

51st CIML Meeting

Strasbourg, France
17–21 October 2016

Minutes



INTERNATIONAL BUREAU OF LEGAL METROLOGY (BIML)
11, RUE TURGOT – F-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



International Organization of Legal Metrology

Secretariat:

BUREAU INTERNATIONAL DE MÉTROLOGIE LÉGALE (BIML)

11, RUE TURGOT – 75009 PARIS – FRANCE

TEL: +33 1 48 78 12 82

FAX: +33 1 42 82 17 27

E-MAIL: biml@oiml.org

INTERNET: www.oiml.org

**Fifty-first meeting of the
International Committee of Legal Metrology**

Strasbourg, France

17–21 October 2016



The International Committee of Legal Metrology was convened by its President,
Mr. Peter Mason, and met from 17–21 October 2016
at the Convention and Exhibition Center, Strasbourg, France.



Contents

Opening speech	8
Roll call	13
Approval of the Agenda	15
1 Approval of the minutes of the 50th CIML Meeting	15
2 General report by the CIML President	15
3 Presentation(s) by candidates for the CIML Presidency and Vice-Presidency	18
4 BIML matters	22
4.1 Report on BIML activities	22
4.2 Discussion on the recruitment of a BIML Assistant Director	24
5 Member States and Corresponding Members	26
6 Financial matters	27
6.1 Approval of the 2015 accounts	27
6.2 Closure of the Translation Center	29
6.3 Arrears of Member States and Corresponding Members.....	30
6.4 Forecast budget realization for 2016	31
6.5 Examination of the proposed budget for the 2017–2020 financial period.....	33
7 Report on matters concerning Countries and Economies with Emerging Metrology Systems (CEEMS)	42
7.1 BIML activities in connection with CEEMS matters	42
7.2 Special projects fund for CEEMS.....	49
7.3 Advisory Group on CEEMS.....	50
8 Special projects	54
8.1 Report of the B 6 revision Project Group	54
8.2 OIML-CS (Certification System) Project Group.....	56
9 Technical activities	68
9.1 Technical items for approval	68
9.2 Technical items for information	85
10 Preparation of the 15th Conference	86
10.1 Nominations for the Presidency of the 15th Conference	86
10.2 Review of the draft agenda for the 15th Conference	86
11 Other matters (1)	89
12 Report on OIML Certificate Systems	89
13 Review of the Resolutions of the 15th Conference	89
14 Liaisons	91
14.1 Report by the BIML on liaison activities.....	91
14.2 Short reports from / presentations by Liaison Organizations.....	91
14.3 Information regarding the RLMO Round Table	97
15 Human resource matters	99
15.1 Election of a CIML Vice-President	99
16 Awards	99
17 Future meetings	105
17.1 52nd CIML Meeting (2017)	105
17.2 53rd CIML Meeting (2018).....	107
18 Other matters (2)	107
19 Approval of meeting resolutions	109
Closing remarks	126
Attendance list	127

**Fifty-first meeting of the
International Committee of Legal Metrology
17–21 October 2016**

Strasbourg, France

– MINUTES –

Opening speech

Mr. Mason welcomed delegates to the city of Strasbourg and to the CIML Meeting, saying that it was a great pleasure for him to return after 30 years. He indicated that he did not intend to make an opening speech, and immediately invited Mme Danielle Giuganti, *Directrice de la Direction régionale des entreprises, de la concurrence, de la consommation, du travail et de l'emploi de la Région Grand Est*, to welcome delegates to Strasbourg.

Mme Danielle Giuganti

**Directrice de la Direction régionale des entreprises, de la concurrence,
de la consommation, du travail et de l'emploi de la Région Grand Est**

Monsieur le Président du Comité International de Métrologie Légale,
Messieurs les Vice-Présidents,
Mesdames et Messieurs les Membres du Comité,
Monsieur le Directeur du Bureau International de Métrologie Légale,
Mesdames et Messieurs les délégués,

Nous voici réunis à Strasbourg en France au cœur de l'Europe dans le cadre des réunions qui ponctuent la vie de votre organisation qui fut fondée en 1955 à Paris, tous les ans pour le Comité et tous les quatre ans pour la Conférence.

Je suis honorée de vous accueillir à Strasbourg et d'ouvrir au nom du Ministre de l'économie et des finances, du Secrétaire d'Etat à l'industrie et du Préfet de la Région Grand Est, la 51ème Réunion du Comité International de Métrologie Légale qui sera suivie par la 15ème réunion de la Conférence Internationale de Métrologie Légale.

En octobre 2015, le CIML s'était réuni en France à Arcachon. C'est assez inhabituel que vos réunions se déroulent deux années de suite dans le même Etat mais j'espère que cela vous donnera l'occasion de découvrir avec plaisir une autre Région française qui joue un rôle capital pour l'Union européenne puisque Strasbourg est le siège – comme vous le savez – de plusieurs institutions européennes.

Vous vous trouvez dans une région qui a vu le jour le premier janvier de cette année dans le cadre d'une grande réorganisation territoriale de la France, la Région du Grand Est, qui fusionne les trois anciennes régions d'Alsace, de Champagne-Ardenne et de Lorraine. Elle est située au cœur de l'Europe et s'étend de la Région parisienne aux frontières de la Belgique, du Luxembourg, de l'Allemagne et de la Suisse.

Elle couvre 57 800 km², compte pas moins de 5,5 millions d'habitants dont plus de 30 % ont moins de 25 ans. C'est une Région avec un passé riche, très active au niveau industriel et qui se veut innovante et entreprenante ; voyez les locaux qui vous accueillent. La qualité de ses infrastructures scientifiques et de recherche a été récemment mise en lumière avec l'attribution du Prix Nobel de Chimie, qui vient de récompenser les travaux de trois scientifiques dont le strasbourgeois Jean-Pierre Sauvage, conjointement avec le britannique James Fraser Stoddart et le néerlandais Bernard L. Feringa pour leurs travaux sur la conception et la synthèse de machines moléculaires. Si la métrologie « légale » dans le domaine des nanoobjets n'est pas encore au programme de vos travaux cette année, en revanche la métrologie dans le domaine des nanotechnologies est un sujet phare de recherche depuis déjà quelques années.

Lors du congrès de l'an passé ma collègue Madame Isabelle Notter avait souligné l'importance de votre organisation et je la rejoins dans cette conviction.

Les réunions régulières du CIML et de la Conférence marquent les progrès de votre organisation dans la mise en place de Recommandations techniques harmonisées au niveau mondial et d'un système de certification des instruments de mesure mais aussi dans le soutien aux Etats qui mettent en place leur système de métrologie légale. Il suffit du reste de parcourir votre ordre du jour pour constater que votre mission n'est pas achevée et reste en pleine évolution.

Les Etats se réfèrent en effet aux Recommandations de l'OIML pour établir leurs réglementations qui se doivent d'être compatibles dans le cadre de la mondialisation des échanges. Grâce aux efforts conjoints des responsables des services de métrologie de l'Union européenne, ces Recommandations de l'OIML ont servi de base à la rédaction des Directives européennes dès le milieu des années 70. Elles tiennent une place prépondérante car elles sont désormais reconnues comme documents normatifs servant de base à l'élaboration de nouvelles Directives.

La France, les autres Etats de l'Union européenne et WELMEC, l'organisation régionale de coopération européenne en métrologie légale, dont je salue la présidente ici présente Mme van Spronssen, continuent à veiller à maintenir cette cohérence et apporter leur expertise technique à vos travaux.

Votre organisation sert également de point de rencontre régulier entre les différentes organisations régionales de métrologie légale qui peuvent ainsi partager leurs expériences au cours de tables rondes.

Votre organisation soutient activement les Etats qui mettent en place leur système de métrologie légale. Les séminaires qui se sont tenus en Chine puis en France en 2015 ont permis des échanges nombreux et fructueux dans ce domaine. Ainsi, deux Centres Pilotes de Formation ont été lancés en Chine au début de cette année et vos discussions permettront de faire progresser d'autres idées avec succès.

Permettez-moi maintenant de rappeler en quelques mots l'organisation de la métrologie légale en France.

Le Bureau de la métrologie de la Direction générale des entreprises, représenté cette semaine par Corinne Lagauterie, Membre du CIML pour la France, et ses adjoints Bernard van Maris et Marielle Fayol est responsable de l'élaboration de la réglementation et coordonne techniquement les activités des services de métrologie des régions.

Les activités de certification et de vérification ont été déléguées en France à des organismes et l'Etat est chargé de les surveiller.

Le Laboratoire national de métrologie et d'essais est l'organisme de délivrance des certificats d'examen de type nationaux et européens mais aussi des certificats OIML. Le LNE joue également un rôle de plus haut niveau en métrologie scientifique concernant la définition et le maintien des étalons avec le soutien financier du ministère en charge de l'économie et de l'industrie.

En région, les services de métrologie légale font partie des pôles C (qui ont en charge la concurrence, la consommation et la métrologie) des directions régionales des entreprises, de la concurrence, de la consommation, du travail et de l'emploi.

En Région Grand Est, le service de métrologie de ma direction, dirigé par François-Xavier Labbe, qui n'a hélas pas pu être parmi nous aujourd'hui, est intégré dans le pôle C dirigé par Eric Lavoignat qui est présent dans cette salle. Ce service régional comprend 13 inspecteurs qui sont chargés de surveillance pour assurer une application correcte des réglementations.

En 2016, ils auront consacré 900 journées à la surveillance du parc d'instruments en service afin de s'assurer que les détenteurs utilisent correctement des instruments appropriés à l'usage et qui sont à jour de leurs vérifications obligatoires. En ce mois d'octobre, ils participent à une opération nationale coordonnée par le Bureau de la métrologie qui concerne les chronotachygraphes des autocars.

Une autre part importante de leur activité concerne la surveillance des organismes agréés auxquels les vérifications ont été déléguées. Cette surveillance prend notamment la forme de visites inopinées sur le terrain (300 seront ainsi réalisées au total en 2016).

Enfin ils participent à la surveillance du marché des instruments neufs mais aussi à la surveillance d'instruments réparés, afin d'assurer que seuls des instruments conformes sont mis sur le marché en service et qu'ils continuent à l'être en cours d'utilisation. En 2017, ils veilleront notamment à ce que les importateurs et distributeurs d'instruments de mesure respectent leurs nouvelles obligations prévues par les Directives européennes.

Un petit clin d'œil pour terminer, vous étiez l'an passé près de Bordeaux, dans une région viticole ; vous l'êtes de nouveau en Grand Est avec le Champagne et surtout plus proche de Strasbourg le vignoble d'Alsace... c'est bien entendu à apprécier mais toujours avec modération !

Je vous souhaite un agréable séjour et avant tout des travaux fructueux. Je suis certaine que vous saurez rester attentifs à ce que les évolutions des exigences métrologiques servent à protéger les consommateurs et à garantir des échanges commerciaux loyaux tout en prenant en compte les besoins des industriels et les autres aspects sociétaux dans le cadre de la mondialisation des échanges, ainsi que les besoins des pays avec systèmes de métrologie émergents.

Monsieur le Président, je vous remercie de m'avoir invitée à ouvrir vos travaux, j'en suis très honorée ; je vous souhaite une excellente 51ème réunion du CIML.

BIML translation

Address by Mrs. Daniele Giuganti

Director of the Regional Directorate for Enterprise, Competition, Consumer Affairs, Labor and Employment of the Grand Est Region

*Mr. President of the International Committee of Legal Metrology, Vice-Presidents,
Committee Members,
Director of the International Bureau of Legal Metrology, Dear delegates,*

Here we are, gathered in Strasbourg, France in the heart of Europe for meetings that are a part of your organization which was founded in 1955 in Paris – the meetings are held every year for the Committee and every four years for the Conference.

I am honored to welcome you to Strasbourg and, on behalf of the Minister for the Economy and Finance, the Secretary of State for Industry and the Prefect of the Grand Est Region, to open the 51st Meeting of the International Committee of Legal Metrology which will be followed by the 15th meeting of the International Conference on Legal Metrology.

In October 2015, the CIML met in Arcachon, France. It is quite unusual for your meetings to be held for two years running in the same State, but I hope that this will offer you the opportunity to enjoy discovering another French Region that plays a key role in the European Union since Strasbourg – as you are aware – is the headquarters of several European institutions.

You are in a region that came into being on the first of January this year following a major territorial reorganization of France in which the three former regions of Alsace, Champagne-

Ardenne and Lorraine were merged into what is now the Grand Est region. It is located at the heart of Europe and stretches from the Paris region to the borders with Belgium, Luxembourg, Germany and Switzerland.

It covers an area of 57 800 km² and has a population of no less than 5.5 million inhabitants, more than 30 % of whom are aged under 25. The region has a rich past, is industrially very active and sees itself as innovative and enterprising; just look at the building in which we are today. The quality of the scientific and research facilities was recently highlighted with the award of the Nobel Prize in Chemistry that has just recognized the work of three scientists, including the Strasbourg native Jean-Pierre Sauvage, jointly with the British national James Fraser Stoddart and the Dutchman Bernard L. Feringa for their work on the design and synthesis of molecular machines. While “legal” metrology in the area of nano-objects does not yet feature on the program of your deliberations this year, metrology in the field of nano technology has been a key research topic over the past few years.

At last year’s meeting, my colleague Mrs. Isabelle Notter underscored the importance of your organization and I share her belief.

Regular meetings of the CIML and the Conference mark the progress made by your organization in implementing harmonized technical Recommendations worldwide and a certification system for measuring instruments, and also in assisting States that are establishing their own legal metrology system. One only needs to go through your agenda to note that your task is not yet complete and is evolving.

States refer to OIML Recommendations when developing regulations that must be compatible within the context of globalization of trade. Thanks to the joint efforts of the heads of European Union metrology services, OIML Recommendations were used as a basis for the drafting of European Directives beginning in the mid-70s. They play a key role because they are now recognized as normative documents used as a basis for the preparation of new Directives.

France, other European Union countries and WELMEC – the regional organization of European cooperation in legal metrology – the president, Mrs. van Spronssen, of which is in our midst and whom I would like to greet, continue to work to maintain this coherence and offer their technical expertise during our deliberations.

Your organization is also a regular meeting point for various regional legal metrology organizations that are thus given the opportunity to share their experience during round tables.

Your organization actively assists States that are establishing their legal metrology system. The seminars held in China, then France in 2015 provided the opportunity for many fruitful discussions in this area. In that regard, two Pilot Training Centers were launched in China early this year and your discussions will successfully advance other ideas.

Allow me to now briefly recall the organization of legal metrology in France.

The Bureau of Metrology of the Directorate General of Enterprise, represented this week by Corinne Lagauterie, CIML Member for France, and her deputies Bernard van Maris and Marielle Fayol, is responsible for developing regulations and technically coordinating the regions’ metrology activities.

Certification and verification activities have been delegated in France to various bodies and the State is tasked with monitoring them.

The Laboratoire National de Métrologie et d’Essais (LNE) is the body responsible for issuing national and European type examination certificates, as well as OIML certificates. The LNE equally plays a higher-level role in scientific metrology with respect to setting and maintaining standards with financial assistance from the ministry responsible for the economy and industry.

Within the regions, legal metrology services are part of Cluster C (in charge of competition, consumer affairs and metrology) of regional directorates for enterprise, competition, consumer affairs, labor and employment. In the Grand Est Region, my directorate’s metrology service,

which is headed by François-Xavier Labbe, who unfortunately could not join us today, is part of Cluster C which is run by Eric Lavoignat who is here with us. This regional service is made up of 13 inspectors responsible for monitoring to ensure proper enforcement of regulations.

In 2016, they will have devoted 900 days to monitoring instruments in service to ensure that their owners use them properly and that the instruments have been the subject of the required verifications. This October, they will be participating in a national operation on bus chronotachographs coordinated by the Bureau of Metrology.

Another important part of their activity is the monitoring of approved bodies to which verifications have been delegated. The monitoring takes the form of unannounced field visits (a total of 300 in 2016).

Last but not least, they participate in the monitoring of the new and repaired instruments market to ensure that only instruments that conform are placed on the market and that they continue to be in conformity when they are being used. In 2017, they will in particular see to it that importers and distributors of measuring instruments comply with their new obligations under European Directives.

Let me conclude with a nod to our vineyards – last year you were near Bordeaux, and now you are again in a wine-growing region, this time in the Grand Est region with its Champagne and above all you are closer to Strasbourg and the vineyards of Alsace... do enjoy the wine of course, but do so responsibly!

I wish you a pleasant stay here and, most of all, fruitful deliberations. I am certain that you will make sure that changing metrological requirements protect consumers and guarantee fair trade, while catering for the needs of industry and other societal aspects within the context of the globalization of trade, as well as the needs of countries with emerging metrology systems.

Mr. President, thank you for inviting me to open your deliberations; I am honored. I wish you an excellent 51st CIML Meeting.

Thanking Madame la directrice, Mr. Mason particularly noted her very good summary of the important subjects to be discussed during the course of the day. She had also highlighted the relationship between the global work of the OIML and the important work carried out in the field, in this region and elsewhere in France, Europe, and most of the rest of the world. It was very helpful to be reminded of the relationship between the work done by organizations such as her own to secure fair trade and the protection of consumers, and the work carried out during meetings. Thanking her again for striking exactly the right note on which to start the meeting, he stated that although she would be unable to stay for the meeting, he was sure his colleagues would continue to inform her of the decisions made, and of their potential relevance to the metrologists working in her organization. Her welcome had been very appropriate.

Roll call

Mr. Mason invited Mr. Dunmill to commence the roll call of Member States present to ensure that the quorum would be met. He reminded delegates that further roll calls would be taken at other times during the meeting as required. The roll call was as follows:

Albania not present, proxy given to Switzerland (not currently present)
 Algeria present
 Australia present
 Austria present
 Belarus not present, no proxy given
 Belgium present
 Brazil not present, no proxy given
 Bulgaria not present, no proxy given
 Cameroon not present, proxy given to Algeria
 Canada present
 Colombia present
 Croatia present
 Cuba present
 Cyprus not present, proxies given to Greece and France
 Czech Republic present
 Denmark present
 Egypt present
 Finland not present, proxy given to Sweden
 France present
 Germany present
 Greece not present (although expected to arrive), no proxy given
 Hungary not present, proxy given to Poland
 India present
 Indonesia present
 Iran present
 Ireland present
 Israel not present, no proxy given
 Italy not present, no proxy given
 Japan present
 Kazakhstan not present, proxy given to the Russian Federation
 Kenya present
 Korea present
 Macedonia not present, no proxy given
 Monaco not present, proxy given to France
 Morocco not present, no proxy given
 Netherlands present
 New Zealand present
 Norway not present, no proxy given
 P.R. China present
 Pakistan not present, no proxy given

Poland..... present
Portugal present
Romania present
Russian Federation present
Saudi Arabia present
Serbia..... present
Slovakia present
Slovenia..... present
South Africa present
Spain..... present
Sri Lanka not present, no proxy given
Sweden present
Switzerland..... not present, proxy given to Austria
Tanzania present
Thailand..... present
Tunisia..... present
Turkey present
United Kingdom present
United States..... present
Viet Nam present
Zambia..... present

Mr. Patoray summarized the roll call. He had counted 12 Member States that were not present and had not given a proxy vote to another Member State. The OIML currently has 61 Member States in total which left 49 Member States to vote. For a quorum 46 votes are needed (75 % of the total Member States), so the quorum was achieved. He emphasized that since there were only just enough votes to meet the quorum, participants should be vigilant to maintain the quorum, and indicate their intention to be absent to a member of the BIML staff.

Mr. Mason was sure that more delegations would be joining the meeting. At the original registration, he had been encouraged to see that 56 delegations had intended to be present or represented through proxies. Their absence, he suspected, may be as a consequence of starting the meeting in the middle of the day and that some colleagues may still be travelling. He felt this may be potentially significant as voting would need to take place during the course of the meeting. Although he did not expect that to be necessary during the course of the first day, voting on a number of issues would be necessary at the end of the following day, as the Committee would have to make certain decisions before moving into the Conference. He thought there would possibly be other issues where it would be necessary to vote during the course of the meeting, rather than the normal practice of taking resolutions at the end, as this would leave fewer decisions to be taken on the last day, Friday. He considered that the situation should be monitored but reiterated he was expecting more delegates to arrive before the following day.

Approval of the Agenda

Stating that the agenda had been circulated several months in advance of the meeting for consideration by the delegates, Mr. Mason verified that there were no objections to the agenda being approved. No objections were raised, so the agenda was adopted unanimously.

1 Approval of the minutes of the 50th CIML Meeting

Mr. Mason said that the draft minutes of the 50th CIML Meeting (2015) had been circulated in March 2016. It was confirmed that no comments had been made since then, and there were none made by Members of the Committee present at the meeting.

Resolution no. 2016/1 approving the minutes was adopted unanimously.

Resolution no. 2016/1

The Committee,

Approves the minutes of the 50th CIML Meeting.

2 General report by the CIML President

The past year has been quite a challenging one for our Organisation. The untimely passing of BIML Assistant Director Willem Kool has been greatly mourned by all who knew him; it has also left a significant gap in the Bureau and thus in the resources we have available to us to tackle the ambitious programme which was adopted in Arcachon. Nevertheless, dedicated efforts by the staff in the Bureau and the continued support we have received from many CIML Members and their colleagues means that we have made significant progress on a number of projects.

As an organisation, our Members are at the heart of everything we do, and it has been a great pleasure to see Thailand join us as our sixty-first Member State. In addition to welcoming Miss Wiboonlasana Ruamraksa as Thailand's CIML Member, I also extend a welcome to our other new CIML Members:

- Mr. Bill Loizides (Australia),
- Mr. Wu Qinghai (People's Republic of China),
- Mr. George Hajipapas (Cyprus),
- Mrs. Hanne Scherrebeck (Denmark),
- Mr. Hans Arne Frøystein (Norway),
- Mr. Maciej Dobieszewski (Poland),
- Mrs. Susana Santos (Portugal),
- Mr. Cedomic Belic (Serbia),
- Mr. Jose Manuel Bernabe Sanchez (Spain), and
- Mr. Lotfi Khedir (Tunisia).

In addition, Angola has joined us as a new OIML Corresponding Member. Unfortunately, three other Corresponding Members have had to be delisted for non-payment of fees, but nonetheless there remains a high level of interest in our activities in all parts of the world.

The BIML Director will be providing detailed information on the current financial position of the Organisation, together with projections for the next four years, as part of our preparations for the 15th International Conference which will be held during the week. Overall, the financial position is a strong one but there are some concerns about cash flow which arise when countries, in particular large ones, fall behind in their payments. There will no doubt be discussions on this during the Conference.

I have already mentioned the sad passing of Willem Kool, and this has of course placed considerable strain on the staff resources within the Bureau. As I noted in my Report last year, staff within the Bureau have a tremendous record of being willing and able to cover for each other, but the impact of

this way of working for any length of time is significant. Work has to be re-prioritised and individuals have to become familiar with new subjects and new issues. I should like to pay tribute to all the staff of the Bureau for the way in which they have dedicated themselves to carry on our Organisation's business under the circumstances.

Our current procedures allow us very little flexibility when there is a need to replace an Assistant Director but it was clear from an early stage that additional resources would have to be brought in on a temporary basis. We are fortunate that we have been able to secure the services of two excellent individuals. First, the UK Government has made available Mr. Paul Dixon, formerly Head of the UK's Certification Body, on a temporary but full-time basis until the end of 2017. Second, Gilles Vinet, who recently retired from his position in Measurement Canada, has agreed to work on specific projects on an hourly basis as and when required. Both Paul and Gilles will be known to many of you and will also be present at our discussions in Strasbourg.

The effect of these arrangements is that hopefully the day-to-day operation of the Bureau has been maintained and many of those contacting the Bureau will have seen little or no impact on the service they receive. Where there have been problems in delivering all of what we hoped to achieve following our 50th meeting, I am pleased to say that CIML colleagues have been understanding. Team morale in the Bureau remains high and I believe we have reason to be proud of the way both the Bureau and the rest of our Organisation have coped.

As I mentioned last year, attention has been increasingly focused on updating the Organisation's IT and communication systems. I am pleased to say that the possibilities provided by the "PG Workspace" facility introduced last year are becoming more widely appreciated as the facility itself becomes used for more and more projects. Nevertheless, there is still a clear need for more training on how to make the most of the new tools which we now have available. The planned programme of training sessions, building on the start made with our German colleagues last year, was one of the items we were not able to progress as the result of the reprioritisation which I have already spoken about. But I hope it is something which we can take forward vigorously in the coming year.

In the meantime, we must also ensure that the rules on how we use these new systems are clear. In Arcachon last year, the CIML agreed to take forward a limited review of the *Directives for OIML technical work* (OIML Basic Publication B 6) specifically to ensure that there is a shared understanding of how we should carry out our technical work with the new facilities we now have. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to keep to the ambitious timetable we set at the 50th CIML Meeting. To a large extent that is because of conflicting demands I have faced which have affected the amount of time I have been able to devote to acting as Convener of the Project Group carrying out this review. Nevertheless, we have been able to produce, and obtain comments on, a number of policy papers which indicate a high degree of agreement on most of the major issues. As a result, although we will not be able to consider a revised text of B 6 at our 51st meeting, I am confident that we will be able to submit a well-crafted revised B 6 for adoption in 2017.

While there are still these areas for further work, however, we are already seeing some benefits from the new systems and the greater transparency they generate. The review of the technical work carried out at the Presidential Council meeting in March was probably the most effective and productive we have had, helped by the greatly improved information that is now provided. I would like to express my appreciation for the way in which so many of the secretariats and conveners have responded to the new reporting requirements. In previous reports I have expressed my concern at what appeared to be a reduction in the amount of technical work being carried out, most notably shown by the reduced number of meetings of Technical Committees, Subcommittees and Project Groups. However, increasingly we are able to see that it is possible to make progress using the new tools and without so many formal meetings. And possibly most encouraging of all, we have a large number of proposals for new projects to be considered at this year's meeting. So there are signs that our technical work is alive and well and I am very pleased to be able to report this.

Another focus of activity this year has been the project to introduce a single, integrated OIML Certificate System. Once again, in Arcachon we adopted a very ambitious timescale for completing this project and I am pleased that it has indeed been possible to get to a point where we have a new

Draft Basic Publication ready for CIML approval. The approach which we have adopted, based on models which have been found to be successful in other international organisations, is one which will place much of the responsibility for running the System in the hands of a new Management Committee. Nevertheless, it is also important that the right balance is struck between proper oversight by the CIML and the practical authority which the Management Committee needs to operate effectively. I am sure this will be a major topic of our discussions in Strasbourg. We will be helped enormously by having available an almost complete set of documentation so that we have a clear picture of how the new System is meant to work, and I would like to express my appreciation of the work which has been put in by the whole of the Project Team, and most particularly its convener, CIML First Vice-President Dr. Roman Schwartz, and Mr. Paul Dixon, who has assumed the role of Bureau contact for this work. As a result of these efforts, we can be confident that if the new Basic Publication is approved at our meeting in Strasbourg the new System will be able to start operating provisionally next year and come into full operation in 2018.

The third major topic discussed in Arcachon led to the adoption of CIML Resolution no. 2015/10 on “addressing the needs of countries and economies with emerging metrology systems” (CEEMS). As foreshadowed in Resolution 2015/10, a lot of effort has gone into developing the concept of Pilot Training Centres and two very successful centres were initiated in Beijing and in Guangzhou in July and August this year. One of the most important features of the approach we adopted last year was the focus on co-operation with others, not least bilateral co-operation with individual Member States. This is clearly illustrated by the initiatives in P.R. China. Another excellent example occurred in Bangkok in March where Manfred Kochsiek and I organised a joint PTB/OIML workshop on different approaches to type approval as part of the PTB’s programme of support to the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN). Nevertheless, there is still much to do in this area and one of the things we will have to discuss in Strasbourg is how we organise oversight of our work on CEEMS matters going forward.

In various conversations I have had with colleagues who are keen to develop the legal metrology systems in their own countries, the approach adopted in Arcachon has generated a lot of interest. This was particularly evident at the Annual SIM Meeting in the Dominican Republic which I attended in November 2015. It is also clear how important OIML Certificates are in establishing our visibility in so many parts of the world. All of this is additional confirmation of the benefits which we can hope to see when the new and improved scheme is introduced.

In my last two reports I made reference to the OIML’s participation in the OECD’s study of the role of international organisations in regulatory cooperation. In fact, the OIML has featured in this work as a case study, carried out under my supervision by Marc Loesewitz, a student at the Nanterre Centre of International Law (CEDIN), who served as an intern at the Bureau. This study has in turn contributed to a major OECD Report which will be published at the beginning of November. As well as giving us the opportunity to share with colleagues in other organisations our experience of introducing reform and modernisation into our processes and procedures, this work has ensured that the OECD Report acknowledges the wide diversity of models for international co-operation, not least our own model which depends so heavily on involving our Member States. It has also been a useful opportunity to raise the profile of legal metrology with other important international organisations. Marc will be present at our meeting in Strasbourg and will be able to provide additional information on his work.

The OECD study has confirmed the importance of the bilateral relationships which we have with a number of other international organisations, most notably the BIPM. Last year I noted the scope there was for our two organisations to work even more closely together in promoting the role which a modern metrology infrastructure, designed to support scientific metrology, industrial metrology and legal metrology, can play in economic development. This is one of the areas that we have not been able to give much attention to this year, due to the need for re-prioritisation, but it remains an important element in our approach to the CEEMS community and I hope the discussions at the 15th Conference will provide an opportunity to explore further how these ideas can be taken forward.

In preparing for the 15th Conference, I have naturally looked again at what we have previously identified as the three main challenges for our Organisation over the next few years. The past year has confirmed the relevance of those priorities:

- First, speeding up and making more efficient our processes for producing and revising our Recommendations and other publications is vital if we are to remain relevant in an ever-changing world. That means embracing new technology, amending our procedures to reflect that new technology and training ourselves on how best to operate those procedures.
- Second, our Certificates are a major part of how we are seen in many parts of the world. Potentially they are one of the most important elements we can offer to countries which want to improve their levels of metrological control but which lack the resources to operate full-scale type approval controls. Simplifying and modernising our Certificate System is key to responding to those needs.
- Third, meeting the needs of our Members – including our Corresponding Members – with emerging metrology systems is an essential part of remaining relevant in a world which is increasingly globalised and where the resources available to public authorities are under pressure everywhere. The comprehensive package of proposals we adopted last year is an excellent start, and has been very well-received, but delivering that package will involve several years of effort.

Finally, on a personal note, many of you will be aware that I and my family have faced some difficult issues of our own this year. I would like to express my thanks to you all for the kindness and support I have received from the two Vice-Presidents, other members of the Presidential Council, many other CIML Members and the Director, Stephen Patoray, and his staff. I am grateful to everyone who makes this the very special organisation which it is.

I look forward to a very successful week of meetings and, together, to taking our Organisation into the future.

Mr. Mason thanked delegates for their attention and said he would be happy to give them an opportunity to ask any questions before moving onto the next agenda item. There were no questions arising from his report.

Resolution no. 2016/2 approving the general report by the President was adopted unanimously.

Resolution no. 2016/2

The Committee,

Notes the report given by its President.

3 Presentation(s) by candidates for the CIML Presidency and Vice-Presidency

Mr. Mason reported that, as recorded in the working document, no CIML Member had put themselves forward for election for the presidency, which would become vacant in a year's time. In addition, there had only been one nomination for the position of First Vice-President – Dr. Roman Schwartz, who was the current First Vice-President. He emphasized that even though there was only one candidate, the election decisions require specific votes and that it was important that Members should be given the opportunity of a secret ballot, at an appropriate time, in order to say whether they support this candidacy. In order to help the process it had been arranged that Dr. Schwartz should give a short address which would form the basis of his request for re-election. Mr. Mason invited Dr. Schwartz to come forward and make the presentation.

Presentation by Dr. Roman Schwartz

“Dear colleagues, you have certainly seen and read my letter of candidacy for CIML First Vice-President which is included in the package of documents you have received for this meeting as Addendum 3.1. It is my pleasure to present a short summary of my CV and application now. Thank you for giving me the opportunity.

I would like to start with the most important question for some of you, which is ‘How old is he?’ I am aged 61, and my academic qualifications are Diploma in Physics (1981), PhD in Electrical engineering (1993). My current employment since 2014 is Vice-President of PTB, and I am also ex-officio head of the conformity assessment body at the PTB. The list of my previous employment is that from 2006-2014 I was head of the division of mechanics and acoustics at the PTB, and before that I was the head of the Department of Solid Mechanics which comprises the weighing instruments laboratory, the mass laboratory, the force and torque laboratory - all the important mechanical quantities. From 1994 to 2001 I was the head of the weighing instruments laboratory at the PTB and before that a scientist in the mass laboratory, so I am happy to have a scientific background as well as legal metrology experience. Before that I studied at the Technical University of Braunschweig.

As for my appointments and experience, in 2010 I started as the Second CIML Vice-President, and then later became the First CIML Vice-President. Since 2007 I have been a member of the Presidential Council. Since 2006 I was nominated as the CIML for Germany, following my colleague Prof. Manfred Kochsiek. From 2006-2015 I was a member of the CIPM Consultative Committee ‘Mass and related quantities’. Since 2005 I have been involved in OIML MAA activities, first as chairman of the ad hoc working group on the revision of the MAA and as a member of the CPRs on non-automatic weighing instruments and load cells, and now the Project Group convener for the Certification System.

A very interesting experience was the revision of R 76, which is one of the most important Recommendations we have in the OIML, because of its worldwide acceptance and transformation into national legislation. Together with Corinne Lagauterie from France I was responsible for the co-secretariat of TC 9/SC 1. In parallel with this, I was chairman of WELMEC Working Group 7 on software, and during that time we developed WELMEC’s software guide 7.2, which we discussed at the RLMO meeting in the morning, and which I am now pleased to hear will be translated into Russian. From 1995-2006 I was a member of WELMEC Working Group 2 on weighing instruments.

Why do I put my name forward for a second period as CIML First Vice-President? What is my motivation? Well, I think that the OIML is a very important player in the field of international metrology and standardization and deserves to be supported. I can bring a long experience and broad knowledge of scientific, industrial and legal metrology and I think I have a good international network of personal and business contacts in the field of metrology. I know legal metrology ‘from scratch’; when I started in the weighing instruments laboratory in 1994, I was pleased to receive a special training course undertaking all the type approval tests which are necessary when following R 76, so I really know it by heart. I have done all the tests myself, including the EMC tests.

Finally, I would like to contribute to shaping the OIML so that it is well prepared for the challenges in the global market. In my first period as CIML First Vice-President I have contributed to the revision of the MAA framework documents B 3 and B 10 and also the amendment to B 10 dealing with the acceptance of test results from manufacturers’ test laboratories. These are now allowed to be taken into account as long as the laboratories are supervised by an OIML Issuing Authority in a certain way and under certain conditions. Although the acceptance of these test results is still voluntary, I think we made an important step in the right direction, as we can see from partner organizations such as the IEC, which also already has in place some rules on how to take into consideration manufacturers’ test results under certain defined conditions.

I think that another important contribution was the OIML statement on the possible impact of the redefinition of the SI units which we expect in two years’ time in 2018, especially of the kilogram, on legal metrology. There was a survey, and it was very interesting to collect all the results and provide a statement to the BIPM, where we cautioned them not to be too quick with the redefinition since there could be some impact, especially on the calibration of E_1 weights. We now have excellent results from

both the Watt balances and the Avogadro cooperation and there is no longer any need to have any doubt about this being the right time to redefine the kilogram and other basic constants of the SI.

There was a comprehensive revision of the OIML Basic publication B 6 *Directives for OIML technical work*, which should always be under consideration since we are always learning and gaining experience and I think we now have a very good starting point with B 6 as it is right now.

Finally I would like to mention the development of the framework for a new OIML Certification System which will hopefully supersede both the Basic and MAA systems. We will report on this later on.

My commitment, if elected as CIML First Vice-President will be to continue to support the CIML and the CIML Presidency with my experience and knowledge. If elected as chair of the CS management committee I will certainly promote the new Certification System and do my best to make it a successful, widely accepted, respected and effective international certification system.

Last of all, I would certainly support efforts to further improve the efficiency of the technical work.

Also important for me is to improve the topicality, quality and uniformity of OIML publications, and I think that, as we heard earlier, COOMET has taken a very good approach in reviewing some OIML publications to see whether they are still topical or whether they should be revised. I think it is important to improve the worldwide acceptance of OIML Recommendations and Documents by means of very close cooperation with ISO and IEC, on the basis of the existing Memoranda of Understanding, under which we should always identify joint work items on the work program, and I think we can only learn by good cooperation with these and other organizations. We should intensify our contacts and cooperation with other organizations, especially the BIPM, as already mentioned by CIML President Peter Mason.

So I started by giving you my age, and I should also say that 2020 will be my retirement year, but I have thought about this and discussed it with my bosses and I can say that I will most likely be able to serve the OIML for another full six-year period if this is what the CIML wishes and considers this useful.”

Dr. Schwartz thanked delegates for their attention and support, and stated he was ready to answer any questions.

Mr. Dixit asked Dr. Schwartz which committee would be working on the OIML MAA certification. He considered that Dr. Schwartz had opted for a single type of integrated system, and wondered how fast the work would progress if Dr. Schwartz left this work and took on more administration.

Dr. Schwartz replied that if Mr. Dixit was referring to the report on the existing Certificate System, this would be discussed later under item 8.2.1.

Mr. Dixit stated that he was actually concerned about the progress of the project Dr. Schwartz had been involved in over the last four years, especially if he was to take on more administration.

Dr. Schwartz replied that he could continue to serve the OIML, especially on the Management Committee, and thus if the proposed OIML Certification System was approved, as he hoped it would be, he would be able to support the new system during the next six years. This could be achieved through the formation of new structures; with the aid of motivated and competent people and lots of hard work, he felt the project could be set off to a flying start, and achieve similar successes to those achieved by the IEC.

Mr. Mason added what he thought may be at the heart of this question. Was it possible for the same person, as well as playing an important role in their own administration, to be the First Vice-President and president of the Management Committee, considering that each was so important and involved so much responsibility. He thought the answer to this would only become apparent when the position of Management Committee chair had been developed and it could be seen how it was operated. From the

point of view of the expectations when the position was looked at, he saw no reason why the two jobs could not be combined. He saw no conflict of interest between the two roles and thought that the amount of work and responsibility for both jobs could be undertaken by one person if that person was elected to both positions.

Dr. Schwartz emphasized that the executive secretary was more important to the proposed OIML Certification System than the chair.

Mr. Dixit's concerns remained as to how Dr. Schwartz would balance the roles of administration and technical co-operation.

Mr. Mason concluded the discussion by observing that Mr. Dixit had made a valuable observation but that it was not appropriate for there to be discussions of the candidates in an open CIML meeting and that each Member should now reflect on the questions and answers raised during the discussion before voting in the secret ballot on Friday.

Mr. Dunmill intervened to remind delegates to introduce themselves before speaking to make writing the minutes easier.

Mr. Mason returned to the subject of the presidency. He was conscious he had skipped over the consequences of there being no candidate for the presidency this year. He stated that his term of office explicitly lasted only until the opening of the 52nd CIML Meeting when, under normal circumstances, if there had been an election, he would hand over to the President-Elect. If instead there was to be an election in 2017 for someone to take up the responsibilities of President immediately on election, what would that mean for the running of the 52nd CIML Meeting in 2017? The President-Elect would not have been involved in the preparation of the meeting and moreover, as delegates had seen, the normal procedure was for candidates to make presentations at the beginning of the meeting but the vote and decision to be made at the end. This presented Members with a problem to which he considered there were three potential solutions:

- Firstly, that Members move immediately to an election at the beginning of the 52nd CIML Meeting. This was likely to be very difficult. It would not give time for a proper consideration of the candidate(s), and would make it extremely difficult for the person who was elected to take over the running of the meeting without having been involved in its preparation.
- Secondly, to allow for a situation in which the post of President was left vacant. In this case the responsibilities of the President would move to the First Vice-President. In this second alternative the First Vice-President would therefore be expected to run the meeting. This solution may present a problem in itself. Should the First Vice-President be Dr. Schwartz, and should he be elected chair of the Management Committee, he would already have a lot of responsibilities without having to prepare to chair the 52nd CIML Meeting.
- The third possibility was that exceptionally his term was extended until the end of the 52nd CIML Meeting. He was still not expecting to be a candidate for the presidency again as he would need approval from his government and was now retired.

He reported that when the presidency had been discussed in the Presidential Council, the third solution was considered the most convenient. Mr. Mason then invited Members of the Committee to share their views, particularly if they would prefer something other than for him to chair the 52nd CIML Meeting. A new resolution would need to be prepared and voted on if the Committee wished him to chair the 52nd CIML Meeting.

Mr. Dixit commented that the Committee had been happy to have the benefit of Mr. Mason's guidance and his long experience of legal metrology administration. Not only was the Committee grateful to Mr. Mason for his work as President but it would also be grateful if he would remain as President and chair the 52nd CIML Meeting. This would give the Committee time to decide on who would be the best person to be the next President.

Mr. Mason thanked Mr. Dixit for his support. No other views were expressed. A resolution extending his term would be prepared to be voted on at the end of the meeting.

4 BIML matters

4.1 Report on BIML activities

Mr. Patoray presented his report on the activities of the BIML. The past year had been one of high emotions for everyone at the Bureau. This had started to a large degree at last year's meeting in Arcachon. The meeting had been very successful, and a number of resolutions had been passed that had indicated there was a lot of work to do. At the end of the meeting, expectations had been high and also there was an observable testament to the Members' dedication to their work, as indicated by the current meeting and the fact that there would be a record number of delegates present. He wanted to keep his presentation focused by moving through the items as quickly as possible, whilst remaining as thorough as possible. Before continuing however, he referred again to the emotional impact of the past year and reminded delegates that the death of Willem Kool in February 2016 meant that they had all lost a very good colleague. Mr. Patoray asked delegates to take a moment of silence to reflect on Willem. A minute's silence was observed.

Continuing his report, Mr. Patoray stated that as of the year ending 2015 the Bureau consisted of nine members of staff, as shown on his presentation slide. Based on the projections for the current workload there were presently no plans to increase that number. However at this meeting, there were now eight full-time members of staff. Here he wanted to acknowledge the very good work carried out by the entire staff during the past year and noted in particular the extra duties undertaken by many of them, all without complaint. Mentioning that many of the delegates would have already met Patricia Saint-Germain, he indicated that in fact all the BIML staff were present at the meeting except for Jean-Christophe Esmiol, who had remained at the Bureau in order to modify the electrical system in the nearly 150 year old building. He encouraged delegates to speak to the staff, particularly if, as CIML Members, they had questions about the website: how to use it, log into it, and how they could change their participation in Technical Committees or Project Groups, or change the name of people involved in those groups. The staff were available to demonstrate the exact steps involved in any of these situations. He urged delegates to use their free time to consult the staff about the website and in this way be able to use the website better to their own benefit.

Returning to the subject of the continuing workload, Mr. Patoray explained that until a permanent replacement was found for the Assistant Director, the BIML had temporarily engaged two people. The first of these was Mr. Gilles Vinet, who had been contracted, within a limited number of hours each month, to provide assistance with tracking the progress of the technical work and updating the technical data on the website. As a project manager, Mr. Patoray stressed that this work was particularly important to him. In this way, technical work could be better tracked and therefore it could be understood how to improve the time taken to complete projects and get the Recommendations published.

The other person was Mr. Paul Dixon, who has been contracted for a "Specific task of limited duration" (as specified in OIML B 7) and would be working at the Bureau on a full-time basis until the end of 2017.

Mr. Patoray observed that in the past year, the current staff of the BIML had been working very well together as a team. This was important to maintain, and as such was high on his own list of priorities.

He informed delegates that initial improvements on the infrastructure of the Bureau had been completed, although he anticipated that there would be issues with its continued maintenance in the future.

He reported that the website tools had been significantly improved and were now being used by most Members. Whether logging in, changing information, changing Technical Committees and or the people involved, all the activity on the website was visible from the Bureau and it was very gratifying to see the tools being used automatically on a daily basis.

He continued that other items that had been completed were listed in the working document and although he would not go into them all in detail, he would like to highlight a few, particularly the

organization of the current meeting. He wanted to mention Patricia Saint-Germain, whom the delegates would have met at the registration. He pointed out that in addition to all the activities she carried out in organizing the meeting, including personal arrangements for delegates such as their visas and reservations, she was always available during the meeting for delegates to consult, and thus her support was invaluable. The other person he wanted to mention was Ian Dunmill, who in addition to his own duties had taken on the role of preparing for this meeting. He considered that preparing for the meetings created a lot of extra tasks and Ian's hard work was appreciated.

Mr. Patoray talked about a number of other notable events that had taken place during the year. Due to heightened concerns over security in Paris, the security system of the Bureau had been enhanced with the replacement of the alarm and the addition of a video surveillance system.

The development of the IT infrastructure had continued with the completion of a full backup system, now including an offsite backup.

New features had been added to the OIML website, and these were detailed in Additional Meeting Document 51-CIML-AMD-04. When staff participated in technical meetings, they had talked to people about the website and its tools which were being used all the time.

The increased activity on the website had been encouraging. He particularly acknowledged the way in which Gilles Vinet, Luis Mussio, Ian Dunmill, Jalil Adnani and Chris Pulham had worked as a team to ensure that the website was up to date and its facilities were operating correctly.

However, he acknowledged that due in part to a lack of time, but not to lack of interest, conducting formal training on OIML B 6 and the PG Workspaces had not been such a success. He was certain more training was necessary, particularly in relation to the changes in B 6, and that this additional secretariat and convener training would take place in the future.

Secretarial support had been provided to the conveners of the Certification System (OIML-CS) Project Group as well as the Project Group revising B 6.

Continuing support had been provided to the CEEMS Advisory Group and the OIML Pilot Training Center. He had had the opportunity to attend both sessions of the OIML Pilot Training Center in P.R. China, where he had observed some excellent work undertaken by the 100 or so participants present at each session.

Ian Dunmill had taken over the chair of the DCMAS Network for 2016–2017 and was developing a new website together with Chris Pulham and an external design company.

The BIML had also played a key role in World Metrology Day, supervising the design of a very interesting poster produced by COOMET, and Russia in particular. A website had been created by Chris Pulham on which events and posters were published from all over the world. Mr. Patoray remarked that this particular project was one of those where the staff of the BIML work closely with their colleagues at the BIPM.

