MINUTES
COMPTE RENDU

Fortieth Meeting of the International
Committee of Legal Metrology:
Lyon, France, 18–20 June 2005

Quarantième Réunion du Comité International de Métrologie Légale:
Lyon, France, 18–20 juin 2005

Minutes – 40th CIML Meeting (2005)

ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE
DE MÉTROLOGIE LÉGALE

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION
OF LEGAL METROLOGY

International Organization of Legal Metrology

Secretariat:
BUREAU INTERNATIONAL DE MÉTROLOGIE LÉGALE (BIML)
11, RUE TURGOT – 75009 PARIS – FRANCE

TEL: 33 (0)1 48 78 12 82
FAX: 33 (0)1 42 82 17 27
E-MAIL: biml@oiml.org
INTERNET: www.oiml.org

FORTIETH MEETING

of the

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF LEGAL METROLOGY

18–20 June 2005 - Lyon, France

The International Committee of Legal Metrology was convened by its Acting President,
Prof. Manfred Kochsiek, and met on 18–20 June 2005
at the Palais des Congrès, Lyon, France.

Contents

Attendance

Member States

ALBANIA
Mr. Bashkim Koçi ..... CIML Member
Ms. Majlinda Hoxha
Mr. Fatos Themelko

ALGERIA
Mr. Samir ..... CIML Member
Mr. Aomar Lechani

AUSTRALIA
Dr. Grahame Harvey ..... CIML Member
Dr. Adrian Caster

AUSTRIA
Dr. Arnold Leitner ..... CIML Member
Mr. Gerald Freistetter

BELARUS
Mr. Nicolai Zhagora

BELGIUM
Mr. Romain Eggermont ..... CIML Member

BULGARIA
Mrs. Ani Todorova ..... CIML Member
Mr. Valentin Starev
Ms. Kristina Petkova
Mr. Ivan Machulekov

CAMEROON
Mr. Hans Ela Essi ..... CIML Member
Mr. Roger Tchapet
Mr. Luc Bienvenu Magloire
Mr. Mbarga Atangana
Mr. Jackai Derrick Mosima

CANADA
Mr. Alan Johnston ..... CIML President
Mr. Gilles Vinet

CHINA
Mr. Li Chuanqing
Ms. Kong Xiaokang
Mr. Xuan Xiang
Mrs./Mr. Zhang Yue
Mr. Xu Xinjian

CROATIA
Dr. Vladimir Pašagic
Dr. Marijan Andrašec
Mr. Zeyko Poturica

CUBA
Mr. Martin Antuñez Ramirez ..... CIML Member

CYPRUS
Mr. Georgios Tsiartzázis ..... CIML Member

CZECH REPUBLIC
Mr. Pavel Klenovský ..... CIML Member
Mr. Vladimir Ludvik

DENMARK
Mr. Poul Claudi Johansen ..... CIML Member

FINLAND
Mr. Tuomo Valkeapää ..... CIML Member

FRANCE
Mr. Gérard Lagauterie ..... CIML Member
Mrs. Corinne Lagauterie
Mr. Jean-Yves Durel

GERMANY
Pr. Dr. Manfred Kochsiek ..... CIML Vice-President
Dr. Klaus-Dieter Sommer
Dr. Roman Schwartz
Dr. Eberhard Seiler
Dr. Wilfried Schulz

HUNGARY
Dr. Péter Pákay ..... CIML Member
Mr. Károly Schmalhofer

INDIA
Mr. P.A. Krishnamoorthy ..... CIML Member

INDONESIA
Mr. Amir Saharuddin Sjahrial ..... CIML Member
Mr. Hari Prawoko
Mr. Wahyu Hidayat

IRAN
Mr. Abbas Akhavan

IRELAND
Mr. Patrick Farragher ..... CIML Member

ISRAEL
Mr. Timor Zarin ..... CIML Member
Ms. Hanah Tiri

JAPAN
Dr. Yukinobu Miki ..... CIML Member
Mr. Toru Kojima
Ms. Akemi Nishio
Dr. Masahiro Okaji
Dr. Akira Ooiwa
Mrs. Hiroe Sakai

KAZAKHSTAN
Mr. Gabit Mukhambetov
Mrs. Marina Mussenova
Mr. Galymzhan Dugalov
Mr. Bakytkan Kunafiyanov

KOREA (D.P.R.)
Mr. Kyong Ho Kim
Dr. Kwang Ho Kim

KOREA (R.)
Mr. Yoo-Tae Jun ..... CIML Member
Mr. Rak-Hoon Jeong
Dr. Jong-Oh Choi
Mr. Oh Yong Kwon

MACEDONIA (The Former Yugoslav Republic of)
Mr. Danco Pendovski ..... CIML Member
Mr. Ljupco Dimov

MONACO
Dr. André Veglia ..... CIML Member

MOROCCO
Mr. Brahim Yahyaoui

THE NETHERLANDS
Dr. Cees van Mullem ..... CIML Member
Mr. Gep Engler
Ms. Anneke van Spronssen

NEW ZEALAND
Mr. Tony Lee ..... CIML Member

NORWAY
Dr. Helge Kildal ..... CIML Member

PAKISTAN
Mr. Tafseer Ahmed Khan

POLAND
Mrs. Barbara Lisowska ..... CIML Member

PORTUGAL
Mr. José Cartaxo Reis ..... CIML Member

RUSSIAN FEDERATION
Pr. Dr. Lev Issaev ..... CIML Vice-President
Dr. Sergey Kononogov
Dr. Vasily Mardin
Dr. Vladimir Krutikov
Mr. Alexander Vishenkov

SAUDI ARABIA
Mr. Khaled Y. Al-Khalaf ..... CIML Member

SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO
Dr. Zoran Marković ..... CIML Member

SLOVAKIA
Mr. Jozef Orlovský ..... CIML Member
Mr. Ivan Mikulecký
Mr. Jaromir Markovic

SLOVENIA
Ms. Natasa Mejak Vukovic
Mr. Matjaz Korosec
Dr. Radovan Sernec

SOUTH AFRICA
Mr. Stuart Carstens ..... CIML Vice-President
Mr. Jaco Marneweck
Mr. Mokgethi Mabalane

SPAIN
Mr. Jose A. Robles
Mr. Jose L. Manchado

SRI LANKA
Mr. K.A. Gunasoma ..... CIML Member

SWEDEN
Mr. Kari Björkqvist ..... CIML Member

SWITZERLAND
Dr. Bruno Vaucher ..... CIML Member
Dr. Philippe Richard

TANZANIA
Mr. A.H.M. Tukai ..... CIML Member

TUNISIA
Mrs. Ghaïet-El-Mouna Annabi ..... CIML Member
Mr. Mourad Ben Hassine
Mr. Mohamed Laouini

TURKEY
Dr. Atilla Sahin ..... CIML Member
Dr. Temel Yalcin
Mr. Seyit Sedat Ömerbeyoglu

UNITED KINGDOM
Dr. Jeff Llewellyn ..... CIML Member
Mr. John Goulding

UNITED STATES
Dr. Charles Ehrlich ..... CIML Member
Mr. Steven Cook
Mr. Stephen Patoray

VIET NAM
Mr. Pham Ngoc Tran ..... CIML Member
Mr. Nguyen Hung Diep
Mr. Bui Quy Long

Corresponding Members

BENIN
Mr. Osseni Loukoumanou

BURKINA FASO
Mr. Oumarou Yankine

CHINESE TAIPEI
Mr. Bo-Chang Su
Mr. Neng-Jong Lin

FIJI
Mr. Anare Vadei

JORDAN
Mr. Osama Melhem

LITHUANIA
Mr. Viktoras Zabolotnas
Mr. Osvaldas Staugaitis

MALTA
Mr. Francis Farrugia

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC
Mr. Hassan Sahloul
Mr. Khaled Osman

UKRAINE
Mr. Sergiy V. Pronenko

ZAMBIA
Mr. Kimon Zulu

CIML Immediate Past President
Mr. Gerard Faber ..... CIML Immediate Past President

CIML Honorary Members
Mr. John Birch ..... CIML Honorary Member
Mr. Samuel Chappell ..... CIML Honorary Member

Liaisons
Dr. Rainer Köhler ..... BIPM
Mrs. Veronika Martens ..... CECIP
Mr. Martin Stoll ..... CECIP
Mr. Michel Turpain ..... CECIP
Mr. Bernhard Mertens ..... CENELEC
Dr. Seton Bennett ..... EUROMET
Dr. Rashid Bin Fahad ..... GSO
Mr. Karim Solaibeekh ..... GSO
Mr. Patrick Reposeur ..... ILAC / IAF
Mrs. Karolina Havrilla ..... IMEKO
Pr. Dr. Léo Van Biesen ..... IMEKO
Mr. Darren Saywell ..... International Water Association
Mr. Alan Bryden ..... ISO
Mr. Otto Loesener-Diaz ..... UNIDO

Observer
Dr. John Ndanusa Akanya ..... Nigeria

BIML

Mr. Jean-François Magaña ..... Director
Mr. Attila Szilvássy ..... Assistant Director
Mr. Ian Dunmill ..... Assistant Director
Mrs. Régine Gaucher ..... Project Leader (MAA)
Mr. Chris Pulham ..... Editor
Mrs. Patricia Saint-Germain ..... Office Manager
Mr. Jean-Christophe Esmiol ..... Systems Engineer

Opening address by Prof. Manfred Kochsiek

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is my pleasure to welcome you here to this 40th Meeting of our Committee, and I thank you in advance for your participation, which I am sure will be as positive, as fruitful as ever. It is also an honor for me to welcome about 170 delegates, observers, guests to the city of Lyon, where we have already had several meetings this week, such as the Committee on Participation Review for the Mutual Acceptance Arrangement, the Permanent Working Group on Developing Countries, a new Working Group on Conformity to Type and a Presidential Council Meeting. In the next few days we will be celebrating not only the 40th Meeting of the International Committee but also the 50th Anniversary of the OIML, and we are involved with several sessions in the 12th International Metrology Congress.

Last year some countries expressed an interest in becoming OIML Member States or Corresponding Members, so today I am pleased to welcome some new Members:

- Turkey has changed from Corresponding Member to Member State;
- We have three new Corresponding Members: Kyrgyzstan, Qatar and Tajikistan; and Zambia has moved from a Member State to a Corresponding Member.

So now there are 60 Member States and 53 Corresponding Members.

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

- Ms. Biserka Mladinic, from Croatia;
- Dr. Yukinobu Miki from Japan;
- Mr. Francis Kamau from Kenya;
- Mr. Tony Lee from New Zealand;
- Mr. Abdul Ghaffar Soomro from Pakistan; and
- Dr. Atilla Sahin from Turkey.

Mr. Drissi from Algeria has replaced the former CIML Member Mr. Boudissa, but up to now his formal designation as CIML Member has not been sent to us by the Algerian Government.

On Monday we will be celebrating the 50th Anniversary of our Organization. On several occasions we reflect on the development, and I will start my opening address with some information on its development.

Already before 1913, that is over 90 years ago, the 5th General Conference on Weights and Measures, which is the decision-making body of the Metre Convention, had discussed the proposal to establish a new international organization for resolving the problems raised by the use of measuring instruments.

At that time, verification in a lot of countries was already developed quite well, and differences between national regulations for measuring instruments subject to legal metrology control disturbed free flow of trade with this measuring harmonization. It was only in 1933 that the 8th General Conference on Weights and Measures commissioned the International Committee to establish a Consultative Committee for Practical Metrology.

Hereupon the International Conference of Practical and Legal Metrology was convened by the French government. The main output of the discussions was to create a Provisional Committee of Legal Metrology, which should have met for the first time in 1938. Due to the occurrences prior to the Second World War, during the War and after the War, it was only in 1950 that it was able to meet for the first time. The layout of a Convention establishing an International Organization of Legal Metrology was developed and submitted to the diplomatic representatives in Paris in 1952. It would come into force after 23 states had signed in 1955.

The First International Conference of the International Organization of Legal Metrology was held in 1956.

The first preliminary Recommendations about weights and commercial weighing instruments were ready to be adopted by the Second International Conference.

During the first years the classical fields of verification (length, mass and volume measurement) were dealt with, but in the course of time main emphasis has been put on new fields of activity. For the past 20 years these have been the

fields of medical measuring instruments, measuring instruments for environmental protection and radiation protection, all of them taking into account the latest developments in the field of electronics and statistical test procedures.

Since 1955, the OIML has grown and produced numerous documents and systems to facilitate mutual confidence and recognitions.

The growth of the OIML can also be demonstrated by other parameters such as the number of Member States. The OIML membership includes Member States, which are countries that participate actively in technical activities, and Corresponding Members, which are countries that join the OIML as observers.

In 1956 there were 22 signatory states, one less than the year before; in 1968 there were already 36 Member States, and 30 years later in 1986 the OIML comprised 51 Member States and 27 Corresponding Members. Now, as already mentioned, in 2005 the OIML has 60 Member States and 53 Corresponding Members and is still growing.

In 1956 there existed no publications at all; at the time of the Third OIML Conference held in Paris in 1968, 18 Recommendations had already been approved, 8 were at the level of final drafts and 33 texts were being developed within the relevant Technical Secretariats.

Up to 1987, 75 International Recommendations (model regulations) and 16 International Documents (informative documents) had been issued, and now 114 International Recommendations are in force and there are 28 International Documents, plus a number of other publications (Vocabularies, Guides and Expert Reports).

A System for issuing OIML Certificates of Conformity of measuring instruments was set up in 1991 and now covers more than 40 categories of measuring instruments. This System is being complemented by a Mutual Acceptance Arrangement (the OIML MAA) whose implementation is now beginning.

This brief outline of the foundation and history of the OIML as well as a 50 year story of success should stimulate further considerations in the next few days.

Coming now to a short review of the last year since the 39th Committee Meeting and 12th Conference in Berlin, first of all I want to mention a new Long Term Strategy, the Action Plan for several years and the Work Program for one year, which will be discussed later on. Another important subject will be the ongoing development of the MAA; as already mentioned, this week we had a successful meeting of the CPR whose objective was to make the MAA a useful operational tool for the globalization of legal metrology.

Another important point which has started and will be continued in the next year is a review of Technical Committees and Subcommittees and several projects. Also, closer cooperation with regional organizations continued. Under the leadership of Mr. Magaña, the effectiveness of the Bureau has improved considerably. The intensification of electronic communication, including an up to date web site, facilitated and speeded up the exchange of information and ideas. The renovation of the OIML building and its adaptation to a growing need for space is a further step forward. However, we will have to consider how we can make the OIML more effective with regard to its working procedures. In this context, we are looking forward to your ideas and suggestions. They will be highly appreciated and implemented wherever possible. I am sure that this positive development will continue under the leadership of the new President, Mr. Johnston, and the Vice President we will elect during this meeting.

So, at the end of my opening address I thank all of you for your support and cooperation, especially Alan Johnston, the President Elect, and Mr. Magaña and his staff for all their support during my nearly two years as Acting CIML President.

So with the following handshake I pass the Presidency to Alan Johnston. ■

Opening address by Mr. Alan E. Johnston

Policies and Priorities

Good morning, bonjour.

Welcome to the beautiful city of Lyon. I hope you will have the opportunity to enjoy the activities that we have planned this week and also to enjoy the city of Lyon. I would like to give you a little piece of advice, though: when you visit Old Lyon, there is a tram that takes you to the top of the hill; my wife and I only discovered this when we walked to the top of the hill, and it took us several hours to recover! If you need further instructions please see me after the meeting this morning and I'll help you out.

I would like to begin by thanking Manfred Kochsiek for his dual role over the last two years as President and First Vice President. I have worked closely with Manfred since the meeting in Berlin; I have learned a lot from him and over the course of the last nine months we have had the opportunity to work together on various issues. One of the concerns I had was whether or not Manfred and I would see eye to eye on most things or whether we would be at opposite ends of the spectrum. I am pleased to say that, for the most part, we agreed on the activities that we had to work together on - I am sure that Jean-François Magaña may not have thought so on occasions when he received emails from Manfred and myself, but this has made the transition very easy for me and I look forward to continuing to receive counsel from Manfred. I have asked Manfred to stay at the front of the room for the entire meeting to show my respect for his capacity, both as the representative for Germany and for his long, long service to the OIML.

Somebody asked what my priorities were going to be during my term as President: I will get into them very briefly but most of the items that I will be talking about we will be discussing at this meeting. Mr. Kochsiek has already mentioned a number of them, such as the Mutual Acceptance Arrangement; we are looking for ways to expedite the work of the Technical Committees; I would like to work with Mr. Magaña and his team in terms of ensuring that the services provided by the OIML Secretariat are relevant and meet your needs - if they do not meet your needs, then we will have to look at how we can improve. I think he is doing an excellent job and I would also like to thank him and his team at this point for the work they have done in organizing this meeting, and also the 50th Anniversary of the OIML and the work that he has done in relation to the International Metrology Congress.

In 1821, John Quincy Adams, who was an American Secretary of State, wrote the following about the importance of metrology:

"Weights and Measures may be ranked among the necessities of life to every individual of human society. They enter into the economic arrangements and daily concerns of every family. They are necessary to ensure every occupation in human industry; to the distribution and security of every species of property; and to ensure transaction of trade and commerce."

Now, that was 1821. You could read this today and I think that everything in there is still relevant. Today the issues are the difficulty of making governments recognize the importance of legal metrology and of metrology in general; it is not "sexy" and it does not usually win too many votes. I know that, talking to my colleagues around the world, most of them are experiencing a reduction in resources, and pressure from their governments to privatize, to involve the private sector more in metrology. There is nothing wrong with that, but I think the role for the OIML will be to ensure that we can provide you with whatever information you need in order to convince your governments of the importance of legal metrology and to ensure that we continue to have a viable system worldwide. We are moving towards this through the development of the MAA, through various regional meetings and regional organizations; but it will be extremely important for me and for the OIML to continue to demonstrate the relevance of legal metrology. How we do this will be on a case by case basis, but I look forward to providing any assistance

I can in terms of this kind of information.

There are many other things that we will be doing over the course of the next two or three days, and Mr. Kochsiek has already touched on the issues that we will be discussing. So I decided that in the interests of brevity this morning I will not repeat them. I would encourage you, though, throughout the day to come and talk to me if you have any issues you would like to discuss. I will make myself available throughout this meeting and I will be here for most of the International Metrology Congress.

In closing, I would like of course to thank you all for your confidence in electing me in Berlin. I hope that I can demonstrate to your satisfaction that I am worthy of the job and I look forward to representing the OIML in the future. Thank you very much for your time. ■

Fortieth Meeting

of the

International Committee of Legal Metrology

– Minutes –

Introductory remarks

Mr. Magaña welcomed Members to the Fortieth Meeting of the International Committee of Legal Metrology, noting that there had been a good attendance the previous year in Berlin (due to the Conference and the special effort made by the German Government) and that this year, because of the special Fiftieth Anniversary celebration, some 170 Members, delegates, observers and guests were present, which was a record attendance at a CIML Meeting.

Roll-call - Quorum

Mr. Magaña proposed a change to the roll-call and voting procedure:

> *It is proposed that Decisions and Resolutions be formally voted as a conclusion to each item on the Agenda; the roll-call would be established from the check-in lists and the quorum would be checked at each vote.*

Traditionally there had been a preliminary vote on each item and at the end of the meeting a quorum was taken and Members had voted again on all the issues. This year, as an experiment, there would just be one vote on each topic, which of course would mean the quorum would have to be taken each time. This method would avoid the long and tedious list of Resolutions having to be taken at the end of the meeting; if it was practical and preferred, this method of voting would be adopted for future meetings. For the roll-call, a list of delegates would be drawn up according to registrations at the door, and the roll-call would merely establish which countries were represented. This immediately took place and it was established that a quorum was present; 53 countries had registered and only 2 had not yet arrived, so there were 51 voting Member States present, plus one delegated vote.

Approval of the agenda

The agenda as below was approved and adopted unanimously. Mr. Magaña reminded Members that this had been made available on the web site and not in the form of hard copy.

Agenda

Opening addresses

Roll-call – Quorum

Approval of the agenda

1 Approval of the minutes of the 39th CIML Meeting

2 Member States and Corresponding Members
2.1 Situation of certain Members

3 Financial matters
3.1 Adoption of the Auditor's report for 2004
3.2 Assets and liabilities as at 01/01/2005
3.3 Information on the implementation of the new Financial Regulations

4 Presidential Council activities
4.1 Report on Presidential Council activities
4.2 Long Term Strategy and Action Plan

5 Developing Country activities
5.1 Report on PWGDC activities
5.2 Report on JCDCMAS activities

6 Liaisons
6.1 Presentation by the Bureau on liaison activities
6.2 Updates by Liaison Organizations
6.3 Updates by RLMOs

7 BIML activities
7.1 Organization of the Bureau
7.2 Communication, web site
7.3 Report on BIML activities and work program for 2005

8 Technical activities
8.1 Approval of International Recommendations and Documents
8.2 Examination of the situation of certain TCs/SCs
8.3 MAA
8.4 Progress in the revision of the *Directives*

9 Human resource matters
9.1 Election of the CIML First Vice-President
9.2 Extension of the contract of the BIML Director
9.3 Appointment of a new Assistant Director in 2007

10 Future meetings
10.1 41st CIML Meeting (2006)
10.2 42nd CIML Meeting (2007)
10.3 13th Conference and 43rd CIML Meeting (2008)

11 Other matters

12 Closure

1 Approval of the minutes of the 39th CIML Meeting

The minutes of the 39th CIML Meeting were approved unanimously.

2 Member States and Corresponding Members

2.1 Situation of certain Members

Mr. Johnston explained that the following items concerned various financial matters, including the types of contribution paid by certain Members, assets and liabilities, and a discussion of the new Financial Regulations. He asked Mr. Magaña to report.

Mr. Magaña reminded Members that in April 2005 the BIML had published a document on the web site concerning the Contributory Classes of Member States. The 12th Conference in Berlin had instructed the BIML to review annually the situation of those Members which were in a lower Contributory Class than that which would normally be applied, and had asked it to re-examine the possibilities of these Members to resume their normal Class as soon as the state of their finances permitted.

The amount paid by any country depended on the size of its population (taking the nearest whole million below) and on its economic situation - the Committee had the power to permit a country to drop by one contribution level. He also reminded Members that the BIML had been asked to draw up a clear and fair rule to govern the situation of such Members.

The proposed rule on the subject, circulated previously to Members, had four elements. A country's Contributory Class might be varied if:

- The economic situation of a country had improved, in which case that country should return to its normal Class;
- The economic situation had deteriorated, in which case the country might be moved down to a lower Class;
- The population had risen, in which case the Class might be increased; or
- The population had decreased, in which case the Class might be reduced.

The proposal was to base the Contributory Class of each country on a classification of the economic situation of each country, drawn up by the World Bank on the basis of the country's gross national income (GNI) per inhabitant.

The World Bank defined four categories of GNI per inhabitant, whose limits in 2003 are:

- Low income: 765 USD or less;
- Low average: 766 to 3035 USD;
- Upper average: 3036 to 9385 USD; and
- High income: more than 9385 USD.

The BIML had looked at this classification system with regard to the possibility of certain Member States dropping to a lower category. The second tranche, low average income, seemed to the BIML to be very broad for classification of contributions, and could be divided into two. The proposal for a general rule was therefore as follows:

> *When a Member State was in the low average category, it would drop by one level if its GNI was more than twice the lower limit of this category (i.e. between 1530 and 3035 USD); under twice the lower limit of this category it would drop by two levels and if the GNI fell into the low category then it would drop by three levels.*

Mr. Magaña looked forward to hearing Members' comments on this proposal but pointed out that it was generally in accord with existing practice in the OIML, apart from a small number of exceptional cases.

Mr. Krishnamoorthy asked for more time to be allowed for consideration of the proposal.

Mr. Magaña pointed out that the proposal had been sent to Members in April, and that further time for consideration would lead to another year's delay before it could be put into practice if accepted. He further pointed out that the suggested new classification system would make no difference to India's contribution.

There being no further comments from the floor, the meeting passed direct to the vote on the proposition, which, as Mr. Magaña pointed out, had been sent to Members in April.

There were no "no" votes; Brazil abstained. The rule was therefore adopted.

Regarding the review of the position of certain Members as requested by the 12th Conference, the situation of six Member States would, for different reasons, be modified by the new arrangements:

- Brazil, which was currently in Contributory Class 2 with a GNI of 2710 USD, would move to Class 3;
- Indonesia, at present in Class 1, with a GNI of 810 USD, would move to Class 2;
- The Republic of Korea would move from Class 2 to Class 3 not because of its GNI but because its population had risen to 47.9 million, and Class 3 contributions were due at or above 41 million;
- Poland, currently in Class 1, had had a GNI of 5270 USD in 2003, placing it in Class 2;
- Saudi Arabia had previously been in Class 1 because of the low population previously recorded for it in the BIML figures but it had in fact 22.5 million inhabitants and therefore should be in Class 2; and finally,
- Spain had just passed the figure of 41 million inhabitants in 2003 and therefore passed automatically into Class 3.

(*Note:* All population and income figures are for 2003, taken from the World Bank web site).

Mr. Magaña asked for comments from the countries concerned by these proposed alterations.

The Republic of Korea representative stated that the Korea's population had been decreasing dramatically since 2003, and also there was below average use of measuring instruments in that country; he asked for his country's proposed transfer from Class 2 to Class 3 to be reconsidered on these grounds.

Mr. Magaña replied that no more recent figures than 2003 were available on the World Bank web site. Increasing populations and GNI were more common than decreasing ones; however, Korea's comments would be noted and Members would be asked for their opinions. Regarding the use of measuring instruments, it was true that the criterion in the text of the OIML Convention stated that where there was below average usage of measuring instruments in a given country, that country could request to be placed in a lower category. But it was difficult to apply objective criteria to the use of measuring instruments and this was why Mr. Magaña had proposed basing judgments on the GNI, which was more measurable and objective. However, it was for the CIML to judge.

Mr. Johnston then suggested that any countries who wished to offer observations on their individual contributions or on those of others should write to him by the end of July with their concerns, with a copy to Mr. Magaña also; the present meeting was not the place for discussion of these. The matters could then be fully considered and a reply sent.

