

MINUTES

COMPTE RENDU

Thirty-Ninth Meeting of the International
Committee of Legal Metrology:
Berlin, Germany, 26 & 29 October 2004

Trente-Neuvième Réunion du Comité International de Métrologie Légale:
Berlin, Allemagne, 26 & 29 octobre 2004





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

FAX: 33 (0)1 42 82 17 27

E-MAIL: biml@oiml.org

INTERNET: www.oiml.org

THIRTY-NINTH MEETING
of the
INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF LEGAL METROLOGY
26 & 29 October 2004 - Berlin, Germany

The International Committee of Legal Metrology was convened by its Acting President,
Prof. Manfred Kochsiek, and met on 26 and 29 October 2004
at the BMWA, Berlin, Germany.



Contents

Attendance	5
Opening address	10
Roll-Call - Quorum	12
Approval of the Agenda	12
1 Approval of the Minutes of the 38 th CIML Meeting	15
2 Member States and Corresponding Members	15
2.1 Situation of certain Members	
3 Financial matters	15
3.1 Adoption of the Auditor's report for 2002 and 2003	
3.2 Draft revision of the OIML Financial Regulations	
4 Presidential Council activities	18
5 BIML activities	19
6 Technical activities	20
6.1 Approval of International Documents, if appropriate	
6.2 Examination of the situation of certain TCs/SCs, if appropriate	
6.3 Implementation of the MAA	
7 Developing Countries	26
8 Coordination with RLMOs	27
8.1 Draft paper on the coordination with RLMOs	
9 Twelfth International Legal Metrology Conference: Agenda and program	28
10 Election of the CIML President and First Vice-President	28
11 Twelfth International Legal Metrology Conference	35
11.1 Examination of the decisions made by the Conference	
12 Future meetings	35
12.1 40th CIML Meeting (2005)	
12.2 41st CIML Meeting (2006)	
13 Other matters	36
13.1 Draft procedure for the selection of the BIML Director and Assistant Directors	
14 Adoption of Decisions	37

Attendance

Member States

ALBANIA

Mr. Bashkim Koçi CIML Member
Mrs. Majlunda Hoxha
Mr. Agron Laçi, GDMC

ALGERIA

Mr. Djaballah Belkacemi
Mr. Samir Drissi
Mrs. Nadira Hamiham

AUSTRALIA

Mr. Grahame Harvey CIML Member
Mrs. Judith Bennett

AUSTRIA

Mr. Arnold Leitner CIML Member
Mr. Gerald Freistetter
Mr. Wolfgang Mikovits

BELARUS

Mr. Nikolai Zhagora

BELGIUM

Mr. Romain Eggermont CIML Member

BRAZIL

Mr. R. Luiz de Lima Guimarães CIML Member

BULGARIA

Mrs. Ani Todorova CIML Member
Ms. Kristina Petkova

CAMEROON

Mr. H. Ela Essi CIML Member
Mr. Liman Maloum

CANADA

Mr. Alan E. Johnston CIML President Elect
Mr. Gilles Vinet

CHINA

Mr. Wang Qinqing CIML Member
Mr. Han Jianping
Mr. Huang Yaowen
Mr. Li Tao
Mr. Liu Hantian
Mr. Xuan Xiang
Mr. Zhong Xinming
Mr. Zhou Lunbin

CROATIA

Mr. Molnar
Mr. Vladimir Pasagic

CUBA

Mr. Martin Antunez Ramirez CIML Member

CZECH REPUBLIC

Mr. Pavel Klenovský CIML Member

Mr. Vladimír Ludvík

Mr. Alexander Šafarik-Pstrosz

DENMARK

Mr. P. Claudi Johansen CIML Member

EGYPT

Mr. Shafik Mahmoud Sharaf

ETHIOPIA

Mr. Arego Fikremariam Woldegiorgis

FINLAND

Mr. Tuomo Valkeapää CIML Member

Mr. Veli Viitala

FRANCE

Mr. Gérard Lagauterie CIML Member

GERMANY

Mr. Manfred Kochsiek CIML Acting President

Mr. Thomas Ernst

Mrs. Susanne Ludwig

Mr. Klaus-Dieter Sommer

HUNGARY

Mr. Peter Pákay CIML Member

IRAN

Mr. Mohammad Ali Akhavan Behabadi

IRELAND

Mr. Pat Farragher CIML Member

ISRAEL

Mr. Timor Zarin CIML Member

Ms. Hanah Tiri

ITALY

Mr. Paolo Vigo

JAPAN

Mr. Mitsuru Tanaka CIML Member

Mr. Tatsuya Daigo

Mr. Toru Kojima

Ms. Akemi Nishio

Mr. Masahiro Okaji

Mr. Akira Ooiwa

Mrs. Hiroe Sakai

Mr. Ryoji Uchida

KAZAKHSTAN

Mr. Galymzhan Dugalov

Mr. Vassily Mikhalchenko

KENYA

Mr. Isaac M. Ngatia CIML Member
 Mr. John M. Masila

DPR KOREA

Mr. Choe Chang Jin
 Mr. Ri Man Ho

REP. KOREA

Mr. Yoo-Tae Jun CIML Member
 Mr. Jong Oh Choi Kriss
 Mr. Oh Yong Kwon
 Mr. Ha-Uk Nam

MACEDONIA (Former Yugoslav Republic of)

Mr. Danco Pendovski CIML Member
 Mr. Risto Josifovski

MOROCCO

Mr. Yahyaoui Brahim

NETHERLANDS

Mr. Cees J. van Mullem CIML Member
 Mr. Pieter van Breugel
 Ms. Anneke van Spronsen

NEW ZEALAND

Mr. John Barker CIML Member

NORWAY

Mr. Helge Kildal CIML Member

POLAND

Ms. Barbara Lisowska CIML Member

PORTUGAL

Mr. J.N. Cartaxo Reis CIML Member

ROMANIA

Mr. F. Iacobescu CIML Member

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Mr. L.K. Issaev CIML Vice-President
 Mr. Vladimir Krutikov
 Mr. Sergey Kononogov
 Mr. Vasily Mardin
 Mr. A. Vishenkov
 Mrs. Vytolskaya

SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO

Mr. Z.M. Marković CIML Member

SLOVAKIA

Mr. Jozef Orlovský CIML Member
 Mr. Jaromir Marković
 Mr. Ivan Mikulecky

SLOVENIA

Mr. Ivan Skubić CIML Member
 Ms. Natasa Mejak Vukovic

SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. Stuart H. Carstens CIML Member
Mr. T. Chesolokile
Mr. Tom Scriven

SPAIN

Mr. J.A. Robles
Mr. Carmen Sevilla Anton

SRI LANKA

Mr. K.A. Gunasoma CIML Member

SWEDEN

Mr. Kari Björkqvist CIML Member
Mr. Ingolf Berg

SWITZERLAND

Mr. Bruno Vaucher CIML Member
Mr. Wolfgang Schwitz

TANZANIA

Mr. Ali H.M. Tukai CIML Member

TUNISIA

Mrs. Ghaïet-El-Mouna Annabi CIML Member

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. J.W. Llewellyn CIML Member
Mr. Martin Birdseye

UNITED STATES

Mr. Charles D. Ehrlich CIML Member
Mrs. Jane Cowley
Mr. Richard Kayser
Mr. Henry Oppermann
Mr. Stephen Patoray

VIETNAM

Mr. Pham Ngoc Tran CIML Member
Mr. Bui Quy Long

Corresponding Members

BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA

Mr. Zijad Dzemic
Mr. Esad Tuzovic

CHINESE TAIPEI

Mr. Brain C.S. Shu
Mr. Jay-San Chen

GABON

Mr. Fernand Koutana
Mr. Dieudonné Lewamou/Ho Obissa
Mrs. Diane Mpolo Mpoungou

LITHUANIA

Mr. O. Staugaitis
Mr. Viktoras Zabolotnas

MALAYSIA

Mr. Abdul Rashid Zainal Abidin

MALTA

Mr. Francis E. Farrugia

MONGOLIA

Mr. Damdin Sharafdorj

SYRIA

Mr. Khaled Osman

Mr. Hassan Sahloul

UKRAINE

Mr. Rostyslav Domnystkyy

Mr. Paulo Neyezhmakov

Mr. Oleh Velychko

UZBEKISTAN

Mr. Abdurauf Abdukayumov

Observer Countries

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

Mr. Mohammed Ahmad Abdulqader Al Mulla

KYRGYZSTAN

Mr. Salmorbek Asanaliev

Mr. Talaipek S. Dusheev

ZAMBIA

Mr. Kimon Zulu

Liaisons

Mr. John Anthony CECIP

Mr. Ismael Castelazo BIPM

Mrs. Veronika Martens CECIP

Mr. Martin Stoll CECIP

Guests

Mr. Gerard Faber CIML Past President

Mr. John Birch..... CIML Honorary Member

BIML

Mr. Jean-François Magaña

Mr. Ian Dunmill

Mrs. Régine Gaucher

Mr. Chris Pulham

Mrs. Patricia Saint-Germain

Mr. Attila Szilvássy

Opening address by

Manfred Kochsiek, CIML Acting President



Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is my pleasure to welcome you to this Thirty-Ninth Meeting of our Committee and I thank you in advance for your participation which, I am sure, will be as positive and fruitful as ever.

Regrettably, I have to open this Meeting on a very sad note - as you have probably already been informed, our Past President Knut Birkeland passed away some weeks ago. Most of you knew him, and some of you knew him very well and worked closely with him. We all appreciated his eminent qualities as CIML President, and his never-failing interest in the activity of our Organization since he handed over the Presidency to Gerard Faber. Under his Presidency, the OIIML began to modernize and to better answer the needs of the Legal Metrology community, and Knut continued to make an essential contribution to this evolution. From a personal point of view, many of us have lost a friend, and I would like to pay tribute to him. You will find in the entrance hall a table with a condolences book, in which you can write some words in his memory.

Let us remember him during a few moments of silence.

It is an honor for me to welcome Delegates to the city of Berlin, where during this week we will be holding the 39th Meeting of the International Committee, the 12th International Conference, a Workshop on the Mutual Acceptance Arrangement and a very important Forum on Developing Countries.

I would like to start with some words concerning our new Members.

Following the Decisions of the 38th Committee Meeting, we regrettably had to strike one Country off the list of Member States, so the number of OIIML Member States now stands at 59 instead of 60 at the last Committee Meeting. I hope that solutions will be found so that this Country may in the near future regain its place among our Members.

In reviewing the composition of our Committee, I have pleasure in welcoming the following new Members:

- For Australia: Dr. Grahame Harvey
- For Croatia: Mrs. Biserka Mladinic
- For Indonesia: Dr. Amir Saharuddin Sjahrial
- For the Democratic People's Republic of Korea: Mr. Jo Hui Kon
- For Republic of Korea: Mr. Yoo-Tae Jun
- For The Netherlands: Mr. Cees van Mullem
- For Sri Lanka: Mr. K.A. Gunasoma
- For Vietnam: Mr. Pham Ngoc Tran

We also have pleasure in welcoming Rwanda as a new OIIML Corresponding Member.

