implementation of OIML Recommendations was discussed, it was the responsibility of the Bureau to obtain all the necessary information in time and to give the necessary help for correct implementation. In each case it should be considered whether this help was structural or incidental. When it was incidental, it was the ordinary responsibility of the Bureau to give the appropriate help. When it was structural, the help should be given subject to approval by the CIML. Mr. Faber added that in his opinion, help to the EU might have been structural if the development of specific OIML papers had been envisaged but that now it seemed to be incidental. Concerning the agreements between the OIML and CEN/CENELEC, Mr. Faber noted that information had regularly been given to the CIML by the BIML Director and that this resulted from an action (D.5.7) explicitly mentioned in the Action Plan as being under the responsibility of the WELMEC Chairperson and the BIML Director. However, for the future and from a more general point of view, a distinction should be made between two types of agreements: (i) agreements limited to exchange of information, which should be concluded by the directors/general secretaries of both organizations without the need to consult the CIML, and (ii) agreements containing more than a simple exchange of information, which should be discussed and approved by the CIML. In this connection the agreements between the OIML and CEN/CENELEC should be carefully reviewed and, if appropriate from the point of view of the OIML, amendments as accepted by the CIML should be proposed to CEN/CENELEC.

As a conclusion of this presentation the Committee decided to modify action D.5.7 and noted with interest that a policy paper governing liaisons between the OIML and other international and regional bodies would be drawn up in time for the next CIML Meeting.

Mr. Kildal expressed his general appreciation for the role of the BIML in promoting the implementation of OIML Recommendations at the European level. He also mentioned the ISO/CEN agreement which was aimed at eliminating double work with the possibility that, in certain cases, the work was developed within CEN before being taken over at the international level. A similar situation could be acceptable in the field of legal metrology as well.

Mr. Vaucher also supported the situation concerning cooperation between the OIML and European bodies. It was the responsibility of the OIML to harmonize metrological and technical requirements and therefore it was in its interest to have OIML Recommendations recognized by the European Union and so to avoid CEN/CENELEC developing their own standards with the risk of creating different requirements which should then be difficult to harmonize.

Mr. Klenovský pointed out the specific characteristics which were currently prevailing in Europe and requested non-European countries to understand the situation and to assist in the elimination of trade barriers.

Mr. Ehrlich supported Mr. Faber's efforts to find reasonable solutions to the problems encountered by the OIML and certain of its Member States. He pointed out that the agreements between the OIML and CEN/CENELEC should be reviewed at least to more clearly address the idea that they were intended to promote the exchange of information.

Mr. Birch said the APLMF had a specific interest in a number of OIML work projects, especially those on water meters and electronic taximeters. In the case of water meters the OIML and ISO Subcommittees seemed to be waiting for the publication of a CEN standard, which might create problems. In addition, there was an important problem of people outside Europe gaining access to the processes that were being developed inside Europe and especially inside CEN. Contrary to what existed with WELMEC, it was very difficult for Asia-Pacific countries to receive information on what was going on within CEN. He supported the proposal from Mr. Magaña that information on the direction of CEN could be the responsibility of European CIML Members but requested

that a process be established in order to inform non-European CIML Members about CEN activities in the field of legal metrology.

Mr. Zhagora referred to the paper distributed by Mr. Magaña and the paragraph dealing with medical measuring instruments. In his view there was a danger that OIML Recommendations could be used by European bodies to develop European standards which might thereafter be revised by these European bodies alone, since in many cases they had the possibility to work more rapidly than the OIML. In addition there was a problem in the fact that these European bodies were benefiting from the worldwide experience of OIML Member States.

Mr. Magaña replied that the OIML was facing a kind of challenge. In the field of standardization, the prevailing standard was that which was developed most rapidly. The OIML had to accelerate its working methods in order to develop or revise its Recommendations more rapidly. Concerning medical instruments, there were a number of OIML Recommendations which had been used in the development of European standards. However, for a number of other medical instruments, there were no European standards, just some rather vague essential requirements specified in the European Directive on medical devices, the interpretation of which was left to notified bodies. Therefore there was still time for the OIML to develop good and modern Recommendations on medical instruments and to propose them to European standardization bodies for use in application of the European Directive on medical devices.

14 Appointment of Honorary Members of the Committee

a) Mr. John Birch

Mr. Faber reminded the participants that Mr. John Birch, who was present at this meeting as representative of two regional legal metrology organizations, had in fact for a long period been an outstanding CIML and Presidential Council Member. He had proved his ability to participate very actively in practically all discussions, whatever the subject matter was. He had also demonstrated to the Committee and to the Council that it was necessary to think not only in technical terms but also in terms of strategy and policy, explaining how to speak with ministers and other policy makers and how to adapt OIML policy and activities to what was going on outside the Organization and to cope with international and regional trends.

