



Report of the 26th Meeting of the JCRB

Held on March 21-22, 2011

BIPM, Sèvres

<u>Item</u>	<u>Page</u>
Participants	3
1. Welcome by the Chairman and approval of the agenda (Doc 26/01)	5
2. Approval of the minutes and discussion of matters arising from the report of the 25 th meeting of the JCRB and a review of pending action (Doc 26/02)	5
3. Report by the Chairman on progress since the 25 th JCRB meeting (Doc 26/03)	5
3.1. Status of the BIPM Quality Management System (Doc 26/03.1)	5
3.2. Summary of the IAEA QMS Annual Report for 2010 and a report on the developments concerning IAEA's QS review (Doc 26/03.2).....	5
4. Report from the CIPM	6
5. Highlights of the RMO reports to the JCRB:.....	6
5.1. SIM (Doc 26/05.1)	6
5.2. EURAMET (Doc 26/05.2)	6
5.3. COOMET (Doc 26/05.3).....	6
5.4. APMP (Doc 26/05.4)	7
5.5. AFRIMETS (Docs 26/05.5.1 and 26/05.5.2).....	7
6. KCDB report (Doc 26/06).....	7
6.1. Procedure for deleting greyed-out CMCs with more than 5 years (Doc 26/6.1)	7
7. Status of CMCs Submission and Review	7
8. Problems due to the increasing number of DIs and CMCs – Task Force Activities (Doc 26/08).....	8
9. Discussion on the use of the CIPM-MRA logo on Quality Management System Certificates.....	8

10. Progress Report on the ILAC – BIPM Joint Document on the accreditation of NMI Services 8

11. Presentation by the delegation of the proposed new RMO of ARABMET..... 10

12. Discussion of issues of concern to the CIPM regarding the proper implementation of CIPM MRA rules (Doc 26/12) 10

13. Discussion of draft CIPM MRA Guidelines for Authorship of Key, Supplementary and Pilot Study Comparison Reports (Doc 26/13)..... 11

14. Any Other Business..... 11

15. Discussion of Initiatives to form new RMOs in the Arab/Gulf regions 11

16. Next Meetings: 11

17. Meeting closure 11

18. Actions 12

19. Resolutions 13

20. Recommendations..... 13

Participants

BIPM-CIPM

Prof. Michael Kühne (Chairman) BIPM
 Dr. Robert Kaarls..... CIPM
 Mr. Ahmet Omer Altan (Executive Secretary) BIPM
 Dr. Claudine Thomas BIPM
 Mr. Andy Henson BIPM
 Dr. Takashi Usuda BIPM

Delegations

Dr. Wynand Louw (Representative) AFRIMETS
 Mr. Donald Masuku AFRIMETS
 Dr. Mohamed Berrada AFRIMETS
 Mr. Dennis Moturi AFRIMETS
 Prof. Dr. Ahmed Ali Mohamed El Sayed AFRIMETS
 Dr Yadong Yu (Representative) APMP
 Ms. Ada Cai Juan APMP
 Mr. Irfan Yeoh APMP
 Dr. Ilya Budovsky APMP
 Dr. Vladimir Nikolaevich Krutikov (Representative) COOMET
 Dr. Nikolaj Zhagora COOMET
 Dr. Pavel Neyezhnikov COOMET
 Dr. Martin Halaj COOMET
 Dr. Leslie Pendrill (Representative) EURAMET
 Dr. Wolfgang Schmid EURAMET
 Dr. Pavel Klenovsky EURAMET
 Ms. Maguelonne Chambon EURAMET
 Dr. Alan Steele (Representative) SIM
 Dr. Claudia Santo SIM
 Dr. Claire Saundry SIM

Guests

Dr. Anna Chukovkina COOMET
Dr. Sergey Alekseevitch Komissarov COOMET
Dr. Hoda Mohamed Eissa Arab Federation for Metrology
Prof. Adel Basyouni Shehata Arab Federation for Metrology

1. Welcome by the Chairman and approval of the agenda ([Doc 26/01](#))

The Chairman welcomed the delegates.