A very large number of countries have expressed their interest in becoming Corresponding Members or full Members of the OIIML and some of them are well advanced in the process of accession. I am very pleased to welcome here, as Observers, delegates from these countries.

The OIIML is now entering its 50th year and we shall celebrate the 50th Anniversary of our Organization in June 2005. The meetings that we have held and shall hold are quite strategic for our Organization. The Conference, which will meet from this afternoon through Friday, will take essential decisions on the future of the OIIML, and this Committee Meeting - although rather short - will still have to examine a number of strategic issues:

- The implementation of the MAA will be one of the most important issues. Following the Workshop which was held on Sunday, we have to make decisions to facilitate this implementation and to advise the Conference on certain aspects which fall under the Conference's competence.
- The organization set up for addressing Developing Country issues is the second main topic of this Committee Meeting. Following the meeting of the Permanent Working Group on Developing Countries and the Development Council Meeting, we have to make proposals to the Conference concerning the future OIML structures for issues concerning Developing Countries. An interesting and positive Forum was held on Monday and showed what kind of support we can give to Developing Countries. This Forum will be followed by permanent actions and other events.

And of course one other essential issue on our agenda that I want to emphasize is that we shall have to elect a President and a First Vice-President. These two elections are of utmost importance to the OIML, and I have no doubt that this new team will bring even more dynamism to our Organization and allow it to progress even further.

These are, my dear Colleagues, the major topics that we shall have to examine and/or decide upon during this CIML Meeting.

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

Mr. Magaña then took the roll call of participants. It was found that 54 Member States were present or represented out of a total of 59.

Approval of the Agenda

The Agenda was approved by Delegates without comment. Mr. Magaña explained that those items on the Agenda which had to be presented to the Conference would be taken first, as the second meeting of the Committee would be after the end of the Conference. The Situation of Certain Members would be discussed shortly, followed by the Auditors' Report, which had to be approved by the Committee and the President instructed to present it at the Conference. This would be followed by an inspection of the OIML Financial Regulations and a summary of Presidential Council activities. The implementation of the MAA must be considered because the Conference had to receive a report and vote on certain issues, including the financial aspects of the MAA. It was also necessary to consider the matter of Developing Countries, upon which Conference had to make decisions. The agenda for the Conference had to be approved also and, of course, there would be presentations for the election of the CIML President and the Vice President, for which the vote would take place at the Committee's later and final Meeting. This gap would allow time for delegates to decide how to vote. There would also be Awards and Letters of Appreciation for some persons at the current Meeting.

Thirty-Ninth Meeting

of the

International Committee of Legal Metrology

– Minutes –

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

– Minutes –

1 Approval of the Minutes of the 38th CIML Meeting

Delegates were asked to approve these. Mr. Magaña apologized for the rather late dispatch of the French translation of the Minutes, but pointed out that all Delegates had received the English version in a timely manner. Mr. Magaña asked for comments on the Minutes. There being no comments or remarks, the Minutes were approved.

2 Member States and Corresponding Members

2.1 Situation of certain Members

The Conference would be obliged to examine the cases of three Members, and on that occasion there would be a longer report on their situation. The Member Countries in question were:

- The Democratic People's Republic of Korea, to whom delays over their arrears had been granted by the last Conference, in London. The DPR Korea had paid all its current contributions to the OIML, and the debt had decreased, but only very slightly. The Conference would have to make a decision about these arrears.
- Zambia had also owed some arrears at the time of the London Conference, and unfortunately their situation appeared to be worsening. It had been decided at the CIML Meeting in Kyoto that if this situation did not improve they should be struck off the list. This had been put into effect; however, Zambia had sent a letter to the Conference explaining its problem, and the Conference would have to discuss what conditions might be set for Zambia re-joining OIML, either as a Corresponding Member or as a Full Member State.
- The third problem regarded Spain; here there was an old issue, dating back to 1992; a cheque had been lost in the post in France, and had never been found. This would also be discussed and a proposal would be made to the Conference for the issue to be closed. A way would be found to regularize this situation.
- One or two other countries were a year or two in arrears, but there were no other major problems. There were no problems regarding Corresponding Members.

3 Financial matters

3.1 Adoption of the Auditor's reports for 2002 and 2003

Mr. Magaña reminded Delegates that the accountant had made an error in the 2002 accounts and that at the previous year's CIML Meeting it had been decided that these should be reassessed with

the 2003 accounts. A new External accountant had now prepared these accounts; this accountant had been very helpful on many issues and there was reason to be pleased with the choice. Delegates had therefore received this auditor's reports for 2002 and 2003, which now had to be adopted by the CIML and then the whole set of reports for the last financial period would be examined by the Financial Commission and by the Conference, together with estimates for the future. These estimates had come out at slightly more than the amount which had been voted, and the costs had been slightly higher than anticipated. This was due to some exceptional expenses in 2002, especially for the St. Jean de Luz Seminar and for some work done in the Bureau.⁽¹⁾

In 2003 there had also been some structural improvements in the Bureau; and 2004 would be almost balanced. Overall the accounts came very close to balancing, and the exceptional expenditure in 2002 and 2003 should not give rise to anxiety over the state of finances in the future. The subject would be discussed in greater depth at the Conference.

As there were no comments, it was taken to be the wish of the Committee that these accounts should be presented to Conference.

3.2 Draft Revision of the OIML Financial Regulations

Mr. Kochsiek asked Mr. Magaña to inform the Meeting on this topic.

Mr. Magaña said that some revision of the Financial Regulations had been discussed in the Presidential Council the previous year. Year after year he had noticed that Members were not very happy with the way the accounting was shown, because this gave rise to some difficulties in understanding the financial affairs of the OIML, and indeed he himself, when he had first taken up his post, had not understood at once how the accountancy worked. It had therefore been decided that the Financial Regulations should be revised to permit the use of new, modern accountancy schemes and to modernize the financial issues of the OIML. The Convention stated that the CIML should prepare the Financial Regulations, which were then voted on by the Conference. Mr. Magaña had prepared them; they had to be looked at in the present Meeting by the Committee, which would give its opinion, and then they would be presented to the Conference during the next few days. There could be further discussion in the Conference, but the Committee should come to some positive decision.

The draft Regulations had been sent to Delegates some months previously, with a view to their discussion and adoption during the current week. Mr. Magaña had prepared transparencies to illustrate his comments, which were as follows:

- Article 2 stated that the obsolete "gold franc" should no longer be used. Since the French Franc had disappeared, all accountancy would henceforth be in Euros. A similar decision had been made in the CGPM, the General Conference on Weights and Measures.
- Article 3 stated that the accountancy would be based on the internationally accepted IPSAS standards (International Public Sector Accounting Standards). These were issued by the International Federation of Accountants for public sector organizations, and were now well established and widely accepted, and the European Union was keen that all public bodies should use them.
- Another change was from cash accounting to accrual accounting: whereas in the past they had just entered the money they received and the money they paid out, and debts, for example, had not been clearly registered. Money received in one year, such as payments in advance, could not be credited to another year, even if that was where they rightly belonged. Nor had it been possible to spread depreciation of any purchased item over several years. For example, the photocopiers bought the previous year had had to be entered as an expense of that year, whereas they should have been depreciated over the five years they were expected to remain in use.

⁽¹⁾ BIML Note: In addition, some doubtful Member States debts were recognized in the 2002 and 2003 accounts and resulted in exceptional losses.

- Debts of Corresponding Members could not previously be put among the assets, but could be recorded under the new system. All assets would have to be re-assessed for inclusion.
- It had also been impossible under the old system to record liabilities. The Reserve Fund had had to appear as an asset, which was inappropriate. The term Reserve Fund was not used in the usual sense of the term; this fund was for use in the case of a shortfall between assets and liabilities.
- The OIML policy of not using loans for its financing would continue unaltered under the new system.
- In regard to the financial management of the Bureau, there would continue to be cash flow planning and management alongside the new accrual accountancy.
- Analytical accountancy would also be introduced, so that the exact cost of the different missions of the Bureau and of the OIML could be identified: for example, the full cost of CIML Meetings, or of promotion of metrology by the Bureau, or of actions for Developing Countries.
- There would also be a facility for managing the budget. The President or Director could at any moment look at the situation regarding implementation of the budget and the forecast for the year. This could be done on an accurate, day to day basis.
- The Financial Regulations would also lay down what should be voted by the Conference. In the past, the Conference had merely voted the expenses, which was not very clear; Conference would from now on vote on the elements of the revenue, which of course mainly came from contributions; they would set the contributions and the Corresponding Members' fees, prices for the Bulletin, fees for implementation of the MAA, and, in general, the cost of running the Bureau.

Preparations had already begun for the introduction of the new accountancy system on 1 January 2005; the new accountancy software, which was a standard package from Sage, probably already known to many of those present, had already been ordered and would be installed within a few weeks, in readiness for the shift to the new system on 1 January.

Mr. Magaña and Mr. Kochsiek then invited comments, reminding Delegates that they had had the papers and explanatory notes about the new system for some time.

Mr. Johnston complimented Mr. Magaña on his presentation of the new financial information, which was much clearer and easier to follow, and expressed support for his efforts to provide more information in the future.

Mr. Lagauterie commented that France also supported the new system, which was much clearer, but the Foreign Ministry had asked him to make a comment to the effect that, in point 18.2 the wording at present stated that “exceptional expenditure and charges above 15 000 euros not covered in Article 16, have to be accepted by the President”. This would imply that the President was obliged to accept such charges. He proposed the following alternative wording: “must be submitted in advance for the agreement of the President of the Committee”.

Mr. Magaña agreed that this wording clarified the text and expressed his intentions in drawing up the Regulations and agreed that it should be substituted for the original phrase.

Mr. Vaucher expressed his gratitude for the work done by the Bureau and its Director to revise the old fashioned Regulations and fully supported this major step forward for the Organization.

Mr. Kildal also congratulated Mr. Magaña and the Bureau on the pleasing transparency of the new system. He pointed out one missing item under Assets: Investments which had not depreciated should also be included under this heading. Also, “loans” should surely read “loans to personnel”.

Mr. Magaña replied that it had been the practice for some time to grant loans to employees, but that he believed some Members wished to discuss this matter at the Conference. In the past, however, loans to employees had appeared as an expense, and reimbursement had appeared as “special revenue”. In fact, this was an investment, and an alternative to banking the money: loans given to employees were repaid with interest which was no lower than the best rates obtained from the bank. Loans would therefore now appear under Assets, because the money had not disappeared from the Organization but was only locked in a loan. The principle of granting loans

to employees would be discussed later, but this was a problem of Staff Regulations and not of Financial Regulations. But loans should be correctly recorded.

On the subject of depreciation, Mr. Kildal pointed out that where part of a purchase had been depreciated, the remainder should be shown as an asset.

Mr. Magaña replied that equipment would have a normal period of depreciation of five years; building work which added value would be depreciated progressively; work which did not add value to the building was an expense and not an asset. All these rules would be detailed and put in Procedures which would be elaborated very shortly. As in any other organization, once equipment had been fully depreciated it would still exist in the Inventory of the OIML but its value in the accounts was given for its raw value and depreciation but its net value would be zero. If fully depreciated equipment was sold, the price obtained was exceptional revenue for the OIML, as would be the case in any other organization.