Mr. Magaña added that such decisions were normally made by the Committee; this could be achieved either by a postal vote or at the following year's CIML.

Mr. Johnston proposed that a postal vote be held once the comments had been received from the countries concerned.

Mr. Robles expressed agreement with the proposal in principle and had no problem with the change in the status of Spain but was troubled by the fact that the figures showed only countries whose prosperity was increasing and did not show any decreases; was it the OIML's view that all the countries in the world were increasing in prosperity?

Mr. Magaña agreed that this was the case; but the World Bank figures regarding Member States had showed only improvements and no deteriorations; he was happy that Member States were prospering; it could of course, however, happen that a country would need to move to a lower rather than a higher category. He added that any increase decided on by postal vote would be applicable only from 2007, since every Member State had a budgetary procedure to go through.

The Czech Republic asked what would be the effect upon the OIML 4-year budget of the changes in question.

Mr. Magaña answered that the proposed Class changes, if adopted, would increase the resources of the OIML by approximately 100 000 € per year on a total budget of 1 400 000 €.

He said there was no need to draw up a proposition immediately since the decision would be taken by postal vote, and added that one further Member State remained to be mentioned: Turkey had joined the OIML a few weeks before, and had asked for its Contributory Class to be reduced since its population was about 70 000 000; according to the rule, therefore, it should be in Class 3, but the GNI was about 2500 USD per head. Application of these new arrangements would put Turkey into Class 2, which they had written to request.

Mr. Magaña asked for an immediate vote on this request, so that Turkey's contribution could be calculated for both the current year and for 2006. No Member voted against this but Bulgaria abstained, so the motion was passed.

3 Financial matters

3.1 Financial Report for 2004 and Adoption of the Auditor's report for 2004

Mr. Magaña apologized for the inevitably disagreeable task of examining the figures. The 2004 accounts for the OIML, approved by their External Auditor, were before Members and were drawn up according to the "old" system, which had been in operation until the end of 2004. The structure was comparable to that of 2003 and preceding years. The table on the screen showed a comparison between:

- Actual figures for 2003;
- The budget voted in 2000;
- The estimates presented in Berlin; and
- Actual figures for 2004.

Mr. Magaña pointed out that the Auditor's report was only in French. His report for 2003 had been translated into English but this had proved very costly and it had therefore been decided to let the figures speak for themselves. It had been considered that the translation of the 2003 Auditor's Report would help delegates to understand the 2004 one, and also the Financial Report sent out by Mr. Magaña gave an overall summary of the state of affairs which would make the main points clear.

The table showed that income from Corresponding Members' fees had been slightly higher than that estimated in Berlin but on the other hand the revenue from the sale of publications had been rather lower, which was to be expected since all publications were now available on line without payment.

Other differences between actual and estimated expenses were mainly in the Miscellaneous category and represented tax payments and other elements which were difficult to budget for.

Salary payments had been slightly lower than the Berlin estimates had allowed for but higher than voted for in the 2000 Budget. Meeting expenses for 2004 had come in somewhat below budget - 140 000 € had been allowed for the Berlin Conference but the actual cost had been 80 000 €. This was partly due to the fact that the German Government had paid much of the cost but also because some of the invoices had not been presented for payment until January 2005 and did not therefore appear in the accounts for 2004.

There were few major differences between the budget presented in Berlin and the final figures, except for certain incidental expenses, which were lower than expected, principally because some of the alterations planned for the BIML offices had been postponed until 2005.

The slight deficit (20 000 €) envisaged in Berlin had not materialized; instead there was a surplus of 96 000 €, mainly due to the above-mentioned delayed building work.

The increase in staff costs (the Bureau's largest expenditure) between 2003 and 2004 was accounted for by:

- A realignment of payments to expatriates, which had been brought into line with practice in other Organizations, giving rise to an increase of 25 000 €;
- One member of staff, previously part time, was now working full time, at a cost increase of approximately 20 000 €;
- Two staff members had been placed on salary scales below the level their qualifications entitled them to, and had been realigned; and
- Normal inflation and advancement up the salary scales accounted for the remaining increases.

Mr. Magaña showed a table detailing the cost of the 2004 CIML Meeting. Even when the invoices settled in 2005 were taken into account, the total was less than budgeted for and also less than in previous years, due to the generosity of the German Government.

Miscellaneous costs for 2004 were higher than for 2003 for the following reasons:

The largest single outgoing was to an external consultant, to assist in setting up the new accountancy system;

The accounts for both 2002 and 2003 had been re-audited, as previously decided.

Under the heading of "miscellaneous expenditure", 2004 costs were higher than 2003 for the following reasons:

- Under a normal accounting system, loans to staff would not appear under the heading of "costs" but under "assets and liabilities";
- Fees had been paid to a consultant for evaluating the Pension Fund;
- There had been costs involved in dismissing a secretary;
- There had been recruitment costs in appointing the engineer in charge of the MAA;
- The remaining miscellaneous payments were more or less equivalent to 2003.

Mr. Magaña asked for comments but there were none. He then asked Members to vote on the acceptance of the accounts for 2004. There being neither "no" votes nor abstentions, the accounts were unanimously approved and would be presented again, as was normal practice, to the next Conference in 2008.

3.1.1 Report on the new Pension System

Mr. Magaña informed Members that a review of the OIML Pension Fund had been requested. The pension arrangements formed part of the Staff Regulations, which set out the rights of certain

BIML employees and the financing of the Pension Fund. The costs of this system had been evaluated by an expert. The OIML Convention stated that if the Organization were dissolved, its funds would be divided among the Member States after deduction of pension payments owed to BIML staff, both serving and retired. Thus, contributors to and beneficiaries of the system acquired rights; these rights needed to be evaluated and shown in the accounts. A summary of the expert's report had been circulated to CIML Members in April; it showed considerable differences from the previous state of affairs. Some of the points made by the expert concerned the following facts:

- 2.5 % per annum was allowed for inflation;
- There was no significant turnover of staff;
- Average retirement age was 63.6.

The expert's report had included the recommendation that:

- A discount rate of 4 % should be adopted; this measures the degree of equivalence of future expenses compared with immediate expenses (for example 104 € to be paid next year is equivalent to 100 € to be paid this year); it was based on a combination of estimated inflation rates and the interest that could be earned by investing the money;
- Life expectancy calculations should be based on tables used by insurance companies; and
- The Pension Fund at present affected 3 members of staff currently working at the Bureau, three receiving pensions, and the widow of a former employee.

The expert had calculated the total sum of money needed in future to cover current requirements. Payments to employees already retired had to continue, and some of the payments that would be made to the three staff members presently working were already due. His conclusions were that:

- The rights which had been acquired by December 2004 amounted to 1 300 000 €. If the OIML were to be dissolved today, this sum would be owed to those people. For this reason, this sum should always appear in the accounts among the Organization's liabilities. This was very different from current practice in the OIML's balance sheet, where the Pension Fund was approximately 250 000 € and was balanced only on a short term, year by year basis. The Organization's commitments in this respect were therefore much larger than had previously been shown in the OIML balance sheet;
- The OIML's responsibilities in this regard should be reevaluated annually because each year certain payments were made, thus lessening the debt; but on the other hand staff still in employment acquired more rights. The increase in this obligation would become an annual cost for the Organization. The annual increase had been roughly estimated by the expert at 100 000 €. Currently the Pension Fund cost approximately 55 000 € per annum, which represented a very considerable increase. Mr. Magaña had not known about this issue when he had prepared the budget which Conference had approved, but it was unavoidable. He would come back later to what was to be done about this, since obviously it was not possible to plan for a much larger deficit than the Conference had approved.

This matter would have considerable repercussions on the OIML balance sheet. Other questions regarding the Pension Fund remained to be considered, for example, what alterations ought possibly to be made to the system in the future? Should the retirement age be changed? Should a dedicated sum of money be invested to cover the needs of the system? Questions such as these were being discussed in many countries at the present time and the OIML also should consider them.

Work on pensions was ongoing, with the President, and this was simply an interim report; it must definitely be completed before the next OIML Conference.

Mr. Yoo-Tae Jun asked whether the OIML Pension Fund had been compared with those of other international organizations such as ILAC or the Metre Convention.

Mr. Magaña responded that the OIML system was indeed very comparable with that of the Metre Convention, though of course the latter employed many more staff. He had also compared notes

with other smaller organizations based in France, and found that their pension schemes varied considerably. Such comparisons were ongoing.

Mr. Tony Lee (New Zealand) asked, as a newcomer to the Organization, about the loans to BIML staff.

Mr. Magaña said this question was frequently raised. It had been practice for a long time for the Bureau to grant loans to its staff; in fact this was quite common practice in many commercial businesses too. Instead of money being in the bank it was out on loan to an individual. He explained that the conditions for granting such loans had been clarified: the first was that the interest should be at least equivalent to the highest rate payable by banks on money deposited, so that the Organization lost nothing. Secondly, all loans had to be repaid before the expiry of the borrower's employment contract; thus repayment was guaranteed (and in any event repayments were guaranteed against salaries due by the BIML to staff). Thirdly, all loans were rigorously recorded and submitted, with the interest payable, to the auditor. Under the new accounting system, these loans would be shown as an investment - the employee paid interest to OIML just as a bank would.

Mr. Johnston added that this matter had been discussed in previous CIML Meetings and would be one of the aspects he had undertaken to review in the coming year.

Mr. Ian Dunmill (BIML) commented that because of the particular status of the Organization, staff could have problems in obtaining a loan from a bank. He himself had been refused a loan to buy a house by two banks on the grounds of the status of the Organization.

Mr. Johnston concluded this item by informing Members that the questions of pensions and loans were ongoing and there would be a further report the following year.

3.2 Assets and liabilities as at 01/01/2005

Mr. Magaña told delegates that information on the assets and liabilities of the OIML was contained in the same information sheet as the previous item, within the framework of the changed accountancy system. As from 1 January 2005 the new system adopted in Berlin had been in operation and would result in a number of credits and debits in the balance sheet being shown in a different manner from previously. When Members saw the 2005 accounts in 2006 they might be surprised by some major differences in presentation. The differences, which of course were very detailed and would be audited by the External Accountant, were as follows:

- The Pension Fund, which existed to meet the OIML's obligations to its present and future pensioners, had been greatly increased and would be shown as a much greater amount in January 2005 than had been the case immediately before that date. It would rise from 223 000 € to 1 300 000 €;
- Assets such as property and equipment had previously been depreciated as soon as they were bought, so that they always showed as having nil value on the Organization's balance sheet. Under the new accountancy system linear depreciation would show the buildings depreciating over 50 years, fixed fittings over 10 years, office equipment over 5 years, etc. All the OIML's assets would therefore be reevaluated, their present state of depreciation assessed and depreciation costs shown. What had previously had nil value would therefore "acquire" a value. This would show much higher assets for property on 1 January 2005, in the region of 107 000 €;
- Amounts owing from Member States would continue to be shown as under the current system, but their advances would be accounted for more clearly as debts. In contrast, Corresponding Members' debts had never previously been shown. When subscription fees were called they would henceforth appear in the accounts and if there were any Corresponding Members' debts these would also be shown in the accounts;

- Loans to BIML staff, as previously stated, would be clearly shown in the accounts as such and not under miscellaneous expenditure; they were not accounted for correctly under the old system but would be under the new one. From 1 January 2005, therefore, the total of loans to staff would show as approximately 100 000 €.
- The OIML Translation Center, the accounts of which had been shown to Members, consisted of voluntary payments by certain Member States to defray the cost of translating certain documents from French to English. This had previously been accounted for separately, but had now been integrated into the accounts;
- There were other minor matters, including the entering of advance payments, for example the cost of hiring the auditorium Members were in, which had had to be paid in 2004 for 2005: such charges would henceforth be accounted for in the year they were related to rather than the year in which they were paid, i.e. in this example, in 2005 instead of 2004 as hitherto.

The most notable overall effect of these changes in accountancy practice was that the money earmarked for the Pension Fund was no longer available in the Reserve Fund (which Mr. Magaña explained as being the amount which would be returned to Members if the Organization was ever wound up). The sum of the working capital and reserves, as far as it was possible to estimate it at the present time, would be in the order of 480 000 € as opposed to the present 1 350 000 €, which was made up of a theoretical working capital of 55 000 € and reserve of 1 300 000 € - a considerable reduction in the Reserve Fund. This was largely caused by the Pension Fund increasing from 203 000 € to 1 300 000 €.

In recent years, the Reserve Fund had appeared to be too high, in that it represented more than the cost of one year's functioning (this had been extensively discussed in a number of previous CIML Meetings); but in fact it had been overvalued, as the obligations had not been taken into account. Thus the "real" reserves of the OIML were 480 000 €.

In summarizing, Mr. Magaña commented that the assets shown for 1 January 2005 were greater than those for 31 December 2004, in that they included effects not yet fully depreciated, loans to staff which had not been correctly entered and other miscellaneous matters. This was an overall estimate of the effect of the new accounting system; there were still some elements to be evaluated before everything was complete and precise.

Mr. Llewellyn asked about depreciation of fixed assets, at present standing at 107 000 €. Would the annual depreciation show up as an additional cost in the annual accounts, in addition to the 100 000 € which would have to be paid into the Pension Fund every year? He also asked about the drop in the Reserve Fund to 430 000 €: would this result in any loss of interest?

Mr. Magaña replied that it was correct that the value of property and equipment would show as an asset and this would be counterbalanced by annual depreciation costs. These had already been taken into account in the budget which Members had adopted. As for the Reserve Fund, this decreased in the sense that the debt of the OIML to its Member States decreased, but the actual money was still invested in the bank and earning the same interest. As there was not a dedicated asset for the Pension Fund, the interest went into the OIML's general fund and not into the Pension Fund. The question remained as to whether the Pension Fund should be privatized or a dedicated asset set up. This decision could have repercussions: for example, if it were decided to privatize the fund, the money would be transferred along with the obligations, and this money would therefore no longer be at the disposal of the OIML. This was a complex decision to make. But for the moment, the Organization's invested capital was not affected by this.

Mr. Kildal asked whether it might be worth exploring the possibility of having a common pension system with the BIPM; the proposed OIML arrangement seemed too complicated for the few recipients involved.

Mr. Magaña responded that this was one of the avenues being explored; he had had brief discussions with Andrew Wallard, where similar questions were arising. There would certainly be further discussions, informally at Director level and quite possibly also between the Presidents.

Mr. Kochsiek added that various possibilities were already being discussed. Another was that the OIML Pension Fund might be transferred to a large pension fund in France or elsewhere. One of the tasks for the new President was to investigate such possibilities and propose a suitable solution.

3.3 Information on the implementation of the new Financial Regulations

Mr. Magaña reminded delegates that the revised Financial Regulations, which had already been largely covered under other items, had been approved by the Conference and had come into effect at the beginning of 2005. Accountancy matters which had always been recorded were already being done in the new way and, with the assistance of the external auditor and other trainers, work was ongoing on setting up systems for recording those matters which had not previously come under accounting procedures. A complete evaluation of the OIML's assets and various analytical accounts was still underway and prevented a full report being offered to the present meeting, but this would be available for scrutiny before the end of the year. The estimates which Mr. Magaña and the Bureau had given the Presidential Council were too complex and not accurate enough to be offered on the present occasion. Large outgoings such as the increase in the Pension Fund were being compensated as far as possible by economies elsewhere. The deficit at the end of the year would be smaller than had been budgeted for. The end of year accounts for 2005 would be complete and in total accord with the new accountancy system and detailed information would be given then regarding the transition from the old system to the new one.

4 Presidential Council activities

4.1 Report on Presidential Council activities

Mr. Johnston reported that there had been two meetings of the Presidential Council since the meeting in Berlin, one in March and one the previous day. Many of the items discussed would be on the afternoon's agenda so he would just touch briefly upon them, as follows:

- There was one resignation from the Presidential Council, Mr. Tanaka from Japan, and two new Members, Messrs. Bruno Vaucher from Switzerland and Grahame Harvey from Australia. (Mr. Tanaka had also resigned as CIML Member, and in this capacity had been replaced by Mr. Miki);
- Meetings had focused mainly on the Long Term Strategy and Action Plan, which would be discussed immediately after the current presentation. There had been long discussions on the financial issues, the new Financial Regulations and the budget;
- Considerable time had been spent on discussion of the Mutual Acceptance Arrangement (MAA), which was an important element of the OIML's medium term strategy, and on which there would be a detailed report and presentation later in the meeting;
- Reorganization of some of the technical work had also been discussed, comprising the search for ways to expedite the work of the Technical Committees; indeed, after the Presidential Council Meeting in March there had been a further meeting to establish the work being done by all the Technical Committees - a status report which had been very informative, and had brought to the attention of the Presidential Council the need to speak to the chair persons of some of the TCs in order to determine their status and to see if their work could be moved forward;
- The election of the new CIML Vice-President would take place later in the meeting; there were two excellent candidates and Mr. Johnston was confident that the election would be successful;
- The contract of the BIML Director would be coming up for renewal and a new Assistant Director had to be appointed since Mr. Szilvássy would be retiring in 2007;

- There had also been discussion of liaisons with other organizations such as ILAC and the Metre Convention, and Ian Dunmill would be giving a presentation on the JCDCMAS;
- All the other matters which had been discussed would form part of the agenda of the current meeting; Mr. Johnston encouraged delegates to raise any questions they might have about Presidential Council or other activities, either on the floor of the meeting or privately with him.

4.2 Long Term Strategy and Action Plan

The Long Term Strategy and Action Plan had both needed reviewing and revising; Mr. Magaña had drawn up and circulated to Members a short summary document describing the OIML's long term goals and objectives, and also a draft 5-year Action Plan highlighting what should be done in order to achieve these ends. Additionally, there was a Work Program for the Bureau for 2005, on which work was already under way.

The Strategy paper began with a general description of the benefits of legal metrology, what it brought to the economy, to health, to human safety, to the environment and to law enforcement in general. This was followed by an explanation of the difference between the OIML and other standardization organizations. He reminded delegates that the OIML was an observer at the WTO/TBT Committee and was considered by the latter to be an international standard setting body.

The second document set out the goals and long term objectives of the OIML and what its Members' commitment should be, as follows:

1 The first long term objective was to bring support to regulators in their regulating activity. This was clearly true for legal metrology regulations, but any authority preparing regulations should make use of the technical work carried out by the OIML;

2 The OIML also had to bring support to national enforcement authorities. Enforcement of legal metrology needed technical guidance and for enforcing aspects such as road safety they needed reliable instruments; so all the activities for type evaluation could support the enforcement of regulations;

3 The third objective was to bring support to users in non regulated areas. The OIML's publications were not only used by legal metrology officers but might also be of benefit to any user of instruments who might find them useful.

4 The fourth item was trade facilitation; it was clear that one of the goals of the OIML was to facilitate trade, which it did in two ways: firstly trade in measuring instruments and secondly the fact that the OIML provided confidence in measurement results was useful for trade facilitation;

5 The fifth objective was the exchange of knowledge and competence: by participating in the OIML activities, by attending working group meetings, Technical Committees and CIML Meetings, Member States and Corresponding Members could meet and exchange information, knowledge and competence, which was very important for developing skills, confidence and efficiency in legal metrology;

6 All the above led to what Past President Knut Birkeland had recommended, that all these actions must go in the direction of building a global metrology system, not, of course, alone, but in conjunction with other organizations such as the Metre Convention, ISO, ILAC and the IEC, in order to continue to be an essential element in a future global legal metrology system;

7 Also important in the OIML Strategy were Developing Countries; it was important for the OIML, in addition to bringing support to a number of countries, to facilitate the participation of Developing Countries in its work, to take account of their specific needs and provide them with some support to find partnerships and to find funding for their needs. The OIML could not contribute funding, but could help countries obtain funds.

Mr. Magaña asked delegates for their comments, proposals and ideas.

Mrs. Todorova referred to the terminology in the third paragraph of the second part of the document: "standardization bodies issue harmonized standards…". She proposed replacing the word "harmonized" because this word was used in relation with European legislation, meaning in relation to the New Approach Directives. Standards might be said to be adopted by consensus, but not all of them were harmonized.

She also wished to ask about two issues. The first was whether there was a need for the OIML to include in this document its strategy concerning cooperation with regional metrology organizations; and the second was whether there was a need for the OIML's strategy to reflect the privatization of certain legal metrology activities. The newly adopted OIML D 1 *Elements of a Law on Metrology* was a response to how metrology would be organized in future, yet this privatization issue was not reflected in detail.

Mr. Magaña agreed that the term "harmonized standards" had a particular meaning in the EU, different from its normal meaning. It was necessary therefore to avoid any ambiguity for European countries. He would look for a term which would not cause confusion. Regarding the matter of cooperation with regional metrology organizations, it was true that this was a strategic element which was not dealt with in the document. Much thought had been given over several years to the role played in the OIML by regional organizations; it was not easy to formalize this role, which was very different from that played by regional organizations in the Metre Convention. This subject must be dealt with, but he had no concrete proposal to suggest at present and so discussion on this point should remain open.

As for the possible privatization of certain legal metrology tasks, Mr. Magaña believed that this was not one of the objectives of the OIML strategy. In D 1, privatization was mentioned as one of several possible ways to move forward but not one necessarily to be recommended. Unless there was a very strong consensus to the contrary, he considered that the OIML should not at the present time make any strong pronouncement either for or against this way forward. OIML Members had very different economic systems and one system must not be favored over another. Discussion of privatization was interesting because the OIML could bring certain elements to the guarantees and safeguards which would have to be put in operation in a process of privatization but it was not a matter of strategy to come down for or against subcontracting, privatization, externalization or any other way of describing this process.

Mr. Issaev said that whilst he was not commenting on the document under discussion, he wished to inform delegates that his Institute had a publication, in Russian, *The Legal and Applied Metrology Journal*, number 3 of which was devoted to special problems faced in legal metrology. One section of the journal was headed *Towards the 50th Anniversary of the OIML* and included a comprehensive summary of the document *Strategy and tactics of the OIML*. This was of great importance at the moment in Russia in the preparation of new legislation related to the MAA.

Mr. Johnston thanked Mr. Issaev for this information.

Mr. Engler suggested two small additions to the Document; in the upper half of page two, under the heading *Harmonization of Regulations must meet very specific additional criteria*, he proposed adding one more bullet point to the effect "the requirements shall be as far as possible independent of technology"; and on the second part of the same page, under *Goals of the OIML and Commitments of Members*, he felt there should be reference to the OIML Convention. He suggested the addition of something along the lines of "The primary goal of the OIML: see the Convention, Article 1 Clause 5".

Mr. Johnston thanked Mr. Engler for his comments.

Mr. Klenovský wished attention to be drawn to the fact that, unlike other intergovernmental standards organizations, the OIML was now publishing the results of its work free of charge; this fact should be highlighted because charges made by other organizations such as ISO often inhibited their use in legislation, and the fact that OIML publications were now free of charge was

an important factor in facilitating trade, and for this reason should be emphasized. He also made the point that 90 % of the OIML's time was devoted to new instruments coming onto the market but in practice 90 % of the time these instruments were already in service so more attention should be devoted to metrological supervision and subsequent verification of instruments already in service.

Mr. Johnston thanked Mr. Klenovský for his comments.

Mr. Kildal felt that the Strategy document should say more about the challenges being faced by the Organization, and the way forward in order to meet them. These included technology, international development, privatization and other ways of organizing. The Strategy document as it stood described what was currently being done rather than the way forward.

Mr. Johnston thanked Mr. Kildal.

Referring to Part 2 of the Document, Mr. Engler wondered what the OIML strategy would be on sharing facilities between national enforcement authorities. He also asked for further information regarding the last sentence of Part 2, which referred to setting up a system of technology surveillance.

Mr. Magaña replied that an important objective for the OIML was to be very reactive. At the moment, when a new problem arose it took years to review, decide to revise and actually revise a Recommendation. With new technology there would be a new challenge, and the Organization must be very proactive in finding out what the new needs were and starting work immediately upon meeting these needs. His name for this process was technological surveillance.

On the subject of sharing facilities, for example for measuring high pressure gas, Mr. Magaña pointed out that several countries, notably large West European countries, had decided to pool resources and to develop shared equipment. Clearly, for certain categories of instruments where there were few instruments to be checked, testing equipment was extremely heavy and expensive, and it did not make economic sense for each country to have their own. One example was measuring cryogenic liquid at extremely low temperatures. The possibility of sharing such instruments was important for industrialized countries and even more crucial for Developing Countries, which probably could not afford to own their own sophisticated equipment. There were political, practical and organizational problems, but this tendency should be promoted and encouraged in many domains, though not necessarily in all. The question merited further thought and consideration.

Mr. Engler expressed agreement, though he thought this might perhaps properly belong under the heading of testing rather than enforcement.

Mr. Magaña defined "enforcement" as "application" and suggested that there might be a need for shared testing equipment, especially among Developing Countries, if it was necessary to do type conformity tests on imported instruments. The necessary equipment might be very heavy and could well be jointly owned. It was not only the equipment and facilities which might need to be shared, but also actions and procedures, viz. organizing checks on instruments which came into use in different countries, exchanging information, setting up mutual warning systems: cooperation between countries on conformity to Certificates might have a place in the objectives of the Working Group on Type Conformity Assurance which had been set up recently.

Mr. Vaucher supported The Netherlands' proposal that the requirements should be technology independent; the focus must be on metrology requirements and not too much on instruments. This was the difference between the technical work of the OIML and the work of the standardization organizations. He also referred to the first sentence of paragraph two: this point should be included not only on regulated products but also measurement procedures and methods.

Mr. Johnston said that the comments made at the meeting would be taken into account, and asked Members to send in additional comments by email before the end of July. The Document would

then be revised in the light of the comments received and sent out again for approval through a postal ballot.

On the subject of the Action Plan itself, Mr. Magaña stated that it envisaged the years 2005 to 2010, in close relation with the Strategy Document. It answered the question: "What is our strategy objective during the next five years?" The document was long and detailed so Mr. Magaña summarized it as below.

1 Technical Work: the aim was to speed up the work and to react as speedily as possible to new developments. This would be achieved by revising the Directives, and the Bureau intended to make a start on this the following month. The "no paper" approach would be used increasingly, employing electronic communications to accelerate the work and, through the OIML web site, to promote interactivity and participation.