Participants were then asked to introduce themselves.

The agenda of the 26th JCRB Meeting was approved without amendments.

2. Approval of the minutes and discussion of matters arising from the report of the 25th meeting of the JCRB and a review of pending action ([Doc 26/02](#))

The minutes of the 25th meeting of the JCRB were approved without amendments.

The chairman of the meeting reviewed the actions agreed upon at the 25th meeting, noting that all had been completed.

3. Report by the Chairman on progress since the 25th JCRB meeting ([Doc 26/03](#))

M. Kühne presented the report on developments at the BIPM since the 25th meeting of the JCRB.

3.1. Status of the BIPM Quality Management System ([Doc 26/03.1](#))

M. Kühne gave a brief presentation summarizing the status of the BIPM Quality Management System (QMS).

After a discussion of issues pertaining to the approval of the BIPM QMS, the delegates agreed on the following action:

Action 26/1: The Director of the BIPM will propose to the CIPM that the CIPM task RMOs to review the QMS of the BIPM and to make comments and recommendations, with approval of the BIPM QMS remaining the responsibility of the CIPM. The BIPM would rotate the presentations of its QMS among RMOs.

3.2. Summary of the IAEA QMS Annual Report for 2010 and a report on the developments concerning IAEA's QS review ([Doc 26/03.2](#))

M. Kühne informed the meeting of the outcome of discussions with IAEA since the 25th meeting of the JCRB concerning their mandatory QS review. The IAEA has indicated a willingness to have their QS review conducted at the meeting of TC-Q of EURAMET in March 2012.

After a discussion of the issues, the following resolution was adopted by consensus:

Resolution 26/1: The JCRB agrees to give the mandate to the TC-Q of EURAMET to conduct the QS review of the IAEA at their next meeting in March 2012. JCRB supports the decision of IAEA to have the review of their quality system conducted at the next meeting of the TC-Q of EURAMET

The JCRB further agrees that there will be no consequences in so far as the continuing validity of IAEA's published CMCs due to the delay in the review beyond the 5 year limit.

4. Report from the CIPM

R. Kaarls presented an oral report, including the following points:

- Changes in the membership of the CIPM
- New BIPM member states and associates to the CGPM
- Resolutions to be put forward at the CGPM in October 2011
- Outcomes of the 99th Meeting of the CIPM in October 2010
- CIPM views on the BIPM QMS
- Developments concerning the revision of CIPM MRA text

5. Highlights of the RMO reports to the JCRB:

5.1. SIM ([Doc 26/05.1](#))

A. Steele presented the SIM report and the report on the activities of the SIM Working Group on Quality Systems.

5.2. EURAMET ([Doc 26/05.2](#))

L. Pendril presented the EURAMET report and the report on the activities of the EURAMET Technical Committee for Quality (TC-Q)

5.3. COOMET ([Doc 26/05.3](#))

P. Neyezhnikov presented the COOMET report including the report on the activities of the COOMET Quality Forum.

5.4. APMP ([Doc 26/05.4](#))

A. Cai Juan presented the APMP report and the report on the activities of the APMP Technical Committee on Quality Systems (TCQS).

5.5. AFRIMETS ([Docs 26/05.5.1 and 26/05.5.2](#))

W. Louw presented the AFRIMETS report and the report on the activities of the AFRIMETS Quality System Working Group.

6. KCDB report ([Doc 26/06](#))

C. Thomas presented a summary of the semi-annual KCDB report to the JCRB.

6.1. Procedure for deleting greyed-out CMCs with more than 5 years ([Doc 26/6.1](#))

O. Altan presented the detailed procedure prepared for the deletion of greyed-out CMCs older than five years.

A. Steele suggested minor modifications to the procedure to further delineate the responsibilities and expected actions of the parties involved.