At President Faber's request, the Committee appointed Mr. Birch CIML Honorary Member.

Mr. Birch expressed his thanks to Mr. Faber and to the Committee for this decision. He briefly evoked his career in metrology starting in 1953 at the Measurement Standards Laboratory in Sydney and going on to become Director of the National Standards Commission in 1986 and CIML Member. He expressed the pleasure he had had in working within the OIML, being thus able to expand his own knowledge and visions and to contribute to a wider international community. He pointed out the multiple facets, historical, technical, juridical and economic, of metrology which make this discipline so fascinating. To conclude Mr. Birch said that he had fully appreciated the friendly atmosphere which existed within the CIML.

b) Mr. Bernard Athané

Following a proposal from Mr. Faber, the Committee appointed Mr. Athané as CIML Honorary Member for his contributions to the developments of metrological science and his action as BIML Director. Mr. Athané expressed his gratitude for this decision on the occasion of the reception given by the OIML on the evening of Wednesday 26 September.

15 Future meetings

15.1 37th CIML Meeting (2002)

Mr. Faber reminded the participants that on the occasion of the 35th CIML Meeting an invitation had been received from Israel. However, because of the current situation, a number of countries had indicated that they might not be able to attend a meeting in Israel in 2002. Mr. Faber indicated that the Israeli authorities had accepted to postpone their invitation to 2004. Since there was no invitation for 2002, the Committee decided that its 37th Meeting would be held in France around late September or early October 2002, organized by the BIML under the supervision of the CIML President and his Council.

15.2 38th CIML Meeting (2003)

Mr. Tanaka officially invited the Committee to hold its 38th Meeting in Kyoto in 2003, on the occasion of the centenary of the establishment of the Japanese legal metrology institute.

The Committee expressed its gratitude to Mr. Tanaka for this invitation which it accepted in principle, a final decision having to be taken during the 37th Meeting.

15.3 Further meetings

In addition to the Israeli invitation, one had been received from Germany concerning the 39th CIML Meeting to be held in connection with the Twelfth Conference. The Committee decided to consider the Israeli invitation as the first option and the German one as the second option, the final decision having to be made in 2002.

16 Other matters

Mr. Magaña gave information concerning the proposed lectures he had received for the workshop *What will Legal Metrology be in the Year 2020*. There was however not sufficient time to organize this workshop in February 2002 as initially planned. He therefore proposed that the workshop should be held in September or October 2002 in conjunction with the 37th CIML Meeting. The Committee agreed with this proposal. Mr. Magaña added that there was still time to put forward additional lectures and that the Presidential Council would make the selection amongst all proposed lectures during its meeting in February 2002.

17 Adoption of decisions

These decisions and resolutions were adopted by the Committee during its last session on Thursday 27 September 2001. It was the first time that Mr. Magaña was participating in this meeting in his new position as BIML Director and Mr. Faber expressed to Mr. Magaña his strong support and wishes for a successful career as head of the Bureau.

Mr. Magaña thanked Mr. Faber and all CIML Members for their confidence. He also expressed his thanks to the BIML staff for their assistance. He read the draft decisions and resolutions which were adopted by the Committee as reproduced on the following pages.

18 Closure

Mr. Faber underlined the somewhat special character of this 36th CIML Meeting, with a number of decisions dealing with the situations of certain persons within the CIML and the BIML, in-depth discussions concerning matters that were crucial for the future of the OIML (e.g. RLMOs), and very interesting positive contributions and presentations from participants (e.g. concerning the MAA).

The success of this meeting also resulted from the efforts of several persons, to whom Mr. Faber expressed his most sincere thanks:

- the Russian Hosts, especially Messrs. Astachenkov, Issaev and Mardin, and all Russian Authorities and Staff Members for the excellent preparation, fine reception, and the possibility for all the participants to discover or re-discover Moscow;
- the two Directors and BIML Staff;
- the two CIML Vice-Presidents and all Members of the Presidential Council for their help;
- the interpretation team;
- all Participants in the 36th CIML Meeting, including Observers from Corresponding Members and RLMOs and especially CIML Members for their fruitful participation in discussions and decision making.

To conclude Mr. Faber invited all CIML Members to meet again in France next year.

Mr. Issaev, on behalf of the Russian Authorities, expressed his pleasure for having hosted this CIML Meeting and invited the various participants to the technical and other visits for which they had registered.

Decisions and Resolutions

Opening addresses

The Committee noted the opening addresses delivered by Mr. Podufalov, Director of the Department of Culture, Education and Science on behalf of the Government of the Russian Federation, by Mr. Voronin, President of Gosstandart of Russia and by Mr. Faber, CIML President.