Mr. Ehrlich added the compliments of the United States, and also asked for clarification of the wording proposed by Mr. Lagauterie.

Mr. Magaña said that the French wording of the Financial Regulations had been drafted by the new accountant to the OIML, who had experience of international accountancy, and the document had been translated into English by a specialized accountancy translator appointed by the accountant. Any clarifications of wording would be referred to these experts. He explained that the change proposed by Mr. Lagauterie made it clear that any unforeseen expenditure over a certain sum had to be submitted to the President for approval: the previous wording had seemed to imply that the President was obliged to agree to such expenditure.

It was noted that the Committee agreed that the new Financial Regulations should be submitted to Conference.

4 Presidential Council Activities

Mr. Kochsiek reminded CIML Members, especially those recently appointed, that the Presidential Council was not a formal part of the Organization, since it was not provided for in the OIML Convention. However, it was a very useful and effective body for preparing discussions at CIML level. It was understood that the Presidential Council in itself did not have any decision making powers, but was an advisory board to the CIML and to the President.

Since the Kyoto CIML Meeting, the Presidential Council had held three meetings, one very short one at the end of the Kyoto Meeting; the second, its principal meeting, in March; and the third immediately before the present occasion, this last meeting being in order to prepare motions for discussion at the 39th CIML Meeting and 12th Conference.

Membership of the Presidential Council consisted of the CIML President and the two CIML Vice Presidents; current membership consisted of:

- Mr. Kochsiek himself;
- Vice President Mr. Issaev,
- Chairperson of the Development Council Mrs. Annabi;

and a limited number of representatives of different regions of the world, at present comprising:

- Mr. Stuart Carstens (South Africa);
- Mr. Ehrlich (United States)
- Mr. Johnston (Canada);
- Mr. Tanaka (Japan); and
- Mr. Wang Qinqing (China).

Mr. Faber and Mrs. Bennett had been Members of the Presidential Council up to Sunday evening but after the nomination of new CIML Members and after the election of the new President and Vice-President it would be the task of the latter to select a new Presidential Council. Mr. Kochsiek did not wish to go into detail at the present moment about these meetings, as he would have the opportunity to report in more depth at the Conference. He merely reiterated that the function of the Presidential Council was to prepare decisions but not to take these decisions.

Mr. Kochsiek next asked Mr. Magaña to sum up the year's activities in the Bureau.

5 BIML activities

Mr. Magaña gave a summary of the year's work, which was brief because Members had already received a written account of these; his talk was supported by slides. The activities had been as follows:

- The first priority had been, as ever, to support Members and Corresponding Members of the OIML, and countries generally. A number of meetings, seminars and conferences had been held, attended by BIML staff, which had been mainly on the subject of awareness and similar topics. Mr. Magaña himself had attended a Seminar in China, for example; but there was not enough time to go into detail about all such occasions. Staff had also attended a number of technical seminars and congresses, such as the NCSLI Congress;
- Staff had continued to supply general information on legal metrology to external bodies with which the OIML liaised, such as the WTO and standardization organizations. The BIML also published Guides and Expert Reports, each of which, he reminded Delegates, was published under the responsibility of the expert who had written it, and not of the Bureau. A paper on statistical principles of pre-packaging had been published, in French, upon which there had been some comment: the Bureau would discuss amendments with the expert who had written it. Publishing and translating OIML Publications made up a large part of the staff's task. The Information Letter mentioned earlier was a new enterprise of the Bureau, and the Members' Page on the web site had also been developed to disseminate more information; Members could now view various databases which had been developed. Mr. Magaña regretted that time did not allow for demonstrating these to the present audience. The Bulletin was a further important source of information, and Mr. Magaña was glad to have the opportunity to encourage Members to submit articles for this publication;
- Support for developing countries was another important activity of the Bureau;
- Much support was also given to the Technical Committees. Bureau staff attended some, though not of course all, Technical Committee and Subcommittee Meetings, selecting those where they considered that their participation could add value. There was systematic editorial support to Technical Committees and Subcommittees, because the Secretariats of these bodies were not always of English mother tongue, so help of this kind was often essential. The Bureau carefully examined and edited all documents issued by the Technical Committees and Subcommittees to ensure their consistency with those of other Recommendations before presenting them for the vote of CIML Members;
- Another vital task was conducting the numerous postal ballots, ensuring that responses were received from all Members;
- The final task, when a document was about to be published, was to translate it into French, the official language of the Organization; this was an onerous task, but indispensable. Such tasks as this were not necessarily very visible, but represented a considerable task for staff;
- Concerning mutual confidence, the Bureau already had to supervise the OIML Certificate System, which occasionally involved approaching the Issuing Authorities when an error occurred. Preparation for the implementation of the MAA had already begun in 2003, when the

Working Group on the subject had been set up. The Bureau had assisted the Technical Subcommittee in organizing the recent Workshop on this topic;

- There had been an attempt to modernize the management of the Bureau. To this end, draft Financial Regulations had been prepared, which had been a major task, compounded by the need to translate this document into English: Mr. Magaña thanked Mr. Dunmill for his assistance in their preparation. The new accountancy system had also been drawn up in readiness for the new accountancy regime to be introduced at the end of the current year. Internal information technology applications had also been developed for the databases in the Bureau. When the efficacy of these applications had been tested they would be put on the web site, but the first objective was to ensure their smooth running locally.

Mr. Kochsiek thanked Mr. Magaña for his report and asked for questions.

Mr. Harvey asked whether, since communication was generally agreed to be so important, it might be possible for a report on issues discussed at the Presidential Council meetings to appear on the web site, or even just a list of topics discussed. This would provide Members with an indication of which way things were moving. He further proposed an electronic “suggestion box” for Members to contribute their ideas.

Mr. Kochsiek replied that the Presidential Council was not an official Council of the Organization; nevertheless, when introducing the Information Letter he intended to report, though without detail, what had been discussed at its meetings.

Mr. Magaña added that among the Bureau’s projects for improving communication and the web site, the database on information from Technical Committees had already been finalized; the database on Certificates was nearing completion and would shortly be searchable; and the next project, to be undertaken as soon as possible, was to add some interactive pages to the web site which could be used as forums for Technical Committees and Members. For example, the Secretariat of a Technical Committee could put its working documents in these forums and the participants in the Committee could add their comments. Once these forums had been set up, all Members could use the general ones for suggestions, and selective ones could be offered for example to each TC and SC.

Mr. Issaev pointed out that the BIML now had good relations with the BIPM. He would like to know the main topics on which there had been collaboration between the two organizations.

Mr. Magaña said that present contacts involved working principally on draft common presentations on international metrology, developing countries, and sundry day to day topics; additionally, information was regularly exchanged, mainly by telephone, on various issues; for example there had been recent exchanges on the subject of the Staff Regulations and Financial Regulations. Informal telephone calls were exchanged every week and informal discussion took place by this means.

Mr. Issaev asked whether this implied that the two Organizations were more or less joined.

Mr. Magaña said they behaved as though they were situated in the same premises, with frequent communication, the telephone taking the place of what would otherwise be informal meetings.

Mr. Kochsiek pointed out that these relationships were between the BIPM and the Bureau, as opposed to the OIML, whose activities were quite distinct from those of the BIPM.

6 Technical activities

6.1 Approval of International Documents

6.2 Examination of the situation of certain TCs/SCs

Mr. Kochsiek invited Mr. Szilvássy to present these items.

Mr. Szilvássy explained that over the last two months, ongoing postal votes on various Documents had ended very well, so that only one Document (Revision of D 1) remained for approval on the present occasion. On 20 October the votes on the revision of D 6 and D 8 had stood at 34 “yes” votes with no negative votes; for the revision of D 14 there had been 32 “yes” votes and again no “no” votes. A minimum of 30 “yes” votes were needed for a Document to be approved by the Committee; where “no” votes were due to a basic reason, a Document might be referred back to the Technical Committee in question. As the Conference had withdrawn R 33, and the replacement Document had received 40 “yes” votes, it also had been adopted and approved by the Committee.

Delegates could see from the slide that the position on 20 October was that the outstanding D 1 Revision had received 28 “yes” votes, falling short of the necessary consensus by two or three votes; he hoped that there would be no problem in obtaining the necessary number of approvals at the current Meeting.

On the subject of the situation of certain TCs and SCs, several aspects were mentioned. One of these was the transfer of Secretariats. On the basis of the agreement between the US and South Africa earlier in the current year, the Presidential Council had agreed to the transfer of the TC 6 Secretariat. Since the new Secretariat had been established in South Africa, work had begun again on various projects; it was now up to the CIML to approve this transfer.

The US had now finished the major project of revising R 111 on Weights and also the revision of R 52; Germany was now ready to take over the Secretariat of TC 9/SC 3 and Members were asked to approve this change.

Mr. Szilvássy then turned to the question of the TC 8/SC 2 Secretariat which had been vacant for a long time, but Russia had taken on responsibility for the Test Report Format for R 125 and this would soon be circulated among CIML Members for approval. The Secretariat of TC 10/SC 3 *Barometers* had been relinquished about a year previously and a new country was now being sought to take over responsibility for it.

As previously announced by Mr. Kochsiek, Germany would relinquish the Secretariat of TC 12 *Instruments for measuring electrical quantities*; this meant that for two Subcommittees and one Technical Committee there was a need for volunteers to take over the Secretariats.

Finally, two new projects had been proposed by two Subcommittees:

- The very important joint publication OIML R 99/ISO 3930 between OIML TC 16/SC 1 and ISO TC 22/SC 5. Both these Organizations having voted for the joint publication, there was a need for CIML endorsement so that work could begin on revision of this very important Recommendation;
- As proposed by TC 18/SC 2 *Clinical Thermometers*, the Subcommittee had met in June in Croatia, upon which occasion two thirds of Committee Members had accepted the proposal to start a new project on infrared ear thermometers instead of revising R 7.

It was proposed that both projects be approved.

Mr. Kochsiek asked if any Member wished to comment on D 1 before decisions were made.

For South Africa, Mr. Carstens stated that although they were going to vote “yes” to D 1, they had difficulty with the concept of introducing traceability; there was an international definition but this did not explain how it was to be applied. Traceability within the legal metrology field needed to be made clear. South Africa had sent a written proposal to the OIML to remedy this problem.

Mr. Magaña said that all comments would be reviewed before publication and corrections made if necessary.

Mr. Issaev wanted to know how many votes had been received.

Mr. Magaña replied that by 20 October there had been 28 “yes” votes and no “no” votes. Only two more positive votes were needed for the motion to be accepted.

Mr. Kochsiek asked whether anyone in the audience had problems with D 1. Seeing no hands raised, he expressed the hope that it would be approved.

Mr. Kochsiek reminded delegates that at the moment there were vacancies for TC 12 and two other Subcommittees. He asked for volunteers from the audience to take over one of these three, adding that if there was nobody in the present audience willing to undertake TC 12 it could continue up to June 2005, but hopefully by the 2005 CIML Meeting a country would have been found.

Mr. Harvey said that Australia would be interested in TC 12 but that it was known that Sweden was still doing some work in that area and might also wish to take it on.