Four issues of the OIML Bulletin had been published, together with its online version. He emphasized that Chris Pulham often struggled to fill the Bulletin, and appealed to delegates to submit articles summarizing their work as information for others.

Moving on to the future, and more precisely dealing with the internal systems, Mr. Patoray reported that a certification audit had been carried out by Bureau Veritas on the electrical system in the Bureau and they had recommended that various improvements should be carried out. In addition, one of the main computer systems had nearly been lost due to an electrical problem. It was therefore very important that the modifications were carried out as quickly as possible, which is one of the reasons why Jean-Christophe Esmiol had remained at the Bureau during the week. As already mentioned, the building would need some regular maintenance and lastly the e-mail system needed to be improved, particularly to help staff when they were travelling.

Mr. Patoray said that a number of external projects were probably of more interest to the Committee. These were the continued improvements to be made to the OIML website, support for CEEMS and its related projects (to be discussed under item 7), support for the OIML-CS (to be discussed under

item 8.2), and support for the revision of B 6 (to be discussed under item 8.1). He also confirmed that the training on the website tools would be an important priority for 2017.

He impressed on delegates that during the meeting there would be a number of important topics to cover. These would be the replacement of a BIML Assistant Director (under item 4.2), the agreement on the four-year budget for 2017–2020 (under item 6.5) which once agreed would need to be submitted to the Conference for approval, and finally a number of technical issues (under item 9). There were also a number of new publications, and a number of new projects to be approved. Mr. Patoray thanked delegates for their attention. There were no questions following from his report. Resolution no. 2016/3 approving his report was passed unanimously.

Resolution no. 2016/3

The Committee,

Notes the report given by the BIML Director on the activities of the Bureau.

4.2 Discussion on the recruitment of a BIML Assistant Director

As this item was to be carried out in closed session on Monday 17 October, Mr. Mason asked that all members of the BIML staff except the Director leave the room, and that the recording of the meeting be stopped. There is therefore no transcript of discussions on this item.

– Closed session –

BIML note: The following took place on Tuesday 18 October but is included here for reasons of continuity in the minutes.

Mr. Mason informed delegates that the next item had been carried over from a discussion that had been started on Monday 17 October. He said there would first be a discussion without the presence of the Bureau staff, and then a vote would be taken. He asked that a roll call be conducted straight away, which would be updated when other delegates joined the meeting during the course of the discussion. One of the Members of Honor, Prof. Kochsiek, had agreed to come forward in order to keep the roll call up to date after the Bureau staff had left.

Mr. Dunmill carried out the roll call:

Albania not present, proxy given to Switzerland
Algeria not present, no proxy given
Australia present
Austria present
Belarus..... not present, no proxy given
Belgium present
Brazil not present, no proxy given
Bulgaria present
Cameroon not present, proxy given to Algeria (not present),
second proxy given to Tunisia
Canada present
Colombia not present, no proxy given
Croatia present
Cuba present
Cyprus not present, proxy given to France
Czech Republic..... present
Denmark present
Egypt not present, proxy given to Saudi Arabia

Finland..... present
France present
Germany present
Greece..... present
Hungary not present, proxy given to Poland
India..... present
Indonesia present
Iran present
Ireland..... present
Israel not present, proxy given to New Zealand
Italy..... not present, no proxy given
Japan..... present
Kazakhstan present
Kenya present
Korea present
Macedonia not present, no proxy given
Monaco..... not present, proxy given to France
Morocco not present, no proxy given
Netherlands..... present
New Zealand..... present
Norway present
China present
Pakistan not present, no proxy given
Poland..... present
Portugal present
Romania present
Russian Federation present
Saudi Arabia present
Serbia..... present
Slovakia present
Slovenia present
South Africa present
Spain..... present
Sri Lanka not present, no proxy given
Sweden present
Switzerland..... present
Tanzania present
Thailand..... present
Tunisia present
Turkey present
United Kingdom present
United States..... present
Viet Nam present
Zambia..... not present, no proxy given

Mr. Patoray summarized the roll call. There were 61 Members in total, but 10 Members were not present with no proxy given. That left 51 Members, which met the 46 Member minimum required for a quorum.

Mr. Mason asked the Bureau staff to leave, and Prof. Kochsiek to join those at the top table to keep track of the voting.

– Closed session –

Following the closed session, Mr. Mason told delegates that there had been one final item of business left over from the discussion on the search for a new Assistant Director, and that was to appoint the selection committee. He did not think there would be time for a lengthy discussion on this matter, so after various conversations, he had decided to propose the Members of the selection committee, although the ultimate decision would rest with the CIML.

According to B 14, the selection committee needed to consist of a chair, who was either the President or one of the Vice-Presidents, four other CIML Members, and the Director. Mr. Mason expressed his regret that he would have a lot to do in the following year, having hoped to be sharing his duties with the President-elect, which would not now be happening, so he had asked Dr. Schwartz to chair the selection committee. He wanted to propose that the four members would be Dr. Miki, the Second Vice-President, Mrs. Lagauterie, the CIML Member for France (as France was the custodian of the OIML Convention), the Canadian CIML Member Mr. Johnston, who, as a past President would have a good knowledge of what would be needed in the candidate, and the final member he wanted to propose was the CIML Member from South Africa, Mr. Madzivhe, who had already given the Committee the benefit of his administrative experience. Mr. Mason asked if this proposal had the support of the Committee and no objections were raised.

Resolution no. 2016/4

The Committee,

Considering and bemoaning the unexpected passing away of former BIML Assistant Director Mr. Willem Kool,

Decides that the vacant position of a BIML Assistant Director be advertised after the 51st CIML Meeting, following the respective regulations set out in OIML B 7:2013 *BIML Staff regulations*, and OIML B 13:2004 *Procedure for the appointment of the BIML Director and Assistant Directors*,

With a view that a new BIML Assistant Director be appointed at the 52nd CIML Meeting.

5 Member States and Corresponding Members

Mr. Mason stated that this item was where the Committee recorded the position regarding the Member States and Corresponding Members. He said he had already mentioned the changes in his report, but would like to take this opportunity to note formally, and indeed welcome, the new Members.

Mr. Dunmill confirmed that since the meeting in Arcachon, the OIML had been joined by Thailand, as a new Member State, and Angola, as a new Corresponding Member. However, during the same time period, the organization had also lost three Corresponding Members, due to issues with the non-payment of their fees. Referring delegates to previous meetings he explained that the rules were the same for both Member States and Corresponding Members. They stated that if fees were not paid for three years, then the country is delisted and is required to repay the three-year debt before they can rejoin.

Mr. Mason remarked that although the Committee does not normally discuss prospective new Members, those delegates that had read the Conference papers would be aware that there was one Member State which had got to an advanced stage of joining, namely they had submitted the necessary

paperwork and the Bureau was only awaiting confirmation that the first subscription had been deposited in the bank account before their accession could be announced, and they could be welcomed. Mr. Mason enquired whether there was a possibility that the welcome might take place during the course of the meeting.

Mr. Patoray replied that the identity of the country would be revealed during the course of the meeting, as he had made allowances for their accession in the new budget but although the Bureau remained in close contact with the country, he was not sure when the deposit would be made.

Mr. Mason asked if there were any comments or observations on the membership position.

Mr. Gittens (St Lucia) wanted to know if there is a rule against a Corresponding Member continuing to claim it is a Member of the OIML, for example on its website, when in fact it has been delisted.

Mr. Mason hoped that there would be legislation against misleading descriptions in the country concerned, and that as an organization they would take up the issue with the necessary authorities. However, he observed that if the OIML had been unable to establish sufficient contact with a country to get them to pay, then it might be equally difficult to establish sufficient contact to request them to change their website. He stressed that the formal position was that if a country ceased to be a Corresponding Member then it should not be describing itself as a Corresponding Member.

Mr. Mason concluded that along with the Committee itself, he would like to extend a personal welcome to their colleagues from Thailand. They had shown a lot of interest in the project he had mentioned in his report and it was a great pleasure to see them at this meeting. He continued that the Committee would be looking for an active contribution particularly in areas of the work where he knew there was mutual interest.

Mr. Dunmill checked that there were no further comments. There were no abstentions or negative votes, so resolution no. 2016/5 was passed unanimously.

Resolution no. 2016/5

The Committee,

Welcomes Thailand as a new Member State,

Welcomes Angola as a new Corresponding Member.

6 Financial matters

6.1 Approval of the 2015 accounts

Mr. Patoray presented the accounts in accordance with Article 21 of OIML B 8:2012. He said he would be summarizing a statement from the auditor's report and informed delegates that there was a copy of this statement in the working document. He reported that the total balance at 31 December 2015 was €5 204 656 and the result for the exercise was €51 277, the detail of which would be explained later.

However before doing this he wanted to draw delegates' attention to the note at the end of the audit, relating to the provision for the former OIML pension system. He wanted to explain this note in more detail, as he had received some questions about it. Prior to his joining the OIML in 2009 or 2010, an actuarial study had been commissioned, and the total provision considered necessary to cover pension liabilities had been estimated at €2 300 000. In 2015, after the pension scheme had been closed, and after one more person had started receiving their pension, the study had been repeated. This study had indicated the provision should be €2 728 000. He explained that the figure in the actuarial study was an estimation of the potential liabilities of the organization over the life-time of any recipient of the pension. The BIML building in Paris has been appraised as being worth €3 200 000, which covered the entire amount estimated in the study. Therefore, in the unlikely event that the OIML was to cease to exist, Member States would have no pension liability, as the money raised from selling the building would cover the pension liabilities. He continued that whereas previously €40 000 had been accounted

for each year as provision against the pension rights, the study had concluded that this was no longer necessary and a zero was now recorded against this item.

Mr. Patoray then showed the delegates a copy of the statement from the auditor's report he had previously mentioned and said he would now expand on each section using a number of graphs.

Looking at the total charges, he said the actual charges (in which were contained the expenses) were exactly as had been predicted in the previous budget. This in itself was very positive but more specifically, he wanted to draw delegates' attention to the fact that since 2011, the charges for meetings, travel and accommodation had remained below budget, and this continued to be the case.

With regard to the total assets, Mr. Patoray expressed the opinion that these indicated the health of the organization. He reported that these had continued to climb, in part due to the reinvestments that had been made in the BIML building, but also due to other capital investments such as in the IT system and other infrastructure used in the functioning of the OIML. However, he emphasized that it was possible that the organization could be asset-rich and still have financial difficulties due to being cash-poor. He therefore wanted to reiterate what Mr. Mason had talked about with regard to the cash flow and stressed that in order to cover the organization's expenses it was important to receive subscriptions on time.

Mr. Patoray underlined his concerns about the cash by drawing delegates' attention to the fact that the year-end cash had decreased in the last year. This was curious given that the results had been positive. He indicated that this decrease was due to several factors:

- the arrears of Member States and Corresponding Members had increased by €67 k since 2014;
- €41 k less advance payments had been made by Member States since 2014;
- due to changes in practice demanded by suppliers (requiring the move from monthly to quarterly payments) €36 k more advanced payments had been made by the OIML;
- in addition, the OIML was also awaiting the reimbursement of €20 k of income tax paid by a staff member which had not been received by 31 December 2015.

With the addition of a number of other minor factors, a total of €164 k less cash was accounted for. If the result of €51 k was added to this, and the sum compared to the €130 k decrease in year-end cash between 2014 and 2015, then the two amounts are reasonably close. Mr. Patoray remarked that this helped to explain the financial position at the end of 2015 and why the cash had reduced.

Mr. Patoray asked delegates to consider the bottom line of the auditor's report. He reiterated that the result for 2015 was €51 277, which when compared to the figure of €24 385 estimated in the budget meant that at the end of 2015 the organization was €26 892 better off than had been predicted.

He continued by asking delegates to compare the result over the last three years, from 2013–2015, to the predicted budget for the same period. Adding the results for the last three years gave €198 194, which exceeded the figure of €140 022 predicted to be achieved over the four-year period from 2013–2016. Mr. Patoray suggested that the main reason for this was that the total income was more than had been expected in the budget. Looking at the income in more detail, two Member States had rejoined the OIML, many more Corresponding Member had joined, and there had also been more certificates than had been planned, all of which had led to there being more income than had been allowed for in the budget. On the other hand, the Translation Center had been closed down, so there was no further income from this source, and less income than had been predicted was being generated from the interest on money in the bank. This was because the money had to be invested safely and thus earned low interest despite the fact that care had been taken to invest it in accounts that maximized the interest.

Regarding the costs, Mr. Patoray referred back to the fact that the total charges had been very close to those predicted in the budget, only differing from them by €8 548. Again looking in more detail at the figures, he explained that the increase in the staff costs could be accounted for by the changes in the new pension arrangements. Whereas in the past the participants in the pension system had had to pay employees' contributions to the BIML, the organization was now having to pay some staff members the equivalent of what it would have paid into the French social security system. He noted that the

total of all the other charges had been less than predicted in the budget. However before concluding on the costs, Mr. Patoray wanted to highlight the item marked “Provision for retirement”, saying that this was the item he had explained in more detail at the beginning of his presentation.

Mr. Patoray concluded his presentation by reminding delegates of where he had begun with the bottom line and the result of €51 277. He judged this was a very positive result, hoped the Committee agreed, and submitted his report for approval. Finally he asked whether there were any questions on the 2015 budget.

Mr. Dixit enquired why the expenses for the staff at the BIML were more than had been foreseen.

Mr. Patoray verified that Mr. Dixit was referring to the “Total staff costs” and went on to explain in more detail that these costs were to do with the closure of the OIML pension system. The budget had been put together when one person was paying into the pension system. The staff regulations had been revised in 2013, and the pension system had been stopped once the participant’s contract had to come to an end.

Mr. Dixit asked for clarification of why there was a €5 000 difference between the voted and realized amounts in the “Pension system” line.

Mr. Patoray replied that this line represented the payments made to pensioners, which were lower than budgeted due to a lower than expected inflation rate in France.

Mr. Dixit asked why, if these payments had been less than expected, the total staff costs were higher than expected.

Mr. Mason intervened to clarify that the basic question related to the salary costs, the details of which were covered in note 14 to the accounts. He explained that the reason why the staff costs were higher than voted was that, even allowing for the correct number of staff, their forecast salary progressions, and inflation, it was difficult to estimate the costs accurately. He felt that there were two important questions related to this point. Why were the figures different? They were different for the reasons previously stated: it was difficult to be precise three years in advance. Was this a serious deviation? Mr. Mason said that this was the most important question for financial control purposes, and in his opinion, a €45 k deviation over a three-year period did not suggest poor financial control.

Mr. Dixit asked whether this should not have been taken into account and increases in membership fees requested.

Mr. Mason replied that he did not agree with this point, and it would later be seen that no increases in Member State contributions were being proposed in the budget for the next financial period.

Mr. Mason then asked that the resolution be taken at this point.

Mr. Dunmill clarified that no Member States had left the room since the roll call had been taken, and asked for comments, of which there were none. There were no abstentions or negative votes, so resolution no. 2016/6 was passed unanimously.

Resolution no. 2016/6

The Committee,

Noting the accounts for 2015 and the BIML Director’s comments,

Considering the external auditor’s approval of the 2015 accounts,

Approves the 2015 accounts, and

Instructs its President to present them to the 15th OIML Conference.

6.2 Closure of the Translation Center

Mr. Patoray stated that at the 2015 CIML meeting it had been decided that the BIML Translation Center would be closed. He reminded delegates that this had been a special fund, raised through voluntary donations from fifteen Member States, which had been set up initially to translate OIML

documents from French into English, and subsequently from English into French. The fifteen countries that had contributed to the fund were Albania, Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Norway, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Switzerland and the United States. Over the years they had contributed a total of €163 k, and on behalf of the OIML, Mr. Patoray wanted to thank them for enabling such important work to be carried out. Mr. Patoray repeated that following the decision to close the Translation Center it had been decided to consult the contributors on what they wished to happen to the €38 988 remaining in the fund. Three options had been proposed to them:

- ten contributors indicated that the BIML could use the remaining funds for translations needed in the future – €12 419 of the remaining funds had been allocated to this first option;
- another two countries had opted to receive a refund. The percentage of the remaining funds that would be refunded to them would be equivalent to the percentage they had contributed to the fund over the years – €1 284 had been allocated to this second option;
- the other three contributors had requested a credit to their subscription fee. This last option ensured that the refund is returned to the specific part of the government contributing to the OIML rather than being refunded to central government – €25 283 had been allocated to this last option.

He reported that all the allocated money had been transferred by the end of December 2015. The Translation Center balance was now zero and it would no longer be considered in the accounts. Before passing the resolution to close the Translation Center, Mr. Patoray asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Dunmill read out resolution no. 2016/7 as the wording was long. He asked if there were any comments, of which there were none. There were no abstentions or negative votes, so resolution no. 2016/7 was passed unanimously.

Resolution no. 2016/7

The Committee,

Recalling that the Translation Center fund had been set up at the 14th CIML Meeting by Resolution 1975-IXc,

Considering its previous discussions in 2011 and 2015 on the future of the Translation Center,

Noting the financial information on the Translation Center provided by the BIML,

Resolves that the Translation Center should be closed, and

Requests the BIML to take any necessary steps for this closure.

6.3 Arrears of Member States and Corresponding Members

Before starting his presentation, Mr. Patoray pointed out that the figures he would present under this item had been compiled on 12 October 2016 and may not reflect precisely the position on the date of this presentation on 17 October 2016. He highlighted the significance of this item by drawing delegates' attention to Article XXVI of the OIML Convention (OIML B 1) which stated that "Contributions shall be paid at the beginning of the year to the Director of the Bureau." He said that as he would go on to show, in some cases this was not being adhered to.

He indicated that, with regard to Member States, the total amount of outstanding contributions was €518 376, and emphasized that this could lead to considerable problems with cash flow. €467 320 of this total was the amount of contributions that had not been paid in 2016 and he indicated that this represented 24 % of the total Member State contributions. He told delegates that, at the time of preparing the reports for the meeting, this figure had in fact been 37 %, which was why Mr. Mason had highlighted concerns over cash flow.

Mr. Patoray continued that with regard to Corresponding Members' contributions, a total of €42 916 was outstanding for 2016. This represented 35 % of the total Corresponding Member contributions, and again, at the time of preparing the report, over 50 % of their contributions had been outstanding (the amount was smaller for Corresponding Members as although there were more of them than

Member States, their contributions only made up 10 % of the total contributions). He asserted that the CIML had a right to know which Member States and Corresponding Members had not paid their contributions, and had prepared the necessary information. However, if the Committee felt it did not need any more details, he would stop his presentation at this point. He asked the Committee to express a preference.

Mr. Johnston (Canada) said that he did not need more details even though he considered finances important.

Mr. Patoray added that he had sent a personal reminder to each Member State and Corresponding Member that owed money, which he felt was the reason why fewer contributions were now outstanding than at the time the reports had been prepared. However, he reminded delegates that it was late in the year and if contributions were not paid this year, it would be even more difficult for two contributions to be paid the following year, and therefore further arrears would build up, leading eventually to being delisted. He emphasized that where possible he wanted to avoid this, and whilst he appreciated that contributions were often made in line with each state's own budget cycle, the BIML would continue to send out quarterly reminders. He made a final appeal to Members to pay their contributions promptly and repeated that if they failed to do so this could lead to severe cash flow problems for the OIML. He asked the Committee if they had any questions.

Mr. Mason had two remarks:

- firstly, he shared Mr. Johnston's view that while it was not yet appropriate to apply what some delegates might call the "naming and shaming" technique, it might well become appropriate in the future;
- secondly, delegates were currently meeting as the Committee but when they later met as the Conference, the delegations representing their Member States may have a different attitude, because those that are paying are carrying a burden that others are not.

In the light of the information received, and in line with past meetings he suggested that the Committee adopt a resolution of encouragement and request.

Mr. Dunmill asked whether there were any abstentions or negative votes. There were none. Resolution no. 2016/8 was passed unanimously.

Resolution no. 2016/8

The Committee,

Notes the report given by the BIML Director,

Encourages the BIML to continue its efforts to recover outstanding arrears of its Member States and Corresponding Members,

Requests those Members with arrears to bring their situation up to date as soon as possible.

6.4 Forecast budget realization for 2016

Mr. Patoray indicated that the following presentation was a budget forecast for the end of 2016. He showed delegates a summary sheet and indicated he would go on to talk about each section in more detail.

With regard to the income, Mr. Patoray stated that these projections were based on the budget for 2016 as well as estimations made by the accountant, as a result of his quarterly audit of the accounts. He reported that the accountant was projecting that the income from Member States would be considerably more than had been voted. A large proportion of this was due to the fact that Thailand had joined the OIML and had paid their subscription fee for 2016. With regard to Corresponding Members, he pointed out that the projected figure was again larger than the budget as although three Corresponding Members had been delisted, more than this had joined. The certificate fees were forecast to be slightly above expectations. As discussed previously the Translation Center would no longer appear in the accounts. Lastly, with regard to the income from interest, this was projected to be

less than anticipated in the budget. Mr. Patoray concluded that the total income was predicted to be €72 700 higher than voted.

Looking at the charges, Mr. Patoray remarked that the staff costs, and more precisely the active staff costs, were anticipated to be less than had been predicted in the budget. There had been a three-month period following the loss of Willem Kool and before Paul Dixon had started work at the BIML when one less salary had been paid, leading to an estimation that the costs would be reduced by €14 312. The pension system costs were predicted to be lower than the budget since the pension payments rise in line with French inflation and this had been lower than anticipated.

Continuing with the other charges, Mr. Patoray expected that the running costs would be greater than had been anticipated by the end of 2016, although the administrative costs were anticipated to be slightly less. The item anticipated to differ most from its projected level was that labelled “Meeting cost – CIML”. Whereas in years when only a CIML meeting was held only three and a half days needed to be paid for, this year included a Conference as well and so five days were required. In addition, since this week’s meetings were not being hosted by a Member State, the full cost of the five days, estimated to be €135 000, was being paid by the OIML. He observed that this cost included VAT tax paid in France, some of which could be claimed back, but he repeated that the anticipated costs for meetings would still be much higher than had been allowed for in the budget. Despite this, he reported that the total charges were not projected to be very different from those in the budget. He felt that looking at total charges was more important than looking at the individual lines, as this allowed for more flexibility on a day-to-day basis.

Concluding his presentation, Mr. Patoray observed that whereas the budget had assumed a result of minus €14 266, the result forecast for this year was €54 600. He judged this was a positive result. Taking this forecast into account when considering a four-year budget period, he submitted that the projected surplus in the budget had been €140 022, but was now forecast to be €252 794. He confirmed that there would be an opportunity to discuss what to do with the surplus money during the Conference, and finally asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Mason verified that Mr. Patoray had no plans to discuss the surplus before the Conference. This being the case, Mr. Mason felt it was important to check that the Committee was happy with this course of action. In practice, since most of the people that were on the Committee were the same as those that attended the Conference, it might be that the delegates would find it perfectly satisfactory for there to be a single discussion about the surplus during the Conference. On the other hand, taking a more theoretical approach, the Conference might well expect the CIML to have made a recommendation as to what to do with the surplus. He considered that if any delegates wanted to take that procedural position, then time should be allowed for the Committee to have the necessary discussion, although he sensed that most delegates were happy to discuss the surplus in the Conference. There were no objections to the surplus only being discussed during the Conference.

Mr. Dunmill asked whether there were any comments on the wording of the resolution noting the report.

Ms. Mikanadze (Georgia) asked whether the resolution should just note the report, or in fact in light of the above discussion, the resolution should say that the report would be submitted to the Conference.

Mr. Patoray replied that there was an item on the surplus on the Conference agenda but he agreed that the resolution should be changed, thus committing the report to being submitted to the Conference.

Mr. Mason confirmed that if it was regarded as an important point then the delegates could add wording to the resolution which would say that the Committee not only noted the forecast but also the fact that it should be made available to the Conference.

Following a brief discussion between the BIML staff and the President regarding their previous experience where the wording of resolutions had needed to be changed in a similar fashion in the past, it was suggested by Mr. Dunmill that the resolution could read “the report of the director is noted and the President is instructed to present this information to the 15th OIML Conference.”

Mr. Mason agreed to this.

Mr. Dunmill verified that Ms. Mikanadze considered this a satisfactory response. There were no abstentions and no negative votes. Resolution no. 2016/9 was passed unanimously.

Resolution no. 2016/9

The Committee,

Notes the report on the forecast budget realization for 2016 given by the BIML Director,

Instructs its President to present it to the 15th OIML Conference.

6.5 Examination of the proposed budget for the 2017–2020 financial period

Opening the next session, Mr. Mason reminded delegates that there would be a full day of meetings as the Committee needed to complete its work before the Conference started the following day. He commented that left over from the previous day was an examination of the proposed budget. He felt this was a very important item as it underlined the recommendations that would be made to the Conference, and on which the Conference would base its decisions on the financing of the OIML's activities for the next four years.

Mr. Mason noted that the Committee had been joined by a number of the delegations it had been expecting the previous day and because of the significance of the vote on the budget he stated that there would be a roll call immediately prior to the vote on resolution 2016/10. He suggested one other change to the order of the agenda: he observed that the Committee was extremely fortunate that Dr. Martin Milton, Director of the International Bureau of Weights and Measure (BIPM), had joined them for the current and following days. Mr. Mason was aware that many of the delegates already knew Dr. Milton, but briefly introduced him, and said he wanted to give Dr. Milton the opportunity to address the Committee. This presentation would have to be made out of order with the other liaison organizations, and the exact timing of Dr. Milton's presentation was contingent on some material arriving, since Mr. Mason had asked him to cover some particular topics. It would be decided later at which point it was appropriate for him to make his address.

Before starting his presentation on item 6.5, Mr. Patoray acknowledged the fact that Mr. Mason and the BIML staff had worked until late the previous evening. He also wanted to welcome the delegates who had been unable to attend the meeting yesterday but who were now present.

Mr. Patoray referred delegates to the information on this item provided in Addendum 6.5. He reminded the Committee that at last year's meeting he had expressed concerns over the growing amount of cash that was in the bank. He felt that it was not appropriate for an organization such as the OIML to build up and hold a large amount of cash in the bank. He considered that the cash should be used for a purpose, or even, as stated in the Convention, refunded, and so he advised the Committee that in this budget he had tried to keep the result as close to zero as possible. He said his approach to the preparation of this budget had been different to that he had taken last time, as he had now been working at the bureau for five years, whereas last time he had only just taken up his post. In addition, he commented that last time he had prepared the budget, it had been more difficult as the OIML had been in the middle of a significant change from cash accounting, which had been used historically, to accrual accounting. At the same time the pension system had also undergone significant changes and the fact that the building was being used to cover the pension liability had distorted some of the previous budgets. Mr. Patoray reiterated that this year's budget had been simpler to produce and was based on data from the accrual accounting acquired over the last four years, as well as on the accounts from 2015. He invited delegates to ask questions either during or after the presentation.

Mr. Patoray described his definition of a budget. He said that it was a "quantitative expression of a plan for a period of time". By "quantitative expression" he meant it would include numbers or quantities and by "plan" he meant it was an estimate of what would be possible in the next four years. He commented that many delegates had been awaiting the predicted improvements in their economies but these had been slow in coming, both in particular cases as well as globally. The inflation rate had been holding very steady at well below 1 % in most places and although it may seem unlikely, it was

predicted to continue at the same rate in the near future. This made it difficult to estimate a budget that would reflect the world four years from the present.

Looking first at 2011–2012, Mr. Patoray stated that there had been 57 Member States, which corresponded to 155 base contributory shares (not allowing for any reductions in contributory class). The number of shares paid by each of these Members depended on its population and would have been one, two, four or eight base contributory shares. He explained that a Member State's contributory class could be reduced depending on its gross national income (GNI) and mentioned that when he had become Director, the number of base contributory shares once this adjustment had been applied had been 122. He went on to explain that the 14th Conference in 2012 had discussed the implementation of previous decisions relating to this class adjustment mechanism and had adjusted the number of base contributory shares to 134. Since the time of the last Conference, the OIML had grown to 62 Member States. He stated that this figure allowed for a new Member State which had taken all the necessary steps to accede to the Convention, but which had not quite completed the process. Since it was about to do so, he had included it in the budget. This resulted in 167 base contributory shares, which would become 145 allowing for the class reductions based on GNI, and 146 in 2018. He explained that this number of base contributory shares was then used to set the amount to be paid by each Member State. This increased number of shares had helped in ensuring that there was no need for the subscription fee to be increased. Mr. Patoray reported that, based on the review that was conducted this year in line with the World Bank figures from 2014 (the latest figures available when the review was started) a few countries had been reclassified. These included:

- Belgium, which had moved from class 1 to class 2 due to an increase in its population;
- Greece, which had moved from class 2 to class 1 due to a decrease in its population; and
- Pakistan, which was changing from class 1 to class 2 since its GNI had now increased and was above the point at which a reduction in the subscription was applied.

Whereas Greece would have its reduction in class applied immediately, the countries whose class was to be increased would be allowed a year's delay before it was applied in order that they make appropriate adjustments to their budgets to be able to accommodate the increased sum. This resulted in there being 144 base contributory shares in 2017, and 146 in 2018, 2019 and 2020. He pointed out that if the OIML gained any new Member States during this period, there would be an increase in income.

Summarizing, Mr. Patoray said that the annual base contributory share for the period 2017–2020 was therefore €14 000, the same as it had been in the previous budget period. He went on to say that the entry fee mentioned in the Convention was to be set at zero for the 2017–2020 financial period, as it had been in at least the last two budgets. He showed the evolution of the subscription fees on a graph.

Mr. Patoray then moved on to discuss the Corresponding Member subscription. He explained that at the 13th Conference in 2008 it had been decided to set this at 10 % of the base contributory share. It would therefore be €1 400 for the forthcoming financial period.

As for the application fee for a new participant in the MAA, Mr. Patoray said that the current fee was €1 700 and it was proposed that it remain the same. However, he pointed out that no new issuing participants had been anticipated in the proposed budget.

The fee for registering OIML certificates under the Basic Certificate System and under the MAA was also unchanged at €350 for the 2017–2020 financial period. Mr. Patoray added that if the framework document for the new OIML-CS were to be approved later in the day, and the organization implemented the new OIML Certification System, the registration fee for certificates would still be €350, but there would be no application fee for any new issuing authorities under the OIML-CS. This would have no effect on the budget since, as he had previously mentioned, no new issuing participants were anticipated for the current certificate system and MAA.

Mr. Patoray pointed out an error in the figures in Annex C: the “Total coefficient” figure for 2016 should read “138” instead of “140”. The rest of the figures shown on this correction slide repeated the totals allowing for the changes for Greece, Belgium and Pakistan which had previously been explained.

Mr. Patoray's presentation then moved on to incomes. First he gave the proposed income figure of €8 827 000 which would be considered later in the week by the Conference. He then explained that this total figure comprised income from Member States, Corresponding Members, certificate registration fees, the Translation Center (shown on his slide for 2016 for reference although it would be zero in the future), and financial income (the lower figure for which in the proposed budget he said reflected today's financial reality). He considered that the significant points for the Conference were the first three of these items.

Moving on to charges, Mr. Patoray said that he had been asked to indicate the effect of the proposed new OIML Certification System on appropriate lines in the charges. He explained that in his presentation, the actual figures for staff costs in the proposed budget were shown in blue. Above these, in black, he had broken this total active staff cost into a part covering the Bureau's activities not including the OIML-CS, and separately the staff cost of the OIML-CS. It was anticipated that 50 % of the time of one full-time staff member (the executive secretary) would be spent on the OIML-CS. An allowance of 10 % of a staff member had also been incorporated to allow for the financial, administrative and website costs of the proposed new system, even though these responsibilities were spread across several posts. Similarly, a certain percentage of running costs (building, electricity, telephones, internet, etc.) had been allocated to the OIML-CS. Mr. Patoray assured delegates that if the OIML-CS were to be approved this week, the true cost would be tracked throughout the year.

Mr. Patoray then said that the most significant change in this budget compared with previous budgets was the item on meeting costs. These costs were higher than in the previous budget. Acknowledging that budgets were tight in the Member States, Mr. Patoray understood why there were fewer invitations to host CIML meetings. In the proposed budget, he had therefore allowed for the full cost of the CIML meetings to be borne by the OIML. This was in fact what was happening this year, and mostly in 2015, although France had made some contribution to the reception costs last year. He expressed his opinion that the OIML should pay for its own meetings rather than expecting the richer countries to subsidize the meetings as had happened in the past. In that way, Members contributed to the meeting costs on an equal basis proportional to their membership contributions. He explained that the budgeted figures were based on last year's experience in Arcachon. He asked delegates to note that this year's meeting, as well as the figure given for 2020, were more than usual due to the fact that there was a Conference as well as a CIML meeting, which meant that more days were needed for the two meetings, as well as entailing other extra costs due to there being more delegates. Mr. Patoray reassured delegates that he expected these figures to be adequate wherever the meetings were to be held, and that invitations to hold meetings in countries other than France would, of course, still be very welcome. He reiterated that although contributions by a host country to the meeting costs would not be expected, they would of course be very much appreciated. He expressed his hope that delegates could understand his reasoning for this major change, which he felt reflected today's economic realities.

Moving on to other items in the charges, he explained that a meeting for the proposed OIML-CS had been allowed for under "Travel and accommodation", and that the cost of an additional seminar was planned each year.

Summarizing the charges in the proposed budget, Mr. Patoray said that the figures were based on what had been spent in 2015 and what was currently being spent in 2016.

Mr. Patoray referred to the previous day's discussion on the search for a new Assistant Director, and explained that he had budgeted for expenses of €40 000 in 2017 to cover the costs of the selection Committee as well as travel costs for the candidates. There was then an allowance of €15 000 in 2018 to cover the costs of moving the successful candidate to France. There was also a projected cost of €40 000 in 2018 to cover the search for a new Director to replace himself, and then €30 000 in 2019 to cover his, and his replacement's, removal costs. He reflected that the total of €125 000 was covered in the proposed budget as an extraordinary expense.

The next item in the proposed budget was depreciation; Mr. Patoray explained that the increased figures over those for 2016 were due to the reappraised value of the BIML's building. He continued by saying that he did not believe the same level of investment as had been made in recent years would be

necessary in the near future, so by the end of the new budget period, the depreciation value would drop since some of the recent investments such as computer equipment, have a shorter depreciation period.

Mr. Patoray told delegates that there was no provision made in the proposed budget for retirement since this was paid out of the budget. No fund was needed since if it were to become necessary, the building could be sold and used to cover the future costs of the pension payments.

He then explained that there was a provision of €14 000 for a Member State's non-payment, although this eventuality was not anticipated.

Returning to a previous slide, Mr. Patoray clarified that the amount for the item called "Special fund for CEEMS" was the same as that in the current budget although the name had changed. He explained that small amounts of this fund had been used each year, although more had been spent in 2016 due to the new Pilot Training Centers. As other examples of its use, Mr. Patoray cited the OIML's participation in some activities with other organizations without affecting the travel budget, the AFRIMETS Legal Metrology School, and the overhaul of the DCMAS website.

Mr. Patoray moved to a slide summarizing the total charges over the four years of the proposed budget period. He pointed out that there was a €4 000 surplus at the end of the budget period, saying that this was very different to the €140 000 projected in the previous budget as well as to the figure anticipated in the current year's forecast. He stated that he believed this was a realistic budget and asked delegates to remember the €125 000 extraordinary expense for the two searches for a new Assistant Director and a new Director. If these were allowed for, the total projected surplus would approach that in the previous budget, but it must also be remembered that the OIML would be paying for the full cost of the CIML meetings and Conference during this budget period and still arriving at a small positive result at the end of the period. He also reminded delegates that the OIML had almost €2 million in the bank, so there was no real risk of the Organization having a cash problem. In view of this, he had tried to put together a budget which did not increase the cash for the OIML.

In summary, Mr. Patoray said that this was a tight budget, but covered extraordinary expenses, the full cost of CIML meetings, and maintenance of the CEEMS special fund, as well as all the OIML's other obligations.

He added a slide which showed that the proposed OIML Certification System should be able to pay for itself (with a small surplus) over the four-year period with the current €350 fee for registration of a certificate. This was based on an increased number of certificates, an expectation based on the fact that if the OIML had an improved Certification System, demand for certificates would increase. These projections would be monitored over the budget period.

Mr. Patoray pointed out that although the overall income figure of €8 827 000 would have to be considered and voted by the Conference, it was the CIML's responsibility to consider whether it agreed with the details of how that money would be spent, as well as the overall result.

Mr. Patoray then invited questions and comments.

Mrs. Lagauterie (France) thanked Mr. Patoray for his detailed presentation which she felt showed how the organization would evolve in the future. It seemed to her that a line explaining how the Recommendations would be translated into French was missing from the budget. Generally three or four Recommendations were adopted each year and in the past these were translated into French by the BIML. Subsequently, the BIML had stopped translating them and a backlog of untranslated documents had built up. The CIML had given permission for the Translation Center to be used to carry out these translations but since this had now been closed she thought that consideration should be given to how the translations would be financed from now on. A number of translations had been put aside as the Recommendations were already under revision but she thought it important to find a way of continuing the translations over the next four years. Since a specific budget would be needed to carry out these translations she wondered whether the cost was covered under "staff costs" but if not, she asked Mr. Patoray if he could indicate how the translations into French would be funded in the future.

Mr. Patoray thanked Mrs. Lagauterie for her question and observations. In response he informed the delegates that by using the Translation Center funds the number of Recommendations awaiting translation had been reduced to almost nothing. However, he agreed that there would indeed be other documents in the future that would need to be translated into French. The money left over from the Translation Center, where some countries had allowed their contribution to continue to be used for translations, would be used to finally eliminate the backlog and would also be used for the necessary translations arising from the current meeting. Thereafter the cost of translations would be absorbed into the existing estimations for the budget. For example it cost €4 000-€6 000 for a Recommendation such as R 76 to be translated. He indicated that some allowance had been made for ongoing translations, although it may not be clear where this was being accounted for. Mr. Patoray went on to re-iterate that future documents that would need to be translated would include the Conference and its resolutions and other documents arising from it and of course the Recommendations. In summary, he said his plan was to use the remaining funds from the Translation Center to complete the backlog of translations together with any other documentation needing translation this year and then to absorb the costs into the existing budget. He reassured delegates that the cost of the translations had not been forgotten.

Mrs. Madhulika Sukul (India) noted that this year the meeting cost was €87 890, which she presumed included the cost of the Conference, whereas next year even without the cost of the seminar the estimated amount was €106 050. This was more than a 20 % increase and there would be no Conference next year. She wondered how this increase in cost could be explained. She suggested if the cost of the Conference was removed then the difference in cost between the two CIML meetings may be more apparent.

Mr. Patoray remarked that €87 890 had been the figure quoted in the budget for the cost of the current meeting but that in fact it would now actually cost €135 000. Looking at cost of the CIML meeting over the next four years, whilst he agreed that the costs were increasing each year, the cost for the last of those four years was predicted to be €129 000, a figure which was similar to the cost of this year's meeting. He added that the predicted cost for this year's meeting had been just below €130 000 before the change of room. The €87 890 was the planned cost to the OIML when there had been an expectation that a host country would be contributing another €50 000 to the running of the meeting. However, since organizing the meeting last year in Arcachon, and allowing for the additional expense of the Conference this year, it was his belief that the whole meeting could be organized on a budget of €110 000.

Mrs. Sukul asked if it was a possible to break down the €135 000 for 2016 into the cost of the CIML meeting and the Conference.

Mr. Patoray replied that it was not currently possible for 2016. The Conference added two extra days onto the cost of the CIML meeting. The additional costs incurred during those days included those of interpreters, the technical equipment, the room, the lunches and the coffee breaks. A detailed spreadsheet existed that showed all the various costs of the current meeting including the Conference which he would show to Members if they were interested, but for the moment he had not separated out the cost of the CIML meeting from that of the Conference, neither in this year's forecast of €135 000 nor in fourth year budget figure of €129 000.

Mr. Edelmaier (Austria) asked Mr. Patoray to comment on the increase in income for the Corresponding Member fees between 2016 and the following years because there was an increase of €12 000 in the budget. He clarified that the figure for 2016 had been quoted as €79 000 whereas in the budget it was predicted to be €91 000.

Mr. Patoray said that the figure of €79 000 for 2016 was the amount that had been budgeted based on the number of Corresponding Members in 2011. However, this differed from the actual amount of fees paid in 2015 as a lot more Corresponding Members had joined the OIML since 2011. The number of Corresponding Members had been in the fifties in 2011 where as now it was in the upper sixties. He concluded that the difference in the two amounts reflected a change in the number of Corresponding Members rather than a change in the fees.

Dr. Ehrlich (USA) wanted to ask two related questions that were to do with personnel costs. He observed that staff costs were the largest share of the budget and noted that there was a 7.5 % increase in staff costs from 2017–2020 compared to the 2013–2016 budget. Firstly he wanted to confirm whether this increase was due to rises in staff salaries or other unspecified aspects. Secondly, although he appreciated that the details of the certification system would be discussed later in the meeting, and whilst he appreciated the staff costs had been broken down, he asked whether the increase in staff costs was in anticipation of additional staff being taken on to work on the certification system, or whether it reflected the amount of time the current staff would be allocated to work on the certification system.

Mr. Patoray replied that the current staff consisted of nine people and that it would remain at nine in the future, unless he was instructed by the CIML to hire more staff. The budget was therefore based on the staff costs of the nine people currently at the BIML and there were no current plans to hire anyone to work on the certification system. He remarked that the amounts quoted came from the budget for 2016, and the actual increase may not be as significant as Dr. Ehrlich had observed. Mr. Patoray went on to explain that the rise in staff costs was partially due to the rise, over the past four years, in the cost of the French social security system to which the BIML contributed, and over which it had no control. Additionally, the cost of contributing to the pensions of the active staff had increased due to the change in the pension system. Mr. Patoray informed delegates that it had been complicated to estimate an accurate amount for the staff costs as there were a number of significant changes anticipated in the future. Whilst some of the work at the BIML was currently being carried out under time-limited contracts (accounted for in the 2017 budget), these would not be renewed as it was anticipated that a new Assistant Director would be recruited instead, and this would lead to a change in personnel costs between 2017 and 2018. At the end of 2018, a new Director would be taking over as Mr. Patoray would be leaving the BIML, and assuming that the new Director started on a salary at the bottom of his or her salary scale, as he had done, then this may also lead to a difference in the personal costs. Mr. Patoray indicated that although it was difficult to predict, he had allowed for an increase in the staff costs as a result of inflation, and he had also allowed for rises in the salaries of the BIML staff, which were reviewed every two years. Lastly he had allowed for an increase in the cost of living. In conclusion, Mr. Patoray said that there was no plan to increase the number of staff working at the BIML. The costs of employing limited-time contract workers remained within the 2016 budget, but the 2017 budget did not allow for the continuation of these contracts (Gilles Vinet had been contracted to work for six months and Paul Dixon until the end of 2017). It was worth noting that some of the staff at the BIML had been at the Bureau for a number of years and had reached the top of their salary scale, so that it was no longer necessary to allow for an increase in salary costs for them, and this would be the case for an increasing number of the staff. The increase in staff costs also took into account the social security costs which he explained were a significant proportion of the salaries in France. Mr. Patoray indicated that he had a number of detailed tables projecting the salaries and staff costs for the budget if any of the delegates were interested, and he wanted to highlight the fact that whilst he had been discussing the costs estimated in the budget, the actual costs were not so high.

Mr. Mason added that obviously staff costs were tracked. The staff regulations that had been approved some years ago had salary scales which had an inflation mechanism built in, and there was a pattern of progression up the salary scale which was assumed, although not guaranteed, with staff reaching a maximum salary having an impact on the process of estimating the cost. Conversely, when an experienced member of staff was replaced by somebody that was inexperienced, this had an impact in the opposite direction. Mr. Mason emphasized firstly that the staff costs were tracked, including by the Presidential Council, who had asked for, and received such information. Secondly he remarked that by his recollection, the history of forecasting on this item was good. Although there had been some significant variations from the budget from one year to another on some items, for example the building costs, the track record in forecasting staff costs, which was important as it was so large compared to other amounts, had been very good.

Mrs. Sukul commented that the 2016 forecast figures were being used for the purposes of comparison and that this forecast had been made in 2011 but that since the audited figures for 2015 were available, she suggested that these would have made a more realistic basis for comparison.

Mr. Mason agreed. Having reflected on the figures, whilst he thought it was important to be reminded of what had been agreed four years ago, it was also useful to be reminded of the actuals for the last year available, as well as the forecast for 2016, in which he had a lot of confidence. He admitted that although he had not reviewed the figures with his usual care, he may have made the same suggestion. He stressed that if necessary, the Committee could go back and look at the actuals for 2015, but that from the review of the forecast numbers in particular he thought that delegates would recognize that the forecast numbers were based to a large extent on the forecast outturn for 2016.

Mr. Klenovský (Czech Republic) congratulated Mr. Patoray on keeping a sharp eye on the income and expenses. Concerning the next budget period and considering what he had understood Mr. Patoray had said he felt there may be an inconsistency in the fact that any reduction in the membership fee was closely connected with the number of new Members. In the last budget period there had been seven new Members and two more new Members in the recent period so he wondered whether there may be room for at least a small reduction in membership fees, as he judged all governments were pressing for this. Mr. Klenovský also questioned the hiring of a new Assistant Director, who he said would come with a “price tag” of €55 000. He remarked that he agreed with the delegate from the Netherlands, amongst others, in that he felt the work of the BIML could easily be carried out with just one Assistant Director acting as a deputy to the Director, and this may lead to some savings in staff costs.

Mr. Mason thanked Mr. Klenovský for his observations, and stated that whilst putting the budget together, the option of reducing the membership fees had been considered. He reminded delegates that the fees had been reduced slightly at the last Conference. The subject had also been discussed at the Presidential Council in May, and he had continued to discuss it with Mr. Patoray. Mr. Mason drew delegates’ attention to the fact that new Members had been joining an organization which has promised to respond to their needs by doing more, and in particular doing more with the non-traditional Members. He observed that there was always the possibility that different countries would have different aspirations when it came to paying, but overall the judgement that had been made was that the best use of new membership fees was a mild expansion of activity. He submitted that this was what he hoped for in the coming period. If the organization was successful then it would be in discussion with a number of other potential Member States. If these discussions were successful, and the organization was joined by more Member States, then he considered this would be an opportunity to do more in response to their needs. That would particularly include responding to a wider range of languages and more effort being put in making sure that the services the organization offered were acceptable to the new Members. He stressed that when the Committee came to vote, that is what it would be voting on. Discussions had led to the recommendation that the contribution rate would not be cut, and also that the current surplus would not be reduced. He expressed the opinion that although the surplus should certainly not grow, a proposal was being made against running a budget deficit over the next four years. It would be for the Committee to make a recommendation to the Conference, and for the Conference to take that decision.

