

53rd CIML Meeting

Hamburg, Germany
9–12 October 2018

Draft 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

biml@oiml.org / 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

biml@oiml.org

www.oiml.org

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

**Hamburg, Germany
9–12 October 2018**



The International Committee of Legal Metrology was convened by its President, Dr Roman Schwartz, and met from 9–12 October 2018 at the Radisson Blu Hotel, Hamburg, Germany.



Contents

Opening speeches		9
Roll call		12
Approval of the agenda		14
1	Approval by the CIML of the minutes of the 52nd CIML Meeting	14
2	General report by the CIML President	14
3	Presentation by the candidate for CIML First Vice-President	21
4	Recruitment of the new BIML Director	24
4.1	Report by the Selection Committee Chairperson.....	24
4.2	Presentation by the selected candidate.....	25
4.3	Discussion by the CIML (closed session).....	30
5	Renewal of the contract of Mr Ian Dunmill, BIML Assistant Director	30
6	Report by the BIML Director on BIML activities	30
7	Report by the BIML Director on Member States and Corresponding Members	35
8	Report by the BIML Director on financial matters	36
8.1	Approval by the CIML of the 2017 accounts.....	36
8.2	Discussion by the CIML regarding the appointment of the financial auditor.....	39
8.3	Overview of the arrears of Member States and Corresponding Members.....	40
8.4	Report by the BIML Director on the 2018 budget forecast	42
8.5	Initial discussions on budget surplus and status of Corresponding Members.....	44
9	Liaisons	49
9.1	Report by the RLMO Round Table Chairperson	49
9.2	Report by the BIML on activities with organisations in liaison	51
9.3	Updates by organisations in liaison	54
9.4	Signature of Memoranda of Understanding.....	68
10	Countries and Economies with Emerging Metrology Systems (CEEMS)	69
10.1	Report by the CEEMS Advisory Group Chairperson	69
10.2	Report by the BIML on activities in connection with CEEMS matters.....	76
10.3	Report by the BIML Director on the special fund for CEEMS-related activities.....	78
11	OIML Certification System (OIML-CS)	78
11.1	Report by the OIML-CS Management Committee (MC) Chairperson.....	78
11.2	Items for approval by the CIML (concerning the OIML-CS).....	85
12	Technical activities	96
12.1	Technical items for approval by the CIML.....	96
12.2	Technical items for information.....	106
12.3	Report by the BIML on TC/SC secretariat and PG convener training.....	108
12.4	Update on the revision of the <i>Système international d'unités</i> (SI)	112

13	Election by the CIML of the CIML First Vice-President	112
14	Decision by the CIML on the appointment of the new BIML Director.....	112
15	Decision by the CIML on the renewal of the contract of Mr. Ian Dunmill, BIML Assistant Director	112
16	Presentation of OIML Awards.....	115
16.1	OIML Medals.....	115
16.2	OIML Letters of Appreciation.....	118
16.3	OIML CEEMS Award.....	121
17	Future meetings	122
17.1	54th CIML Meeting (2019 – Slovak Republic).....	122
17.2	55th CIML Meeting and 16th International Conference (2020 – People’s Republic of China).....	123
18	Other matters.....	124
19	Review of meeting resolutions	125
	Closing remarks by Dr Schwartz	132
	List of Participants in the 53rd CIML Meeting	134

BIML note:

*The agenda items are transcribed in these minutes in the order of the agenda,
which is not necessarily the order in which they were discussed.*

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

Hamburg, Germany

9–12 October 2018

– DRAFT MINUTES –

Opening speeches

Dr Schwartz, CIML President

Dr Schwartz welcomed delegates to the 53rd meeting of the International Committee of Legal Metrology, to Hamburg, and to Germany. He thanked them for coming and remarked that there was a record participation at this meeting, with more than 170 delegates attending. 55 Member States were present or represented, together with 17 Corresponding Members, as well as organisations in liaison. He said that this gave him confidence that this year's meeting would be as positive and fruitful as ever, all the more so following the very successful start the day before with the seminar on Legal Metrology in Practice, which had also included a visit to the verification authority in Hamburg and a workshop on the Quality Infrastructure Toolkit.

He pointed out that this would again be a very busy Committee meeting, with a number of important items on the agenda. Members would have to make decisions which were very important to the Organisation, including about the First Vice-President and about the new Director of the BIML. There would also be a ceremony to sign two important Memoranda of Understanding: with the IEC, and with ILAC/IAF. He therefore extended a very warm welcome to Mr Frans Vreeswijk (IEC General Secretary and CEO), Ms. Merih Malmqvist Nilsson (ILAC Chair) and Mr Jianhua Xiao (IAF Chair), said that he looked forward to the reports they would be presenting the next day, and thanked them for attending this CIML meeting. He also welcomed Mr Andy Henson, Director of the Communication and International Liaison department at the BIPM, and the representatives of CECIP: Mr Roland Nater, Mr Karlheinz Bahnholzer and Dr Louis Cachon.

Dr Schwartz reminded delegates that the last CIML meeting to have taken place in Germany had been held 14 years before, in Berlin in 2004, in association with the 12th OIML Conference. At that time, Prof Manfred Kochsiek had opened the meeting as the Acting CIML President. Dr Schwartz said that he was pleased to be able to welcome him today, as a very active Member of Honour of the Organisation, as well as the other Members of Honour present today, notably the immediate past-President of the CIML, Mr Peter Mason.

Dr Schwartz then went on to welcome two distinguished guests: Dr Ole Janssen, representing the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy, and Dr Torsten Seveke representing the City of Hamburg. He mentioned that both had kindly agreed to give the Committee an opening address, for which he thanked them.

He then went on to introduce the first speaker for this year's meeting, Dr Ole Janssen, explaining that he was the Deputy Director General at the Directorate of Innovation and Technology Policies at the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (BMWi) in Berlin. Dr Schwartz said that he had had a varied career, beginning at the University of Hannover, where he had graduated in Economics in 1996. He then became an academic assistant at the University of Greifswald where he completed his doctorate in 2002. His political career started in 2003, at the Ministry for Economic Affairs, Labour and Transport of Lower Saxony, where he served in various offices, and finally in the State Chancellery as head of the department representing the federal state of Lower Saxony to the Federation. In 2011, he moved to the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy, where he again served in various offices, before

becoming the Deputy Director General for Innovation and Technology Policies. He invited Dr Janssen to the stage to address the Committee.