Mr. Kochsiek asked Sweden for their comments on this point, stating that he himself had had the impression during recent months that Sweden was not directly interested. Mr. Kochsiek said that Sweden could be approached after the CIML Meeting was over, to ascertain their feeling on the subject. He wished to verify that if Sweden did not wish to undertake this project, Australia was willing to do so. This was agreed.

For the Czech Republic, Mr. Klenovský said that he had been in communication with Mr. Svenson of the Swedish Metrology Institute, he knew that work was under way on a draft of a new Recommendation on Electricity meters; it would therefore seem logical to approach them in the first instance.

He also wished to enquire about progress on the long overdue document on uncertainty in legal metrology.

Mr. Kochsiek replied to the first question that this was indeed his intention; and he invited Mr. Ehrlich to respond to the second question, hopefully with some good news.

Mr. Ehrlich said that the uncertainty document was one of TC 3/SC 5's high priority projects, and agreed that it was now long overdue. He had been meeting Dr. Sommer and some others with a view to developing a draft. Without making excuses for the delay, it had been due to work and consultation on related subjects which was going on in the JCGM (Joint Committee on Guides in Metrology), which was working on developing a supplement to the GUM (Guide to the Expression of Uncertainty in Measurement) on the subject of the incorporation of uncertainty in assessment. Unfortunately that work had not progressed as quickly as might have been hoped. He and Mr. Sommer had therefore decided to go ahead with developing a first draft without waiting. The advantage of waiting would have been the possibility of a common terminology on incorporating uncertainty in the assessment of legal metrology for tolerance testing for many types of applications, to be used throughout the world. The plan was to have the draft ready by summer 2005.

There being no further comments, Mr. Kochsiek thanked Mr. Szilvássy.

6.3 Implementation of the MAA

Mr. Magaña informed the meeting that an informal workshop on the MAA had been held; this involved no decisions, but presentations and discussions on the subject of the MAA and its implementation for those who might not know very much about it. It had been decided at the previous CIML Meeting that the MAA should be adopted and implemented as soon as possible for two OIML Recommendations; R 60 *Load Cells* and R 76 *Nonautomatic Weighing Instruments*. A Working Group had met in January to look into the implementation of the MAA and its financial implications, and in March the Presidential Council had looked into the proposals of this Working Group. A number of decisions relative to its implementation now had to be taken by the Committee, regarding the level of fees and who should pay them, and other aspects. There had been discussion of the issues in the Workshop chaired by Mr. Ehrlich, which was an informal advisory body. Mr. Magaña called upon Mr. Ehrlich to make a presentation of the outcome of the Workshop.

Mr. Ehrlich thanked Mr. Magaña for his clear overview of the subject. He explained that in the Workshop there had first been a presentation of the current document, B 10-1, published in the current year, and then answer any concerns and requests for clarification. Topics covered included who could participate, how they could participate, relationships between the MAA and other international agreements, such as the BIPM's MRA, possible roles for Regional Legal Metrology Organizations, how manufacturers' testing laboratories might be incorporated, and overall advantages and disadvantages of participation.

However, as indicated by Mr. Magaña, the major topics discussed were the costs and the impact on the current OIML Certificate System, and it had been agreed that that the voting items at the CIML should remain limited to those two areas and that the other issues raised should be taken into account during a revision of the MAA Document which was expected to take place within the coming year. This time frame would allow for the MAA to be implemented for a time and for operating issues to be discovered. The detailed clarifications which had been asked for could be provided at that time.

Mr. Magaña reminded the Committee that some decisions now had to be taken. He drew Delegates' attention to certain effects of MAA:

- Once a Declaration of Mutual Confidence was operational, after a certain time, OIML Certificates issued by participating Issuing Authorities for this category would be issued under the rules of the Declaration of Mutual Confidence and not outside them;
- When a Declaration of Mutual Confidence had been signed and come into force, which would be on the date when it was signed, there should be a transition period, after which all OIML Certificates for this category should also be issued under the conditions of the Declaration of Mutual Confidence;
- If an Issuing Authority did not participate in the Declaration of Mutual Confidence, it could issue Certificates up to the end of the transition period, and, for those who participated, as soon as it came into force, all their Certificates for this category should be issued only under the conditions of the Declaration of Mutual Confidence;
- The transition period would have to be decided by the Committee. Its length might vary from case to case - an all-encompassing decision could not be taken at this point. What would happen would be that, once a Declaration of Mutual Confidence was signed, the Committee on Participation Review for that Declaration would propose a date for the end of the transition period and this proposal would be put to the CIML for discussion and voting;
- Another issue was the fees due by participating Issuing Authorities. Delegates already knew that a great deal of work had been done by the Bureau and Issuing Authorities would need to pay fees. These fees could be based either on the number of Certificates, at so much per Certificate; or, alternatively, on the amount of participation, with each participation of each Issuing Authority giving rise to one fee. If fees were based entirely on Certificates, the cost would be 300 Euros per Certificate. On the other hand if they were based on the number of Participations, the fee would be 2400 Euros per participation and per year. There had been much discussion in the Working Group, and the matter had also been discussed in the Workshop; the problem was not easily resolved, but the proposal finally arrived at was to split the fee into two parts: half the cost would be based on the number of Certificates issued, and the other half on the number of participations. Thus the annual fee for each participation by one Issuing Authority would be 1200 Euros, plus 150 Euros per Certificate. This was a proposal of the Bureau, which had reached consensus in the Working Group. The Workshop had considered further variations, such as a two thirds/one third or three quarters/one quarter split one way or the other; it had been difficult to reach a decision;
- It had already been decided that another Staff Member would be recruited. This had already been done, and letters had been circulated concerning the method and process of her appointment; the Staff Member was Mrs. Gaucher, who was present and who would be available to meet Delegates at breaks and lunch time. The budget for implementation of the MAA was an additional budget, identified in the main budget as a special issue, showing the MAA's own implementation costs and revenues. The process was expected to begin on 1 January

2005 and the aim was to have the first Declaration of Mutual Confidence signed by June 2005. This was a tight schedule but every effort would be made to keep to it;

- A certain number of amendments had to be made to Document B 3; this would be done later on so that an amended version could be presented in the light of decisions taken. Matters to be dealt with included the transition period between the OIML Certificate System and the System enhanced by the MAA.

Mr. Magaña concluded by saying that he had now summed up the main points; the draft decisions document produced by the MAA Workshop made the same points in more detail. Relations between Declarations of Mutual Confidence and the OIML Certificate System meant that the transition period would be planned and agreed on by the Committee, which would adopt the dates of transition case by case. There were also plans to have a logo on the Certificates covered by the Declarations of Mutual Confidence. Certificates previously issued would of course still be found in the database on the OIML web site and remained valid. The new MAA Certificates would be recorded and appear separately in the OIML database and web site. Financial provisions were as already presented: the Conference had to approve it in the Budget but the Committee could give a resolution on the subject. Fees would be due by Issuing Authorities and not by Manufacturers to the Bureau. The proposal was that fees should be 1200 Euros per year per Issuing Authority plus 150 Euros per Certificate. Mr. Magaña hoped that the Committee would find itself able to present these decisions to the Conference. He asked for comments and questions.

Mr. Harvey referred to the Workshop on Sunday, at which a proposal had been made that three quarters of the fees should be levied on Certificates. He himself wished to propose that they lean yet further in that direction and charge 100 % of fees on Certificates. This was for two reasons: it would speed up the provision of Certificates to manufacturers; and the MAA would greatly reduce the cost to manufacturers, saving thousands of dollars of the cost of testing, though there would still be additional national charges for the issue of Certificates. But in general they would save tens of thousands of dollars for having a Certificate issued over several economies. In view of the scale of these savings, it would be quite reasonable to levy a charge of a few hundred Euros per Certificate. In fact Mr. Harvey himself would be in favor of increasing the charge still further.

On the other side of the equation, Mr. Harvey also supported the views put forward by John Barker, regarding the impact of the MAA on Issuing Authorities and smaller economies. One of the impacts of the MAA would be the additional costs for the Issuing Authorities, due to the need to comply with the MAA procedures. If they attempted to recover these costs over a smaller number of approvals, this would put them at a disadvantage vis-à-vis larger Issuing Authorities. The MAA would in any case reduce the viability of the smaller Issuing Authorities, and this would reduce their capability to detect non complying instruments, which was really what should be being done. He would therefore be reluctant to load any additional costs onto these Issuing Authorities. For these two reasons, therefore, it was Mr. Harvey's view that the full amount of the costs should be based upon the Certificate.

Mr. Harvey further reminded Delegates of the point made by Mr. Tanaka on Sunday, which was that not all Certificates were equal. Certainly, in Australia, there were full Certificates of approval, and there were variants. The full Certificates had much higher associated costs than the variants. In his view, the costing structure should be looked at in more detail; rather than charge a flat 300 Euros per Certificate they should take into account whether a full Certificate or a simple variant Certificate was involved.

In summary, therefore, Mr. Harvey considered that 100 % of the charges should be put onto the Certificate and paid by the manufacturers; and that the fee structure should be given further consideration. About 1000 Euros per full Certificate and 100 Euros per variant would seem to him to be a good starting point for discussion. If this arrangement should lead to a surplus, then any such surplus could be directed to a Patent Reliance Program.

Mr. Kochsiek thanked Mr. Harvey but pointed out that there was not time to discuss all proposals in the current session. A number of Delegates had approached him since the Workshop with different proposals regarding financing. He therefore proposed that the Financial Committee and Technical Committee should discuss these matters in depth the following day.

Mr. Kildal also expressed support for the views expressed and voiced some skepticism about the financial arrangements, and also about additional technical requirements. In his view, additional technical requirements would constitute barriers to trade, and as such, should not be supported by the Organization.

Mr. Magaña pointed out that the wording and text of the MAA had been adopted the previous year and could not now be altered. It was clear that the additional requirements might be acceptable in some cases, for example climatic conditions for Nordic countries, and in tropical countries, both of which could differ from those in other places; in other cases additional requirements were not acceptable. But this text could not be amended here; any amendment would have to be made in the Committee on Participation Review, which could look at additional requirements and try to reach consensus as to whether or not they were acceptable.

Mr. Kildal stated that in his view, if the OIML Recommendations were not perfect, which was what was being implied, these Recommendations should be reviewed and got right, so that there would not be the need for exceptions, as these made for confusion.

On the subject of the fee structure, Mr. Johansen would be in favor of the structure proposed by Australia; but his comment referred to the situation that would arise if the fee structure were not changed. In his view, if the structure remained unaltered, very few Issuing Authorities would participate, because it would not be profitable for smaller ones to do so. This would mean that, for example, in Europe, where there was a tradition of referring to Certificates, there would be a need, either for another system, or for the continuance of the old one. Mr. Johansen himself would prefer the fee structure to be changed so that this situation did not arise. Otherwise they would either have to retain the old system alongside the new one, or else realize that some regions would set up their own systems; this had definitely not been the intention in creating the MAA.

Mr. Kochsiek asked Mr. Magaña to make a summary of all the comments for full discussion in the Technical Committee.

Mr. Robles asked whether calculations had been made for the cost of carrying out Peer Review, which would be necessary for verifying exactly the technical competence of Issuing Bodies.

