



Report of the 27th Meeting of the JCRB

Held on September 14-15, 2011

BEV - Vienna, Austria

<u>Item</u>	<u>Page</u>
Participants	3
1. Welcome by the Chairman and approval of the agenda	5
3. Report by the Chairman on progress since the 26 th JCRB meeting	5
4. Report from the CIPM	6
5. Highlights of the RMO reports to the JCRB:.....	6
5.1. SIM	6
5.2. EURAMET	6
5.3. COOMET	6
5.4. APMP	6
5.5. AFRIMETS	6
6. KCDB report.....	6
7. Status of CMCs submission and review / Issues from Consultative Committees....	7
8. Report on Action 26/3: Obtaining information on DI designation scopes and advising new CIPM MRA signatories of expectations for participation	8
9. Status report on the ILAC-CIPM Joint Communication on the accreditation of NMI Services and the ILAC P10 Document.....	9
10. Discussion of draft CIPM MRA Guidelines for authorship of Key, Supplementary and Pilot Study Comparison Reports.....	9
11. Update on initiatives to form a new RMO in the Arab region	10
12. Documents to be submitted to the CIPM for approval.....	11
12.1. Changes to the CIPM MRA-D-05.....	11
13. Any Other Business.....	11

- 13.1. Proposal by COOMET to hold annual RMO Roundtable in conjunction with RMO-hosted JCRB meetings..... 11
- 14. Next Meetings 11
- 15. Meeting closure..... 12
- 16. Actions 13
- 17. Resolutions 13
- 18. Recommendations..... 13

Participants

BIPM-CIPM

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

Delegations

Dr Mourad Ben Hassine (Representative) AFRIMETS
 Dr Mohamed Berrada AFRIMETS
 Mr Dennis Moturi AFRIMETS
 Dr Yadong Yu (Representative) APMP
 Ms Ada Cai Juan APMP
 Mr Irfan Yeoh APMP
 Dr Ilya Budovsky APMP
 Dr Yukinobu Miki APMP
 Dr Vladimir Nikolaevich Krutikov (Representative) COOMET
 Dr Nikolaj Zhagora COOMET
 Dr Pavel Neyezhnikov COOMET
 Dr Martin Halaj COOMET
 Dr Anna Chukovkina COOMET
 Dr Kamal Hossain (Representative) EURAMET
 Dr Wolfgang Schmid EURAMET
 Dr Pavel Klenovsky EURAMET
 Ms Maguelonne Chambon EURAMET
 Dr Janko Drnovsek EURAMET
 Dr Arnold Leitner EURAMET
 Dr Alan Steele (Representative) SIM
 Dr. Jose Dajes SIM
 Dr Claudia Santo SIM

Dr Claire SaundrySIM

Guests

Dr Sergey Alekseevitch Komissarov COOMET

Dr Ekaterina Kromkova COOMET

Dr James OlthoffSIM

1. Welcome by the Chairman and approval of the agenda

The Chairman welcomed the delegates.

Participants were then asked to introduce themselves.

The agenda of the 27th JCRB meeting was approved without amendments.

After the welcome by the Chairman, Dr Arnold Leitner, Director of the BEV and host for the meeting, gave a presentation on metrology in Austria.

2. Approval of the minutes of the 26th meeting of the JCRB and a review of pending actions.

The minutes of the 26th meeting of the JCRB were approved without amendments.

The Chairman of the meeting reviewed the actions agreed upon at the 26th meeting, noting that all had been completed.

The chairman noted that the Action 26/1 concerning the review of BIPM's QMS by RMOs was approved by the CIPM.

Delegates were informed that in accordance with Action 26/3, letters requesting designation information from DIs and informing new DIs of expectations for their active participation in CIPM MRA activities had been drafted and would be presented later in the meeting.

The head of the AFRIMETS delegation spoke in regards to Action 26/6. In accordance with the action, the issue of inviting non-member Middle Eastern countries to participate in AFRIMETS activities was discussed at the most recent AFRIMETS General Assembly but no resolution had been agreed upon. Saudi Arabia has been invited to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with AFRIMETS in order to initiate their participation in RMO activities, most likely as an Observer Member. Tunisia has made some progress in the process of signing the Metre Convention.