Dr Ole Janssen, Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy

Dear Mr President, Dear Dr Sevecke,

Dear CIML Members and Corresponding Members,

Ladies and Gentlemen, distinguished guests,

It is my great pleasure to welcome you all, on behalf of the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy, to the 53rd meeting of the International Committee of Legal Metrology.

I am especially pleased that this meeting, which is so important for international legal metrology, is taking place in the Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg, one of the most important commercial centres in Germany today, with a long tradition going back to the 7th century.

The last meeting of the CIML in Germany, in combination with an OIML Conference, took place in our capital Berlin in 2004. It is a great honour and pleasure for our country to host another CIML meeting after 14 years.

Germany is a founding member of the OIML, which was created in 1955. Germany fully supports the primary goal of the OIML, which is to internationally harmonise technical regulations, technical requirements, and test procedures for measuring instruments under legal control, and to promote mutual recognition of test results and certificates, with the aim of reducing technical barriers to trade in the sense of the WTO TBT agreement.

I am pleased that an important step in that direction was taken by the OIML with the launch of the new OIML Certification System on 1 January 2018. I am optimistic that the stakeholders in that system – most importantly the manufacturers of measuring instruments and the utilising National Authorities – will soon discover the benefits; namely that unnecessary and costly double testing is avoided by mutually recognising qualified certificates and related test results.

Legal metrology is an important pillar of Germany's quality infrastructure. Verifiably safe products, efficient market surveillance and a consistent metrology system guarantee fair trade and are important factors for a competitive business location.

In Germany, there are about 130 million measuring instruments under legal control, such as weighing instruments, fuel dispensers, water, gas and electricity meters – in total about 150 different types of measuring instrument. Many of these measuring instruments are regulated by the NAWI [Non-automatic weighing instruments] Directive and the Measuring Instruments Directive. But Germany has taken a further step: Since 2015, we have applied the European regulatory framework to all 150 categories of measuring instruments at the national level. In Germany, every measuring instrument under legal control has to fulfil the essential requirements when being placed on the market.

Within this framework, OIML Recommendations play a significant role: a large number of them have been identified, either by the European Commission, or by the responsible body in Germany, as normative documents. Thus, adhering to them provides presumption of conformity with the essential requirements for measuring instruments.

Let me now say a few words about the PTB. The PTB, as the national metrology institute, plays an important part in the new German legal metrology system by operating a conformity assessment body, by providing traceability and support for the verification authorities, and by informing and consulting with stakeholders. All of this is done with the aim of consumer protection, fair trade, and in support of industry.

The PTB also supports international technical cooperation and CEEMS activities, with more than 40 projects in 90 countries and regions.

Let me finally say some words about how legal metrology relates to several high priority topics of the German government.

The German government is committed to promoting e-mobility. This can only be achieved if consumers have confidence in every aspect of these new technologies. This is where legal metrology plays an important role, making sure consumers are confident in the charging infrastructure by ensuring correct measuring – be it electricity or hydrogen.

Another field is digitisation, which will also become more and more important for politics and industry alike. We can already foresee that practically every measuring instrument will be connected to the internet in the future, with every advantage and disadvantage this entails.

May I conclude by wishing you a successful meeting, interesting discussions, and enjoyable days in the Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg.

Thank you very much for your attention.

Dr Schwartz thanked Dr Janssen for his introductory speech, and then introduced Dr Torsten Seveke, the State Counsel of the Hamburg Ministry of Economy, Transport and Innovation. Dr Seveke studied law and social and economic history at the University of Hamburg where he completed his second state law examination in 1995 and his PhD examination in 1997. He then entered the Hamburg State administration and served in various offices. This year he became the State Counsel of the Ministry of Economy, Transport and Innovation of the federal state and city of Hamburg. Dr Schwartz invited Dr Seveke to the stage.

Dr Torsten Seveke representing the City of Hamburg

Dear Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak to you. On behalf of the Senate of the Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg, I would like to welcome you here in my home town.

The International Committee of Legal Metrology is holding its 53rd meeting here in Hamburg for the first time in my city and we are very proud to have you here. We asked in the “upper circles” if it was possible to give you the best weather ever, and He decided yes! So what you see outside is the legal standard here in Hamburg, the best weather for your conference Ladies and Gentlemen.

As my colleague told you, I am responsible for the Harbour and for other matters here in Hamburg. You have seen our shipping lines and the big cargo terminals; this is the heart of our city and all of industry transits through the port. For over a hundred years Hamburg has been a major industrial port, moving people and goods all over the world and so we are very proud to see you here in our beautiful city especially with these excellent weather conditions.

You have been holding your meetings worldwide since 1955 and you have seen different cities; you have a very interesting agenda for your meeting and from my point of view legal metrology is very important for human beings considering all the industrial products they will use in their lifetime. We are very happy to have you here and I know you will be visiting the Airbus site. The aviation industry here is responsible for even more metrology questions than the shipping lines or the Harbour. The aviation industry here in Hamburg is the second largest in Europe and, together with our colleagues in France, we try to be much better than our colleagues in the United States!

The people of Hamburg have worked hard to hold your congress here in Hamburg. It took us nearly ten years to build a new opera house! This is not as long as some colleagues in other cities such as Berlin to build the airport, which I've heard about but I haven't yet seen finished! So please feel free to visit the opera house in the centre of the Harbour – it is free of charge to visit but you may not be able to buy a ticket for a music concert, although there is a beautiful view with this beautiful weather. I hope you enjoy visiting my city here in Hamburg.

Thank you very much.

Dr Schwartz thanked Dr Seveke for his opening address on behalf of the city of Hamburg. He continued that they very much looked forward to having some time to see some highlights of Hamburg later in the week. He said that he was very happy and proud to be able to hold this meeting in this wonderful city, especially with such good weather.

Before proceeding with the roll call, Dr Schwartz concluded the opening addresses by again thanking delegates for coming, wishing everyone a successful meeting, hoping that they would enjoy the special, and maybe unique framework programme that had been organised for that evening and the next, as well as Thursday afternoon with the Airbus tour. He recommended that delegates missed none of these, as well as wishing them a great time in Hamburg, saying that he hoped they would have time to see some of its highlights. He went on to indicate that an official photographer would be present throughout, taking pictures some of which would be published. He hoped that this was acceptable to everyone. He then asked Ian Dunmill to take the roll call.

Roll call

Mr Dunmill asked delegates to indicate their presence when their country's name was called, and to indicate proxies that they held was asked.