After a brief discussion, the JCRB agreed to the following resolution:

Resolution 26/2: The JCRB approves the procedure for the deletion of the greyed-out CMCs after a period of 5 years. The procedure shall be put into effect beginning in April 2011.

7. Status of CMCs Submission and Review

O. Altan reported that there were no current issues to be brought before the meeting concerning CMC submissions and reviews.

Recalling Action 25/8 of the 25th meeting of the JCRB, O. Altan presented a draft agenda for the proposed “Workshop on the best practice for the review of CMCs”. The following discussion having revealed that there was very little agreement on the particulars of the workshop, the JCRB agreed to the following action:

Action 26/2: A brainstorming session will be held on the second day of the 27th Meeting of the JCRB in September 2011, in order to clarify the specifics (scope, agenda, intended outcomes, participants, etc.) of the planned workshop on CMC

review practices with a view towards holding the workshop in conjunction with the 28th Meeting of the JCRB in March 2012. In preparation for this session, RMOs are to collect information on the CMC review practices within their TCs and BIPM will collect information on the CMC review practices of Consultative Committees.

8. Problems due to the increasing number of DIs and CMCs – Task Force Activities ([Doc 26/08](#))

M. Chambon presented a report on the findings of the task group formed per Resolution 25/2 of the JCRB on the problems that have arisen due to the increasing number of DIs.

A discussion ensued on the differing practices within RMOs concerning the designation of institutes and the criteria they are expected to meet. A. Henson pointed to the necessity of separating the issues pertaining to DIs recognized by the RMOs and to those that are operating within the CIPM MRA. At the conclusion of the discussion, the JCRB agreed to the following action:

Action 26/3: BIPM to send request to the designating authority upon notification of a new Designated Institute for information on scope of designation, stating that the information of the new DI will not be published on the BIPM website unless such information is received. The BIPM will advise any new participants in the CIPM MRA regarding expectations concerning their active participation in the activities of the CIPM MRA. Such information will also be made available on the BIPM website.

9. Discussion on the use of the CIPM-MRA logo on Quality Management System Certificates

A. Steele presented SIM's plans and templates for the use of the CIPM MRA logo on the certificates issued to member NMIs upon approval of their quality systems by the SIM Working Group on Quality.

In conclusion to the ensuing discussion, M. Kühne requested the opinion of each RMO concerning the use of the CIPM MRA logo on QMS certificates issued by RMOs by September 2011, after which he would present the issue to the CIPM for a discussion at their meeting in October 2011.

10. Progress Report on the ILAC – BIPM Joint Document on the accreditation of NMI Services

A. Henson opened the agenda item by presenting the latest draft of the ILAC P10 document on traceability, which has implications for the content of the ILAC-BIPM Joint Document on the accreditation of NMI services. He, in particular, drew attention to Section 2 of the draft P10 document that states ILAC policy on equipment and reference standards that must be calibrated.

A lively discussion ensued on the implications of the stated section for NMIs that have not signed the CIPM MRA. The RMOs were in agreement that the text, as drafted favored the accreditation community and did not pay sufficient heed to the role played by NMIs holding national measurement standards and offering calibration services. It was reported that ILAC did not intend to create a hierarchy, but this impression was created among the NMI community nevertheless. Both SIM and AFRIMETS proposed alternative texts to cases 1 and 3, respectively, to address this issue. Although AFRIMETS preferred to modify the text under case 3, they later agreed to accept the SIM proposal to modify case 1, which received the support of the other RMOs.

The alternative text for case 1 proposed by SIM was as follows:

“1. An NMI whose service is suitable for the intended need and has established traceability to the SI through appropriate national standards. Many such NMI services are covered by the CIPM MRA, which provides a rigorous international framework for quality assurance. Services covered by the CIPM MRA can be viewed in Appendix C of the BIPM KCDB, which includes the range and uncertainty for each listed service.”