2 Certification Systems:

- The OIML Certificate System needed to be revised to take into account both developments due to the MAA and all other present and future requirements. This important work would be done very rapidly. Work on the MAA was going well, and must continue and extend to other categories of instruments; there would be a presentation on this subject the following day. The OIML needed the adherence of the larger countries and the system must also be responsive to the needs of Developing Countries, and Document B 10 would be revised in the light of experience, as discussed the previous year in Berlin;
- Individual certification of instruments, with a recognizable and accepted OIML conformity mark;
- A system of pre-packaging conformity, upon which work had been under way for some time;
- A certificate for the measuring of bulk items for international trade and transport;
- A system of conformity assurance for instruments, products or certificates was already in preparation; this would perhaps not go as far as an individual branding but would go further than the present system.

Work on all the above should begin in the course of the coming five years and make significant progress.

3 Mutual information guides: the mutual exchange of information amongst Members and Corresponding Members had been one of the aims of the OIML even when it had been set up 50 years previously and it remained an essential objective that each Member should have information that was as up to date as possible about what was happening abroad. The technical guides were not type regulation documents but technical guides which were essential for everyone. Much work had been done on measurement uncertainties and guides on accreditation, which were now being implemented.

4 Promotion of legal metrology: spreading general awareness of metrology and legal metrology and the strengthening of links with other organizations. There would be a presentation on the subject of communication later in the meeting. Coordination with Regional Organizations, mentioned by Mrs. Todorova, was very important; it had not been explicitly mentioned in the Strategy Document but did feature in the Action Plan. There was still a need for clarity and precision in this area.

5 Developing Countries: a certain number of actions would have to be taken in the next five years: there would be a report from the Permanent Working Group. Its work needed to be encouraged and supported. There might be more seminars, as in previous years, in partnership with other organizations, and the system of expert reports was to be developed.

6 Still important, though less visible from outside the Organization, internal structures needed to be clarified or set up. For example, guides for organizing CIML Meetings and the Conference were aging and should be brought up to date. The organization and efficiency of the Bureau should also be further improved.

Members would note that each point in the Action Plan referred to the corresponding point number in the Strategy Document.

Mr. Johnston reminded delegates that comments were sought, both immediately from the floor and up to the end of July by e-mail. The Action Plan could be adjusted in the light of comments received about the Strategy Document, and vice versa.

Mr. Ehrlich complimented Mr. Magaña on the preparation of these documents, which were appreciated. His comment referred primarily to the statements in 2.3 and 2.4, where a specified date of January 2009 was given for implementation to start. This seemed to Mr. Ehrlich to be perhaps a little premature, especially pertaining to 2.4 on the prepackage conformity mark. In his opinion, South Africa had done a very good job in the document they had prepared, but some concerns remained.

Mr. Ehrlich also referred to the RLMOs, and the point made by Mrs. Todorova. He believed that, especially regarding the setting up of regional systems, until further discussion had taken place and there was a policy, it was rather premature to include this in the Action Plan.

Mr. Magaña agreed that fixing a possible date was ambitious but if no target date was set then little would happen. This was a suggested date only; he believed, however, that it was essential to move as quickly as possible on these fronts. Regarding RLMOs, he offered a personal viewpoint: at the moment regional organizations did not fulfill an important role in the MAA, since there were only a few Issuing Authorities, so there could only be a small number of participants in any given region. However, in a certification system for prepackaging, with numerous tests done in numerous countries, the regional organizations could play a very large part.

On Point 1, Technical work, Mr. Johansen commented that in 1.1 there was reference to transparency, which he considered to be very important for OIML work; but then in point 1.3, among ways of accelerating the work, there would be a Working Group. Working Groups had been increasingly used recently: this might be effective, but it was not transparent. There was full transparency in the structure regarding TCs and SCs, in that Members who did not have the resources to participate could nevertheless follow the work as O-Members; this possibility did not exist in the Working Group structure. This was a matter of concern, because transparency was essential for the work to be accepted. If Working Groups were used, a way had to be found to open up their work to O-Memberships.

Mr. Magaña agreed with Mr. Johansen that all work that was done must be as open as possible for observation by Members, Corresponding Members and liaison organizations. For the Committee on Participation Review (CPR), within the framework of the MAA, things were somewhat different, because the CPR had to examine the files of a number of authorities, some of which contained confidential or sensitive material; the aim was similar to that of an Accreditation Committee. The MAA of course involved peer assessment rather than accreditation, but had the same aim, which was to give confidence, so the same rules of discretion and confidentiality had to be followed. It was not therefore possible to make available to all Members and Corresponding Members, much less to the general public, all the information on discussions within the CPR. He acknowledged that all OIML Members were aware of the need for confidentiality about the information they received, but it sometimes was not appropriate for the CPR's discussions to be open to all, and knowledge had to be limited to those participants who were going to sign the Declaration of Mutual Confidence.

Mr. Johansen understood the point Mr. Magaña was making, but he had been worried on reading the document on item no. 8, Technical Committees, because here it was proposed that the CPR should take over some of the problems to be solved, instead of what was now handled by OIML TC 3/SC 5. This went against what Mr. Magaña had just said. They would not then be dealing with matters directly related to peer evaluation, it was now proposed that they should deal with real OIML technical work. This was undesirable, in his view: technical work should take place in the TCs and SCs.

Mr. Magaña said this point could be dealt with under item 8.3 after hearing the progress report, when any ambiguity could be ironed out. He explained that the CPR consisted of representatives of the relevant TC Secretariats and was in no way intended to be a substitute for the TCs/SCs. It was a point to be borne in mind and agreed upon between the CPR and the Technical Committee while the MAA was being set up. But the Participation Committee's interpretations of the recommended requirements would be submitted with all possible speed to the Technical Committees and would have to meet their approval. He repeated that all this belonged in the MAA item to be discussed later in the CIML, and was not strictly relevant to the Action Plan. Everything would be as open as certain considerations of confidentiality permitted.

Mrs. Xiaokang felt that it was very important for Member States and Developing Countries to share information and improve communication in order to build up their capabilities. There were very successful stories from China about information exchange. Every year since 2001, by taking advantage of the World Metrology Day, there had been major moves towards spreading awareness and knowledge of metrology, especially in the field of legal metrology, because this was the work of the government. On that day many people attended to extend their knowledge of the subject, supervision and other metrology activities; answering consumers' inquiries about safety in using measuring instruments or other household appliances was an important feature, and the outcome was always excellent. She suggested therefore that the OIML could use World Metrology Day to define one subject each year, with activities being offered by each Member State; this would serve to draw the attention of governments and the public to the importance of legal metrology work.

Mr. Kildal asked whether the final edition of the Action Plan would include the names of those who would be responsible for each of the items, plus start and completion dates; all this had been done in the previous Action Plan and it had been very useful in following the progress of the work.

Mr. Magaña said that this was indeed his intention. It was easy for him to include in the Action Plan the proposed contribution of the Bureau, which was at the service of the OIML, but aims could not be fixed for a Secretariat without the prior consent of that body. This would require some bilateral discussions with leaders of the relevant Secretariats.

Mr. Engler suggested the addition of another bullet point to 1.1. If different Recommendations were compared there was often some inconsistency in the way they were written; the additional bullet point would be: more consistency between OIML Recommendations, or words to this effect.

Mr. Vaucher referred to an item in the summary of the Presidential Council activities, which was to review systematically the projects and existing Technical Committees and to disband those which had not made progress or were not in line with the specific criteria which had just been discussed in the Strategy Document; he could not find this in the Action Plan.

Mr. Magaña said this was what he and his colleagues had in mind when they referred to reviewing the Directives for Technical Work. There had to be sufficient adaptability to abandon useless projects, launch useful new projects rapidly and if necessary have the flexibility to transfer a Secretariat from one country to another which might pursue the work more energetically.

Mr. Vaucher said there were very many projects and this represented a heavy load for the active Member States.

Mr. Johnston agreed. He encouraged Members to send comments by the end of July and stated that revised versions of the Action Plan and Strategy Document taking account of Members' spoken and e-mailed comments would be sent out as soon as possible for approval by postal ballot.

5 Developing Country activities

5.1 Report on PWGDC activities

Mr. Seiler reported that since the last meeting in Berlin, the Permanent Working Group on Developing Countries, established in May 2004, consisted of members who were not only specialists but also represented certain regions of the OIML.

Three meetings had been held, two in Berlin and one the previous day in Lyon. Members had discussed the work they wanted to achieve, the contribution of each member of the Working Group and what should be planned for the future. They had made the following resolutions:

- At the Berlin meeting the Committee had decided to find out what kind of simplified verification instructions were necessary; by this they meant verification instructions based on OIML Recommendations but taking into account the state of the art in Developing Countries. For example, the regulations for nonautomatic weighing instruments were very complicated, mainly due to the electronics involved. But for verifying mechanical balances fewer tests were needed, and a lot of these were still in use, so the lives of inspectors in Developing Countries could be made easier by drawing up simplified verification instructions. They aimed to discover which kinds of instructions of this sort had already been elaborated, to obtain copyright clearance and make links to the sources. This meant that information about these verification instructions would be collected and put on the OIML web site with a link to its source;
- They would like to do the same with translations of OIML publications. These had already been translated into many languages such as Russian, Spanish, Portuguese and others but these translations were not easy to find and the intention was to create a focal point where Members could discover where all the relevant information was available;
- The third point was to retrieve existing teaching material, to see whether there were copyright problems, and how to make this material available for others and again to indicate the link to the source of this material;
- They wished to deal with the needs expressed during the Berlin Forum "Metrology - Trade Facilitator?"; many delegates had attended this meeting and there had been about 60 posters, 40 requesting support and about 20 offering support. This material, together with all the presentations made during the Forum, had been put on the OIML web site so that there was full documentation and it was still possible to see the information presented on that occasion; Mr. Seiler urged Members to make use of it. Requests for support would be followed up and everything possible would be done to solve problems and provide support for those who needed it.

All this work, taken together, would form what would be called the Virtual Forum on Legal Metrology; work on the project would be ongoing and Members were invited to feed in information or requests, or anything considered to be of use to the OIML community. The Working Group would try to help those requesting support and would appreciate offers of support from others.

After the Berlin Forum the BIML had put all the documents on the web site; some of the equipment which had been offered on that occasion had been sent to Developing Countries, and additional offers of equipment had been received since then; details of this would also be published on the web site. Several seminars and special training courses were in preparation. As announced in Berlin, one of these would take place in Minsk on the subject of prepackages, mainly for COOMET Members. There would be another seminar on pressure measurements in the PTB, another for medical instruments also for COOMET members, and a seminar for flow measurement for members of the SADC Region.

Four balances, 200 pieces of 50 kg weights and nine testing devices for petrol pumps had been sent to a total of eight Developing Countries; shipment of these had cost approximately 23 000 €; the recipient countries would pay part of this cost and the remainder would come from PTB

projects. Mr. Seiler gratefully acknowledged the support of Mettler Toledo, who had checked the balances before they were packed, and also thanked the authorities of Baden Würtenberg, who had adjusted the weights and calibrated the testing devices for petrol pumps. He expressed gratitude as well to the PTB because he still had their full support despite having retired at the beginning of the year.

Future plans involved building up the Virtual Forum already mentioned, as a focal point of interest to all who were interested in legal metrology, and in order to make it attractive there would be announcements of equipment which was available. The following conditions would, however, be imposed upon those who wished to receive the equipment:

- Guarantees that the equipment would be used for metrology, especially legal metrology;
- Willingness to look for resources to pay for transport of the materials; and
- Reports on the activities carried out using the equipment, so that the benefit of the action could be seen.

During the previous day's meeting there had been discussion of points which would be of great help for the work of this Permanent Working Group. The conclusions had been:

- The Virtual Forum should be used as a source of information and support - all OIML Members should make use of it, either by providing relevant information or by contacting this point when they required help and advice;
- OIML officials should give support if there was a request from Developing Countries to address political decision makers, or to aid awareness and provide advertising for the establishment or implementation of the metrology system, especially the legal metrology system. The PWG appreciated the initiative to prepare background papers on metrology which could be used to promote legal metrology; and
- The PWG needed feedback from its customers, the Developing Countries, who needed to let the them know what kind of work they should be undertaking and whether what they were doing was worth while. Comments and suggestions would be welcomed.

Mr. Seiler concluded by thanking his colleagues in the PWG for helping to achieve these results and for promising to continue this work for the benefit of Developing Countries.

Mr. Johnston added his thanks to the Working Group and in particular he thanked Mr. Seiler for his efforts and congratulated him on a job well done. He invited questions from the floor.

Mrs. Annabi pointed out that the list of members of the Working Group should also include Mr. Tukai of Tanzania, who had taken part in the June meeting with the others and had made a valuable contribution.

Her second point was that, regarding the translation of certain documents, as had been agreed, translations were the responsibility of certain countries. Mr. Seiler had mentioned the translation of Recommendations into Russian and Spanish; Mrs. Annabi wished to add Arabic to this list and to point out that 50 of the 114 Recommendations had been translated by the Syrian representative; they were seeking (with the aid of the Bureau) to find out how these might legally be made available for consultation on the Forum and were examining the conditions for translating the remaining Recommendations.

Thirdly, with reference to the Virtual Forum, this was indeed extremely important, but there might be Developing Countries which did not have access to electronic communication and the internet; she therefore suggested that for a certain time the documents and information should also be available on paper and by post to any such countries which requested it.

Mr. Seiler apologized for having omitted Mr. Tukai's name, and would remedy the error.

Mr. Kildal commented that he thought everybody would like to be able to use the simplified verification instructions.

Mrs. Todorova asked whether it would be possible to establish cooperation with manufacturers of measuring instruments with a view to participating in donations to Developing Countries. The manufacturers were the main group to benefit from free OIML Recommendations. The Meeting had just heard that the OIML was working on making their Recommendations more transparent, and she believed that manufacturers could be attracted to participate in these donations and also perhaps in training activities.

Mr. Seiler explained the procedure that was planned: equipment availability would be published on the OIML web site, applications would be asked for and interested metrology services should fill in a special form, indicating whether they had regulations and qualified personnel, whether they could pay the transportation costs and taxes, etc. Suitable recipients would then be selected for distribution.

Mrs. Todorova considered that metrology institutes could provide second hand equipment to other institutes, but producers could provide new equipment, so the OIML should at least make an attempt to involve them in this activity.

Mr. Seiler agreed that this was a good idea, and that any donations from producers would be very welcome.

Mr. Abdul Ghaffar Soomro introduced himself as a new Member and said that he would like to be part of the Developing Countries Forum.

Mr. Seiler explained that members of the Working Group were selected by the OIML President.

Mr. Johnston said that he had taken note and would discuss the matter with Mr. Seiler later.

5.2 Report on JCDCMAS activities

Mr. Dunmill reminded Members that a report on the OIML's activities had been given at the Berlin meeting the previous October, and that the membership of JCDCMAS consisted of representatives of metrology organizations, accreditation organizations and standardization organizations that acted at international level, plus the ITC and UNIDO which, whilst themselves not directly standardizing bodies, were representing the interests of assistance to Developing Countries at international level.

The most recent meeting of the JCDCMAS had been held in March 2005, at the BIPM, with the OIML taking over its Secretariat for the coming year. At the March 2004 meeting, it had been decided that the secretariat of the JCDCMAS would rotate among its members and, in principle, between different kinds of organization. This explained how the OIML had come to be taking over in the current year.

There had been a background paper on the subject of metrology, accreditation and standardization as a package that went together to support the infrastructure development in countries; this had been produced during 2004 but never finalized; it was intended to update this because, of course, the last version was now rather out of date for some organizations. After updating it would be "published" - i.e. it was not intended that the document would be published by the Committee; it would be available for members to publish in any form they wished. The ITC intended to publish it as a kind of leaflet, but information from it could also be used in other supporting documentation which individual countries or organizations wished to produce themselves. With the paper, additionally, a standard PowerPoint presentation was being produced, which again presented the three topics and was intended to back up the written paper.

It had also been decided that frequently events were going on around the world which could be of interest to other members of the Committee, but which they were not always aware were going on. JCDCMAS were therefore setting up an online calendar of events which could be of interest to any one of those members. The OIML, for example, might not hear of some event concerning

Developing Countries which was taking place in the standards field; hopefully, through this system, they would have this information and could either participate directly or simply highlight some current information concerning the OIML which might be of interest and which somebody else could bring up at the meeting.

The presentation previously referred to was intended for awareness raising events amongst people who were not themselves metrologists, standardizers or accreditation experts. All of the organizations involved recognized that there was a big problem in raising awareness amongst people at political level or non-experts; otherwise one was just preaching to the converted, which was not a problem. The idea was that the presentation could be used by people in any one of the organizations or even outside those organizations to promote the whole package of metrology, accreditation and standardization. It was not a huge presentation; speakers were often given 10 or 15 minutes to deal with the subject and the intention was that it should consist of no more than 16 slides. This meant that the whole of metrology was four slides long, which would not be easy to do, but for presenting to non-expert people it should be enough. The original idea had been to produce a completely stand-alone presentation, but it had been felt that it would be better to develop it from the background paper which had already been written, so that the two went together - one could be handed out as a pamphlet at the meeting after the presentation had been given.

JCDCMAS had a web site, which at the moment was hosted by the BIPM and which was changing slightly because some pages were currently being updated.

Mr. Lee asked whether the presentations mentioned by the two previous speakers would be available in electronic form by e-mail or on the web site.

Mr. Dunmill explained that at present on the web site there was a public section and a Members only section. The public section contained the last draft of the background paper, which dated from the previous year, but the intention was that both the presentation and the background paper would be publicly available electronically.

Mr. Johnston added that the paper by Mr. Seiler would also be made available.

6 Liaisons

6.1 Presentation by the Bureau on liaison activities

Mr. Magaña informed Members that the Bureau had had a period of intensive activity with a number of liaisons. He wished to highlight especially the World Trade Organization; BIML staff had attended all the TBT Committee meetings of this organization, in addition to several workshops organized by the TBT Committee every year. More information on TBT activities would be put on the web site, in information letters, etc., as time on the present occasion was limited. The OIML was well recognized by the TBT Committee and cooperation was good.

Much work was done in common with standardization organizations, and most Technical Committees and Subcommittees had tight liaisons with ISO, the IEC and so on.

There were also very privileged liaisons and good relationships with the BIPM and ILAC; information about the annual tripartite meetings between these organizations had been sent to Members. The Bureau had frequent meetings with colleagues from the BIPM for informal discussions on a number of issues including administrative matters, ideas for joint activities, etc. Members had received information about the joint work with the BIPM in connection with Developing Countries.

A talk would be given the following day by the new ILAC contact person Mr. Patrick Reposeur, Assistant Director of COFRAC, the French accreditation body; since he was based in Paris it was

easy to arrange meetings with him. This was a very active and efficient liaison and there had already been a couple of meetings with him concerning the MAA.

The annual meetings of all the Regional Legal Metrology Organizations had been attended by an OIML representative, either the President or one of the Vice-Presidents of the CIML, the BIML Director or one of the BIML Assistant Directors. In this way they could inform CIML Members of recent developments, give advice and listen to their needs and expectations.

6.2 Updates by Liaison Organizations

BIPM

Mr. Köhler, representing the International Bureau of Weights and Measures (BIPM), said the Bureau was only a small, and lower, part of the whole organizational structure which consisted of the CIPM, the International Committee of Weights and Measures, which in a way was comparable to the CIML, since it consisted of 18 individuals who controlled the Bureau staff and met once a year; and the General Conference, CGPM, which met every four years and which was a very important event for the BIPM, but it was more of a Government level meeting and the important thing was that they decided the BIPM's budget for the ensuing four years.

At the moment there were 45 Full Members and 17 Associates of the *Conférence Générale*, the CGPM, with an 18th expected in the immediate future. The Mutual Recognition Arrangement, which had been mentioned before, had now been signed by 61 organizations and actually covered 79 additional institutes because not every country had only one laboratory to cover the whole scope of metrology in that country.

Since 1 January 2004 there had been a new Director, Andrew Wallard, who sent his apologies for not being present.

The mission of the BIPM was world wide uniformity of measurements, and they provided that by giving the necessary and scientific basis for such uniformity. They collaborated with other institutes and organizations which had related missions. They did not work with industry or individuals but only with national metrology institutes and certain international organizations.

The BIPM provided a single coherent system for measurements through the *Système International*, the SI. They tried to coordinate and harmonize work performed with regional metrology organizations, APMP, SIM and others, many of which had been mentioned in the course of the last three days.

The BIPM performed certain calibrations for a number of National Metrology Institutes (NMIs) at the highest level, and the activity that took up the major part of the BIPM's time was organizing international comparisons of national measurement standards to verify that in each country they were comparable. Last but not least, they maintained a small but very high level scientific activity.

The CGPM, or General Conference, as mentioned, decided the BIPM's budget, which was currently about 10 million euros, or 13 million dollars per year to cover salaries, laboratory work, and building maintenance. The most recent budget had been the first increase in real terms for almost 40 years. This was an important statement because international organizations were usually striving to reduce costs, and this showed how much their work was appreciated.

A new activity in the past three years or so had been a scientific activity in chemistry, and two other new activities were just about to begin: the watt balance, which was an experiment in trying to replace the kilogram (which was the last artifact for one of the base units); they were also working on a calculable capacitor, in cooperation with Australian colleagues.

The Mutual Recognition Arrangement Statement was already used on certificates by many NMIs. It was a breakthrough, in that accreditors and regulators now, if they saw this statement, knew

that they did not need to investigate any further, and that what was claimed on the certificate was correct. There was now also an MRA logo, which it was proposed the NMIs should put on the certificates just to highlight that the certificate had been issued under the MRA, and as such could be accepted world wide.

The BIPM maintained the Key Comparison DataBase, KCDB, which was a comprehensive and quantitative database on the Calibration and Measurement Capabilities (CMCs), awarded by peer review. The CMCs were underpinned by key comparisons. It was not possible to compare everything which had to be measured and could be measured in the world but these were comparisons which were chosen by the Consultative Committees, which Mr. Köhler had not had time to explain at the beginning of his talk, but which were the major contributors in the metrology sector; they had very strict rules on how comparisons were to be carried out. It was not possible simply to do a comparison over and over again until it was right, there were guidelines and rules. The results of the key comparisons were reviewed by peers, i.e. by the Consultative Committees. All of them were published in scientific journals, most of them in *Metrologia*, which was the journal of the BIPM. The full reports could be obtained on demand, but Mr. Köhler warned his listeners that some of them could consist of up to 450 pages of detailed information.

However, the most important thing was that all this information could be found on the KCDB database. Mr. Köhler invited members to look at www.kcdb.bipm.org. This web site was public, there was no need to subscribe or register; anyone could go there and look up anything they wanted.

The procedure was that the signatories of the MRAs submitted their calibration and measurement capabilities to the BIPM, which passed them on for review within the regions where they were heavily scrutinized. Then the CMCs were sent to the Joint Committee of the Regions in the BIPM (JCRB) where they were once again peer evaluated, and finally sent to the BIPM, where they were put on the web site, and could be consulted. One member of staff was there on a two-year secondment basis to help with the review process.

Currently there were about 1600 such CMC entries on the KCDB, and they were growing by the day. There was a very comprehensive search engine where looking up could be done by theme, for example there was an electricity sub-theme and a capacitance sub-theme. Any country's NMI which provided these capabilities, and the corresponding uncertainties, could be looked up. Regulators or accreditors in search of this service should use the KCDB, which would save them much time and money. This was the only database available of NMI calibration services.

The BIPM ran a quality system, which came quite naturally because the MRA stipulated that the signatories must have a quality system; Mr. Köhler was the Quality Manager and, with his colleagues, chose to run ISO/IEC 17025, self-declared, because as an international organization they did not think they could ask a national accreditation body to make an assessment; their choice was to be peer reviewed. Luckily for them, they had all the Consultative Committees and other occasions where people came from around the world, so it was not very expensive to ask them to stay two or three days longer and scientifically review the BIPM's quality system. They were currently extending this to ISO 9000 functions - administration, health and safety, and the workshop. Most of these procedures already existed but had not yet been reviewed by Mr. Köhler in a formal internal audit.

The BIPM also, of course, collaborated with many international organizations, for example, recently the United Nations Codex Alimentarius; they had also signed agreements with ILAC and with the International Federation of Clinical Chemistry (chemistry being a new and important activity at the BIPM). All the above organizations together had created a new committee, the Joint Committee of Traceable Laboratory Medicine.

The BIPM collaboration with the OIML and ILAC continued to be of very strategic importance both for the Metre Convention and for the other two organizations. With ILAC, they were on the point of completing a joint statement which explained their mutual responsibilities and the sharing of their work; they hoped this would be out by the end of the year for the meeting of the

directors of National Metrology Institutes, held annually at the BIPM. Yearly common meetings of the three organizations took place; the most recent had been in March.

The BIPM now had a very strong interest in working together with ISO on standards which were of common interest to the two organizations and to their stakeholders.

Mr. Köhler concluded with what he described as his simplistic view, and, he believed, that of his ILAC colleagues, of how the contemporary metrology world was going: an NMI which had primary standards and working standards gave traceability to an accredited calibration network in the country, and perhaps to testing laboratories. This system could only work if it was possible to be confident that in different nations the same thing was described with the same resolution and the same quality. So there were checks: there were key comparisons between the BIPM and national metrology institutes, the Regional Metrology Organization comparisons, and there were comparisons of parts which were covered regionally and nationally by accreditation laboratories. There was the so called PT, Proficiency Testing, as checks. This part was covered by the CIPM MRA: they signed for that, they looked after it and they ensured that the work which had been started would continue to be correct. Another part was covered by ILAC colleagues, but collaboration was close, with regular e-mail and face to face contacts. The whole was under the MoU, signed in 2002, under which all this collaborative work had started.

Mr. Johnston thanked Dr. Köhler.

ILAC

Mr. Reposeur informed Members that he was present because he was responsible for ILAC liaisons with the OIML. His normal job was as technical chief in the French accreditation body, COFRAC. He intended to explain briefly the Multilateral Recognition Agreement between the different regions which made up ILAC, and the structure of ILAC.

Members could see on the screen what constituted an accreditation: the key word was "competence" in very detailed specific, recognized actions since nobody could be competent at everything. An accreditor's principal job was to develop, in the eyes of regulating authorities and free market clients, confidence in the services of accredited organizations, in the case of ILAC mainly calibration and testing laboratories.