Albania.....	Present
Algeria	Not present (but expected)
Australia.....	Present
Austria	Present
Belarus	Present
Belgium	Present
Brazil	Present
Bulgaria	Present
Cambodia.....	Present
Cameroon.....	Not present, no proxy
Canada	Present
Colombia	Not present, proxy to Cuba
Croatia	Present
Cuba.....	Present
Cyprus.....	Present
Czech Republic.....	Present
Denmark	Not present, proxy to Norway
Egypt.....	Present
Finland.....	Present
France	Present

Germany	Present
Greece	Not present, no proxy
Hungary	Present
India	Present
Indonesia.....	Present
Iran.....	Present
Ireland.....	Present
Israel	Not present, proxy to Ireland
Italy	Not present (but expected)
Japan	Present
Kazakhstan.....	Not present, proxy to Russian Federation
Kenya.....	Present
Republic of Korea.....	Present
Macedonia	Present
Monaco	Not present, proxy to France
Morocco.....	Not present, no proxy
Netherlands.....	Present
New Zealand.....	Present
Norway	Present
P.R. China.....	Present
Pakistan.....	Not present, no proxy
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
Sweden.....	Present
Switzerland.....	Present
Tanzania.....	Present
Thailand.....	Present
Tunisia	Present
Tunisia	Present
Turkey.....	Present
United Kingdom	Present
United States.....	Present
Vietnam	Present
Zambia	Present

Mr Patoray indicated that since there were 62 Member States, the Convention required that 42 be present for the quorum to be achieved. Five Member States were not attending the meeting and had not supplied a proxy. There were also two Member States that, although expected, were not currently in the room. This meant that 55 were currently present or represented, so there was a quorum. He finished by saying that he thought that, if the remaining two expected Member States arrived, this would be a record attendance at a CIML meeting.

Dr Schwartz said that it was reassuring to know that they exceeded the requirements for the quorum of 42 Member States.

Approval of the agenda

Dr Schwartz told delegates that they had received version 2 of the agenda along with the other meeting documents. He made the proposal to move agenda items 13 *Election by the CIML of the CIML First Vice-President*, 14 *Decision by the CIML on the appointment of the new BIML Director*, and 15 *Decision by the CIML on the renewal of the contract of Mr Ian Dunmill, BIML Assistant Director* to before agenda item 10, which was to be discussed the following afternoon. This was because the related agenda items 3, 4 and 5 would be dealt with that afternoon, and he hoped that one night would be sufficient for delegates to consider their decisions so that the three candidates did not have to wait longer than necessary. He had very much appreciated this arrangement the previous year, and would like to make the same arrangements for the candidates this year. He asked whether Members agreed with this proposal, and there were no objections. He thanked them and confirmed that agenda items 13, 14 and 15 would therefore be taken before item 10.

With this change, Dr Schwartz asked whether Members could accept the agenda, noting that any extra points could be covered under agenda item 18 *Other matters*. The agenda was adopted unanimously.

1 Approval by the CIML of the minutes of the 52nd CIML Meeting

Dr Schwartz moved on to agenda item 1 *Approval by the CIML of the minutes of the 52nd CIML Meeting*, which had been held the previous year in Cartagena de Indias, Colombia. He reminded delegates that they had received both the Resolutions of this meeting and the draft minutes in English. He asked for any questions or comments. There were no comments, and Dr Schwartz remarked that the minutes were well written and thanked the BIML team for organising this. He read Resolution 2018/1:

The Committee,

Approves the minutes of the 52nd CIML Meeting.

There were no comments, negative votes or abstentions, so the resolution was unanimously adopted. He again thanked the BIML team.

2 General report by the CIML President

Dr Schwartz moved on to this item by alerting delegates to the fact that they had received two Additional Meeting Documents on this point: AMD04 (English) and AMD11 (French). Dr Schwartz began in French:

Chers collègues, j'aurais aimé être en mesure de vous présenter ce rapport en français, mais il va me falloir quelque temps pour améliorer mon français. Mais au moins il existe une traduction française de mon rapport, le document complémentaire numéro 11. J'espère que nos collègues francophones seront reconnaissants de cet effort et accepteront que je repasse en anglais dès à présent. Merci.

Dear Colleagues,

Introduction

This is my first report as your CIML President. I thank all CIML Members once more for your confidence and very encouraging support; it is highly motivating for me to serve our Organisation and its Members as best as I can for the upcoming years.

Handover

In Colombia there was a very smooth handover of the CIML Presidency after six very successful years of Presidency by Peter Mason, who was made CIML Member of Honour in recognition of his service to the Organisation. CIML Past President Alan Johnston was also made Member of Honour, and this became effective in April 2018 on his retirement from Measurement Canada.

Again, the past year has been very busy and I have a lot to report.

Membership

Concerning the changes in membership of our Committee, I am pleased to welcome the following new CIML Members:

Ms Diane Allan Canada
Mr QIN Yizhi China
Mr Jairo Enrique Malaver Barbosa Colombia
Eng. Abdallah Moantasser..... Egypt
Dott. Giuseppe Capuano..... Italy
Ms. Merita Mustafai Macedonia
Dr Bobjoseph Mathew..... Switzerland
Dr Ludovic Manege..... Tanzania
Mr Boonyarit Kalayanamit..... Thailand
Mr Richard Sanders..... United Kingdom

I am also pleased to welcome the Republic of Kiribati as a new Corresponding Member.

As President Mason stated in Colombia last year, we can again confirm that interest in the work of the OIML across the globe has never been greater and we can all be proud of this fact. We will certainly not rest on our laurels, but take this as an incentive and motivation to work hard in order to keep this high level of interest and remain relevant in a rapidly changing world.

Presidential Council

As CIML President, I have reviewed and slightly modified the composition of the Presidential Council (PC). I appreciate that Charles Ehrlich, Sergey Golubev, Yukinobu Miki and Corinne Lagauterie continue to be members of the Council, and I have also invited Bill Loizides, Mairead Buckley, Himba Cheelo, and Bobjoseph Mathew to join as new members. Their support and advice is precious to me as President and I value their contributions.

At our February-March 2018 PC meeting we discussed many points. We also thoroughly reviewed the 2017 CIML resolutions and the minutes of the 2017 PC meetings and drew up a list of actions to use as a working basis. Let me summarise the key elements below, starting with the review of technical activities.

