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1. **Opening of the meeting**
	1. **Welcoming remarks**

C. Ehrlich welcomed all participants to the online meeting, which was held via WebEx.

* 1. **Membership of WG2**

There were no changes to membership.

* 1. **Purposes of the meeting and anticipated meeting outcomes**

See document JCGM-WG2-N21-04 *“Draft Agenda for the WG2 meeting 10 September 2021 (V.1)”, agenda item 1.c* for details of the purposes and anticipated outcomes*.*

1. **Review and approval of the agenda**

C. Ehrlich reviewed the agenda, which was approved without change.

1. **Access to WG2 SharePoint Site on BIPM website**

C. Ehrlich noted that when working on files directly on the SharePoint site, the site can be slow. He commented that files are often downloaded for editing and then reloaded onto the site. Similar problems had been reported by other members of WG2. In general, the site is working well.

1. **VIM4 1CD**
	1. **Review of efforts so far in handling comments received on VIM4 1CD**

C. Ehrlich gave a summary of efforts so far in handling comments received on VIM4 1CD, details of which can be found in document JCGM-WG2-N21-04 “*Draft Agenda for the WG2 meeting 10 September 2021 (V.1)*”, under agenda items 4.a.i to 4.a.ix. It was clarified that S. Trapmann had worked on Chapters 2 and 5 but not Chapter 6. G. Nordin had worked on Chapter 6 alone.

C. Ehrlich continued by giving the PowerPoint presentation JCGM-WG2-N21-05 “*JCGM WG2 Meeting on VIM4 1CD Comments*”. This presentation gives an overview the comments received and describes the work that has been undertaken so far to handle to comments. Suggestions are made for dealing with the comments and a summary is given of the general highest-level/impact content related issues. See document JCGM-WG2-N21-05 for full details.

* 1. **Develop strategy for completing the files “Chapter # with Comments.docx”**

C. Ehrlich asked for volunteers to help complete the task to add the comments into Chapter 1. S. Sidney did the same for Chapter 4.

* 1. **Discuss strategy to further develop classification categories for comments received on VIM4** **1CD (Review “Candidate categories to classify comments (1 September 2021)” and “Dealing with the comments to the VIM4 CD: a note”);**

It was stressed that in parallel to the classification of comments as general, technical, or editorial, the received comments can be classified in two basic categories:

* those related to fundamental subjects, such that accepting them would require introducing substantial changes to the structure of several entries, or the entire vocabulary: they may be called **structural comments**;
* those related to single entries, such that accepting them would not affect any other entry: they may be called **pointwise comments**.

The reason for this distinction is that WG2’s critical target is to reach a consensus position on structural comments, that it is confident would be approved by the JCGM member organizations. Pointwise comments can be dealt with one-by-one and can remain as pending if a consensus cannot be reached.

* 1. **Begin identifying highest level issues for WG2 to consider in how to proceed with VIM4;**

C. Ehrlich asked the members of WG2 if they agreed with the VIM4 1CD that had been sent out for comment and therefore if it was truly a joint document. M. Desenfant said that the LNE had expressed some concerns about parts of the VIM4, particularly whether two separate terms ‘general quantity’ and ‘individual quantity’ are required. If it is decided that both terms should be retained, a solution will need to be found regarding how to translate the word “instance” into French. J. Schwob commented that he is in favour of retaining both definitions. It was suggested that M. Desenfant and J. Schwob should discuss the issue to find a solution.

G. Nordin gave a presentation on the comments received on Chapter 6. It was agreed that comments suggesting that Chapter 6 on nominal properties should be deleted and that the VIM4 should not include any entries relating to nominal properties can be ignored as WG2 has a mandate from the JCGM to deal with nominal properties by including some related entries. G. Nordin summarized the main comments on Chapter 6 that had been received. He identified the highest-level issues as:

* the alignment between the proposed definitions of quantity, ordinal quantity and nominal property, in particular by changing the definition of quantity through the addition of ‘equivalence’;
* the definitions of ordinal and nominal properties do not take into account the latest research;
* perceived confusion over what is meant by ordinal and nominal properties;
* revising the language used in certain definitions to improve readability;
* value of a quantity and value of a nominal property, which have definitions that can cause misunderstandings;
* use of the term ‘examination’ and ‘examination reliability’;
* the use of “instance” in the definition of nominal properties (“attribute” was suggested as an alternative);
* use of the term “equivalence” in the definition of nominal properties without it being defined.
	1. **Begin considering possible strategies for responding to comments received on VIM4 1CD;**

It was suggested that high-level issues should be agreed and discussed by the whole of WG2, whereas pointwise comments could be dealt with in focus groups for each individual chapter. A full WG2 meeting will be arranged for November 2021 to discuss the high-level issues.

* 1. **Other VIM4 1CD issues?**

The procedure by which the JCGM will approve the VIM4 was questioned. It was recalled that the JCGM Charter includes the following guidance:

***7.1.5. Decisions of the Joint Committee***

*Decisions of the Joint Committee shall be by consensus, bearing in mind the following definition:*

***consensus:*** *General agreement characterized by the absence of sustained opposition to substantial issues by any important part of the concerned interests and by a process that involves seeking to take into account the views of all parties concerned and to reconcile any conflicting arguments*

*Note Consensus need not imply unanimity.*

*Should an indicative vote be considered necessary by the Chairman, the decision shall be taken by unanimity of the member organizations and each member organization shall have one vote. Such a vote may be organized by letter ballot, if necessary.*

1. **Important general communications from the WG members (only if urgent)**
	1. **JCGM member organization updates**

Z. Mester reiterated that there is no official IUPAC organizational position on the VIM4 CD. The comments and opinions have come from individual IUPAC members.

* 1. **Update on CCU/CIPM matters (Pavel)**

P. Neyezhmakov presented the report JCGM-WG2-N21-06 “*Update on CCU and CIPM matters to JCGM WG2*” for noting. He recalled that there had been no discussions within the CCU Working Group on Core Metrological Terms (CCU-WG-CMT) on ‘general quantity’ and ‘individual quantity’. C. Ehrlich asked if P. Neyezhmakov could discuss some of the high-level content related issues that had arisen from the circulation of the VIM4 1CD with the CCU-WG-CMT. L. Mari commented that the definition of ‘quantity’ proposed by the CCU-WG-CMT is a definition of ‘individual quantity’ that does not cover the entities such as mass, which cannot be compared by ratio. C. Ehrlich added that his interpretation is that the definition of ‘quantity’ proposed by the CCU-WG-CMT is a definition of ‘general quantity’. This ambiguity supports the proposal in the VIM4 that there should be two separate definitions or explicit clarification of the differences in the notes.

* 1. **Update on ISO/REMCO (Stefanie)**

S. Trapmann said that ISO/REMCO is in the transition phase of becoming ISO/TC 334 – Reference materials. As a result, there have been no recent discussions on ISO Guide 30 and consequently no further feedback is available on the ISO/TC 334 position regarding terminology, particularly whether measurement should cover examination.