Mr. Reposeur explained that a laboratory accreditation was done either for a set number of identified tests, or for a limited type of measurements and their associated uncertainties, which were equally defined; the BIPM speaker had referred to CMCs, and for the moment ILAC was using the term "Best Measurement Capabilities", or "BMC" though for certain specialized methods these were not necessarily always standardized. This constituted the chain of criteria used by ILAC to evaluate a laboratory and then to evaluate themselves between accreditors. Their basis was ISO/IEC 17025, at times complemented by specialized criteria in certain spheres. He hoped nobody would hold it against him that he had used electricity as an example: technical requirements, procedural methods and regulatory requirements reinforced an evaluation and made up what they called a complete accreditation, so that competency could be effectively evaluated.

ILAC had begun life as a conference (the International Laboratory Accreditation Conference in 1979) and had become a corporation in 1996 at a meeting held in Spain, in order to promote their principal role: that of avoiding tests having to be carried out several times in different parts of the world.

In 2000, they had signed the first ILAC Recognition Agreement, which was an amalgam of several regional agreements; he would go into the role of the various regional organizations later.

ILAC's principal activity (recognition of competency, promotion of accredited laboratories and assistance to countries or bodies without much experience) had been ongoing for some 35 years.

ILAC attempted to help countries develop their own accreditation organizations in conformity with ILAC acceptance criteria.

Their structure was somewhat similar to that of the BIPM: the annual General Assembly was the place where decisions were taken, to be carried out thereafter by a number of committees meeting twice a year. This year's General Assembly would be held in Auckland at the end of September. All parties interested in accreditation or evaluation of competency were represented within ILAC; there was a committee specific to their stakeholders.

There was a Secretariat, held at the moment by the Australian body; an executive body composed of the President, the Vice President and the Presidents of each of the committees. The list of committees (shown on the screen) spoke for itself, the Laboratory Committee being the committee reserved for stakeholders as an advisory group.

There were at present 47 Members representing 38 economies which had signed the recognition agreement and which could therefore use the ILAC MRA brand. The status of Full Member was given only to signatories of the MRA. It was possible to be an Associate Member, but this did not imply being a signatory. The signatories had to have been evaluated in the processing framework in order to become Full Members.

ILAC was placed under Dutch law for reasons of ease of declarations and had at present four applicants for membership, some from the Euro-Mediterranean zone and others from central Europe.

Their aim was to make it possible for a laboratory which was accredited for calibration and standardization or for testing not to have to keep re-proving its competency every time a client from a country came to it. The idea was to make it possible for an instrument which had been calibrated in one part of the world to be accepted as traceable according to the International System of Units (SI). Another objective was to ensure that uncertainties were accepted as beyond discussion through the laboratories accredited via a Signatory member of the MRA.

This was a quick résumé of ILAC criteria; they undertook peer evaluations, which might be carried out either by the regions, either exclusively for that region (Europe, Asia-Pacific or the Americas) or with bilateral evaluations, as for example with South African colleagues. South Africa was at the moment rather isolated from any zone containing multiple accreditors.

Their criteria were now harmonized for conformity assessment activities under ISO/IEC 17011 and laboratory comparison programs or aptitude tests.

There were some interconnections between the regions, notably between South Africa and Europe; certain countries and certain Northern American and Brazilian accreditors (mainly with Europe). These links allowed them to reassess every three years, which was better than their aim of every four years.

The aim of a MRA was for equivalence to be accepted whenever the market and national laws permitted it, and to try to save time and money by not duplicating testing or carrying out pointlessly repeated calibrations and assessments.

The role of cooperation between different regions was mainly to guarantee the validity of ILAC assessments and decisions regarding the acceptance of members of the MLA (at international level, within Europe), and the MRA (for state to state recognitions, the different term being used for political reasons). *A posteriori* checks of ILAC accreditations were effected by inter-laboratory comparisons to check that accreditations of laboratories had been correctly and coherently carried out, both in Europe and elsewhere.

The role of the secretariat was to:

- Try to promote, understand and improve their process in terms of the MRA;
- Detect, for their Technical Committee, the points which were in need of harmonization;
- Provide textual explanations making it certain that the general criteria had been understood in the same way;

- Provide evaluators, which was by no means their lightest task; and
- Attempt to keep their assessments down to the permissible maximum without sacrificing quality.

Finally, ILAC was there to support all developments in accreditation, providing that they were necessary and useful, while avoiding commercial activity and financial gain. Europe, especially, did not want accreditations to awarded by free market bodies which might profit from competition at the expense of their evaluations so as to maximize their client base; this caused some problems for Europe at the moment *vis-à-vis* other regions.

Mr. Reposeur showed delegates the MRA logo; it was not obligatory to use this but when an accrediting laboratory displayed it beside its national accreditor sign, this showed that it was accredited by an MRA signatory as a testing or calibrating laboratory; the national signs indicated which of these categories the laboratory was in.

For Members who might want more information, Mr. Reposeur gave the name of Mr. Alan Squirrel, the present ILAC Secretary; alternatively information in English, French and Spanish and in some cases Russian could be found on the ILAC web site www.ilac.org. The regional organizations could also be contacted via the ILAC web.

Mr. Johnston thanked Mr. Reposeur.

ISO

Mr. Bryden, for ISO, brought greetings from the standardization "family"; he said that ISO constituted, with the IEC for electro-technology and the ITU for telecommunications, the World Standardization Corporation, and they had strong links with metrology. He also brought the greetings of the 153 Members of ISO (an increasing number of national members) and his own personal greetings, because he had been associated with metrology in general and legal metrology in particular for many years before taking the position of Secretary General of ISO in Geneva.

International Standards of the type produced by ISO, with a double level of consensus (across nations and amongst stakeholders) were more and more in demand because of the globalization of trade in products and services, because there was an increasing delocalization of investment and procurement, because public services were being privatized or deregulated in many countries, and also because the general public had a growing demand for quality, safety and environmental protection and was exposed to a more international offer of products and services.

Unfortunately, it was also necessary to be more firm in relation to security issues and international standards were also the vehicle for the dissemination of new technologies and innovation. The success of the internet, for example, could not have happened without international standards to transmit and compress information for transmission across the web.

There was a new political framework to develop these international standards. The WTO had 148 Members, just a few less than ISO, and it had been shown in the evolution of the WTO that having a national standardization body was one of the elements of the tool kit, as it were, to access the WTO.

Because it recommended the use of international standards to eliminate technical barriers to trade, created by technical regulations, the WTO had also been a driver to review national legislative contacts for technical regulations.

Mr. Bryden extolled the concept of good regulatory practices, making reference to voluntary standards instead of reinventing the wheel, and making the best use of what the stakeholders themselves had evolved to harmonize, in terms of test methods or implementation procedures for products and services. Good regulatory practices were highly recommended. It could be seen that competition between European standards and US standards was not so topical now, because

companies were becoming more and more multinational; they operated worldwide, rather than just with one foot on each side of the Atlantic.

There were new emerging strong economies such as China, India, Brazil and Indonesia and they also wanted to take part in the development of international standards. Society around us was increasingly seen to make its opinion heard on how globalization should go forward. No meeting of the G 8 or the Ministerial Conference of the WTO was without some element of non-governmental organizations making their voice heard.

There was also a multiplication of regional and bilateral free trade agreements. International standards could help in that area, in particular to avoid such regional agreements creating a new fragmentation of standards. The relationship between ISO and CEN, in Europe, was quite exemplary: with the Vienna Agreement they had obtained that Europeans would work as much as possible in an international context to develop the standards that they needed to consolidate their internal market.

In this context, since 1946 ISO had developed as one of the leaders for the production of international standards. They now had 153 National Members, many of them with links with the organizations represented by the delegates present, because metrology and standardization, accreditation and conformity assessment were the basis of national quality infrastructures. This number of members had increased significantly. 100 of them were Full Members with voting rights, this number having been reached a few weeks previously. The other pillars of their system were 177 active Technical Committees with Subcommittees and Working Groups. Every day there were between 10 and 15 ISO physical meetings taking place, not counting the virtual meetings organized through the IT tools operated by ISO. This represented a lot of experts. At the Geneva headquarters there was a staff of 150, where they were close to many other international organizations with which they worked.

In the past two years ISO had adjusted its strategy, policies and organization to the challenges of the 21st century. After broad consultation of the members, a new strategic plan had been adopted; a code of ethics for ISO activities had been developed and published and an action plan for Developing Countries had been adopted. More than 80 % of the members were from Developing Countries and so a policy on the global relevance of ISO standards had been adopted: an ISO standard should be able to be used anywhere on the planet; and communication on the benefits and importance of standardization had been enhanced. The well known ISO IEC toolbox for conformity assessment had also been updated and consolidated.

In the current year, the overall collection of ISO Standards had reached 15000 in use and there were 4000 work items in progress.

Since the creation of the OIML, a very close relationship between the two organizations had been enjoyed. They worked together on certain Guides related to metrology and uncertainties of measurement: the very well known VIM and GUM Documents were the joint production of the OIML, ISO, and various other organizations such as the BIPM involved in the metrologies. The OIML had a liaison status with seven ISO TCs and also with two specific Committees, REMCO on reference materials and CASCO for conformity assessment. One double logo standard had already been produced and there might well be more in the future. Concerning reference materials, the expansion of the needs for metrology in chemical measurements, biological measurements and environmental measurements had expanded the need for traceability in these areas and therefore REMCO had gained a new exposure for needs in the orderly production of reference materials to ensure that traceability.

ISO was known particularly for its 9000 series of standards on quality management, and he understood that the OIML was making considerable use of this series. It should be underlined that these standards had been implemented since 1987, almost 20 years. It had certainly served to make industry more aware of the concept of quality management, of which one component was of course the monitoring of the measurement function. Mr. Bryden was sure that the success of these standards over the world had also resulted in a greater interest in metrology and

traceability. ISO was also collaborating with the OIML on the subject of Developing Countries, where the ISO action plan had already been adopted. With the OIML, the BIPM and some others, there was now a Joint Committee for Developing Countries in Metrology, Accreditation and Standardization (JCDCMAS). A collective document had been produced on the subject, which was a good reference document on the various components which should be taken into account when building a quality infrastructure.

Mr. Bryden had been pleased in the course of the meeting to hear numerous references to ISO 17011, *Requirements on Accreditation Bodies* and Guide 65, *Certification of Products*. ISO was currently working on the new 17021, which would be the requirement document for bodies operating the certification of management systems; publication was expected in the current year. This was an area where ISO had become a household name, but where they had to make sure the name was not misused or misleading, and therefore it was very important that the certification of management systems to ISO 9001 was done correctly. The standard on inspection had not been updated for some time and Mr. Bryden understood that the OIML had made use of Guide 68 on *Mutual Recognition Agreements*, which was also helpful when designing a Mutual Recognition Agreement or Arrangement.

Mr. Bryden said in conclusion that ISO was keen to pursue cooperation with the OIML and other organizations in a positive way, to help the global metrology community improve the quality of its products and services.

Mr. Johnston thanked Mr. Bryden.

UNIDO

For UNIDO, Mr. Loesener-Díaz conveyed his appreciation to the OIML for its kind invitation to address the CIML, and offered congratulations on behalf of UNIDO on its 50th Anniversary.

As the CIML President had mentioned in his opening remarks, Mr. Loesener-Díaz told Members that metrology in general had no "sex appeal". At UNIDO, therefore, a more comprehensive package of services had been developed, including metrology, which appeared to be more attractive to the international community. Members were of course not expected to study this in detail; he showed the concept of the UNIDO trade capacity building initiative. Within the framework of the mandates of both organizations, with the OIML leadership, the Strategy Document discussed in the current meeting and the excellent working relationship between UNIDO and the BIML, he was sure that the two organizations would make substantive progress in building on the institutional and technical underpinnings of trade capacity reached so far for the benefit of Developing Countries.

Mr. Loesener-Díaz went on to say that Developing Countries had in the recent past expressed their concerns with regard to the effective implementation of the TBT agreement. The WTO TBT Committee had been mandated at the last ministerial meeting in Cancun to find the reasons for these concerns. UNIDO, in cooperation with the WTO/TBT Secretariat, had analyzed the responses of almost 60 Developing Countries, with the following findings:

- More than 90 % of the responses indicated a need to improve the situation with regard to national quality policy; this should include a strategy on the implementation of metrology, accreditation and standardization activities in the countries;
- Almost 80 % of the responses referred to the lack of standardization infrastructure in the countries;
- Around 90 % identified the need to improve conformity assessment infrastructure; and, last but not least,
- Although not explicitly requested, many countries made reference to the need to include metrology activities in connection with the activities of the TBT agreement.

Mr. Loesener-Díaz told Members that it was in this context that UNIDO was providing vital trade-related technical assistance and capacity building in coordination with international organizations, members of JCDCMAS such as the OIML, as well as with the sister organizations of the UN system and other institutions. The UNIDO strategy towards enabling the participation of Developing Countries in international trade foresaw cooperation with these bodies. So far, cooperation agreements had been signed with the ILAC/IAF to support the globalization of accreditation; with the WTO to improve the participation of Developing Countries in international trade; with ISO to support standardization bodies; and with the OIML and the PTB to support the development of legal metrology, focusing on African countries.

During the last Conference in Berlin, Mr. Loesener-Díaz's colleagues from the French speaking countries in Western Africa had given a presentation on their achievements under the UNIDO-UMR regional trade capacity building program. This time, he had the pleasure of being accompanied by Dr. John Acaña, Director General of SON, Nigeria, with whom they would be embarking upon legal metrology in the near future.

On this occasion, in the context of the trade capacity building initiative, Mr. Loesener-Díaz was pleased to announce that UNIDO was supporting the development of legal metrology in Afghanistan, Ecuador, Guatemala, Nigeria and Pakistan, on top of the ongoing activities reported on in earlier meetings.

The publication of the OIML International Document D 1 would play a key role, as agreed, in the context of cooperation between the OIML, the PTB and UNIDO, and these activities had been linked to the OIML Permanent Working Group to ensure effective and efficient implementation of these technical assistance programs.

Finally, Mr. Loesener-Díaz emphasized, as he had done in the past, that in order to make progress in these areas it was essential to work in concert, joining hands by each one contributing what they did best. The overall approach required cooperation with a key group of international actors, represented by the specialist organizations that operated at global level in areas immediately relevant to the trade capacity building initiative, such as the OIML and the BIPM in metrology, ILAC and IAF in accreditation and ISO in standards, through the work conducted in the JCDCMAS.

Mr. Loesener-Díaz concluded by congratulating the OIML again on its 50th Anniversary and stating that he looked forward to even closer cooperation in the years to come.

Mr. Johnston thanked Mr. Loesener-Díaz.

IMEKO

For IMEKO, Mr. Van Biesen expressed gratitude for the opportunity to present the aims of their organization, the International Measurement Confederation. He began by showing delegates the IMEKO logo and explaining that its secretariat was based in Hungary; Mr. Van Biesen himself was currently its President, based in Brussels.

The current presentation was aimed primarily as a reminder for those who had been with IMEKO for a while but had forgotten them, and as an introduction to their activities for countries which did not already know them.

IMEKO was a non governmental federation with 36 national member organizations; all members were countries not individuals, represented by delegates from scientific and technical societies or committees concerned with the advancement of measurement technology and instrument engineering, or delegates from higher education, industry or simply instrument users.

IMEKO had been founded in 1958 in Budapest, in Hungary so in 2005 it was only its 47th anniversary whereas it was the OIML's 50th. He offered congratulations.

Mr. Van Biesen showed a map and table of the 36 members. If a country was not shown, then either it had been a member but was no longer one or else it had never been a member. In this case he asked those OIML Members whose country was not shown on the map to contact him or the organization's secretary to suggest possible candidate organizations for membership within their country. In this way their country would be able to benefit from the many activities organized within IMEKO.

The objective of IMEKO was the promotion and interchange of scientific and technical information in the field, of measurement and instrumentation, and the development of international cooperation among scientists. It was therefore also a platform for individuals to meet and make good contacts for future projects.

Regarding the structure, without going into detail, there were boards, committees, and a number of officers. More detail could be found on the web site. The Secretariat was in a very beautiful location alongside the Danube and opposite the Hungarian Parliament - anyone visiting Hungary was welcome to drop in. The 20 Technical Committees were the most important part of the organization; activities were mainly conducted through these and this was done by organizing symposia, workshops, conferences, seminars, etc. on specific topics and at very regular intervals. Proceedings and textbooks were also published, and details of individual technical committees, their members and past, present and future activities could be found on the web site.

The main activity, in which all the Technical Committees worked together towards a global theme, was the IMEKO World Congress which was held every three years. Members were shown a slide of where previous Congresses had been held and their themes. The September 2006 Congress would be held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil and in 2009 it would be in Paris in conjunction with the Metrology Congress soon to be in session in Lyon. Mr. Van Biesen invited all Members to participate in this IMEKO World Congress, the theme of which would be modern and very topical: the need for metrology for sustainable development. The deadline for submission of extended abstracts was 3 October 2005 and more information was available on the IMEKO web site www.imeko.org.

Regarding publications, the IMEKO journal, with a recently modernized cover, was called *Measurement*. Other IMEKO publications could be found on their web site and were downloadable in PDF form.

News of IMEKO activities could also be found on the site, which was hosted by PTB; Mr. Van Biesen expressed his gratitude for this.

International contacts included membership of the so-called Five International Association Coordinating Committees (FIACC), and there were good working relationships with other organizations such as the OIML, BIPM and so forth.

Mr. Van Biesen concluded with congratulations and thanks to the OIML and Mr. Johnston thanked Mr. Van Biesen for his presentation.

CECIP

Mrs. Martens explained that she was a member of the Legal Metrology Group of CECIP, which was the European Organization of Manufacturers of Weighing Machines. She expressed pleasure at once again being able to address an OIML meeting. Many of the decisions made at these meetings, the work programs that were laid down and the objectives that were set, had a direct effect on the weighing machine industry, and CECIP welcomed the opportunity to participate in all the discussions. They hoped that their input was seen as useful and constructive.

At the Berlin meeting, and again at this one, the OIML MAA had been a major topic that interested CECIP. They had said in Berlin, and now repeated, that they supported the intention of

the MAA, which was a way forward towards a global system for type approval. However, they were concerned that the system being introduced should have benefits over and above the OIML Certificate System that it complemented and at the moment they were still struggling to see where these additional benefits came from. The MAA would undoubtedly result in increasing costs for industry: not only the direct cost of the Certificates themselves but also indirect costs such as providing experts for peer assessment and attending committee meetings would be borne by industry in the form of higher testing costs. Like all people and organizations, when faced with higher costs they expected to see benefits in the form of added value, and, as they had said in Berlin, and in their submissions since, this added value had yet to be demonstrated to them.

It might be that CECIP's worries were ill founded, and that the MAA indeed took them forward and gave them benefits that they had not yet recognized. If this proved to be the case, then they as an organization would be delighted, but at the moment they had not yet been convinced that this would happen.

CECIP felt that the MAA was replacing a scheme which had worked well since its introduction, which had gained the support of industry, and which had improved the confidence that national metrology authorities had in their counterparts and in other countries. If, as the OIML expected, the MAA provided added value for CECIP and for industry, then it would sell itself. The OIML would not have to impose the system, industry would take it up willingly and the OIML would face demand from industry to use the new system. The existing Certificate System would then die out naturally. CECIP urged the OIML to allow that to happen, by running the two schemes side by side, even within the same Issuing Authority, and to let industry have the choice. This way, the better scheme (i.e. the one which provided better value for customers) would survive and flourish.

On behalf of CECIP, Mrs. Martens made an additional plea. As manufacturers, they faced an ever increasing burden of regulation and control. This might be inevitable as technology moved forward; the regulations faced by industry were not only based on metrology, but also dealt with safety, environmental matters, financial rules and many other topics. It seemed to them that each new set of rules and regulations that appeared was more complex than the set it replaced. Manufacturers nowadays had to spend many hours working through complex legislation, trying to understand it and implement its requirements. It was almost inevitable that at some point industry would miss something because of the complexity. It would not be in their interests deliberately to do something wrong; they saw the need for regulations and for control since these gave benefit to manufacturers' customers, their customers and benefited themselves. They wanted to follow the rules, but if those rules were so difficult to understand and if they were not clearly and logically set out, then in time mistakes would be made.

Many years ago when an individual bought a new product such as a television set or a washing machine, or any other major item of domestic equipment, it came with an instruction manual which had been written by the engineers who had designed and developed the product. When the product was simple to use, the instruction manual was there to help when there was a problem. The fact that it was a little difficult for the user to understand was not a major concern. However, as domestic products had since become more sophisticated, offering more options and facilities to the user, the instruction manuals had had to become much easier to follow. Manufacturers had had to find different ways of presenting the information on how to use their products so that their customers operated them correctly and got the full benefit from them.

The rules and requirements that manufacturers faced were in effect the instruction manuals that they had to follow, yet in most cases the method of presenting that information had not changed. This was true not only for metrology rules and the OIML requirements and publications, but also for all the other aspects of legislation that industry had to meet. They needed help to find their way through the complexities that faced them. Industry's plea, therefore, was for clarity and simplicity in the content and format of OIML Recommendations, and for requirements to be limited to the basic and the essential. The basic format and structure of OIML Recommendations had changed little since the first ones had appeared. Mrs. Martens asked whether that format and structure were right for the Recommendations being produced today, and whether the new

Recommendations were easy for manufacturers or legislators to understand. Could manufacturers and legislators find their way through the Recommendations without difficulty? The test to apply was not "do I as the author understand this document?" but rather "will the user of this Recommendation be able readily to understand the requirements and apply them?".

Mrs. Martens assured the audience that CECIP had always been a staunch supporter of the OIML, and continued to be so. The OIML had from the beginning made CECIP welcome at its meetings and its Technical Committees. It had been an example to other legislation organizations of how to involve industry. They were grateful for that and regarded themselves as partners and friends of the OIML. If they offered any criticism of the OIML it was not done maliciously but in a spirit of cooperation. They hoped their criticisms were constructive.

Mrs. Martens thanked the OIML once again for the opportunity to make these remarks and wished them a successful and enjoyable meeting.

Mr. Johnston thanked Mrs. Martens, adding that he shared her view that everything should be made as clear and simple as possible. It was true that things did at times become complicated. He had noted her comments and they would be taken into consideration.

Gulf Standardization Organization

For the Gulf Standardization Organization, the speaker thanked the OIML for inviting them to the meeting.

The Gulf Standardization Organization was a regional organization which coordinated standardization activities in the Gulf States, which comprised Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Kuwait, Qatar, Bahrain and Oman. Their organization was new and was the successor to a former organization the Gulf Standards and Metrology Organization. Their task was not just standardization; they were responsible for developing other sectors of the total quality system, which included metrology, conformity assessment and standardization. At this stage they were building a structure for the whole Gulf to set up a metrology system for their region, and the same thing with the other sectors. So they looked forward to receiving help and technical assistance from the OIML.

The speaker thanked the OIML for setting up the PWGDC, which was felt to be a good venue for Developing Countries to express their needs; they looked forward to working with the OIML in the future and congratulated them on their 50th Anniversary.

Mr. Johnston thanked the speaker.

6.3 Updates by RLMOs

APLMF

The President of the APMLF, Mr. Ooiwa, said that he was pleased to report some progress in APLMF activities during the past year. He had been the President for almost three and a half years, and the APLMF was currently in the process of looking for a new President. There were 26 Member Economies from almost all the nations on the Asian Pacific rim, many of whom were present during this CIML Meeting. He showed a slide of the membership, showing APLMF and APEC Members and Corresponding Members.

There were seven Working Groups, which dealt with such technical areas as pre-packages and now the Mutual Acceptance Arrangement, utility meters, medical measurements, rice moisture

measurement, and preserving legal metrology and pattern compliance, where it was vital for these countries to make progress.

The main activities of the APLMF involved training seminars for aiding Developing Countries as well as some legal metrology systems. There were many Developing Countries which needed new legal metrology systems. The APLMF had in the past year started training courses in such fields as developing legislation for the implementation of OIML R 87 *Quantity of product in prepackages* and a seminar on automated sphygmomanometers for medical measurements, and training on traceability in rice moisture meters. Since the previous year's CIML Meeting they had already carried out six training seminars, on the following topics:

- Traceability in non contacting body meters; this was useful for body temperature measurement, for example at airports to detect people suffering from SARS or similar;
- Traceability in rice moisture meters;
- Verification of nonautomatic weighing instruments;
- Electricity meters;
- Fuel dispensers; and
- Clinical thermometers.

Other seminars were also planned for the near future in clinical thermometers and a "train the trainer" course in verification of nonautomatic weighing instruments and electricity meters. For the benefit of its members which were Developing Countries, the APLMF also planned training courses on fuel dispensers, and seminars and training courses on thermometers, food safety and culture metrology.

Mr. Ooiwa showed photos of the participants at these training sessions.

The APLMF was very busy arranging many training courses, which were much appreciated by a large proportion of the Developing Countries. The problem was, however, that most of the Developing Countries had other needs too: for example in their legislative systems they needed not only technical competence but also systems for legislative control, so yet more training and seminars were needed. They were in the process of studying how to offer activities of this sort.

COOMET

COOMET President and Director of the Belarusian State Institute of Metrology Mr. Zhagora spoke of COOMET's activity in the field of legal metrology. There was no organization in their region which specialized in legal metrology questions but nevertheless COOMET very often encountered these questions. They had begun by studying the legislation in different countries regarding legal metrology questions and this year this work would be finished. Several countries, for example Russia, Belarus, etc. were currently drawing up new laws on legal metrology. The draft had passed its first step in the Belarus parliament and had been adopted unanimously; this was why, in the future, they were going to receive a new version of the law, which was based on OIML D 1. This Document had been translated into Russian and distributed to participants who were Members of COOMET and it had made an excellent contribution to the legal metrology movement in the COOMET countries.

A seminar, *The role of Metrology in Trade*, had attracted 100 participants from 18 countries and had been held in conjunction with the 14th Meeting in Minsk on 20 May 2005. Some inter-governmental agreements on legal metrology were currently in preparation, for example Belarus with their neighbors, and agreements between national metrology institutes and cooperation in the field of conformity assessment of measuring instruments and other goods.