3. Report by the Chairman on progress since the 26th JCRB meeting

M. Kühne presented the report on developments at the BIPM since the 26th meeting of the JCRB. Important points in the report concerned preparations for the approaching 24th meeting of the CGPM, outcomes from the NMI Directors Meeting and Informal Meeting of Government Representatives held in May, and the switch to accrual accounting at the BIPM.

Upon a question by the SIM delegation concerning the potential rapprochement between the BIPM and the OIML, the Chairman informed the meeting that discussions on the subject were ongoing. The OIML General Conference in 2012 is to discuss the issue and decide on the further procedure. Should the OIML consider cohabitation with the BIPM at the site in Sevres the French government would have to be consulted

as at present the use of the site is authorized only for the BIPM. The CIPM remains receptive to considering any proposal made by the OIML towards the BIPM.

4. Report from the CIPM

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

- New Member States of the BIPM and Associates to the CGPM
- Resolutions to be put forward at the CGPM meeting in October 2011
- Outcomes of the 1st part of the 100th Meeting of the CIPM in May 2011.
- The decision by the CIPM to keep the authorized use of the CIPM MRA Logo limited to Calibration and Measurement Certificates issued by signatory NMIs.
- The endorsement by the CIPM of the authorship guidelines for comparison reports discussed at the 26th JCRB.

5. Highlights of the RMO reports to the JCRB:

5.1. SIM

A. Steele presented the highlights of the SIM report.

5.2. EURAMET

K. Hossein presented the highlights of the EURAMET report.

5.3. COOMET

P. Neyezhnikov presented the highlights of the COOMET report.

5.4. APMP

A. Cai Juan presented the highlights of the APMP report.

5.5. AFRIMETS

M. Ben Hassine presented the AFRIMETS report.

6. KCDB report

C. Thomas presented a summary of the semi-annual KCDB report to the JCRB. Important points of the presentation included:

- The importance of following the rules for properly formatting the Excel worksheets used to submit CMC claims.
- New search capabilities for Chemistry CMCs on the KCDB.

After the presentation, M. Kühne spoke about the issue of using the number of CMCs published on the KCDB as a performance indicator of NMIs, which he thought to be inappropriate considering that emphasis should be on “quality”, in terms of ranges and uncertainties, rather than “quantity” of CMCs. He suggested that TC Chairs could check range subdivisions in submitted CMCs for artificial inflation of CMC numbers and that common sense should be sufficient for making an appropriate judgment in this regard. C. Thomas concurred that comparability among CMCs becomes difficult when ranges are differently divided.

B. Kaarls asked whether work by the BIPM and ILAC continued on harmonization of CMCs and accreditation scopes. M. Kühne replied that not all issues had been worked out and that RMOs could meet with Regional Accreditation Bodies to continue this work.

At the end of the discussions, the following action was agreed upon:

Action 27/1: RMO representatives will remind the chairs of the technical committees/working groups of the importance of observing the established instructions for modifying existing CMCs as stated in document CIPM MRA-D-04.

7. Status of CMCs submission and review / Issues from Consultative Committees

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

There were issues to be brought before the JCRB from two Consultative Committees:

- CCRI WGRMO requested guidance on whether the CMCs belonging to the institute in Latvia whose designation in the area of RI was removed in 2010 by the NMI should be permanently deleted from the KCDB. After a brief discussion, the JCRB decided on the following:

Action 27/2: The CMCs of RMTIC of Latvia will be permanently deleted from the KCDB due to the fact that it is no longer the designated institute for Latvia in the field of ionizing radiation.

Resolution 27/1: The JCRB resolves that the CMCs of those institutes removed from Appendix A will automatically be deleted from the KCDB.

- The issue that has arisen within CCL WG-MRA concerning the request for a change in the format of how uncertainty is expressed in terms of a function of a measurand was discussed. The proposed change would affect CMCs outside the Length area, up to a total of 17 000 CMCs. Furthermore, a change in the rules outlined for the expression of uncertainty in document CIPM MRA-D-04 would be required, which would involve the JCRB in the matter. After discussion, it was agreed that it would be better to wait until a concrete proposal was made for the change and in the meantime, to continue communication with the Chairman of the CCL WG-MRA concerning the issue.

8. Report on Action 26/3: Obtaining information on DI designation scopes and advising new CIPM MRA signatories of expectations for participation

O. Altan presented two letters that were prepared in accordance with Action 26/3. One letter is to be used to obtain designation information from designating authorities when notification of a new Designated Institute is received. The second letter aims to inform newly designated institutes of the expectations for their active participation.