Mr. Magaña said that Issuing Authorities being peer assessed would bear the traveling and accommodation costs for the experts to affirm their competence, but it was not expected that these experts would receive fees for peer assessment. He could not give an exact figure for the cost of a Peer Review.

The suggestions concerning the repartition of the fees to be charged would need to be discussed and accepted, by a qualified majority, in the Conference, because it would form part of the structure of the budget. He had noted the various comments on this subject and would seek a way of reaching a satisfactory solution.

Mr. Kochsiek added that Mr. Robles's point had also been discussed in the Workshop. In his own opinion, the system should be kept as un-bureaucratic and inexpensive as possible, otherwise smaller Issuing Authorities would have no chance of participating. There had been proposals at the Workshop. It was essential to make and discuss a proposal the following day.

Mr. Lagauterie expressed his pleasure that the comments he had made at the Workshop about the distribution of the costs had found supporters. He expressed support for Mr. Harvey's view that the cost of a Certificate was not high enough in relation to what a manufacturer would be gaining. It had already been seen that the developing countries had needs, particularly for a metrology infrastructure; for many years the Organization had sought ways of aiding developing countries. The OIML was good at intellectual support but less good at giving infrastructure support. He

offered for general consideration the idea that, if the MAA system should result in a surplus, this should be used for the assistance of developing countries.

Mr. Magaña replied that, as far as the cost of Certificates was concerned, some colleagues, such as Mr. Lagauterie and himself, thought they were too cheap and others thought they were too expensive. In any case, there was no intention to make any profit out of the system, merely to cover costs. The plan was that in approximately four years' time there should be perhaps five Declarations of Mutual Confidence with about five Issuing Authorities in each, making twenty-five participations. They should expect that altogether there would be 200 Certificates per year. With these dates and these costs he could balance the costs of half an agent in the Bureau, which should be enough to deal with this amount of take-up. If there should be more take-up, there would be more money but more work, but these were the projections upon which his financial calculations had been based.

It had also been decided that, in the long term, OIML Certificates should not be financed by Members' contributions, nor should Manufacturers be expected to finance normal actions of the OIML. If support to developing countries was considered to be a normal activity of the OIML, then resources should be found for this without taxing manufacturers.

Mr. Freistetter said he was commenting from the point of view of the WELMEC (European Corporation in Legal Metrology) rather than that of Austria; he wanted to point out that there were now almost 30 countries in Europe which should be accepting each others' Certificates by now; so he wanted to appeal for costs to be kept low for the sake of developing countries. More than half the OIML Members were in some financial need.

7 Developing Countries

Mr. Magaña reminded delegates that since the week began there had already been two or three events on this subject. The Permanent Working Group on Developing Countries had met and discussed a number of items for the benefit of developing countries; there had been the successful Forum, which was one of the outcomes of the Working Group; and there had been a meeting of the Development Council. Mr. Magaña reminded delegates that as a result of CIML decisions the previous year its President had set up the Permanent Working group to accelerate and increase the efficiency of work on developing countries. The intention was to transfer the activities of the Development Council to this Working Group, taking into account that a small Working Group could be more effective than a large Council which met only once a year. The Permanent Working Group had confirmed that they were ready to take over the work for developing countries. This proposal was put to the Development Council, which had come to the following decision:

“The Development Council, considering that the organization of the OIML's work on developing countries can be more effectively handled by the Permanent Working Group, proposes to the CIML that the tasks allocated to the Development Council by a decision of the 6th International Conference of Legal Metrology in 1980 should be henceforth transferred to the Permanent Working Group, and decides that the existing Development Council should therefore cease to exist.”

The Committee now had to make a decision upon these conclusions of the Development Council; this would subsequently be submitted by the CIML as its proposal to the Conference.

Mr. Magaña wished to underline to Delegates that the fact that the Development Council was ceasing to exist by no means meant a cessation of the OIML's work for developing countries. Information would circulate even better to developing countries under the new system, and forums like the recent one, and seminars, would be organized whenever need arose, either internationally at Committee Meetings, or regionally. Activity was therefore expected to increase rather than decrease.

Mr. Dunmill added that, in the decision Mr. Magaña had outlined, taken by the Development Council for proposition to the CIML, the only details which needed to be clarified in the decisions of this Committee were that the Terms of Reference of the Permanent Working Group had yet to be established by the CIML. It was hoped that the Committee would vote that these Terms of Reference would be established by a Committee-level vote. It was also important to say that the tasks previously undertaken by the Development Council were merely being carried over to the Permanent Working Group, a move which was designed only to make the work for developing countries more efficient. The Permanent Working Group would act as an advisory body to the CIML, which would take all decisions.

Mr. Kochsiek reiterated that the intention was to increase the work with developing countries; there would be another meeting of the Permanent Working Group in the course of the current week, when, following the Forum, the exhibition of posters from donor Organizations and from developing countries, and the Committee Meeting and Conference, the Permanent Working Group would begin its first real actions. Some such actions were already envisaged, but the Group was awaiting the outcome of the gatherings in progress.

Mr. Harvey suggested that one thing that could be done for developing countries was to help them to avoid becoming “dumping grounds” for sub-standard instruments. There was evidence in Australia that this was happening in a number of areas, and this evidence could be made available if required.

John Birch expressed support for the motion before the Committee, as he was sure it would ensure more effective action by the CIML in support of developing countries. He took Mr. Dunmill's point that the Terms of Reference of the PWGDC were still to be established, and suggested that an important aspect of those Terms of Reference was the access of developing countries to that Group. He thought this was of sufficient importance that the CIML should ensure that the Terms of Reference to be established should include the establishment of structures to ensure appropriate access for developing countries to the Permanent Working Group.

There being no further comments, this motion was approved by the Committee for presentation to the Conference.

8 Coordination with RLMOs

8.1 Draft paper on the coordination with RLMOs

Mr. Magaña informed Members that he had begun some time before to work out a draft paper on coordination with Regional Legal Metrology Organizations. For the moment, the BIML had no mandate to give any directives or guidance to the Regional Organizations, so that what was loosely being described as coordination in fact consisted only of increasing contacts and exchange of information. The paper had not been presented to Members more formally or in more detail because its contact was limited to the informal exchange of information.

Mr. Birch told Members that although he appreciated the point being made by Mr. Magaña, he considered that there was an important issue in terms of improving the effectiveness of the work of both RLMOs and the OIML. The document made a contribution to this objective. It had been discussed in San Diego recently and the general opinion had been that this was a useful draft which should be developed; he suggested that a meeting should be held in 2005 between the RLMOs and the new Permanent Working Group on Developing Countries to consider the effectiveness and activities of those organizations.

Mr. Kochsiek asked for clarification as to whether this represented an additional proposal or merely a remark.

Mr. Magaña replied that an important activity planned by the Permanent Working Group on Developing Countries was to collect as much information as possible from Regional Organizations on the subject of their training activities and materials, etc., and to circulate this information among other regions. In the light of this activity on the part of the Permanent Working Group, Mr. Magaña needed to review and perhaps re-draft his paper on what the OIML could do to improve the flow of information between the different Organizations. He accepted Mr. Birch's proposal that work should continue to be done on regional training and development along these lines.

9 Twelfth International Conference of Legal Metrology, agenda and program

Mr. Kochsiek asked for comments on the Conference agenda and program, which Delegates had already received.

Mr. Magaña told Delegates that the agenda was quite lengthy, and traditional, with opening, roll call and a number of the usual items, the establishment of Working Commissions and so on. Then there were Member States and Corresponding Members, new Members and the situation of certain Members. There would be a report on the implementation of the Long Term Policy since the previous Conference; all reports would relate to the whole period since the previous Conference. There would be reports from Liaisons, both International and Regional; the agenda also included technical issues, the Certificate System and MAA, developing countries, which the Committee had just been discussing, administrative and financial matters, plus any other business. The technical issues would be prepared in the Technical Commission and then voted by Conference, and financial matters, similarly, would be examined in the Financial Commission and the outcome also voted by the Conference.

10 Election of the CIML President and First Vice-President

10.1 Presentations given by candidates to the CIML Presidency and First Vice-Presidency

Mr. Magaña first introduced Alan Johnston, the only candidate for CIML President and asked him to make his short speech about his proposals for the future.

Mr. Johnston began by thanking Mr. Kochsiek for hosting the 2004 CIML and 12th International Conference; having hosted a similar occasion in Vancouver in 1996, he had some appreciation of the logistics and work involved.

He also thanked Delegates for giving him the opportunity to speak to them about his views. He assumed that everyone had received a copy of the paper he had prepared on his views, and he now intended to address very briefly some of the issues referred to therein.

Regarding the environment, this was a period of constant change for legal metrology organizations. He had originally meant to refer to a period of great change, but now he thought it was constant change. No sooner had some changes been successfully negotiated than many more presented themselves. He would refer later to the MAA as an example of this. There were companies now that were becoming global. They were merging and becoming multinational

corporations, and these same companies were demanding access to all the markets in the world without having to seek individual approval in each country. Indeed, Members' own governments were asking them to eliminate trade barriers, and consumers were now approaching them as well, to say, "We've seen this technology, why can't we have access to it?" Mr. Johnston considered that this was putting a lot of pressure on legal metrology organizations in the world today, particularly at a time when all, or at least most of them, were facing reduced resources available to legal metrology organizations. He therefore felt it was extremely important that OIML should step up, as it had done, the continuous leadership in ensuring that the concerns of countries and of legal metrology organizations were expressed and were known to everybody in order to seek common solutions. Basically, he was saying, "Let's keep up the good work, set priorities, look forward and find solutions to the problems ahead".

Governments were also looking for more private sector involvement in legal metrology, for partner arrangements, and at the same time they were expecting the OIML to provide strong support. This could cause concern within countries, many of which had excellent relationships with their private sectors, others of whom had not yet gone down that path and had not experienced the pros and cons of that type of work. It was important, however, to look at various ways of making sure the work could be carried on and completed, and partnerships with the private sector had to be looked at in order to achieve that. When there were fewer resources, it was necessary to look around and see what resources were available, in order to move forward on the agenda.

Mr. Johnston asked where that left the OIML in terms of specific current issues. The first issue he would refer to would be the Mutual Acceptance Arrangement, and he wished to thank Mr. Ehrlich for his continued leadership, perseverance and patience on this project. Mr. Johnston was departing from his prepared script to say that after what he had heard in the current session, he presumed that there would be lengthy and intense discussion on issues raised at the Workshop and referred to in the CIML. If elected President, he could guarantee that he would listen carefully to all of Members' comments and concerns in relation to indirect costs, the distribution of the costs and the complexity of the MAA, with a view to trying to find solutions to them.

Mr. Johnston then moved on to touch briefly on the Technical Committees. There had been discussion the previous year about expediting the work of the Technical Committees, and Delegates would have read the report sent out by the BIML. Some success had been achieved in that area, but it was necessary to go still further in that direction. There had been discussion at the Presidential Council on the need to continue that work. Mr. Johnston considered the Technical Committees to be the heart and *raison d'être* of the OIML, but at the same time, there was again pressure from companies to approve devices faster. These companies wanted access to the global market place, and processes needed to be in place to ensure that the devices being put on the market met the requirements, and, as Mr. Harvey had said, that production met requirements after they were on the market. There was therefore a need for discussion on this matter, and if elected as President he would be reviewing this in order to determine whether there were any other solutions or streamlining processes that could be put into place, to try and find a way of helping these Committees achieve their objectives. Mr. Johnston reiterated that he was not being critical of the Committees, they were doing excellent work and improvements had been made, but he was just drawing attention to the need for the Organization continually to seek further improvement.