Roll-call - Quorum

The roll of delegates was called. It was found that 47 CIML Members (out of 57) were present or represented and that the statutory quorum of three-quarters was therefore reached.

Approval of the agenda

The final draft agenda was approved without modifications.

1 Approval of the minutes of the 35th CIML Meeting

The minutes of the 35th CIML Meeting were approved without modifications.

2 Implementation of the decisions and resolutions of the Eleventh Conference

The CIML President reviewed the decisions and resolutions of the Eleventh Conference and the Committee noted that these had either already been implemented in a satisfactory manner or were to be considered by the CIML under the various items on its agenda with a view to their implementation.

3 Reexamination of the 1999–2002 Action Plan and its extension to cover the period 2003–2004

The Committee noted the request from the USA to review action D.5.7 and decided that this would be considered in connection with agenda item 13.2. In addition, the Committee approved the following Resolution:

The International Committee of Legal Metrology

CONSIDERING the decision of the Eleventh Conference concerning the OIML long-term policy;

CONSIDERING the draft revision 2 of the *1999–2002 Action Plan with preliminary extension to 2003–2004*;

CONSIDERING the comments expressed by certain CIML Members;

INSTRUCTS the BIML, under the supervision of the CIML President, to publish this new *Action Plan* taking into account the comments received and to distribute it to all OIML bodies concerned, for implementation, and to interested international and regional institutions, for information;

INSTRUCTS the CIML President to report on the implementation of this *Action Plan* at future CIML Meetings;

INSTRUCTS the CIML President and his Council to reflect about any necessary extension of this *Action Plan* so as to fully cover the period 2003–2004, and to prepare a draft with a view to its approval by the CIML at its 37th Meeting.

4 Member States and Corresponding Members

4.1 New Members - Expected accessions

The Committee noted information given by its President and by the BIML concerning the current and expected membership.

4.2 Situation of certain Members

a) Member States having been granted extra time to pay their arrears by the Eleventh Conference

Democratic People's Republic of Korea:

The Committee noted with satisfaction that this Member State had not only paid its 2000 and 2001 contributions, but had also started paying its 1996–1999 arrears.

Zambia:

The Committee noted that only a part of the 2000 contribution of this Member State had been paid. The Committee fixed at 2002.06.30 the final deadline for this country to pay its 2000 and 2001 contributions in full and requested the BIML to report about the situation at the 37th CIML Meeting.

b) Other Member States that are very late in the payment of their contributions

The Committee noted the situation of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy and Kazakhstan with respect to the payment of their contributions to the OIML. The Committee also noted information given by the Bureau concerning an announcement by the Italian Authorities of the imminent full payment of their arrears, and concerning the willingness of the Kazakh Authorities to pay their arrears as soon as possible. The Committee fixed at 2002.06.30 the final deadline for these three countries to pay their arrears and requested the BIML to report back on the situation at the 37th CIML Meeting.

5 Financial matters

5.1 Adoption of the Auditor's report for 2000

The Auditor's report for 2000 was adopted without comments and the Committee instructed its President and the BIML Director to submit it to the Twelfth Conference.

5.2 Examination of the financial situation for 2001 and 2002

The Committee took note of information delivered by the BIML concerning the financial situation of the Organization in 2001 and found that this situation was in line with the decisions of the Eleventh Conference. The Committee also noted information delivered by the Bureau concerning 2002 including the changeover to the Euro, a new presentation of BIML accounts in order to better estimate the operational costs of the various bodies constituting the OIML and the production costs of the products and services provided by the BIML, and the new publications pricing and sales policy of the Bureau.

6 Presidential Council activities

The Committee took note of a report by its President concerning the activities of the Presidential Council since October 2000.

7 The situation at the BIML

7.1 BIML Staff - General situation - Renewal of the contract of Mr. Attila Szilvássy

- a) The Committee took note of information delivered by the Bureau concerning the current situation of the BIML Staff and its possible evolutions.
- b) Following a secret ballot, the Committee renewed for five years the contract of Mr. Szilvássy, Assistant Director, starting from September 2002.
- c) During a special session restricted to CIML Members or their representatives (discussions not taped) the Committee took note of information delivered by its President concerning the conditions under which the transition from the former to the new Directors has happened.

7.2 BIML activities

The Committee took note of a report on BIML activities from October 2000 through September 2001 and requested the Bureau to publish it in an appropriate format in the January 2002 issue of the OIML Bulletin.

8 Technical activities

8.1 Work programs of TCs/SCs and

8.2 Examination of the situation of certain TCs/SCs

The Committee took note of information delivered by its Vice-President Issaev and by the Bureau concerning OIML technical activities and, while expressing its satisfaction for the work accomplished, requested the OIML TCs/SCs to accelerate their work in fields listed as *high priority and priority projects* according to the document approved in this connection.