Review of projects

At the February-March 2018 PC meeting the status of all 55 ongoing projects was reviewed. Of these, 15 projects were identified as having been inactive for a long time and they were therefore submitted to the CIML to decide whether they should be cancelled or not. There was a clear decision to cancel all of them, leaving 40 active projects. I am also pleased to report that some previously dormant projects have now started to make progress. There is a strong indication that the recent training sessions coupled with the fact that some new conveners have come on board for several projects have helped in this respect.

Convener training and support

You will be given detailed information on convener training under agenda item 12.3. Training has been held in a number of locations over the last year and further courses are planned for the near future. There was excellent interaction with participants, many of whom confirmed that they found the course to be enjoyable, informative and professional.

I understand that the situation of Project Group conveners is often difficult. I have great respect for the conveners and for the work they carry out, which is often in addition to their work in their national institute, however one of the concerns I have is that globally, the project management needs to be analysed and improved. I personally attended a convener training session at the BIML to provide my thoughts on how good project management would help the delivery of Draft Recommendations and Documents. This was based on my personal experience with the revision of R 76. It is my intention that information on project management be incorporated into future training courses.

At our CIML meeting in 2017 I said that I consider it crucial for our Organisation that we keep the relevant publications up to date. As we have limited resources, these must be allocated to carrying out key tasks. I have therefore asked the BIML to produce a list of all the Recommendations so that priorities for publication reviews can be identified.

I also asked if the BIML would be able to offer even more support, at least for high priority projects, so that the conveners can focus on the technical aspects of their projects. This is certainly something I will discuss further with the new BIML Director and the PC.

Translations into French

As French is the official language of the Organisation, it is important that we make as many key publications and parts of the website as possible available in French. Firstly, I am pleased to report that full introductions to both the OIML-CS and the CEEMS sections of the website are now available in French. Secondly, a priority list of publications that require translation has been drawn up, and work has started to translate R 59 and R 60. OIML B 18 has already been translated, as have R 87 and R 147. R 61 is the next Recommendation on the list of priorities. The BIML is using the support from two professional external translators in order to accomplish the translation work, and the minutes of the 15th Conference are also being translated by a third translator. All this translation work is being carried out in close cooperation with Mrs. Lagauterie.

BIML staff

I would now like to report to you on the BIML staff, especially the situation concerning the three senior members.

As you know, Stephen Patoray will retire at the end of 2018 after eight years as BIML Director. At last year's meeting in Colombia, Resolution no. 2017/3 was approved with the aim of appointing a new BIML Director at the 2018 CIML meeting. Based on that Resolution and on B 13:2004 *Procedure for the appointment of the BIML Director and Assistant Directors*, a Selection Committee was established, composed of six members of the Presidential Council. I have informed CIML Members about the selection process and its outcome by letter, and I will be giving a report under agenda item 4.1.

I am pleased that the Selection Committee was very successful in finding the right candidate to be proposed for appointment as the new BIML Director. There will be a presentation by the candidate under agenda item 4.2 and you will have the opportunity to discuss his candidacy during the meeting.

Still on the subject of the Bureau Staff, in January 2018 we were pleased to welcome Paul Dixon into his role as BIML Assistant Director, having been appointed by the CIML in Colombia.

Finally, also during our meeting in Hamburg the CIML will be discussing and voting on the renewal of the contract of Ian Dunmill. You will recall that in Colombia, the CIML voted to not appoint a Selection Committee for the renewal of his contract.

Financial status

Under item 8, the BIML Director will give a detailed report on the financial situation of the Organisation. The global financial health of the Organisation is good. I would like to emphasise, however, that in addition to this overall financial situation, it is necessary to keep a close watch on the cash position, and in particular the cash flow, if the Organisation is to continue to function smoothly. Our dependence on subscriptions from Member States as the principal source of income means that we rely on timely payments coming in from our Members, in particular the larger ones.

At the 15th International Conference in Strasbourg, we discussed the surplus which built up in the accounting period 2012–2016, and decided that this surplus should primarily be used for PG training, in order to improve the efficiency of our technical work.

Related to that discussion, at the last CIML meeting we started to think about the appropriate level of reserves that the Organisation should hold. Under agenda item 8.5 of this meeting we will resume the discussion on the surplus and reserves with the aim of submitting a proposal for consideration by the 16th Conference in 2020. It is my firm belief and strong recommendation that we focus the discussion on investment in the future of our Organisation in order to ensure that the OIML remains viable and be well prepared for the future. I will come back to this at the end of my report when I will speak about my vision and goals for the Organisation.

Corresponding Members

Corresponding Members now benefit much more than in the past from their membership thanks mainly to the interactivity of the OIML website. They can now also participate actively in our technical work, though of course they do not have voting rights.

After discussion at the PC meeting in 2018 it was agreed that a proposal should be developed to ask CIML Members about the possibility of introducing four distinct classes for Corresponding Members. So under agenda item 8.5 I propose that we have an initial discussion with a view to presenting a proposal that could be put to the 16th Conference in 2020.

The revised SI and cooperation with the BIPM

As I said last year in Colombia, I consider the good and fruitful cooperation with other International Organisations as very important.

Let me begin with our sister organisation dealing with scientific metrology, the BIPM. They are preparing for the 26th General Conference on Weights and Measures (CGPM) to take place from 13–16 November 2018 in Versailles near Paris. This is a most exciting event, at least for metrologists, because it is expected that the CGPM will follow the CIPM recommendation to revise the current International System of Units, the SI, so that it will be based on seven fundamental constants, to come into force on World Metrology Day in May 2019. This will be a real cornerstone for metrology, although the impact on practical measurements will be minimal or unnoticeable for nearly all users.

As an official member of the CCU, the OIML has closely monitored the development of the revised SI from the beginning, and we are looking forward to hearing more about the current developments and decisions in the report of the BIPM under agenda item 9.3 and under agenda item 12.4.

We will certainly need to consider the impact on OIML publications, e.g. D 2, for which a Project Group has been set up. The BIPM as a liaison organisation will be following the work closely with us. There is also a need to identify other OIML publications that will possibly be affected by the revision of the SI, such as R 111 for weights of different accuracy classes. To this end the BIPM is about to put out a call to all Secretariats to review their respective publications to see if there are any changes required.

In my new role as CIML President I have not yet had very many opportunities to meet with representatives of the BIPM. A good opportunity was the quadripartite meeting in March 2018, which I attended together with Charles Ehrlich and Stephen Patoray, where we discussed – among many other things – the update of the Joint “BIPM, OIML, ILAC and ISO declaration on metrological traceability”. I would also like to mention the excellent cooperation between the BIPM and the OIML on World Metrology Day, which was again this year a resounding success. As I mentioned, next year’s World Metrology Day will be a really exciting event.