A discussion then followed on the proliferation of Designated Institutes, particularly in EURAMET and actions that can be taken to ensure their participation in CIPM MRA activities. EURAMET has worked on developing a policy in relation to designation of institutes that will increase their engagement with CIPM MRA activities. EURAMET proposed a four step designation process that includes a formal notification to DIs of expectations in regards to CIPM MRA activities and a later follow-up procedure if certain requirements are not met after a defined period of time. The proposed procedure would entail closer cooperation between the BIPM and RMOs to monitor the designation process.

In a related matter, A. Henson presented the delegates with PTB Guide 6, which was prepared with input from the BIPM and which is intended to be used as a teaching instrument in developing NMIs that intend to sign the CIPM MRA. The guide summarizes the CIPM MRA and its requirements in a simplified, easy-to-understand manner.

At the end of the discussions, the JCRB decided on the following:

Action 27/3: The BIPM International Liaison Officer and the Executive Secretary of the JCRB will work to obtain information on the fields of designation of all DIs listed in Appendix A and report on the progress of such work at the next JCRB.

Action 27/4: The BIPM will prepare a draft document on expectations from DIs for active engagement in the CIPM MRA (declaration of CMCs, participation in RMO activities) using the input provided by EURAMET at the meeting, in time for the next JCRB meeting.

Action 27/5: The BIPM International Liaison Officer will explore the possibility of adopting PTB Guide 6 as a BIPM document.

9. Status report on the ILAC-CIPM Joint Communication on the accreditation of NMI Services and the ILAC P10 Document

A. Henson gave an update on the latest status of the ILAC-CIPM Joint Communication on the Accreditation of NMI Services and the ILAC P10 Document.

The ILAC-CIPM Joint Communication on the Accreditation of NMI Services has gone through two rounds of comment and discussion by interested parties and is now considered to have reached its final shape.

A. Henson told the meeting that, in accordance with Action 26/5, he had shared the concerns raised by RMOs at the 26th meeting of the JCRB and different proposed solutions discussed at that meeting regarding the P10 document with the ILAC AIC at Montreux and that some changes had been made in response to the feedback. The finalized text is ready for voting by ILAC members, which will end on October 7th.

The agenda item was closed with the following recommendation:

Recommendation 27/1: The JCRB recommends to the CIPM to approve the BIPM ILAC Joint Communication on the Accreditation of NMI Services

10. Discussion of draft CIPM MRA Guidelines for authorship of Key, Supplementary and Pilot Study Comparison Reports

R. Kaarls opened the agenda item by stating that he had not received any comments from the RMOs concerning the Guidelines for authorship of Key, Supplementary and Pilot Study Comparison Reports since they were brought before the 26th meeting of the JCRB. He thus proposed that he finalize the document for approval at the 100th meeting of the CIPM.

A. Steele proposed that the authorship guidelines include a recommendation against having sole authorship from the pilot laboratory. R. Kaarls responded that he would incorporate such language into the final version to be recommended to the CIPM.

The discussion concluded with the following recommendation:

Recommendation 27/2: The JCRB recommends that the CIPM adopt the draft guidelines on the authorship of comparison reports subject to the inclusion of SIM comments

11. Update on initiatives to form a new RMO in the Arab region

A. Henson opened the agenda item by describing the latest developments concerning the three known separate initiatives in the Arab Region to form a new RMO. The GULFMET initiative now has one member state, Saudi Arabia, and letters of intent have been received from a number of other GSO countries. A. Henson stated that in view of the modest number of countries involved in the initiative (Saudi Arabia and six others) and the limited metrology capability in those countries it would still be a challenge for GULFMET to form a viable RMO in terms of the required expertise.

The AIDMO initiative encompasses a wider set of countries – potentially up to 20. M. Ben Hassine stated that there was a consultative committee within AIDMO that was dealing with metrology and that its goal is to set up an Arab Metrology Programme similar in function to APMP. He further stated that the discussion was ongoing within the AIDMO and that there should be more clarity as to the manner in which the initiative will proceed after a meeting scheduled in November 2011.

A. Henson stated that the present situation where there is overlapping initiatives is difficult to understand. He further stated that with the exception of the GULFMET initiative there has been little communication from individual states confirming their claimed commitment to one initiative or another, which is what BIPM must take into account.