Mr. Patoray added that regardless of whether or not the CIML decided to search for another Assistant Director, there would still be a need for a new member of staff at the BIML. There would still have to be interviews and money would still have to be found for the applicants to travel. The only saving would be that a selection committee formed by the CIML would not be required. Instead, it would be up to the Director to hire a member of staff, interviews would have to take place, and unless someone was found in Paris, the successful candidate’s moving costs would still have to be paid. Following the previous day’s discussions, Mr. Patoray had the impression that there was a consensus to maintain two Assistant Directors but he did not want to give the impression that if it was voted that there should only be one Assistant Director, the costs would be significantly reduced.

Mr. Mason commented that whilst the budgeted costs for searching for an Assistant Director may have been generous, he felt that this was the right approach bearing in mind that it would not be satisfactory to come to the CIML and report that there was not the money to carry out a search activity in the way the CIML required. Whilst he insisted that the actual expenditure would be kept as low as possible, and if at all possible less than the €55 000 budget, he considered it was correct to put this amount in the budget to ensure that the process was carried out correctly. He repeated his concern that reducing the amount may mean that the CIML would not have the money to do what it wanted in this

recruitment. Mr. Mason asked if there were any other questions or observations. He repeated that there would be the opportunity in the Conference to revisit the question of Members' contributions, as the Conference was being asked to make a decision specifically about this, and therefore much of this discussion would be repeated the following day.

Dr. Ehrlich welcomed the proposed budget and said he appreciated the level of detail that it contained. He applauded the Bureau's efforts in decreasing the costs for travel and accommodation. There was an expectation that international organizations would find cost-savings and efficiencies, and with the Bureau's commitment to achieve further cost-savings, whilst recognizing that certain increases in personnel, and some operating costs, were unavoidable, as well as appreciating that the Bureau had achieved cost-savings in some areas, he agreed to support the budget as proposed.

Mr. Mason moved to a roll call and suggested that the resolution be displayed on the screen as the roll call took place to give delegates a chance to consider it.

Mr. Dunmill took the roll call including specific mention of proxies.

Albania not present, proxy given to Switzerland
Algeria present
Australia present
Austria present
Belarus present
Belgium present
Brazil not present, no proxy
Bulgaria present
Cameroon not present, proxy given to Algeria
Canada present
Colombia present
Croatia present
Cuba present
Cyprus not present, proxy given to Greece (Greece not present; 2nd proxy given to France)
Czech Republic present
Denmark present
Egypt present
Finland present
France present
Germany present
Greece not present, no proxy given
Hungary not present, proxy given to Poland
India present
Indonesia present
Iran present
Ireland present
Israel not present, proxy given to New Zealand
Italy present
Japan present
Kazakhstan not present, proxy given to Russian Federation
Kenya present
Korea (Republic of) present

Macedonia (F.Y.R) not present, no proxy given
Monaco not present, proxy given to France
Morocco not present, no proxy given
Netherlands present
New Zealand present
Norway p resent
P.R. China present
Pakistan not present, no proxy given
Poland present
Portugal present
Romania present
Russian Federation present
Saudi Arabia present
Serbia present
Slovakia present
Slovenia present
South Africa present
Spain present
Sri Lanka not present, no proxy given
Sweden present
Switzerland present
Tanzania present
Thailand present
Tunisia present
Turkey present
United Kingdom present
United States present
Viet Nam present
Zambia present

Mr. Patoray summarized the roll call. Of the 61 current Member States, six were not present and had not given a proxy. This left 55 Member States, and since there was a requirement of 46 Members for a quorum, the quorum was achieved.

Mr. Mason added that in the ten years he had been attending the CIML meetings, this was the largest quorum he could recall and he stated it was a great pleasure to see so many Members present.

Mr. Dunmill clarified that there were no comments on the resolution as displayed on the screen. There were no abstentions or negative votes and resolution 2016/10 was carried unanimously.

Resolution no. 2016/10

The Committee,

Having examined the proposed budget for the 2017–2020 financial period,

Approves this budget, and

Requests the 15th Conference to take this Resolution into account when deciding the overall amount of credits necessary to cover the OIML’s operating expenses in the 2017–2020 financial period.

7 Report on matters concerning Countries and Economies with Emerging Metrology Systems (CEEMS)

In his introduction to this group of items, Mr. Mason said that what he had in mind overall was a broader report on the follow-up actions that had been taken in response to the resolution on CEEMS that had been passed at the 50th CIML Meeting in Arcachon. Due to time constraints, Martin Milton (BIPM) would also be making his presentation to the CIML under this item, and would focus on what the BIPM has been doing in the area of capacity building.

Mr. Mason commented that he liked the fact that the acronym CEEMS had become part of the vocabulary used within the OIML. He thought it was important (and here he highlighted the contribution made by the Member for P.R. China) to have come up with a phrase that was not based on “developing countries”. He considered it was important to acknowledge that when the Committee talked about CEEMS it was not just talking about countries with a long way to go in terms of economic development, but in fact was talking about countries and economies that were in the process of developing their metrology systems and all of whom, in their different ways, were entitled to look to the OIML for some help and support when they become members.

7.1 BIML activities in connection with CEEMS matters

Mr. Dunmill reported on some of the activities that the Bureau had been engaged in with CEEMS. He remarked that delegates would be familiar with some of the work from past CIML meetings, but not with it all.

AFRIMETS Legal Metrology School

Firstly, he wanted to draw delegates’ attention again to the work that had been carried out with UNIDO on the AFRIMETS Legal Metrology School held in Tunisia in October 2014. The OIML had helped with finding presenters, and with ensuring that the candidates that had been selected were those that would benefit the most from the event since the course had been oversubscribed. Following on from the event, UNIDO had this year produced a report highlighting the benefits accrued in the countries which participated in the school, and in the working document there was a link indicating how delegates could access this report. One of the objectives of the report was that it could be used as a resource by countries that were seeking funding from donors, as an example of what kind of benefits could be achieved by this kind of training, and also by donor countries to find out to what purpose their money could be used in the development of other countries. The report was an important part of the project and gave a lot of detail about its results. A video had also been made supporting the event, which was available at various locations online, the easiest one to find being the one on YouTube. The video was only three minutes long and although Mr. Dunmill did not think it was appropriate to show it to delegates during this meeting, it showed some of the participants talking about the course and was used by UNIDO as a promotional tool, and so could also be used as a promotional tool by countries to show the importance of legal metrology as well as to justify why they needed to spend money on it.

DCMAS Network

Secondly, Mr. Dunmill wanted to talk about the DCMAS Network. This was a network of those international organizations which were involved in quality infrastructure development. The various member organizations contribute their experience on metrology, standards, accreditation and conformity assessment. Mr. Dunmill drew attention to the fact that the IEC was one of the members of this network and not only were they present at this meeting but also that the OIML had been working more closely with them, particularly with regard to certification. The original idea of the DCMAS was to co-ordinate the work being carried out with developing countries by the various members of the network, which was why the name contained “DC”. The co-ordination was found to be too difficult, and currently the network was used as a resource: the results of each other’s initiatives could be shared, and when possible the member organizations would share participation in events. Mr. Dunmill indicated that discussions were taking place in the network to change its name away from one including “DC” perhaps to something more akin to CEEMS. Representatives from each member

organization took turns in chairing the network. Last year the BIPM had taken on this job, and this year it was the turn of the OIML. The main activity carried out by the OIML has been the revision of the network's website. Whilst the website did provide information to the public on quality infrastructure, by showing the interaction of the pillars of the quality infrastructure framework, it also acted as a repository of documents for members of the network, acting as an archive as well as a place where current work could be organized. Mr. Dunmill said that the OIML had always hosted the network's website (resulting from the last time it had taken on the role of chair) and he showed delegates a screenshot of the home page of the new website. This would have a series of links to the member organizations' own websites, as well as a short paragraph about the expertise offered by each of them, so that visitors could see the interaction between metrology, standards, accreditation and conformity assessment, the different arms of the network.

ACP EU TBT Programme

Thirdly, Mr. Dunmill wanted to report on the ACP EU TBT Programme, since Mrs. Irina Kireeva from the Programme had participated in the CEEMS seminar that had been held in Arcachon the previous year. For those delegates that were not familiar with the acronym or the Programme, Mr. Dunmill explained that the "A" stood for Africa, the "C" for Caribbean, the "P" for Pacific, and the "EU" for the European Union. The Programme was aimed at specific countries in the above regions (and here he emphasized that not all of the countries in each of those regions were included) with the EU providing the funds to operate the Programme. The aim of the Programme was to coordinate and fund activities that reduced Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT), often through connecting various experts in the target countries with funding available from the EU. Although there were significant constraints on what the funds could be used for, Mrs. Kireeva had seen legal metrology activities as being relevant to the Programme, and had made funds available for legal metrology training through an e-learning platform. The Programme, and the funding it was supplying, would not be available after the end of this year, so the training had to be developed quickly, and although it had initially only covered legal metrology, there had been discussions with the BIPM and the PTB on the idea of extending it to cover all metrology. Due to the complicated tendering process required by the EU to select the companies which would create the training platform, the project had been slow to get started but was now progressing much faster. Although it was not yet available to the public, Mr. Dunmill showed delegates some screenshots illustrating the framework for the e-learning platform which would be developed further in November. The idea was to put in place a series of online modules on legal metrology that could be followed, initially by people from the ACP countries, although they would later be made available to people from any country. Through branding, the platform would be identified as having been created by the ACP EU TBT Programme since they had funded it, but the other partners, including the OIML, would be identified, and the appropriate copyright information concerning the content of the modules would be provided. In addition to helping with the content of the training platform, the OIML would also be hosting the platform on one of its servers so that when the ACP EU TBT Programme came to an end, the training platform would continue to be available. Additionally, to ensure the sustainability of the training platform, it had been set up using standard e-learning software called Moodle, which is used by many universities, schools and training companies for e-learning. Apart from following the course, the software also provides course assessment and certificates of completion and competence can be made available. This also meant that the partners would be able to add courses in the future, provided funding could be found. Simple courses were not difficult to add, but the more interactive video-based courses required more technical ability to set up. Mr. Dunmill asked if there were any questions or observations about this item so that he could take them into consideration whilst at the meeting in November.

Mr. Dixit drew delegates' attention to the fact that India already conducted many training programs on legal metrology, and had good laboratories, to which many developing countries such as Nigeria and Bhutan sent candidates to be trained. He stated that the institute and laboratories were always open to provide the training needed by candidates from any developing country.

Mr. Dunmill thanked Mr. Dixit for this offer. An idea for one of the modules of the e-learning platform was to use existing physical training courses to make videos showing candidates being trained, and to show, for example, how the verification of a weighbridge is carried out.

Mr. Dixit reiterated that the facilities in India could help the BIML with this initiative but were also always available to help develop legal metrology sectors in other countries.

Mr. Mason remarked that the Committee would take careful note of Mr. Dixit's offer as it sounded like some of his ideas were very similar to the Pilot Training Center which would be discussed under Item 7.3.

Mr. Richter (USA) wanted to ask a question about the new website being developed by the BIML staff for the DCMAS Network. He had noted that the new website had a “.org” address rather than “.net” address.

Mr. Dunmill replied that dcmas.org was the address of the existing website and would also be the address of the new website. What had been shown on the screenshot had been taken from the new website which was still on a development server. If Mr. Richter were to go to the dcmas.org at the moment, he would find the old website which had existed for a number of years and which had become very out of date. The new website was not being developed by the BIML staff themselves but by an outside company with the BIML's input on the technical and structural content.

Mr. Richter checked he had understood stating that all that was accessible currently was the old website.

Mr. Dunmill confirmed Mr. Richter's understanding was correct.

Mrs. Vukovic (Slovenia) had found that when she went to the old website it was necessary to log in.

Mr. Dunmill confirmed that the old and new websites were the same in that there was a only a small amount of information available to the public and the rest of the content, such as details of meetings, were only available to members of the DCMAS Network. The only information that was available to the public was a background paper on quality infrastructure and a little information on what each of the domains was about; this was the same on the new website. You only need to log in if you participated in the DCMAS Network itself.

Mr. Khedir (Tunisia) thought it was important to acknowledge that training in metrology was very important to the development of metrology in general, as well as to the development of quality standards. Tunisia had been developing a metrology training center since 2008 and had hosted the AFRIMETS Legal Metrology School in 2014. He wanted to propose to use this as a new training center for Africa like the one that had been established in P.R. China.

Mr. Mason thanked Mr. Khedir for his suggestion, which he thought would be important to follow up. He reminded delegates that the idea of training centers in general would be discussed under later items.

Legal metrology in the SIM area

Mr. Mason began his report on the discussion on legal metrology which had been held in November in the Dominican Republic (for the SIM region). This event had involved himself, Stephen Patoray and Luis Mussio attending the SIM General Assembly, where they had organized a workshop on legal metrology. He pointed out that the level of engagement between the Americas and the OIML was more limited than in many other areas of the world. He remarked that with regard to technical work, the only significant participation came from the USA and Canada, even though the OIML was fortunate to have other members from that part of the world including Brazil (who were not able to be present at this meeting), Cuba and Colombia. The reason for attending the General Assembly was therefore to encourage more participation. In addition to presenting the work of the OIML, Mr. Mason highlighted that the timing of the workshop had been ideal as it had come immediately after the Arcachon CIML meeting and the passing of resolution 2015/10 on CEEMS activities. The first session of the workshop had asked what the legal metrology authorities, particularly in Central and South America, saw as their challenges, and this had mirrored what the OIML Advisory Group was doing in surveying needs and matching those needs to what the OIML could do. The second session followed

the same pattern, and tried to identify what the OIML could do to reduce these challenges, as well as identifying what was preventing the OIML from making more of an impact in this part of the world.

Mr. Mason said that the information gained had led to a number of conclusions:

- The first was that the OIML needed to find a way to take into account the needs of smaller countries, focusing on producing guides, for example on the periodic verification of instruments. This had included some debate about whether it would be better to produce separate guides, or whether it was better if the OIML rethought the way that Recommendations were written so as to include a section on verification in the field. At this point, Mr. Mason mentioned that a project would be proposed to delegates later that afternoon that would take these ideas forward.
- The second conclusion was that the OIML should provide more information to potential members on the benefits of membership and the procedures necessary to join the organization. He thought it was generally recognized that one of the tasks of all of the office holders, and by extension many CIML Members, was to explain the advantages of being associated with the OIML to relevant representatives of other countries.
- The third conclusion was that more information should be provided on how to participate in Project Groups. Participation as an observer (O-member) was available to Corresponding Members and since the region had a number of Corresponding Members this was of considerable interest. More concretely, it was pointed out that the training and awareness activities in this part of the world normally took place at sub-regional level (i.e. Central America, parts of the Mercosur area, and the Caribbean) and that OIML activity should reflect this way of working, but find a way of coordinating those activities with the SIM legal metrology working group.
- The fourth conclusion was that the OIML should be invited to future SIM workshops and seminars on legal metrology, and in particular those organized at a sub-regional level. It was felt that these seminars needed to focus on creating awareness among policy makers and not just among metrologists.
- Finally it was requested that more documents be made available in Spanish, Portuguese and Dutch. Mr. Mason commented that the ability of the OIML to engage in large scale translation activities was problematic because if the Committee were to consider a situation other than the current one, where English was the working language and French the official language, it would be difficult to know which translations could be considered a legitimate OIML expenditure and which could not. Mr. Mason said that in the past, the solution to this has been that the OIML has worked with Member States which had produced their own translations and made these documents available to a wider community by allowing access to them through the OIML website. This way round the problem had been highlighted at the workshop. Mr. Mason pointed out that, particularly with regard to the Spanish speaking countries, the weight of these translation has fallen largely on Spain itself which had done a lot of good work in producing translations which had been made available to others. However, if more translations were needed, then a wider pool of countries willing to carry out translations should be created, and those translations could then be made available on the OIML website.

Mr. Mason mentioned that since the past year had been a difficult one, the follow-up on the SIM workshop had been one of the activities that had been reprioritized, and consequently not as rapid as he would have hoped. However he concluded by saying that not only did the Committee have representatives in that part of the world, but also that there had been some very recent discussions about finding ways to participate. He wanted these ideas to be followed up and to make sure that the OIML did more in this part of the world. Finally he asked if there were any comments or questions.

Mrs. Van Spronssen (Netherlands) informed the committee that the Dutch government may be able to help with translations into Dutch and asked Mr. Mason to confirm precisely which countries had asked for these as she could only think of the Dutch Caribbean and Suriname that might be interested. She said that they could contact these countries and find out what their needs were.

Mr. Mason was extremely grateful for this offer and confirmed that he had been referring to the Dutch Caribbean. He indicated that one of things he had thought of doing after the workshop was putting Mrs. Van Spronsen in touch with them and this could be done now.

Mr. Gittens (Saint Lucia) commented that the country that expressed particular interest in a Dutch translation was Suriname because Suriname was an active member of SIM.

Mr. Mason thanked Mr. Gittens, and as there were no further comments or questions, asked Dr. Milton to report on what the BIPM has been doing in this area, and to describe the opportunities there may be for collaboration.

BIPM

Dr. Milton remarked that it was a great pleasure to be at the CIML meeting again. He said he had submitted a report which delegates would find with all the documents on the website but that the President had asked him to talk about what the BIPM called capacity building. Dr. Milton stated that the BIPM was also promoting the use of the acronym CEEMS, and although it had not yet caught on with their Member States and NMIs (National Metrology Institutes), he expected it would do so. Dr. Milton agreed with the point that Mr. Mason had made that these were initiatives for states and economies with emerging metrology systems and not simply for developing nations. He said that many of the BIPM's activities were of great benefit to those that were not developing states, but were states where metrology was still developing.

Dr. Milton started by talking about participation in the activities of the BIPM. Currently the BIPM had 58 Member States and 41 Associates of the General Conference, and not only did these already include countries and economies with emerging metrology systems, but he considered that looking at the map of the world, future Associates and Member States were very likely to be in this category too. At the very least, these Associates wanted to be able to participate in the BIPM's MRA (Mutual Recognition Arrangement), which was the reason the Associate status existed. The MRA was signed in 1999, and its objectives were to establish the degree of equivalence of national measurement standards and to provide for the mutual recognition of calibration and measurement certificates. Dr. Milton directed delegates' attention to the map on the screen showing the RMOs (the BIPM's Regional Metrology Organizations) because their involvement in the MRA was absolutely essential, as it was a set of arrangements that were administered through the regions. Regarding participation in the MRA, there were 99 National Metrology Institutes from 58 Member States and 41 Associates, there were also four international organizations involved, and 153 designated institutes. To find out about the users of the MRA in more detail, Dr. Milton referred delegates that were interested to the BIPM's key comparison database, where they would find information about the key comparisons themselves, of which there are now more than 1 300, and about the calibration and measurement capabilities, which were the point at which recognition was given and of which there are nearly 25 000. Dr. Milton again drew delegates' attention to the map on the screen, where the size of the spots showed that participation in the comparisons was truly spread around the world. He observed that of course there were some big spots where delegates might expect them, but asked delegates to note just how many countries had some sort of spot or some sort of engagement with the BIPM's key comparisons.

The idea behind Capacity Building and Knowledge Transfer (or CBKT as it was called at the BIPM) had started at the 25th General Conference in 2014, when a proposal had been made for a BIPM visitor program which, although tabled, had not been funded. Despite this, there had been very strong support in the discussions amongst Member States that the BIPM should find ways to do this work, and a resolution had been amended to this effect. Following the 25th CGPM, the ideas had been refined, and based on what had been discussed at the General Conference, the CBKT had been developed, which was a voluntarily-funded program. This had a new name, and had built on what the BIPM had learnt from its Member States at the Conference. The CBKT aimed to reinforce the international metrology system, and to balance the workload amongst NMIs. This had been the starting point, as there had been a recognition that a disproportionate fraction of the work at all levels within the MRA had been falling on the largest Member States. Whilst the largest Member States had been pleased to carry out the majority of the work, they wanted to see a future in which the engagement was spread more evenly. The CBKT also worked to promote efficient operation of the system by training all those involved with the BIPM KCDB to know how to use the databases and

how the processes worked. It also helped NMIs from countries with emerging metrology systems to engage appropriately and efficiently. There was now a member of staff whose work was specifically dedicated to these activities (Chingis Kuanbayev from Kazakhstan) who had joined the BIPM in July, and who many of the delegates may know since he had been executive secretary of the JCRB for a period.

Dr. Milton identified three main types of activity: focused training aimed at the BIPM's objectives; engagement with the global quality infrastructure capacity-building community, and Mr. Dunmill had already referred to the DCMAS, to which the BIPM was committed and which along with the OIML it would like to see becoming an organization with more momentum and having more impact. Finally there was a technical element to capacity building: Dr. Milton explained that this included certain types of comparison activities, which were at the heart of what the BIPM did currently, and which were of particular interest to Member States which were developing their metrology systems. The program was open to sponsors' ideas for initiatives which contributed to the BIPM's objectives, which was the nature of a voluntary program. Within the agreed objectives, the sponsor would come to an agreement with the BIPM as to which actions they wish to support, as well as the scope of the engagement. Dr. Milton emphasized that as an international organization, everything that was done was fully open to the 58 Member States, and Associate states and economies were involved as much as possible, but since they could not be as fully involved as Member States, there had to be discussions as to whether the funding would cover Associates' involvement. Finally there had to be discussions as to whether particular initiatives would focus on particular regions.

A significant number of initiatives were underway, and Dr. Milton said he would describe a number of them for delegates. The first had already been completed, and had been one of the smaller collaborations where, with the aid of support sponsorship from METAS in Switzerland, three students from CEEMS had been sent to the summer school which the BIPM had organized in Varenna in Italy, and additionally they had been offered two weeks' work in the METAS laboratories before or after the summer school. Dr. Milton remarked that he thought this was an excellent example of how what the BIPM was doing was not simply about training. It was more than that, it was about training and exposure to what went on in the international metrology system. The students that had benefited from this initiative had originated from Albania, Argentina and South Africa and there had been over 60 applicants for the three places. He confirmed that if there were any other laboratories that wanted to come forward to sponsor similar activities with the BIPM, they would find there were very many interested candidates who could benefit from this sort of activity.

The second initiative Dr. Milton wanted to highlight was the BIPM's Leaders of Tomorrow course which would take place the following month at the BIPM. This would be an 11-day course which would be aimed at the next generation of Technical Committee chairs. These would be the people from the regions, within the system that would operate the Mutual Recognition Arrangement, who would have to fully understand the processes that made the BIPM's Mutual Recognition Arrangement work. This would be one of two activities sponsored by NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology, USA), and NIST had asked the BIPM to give priority to candidates from Africa and the Americas, and he drew delegates attention to the list on the screen. He said there would be 18 spaces on the course, as the idea had been to provide detailed training with the opportunity for participants to be involved in case studies. Again, the course had been oversubscribed, and the BIPM had consulted NIST as to who they would like to be involved. There also turned out to be 18 speakers, including Mr. Dunmill and Mr. Dixon, because one of the days of the course was devoted to legal metrology. Dr. Milton emphasized that the BIPM wanted to present its capacity building work as part of an integrated activity together with legal metrology, accreditation and standardization, helping participants from CEEMS learn about how Quality Infrastructure works.

Dr. Milton reiterated that it was not all training; there were also technical activities. The first activity he wanted to describe was a project defined by AFRIMETS on safe food and feed. This addressed the issue of the measurement of mycotoxins, which were a result of bacterial contamination in food, the presence of which was the single largest reason for the rejection of food in trade. It was therefore a very significant issue that mycotoxin measurement capacity should be available in countries with developing measurement systems. The BIPM had put together a new model for how a comparison activity might take place, and this happened in a number of stages. The first stage was that scientists

from NMIs in emerging metrology systems came to the BIPM to work with its scientists on the materials needed for these projects. Secondly they took these materials back to their NMIs, and in a third stage they took part in a comparison coordinated by the BIPM to determine whether something had been learnt and therefore whether there was new capacity in the region. The BIPM could then withdraw and the region should then have a basis to be able to coordinate new capacity itself. He said that although the first example of the use of this new model had been in relation to mycotoxin measurement, a second example had just been started on metrology for clean air, based in Mexico, where the training concerned the measurement of nitrogen oxides, which was a huge problem in many developed and developing countries. He repeated that again the model was that scientists came to the BIPM and worked with the BIPM to develop capacity which they could then take home.

The sponsorship of these technical projects was more distributed than with the training projects. For example NIM (P.R. China) had supported the safe food and feed project by sending guest workers to the BIPM to do the technical work, and they had also provided the very expensive materials needed for this kind of chemistry, and NMISA (South Africa) had provided scientists and a lot of support in getting the project working. The PTB had also supported scientists to come to the BIPM from Thailand, Argentina and Brazil, and UME in Turkey had sent visiting scientists. On the clean air project, the PTB were supporting scientists from CENAM (Mexico).

Looking to the following year, Dr. Milton stated that the BIPM would have the next course supported by NIST which would be entitled “Sound beginning in the CIPM MRA”. This would provide training aimed at relevant staff from NMIs which had recently signed the MRA, but which had not yet submitted CMCs, which were the basic recognitions of competence that the BIPM had, and which enabled the NMIs to become involved in the system in an efficient way. This would also be an 11-day course, run at the BIPM, with a focus on participants from Africa and the Americas.

Dr. Milton concluded with a summary of what the BIPM had learnt so far. Although it was still early days for the BIPM’s activities in this field, it was an area that was proving very popular. The number of sponsorship opportunities that had been identified was already more than they could immediately deliver, and there was certainly very much more interest in taking part by participants from countries with emerging metrology systems. The first project had been successfully completed, there were more underway, and a lot in pipeline. Although the BIPM was disappointed that this program had not been funded as part of its core dotation, the voluntary funding had enabled the BIPM to be more flexible in its work with sponsors, and often the sponsors and regional metrology organizations knew best what the issues were and how best the BIPM could be involved. The BIPM now considered the CBKT as a spectrum of activities, some of which benefited the entire community, and it felt like something the BIPM ought to be doing. He particularly mentioned the training of Technical Committee chairs that came from all NMIs, from the biggest to the smallest. Dr. Milton said that other activities specifically added value around topical challenges for participants from CEEMS.

Lastly, Dr. Milton wanted to mention that the BIPM would also be running training the following month in Dubai at the request of GULFMET, and in February at the request of EURAMET. In both of these examples, GULFMET and EURAMET had provided support so that the BIPM could run a subset of the course it had run for the global community. The BIPM was also working on another technical project, and here he emphasized the importance of using capacity building involving technical projects as well as training projects, and was expecting to agree with the PTB on some training on calibrations to support the universal time system. Although he did not have time to talk about it in detail, this would be an activity that would be spread over 140 laboratories around the world. As laboratories became involved, they would have to carry out certain calibration activities, and it was in everybody’s interest that they were carried out effectively at a regional level.

Mr. Mason thanked Dr. Milton very much and asked delegates to address any questions to Dr. Milton himself after the break. Mr. Mason mentioned that Dr. Milton would be at the meeting for the rest of the day and the following day. Since the Committee was now short of time, Mr. Mason requested that the resolution on this item be delayed to Friday, and asked whether the Committee would agree to move on to item 7.2.

7.2 Special projects fund for CEEMS

With regard to this item, Mr. Mason indicated that he wanted to explain how the CIML's CEEMS resolution (2015/10) had been followed up. Mr. Mason reported that he had used the resolution, but had broken it up in a different way than it was written in the resolution itself (an approach he had used at the SIM meeting).

He felt that although essentially CIML Resolution 2015/10 gave a set of instructions to the BIML, there were also items stating how the technical work should be conducted, a set of recommendations that were directed to CEEMS members, and finally a set of recommendations to other Member States as well as to other organizations. He reported that within the Bureau a tracking mechanism was being used to monitor the work. One of the instructions that had been given to the Bureau was that they should continue to participate in training courses, and the Committee had heard this had been done and later they would be hearing a little more. There had also been an instruction that the Bureau should continue working with DCMAS, and as the Committee had seen, the OIML had taken over its chairmanship and was improving its website. There had also been a requirement that the part of the OIML website relating to CEEMS was developed. This was ongoing, and would be improved further as there were now some more ideas from the Advisory Group. The suggestion about the database of experts had not progressed as quickly as Mr. Mason would have liked. It was still outstanding but again, some ideas had now been put forward by the Advisory Group on how the work might be accelerated. It had been requested that there should be more use of the OIML Bulletin and the website to share new ideas, and here he highlighted the article that had been produced about a voluntary approach to the measurement of milk supplies, and he also mentioned there had been other articles on projects such as the Pilot Training Center.

On the research program, Mr. Mason reported that the Advisory Group was now at the point where it was looking for partners in the work that was being done, as well as for other ideas. This was not an area of major activity at the moment, but could be something that the organization could build on. In the case of continued promotion of the case for better metrology, Mr. Mason said that his own travelling program had been more restricted than he had hoped, but that both the Vice-Presidents and the Director had been involved in quite senior level discussions in Egypt, Thailand and P.R. China, and he had taken the opportunity of attending a major regulatory conference in London the previous week to emphasize once again the importance of metrology and he would be writing an article for the OIML Bulletin shortly to follow that up [*BIML note: this article was published in the April 2017 Bulletin*].

In terms of the direction of OIML technical work, Mr. Mason confirmed that there had been a proposal for a review of R 76, which had been a direct response to some of the comments that had been made at the SIM workshop. Mr. Mason also hoped that some of the work he was doing in ASEAN, which he had already mentioned, would feed into the handbook project being carried out by OIML TC 3/SC 1. The possibility of revising OIML D 1 *Considerations for a Law on Metrology* was also being mooted, and this would be reconsidered later in the meeting. There was also a proposal to revise R 23 *Tire pressure gauges for motor vehicles* which Mr. Mason said he would also be mentioning later. In terms of the Certification System Project Group, the new proposals explicitly allowed for Corresponding Member participation. The way the proposal had been drafted was also intended to recognize that the OIML wanted a wide range of involvement in the new system.

With regard to the specific projects that were mentioned in the Arcachon resolution, Mr. Mason indicated that the TC 6 project *Guidance for defining the system requirements for a certification system for prepackages* would hopefully soon reach preliminary ballot stage. If this was successful, then because it was a Guide, he expected that it would be published very soon. The TC 3/SC 6 project on conformity to type (*Premarket surveillance activities*) was continuing, and he thought the decision had been made that this would ultimately be a guide. He believed it had passed the 2CD stage, so if that was indeed the case, and it was a guide, then it would be possible to publish it without going through further formalities.

With regard to recommendations for CEEMS, there had been the idea of seconding staff to the Bureau, and although this was not quite the same as the BIPM's visitor program, there were some similarities, and there were currently discussions as to a possible secondment. CEEMS had been asked to propose conveners, but because the full reports of the 2015 seminars had not yet been published because there

were some problems with translations, there was not a comprehensive list of the documents that had been proposed. However, Kenya had already volunteered to become a convener on the revision of R 23.

In terms of the recommendations to Member States, Mr. Mason felt the Committee would know from what had been said that there was continued support for the activities of other organizations, and he indicated that they had the specific example of the OIML's engagement with the BIPM. With regard to encouraging DCMAS, Mr. Mason mentioned that it was relevant that the OIML had taken over its chairmanship. Considering the Pilot Training Center, Mr. Mason said that the Committee would be hearing about it in more detail shortly. Even last year, other Member States had been urged to study this pilot, and to consider whether they might do something similar. He noted that last year Kenya had already suggested they would be interested, and yesterday there had been a suggestion from COOMET that they would also be interested. During today's proceedings, both India and Tunisia had also expressed an interest. Mr. Mason considered that there was a considerable degree of momentum on this. He pointed out that this had all been achieved without spending a lot of money. In 2015, the special project fund was used primarily to support some presenters at the 2015 seminars. In 2016, the money had been used to support some of the Pilot Training Center's expenses, and it was also the source of funding for improving the DCMAS website. In conclusion, Mr. Mason submitted that he had given concrete examples that the work being carried out matched what the Committee had required.

7.3 Advisory Group on CEEMS

Mr. Mason continued that the next item was to report on the Advisory Group (AG) on CEEMS. This report would be made by himself and Mr. Guo Su (P.R. China). Before he started, he wanted to point out that the AG had met the previous day. This group had been set up as a result of a proposal from the then CIML Member for P.R. China on a temporary basis. Members had been invited to participate and it had been agreed that the BIML and AQSIQ would form a joint secretariat. There was a meeting of the AG in 2014, and although the oral report had described the activities of the group, it had not decided whether the group should become a permanent one. As so much time had been dedicated to preparing for the seminar in Arcachon, the AG had not met, so yesterday's meeting had only been the second time it had been convened. Mr. Mason asked Mr. Guo Su to report on the activities of the group.

Mr. Guo Su said he would present the activities of the Advisory Group since 2013. As an introduction, his first slide showed Mr. Pu in Beijing, as the AG chair, opening the OIML Pilot Training Center. Mr. Guo Su stated that his presentation would have three parts. Firstly he would provide a brief introduction to the AG, secondly he would describe its achievements so far, and finally he would indicate what the group would advise for the future. As Mr. Mason had already talked about the CIML resolution, he would highlight the key stages of the group's activities, which were that:

- in 2013 the CIML had decided to set up the Advisory Group;
- in 2014 the CIML had promoted the economic development of the CEEMS community; and
- in 2015 in Arcachon the CIML had approved the setting up of the Pilot Training Center by P.R. China.

With regard to the activities of the group, Mr. Guo Su said that in 2014 the Advisory Group had developed its terms of reference (ToR), which had included the composition of the group, its objectives, principles and tasks, which he reminded delegates were now available on the OIML website. During the AG meeting the previous day, the composition of the group had been discussed again, and had it had been decided to encourage other CIML Members and RMLo members to join the group. In 2014 the group had carried out a survey, to which 13 Member States and Corresponding Members had replied. This had shown up the needs, strengths and weaknesses, and plans of those that had replied, and this had been reported on. The group's webpage content had been given to the BIML so they could decide what could be put on the OIML website. In 2015, the group had decided to send the survey to African countries a second time as the first survey had not been adequate for them. The same year, the first seminar *Metrology in daily life* had been held in Chengdu. This had been attended by over 100 participants from 17 countries. The key note speeches made by the guests and OIML experts, the participants' work on case studies from Chengdu about metrology in daily life, for

example about going to the market, as well as the group discussions, had all contributed to the recommendations on what actions the OIML should take in the future. This had been followed in 2015 by the CEEMS seminar in Arcachon, where the agenda had been about capacity building, and helping CEEMS improve their regulations, their markets, and new ideas. This had been a very productive seminar which had led to CIML Resolution 2015/10.

After the CIML had agreed to set up the OIML Pilot Training Center (OPTC), Mr. Patoray had visited P.R. China on behalf of the BIML, and Mr. Guo Su showed delegates a picture of him with Mr. Zhi Shuping, the minister of AQSIQ who had officially opened the OPTC. This Pilot Training Center had run a course on non-automatic weighing instruments (NAWI) in Beijing, P.R. China, with over 50 participants from 20 economies attending, and this was the beginning of building the expert database. The training course had started with a talk on the practical implementation of OIML Recommendations and had included a visit to a NAWI manufacturer. Mr. Guo Su showed delegates a video about the event. It showed in detail the official opening of the OPTC followed by the attendees from each participating economy talking about their metrological system and their NMI's metrological control. After that, the participants had attended the NIM laboratory, and this was followed by the training course. The video also showed the experts from PTB and NIM. The participants had been divided into six or seven groups, with each group taking part in practical activities and having a visit to a manufacturer (which Guo Su believed was Sartorius). On the final day, the participants had been given a questionnaire and had taken part in a final discussion session. There had also been a closing ceremony, after which the participants had been given their certificates. The participants had also been invited to visit the Great Wall.

The second training seminar was on legal metrology management systems. This had also been attended by over 100 participants from 16 economies. It had taken place in Guangzhou, P.R. China and again, experts from the PTB and P.R. China had been invited. The participants had had a chance to talk about their own economies, and an opportunity to tour the laboratory. He showed delegates a second video. An opening ceremony had been attended by various VIPs such as the new CIML Member for P.R. China, Mr. Qinghai Wu, and Mr. Pu from the Advisory Group. Each economy had given a presentation of their legal metrology management system, and he observed that delegates may have noticed some familiar faces. On the second day, participants had taken part in discussions. The international participants had been divided into three groups, each group being given three topics to discuss. Their comments were presented on boards and analyzed. On the last day, the participants had visited a laboratory in Guangzhou Institute of Metrology to see the facilities and talk to the staff.

This year, the Advisory Group wanted to set up an expert database including basic contact information such as nationality, which would help when considering the necessity for visas, but also occupation and background, as well as a short curriculum vitae (CV).

Mr. Guo Su stated that he would report briefly on the analysis of the survey from both events. He stated that almost all attendees' countries had applied OIML R 76, except for the Philippines, which was not yet a member of the OIML. From the first training course, 47 % of the participants were government officials, with 53 being from technical departments. Mr. Guo Su observed that the most interesting part of the survey was that 76 % of the participants' preferred subject for future training was type evaluation, 35 % would prefer verification, and 29 % metrological management. 53 % of the participants wanted the training to last for two weeks in future, with only 23 % preferring one week. Regarding current understanding, 34 % of the attendees already had an understanding of R 76, half of them had an understanding of legal metrology, other OIML members and other economies. About one third of the participants were partially confused about type evaluation, and a seventh of them were confused about verification. Generally (94 %), the attendees had been very satisfied with the agenda and organization of the meeting.

Mr. Guo Su said that because the number of comments from the seminar was so large, he would summarize just a few of them. The proposal from the participants on how to optimize legal metrology management systems was to add non-governmental bodies to D 1. It had also been recommended that a legal metrology management institute was a good innovation for legal metrology systems, which may be able to link with the Advisory Group which needed competent members and this would enable the discussion of emerging issues. With regard to raising awareness of metrology, participants had divided up possible stakeholders such as businesses and universities, and they had also been concerned

about the public relations message. The report highlighted some good solutions to these concerns, such as how to use social networks. With regard to improving capacity building in the organization, most of the participants had been concerned about human resource development.

Regarding the future, Mr. Guo Su suggested that there was a desire to develop a more concrete framework including a composition, introduction, reference, and structure so that information could be put into an OIML Basic Publication in the future. He said they also wanted to contribute more articles to the Bulletin, to produce more reports, and possibly contribute to Guides. Mr. Guo Su showed delegates a slide of the structure of the OPTC, and said it would survey needs, conduct training (with help from the OIML experts), and develop the website. This would be a branch website to the OIML site, which may have features to enable the collection of data, and perhaps include some apps for delegates' mobile phones. There was also a desire to cooperate more with RLMOs and other projects for online training or e-learning, and to have an interactive area. They wanted to build an expert database, and in the future add some simplified OIML Recommendations. In the meantime, the AG would still conduct training seminars, seek funding, help to raise awareness of legal metrology, and build a rewarding system. Finally they wanted to build connections with the BIML, Member States and Corresponding Members, and to have a feedback system which would be used to publicize the OIML's work and build liaison with UNIDO to seek funding and support.

Mr. Mason thanked Mr. Guo Su and said he wanted to move on to the slides he had prepared summarizing the Advisory Group's discussions, following which delegates would be given an opportunity to question himself and Mr. Guo Su. The basic conclusion of the Advisory Group meeting was that it had played a useful role in providing a framework for the OIML's CEEMS activities. As a result of that, the Advisory Group had recommended that the CIML should confirm its current role operating broadly its current range of activities. It was also being recommended that Mr. Pu Chan Cheng should continue to be the chairman of the Advisory Group. Although he was no longer the CIML Member for P.R. China, he was still extremely active in the field of legal metrology. There was also a proposal that more shape should be given to the Advisory Group's work by producing a Basic Publication. This was a change from the position that had been adopted in 2014, when the Advisory Group was left to draw up its own terms of reference. The final conclusion was that a more stable and active membership of the Advisory Group was needed, and that this should be encouraged in particular through nominations by RLMOs and volunteer CIML Members, as already provided for in the current terms of reference, but RLMOs and CIML Members needed to make use of them to give the group more shape. If these conclusions were accepted, then Mr. Mason thought it would be appropriate to adopt a resolution that reflected this. He pointed out that there was something significant because it had not been said so far. This was a decision that the group was inviting the CIML to take. Initially, when the idea of producing something more concrete for developing countries (as they were still called at that time) had been considered, the thinking had still been about the Development Council and the Facilitator position, all of which had involved decisions being made by the Conference. However, experience had shown that if the Conference was asked to do something, it set up a structure that was then fixed for four years. What was needed was something more fluid and more flexible, and this was something that Mr. Mason felt the CIML could authorize, just as it had authorized the Advisory Group. He thought it was necessary to point out that if the Committee adopted this resolution, then it was making a decision which would be reported to the Conference the following day. Mr. Mason asked for comments or questions from delegates, firstly on what they had heard and the conclusions of the Advisory Group, before moving to the rest of the resolution.

Mr. Patoray underlined that from what he had heard from Mr. Mason about the activities that had taken place since last year's resolution, together with the time he had spent in P.R. China at the Pilot Training Center and with the Advisory Group, he was impressed by the large amount of work that had been carried out. He considered that this was the beginning of the future. When he had proposed the previous budget with the small amount of money to be dedicated to developing countries he had not been sure what it would be used for, and the Committee had asked why there should be a budget line for it. These activities were the result of that initial conversation four years ago, and with the continuing conversation involving the Advisory Group, it was turning into a concrete set of activities. The frustrations of trying to do something with what had been called "developing countries" seemed to be in the past, and he was happy to see that progress was being made. He hoped that the Committee

would continue to support and appreciate this work, and he wanted to encourage the other volunteers that had come forward at this meeting. He concluded his comments by thanking everyone for the work that had been done. Mr. Mason stated that there had been a wide attendance at the Advisory Group meeting, which he hoped was an indication that Members had convinced themselves this was the right thing for the OIML to be doing. Mr. Dixit commented that it was a matter of great pleasure that the training program on non-automatic weighing instruments had been organized in association with the BIML. However, he judged that other instruments should also be included such as fuel dispensing pumps, meters for liquids other than water, and automatic gravimetric filling instruments, amongst others. He also commented that running training programs should be considered in other countries which had developed similar modules to that which had been developed for non-automatic weighing instruments. He underlined that India was very grateful to AIST (Japan) who had arranged a train-the-trainer course for some Indian experts. He remarked that India now had a list of experts which he could provide, and whose services could be used for advanced training. Mr. Mason thanked Mr. Dixit for his constructive comments and reminded him that the more he said, the more he was committing himself to a Pilot Training Center! Mr. Dixit retorted that he was a committed man.

Mr. Mason concluded this item by indicating that if he felt the Committee was in favor of passing the resolution, it did not need to be voted on immediately, but could be left until Friday. He had written the resolution quickly the previous night, and therefore felt it might be useful for Members to think more about the wording. For example, Dr. Schwartz had just pointed out that it would probably be worthwhile to include something about the RMLOs, which were a very important part of the discussion on Monday. Mr. Gittens asked whether the Pilot Training Center in P.R. China had been set up to provide training only in the Asia-Pacific region, or was it meant to be a training center for the entire world. He pointed out that coming from the Americas, it would be very expensive to attend training in P.R. China. Mr. Mason stressed there was no exclusion on who could participate, but the whole idea of the pilot centers was that they form a model which could then be organized in other parts of the world. He observed that it was consistent with the conclusions of the SIM workshop that the Committee should be looking forward to a time when there would be centers like this in the Americas. Mr. Marneweck (South Africa) wanted to alter the punctuation of the resolution. He directed delegates' attention to the third line of the second paragraph and stated that the full stop in the phrase "*and if possible adoption. at its 52nd Meeting*" should be removed. Mr. Mason observed that this reinforced how important it was to do a little more work on the resolution before it was passed on Friday, providing that the CIML was happy with the broad conclusion that the Advisory Group should continue largely as it was, but should be given more structure through a Basic Publication, and that conclusion should be reported to the Conference. Mrs. Sukul (India) commented that the ACPEU/TBT programme was also developing some modules for online training and e-learning at the same time as the OPTC would also be developing them; she reinforced the need to avoid duplication. She suggested that this could be considered in the Basic Publication. Mr. Mason agreed, asserting that avoiding duplication was one of the OIML's fundamental objectives, as this was a waste of money when the organization should be sharing resources and making the limited funds work harder. Mr. Dunmill commented that Mrs. Sukul's concerns highlighted the ideal position from which to regard the work of the ACPEU/TBT programme. It was carrying out the difficult technical work of putting into place the framework for the e-learning programme, and deciding on and providing future content would be the OIML's responsibility. Ms. Mikanadze (Georgia) directed delegates' attention to the last paragraph of the resolution which read "invite other Members of the Committee". She observed that there may be more CEEMS countries amongst the Corresponding Members, and wondered how they would be involved and how the linkage between those Members and the Advisory Group would be ensured. Mr. Mason stated that the wording of the resolution made reference specifically to Members of the Committee, so the ability for CIML Members to nominate themselves was restricted to Member States. However, the RMLOs would be able to nominate Corresponding Members as well as Member States, and there was also the provision to co-opt experts, and some of those experts could come from Corresponding Members. He thought there was provision for the links to be made, but submitted that this was a little bit of an encouragement for countries to become a full Member of the OIML at the right time. Mr. Mason stated he was conscious not only that this session had over-run but also that the Committee had had to examine a lot of material very quickly. He wanted to express his thanks to everyone that had contributed to the work and in particular his Chinese colleagues Mr. Guo Su as well

as Mr. Pu, who had not been able to come to this meeting, but who had provided a lot of support to the project.