Finally, I would like to mention that I am invited to attend the 26th CGPM and to give a presentation entitled *Developing a common vision for scientific and legal metrology: the OIML perspective*. I am sure that a common vision and a common concept to promote metrology as an important element of the quality infrastructure of a country makes perfect sense in an interconnected world.

OIML-IEC and OIML-ILAC/IAF cooperation

I am pleased to report that the liaisons with the IEC and ILAC/IAF also remain a very significant part of the OIML’s work. We are going to renew our MoUs with both the IEC and ILAC/IAF at our meeting in Hamburg and I very much look forward to the signing ceremony under agenda item 9.4. I am pleased that Mr Frans Vreeswijk, IEC General Secretary and CEO, Ms. Merih Malmqvist Nilsson, ILAC Chair, and Mr Xiao Jianhua, IAF Chair, will personally attend the CIML meeting in Hamburg to represent their organisations.

One of the key reasons for updating our MoUs is to address the new OIML Certification System (OIML-CS) which came into force on 1 January 2018.

Concerning the cooperation with IEC, Paul Dixon and myself met several times with representatives of the IEC (Chris Agius, Executive Secretary of IECEx; Mark Amos, IECEx secretariat; Dr Thorsten Arnhold, IECEx Management Committee Chair) to discuss the renewal of our MoU and possibilities to strengthen our cooperation in the future. Paul Dixon and I were also invited to attend the IECEx Management Committee meeting in Cannes, France, on 20–21 September 2018, where we gave a report primarily about the current status of the OIML-CS.

Please refer to CIML agenda items 9.3 and 9.4 for more information.

RLMOs

I am pleased to report that as in previous years, over the past year BIPM staff have attended meetings of a number of regional legal metrology organisations. I personally hope to be able to accept invitations to RLMO meetings in the future.

I am also pleased to point out that all the RLMOs have been invited to participate in the OIML-CS Management Committee as observers. Dr Miki will be giving a comprehensive oral report during our meeting.

Other organisations

I would like to mention four other organisations with which we maintain regular contacts: the International Organization for Standardization (ISO), the World Health Organization (WHO) concerning medical devices, CODEX Alimentarius concerning food packaging labelling, and UNECE WP.6 regarding regulatory cooperation.

CEEMS Advisory Group (AG) and CEEMS activities

Concerning CEEMS, the Advisory Group is now established and B 19 *Terms of Reference for the Advisory Group on matters concerning Countries and Economies with Emerging Metrology Systems (CEEMS)* has been published. A joint project of the CEEMS AG with the BIPM is the revision of D 1 *Considerations for a Law on Metrology*, and in the future we envisage even closer cooperation with the BIPM, especially in capacity building and Quality Infrastructure (QI) activities.

Improvements have been made to the webpages for CEEMS activities (including translation into French) and some further upgrading is ongoing to address the training centres.

A survey of the needs of CEEMS was sent out to OIML Members in June 2018 to assess what support they require. The outcome will be analysed and more information will be given under agenda item 10.

An Expert database is currently being compiled and work is being carried out on the required legal disclaimer before it can be made live.

There have been three successful Pilot Training Centre events in Kenya, P.R. China and Cuba. Detailed information will be provided on this under agenda item 12.3. In this context, at the last PC meeting we also discussed the need to review the Arcachon resolution on CEEMS and develop a consistent curriculum for the OIML Training Centres (OTCs).

OIML-CS

On 1 January 2018, the new OIML Certification System (OIML-CS) came into force and replaced the former Basic Certificate System and the Mutual Acceptance Arrangement (MAA). The first OIML-CS Management Committee (MC) meeting was held in Sydney, Australia on 21–22 March 2018, in conjunction with a meeting of the Review Committee, which is a sub-committee of the MC, and a lab-tour and symposium organised by the host, NMI Australia. As the Chairman of the provisional Management Committee (prMC) I attended all the meetings, which were very successful with almost 50 participants from 18 countries. At the time of compiling this report there are 12 OIML Issuing Authorities, 20 Utilisers, two Associates and 19 categories of measuring instruments. The objective for 2020 is 36 categories.

I would again like to stress the importance of awareness raising and identifying potential opportunities. ‘Standard’ presentations will be made available which can then be used when talking about or promoting the OIML-CS. It is important, for instance, to get the message across that a Member State does benefit from the OIML-CS not only as an OIML Issuing Authority, but also as a Utilizer, with full voting rights in the MC. In addition, Corresponding Members can also benefit as Associates.

Together, we can all help promote the OIML-CS and ensure it is successful. It is also important to ensure that the OIML-CS is included on the agenda of RLMO meetings.

We will be given detailed reports during our meeting from the MC Chairperson, Cock Oosterman and from the Executive Secretary, Paul Dixon under agenda item 11.

Vision and goals

I spoke of my vision and goals a year ago in Colombia. I believe that our Organisation is in very good shape, but that we still face some challenges to ensure that we are well prepared for the future.

At our CIML meeting in 2017 I summarised my vision as follows:

1. Technical work – there is a need to improve the effectiveness of our technical work with the aim of keeping the relevant Recommendations and Documents up to date. It is therefore important that we identify the priority for reviewing and updating publications. We must use all available resources to carry out key tasks and identify possibilities to further support conveners.
2. OIML-CS – to make it a success we need to continue to promote it to manufacturers and to potential Utilisers and Associates. To support this, further promotional activities will be undertaken and additional promotional materials made available.
3. CEEMS – greater cooperation is required with the BIPM and the RLMOs to “sell” metrology as a package that is part of the QI for a country. We will work on this together.
4. Closer cooperation is required with other international organisations, especially the BIPM. A small task group should look at this within the current framework. A suggestion is for the Directors and Presidents to meet, which would result in a win-win situation if done in the right way.

My proposal is that after the PC meeting in March 2019, a respective “Task Group 2023” be formed, including the President, the two Vice-Presidents, the new BIML Director, the two Assistant Directors, and one or two PC members, with a view to elaborating proposals to be put forward to the CIML in 2019 or the 16th Conference in 2020. Leading on from this, it is crucial that the OIML adapts to address the key challenges of the 21st century such as digitisation, analysis of big data, better market surveillance and remote verification.