AFRIMET’s proposed alternative text for case 3 was as follows:

“3. An NMI or calibration laboratory whose service is neither covered by the CIPM MRA nor the ILAC Arrangement. In these cases the accreditation body shall ensure that the laboratory undergoing accreditation that has used such service shall provide evidence that the NMI or calibration laboratory meets the relevant criteria of ISO/IEC 17025:2005 and that the calibration certificate includes statements concerning measurement uncertainty and traceability. The evidence shall be documented and the documentation shall be assessed by the accreditation body. This applies also to internal calibrations.”

The view of the CIPM was that the language proposed by SIM unnecessarily weakened the MRA. The BIPM did not agree with the text proposed by SIM and thus no JCRB consensus was reached on a proposal to modify the ILAC text. It was then decided that the BIPM International Liaison Officer would communicate to ILAC the proposals and opinions discussed by the JCRB at this meeting. It was also noted that the opportunity to provide national or regional comments directly to ILAC remained available.

Pertaining to the draft ILAC P10 document, the JCRB agreed to the following actions:

Action 26/4: The BIPM International Liaison Officer would advise ILAC of serious concerns but different views within JCRB concerning the wording within ILAC Document P10 on Traceability

A. Henson then summarized the latest developments concerning the draft of the ILAC-BIPM joint document on the accreditation of NMI services. ILAC's request to have access to the guidance documents of each RMO concerning the qualifications required of accreditation experts and peer reviewers. Each RMO delegation said that these would be made available.

A. Henson summarized the comments received from NMIs on the joint document.

Action 26/5: The BIPM International Liaison Officer will present the main points of the deliberations put forward by the RMOs concerning the text of the draft Joint ILAC-BIPM Communication on the Accreditation of NMI Services at the next AIC meeting. Developments will be reported at the next JCRB meeting by the International Liaison Officer and the Director.

11. Presentation by the delegation of the proposed new RMO of ARABMET

A. Elsayed gave a presentation on the initiative led by the NIS (Egypt) to form a new RMO named ARABMET initially encompassing Egypt, Syria, Jordan and Yemen.

In the discussion following the presentation, it was noted that there were two other initiatives (GULFMET and Arab Metrology Program) to form an RMO encompassing parts of the Arab region, leading to a lack of coherent voice that represented the Arab region in the area of metrology. Furthermore, concerns were expressed about the feasibility of conducting all activities expected of an RMO within the CIPM MRA with the limited membership proposed in each of the initiatives. The discussion was concluded with the JCRB agreeing to the following action:

Action 26/6: The JCRB acknowledge that although the meeting do not foresee at present the possibility to suggest to the CIPM a new RMO in the Arabic region in the framework of the CIPM MRA due to the present shortage of Members of the BIPM and Associates of the CGPM within the proposed entities as well as an insufficiency of general knowledge of RMO issues, there is a need to further the knowledge of the role of such a RMO. The JCRB therefore asks AFRIMETS to proceed with their offer that their membership will be requested to allow the Arab countries outside Africa to participate in the activities of AFRIMETS, as an interim measure

12. Discussion of issues of concern to the CIPM regarding the proper implementation of CIPM MRA rules ([Doc 26/12](#))

R. Kaarls opened the discussion on the paper he had prepared citing specific issues of concern regarding the proper implementation of CIPM MRA rules. The first of these issues was the question of non-member and non-associate states participating in RMO key and supplemental comparisons.

In the discussion, it was pointed out that CIPM MRA rules did not specifically rule out the participation of the NMIs and DIs of non-member and non-associate states in RMO comparisons, but specified that their results from comparisons would not be included in the KCDB. C. Thomas explained the current practice in which comparison reports are posted as received but tables and graphs created by the KCDB office do not include results from participants that have not signed the CIPM MRA.

13. Discussion of draft CIPM MRA Guidelines for Authorship of Key, Supplementary and Pilot Study Comparison Reports ([Doc 26/13](#))

R. Kaarls presented the main points of the draft CIPM guidelines for authorship of comparison reports. After a brief discussion, the JCRB agreed to the following action:

Action 26/7: RMOs will send their comments on the proposed guidelines for authorship of key and supplementary comparison reports to the CIPM Secretary.