8 Special projects

8.1 Report of the B 6 revision Project Group

Before proceeding with his report, Mr. Mason indicated that he had not been able to deliver the work in line with the ambitious time scale that he had been asked to follow in the Resolution agreed last year (Resolution 2015/13). He reminded delegates that the resolution contained four elements:

- firstly to look at the “step two” proposals which had been held over from 2013;
- secondly to review each step in developing an OIML publication with the aim of reducing the process time, whilst maintaining the integrity of the process;
- thirdly the resolution had authorized the group to make editorial changes, but not technical changes, which were outside the scope described in the two previous criteria; and
- the fourth element was to integrate the working methods made possible by the OIML website tools into B 6, and this particularly meant the facilities made available in the workspace.

It had also been requested that the group avoid wording B 6 in any way that unduly restricted its further development. In summary, the resolution required work on step two proposals, changes to speed up work, reflections of new technology and editorial changes. A Project Group approach had been adopted, based on its own (B 6) methodology. The current B 6 demanded an ad hoc approach when drafting Basic Publications. It had been agreed that Mr. Mason would act as the convener, and although there had been a high level of input from CIML Members, he reiterated that the group had set itself an ambitious timetable, which it had not been able to keep to. What they had managed to do was to produce what Mr. Mason called “policy papers”. Mr. Mason and the BIML had analyzed various items, producing policy papers to which other members of the Project Group had then added their comments.

The results were firstly that a significant number of the “step two” changes were either considered non-controversial or had already been implemented in some way. Secondly, a variety of proposals for speeding up the technical work had been recommended, of which the most important was speeding up the authorization of new projects, as this was a very lengthy process at the moment. Thirdly, the group had also considered issues of “transparency” which questioned whether Members be able to see what other people had already voted during online voting, and the outcome of that was, if it were possible, should Members be able to change their vote if they wished to as a result of what somebody else had voted or commented. Mr. Mason reported that there had been widespread agreement that both these changes were desirable. The fourth item considered was whether there was scope for making non-editorial changes after a Committee Draft had been passed, or after a Preliminary Ballot, and to rehearse the question “was there any scope for non-editorial changes after a Final Draft had been approved by the CIML”. This had resulted in the most controversial of the policy papers, and he told delegates he would consider the consequences of that shortly. Finally, the Project Group had produced a policy paper on the approach to passive and active abstentions. A number of Project Group members wanted to find a way to distinguish, in voting terms, between CIML Members who had decided to abstain having been actively involved in a publication’s development, and passive abstentions, when Members did not respond to e-mails, did not attend meetings, and were not party to or were not present during the discussions. There was a little more work to do on this last subject, but the situation was becoming clearer having considered the implications of using a similar methodology to that used in the work of the CIML.

Mr. Mason reported that the comments on the policy papers had led to the conclusion over the summer that some of the future work needed to be carried out by people facing each other across a table with a pen or computer in hand. Since it was difficult to get people together face to face, but also very difficult for discussions to take place remotely, it had been decided to adopt a “drafting team” approach, an idea which had been borrowed from some other successful projects. Two drafting teams

had been proposed, one of which would look at changes, including editorial changes, which were technical rather than controversial in nature, and the volunteers to work with the Bureau on these matters came from the Netherlands and from Germany. The second drafting team had been set up to look at the more contentious issues, and the experts for this had come from the USA and the UK. Poland would also be invited to join this team shortly. The issues which were non-contentious which were considered by the first team included any non-editorial changes following a successful Committee Draft and a Preliminary Ballot; Mr. Mason felt that everyone agreed that only editorial changes should be allowed after a CIML final approval. The second area was the additional material that needed to be produced on the proper use of the OIML website's workspace during the development of publications, and Mr. Mason reminded delegates about the discussions that had taken place in Arcachon concerning Working Drafts. Lastly, the team had wanted to develop the suggestion from Poland for a sequential approach to approving new projects but which was accelerated. It had originally been suggested that Technical Committee and CIML approval would be done in parallel, so that is why Mr. Mason considered there was more work to do. Mr. Mason expressed the opinion that there was one elephant in the room in all these considerations, which was the vexed question of how far should the Committee apply B 6 when Basic Publications were being developed. He asserted that that would be extremely difficult to get agreement on this because he was aware that there was a wide range of very strongly held views on this issue, and work had not started on this question yet.

Mr. Mason confirmed that Drafting Team One had already met, had produced a revised text, and would continue working until it had a text which the Project Group could approve. Here, he reiterated that the drafting team approach was probably the right one for picking up the many minor changes that were editorial or non-controversial. With regard to Drafting Team Two, Mr. Mason reported that he had already produced the first draft of possible changes for the first two issues, and told delegates he would be circulating them shortly. The aim was to continue the work by correspondence until it was ready to be submitted to the full Project Group, recognizing that with these issues there may still be two alternatives, between which the Project Group would be asked to choose. Finally, he emphasized that the only way to ensure that the right number of people got into a room and discuss the issues was by planning well in advance, and therefore a full meeting was planned in March around the time of the Presidential Council meeting. Since a near-final text should be presented at that meeting, the draft revision of B 6 should be ready to be circulated well in advance of the CIML Meeting in 2017. Mr. Mason said he had presented an account of what had been completed, and what work remained to be done, and he asked for comments or questions before the resolution was passed on Friday.

Mr. Dixit asked what the objective had been in forming two drafting teams, and what had they achieved.

Mr. Mason explained that the objective of there being two groups was that this had been the best way of making the use of a limited number of experts who were familiar enough with the process of drafting complex Recommendations that they understood how to use B 6, and where the problems were. Generally when seeking such experts, it was necessary to consider the large and active TC/SC secretariats which were held by the USA, the UK, the Netherlands and Germany. In terms of activity, it would also include Japan and Australia (amongst others), but these countries may have difficulty in attending a Drafting Team meeting. That had been the reason for the membership decisions, and even among this group of experts, Mr. Mason commented that, to make the most of their contributions, it was more efficient to create two groups, rather than to get a single group to meet.

Mr. Dixit checked he had understood correctly that the two teams would report to the Project Group and that the Project Group would accept their reports.

Mr. Mason confirmed Mr. Dixit had understood the process correctly but underlined that he would expect the Project Group, which included a number of CIML Members, to review all the work of the Drafting Teams in detail, line by line, over a two-day period. The Project Group had invited participation, but had not encouraged a large number of people to sign up as members, since the work was difficult and sometimes very tedious. As to what had been achieved, Drafting Team One had had a first run-through of all of the changes they had been asked to look at. Drafting Team Two had found it difficult to have face-to-face meetings, but by narrowing down the issues to be considered to a small number and moving everything else to Drafting Team One, the smaller number of issues could

considered by correspondence. The meeting in March would also give the Project Group another opportunity to discuss how B 6 is applied to Basic Publications.

Mr. Dixit expressed concerns that the work of the two Drafting Teams was not united, and wondered how the Project Group would compile its final document.

Mr. Mason indicated that they were united by the convener who was overseeing the work of both Drafting Teams. He repeated that the convener was himself.

Mr. Dixit remained concerned that the Drafting Teams were separate.

Mr. Mason again reassured him that the Drafting Teams were united by the convener and offered to discuss the project with Mr. Dixit after this session if he still wanted further information.

Mr. Dixit thanked Mr. Mason for his offer.

8.2 OIML-CS (Certification System) Project Group

Dr. Schwartz said he would give a comprehensive report on the activities of the OIML Certification System Project Group (CSPG). He observed that a lot of activity had taken place, and that a lot of documents had been produced, the larger part with the support of Mr. Paul Dixon, so it had been decided that he would share this report with Mr. Dixon. Dr. Schwartz referred delegates to the documents submitted under Addendum 8.1, plus some Additional Meeting Documents, and to the approval of the Framework Document to be found in Addendum 8.2.2, which had been replaced by Additional Meeting Document AMD03. Dr. Schwartz reminded delegates of Resolution 2015/17, which had been passed the previous year in Arcachon, in which the Committee had approved the principles for a single OIML Certification System, and the proposal for the structure and organization of such a system contained in certain documents. This had been the principle, and the next Resolution, 2015/18, had stated what would be expected of the CSPG. This was to prepare the relevant documents and to take the appropriate actions with the aim that the proposed OIML Certification System would become effective by 1 January 2017. The CSPG had been requested to submit the Final Draft of the Framework Document for approval at the current CIML meeting. The membership of the CSPG had been open to interested CIML Members or their expert representatives, and following a letter which had been sent out the previous September, 13 countries had expressed an interest in participating in the CSPG as P-members, with Sierra Leone wishing to be an O-member, and with Dr. Schwartz acting as the convener. Here, Dr. Schwartz wanted to draw attention to the fact that Mr. Kool had originally provided the secretarial support for the CSPG, and that he and the rest of the PG missed Mr. Kool very much.

There had been three tasks:

- The first had been to prepare a Final Draft for a Basic publication containing the framework for the organization and structure of the single OIML Certification System replacing both the existing Basic Certificate System and the MAA. This was the draft Framework Document that delegates would be asked to vote on later.
- The second task had been to consider the nomination process for membership of the OIML-CS Management Committee. This had turned out to be superfluous because although at the beginning it had been thought that there would be a small Management Committee with no more than 12 or 13 members to keep it efficient, following discussions at the Presidential Council meeting it had been decided that membership of the Management Committee should be open, so there was no need for a nomination process.
- The third task of the CSPG had been to draft procedures and operational documents for the OIML-CS on the basis of existing procedures and documents, in particular B 3, B 10 and MAA01. CSPG decisions had been taken on a two-thirds voting rule.

With regard to the road map, Dr. Schwartz reported that the CSPG had soon realized that 1 January 2017 was an unrealistic target starting date, so the road map had been updated. If the Framework Document, B xx, was approved at the current meeting, the revised road map would foresee that in 2017 the provisional Management Committee would develop the operational and procedural documents for the OIML Certification System. The new starting point for the Certification System would be in 2018, which Dr. Schwartz still thought was a little ambitious, but realistic. If anyone was

interested, Dr. Schwartz told delegates he would be happy to show them more detailed information about the road map, but would skip it for the moment.

With regard to the CSPG's activities since the last CIML meeting, Dr. Schwartz reiterated they had been quite numerous. In February, an intermediate project draft had been developed, based on the working document that had been presented and approved at the last CIML meeting, and this had been circulated to the CSPG. In March, all the work of the CSPG and the draft Framework Document had been discussed at the Presidential Council meeting, and the road map had been updated. The Framework Document had been revised and circulated to the CSPG for comments and voting, and in April the CSPG had approved a new version which removed the original restriction on the size of the Management Committee because, as he had already explained, there was no longer a need for it. Also in April, a new framework draft B xx, based on the comments received by the CSPG, had been circulated to the CIML for a preliminary online ballot with a deadline in June. Soon after that, with Mr. Dixon's support, the comments had been summarized and the responses from the convener had been put together. In July, the Final Draft Basic Publication B xx had been circulated to the CIML, along with the working drafts of operational and procedural documents. Dr. Schwartz said that one important point was that there had been concern that the CIML would not be able to vote on the B xx Framework Document at the current meeting if it did not know enough about the contents of the Management Committee documents (which were now called operational and procedural documents). It had therefore become the major task of a smaller drafting team to produce at least draft documents that could be submitted to the CIML. This had been achieved, and Members had therefore received a complete package of documents that would be explained later. A further meeting had been held in August two months before the CIML meeting (since it had not been possible to have a meeting before circulating the Final Draft Basic Publication to the CIML) where B xx had been discussed together with the comments that had been received from the CIML. The operational and procedural documents had also been discussed and the decision had been taken to submit two additional meeting documents, AMD02 and AMD03, which contained a report of the meeting in Teddington and some concrete proposals. Dr. Schwartz also indicated that some amendments to the document that had been submitted to the CIML had also been agreed at this meeting.

Dr. Schwartz concluded with a short overview of the package of CSPG documents. The first package had been included in working document version 2 under Addendum 8.2.1 and then as he had explained two additional meeting documents were submitted later: AMD02 and AMD03 with a report and concrete proposals. Dr. Schwartz indicated that although he had talked about quite a lot of documents, which may appear confusing, he considered that only one document was important for the current meeting which was the Framework Document B xx. This had been available to the CIML as AMD03, and he would explain the differences between the version 2 and the version 1 which had originally been submitted. This was the document that had to be voted on. The other documentation had been provided to show what would be discussed by the provisional Management Committee the following year if the B xx document was approved.

Mr. Dixon told delegates that he had the pleasure of talking to them about the documents that had been produced for the Certification System and also to give them some additional information. He reiterated that, as Dr. Schwartz had indicated, a rather extensive list of documents had been produced. The first one had been the CSPG report giving information on what work had taken place, and, following the meeting in August, a supplementary report had been produced. There was also the updated project road map that Dr. Schwartz had mentioned, and then there was the summary of the online ballot and the comments and the convener's responses to these comments. These had resulted in a Final Draft Basic Publication which had been submitted to the CIML for a vote. Following the meeting in August, some amendments had been made, resulting in the Final Draft Basic Publication version 2, which had been put forward to the Committee for approval as AMD03.

Mr. Dixon went on to show delegates the structure of the documentation, which he hoped would clarify how that documentation would support the Framework Document. He stressed that the working drafts of the operational documents were *just* working drafts, they were not final versions, would not be submitted to CIML approval, and had been provided purely for information. There were also the drafts of the procedural documents. In addition, the CSPG had produced some cross reference tables to show how the requirements from the existing B 3, B 10 and MAA01 had been transposed into B xx

and the working drafts of the operational and procedural documents. A couple of draft resolutions had also been produced, which would be discussed under item 8.2.2, where Mr. Dixon hoped the Committee would move on to the approval of the Framework Document. Following the meeting that had been held in Teddington in August, some amended draft resolutions had been produced which could be found in AMD03. Mr. Dixon referred delegates to the document structure he had mentioned, and to the list of all of the information and documents that Dr. Schwartz had shown them. He showed delegates the Framework Document, which he underlined was the document currently being put forward for approval, and which was supported by three operational documents: one for the Management Committee, one for the Advisory Panel, and one for the test laboratories forum. He emphasized that the operational documents were meant to be the rules of procedure for these elements of the Certification System, and these were underpinned by a set of procedural documents, which would cover the detailed mechanisms for appeals, for accepting new issuing authorities, for issuing certificates, accepting certificates, and for signing the declaration and so on. Underpinning the procedural documents would also be a set of templates and forms. This was because one of the concerns raised about the current system had been the lack of information. For example, how could Member States who had wished to become a new issuing participant, or wished to extend their scope go through that process, whereas in the new system, all of that information would be clearly available for users of the system. Mr. Dixon showed delegates a diagram with which he said they should be familiar, as they had seen it in the working documents put forward at last year's CIML meeting. He said that the OIML Certification System and the documentation that he had just explained, covered the area within the red box in the diagram which included the Board of Appeal, the Management Committee with its Chairperson supported by an Executive Secretary, an Advisory Panel again supported by the Executive Secretary, and a Test Laboratories' Forum.

Mr. Dixon drew delegates' attention to the working draft of the framework that had been put forward at last year's CIML meeting for discussion, and said that he would now explain the differences between that and the version of the Final Draft publication that had been put before Members at this CIML meeting.

With regard to the Management Committee, the original view had been that its membership should be quite small, and therefore there would have needed to be a nomination procedure to select members of the Management Committee. Based on the comments received, it had finally been considered that it would be better not to restrict the membership of the Management Committee, so now it had been opened to all OIML Member States that had (or will have) at least one Issuing Authority or Utilizer in their country. However, he emphasized that each Member State would only have one vote. Corresponding Members that had at least one Associate in their country would also be able to participate as observers. In addition, there had been a desire to include the Chairpersons of the Advisory Panel and the Test Laboratories' Forum as well as the secretariats of the relevant OIML TCs and SCs. Mr. Dixon explained this by saying that if certain categories of measuring instruments were being included in the Certification System, then it was very important that the secretariats of the relevant TCs and SCs were involved in the Management Committee and had an input into that work. It would also be desirable that users of the system (representatives from liaison organizations, for example CECIP and CECOD in Europe, or other manufacturers' associations) be able to attend the Management Committee as observers. It had been decided that delegations at the Management Committee could consist of up to three people from each Member State and Corresponding Member participating the OIML-CS. It had been anticipated that each delegation would have a head, who would then have the vote for that particular country. He drew attention to fact that membership of the Management Committee has been opened up quite wide to address concerns that had been raised about it being almost a "closed shop" with a fairly small membership.

Mr. Dixon told delegates that as a result of some of the feedback received from the preliminary online ballot, voting rules for decisions taken during a Management Committee meeting had now been included in the Framework Document. An effort had been made to be consistent with the current system in B 10, so approval, re-approval or suspension of an Issuing Authority or test laboratory would require the support of at least 80 % of the Management Committee members from OIML Member States, and for all other proposals at meetings, 50 % or more of members were required to vote in support. This rule, taken from B 6, had been followed in order to be consistent with the voting

rules that Members would find elsewhere. For decisions taken outside meetings regarding approval, re-approval or suspension of issuing authorities and laboratories, requires the support of at least 80 % of the MC Members from OIML Member States. Mr. Dixon confirmed that the CSPG had wished to take a consistent approach to this, so they did not want it to be easier to be approved or suspended outside of a meeting than at a meeting. For all other proposals, there was a requirement for two thirds of the Management Committee members to vote in favor of a proposal, and this again had been taken from B 6. Abstentions would not be considered as votes cast.

One item that had been included in the Final Draft Basic Publication was that “a failure to reply shall be considered as a positive vote”. This had been seen as being contentious, but there had been a good reason for including it because under the current system, the problem encountered in the acceptance of new participants into the MAA had been a lack of response to requests for voting. During CSPG discussions, it had been considered that there was an opportunity to address that, and that was why this requirement had been added. However, at the CSPG meeting which had been held in August, it had been considered that this requirement was a step too far and could jeopardize the approval of the Final Draft Basic Publication, so this requirement had now been deleted in version 2 which was submitted for voting.

With regard to the Advisory Panel, Mr. Dixon reported that the original thoughts were that the Executive Secretary could act as the chair of the Advisory Panel and also the Test Laboratories Forum. The feedback that had been received had raised concerns about this composition. It had been considered that this was potentially putting too much power and decision-making into the hands of one person so a change had been made, and now there would be a chairperson for the Advisory Panel, who would be nominated from amongst the membership to separate this position from the role of the Executive Secretary. The Executive Secretary would be there to provide secretarial support to the work of the Advisory Panel, and the same composition had been adopted for the Test Laboratories Forum. With regard to the Board of Appeal, the original idea had been that this would be formed as and when it was required so it would not have been a standing committee, but again following the feedback, this had been changed so that now there was a standing Board of Appeal which would have a chairperson and four members appointed by the CIML. It would have the task of managing appeals against decisions of the Management Committee, and also recommending solutions to any other disputes regarding the operation of the OIML Certification System.

Mr. Dixon also commented that a number of important amendments had been made to version 2. Regarding the operation of the proposed Certification System, it had now been proposed that all categories of measuring instruments would be automatically included into the Certification System as long as the applicable OIML Recommendations specified the metrological and technical requirements, the test procedures and the OIML Test Report Format (i.e. what was currently referred to as Parts one, two, and three of a Recommendation). They would initially be placed in what was called “Scheme B”, which was the equivalent of the current Basic Certificate System. Two years after being included in the Certification System, that category of measuring instrument would automatically transition to “Scheme A”, which was the equivalent of the current MAA system, although in exceptional circumstances the Management Committee may propose to the CIML that there should be a longer or shorter transition period. For example, if there were to be a new category of measuring instrument, covered by a new Recommendation, it would come into the System in Scheme B. However, if there were not enough experts available to participate in the necessary peer assessments or accreditation assessments, then it may be possible that the automatic two-year transition would need to be delayed for a period of time so that suitable experts could be identified. Alternatively, in the case where there was already an existing OIML Recommendation in the Certification System and that Recommendation was revised, then the category of instrument would remain in the same scheme, either A or B, but the Issuing Authorities under that scheme would have to provide evidence of their competence to test and certify against the new requirements in the revised Recommendation. Mr. Dixon pointed out that some of the comments that had been received questioned what would happen to existing Basic and MAA Certificates when the new Certification System was put in place. He underlined that they would remain valid, and utilizers would be able to establish conditions for the acceptance of existing MAA Certificates or they could continue to accept them on a voluntary basis as they currently do.

Mr. Dixon went on to give delegates an overview of the agreements that had been produced following the CSPG meeting held in Teddington in August. The meeting had resulted in Additional Meeting Document AMD02, and the executive summary that had been circulated with it. One point of discussion had been the original wording in Addendum 8.2.1, where it had said that “the CSPG recommends that the CIML accepts the Final Draft Basic Publication ...”, and it had been suggested that it would be more appropriate for this to read “the CSPG chair recommends ...”. Mr. Dixon thought this was as a result of there not having been a CSPG meeting before the documents had been circulated. Mr. Dixon reported that an amended version (version 2) of the Final Draft Basic Publication had now been produced, which could be found in Additional Meeting Document AMD03, and which he underlined had now been submitted to the Committee for approval. Mr. Dixon indicated that the proposed changes in version 2 were editorial, except for the important change that the line stating that *failing to vote would be considered a positive vote* had been deleted. The CSPG had recommended that if the Final Draft Basic Publication was approved now, but further changes or improvements were considered necessary to it in the future, then these should be considered by the proposed provisional Management Committee, and then submitted to the CIML the following year, as a revision of B xx. Mr. Dixon emphasized that if the Framework was approved now it was not fixed, and there would be the opportunity to review and amend it to develop the system further as the document began to be used. The CSPG had also considered the original draft resolutions that had been produced, and had agreed that some amended draft resolutions should be supplied. Most notably, these included the requirement to set up a provisional Management Committee, which, if approval was given to the Framework, would be able to proceed with the work of getting the system into place ready for the proposed date of 1 January 2018. The CSPG had also discussed the operational and procedural documents which had been produced. These were the working drafts, which Mr. Dixon described as a useful basis for further work by the provisional Management Committee. Since the document pack had been circulated, additional work had already taken place to improve and refine the working drafts, and Mr. Dixon assured Members that if they had any comments or feedback, these would be taken on board by the provisional Management Committee and by himself, when finalizing the documents.

The CSPG had also decided that one of the responsibilities of the Management Committee was to approve the operational and procedural documents, as well as any changes required to them. Mr. Dixon insisted that this responsibility had been considered a core element in the work of the Management Committee, and not only would any changes be fully considered by its members, but also any changes that were made to the documents could be vetoed by the CIML as part of the annual reporting process that was being proposed, and thus the CIML would be able to oversee the work of the Management Committee. Where any changes to an operational or procedural document were seen as being contentious, or would represent a significant change in policy, the Management Committee would consult the CIML prior to making the change. He concluded that this would also give the CIML the opportunity to oversee, and to have an input into the work that the Management Committee was undertaking. Mr. Dixon thanked delegates for their attention, and said Dr. Schwartz would continue the presentation.

Dr. Schwartz indicated that the proposals that had been put forward to the current CIML meeting could be found in Addendum 8.2.1. The first proposal was just a report in accordance with CIML Resolution 2015/18 and the updated project road map; the Final Draft Framework document version 2 was submitted for CIML approval under the next agenda item. In accordance with CIML resolution 2015/18 and the updated project road map, it had also been proposed that the Certification System Project Group be disbanded, and that a provisional Management Committee be formed to consider, modify if necessary, and approve the operational and procedural documents as well as the associated template forms and guidance documents. Proposal number three was that in order that the provisional Management Committee could be formed, CIML Members were requested to indicate their interest in participating in the Certification System as Issuing Authorities, or Utilizers, and Corresponding Member representatives were requested to indicate their interest in participating in the Certification System as Associates, and if so, to designate members for the provisional Management Committee. The last proposal was that the new System should be implemented by 1 January 2018 rather than the original target date of 1 January 2017, which would allow sufficient time to complete the preparation work on the operational and procedural documents. As chair of the CSPG, Dr. Schwartz recommended

that the CIML approved the Final Draft Basic publication B xx (the Framework Document) and there were some references to the respective documents submitted. He also recommended to the CIML that the CSPG be disbanded and that a provisional Management Committee be established, and that the CIML instructed the provisional Management Committee to take appropriate action so that the new System could become effective by 1 January 2018. Dr. Schwartz did not consider it necessary to talk about the draft resolutions, because they had been put before Members, and would be discussed later.

Dr. Schwartz concluded that the former ad hoc working group, as well as the still existing CSPG, with the support of the BIML, had put a great deal of effort into the development of the detailed concept and the draft documents for the new Certification System, based on the mandate given by the CIML in the two previous years. As chair of the CSPG, he wanted to thank all members of the group, and especially Paul Dixon, for their support. The new OIML Certification System could be considered the next important step following on from the launch of the OIML Basic Certificate System in 1991, and the MAA in 2005. Due to the extremely detailed work undertaken in preparing the Framework Document B xx, and the draft operational and procedural documents, Dr. Schwartz was convinced that the new Certification System had the potential to be “future proof” for at least the next ten years, and he showed delegates a graph of its possible development. Following the Basic Certificate System in 1991, Basic Certificates and test reports had been issued for 18 measuring instrument categories. These Basic Certificates had been “unqualified”, meaning that there had been no requirement on the Issuing Authority to prove their competence. The next important step had been the development of the MAA 14 years later, which had resulted in “qualified” MAA Certificates and test reports being issued for three measuring instrument categories, which were R 76 (non-automatic weighing instruments), R 60 (load cells), and R 49 (water meters). Based on his experience, he considered that the new OIML Certification System would enable qualified certificates and test reports to be produced for more than three categories of measuring instrument, and although it would take time, hopefully at least 18 categories. He concluded by appealing to Members to support the new Certification System by voting “yes” to the Framework Document, and emphasized that if the Certification System was to start in January 2018, it would need to be promoted, and training would have to take place in order for it to be globally accepted. This would not only be an important task for the Management Committee, but also for CIML Members themselves. Finally, he underlined that it was in the interests of reducing technical barriers to trade to ensure that the system was accepted and effective worldwide. He thanked Members for their attention, and asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Mason thanked Dr. Schwartz and Mr. Dixon for their comprehensive report. He considered that an enormous amount of work had gone into developing the framework, but that this was as it should be, since this was possibly the most important decision that the Committee would have to take during this meeting. He said it was desirable that a decision should be taken that could be reported to the Conference. It had already been decided that such a decision was within the competence of the Committee, and so although the Conference was not being asked to approve the Certification System, it had a right to know if such a significant change was being made to the way the OIML operated. Mr. Mason also wanted to remind Members of the Committee that it had taken the decision last year to do this in principle, and he urged them not to go back on this decision, and on the broad shape of the scheme.

He said that he wanted to invite three types of comments from Members. The first thing that Members should be asking was whether, in the light of last year’s decision and what they had heard, the Final Draft Basic Publication itself and its supporting documents were broadly what they were expecting. He suggested that Members should ask themselves whether they were happy with the thrust of what had been proposed, and emphasized that if they had fundamental concerns about the direction that was being taken, then those concerns should be voiced now. The second question that should be asked by the Committee was whether the dividing line between what was in the Final Draft Basic Publication and its supporting documentation had been drawn in the right place, because the Committee was taking a position where the content of the Basic Publication would be a CIML decision, but the content of the supporting documentation would be, at least initially, a Management Committee decision. There would be the opportunity for the CIML to object to, and ultimately veto, the Management Committee decisions, because the CIML would expect a report on the changes to the documentation to be given to it. Here, he highlighted that provision had been made in the Framework

Document itself stating that the CIML would be consulted on anything which was of a controversial nature. He underlined that the distinction between what the CIML would do, and what the Management Committee would do, was the second issue to discuss. The third area was the detailed content of the Framework Document, which needed to be approved by the Committee. Mr. Mason reminded delegates that, although they would be approving it now to form the basis of what the provisional Management Committee would do, there would be the opportunity to reconsider the Framework Document in a year's time before the intended start date of 1 January 2018. Mr. Mason asked Members to bear in mind these three points.

Mr. Dixit congratulated everyone involved in the production of the Framework Document, which he anticipated would be approved. Following on from this, the Basic Certificate System would be stopped, but before that he had understood from Dr. Schwartz that the CSPG would be dissolved immediately. Mr. Dixit suggested that the CSPG should not be dissolved immediately, but rather it should remain active for five years. Two years would be required for the closure of the Basic Certificate System, and after that it would be needed to monitor the new system, so that if any changes in the documentation were needed, it could review this and make appropriate recommendations to the CIML. He also considered that a statement should be made in the Framework Document that the commercial activities of manufacturers whose business was in developing countries should not be burdened by this framework. He was concerned that the Framework Document should not give certain manufacturers a monopoly throughout the world; small businesses would not be able to compete in other countries, and their interests should be taken into account. Mr. Dixit also commented that the Basic Certificate System had been running for approximately 15 years. He judged that a lot of the manufacturers had not signed up to the Certificate System voluntarily, but because they had had to conform to the system. Mr. Dixit suggested that their certificates should not be invalidated, but that they should be given a time frame, for example five years, within which their certification must be converted to an OIML-CS certificate. He was concerned that no one should be disadvantaged by this new document and a clause should be added to the document to this effect.

Dr. Schwartz said he had understood that Mr. Dixit did not want the CSPG be disbanded immediately. The terms of reference that had been given to the CSPG had been to develop the Framework Document B xx and to draft the operational and procedural documents. As he had indicated in his report to the CIML, this work had been completed. He reiterated that the recommendation of the CSPG was that the remaining work to finalize the operational and procedural documents should be given to the provisional Management Committee. He indicated that there had been a similar experience at the start of the MAA system where a provisional Committee on Participation Review (CPR) had been established, which had been responsible for finalizing all the documents with the final CPR starting the work. He indicated that it could be seen simply as a change of name, but it was more than that since with the provisional Management Committee all CIML Members, Corresponding Members and liaison organizations such as CECIP and CECOD would be given the opportunity to join the group and participate in the work.

Mr. Dixit expressed concern over who would be observing and overseeing the work carried out by the provisional Management Committee, since they would be submitting the final document that may require to be amended in future years. If the provisional Management Committee was using its authority, he wondered who might make corrections to the documents it produced.

Mr. Mason interjected that if he understood correctly, one of Mr. Dixit's concerns was that the provisional Management Committee would have an interest in the new system and would be very much identified with the new system, and that if there were transitional issues, particularly related to the old system, it may be that the provisional Management Committee was not the ideal body to do that work. Mr. Mason indicated that he was not sure that the CSPG would be the ideal body to carry out that work either, because apart from anything else there would be a high level of cross-membership. So in answer to the question of who would exercise the oversight, Mr. Mason judged it would be the Presidential Council. He considered that it was the role of the President and Vice-Presidents, supported by a number of CIML Members on the Council to take a wider view of what was happening across the whole organization, and he said he was happy for it to be recorded in the minutes that one of the roles of the Presidential Council was to continue that oversight. Mr. Mason hoped that would give Mr. Dixit the assurance he sought.

Mr. Dixit was grateful that Mr. Mason took care of the interests of all Members, but he remained unconvinced that the CSPG should be dissolved because other work may arise as a result of implementing the Framework Document, which could lead to difficulties, and he repeated his concern that until the Framework Document was fully implemented, the CSPG should remain in place. He added that, particularly if it was anticipated that in the future more than three instrument categories were to be covered, the CSPG would still have a lot of work to do.

Mr. Mason repeated that he could not say to the Committee that the people who were on the CSPG would be the best people to do the job that Mr. Dixit was expecting, as the active people in the CSPG would probably find their attentions directed at the provisional Management Committee. Mr. Mason understood Mr. Dixit's concerns but thought the solution proposed by Mr. Dixit may result in a large number of overlapping groups. Mr. Mason reiterated that the Committee had heard Mr. Dixit's concerns and the Presidential Council understood the need to oversee the transition from the old system to the new one. This included the question about continuing the status of existing certificates, to which Dr. Schwartz had not yet had a chance to respond, but which had been covered in his presentation. Mr. Mason therefore requested that other Members of the Committee should now be heard from, as there was a limited amount of time in which to complete the business before the meeting had to close and preparations for the Conference were started.

Mr. Bjorkqvist (Sweden) said he had a question about the borderline between the responsibilities of the CIML and those of the provisional Management Committee. He said delegates had been told about the CIML veto that could be exerted if they did not approve of the decisions that the provisional Management Committee was making. He had found one reference in clause 9 of the Framework Document where the responsibilities of the CIML were mentioned with regard to the OIML Certification System. Sub-clauses 9 c) and 9 d) stated that the CIML needed to approve the revision and certain other proposals, but CIML approval seemed to be limited to those issues, and he wondered where he could find reference to the CIML veto to go against proposals from the provisional Management Committee.

Dr. Schwartz replied that in the Framework Document it stated that the chair of the provisional Management Committee must make an annual report to the CIML, and the Framework Document even listed all the points which must be included in the report, so as to ensure that all the important items were mentioned at every CIML meeting. He said that in this way, the CIML would be kept informed about everything going on in the system, and although the Framework Document did not explicitly mention the possibility of a veto, it implied that this would be possible if the CIML disliked anything in the report.

Mr. Mason added that the reason for taking this approach was so that the members of the provisional Management Committee were clear that they operated under the oversight of the CIML. The CIML was delegating to them, and was accepting that they would make various decisions and, although he did not think it was necessary to put it in the Framework Document, two points were being stipulated by the CIML:

- the first was that there was an expectation that the Management Committee would consult on anything which it thought was contentious, and here he highlighted that this was one of the roles of its chairperson, who would be appointed by the CIML;
- the second was that it was clear that the CIML had the ultimate authority. The Framework Document represented what had needed to be put in writing, but on top of that Mr. Mason hoped there was a clear understanding that if the CIML was not happy with some of the things that the Management Committee had done, then it would be possible for the CIML to say “change what you are doing because what you have done is not an acceptable way of exercising the delegations the CIML has given you”.

Mr. O'Brien (New Zealand) commended the CSPG on such a comprehensive framework, and on the huge amount of work that had gone into the documents that had been placed before the Committee at this meeting. New Zealand would potentially be a utilizing participant, and the robust framework would give them confidence in the governance arrangements to be put in place, and he commented that he supported the document. He wanted to know whether the CSPG had received any formal or informal feedback from manufacturers, and if they were supportive of this change.

Mr. Mason asked if at least one of the manufacturers' representatives present would like to comment.

Mr. Nater (CECIP) said he was happy with the Framework Document, and was happy to have been part of the group. He said they had been involved in the development process and the extensive discussions, and although he had not agreed with the proposals all of the time, the final document was the best for manufacturers and customers, and he considered that they could move quickly forward with the work in the new system.

Mr. Mason said that they had not dealt with the question from Mr. Dixit as to whether there was a danger of monopoly in all of this. Mr. Mason said he did not think that there was, as the whole structure, like so much else in the certification market, was built on competition and the processes had been designed to serve as a level playing field between the various issuers and to give manufacturers the ability to look for the route that suited them in their particular circumstances.

Dr. Schwartz added that, regarding the danger of a monopoly, in Germany there were 50 to 60 weighing instrument manufacturers, and he had never heard any complaint about the MAA system when it had come into place in 2005. He also knew that there were hundreds of manufacturers in the European Weighing Instrument Manufacturers Association (CECIP), so it would be possible to ask CECIP whether they represented not only the big companies but also the small and medium sized ones, and whether they saw any danger of a monopoly in the new system.

Mr. Banholzer (CECIP) confirmed that there were differing views represented during the CECIP discussions, but the main concerns were that the old certificates should remain valid. It was important they did not have to revise the old certificates, and that the costs were on the same level as before, because the small companies had big problems with money, so they did not want to spend more money for certificates. CECIP tried to keep all its members informed, and Mr. Banholzer felt that they collectively agreed that the right course of action was being taken.

Mr. Dixit expressed the concern that members of appellate authorities and certifying authorities should not be mixed. If a country had an approved certifying authority, it should not be an appellate body.

Mr. Mason asked Dr. Schwartz to clarify how the appeals mechanism worked, and in particular how the situation would be dealt with where someone on the appeal board may be looking at a decision affecting his own country.

Dr. Schwartz stated that an appeals mechanism was described in the Framework Document and a Board of Appeal (BoA) would be formed.

Mr. Dixon continued that procedural document, PD01, covered the appeals mechanism, and that in the Framework Document it stated that the BoA would comprise a chairperson and four members who would be appointed by the CIML. In the procedural document itself, it would be made clear that anyone on the BoA could not be involved in an appeal against their own organization (for example their own Issuing Authority), so that would be built into the appeal procedure.

Mr. Dixit sought an assurance that it would be mandatory that certifying authority members should not be part of the appeals mechanism.

Dr. Schwartz clarified that the Framework Document was rather general, as it simply described the composition of the Board of Appeal which Mr. Dixon had just described, and also defined the tasks to be undertaken by the Board. The detailed procedures would be described in the procedural document, also as Mr. Dixon had just explained.

Mr. Mason added that he was under the impression that there had been some discussion as to whether the procedural documents on appeals should be approved by the CIML rather than by the Management Committee, but asked Dr. Schwartz to confirm this.

Dr. Schwartz asked that the Committee thought in sequential steps. He said that the details would be submitted to the CIML meeting in 2017, when there would be a chance for the CIML to veto the contents, but for the moment he wished to adhere to the rule that the operational and procedural documents would be approved by the provisional Management Committee and by the subsequent Management Committee. Although he would not make an exception to this rule now, he stressed that if this procedural document was considered of particular relevance, it would be given special consideration in the following year's report to the CIML, and the CIML would then be given the opportunity to change or veto it.

Mr. Mason pointed out that if the Committee were given the chance to look at the Framework Document again in twelve months' time, this was likely to be something which they would want to make sure would work.

Dr. Schwartz said he had just been informed by Mr. Dixon that the possibility that the procedural document relating to the Board of Appeal could be presented as an annex to the Framework Document had already been considered, so in 2017 the CIML would be given the opportunity to vote on this.

Mr. Mason expressed his relief that he had been correct.

Mr. Bjorkqvist had a question regarding points 16.10 and 16.11, where it stated that old certificates would remain valid, and he wanted to know how long they would be allowed to remain valid.

Dr. Schwartz replied that the first parts of 16.10 and 16.11 indicated that old certificates would remain valid but then went on to say that Utilizers, Associates and users may continue to accept, or not accept, these certificates or test reports on a voluntary basis. This meant that the intention of the new system was not to make a total cut, but to allow what had already been established to continue, so that as far as possible, Utilizers continued to accept the old MAA and Basic Certificates, but in their scopes they could define the exceptions to this general rule. In certain circumstances, a Utilizer or Associate could say that, for certain reasons defined in their scope, they did not accept old certificates for a particular Recommendation.

Mr. Mason remarked that he had a sense that there was strong support for the overall approach amongst delegates, and there would be another opportunity in 2017 to look at the precise details of the Framework Document, or indeed even earlier, so he thought it was now appropriate to move to a vote on the proposed resolutions. He thought it was important that the Committee be in a position to report to the Conference that this step had been taken.

Mr. Patoray interjected that because of the length of time since the previous vote, and the importance of this vote, there would need to be another roll call. Another country had been given a proxy since the last vote had taken place, which needed to be included in the records. He also suggested that delegates reviewed the resolutions now, as after the break they would be moving straight on to the technical discussions of approving Recommendations, etc. If the roll call was taken then, they would therefore be able to save some time.

Mr. Mason confirmed this was a good idea, and asked Mr. Dunmill to read the two parts of the Resolution. There being no comments, Mr. Mason invited him to take the roll call to verify that there was a quorum:

Albania not present, proxy given to Switzerland
Algeria present
Australia present
Austria present
Belarus present
Belgium present
Brazil not present, no proxy given
Bulgaria present
Cameroon not present, proxy given to Algeria
Canada present
Colombia present
Croatia present
Cuba present
Cyprus not present, proxy given to France
Czech Republic present
Denmark present
Egypt present

Finland..... present
France present
Germany present
Greece..... not present, proxy given to Portugal
Hungary not present, proxy given to Poland
India..... present
Indonesia present
Iran present
Ireland..... present
Israel not present, proxy given to New Zealand
Italy..... present
Japan..... present
Kazakhstan not present, proxy given to the Russian Federation
Kenya present
Korea present
Macedonia not present, no proxy given
Monaco..... not present, proxy given to France
Morocco not present, no proxy given
Netherlands..... present
New Zealand..... present
Norway present
China present
Pakistan not present, no proxy given
Poland..... present
Portugal present
Romania present
Russian Federation present
Saudi Arabia present
Serbia..... present
Slovakia present
Slovenia..... present
South Africa present
Spain..... present
Sri Lanka not present, no proxy given
Sweden present
Switzerland..... present
Tanzania present
Thailand..... present
Tunisia present
Turkey present
United Kingdom present
United States..... present
Viet Nam present
Zambia..... present

Mr. Patoray summarized the roll call. There were 61 Members, of which five were not present and had not given a proxy, which left 56 Members, so a quorum was achieved.

Mr. Mason remarked that this was a record attendance, which he considered reflected the importance of the decision the Committee was being asked to take. He said that the Committee had two Resolutions before it which had been discussed extensively, so unless there were any further comments, he proposed to proceed immediately to vote on them. The first was to approve the Final Draft Basic Publication, and had been read before the coffee break.

Mr. Dunmill pointed out that he had altered two line breaks in Resolution 16 and added an “s” in the text that he had read before. Austria abstained. No countries voted against the resolution so it was carried:

Resolution no. 2016/16

The Committee,

Recalling its Resolutions nos. 2015/17 and 2015/18,

Noting the report of the chair of the CSPG,

Approves the Final Draft Basic Publication OIML B xx *Framework for the OIML Certification System (OIML-CS)*, as amended,

Instructs the BIML to continue to operate the existing Basic and MAA systems until such time as the OIML-CS becomes operational,

Encourages all participants in the existing Basic and MAA systems to fulfill their obligations.

Mr. Dunmill drew delegates’ attention to the fact that the second Resolution, no. 17, was split over two slides due its length. Austria abstained. No countries voted against the resolution so it was carried:

Resolution no. 2016/17

(Agenda Item 8.2.2)

The Committee,

Recalling its Resolution no. 2016/16,

Thanks the chair and members of the CSPG for their work,

Disbands the CSPG,

Decides to establish a provisional Management Committee (prMC) with immediate effect,

Requests its first Vice-President to chair the prMC,

Requests interested CIML Members, representatives from OIML Corresponding Members and representatives from Liaison Organizations to participate in the prMC, or to designate expert representative(s),

Instructs the BIML to provide secretarial support to the prMC,

Confirms that the prMC has the authority to act as the Management Committee for the purposes of approving OIML-CS Operational Documents, Procedural Documents, Guidance Documents, Template and Forms,

Requests the prMC to identify potential improvements and amendment to OIML B xx *Framework for the OIML Certification System (OIML-CS)* for consideration at the 52nd CIML Meeting in 2017,

Instructs the prMC to take appropriate actions so that the OIML-CS may become effective 1 January 2018,

Requests the prMC to provide a report on its activities at the 52nd CIML Meeting in 2017, with a view to the OIML-CS becoming effective 1 January 2018.

Mr. Dunmill thanked delegates.

9 Technical activities

Mr. Mason reminded the Committee that they would be talking about three categories of issues:

- the first concerned Final Draft Publications, which the Committee should approve before the Conference, so that the Conference could sanction them. These would be given priority in terms of the discussions;
- the second concerned projects to be approved by the Committee. These did not need to be completed before the Conference, and would come second in terms of priority; and
- the third concerned items for information. If there was time, these would be completed during the course of the day but if this was not possible, they would be held over to Friday. This was because it was important that a short amount of time was spent preparing for the Conference, so the next agenda item (item 10) would also take priority over these information items.

9.1 Technical items for approval

Mr. Dunmill reminded delegates that these mostly involved publications to be approved, so the voting rules would be taken from B 6 and were based on the requirements in the Convention which stated that Recommendations and Documents were approved if at least 75 % of all CIML Members were present or represented; he commented that this number had been realized in the roll call just taken. At least 80 % of those present or represented must then cast a vote (and since none of the votes would be on paper, blank and null votes were irrelevant) but abstentions would not be counted as votes cast. Of the votes cast, at least 80 % must then be in favor.

9.1.1 Approval of Final Draft Publications

The first group of technical items for approval were the Final Draft Recommendations and Documents which had been through the preliminary CIML online ballot in the year since the last CIML meeting. Mr. Dunmill told delegates that in each case he would indicate the result of the online ballot, ask for comments, then ask for any abstentions and no votes to see whether the Final Draft Publication was approved. He pointed out there would be a resolution at the end of this section of the agenda which listed the Recommendations and Documents, and which delegates could review to be clear about which publications had been approved.

1) **New Recommendation *Protein measuring instruments for cereal grains and oil seeds***

The preliminary CIML online ballot had finished on 15 November 2015. There had been responses from 23 of the 60 CIML Members, 1 abstention, 2 no votes and 20 yes votes, so it had passed the preliminary online ballot. There were no comments on the Final Draft Recommendation. Sweden and Switzerland wished to abstain from this vote (the abstention from Switzerland was for itself only and did not include the proxy vote it held). No countries wished to cast a no vote. The Final Draft Recommendation was approved.

2) **Revision of R 59 *Moisture meters for cereal grains and oil seeds***

The preliminary CIML online ballot had finished on 15 July 2016. There had been responses from 28 of the 60 CIML Members, 3 abstentions, 2 no votes, and 23 yes votes. There were no comments on the Final Draft Recommendation. Sweden, Switzerland (not including the proxy it held), and the Netherlands wished to abstain. Australia wished to cast a no vote. The Final draft revision of R 59 was approved.

3) **New Recommendation *Standard black body radiator for the temperature range from –50 °C to 2500 °C***

The preliminary CIML online ballot had finished on 15 November 2015. There had been responses from 27 of the 60 CIML Members, 5 abstentions, 0 no votes and 22 yes votes. There were no comments on the Final Draft Recommendation. Australia, Sweden, Switzerland (not including the proxy it held), Finland, France and Monaco wished to abstain. No countries wished to cast a no vote. The Final draft Recommendation was approved.

4) **Revision of R 87 *Quantity of product in prepackages***

The preliminary CIML online ballot had finished on 23 September 2016. There had been responses from 37 of the 61 CIML Members (another member having joined the OIML), 1 abstention, 2 no votes and 34 yes votes.