The Committee also noted:

- the need to find a country which would volunteer to undertake responsibility for the TC 13 secretariat,
- that closer cooperation should exist between the activities of the SCs on automatic and non-automatic weighing instruments, and
- the need to accelerate the work on measurement uncertainty in legal metrology.

8.3 Approval of draft Recommendations

The Committee approved the following draft Recommendations:

- Non-invasive sphygmomanometers. Part 1: Mechanical; Part 2: Automated (Revision of R 16)
- Liquid-in-glass thermometers (R 133)
- Water meters intended for the metering of cold potable water. Part 2: Test methods (R 49-2)
- Heat meters. Part 1: General requirements; Part 2: Pattern approval and initial verification tests (Revision of R 75)

and requested the Bureau to publish them as soon as possible after the necessary editing work has been carried out in close liaison with the Secretariats of the TCs/SCs concerned, taking into account the comments expressed by certain Members.

8.4 Future developments in TC/SC working methods and use of modern communication means

The Committee took note of information delivered by the BIML concerning the use of e-mail and the Internet in the development of OIML technical work and of remarks put forward by certain Members (communication using either paper or e-mail; use of CD roms, harmonization of technical facilities for video conferences, etc.). It requested the Bureau to give urgent priority to carrying out the revision of the *Directives for the technical work* and urged its Members to develop modern communication means at the national level, in order to accelerate and facilitate the technical work of the OIML and at the same time decreasing operational costs.

9 OIML Certificate System for Measuring Instruments

9.1 General information

The Committee took note of information delivered by its Vice-President Kochsiek and by the Bureau concerning the current situation of the *OIML Certificate System* and expressed its satisfaction with the situation.

9.2 New Recommendations applicable within the System

The Committee decided that the following Recommendations would become applicable within the *System* when published:

- Non-invasive sphygmomanometers (R 16)
- Liquid-in-glass thermometers (R 133)

9.3 Plans for future developments (see also MAA below)

The Committee took note of information concerning the current revision of the paper describing the operational rules of the *System* and urged TC 3/SC 5, under the joint responsibility of the USA and of the Bureau, to complete this revision urgently. The Committee noted that certain very important matters, especially the certification of individual instruments, were not covered in this revision; the Committee therefore requested TC 3/SC 5 to start working on such matters as soon as possible and at the latest when the current revision is completed. Finally the Committee noted that a number of operational aspects of the *System* (e.g. the role of CIML Members) were closely connected with operational aspects of the future MAA (see item 10 below) and requested TC 3/SC 5 to eliminate any possible discrepancy between the two papers.

10 Mutual Acceptance Arrangement (MAA)

The Committee took note of information delivered by Mr. Ehrlich, USA, and of remarks made by a number of Members. The Committee expressed its appreciation for the considerable improvements introduced in the 8th committee draft. It also pointed out the urgency of establishing the proposed framework for mutual acceptance arrangements and requested the TC 3/SC 5 Secretariat to do its utmost in order to complete the work taking into account both the comments expressed during the CIML Meeting and those received from TC 3/SC 5 members in the framework of the current postal consultation which ends on 15 November 2001.

11 IQ mark for prepackaged products

The Committee took note of information delivered by Mr. Ehrlich, USA, concerning the development of a paper on the establishment of an OIML IQ mark, which is now distinct from the development of the revision of R 87. The Committee also noted remarks made by certain Members and encouraged TC 6 to pursue its work actively.

12 Report on the Development Council meeting of 24 September

The Committee took note of a report presented by Mrs. Annabi, Chairperson of the Development Council concerning the meeting of 24 September 2001.

13 Liaisons with international and regional institutions

13.1 Regional Legal Metrology Organizations (RLMOs)

The Committee took note of a report presented by its President concerning the meeting of 25 September 2001 and of comments put forward by certain Members. The Committee noted with interest that a policy paper would be developed soon by the Presidential Council and the Bureau concerning certain aspects of OIML/RLMO interactions.

13.2 Other institutions

The Committee took note:

- a) of a report presented by its President concerning the Meter Convention/ILAC/OIML cooperation; the situation created by ISO 17011 was mentioned and the Committee noted with satisfaction that the OIML (as well as the BIPM) should soon establish a category “A” liaison with ISO/CASCO;
- b) of a report presented by Mr. Magaña concerning OIML/WTO cooperation especially in the field of assistance to developing countries;
- c) of reports presented by Mr. Magaña and by the CIML President concerning the relationship between the OIML (most often represented by the BIML) and EU bodies (European Commission, CEN and CENELEC). The Committee also took note of comments put forward by certain CIML Members about this and it was generally agreed that the Bureau may negotiate and sign agreements of cooperation with other international or regional bodies provided that such cooperation is limited to an exchange of information. If the agreement goes further, then the CIML is responsible (see d) below); action D.5.7 of the *Action Plan* will have to be modified to read, for example: “to maintain links with the European Commission and CEN and CENELEC to make sure that OIML Recommendations are appropriately implemented within the EU and to review the OIML/CEN and OIML/CENELEC agreements as far as necessary from the point of view of the OIML”, the responsible body being the CIML or the CIML President with his Council;
- d) that a policy paper governing liaisons between the OIML and other international and regional bodies would be drawn up in time for the next CIML Meeting.