M. Berrada stated that the Arab Federation for Metrology, the third initiative, had been rendered obsolete in terms of forming an RMO within the meaning of the CIPM MRA since they had not been able to draw interest from a viable number of countries. He further stated that after the scheduled meeting in November 2011, AIDMO would relay information to the BIPM concerning a roadmap to forming an RMO and other outcomes.

M. Kühne reiterated the necessity to have statements from NMI representatives on their association with any one of the initiatives and that the JCRB must see evidence

that any proposed RMO has the capability to act as a fully functioning RMO within the scope of the CIPM MRA.

12. Documents to be submitted to the CIPM for approval

12.1. Changes to the CIPM MRA-D-05

O. Altan presented proposed changes to the CIPM MRA-D-05 which consist of minor corrections to the existing text and flowcharts meant to clarify certain points in the procedures applicable to measurement comparisons.

The changes were approved by the JCRB and the following recommendation was made:

Recommendation 27/3: The JCRB recommends to the CIPM to approve changes to CIPM MRA-D-05

13. Any Other Business

13.1. Proposal by COOMET to hold annual RMO Roundtable in conjunction with RMO-hosted JCRB meetings

Prior to opening discussion on the COOMET proposal for holding annual RMO Roundtables, M. Kühne proposed a discussion on holding one JCRB meeting per year instead of the current practice of having two meetings. The opinions expressed by the RMO delegations indicated that while cost issues were a concern with having two JCRB meetings per year, that the majority were in favor of continuing with the practice of having two JCRB meetings per year. M. Kühne closed the discussion by stating that the JCRB would continue to meet twice a year while striving to operate more efficiently.

The proposal to hold annual RMO Roundtable was then discussed. P. Neyezhmakov stated that the purpose of holding such a meeting would present the opportunity to discuss issues outside of the CIPM MRA that are of concern to RMOs, such as cooperation in research and coordination of activities. He suggested that holding the inter-RMO meetings in conjunction with RMO-hosted JCRB meetings would hold down the associated costs. The other RMO delegations responded to the proposal favorably. The SIM delegation expressed willingness to hold the first inter-RMO meeting in conjunction with the 29th meeting of the JCRB that will be held at NIST in September 2012.

14. Next Meetings

It was recalled that in accordance with JCRB Resolution 26/3, the 28th meeting of the JCRB was scheduled to take place March 21-23, 2012 at the BIPM. M. Kühne stated that due to scheduling conflict that required him to be elsewhere at the time, he

would like the proposed date for the 28th meeting of the JCRB to be changed. The JCRB agreed to the following:

Resolution 27/2: The 28th meeting of the JCRB will take place at the BIPM, beginning at 13:00 on April 3 and continuing full day on April 4, 2012.

Resolution 27/3: The 29th meeting of the JCRB will take place at NIST on September 25 and 26, 2012.

15. Meeting closure

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

16. Actions

27/1: RMO representatives will remind the chairs of the technical committees/working groups of the importance of observing the established instructions for modifying existing CMCs as stated in document CIPM MRA-D-04.

27/2: The CMCs of RMTC of Latvia will be permanently deleted from the KCDB due to the fact that it is no longer the designated institute for Latvia in the field of ionizing radiation.

27/3: The BIPM International Liaison Officer and the Executive Secretary of the JCRB will work to obtain information on the fields of designation of all DIs listed in Appendix A and report on the progress of such work at the next JCRB.

27/4: The BIPM will prepare a draft document on expectations from DIs for active engagement in the CIPM MRA (declaration of CMCs, participation in RMO activities) using the input provided by EURAMET at the meeting, in time for the next JCRB meeting.

27/5: The BIPM international liaison officer will explore the possibility of adopting PTB Guide 6 as a BIPM document.

17. Resolutions

27/1: The JCRB resolves that the CMCs of those institutes removed from Appendix A will automatically be deleted from the KCDB.

27/2: The 28th meeting of the JCRB will take place at the BIPM, beginning at 13:00 on April 3 and continuing full day on April 4, 2012.

27/3: The 29th meeting of the JCRB will take place at NIST on September 25 and 26, 2012.

18. Recommendations

27/1: The JCRB recommends to the CIPM to approve the BIPM ILAC Joint Communication on the Accreditation of NMI Services

27/2: The JCRB recommends that the CIPM adopt the draft guidelines on the authorship of comparison reports subject to the inclusion of SIM comments

27/3: The JCRB recommends to the CIPM to approve changes to CIPM MRA-D-05