Mr. Mason stated that delegates would note that the preliminary online ballot date that had been quoted was September 2016. The normal procedure was that the preliminary CIML online ballot finished at least three months prior to the CIML meeting, and that if the draft publication passed the preliminary ballot, the Final Draft Publication would be circulated three months in advance of the CIML meeting. That requirement had not been able to be satisfied in this case. This raised the question as to whether it was appropriate to take a vote on this Final Draft Publication, and he suggested that the Committee should be given an opportunity to decide whether it wished to vote. He proposed that this vote should be taken as a separate issue from the vote on the Final Draft Publication's actual approval. He remarked that this was an important issue, as he did not think the Committee should set aside the normal rules laid down in B 6 lightly. Equally, rules such as those in B 6 had been written by the Committee, and he felt that although it was up to the Committee to make the decision, there was nothing in principle which prevented the Committee from taking a different action from that prescribed in B 6. The Committee was in a different position to everyone else who had to comply with what was laid down in B 6. In terms of the case for taking an early decision, the fact was that R 87 was one of the most important Recommendations, as it was the cornerstone of the average system for pre-packages. The revision had been worked on over many years, and the convener from South Africa had struggled long and hard with the issues. Mr. Mason reported that he had only participated in one of their meetings, but he knew how hard they had worked on the subject. The document had been available for potential approval at the last CIML meeting, as it had passed the preliminary CIML online ballot, but there had been significant comments raised at that stage and during the CIML meeting. These comments had led to a meeting being held in Brazil in January, as well as further exchanges to clarify some concerns that certain Members, and the experts advising them, had had about the statistics. Mr. Mason remarked that most of those directly involved had been satisfied with the compromise resulting from these exchanges, and there had therefore been a second preliminary CIML online ballot, but the time that all of this had taken meant that the ballot had been late in the year. This was a Recommendation that had been in existence for a long time; it was an important one, and Mr. Mason considered that it was in the interests of the OIML's reputation that there was a modern version of R 87 rather than a dated version. Mr. Mason re-iterated that it was for this reason that the Committee should be given the opportunity to vote on the approval of this Final Draft Recommendation, but equally, he thought that on an issue as important as this, quite apart from the formal voting he would want to be happy that he was not ignoring the feelings of any Committee Members in taking this vote. He invited Members to comment on whether they wished to vote on this or whether there were any Members who would like to ask the Committee to postpone the decision for another year. Although a direct CIML online approval could be tried, Mr. Mason thought that the history of voting on this Recommendation meant that this would not be successful, so he considered that the choice was either to vote now, or to vote in twelve months' time. In the light of these comments, and stressing that at the moment he wanted the Committee to consider the principle of whether they should vote on the Final draft Recommendation, and not on its merits, he asked Members for comments.

Dr. Miki (Japan) observed that although Japan always asserted that the processes laid down in B 6 should be strictly adhered to, Japan had been heavily involved in the whole discussion on the revision of R 87, so he knew what the problems had been during these discussions. They had been mainly on mathematical subjects, so he supported the proposal to vote now.

Mr. Mason thanked Dr. Miki, and said that he should have mentioned that the Final draft Recommendation now placed before the Committee was substantially the same as the one that had been circulated in the preliminary CIML online ballot, and although there had been some editorial changes, they were not significant. Therefore the Committee was being asked to vote on something it had been able to study for more than three months.

Dr. Ehrlich (USA) commented that the USA found itself in a similar position to Japan, where normally it would want the procedures of B 6 to be followed, but in this instance, it had also been heavily involved and concurred with Dr. Miki's comments about the technical nature of the comments and discussions, and felt that under the circumstances it would be appropriate to proceed with the vote.

Mr. Mason stated that in the light of these two comments from Members who normally acted as his conscience, it was his intention to proceed to a vote unless any Member of the Committee spoke against that proposal. No members spoke against it, so Mr. Mason moved on to a vote on the substance of the Final Draft Recommendation.

Mr. Dunmill took the vote. Turkey wished to abstain. Australia and Austria wished to cast a no vote. The Final Draft Recommendation was approved.

Mr. Patoray thanked delegates for their support. He said that Mr. Kool had been heavily involved in this work, and when he had taken it over in January, he had found himself not adequate for the task. He therefore appreciated Mr. Marneweck's hard work, as well as that of what he thought had been called the "reconciliation group", the small group that had worked hard to produce the final draft.

Mr. Marneweck (South Africa) confirmed the group had been called the "statistical group". He seconded Mr. Patoray's motion: Japan, Switzerland and the USA's resolve had helped tremendously.

Mr. Dunmill asked delegates to approve the resolution listing the Recommendations that had been approved.

Mr. Mason questioned whether this was appropriate, considering that each had had a different result.

Mr. Dunmill commented that each of the results would be recorded separately, but there was a single resolution indicating which Recommendations had been approved by the Committee. He clarified that this concerned the four publications that had just been discussed. There were no objections to the wording of the resolution. There were no abstentions and there were no votes against.

The Resolution was unanimously passed:

Resolution no. 2016/18

(Agenda Item 9.1.1)

The Committee,

Approves the following Final Draft Publications:

- New Recommendation
Protein measuring instruments for cereal grains and oilseeds
- Revision of R 59
Moisture meters for cereal grains and oilseeds
- New Recommendation
Standard blackbody radiator for the temperature range from $-50\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ to $2500\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$
- Revision of R 87
Quantity of product in prepackages

Mr. Dunmill indicated that this completed the section on the approval of publications, and the Committee would now be asked to approve new projects.

9.1.2 Approval of new projects

Mr. Dunmill stated that for each of the proposed projects, Committee Members had a document which had been made available as an Addendum to the working document, so he would run through each project proposal briefly. If there was any need to discuss any of the items, then Members could look at the Addendum to the working document, but Mr. Dunmill remarked that he would not do so systematically since these Addenda had been available to Members for the last three months. He felt that some of the project proposals may need a little more explanation, and he would be asking the person who had proposed them to give that explanation. Otherwise, he would just pass through them, taking a vote on each.

9.1.2.1 Amendment to the terms of reference of an existing project in TC 1

The first proposal was for an amendment to the terms of reference of an existing project in TC 1 to allow for the *Setting up and maintenance of a bilingual electronic vocabulary*, which had been proposed by Poland who had the convenership for this project. Mr. Dunmill asked whether there were any comments on the proposal made in Addendum 9.1.2.1.

Mr. Golubev (Russia) commented that Russia supported this project, but since Russian translations of these vocabularies existed, he thought it might be useful to state this at the outset.

Mr. Dunmill replied that the term “bilingual” had been used because French was the official language of the organization and English was its working language. The alternative would be that it was a multi-lingual electronic vocabulary to allow for the possibility of other languages. Generally other languages were not used in official OIML publications because the Bureau cannot control what was written in them. He asked if there were any other comments.

Mr. Mason wondered whether this was something that the Project Group could be asked to consider. He underlined that the fact that there was already a Russian version was something which should be taken into account. The fact that other language versions may be proposed, or may be in existence, should also be taken into account, so if the terms of reference of the Project Group gave them the opportunity to study this issue and make proposals, then Members would have the benefit of their expertise, and this would avoid a solution being proposed before the project was started. Mr. Mason enquired whether this was acceptable.

Mr. Golubev indicated this was acceptable.

Mr. Mason confirmed that the necessary changes would be made to the resolution.

Dr. Ehrlich supported the proposal, but suggested that the convener should consider whether it was appropriate to have a paper or PDF version of G 18, or whether it should just be turned into a database.

Mr. Dunmill concluded that the resolution may need to be amended in the light of the comments from Russia as well as the USA.

Mr. Mason judged that this was a resolution that should be taken away, redrafted, and brought back at the end of the meeting on Friday as it was not something that needed to be decided before the Conference. He commented that there was another issue that had not been mentioned in the discussions yet: there had been a suggestion in the documentation that the terms of reference for the review of B 6 should be amended to allow the Project Group to examine some proposals that were likely to come out of this work. Mr. Mason thought that there was a proposal for a vocabulary or a definition group but he asked one of his colleagues to give delegates more information, and to indicate how far this had got, as he could not remember the precise details.

Mr. Dunmill responded that it was not listed as a project to be approved at the moment.

Mr. Mason said that as far as he recalled, the documentation raised the question of whether B 6 should also be amended so that there would be a more formal process to consider the vocabulary and definition implications of the work during the course of drafting a Recommendation. This would require an amendment to the terms of reference for the Project Group revising B 6, because so far the

review had strictly adhered to the particular areas identified in the resolution passed in 2015, and this proposal did not fall into any of the categories covered by that resolution. Mr. Mason suggested that the Committee should therefore be asked to comment on the desirability of extending the B 6 review. He observed that a resolution would have to be prepared on this issue, but concluded that he would like to receive views from the Committee on whether they had objections to the B 6 project being extended in such a way.

Dr. Ehrlich asked Poland to clarify item 9 in the project proposal, where it stated that the provisions of clause 6 of OIML B 6 on the development of publications were not applicable. Dr. Ehrlich wondered whether a lack of understanding about this clause may be causing this question.

Mr. Borzyminski (Poland) replied that the proposal for the amendment of the terms of reference would comprise two steps. The first one was that G 18 would be updated. The other was a logical consequence of the existing terms of reference, since the proposal was that OIML Project Groups should submit new or revised terms and definitions for validation by the Terminology Validation Team (TVT), which was the Project Group of TC 1/p 3. Without this, there would be no obligation for any Project Group revising or drafting an OIML Recommendation or OIML Document to send their publications to the TVT, nor to react to a request from that team.

Mr. Mason drew delegates' attention to paragraph 4.2 on the final page of the report in the working document, where it had been proposed that a reference to the terminology validation team should be included in B 6. He indicated that this was what he had been referring to, and what was being discussed currently. Mr. Mason highlighted that the question before the Committee was one of timing. He asked whether the Committee wanted to accelerate consideration of the proposal for a terminology validation team to be referred to in B 6, so that it was part of the current workload, or did they want the current project to continue, with the recognition that it may result in the conclusion that B 6 would need to be amended sometime in the future when the project was over. At the time these two options had been documented, it had not been possible to choose between them, but he stressed that this was what the Committee was debating at present.

Dr. Issaev (Russian Federation) observed that he knew that the convener, Dr. Borzyminski, spoke good Russian, but indicated that he would be willing to support and help him prepare the Russian version in time for it to be included in the first draft. Russian versions of the VIM 3 and the VIML already existed.

Mr. Mason replied that this comment confirmed the need to reflect this in the resolution. With regard to the timing issue, Mr. Mason appealed to the secretariat of TC 1 to advise the Committee when he judged would be the best time for a B 6 amendment to be considered.

Dr. Borzyminski thought that from the viewpoint of the efficiency of the project realization, it would be good to decide whether Project Groups should submit their revised terms, etc. to the TVT. Otherwise, as he had already said, they were not obliged to cooperate with the TVT. However, if time was pressing and was an obstacle, then it could be considered later and simply the first proposal of the change of the terms of reference could be agreed on now. He concluded that sooner or later the Committee would have to return to the proposal that Project Groups are requested or obliged to send their Committee drafts to the TVT.

Mr. Mason agreed that this was a clear recommendation, but he would particularly like to hear comments from members of the B 6 Project Group because the consequence of this decision would be that there would be another item to be considered at the March 2017 meeting. He thought it was definitely a Drafting Team 2 issue, and that the Committee would also have to consider the implications carefully, as well as where it fitted into the rest of the B 6 machinery. He asked for comments, and in particular comments from members that were on Project Groups, and who would have to do the additional work.

Dr. Schwartz confirmed that he understood the intention and the aim of this proposal. He observed that he had some experience with opening terms of reference of a project team and he was concerned that there was not enough time to start the second step. He did not want the project team for the revision of B 6 to take on this additional work at the moment but considered that it might be implemented later.

Mr. Marneweck commented that he supported what Dr. Schwartz had said and considered that it might be better to implement the proposal in two steps. Looking at the project submission, it seemed that

there would be a terminology validation team that would look at the terminology that was used in OIML publications. Firstly it would look at the existing terminology used in the VIM and in the VIML, and this would then be extended to all the Recommendations issued by the OIML. Finally any new Recommendations and Final Draft Recommendations would have to be circulated to the team. That would mean that the terminology validation team would be a body that would check all the Recommendations, and he considered that it was the role of the BIML to check Recommendations against the VIM and the VIML. He stressed that this meant every document would have to go to the BIML to be checked for compliance, and then go to the terminology and validation team, which he considered would be a duplication of the work. He emphasized that he would rather see the group finish the electronic bilingual or trilingual vocabulary which all Technical Committees could then use in developing their documents.

Dr. Borzyminski asserted that this was not an accurate description, and explained that the terminology validation team was the title of the TC 1/p 3 Project Group. Its terms of reference required it to work on behalf of the BIML to survey the terminology sections of Documents or Recommendations under revision or being drafted. He insisted that it did not duplicate the work, but supported each Project Group in applying the terminology approved by the OIML. The terminology validation group was asking for a change in its terms of reference and in its role because it did not seem a good idea for them to have to approach each Project Group and require them to send their drafts to be validated. Rather, it should be the wish of each Project Group for this to happen, or it should be accepted by the CIML that Project Groups should send their texts for validation of the terminology. With regard to building an electronic vocabulary, he said this already existed. There were already two documents on the OIML website which were accessible from one location, and these were the VIM (version 2012) and VIML (version 2013). He considered that these should be validated immediately.

Dr. Ehrlich supported what Dr. Schwartz had said. He thought it would be better to delay implementing this into the current B 6 revision process. He felt that the TC 1/p 3 Project Group should go ahead with updating G 18, which he anticipated would take longer than the time frame foreseen for the revision of B 6.

Mrs. Lagauterie shared the same opinion as Germany and the USA. She did not think the work on B 6 should be delayed.

Mr. Mason concluded that there had been a consistent message in the comments the Committee had received from those who would have to do the work on B 6. He summarized that the Committee was being asked to authorize the TC 1/p 3 Project Group to do three things. The first was for it to proceed with the G 18 work as it has requested. The second was for it to develop the concept of the terminology validation team with a view to putting forward proposals which might be added into B 6 later. Mr. Mason had the impression that those working on B 6 would like a clearer understanding of how this new mechanism was meant to work, although he considered that he had heard that their comments supported this work being carried out. The third was that the Committee was asking the TC 1/p 3 Project Group to advise them on what the approach should be to the Russian language version, and any other language versions. This would require some amendments to the resolution authorizing the new terms of reference, and he asked Dr. Borzyminski if this was an acceptable way forward.

Dr. Borzyminski agreed.

Mrs. Lagauterie said that when reviewing the decisions that had been made, it was not always clear from the Project Group numbers which decision was being referred to, and she requested that the Project Group titles be recorded in addition to their numbers.

Mr. Mason agreed. There were no more comments. The resolution would be redrafted and considered again on Friday morning.

9.1.2.2 New project in TC 5/SC 2 Software

Mr. Dunmill told delegates that the next item was a proposal for a new project in TC 5/SC 2 *Software*. This was a revision of D 31 *General requirements for software controlled measuring instruments* and had been proposed by Germany. He said that the details could be found in Addendum 9.1.2.2 which had been made available with the meeting documents.

Dr. Schwartz observed that Germany had held this secretariat for a long time, and his experience led him to believe there were two reasons for the revision. Firstly, D 31 was now eight years old, and secondly they had received comments from members of TC 5/SC 2 indicating that a revision was needed to address new challenges in software in legal metrology. He was aware that in Europe WELMEC WG7 was dealing with these issues. They had created two working groups that had been looking for reference architectures and carrying out risk analyses. In the light of this, and in order to keep up with modern technology, he submitted that it was time for a revision from a technical point of view. He drew delegates' attention to the fact that "*Methods and means for verification*" which was the title of project TC 5/SC 2/p 2, had been included in the terms of reference of the new project so he suggested that the existing project p 2 be cancelled. From his involvement in WELMEC discussions, Dr. Schwartz said he had learnt that less pressure should be placed on field inspectors, and that rather than complicated procedures for testing software during verification, easily applicable verification tools for inspectors to check software should be developed. He concluded that this would all be reflected in the new project, as well as the work that would have been done in project p 2. He added that Dr. Grottker had just retired, and although there was someone ready to take over as convener of the group, the Committee could consider this too if necessary.

Mr. Gittens wanted to know whether the revision of D 31 would require the software version to be displayed on the measuring instrument. For example when doing a field verification of a smart meter, it was useful to know, and therefore have clearly displayed, the most recent software version that had been installed in that particular smart meter.

Dr. Schwartz replied that he was not sure what the Project Group would decide, but this was a useful comment, which he was sure would be taken into account. He suggested that Mr. Gittens joined the Project Group.

Mr. Mason pointed out that this would only be possible if St Lucia were to become a Corresponding Member!

Mr. Degavre (Belgium) supported the proposal, but wanted to know if a chapter would be included regarding data transmission. He said that it was clear that the software in the measuring instrument had checksums, etc., but when the data were transmitted elsewhere there could be electronic signatures and encryption to remotely ensure the confidentiality and authenticity of the data. This approach was commonly used in vehicle speed measuring instruments, for example.

Dr. Schwartz indicated that this would have to be considered, and this was also something that WELMEC WG 7 had just discussed. He remarked that not only were software controlled measuring instruments being considered but also distributed measuring instruments, which had communication with the cloud, and their important data was stored in the cloud, so this was precisely why D 31 needed revising.

Dr. Ehrlich asked that since Dr. Schwartz had said that the revision of D 31 would be affected by the current project for the field verification document, would the proposal for a new project be restructured to indicate this, or would there be a separate proposal to withdraw the other project. He wanted to know how it would be documented.

Dr. Schwartz referred Dr. Ehrlich to the terms of reference of the proposed project, which he said read "to revise existing D 31 to take account of new developments in software legal metrology as well as methods and means of its verification". Thus it included project p 2. He admitted that this did not explicitly state that p 2 would be cancelled, but this would be reflected in the draft resolution.

Mr. Mason concluded that an amended resolution should be prepared, to be voted on the last day, as this project appeared to have the support of the Committee.

Before moving onto the next item, Mrs. Lagauterie pointed out that although several references had been made to WELMEC, they were not referenced in the liaison list, and she suggested that they should be included.

Mr. Dunmill responded that the list of liaisons on project proposals was to give an idea of the scope of interest on the project. The list was not definitive, and this suggestion could be taken into account when the Project Group was set up. The fact that WELMEC had been missed off was not a restricting factor.

9.1.2.3 New project in TC 8/SC 1 *Static volume and mass measurement*

Mr. Dunmill informed delegates that the next item was a proposal for a new project in TC 8/SC 1 *Static volume and mass measurement*. This was a revision of R 125 *Measuring systems for the mass of liquids in tanks* and had been proposed by the USA.

Mr. Richter drew delegates' attention to the fact that the Netherlands and the USA had taken over the co-secretariat of TC 8/SC 1 in June. At a subsequent meeting in Gothenburg, Sweden, all participants had agreed that a revision of R 125 should be undertaken, so he wanted to point out that whilst his name was the only one that had been cited as proposing this project, both the USA and the Netherlands were proposing it, and they would be acting as co-conveners on the project. He invited questions from Members.

Mrs. Lagauterie said that with regard to the liaison list, in this case WELMEC appeared and she did not know why. WELMEC did not carry out work on this subject; it was not a one of the categories covered by the MID, and it was not in the terms of reference of WELMEC WG 10 which was concerned with measurement of liquids. She suggested that WELMEC should be taken off the list.

Mr. Dunmill checked whether there were any other comments on this project proposal. There were none.

Following a brief discussion with Mr. Dunmill, Mr. Mason suggested that all the project resolutions should be held over to Friday. He encouraged any Committee Members who had reservations about any of the projects to voice them now, because although work would be carried out on the resolutions, this would be done on the basis that the Committee had supported them. In the light of this, Mr. Dunmill verified that there were no objections to the project just discussed. Again there were none.

9.1.2.4 New project in TC 8/SC 7 *Gas metering*

Mr. Dunmill informed delegates that the next item was a proposal for a new project in TC 8/SC 7 *Gas metering*. This was a revision of R 139 *Compressed gaseous fuel measuring systems for vehicles*. This had been proposed by Japan to include hydrogen measurement, and he stated that Mr. Takatsuji had a short presentation on this item.

Mr. Takatsuji thanked delegates for giving him the opportunity to explain the necessity of this amendment to R 139. He observed that hydrogen, or fuel cell, vehicles were not very common in most countries but that in Japan, Toyota had been selling fuel cell vehicles since 2014, and the name of their car was "Mirai" which meant "future" in Japanese. Honda had also been selling fuel cell vehicles since 2016 and theirs was called the "Clarity Fuel Cell"; he added that there were at least 50 hydrogen refueling stations in operation in Japan. Japan had just published "Japan Industrial Standard (JIS) B8576 *Hydrogen metering system for motor vehicles*". The current R 139 could be used for any kind of gaseous fuel, including hydrogen, but due to the different characteristics of hydrogen compared with other fuels, it was not very easy to implement in this case. The new JIS could be used for the refueling of motor vehicles with compressed hydrogen gas, and this measuring system was the one that had been installed at hydrogen refueling stations and used for transactions for legal metrology purposes. He pointed out that the JIS was a voluntary standard, not a compulsory standard, and that since no legal metrology regulations for this technology had been adopted in Japan yet, he emphasized that he was not imposing Japanese requirements on this Recommendation, but just suggesting that the JIS could be the starting point for the discussion. One of the technical points that had been adopted in the JIS was that it had four MPE classes: 2, 3, 5 and 10, whereas R 139 had only defined just one class: class 2. For various reasons which he would explain later, the application of this class 2 to compressed hydrogen measurement was very difficult, and this was the reason for proposing the additional classes. Mr. Takatsuji pointed out that in the case of class 10, the MPE in-service was 10 %, which was very large, and he could imagine that customers would not be happy with this class. Although the contents of R 139 would still need to be discussed, he felt that class 10 should not be included in the Recommendation. This meant there would still be three accuracy classes, because achieving class 2 was very difficult for most manufacturers of these instruments. This was because the "depressurization loss" had to be considered, and he showed a diagram and equation which explained the technology of these measuring instruments. He illustrated and explained the various components of the systems, mentioning that they mostly used Coriolis meters. He also explained that the system

included a pre-cooler since they work at very high pressure, almost 82 MPa. The temperature of the fuel rises spontaneously when vehicles are being filled, especially if they are to be filled in a short period of time, making the pre-cooler an essential element of the system, just before the cutoff valve, to cool the hydrogen to $-40\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$. After the pre-cooling, the hydrogen passes into the vehicle, but placing the cutoff valve close to the vehicle is impossible due to the high pressure, so normally it is very far from it. Once the valve is closed, all the hydrogen in the pipe connected to the car must be vented to the atmosphere. In the system in use in Japan, Mr. Takatsuji explained that the amount of hydrogen lost in this way is 10–50 g, which is not a negligible amount. In the case of the Toyota Mirai, the tank capacity is 5 kg, but the tank is not usually filled from empty, so for example if only 1 kg was added, a 50 g loss would represent 5 % of the delivery. The Recommendation therefore needed to consider how this loss was to be treated. Should the customer pay for it? Should the station pay for it? Should it be divided between the two parties? Another problem which needed to be considered in the Recommendation was that due to the large facilities needed to compress hydrogen, verification should always be done at the filling stations, and not in the factory.

Mr. Takatsuji then summarized the three reasons why the existing R 139 was not easy to apply to hydrogen measuring instruments: high pressure, low temperature and significant de-pressurization loss, and explained that these were the reasons they were proposing an annex or amendment to the Recommendation. He stressed that it was not his intention to revise the whole of R 139, and said that the proposed additions would not affect gases other than hydrogen. Additionally, since hydrogen measurement technology was still quite immature, the requirements should not be made too strict or too detailed, so only minimum requirements would be added. He explained the proposed time frame for the project, saying that if the project were to be approved, a meeting would be held as soon as possible (probably in Japan), and that the Netherlands, current secretariat of TC 8/SC 7, and Japan would be willing to be co-conveners for the project.

Mr. Mason observed that this was potentially a very significant project and asked Members whether they had any questions.

Mrs. Lagauterie confirmed her whole-hearted support for this project. Without mentioning the make of vehicle, in France there were already buses and taxis that used hydrogen. These measurements for filling vehicles were not currently regulated, but she could see that there would be a need for this in the near future. They had already noticed that the current R 139 could not be applied easily, so she reiterated that she not only supported the project but would be taking an active part.

Dr. Schwartz (in his role as CIML Member for Germany) also supported this proposal. He had attended a meeting in July at the PTB when he had met with various experts and he agreed with Mrs. Lagauterie that there was definitely a need for an amendment to R 139. He considered that it was an excellently prepared proposal with questionnaires being supplied which would pick up the most important questions so that these could be considered early. He indicated that he would also like to participate if the proposal was approved.

Dr. Miki added that now under a European Project (EMPIR) which was being conducted by EURAMET, metrology for hydrogen vehicles was being planned. NIMJ was now a registered collaborator in this project so through this project information could be exchanged on the technology of hydrogen measurement flow metering. The EMPIR project would have information relevant to an international standard.

Mr. Gittens wanted to know whether there would be any collaboration with TC 8/SC 7 and TC 8/SC 1 because he noticed that although hydrogen was a liquid, it was actually the mass that was being measured, and he wondered whether the Project Group that would be working on the revision of R 125 *Measuring systems for the mass of liquids* would also be able to contribute to the development of the revision of R 139.

Ms. Van Spronssen added to what Dr. Miki had said concerning the EMPIR project, saying that it would not be put forward for approval until the end of the year, but since Japan had been supporting it, she anticipated that it would be approved.

Mr. Richter responded to the question that had been raised by Mr. Gittens, stating that hydrogen was not a liquid; it was still in gaseous form, but under extremely high pressure.

Mr. Mason concluded that he had the impression that this resolution had the support of the Committee. The Committee would vote on it on Friday, and in the meantime, he asked those drafting the resolution to consider whether it should leave open the possibility that of producing either an amendment to R 139 or a new Recommendation. He considered that during the development process it would become apparent which was more suitable.

Mr. Khedir wished to add his support to the project and remarked that the project showed that metrology helped trade rather than creating barriers to it.

9.1.2.5 Proposal for a new project under TC 9/SC 1 *Non-automatic weighing instruments*

Mr. Mason informed delegates that the first project for consideration was the revision of R 76, which had already been mentioned, particularly in relation to CEEMS activities.

Mr. Dunmill told the Committee that there would not be a presentation on this, as they had received information on the proposed project circulated in Addendum 9.1.2.5, but if any of the delegates had questions then the project could be displayed.

Mr. Mason stated that the convenership for this project would be held jointly by France and Germany, and asked if one of the conveners would like to comment before inviting questions.

Dr. Schwartz observed that the changes to parts one, two and three would be quite simple. He said that that R 76 was now ten years old, and there had been a couple of new technological developments that needed to be taken into consideration, but the main task would be to re-organize it into the new format which had been agreed, since what were now consistently referred to as part one (metrological and technical requirements) and part two (test procedures) were still in one part in the current R 76. The current part two (test report format) would then become part three. He emphasized that there was no need to change R 76 more than was absolutely necessary. There was a proposal to create a new part four to cover verification and inspection of non-automatic weighing instruments. This idea had been considered rather late in the project proposal process, and it had also been discussed at the Pilot Training Center in China where there had been a seminar on non-automatic weighing instruments which had identified the need to cover the verification and inspection of measuring instruments more in the future. He wanted to hear delegates' opinions about part four, but he proposed to separate part four from the rest of the work, as he emphasized that the new part four should not delay the review and revision of the existing R 76. He thought part four was important and should be taken into consideration, and observed that perhaps there could be some quick feedback about part four in general which could then be used as a model for the development of other new and revised OIML Recommendations in the future. For him it made sense to start this with non-automatic weighing instruments because they were the most common. He concluded that he would like to invite questions on part four and the project proposal.

Dr. Ehrlich remarked that adding a part four could very easily delay the revision of parts one, two and three, and he did not want this to happen. He said that whilst he was supportive of the idea of providing guidance to CEEMS and other countries on how some elements of R 76 might be able to be used in a field verification setting, he felt that that work should be carried out separately and laid out as a separate document. This could be in the form of an annex, or preferably as a separate document in the form of a guide that could accompany R 76, and in the future other Recommendations.

Mr. Dixit agreed with the USA, and to this end he indicated he was ready to take on the secretariat regarding non-automatic weighing instruments in India.

Dr. Miki commented that they had discussed this in Japan and he considered that verification and testing was country-dependent; by this he meant that in different countries verification was organized differently. He therefore considered that part four should not be compulsory but should be a guidance document. He said that if it was compulsory, there were many things to resolve in it.

Mr. Mason acknowledged what Dr. Miki had said, and observed that in many of the countries present, and particularly the USA, much of the OIML's work was never completely compulsory.

Mr. Rachkovskiy (Russia) confirmed that they already had R 76 as a national regulation and they had a separate annex for the verification procedure so he proposed that this be included as an annex. He also considered that the lower temperature ranges should also be revised in the Recommendation, as this was needed in some countries.

Mr. Dunmill added that in the work he had done in various CEEMS countries, a common request had been that the OIML provide some guidance regarding which tests were applicable when carrying out verification. This was where this idea had originated and he knew that when Mr. Patoray and Mr. Mussio had attended the SIM seminar it had also been one of the outcomes. Countries that had an established system had their own ways of doing things, but people who were trying to put systems into place had difficulty identifying which tests to apply. This would be a subset of the existing tests which would probably be in the Recommendations, and it seemed that the most logical way of avoiding a proliferation of different documents and guides, etc. would be to attach it as another part of the Recommendation, even if that were an optional part.

Mrs. Lagauterie (France and as co-convener) replied specifically to the concerns Dr. Miki had expressed. It was not the intention of the project to interfere with the organization of the controls in the different countries. The Project Group appreciated that everyone had different methods of carrying out their controls. The idea was to provide technical procedure guides, and as Mr. Rachkovskiy from Russia had emphasized, there were already elements in the existing R 76 that could be used. It was a matter of isolating these and adding to them as necessary. She considered that the technical guides could be used by those countries that needed them, but stressed that the document in no way sought to organize in-service controls or periodic verifications, because the Project Group was aware these were organized differently in each country.

Mr. Marneweck supported the comment made by Mrs. Lagauterie. He remarked that it would be very useful for an annex to be added to Recommendations that contained all the verification requirements clearly organized into a procedure or guidance for verification since a lot of the countries in his sub-region and region used OIML documentation in their technical regulations, and adoption of these requirements would make it so much easier to proceed with the verification and acceptance of those verification requirements.

Mr. Sanders (United Kingdom) underlined that in the UK it was a common complaint from businesses that were inspected that the testing was inconsistent, and for that reason he would welcome some guidance on the verification and inspection of these instruments.

Mr. Gittens observed that as a member from one of the SIM countries, and as someone who had been present at its last AGM when the matter had been discussed, he confirmed that he would support the development of a part four to R 76 so that there was a consistent guide in the verification procedures that could be used in those countries.

Mr. Loizides (Australia) stated that R 76 was the most extensively used weighing standard in Australia covering simple scales through to weighbridges, and he considered that it was important to keep it current with new technologies being developed and so he supported the project.

Mr. Dixit agreed that non-automatic weighing instruments were used everywhere and were a major consideration for legal metrology. He maintained that wherever you went there were complaints from consumers that they were treated differently in different regions and that in many countries there were many more instruments than there were people to verify them. The question was what sort of formula would lead to all the instruments being properly verified and sealed. If this was not done properly, there would always be problems. This was an important document and he considered that for this reason, and the fact that there were more than 500 manufacturers in India, he wanted to hold the secretariat.

Mr. Nater (CECIP) said that as an association of manufacturers they could support the part four as it would help them to harmonize the verification and inspection of instruments in the world.

Ms. Buckley (Ireland) confirmed that she would be very supportive of the development of either an annex or guidance in relation to verification and inspection. In particular she wanted to express the view that in the field, it was sometimes not easy to apply the tests as they had been outlined for type approval, and with ever-decreasing resources being allocated to authorities, she said that a credible set of tests would be needed which would assure the necessary accuracy in the field. She thought that this may be a slightly different testing regime than would be applied for type approval, and she would welcome the OIML looking at this problem. She thought that it was important that the information already available for type approval should be applied to work in the field.

Mr. Khedir (Tunisia) supported the French position. He agreed with Mrs. Lagauterie, but also stated that if the idea of a guide was adopted, it meant that countries could become familiar with the processes and it could be integrated into R 76.

Mr. Mason summarized the discussion. He said there had been complete agreement that it was now time to revise R 76, and that would be the revision of parts one, two and three. There seemed to be no opposition to this as a proposal. He considered that there had been agreement to bring together the various parts of R 76, some of which were already there, to make sure that it would be easier to use for verification in the field. He had the impression that there was enthusiasm that this work should be carried out shortly rather than left until later. However, he felt that there had been a mix of views as to whether the best solution was to produce a part four, an annex or a separate document. He therefore proposed that it could be left to TC 9/SC 1 to form a view on this. Finally, he thought the views expressed had indicated that the work on what he would refer to as “consolidating the verification requirements” should not hold up the revision of this important Recommendation. Mr. Mason checked that Members agreed with this summary. He added that the wording in the resolution may need to be adjusted, but the decision as to whether this would consist of one or two projects should be left to TC 9/SC 1 and if it was decided that it should be two projects, then there may be a case for looking for another person to act as a convener.

Dr. Ehrlich interjected that he agreed with everything except for the decision of leaving TC 9/SC 1 to decide what to do with part four. He considered that this had broader implications for the CIML as a whole since it had been put forward as a pilot program for something that would be extended to other Recommendations. TC 9/SC 1 could be responsible for seeing how the work went, but not for the decision about whether there should be a part four or not that would be attached to the Recommendation. He would rather that the resolution was worded to say that the CIML would decide on this, and that at least such a part four would be an informative, non-mandatory annex. He would actually have preferred the wording to go even further and say that the part four would be a guide or a separate document. He considered that using the term “part four” implied that it would be part of the Recommendation, which the USA felt would slow down the work and would imply that it was mandatory. He repeated that at the very least it would have to be clear that it was non-mandatory.

Mr. Mason stressed that anything that came out of TC 9/SC 1 would ultimately be for the CIML to decide upon, so that whichever of the three approaches it recommended, whether to produce a part four, or an annex, or a separate guidance document of a more generic nature, then he repeated it would be for the CIML to decide upon. He judged that Committee Members did not want to exclude any of the options, not least because of the strength with which some people had put forward the case for a part four structure as a possible solution. If the Committee was going to establish whether that was a possible solution, and a model for other Recommendations, then he concluded that R 76 was the ideal place to investigate that matter.

Mr. Marneweck (convener of TC 6) did not think this should be the pilot for including verification procedures in a Recommendation. OIML R 79 and R 87 already included verification procedures for various test methods used to validate the contents of prepackages, either randomly packed, or drained weight, or frozen packages, and all of those annexes had been included in the Recommendations by the Project Groups so as to strengthen the regulatory part of the Recommendations, and they were all mandatory requirements rather than being informative.

Mr. Mason commented that the text of the proposal had been drafted quickly when it had been decided that this was the best opportunity to give the CIML three months' notice of this issue, and therefore with regard to the word "pilot", Mr. Mason wished to make it clear he was talking about pilots for those Recommendations which were intended otherwise to take the part one, two and three format, namely those Recommendations which might potentially be used for type approval purposes. He would see recommendations like R 79, R 87, R 111 and many others as falling outside this issue altogether.

Mr. Dixit considered that this was a very important topic because OIML certification was part of this issue. A lot of certificates had been issued, and the Basic and MAA certificates had been clubbed together, and those manufacturers would get the benefit of importing their instruments from one country to another. There was the question that there would not be any harm to that economy to which the instrument had been supplied, and there were always questions on non-automatic weighing instruments which did not have the necessary accuracy. In some regions this may be because where the software had been prepared, the gravity may have been different to that where it had been supplied, and it had not been calibrated according to the software. He said there were many problems arising from these issues, and emphasized that it was not a small issue. He suggested that a separate document or an annex should be created for R 76.

Mr. Mason suggested that in the light of these remarks it would be necessary to look at the precise wording of the resolution, and he repeated that there was support for addressing this issue now, as well as for asking the Technical Committee responsible for R 76 to make a recommendation on how to tackle this issue, whilst making it clear that this request should not hold up the timetable for the revision of the current R 76.

9.1.2.6 Proposal for a new project under TC 9/SC 2 *Automatic weighing instruments*

The next item was a proposal for a continuous totalizing automatic weighing instrument of the arched-chute type. Mr. Mason observed that the Committee had now had the opportunity to look at the photographs which had been requested at the last meeting as they had been included in an article in the OIML Bulletin. He stated that they had also had the opportunity to study the proposal in more detail than had been possible in Arcachon, and since it had been discussed at some length there, he hoped that this year's discussion would not take too long. He considered that this was most likely to be a new Recommendation, although the possibility of it becoming a modification of R 50 would not be excluded if that was what the Project Group recommended. He emphasized that the CIML would not be taking a view at the technical level on this issue. Mr. Mason knew this had been a Dutch proposal, but as the secretariat of this Subcommittee, the UK would be taking on the role of convener for the Project Group. He asked the Netherlands to comment first.

Mr. Teunisse (Netherlands) said that the project proposal was the same as that which had been put forward at the last meeting, but it now contained a lot of information about this type of weighing instrument. He said the arch-chute weighing instrument was a continuous totalizing automatic weighing instrument which had not existed when R 50 had been developed. The scope of R 50 had been restricted to belt weighers only, and it had only been during the late stages of the development of R 50 that the Project Group had become aware of this new kind of weighing instrument. The weighing instrument industry had asked how this could be implemented in R 50. At that time it had been suggested that, for clarity, it would be better to create a new Recommendation which was completely in line with R 50 rather than including the requirements for these new instruments in R 50 itself. He suggested that it would be up to the Technical Committee to decide whether it could be integrated into R 50 immediately. He hoped that now CIML Members had seen all the information, they now understood how the weighing instrument was constructed. He underlined that the extra information had also been published in the OIML Bulletin at the beginning of the year, and he hoped that delegates had sufficient information to form an opinion of the weighing instrument.

Mr. Mason asked the UK to confirm that their position on acting as convener for this project, if approved, continued to be as he had understood it to be.

Mr. Sanders confirmed this was correct. He thought it was very important that the OIML did not inhibit innovation, so the UK would be pleased to work on this.

Mr. Mason asked the Committee if they needed any more information before taking a decision.

Dr. Ehrlich was concerned about Mr. Mason's comment that the Committee would not be asked about whether this would be a new Recommendation or part of R 50. He expressed the opinion that the wording of the resolution clearly stated the development of a new Recommendation, as did the project proposal. His understanding had been that the Committee would be voting on a new Recommendation. He stressed that the USA would be fully prepared to vote in favor of that, but they would not be in favor of combining this work with a revision R 50.

Mr. Mason stressed that this was clearly not a revision of R 50, but it was likely to be a new Recommendation. He said that bearing in mind the earlier discussions, it was easier to decide the format of these publications after the work had been completed rather than from the outset. This did not exclude the possibility that when the work was completed, and if the Project Group believed that the right approach would be a modification or an addition to R 50 rather than a completely new Recommendation, then that would be something they would be able to put to the CIML, and it would be for the CIML to decide whether that was the right solution.

Mr. Nater (CECIP) said that they fully supported this idea, as they had discussed it with manufacturers.

Mr. Dixit insisted that this was very important equipment which was used in industry for filling packages amongst other things, and no verification procedures were prescribed in the documents. He remarked that, as with R 76, there should be a document or an annex for the purpose of verification of the instrument, and he considered that verification and sealing the instrument were particularly important.

Mr. Sanders reported that he had read the interesting description in the July OIML Bulletin. In the final line there had been an internet link to read more, and in this there had been an application for a patent so he wanted to know whether there was more than one manufacturer of this instrument because he would be concerned if the CIML were creating a Recommendation for an instrument which could only be produced by a single manufacturer.

Mr. Nater told the Committee that this type of instrument was very old technology. 20 or 30 years ago there had been a solution for such instruments, but it had not been for verified use, so it had not come to the market, but it was patented. He thought there were a lot of different patents of such instruments, and there were different solutions so it was not a problem for the manufacturers.

Mrs. Lagauterie remarked that in general France was not in favor of developing a new Recommendation each time a new technology appeared. She underlined that, as she had already said last year, a number of years ago Professor Volkmann had questioned whether there was a need for as many different Recommendations on automatic weighing instruments. She said France was not against this proposition and would vote in favor of this work, but it was highly desirable that there was as little difference as possible in the general requirements applied to all types of automatic weighing instruments.

Mr. Mason recalled that there had been different views on the question of specialized Recommendations or broad Recommendations. He hoped that if approved, the Project Group would read the comments that had been made, and which would be reflected in the minutes, and he suggested that this proposal gave rise to an expectation that in this case there would be a new Recommendation, but that it would be possible for the Project Group to propose a solution, and for the CIML, not least at the preliminary ballot stage, to decide whether this was the right solution or not.

9.1.2.7 Proposal for a new project under TC 12 *Instruments for measuring electrical quantities*

The next item was a proposal on the revision of R 46 proposed by Australia. Mr. Mason observed that this was an important area of measuring instrument technology, and he stressed that it was important that the Recommendations were kept up to date. He invited questions or comments. He pointed out that as with all the project approvals, the voting threshold was 50 %, so he was assuming that it would be unlikely that there would be any opposition if it was not voiced at this stage.

Mr. Gittens said that he had noticed that it had taken a long time for R 46 to come out since it had only been published in the last few years. St Lucia planned to adopt OIML R 46 in its regulations and now there was a proposal to revise it further, so he wanted to know what would be the time scale for the completion of the new revision.

Mr. Mason said that any project that was approved would be expected to follow the time line set out in the current version of B 6, which raised higher expectations than was previously the case. The convener would be aware of the expectations in B 6, and would organize the work accordingly.

Mr. Dunmill added that the Bureau was intending to follow up the adherence to the time frames given in B 6 much more closely.

9.1.2.8 Proposal for a new project under TC 17/SC 2 *Saccharimetry*

The next item was a new proposal for a project in TC 17/SC 2 *Saccharimetry*. This proposal was also from Australia; the proposing Member did not wish to add any remarks. Mr. Mason observed that there was always the question with some of the instrument categories of how wide the interest was in the subject. B 6 required the Project Group to have the right number of P-members in order to proceed, so at the moment, the Committee should assume the project would proceed as though these criteria had already been met.

Dr. Ehrlich stated that the USA was supportive of this proposal, but he wanted to point out that in the USA, these instruments would be used for sugar mill production rather than commodity exchange, and he wanted to encourage the secretariat to include the International Commission on Uniform Methods of Sugar Analysis (ICUMSA) in this work. It had not been clear in the documentation whether they had been consulted, but he would like to encourage their strong involvement in this.

Mr. Mason observed that just from the name it sounded like an obvious liaison organization, and he thanked Dr. Ehrlich for his observation. There were no other comments or questions.

Mr. Dunmill indicated that was the end of the project proposals and commented that a number of other technical items also required approval.

9.1.3 Changes to allocations of convenerships

Mr. Mason indicated that the next item was a technical issue arising from the fact that there were two projects for which the UK had held the convenership previously, and Paul Dixon had been the individual acting as the convener. Mr. Mason said that since Mr. Dixon was now working on contract for the BIML, and according to the strict letter of B 6, the CIML needed to approve the allocation of a convenership or secretariat to the BIML. This requirement had been included at a time when there had been a reluctance to see technical work undertaken by the Bureau rather than by Member States. Mr. Mason pointed out that Mr. Dixon continued to be a UK civil servant although he was working for the Bureau, and whatever his employment status, if he worked on this he would be doing so as part of the Bureau's team and so the convenership would have to be transferred to the Bureau in order for Mr. Dixon to continue this work. This was a technical matter, but one which Mr. Mason considered should be brought to the attention of the CIML. He asked if there were any questions or comments about this.

Dr. Schwartz said that although he agreed with the resolution that had been put forward, in this case he wanted to ensure that, in general, the spirit of B 6 was followed, and that Project Groups may decide for themselves who would be their convener. He wanted to make sure that this was an exception.

Mr. Mason confirmed that it was an exception. It had been pointed out that if Mr. Dixon had transferred to any other administration in the UK, then then this would not have been brought to the CIML, as the convenership was allocated to a Member State which was a P-member, and that Member State can then decide to award the convenership of a project to anyone within that country. He reassured the Committee that the current situation was exceptional.

Mr. Dunmill clarified that the requirements on the transfer of convenership in B 6 had been written in order to be able to do something about a convener that was not doing anything, so the situation regarding voluntary transfers was rather unclear in the existing B 6 but it was one of the topics that would be clarified in the revision if possible.

Mr. Mason responded that if the Committee was wondering why it was being asked because in 2016 it was not as concerned about the Bureau adopting co-convenerships, then this provision was not needed in B 6, and this would be an opportunity to express that view and it could be taken into account in the revision of B 6. He wanted to make it clear that this was not a specific proposal that he was putting forward.

There were no further comments.

9.1.4 Proposal to revise the terms of reference of TC 4/p 8

The next item was a proposal to revise the terms of reference of TC 4/p 8, which had been proposed by Slovakia.

Mr. Patoray remarked that a lot of work had been carried out on this proposal, but that the Committee may not have been made aware early enough in the process. The idea was quite simple, but the reason it needed Committee approval was that it had been proposed to cancel a project. It was proposed that two existing projects, p 8 and p 1, should be combined, moving all of the activity in p 1 into p 8 and cancelling the p 1 project. The same work would continue and the scope of the project would be a combination of the scopes of the existing two projects. He understood that there was an existing document under p 8 which would be revised to include all the necessary information instead of creating a new document under p 1.

Mr. Dixit stated that if it was a new project he would be ready to handle it.

Mr. Mason thanked him for his offer but he wanted to be clear that this was not a new project, it was a combination of two existing projects and as he understood it Slovakia already had the work in hand.

9.1.5 Proposal for a resolution on the non-exploitation of the MPE rule for utility meters

Dr. Miki hoped Members remembered the discussion on this subject from the last CIML meeting and that they were aware of the working documents that had been uploaded onto the website. The background to this was that at the Presidential Council meeting in 2014, TC 8 had been asked to carry out a survey on the non-exploitation of MPEs, otherwise known as the “same sign rule”. In 2015, a report had been compiled and a draft CML resolution had been written, but it had not been based on the discussions, and contained some mistakes. The resolution had been withdrawn, and it had been decided that TC 8 should carry on its work on the survey.