14 Appointment of two Honorary Members of the Committee

The Committee, expressing its deep appreciation for the work Mr. John Birch had accomplished over many years within the OIML as Australian Representative and Member of the Presidential Council, and also as Convener of two Regional Legal Metrology Organizations, appointed him as CIML Honorary Member.

Secondly, the Committee, expressing its deep admiration for the contribution of BIML Director Mr. Bernard Athané to metrological science, and its deep appreciation for the way in which he fulfilled his responsibilities, appointed him CIML Honorary Member.

15 Future meetings

15.1 37th CIML Meeting (2002)

The Committee decided to hold its 37th Meeting in France around late September or early October 2002, organized by the Bureau under the supervision of the CIML President and his Council.

15.2 38th CIML Meeting (2003)

The Committee accepted in principle the invitation from Japan to hold the 38th CIML Meeting in Kyoto in 2003. A final decision will be taken during the 37th CIML Meeting in France.

15.3 Further meetings

The Committee noted the invitations from Israel (first option) and from Germany (second option) to hold the Twelfth Conference and 39th CIML Meeting in 2004.

16 Other matters

The workshop *What will Legal Metrology be in the Year 2020* for which a number of lectures have already been proposed, will be held over one and a half days in connection with the 37th CIML Meeting in France in September or October 2002.

17 Adoption of decisions

The above decisions and resolutions were adopted. ■

– Annex –

Minutes of the meeting of Regional Legal
Metrology Organizations

Tuesday 25 September 2001 (morning)

Following two informal or semi-official meetings of Representatives of Regional Legal Metrology Organizations held in 1999 and 2000 at the initiative of Mr. Bennett, WELMEC Chairman, in connection with the OIML meetings of Tunis (October 1999) and London (October 2000), the Presidential Council had instructed Mr. Magaña to organize another meeting of this kind with a view to discussing the liaisons between the OIML and the various RLMOs and the role that the OIML should play in facilitating cooperation amongst RLMOs and assisting them as far as necessary so as to ensure the necessary complementarity and harmonization between the international and regional levels.

The RLMO meeting was held on Tuesday 25 September 2001 (morning) in Moscow on the occasion, but not as a part, of the 36th CIML Meeting. It was chaired by Mr. Faber, CIML President, and was attended by a number of CIML Members and other participants in the 36th CIML Meeting, by the BIML Staff, and by the following RLMOs:

Asia-Pacific Legal Metrology Forum (APLMF):

Mr. Birch, Chairperson and Mr. Ooiwa, Appointed Chairperson

Euro-Asian Cooperation of National Metrology Institutes (COOMET):

Mr. Zhagora, Chairperson

Euro-Mediterranean Legal Metrology Forum (EMLMF):

Mrs. Annabi and Mr. Lagauterie, co-Chairpersons

Indian Ocean Legal Metrology Forum (IOLMF):

Mr. Birch, Chairperson

Sistema Interamericano de Metrologia (SIM):

Mr. Ehrlich, Member

Southern African Development Community Cooperation in Legal Metrology (SADC MEL):

Mr. Tukai, Chairperson, and Mr. Beard, Secretariat

European Cooperation in Legal Metrology (WELMEC):

Mr. Bennett, Chairperson

The agenda proposed by the BIML was discussed by participants and finally approved as follows:

- 1 List of Organizations represented
- 2 Exchange of information concerning RLMOs
- 3 Participation of RLMOs in OIML work
- 4 Relations between RLMOs
- 5 Relations between RLMOs and the Development Council
- 6 RLMOs and training issues

Minutes

1 List of Organizations represented

Mr. Faber established the list of RLMOs that were present at the meeting (see above) and identified those participants who would speak on their behalf.

2 Exchange of information concerning RLMOs

Each RLMO was invited to make a brief presentation of its membership, current activities and trends for the future. These presentations are not reproduced in full in these minutes since updated information is permanently available from literature issued by these RLMOs and, for some of them, from their web sites. Only the main aspects are summarized below.

APLMF

Focus was currently on developing training courses, organizing workshops on high economic value measurements (e.g. verification of meters for gas pipelines) and on the modernization of legislation and administration, and providing information to its members. A MoU with a fee structure was being implemented. In the field of training the APLMF would be interested in being kept informed of the programs and needs of other regional bodies or countries for the next three or four years. At the next APLMF meeting in New Zealand in November 2001, cooperation with consumer associations would be an important item for discussion.