Some changes had taken place in state supervision on measuring instruments, and on market surveillance. Now they were working on the question of certification or attestation of software for

legal metrology purposes and preparing a draft of a normative document, *Methodology: How to Check Software*.

A major question which was common to other regional metrology organizations was how to use ISO/IEC 17025 for legal metrology. For example, their institute was accredited as a calibration and testing laboratory but it was accredited as a verification body by the national metrology body, in other words by their own state standards. How to use ISO/IEC 17025 for verification was an urgent problem. Mr. Zhagora wished to express his thanks to the Vice Presidents of the OIML, Messrs. Kochsiek and Issaev and to the Director, Mr. Magaña, and especially to the PTB for their input to COOMET activities.

EMLMF

Mr. Lagauterie informed Members that the EMLMF had held its latest meeting the previous Thursday, 16 June in Lyon, with nine out of its fourteen Members present. This showed the interest of members in the Forum's work. They had had the pleasure and the honor of the presence of both Presidents of the CIML, Messrs. Kochsiek and Johnston, and also of WELMEC President Mr. Freistetter. Matters dealt with had included the creation of a warning network for non conforming instruments, a matter raised by Members. After that, each State had made a presentation on how legal metrology was organized in that country. The following topic had been the designation of bodies in the framework of the Directive on Measuring Instruments (MID). Mr. Lagauterie himself had spoken to various bodies on the French approach to delegation and there had also been an item on the preparation for the MID, notably the EU and WELMEC initiatives.

SADCMEL

Mr. Carstens reported on the two meetings which had been held since the last CIML Meeting, the first in November 2004 in Namibia, the other in May 2005 in Mozambique.

The current membership situation was that Seychelles had withdrawn and that Madagascar might possibly join, which would bring numbers back to 14 Member States. The current status of legal metrology within the SADC countries fell into three categories:

- States with almost no legislation or infrastructure, which included Angola, Lesotho and Mozambique. At the moment, Angola and Mozambique were in the process of having legal metrology legislation promulgated in their countries; there had been considerable movement there; but Lesotho still had no infrastructure at all - no staff, no funding, etc.;
- National legislation, not SADC harmonized, and regulatory control of simple or basic instruments for mass, volume and length of goods; this category included Botswana, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Malawi, Libya, Swaziland, Tanzania and Zambia;
- National legislation, not SADC harmonized, and regulatory control, inspection, verification of more sophisticated instruments for mass, volume and length of goods: these states comprised Mauritius and South Africa.

During the November meeting there had been a workshop on OIML D 1, *Law on Metrology*. This had been a joint venture with SADCMET, which was the national metrology laboratory forum. This seminar had been presented by Mr. Brian Beard and Mr. Carstens himself and had been very successful.

There had also been discussion on the changes to the SADCMEL 1 Document, raised in particular by South African industry, and changes to the SADCMEL 4 Document on tolerances.

The main meeting in Maputo had been attended by all the Member States except Zambia, by Mr. Dunmill of the BIML, PTB representatives, Mr. Loesener-Díaz from UNIDO, the SADC Secretariat, observers from Egypt, Madagascar and Nigeria, and the other SADC bodies, SADCSTAN, the standards body, SADCA the accreditation body and SADCMET the metrology body.

The highlights of the reports to the meeting had been:

- The study visit to Berlin by the Chair;
- The ILAC/IAF meeting held in Cape Town and attended by the Chair;
- The D 1 workshop mentioned earlier, organized by the Chair;
- The alignment of prepackaged goods requirements between South Africa and Mauritius, both of which countries would soon be adopting the SADCMEL 1 document into their legislation;
- INMETRO assistance to Angola and Mozambique in having their documentation translated from English into Portuguese; and
- The Beam Scales and Counter Scales Documents, Documents 2 and 3, which had been published as national standards in South Africa.

Some of the projects which had been discussed were:

- SADCMEL Document 4 on tolerances, which had been finalized and submitted to the SADCSTAN structure to be adopted as regional standard;
- OIML R 35, which had been adopted for all SADCMEL countries: the verification requirements which had been identified should be regarded as a national issue and would therefore not be a SADCMEL issue, but handled by each state itself;
- A decision to look at a harmonized document on liquor dispensing measures as the next project;
- The PTB funding project: Angola and Mozambique were to make a joint proposal for assistance from INMETRO which could also entail training on NAWIs according to OIML R 76;
- Beam Scales and Counter Scales, two SADCMEL Documents; and
- Liquid fuel dispensers.

A training course on presentation skills on NAWIs, beam scales and counter scales was to be given in Pretoria in June/July 2005 by Mr. Brian Beard. Concerning training on liquid fuel dispensers, no legislation based on OIML Recommendations was yet in place in the SADC community so it had been decided to approach DAM (Germany) with the intention of getting them to give a course on liquid fuel dispensers.

The course on the verification of volume measures was to be converted into a calibration course. The National Laboratory Association in South Africa would be approached for this since it was offering courses which were part of the SRCME (the SADC Resource Centre for Metrology Education), which was still in its infancy. The SRCME nevertheless had a range of calibration courses which could be used for this issue.

For automatic weighing instruments training, a circular would be issued to all members to gauge the extent of training needed. There would be a course on the Labeling and Tolerance Documents in Mauritius, envisaged for September 2005; and some ISO/IEC 17025 training would be arranged through SANAS, the South African National Accreditation Service.

A need was identified for a course on general inspection methodologies and Tanzania had been asked to develop a course on this issue.

All the Documents which SADC had produced had been handed to the Permanent Working Group on Developing Countries to be put on its web site for use by any other countries which might find them helpful.

SIM

In the absence of Mr. da Silva from Brazil, Mr. Ehrlich, on behalf of SIM reported to Members that this Legal Metrology Working Group had not been very active but that it had sponsored a training course in December 2003 on mass metrology, from a legal metrology perspective, and quality systems. This had been held in Mexico, and had been funded through the Organization of American States. The instructors had been from Uruguay, Antigua and Barbados and there had been 18 participants from countries throughout Southern America, Central America and the Caribbean.

South Pacific Legal Metrology Forum

Mr. Vadei wished to thank the OIML for inviting him to attend the CIML Meeting. A forum was being created for the South Pacific Island countries, which were generally small economies. They had found out from the PASC, from the APMP and from the APLMF that many instruments found their way very well to the Developing Countries in the region and so they were undertaking a number of studies which were being conducted by technical authorities from Australia and New Zealand as well as from the OIML.

Other studies had been undertaken on shaping their organization as well as funding requirements; they were therefore well versed with what was going on at the moment.

Looking at the scope of their island countries, only Papua New Guinea and Fiji were members of the Asia Pacific Legal Metrology Forum. Papua New Guinea had a greater land area and population than Fiji but Fiji had been selected to hold the Secretariat of the new Forum for the South Pacific Islands. Regarding the establishment of legal metrology, some of the islands were at very infant stages. Filtering the information down the line, it was very difficult for them to develop. As a result, Mr. Vadei was quite alarmed today to see how much was happening in other places in the field of legal metrology. He hoped the OIML would look into their development and help with shaping their organization and with its progression in legal metrology in the small Pacific islands.

WELMEC

The chairman of WELMEC, Mr. Freistetter wished to give information on its activities in the past year, especially concerning the implementation of the MID in Europe, which very much concerned OIML Recommendations.

A very long list of measuring instruments was already subject to legal metrology control in Europe and all over the world. The MID highlighted ten kinds of measuring instruments, starting with utility meters and weighing instruments since these had been considered by the European Union countries as the most interesting measuring instruments in being subject to legal metrology control. The MID was the Directive for the free circulation of goods in the field of measuring instruments subject to legal metrology control.

In the structure of European cooperation and legal metrology, it could be seen that the Committee and all of the Working Groups had to struggle with implementing the MID in that they had to examine the Directive and prepare guidance documents for its implementation. At present there were about 20 such documents, notably approximately 15 related to a comparison between OIML Recommendations and the requirements of the MID.

On the other hand, preparation was under way in Europe of a new Directive concerning prepackages and the ideas of these developments were very closely following the OIML's

Recommendation R 87 concerning prepackages. Looking at the MID in software, WELMEC had already endorsed the Guide which was related to software in measuring instruments subject to legal metrology control. This had been done in the current year.

A European project had also been running on this with the cooperation of industry, authorities and other interested parties, and WELMEC had decided to develop a software guide because the European standardization institutes such as CEN and CENELEC had produced nothing on software. The WELMEC draft document was being forwarded to the OIML for further consideration. Thus a guide already existed in Europe concerning software in relation to legal metrology instruments.

All the other Working Groups were working hard on guidance documents for the implementation of the MID. Only a few decisions had been taken in the current year: first, there were now 31 Member Countries, consisting of the 25 member countries of the European Union, plus the EFTA countries, and Bulgaria and Romania which hoped to become EU Members by 1 January 2007. Turkey had also joined as a new Associate Member.

Mr. Freistetter had been re-elected chairman of WELMEC for a further three years. Three new Guides or updates of Guides had already been adopted in the current year, concerning nonautomatic weighing instruments, a Guide for packers in the field of prepacked products and the new WELMEC Guide 7.2 for software in relation to the MID.

The close cooperation with the European Union and the European Commission was related to market surveillance activities, to the conformity assessment activities foreseen in the Directive and to the operation of notified bodies. This was an interesting area of work, connected with the common approach in Europe, which had also been done in such areas as calibration: doing the same work in different regions of Europe.

Identification of relevant OIML Recommendations/Documents, development of guidance documents and close administrative cooperation was a new issue in the Directives; authorities were required to work closely together for implementation for a common approach all over Europe.

Other guides were being developed in cooperation with the European Commission; these included the *Software and measuring instruments for legal metrology* Guide and other Guides for conformity assessment modules and on how to look at the competence of notified bodies in the field of legal metrology.

It had been agreed at the last meeting in Edinburgh that Working Groups were requested to examine the OIML Recommendations on water meters, electricity meters and others; about 15 of these were under consideration. The WELMEC Working Group 8 would make a table in relation to the requirements in the OIML Recommendations and those of the MID, and then this document would be passed to the European Commission which would publish a document indicating which parts of OIML Recommendations lead to a presumption of conformity with the MID.

Mr. Freistetter then moved to the analysis of existing WELMEC work in relation to the European Commission. WELMEC Guides would be studied by a Commission working group and published by WELMEC but if the Commission working group endorsed these documents, a link would be found on the Commission web page, to the effect that these Guides written and published by WELMEC were the best expositions of legal metrology in Europe. This would give WELMEC excellent status.

Looking to the near future, some areas of the Measurement Instruments Directive were still in need of clarification and the approach to some questions remained problematical. Close cooperation with the European Commission was taking place regarding the software requirements, and WELMEC was also giving seminars and workshops on the MID. Members would find all they needed to know on the web site (www.welmec.org).

CENELEC

Mr. Mertens, CENELEC Director Corporate, began by passing on some words from the CENELEC Director General and from the CEN Secretary General who thanked the OIML for allowing their organizations to be represented at the CIML Meeting in an observer role and to make the presentation. They congratulated the OIML on its 50th Anniversary.

He had been particularly interested in the previous day's Strategy Document, in particular the paragraph concerning the difference between the OIML and international standardization. Being himself in European regional standardization, he would concentrate in his presentation on giving Members food for thought and bringing them closer together to his organization.

CEN and CENELEC were two of the three regional bodies active in standardization in Europe. CENELEC is the European Committee for Electro-technical Standardization; they were younger than the OIML, having been founded in 1973. They have a Central Secretariat in Brussels and their members were the national electro-technical committees of 28 European Countries. CEN is the European Committee for Standardization, a non profit making organization founded in 1961, also based in Brussels and the members were the national standards institutes of the same 28 European countries.

Besides CEN and CENELEC, the third European standardization body is ETSI. All three were officially recognized by the European Commission as standard-setting bodies in their area of competences. On a global scale, however there was a kind of matrix: these organizations were between the international ones, ISO, IEC and the ITU on the one hand and national electro-technical committees or institutes on the other. There was therefore a matrix between the three levels, each body having its equivalent at each level.

One important general feature in European standardization was that CEN/CENELEC standards were implemented as identical national standards in 28 countries. In addition all conflicting national standards had to be withdrawn.

The Members of CEN and CENELEC were the organizations within the 25 EU countries and three EFTA countries, and membership was still growing. In 2007, when Romania and Bulgaria will join the EU, they would undoubtedly also join the ranks of CEN and CENELEC but they were already there as affiliates, and as such, invited to "play the game" as the members did, but without having the members' obligations.

CENELEC also had partnerships with 33 industry federations and with other associations, among them the OIML. CEN had eight Associate Members and a lot of technical cooperation agreements with many organizations, again including the OIML. Cooperation between CEN, CENELEC and the OIML had always been smooth in the past; results had been relatively few, but one which merited a mention was the European Standard EN 45001 (1992) which covered the metrology aspects of nonautomatic weighing instruments. The OIML reference document was R 76-1 (1992).

The first element of the presentation had been an explanation of who CEN and CENELEC were; the second was to present the European Standardization Model. Mr. Mertens wished to highlight a few aspects of this.

The structure in which the organizations worked: standards were elaborated in the technical body on a consensus basis. The delegates who discussed this matter came from the national committees, so that ideas followed a bottom up approach whereby the national bodies gathered all interested parties, such as industry, legal authorities, metrology experts and others, round the table for each new work item. They then brought a national viewpoint to the European or international scene, where they tried to reach a consensus. Others may be present as observers in the technical body activity, including cooperating partners, of which the OIML was one.

The standardization process consisted firstly of programming, which involved checking the market relevance for each new work item to be elaborated, to see whether a standard for this item would satisfy the stakeholders' needs. Secondly, the drafting was done by experts: it must not be

forgotten that standards were voluntary documents and that their importance was the state of the art of each document, so at that level the experts were very important. This was followed, in the interests of transparency, by a public inquiry at national level: anyone, expert or not, could comment upon any document, and that resulted in clarification of many aspects which might not have been clear at the first draft. Then there was a vote: the key word here was democracy; CEN and CENELEC followed the voting procedure set out in the Nice Treaty for voting in the EU. Ratifications indicated when a European Standard was really in place and implementation was done at national level by the 28 Members adopting the single European standard.

Concerning international standardization, CENELEC had cooperation agreements with the IEC (the Dresden Agreement), and CEN with ISO (the Vienna Agreement). The principle was to work at international level and not at European level unless absolutely necessary. Consensus results established at international level were then brought to Europe. As an illustration of the success of this type of cooperation, mention was made that two out of every three of CENELEC's European Standards were identical to IEC standards.

The importance of cooperation with the European Union and EFTA had already been referred to by the WELMEC speaker. A key word was the New Approach Directives, which were Directives issued by the European Commission defining essential requirements for products. For example, the Low Voltage Directive, in simple words, stated that electro-technical products, when put on the market, must be safe. Of course safety was different from one product to another so the Commission issued mandates to the European standardization work to complement the essential requirements of the Directive with requirement specifications for each product. CENELEC responded to these mandates by having a program of standards and working them out.

Harmonized standards were those standards which fulfilled the requirements set by Commission New Approach Directives. Products which were manufactured following these harmonized standards were granted automatic presumption of conformity with the Essential Requirements of the identified EU Directives.

Mr. Mertens showed a slide demonstrating how the legal field and the voluntary field could work together, on the same principle. He reminded delegates that they tried to have the same voluntary standard implemented in all the 25 or 28 countries as national, identical standards; the European Commission has similar intentions with New Approach Directives - they aimed for an approximation or harmonization of the laws in Europe to be implemented at national level. The general cohesion in this field was the result of many years of good cooperation between European standardizing bodies and the European Commission. All this constituted the presentation of the European Standardization Model.

Coming to the topic of the Measuring Instruments Directive, Mr. Mertens pointed out the common interest with the OIML. According to the wording of this, "presumption of conformity with the official requirements of the Directive can be done either through normative documents (as mentioned by the speaker from WELMEC) or through harmonized European Standards". It was possible that this may give rise to some confusion. The next step was that Mandate 347 (Measuring Instruments) was received. This Mandate invited CEN, CENELEC and ETSI to prepare a work program of European Standards in support of the Measuring Instruments Directive. This had already been answered by giving the programs of four of the Technical Committees of these bodies: from CENELEC, TC 13 *Electricity meters*; and three from CEN: TC 92 *Water meters*; TC 237 *Gas meters* and TC 176 *Heat meters*. In their mandate however, very importantly, they were asked to take into account the work of the OIML, ISO and the IEC; this was the promise Mr. Mertens wished to make to the OIML: their activities would be taken into account.

Mr. Mertens closed with an assurance of the sincere wish of CEN and CENELEC to work together with the OIML and WELMEC in Europe to ensure that the stakeholders, those who used the Directive, would have clear documentation in support of their essential requirements.

Mr. Johnston thanked all the presenters for the information they had provided.

7 BIML activities

7.1 Organization of the Bureau

Mr. Magaña told Members that there had been some staff changes in the Bureau since the last CIML Meeting. One of the secretaries had left and had been replaced, and one of the engineers, Edouard Weber, had resigned at the beginning of 2005. One of his tasks had been the translation into French of the OIML's publications. He had not yet been replaced, and the French speaking countries might notice that there was a backlog in the translation of publications into French. Mr. Magaña apologized for this and assured Members that they would very soon be seeking a replacement staff member and a solution to have publications translated into French.

Mrs. Régine Gaucher had also taken on her role at the beginning of 2005 as MAA Project Leader; she would be giving a presentation the following day on the progress of the MAA.

The distribution of the Bureau's tasks had been to a minor extent reorganized, and the responsibilities of each staff member had been clarified and confirmed.

Members could also find the name of the Bureau's contact person for each OIML TC/SC in the database on the web site - any questions concerning the work and subject matter of that Committee should be addressed to this person, which would avoid duplication of tasks and help both the Bureau and the Members. Much of the administrative responsibility for enquiries regarding the state of progress of the TCs and SCs had been transferred to Mrs. Patricia Saint-Germain, to allow the engineers to concentrate on the actual technical work of the TCs and SCs, which would make better use of their technical skills.

A number of tasks had been transferred and redefined, and in particular Chris Pulham, who would later be making a presentation about communication, had had his responsibilities regarding communication confirmed in addition to editing and producing OIML publications.

These alterations in the organization of the Bureau did not amount to a revolution but hopefully improved its efficiency and responsiveness.

7.2 Communication, web site

Mr. Pulham first summarized the situation concerning the production of OIML publications approved in Kyoto and Berlin. The Conference had decided in Berlin to make all OIML publications available free of charge: even industrials or other customers could now simply, without charge, download all publications from the OIML web site in the form of PDF files. However, the counterpart of this was that paper versions of these publications were no longer produced. As had been explained, this did not affect the budget and was a strategy adopted with the approval of Members which had greatly relieved the secretarial activities of the Bureau, because previously there had been a large number of daily requests for pricing and delivery information on publications. Many of the invoices, together with the effort and cost that had gone into sending out often just one paper publication, were simply not profitable and were a waste of resources. Despite the fact that this strategy had only been in operation for a few months, it was working very well.

Whilst some publications were still awaiting final editing and publication, the following had already been published and were available on the OIML web site:

- B 8: *OIML Financial Regulations*;
- D 8: *Measurement standards. Choice, recognition, use, conservation and documentation*;
- D 11: *General requirements for electronic measuring instruments*;
- D 14: *Training and qualification of legal metrology personnel*;

- R 49-3: *Water meters. Part 3 Test Report Format*; and
- R 61-2 *Automatic gravimetric filling instruments. Part 2 Test Report Format*; plus a short document outlining the differences between this edition and the previous edition as far as the issuing of OIML Certificates against R 61 was concerned.

Mr. Pulham confirmed that R 111-1 and -2 were on their way. He knew that everyone was waiting for this Recommendation but explained that there had been a Secretariat change as far as this publication was concerned. When re-reading it, both the old and the new Secretariats and the BIML had thought that it would be better to wait until certain minor and not quite so minor modifications could be made before it was published rather than having to produce a series of errata. The holding of the CIML Meeting in June instead of the normal October or November had shortened the time span available by some 4-5 months, and the fact that the Meeting was held in France had also led to a certain amount of extra work for the BIML. Once published, R 111 would be the only exception to the rule, decided the previous year, of no paper documents - it would be produced on paper as well as posted on the web site.

Regarding the other publications, the Minutes of the 12th Conference, 39th CIML Meeting and Development Council had already been produced.

The January and April Bulletins had been published, and the July edition had been completed immediately before he and his colleagues had left the Bureau for Lyon and had just gone to press. He reminded Members that the OIML was open minded about articles accepted for the Bulletin; articles on any legal metrology subject were welcome and could be on legal metrology in Members' countries, or on any legal metrology related technical subject. Members should not hesitate to submit articles. Fewer and fewer articles were being received; Members would find that in the July 2005 Bulletin there was no *Technique* section at all as no technical articles whatsoever had been received. Mr. Pulham asked Members to give consideration to sending in material which they would like published. He knew that Members were sometimes inhibited from sending articles by fears that what they wrote might be deemed to be their Government's opinion instead of their own personal viewpoint, but he appealed to them to send any articles of interest to readers and CIML Members.

Successive Presidential Council Meetings had also decided that the BIML would produce an *Information Letter* on a regular basis. The last one which had been published was Number 6, on the implementation of the MAA, two or three months previously. The aim was, in conjunction with the web site, to issue an *Information Letter* for anything major which merited specific attention, to draw it to Members' notice. Here again, if Members or Corresponding Members would like the OIML to announce any striking news or developments in their country, there was no reason why an *Information Letter* might not be used for this purpose.

Preparations for Lyon, including creating and updating a dedicated web site and designing a brochure, had taken up a large proportion of Bureau staff's time since January or February. This summarized the Bureau's recent activities as far as document publication was concerned.

Moving on to talk about the OIML web site, Mr. Pulham said that this was now the Bureau's main communication vehicle. Paper circulars were rarely now sent out to Members, and every time the site was updated an e-mail was sent to all Members advising them of the various updates. If any Member was not receiving these emails, they were asked to let Mr. Pulham know, because this was now virtually the only way in which the Bureau communicated with Members: for example, all the documents relating to the current meeting had been exclusively available on the web site and not on paper.

Mr. Pulham said that the Bureau was now at a turning point where it was starting to place more emphasis on communications, to develop their own ideas and also, predominantly, to help Members to communicate better with other authorities, institutions or manufacturers in their own countries and "sell" the concept of legal metrology. The Bureau's aim was to put together a package to help Members to accomplish this.

To this end the Bureau had designed, based on the drafts of the Strategy Document and the Action Plan, a brand new four-page color leaflet in English and French (which Mr. Pulham showed to Members), of which 2000 copies had been brought to Lyon for Members to take. The leaflet was brand new and had been designed professionally to be a showcase for the whole of the OIML; at the same time it was very factual.

This was the OIML's first concrete attempt to assist Members in communicating the nature of legal metrology in their own countries. Mr. Pulham continued that the Bureau was also thinking of bringing out some thematic leaflets: legal metrology, as Members knew, was applicable to a number of fields and they were thinking of producing a series of single page documents relevant to specific fields. The old "Blue Brochure", which described the aims of the organization, also needed to be updated. This had been discussed the previous year as a project but work on it had not yet begun due to time constraints. The Bulletin would remain as a communication vehicle, together with the web site.

Mr. Pulham also informed Members that, also as part of the OIML's new communications strategy, a stand had been booked at the 12th International Metrology Congress; there would be poster sized versions of the leaflet on the stand, and the leaflet would be available to the Congress's wide audience as another way of communicating the message of the OIML. He was pleased to announce that the BIML would finance the printing and shipping of one set of posters to each Member that wished to acquire them.

Since the Berlin Conference there had been a number of changes to the web site, notably related to the interactivity between the web site and the in-house databases; this interactivity was being progressively programmed from scratch. It was now possible to consult online the databases of Certificates (including PDF files of actual Certificates since 1 January 2005), Issuing Authorities, categories of instruments and the OIML Technical Committees and Subcommittees: it was possible to search by publication, by field, by category or by TC/SC number.

Usage statistics for the whole web site showed that a large number of people were now making extensive use of all the facilities available on the site.

Another project in the pipeline was to have a personalized rather than a general Members' Page. Members would log in using their 2-digit ISO Country Code and personal password, which would show their status of on-line voting, the possibility of changing address details, etc.

A further project, also mentioned in Berlin and already under discussion with the BIPM, was to create a joint portal with their website. The BIPM was in favor but again, time was needed in order to decide what exactly to do, how to do it, who would manage it, from where each Organization's own web site would be accessed. Together with interactive forums for discussing TC/SC work and submitting comments on drafts, many things had been begun but time was needed to complete them all.

Mrs. Lisowska commented that OIML publications were being translated into Polish. Poland would like to put them on their web site and asked whether special permission was needed from the Bureau to do this.

Mr. Magaña replied that no permission was needed: any country could translate publications and put them on line; the only thing necessary was for to make it clear that the translators, and not the Bureau, took legal responsibility for the translation. The Bureau would also of course like to be informed of the existence of such translations, and to pass on the information to other Members.

Mr. Dunmill added a request for countries translating publications to tell the Bureau they had done so, as the translations could be of use to others; this had been mentioned earlier in the context of the Developing Countries.

Mr. Seiler congratulated the Bureau on all the work they had done and had before them, and hoped that time could also be found to work on the Virtual Forum for Developing Countries.

Mr. Pulham explained that Mr. Dunmill was working on this aspect of the web site and in addition to the Virtual Forum was starting to put together a number of web pages in support of Developing Countries; this had most certainly not been forgotten, and although it had not featured on his list it was a major aspect of ongoing work.

Mr. Lee commended the Bureau on the work done. He said that engineers and scientists were in general poor at marketing and selling themselves; the field of legal metrology was like other scientific fields in this respect. A number of issues had to be faced in the next few years, and if the OIML did not market what they were doing, they would not obtain the necessary support at Government level. He particularly commended the Bureau on their marketing initiative and recommended Members to support it to the full.