He went on to explain briefly the non-exploitation of MPE rule, and especially the quantitative rule. He showed delegates a diagram showing the flowrate of a water meter, and indicated a green line which he said showed the Maximum Permissible Error (MPE). He said that the meter was usually tested at three points, and modern technology would allow manufacturers to adjust the meter so that

the errors were close to the MPE. This meant that service providers such as gas stations or water companies, or in some cases electric power companies, could have huge benefits because the accumulation of error was used in the calculation of the fees consumers pay. In some cases, especially for water meters, they used a quantitative rule (and here Dr. Miki indicated red and blue lines on the graph on the screen), one usually expected that the errors would be randomly distributed around the zero error line, but if all the errors had the same sign, at least one of them should be less than half the MPE. He again indicated the red and blue lines, showing that the blue one passed the test and the red one failed. This was a typical qualitative rule, which was meant to prevent the exploitation of MPEs, but many doubted the scientific grounds for it. Modern technology could make many different adjustments, and if we used this rule, many manufacturers would finally circumvent it – maybe it would be possible to make a new rule, but they would circumvent that one as well.

During the last year, they had made minor changes to the report following comments received from the Netherlands, and it had been decided that there should be a very generic rule that there should not be exploitation of MPEs, but the quantitative rule was already in the document although it was not clear how this could be used. This year it had been decided that only the generic rule should be written in the document. This was the conclusion, even though some existing Recommendations such as R 49 and R 139 already included generic and quantitative rules, and some countries were also using such rules. This showed that there was a need for rules to exploit MPEs, and that there was a need for quantitative rules, especially in field verification and testing.

Dr. Miki then showed delegates the proposed draft resolution, which said that instruments shall not exploit the MPEs systematically to favor any party. This was the proposal for the first step in applying these rules; how to apply the current quantitative rules, or how to make another rule, would be postponed for future work. Dr. Miki said that there had been some comments that their documents had been uploaded too recently and therefore did not respect the requirement that the CIML needed three months' notice of documents. He clarified that this only applied to publications, which this was not. In view of the fact that there had been discussions on this item the previous year and that this was a very important topic, Dr. Miki felt that the CIML should be able to vote on this resolution, but asked Members for comments.

Mr. Patoray stated he was responsible for the Committee not having received this document to consider according to the three-month rule. Within the necessary time scale Dr. Miki had forwarded it to him in conjunction with some other information and he had not noticed. As a result of a recent conversation with Dr. Miki he had realized what had happened and hoped that this error would not impede progress on this item.

Mr. Mason added that it was one of those things that probably would not have happened if Mr. Kool had been there. Constitutionally he was in no doubt that this resolution could be adopted. He underlined that the Committee frequently adopted resolutions that were developed at the stage of the CIML. This was not something that was covered by B 6 and he did not see a problem on voting on it if the Committee was happy that they had had the opportunity to consider it, and he emphasized that the current considerations followed on from last year's discussion.

Ms. Van Spronssen commented that she was pleased to see that the document would only apply to relevant categories of measuring instruments. The problem that was faced in Europe was that it was difficult to agree how to apply this general statement. The European legislation had been changed in 2009, but there had not been an agreement on how to implement a non-exploitation requirement in all the instruments that required it. Dr. Miki had concluded that the qualitative statements of R 49 and R 137 were going to be replaced by a general statement, and she had noticed from Dr. Miki's last slide that a lot of countries had found a solution to this. Ms. Van Spronssen asked if the solutions that had been found in different countries for manufacturers and issuing authorities could be documented so that there would be some guidance how to deal with the general statement and to give Project Groups some idea of how the general requirements could be implemented in their Recommendations.

She concluded that if this was done she would be even more pleased with the resolution than she was now.

Mr. Mason said that if the resolution was passed, it would be an excellent subject to cover in an article in the Bulletin which would both give publicity to the resolution and discuss how it might be implemented in practice in various areas. He understood from Members' reactions that they may be volunteering to at least comment on the draft article and so that would be his proposal.

Mr. Valkeapaa (Finland) assured the Committee that he fully supported the generic statement because he considered it was a very important principal. In Europe about 15 years ago when the Measuring Instruments Directive had been drafted, this principle had been followed in many countries but in most legislation it had only been weakly expressed, if at all. This was why, when the technology had developed and there were accurate electronic meters, misuse of the uncertainties was still relatively easy. There was not always a good technical way of implementing this rule, and he thought it was not risky for manufacturers because following normal principles of justice, the burden of proof lied on the authority's side if an instrument was thought not to be fulfilling this requirement. He thought this was an important issue.

Mr. Richter (USA) stated that the USA had been working on the issue of the non-exploitation of MPEs for several years and they preferred to have just the generic statement. However, after consultations with Dr. Miki and the Netherlands, they could support having additional language to encourage secretariats, conveners and Project Groups to lay out what they believed would be the best way to implement, in a practical way, the non-exploitation of MPEs for their particular measuring instrument. He believed this should be on an informative basis only, possibly in an informative annex or in a separate guidance document. He said that the USA had already drafted some language to that effect which could be used.

Mr. Mason commented that this could also form the basis of an OIML Bulletin article.

Dr. Miki wanted to add that Mr. Patoray had taken the responsibility for the delay in uploading the document but he wanted to point out that he had not taken any action after sending him the information so he apologized for that.

Future proposal for a project to revise D 1 *Elements for a law on metrology*

Mr. Mason said he had just been reminded that during the Conference there had been a proposal for a new project to undertake a revision of D 1, and to do so with an even more substantial involvement from the BIPM. He had held some discussions with a number of people about this, notably the secretariat for TC 3, but they did not feel it was right to put forward a project for approval at this point when there had not been the time to sketch out the terms of reference for such a project. He considered that there was a distinct possibility that online approval could be sought for such a project. This gave him an opportunity to emphasize how important it was that the enthusiasm that they had seen during the week in attendance at the Committee meeting be transformed into an enthusiasm for responding to the requests for their votes and opinions when electronic responses were asked for. The record of online voting on project approvals was a very poor one. He had been advised not to even try for an online vote on this issue, but he had insisted that he was more of an optimist than that, so if he could obtain agreement on the terms of reference, he would ask for online approval. However, he stated he would be very disappointed if his colleagues were proved right and he had to come back to the next CIML meeting with this proposal.

Mr. Mason said this concluded item 9.1.

9.2 Technical items for information

Due to time constraints, agenda item 9.2 was not discussed during the meeting. However, information was made available in Addendum 9.2.1 to the Working Document.

10 Preparation of the 15th Conference

10.1 Nominations for the Presidency of the 15th Conference

Mr. Mason stated there were two items which he thought it would be useful for the Committee to discuss. The first was the nominations for the Presidency of the 15th Conference. The first thing that the Conference would have to do would be to elect its President and two Vice-Presidents. There was no guidance in the Convention as to how this should be done, and what was clear from the timetable was that there would not be a lot of time for it to decide on the correct course of action. He therefore considered it would be helpful to the Conference if the Committee were to put forward a suggestion which could be readily accepted, would not require a vote, and would allow the Conference to proceed quickly with the rest of its business. As a result of discussions with his colleagues, Mr. Mason suggested to the Committee that the most appropriate person to preside could be recommended using the precedent that had been established by the last two Conferences, namely, that it would be someone from the host country. Although France was not the official host, the Conference would be taking place in France, so he would propose that Mrs. Lagauterie was put forward to the Conference as its President. Mr. Mason wanted to confirm that delegates agreed with this suggestion, as he re-iterated that what was required was a recommendation to the Conference which had been the result of the Committee's discussions. He said that delegates also needed to elect two Vice-Presidents for the Conference, as described in the Convention. He expressed the opinion that if Mrs. Lagauterie were to chair the Conference, there would be very little to do as Vice-President, but just in case someone needed to step in, it would be useful if the Vice-Presidents were people used to organizing large gatherings like the CIML. He therefore suggested that the Vice-Presidents for the Conference might be Mr. Johnston and himself, as the two Members in the room who had the most experience of chairing meetings of this kind. Mr. Mason checked that this was an acceptable proposal. No objections were raised, so he told delegates that was what he would ask the Director to propose to the Conference.

10.2 Review of the draft agenda for the 15th Conference

Mr. Mason said this would be the Committee's opportunity to review the draft agenda of the 15th Conference and to make sure that everything was prepared for the Conference. Mr. Dunmill indicated that English and French copies of the agenda were available if delegates required them. This agenda had been prepared using the same format as those that had been prepared in the past, but he expressed the opinion that the Committee had spent a day and a half considering some very important questions, and he felt that the CIML needed to be sure that if it wanted the Conference to be aware of, and to express a view on, anything they had been discussing, then this should be catered for in the agenda.

Mr. Mason then read through the agenda, highlighting certain points:

2.1 Report by the CIML President

This was required by the Convention, and Mr. Mason indicated that he had already circulated this document.

3.2 Liaisons with other organizations

Since there would not be any presentations by liaison organizations at the Conference, this would be just a report.

3.3 Technical work and management of OIML systems

There would be a brief report under this item.

3.4 Activities relating to the OIML Certificate Systems

Mr. Mason clarified that both the MAA and the Basic Certificate System would be discussed under this item, and confirmed that this was the point at which a report on the new Certification System would be made.

3.5 *Activities relating to CEEMS*

Mr. Mason indicated that he would include an expanded version of the presentation he had made earlier in the day under this item. He clarified that this would be a presentation that he would make, rather than the advisory group.

Mr. Mason asked if there were any comments from the Members on this part of the agenda. There were none.

4 *Report on the 2013–2016 financial period*

Mr. Patoray interjected that since the accounts had not been completed for 2016, he would only be presenting the results for the period that had been completed. However, this included a substantial potential surplus at the end of the current year, and the Conference would be asked to decide what it wished to do with this surplus. Mr. Patoray indicated that the most recent past finances, including the 2015 budget, would be discussed under Item 5. 2012 was the end of the previous period and 2013, 2014 and 2015 would be the three years considered in the current financial period. This would be covered under the item on the approval of the accounts. He referred delegates to the short resolution which had just been passed instructing the CIML President to present those years' accounts to the Conference. He said that there was a lot of documentation in item 5 but he did not intend to go through every line in the budget for those four years from 2012 to 2015 so he asked that if any CIML Members who would be attending the Conference had questions, they should alert him to these before his presentation so that he could prepare. He asked for the questions to be specific and relevant to that particular budget.

Mr. Mason continued reading the agenda.

6 *Sanctioning of OIML publications*

The four publications that had been approved during the current session would be added to this list. Mr. Dunmill pointed out that according to the 2013 revision of B 6 a report would be presented to the Conference rather than each individual Recommendation. In the past it had taken a long time to go through each Recommendation and vote on it separately and so B 6 had been amended: now the report, which was one of the annexes to the working document for the Conference, contained a list of all the publications which had been approved over the past four years including those that had been approved during the current CIML meeting. It would that report which would be sanctioned. If there were any problems and if delegates to the Conference did not want to sanction a particular Recommendation then it would be necessary to record the fact that that Recommendation had been removed from the report.

7 *Member States' contributory classes and the base contributory share for 2017–2020*

Mr. Mason asked for clarification as to why this would be discussed before the budget.

Mr. Patoray replied that this would be a summary of the countries, their classifications, and reclassifications and this needed to be presented first so as to illustrate how the number of 146 base contributory shares had been arrived at. This was then relevant to determining the Member State contribution in the budget. The Conference would not be going through the same degree of detail as the CIML had, but would be approving the total contributions necessary for the forthcoming budget. The individual Member State contributions and Corresponding Member fees depended on the number of Member State contributory shares, so he expressed the opinion that it made sense for this item to come before the budget.

Mr. Mason remained concerned about the sequence of Conference agenda items 8.1, 8.2, 8.3 and 8.4. He maintained that the Conference ought to have a view on what the money would be spent on before a decision was made about what the Member State contribution should be. He presumed that all of these items would be voted on by the Conference as a single block, after there had been an opportunity to hear what the proposals would be regarding the Member State and Corresponding Member fees, and after the presentation on the budget, which would indicate what the shape of the expenditure would be if those recommendations were approved.

Mr. Patoray underlined the fact that the Conference would not be voting on the individual expenditures. It would be voting on the total amount of income, and on the amount of the contributions being made. This had been discussed at length at the last Conference.

Mr. Mason reiterated that if there was going to be a discussion with contributing Member States about what their contributions should be, they would only be able to decide that *after* they had an understanding of how that money would be spent.

Mr. Patoray replied that this would be discussed under Conference item 8.4, following which the budget period from 2017 to 2020 would be approved.

9 Examination of the situation of Member States in arrears

Mr. Patoray indicated that he would take the same approach to this item as he had done during the CIML meeting. He would present a general slide, but would not be discussing individual cases unless the Conference wanted to.

10.1 Proposal for an interpretation of the Convention

This was an item which had been discussed previously, and followed a CIML resolution that had been adopted the previous year, so it was now simply a matter of discharging something that had already been agreed, details of which were in the working document.

11 Date and venue of the next Conference

Mr. Patoray indicated that this item was simply to set the year in which the next Conference was to be held, since the Convention stated that it was to be held at least every six years. Traditionally it had been held every four years, and in conjunction with that year's CIML meeting. He said that the point of this item was also that the Conference should charge the CIML with organizing the next Conference. Mr. Mason checked that the Committee was still happy that the Conference be held on a four-yearly cycle. No objections were raised.

12 Any other business

Mr. Mason checked whether anything was expected under this item. Nothing was proposed at this time.

Mr. Mason concluded that the result of these discussions would give the Conference a thorough understanding of what it would be expected to consider. He asked if there were any other comments from CIML Members. There were no further comments.

Mr. Patoray stated that the Conference had been scheduled for Wednesday and Thursday mornings. He had tried to estimate how long each item would take, but was concerned that the Conference might overrun, so he urged participants to consider the possibility that it might have to continue into Wednesday afternoon when making their plans for that day. He said he had sent out an alert to participants to that effect. He said that roll calls would be taken at the beginning of the Conference and, if necessary, before each vote, and he urged participants to be on time for each session. Thursday afternoon would be needed for BIML staff to prepare the resolutions which would result from the Conference for the final day of the CIML meeting on Friday. Finally he hoped that the Conference would go well for everyone.

Mr. Mason told delegates that he had consulted with the First Vice-President, and they did not think the Committee should be expected to return to the technical issues in what remained of the current session. The CIML meeting would therefore be adjourned, but when it returned on Friday morning there would be a substantial amount of work to be completed. There would be some very important technical issues to discuss, and he observed that he would not be surprised if a number of CIML Members wanted to discuss R 76, and the proposal to add a "Part 4" on verification to this Recommendation. However, he declared that the Committee would leave the agenda at this point, and that it would reconvene on Friday morning. He concluded that he looked forward to seeing most delegates, if not everyone, at the Conference the next day. He reminded Members that the Conference would start at 9 am.

Mr. Patoray announced that the group photograph would be taken just before lunch the following day as it had been considered that would be when most people would be present.

11 Other matters (1)

No points were raised under this item.

12 Report on OIML Certificate Systems

With regard to agenda item 12 “Report on OIML Certificate Systems”, Mr. Mason said that a report on this had been given to the Conference. The presentation Luis Mussio had intended to give would be available to the Committee, so if it was acceptable to the Committee, he would take this item as having already been covered, and move on. No objections were raised.

13 Review of the Resolutions of the 15th Conference

Mr. Mason stated that agenda item 13 was a review of the resolutions of the 15th Conference, but since every CIML Member had been present at the Conference as part of their delegation, they would be aware of the resolutions and further would have received a copy of them. He therefore proposed that the resolutions would be read into the minutes and would be regarded as having been noted by the Committee, and that it was therefore not necessary to go through them unless there were any objections. He considered that from the point of view of the conduct of the Committee, the most important ones were those concerning finances, and he highlighted the fact that there had already been a discussion before the break as to how the Committee would follow up the decisions taken by the Conference. There were no objections raised. The 15th Conference Resolutions are reproduced below.

15th Conference Resolution no. 2016/1 *(Agenda item 1)*

The Conference,

Approves the minutes of the 14th Conference in 2012.

15th Conference Resolution no. 2016/2 *(Agenda item 4.2)*

The Conference,

Having regard to Article XXV, final paragraph, of the Convention,

Resolves:

- a) The budget surpluses (net results) from the 2013–2016 financial period shall be added to the reserve funds;
- b) During the financial period 2017–2020, the increase in the reserve funds mentioned in a) above should be made available to provide time-limited support to secretariats and conveners in developing their capability, in particular through training, to deliver the technical work of the OIML.

Instructs the Director to prepare budgets to be presented to the CIML for the years 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020 which reflect this expenditure.

15th Conference Resolution no. 2016/3 *(Agenda item 4.2)*

The Conference,

Having regard to its discussions on the levels of reserves appropriate to its operations,

Requests the Committee to consider the policy it should adopt towards the long-term level of the reserve funds and the purposes for which they should be used, and to report on its recommendations to the 16th Conference in 2020.

15th Conference Resolution no. 2016/4

(Agenda item 5)

The Conference,

Having regard to Article XXV, penultimate paragraph, of the Convention,

Noting CIML Resolutions nos. 2013/7, 2014/6, 2015/5 and 2016/6,

Resolves:

The audited accounts for 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015 are hereby approved. The CIML President and the BIML Director are finally discharged for the financial management during these years.

15th Conference Resolution no. 2016/5

(Agenda item 6)

The Conference,

Having regard to Article VIII, first and fifth paragraphs, of the Convention,

Noting the report on publications approved by the Committee since the 14th Conference in 2012 in Annex D,

Resolves:

The OIML publications listed in the report in Annex D are hereby sanctioned. Member States are reminded of their obligation to implement OIML Recommendations as far as possible.

15th Conference Resolution no. 2016/6

(Agenda item 8.4)

The Conference,

Having regard to Article XXIV, first paragraph, Article XXVI (1), and Article XXVIII, second paragraph, of the Convention,

Noting Resolution no. 2016/10 of the 51st CIML Meeting,

Considering that the total number of base contributory shares, taking into account the classification of Member States as reviewed in 2016, is 144 for the year 2017 and, after reclassification of some Member States, 146 for the remaining years of the 2017–2020 financial period,

Resolves:

- a) The overall amount of credits, necessary to cover the Organization's operating expenses shall be €8 827 000 for the 2017–2020 financial period;
- b) The annual base contributory share for the 2017–2020 financial period is €14 000. This results in a total contribution for a Member State classified according to Article XXVI (1) of the Convention in Class 1, Class 2, Class 3 or Class 4 of €56 000, €112 000, €224 000 or €448 000, respectively;
- c) In the case of the admission of a Member State during the financial period, the overall amount of credits mentioned in a) above is increased by the contributory share of that Member State, calculated from its classification and the base contributory share, proportionate to the period from its admission to the expiry of the financial period;
- d) For the 2017–2020 financial period, newly admitted or readmitted Member States shall not pay an entry fee.

15th Conference Resolution no. 2016/7

(Agenda item 10.1)

The Conference,

Having regard to Article XIII of the Convention,

Noting the discussions at the 50th CIML Meeting in 2015 and its Resolution no. 2015/19,

Resolves:

- a) If the Bureau has been notified that the designated representative of a Member State no longer satisfies the conditions for membership of the Committee and the Member State has not yet designated a new representative, this person shall no longer be taken into account when establishing the quorum for decisions of the Committee;
- b) If the designated representative of a Member State has not responded to any communication from the Bureau for more than six months and the Bureau has made all reasonably possible attempts to contact the designated representative, the Bureau shall seek confirmation from the Member State as to the status of its representative in the Committee, according to a procedure decided by the Committee;
- c) If it is not possible, within a reasonable period of time to be decided by the Committee, to obtain confirmation from the Member State as to the status of its representative in the Committee, this person shall no longer be taken into account when establishing the quorum for decisions of the Committee.

15th Conference Resolution no. 2016/8

(Agenda item 11)

The Conference,

Having regard to Article X of the Convention,

Considering the standing practice to organize a Conference once every four years,

Resolves:

The Committee is hereby charged to organize the 16th Conference in 2020, the venue and dates to be decided by the Committee.

14 Liaisons

14.1 Report by the BIML on liaison activities

14.2 Short reports from / presentations by Liaison Organizations

Mr. Mason stated that one of the liaison organizations, CECIP, had unfortunately had to leave the meeting, but their presentation would be made available on the website.

Mr. Dunmill added that there had been two presentations: one from each of the representatives that had attended the meeting, and both of them would be made available.

Mr. Mason said there would be two presentations from the IEC and ILAC. Normally there would also be a presentation on general liaison activities, but he recalled that this presentation had been made during the Conference, and so hopefully the Committee would feel they had received enough information about this. No Members required a BIML presentation on this.

Since the IEC was alphabetically the first of the liaison organizations, Mr. Mason asked them to make their presentation first.

International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC)

Mr. David Hanlon introduced himself as the secretary of the Conformity Assessment Board (CAB) of the IEC. He said he would tell the Committee a little about the IEC, and especially about its conformity assessment activities. However, before he did so, on behalf of the IEC he wanted to offer his regrets and condolences for the passing of Willem Kool. He said that Willem had had a very good relationship with the IEC, and had been much appreciated. Willem had also had ideas for an even closer working relationship between the two organizations in conformity assessment. During Willem's illness, Ian Dunmill had stepped in and had made a connection with the IEC, and more recently, they had been talking with Paul Dixon on possible opportunities for creating synergies on the conformity assessment front.

Mr. Hanlon said that the IEC's work covered billions of electrical and electronic components devices and systems that were used in homes, offices, industry, health facilities, public spaces, power networks, cities, transportation, information technology, agriculture, manufacturing and many more areas. The IEC always looked at safety interoperability, electromagnetic interference, responsible use of hazardous substances, waste management, and the environment. Mr. Hanlon said that electrical and electronic devices were now the biggest trade sector in the world, and he stated that in 2015 they had represented 17.7% of trade value according to UN trade statistics. Many, if not most of these electrical and electronic goods relied on IEC international standards and IEC conformity assessment activities. He said that currently, electronic and electrical materials, parts and sub-assemblies transit through many countries before they were assembled somewhere, then shipped somewhere else, and then consumed. He said they were generally no longer the industrial manufacture of a single country. More often than not electrotechnical devices were "made in the world". He underlined that without imports there would be no exports, and that currently, economic growth directly depended on the ability of industry to successfully sell inside a country, and increasingly beyond. Mr. Hanlon observed that manufacturers and suppliers must not only satisfy consumers' needs and regulatory requirements, but also the requirements of other manufacturers and suppliers in business-to-business transactions, and to create confidence and acceptance, all of this entailed testing and verification. The IEC enabled all of this, and he emphasized that without standards and verification, quality, safety and overall risk management would simply be impossible.

The IEC had been established in 1906 and currently it had regional offices in North and South America, in Africa, in Asia and Australia, and its central office was in Geneva in Switzerland. The African Office in Nairobi, Kenya had been inaugurated in 2015. Mr. Hanlon said the IEC had 169 countries as members or affiliates. He stated that it had two main activities which were standards development and conformity assessment. The standards development activities were managed by the Standardization Management Board (SMB) while the conformity assessment activities were managed by the Conformity Assessment Board (CAB), and he re-iterated that he was the secretary of the CAB. He reported that the IEC recognized the value of standards, but it also recognized that in most cases, using standards equated to doing conformity assessment. Whether talking about a manufacturer, end user, or an independent third party, when they used a standard to check a product or a service, they were carrying out conformity assessment, and in this way standards and conformity assessment were like two sides of a coin, neither side having value without the other. Only together did standards and conformity assessment create value. The IEC developed international standards, but it also managed global conformity assessment schemes. The IEC helped industry to get access to foreign markets. It did this by operating international certification schemes. Products were tested and services assessed by commercial conformity assessment bodies anywhere in the world, and the results were recognized everywhere in the world. He said that an IEC CA system certificate was like a passport to the world.

Mr. Hanlon explained that the IEC had four global conformity assessment systems, and almost a million certificates had been issued through the IEC CA systems, with more than 80 000 certificates currently being issued each year. There were more than 800 commercial testing laboratories and certification bodies from around the world that were Members of the IEC CA systems. The IEC

systems were the IEC EE, which was for products and equipment for homes, offices, medical, manufacturing, public spaces, smart grid, electric vehicles (EVs) and so on, and its well-known certification scheme was called the CV scheme. The IEC Ex was for the verification needs for the Ex industry (the explosive atmospheres industry). The IEC Q served mainly business-to-business interests, but with a trickle-down effect for consumers, and it covered electronic components, supply chain, supplier qualification, hazardous substances, and much more. He drew Members' attention to the aircraft that were used by people like themselves to fly to their various meetings around the world, and said that the maintenance and supply of parts for those aircraft were all qualified by the IEC Q, so it had a personal impact on their lives. Lastly, he mentioned the IEC RE which was the most recent conformity assessment system for renewable energies in the wind energy, marine energy, and the photovoltaic solar sectors.

Mr. Hanlon went on to explain that all of the IEC global CA systems were membership and rules-based organizations. He stated that the members wrote the rules and were obliged to abide by them. There was one member per body, and one member body per country. The IEC CA systems were open to all qualification certification bodies and testing laboratories. He certified that the fundamental strength of the IEC CA systems was that they created the essential confidence that was needed to accept the test and certification results from other bodies within the IEC CA systems. The way they did this was through an operational model which involved two pillars. The first pillar created the conditions for consistent reproducible and comparable results, and was based on the use of common predefined rules of procedure and common interpretation of the standards being used. He said that these common rules and interpretations were developed by the participating certification bodies and test laboratories themselves. The second pillar ensured that those doing the testing and certification had the qualifications, competencies, and capacity to do the work correctly. He underlined that this was similar to an accreditation audit, but said that the IEC peer assessment went much further, as it also ensured that the work was performed in the same way by all, according to the common rules and procedures of the first pillar. He highlighted that this was the source of the world-wide confidence in certificates issued within the IEC global CA systems. He emphasized that this was what made those test results and certificates believable. Mr. Hanlon said that accreditation was an essential element in the world of conformity assessment. It was the basis for recognizing national competency and therefore recognizing a result.

The IEC would liken accreditation to qualifying for individual activities. He gave the example of a musician, where accreditation would check if a musician was qualified to play music: did they have a musical instrument, could they read the music, and could they play the music correctly. Accreditation would not check the choice of instrument to play, nor the tempo, nor the style in which it was played, whereas IEC peer assessment was all about qualifying team activities. He used the example of a musician again and said that the basic ability to play an instrument must of course be present, but to play in an orchestra and make beautiful music together would require much more: the ability to play with other musicians in the orchestra, agreement on playing the same music in a harmonized way, playing in accordance with the rhythm and following the instructions of the conductor. Each musician needed to be confident in the ability of the other musicians, and to achieve this, musicians went through auditions where musicians check musicians, or in other words, they did peer assessment. That was what created the confidence to allow them to play as a team. The goal of the two pillars of the operational model was to create confidence for multilateral mutual recognition of test results and certificates issued by participants in the IEC CA system. Successful mutual recognition was the proof that a certification scheme actually worked. The IEC CA system's participants recognized the results coming from other participants because they themselves helped to develop the rules and interpretations used to reach those results, and they knew they would obtain the same results themselves. This was because the conformity assessment results were based on appropriate competency, on the use of harmonized rules and work processes, and on the application of common understanding and interpretation of the standards. Moreover, all the participants knew that the other participants that

produced the results had been peer-assessed in the same way that they had themselves been peer-assessed. Successful mutual recognition was proof that the IEC CA systems actually worked.

Mr. Hanlon stated that the IEC CA services existed because the market wanted them. The market paid money for these services because it got value for its money. The value that these services brought occurred on two levels. Firstly, the certificates represented consistent and reliable high quality results from anywhere in the world, and secondly, these results were recognized and accepted all over the world. He concluded that if anyone wanted to learn more about the IEC CA systems, how they worked, and the value they created, there was a series of e-learning modules on the IEC website.

As Members had seen, the IEC had extensive experience in establishing, operating and creating value with global conformity assessment systems, and Mr. Hanlon said it was because of this experience that Willem Kool had had the idea that the IEC could lend support to the OIML for its own certification system. Legal metrology was an essential activity that facilitated commerce and trade. Since the IEC's activities were also involved in facilitating world trade, the two organizations were complementary, and there were synergies that could be created by working closely together on conformity assessment activities. Perhaps together, some day, the two organizations could achieve Willem's vision. The IEC and the OIML currently had a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) which had last been signed in 2011 but which had been anticipated to be renewed every three years, so it was currently overdue. It covered activities on the standards side, both concerning standards development as well as the referencing of standards, and it also covered activities on the conformity assessment side. However, on the conformity assessment side there were opportunities to create stronger links, certainly in connection with the new OIML certification system. Lastly, he said if any Members had any questions, he would be happy to try to answer them.

Ms. Vukovic (Slovenia) wanted to know why the MoU between the IEC and the OIML was overdue and whether they were going to renew it.

Mr. Hanlon replied that the MoU had been updated in 2011, and it stated that it should be updated every three years. He said he had the report from the IEC representative who had been at the CIML meeting that had been held in Auckland in 2014, where it had been agreed that the MoU should be discussed and updated, but apparently it never had been. It was still valid, and in use, but there may now be things that they could talk about which would be useful to both organizations, and which could be included in the MoU. He said that this was an offer from the IEC to the OIML to open discussions again, but he said it did not need redefining, rather just some fine tuning.

Mr. Mason remarked that if he remembered correctly from the discussions that had taken place in Auckland, the MoU document had been reviewed, and it had been decided that at that time it did not needed to be changed, probably because no one had realized it was about to expire. He added that he was not sure that a three-year term was appropriate for an MoU. He considered that more stability should be introduced into the organizations' relationships than this would allow. He also observed that when he had signed the MoU in 2011, he had been very much focused on the standards side of what the IEC had to contribute, and in that sense, he had thought of ISO and the IEC in almost the same way, as standards-making bodies, and that one of the things that this presentation had brought out was the extent to which the IEC had a much wider field of activity, which covered conformity assessment. This was of massive significance to the OIML, as the OIML was revising its certification system, so he concluded that they would definitely be following up this invitation, and it was now the time to have a fresh look at the MoU in the light of the much wider overlap of activities than there was five years ago.

Mr. Mason added that time was now short and suggested that if there were any other questions, they were addressed to Mr. Hanlon in person after the meeting. He thanked Mr. Hanlon for his presentation and added that it was of great significance that the second of the presentations by liaison organizations also concerned the conformity assessment side of the OIML's activities.

**International Laboratory Accreditation Forum (ILAC) /
International Accreditation Forum (IAF)**

Mr. Mason said that it was a great delight to invite the representative from ILAC to make a short presentation. He said that he always used the phrase ILAC/IAF in recognition of these two sister bodies, and he could see this was a report on both of them.

Mr. Andre Barel introduced himself and stated that normally he worked in the accreditation laboratory in the Netherlands (RvA), but that he had been asked by ILAC and IAF to summarize the global co-operation of accreditation bodies. He asked delegates to consider the main visions of the accreditation fora, which were to achieve one single worldwide program on conformity assessment and that accredited services should be reliable. He also considered that governments and regulators should be able to rely on IAF and ILAC arrangements to further develop and enhance their trade agreements and also to support the freedom of world trade by eliminating technical barriers, and of course realizing the free trade goal of “tested and certified once and accepted everywhere”. Mr. Barel said that in order to achieve this, IAF and ILAC had some common objectives, which were to maintain and expand the mutual recognition agreements by including more economies and expanding into new areas. They also wanted to increase co-operation with all relevant stakeholders, and he considered that the OIML was one of the more important of these. He indicated that they would act as a central hub to harmonize best practice in conformity assessment and to provide assistance in developing countries, providing training and support to new accreditation activities so that they could participate in the MRAs.

He stated that ILAC was not as old as the OIML and the IEC, having started with laboratory accreditation in 1977, which had been followed by work in the certification area in 1993. During this time, various bilateral agreements had been forged, followed by multilateral agreements and mutual recognition agreements, and at the moment the organization had a number of standards which were covered by these agreements, and they were continuing to expand, for example with ISO 17043 for providers of proficiency testing, and they were planning to work with reference material producers according to ISO 17034.

He described the signatories to the ILAC and IAF arrangements as accreditation bodies which were expected to comply with the requirements of ISO/IEC 17011, and additionally with the IAF-ILAC Series A documents. The aim was that signatories recognized each other’s work, such as certification and testing reports, etc., which provided businesses with the assurance that bodies worldwide operated to the same standards. As with the IEC, the organization tried to harmonize its work and make sure that the results were comparable, with the main target being the removal of technical barriers to trade.

Mr. Barel showed delegates a slide of the IAF and ILAC Regional Cooperation Bodies, and pointed out that the Pacific Accreditation Cooperation body (PAC) was only involved in the certification area, whereas the Asia Pacific Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation body (APLAC) was responsible for laboratory accreditation.

With regards to the scale of the cooperation, Mr. Barel stated that the ILAC network included 150 bodies from more than 110 economies, which meant that 91 MR.A signatories represented 97 economies at the moment. The ILAC MR.A covered testing, calibration and inspection to ISO/IEC 17025, and for medical devices to ISO 15189. In total they covered about 95 % of global GDP. Currently more than 52 000 laboratories were accredited, as well as approximately 8 000 inspection bodies, although the numbers were increasing. He went on to show delegates a slide of the countries covered by accreditation, although he indicated that a few more countries had joined the accreditation scheme in the last year since the slide had been produced. With regard to certification, Mr. Barel indicated that the IAF MLA covered a lot of scopes, but he considered the most interesting of the more recent schemes was GLOBALG.A.P, the ISO 22000 series for food safety management systems, and the ISO/IEC 27000 system for information security management systems. He showed delegates a map of the countries covered by certification bodies within the MR.As, which he indicated was also a growing number.

Mr. Barel indicated that accreditation was run by the accreditation bodies, which were checked by peer evaluation. As the system was designed to be free from commercial aims, it needed to be one where

the accreditation bodies were free of competition and without hierarchy, so it had been decided that peer evaluation would be used to assess each other's compliance with ISO 17011. The conformity assessment bodies were then under the accreditation bodies, and used the accreditation standards ISO/IEC 17025, 17020, 17065 and so on. The conformity assessment bodies then used regulatory requirements, product standards and schemes to check the products they were testing or certifying on behalf of manufacturers.

Mr. Barel went on to summarize what was going on in the accreditation business. He said there was a commitment to developing a harmonized global approach for accreditation practices, and to maintaining the arrangements on the equal reliability of accreditation services. There was also a commitment to promoting the accreditation system for government regulators and businesses, to remove technical barriers to trade, and to supporting developing economies in the development of their infrastructure and in encouraging them to join the accreditation system. The ultimate goal was public confidence in goods and services.

He highlighted the joint programs between ILAC and the OIML, stating that there had been a pause in this due to the passing of Willem Kool, but he was glad that Paul Dixon had now taken his place, so that the work program could start up again. They would continue to increase the cooperation, and one of the most recent aspects of the joint work had been OIML D 10, which was almost finished. Although there were no concrete ideas for cooperation between the IAF and the OIML for the moment, there was a survey scheduled to gather some ideas for possible cooperation. As an example, he suggested that product certification might be a good opportunity for cooperation in Europe, where there was a notification system, and widespread use of different standards, including those which are being used in the certification area.

He considered that the common denominators for ILAC/IAF and the OIML were that there should be a level playing field for all parties involved, the promotion of free trade, conformity assessment, trying to improve the traceability of measurements, minimizing cost where cooperation might result in joint assessments, and achieving market confidence by the use of accreditation. Lastly he mentioned that ILAC and IAF had different secretariats and he showed delegates a slide with their contact details, saying that delegates could directly approach them. He asked if anyone had any questions.

Mr. Mason thanked Mr. Barel and asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Dixit asked about the agreement that followed ISO/IEC 17025. He asked what the impact would be on a country or laboratory that did not recognize ILAC. Suppose one of the NMIs considered that ILAC was not relevant to them: what would be the impact on that laboratory?

Mr. Barel was not clear what question was being asked.

Mr. Mason said that the question, as he understood it, was what happened if a laboratory, particularly one that was operating in the sphere of legal metrology, was outside the ILAC system and did not have an accreditation under the MR.A arrangements?

Mr. Barel said that if accreditation bodies were working outside the MR.A, it would be up to the customer and the local government to make up their minds to what extent they could demonstrate that they were following the accreditation requirements, or that they were delivering a reliable service.

Mr. Mason added that under the OIML Certification System that had been approved earlier on, there was an assumption that accreditation would play a very important part in establishing that issuing authorities for the purposes of the new scheme met the standards that are expected in ISO/IEC 17025.

Before closing the session, Mr. Mason thanked the representative from ILAC/IAF, and emphasized the importance of the relationship between the OIML and ILAC/IAF, especially in the light of the OIML Certification System activities, and he was extremely grateful to Mr. Barel for having attended the meeting.

He added that there were two more formal resolutions noting the liaison presentations. The first of these was to note the reports by the liaison organizations, which included both the oral reports and the written reports which had been included in the material for the meeting. There were no comments on

the resolution. There were no abstentions. There were no votes against the resolution. The resolution was passed unanimously.

Resolution no. 2016/30

(Agenda Item 14.2)

The Committee,

Notes the reports made by liaison organizations,

Thanks their representatives for providing this information to the Committee.

14.3 Information regarding the RLMO Round Table

Mr. Mason asked the Second Vice-President to make a presentation about the Regional Legal Metrology Organizations (RLMO) Round Table.

Dr. Miki stated that there had been 30 participants representing 15 Members States, the BIML, and also AFRIMETS, APMLF, COOMET, SIM and WELMEC. These were the full members of the RLMO Round Table, but this time GULFMET had attended as an observer. The RLMO Round Table was a meeting where the various representatives gathered together to exchange information about their various activities and to discuss what they could do that would be of benefit to the other RLMOs. GULFMET had asked to become a full member and had made a presentation. Dr. Miki showed delegates a copy of the agenda of the meeting. The two new items this time had been the presentation by GULFMET and the fact that the Round Table had been followed by the Advisory Group meeting for CEEMS, so in the agenda he had added the presentation by GULFMET under item 4 “Updates from regional organizations and observers” and also all the members had agreed to attend the ASEAN group meeting so item 5 had been moved.

The RLMO reports had been made by Mr. Jaco Marneweck from AFRIMETS, Mr. Steven O’Brien from APMLF, Mr. Peter Ulbig from COOMET, Mr. Omar Kanakrieh from GULFMET, Mr. Ralph Richter from SIM, and Ms. Anneke van Spronsen from WELMEC.

After the exchange and updates, members had discussed the possible actions, and this time there had been three major items that the RLMOs had considered important. The first of these was that e-learning was becoming a common and effective tool among most RLMOs, so Mr. O’Brien had been asked to become a coordinator on this subject, to act as a hub for information between the RLMOs and also with the BIML and the Advisory Group meetings.

Seminars and training were also subjects that various members were interested in, and lastly many participants said that they needed practical documents meaning that when they implemented OIML Recommendations or Guides such as G 1, there was a need for practical explanations. This had led to a long discussion, in which the BIML was interested. At the last meeting, COOMET had suggested that OIML D 1 *Considerations for a law on metrology* would be a good starting point for the creation of a practical document, so this item had been very important. These subjects could be seen as targets for further discussions. These matters also concerned the Advisory Group, the BIML and the OIML, so their collaboration would be indispensable.

Dr. Miki said that there was not really sufficient time to discuss the provisional website he was constructing for the RLMOs. He showed delegates a diagram indicating the site and said that it had links to the RLMOs own websites, to enable easy access to their recent news, event calendars and so on. In the future it was also anticipated that it would contain information on Round Table meetings, such as documents and files related to them. The site would not be open to the public, but Committee members and RLMO representatives would be able to access it.

He felt that the discussions that had taken place had been very exciting and that the website would eventually move to the OIML website. GULFMET had been accepted as a full member. Dr. Miki believed that all members would agree to holding the next meeting in conjunction with the next CIML Meeting in 2017.

Mr. Khedir (Tunisia) asked what GULFMET would be a member of. Dr. Miki replied that they would be a member of the RLMO Round Table. He reported that the Presidential Council had previously discussed who should be members of the Round Table and what its function was, and it had been decided that it should be for the RLMOs to gather and exchange information. He said that the members of the RLMO Round Table wished it to be open to requests to join.

Mr. Khedir considered that the conclusions of the meeting were not clear, for example, he felt that the information on seminars and guides was too vague.

Dr. Miki stated that seminars were common training activities amongst all the RLMOs concerned, and that information on this could probably be collected.

Mr. Khedir interrupted to ask for specific information about the areas that would be covered by these seminars, and the subjects that were of the highest priority.

Dr. Miki replied that COOMET had said that they would be leading a seminar on technical activities such as the OIML Certification System.

Mr. Khedir found this too general.

Mr. Mason agreed that it was very general as it was guidance on the sort of areas that the Bureau and the Advisory Group could work on together with the RLMOs. The Round Table was an encouragement for them to look for specific examples. The RLMO Round Table was not a decision-making body. Mr. Mason's expectations were that it would make general decisions, but he understood it to be mainly a mechanism for sharing views amongst the RLMOs so that those views could be fed into the other parts of the OIML's work. He was not concerned that the conclusions were not specific, and said the specific ideas would come when the Bureau and the Advisory Group pursued these ideas as part of their follow-up to CIML Resolution 2015/10.

Mr. Patoray said that when he had started at the Bureau, there had been an RLMO Round Table, but he considered that the aims of the group had not been very clear, although a lot of work had been carried out early in its existence, and they were now trying to identify how this could be improved on. Initially, Mr. Mason had stepped in and tried to focus the group more by including more detail in its terms of reference. When Dr. Miki had become the chair of the group it had become more focused, but the idea of the group was that it was a network where the RLMOs could meet, exchange information, and be able to build on each other's activities, so that they were aware of what the others were doing. It provided a forum or a platform for the RLMOs to network with each other, and with the addition of the website that Dr. Miki had described, there would be a common way of looking at e-learning, seminars, and other practical aspects that the individual RLMOs, or the region that they were from, were planning to do. There was now much more concrete information resulting from the discussions within the various regions, and this group was there to gather that information. The work had been more dynamic, and he felt that it had been improving the communication and network capabilities of the RLMOs. He welcomed GULFMET being able to join, and felt they would be a positive influence. Mr. Patoray considered the regions to be very important, and said that they sent a representative from the Bureau to each regional meeting whenever possible, but that the RLMO Round Table was the one time of year when they could meet together, which helped with communications, and in developing trust. He said he would expect more detailed information from this group in the future.

Mr. O'Brien (on behalf of the APMLF) said that Mr. Patoray had just summed up what he wanted to say, but added that what the RLMOs were doing was assessing what resources were readily available within the various regions, and ensuring that they were not duplicating their efforts by sharing available resources. This was particularly important for example where he had been coordinating some of the e-learning activities, and there were resources readily available within some of the RLMOs and within different individual economies. This group ensured that the activities were not being duplicated. He anticipated taking small steps, and felt that the Round Table would be a very useful way of exchanging ideas.

Mr. Mason added it was important to reflect on how far the group had come. Although he had not been involved in the first meetings of the Round Table, he had been told that at that time there was a certain amount of suspicion and concern about the nature of the relationship and ambitions of the OIML

alongside the regional bodies. He now felt that there was extremely good cooperation with the regional bodies, and there was a much better understanding of what was best done at the regional level, what was best done at the regional level but in a coordinated way, what was best done at the OIML level, and indeed what was best done through a mechanism such as the Advisory Group. He reinforced what the Director had said: he had been very impressed by what he had heard about the way the Round Table had been conducted. There were no more questions about this.

Mr. Mason went on to highlight the fact that the RLMOs had put a lot of effort into their Round Table, and the Second Vice-President had put a lot of effort into giving an account of that meeting, so it was therefore only right to take a resolution on this item.

Resolution no. 2016/31

(Agenda Item 14.3)

The Committee,

Notes the report made by its Second Vice-President on the RLMO Round Table held on Monday

17 October 2016,

Thanks the Second Vice-President for his leadership of this Round Table.

15 Human resource matters

15.1 Election of a CIML Vice-President

This item was dealt with directly under item 19 *Approval of meeting resolutions* – see item 19 below.

16 Awards

Eighth OIML Award for excellent achievements in legal metrology in developing countries (2016)

Although he had not actually counted them, Mr. Mason had the impression that there had been a record number of nominations for this award, some of which had been very good, but there had been one that stood out for him. He did not want to leave Members in suspense and so he declared that the eighth *OIML Award for excellent achievements in legal metrology in developing countries* would go to the Institute of Trade Standards Administration, Kenya. They were known by the initials of ITSA, or as it would be for him “the other ITSA”, because as many Members would know, the professional association for trading standards inspectors, the old weights and measures inspectors, in the UK also called itself the Institute of Trading Standards Administration, or ITSA, so this was “the other ITSA”.

ITSA Kenya was a professional body of legal metrologists in Kenya which administered, in conjunction with the department of weights and measures, the curriculum for legal metrology officers in Kenya, and it trained legal metrology officers, which sounded just like the UK’s ITSA. The Institute also organized short training courses on request, and had already done so, not just for its own officers, but for the legal metrology officers and training institutions in Burundi, Rwanda and Ethiopia. These training courses had been an important contribution to the development of reliable legal metrology systems in east Africa. He had been told that the intention of ITSA was to continue to expand these activities in the future. Although ITSA did not have a permanent management staff or an office as such, it was run by an executive council elected by its Members at its annual general meeting. The elected members of the ITSA executive council also happened to be the serving legal metrology officers in the department of weights and measures of Kenya. On behalf of the Committee he wanted to offer the warmest congratulations to the Institute through the Kenyan CIML Member, who he hoped would come to the podium to accept the award. He wanted him to pass on the Committee’s thanks and congratulations for everything ITSA did for its legal metrology community. Mr. Mason invited Mr. Onyancha to say a few words, although he revealed that he had decided not to

tell Mr. Onyancha that he was going to receive this award, so he had not had a chance to prepare an acceptance speech!

Mr. Onyancha said he was very surprised and commented that Mr. Mason had managed to keep it a secret all week. He said he was delighted, and on behalf of his country he wanted to thank the Committee for recognizing what his institution had been doing to help developing countries achieve the level of legal metrology that was required. As Members were aware, legal metrology was everything, since without legal metrology, trade could not take place, so in Kenya they were striving to ensure that all their neighboring countries developed their infrastructure so that they could contribute effectively. He wanted to thank Mr. Mason specifically, and said that he would be leaving a good legacy behind which would continue long after his tenure. He also wanted to thank all his colleagues who had assisted in some way or another, specifically the PTB, and he emphasized that Kenya would carry on cooperating with them so that legal metrology could go on being developed in Africa and the rest of the world.