COOMET

Much information had already been delivered during the meeting of the OIML Development Council; in addition the COOMET Chairman had suggested a number of matters to be discussed under item 3 of the RLMO meeting.

EMLMF

Information concerning EMLMF, its MoU under preparation and the planned activity of its working groups had also been delivered during the Development Council meeting. The EMLMF was willing to work in close cooperation with the OIML Development Council and the other RLMOs.

IOLMF

Was still at a formative stage. When delivering information concerning the difficulties being faced by this region in the establishment of a legal metrology cooperation, the IOLMF Chairman suggested that the OIML should carry out actions aimed at ensuring that any OIML Member would have the possibility to participate in at least one RLMO.

SADCMEL

Main priorities were harmonization of legislation and of test procedures, and development of training.

WELMEC

Focus was on the European Measurement Instruments Directive (MID) the implementation of which would drastically change the way of carrying out legal metrology activities in European countries and therefore their participation in OIML work. Presumption of conformity through OIML Recommendations was an important matter from the point of view of the OIML. Mr. Bennett also pointed out that there were trends in Europe which might result in the fact that, for certain aspects of international cooperation, the fifteen European countries would be represented by a unique European spokesman. This could quite well apply to OIML work in the not so distant future. Mr. Magaña said that there was here a special problem for the OIML and indicated that this matter was mentioned in a paper he had prepared for item 13.2 of the 36th CIML Meeting. Mr. Boudissa also mentioned the cooperative agreements which had been or were to be signed between the European Union and a number of countries concerning topics such as standardization and patents but also legal metrology.

3 Participation of RLMOs in OIML work

Mr. Magaña presented a list of topics, the discussion of which was suggested either by certain RLMOs or by the BIML.

- How can RLMOs associate non OIML Members in OIML work? and
- How should the specific needs of a Region be represented and taken into account in the work of TCs/SCs?

Mr. Beard said that within SADCMEL an OIML Member State that belonged to a given OIML TC/SC would bring the work of that TC/SC to SADCMEL meetings. It had been the case in particular for the revision of OIML R 87, for which all SADCMEL countries, whether or not OIML Members, had had the possibility to express their views and to transmit them to the OIML

TC 6 Secretariat through South Africa. In the same way needs at SADCMEML level would be identified and then transmitted to the relevant TC/SC by one SADCMEML country that was also an OIML Member.

Mr. Athané said that RLMOs should participate in OIML technical work in order to make sure that the relevant TCs/SCs were well informed of the specific needs of each region. To this end, he suggested that RLMOs should have the possibility to register as liaison organizations of the TCs/SCs of interest for them and appoint their representatives. This kind of formal participation would probably be more effective than the ad-hoc participation which had prevailed up to now and would allow non-OIML Members to participate in OIML work when so mandated by RLMOs.

Mr. Bennett reminded the participants that he had not supported a proposal contained in the Birkeland report aimed at establishing a formal structure for coordinating RLMOs and their cooperation with the OIML. It should be remembered that RLMOs were not subdivisions of the OIML but were independent organizations that had been set up with different reasons in the different regions, although with some commonality of purpose. A single regional policy would therefore be impossible to establish. Practically all WELMEC countries were OIML Members and had the possibility to participate by themselves in OIML technical work. Consequently any structure formalizing the participation of RLMOs in TC/SC work would just be a duplication for WELMEC countries.

Mr. Faber agreed with the necessity to avoid any bureaucracy and avoid the proliferation of structures. However, he was convinced that it would be appropriate for the OIML to develop a policy paper to define the relationship between the OIML and RLMOs and OIML responsibilities in this connection.

Mr. Birch repeated his views concerning the relationship between regional specialist bodies (such as legal metrology or standardizations bodies) and the regional intergovernmental structures that might exist in the regions. There was a certain similarity with the relationship between the OIML and RLMOs and, in his opinion, policy issues were far better than structural issues to solve the problems which were being faced. Other problems to be considered were (a) the fact that there might be a need for a region to develop and implement a specific regional standard in a field where no international standard was available and (b) the fact that international standards might be developed at the highest technical level and were therefore difficult to be understood and implemented by developing countries. He concluded that there was a need for a policy although he had some reservations about any formalized structure.

Mr. Ehrlich said that on a personal basis he supported the comments presented by Messrs. Bennett and Birch and believed that it was premature to develop a formal cooperation mechanism between the OIML and RLMOs, especially owing to the big differences that existed amongst the various RLMOs.