There is also the issue of Conformity to Type (CTT) and how to best assist Member States to overcome the “golden sample” issue, which some of our Members claim to have resolved by certain regulations and programs, but others possibly still consider as a key challenge. I recall saying during the seminar held in Utrecht in 2011 that the OIML should concentrate on pre-market activities, because post-market activities are up to countries and are concerned by national legislation. I hope that the new OIML Document on CTT that is being developed will be finalised very soon.

Thank you for your support!

In concluding my report, after my first year as your President I would like to extend my deepest appreciation for the support I have received from Acting First Vice-President Dr Miki, all the members of the PC, the BIML Director and all his staff, and also our Immediate Past President Mr Peter Mason. Your support and guidance has meant that over the past year we have accomplished a great deal and we are shaping the way for our future.

I very much hope that the vacancy of the position of the CIML First Vice-President can be filled at the CIML meeting in Hamburg. There will be a presentation by the candidate and a vote on his election.

Looking forward, I am confident that our Organisation is well prepared to meet the needs of our Members and the challenges we will certainly be facing. I hope you share my optimism and look forward to heading into 2019 and the following years.

Dr Schwartz invited any comments or questions. There being none, he asked delegates to consider the resolution.

The Committee,

Notes the report given by its President.

There were no comments, negative votes or abstentions, so the resolution was unanimously adopted.

3 Presentation by the candidate for CIML First Vice-President

Moving on to this item, Dr Schwartz reminded Members that they had already received the respective presentation, CV and the motivation statement from Dr Charles Ehrlich, who he invited to make his statement.

Dr Ehrlich began by thanking Dr Schwartz and his fellow CIML Members.

It's an honour to be here and to be considered for the position of First Vice-President of the CIML. As I wrote in the motivation document you have received, my primary motivations for running for CIML First Vice-President are to provide assistance to the President in carrying out the difficult and sometimes laborious tasks of the Presidency, and to assist him in carrying out his, and your, vision for the future of the OIML.

I now have about 20 years of experience in the OIML, most of them as CIML Member and as a member of the Presidential Council, and I believe this experience would be beneficial as Vice-President. During those years I have been involved in many OIML activities at all levels, from serving on Technical Committees, Subcommittees and Project Groups, to overseeing the work and serving as chairman, secretariat and convener of several of those bodies. For example I've worked directly on several technical Recommendations as well as on the model law on metrology (D 1) and the technical directives (B 6). In addition I have represented the OIML for many years on the Joint Committee for Guides in Metrology (JCGM) and its two Working Groups, and have served for ten years as Chairman of Working Group 2 (International Vocabulary of Metrology). I have also provided both formal and informal training to OIML Secretariats on incorporating measurement uncertainty into legal metrology considerations, and led the effort to develop the OIML Guide on Uncertainty (G 19).

Throughout my career in industry, scientific metrology, and legal metrology I have always sought to stand up for fairness and a level playing field in whatever I was doing. I value independent thinking and will always approach the work from that perspective. While performing research and development in the semiconductor capital equipment industry I gained a keen awareness of the difficulties that industry faces in dealing with the regulatory world. As Group Leader of the NIST Pressure Group I was responsible for both research activities and the NIST Pressure Calibration Service, which provided calibrations to a broad array of customers. I served as a technical assessor for pressure for the National Voluntary Laboratory Accreditation Program (NVLAP) at NIST, learning the nuances of accreditation which has helped me in serving on the Management Committee and the maintenance group of the new OIML Certification System. I served for three years on the Executive Standards Council of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI), which is the US representative to ISO and IEC. This provided me with experience and appreciation of both the domestic and international standardisation communities. I saw the importance of the products and tools that the OIML has to offer. In all of these activities I've learned that maintaining a balanced perspective and listening to all stakeholders, while striving for consensus is key to achieving successful outcomes, and so I will bring that philosophy to serving as CIML First Vice-President.

One of my most rewarding experiences in the OIML has been continuing the work of my predecessor, Dr Samuel Chappell, in shepherding the OIML Mutual Acceptance Arrangement (MAA) into existence through our roles as secretariat of TC 3/SC 5 on conformity assessment. For many years, as Chairman of the APLMF Working Group on Mutual Recognition

Arrangements, I promoted the MAA in the Asia-Pacific region (including in the US), and I continue this effort, now as a designated subject matter expert, in promoting and supporting the development of the new OIML Certification System. I have also served in the past as Co-Chair of the SIM Legal Metrology Working Group. I have joined the CEEMS Advisory Group to help find ways to make the OIML more relevant and accessible to the CEEMS community, and I will continue that pursuit.

As we have heard, one of the key issues that the OIML has faced over the years is how to accomplish a number of high-priority projects with just a handful of secretariats and conveners that are able to devote a large part of their work and time to these projects. I would like to thank and acknowledge here these dedicated, hard-working individuals, several of whom are in this room: Morayo Awosola, George Teunisse, Ralph Richter – thank you, without whom the core work of the OIML would not have progressed to where it has. My vision here is to explore alternative methods, models and mechanisms for bringing additional resources to bear on this work.

Let me conclude by saying that if you elect me as CIML First Vice-President I will work with the President, the Second Vice-President and the Presidential Council to support the strategy, vision, objectives and mission of the OIML by utilising my experience in the international metrology and standardisation communities (such as BIPM and ISO), and by interacting with as many of you as possible, to listen to your perspectives and learn about your concerns and implement your ideas. I appreciate your support, and look forward to working with all of you. Thank you.

Dr Schwartz thanked Dr Ehrlich for his speech, and invited questions from delegates.

Ms. Natasa Vukovic (Slovenia) congratulated Dr Ehrlich for his achievements, but pointed out that the role of CIML Members is to promote OIML publications, so she asked how he would evaluate the implementation of OIML publications in the country he represents, and what would be his vision in this regards as possible future Vice-President of the CIML. Dr Ehrlich thanked Ms. Vukovic for her very legitimate question and said that he met at least once, and usually twice each year with the US National Conference on Weights and Measures, which develops Handbook 44 and other NCWM documents pertaining to type evaluation. He explained that he gave a report to that conference, which is attended by regulators and industry – all the stakeholders in the US system. He said that he reported on what was happening within the OIML, on the status of projects under US responsibility. He added that in the past he had worked hard to try to harmonise the US NTEP and NCWM recommendations with the OIML Recommendations. They had been very successful with this for R 60, and as she would be aware, they were now a Utilizer in the Certification System and had been in the MAA. Their requirements for load cells were almost identical to those of R 60, having only one additional national requirement. He also talked to the board of directors regularly and did what he could to make them aware of OIML Recommendations, which was a slow but steady process. He hoped that there would also be some success with other documents which were coming along. This being a standardisation process, sometimes it moved slower than one would like.