Mr. Johnston also felt that the work of establishing liaisons with other standard-setting bodies must continue. Again, in an area of scarce resources it was extremely important to avoid duplication of effort, to find out what other Organizations were doing and learn to adapt and adopt as required. This did not of course mean that the OIML would give up any of its mandate or authority, just do what he would call "working smarter", and he would continue to support the BIML in that work as he had done in the past.

The OIML also had an excellent long term strategic plan. This had been discussed the previous year and an Action Plan set up. This must be examined on a regular basis. In Canada there was an expression “taking it off the shelf”, meaning that it was not enough just to develop a plan, put it on the shelf and hope that everything would work out fine, it must be continually reviewed, and changes made as required, in order to ensure that everyone was heading in the same direction.

On the subject of the Presidency of the CIML, Mr. Johnston was a little concerned that in 2004 and 2005, there had only been one candidate for president. If elected, Mr. Johnston would want to discuss with a number of the Members the reasons for this phenomenon, to try to determine whether measures could be put into place to encourage more people to come forward in future. He was pleased that there were two candidates for First Vice-President: this was a step in the right direction. He had some ideas as to why this situation had arisen, which he would like to validate with Members at some point in the future.

Mr. Johnston asked why Members should vote for him as President of the CIML, and answered himself saying that, apart from the obvious reason that he was the only candidate, he had represented Canada as its CIML Member for the last ten years; he had been a member of the Presidential Council since 2001; as President of *Measurement Canada*, he was responsible for the legal metrology organization of Canada; and he was also a member of the Advisory Council for the Institute of National Measurement Standards of the National Research Council of Canada. The National Research Council in Canada, he explained, was the National Metrology Institute for Canada. He had thus gained some insight into other metrology issues. Mr. Johnston informed members that he had thought very carefully about whether or not to run; the previous year there had only been one candidate, and he was extremely concerned about the time involvement of the post. He had discussed it with various people, but it was difficult to assess in advance. He had approached his boss and spoken to his colleagues in Measurement Canada, and all these people had been very supportive of his candidacy, and his Vice-President had agreed to assume more responsibility in order to enable him to allocate time for the Presidency. He had also discussed his candidacy with his wife, who had been very supportive. All this underlined the fact that he had not entered lightly into the decision to run; he took his candidacy seriously, and, if elected, he would take his responsibilities seriously. He also informed Members that he had a paper from the Canadian Federal Government affirming that he was bilingual, though in fact he was more confident in English; the ability to speak French could be an advantage at times, a disadvantage at others.

Finally, Mr. Johnston had sought the advice of Past President Gerard Faber in terms of areas where he could improve.

The two candidates for First Vice-President then made their presentations in alphabetical order: first Mr. Ehrlich and then Mrs. Todorova.

Mr. Kochsiek then referred to his earlier announcement of the bad news of Past President Knut Birkeland's death. Now he had good news for delegates. The OIML comprised about 109, and in future 110, 111, 112 Member Countries. But they were one big family. In a family, from time to time, thanks were due to Members who were very engaged on behalf of the family. A couple of years ago, the OIML had decided to honor persons who had worked very hard and were very engaged for the OIML. He now had the pleasure, therefore, together with Vice-President Mr. Issaev to present four OIML medals and three Letters of Appreciation; Mr. Kochsiek personally had the honor to present the medals and Mr. Issaev the Letters of Appreciation.

The first recipient of the awards was the Immediate Past President, Mr. Faber. The previous year, during the 38th CIML Meeting in Kyoto, Mr. Faber was honored by a farewell speech. Mr. Kochsiek was not going to repeat that speech, which he would shorten, but he felt it was necessary to report on his merits on behalf of the Organization.

Mr. Faber had been elected President of the CIML in 1994. He was in fact the second CIML President to come from the Netherlands. In this position he rendered outstanding services to the

Organization by spreading awareness of the significance of legal metrology to a growing number of OIML Members - of which, at present, there were 109. By continuous efforts he had succeeded in adapting the structure of the Organization to modern requirements. Under his Chairmanship, in 1994, preliminary discussions were begun for a possible merger between the OIML and the Metre Convention. Later, the roles of the President and the two Vice-Presidents had been redefined. A symposium *Metrology Activities in Developing Countries* had been held, and a seminar *Weighing Towards the Year 2000* organized. Also important was a Round Table discussion on the subject of confidence in type approvals for bilateral recognition and the MAA. The idea of the MAA had thus been initiated eight years previously and was now coming to fruition. The OIML Certificate System was prospering with, at that time, 300 issued Certificates; now there were about 1400. The Birkeland Study had provided new impulse for the long term policy of the Organization and contacts with ILAC and the WTO were also formed and deepened at that time. The OIML was now also collaborating in the JCDCMAS.

During the last four years, the OIML's accession to the WTO as Observer could be seen as an acknowledgement of the Organization's contribution to global input. The activities of the ten Technical Committees had needed to be evaluated, and new priorities assigned. Discussions for the MAA had turned out to be somewhat difficult, as had been seen in the last few hours also; but there was hope that the system could now be finalized. There had been full cooperation with the Metre Convention and ILAC; for instance, the work on the Law on Metrology was now finished. Policy papers, horizontal documents and strategy papers were in the process of preparation. The Birch study "Benefit of Legal Metrology for the Economy and Society" had been presented the previous year, and met with OIML approval.

Mr. Kochsiek invited Mr. Faber to the front of the room, saying that he had shown the success story that was OIML under his Presidency. He asked him to accept his words and sincere thanks for the important and successful work he had done. Mr. Faber was presented with a Medal and a personal gift.

Mr. Faber thanked Members. He said that the burden of making speeches would henceforth fall upon Alan Johnston and not upon himself. Nevertheless, he thanked Members for the medal and gift, saying that he looked back on his OIML career with much pleasure and gratitude. As his friends in the Organization already knew, it was not the last time he would be present, because the OIML was an essential part of his life, which meant that he would follow all its activities, from a certain distance but very carefully, which meant that he hoped to continue to keep in touch for many years to come.

Mr. Kochsiek said that he now had the pleasure of rewarding three other colleagues. The first of these, taken in alphabetical order, was Mr. Anthony.

After graduating as a Weights and Measures Inspector in the UK, Mr. Anthony had begun work in 1971 in the Weights and Measures Office in the City of Birmingham, and later as an officer in West Midlands. In 2002 he had gone on to become a Fellow of the Institute of Trading Standards and Administration. During his career, in which he gained strong experience in legal metrology, and especially in the very important aspects of the use of measuring instruments, in 1978 Mr. Anthony had joined one of the most important manufacturers of weighing instruments, where he continued to work on the quality of measurements. His responsibilities in this international company were numerous, and included, to name but a few: Metrology Supervisor; Quality Assurance Manager; and International Approval and Compliance Manager.

Mr. Anthony's involvement in international work in legal metrology had been quite important as well as effective and positive, and he had always played a prominent role in representing the Weighing Instrument Federations, both National and European, in all international work, with the European Commission, with WELMEC and with the OIML.

Mr. Kochsiek invited Mr. Anthony to come up. He informed delegates that Mr. Anthony had been the Chairman of the Legal Metrology Group of CECIP, the European Confederation of Weighing Instrument Manufacturers for more than ten years, and also secretary of the CECIP Business and

Trade Group. In these positions he had always contrived to reach the best possible consensus; he had also made many positive contributions to OIML work.

Accepting the Medal, Mr. Anthony told Delegates that he felt as though he had won an Oscar in Hollywood! To be honored in such a way by such an august body as the OIML was indeed something he had never expected. He was not sure he deserved to be ranked at the same level, or, at any rate, to receive the same medal as Mr. Faber. It had been a pleasure to work with the OIML and would a pleasure to continue to do so.

Mr. Kochsiek then turned his attention to Mr. Brinkmann, saying that he had been born in 1937, and had received his University degree in Physics in 1963 and his PhD in 1966 on the generation of high intensity ultrasonic waves and phonometers in non linear acoustics. Acoustics was the key word to bear in mind. Mr. Brinkman had worked for forty years at the PTB, Germany's National Metrology Institute, initially in a laboratory for acoustics, finally as head of a division with a diverse scientific and technical cross section of tasks. His main activities and interests always lay in acoustics and especially in acoustics standardization. He was still active in this field, as Chairman of ISO TC 43 *Acoustics*. He had also chaired various Technical Committees in a number of international organizations. In the OIML, for example, he had chaired the Secretariat of TC 13, *Measuring instruments for acoustics and vibration*, and in IEC, the Technical Committee *Electro-acoustics*.

Mr. Brinkmann's first contact with OIML technical work had been in 1976, and in 1978 he had begun work with audiometers in the former SP14. Having insight into the work of different Committees and Organizations, he had been the first to realize the need for harmonization of OIML Recommendations and IEC Standards, and actively to pursue cooperation between the OIML and the IEC in the field of acoustics standardization.

Mr. Kochsiek then called upon Mr. Brinkmann to go up to receive his Medal.

Accepting the award, Mr. Brinkmann told the President and Delegates that he felt greatly honored by it, but that, on the other hand, his work with this Organization over more than twenty years had given him great pleasure. Especially during his Chairmanship, or Secretary's work in TC 13, it had been his main goal to organize the work as effectively as possible. His idea had therefore been to bring as close together as possible the two International Organizations which had been active at that time in the field of specifications of electro-acoustics instruments, which were the IEC and the OIML. Both Organizations had accepted this intention very well and both had greatly benefited from the cooperation. OIML could simply refer all the technical work to the IEC, and the IEC took much more notice of metrology aspects than previously. This willingness to cooperate had given Mr. Brinkmann much pleasure and led to his being able, in the field of acoustics, to issue Recommendations with a double logo, IEC and OIML. He would like to suggest that this route might be followed by other TCs.

Mr. Kochsiek then introduced the fourth person to be awarded a Medal. Mr. Onoda, from Japan, had joined the manufacturer Kimmon in 1958 and become Technical Director in 1961, just as Japan joined the OIML. He had had contacts with the OIML since 1962, which was more than forty years, when he had visited the BIML in Paris for the first time. Mr. Onoda had had a brilliant career, in the course of which he had received many honors from Japan. To give a full description would take too long; Mr. Kochsiek would mention only one or two outstanding elements: in 1976, Mr. Onoda had become President of the Japan Gas Meter Association and Vice-President of the Japan Water Meter Industry Association, a post which he still held. In 1984 he had been appointed President of the Japanese Weights and Measures Association. In 1990 he had been appointed a member of the Board of Directors of the Japanese Institute of Invention and Innovation, which post he still held. Mr. Onoda had been an active and successful promoter of the SI system in Japan, and, among the numerous honors which had already been awarded to him, Mr. Kochsiek would mention but one: a letter of thanks from the Prime Minister for distinguished services to the Weights and Measures industry ten years previously. To make a list of all the OIML work in which Mr. Onoda had participated would take too long; but mention should be made of his active participation in work on water meters since 1977; on weighing instruments and electronic

instruments since 1983; and on gas and water meters since 1986. The OIML was grateful to Mr. Onoda for his eminent contribution to the Organization.