His other point, also regarding publicity, was that the OIML should work on supporting an International Legal Metrology Day. Mr. Magaña replied that there were two antecedents for the International Legal Metrology Day: an International Standardization Day and an International Metrology Day, proposed by the Metre Convention and held on the anniversary of the signing of this Convention, 20 May. The OIML had never felt it necessary to create a third International Day for legal metrology, which occupied a sort of intermediate place between the other two. They had never participated in the International Standardization Day because they were not, properly speaking, a standardization organization, but in many countries there was a National Metrology Day when scientific, legal, practical and industrial metrology were all discussed.

The Metre Convention had proposed the International Metrology Day; it had not been internationally registered with UNESCO, which was responsible for registering such events, but it was observed in many countries. What could be done was to recommend Members to associate themselves with any metrology events which might be taking place in their countries on 20 May. He himself had attended such an event in the Czech Republic, and sundry similar events in other countries in previous years. It was worth while to reflect upon the message one wanted to send, what one wanted to say, and what public one wanted to address on such a day. Was one speaking to laboratories and metrologists, to the general public or to industry? Every event must have a specific target audience.

This concluded the report and discussions on publications, communication and the OIML web site.

7.3 Report on BIML activities and work program for 2005

Mr. Magaña told Members that, complementing the Action Plan and Strategy Document discussed earlier, the BIML had drawn up a Work Program for 2005, which had also been addressed to Members. Among the Bureau's aims were:

- To review the role and functioning of the Conference and Committee;
- To review the *Guide for CIML Members* and revise it as necessary;
- For Developing Countries, to organize OIML activities and attend events organized in conjunction with other organizations;
- To speed up OIML technical work and revise and simplify the Directives;
- To set up and make increased use of interactive online tools in order to follow and speed up the work of the Technical Committees;
- To make increased use of electronic voting on Recommendations and create interactive forums for TCs;
- To keep delays in revising and publishing Recommendations down to an acceptable level;
- For the OIML Certificate System and the MAA, to put certain tools on line, for example online database search facilities, and to restructure the database of Certificates (which could now be consulted on the web site);

- To undertake a review of OIML B 3 on the OIML Certificate System;
- To expand the scope of the MAA, since its initial implementation had generated much more interest than initially anticipated;
- To improve the organizing of meetings, for example electronic registration (which to date seemed to be working well), and to develop practical guidelines specifically for organizing CIML Meetings (to be offered to host countries and to act as a checklist for the Bureau);
- To undertake specific studies, already underway, regarding the best way of collecting information and disseminating it to Members to make the information flow simpler and more automated notably using the web site;
- To develop presentations of international metrology; discussions would begin shortly on an overall explanation of international metrology to be prepared jointly with the Metre Convention;
- To finish setting up the new accountancy system; and
- To finish the ongoing analysis of the pension fund.

The above constituted the state of progress on the work objectives.

Mr. Engler asked about the Action Plan concerning the Certificate System. Mr. Magaña commented that work on the revision of B 3 was under the responsibility of OIML TC 3/SC 5, and that the Bureau would offer its help on the subject as Co-Secretariat (with the USA). Members also had many ideas and numerous possibilities were envisaged.

Mr. Llewellyn asked what security safeguards had been built into the online voting system. He felt sure that OIML Members would not abuse the system, but hackers might use the signatures for unintended purposes.

Mr. Magaña said that various safeguards against hacking had been included in the system, which for obvious reasons he would not detail. Once a Member had voted, his vote was recorded on the database and could not be changed, and once his comments had been uploaded they could not be changed or withdrawn and no further remarks could be added, unless by written request to the Bureau. Every Member could also use their password to check that there was no error in recording a vote, and only the Bureau could alter what was on the database.

8 Technical activities

Mr. Szilvássy said that he would show the present situation of ongoing projects, explain the situation regarding the approval of Recommendations and present an examination of the situation of certain TCs and SCs.

8.1 Approval of International Recommendations and Documents

The short time that had elapsed since the last CIML Meeting and Conference had not allowed for much progress in several projects, but the outlook for the coming year was very good, and so a number of Recommendations should be able to be finalized and approved in 2006.

Six TC/SC meetings had been held already in 2005 and it was foreseen that a further six to eight would be organized in the present year or early in 2006. Sixteen drafts had been circulated, especially in the last three months.

Priority and high priority projects in particular were progressing well. Among the important ones were:

- The combined revision of the Recommendations on gas meters;

- The combined revision of R 117 and R 118 for the measurement of liquids other than water; this was progressing well and the final draft was due to be circulated in the next few weeks;
- Good progress was being made with revisions of electricity meters, nonautomatic weighing instruments and the combined revision of water meters including hot water meters.

There were also ongoing projects with TC 7, TC 7/SC4, TC 8/SC 1 and TC 9/SC 2.

Due to the short time between Berlin and the 40th CIML Meeting, it had not been possible to reach final Draft Recommendation stage for R 51-1, 51-2 and R 134-1 but the postal ballots were practically complete for these. Various comments had been received and it was hoped that once these had been taken into consideration the present "no" votes could be changed. Once the final DRs were issued by the Secretariats it was proposed, based on previous experience with R 111, to proceed directly to CIML postal approval.

The draft revision of R 39 had recently been posted on the web site, again for online postal ballot, and it was proposed to also include this Recommendation in the CIML postal approval. This was an accelerated procedure allowable under the Directives for Technical Work, but the requirements were very strict: there must be no "no" vote for approval of these projects. This procedure could accelerate the publication of revised Recommendations.

Mr. Magaña asked whether Members voted in favor of using the postal vote for the adoption of the three Recommendations mentioned by Mr. Szilvássy, so as not to have to wait for the next CIML Meeting. This motion was passed unanimously.

8.2 Examination of the situation of certain TCs/SCs

A proposal had been announced at the Conference to withdraw R 62, the only Recommendation TC 10/SC 6 had been responsible for. Based on this SC proposal, it was proposed to disband TC 10/SC 6: the justification could be found in Annex 1 of the report on item 8.2, where it was explained that this Subcommittee's only project had been withdrawn, that it was not responsible for any other Documents, that it only had four members, and that if something had to be done on the subject of strain gauges it could be handled within the scope of OIML R 60 on load cells. For these reasons, the Presidential Council had recommended the disbanding of this Subcommittee.

For the disbanding of TC 10/SC 6, there was also unanimous approval.

Mr. Szilvássy presented the next proposal, which was to merge two existing Subcommittees within TC 8, SC 1 for static volume measurement and SC 2 for static mass measurement. Those who were active in the OIML could remember the early 90's, when reconstruction of the technical work had taken place. It had been decided at that time to have these two separate Subcommittees, but now there was a situation that favored having only a single SC. They were aware that this proposal demanded an accelerated decision by the CIML because there had been no previous references to it, but in Annex 2 of this technical report, a fully itemized justification for this proposed merger could be found. There had been an important discussion during the last meeting of SC 1 and this SC was proposing two new working projects which had coincided with the proposal of the Bureau to revise R 125, for mass measurement, and to have only one Recommendation for static volume and mass measurement. During that meeting the representative of the PTB announced that they might consider undertaking the work for the mass measurement part, and after the meeting Professor Kochsiek and Dr. Leitner had had a discussion on this proposal to merge the two Subcommittees. This would result in a good combination, because SC 1 had 22 P-members and SC 2 had 16 P-members, all of them also P-members of SC 1. In other words, the majority of members of these two Subcommittees were the same people. The PTB had declared itself ready to take over responsibility as co-secretariat, together with Austria. So the conclusion was that there was no strong reason for maintaining these two separate SCs since all static measurements were based primarily on determination of volume and then converting this into mass.

Mr. Magaña asked whether there was any opposition to this proposal. There were neither negative votes nor abstentions so the merging was adopted unanimously.

Mr. Szilvássy went on to say that China had offered to take over responsibility for the secretariat of TC 10/SC 3 *Barometers*, which had been vacant for two years since the UK had relinquished it. This offer was welcome because China had until now been responsible for only one Subcommittee and this would be the second.

Mr. Magaña asked if there were negative votes or abstentions: this motion also was accepted unanimously.

Mr. Szilvássy then listed some working projects which it was proposed to withdraw:

- TC 7/SC 1: This Subcommittee proposed stopping the project of revision of R 30 on length gauge blocks. However, the Secretariat of the same Subcommittee also proposed the withdrawal of R 30 and R 66, but it was pointed out that this had to be done according to the rules of the Directives for Technical Work;
- TC 10/SC 4 wished to withdraw its working project, the requirements for measuring instruments for verifying material test machines, in favor of using the existing ISO 376, which corresponded better to the needs of legal metrology;
- TC 17/SC 6 had proposed two working projects some five years previously but it had turned out that most of the Subcommittee members did not want to participate and did not need these two documents, originally proposed by the Subcommittee secretariat in Russia; this was why it was proposed to withdraw these two working projects.

Mr. Magaña asked whether there were any comments on the withdrawal of any of these working projects.

Mr. Issaev regretted of course that it was necessary to withdraw these two projects, for the calibration procedure for mine methanometers and the procedure for the calibration of alarms of combustible gases and vapors, because this was related to safety, so he had intended to appeal once again for somebody who might be more interested in taking on these projects, because few members were interested, but the topic seemed to him very important.

Mr. Magaña pointed out to Members that all the projects which were proposed for withdrawal had had no work done on them for a long period and there had not been any signs of great interest from the members of the Subcommittees.

Mr. Engler remarked on the absence of R 66 from the sheet shown in the CIML, which on the paper which had been distributed the previous week had also been a candidate for withdrawal, and had also been mentioned by Mr. Szilvássy. He thought this Recommendation might be of importance for the MID in the European countries.

Mr. Szilvássy explained that it was the Secretariat in question that wished to withdraw this Recommendation. First the proposal had to gain the approval of the Subcommittee, and, if the SC approved, the correct procedure according to the Directives was for it to be handed over to the BIML and then submitted to the CIML. For the time being, this was merely the proposal of the Secretariat.

Mr. Magaña added that this discussion was about the withdrawal of certain work projects, not about the withdrawal of Recommendations. The proposal was to stop work on projects which were not making progress or creating much interest.

Mr. Klenovsky asked for clarification on the subject of R 30.

Mr. Szilvássy explained that the proposal was not to withdraw R 30 but to withdraw the project of revision of R 30. The withdrawal proposal would be justified by the Secretariat in a detailed memorandum circulated for approval to P- and O-Members of the Subcommittee in question. It was now only at Subcommittee level and not at CIML level. The intention was to stop working on its revision while awaiting the further decision of the Secretariat regarding its future.

Mr. Szilvássy added that there was an existing ISO Standard which, in the view of the Secretariat, fully conformed to the needs of the OIML.

Mr. Magaña suggested a global vote encompassing all the above proposals; they were unanimously accepted so the work projects in question would be abandoned.

Mr. Szilvássy then moved on to those Subcommittees which had problems or were changing their work projects:

- TC 3/SC 5, on conformity assessment: there were long standing projects on the elaboration of guidance documents based on the ISO/IEC Standards and Guides. Since the implementation of the MAA had begun earlier in the current year, the CPR had needed these documents, and had started to develop drafts; these drafts had been discussed during the CPR meeting the previous week and some CPR members had proposed handing these working drafts over to TC 3/SC 5. This Subcommittee would then continue to elaborate and approve them according to the Directives on Technical Work;
- With regard to the long standing story of TC 4, *Measurement standards calibration verification devices*, one of the responsibilities of this Subcommittee was the D 10 Document, which had originally been produced by ILAC and which had also now been revised by ILAC. There had been some lack of harmonization between the two Organizations. The CIML had already approved this Document but ILAC had continued its revision and they were now proceeding to final ILAC vote this year. There was a proposal from TC 4, looking at the scope of the existing and revised D 10, that there was a need for an additional OIML Document concentrating on reverification intervals and there was therefore a proposal: ILAC had proposed that the revised D 10 be a common Document posted on the web site for free downloading by both Organizations. The Bureau's suggestion was to authorize the TC 4 secretariat and the Bureau to agree with ILAC on the joint publication of D 10 to avoid duplication of work.

The proposed Decision read: "The Committee authorizes the Bureau, together with the TC 4 Secretariat, Slovakia, to decide together with ILAC on the way to jointly publish the revised D 10".

This was passed unanimously.

The Bureau was of the opinion, confirmed by the Presidential Council, that two Subcommittees, TC 8/SC 7 *Gas metering* (which had a long standing project, advancing into its final stages) and TC 8/SC 8 *Gas meters* (which was revising three existing Recommendations on gas metering) had developed requirements which were not harmonized and did not coincide with each other. Therefore there was a proposal that the Bureau and the two Secretariats should try to harmonize these Documents, in order to avoid overlapping unnecessarily and also to avoid inconsistencies between the two Recommendations.

The proposed Decision read: "The Committee instructed the Bureau to organize a meeting with the Secretariats of TC 8/SC 7 and TC 8/SC 8 and to redefine the scope of these Subcommittees' projects so as to avoid unnecessary overlapping and eliminate redundancies, discrepancies and duplication of work".

There were no comments, negative votes or abstentions so the decision was passed.

Mr. Magaña next asked the Committee to reach a decision on TC 3/SC 5 and to decide that documents relevant to the application of standards should no longer be developed by the TC 3/SC 5 working group and could be directly dealt with by TC 3/SC 5 itself. He asked for comments on the proposal.

Mr. Llewellyn was not sure that he had understood the proposal. It read as though the CPR was proposed to be a working group of TC 3/SC 5. If that was the case, he felt there was a problem with structure and function. He asked for further explanation.

Mr. Magaña said that the CPR was not at all a working group of TC 3/SC 5. The proposal was to note that the TC 3/SC 5 working group was no longer needed since the CPR Documents could be used directly by TC 3/SC 5.

Mr. Kochsiek asked Mr. Magaña to explain in a little more detail the outcome and especially the results of the CPR and whether the decision was to be made by the CIML or was outside its scope.

Mr. Magaña explained that two years previously a working group had been set up within TC 3/SC 5 to prepare documents for the implementation of standards on the competence and impartiality of laboratories and certification bodies. This working group, headed by Mr. Lagauterie, was to provide implementation guides for ISO/IEC 17025 and for ISO Guide 65 for general application in the field of legal metrology. Mr. Lagauterie had prepared a first working document for this working group but after that the working group had not had time to meet and work because, in particular, the setting up of the MAA was beginning and the Bureau had been unable to advance the work on this project. Since then, for the implementation of the MAA, the CPR had needed the document and had adopted and adapted the working document drawn up by Mr. Lagauterie and were using it for the peer assessments to be done in the coming months. So the documents were already being used for internal work within the CPR. They were not, however, official OIML Documents, but working documents for use in implementing the MAA. The proposal was therefore that the CPR had its own working documents, which could be transferred to TC 3/SC 5 for the latter to introduce it into the normal channels of development of OIML Documents and eventually use it as the basis for application guides for establishing competence and impartiality. This meant that the working group which had been set up would be duplicating work to a certain extent with the CPR. It had seemed rather heavy handed to say that the CPR would pass these documents on to the working group and the working group would pass them afterwards to TC 3/SC 5. Mr. Magaña felt the working group stage could be omitted in the development of these documents.

Mr. Kildal proposed that the Decision be re-written in a way that was easy to understand because he did not understand it in the terms being used orally. His impression was that it was being said that the project on conformity assessment should be stopped in TC 3/SC 5. He would regret this because this kind of document was important to him and, he thought, also to many OIML Members who were not participating in the MAA.

Mr. Magaña said that it was not proposed that the project on the guides on ISO/IEC 17025 and Guide 65 should be stopped. On the contrary, the proposal was to accelerate this project by eliminating the intermediary stage of the TC 3/SC 5 working group and allowing the project to progress directly within TC 3/SC 5.

Mr. Lagauterie said that what needed to be said was that TC 3/SC 5 would develop a project on conformity assessment based on a draft document from the CPR.

After more discussion, the following Decision was drawn up: "The Committee approved the proposal from TC 3/SC 5 to use the documents drawn up by the Committee on Participation Review on R 60 and R 76 as working drafts and to proceed to the approval of the guides following the Directives on Technical Work. These documents are guides for the application of ISO/IEC 17025 and ISO Guide 65."

Norway voted against; Denmark and the Czech Republic abstained. This concluded discussion on these working drafts.

Mr. Szilvassy explained the situation of various other TCs/SCs.

- The revision of R 76 within TC 9/SC 1 was at an advanced stage: based on the 1 CD and the comments received on it, the Co-Secretariats would elaborate the final CD and if the Subcommittee accepted this it would be circulated by the end of October in order that this Recommendation could be approved in 2006.
- The US was considering relinquishing the TC 10 Secretariat; as soon as it was available, the floor would be opened for volunteers to take on this TC.
- The Secretariat of TC 12 had been vacant since Germany had relinquished it, but work on the revision of R 46 was continuing and advancing well. Sweden had been requested to take on TC 12, based on the fact that the Working Group was led by Sweden and was advancing well.

If Sweden did not take the secretariat, there was another volunteer which was Australia.

- The Secretariat of TC 15 and TC 15/SC 1, led by Russia, had gone through a difficult period due to the institution they had chosen not being able to start the work; they were actively looking within Russia for another institution and hoped soon to find one that was ready to take on the responsibility and start the work
- The Bureau had been informed that China was considering nominating a different Contact Person with a better command of English in order to be able to communicate with the Subcommittee members and to advance the revision of R 59 within TC 17/SC 1.

Mr. Szilvássy said that this completed the information regarding Subcommittees.

8.3 MAA

Mr. Johnston asked Mrs. Régine Gaucher to speak on the OIML Mutual Acceptance Arrangement.

Mrs. Gaucher explained that she was the engineer and Project Leader responsible for the implementation of the MAA. She had now been working at the Bureau for six months, prior to which she had been responsible for the development of regulations, and had been involved in type evaluation and type testing of one third of the categories of measuring instruments affected by legal metrology in France. She also had some experience in organizing training for legal metrology staff, and for 15 years had been a metrological and technical assessor and a quality systems assessor in COFRAC, the French accreditation body.

The implementation of the MAA had begun with two categories, load cells and nonautomatic weighing instruments, fields in which a large number of OIML Certificates had been issued - 422 for load cells and 632 for nonautomatic weighing instruments - representing some 75 % of the Certificates issued since the beginning of the implementation of the OIML Certificate System in 1991.

About 20 participants were now expected in the first two Declarations of Mutual Confidence (DoMC); as Members knew, there were two types of participant: Issuing Participants and Utilizing Participants. Among the participants there were eight European countries, and most of the Issuing Participants were outside Europe. As in any official accreditation process, it had been decided to keep the names of the participating countries confidential up until the moment of signing the DoMC.

Mrs. Gaucher felt that most Members were now familiar with the MAA terminology, but reminded them that Issuing Participants were Issuing Authorities which would deliver OIML Certificates of Conformity based on OIML Test Reports issued under Declarations of Mutual Confidence. Utilizing Participants would not issue any OIML Certificates of Conformity under the DoMCs but would accept OIML Test Reports attached to the OIML Certificates issued by the Issuing Participants. Of course, an Issuing Participant was also a Utilizing Participant. So Utilizing Participants might be either OIML Issuing Authorities which were not Issuing Participants or national Issuing Authorities, for instance a national Type Approval body.

Even though the OIML publication B 10-1 specified that one Committee on Participation Review (CPR) should be established per DoMC, it had been decided that only one should be established for the first two DoMCs, as the scope of these was fairly similar. Before the DoMC was signed, the CPR was of course a provisional one; the definitive CPR would be established when the DoMC had been signed. It would be composed of one representative of each signatory or of a maximum of two per signatory, for instance, one per category. But nevertheless, in any case, each participating country had only one vote in the Committee on Participation Review.

The provisional CPR had held its first meeting three days previously, on 15 and 16 June 2005. As previously stated, as this body was provisional only, it had been decided, up to the signature of the Declaration of Mutual Confidence, to accept more than one or two representatives per

country, in particular to have all the necessary competences. Several additional observers had also had the opportunity to participate in the first meeting. Of course, these observers had come from participating countries, but had not taken part in any decision of the CPR and had not been present during the examination of the application files.

As for the first two Declarations of Mutual Confidence, all the participating countries were OIML Member States, the majority of them already designated representatives in the CPR; no Associate participated. Mrs. Gaucher reminded Members that, according to OIML B 10-1, Associates were participants from Corresponding Members.

The CPR had been composed of additional members, one representative of TC 3/SC 5, which was responsible for OIML B 10, one representative of TC 9, which was responsible for OIML R 60 and one representative (two at the first meeting) of TC 9/SC 1, which was responsible for R 76. The BIML was responsible for the Secretariat of the Committee on Participation Review.

Information related to the MAA implementation and the ongoing process was available on the MAA part of the OIML web site. This contained general pages accessible to everybody and two password-protected pages: a special password-protected CPR page was accessible to CPR Members and to CIML Members of participating countries. A special password-protected Assessors page was being developed for assessors, which had been validated by the CPR and which would conduct peer assessments.

Some of the working documents adopted by the CPR would soon be posted on the general MAA part of the web site and would then be accessible to everybody. Mrs. Gaucher regularly updated the MAA site in order that Members might be informed of the MAA process, so she recommended Members to visit it as often as possible.

The first CPR meeting had been an intensive meeting with lively exchange of points of view. Firstly, general issues had been discussed on the basis of working papers prepared for the meeting. These had been related to the operating rules of the Committee on Participation Review and of Declarations of Mutual Confidence. These general rules had of course had to be adopted before the examination of the files.

The first Working Document had been a general document adopted by the CPR and related to operating rules for a DoMC; its aim was to clarify some points of OIML B 10-1, and to propose a few amendments to it. This document would be taken into account by TC 3/SC 5 for the revision of B 10. The CPR had decided to submit some of these desired amendments to a vote of the CIML:

The first was related to the DoMC signatories: B 10-1 dealt with Participants, and the definition of the final signatories was not quite clear, so the proposal was that the signatories should be official authorities. Testing laboratories which were designated by Issuing Authorities were in fact their sub-contractors; so under the DoMC, the OIML Certificate of Conformity as subjected to the Test Report was issued by the Issuing Participant. The proposal for the first Resolution submitted to the CIML for MAA implementation was as follows:

Signatories of a Declaration of Mutual Confidence shall be either OIML Issuing Authorities; or national Type Approval Bodies; or national bodies responsible for putting the instrument on the market.

Mr. Magaña asked for comments on this proposal, which represented only a minor change from B 10 but merely a necessary clarification which needed CIML endorsement.

Mr. Magaña commented that there were several structures constituting an Issuing Authority, and what the difference was between the three potential signatories - this could be confusing. An OIML Issuing Authority was the authority which had been appointed by the CIML Member in the application of the OIML Certificate System; this might be in some cases the CIML Member's Organization, or another organization in other countries; it was the authority which issued the OIML Certificate. This Issuing Authority might work in different ways in different countries; in some places the Issuing Authority had its own laboratories and did all the work and testing and

issued the Test Reports and the Certificate; in other countries the Issuing Authority subcontracted testing and Test Reports and issued only the Certificate, this being based on the Test Reports it had subcontracted. In all cases, therefore, although the MAA was about acceptance of test results and Test Reports, it was said in the MAA that OIML Test Reports were validated by an OIML Certificate. The question was whether the Issuing Authority or the Testing Laboratory should sign. It appeared to the CPR that as Test Reports had to be covered by a Certificate, it would be simpler for the signatory to be the OIML Issuing Authority. When there was no Issuing Authority, the DoMC might be signed by the national Type Approval body or, if there was not formal type approval but there were procedures for placing instruments on the market, the authority responsible for this process would sign.

Mr. Johansen wished to comment on the procedure. It was true that B 10 was not clear, but, as he did not have it with him, he was not able to compare and therefore not able to evaluate the changes, of which he supposed there were others also. He suggested that the proposals be presented to the CIML and then that the decisions be taken later by postal ballot.

Mr. Johansen also wished to ask whether the phrase "or national bodies" meant that there could be more than one such body in a country. This had been one of the concerns expressed in the CPR.

Mr. Magaña agreed that B 10 could not be compared in the current meeting with the amendments requested. This was not, however, an amendment but merely a small addition which did not change the principles, which were that there should be one signatory per country in accordance with the OIML Certificate System. He agreed that the draft resolutions should be sent with some explanations to CIML Members for postal ballot after the CIML Meeting.

Mr. Kildal agreed with that suggestion and suggested that when the proposals were sent out they should be accompanied by an explanation as to how this procedure fitted in with the MID with which, due to some confusion about terms, he was having problems in relating it.

Mr. Magaña agreed to this request. He explained that in general, currently in Europe there was no Type Approval Body as such for most categories, but European Notified Bodies; the wording therefore needed a slight amendment.

Ms. van Spronssen expressed pleasure that the process was ongoing and that it gave a tool to accept test results and not have to duplicate testing in different countries. But during the presentation there had been a reference to "a representative of the country who was a member of the CPR". She wished to remind Members that in her view the Member States were giving an outline and a tool to give more confidence. In Holland it was the test laboratories that were the notified bodies, but in other countries participating in the whole scheme it was the National Type Approval Bodies. It was never the country that was a member of the CPR, and even if there was only one signatory, that signatory could not bind other notified bodies in the country: everybody had to accept their own responsibility.

Mr. Magaña agreed that this was correct: Declarations of Mutual Confidence were not signed by countries but by technical bodies. Membership of the CPR was not by states but by technical bodies designated by the CIML Member. Just as the CIML Member designated the Issuing Authority, and also in the same way the expert who would participate in the CPR. Concerning the DoMCs, the signatory would sign in his capacity of technical body, not as Member State; in some cases the signatory might be someone in public administration, but he would be signing as the OIML Issuing Authority and not as representative of the State.

Mr. Issaev said that he and his colleagues did not find the clarification very clear, because in their country different bodies were responsible for the OIML Issuing Authorities. The national Type Approval Board was Special Number 20; the national board responsible for putting the instruments on the market, agency or ministry. So these were absolutely different participants, therefore it would be necessary to mention, in the document for postal discussion and voting, that the CIML Member was responsible for choosing which should be the representative. Some people might be in an awkward position; for example, if national Type Approval Boards were not willing to take part, what could the CIML Member do?

Mr. Magaña agreed that the organization in each country might be quite complex, and this concept was not easy for the MAA, which had to take account of many different situations. He told Members that in the paper which would be sent out, presenting the proposals for postal ballot, every attempt would be made to be as clear as possible and to give indications on how it would apply in different cases.