Mr. Magaña pointed out that the input of RLMOs was very important for TC/SC activities. However he had doubts concerning the opportunity for RLMOs to register as liaison organizations since their input would not be of the same nature as that of e.g. an association of manufacturers. He suggested that the *Directives for the technical work* should include a provision requesting the secretariats of TCs/SCs to systematically send their committee drafts to all RLMOS for comments if they so wished. Such a procedure would not increase the secretariats' workload too much; however sufficient time should be allocated to RLMOs for consultation of their members.

Mr. Zhagora supported the views expressed by Mr. Birch and further explained that regional organizations are established within defined economic regions and with the objective of solving technical problems within the framework of agreements, some of which are concluded at intergovernmental level. These organizations use two kinds of documents: on the one hand international, regional or national standards, and on the other hand agreements or contracts and other documents regulating relations and procedures.

As an example he referred to the CIS agreement on mutual recognition of type approval test results of measuring instruments within the framework of which OIML Recommendations are implemented and for the decision taking procedure on recognition, a guidance document has been developed. Based on this agreement for example each year more than one hundred types of measuring instruments manufactured in Russia are approved in Belarus and vice-versa. All these have significant economic consequences and in addition provide benefits for manufacturers.

For this reason he agreed with Mr. Birch's point of view that it is necessary to take into account the needs and goals of regions and to find regional solutions for problems where it would be difficult to harmonize needs and requirements of all the regions.

Mr. Faber asked Mr. Zhagora whether he would prefer to have a policy paper or a structural mechanism, e.g. a joint committee.

Mr. Zhagora answered that they proposed to establish a body under the leadership of a CIML or BIML representative with the objective of being a coordinating body rather than a directing one for the exchange of information, experience etc. among the RLMOs.

Mrs. Annabi fully supported Mr. Magaña's proposal concerning the participation of RLMOs in OIML technical work, it being well understood that this participation would not be mandatory but ad-hoc on the basis of the needs, interests and possibilities of each RLMO.

Mr. Lagauterie, coming back to Messrs. Athané and Magaña's views, supported the idea that RLMOs be officially listed as liaison organizations of relevant TCs/SCs since this would put a greater responsibility on both the RLMOs and those who would represent them. He also said that the participation of RLMOs in OIML work should not be a reason for delaying the work which was already too slow by itself.

4 Relations between RLMOs

Mr. Birch pointed out that, probably because of a lack of resources, there was a need for RLMOs to be in communication with each other about their programs. In addition it would perhaps be appropriate to define the role of RLMOs as distinct from the OIML and Development Council roles. It would also be necessary to make sure that duplication is avoided e.g. in the development of training courses. In order to implement these views the APLMF had tried to share information with other RLMOs by inviting them to attend Asia-Pacific meetings and reacting positively to invitations of this kind from other RLMOs and providing them with reports concerning APLMF activities. Similar cooperation amongst RLMOs should exist in the field of intercomparisons owing to the cost of such actions and to the fact that intercomparisons should probably be carried out at regional level. The utilization of common test facilities, and therefore their accessibility, should also be of interest for RLMOs. Mr. Birch concluded by pointing out the role of RLMOs in the implementation of OIML Recommendations and in the establishment of a global measurement system. RLMOs therefore need to interact.

Mr. Faber said that the fundamental question for the OIML was what do the RLMOs want the OIML to do.

Mr. Eggermont said that the OIML as a worldwide organization should continue to cooperate with RLMOs and have a coordinating role with a view to preventing them from evolving in opposite directions. This would not mean that the OIML should deal with all the details of RLMO work but mainly convene a yearly meeting of RLMOs and the OIML e.g. on the occasion of each CIML Meeting.

Mr. Lagauterie supported this proposal.

Mr. Boudissa agreed that it was imperative for the OIML and the BIML to have an interest in general RLMO activities and coordinate them in order to maintain the strategy adopted by the OIML in connection with International Recommendations but even more with the strategy of the development of legal metrology in Member States and Corresponding Members. To this end the BIML should bring its support to RLMOs. In addition, it could be envisaged to appoint a person who would be responsible for permanently circulating all relevant information amongst RLMOs without waiting for annual meetings which were surely very useful but not sufficient for permanent and timely information.

Mr. Bennett noted that the structure of this RLMO meeting was not clear in advance, certain persons thinking that it was a meeting of chairpersons of RLMOs, others that it was a part of the CIML Meeting or an open meeting. However he agreed that the discussion had been very interesting and he suggested that for the future, rather informal meetings of chairpersons of RLMOs and representatives of the OIML would be appropriate to identify the matters which should then be examined without repeating this rather large forum.

Mr. Magaña said that the role of the OIML and of the BIML was mainly to facilitate the transmission of information amongst RLMOs and to check that no regional regulations were being developed which would conflict with OIML Recommendations. Information was in most cases available from the web sites of RLMOs. The problem was perhaps that such information was not sufficiently used by other RLMOs and he suggested that each RLMO should examine the work of the other RLMOs so as to identify those activities with which they might wish to be associated.