In the absence of Mr. Onoda, Mr. Kochsiek asked Mr. Tanaka to receive the medal.

On behalf of Mr. Onoda, Mr. Tanaka told delegates that he was sure his colleague was sincerely grateful for the award; and his Japanese colleagues were very pleased by this acknowledgement of their contribution to OIML work; they were also happy to see how much Mr. Onoda enjoyed this type of activities as a delegate of Japanese Societies. He was very sure that the Japanese would find this award most encouraging in their contribution to OIML activities. He thanked the President and Members.

Mr. Kochsiek next invited the Vice-President Mr. Issaev to present the Letters of Appreciation.

Before moving on to this stage of proceedings, Mr. Issaev wished to add a couple of words to the tribute to Mr. Onoda: anyone who had been in Kyoto in 2003, he said, would remember his passion for photography; he was a professional Master of Photography. The award to him was therefore very pleasing, and Mr. Issaev added his best wishes.

Concerning the Letters of Appreciation, Mr. Issaev informed Delegates that it had been decided that three persons' contribution should be marked in this way, by receiving letters signed by Mr. Kochsiek. In alphabetical order, the first person to receive this mark of appreciation was Mr. Gupta, from India.

Having studied Physics and Mathematics at University, Mr. Gupta had joined the National Physical Laboratory in New Delhi in the 1950's and been placed in the division of Weights and Measures. For almost four decades he had been associated with the areas of mass, volume, density and viscosity measurements. In the late 70s, as Director of Weights and Measures for the Ministry of Civil Supply and Cooperation in the Government of India, he had undertaken projects as an expert and adviser to the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Cooperation and UNIDO. He had produced a large number of metrology related publications and articles, including an Expert Report for the OIML *Verification of commercial weights*, OIML E 3.

Mr. Issaev added that it gave him great pleasure to congratulate Mr. Gupta and to thank him for his contribution to international legal metrology. He knew that nobody from India was present, so the only way of getting the Letter of Appreciation to Mr. Gupta would be for the Bureau to send it by mail.

The second Letter of Appreciation marked the achievements of Mrs. Vytolskaya, from Russia. Mrs. Vytolskaya had graduated from the Moscow Institute of Economics and Statistics and since 1956 she had been working in the Metrology Department of Mr. Issaev's own Institute, the VNIIMS, the Russian Metrology Service. Speaking fluent English and French, she had worked since 1967 as the main expert on issues relating to International Cooperation and had supervised OIML activities in the USSR and later in Russia, during which time she had participated in the preparation and organization of a large number of meetings of OIML Technical Bodies. In 2001, as some Members might remember, she had been the head of the Russian Technical Secretariat of the 36th CIML Meeting in Moscow. During her career she had been given the Merit in Standardization award, and had also received numerous official Diplomas and expressions of gratitude. She was very active in offering assistance and consultation to all Russian Metrology Institutes, of which there were ten, which carried out Secretariat duties of OIML TCs and SCs in which Russia was involved.

It was also, therefore, Mr. Issaev's great pleasure to congratulate Mrs. Vytolskaya on her achievements and to thank her for her contribution to international legal metrology.

Mr. Issaev asked Mrs. Vytolskaya to come forward.

Mrs. Vytolskaya, expressing her gratitude for the Letter of Appreciation, said that she was very happy to have worked virtually all her professional life in the exciting and excellent world of metrology.

Mr. Issaev then informed the Meeting that the third and final recipient of a Letter of Appreciation was Mr. Wünsche. Mr. Wünsche had already retired in May of the previous year after thirty eight years of highly successful work in the field of testing and certification of automatic weighing instruments at the PTB. He had certainly been one of the most experienced and universally respected experts in the manifold field of automatic weighing technology. He had promoted important developments over the last two decades, such as mobile weighing with shovel dozers and refuse vehicles or in motion weighing with road vehicle instruments. Due to his extensive practical experience, theoretical competence, sense of duty and remarkable farsightedness as regards international development, he had been intensively involved in the development of the six existing OIML Recommendations, R 50, 51, 61, 106, 107 and 134. These six Recommendations formed the basis for fifteen per cent of OIML Certificates. Mr. Wünsche's input had been very important, and Mr. Issaev had great pleasure in congratulating him and thanking him for his contributions to international legal metrology. He knew that Mr. Wünsche was absent but asked his Chief, Mr. Schwartz, to accept the Letter of Appreciation on his colleague's behalf. (Applause) Mr. Schwartz accepted the Letter of Appreciation on behalf of Mr. Wünsche, saying that they had worked together for a long time and it would give him great pleasure to pass it on to his former colleague. Mr. Wünsche's contribution to OIML Recommendations for automatic weighing instruments had indeed been great and Mr. Schwartz was pleased to have been given this agreeable task.

10.2 Election of the CIML President and First Vice-President

Mr. Kochsiek asked Mr. Magaña to explain the situation which had prevailed since the 38th CIML Meeting in Kyoto.

Mr. Magaña reminded Members of the procedure for the election. Following the previous year's meeting the President had decided that a call should be made for candidates to the Presidency of the CIML. The Bureau had sent a letter on behalf of the President to all CIML Members, asking for candidates and setting a deadline. There had initially been two candidates for President, but one had been obliged to withdraw, leaving a single candidate. There were two candidates for the Vice Presidency. Members had received a letter during the summer reminding them of the procedure and naming and giving information on the candidates for both elections. The candidates had already given their presentations.

Mr. Kochsiek appointed Honorary Member Mr. Birch and Past President Mr. Faber to count the votes, which Bureau staff collected from Delegates. Mr. Kochsiek announced the result: 49 "yes" votes, 1 "no" and 4 abstentions. He congratulated Mr. Johnston on this good result and declared him President Elect.

Mr. Johnston, in accepting the post, said that he had not been aware that he was nervous until Chris Pulham passed by without handing him a ballot paper! At that point he had realized that it was important to him to win the position; he thanked Members for their vote of confidence in him. It was an honor for him to have received so many votes and he felt honored to accept the post. He reminded Members that Mr. Kochsiek had agreed to remain as acting President until the CIML Meeting in Lyon in June 2005, and he looked forward to working with him over the intervening months in order to ensure a seamless transition to his new responsibilities. He had already explained his priorities to Members and would only mention three of these at the present time; these were:

- To develop the OIML Long Term Plan and Action Plan;
- To ensure that the MAA received the care and attention that it deserved in order to assure its success; and
- To try to slow down when speaking in public, as this was something he found difficult!

In conclusion, Mr. Johnston thanked Members for electing him, Mr. Faber for his support, and Mr. Kochsiek and the PTB and the BIML for organizing the meeting, which he was much enjoying. He asked delegates to applaud the organizers.

Mr. Kochsiek next asked Mr. Magaña to clarify the situation regarding the election for First Vice-President.

Mr. Magaña explained that two countries had departed but had left proxy votes. There were two candidates, Mr. Ehrlich, USA and Mrs. Todorova, Bulgaria, who had already given their presentations. As the outcome of the votes did not allow a decision to be made according to the rules of the Convention, Mr. Johnston asked Mr. Kochsiek to remain as First Vice-President until the Meeting in Lyon, at which time another election would be held.

In view of the emergency situation, Mr. Kochsiek agreed to do so. He added that it was the convention for the office holder to continue in this way, and it was to be hoped that there would be a successful election the following year. The same arrangement had been made the previous year in Kyoto. He asked for alternative solutions, but none was offered.

11 Twelfth International Legal Metrology Conference

11.1 Examination of the decisions made by the Conference

Mr. Kochsiek suggested that this item should be brief, because the decisions had all been discussed in detail at the Conference and it made no sense to repeat them.

Mr. Magaña explained to Delegates that it was customary, following the Conference, for the Committee to pass a Resolution taking note of the decisions of the Conference and expressing its intention to implement them. This would be found among the Resolutions of the Committee.

12 Future meetings

12.1 40th CIML Meeting in 2005

Mr. Kochsiek reminded Delegates that the date and location for this Meeting had already been agreed. Mr. Lagauterie was asked to take the floor to give some information about it.

Mr. Lagauterie said that he took pleasure in informing Members that they would be the guests of the French Government in Lyon in June 2005, under the patronage of the French President. Mr. Lagauterie invited Members to understand from this gesture the high level of support of the French Government for OIML activities and legal metrology. He hoped to see all present in Lyon the following year.

Mr. Magaña added some details about the forthcoming occasion. The Meeting would be held in the large International Congress Centre in Lyon. He showed a slide of the building, which could be seen to be adjacent to an attractive park. The Meeting would be held in conjunction with the International Metrology Congress, about which Members had seen information through links on the OIML web site. Lyon was pleasingly situated between two rivers and was one of the oldest French industrial cities. Industrial automation for textile making had been invented there; it was an ancient city, the capital of old Gaul; it was the capital of French gastronomy and of Beaujolais wine; in short, Mr. Magaña was sure that Members would enjoy it.

The Metrology Congress would take place just after the CIML Meeting, which would end on Monday at the end of the morning session. That same afternoon, there would be a preliminary OIML session of the Congress, with some presentations which had been received. It would be largely focused on rather specialized issues of legal metrology but would be of interest to Members. That evening there would be an OIML reception and the OIML Anniversary celebrations and opening of the Congress, all combined.

On the Tuesday morning, the main Congress would begin, with another legal metrology session, this time on subjects of more general interest. Congress was normally attended by about 500 people from many countries as well as from industry and laboratories, which might be known to some Members and which was somewhat similar to NCSLI; and on this occasion it was proposed to invite manufacturers who held OIML Certificates to participate in the exhibition, because this would be a good opportunity for manufacturers to show their products to the large number of CIML Members who would be present. Mr. Magaña recommended Members to speak to manufacturers in their countries and tell them that it would be in their interest to exhibit at this event, which would gather people from about a hundred countries.

The Bureau had decided, if Members approved, to pay the registration fee for the Congress for one person from each Member State and Corresponding Member, while up to two other representatives of Member States would pay a discounted rate of 400 Euros instead of 700. The Congress would last three days; the program had been finalized in the last few days and more information would soon be available. Members wishing to take advantage of the discounted rate should do so through the Bureau. There would be a number of very interesting presentations, not only in the legal metrology session but also with legal metrology implications in other sessions.

Mr. Kochsiek thanked Mr. Lagauterie and Mr. Magaña for the invitation and for their additional remarks, and invited questions from the floor.

Mr. Vaucher asked for deadline dates for submitting papers to this event.

Mr. Magaña thought that this had been in the previous June, but that other drafts and proposals for papers had been received up to the end of August. There were now a large number of these, and Mr. Magaña, who was a member of the Organizing Committee for the Congress, had asked for the planned one legal metrology session to be expanded to two, but unfortunately time would not allow for this. Members who wished to discuss the possibility of additional presentations might contact Mr. Magaña, but it would probably be difficult to fit in any more.