Mr. Lagauterie suggested that it would be useful if, in the presentation for the vote, exact details could be given. If he remembered correctly, the present text stated that both the Issuing Authority and the CIML Member would sign the MAA. It did seem to him essential that the Issuing Authority should sign; it must be made clear whether this replaced the double signature or whether it was still possible for there to be two signatures.

Mr. Magaña conceded that the present text mentioned signatures by both the Issuing Authority and the CIML Member, but the signature of the CIML Member was not compulsory. The vital signature had to be that of the accepting authority which issued its Certificate on the basis of Test Report. It was possible that in some countries the issuing signatory might need the CIML Member's authority, in which case a double signature was acceptable, but this condition was imposed by the country in question and not by the OIML. The proposals for voting would be accompanied by a very detailed explanatory document.

Mr. Robles wished for clarification. As he understood it, when a country signed these Arrangements, all the bodies in the country were more or less obliged to accept them. But different local authorities, etc., might not be willing to accept each others' arrangements. He felt that there must be a national authority which could insist that these arrangements were acceptable everywhere within the country.

Mr. Magaña said there had been long discussions on this subject when the MAA was being prepared. What must be clear was that the signatories of these Declarations of Mutual Confidence, first of all had no legal obligation. This meant that the signatories were declaring an intention of accepting and utilizing the test results - not the Certificates - to integrate them in their own procedures. Along with these accepted and integrated test results, they could give national type approval, i.e. permission to market. But with the MAA there was no question of directly accepting a Certificate to transpose it into national law. Once a national Type Approval Authority had accepted the test results provided by an organization in another country, integrated them and made them into a national type approval, then the other organizations in that country should not have any problems. Mr. Magaña added that this signature to a Declaration of Mutual Confidence was a declaration of intention; obviously, when a signatory received a particular Test Report, he remained free to examine it and to accept or reject it. He could always say, "I do not like this Test Report, I have doubts about it, I will not accept it". However, if he did this, he was asked to inform the body whose Test Report he had rejected and also the Bureau, which needed to know this for the good functioning of the MAA. It was true that the MAA was a complex document; this was because the situation in different places varied. The legal implications were not the same in different countries. It might be a good idea to hold an MAA seminar to explore its intricacies. What was at issue was not the CPR or the DoMC, but a clear understanding of the MAA itself.

Mrs. Gaucher then moved to the next proposed amendment. This concerned the point relating to the establishment of just one CPR for several DoMCs, and more than one representative per participating country, if the scope of the DoMCs was similar and if it was not possible to have a representative body competent for all scopes. Her proposed resolution was that one Committee on Participation Review might be established for several Declarations of Mutual Confidence if their scopes were similar; in such a case the CPR might be composed of several representative members from one country, to include somebody competent in each of the necessary areas.

Mr. Lagauterie asked for confirmation that the role of such people stopped with the number of Recommendations in question.

Mrs. Gaucher replied that it was indeed the case that a CPR should not deal with too many Recommendations. In fact, in the case of Recommendations covering a large number of

categories, it was envisaged that one CPR might be set up for each type of measuring instrument; this was particularly true in the case of OIML R 117 on measurement of liquids other than water - here it was likely that a number of CPRs might be set up, one for whole measurements, one for measurements in lorries, etc.

Mr. Magaña said that it was correct to present this amendment to the CIML, since it required an alteration in the original text, but that this alteration was a very minor one.

Mrs. Gaucher's next point regarded rules for decisions in the CPRs; OIML B 10-1 did not specify any rules for voting general decisions in CPRs. For decisions on the acceptance of applicants, OIML B 10-1 required unanimity and the CPR proposed changing the rule and adopting a common rule for making all types of decision in the CPR. The proposal was to adopt for all CPR decisions, a majority of 80 % of "yes" votes with a maximum of one "no" vote from an Issuing Participant. The proposed resolution read: "Decisions in the CPRs are validated if 80 % of participating countries which have appointed a representative member in the CPR vote "yes", with a maximum of one "no" vote from an Issuing Participant".

Mr. Magaña pointed out that this particular modification to the MAA was a rather major one; the MAA had required unanimity for acceptance of new participants but had not provided rules for other types of decision. The proposed rules would be more flexible for all decisions and also for accepting new participants; an 80 % majority was very like the majority required in the CIML and had seemed consistent with the general rules of the OIML.

Mrs. Gaucher's next point related to the admission of new participants in a DoMC. The CPR agreed with the rules for accepting new participants in a signed Declaration of Mutual Confidence; nevertheless, the proposal was that new applications for Issuing Participants should be examined twice a year during planned reviews. New applications for Utilizing Participants could be taken into account at any time, although, if their acceptance would lead to modifications in the scope of the DoMC by, for instance, including additional national requirements, then this modification would be taken into account at the biannual reviews as it might lead to a need to conduct new peer assessments.

The wording of the proposed resolution was as follows: "Applications for admission of new Issuing Participants or of new Utilizing Participants with additional national requirements shall be examined by the CPR twice a year; applications for admission of new Utilizing Participants without any additional national requirements shall be taken into account at any time by the BIML".

Mr. Magaña explained that in a number of cases this would mean that Issuing Participants could not join at any time; if they "missed the train" they would have to wait for the next time.

The last amendment mentioned by Mrs. Gaucher on behalf of the CPR was that the CPR had proposed that the BIML should bear the cost of peer assessment, invoice the assessed laboratory and then pay fees to the experts concerned. In order to avoid discrepancies between assessed bodies, the CPR had agreed upon a lump sum.

The proposed Resolution read as follows: "The BIML shall bear the cost of peer assessments and invoice the peer assessed bodies with a lump sum equal to 2000 € per assessment plus 2000 € per day of assessment. These fees shall be reviewed and if necessary revised at the 41st CIML Meeting".

Mr. Magaña commented that this constituted a difference from the MAA, which had said that the peer assessed body would bear these costs directly and the BIML would not be involved in the problems of fees, travel and accommodation costs. It had seemed more appropriate that the Bureau should bear the costs and invoice the laboratories so that the cost of peer assessment would be the same for all peer assessed bodies, whatever the distance traveled. The figure of 2000 € would be reviewed by the Bureau before sending this Resolution for postal voting; roughly, the fixed 2000 € probably represented the average travel cost for an expert and 2000 € per day of peer assessment represented an overall figure including the expert's fees, accommodation costs

and similar expenses for two assessors. The reviewed figures would be carefully explained in the document accompanying the Resolutions for postal ballot. The Bureau was not intending to make any profit out of this operation, but neither should it lose money.

Mr. Kildal added that the Resolution should contain a statement to the effect that there should be no net contribution from the BIML to the assessment.

A delegate asked for clarification: an accredited Issuing Authority incurred costs to attain this position; should he conclude that an authority which undertook to be evaluated by its peers would not be charged?

Mr. Magaña said that there would not normally be any peer assessment for an accredited authority, so it would not incur this type of costs. On the other hand, the Issuing Authority had already incurred the cost of accreditation. All the Issuing Participants would incur certain fixed fees but these were minor costs and had been approved the previous year. Issuing Authorities which were the object of a peer assessment would have to pay the cost of the peer assessment, i.e. the expert's fees and expenses.

The same delegate said he had read that the BIML would bear these costs and not the evaluated body.

Mr. Magaña explained that the BIML would regulate these fees and bill the peer assessed body for a prearranged lump sum. This sum was set as an average amount, so that all peer assessed bodies would pay the same amount, regardless of the amount of actual costs incurred due to geographical or other factors.

Mr. Vaucher said that Switzerland was in general agreement with the theory of equal fees but wished to propose an upper limit, particularly on the duration of peer assessments, to avoid excessive fees in the case of inefficient assessments.

Mr. Magaña replied that peer assessments lasting two days were envisaged; perhaps in the case of two categories a third day might be necessary, but the norm for one category would be two days.

Mr. Kochsiek had a question concerning additional national requirements. He understood that this was being left to the CPR, and from his point of view, this might make work for the TCs more difficult in the future. He wished for clarification on what was allowed and what had to be left to the TCs.

Mr. Magaña said that this would feature shortly in the presentation.

Mr. Ehrlich was not sure if the proposed Resolutions had now been passed or were still under discussion.

Mr. Magaña said that all the proposed Resolutions would be submitted for comments and then, with explanatory notes, for postal ballot.

Mr. Ehrlich proposed that the Resolutions sent out for postal ballot should contain the exact language that would be contained in B 10-1, rather than merely in separate Resolutions. He offered his assistance in this regard.

Mr. Llewellyn referred to the last of the proposed Resolutions; he wanted to clarify a point: the Resolution set out a schedule of fees for the BIML to invoice to an assessed laboratory. Was it envisaged that the BIML would also issue a schedule of payments to the people carrying out the assessments, i.e. a list of charges they would accept, or would they simply accept costs presented to them by the assessor?

Mr. Magaña said a paper would be drawn up informing the experts of the level of expenses which might be claimed.

Mrs. Gaucher suggested that this paper should be drawn up and presented to the experts at the seminar in September.

Mr. Miki wanted to make sure that the proposed 2000 € per day did not depend on the number of assessors.

Mr. Magaña responded that the number of assessors was fixed. There should be one technical assessor and one quality systems assessor; the 2000 € was what was estimated, looking at the two peer assessments already planned.

Mr. Klenovský wanted to know why the fees were not based on the actual costs incurred.

Mr. Magaña said the figures were based on a rough estimate of average travel costs in economy class by plane and seemed reasonable; more details would be given later.

Mrs. Gaucher told Members that the CPR had decided that for the first two Declarations of Mutual Confidence the possibilities to Issue an OIML Certificate according to OIML B 3 or under the MAA would both be kept in parallel. Nevertheless, the OIML issuing signatory would not be able to issue OIML Certificates outside the MAA. This decision would be examined again during further CPR meetings.

Mr. Johansen agreed with this proposal but did not believe that this decision should be taken by the CPR - it was clearly a decision to be taken by CIML.

Mr. Magaña said that it was a decision which the CPR would propose to the CIML Members.

Mrs. Gaucher informed Members that peer assessment would be conducted by a team of experts, one metrology and technical expert from the list validated by the CPR, and one expert in quality systems who would be an ILAC assessor competent for assessment according to ISO/IEC 17025. Guidelines for the application of ISO/IEC 17025 to peer assessment for the implementation of the MAA had been adopted by the CPR. They would be presented to the assessors during a seminar for assessors which would be organized on 5 and 6 September in Paris. The aim of this seminar was to make assessors familiar with the documents which would be used in conducting peer assessments and to have the assessments as harmonized as possible. Peer assessments should be conducted between September and December 2005. The next CPR meeting was planned for the end of January or beginning of February 2006 to examine the results of peer assessment and to take final decisions. The CPR meeting had decided that three full peer assessments should be conducted, one for OIML R 76 and two for OIML R 60.

The participants who had additional national requirements would submit the relevant detailed procedure to the BIML. This would be examined by the CPR at its next meeting and of course these additional detailed procedures would be attached to the Declaration of Mutual Confidence if the participants became signatories. The aim of the CPR was neither to replace the relevant TCs/SCs in doing the technical work nor to include a large number of additional requirements. To this end, the relevant TCs/SCs participated in the CPR in order to keep in touch with any future amendments deemed necessary. The necessity of maintaining such additional requirements should be reviewed periodically, in line of course with the revision of the applicable OIML Recommendations and with national legislation.

Mr. Lagauterie asked for some significant examples of additional requirements which had been accepted.

Mr. Magaña said there were some participants who required types of extra accuracy classes and durability requirements. The CPR had accepted the principle of these extra requirements on two conditions: firstly that the exact details of the requirements and procedures be received; and secondly that they should have been examined by the TC/SC in the course of its work. These extra requirements would be reviewed each year to decide whether they needed to be kept.

Mr. Lagauterie said he understood that some particularly hot or cold countries might have special requirements regarding durability under extreme temperature conditions. The TC/SC concerned should have the right to decide whether the OIML needed to be ruled by these local requirements. As for countries requiring different accuracy classes from those specified by the OIML, he felt that these constituted barriers to trade which the Organization should not encourage.

Mr. Magaña said that these important and serious discussions could continue in the CPR. The Technical Committee representatives had accepted that these additional requirements should be

examined by the Technical Committee so that the latter could decide whether or not they should be taken into account when the Recommendation was revised. It could not of course accept them on the spot but it had agreed to examine them. The Technical Committee remained open to the possibility of consequent revision of the Recommendation. It had therefore seemed to the CPR that these additional requirements might be acceptable insofar as they might eventually become amendments to the Recommendation. If, however, they were rejected in the amendment to the Recommendation, the CPR would accept the consequences and re-examine the question of whether to keep them or not. He believed Members would agree that an additional requirement would not remain as such in perpetuity - it was a temporary measure to ease progress while the long term problem was resolved.

Mr. Kildal asked whether the all Issuing Participants would have to abide by these additional test requirements accepted by CPR; because if this were not the case, then test certificates could not be interchangeable.

Mr. Magaña said that the commitment of Issuing Participants was that they would all issue at least Test Reports based on the OIML Recommendations; they were not committed to performing tests according to the additional requirements; this was voluntary. If an Issuing Authority said it would issue only the Test Reports for the OIML Recommendations, this was possible; alternatively, they could also offer to issue Test Reports for the additional requirements. On the other hand, all Participants, both Issuing and Utilizing, would declare that they would accept and utilize the Test Reports related both to the OIML Recommendation and, when applicable, to the additional requirements.

Mrs. Gaucher referred again to the Assessors' Seminar on 5 and 6 September 2005 in Paris. Peer assessment would be conducted by a team of experts, whose leader would be a technical and metrology expert. The CPR had examined all the candidacies for technical and metrology experts and had validated a list of such experts, which would soon be available on the web site. Regarding the experts in quality systems, discussions were under way with ILAC to use assessors who were ILAC evaluators.

The second meeting of the provisional CPR was planned for January or February 2006, upon which occasion examination of the results of peer assessments would be the main topic for discussion.

Mrs. Gaucher's last piece of information concerned the cooperation of manufacturers in implementing the MAA. The BIML would develop a discussion forum on the web site to create a special tool accessible to manufacturers to raise their questions and concerns regarding the MAA, which would be taken into account in the MAA implementation.

Mrs. Todorova asked for clarification on how the number of participants was calculated. Initial information had been that there were 20 participating countries, five of them applying to be Issuing Participants and fifteen to be Utilizing Participants, for example for R 60. Presumably this meant that the five Issuing Participants would not also be Utilizing Participants.

Mr. Magaña said this in fact meant 15 countries only Utilizing and five both Issuing and Utilizing.

Mr. Kildal asked how the forecasts and budget set up in Berlin in 2004 were comparing with actual expenditure.

Mr. Magaña replied that, to date, expenses had been slightly lower than planned because the Project Leader had not had to travel as much as had been anticipated. Many countries had joined without needing visits from the Project Leader. Staff costs were as expected and operational costs were slightly lower. It had been decided to spend the amount saved on a seminar for peer assessors, an important event which had not originally been planned, so with this, the overall cost would be more or less as initially planned.

Reverting to the matter of additional requirements, Mr. Lagauterie said that the Bureau should make sure the TCs and SCs examined these very speedily and reported to the next CIML Meeting on the subject.

Mr. Magaña said this had already been discussed both at the CPR and informally with the Technical Committees concerned which would be doing the work and sending their comments as soon as possible. The extra requirements must not become a permanent feature and the OIML had no interest in becoming a catalogue of national requirements. Its mission was to unify and harmonize and any exceptional requirements must remain temporary only.

Mr. Johnston concluded this topic, saying that OIML had promised clarification in writing, taking into account all the morning's comments, and the proposed amendments would be submitted to a postal ballot. He thanked Members for their time.

8.4 Progress in the revision of the Directives

Mr. Magaña reminded Members that this was a high priority project approved in previous years and it had been planned to start as soon as possible. The Bureau was in charge of making this progress but, due to the short time between the previous CIML Meeting and this one, it had not yet been possible to start. There was a working group comprising a number of countries which had expressed their wish to participate in the revision of the Directives for Technical Work and Mr. Magaña was in a position to tell Members that the Bureau would now begin the work very shortly and expected to make speedy progress.

It was intended to simplify the administrative and procedural work in this revision so that Secretariats and participants were able to focus on the essential issues, and the work should be considerably accelerated thereby. It was also intended to give some tools to Secretariats and participants in the form of templates etc., so that the work could be facilitated.

The proposed Resolution was:

"The Committee took note that the Bureau will start the revision of the Directives for Technical Work before the end of 2005, and indicated that this work must be considered a high priority. This revision should simplify procedures and make use of information technologies in order substantially to accelerate the work".

The Resolution was passed unanimously.

9 Human resource matters

9.1 Election of the CIML First Vice-President

Mr. Johnston told Members that, as they knew, there were two candidates for the CIML First Vice-Presidency. The 80 % rule used the previous year in Berlin would be applied again this time, and Mr. Johnston commented that a new proposal for electing Presidents and Vice-Presidents by simple majority of CIML Members would shortly be sent out for Members' approval by postal ballot.

If, as Mr. Johnston hoped and trusted, the ballot was successful the new First Vice-President would take up his responsibilities immediately. Mr. Kochsiek would remain in office until the Cape Town Meeting, so for a period of time there would be three Vice-Presidents. Mr. Johnston had requested this because he had found Mr. Kochsiek's advice very helpful; Mr. Kochsiek had also been very successful in recruiting new Members to the OIML, and Mr. Johnston hoped to use his expertise for the benefit of the Organization.

The candidates made their presentations in French alphabetical order of their countries; this meant Mr. Stuart Carstens from *Afrique du Sud* was the first.

Presentation by Stuart Carstens

Mr. Carstens thanked Members for giving him the opportunity to present himself and his experience and what he believed he could bring to the Organization.

As indicated in his CV, Mr. Carstens had been associated with legal metrology for 33 years, his main emphasis being on the enforcement and strategic side and the administration of the legal metrology division in South Africa, with a limited experience in type approval. He had been involved in the strategic level since 1991, when he had been transferred from the Cape Town office to the Head Office in Pretoria, in control of the five regional offices in South Africa.

He had also been actively involved in the privatization of the verification function in the early 1990's and then with the transfer of this accreditation function to the South African National Accreditation Service (SANAS) in 2003, as recommended by a SQAAM (Standards, Quality Assurance, Accreditation and Metrology) review undertaken by the South African Government in the late 1990s.

In his position as Director of Legal Metrology he was also part of the South African Bureau of Standards (SABS) top management, and he had been involved in policy formulation during two restructuring exercises, and in a third which was currently underway.

He was also involved in two initiatives with the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI), namely the envisaged separation of the regulatory and the consumer protection divisions of the South African Bureau of Standards, of which legal metrology was a part; they were liaising with the DTI to ensure that the transition was smooth. He was also involved in the creation of a policy on legal metrology within South Africa, which would form the basis of this move, establishing an exact policy and enabling the promulgation of the Legal Metrology Act. Both of these initiatives had also come out of the SQAAM review.

Mr. Carstens had been involved in a number of committees over the years, and had chaired a number of them in meetings and in negotiations with local industry and with other parties involved in legal metrology, in the development of transparent policy and legislation acceptable to those affected.

He was also actively involved in the harmonization of technical regulations in the SADC region, which had resulted in the signing of the SADC trade protocol, and South Africa had been the founder of the regional legal metrology organization, SADCMEL, within the SADC structures.

Over the last couple of years, full regional technical regulations had been developed and these had been put out as virtual standards within the SADC community, and South Africa held the SADCMEL Secretariat, of which Mr. Carstens was also the Regional Coordinator. Interaction with these Member States on the legal metrology infrastructures, which ranged from non-existent to well entrenched, had given Mr. Carstens considerable knowledge of the problems and needs of Developing Countries.

Mr. Carstens was also involved in the new Program for African Development, the NEPAD Program, which would broaden the harmonization process to include all African states and place Africa on the road to becoming an economic force in the international arena.

Mr. Carstens concluded by stating that he thought he would bring to the position of Vice President his 33 years of experience at all levels of legal metrology, the experience of coordination and the chairing of committees, an intimate knowledge of Developing Countries and their problems and needs, and a personal knowledge of change, having been through various change processes in the last twelve years.

These days, change was part of everyone's life, and in particular in the legal metrology arena. He also believed that, having been involved in the aims of the WTO/TBT, he had an intimate knowledge of its requirements which could be of assistance. He also emphasized his involvement within the SADCMEL community in the harmonization of regulations.

Mr. Carstens thanked Members for listening.

Presentation by Grahame Harvey

Mr. Harvey thanked the Chairman and Members for the opportunity to put forward his credentials for the position of Vice-President and informed Members that he had had about 20 years' experience in legal metrology, following a life in academia, and he had had extensive experience in such matters as policy development, strategic planning and associated writing of measurement legislation. This was demonstrated by his work on utility metering, regulatory measurements for the police and quality measurements for grain, wine and sugar. He had been involved in the harmonization of state trade measurement activities within the Australian Federal system, including being a representative on SCERCA, which was the committee which advised the Ministers, and also on the Trade Measurement Advisory Committee, which advised SCERCA. For the next two years he would be chairing that committee. He had also persuaded SCERCA to think about the introduction of a national system of trade measurements, something desperately needed in Australia.

Mr. Harvey had been CIML Member in the 1980's, prior to John Birch joining the NSC. He had contributed to several Technical Committees including TC 8/SC 7 and TC 12. He had given an introductory presentation at the Berlin seminar, the first session of which he had also chaired. In 2002, he had proposed the formation of an OIML TC on agricultural quality measurements, and subsequently TC 7/SC 8 was formed. This was an important area, because production of bulk commodity exports was not only weighed for trade, but also, these days, measured for quality parameters such as protein concentration, in the case of grain, and numerous measurements in the wine area, such as the sugar concentration in the grapes, the color of red grapes, and many others. Mr. Harvey had been heavily involved in activities of this sort in Australia and he was chairing a meeting of TC 17/SC 8 in Berlin the following week, following the Congress.

In 2004 Mr. Harvey had proposed a modification of the MAA funding formula, so as not to disadvantage developing economies, and strongly supported the solution proposed by the Acting President. At the 2005 Presidential Council, he had proposed the formation of a small working group on conformity to type (which at that stage he had been calling pattern compliance); the first meeting of that working group had been held the previous Friday and Mr. Harvey would be preparing the minutes and circulating them widely. He had also suggested to the Director a forum on packaging issues in conjunction with the 2006 CIML Meeting in South Africa.

Mr. Harvey then explained his reasons for seeking nomination: firstly, a personal one - he had a passionate belief in legal metrology and the benefit that it could bring to the community and the world. This was his main reason for putting his name forward. He was also concerned for small and developing economies. His activities within the OIML and the APLMF had had a strong emphasis on assisting the smaller economies. He had listed a few, which included pattern compliance, or conformity to type activity; one of the major effects of this was to try to avoid the dumping of sub-standard instruments into smaller economies which were already unable to defend themselves against this sort of dumping. With the advent of the MAA, they would continue to lose their technical capability; it would be more difficult for them to fund their technical capability, and a program was therefore needed to remedy this effect.

Mr. Harvey had been involved in the early development of APLMF regional training courses, which had now become a major activity of the new NMI in Australia and also in the APLMF.

Mr. Harvey was also concerned for the OIML. They were facing a number of challenges from other international organizations and he felt that the OIML should be taking a central role in these activities. This was one reason for proposing the packaging seminar, because they would invite the WWTG, the WTO and a number of other international organizations and would be seen to be taking the lead.

At the same time, the OIML had unique strengths: for example their linkage with the WTO, which other organizations, such as the BIPM, would dearly love to have; they should make the most of this on every occasion. They needed to focus on their external environment; he endorsed most

strongly what Mr. Lee had just said: they needed to externalize what they were doing and adjust their priorities accordingly.

Mr. Harvey concluded by saying that he felt he not only had the necessary qualifications and experience for the position but felt he had demonstrated initiative and vision in the programs he had promoted within the OIML to date and as its First Vice-President he would be able more effectively to promote these activities. With his strong technical background, he would complement the strengths of the new President.

Mr. Harvey thanked his listeners.

The vote then took place and Mr. Johnston invited Mr. Kildal and Mr. Lee to assist with counting the votes. 53 Member States were present or represented for this vote.

Mr. Johnston announced the result of the first round of voting, which was: three abstentions, 21 votes for Mr. Harvey and 29 for Mr. Carstens. According to the rules, a second ballot would be held to see whether Mr. Carstens could receive 80 % of the votes. Mr. Johnston thanked Mr. Harvey for his candidature and looked forward to his continuing participation on the Presidential Council.

The Meeting then proceeded to the second ballot after a further roll call.

Mr. Magaña explained that three calculations had to be made:

- That the quorum presented no problems;
- 43 votes needed to have been cast, and 47 had in fact been cast;
- 80 % of these 47 (i.e. 38) had to be "yes" votes.

Mr. Carstens had received 44 votes and was therefore declared elected.

Mr. Johnston congratulated Mr. Carstens and thanked both candidates again for offering themselves for election. He had been confident that the election would be successful, and was glad to see that this confidence had been well placed.

9.2 Extension of the contract of the BIML Director

Mr. Magaña's five-year contract as BIML Director would expire in January 2006, and the renewal of his contract was submitted to secret CIML ballot.

The Bureau staff left the room and the ensuing discussion was not recorded; upon their return, Mr. Johnston announced that the vote had confirmed the re-election of Mr. Magaña as BIML Director for five years until January 2011. He congratulated Mr. Magaña, who expressed his gratitude to the Committee for its decision and affirmed his willingness to continue to serve the OIML in the best possible way.

9.3 Appointment of a new Assistant Director in 2007

Mr. Johnston explained to Members that Mr. Szilvássy would be retiring on 31 August 2007, so a new Assistant Director should be appointed at the CIML Meeting in Cape Town in October 2006.

Mr. Magaña explained that the appointment procedure would be to nominate a Selection Committee to recommend a candidate at the Cape Town meeting. A call for candidates would be sent out to all CIML Members to distribute in their countries in September 2005; a Selection Committee would examine the applications and meet at the beginning of 2006, no doubt in conjunction with the Presidential Council Meeting and their chosen candidate would be proposed to the CIML in Cape Town.

