

Comments associated to the NL negative vote cast on the Draft VIML

At first stages of the project for revision of the VIML we were very captivated with the approach of the convener for having performed a profound study on all terminology in use in OIML documents in preparation of a draft.

During the meeting discussing the first committee draft the approach has been the ordering of terms and making choices on the most adequate related definitions to be implemented in the VIML where more than one definition for a same or similar term had been defined. At that time it was already made clear that the grammar of specific definitions could need some upgrading in order to prevent for misinterpretations, which in our view is especially of importance where the definition of the terms need to be translated for implementation into the member states legislation.

In our observation it was justified to give first priority to the completeness of this inventory and the selection of most adequate definitions for the terms. In fact the present draft vocabulary comprises the result of this inventory and selection.

During the further processing in the 2nd and 3rd draft it was observed that in his observations on the comments the convener tended not to support suggested grammatical corrections and improvements by several contributors, often using the argument that the specific definitions of terms has already been applied in many OIML Recommendations.

We would like to stress that for the following reasons in our opinion still a next step in the development is considered required.

- In the development of Recommendations it is of the utmost importance to try to minimize the time spent on discussions on definitions so that the experts can concentrate on discussing the technical aspects. This also accounts for the conveners efforts needed. For that the definitions need to be unambiguous.
- Like mentioned before the definitions will need to be implemented in legislation, which will require translation into the specific member state language. Therefore attention should be paid especially concerning a vocabulary on correctness of the English grammar.
- When interpreting the accepted 24th resolution of the CIML 2011 meeting the use of the exact definitions for the terms as specified in the vocabulary is made rather mandatory. In combination with the approach of non-revision of existing definitions this will in our vision ultimately lead to the blocking of any improvement in (grammar of) terminology, unless a new revision of the VIML is foreseen on short term.
- Last but not least: Unnecessary complex or even weird formulations of terminology will degrade the acceptance of OIML publications in the international standardisation community.

Taking into account the work done we regret to have to cast this negative vote for the above mentioned reasons and are open for any suggestion on resolving the drawback.