Mr. Kochsiek said that he had with him fifteen summaries of proposed Poster Sessions and Plenary Sessions dealing with legal metrology which interested members might consult; they might also approach him with ideas for future presentations.

12.2 41st CIML Meeting (2006)

As had been announced the previous year in Kyoto, there was an offer from South Africa, and today approval had to be given for a 41st CIML Meeting in Cape Town.

At the invitation of Mr. Kochsiek, Mr. Carstens informed Delegates that the Meeting would be held in the first or second week of October 2006, in a newly built Conference Centre in Cape Town and the adjacent Sheraton Hotel, which also had excellent facilities.

13 Other matters

Mr. Kochsiek announced that Israel had offered to host the 42nd CIML Meeting in 2007. He had heard that another country might be making an offer and he paused to allow an opportunity for this offer to be made to the Meeting; however, no offer was made. No decision needed be taken until the following year.

13.1 Draft procedure for the selection of the BIML Director and Assistant Directors

Mr. Kochsiek asked Mr. Magaña to present to Members the draft procedure he had been drawing up.

Mr. Magaña explained that his contract would end at the end of 2005 and that of Assistant Director Mr. Szilvássy in 2007. Mr. Magaña proposed that the procedure used for his own selection should be used again. This consisted of:

- Call for candidates;
- Selection Committee appointed by CIML meets and makes a proposal;
- President puts proposal to CIML.

Mr. Magaña proposed that the above method of selection be used in the future for the appointment of Directors and Assistant Directors. This procedure had not previously existed in writing, which was the reason for presenting the present draft document to the Meeting for adoption.

At Mr. Kochsiek's request for comments, Mr. Lagauterie asked whether it was possible under this procedure for several candidates to be proposed to the Meeting.

Mr. Magaña replied that, as under the provisions made for the selection in 2000, the more normal situation was for a sole candidate to be chosen by the President and Selection Committee, but there was the possibility in exceptional circumstances of offering two candidates; however, it was felt in principle that the Selection Committee, who had heard the candidates' presentations and conducted interviews with them, were in a better position to make the choice.

There being no further comments, Mr. Kochsiek proposed the adoption of this draft procedure along with the other decisions at the end of the CIML Meeting.

In the absence of Bureau staff, the CIML Meeting held a short session on the subject of forthcoming appointments and reappointments of senior Bureau staff.

14 Adoption of decisions

The Committee adopted the following decisions.

Opening address

The Committee took note of the opening address delivered by its Acting President.

Roll-call - Quorum

The roll of Delegates was called. It was found that 54 Member States out of 59 were present or represented and that the statutory quorum of three quarters of the total number of CIML Members was therefore reached. The Committee also noted the participation of a number of Corresponding Members, Observer Countries, Liaison Institutions and Regional Legal Metrology Organizations, as well as the CIML Immediate Past President, one CIML Honorary Member and members of BIML Staff.

Approval of the agenda

The Committee approved the draft agenda without modification.

1 Approval of the minutes of the 38th CIML Meeting

The Committee approved the minutes of its 38th Meeting without modification.

2 Member States and Corresponding Members

2.1 Situation of certain Members

The Committee noted that Zambia had been struck off the list of Member States, following the decisions made at the 38th CIML Meeting.

The Committee noted that a number of countries were in the process of, or were envisaging joining the Organization as Member States or as Corresponding Members.

3 Financial matters

3.1 Adoption of the Auditor's report for 2002 and 2003

The Committee approved the Auditor's report for 2002 and 2003 and requested its Acting President and the BIML Director to submit it to the Conference.

3.2 Draft Revision of the OIML Financial Regulations

The Committee approved the Draft Revision of the OIML Financial Regulations and instructed its Acting President to submit it to the Conference.

4 Presidential Council activities

The Committee took note of a report from its Acting President concerning the activities of the Presidential Council since the last CIML Meeting.

5 BIML activities

The Committee took note of a report describing the activities of the Bureau since the last CIML Meeting.

6 Technical activities

6.1 Approval of International Documents

The Committee approved the following International Document:

- Revision of D 1 *Elements for a law on metrology*.

The Committee took note that the following International Documents and one Test Report Format had been approved by CIML postal vote since the 38th CIML Meeting and that the BIML would proceed with their publication:

- Revisions of D 9, D 11, D 14 and D 6/D 8;
- The new D 28 *Conventional value of the result of weighing in air* (reclassification of R 33);
- R 111-2 *Weights of classes E_p , E_2 , F_p , F_2 , M_p , M_{1-2} , M_2 , M_{2-3} and M_3 . Part 2: Test Report Format* (Edition 2004)

6.2 Examination of the situation of certain TCs/SCs

The Committee took note of a report from the BIML describing the situation of certain Technical Committees and Subcommittees.

The Committee approved the proposal to allocate the Secretariat of TC 6 to South Africa and TC 9/SC 3 to Germany.

The Committee noted firstly that the Secretariats of TC 8/SC 2 and TC 10/SC 3 were still vacant, and secondly that Germany wished to relinquish the Secretariat of TC 12. It asked Members to consider taking on responsibility for the Secretariats of these technical bodies.

The Committee approved two new working projects:

- Revision of R 99/ISO 3930 *Instruments for measuring vehicle exhaust emissions* as jointly proposed by TC 16/SC 1 and ISO TC 22/SC 5;
- New Recommendation on *Clinical infrared ear thermometers* as proposed by TC 18/SC 2.

The Committee set the deadline for issuing Certificates according to the 1996 edition of R 61 to 31 December 2005 and requested Issuing Authorities to notify the BIML about their readiness to issue Certificates according to the requirements of the revised R 61 (2004), since R 61-1 had already been published and the publication of R 61-2 (2004) was imminent.

Note: The transformation requirements for Certificates issued against the 1996 edition (*Supplement* to OIML R 61 *Automatic gravimetric filling instruments*) have been drawn up by TC 9/SC 2 according to the decision of the 38th CIML Meeting and will be applicable as soon as approved and published.

6.3 Implementation of the MAA

The Committee took note of a report on the Workshop held on Sunday 24 October, and approved the proposed decisions annexed to these decisions.

The Committee instructed TC 3/SC 5 and the Bureau to start a revision of B 3 and B 10 after some experience of the MAA had been gained.

The Committee took note of the draft schedule for the implementation of the MAA.

6.4 Other decisions related to the OIML Certificate System

The Committee decided that from 1 January 2005 OIML Issuing Authorities shall establish OIML Certificates in electronic format as defined by the BIML, so that these Certificates may be published on the OIML web site.

6.5 Miscellaneous

The Committee wished it to be noted that substantial interpretations of Recommendations and Documents are the responsibility of OIML Technical Committees and Subcommittees.

7 Developing Countries

The Committee took note of a report given by Mr. Seiler concerning the Forum *Metrology – Trade Facilitator* held on Monday 25 October and instructed the Bureau to organize the following-up of this Forum.

The Committee took note of a report given by Mr. Magaña on the activities and future of the OIML Development Council and expressed its utmost appreciation for the contributions of its Chairperson, Mrs. Annabi.

The Committee noted that OIML work on Developing Country matters could be more efficiently managed by the Permanent Working Group on Developing Countries as established by the 38th CIML Meeting; the PWGDC should replace the Development Council.

8 Coordination with the RLMOs

The Committee instructed its President and the Director of the Bureau to continue to liaise closely with RLMOs.

9 Twelfth International Conference of Legal Metrology

Agenda and program

The Committee endorsed the draft agenda and program for the Conference. It noted that Dr. Röhling would act as Conference Chairman and approved the proposal from the CIML Acting President to nominate Mrs. Annabi and Dr. Zhagora as Conference Vice-Presidents.

10 CIML Presidency

The Committee elected Mr. Alan E. Johnston (CIML Member for Canada) as its President for the next six years.

The elected President will take up his duties at the 40th CIML Meeting in 2005. The Acting President will pass the CIML Presidency over to the newly elected President at the opening of the 40th CIML Meeting. The term of the elected President will be six years and will end at the opening of the 46th CIML Meeting in 2011. The next election of a President will be organized at the 45th CIML Meeting in 2010 in order to allow the same transition period.

As the required majority of votes was not obtained, the Committee was unable to elect a First Vice-President.

The elected President asked Prof. Kochsiek to continue his role as CIML First Vice-President until the election of a new First Vice-President at the 40th CIML Meeting. This was approved by the CIML.

11 Twelfth International Conference of Legal Metrology

Examination of the decisions made by the Conference

The Committee took note of the decisions made by the Twelfth Conference and requested its Acting President, the Presidium and the Presidential Council to monitor their implementation and to report back at the next CIML Meeting.

12 Future meetings

12.1 40th CIML Meeting (2005)

The Committee thanked the French Government for its invitation to hold its 40th Meeting in Lyon, France, from 17 to 20 June 2005, in conjunction with the International Metrology Congress. The Committee noted that a gala reception would be organized on 20 June 2005 to celebrate the 50th Anniversary of the OIML.

The Committee also noted that legal metrology sessions would be organized by the Bureau during the International Metrology Congress and that the Bureau would pay the registration fee for one participant from each OIML Member State and Corresponding Member to attend this Congress.

12.2 41st CIML Meeting (2006)

The Committee accepted the invitation of South Africa for the 41st CIML Meeting and expressed its thanks to Mr. Carstens for this invitation.

13 Other matters

13.1 Director of the BIML

The Committee approved the Procedure for the selection of the BIML Director and Assistant Directors.

14 Adoption of decisions

The above-mentioned decisions were adopted.

ANNEX

Rules applicable to the implementation of the OIML MAA

1 Relation between the DoMCs and the former OIML Certificate System

- 1.1 When an Issuing Authority signs a Declaration of Mutual Confidence (DoMC) in the framework of the MAA, all OIML Certificates and associated test reports issued by this Issuing Authority for the considered category of instruments will then be issued under the particular conditions resulting from its participation in the DoMC. This Issuing Authority will not be allowed to continue to issue Certificates under the sole conditions of the OIML Certificate System.
- 1.2 OIML Certificates and associated test reports issued under the conditions of a DoMC will bear a specific OIML logo (to be defined by the BIML), affixed by the Issuing Authority and under its own responsibility. This logo will be the property of the OIML and its use will be authorized by the Bureau to these Issuing Authorities.
- 1.3 After a DoMC has been signed, the Bureau will propose at the next CIML Meeting to decide that for this category the OIML Certificate System will be applicable only by signatories of this DoMC and under the conditions of this DoMC. This should come into force on a date defined by the CIML.
- 1.4 OIML Certificates that have been issued prior to the establishment of the DoMC or during this transition period according to the previous rules, will continue to appear in the OIML databases published on the OIML web site.
- 1.5 OIML Certificates issued under the conditions of a DoMC will be recorded separately and will appear separately in the OIML databases published on the OIML web site.

2 Final provisions

These decisions will be applied for the implementation of the MAA and for the operation of the OIML Certificate System as of 1 January 2005.

TC 3/SC 5 will revise Publication B 3 (ex. P 1) *OIML Certificate System for Measuring Instruments* according to these decisions and will develop, if necessary, detailed regulations for the implementation of the MAA in order to submit them for CIML approval. ■