Presentations by the winners of the Seventh OIML award for excellent contributions from developing countries to legal metrology (2015)

Mr. Mason reminded Members that at last year's meeting, this award had gone to two individuals. As usual, the Committee offered them an opportunity the following year to make a presentation about their activities, so that so that it could hear why they were deserving of this award.

Anselm Gittens, Saint Lucia

The first person he called to make his presentation was Mr. Anselm Gittens. Members had already heard from him on a number of occasions during the course of the meeting, and Mr. Mason reported that he had had the pleasure of meeting him when he was in the Dominican Republic in November 2015. He had been impressed by his enthusiasm and his determination to make a contribution, which went beyond the confines of the beautiful island of St Lucia. He asked Mr. Gittens to make his presentation.

Mr. Gittens thanked Mr. Mason for his introduction, and before he proceeded with his presentation he took the opportunity to congratulate Kenya on their award this year. He joked that Kenya was welcome to the club, and pointed out that they would be following St Lucia, but that was OK. His presentation was entitled "*Metrology in a small island developing state*".

As everyone knew, St Lucia was a small country in the Caribbean. It was a mountainous country of volcanic origin, and its main activities were tourism, financial services, agro-processing, construction, and beverage production, the main one being alcohol: specifically rum and beers. St Lucia was an independent country in the British Commonwealth and the official language was English, but due to the fact that the English and French had fought over St Lucia, and it had changed hands fourteen times, the majority of St Lucians spoke French creole. It was part of the Windward Islands and part of the chain of islands called the Lesser Antilles. Mr. Gittens said that St Lucia was a very small dot on the map, with an area of 616 square kilometres and a population of 170 000 people but despite this, they were proud of the fact that they had two Nobel prize winners. In 1979, Sir Arthur Lewis had received the Nobel prize for economics, and in 1992, Sir Derick Walcott had received the Nobel prize for literature. By coincidence they had both been born on 23 January, but ten years apart.

Of course, St Lucia had been very proud to have received the OIML award the previous year. He showed delegates a slide of one of the most picturesque parts of St Lucia, and told them that it was a UNESCO World Heritage Site. It was one of the landmarks of the Caribbean and was called the Pitons, which was from the French for "peaks" and it was St Lucia's Twin Peaks. Although the area was very beautiful, it was volcanic, and there was an area of boiling mud and there were development issues since they were exploring the potential for geothermal energy, so that St Lucia did not have to rely on fossil fuels in the future. The seismic activity was also monitored 24 hours a day, 7 days a week because of the earthquakes that originated in that area.

In terms of weights and measures, or legal metrology, there had been an Ordinance in 1911, under which the police force had been made responsible for weights and measures. In the 1970s, the Department of Consumer Affairs had started weights and measures activities, but unfortunately this had not been done in a very scientific manner, so in 1993, a weights and measures unit had been established within the St Lucia Bureau of Standards (SLBS). SLBS was also the National Standard body. In 1994, SLBS had begun joint verification with the consumer affairs department. At that time, they had been located on the fourth floor of the government building, which Mr. Gittens commented had not been ideal for weights and measure work, particularly in the area of mass, and he recalled that at one time the elevator had broken down for six months and all the weights had been stuck on the fourth floor! In 1996, a survey had been carried out on the accuracy of fuel dispensers in St Lucia, which had concluded that consumers had not been getting value for money. On further investigation, they had realized that the standards used by the technicians to adjust all the fuel dispensers had not been verified or calibrated in years, and this had introduced an error into the petrol pumps, to the detriment of the consumers. Mr. Gittens said that they had told the government that the only way to correct this problem was to pass a new law, since the 1911 law made no provision for petrol pumps as in those days there had been no petrol pumps or fuel dispensers in St Lucia. In 2000, the government had acted on this proposal, and had passed a new Metrology Act, which had been based on OIML Recommendations. The following year they had passed the regulations which had incorporated the various Recommendations into law, which allowed verification to be conducted according to OIML Recommendations. At that time, there had only been 11 employees. In 2004 they had moved to a new building, where everyone had been housed under one roof in an area of 921 m², and by 2010 there had been a staff of 22 people, although only three had been working in the metrology department. At present there were 30 staff, with five working on metrology.

They were responsible for the type approval of measuring instruments, the verification and calibration of measuring instruments, measurement assurance, and quality management systems. In addition, they became involved in measurement disputes between suppliers and consumers, and were also responsible for the advancement of the use of the SI. For type approval they relied on OIML certificates issued by the USA's NTEP, and on certificates from Measurement Australia. The program ensured that there was proof of type approval as a prerequisite for verification. He showed delegates a slide demonstrating an example where they had applied type approval. This particular company had a quarry and exported boulders, and they had approached the SLBS to verify their on-board weighing system. When the SLBS had carried out the necessary checks, they had realized that the system had not been legal for trade, so they had asked the company to upgrade to a model from the same manufacturer that met requirements of R 51 *Automatic catchweighing instruments*, and also the requirements of R 76 *Non-automatic weighing instruments*. They now picked up the aggregates, sand, and so on, and automatically computed the weights, and the SLBS now verified the on-board weighing system to ensure that everything met the legal requirements. Mr. Gittens put up a slide showing the inside of the bucket of the scoop of the tractor, with the roller weight standards that were used to check the accuracy.

Mr. Gittens explained that the SLBS had a lot of capacity in the area of mass for the verification of weights, non-automatic weighing instruments, automatic catchweighers and weighbridges, and they could also check the accuracy of prepackaged goods. In the area of volume, they could carry out the verification of fuel dispensers and flow meters, and they could also verify the accuracy of test measures. In the area of force, they could verify compression machines, and in the area of pressure they verified sphygmomanometers. They had also put in place a temperature capability, although the equipment was not yet commissioned. The SLBS also had capacity in time and frequency, and their intention was to be able to disseminate time nationally, so that all legal clocks would eventually be synchronized to the national standard that existed at the SLBS. With regard to the verification of mass, one of the things they had noticed was that people were importing weighing instruments from North America and Europe, and were trying to put them into service. However, because St Lucia was closer to the equator, the gravity was lower, and the instruments had to be adjusted. However, they had

recently found out that there was a serious negative gravity anomaly in St Lucia where the gravity was less than it should be. This was because St Lucia was close to the point where the Caribbean plate met the Atlantic plate, so that as one travelled from West to East across St Lucia at the same latitude and the same height above sea level, one would still notice a decrease in gravity. The SLBS wanted to carry out some investigations to determine whether this negative gravity anomaly actually affected the integrity of the verification program. At times people brought in weighing instruments to the SLBS and then took them back to their business locations and the SLBS was not sure whether there would be a change in the indication of the weight based on the negative gravity anomaly, so this would require further research. Mr. Gittens quoted the phrase “a picture is worth a thousand words” and showed Members a slide of the “pass” sticker the SLBS used once an instrument had been found to comply with the law. If it did not comply, he said they used a red “rejected” sticker, and consumers knew to look for the stickers on weighing and measuring instruments. They also used wire seals to ensure that there was no tampering and it was illegal to break the seals or remove the stickers.

The SLBS also carried out verification for official activities, for example in the area of forensics, and Mr. Gittens said that the commodity being weighed in the slide he was showing delegates was “an illegal substance called marijuana” which was still illegal in St Lucia. He observed that this was not being weighed at the SLBS, but at the forensics laboratory, where the SLBS had verified the weighing equipment so the court could apply the appropriate fine.

Mr. Gittens re-iterated that they verified weighbridges, and showed delegates a slide of an old weighbridge that had been built in the 1940s. He said that for decades, the police had carried out verification, but they had not done this in a very scientific manner. They would just put 50 kg on a weighbridge of ten metric tons capacity, and if it seemed correct, the police had passed it. When the SLBS had checked it in 2001 they had found a number of errors which he highlighted on a slide. The company involved, which had purchased copra to convert into coconut oil, had actually been over-paying farmers for decades, and eventually they had gone out of business, making many people redundant and putting them on the bread-line, so it had had a detrimental effect on the community. The fact that the weighbridge had been inaccurate had contributed significantly to the decline of the business. Mr. Gittens went on to show delegates a slide of the verification of an electronic weighbridge. Instead of a wire seal, this weighbridge used an electronic audit trail, which could be followed to determine whether there had been any tampering after the verification had been carried out. The SLBS also verified hopper scales used in batching plants to produce ready-mixed concrete. Mr. Gittens remarked that as Members would know, the strength of the concrete was critical to any major engineering project, so the batching plant would measure the percentage of water, cement and sand to determine the strength of the concrete. He showed delegates a hopper scale together with the rectangular weights which were OIML class M₂. They also certified weighbridges at landfill sites. All waste that came into the landfill had to be weighed to determine the life-span of the landfill site and to quantify the amount of waste going into the landfill.

They also carried out the verification of scales in supermarkets against the requirements of R 76. The SLBS was also involved in metrology in sports, since certain sports such as boxing were weight-based. He showed a slide of an international boxing tournament that had been held in St Lucia a few years ago, and said that the SLBS had verified the scales that had been used to weigh the boxers. In 2009, St Lucia had hosted an event sanctioned by the IAF (International Athletics Federation). The IAF rules stated that if any records were to be recognized for throwing implements such as the javelin, shot-put, or discus, those implements had to be weighed on a verified weighing instrument. The SLBS had therefore verified the non-automatic weighing instrument used to weigh the javelins so that any records made in that event would be valid.

They were also involved in legal metrology in health. They had held a public awareness activity where they had taken scales and measuring tapes to a central point in the city and used these to determine people’s body mass index. Then a doctor had taken their blood pressure measurements, so the public had received an assessment of their risk factors in terms of heart attacks and strokes. Mr. Gittens

commented that this had always been a popular activity, and they always had a long line of people who wanted their blood pressure measured, with some people finding out for the first time that they were hypertensive.

Mr. Gittens continued that if they did not have the capacity in St Lucia to do the necessary verification or calibration, then they would contact their colleagues from neighboring islands and showed delegates an example where they had contacted the Jamaican Bureau of Standards to assist them in the calibration of large storage tanks that had been used in a plant which manufactured juices and bottled water. He also showed delegates a slide of the SLBS carrying out the verification of fuel dispensers which was the application of R 117, and R 120 applied to the accuracy of the test measures. The inspectors had actually been from the Trinidad Bureau of Standards, which was to the south of St Lucia, and had been undergoing training because St Lucia had a good program for the verification of fuel dispensers. Mr. Gittens indicated that the verification of compression machines would be carried out from next year against the requirements of R 65. He showed delegates a slide demonstrating the verification of a blood pressure meter with its green sticker so that the public would be aware that it had been verified. He also showed delegates a slide of the working standards, stating that they used the R 111 requirements. Mr. Gittens stated that they now recalibrated their test measures in-house using the gravimetric method, and emphasized that distilled water was used for this.

With regard to measurement disputes, when consumers felt that they had not received value for money, they carried out an investigation to determine what the nature of the problem had been, and he said that they had had many disputes involving utility meters, smart meters and water meters, and in many cases they had found that the customers had been the first ones to detect that there had been a problem. In St Lucia there was no piped gas, so they used what would be referred to in the UK as “camping gas”. All gas was supplied in cylinders, and there were issues with the accuracy of these. The cylinders were sold by weight, and consumers often complained that the weight had been inaccurate and they had not received value for their money.

The next slide showed the problems of imported prepackaged goods. It demonstrated the classic inadequate package which said “net weight 40 g” but the gross weight had only been 23 g. Mr. Gittens went on to show Members a slide of an investigation involving an electromechanical electricity meter. The consumer’s bill had suddenly increased when he had moved to a new apartment, although he had not been using any extra appliances. When they had put 10 kWh through the meter it had actually registered 20 kWh. It had had an error of 100 %, and had been found to have no type approval. Investigations had revealed that an incorrect component had been used when the instrument had been assembled. Based on that investigation, the power company had invested in a new state-of-the-art test bench and had begun to test all their meters. He also showed the SLBS carrying out an investigation on the accuracy of smart meters. Mr. Gittens showed a slide on which the meter at the top had type approval against the NMI Australia (and IEC) requirements for smart meters, and the one below had been designed according to ANSI requirements. They had found that the one at the top, which met the IEC requirements, had been more accurate than the one below that met the ANSI requirements, and they had also discovered that the ANSI meters had been very sensitive to harmonics and direct current in the alternating current circuit, so Mr. Gittens reported that certain appliances would produce large errors when ANSI meters were used. Mr. Gittens reported that the SLBS did not have a test bed but they had recently acquired a meter from NES, which had been the first company to obtain approval according to R 46, and they intended to use this meter when they were carrying out investigations in the field on the accuracy of meters.

Mr. Mason intervened to indicate that unfortunately the Committee was running out of time. He asked that the rest of the presentation be made available on the website, but he wanted to emphasize that this presentation had been an inspiration to many of the Members as it had demonstrated what could be achieved on a very small island with very few people. He stressed that the Committee was very grateful for the presentation but unfortunately they needed to move onto the next item.

Mr. Nam Hyuk Lim, Republic of Korea

Mr. Mason said that the next presentation was from the other award winner from the previous year, Mr. Nam Hyuk Lim from the Republic of Korea. He considered that the significance of this award was that it reminded the Committee that part of the story of helping developing countries was transferring expertise from the developed world to developing countries, adding that he would not dream of describing the Republic of Korea as a developing country now! This was rather a demonstration of what it was possible to do when a country with expertise set out to share that expertise with others.

Mr. Nam Hyuk Lim introduced himself and his country of origin again. He joked that one of his friends, who lived in Germany, had told Mr. Lim that because of him, he had a problem with his jaw. Mr. Lim said he had asked him what had happened. His friend had replied that pronouncing Mr. Lim's name was so difficult it had broken his jaw, so from that time on, when he carried out overseas business, he had used an English name. Therefore, to protect their "valuable jaws", Mr. Lim said the Committee could refer to him as "Anthony". With regard to the main topic of his presentation, Mr. Lim said he had been involved in legal metrology and conformity assessment for the last 15 years, but since his time was limited, he would be focusing on a co-operation project with developing countries, and especially its recent activities. About 23 years ago, various CIML Members had helped Korea to establish legal systems. Sometimes they had bought equipment and installed it for Korea, and sometimes they had trained Korean experts and shared experience with them. One day, they had thought about this, and decided that it was time to pay back, so they had decided to cooperate with developing countries, to help them, and to work together. By "they" he meant KATS, the government agency responsible for legal metrology. In Korea, the KTC was the testing and certification body which carried out the type approval and verification of measuring instruments. He showed delegates a slide indicating the outline of the cooperation project. The project was made up of three stages. The first was to help establish legal systems, the second was to help with the installation of measuring instruments and the modernization of testing laboratories, and the third was the cultivation of experts. But, as Members were aware, money was always a problem. Initially the budget had come from KATS and KTC, but they had needed a larger budget because it cost a lot of money to install new equipment and to run various training courses. They had therefore worked with the Korean International Cooperation Agency (KOICA) which controls the official development assistance budget and provides grant aid. Mr. Lim went on to show Members some examples of their work, such as in 2016, when they had helped to establish a master plan for the modernization of legal metrology in Ecuador. They had also invited several government officials who worked on legal metrology issues. A second example was a project in Bolivia, which started in 2015, and which had a budget of about 4 million USD, and which involved the establishment of legal systems, the installation of 26 types of testing equipment for type approval, calibration and verification, the training of around 25 experts, as well as the development of manuals for the operation of testing laboratories. They were now working on similar projects in Cambodia, Paraguay and Viet Nam. Concluding his presentation, Mr. Lim said that he hoped to have more chances to run cooperation projects with developing countries, and that it was his honor to win this OIML award when there were so many other excellent people compared with what he felt were his minor and humble activities. He especially thanked the Peter Mason, Stephen Patoray and Patricia Saint-Germain.

Mr. Mason thanked Mr. Lim for his presentation and expressed his appreciation for the fact that he had been able to speed up and shorten it.

OIML Medal

This year, Mr. Mason announced, this award was given with mixed emotions, as it had been decided to award a posthumous medal to Mr. Willem Kool. Mr. Mason observed that there had been many tributes to Willem during the course of the week, but he wanted to read from the letter of nomination at least some of the things he was remembered for.

Willem was born in 1953 and passed away in February of this year all too early. He was highly regarded by everyone, both in Europe and internationally, who had had the opportunity to work with him, for his professional approach, his technical knowledge and his willingness to give support when needed. Willem had trained as a mechanical engineer, starting his career in metrology in 1980 in a division of the Dutch Ministry of Economic affairs. Willem had been a very active metrologist in the Netherlands. The transition from that institution into a privatized NMI had been the subject of many discussions in which Willem was very active, precisely analyzing the pros and cons, although Mr. Mason wondered which side of the argument he had favored. Willem had been involved primarily in legislation for the evaluation of weighing instruments, but by that time he had already showed his interest in the international aspects of legal metrology. He closely followed the activities of the OIML, and participated in several working groups. In many discussions he had shown his capacity for analyzing problems precisely. Coming to a compromise when participants looked at the problem in different ways was not always easy for him, but in the end he accepted a reasonable outcome and was ready to defend that where and when necessary. After some years of being employed by private companies in weighing instruments, Willem decided to start his own company. During that period as a consultant, he had assisted a number of eastern European countries to adapt their legal metrology system in such a way that they would be able to align with the requirements of the European Union. A few of the countries in which Willem was active were Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Cyprus, Romania, Latvia, Estonia, and Turkey, many of which he had persuaded to become Member States of the OIML. Those projects had not been limited to legal metrology, but had included legislation, the organizational structure, accreditation, standardization and measurement standards. Over the years, Willem developed himself into an international metrology expert, even more so after he became one of the assistant directors of the BIML in 2007. Willem was a good representative for the OIML to the outside world. He had represented the OIML at numerous international meetings, liaised with officials at the highest level, strengthened the links with sister organizations, and ensured that the voice of the OIML was heard around the world. He structured the CIML meetings, and also provided support to a large number of Technical Committees, Subcommittees and Project Groups, most notably those relating to prepackaging and the MAA. Mr. Mason added that in terms of his contribution to running the CIML meetings there was the phrase “you don’t know what you have got until it’s gone”, and although he had managed to do things which Willem would not have allowed him to do had he been here, he had missed Willem’s contribution greatly. So throughout his life, next to his family, metrology was a key issue for Willem. He would be missed dearly, as it had always been a pleasure to meet up with him. He was a professional, but also a very kind person, and very approachable for everybody.

Mr. Mason felt that there would be unanimous recognition that this was a very well-deserved award. The medal itself would be passed to his wife Mona, who Mr. Mason had had the pleasure to meet at the Presidential Council dinner earlier this year. They were a wonderful family and they shared so many of his passions. For the purposes of today, he asked the CIML Member for the Netherlands to come forward to accept the medal and the certificate in order to pass it to Mona.

Ms. Van Spronssen observed that Willem would have appreciated the award, and she was quite sure that his family would appreciate this recognition of the work he had been doing during the times they had missed him.

17 Future meetings

Mr. Mason moved on to item 17 “Future meetings”.

17.1 52nd CIML Meeting (2017)

Mr. Patoray said that item 17.1 related to the CIML meeting in 2017. He reported that Mrs. Saint-Germain had looked at 20 to 30 locations in France to find one that was suitable. In many cases, the

meeting rooms had been too small; amongst these were locations in Avignon and Reims. He was aware that some delegates had considered Arcachon difficult to get to because of having to stop in Bordeaux and transport having to be organized from there to the meeting, so several locations had been ruled out as they would present the same difficulty. Finally two places had been selected, one of which was holding a reservation for the CIML meeting. However since the budget had just been passed, and the OIML would now cover the cost of the next meeting, Colombia had offered to host it in Cartagena de Indias. This invitation was not finalized yet, as Mr. Lopez had to discuss the matter with his superiors before making the offer final. So the 2017 CIML meeting would probably take place in Colombia, and if not, a location had been identified in France which would be reasonably easy to get to despite requiring a long train journey from Charles de Gaulle airport. The final information would be sent to delegates as soon as possible. However, he reiterated that since Paris was too expensive to hold the CIML meeting, if anyone wanted a future meeting to be held in France Mrs. Saint-Germain had carried out lots of research, and would be happy to share the information she had. Now that a budget had been allocated to pay for the CIML meeting, a number of people had requested information about what was needed in order to host it so that they could find suitable facilities in their countries. Moving around in this way would mean that Members in different regions would be able to attend the CIML meetings, and also some non-members may be able to participate, particularly if the meeting was to be held in South America. It would be a good opportunity for non-members to see what the organization was doing, and be encouraged to join the OIML.

Mr. Madzivhe (South Africa) wanted to know whether countries were seen as being generally available to host the CIML meeting or whether they had to volunteer for a particular occasion. He wanted to know whether the rotational aspect of the meetings still existed or whether it just depended on particular offers.

Mr. Patoray said that in recent years there had been no offers to host the meeting, so there had been no rotational capability. Where possible, the aim had been to move the meeting around the world as much as possible, and he reminded delegates that two meetings had been held in the Asia-Pacific region in two successive years – one in Vietnam, and then the next year in New Zealand, but for the past two years the meeting had been held in France, so it would be interesting to go to South America in 2017, and the final decision had already been made for 2018. For the future, written information would be sent out to all CIML Members on what facilities were needed. These included not only a large room, but two or three small rooms, as well as facilities for coffee breaks and lunches. The location had to be easy to get to, and there had to be the ability to get around outside of the meeting, so there had to be some logistical planning as well. In general, there were a lot of less expensive places in the world to hold a meeting than Paris. Mr. Patoray's expectations were that the budget would be able to be held at the same level, but that other locations around the world could be used and in this way, other countries that were not OIML members would be able to attend on a regional basis. Mr. Patoray agreed with Mr. Madzivhe that it would be good for the meeting to rotate to different locations.

Mr. Mason asked that the resolution be passed regarding the meeting in 2017, noting the information provided by the CIML President, and instructing the Bureau to make the necessary arrangements to organize the 2017 meeting. He highlighted the decision taken in this resolution that there would be a meeting in 2017, as the Convention only required a meeting every two years, but he felt it was inconceivable that the organization could want to wait for two years to follow up the important work that would have been undertaken during the year.

There were no abstentions, and no votes against the resolution. The resolution was passed unanimously.

Resolution no. 2016/35

(Agenda Item 17.1)

The Committee,

Notes the information provided by its President and the BIML Director on the organization of the 52nd CIML Meeting in 2017,

Instructs the Bureau to make the necessary arrangements to organize the 52nd CIML Meeting in 2017.

17.2 53rd CIML Meeting (2018)

Dr. Schwartz was asked to talk about the 2018 CIML Meeting.

He said he would like to invite delegates to his home city, Hamburg, for the 2018 meeting. He anticipated the date of the meeting being from Monday 8 to Friday 12 October 2018. He said the city of Hamburg was the second largest city in Germany, with almost 2 million inhabitants, and the biggest city in Europe which was not a capital, which made it even larger than Barcelona for example, and of course larger than Strasbourg.

Economically and culturally, Hamburg was at the center of Northern Germany, situated on the river Elbe. It had an international airport, so it could be reached easily with a lot of connections and direct flights to many parts of the world. It had some beautiful buildings, and he showed delegates a picture of the city hall, saying that he was hoping to convince the Mayor of Hamburg to address the meeting, in which case delegates might be able to visit the building. In the middle of the city, there was also a lake called Alster, which was surrounded by department stores, galleries and museums so there were many opportunities to enjoy culture and shopping. He also showed delegates the new concert hall, the Elbe Philharmonic Hall, which had been built in the new quarter called Hafencity, located at the harbor where the big cruise ships stop, and which was another area of cultural interest. He said that each May, on Hamburg's birthday, it was possible to see some old sailing ships, but that although delegates would obviously miss this, the harbor was one of the most modern in the world, and was one of the world's 20 biggest container ports.

Finally Hamburg was also a center of economy, science and technology. Airbus's A320 and A380 aircraft are assembled and customized in, and finally delivered to the customer from Hamburg. He said that he would try to organize a visit to the Airbus production site. The venue for the meeting would be the Empire Riverside Hotel, which was in the harbor district, and which was connected to the hotel Hafen Hamburg. In conclusion he said he looked forward to seeing all Members in Hamburg in 2018.

Mr. Mason asked that the resolution be passed, noting the information and instructing the Bureau to make the necessary arrangements for the meeting in Hamburg in 2018. There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no votes against the resolution. The resolution was passed unanimously.

Resolution no. 2016/36

(Agenda Item 17.2)

The Committee,

Notes the information provided by the CIML First Vice-President on the organization of the 53rd CIML Meeting in Hamburg, Germany in 2018,

Instructs the Bureau to make the necessary arrangements to organize the 53rd CIML Meeting in 2018.

18 Other matters (2)

Before closing the meeting, Mr. Mason asked whether there were any other matters which a Member of the Committee wished to raise.

Mr. Khedir (Tunisia) stated that he thought the meeting had been very beneficial, but he wanted to ask several questions: firstly, he wanted to clarify the relationship between the RLMOs and the OIML. He wondered whether it was possible for regional organizations to be responsible for legal metrology. Mr. Khedir's second question was what effect the revision of the SI in 2018 would have on OIML Recommendations. Thirdly, he wanted to know whether the OIML had undertaken a study on the level of implementation of OIML Recommendations. Fourthly, he asked whether there were any revisions to ISO/IEC 17020.

Mr. Mason said that with regard to the regional legal metrology organizations he believed there was an OIML International Document or Basic Publication setting out the relationship of the OIML with liaison organizations, and the RLMOs were referred to in that. When he had last looked at that at the

beginning of the week, he had thought it may benefit from being updated, because the relationship between the RLMOs and the OIML had developed since that document was drafted. He considered that at present they did not have the formal procedures for recognition which the BIPM had for its RMOs. The BIPM needed to have a formal recognition process because of the way its MRA operated, whereas the OIML did not need this. That meant that the OIML had more flexibility in what it considers a RLMO for its purposes. At the moment he considered there were essentially three criteria he would apply:

- one of them was the question “was the organization which would like to be recognized as an RLMO doing the sort of things that other RLMOs do?” In other words, what does it do and is it effective in doing it?
- the second was whether the organization was representative of its area, did it have sufficient authority and was it of a sufficient size for it to be a credible organization alongside the others?
- the third was the question of whether there was a degree of overlap with other RLMOs, which would give the OIML concern that in a sense it was endorsing competing organizations looking for the same members.

These were the criteria he would apply, but as to who would apply them, he considered that there was nearly a consensus that it was the Round Table itself that should apply these criteria. In his opinion, they were the best people to take a view on whether an applicant organization was like them, or was a threat to their way of operating. That was the view that had been taken so far. It was not formal, but as the Committee had seen in the case of GULFMET, they had been invited as an observer organization to the RLMO Round Table meeting that had taken place this week. The Round Table had had an opportunity to listen to their activities, and it had already indicated that GULFMET was likely to be invited as member of the Round Table next year.

With regard to monitoring the implementation of the OIML’s Recommendations, this was something that Mr. Mason considered the organization needed to do more of. He said that there had been attempts from time to time to do so, but they were not easy because apart from anything else different Member States had different understandings of what it actually was to implement an OIML Recommendation. Significantly, a couple of references had been made to the OECD work during the course of the meeting. The question of monitoring the effectiveness of the work, where effectiveness was judged by whether the things that the OIML produced were actually used, was one of the themes of their case study, and one of the things that Marc Loesewitz, who carried out the case study, had identified that the OIML should be doing more of. Mr. Mason said he was not quite sure exactly how this would be done, and how the methodology should be developed. He reported that this was a common theme amongst many of the international organizations, and although he had not read the other case studies, or the final report, which would be launched in two weeks’ time in Paris, he felt that it would provide some guidance on how to proceed.

Mr. Mason asked to be reminded about the other two questions. Mr. Khedir reminded him that the next was about the implications of the new SI.

Mr. Mason emphasized that in a normal week there would have been an item on this subject as it was an important work item. When the agenda had been put together, it had been realized that there was a lot to discuss, and therefore the view had been taken that this was not something that would be needed to be covered specifically at this meeting. Mr. Mason asked Mr. Gregor Dudle (Switzerland) to add to what he was about to say, but Mr. Mason’s understanding was that there was still some way to go before the final decision on the new SI was made, although the OIML was an active participant in this decision process, as had been mentioned by Dr. Schwartz earlier on in the meeting. The reason it had not been included on the agenda for this Committee meeting was simply as a result of the amount of business to be covered. There had been the offer of a presentation, as well as someone who was prepared to give the presentation.

Mr. Dudle said that as the representative of the OIML in the CCU (Comité Consultatif pour les Unités) he would be happy to answer any questions from the Tunisian delegation after the meeting, specifically with regard to the SI and the redefinition of the kilogram.

Mr. Mason was not sure whether the new definitions would be adopted by 2018.

Mr. Dudle reported that the date of 2018 was pretty much settled, although there had been a little uncertainty over when the definitions might come into force. The definitions would probably be completed by the CGPM in October 2018, although exactly when it would come into force was still under discussion.

Mr. Mason added that this would therefore be something he would expect to be on the agenda of the 2017 meeting.

Dr. Schwartz wondered whether it would be useful, after the CIPM meeting, to publish an article in the Bulletin, perhaps about the outcome of the meeting, although he was not sure whether it would be too early to publish something about the new SI. He considered that the right time to publish an article to raise awareness should be carefully considered, but it should not be left until 2018.

Mr. Dudle added that the Committee would have to deal with the fact that the OIML had an International Document (D 2 *Legal units of measurement*) dealing with the base units and that this would have to be revised anyway if a new system was decided on. If a new project was defined, this would be the right time to put something in the Bulletin.

Mr. Mason asked Mr. Khedir to remind him of his last question which he replied was about accreditation and the revisions to ISO/IEC 17020 because it concerned legal metrology and inspection.

Mr. Mason referred the question to Mr. Dixon.

Mr. Dixon said that he was not aware of any proposed revision to ISO/IEC 17020 at the moment.

Mr. Mason added that if there was a specific reason why the OIML should be promoting a revision to ISO/IEC 17020 then he asked Mr. Khedir to provide the Committee with some thoughts about it. He said that the OIML met with ILAC, IAF, BIPM and ISO in March every year at the so called “quadrilateral meeting”, and so if there was a case for that, the quadrilateral meeting would be the time to raise this issue.

Mrs. Nataša Vuković (Slovenia) wanted to check what had happened about the decision for the revision to D 1. As far as she was aware there had been no further discussion on this matter.

Mr. Mason said that as far as he was concerned he had said that he had spoken to the secretariat of TC 3, and also to Prof. Manfred Kochsiek, and it had been decided that the Committee could not formulate a project approval for voting at this meeting, but that it was likely that a project approval would be put together for online voting and he reiterated that he had encouraged all Committee Members to be alert for this project approval and to vote for or against it. The threshold for online voting was high, and therefore it may be that it would have to come back to the 2017 CIML meeting, but he was hoping that this would not be necessary. In the meantime, he expected to be doing some preliminary work on this.

There were no further comments.

Mr. Mason explained that although there had been an item for approval of the meeting resolutions, they had been passed as the meeting had gone along, so this was no longer needed.

19 Approval of meeting resolutions

Mr. Mason pointed out that the Committee needed to review the wording of several resolutions before voting on them. He suggested that a roll call should be taken, followed by a review of the relevant resolutions.

Mr. Dunmill carried out the roll call:

Albania not present, proxy given to Switzerland
Algeria present
Australia present
Austria present
Belarus not present, no proxy given
Belgium present
Brazil not present, no proxy given
Bulgaria present
Cameroon not present, proxy given to Algeria
Canada present
Colombia present
Croatia present
Cuba present
Cyprus not present, proxy given to France
Czech Republic present
Denmark present
Egypt present
Finland present
France present
Germany present
Greece present
Hungary not present, proxy given to Poland
India present
Indonesia present
Iran present
Ireland present
Israel not present, proxy given to New Zealand
Italy not present, proxy given to Belgium
Japan present
Kazakhstan present
Kenya present
Korea present
Macedonia not present, no proxy given
Monaco not present, proxy given to France
Morocco not present, no proxy given
Netherlands present
New Zealand present
Norway not present, proxy given to Finland
China present
Pakistan not present, no proxy given
Poland present
Portugal present
Romania present

Russian Federation present
Saudi Arabia present
Serbia..... present
Slovakia present
Slovenia present
South Africa present
Spain..... present
Sri Lanka not present, no proxy given
Sweden present
Switzerland..... present
Tanzania present
Thailand..... present
Tunisia present
Turkey present
United Kingdom present
United States..... present
Viet Nam present
Zambia..... present

Mr. Patoray summarized the roll call. There were 61 Members in total, but six were not present and had not given a proxy, which left 55, so a quorum was achieved.

Mr. Dunmill stated there were a couple of resolutions where the Committee had heard a presentation on an item and where it was the tradition to record that the CIML had noted the presentation.

7.1 BIML activities in connection with CEEMS matters

Mr. Dunmill said the first of these presentations was the CEEMS report from the BIML. Mr. Dunmill re-iterated that the Committee needed to formally record this. He asked if there were any comments on the resolution.

Mr. Dixit enquired what the “oral report given by the BIML” referred to.

Mr. Mason replied that it was the oral report that had been given by Mr. Dunmill on Tuesday. He re-iterated that this item was a formality to record the fact that the decisions which had been taken were in the light of that report.

There were no other comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was passed unanimously.

Resolution no. 2016/11

The Committee,

Notes the oral report given by the BIML on its activities in liaison with other international organizations aimed at CEEMS.

7.2 Special projects fund for CEEMS

Mr. Dunmill indicated that the second of these presentations was the one given by the president Mr. Mason. Again this was the resolution to note that presentation.

Mr. Mason considered that this resolution needed amending because, as he had already stated, his presentation had covered more than special project fund. The title of the presentation, if he

remembered correctly, was “The follow up to Resolution 2015/10”. Mr. Mason observed that it was important to word the resolution correctly as it was committing to follow up work, and he said the resolution should read “The oral report given by the CIML President on the follow up to Resolution 2015/10”. The remaining words could be removed.

There were no further comments on the resolution. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was passed unanimously.

Resolution no. 2016/12

The Committee,

Notes the oral report given by the CIML President on the follow-up to resolution 2015/10.

7.3 Advisory group on CEEMS

Mr. Dunmill stated that the next item covered two presentations: the first from Mr. Mason, and the second from Mr. Guo Su on behalf of the Advisory Group. The conclusions had been presented, and then there had been two resolutions, which had been discussed by the Committee, but which had not been approved.

Mr. Mason did not think it was necessary to read these through as this had been done at the time of the discussion.

There were no comments on the resolutions. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolutions were unanimously passed.

Resolution no. 2016/13

The Committee,

Recalling its Resolution no. 2013/9, setting up an Advisory Group to carry out wide consultation, to seek suggestions and to build up links with other bodies with an interest in promoting the economic development of countries and economies with emerging metrology systems,

Notes the report of the meeting of the Advisory Group held on 17 October 2016,

Confirms that it wishes the Advisory Group to continue as the main focus of activities relating to matters of interest to countries and economies with emerging metrology systems,

Renews the appointment of Mr. Pu Changcheng to act as Chair of the Advisory Group.

Resolution no. 2016/14

The Committee,

Requests its President and the Chair of the Advisory Group to prepare a draft “B” publication, developed from the current terms of reference, for consideration, and if possible adoption, at its 52nd Meeting,

Urges each of the Regional Legal Metrology Organizations to nominate a representative to serve on the Advisory Group,

Invites other Members of the Committee with an interest in matters relating to countries and economies with emerging metrology systems to volunteer to serve on the Advisory Group.

8.1 *Report of the B 6 revision Project Group*

Mr. Dunmill described the next item also as a formality. The Committee had been presented with a report by Mr. Mason on the progress that had been made in the revision of the Directives. This item was to remind the Committee of the resolution that had been taken the previous year to conduct that revision, to note the report presented by Mr. Mason, and to urge the Project Group to complete its work as soon as possible.

There were no comments on the resolution. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was unanimously passed.

Resolution no. 2016/15

The Committee,

Recalling its Resolution no. 2015/13 approving a project for the revision of OIML B 6 *Directives for OIML technical work*,

Notes the oral report given by the CIML President on the revision of OIML B 6 *Directives for OIML technical work*,

Urges the Project Group to complete its work on the revision as soon as possible.

8.2 *OIML-CS (Certification System) Project Group*

Mr. Dunmill stated that the CSPG resolutions (2016/16 and 2016/17) had already been passed under item 8.2 of the agenda. Mr. Mason agreed that they had been adopted.

9.1 *Technical items for approval*

9.1.1 *Approval of Final Draft Recommendations and Documents*

With regard to the technical activities Mr. Dunmill said the Committee had already covered the approval of the Recommendations because they had been needed so that the Conference could sanction them.

9.1.2 *Approval of new projects*

The Committee now needed only to consider the approval of the resolutions on new projects.

9.1.2.1 *Proposal for an amendment to the terms of reference for existing project TC 1/p 3 “New publication: The setup and maintenance of a bilingual electronic vocabulary”*

The first project that had been discussed was a proposal to amend the terms of reference for the project concerning the electronic vocabulary. Mr. Dunmill asked if Poland wished to make any further comments following the extensive discussions that the Committee had already had. Mr. Dunmill added that during the discussion there had been a number of concerns on the addendum. He remarked that the resolution as presented was to accept the terms of reference of the project as provided in the addendum, which had been circulated three months before the meeting. Following the discussion, Poland had revised that document but the Committee had not seen this in advance, and he said he did not want to go into the technical details of it at the moment.

Mr. Mason asked whether it would be acceptable to generalize the resolution so that the Committee was amending the terms of reference as provided in the documents made available to the Committee for this meeting. In that way, it would not be necessary to say which documents they were, or when they were made available. He enquired whether this gave the Committee the necessary authority. After a brief discussion with Mr. Dunmill, Mr. Mason suggested that this was submitted to the Committee, and stated that if Members were not happy with this as a resolution, then it would have to be approved online. The wording of the resolution was amended as he had suggested, and Mr. Mason reiterated that if the Committee was uncomfortable with this vague wording, which he felt it was clear enough, then

this would have to be revised and submitted to online approval. He hoped that it could be approved now.

Dr. Schwartz had had a short discussion with his colleague from Poland and was wondering whether Mr. Borzyminski was happy with the wording, and whether it was in line with what he had developed in the meantime. He considered he had added some detail in the terms of reference in the meantime, and that the Committee should know about this.

Mr. Borzyminski enquired whether he should share the information.

Mr. Mason expressed the opinion that there was not time to share the information. He asserted that the question Mr. Borzyminski should ask himself was whether, as convener of this project, he was happy to work on the basis of a resolution of this kind, or whether he would prefer a more detailed resolution, which would need online approval.

Mr. Borzyminski stated that the text of the resolution on the screen was quite alright.

Mr. Mason summarized that the resolution was acceptable to the convener but he wanted to establish whether it was acceptable to the Committee.

Dr. Ehrlich observed that he was a little confused about this, as one of items in the proposals talked about revising B 6, and it was not clear whether this would be a direct revision of B 6, or whether it would be part of the ongoing effort to revise B 6. He considered that if it was part of the ongoing effort then this could wait for later. If this was an immediate revision of B 6 then the USA would wish to see the full resolution.

Mr. Mason clarified that during the discussion it had been decided not to amend the terms of reference of B 6, so he considered, in the light of that hopefully minuted discussion, that he did not see that this authorized a change to B 6.

Mr. Borzyminski added that the resolution only talked about the terms of reference for the existing project TC 1/p 3. The terms of reference were something different to the possible changes in B 6.

Mr. Mason asked whether that clarification was acceptable to the USA.

Dr. Ehrlich replied that he had not followed what Mr. Borzyminski had said and asked him to repeat it.

Mr. Borzyminski said that the text of the resolution which was on the screen referred to an amendment to the terms of reference of the existing project TC 1/p 3. These terms of reference had been adopted at a previous CIML meeting, and what was suggested by this resolution was that there would be a change in these terms of reference of the project. On Tuesday, the future changes to B 6 which would be required had also been discussed, but it had been agreed that this could wait, and in this resolution, there was no mention of any changes to B 6 as he understood it.

This clarification having been made, Mr. Dunmill asked that the Committee voted on the resolution.

There were no further comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was unanimously passed.

Resolution no. 2016/19

The Committee,

Approves the amendment to the terms of reference for the existing project TC 1/p 3 set out in the documents provided for this meeting.

9.1.2.2 Proposal for a new project under TC 5/SC 2 “Software”

Mr. Dunmill said the next item was a proposal for a new project on software, which the Committee had been able to consider in the working document. The resolution proposed a new project in TC 5/SC 2 according to the information that had been provided in Addendum 9.1.2.2 to the working document.

There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was passed unanimously.

Resolution no. 2016/20

The Committee,

Approves as a new project in TC 5/SC 2 *Software* the revision of D 31:2008 *General requirements for software controlled measuring instruments* to be conducted as specified in the project proposal provided in Addendum 9.1.2.2 to the working document for this meeting.

9.1.2.3 Proposal for a new project under TC 8/SC 1 “Static volume and mass measurement”

The next item had concerned the proposal for a new project for the revision of R 125, and Mr. Dunmill said this had been detailed in Addendum 9.1.2.3 to the working document, as mentioned in the resolution. He asked if there were any comments.

Mrs. Lagauterie reminded delegates that she had asked that the reference to WELMEC be removed from the bottom of the page. Nevertheless, she was not against this project.

Mr. Dunmill recalled that during the discussion, he had said that the list of liaisons in the project proposal was intended to be indicative rather than definitive, so he thought it would be sufficient to note the comment from France, and since it would have been minuted, it would be understood that when the Project Group was formed, WELMEC would not be included as a liaison organization. He asked whether this was acceptable.

Mr. Mason interjected that it appeared to be acceptable, but he wanted to make the general point that when the Committee approved a project, the important thing was that the Committee limited that project, so it was clear how far the Project Group ought to go, and what it should and should not do in terms of its scope. He underlined that it would be unusual for the Committee to instruct a Project Group exactly on how it should carry out the work, so he would see this sort of question as something in the CIML meeting minutes which the Project Group should take into account, rather than an instruction for the Project Group.

There were no other comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was passed unanimously.

Resolution no. 2016/21

The Committee,

Approves as a new project in TC 8/SC 1 *Static volume and mass measurement* the revision of R 125:1998 *Measuring systems for the mass of liquids in tanks* to be conducted as specified in the project proposal provided in Addendum 9.1.2.3 to the working document for this meeting.

9.1.2.4 Proposal for a new project under TC 8/SC 7 “Gas metering”

The next item concerned the revision of R 139 to include requirements covering hydrogen measuring devices. Mr. Dunmill reminded the Committee that they had heard a presentation from Japan on this item. He continued that the resolution made the proposal to accept the project proposal given in Addendum 9.1.2.4 to the working document.

Mr. Mason recalled that there had been an outstanding question as to whether this would be a revision of R 139 or a new Recommendation. If that was the case, then the Committee would need a broader definition of the project. Mr. Mason asked if the Netherlands would comment on this, since he understood they would be doing the work.

Mr. Teunisse thought that the proposal from Japan was in effect a proposal for a revision of R 139, and that was the way it had been foreseen in the proposal itself. Originally Japan had proposed a new Recommendation, but through contact between the two countries during the course of the year, it had

been considered better to make it a revision of R 139, and that not such a great effort would be needed for this.

Ms. Van Spronsen added that looking at her notes, she had understood that the conclusion at the end of the discussion had been that it would be left open as to whether it would be an amendment or a new Recommendation, and she said this should be reflected in the resolution.

Dr. Schwartz responded that he was not so sure. He had understood from the discussion that the majority had been clearly in favor of the resolution as written, with the aim of a revision of the existing R 139.

Mr. Mason added that, on reflection, the same issue had come up when the Committee had talked about the arched chute instruments. He considered the conclusion had been that sometimes the Committee might say it wanted a new Recommendation, but the Technical Committee or Subcommittee may suggest that it should be an amendment to an existing Recommendation, and that sometimes the Committee might say that it should be a change to an existing Recommendation and the Technical Committee or Subcommittee might recommend that it should be a new Recommendation. Mr. Mason emphasized that, in passing a resolution of this kind, the Committee would not be limiting the Project Group to what they may recommend when they produce the document, and he added that since the project would take more than one year, the terms of reference could be changed if necessary.

Mrs. Lagauterie supported the position expressed by the First Vice-President that it was indeed a proposal to revise R 139 to include this new technology. It was different to the other subject concerning the automatic weighing instruments.

Mr. Mason summarized that there seemed to be support for the resolution as drafted.

Mr. Richter said he had been involved in the hydrogen issue with the Netherlands and Japan, and he fully supported the view that it should be a revision of R 139 rather than a new Recommendation. He also wanted to point out that in the presentation given by Japan, they had changed what had been in their project proposal, which had had four accuracy classes (including an accuracy class 10), whereas in their presentation, which the USA did not want to support, they had deleted the accuracy class 10, leaving only three accuracy classes. He wanted it noted in the minutes that this project was proposed to go forward with only three accuracy classes.

Mr. Mason enquired whether that clarification was acceptable to the proposed conveners?

Mr. Teunisse said that this was completely acceptable. This was what had been discussed prior to this meeting.

Mr. Mason verified that Japan also agreed with this.

Mr. Takatsuji said that he agreed they had proposed three classes for this amendment. He considered this was a very technical issue but if this was what the Committee approved, he would follow the resolution.

Mrs. Lagauterie asked whether it would be possible to clarify the current position exactly, as there had been an initial proposal which had then been presented differently during the presentation of this subject. Now there was another idea for a modification, and then there had been comments that had taken another direction. She considered that what they were being asked to vote on was very confused. She also wanted to point out that in general she had noted that there had been a lot of details in some of the proposals, and although these had been in the annexes, she thought that the aim of the CIML meetings was that they would take a vote on the principle of working on a revision, rather than voting on the technical details that were in the document which were simply presented in the annex for information.