Mr. Vaucher supported what had been said concerning the need to define a policy, not to establish new structures. However it would be appropriate to continue this kind of open meeting to implement the policy and obtain the views of participants. An essential topic of cooperation and coordination would be an efficient implementation of the future OIML MAAs including, if appropriate, the organization of intercomparisons which should be carried at the level of RLMOs with the participation of countries from other regions.

Mr. Lagauterie suggested that the Bureau should systematically publish reports concerning RLMOs activities in the OIML Bulletin. Mr. Magaña agreed with this proposal but pointed out that this was possible only if RLMOs send their reports to the Bureau as soon as available.

In connection with the role of the CIML and the Bureau vis-à-vis the RLMOs Mr. Zhagora raised the question as to whether the CIML and the Bureau should not take the lead when establishing the Global Measurement System since the problems of both legal and industrial metrology are being handled by most of RLMOs in question and by the OIML.

Mr. Faber concluded this item by noting that a number of participants had suggested that a small informal group of persons, e.g. the Chairpersons of RLMOs, might meet from time to time with the Bureau as coordinator. The suggestion was also strongly supported to have a policy paper but not a formal structure. This would be discussed by the Presidential Council in February 2002 with a view to developing a draft policy paper which would be submitted to the CIML at its next meeting.

5 Relations between RLMOs and the Development Council

Mr. Birch said that it would be necessary to define the appropriate areas to be taken on by the Development Council on the one hand and by RLMOs on the other hand, especially in connection with training. Regular meetings of the Development Council and RLMOs would probably be appropriate in order to identify and eliminate overlapping activities.

Mrs. Annabi agreed that the cooperation between RLMOs and the Development Council was fundamental as noted during the Development Council meeting especially in connection with the activities of its three working groups.

Mr. Magaña supported the view expressed by both Mr. Birch and Mrs. Annabi and noted that the Development Council should not duplicate the work carried out within the various RLMOs but should be kept well informed of regional activities and disseminate relevant information so that all members of the Council could benefit from such activities.

6 RLMOs and training issues

Mr. Faber noted that this matter had already been discussed under the various items of the agenda.

Closure of the RLMO meeting

Mr. Faber noted that all items on the agenda had been discussed and that the meeting had been very useful to identify the main key issues of the interaction between the OIML and RLMOs. He confirmed that a policy paper would be prepared for examination by the CIML in 2002 and asked Mr. Magaña to prepare draft conclusions of this RLMO meeting for presentation to the 36th CIML Meeting. The final conclusions as generally accepted by the CIML are reproduced below.

Conclusions of the RLMO meeting

Exchange of information concerning RLMOs

Each RLMO presented the main aspects of its activities. The following issues were highlighted:

- *Need to improve the mutual information and coordination between the RLMOs concerning the development of training materials.*
- *Need to identify those skills and facilities which are present in only a few countries.*
- *Interest of trying to associate consumers in the work of RLMOs.*
- *Need to make funding organizations aware of the work of RLMOs.*
- *Need that each OIML Member be a member of at least one RLMO.*

Participation of RLMOs in OIML work

- *How could the RLMOs associate non OIML Members in OIML technical work?*
- *How should the specific needs of a region be represented and taken into account in the work of TCs/SCs?*
- *It was concluded that RLMOs might be - and should be - listed as organizations in liaison in the different TCs/SCs which would allow their needs to be expressed as such and not only as comments from one country, and would give them the possibility to be represented by a non-OIML member should they so wish.*

- *It was also concluded that RLMOs could facilitate the implementation of OIML Recommendations and should probably play an important role in the implementation of the future MAAs.*

Relations between RLMOs

- *It was noted that there was a strong need to improve communication between the RLMOs in order to coordinate actions, avoid duplication of work, avoid deviations in the interpretation of OIML Recommendations and share experience.*
- *A meeting should be organized each year with the Chairpersons and/or nominated representatives of the RLMOs, the CIML President, the Chairperson of the Development Council and the BIML Director acting as facilitator.*
- *The BIML should distribute all relevant information among the different RLMOs and provide the means for facilitating mutual information.*

Relations between RLMOs and the Development Council

- *The RLMOs and the Development Council should have close interconnections in order to avoid overlapping of work (in particular in the field of training) and to ensure good coordination and complementarity of the actions carried out.*

RLMOs and training issues

- *This matter had already been dealt with in connection with the various items above.*

Conclusion

- *The BIML was instructed to prepare a policy paper concerning the position of RLMOs in the OIML, this paper to be examined by the CIML President and the Presidential Council in time for the next CIML Meeting.* ■