Mr Dixit (India) thanked Dr Ehrlich for his presentation and remarked that the US was very different even though Dr Ehrlich had been in the CIML. There would be a great change in the SI system and CIML procedures, and Mr Dixit wanted to know how Dr Ehrlich would support countries which do not accept the OIML and CIML system. Dr Ehrlich asked for some clarification about “acceptance” and Mr Dixit replied that he was talking about uniformity of legal metrology laws, pointing out that they had found different versions of the law in Europe and similarly at the international level there are many countries where the law has not been implemented and consumers are looking for higher quality products, and some countries where the quality infrastructure has not been implemented. He wondered how Dr Ehrlich would promote these things from his different background. Dr Ehrlich replied that he had been a member of the CEEMS Advisory Group for a while, and that he saw the CEEMS effort as helping those countries in a variety of ways, including providing information through OIML D 1 on

how to develop a metrology law and infrastructure in a country. He stated that he would certainly work to promote this, and agreed that in the US they would not be using D 1, since they had a unique system. He indicated that he felt it was the role of the OIML, through its guidance documents, to provide leadership to countries and economies, even though they had their own ways of conducting legal metrology. Although he came from a country with a well-developed system, Dr Ehrlich said that he was well aware that it was very different from the system in most countries, so he was very open to looking at other systems. As he had previously mentioned, he was very keen on open thinking and was certainly not of the opinion that one system was better than another.

Mr Khedir (Tunisia) said that he was sure that Dr Ehrlich would manage the role of Vice-President, but he had an idea or reflection to make. To allow for competition in the new OIML Certification System there was an offer from the countries producing certificates, and there was the demand from the Utilizers and other countries. He felt that this was a point to be developed. The OIML-CS had started with type approval, but of course there was also initial and periodic verification to consider. He wondered whether Dr Ehrlich had considered a project in this area. Dr Ehrlich agreed that the Certification System was orientated towards type evaluation, and considered that the impact of the OIML-CS on everyone (including manufacturers) should be examined.

Mr Madzivhe (South Africa) asked Dr Ehrlich what percentage of OIML Recommendations were currently accepted and used in the US, and secondly, he asked for Dr Ehrlich's views on the use of OIML funds for CEEMS. Dr Ehrlich thanked Mr Madzivhe for his questions. He said that the first question was easier to answer. He replied that the US had its own programme, the National Conference on Weights and Measures, which developed its own publications. These were harmonised as far as possible with OIML Recommendations, but Recommendations were never adopted outright. He pointed out that the requirements in R 60 were essentially identical to the US requirements, and that the US requirements for NAWIs were very close to those in R 76, except that there was an additional accuracy class. The requirements for prepackaged products were also very close to those in R 87, and he felt that as time went on, the requirements for metering would become more harmonised. He added that they did not have a system in which compliance with an OIML Recommendation gave presumption of conformity to the US requirements. He hoped that Mr Madzivhe did not see this as an impediment to his serving as CIML Vice-President. He understood that many countries used OIML Recommendations, and that they were used in some ways in others, and not in some other countries. From a personal point of view, Dr Ehrlich said that he would like to see as much harmonisation as possible, and he always worked towards this goal. Turning to the question of funds to support CEEMS, he pointed out that this was a question of national policy, and mentioned that the US has a substantial programme which provides support through USAID to many countries and for a variety of reasons. This of course included CEEMS, although this was not the terms used by USAID. It was US policy to support development in other countries through aid. He was not sure how this might pertain to his Vice-Presidency, but indicated that he supported the CEEMS activities and the funding of these seemed perfectly reasonable to him.

Mr Rifan Ardianto (Indonesia) thanked Dr Ehrlich for his presentation. He pointed out that public awareness of legal metrology was poor, and asked him how he thought this situation could be improved through the establishment of a framework to educate society of its value. Dr Ehrlich replied that the Office of Weights and Measures, in which he worked, promotes awareness of legal metrology, and he had given presentations on this. He felt that the OIML Bulletin was a good tool for awareness, as was the e-learning platform. He thought that more could be done in working with Members in individual countries to identify who needed awareness-raising activities. There was also the possibility of helping Members to set up their own awareness-raising events. Particular needs should be identified to the Presidium for possible action.

Dr Schwartz thanked delegates for their questions and Dr Ehrlich for his presentation and for having answered all the questions.

4 Recruitment of the new BIML Director

Introducing the next item on the agenda, Dr Schwartz made reference to the important decisions to be taken during the current meeting, one of which was the recruitment of the new BIML Director.

He explained that the call for candidates for this post had been circulated on 3 November 2017, in circular BIML 17/217. The applications received had been considered by the selection committee which had been established at the previous CIML meeting under resolution 2017/3. He had personally circulated a private note on the outcome of the selection process to each CIML Member prior to this meeting, and he would now report in more detail on this process, and on the recommendation of the selection committee. He emphasised that he had notified Members separately because he considered that it was very important to maintain confidentiality for the proposed candidate.

Dr Schwartz read out resolution 2017/3. He also read out what was written in B 13 about the procedure for the appointment of the new Director, as he acknowledged that it was very seldom used, the last time having been some eight or nine years ago. It read:

“At the CIML Meeting preceding the Meeting at which the Director is to be appointed, the CIML shall appoint a selection committee, which will be composed of the President of the CIML, who will chair the selection committee, and at least four CIML Members who should be Presidential Council members”.

4.1 Report by the Selection Committee Chairperson

Dr Schwartz explained that the members of the selection committee had been himself, acting First Vice-President Dr Yukinobu Miki (Japan), Mr Bill Loizides (Australia), Dr Chuck Ehrlich (USA), Mrs Corinne Lagauterie (France), and Ms. Himba Cheelo (Zambia). Regarding the selection process itself, B 13 stated *“the selection committee will examine the candidacies in the following manner. The chair of the selection committee, after consultation with the other members of the selection committee, shall pre-select one or several candidates to be interviewed”*. He called this a pre-selection process and then continued *“the selection committee will then meet with the pre-selected candidates to evaluate them”*, and finally *“the Selection Committee shall propose to the next CIML meeting the person to be appointed, following this evaluation”*. He emphasised that B 13 clearly stated “the person to be appointed” and so re-iterated that it was clear from these words that the selection committee should propose just one candidate. He judged that B 13 had been closely observed. The call for candidates for the post had been circulated on 3 November 2017, three weeks after the CIML meeting in Cartagena. Candidates had been encouraged to familiarise themselves with the contents of the OIML website, and they were also reminded that submissions must include a detailed CV, a certified diploma, certified transcripts, two references, and a personalised letter of motivation. Dr Schwartz noted they had received 13 applications by the deadline of 1 February 2018.