Mr. Mason re-iterated that from what had been said on earlier projects, there was an understanding that what was decided during the CIML meeting was whether to carry out the work, and what the scope of the work was. The Committee tried to avoid instructing the Project Group on how they

should do the work, which probably included telling them how many accuracy classes there should be in the eventual Recommendation, but if there were comments made during the course of the CIML discussion, then the Committee would expect those to be minuted and taken into account by the conveners when they carried out the work. He judged that this was the right balance between the CIML's authorization of work and the ability to make suggestions on how that work was conducted.

Mrs. Lagauterie replied that in that case, she would like it noted that France had been involved in the preparatory work since they had received the Japanese delegation, and that they had expressed their disagreement with including class 10.

Mr. Mason thanked Mrs. Lagauterie for her comments and, underlining that her comments would be minuted, stated that the Project Group would be under no illusions as to weight of opinion!

There were no further comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was passed unanimously.

Resolution no. 2016/22

The Committee,

Approves as a new project in TC 8/SC 7 *Gas metering* the revision of R 139:2014 *Compressed gaseous fuel measuring systems for vehicles* to be conducted as specified in the project proposal provided in Addendum 9.1.2.4 to the working document for this meeting.

9.1.2.5 Proposal for a new project under TC 9/SC 1 "Non-automatic weighing instruments"

The next item was the revision of R 76. Mr. Dunmill said there had been a considerable discussion on this item, and this was the resolution that had been proposed.

Mr. Mason remarked that the Committee had agreed that there should be an amendment to this resolution. He had been hoping this would have been done during one of the breaks, which it had not, so he was afraid that it would now be necessary to for it to be redrafted on the screen. He recalled that the Committee had decided to approve a new project to revise R 76 as specified in the project proposal. This had been the first element. He continued that the second element in the resolution should read that the Committee was going to "request the Project Group to advise how best to ensure that R 76 can be used by those involved in verification and inspection". He considered that this would leave open the possibility of a "part four" solution as an annex or as a separate document. Mr. Mason expressed the opinion that it had originally been envisaged that this would be a pilot and an example, and he thought that this was still the case, so when the Committee received the revised Recommendation, it could decide how far that decision would be capable of being transferred into other Recommendations. He considered that there was a third element, which was that the resolution should read that it "records its wish that this work on verification and inspection should not delay the completion of the rest of the R 76 revision". Mr. Mason apologized that this was not perfect wording, but submitted that this was essentially what the Committee had been hoping for, and it could be changed. Mr. Mason asked for comments on this wording, which he considered reflected the discussion.

Mr. Richter said he had three comments which he said he would separate, so that Members could comment on them separately. Firstly, in the first paragraph, which started with the word "approves", he noted that the Committee was approving the project proposal but that since the project proposal in 9.1.2.5 had specifically stated there would be a part four, he considered that this paragraph should be amended.

Mr. Mason said that point would be noted, and it would be considered how a redraft could best meet the point.

Mr. Richter said that secondly, for some reason this project had been proposed by the BIML, so he wanted to confirm that France and Germany were planning to be the co-conveners on this project.

Mr. Mason thought this had been obvious from the discussions at the time, but he would record the confirmation of this from the French and German delegations.

Mr. Richter said his third point was that the Committee had heard from Dr. Schwartz that he had planned that this revision was going to be a minor, or limited, revision. However, there did not seem to be any documentation that said this, and Mr. Richter felt that if a revision project was started, it would be a full revision. He considered that there was no such thing as a limited revision.

Mr. Mason maintained that it was a limited revision if the project specified this, and he underlined that this was what had been achieved with B 6, and considered that when the CIML approved a project, it could apply limits to it, but Mr. Mason's understanding was that the actual resolution and project proposal did not involve such limits, so he asked Dr. Schwartz to comment on this.

Dr. Schwartz said he would describe the basic intention of the project, but did not think it was necessary to write it into the project description. He observed that most Members were aware that in many countries, R 76 had been implemented into national legislation, but he wanted to caution everybody that if this project was opened up completely, then the Committee could end up with a problem. He said he had already talked to Mrs. Lagauterie and they would probably start again with a questionnaire on the most important issues which they would like to be addressed when revising this Recommendation.

Mr. Mason remarked that if this was the case, and the Committee was to consider Mr. Richter's first point again, he thought that the best way to meet it was to change the wording of the resolution. He suggested that instead of "provided", the expression "set out" should be used, and that at the end it should read "as modified by comments made during the Committee's consideration of this proposal". He commented that this would allow Members to refer to the minutes to meet the "part four" point. He stressed that it would be obvious that the Committee was asking the Project Group to consider the full range of possibilities on how to meet this. Mr. Mason asked if that was acceptable.

Mrs. Lagauterie said if the Committee added this phrase regarding this project, it should be added to the other projects as well. She added that remarks had also been made during the previous items regarding the projects on hydrogen measurement and on R 125.

Mr. Mason replied that this was a good point, although he asserted that the significance of the comments that had been made on R 76 had a greater relevance to the way in which the project would be approached than those which had been made in the previous two resolutions. He also pointed out that the other two resolutions had already been adopted. For the future, he considered it would be desirable that the Committee found a formula which allowed it to modify a proposal, or to reflect in the resolution that a proposal may be modified before it was passed. He confirmed that this was what he would propose to do in the future but stated that at this time he was a little reluctant to go back and re-open resolutions that had already been passed.

Mr. Richter indicated he was responding to the comments that Dr. Schwartz had made. He wished to fully clarify, since there was no wording on this, that this would be a limited revision. However, he felt that once the ICD was sent out, all parts of the Recommendation would be open for comments and discussion by the Project Group. Technically there was no limit on what was going to be revised and what was off limits as there had been, for example, with the revision of B 6.

Mr. Mason confirmed that this was the case, and underlined that ultimately it was for the Project Group to decide the scale of the revision it wished to undertake. He emphasized that what was being preserved was the right of the CIML sometimes to specify that a project should deal with certain subjects and no others, and therefore, even if the Project Group wished to expand the scope of the exercise, it would be going beyond the CIML's authorization if it did so. He expressed the opinion that this project was a different situation, as they were expecting the Project Group, and specifically the conveners, to undertake a fairly limited revision, but the resolution itself would not act as a restraint on how extensive the revision was. Mr. Mason stated that Dr. Schwartz agreed with this.

Mr. Marneweck commented that from the resolution he understood the revision would not include a part four if at all possible. He felt there had also been a lot of support amongst Members for including a part containing verification details, and it now seemed that that there had been some comments by the Committee and he judged they were totally different to what was in the proposal.

Mr. Mason did not think they were totally different, and insisted that he had always had in mind that this project would be encouraged to look at the “part four” approach to meeting the requirement mentioned in the second paragraph, namely that R 76 should be improved so that it could be better used by those involved in verification and inspection. He thought that the debate that had taken place earlier had identified that adding a “part four” was one approach, an additional annex was another, and a separate document yet another, so that in the modification he had been talking about, that issue would be handed to the Project Group to advise the Committee. If their advice was that a “part four” approach should be adopted, then this was an authorization for them to come forward with a revision of R 76 which included part four. Mr. Mason checked that was acceptable.

Mr. Marneweck confirmed he had understood.

There were no more comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was unanimously passed.

Resolution no. 2016/23

The Committee,

Approves as a new project in TC 9/SC 1 *Non-automatic weighing instruments* the revision of R 76:2006 *Non-automatic weighing instruments* to be conducted as specified in the project proposal set out in Addendum 9.1.2.5 to the working document for this meeting, as modified by comments made during the Committee’s consideration of this proposal,

Requests the Project Group to advise how best to ensure that R 76 can be used by those involved in verification and inspection, and

Records its wish that this work on verification and inspection should not delay the completion of the rest of the R 76 revision.

9.1.2.6 Proposal for a new project under TC 9/SC 2 “Automatic weighing instruments”

The next item on the list of new projects was a new Recommendation on *Automatic weighing instruments of the arched-chute type*. Mr. Dunmill indicated that following the discussion that had been held earlier, the resolution on the screen proposed to accept this new project on the basis of the proposal in Addendum 9.1.2.6. He asked if there were any comments on this resolution.

Mr. Rachkovskiy commented that they would prefer this to remain a part of R 50 rather than being published as a separate Recommendation, since the methods and technical requirements were almost the same.

Mr. Mason replied that from the comments that had been made by other delegations up to now, he considered they took the opposite view: that it should be a new Recommendation, but the discussion, which would be minuted, would also make it clear that when this work was authorized by the Committee, whether it was expecting a new Recommendation or a revision, it was ultimately for the Project Group to decide on the best formula, and if there was agreement on the content but some debate about whether it should be a new Recommendation or a separate part of the existing Recommendation, then this was something he would imagine would come up at the CIML preliminary ballot. He assured Mr. Rachkovskiy that his comments would be noted, and that they would also be noted by the Project Group.

There were no further comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was passed unanimously.

Resolution no. 2016/24

The Committee,

Approves as a new project in TC 9/SC 2 *Automatic weighing instruments* the development of a new Recommendation on *Continuous totalizing automatic weighing instruments of the arched chute type*, to be conducted as specified in the project proposal provided in Addendum 9.1.2.6 to the working document for this meeting.

9.1.2.7 Proposal for a new project under TC 12 “Instruments for measuring electrical quantities”

The next item on concerned the project for the revision of R 46 in TC 12. Mr. Dunmill stated that this had been presented in Addendum 9.1.2.7 to the working document which had been made available three months before the meeting. He asked if there were any comments on this resolution.

There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was passed unanimously.

Resolution no. 2016/25

The Committee,

Approves as a new project in TC 12 *Instruments for measuring electrical quantities*, the revision of R 46:2012 *Active electrical energy meters* to be conducted as specified in the project proposal provided in Addendum 9.1.2.7 to the working document for this meeting.

9.1.2.8 Proposal for a new project under TC 17/SC 2 “Saccharimetry”

The next item was the proposal for a new project in TC 17/SC 2 *Saccharimetry* which had been provided in Addendum 9.1.2.8 to the working document. The resolution was on the screen. He asked if there were any comments on the resolution.

There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was unanimously passed.

Resolution no. 2016/26

The Committee,

Approves as a new project in TC 17/SC 2 *Saccharimetry* the development of a new Recommendation on *Near infra-red instruments*, to be conducted as specified in the project proposal provided in Addendum 9.1.2.8 to the working document for this meeting.

9.1.3 Changes to allocations of convenerships

The next item was the transfer of the convenerships of two projects which were currently under the responsibility of the United Kingdom with the work being undertaken by Mr. Paul Dixon. As the Committee had already heard, in order to complete these projects in the most efficient manner, it was proposed that the convenerships were transferred to the BIML, where Mr. Dixon was currently working on a contract basis. Mr. Dunmill asked if there were any comments on the resolution as worded.

There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was passed unanimously.

Resolution no. 2016/27

The Committee,

Approves the allocation of the convenership of the following projects to the BIML:

- TC 3/SC 5/p 5
New publication: *Guide for the application of ISO/IEC 17065 to assessment of certification bodies in legal metrology*,
- TC 3/SC 5/p 12
Revision of D 30: *Guide for the application of ISO/IEC 17025 to the assessment of Testing Laboratories involved in legal metrology*.

9.1.4 Proposal to revise the terms of reference of TC 4/p 8

The next item was to do with the revision of the terms of reference for an existing project so as to incorporate another project which was already within the same Technical Committee. This would result in the cancellation of project TC 4/p 1, and the amendment of the terms of reference of TC 4/p 8. He asked if there were any comments.

There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was passed unanimously.

Resolution no. 2016/28

The Committee,

Approves the revision of the Terms of Reference of the existing project TC 4/p 8 as specified in additional meeting document 51-CIML-AMD-07, and

Cancels existing project TC 4/p 1.

9.1.5 Proposal for a resolution on the non-exploitation of the MPE rule for utility meters

The next item concerned the proposal from Japan that had been presented by the Second Vice-President on the non-exploitation of MPEs. The resolution, which had been the last slide in his presentation, was being presented again now.

Mr. Mason interjected that this was an important resolution and asked that it be read out before it was voted on.

Mr. Dunmill read the resolution as follows:

“The Committee resolves to instruct the secretariats of Technical Committees and Subcommittees, and conveners of Project Groups, when OIML Recommendations for relevant categories of measuring instrument are being revised, to ensure that a requirement should be included if necessary stating that the instruments shall not exploit the maximum permissible errors or systematically favor any party and instructs the Bureau to monitor the implementation of this resolution.”

Mr. Dunmill added there was one point that Dr. Miki had pointed out to him which did need changing. The resolution only mentioned OIML Recommendations being revised and not those being developed so it should read “developed or revised”, otherwise new Recommendations would not have to take account of this requirement. The words were changed to “secretariats and conveners are asked to include these requirements when developing or revising a Recommendation”.

Mr. Mason enquired whether there were any comments. He underlined this was an important recommendation as it was a clear instruction to Technical Committees.

Mr. Richter suggested that instead of starting the first paragraph with “resolves” it could start with the word “instructs”.

Mr. Mason agreed.

There were no other comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was passed unanimously.

Resolution no. 2016/29

The Committee,

Instructs the secretariats of Technical Committees and Subcommittees and conveners of Project Groups, when OIML Recommendations for relevant categories of measuring instruments are being developed or revised, to ensure that a requirement should be included, if necessary, stating that the instruments shall not exploit the maximum permissible errors or systematically favor any party, and

Instructs the Bureau to monitor the implementation of this resolution.

15.1 Election of a CIML Vice-President

Mr. Dunmill said the next item was the secret ballot on the election of a CIML Vice-President.

Mr. Mason asked the Members of honor (although he admitted he should have notified them in advance) to be the scrutineers of this election. He asked them to conduct the count and to inform the Committee whether the single candidate had reached the 50 % threshold necessary for election.

Announcing the result of the election for CIML Vice-President, Mr. Mason said that fortunately it would not necessary to work through the complicated process of working out abstentions, and announced that there had been 55 votes cast. 52 of those were in favor, and only three against, so there was a resounding re-election of Roman Schwartz as CIML First Vice-President.

Prof. Schwartz thanked delegates for their confidence and trust and said that he had reached the two sigma level, almost 95 %, which was quite a good confidence level, and promised to adhere to the commitments he had made during his earlier speech.

16 Awards

The next item consisted of two resolutions to recognize the awards that had been made earlier: the OIML medal and the developing country award.

The first resolution was for the award of the OIML medal to Willem Kool. Mr. Dunmill asked if there were any comments of the wording of the resolution.

There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was passed unanimously.

Resolution no. 2016/33

The Committee,

Recognizing Mr. Willem Kool's significant contribution to international legal metrology throughout his lifetime,

Wishing to record its appreciation of his achievements,

Awards him posthumously the OIML Medal.

The second resolution thanked the award winners of last year's developing country award for their presentations and congratulated the Institute of Trade Standards Administration from Kenya, this year's recipient of the OIML Award for excellent achievement in Legal Metrology in Developing Countries. Mr. Dunmill asked if there were any comments on the resolution.

There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was passed unanimously.

Resolution no. 2016/34

The Committee,

Thanks Mr. Anselm Gittens and Mr. Nam Hyuk Lim, joint winners of the 2015 *OIML Award for Excellent Achievements in Legal Metrology in Developing Countries*, for their presentations,

Congratulates this year's recipient of the *OIML Award for Excellent Achievements in Legal Metrology in Developing Countries* – The Institute of Trade Standards Administration, Kenya.

Mr. Khedir wanted to propose that the OIML published an explanation of how to make a nomination for this award, details of the criteria, and deadlines for nominations, as well as details of what support the OIML was able to give to these countries in order that they might do better. He also wanted to suggest that if several nominations had been made, details of the ranking of those nominations should be published.

Mr. Mason agreed that it was a good suggestion that more publicity should be given to this award. At present there was a formal letter sent to all Member States and Corresponding Members inviting applications.

Mr. Dunmill clarified that an announcement was also normally made on the OIML website and in the OIML Bulletin, although this year it had not been announced in the Bulletin. He considered it could be given wider publicity and this was something the BIML could look into.

Mr. Mason said that with regard to ranking the nominations, sometimes very few were received. Although this year there had been more nominations than usual, one year he was pretty certain there had only been one, and there had been a lot of consideration of whether it was deserving of the award. The process that was being followed at the moment allowed for there to be a joint award when there were two good candidates as there had been last year, but he thought it would be difficult to introduce a first, second, and third, because, apart from anything else, it may very well be that the third in the list of three would not be very deserving at all. He assured Mr. Khedir that the mechanics of this award would be kept under review. When it had been created it had taken a long time to make an impact, but as the Committee had seen, it had grown in importance, and he considered that they could continue to develop it and he hoped his successor might find ways of making it more formal.

Mr. Dunmill verified that the Committee's position was the same as previously voted before Mr. Khedir had asked his question. The result was the same.

Reverting to item 6.5 on the budget Dr. Ehrlich wondered, before losing the quorum, if and when Mr. Mason intended to ask delegates to finalize the budget under item 6.5, because during the Conference, he had stated that it was for the Conference to decide on the income, but for the CIML to decide on the total budget, and there had been a proposed revision to the total budget to add the item about the surpluses. He therefore wondered when this was going to be considered.

Mr. Mason asked Mr. Patoray to comment on this. Mr. Patoray said that as he had understood the resolution from the Conference, it had put the money into the reserve, and there would be plans for reducing the reserves, but he would not expect the detail of this to be discussed at this meeting. This would be considered as the plans for training were developed. He said that the budget itself had not changed, other than that the Conference had given an instruction to use the money they had put into the reserve fund as described in the resolution.

Mr. Mason clarified that they would need to rethink the concept of the voting of figures for the four-year financial periods, which had perhaps developed over a period of time. It had been presented as something which was fixed between each of the four years of the financial period, but he had looked at what was specified in the Convention, and it stated that it was the income and the use of reserves which was fixed, but actually he considered a more fluid approach needed to be taken to setting

budgets on a yearly basis by means of reports to the CIML, so he was not proposing that there should be another resolution on this subject at this time. He thought that the material which had been provided gave a clear indication of what was being done, and there would be an opportunity at each CIML meeting to consider to what extent the commitments made at the Conference were being implemented.

Dr. Ehrlich said he understood the situation as well as the explanation, but he wanted to request that the modified budget that the Director had shown on the screen during the Conference be made part of the minutes. (*BIML note: this table is given on the next page.*)



BUDGET 2017 – 2020

INCOMES	2015 ACTUAL (for comparison)	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total (2017-2020)			
Member State Contri. – 0%	1 960 000	2 016 000	2 044 000	2 044 000	2 044 000	8 148 000			
C M Fees – 0%	95 200	91 000	91 000	91 000	91 000	364 000			
Certificates Fees	84 697	77 000	77 000	80 500	80 500	315 000			
Translation Center	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Financial Income	7 335	8 000	8 500	8 500	9 000	34 000			
TOTAL INCOMES	2 147 240	2 192 000	2 220 500	2 224 000	2 224 500	8 861 000			
CHARGES									
						2020-2017	% Increase	% of Total 2020	
<i>Active Staff less OIML-CS Costs</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>1 297 715</i>	<i>1 308 289</i>	<i>1 313 868</i>	<i>1 343 220</i>				
<i>OIML-CS Staff Costs</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>64 400</i>	<i>71 000</i>	<i>74 900</i>	<i>77 000</i>				
Active Staff (TOTAL)	1 360 376	1 362 115	1 379 289	1 388 768	1 420 220	58 105	4,27	63,98	
Pension System	107 528	111 872	114 110	116 392	118 720	6 847	6,12	5,35	
TOTAL STAFF COSTS	1 467 903	1 473 987	1 493 398	1 505 160	1 538 939	64 952	4,41	69,33	
						2020-2017	% Increase	% of Total 2020	
<i>Running Costs less OIML-CS Costs</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>72 868</i>	<i>74 326</i>	<i>75 812</i>	<i>77 328</i>				
<i>OIML-CS Running Costs</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>2 351</i>	<i>2 398</i>	<i>2 446</i>	<i>2 494</i>				
Running Costs (TOTAL)	73 744	75 219	76 723	78 258	79 823	4 604	6,12	3,60	
Administrative Costs	70 396	71 614	72 854	74 116	75 400	3 786	5,29	3,40	
<i>Communication Costs less OIML-CS Costs</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>59 957</i>	<i>60 873</i>	<i>61 804</i>	<i>62 750</i>				
<i>OIML-CS Communication Costs</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>1 934</i>	<i>1 964</i>	<i>1 994</i>	<i>2 024</i>				
Communication Costs (TOTAL)	60 961	61 891	62 837	63 798	64 774	2 883	4,66	2,92	
<i>CIML Meeting</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>106 050</i>	<i>107 111</i>	<i>108 182</i>	<i>129 263</i>				
<i>Additional Seminar</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>5 782</i>	<i>5 869</i>	<i>5 957</i>	<i>6 047</i>				
Meetings Costs – CIML plus Seminar (TOTAL)	83 772	111 832	112 980	114 139	135 310	23 478	20,99 incl VAT	6,10	
<i>T & A Costs less OIML-CS Costs</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>91 593</i>	<i>93 465</i>	<i>95 374</i>	<i>97 322</i>				
<i>OIML-CS T & A Costs</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>2 000</i>	<i>2 000</i>	<i>2 000</i>	<i>2 000</i>				
Travel & Accommodation Costs – BIML (TOTAL)	99 601	93 593	95 465	97 374	99 322	5 729	6,12 no MoH	4,47	
Miscellaneous Costs	20 505	20 813	21 061	21 312	21 567	754	3,62	0,97	
Search for AD	<i>n/a</i>	40 000	15 000						
Search for Director	<i>n/a</i>		40 000	30 000					
Special Fund for Developing Countries	4 654	35 000	35 000	35 000	35 000	0	0,00	1,58	
Training for Technical Work	0	100 000	75 000	75 000					
TOTAL OTHER CHARGES	413 632	609 962	606 920	588 997	511 195	41 233	46,80	23	
						2020-2017	% Increase	% of Total 2020	
Depreciations	193 428	186 750	190 500	189 250	155 500	-31 250	-16,73	7,01	
Provision for retirement	0	0	0	0	0	0		0,00	
Provision for uncollected funds	21 000	14 000	14 000	14 000	14 000	0		0,63	
TOTAL DEPRECIATIONS & PROVISIONS	214 428	200 750	204 500	203 250	169 500	-31 250	-15,57	7,64	
						2020-2017	% Increase	% of Total 2020	
TOTAL CHARGES	2 095 963	2 284 700	2 304 818	2 297 407	2 219 635	-65 065	-2,85		
RESULT	51 277	-92 700	-84 318	-73 407	4 865	-245 559			
Total Coefficient	140	144	146	146	146	Includes Thailand, Cambodia and changes to Belgium, Pakistan, Greece			

See other tabs for details

CS System Certificate Income	77 000	77 000	80 500	80 500	315 000
CS System Total Costs	70 685	77 332	81 280	83 429	312 725
Result					2 275

Mr. Mason confirmed that this would be done, and a confirmation and elaboration of that would be one of the items for the next Presidential Council to look at. He also wanted to confirm that the written ballot they had taken was the approval of this resolution. Mr. Mason added that he had been informed that Members who had left had deposited appropriate proxies with the BIML staff, and he would therefore assume that the quorum had been maintained according to the last roll call.

Closing remarks

Mr. Mason wished to say a few words about the meeting, the technicalities of organizing the agenda, the struggle to fit everything into the week, and some of the modifications that had been introduced such as voting on important resolutions during the course of the meeting. This was a move away from how things had been done previously, and he asked delegates to reflect on whether this had been an improvement, or whether the old system was better.

The Committee had had to cope with several unusual elements. One of them was that there were many more people present than there usually were. There was also a lot more happening than there had been in previous years. For instance, the number of projects for approval was far greater since the system of CIML approval of projects had been introduced. The third was that Willem Kool had not been there to keep delegates “in line”. However Mr. Dunmill had done a splendid job in learning how to run the meetings, and he asked delegates to show their appreciation with a round of applause.

He emphasized that if he were to thank everyone that had made a contribution to the meeting and made it what he thought was the success it had been, he would be detaining delegates even longer and since he felt that most of the thanks and congratulations had been made the previous evening, he asked delegates to consider these as having been done. He asked delegates to consider more generally the way that CIML meetings should be approached in the future, because even though there was now someone who could take on Mr. Kool’s role, the OIML would still have to cope with the fact that there would be more people at the meeting, there would be more people that would want to contribute to the discussions, and there was more to discuss. He was not sure what the response to these developments should be, but he felt that they were certainly things that he would want to discuss with the Presidential Council. He added that for those members of the Presidential Council who he had not managed to speak to, the meeting planned for that evening was cancelled. He felt that this CIML meeting had been a fantastic one, with a fantastic response, which had meant they had touched on areas that had not previously been considered, and he thanked everyone for their contributions.

Mrs. Lagauterie asked that, although they were all tired, they took the time to thank the interpreters who were probably also tired after the long week’s work.

Mr. Mason then declared the meeting closed.

**

*

Attendance list

OIML

Printed on 26/10/2016 15:45:13

CIML Meeting 2016

Total number of participants: 160

Member States: 50

Number of delegates: 102

ALGERIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Rabah Messili	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Directeur	messili_rabah@yahoo.fr	1

AUSTRALIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Bill Loizides	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Manager of Legal Metrology	bill.loizides@measurement.gov.au	1

AUSTRIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Robert Edelmaier	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Director of the Metrology Service	robert.edelmaier@bev.gv.at	2

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Ulrike Fuchs	<input type="checkbox"/> Welmec Vicechair	ulrike.fuchs@bev.gv.at	0

BELARUS

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Maksim Shabanov	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of legal metrology department	shabanov@belgim.by	0

Mr. Valery Hurevich Valery	<input type="checkbox"/> Director of NMI	valery.hurevich@gmail.com	0
----------------------------	--	---------------------------	---

BELGIUM

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Philippe Degavre	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conseiller Général - Service Métrologie	philippe.degavre@economie.fgov.be	1

BULGARIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Paun Ilchev	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acting President	p.ilchev@bim.government.bg	2

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Valentin Starev	<input type="checkbox"/> Director-General	v.starev@bim.government.bg	0

CANADA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Alan E. Johnston	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measurement Canada President	alan.johnston@canada.ca	1

CIML Meeting 2016

Total number of participants: 160

COLOMBIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Alejandro Giraldo Lopez <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Superintendente Delegado para el Control y Verificación de Reglamentos Técnicos y Metrología Legal	agiraldo@sic.gov.co	0

CROATIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Bozidar Ljubic <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Deputy Director	bozidar.ljubic@dzm.hr	0

CUBA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Eng. Fernando Antonio Arruza Rodriguez <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Director of Metrology	arruza@ncnorma.cu	0

CZECH REPUBLIC

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Pavel Klenovský <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Director General	pklenovsky@cmi.cz	1

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Zbynek Veselak <input type="checkbox"/>	Director of the Metrology Department	veselak@unmz.cz	0

DENMARK

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Ms. Hanne Scherrebeck <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Engineer of Metrology	hsc@sik.dk	0

EGYPT

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Mohamed Hanafy Imam Hanafy <input type="checkbox"/>	Head of Administration of Assay & Weights	ahmedjosef2010@yahoo.com	0

Mrs. Rabha Fouad Abdelsamie Ahmed <input type="checkbox"/>	Director	ahmedjosef2010@yahoo.com	0
--	----------	--------------------------	---

FINLAND

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Tuomo Valkeapää <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Chief Engineer	tuomo.valkeapaa@tukes.fi	0

FRANCE

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mrs. Corinne Lagauterie <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Chef du Bureau de la Métrologie	corinne.lagauterie@finances.gouv.fr	1

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Ms. Marielle Fayol <input type="checkbox"/>	Adjoint au chef du Bureau de la Métrologie	marielle.fayol@finances.gouv.fr	0

CIML Meeting 2016

Total number of participants: 160

Mr. Bernard van Maris	<input type="checkbox"/>	Adjoint au chef du Bureau de la Métrologie	bernard.van-maris@finances.gouv.fr	0
-----------------------	--------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---

GERMANY

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Prof. Roman Schwartz	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Vice-President	roman.schwartz@ptb.de	1
Dr. Peter Ulbig	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of Division Q	peter.ulbig@ptb.de	0
Mr. Johann Fischer	<input type="checkbox"/> Director	johann.fischer@lme.berlin-brandenburg.de	0

GREECE

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. A. Desis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Technical Officer	legmetro@gge.gri	1

INDIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. B.N. Dixit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Director of Legal Metrology	dirwmca@fca.nic.in	2
Ms. Madhulika P. Sukul	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional Secretary		0

INDONESIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Giyanto	<input type="checkbox"/> Delegation	subdit.skk@gmail.com	0

IRAN

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Khosro Madanipour	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> President NMCI	madanipour@isiri.org.ir	2

IRELAND

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Ms. Mairead Buckley	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Director	mairead.buckley@nsai.ie	0

ITALY

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Giuseppe Capuano	<input type="checkbox"/>		0

JAPAN

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Yukinobu Miki	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Director of Metrology Management Center	y.miki@aist.go.jp	0
Dr. Toshiyuki Takatsuji	<input type="checkbox"/> Director, Research Institute for Engineering Measurement	toshiyuki.takatsuji@aist.go.jp	0

CIML Meeting 2016

Total number of participants: 160

Dr. Tsuyoshi Matsumoto	<input type="checkbox"/>	Associate Manager, International Cooperation Office, Research Promotion Division	ty-matsumoto@aist.go.jp	0
Mr. Katsuhiko Yoshioka	<input type="checkbox"/>	Director, Metrology Policy Office, Ind. Sci. & Tech. Policy and Env. Bureau	yoshioka-katsuhiko@meti.go.jp	0
Mr. Yasuhiro Koyano	<input type="checkbox"/>	Principal Research Manager, Research Institute for Engineering Measurement	y-koyano@aist.go.jp	0
Ms. Yuka Okada	<input type="checkbox"/>	Metrology Policy Office, Industrial Science and Technology Policy and Environment Bureau	okada-yuka@meti.go.jp	0

KAZAKHSTAN

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mrs. Karlygash Sattybayeva	<input type="checkbox"/> Deputy Head of Department of Legal Metrology and International cooperation	karlygash_sat@mail.ru	0

KENYA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Michael Nyamwamu Onyancha	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acting Director of Weights and Measures	weightskenya@gmail.com	0
Ms. Getrude Nyungu	<input type="checkbox"/> Weights and Measures Officer 1	getrudenyunguq@gmail.com	0
Mrs. Lynette Nekesa Maina	<input type="checkbox"/> Finance Officer	weightskenya@gmail.com	0

KOREA (R.)

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Choi Mi-Ae	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Director	metrology@korea.kr	0
Mr. Hong-ho Shin	<input type="checkbox"/> Market surveillance of instruments and prepackages	hhshin99@daum.net	0
Mr. Kwang-min Park	<input type="checkbox"/> Measuring Instrument Evaluation Center	legend618@ktc.re.kr	0
Mr. Nam-hyuk Lim	<input type="checkbox"/> Director of International Technology & Business Cooperation Center	alwaysim@naver.com	0
Mr. Seung-ho Bae	<input type="checkbox"/> Metrology Research Official	baesh1219@korea.kr	0

CIML Meeting 2016

Total number of participants: 160

NETHERLANDS

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Ms. J.M. van Spronssen (Anneke)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Senior policy advisor on Metrology	j.m.vanspronssen@minez.nl	0
Mr. George Teunisse	<input type="checkbox"/> Senior advisor/ OIML assignee	george.teunisse@agentschaptelecom.nl	0

NEW ZEALAND

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Stephen O'Brien	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Manager, Trading Standards	stephen.obrien@mbie.govt.nz	0
Mr. Phillip Sorrell	<input type="checkbox"/> Team Leader Compliance and Inspection	Phil.Sorrell@mbie.govt.nz	0

NORWAY

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Hans Arne Frøystein	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acting Director	haf@justervesenet.no	0

P.R. CHINA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Qinghai Wu	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Vice-Minister	hanjp@aqsic.gov.cn	0
Mr. Qiang Liu	<input type="checkbox"/> Deputy DG of NIM	ws@nim.ac.cn	0
Mr. Su Guo	<input type="checkbox"/> Official, Dept. of Metrology	guosu_aqsic@163.com	0
Mr. Xiaobang Kong	<input type="checkbox"/> Official, Dept. of Administration Office	zhenghx@aqsic.gov.cn	0
Mr. Xin Wang	<input type="checkbox"/> Official, Dept. of International Cooperation	zhenghx@aqsic.gov.cn	0
Mr. Yue Zhang	<input type="checkbox"/> Division Director	ws@nim.ac.cn	0
Mrs. Huaxin Zheng	<input type="checkbox"/> Director, Dept. of Metrology	zhenghx@aqsic.gov.cn	0

POLAND

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Maciej Dobieszewski	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Vice-President	wiceprezes1@gum.gov.pl	0
Mr. Marcin Mikiel	<input type="checkbox"/> Senior specialist	m.mikiel@gum.gov.pl	0
Dr. Jerzy Borzyminski	<input type="checkbox"/> Counselor to the President of the Central Office of Measures	j.borzyminski@gum.gov.pl	0

CIML Meeting 2016

Total number of participants: 160

PORTUGAL

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mrs. Susana Santos	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Director, Serviço de Metrologia Legal	ssantos@ipq.pt	0

ROMANIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Prof. Fanel Iacobescu	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Director General	office@brml.ro	0

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Dumitru Dinu	<input type="checkbox"/> Deputy General Director	dinu_dumitru_dga@yahoo.com	0
Ms. Alina Elena Taina	<input type="checkbox"/> Coordinator of the Centre of Excellence and Programs in Metrology	alinataina81@yahoo.com	0

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Sergey Golubev	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Deputy Head	sgolubev@gost.ru	1

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Alexey Rachkovskiy	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of Department	alexey@vniims.ru	0

SAUDI ARABIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Saad Al-Kasabi	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Governor	metrology@saso.gov.sa	0

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Bader Alfaiz	<input type="checkbox"/> Director of Metrology Specification Dept.	b.faiz@saso.gov.sa	0
Mr. Mohammed Alshahrani	<input type="checkbox"/> Secretary	m.sahab@saso.gov.sa	0
Mr. Nasser Alqahtani	<input type="checkbox"/> Director of Physical Calibration Dept.	n.qahtani@saso.gov.sa	0

SERBIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Cedomir Belic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acting Director	cedomirbelic@dmdm.rs	0

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Zoran Markovic	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of Group for certification	zmm@dmdm.rs	0

SLOVAKIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Peter Adam	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of Metrological workplace	adam@slm.sk	1

Mr. Zbynek Schreier	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of Department of Metrology	zbynek.schreier@normoff.gov.sk	0
---------------------	--	--------------------------------	---

CIML Meeting 2016

Total number of participants: 160

SLOVENIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Ms. Natasa Mejak Vukovic <input type="checkbox"/>	Senior legal Adviser	natasa.mejak-vukovic@gov.si	0

SOUTH AFRICA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Nnditsheni Thomas Madzivhe <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	General Manager	thomas.madzivhe@nracs.org.za	0

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Jaco Marneweck <input type="checkbox"/>	Senior Manager : Legal Metrology	jaco.marneweck@nracs.org.za	0

SPAIN

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Jose Manuel Bernabe Sanchez <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Director, CEM	jmbernabe@cem.minetur.es	0

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Ms. María Teresa López <input type="checkbox"/>	Deputy Director Legal and Applied Metrology	mtlopez@cem.minetur.es	0

SWEDEN

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Kari Björkqvist <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Head of Legal Metrology Division	kari.bjorkqvist@swedac.se	0

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mrs. Renée Hansson <input type="checkbox"/>	Technical advisor	renee.hansson@swedac.se	0

SWITZERLAND

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Gregor Dudle <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Deputy Director of METAS	gregor.dudle@metas.ch	0

TANZANIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Ludovick Manege <input type="checkbox"/>	Chief Executive Officer	Stella Kahwa <sterwega@hotmail.com>	0

Ms. Stella Kahwa <input type="checkbox"/>	Director of Technical Support	Stella Kahwa <sterwega@hotmail.com>	0
---	-------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---

THAILAND

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Suchat Sinrat <input type="checkbox"/>	Deputy General Director	bs.974350@gmail.com	0

Miss Benjamas Siriwannangkul <input type="checkbox"/>	Weights and Measures Officer	bs.974350@gmail.com	0
---	------------------------------	---------------------	---

Mr. Chartree Areewong <input type="checkbox"/>	Director of Weighing Instrument Standards Section	bs.974350@gmail.com	0
--	---	---------------------	---

CIML Meeting 2016

Total number of participants: 160

TUNISIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Lotfi Khedir	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Directeur General	dg@anm.nat.tn	0

TURKEY

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Prof. Necip Camuscu	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Director	necip.camuscu@sanayi.gov.tr	0

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Mustafa Kaybal	<input type="checkbox"/> Industry and Technology Expert	Mustafa.Kaybal@sanayi.gov.tr	0

UNITED KINGDOM

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Peter Mason	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Head of International Legal Metrology, CIML President	peter.mason@nmro.gov.uk	1

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Richard Sanders	<input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Director	richard.sanders@bis.gsi.gov.uk	0

UNITED STATES

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Charles D. Ehrlich	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Group Leader, International Legal Metrology Group	charles.ehrlich@nist.gov	1

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Douglas Olson	<input type="checkbox"/> Member of Delegation	douglas.olson@nist.gov	1

Mr. Ralph Richter	<input type="checkbox"/> Member of Delegation	ralph.richter@nist.gov	1
-------------------	---	------------------------	---

VIET NAM

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Hai Nguyen Nam	<input type="checkbox"/> Deputy Director-General	nguyennamhai@tcvn.gov.vn	0

Mr. Du Tran Van	<input type="checkbox"/> Editor-in-Chief	trandutdc@gmail.com	0
-----------------	--	---------------------	---

Mr. Diep Nguyen Hung	<input type="checkbox"/> Director of Metrology Department	diepnhbdl@tcvn.gov.vn	0
----------------------	---	-----------------------	---

Dr. Xuan Vu Khanh	<input type="checkbox"/> Director	xuanvk@vmi.gov.vn	0
-------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------	---

ZAMBIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Ms. Himba Cheelo	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chief Executive Director	cheeloh@zwma.org.zm	0

CIML Meeting 2016

Total number of participants: 160

Corresponding Members: 16

Number of delegates: 30

ANGOLA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Carmo Santos	<input type="checkbox"/> Deputy Director of IANORQ	carmo.santos@ianorq.co.ao	1
Mr. Homar Simao	<input type="checkbox"/> Metrology Department Head	homar.simao@ianorq.co.ao	1

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Haris Memic	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of Department for Legal Metrology	haris.memic@met.gov.ba	0
Mr. Zijad Dzemic	<input type="checkbox"/> General Director	zijad.dzemic@met.gov.ba	1

BOTSWANA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Ditlhake Tau	<input type="checkbox"/> Manager Trade Metrology	tau@bobstandards.bw	0

CAMBODIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Ms. Vorleaks Peou	<input type="checkbox"/> President of National Metrology Center	p.vorleaks@gmail.com	0
Mr. Ousa Khlaut	<input type="checkbox"/> Deputy Director	p.vorleaks@gmail.com	0

CHINESE TAIPEI

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Chun-Der Hsia	<input type="checkbox"/> Senior Technical Specialist	chun.hsia@bsmi.gov.tw	0
Dr. Cheng-Tsair Yang	<input type="checkbox"/> Deputy Division Director	ctyang@itri.org.tw	0
Dr. Ming-Jong Liou	<input type="checkbox"/> Director General	metrology@bsmi.gov.tw	0

GEORGIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Ms. Nino Mikanadze	<input type="checkbox"/> Director of Metrology Institute at GEOSTM	geostm@geostm.ge	0

GHANA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. George Omane-Twumasi	<input type="checkbox"/> Head, Legal Metrology Department	omanetwumasi@yahoo.com	0

IRAQ

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Mustafa Gailan Hashim	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of Legal Metrology Section	gailan0099@yahoo.com	0

CIML Meeting 2016

Total number of participants: 160

Mr. Qussay Khaleel	<input type="checkbox"/>	DG of standardization	Qussay60@hotmail.com	1
LATVIA				
Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)		Position	E-Mail	Acc. persons
Dr. Valdis Gedrovics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Acting Head	valdis.gedrovics@latmb.lv	0
MONTENEGRO				
Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)		Position	E-Mail	Acc. persons
Mr. Goran Vukoslavovic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Deputy Director	goran.vukoslavovic@metrologija.gov.me	0
Prof./Dr. Vanja Asanovic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Director	vanja.asanovic@metrologija.gov.me	0
MOZAMBIQUE				
Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)		Position	E-Mail	Acc. persons
Mr. Alfredo Filipe Siteo	<input type="checkbox"/>	Director	alfredosito@innoq.gov.mz	0
NAMIBIA				
Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)		Position	E-Mail	Acc. persons
Mr. Victor Rodreck Mundembe	<input type="checkbox"/>		hindac@nsi.com.na	0
Mr. Simasiku Matali	<input type="checkbox"/>		hindac@nsi.com.na	0
SUDAN				
Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)		Position	E-Mail	Acc. persons
Mr. Saifeldin Mohamed Abdelwahid Mohamed	<input type="checkbox"/>	Manager of Central Measurement Workshop	saif.M.abdalwahed@gmail.com	1
Mrs. Izdihar Eltayeb Ahmed Abdalla	<input type="checkbox"/>	Manager of Measurement Section	ir-ssmo2012@hotmail.com	1
UEMOA				
Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)		Position	E-Mail	Acc. persons
Mr. Salifou Issoufou	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chef de la Division de la Promotion de la Qualite	sissoufou@uemoa.int	0
UKRAINE				
Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)		Position	E-Mail	Acc. persons
Mr. Iurii Kuzmenko	<input type="checkbox"/>	Deputy General Director	jkuzmenko@ukrcsm.kiev.ua	0
Mr. Oleksandr Burlakov	<input type="checkbox"/>	Deputy Chief	burlakov@kmu.gov.ua	0
Mr. Oleksandr Hilenko	<input type="checkbox"/>	Deputy Director	tnv@me.gov.ua	0
Mr. Sergey Tsiporenko	<input type="checkbox"/>	Head of Mass Measurements Department	"Sergey Tsiporenko" <s_tsiporenko@ukrcsm.kiev.ua>	0
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES				
Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)		Position	E-Mail	Acc. persons
Eng. Ahmed Al Marzooqi	<input type="checkbox"/>	Retail legal metrology senior analyst	a.almarzooqi@qcc.abudhabi.ae	0

CIML Meeting 2016

Total number of participants: 160

Mr. Khalaf Almazrouei	<input type="checkbox"/>	Acting Executive Director	k.almazrouei@qcc.abudhabi.ae	0
Mr. Suhail Al Falasi	<input type="checkbox"/>	Acting Legal Metrology Director	s.alfalasi@qcc.abudhabi.ae	0

Observer Countries: 1

Number of delegates: 3

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Aime Koizan Kablan	<input type="checkbox"/> Directeur General du Commerce Exterieur - IVORY COAST	emmanueldeza@hotmail.com	0
Mr. Emmanuel Zabo Deza	<input type="checkbox"/> Sous-Directeur - IVORY COAST	emmanueldeza@hotmail.com	0
Mr. Georges Kouassi Yapi	<input type="checkbox"/> Directeur - IVORY COAST	emmanueldeza@hotmail.com	0

Honorary Members: 1

Number of delegates: 4

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Gerard Faber	<input type="checkbox"/> CIML Past President	gerard.j.faber@gmail.com	1
Mr. John Birch	<input type="checkbox"/> Member of Honor	jbirch@bigpond.com	1
Prof. Lev Issaev	<input type="checkbox"/> Member of Honor	isaev-vm@vniims.ru	0
Prof. Manfred Kochsiek	<input type="checkbox"/> CIML Past Acting President	manfred@kochsiek.com	1

CIML Meeting 2016

Total number of participants: 160

Liaison: 6

Number of delegates: 8

BIPM

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Martin Milton	<input type="checkbox"/> Director	martin.milton@bipm.org	0

CECIP

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Roland Nater	<input type="checkbox"/> International Cooperation Group	roland.nater@mt.com	1
Mr. Karlheinz Banholzer	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal Metrology Group	karlheinz.banholzer@sartorius.com	0

CECOD

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Andre Onclin	<input type="checkbox"/> Regulatory Approvals Manager	Andre.Onclin@TokheimGlobal.com	0

GSO

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Eng. Omar Kanakrieh	<input type="checkbox"/> Gulfmet Secretary	okanakrieh@gso.org.sa	0
Mr. Abduldelah Al-Qarnas	<input type="checkbox"/> Gulfmet Secretariat	alqarnas@gso.org.sa	0

IEC

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. David Hanlon	<input type="checkbox"/> Secretary of the Conformity Assessment Board	dha@iec.ch	0

ILAC

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Andre Barel	<input type="checkbox"/>	ilac@nata.com.au	0

Observer: 1

Number of delegates: 1

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Anselm Gittens	<input type="checkbox"/> Metrology Department	a.gittens@slbs.org	0

CIML Meeting 2016

Total number of participants: 160

Individual: 1

Number of delegates: 5

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Gilles Vinet	<input type="checkbox"/> OIML	gilles.vinet@oiml.org	0
Mr. Paul Dixon	<input type="checkbox"/> OIML	paul.dixon@oiml.org	0
Mr. Marc Loesewitz	<input type="checkbox"/> OIML	m.loesewitz@gmail.com	0
Mr. Garry Hutton	<input type="checkbox"/> Interpreter	garry-hutton@hancock-hutton.com	0
Mr. Marc Potentier	<input type="checkbox"/> Interpreter	garry-hutton@hancock-hutton.com	0

BIML: 1

Number of delegates: 7

BIML

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Ms. Florence Martinie	<input type="checkbox"/> Administrator, Finance	florence.martinie@oiml.org	0
Mr. Chris Pulham	<input type="checkbox"/> Editor - Webmaster	chris.pulham@oiml.org	0
Mr. Ian Dunmill	<input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Director	ian.dunmill@oiml.org	0
Mr. Jalil Adnani	<input type="checkbox"/> Database Systems Management	jalil.adnani@oiml.org	0
Mr. Luis Mussio	<input type="checkbox"/> Engineer	luis.mussio@oiml.org	0
Mr. Stephen Patoray	<input type="checkbox"/> BIML Director	stephen.patoray@oiml.org	1
Mrs. Patricia Saint-Germain	<input type="checkbox"/> Administrator, Members	patricia.saint-germain@oiml.org	0