What had to be done was to designate the members of the Selection Committee; Mr. Johnston proposed that it should comprise Mr. Kochsiek, Mr. Ehrlich, Mr. Harvey, Mr. Carstens, Mr.

Magaña and himself. This large number of people might seem intimidating, but members of the Presidential Council had felt it important that there should be sufficient representation of the CIML Members in order to ensure that the best candidate was selected. He asked for questions relating to the process, and encouraged all Members to make sure that if they knew of a suitable candidate, this person received the job specification.

10 Future meetings

10.1 41st CIML Meeting (2006)

Mr. Carstens cordially invited members to South Africa in October 2006 and was sure it would be a great experience. They would not be using the Conference Center but the Sheraton Hotel which had been seen on the DVD and which had ample conference facilities. The Sheraton was situated right on the water front with easy access to the city center.

He then showed a DVD from the Cape Town Tourist Bureau and gave a few miscellaneous facts about South Africa:

- South Africa had the 5th highest number of physicians in the world per 100 000 inhabitants (so Members should not fear if they had any health problems!);
- The first ever heart transplant operation was performed in Cape Town;
- There were some direct flights into Cape Town airport, mainly from America and London;
- There was a mountain for Members who were climbers;
- South Africa was at the moment the country with the highest proportion of women in its parliament (30 %).
- South Africa was the first country voluntarily to have abandoned its nuclear weapons capability;
- There was a constitution now considered to be one of the most progressive in the world;
- The Cape Peninsula had the most species of plants per hectare in any area of the world.

Mr. Johnston thanked Mr. Carstens and said that exact dates and other details would be circulated at a later date.

10.2 42nd CIML Meeting (2007)

No official invitations had yet been received, but China had expressed interest. Mr. Johnston wondered if the Chinese delegation would like to say anything, in the knowledge that a decision did not have to be made until the following year.

Ms. Kong Xiaokang said that China had the previous year expressed interest in hosting the 42nd Meeting in China. At the moment, however, they had not yet prepared an invitation because they had not gone through all the procedures. Nevertheless, there would be nothing to stop them hosting a CIML Meeting in 2007. She therewith confirmed China's invitation to CIML Members to attend the 42nd CIML Meeting, in Shanghai this time, since there had already been a meeting in Beijing in 1995. More detailed information and a formal invitation would be sent later.

Mr. Johnston said that an official decision would not be made that day but thanked China for its expression of interest.

10.3 13th Conference and 43rd CIML Meeting (2008)

Mr. Johnston said that an expression of interest had been received from Australia. He invited Mr. Harvey to speak.

Mr. Harvey limited himself to cordially inviting the CIML to Australia in 2008 for the Conference and CIML Meeting, adding that no firm arrangements could or had been made yet.

11 Other matters

11.1 Awards and Letters of Appreciation

Mr. Johnston wished to say a few words on the subject of OIML Awards, of which there were three types:

- The Honorary Member Award: this was the OIML's highest Award, and rarely given, although there was one today;
- Medals were given to recognize the outstanding contribution of individuals to the development of legal metrology; and
- Letters of Appreciation demonstrated excellent work on a specific project relating to legal metrology.

Mr. Johnston also wished to make a proposal for comment: to develop a call letter for nomination for these Awards in future. By this he meant the development of a template which would lay out the criteria for each of the Awards, so that there would be some understanding as to how to nominate a person for one or other of them. This call letter would go out well in advance of the meeting; nominations would then be received and discussed at the Presidential Council and the President would make a final decision based on the nominations presented. Mr. Johnston hoped that in doing this two things would happen: firstly, that it would encourage more nominations - sometimes people were reluctant to nominate their colleagues because they did not understand the criteria; and secondly he wanted to ensure that everybody felt that the process was open for many people whose contribution might not have been recognized simply because the criteria had not been in place. After the meeting, therefore, Mr. Johnston would start to develop criteria; these would be sent out for Members' comments so that they could participate more fully in the process. He hoped Members would agree to this, and looked forward to their input in the future.

Mr. Johnston then asked Mr. Kochsiek to make the first presentation: Members would understand why when they knew who would be receiving the Award.

Mr. Kochsiek told colleagues that in 1994 Gerard Faber had been elected President of the CIML, and in fact he had been the second CIML President from the Netherlands. In this position, he had rendered outstanding services to the Organization by raising awareness of the significance of legal metrology among a growing number of OIML Members, and by continuous efforts to adapt the structure of the Organization to modern requirements. Under his chairmanship, in 1994, preliminary discussions about a possible merging of the BIML and the BIPM had been started. In 1995 and 1996 the role of the President and the two Vice-Presidents had been redefined with new competences. A symposium, Metrological Activities in Developing Countries, had been held and a seminar, Weighing Towards the Year 2000, had been organized. Also of importance was a round table discussion on Confidence and Type Approvals for Bilateral MoUs and the MAA.

In 1997, the so-called *OIML Certificate System for Measuring Instruments* was prospering, with more than 200 issued Certificates. The Birkeland Study had given the OIML a new impulse for its long term policy. Preliminary contacts with ILAC and the WTO had been formed and deepened, and the OIML was by then collaborating in the Joint Committee for Guides in Metrology.

In June 1998, and in cooperation with other organizations, the OIML had organized the seminar *The Role of Metrology in Economic and Social Development*, which had taken place in Braunschweig, Germany. RLMOs had been developed for many regions in legal metrology and the OIML was actively cooperating with them.

In the years 2000 and 2001, the admission of the OIML as an observer on the WTO TBT Committee could be seen as an acknowledgement of the OIML's contribution to global input. The activities of the TCs had needed to be evaluated and new priorities were assigned.

The discussions for the OIML Mutual Acceptance Arrangement, held in 2002 and 2003, had concluded in 2003. In the meantime the implementation of the MAA had got off to a flying start - 17 States had been registered for participation in the system, either as Utilizing Participants or Issuing Participants. Cooperation with the Metre Convention and ILAC had been fruitful: for instance, *Elements for a Law on Metrology* had been born, and had now been published. Policy papers on horizontal documents and strategy papers were currently in progress. The Birch study, *The Benefit of Legal Metrology for the Economy and Society*, was a brilliant achievement that met with the approval of all.

Addressing Gerard Faber, Mr. Kochsiek said that he had outlined the success story of the OIML under his Presidency from 1994 to 2003. He asked him to accept his words as sincere thanks for the important and successful work which he had done. Everyone hoped that Mr. Faber would continue his efforts in further contributing to OIML issues.

Mr. Faber thanked Mr. Kochsiek for his kind words. He felt that Mr. Kochsiek's description of the achievements of his nine years in the Presidency had been good; but he should not have given the impression that this was Mr. Faber's work. It had been done with a wonderful team, including two Directors and a committed staff at the Bureau, very committed Vice-Presidents and a lot of fine colleagues. So Mr. Faber's role had been not only leading the Organization but also cooperating in it; he had always had the feeling, which he had expressed on many occasions, that they were a sort of metrology family. Again, following this nomination, he was very proud to be a member of the family and, as he had said to Members the previous year, he hoped to attend meetings as long as he was able to do so, and to see further developments in projects started some time before. He took the opportunity to thank Mr. Kochsiek for his work as Acting President after Mr. Faber's own nine years and also to wish every success to the new President.

Mr. Johnston thanked Mr. Faber and said that he now had the honor of making a number of other presentations. The first was to Mr. Tanaka of Japan. Members already knew that Mr. Tanaka had recently been promoted to being Director of his institute, as a result of which he felt that his work load was now too great to permit his continuing as CIML Member for Japan.

Mr. Tanaka had also been a member of the Presidential Council since 2003. Mr. Johnston had particularly enjoyed Mr. Tanaka's counsel and his advice as a member of the Council and also his insight into legal metrology world wide and how it affected everybody. It had been Mr. Johnston's own decision to nominate Mr. Tanaka for an Award, and although he had a long list of his accomplishments, he was not going to read them to Members on the present occasion, but simply to say that he was going to miss him and he wished him well in his new job and in all his future endeavors. He asked Mr. Miki to come up and accept the award on behalf of Mr. Tanaka.

Mr. Miki promised to convey Mr. Johnston's kind words to Mr. Tanaka, who, he was sure, would be delighted.

Mr. Johnston handed over a medal to Mr. Miki, together with a letter.

The second medal was awarded to Ken Butcher from the United States. Again, Mr. Johnston would give only a short summary of Mr. Butcher's achievements. He had joined the Office of Weights and Measures at NIST in 1991. Due to their mutual involvement in the National Conference of Weights and Measurements and NIST, Mr. Johnston had known Mr. Butcher for a number of years. Mr. Butcher had been very instrumental in formalizing the involvement of the United States in OIML activities. He had assumed responsibilities as the secretary of TC 6; he had

worked in preparing the latest editions of OIML R 79 and R 87; he had also held the Secretariat for TC 9 and TC 9/SC 3, during which he had worked with the PTB and the BIPM to prepare the latest editions of OIML R 52, R 33 (now D 28) and R 111; he had worked very hard for the OIML.

As Mr. Johnston knew Mr. Butcher personally, he was able to confirm that he was very passionate about his work and believed in what he was doing. Mr. Butcher was not shy about letting his colleagues know whether or not he agreed with them, which was another good point. Mr. Johnston asked Mr. Ehrlich to come forward and accept the Award on Mr. Butcher's behalf.

Mr. Ehrlich thanked Members and said that he was sure Mr. Butcher would be very happy to receive this Award. As a colleague of Mr. Butcher's, he agreed with Mr. Johnston that it was very well deserved.

The third medal was for Mr. Li from China. When Mr. Li had become the OIML representative for China, China had been in the background. Since Mr. Li had become their representative, the Chinese had taken on a very active role within the OIML. They had taken over a number of TCs, they had provided training, they had hosted a CIML Meeting in 1995, and Mr. Li had encouraged the building of metrology within his country and the countries in the Asia Pacific region. China had also made substantive progress in adopting OIML Recommendations and had been a very active member of the OIML. Mr. Johnston considered that much of this was due to Mr. Li's contribution. He therefore had pleasure in presenting Mr. Li with an OIML Award.

Accepting the medal, Mr. Li said (through his interpreter) that he regretted his inability to speak good English; he felt it a special honor to receive this Award, which, he felt, was given, not to him as an individual, but rather to the whole government and to the legal metrology authorities in China. He had been appointed as CIML Member for China in 1994, and later a member of the Presidential Council, and of course in these capacities he had done some work; but this work had not been done by himself alone but with the support of all his colleagues and from his Government.

Receiving this Award was a very important occasion for him. Legal metrology was playing a very important role in China at present; the Chinese Government gave great support to their work. Legal metrology was seen as the core in China, and scientific and industrial metrology as the foundation, with the support also of the calibration and verification services, all of which made for an excellent national system of legal metrology, supported by their Government with funding and in other ways. He felt it a special honor to be working with his colleagues under such good circumstances.

He received the honor therefore not only for his own contribution to legal metrology activities in China but also on behalf of his organization and the Central Government. The Award would be of great significance to legal metrology work in China and also in promoting legal metrology activities in the Asia Pacific Region and internationally. Due to changes in Mr. Li's responsibilities, he would no longer be directly involved in legal metrology activities in China, but in any case he was still working for the Government, which was responsible for certification, accreditation, metrology and quality inspection. But he felt the Award to be an honor and he would in the immediate future give his personal advice and assistance to support the OIML activities in China, especially in long term policies and the future Action Plan and in promoting trade facilitation and economic development in the countries of the Asia Pacific region and in the Developing Countries.

Mr. Johnston announced that the last medal of the day would be awarded to Aart Kooiman. Sadly, Mr. Kooiman had died on 20 October 2004. Legal metrology would miss him, as would all of his friends. He had been influential in the development of R 117 and R 118; the drafting of R 117 had been initiated in 1987, mainly by Germany and France, and Mr. Kooiman had become involved in this work somewhat later, but he had had a major influence on the first version of R 117, and had had main responsibility for R 118. He had been the chairman of WELMEC Working Group 10, OIML TC 8/SC 1 Working Group 2, and, of course, he had carried the load for the revision of R 117, along with Ralph Richter from the United States. He had additionally begun work on a

revision of R 71 and R 85, and it was unfortunate that he could not be present to receive the Award. Mr. Johnston asked Mr. van Mullem to come forward and accept it on his behalf.

Mr. van Mullem said that it was a special moment for him, to receive the Award for Mr. Kooiman. He had been not only a colleague but also a friend, missed daily by his colleagues. His wife, who was another colleague, was struggling to rebuild her life without him. The medal would be a help and comfort to her and Mr. van Mullem would hand it to her.

Mr. Johnston explained that one further medal would be presented, to Bernard Athané, who was unfortunately unable to attend.

Two Letters of Appreciation were presented: the first went to Mr. Michael Gläser of the PTB. Mr. Gläser had played a decisive role in the work of OIML TC 9/SC 3, and had successfully finalized two important projects in 2004: the revisions of R 111 and R 33 (which would be published as a new Document D 28, *Conventional value of the result of weighing in air*). The revision of R 111 had been a high priority project for the OIML, since it was considered to be one of the most basic and important sets of requirements that Member States could adopt as the foundation for their laws in metrology. To a great extent, it was certainly the merit of Mr. Gläser and his long experience in the field of mass metrology that this important Recommendation could now be published with significant improvements compared to the previous edition. Mr. Johnston asked Mr. Kochsiek to come up and receive the letter on his behalf.

Mr. Kochsiek thanked the President on behalf of Mr. Gläser. As former Acting President, he was in a position to say that Mr. Gläser had made a really good contribution to all the work Mr. Johnston had mentioned.

Mr. Johnston told members that the other Letter of Appreciation went to Mr. Richard Davis from the BIPM. Mr. Davis had worked since 1990 with the BIPM and currently headed the Mass section; he was a fellow of the American Physical society, who had also brought an outstanding contribution to the revisions of OIML R 111 and R 33 (D 28). It was his pleasure to make this presentation, and he asked Mr. Rainer Köhler to come up from the BIPM to accept on behalf of Mr. Davis, as Mr. Davis was unfortunately unable to be present.

Mr. Köhler wished to thank the President and the OIML for the Award in the name of Richard Davis and it would be a pleasure to hand it over to him upon resuming work in the laboratory.

12 Closure

Mr. Johnston closed the 40th CIML Meeting and thanked all delegates for attending, wishing them a pleasant stay in France. He also expressed his thanks to the organizers of the International Metrology Congress, who had taken care of many administrative arrangements including for the CIML Meeting, and finally thanked the BIML Director and Staff for their role in making the event a success.

With a final few words on administrative matters from Mr. Magaña, the 40th CIML was declared closed. ■

2005.06.18–20

Decisions

DECISIONS

40th CIML Meeting

40ème Réunion du CIML

ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE
DE MÉTROLOGIE LÉGALE

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION
OF LEGAL METROLOGY

Lyon, 2005.06.18–20

DECISIONS

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

FORTIETH MEETING
of the
INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE of LEGAL METROLOGY
Lyon, 18–20 June 2005

DECISIONS

Opening addresses

The Committee took note of the opening address delivered by its Acting President Manfred Kochsiek, who then handed over the CIML Presidency to Alan Johnston (Canada), who also gave an opening address.

Roll Call - Quorum

52 Member States out of 60 were present or represented at the opening of the 40th CIML Meeting. The quorum (45 member States) was therefore reached. *Note: During the various sessions, the number of Member States present or represented varied between 52 and 53. Details of the votes will be mentioned in the 40th CIML Minutes.*

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, two CIML Honorary Members and members of BIML Staff.

Approval of the Agenda

The draft agenda (Version 3 dated 2005.04.19) was approved without modification.

1 Approval of the Minutes of the 39th CIML Meeting

The Minutes of the 39th CIML Meeting were approved without modification.

2 Member States and Corresponding Members

2.1 Situation of certain Members

The CIML noted the commitment of the DPR Korea and Zambia to pay their arrears according to an agreed schedule.

The CIML approved the following rule for the reduction of the contributory classes of certain Member States according to their Gross National Income per capita:

According to its Gross National Income per capita, a country may be declassified:

- *by one class for lower middle income countries whose Gross National Income per capita is greater than twice that of low income countries;*
- *by two classes for lower middle income countries whose Gross National Income per capita is lower than twice that of low income countries;*
- *by three classes for low income countries.*

The CIML took note of a report given by the BIML Director concerning the contributory classes of six Member States, which would be reclassified as follows according to the above rules:

Member State	Present class	Application of the rule	Comment (World Bank 2003 data)
Brazil	2	3	GNI per capita = 2 710 USD
Indonesia	1	2	GNI per capita = 810 USD
Rep. Korea	2	3	47.9 million inhabitants
Poland	1	2	GNI per capita = 5 270 USD
Saudi Arabia	1	2	22.5 million inhabitants
Spain	2	3	41.1 million inhabitants

Members shall send their comments on these envisaged reclassifications to the CIML President before end of July 2005. Once these comments have been received and analyzed, the CIML President shall submit a decision to the CIML for postal approval.

The CIML accepted to classify Turkey, which had just become an OIML Member State, in Class 2 instead of Class 3. This country's classification shall be reviewed annually in line with the decisions and resolutions of the 39th CIML Meeting.

3 Financial matters

3.1 Adoption of the Auditor's report for 2004

The Committee approved the Auditor's report for 2004 and requested its President and the BIML Director to submit it to the Thirteenth Conference.

3.2 Assets and liabilities as at 2005.01.01

The Committee took note of a report given by the BIML Director concerning the OIML Pension System and instructed its President and the Director of the Bureau to continue to study the possible evolutions of the System, compared to other systems existing in similar organizations, and to report back at the 41st CIML Meeting in 2006.

The Committee took note of a presentation given by the BIML Director concerning the estimation of the assets and liabilities according to the new accountancy rules laid down by the new Financial Regulations.

The Committee noted that taking account of the evaluation of the Pension Fund, the Reserve Fund would be significantly reduced.

The Committee instructed its President to examine the conditions and procedures related to personal loans to BIML Staff Members and to report back at the 41st CIML Meeting in 2006.

3.3 Information on the implementation of the new Financial Regulations

The Committee took note of a presentation given by the BIML Director concerning the implementation of the new Financial Regulations. It was noted that the details of the transition from the previous to the new accountancy systems shall be assessed by the external accountant and presented at the 41st CIML Meeting in 2006.

It was also noted that the charges resulting from the evaluation of the Pension System will increase staff costs. The Committee instructed the BIML Director, under the supervision of the CIML President, to take any necessary measures to keep the accounts within a balanced situation and to maintain the Reserve Fund at an acceptable level during this period.

4 Presidential Council activities

4.1 Report on Presidential Council activities

The Committee took note of a report from its President concerning the activities of the Presidential Council since the 39th CIML Meeting.

4.2 Long Term Strategy and Action Plan

The Committee discussed the Strategy and the Action Plan, and expressed comments on them. CIML Members are requested to send additional comments to the President and to the Bureau by the end of July 2005.

The Committee instructed its President and the Bureau to circulate these drafts, amended in line with the comments expressed, for postal approval before the end of 2005.

5 Developing Country activities

5.1 Report on PWGDC activities

The Committee took note of a report given by Dr. Seiler on the activities of the Permanent Working Group on Developing Countries and expressed its appreciation to Dr. Seiler for his efficient chairmanship.

The Committee expressed its thanks to the Members of the Permanent Working Group for their involvement in this work and for the responsibilities that they have undertaken.

5.2 Report on JCDCMAS activities

The Committee took note of a report given by Mr. Dunmill on the activities of the Joint Committee for the coordination of Technical Assistance to Developing Countries, chaired in 2005 by the Bureau.

6 Liaisons

6.1 Presentation by the Bureau on liaison activities

The Committee took note of a presentation given by the BIML Director concerning liaison activities.

6.2 Updates by Liaison Organizations

The Committee took note of information given by the following liaison organizations concerning their activities and thanked their representatives:

BIPM ..... Mr. Köhler
ILAC/IAF ..... Mr. Reposeur
ISO ..... Mr. Bryden
UNIDO ..... Mr. Loesener-Diaz
IMEKO ..... Pr. Van Biesen
CEN/CENELEC ..... Mr. Mertens
CECIP ..... Mrs. Martens
GSO ..... Dr. Bin Fahad

6.3 Updates by RLMOs

The Committee took note of information given by Regional Legal Metrology Organizations concerning their activities and thanked their representatives:

APLMF ..... Dr. Ooiwa
COOMET ..... Mr. Zhagora
EMLMF ..... Mr. Lagauterie
SADCMEL ..... Mr. Carstens
SIM ..... Dr. Ehrlich
SWPLMF ..... Mr. Vadei
WELMEC ..... Mr. Freistetter

7 BIML activities

7.1 Organization of the Bureau

The Committee took note of a presentation given by the BIML Director concerning the organization and activities of the Bureau. It was noted that one BIML Staff Member had decided to leave the BIML at the end of 2004; a suitable candidate would be recruited shortly.

7.2 Communication, web site

The Committee took note of a presentation given by Mr. Pulham concerning the production of OIML Publications, activities aimed at improving communication, and the OIML web site.

The Committee expressed its high appreciation of the achievements presented and encouraged the Bureau to continue this development. In particular, a new OIML Leaflet was presented describing the Organization, its role and its structures. The BIML proposed to make the Leaflet available free of charge to all Members to promote legal metrology in their countries.

7.3 Report on BIML activities and work program for 2005

The Committee took note of a presentation given by the BIML Director concerning the 2005 work program of the Bureau, based on the Strategy Document and Action Plan presented during the Meeting.

8 Technical activities

The Committee took note of a presentation given by Mr. Szilvássy concerning the general situation of OIML technical activities, specifically the drafts of Recommendations to be approved and the situation of certain TCs/SCs.

8.1 Approval of International Recommendations and Documents

Since the number of votes received on the two current drafts submitted for voting (revisions of R 51 and R 134-1) had been too low and the number of comments and negative votes received for R 134-1 did not allow any decision to be made, the Committee instructed the Secretariat of TC 9/SC 2 to draw up the final Draft Recommendations taking account of the comments received, and instructed the Bureau to proceed with a CIML postal approval of these two projects.

The Committee decided that the same CIML postal approval procedure will apply for the DR of the revision of R 39, posted on the web site immediately prior to the CIML Meeting for on-line postal ballot.

8.2 Examination of the situation of certain TCs/SCs

The Committee decided:

- to disband and discontinue the work of TC 10/SC 6 *Strain gauges*,
- to merge TC 8/SC 1 *Static volume measurement* and TC 8/SC 2 *Static mass measurement* under the Co-secretariat of Austria and Germany under the title TC 8/SC 1 *Static volume and mass measurement*, and to disband TC 8/SC 2,
- to allocate the Secretariat of TC 10/SC 3 *Barometers* to China,
- to withdraw the following work projects:
  - TC 7/SC 1: p 1 revision R 30 *End standards of length (gauge blocks)*,
  - TC 10/SC 4: p 2 *Requirements for force measuring instruments for verifying material testing machines* in favor of the utilization of ISO 376,
  - TC 17/SC 6: p 1 *Calibration procedure for mine methanometers* and p 2 *Procedure for calibration of alarms of combustible gazes and vapors*.

The Committee approved the proposal from TC 3/SC 5 to use the Guides for the application of ISO 17025 and Guide 65 drawn up by the CPR on R 60 and R 76 as a first Working Draft and to proceed following the Directives for Technical Work.

The Committee authorized the Bureau, together with the TC 4 Secretariat (Slovakia), to decide together with ILAC on the best way of publishing the joint publication of the revised D 10.

The Committee instructed the Bureau to organize a meeting with the Secretariats of TC 8/SC 7 and TC 8/SC 8 and to redefine the scope of these Subcommittees' projects so as to avoid unnecessary overlapping, eliminate redundancies, discrepancies and duplication of work.

8.3 MAA

The Committee took note of a report presented by Mrs. Gaucher, MAA Project Leader at the BIML, showing the progress in the implementation of the MAA and the outcome of the first CPR Meeting.

Twenty one participants are expected in the first two Declarations of Mutual Confidence related to Load cells and Nonautomatic weighing instruments. Among these participants, eight are expected to be Issuing Participants.

The CPR proposed some clarifications and amendments to OIML Publication B 10-1, which should be submitted to the CIML for voting.

The Committee asked the Bureau to submit the CPR proposals, amended according to the comments made at this CIML Meeting and accompanied by a detailed explanatory note, to the CIML for postal approval before the end of 2005. The proposals to be voted on are related to the following issues:

- the signatories of a DoMC;
- the establishment of one CPR for more than one DoMC;
- the CPR voting rules;
- the admission of new participants after a DoMC is signed; and
- the fees for peer assessments.

8.4 Progress in the revision of the Directives

The Committee took note that the Bureau will start the revision of the Directives for Technical Work before the end of 2005 and indicated that this work must be considered a high priority. This revision should simplify the procedures and make use of information technologies in order to substantially accelerate the work.

9 Human resource matters

9.1 Election of the CIML First Vice-President

The Committee elected Mr. Stuart Carstens, South Africa, as First Vice-President. He will take over his duties immediately. The Committee also decided that Pr. Kochsiek will remain Vice-President until the 41st CIML Meeting in 2006.

The Committee instructed the CIML President to draw up a draft procedure for the election of the CIML President and Vice President. This procedure shall be submitted for CIML postal approval in order to be applicable at the 41st CIML Meeting.

9.2 Extension of the contract of the BIML Director

On the proposal of the CIML President, the Committee approved the renewal of the contract of Mr. Magaña as BIML Director from 1 January 2006 to 31 December 2010.

9.3 Appointment of a new Assistant Director in 2007

The Committee endorsed the proposed list of members of the Selection Committee as follows:

Mr. Johnston,
Pr. Kochsiek,
Dr. Ehrlich,
Mr. Carstens,
Mr. Harvey,
Mr. Magaña.

10 Future meetings

10.1 41st CIML Meeting (2006)

The Committee took note of a presentation given by South Africa about the organization of the 41st CIML Meeting in Capetown in October 2006 and thanked the South African Government and the South African CIML Member for their invitation, which was confirmed as accepted by the Committee.

10.2 42nd CIML Meeting (2007)

The Committee noted that the People's Republic of China was considering inviting the CIML to hold its 42nd Meeting in China in October 2007. A decision will be taken at the 41st CIML Meeting. ■