14. Any Other Business

15. Discussion of Initiatives to form new RMOs in the Arab/Gulf regions

In light of the discussion had upon the presentation made under agenda item 11 and Action 26/6 to which JCRB had agreed, it was agreed that no further discussion was necessary.

16. Next Meetings:

It was recalled that in accordance with JCRB Resolution 25/4, the 27th JCRB meeting of the JCRB is scheduled to take place September 14-15, 2011 in Vienna.

Resolution 26/3: The JCRB agrees to hold the 28th Meeting of the JCRB on March 21 – 23, 2012 at the BIPM in Sevres.

17. Meeting closure

With no further issues to discuss, the meeting was adjourned.

18. Actions

Action 26/1: The Director of the BIPM will propose to the CIPM that the CIPM task RMOs to review the QMS of the BIPM and to make comments and recommendations, with approval of the BIPM QMS remaining the responsibility of the CIPM. The BIPM would rotate the presentations of its QMS among RMOs.

Action 26/2: A brainstorming session will be held on the second day of the 27th Meeting of the JCRB in September 2011, in order to clarify the specifics (scope, agenda, intended outcomes, participants, etc.) of the planned workshop on CMC review practices with a view towards holding the workshop in conjunction with the 28th Meeting of the JCRB in March 2012. In preparation for this session, RMOs are to collect information on the CMC review practices within their TCs and BIPM will collect information on the CMC review practices of Consultative Committees.

Action 26/3: BIPM to send request to the designating authority upon notification of a new Designated Institute for information on scope of designation, stating that the information of the new DI will not be published on the BIPM website unless such information is received. The BIPM will advise any new participants in the CIPM MRA regarding expectations concerning their active participation in the activities of the CIPM MRA. Such information will also be made available on the BIPM website.

Action 26/4: The BIPM International Liaison Officer would advise ILAC of serious concerns but different views within JCRB concerning the wording within ILAC Document P10 on Traceability

Action 26/5: The BIPM International Liaison Officer will present the main points of the deliberations put forward by the RMOs concerning the text of the draft Joint ILAC-BIPM Communication on the Accreditation of NMI Services at the next AIC meeting. Developments will be reported at the next JCRB meeting by the International Liaison Officer and the Director.

Action 25/6: The JCRB acknowledge that although the meeting do not foresee at present the possibility to suggest to the CIPM a new RMO in the Arabic region in the framework of the CIPM MRA due to the present shortage of Members of the BIPM and Associates of the CGPM within the proposed entities as well as an insufficiency of general knowledge of RMO issues, there is a need to further the knowledge of the role of such a RMO. The JCRB therefore asks AFRIMETS to proceed with their offer that

their membership will be requested to allow the Arab countries outside Africa to participate in the activities of AFRIMETS, as an interim measure

Action 26/7: RMOs will send their comments on the proposed guidelines for authorship of key and supplementary comparison reports to the CIPM Secretary.

19. Resolutions

Resolution 26/1: The JCRB agrees to give the mandate to the TC-Q of EURAMET to conduct the QS review of the IAEA at their next meeting in March 2012. JCRB supports the decision of IAEA to have the review of their quality system conducted at the next meeting of the TC-Q of EURAMET

The JCRB further agrees that there will be no consequences in so far as the continuing validity of IAEA's published CMCs due to the delay in the review beyond the 5 year limit.

Resolution 26/2: The JCRB approves the procedure for the deletion of the greyed-out CMCs after a period of 5 years. The procedure shall be put into effect beginning in April 2011.

Resolution 26/3: The JCRB agrees to hold the 28th Meeting of the JCRB on March 21 – 23, 2012 at the BIPM in Sevres.

20. Recommendations

The JCRB did not issue any recommendations at its 26th meeting.