He then presented the results of the pre-selection process. Based on the criteria mentioned in the call for candidates, a detailed review sheet had been developed for the selection committee to pre-select the appropriate candidates for interview. This sheet contained ten criteria which had been mentioned in the call for candidates, and each member of the selection committee had been asked to rate each candidate against these criteria. Four possible ratings for each of the criteria had been used:

- the candidate met the criteria convincingly and additional information had been provided as requested;
- the candidate met the criteria convincingly but some questions remained;
- the candidate did not meet the criteria convincingly but showed some promise; or
- the candidate did not meet the criteria at all.

The ratings had been collated in a table, and the selection committee met on 2 March 2018 to discuss the ratings and the implications, as well as to select the highest-ranked applicants for interview. Following this pre-selection process, six candidates had been invited for interview.

The interviews had taken place on 13 and 14 June 2018 at the BIML in Paris. As chair, Dr Schwartz said that he had developed an interview guide which addressed all the criteria from the call for candidates to make sure they were all being considered, and so that there was a sound basis for the decision. He reported that, in his experience, this also provided the necessary confirmation that each candidate has been treated equally. Each interview had consisted of four parts:

1. there had been a twenty-minute presentation by each candidate, during which they had been asked to demonstrate their experience, their motivation in applying for the post, and their vision as director if selected. Although twenty minutes was not long, this enabled the selection committee to assess the candidates' abilities in making succinct presentations;
2. there had then been a sixty-minute interview, based on the interview guide;
3. this was followed by a ten-minute clarification of various issues;
4. following this, finally each candidate had met the BIML staff members for thirty minutes. He observed that from his experience with the interview process at the PTB, it was important that candidates should be able to see the work place and meet the people they would be working with, and also to obtain feedback from staff members. Although there had been some initial hesitancy concerning this concept amongst the BIML staff, he had helped them to prepare for this, and confirmed that they had finally been convinced about the process.

Four candidates had been invited back for a second interview the following day for twenty minutes to clarify remaining questions arising from the discussions after the interview, or from the feedback provided by the BIML team.

The selection process had taken three whole days. On the last day, the ratings had been reviewed again, together with the information they had received from the interviews and the feedback from the BIML staff, and the selection committee had taken a unanimous decision. The selection committee therefore proposed Mr Anthony Donnellan from Australia as the candidate for appointment as the new BIML Director. Mr Donnellan's current position was as Senior Manager in the legal metrology branch of the National Metrology Institute of Australia. He would be available as Director Designate from 1 November 2018, and as Director of the BIML from early January 2019. Dr Schwartz suggested that Members first listen to Mr Donnellan's presentation, then discuss his candidacy with him, and if necessary, move to a closed session to discuss this and the selection committee's report in preparation for their decision under agenda item 14 the next day. He said he would strongly recommend that they followed the proposal of the selection committee and appoint Mr Donnellan as the new Director of the BIML. He asked Mr Donnellan to make his presentation, and recommended that the Committee should then take the opportunity to ask Mr Donnellan and himself any questions.

4.2 Presentation by the selected candidate

Mr Donnellan made the following speech.

Good afternoon, bonjour, Dr Schwartz, Mr Patoray, distinguished guests, members of honour and delegates, including liaison organisations, CIML Members, Corresponding Members and friends of legal metrology. It is my pleasure and honour to stand here before you today to present my credentials as the candidate selected for the BIML Director position. If you will indulge me for a moment, in respect and honour of the two official languages of the OIML, and with French taking the lead role, I have prepared an opening statement in French:

Merci pour cette occasion de me présenter à la 53ème Réunion du CIML dans la belle ville de Hambourg, en Allemagne. C'est un immense honneur et un privilège d'être considéré pour le poste de Directeur du BIML. Mon français est basique mais grandit. J'étudie actuellement le français et je l'apprécie beaucoup. Encore une fois, merci de me donner l'occasion de me présenter à un public aussi distingué.

In respect for our German hosts, I will attempt to honour them with hopefully a coherent introduction in German:

Ich fühle mich sehr privilegiert und freue mich, in Hamburg zu sein. Mein Deutsch ist noch begrenzter als mein Französisch! Ich möchte jedoch unseren deutschen Gastgebern Respekt zollen und dafür danken, dass dieses Treffen in Ihrem wunderbaren Land stattfinden kann.

I will stop there and revert to my mother tongue. I have prepared this presentation for you to familiarise the Members in this room with myself, my intentions and my credentials, and I will go through that systematically. I am very enthusiastic about this position. It is one that has driven me for a number of years, to look at the benefits of metrology in facilitating a fair and equitable society.

I am currently, as was mentioned by Dr Schwartz, living in Sydney, Australia. I have undergraduate qualifications in economics and also in investigations, and postgraduate qualifications in management, public policy and international business. I have undertaken part of a PhD earlier in my life, on international water policy and law. I feel this presents unique opportunities to build on that expertise in the BIML Director role, should I be selected and endorsed. I have also spent some time overseas, representing the Australian government. For approximately four years, I was posted to the Australian consulate general in Dubai, United Arab Emirates. That was a very exciting and rewarding experience. I have held various leadership roles, representing the Australian Government in ministerial meetings and in bilateral cooperation. At the moment I am leading Australia's review of its measurement laws to modernise them and to ensure they are fit-for-purpose, which is something we have already heard about today. This is being done to facilitate increased economic productivity and growth, which is again a dominant theme of what the last two days have been about. On the formal side, I am an appointed Trade Measurement Inspector under Australia's national measurement law, and I have carried out various duties in this role.

So a little bit more about me and my credentials. I have held leadership roles in NMIA for close to a decade. I have also worked for our parent department, the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science for close to twenty years. I have nearly two decades of experience, both in a policy role, but also in a metrology role. I have managed teams of metrologists, trade measurement inspectors, compliance and enforcement officers, metrology specialists and others, such as laboratory and calibration experts. I have a wide level of experience, and these teams have ranged from 5 to 120 staff in various capacities. I have a background in international affairs and experience in working with international organisations, a number of which we have talked about in the last couple of days and are present in this room including the World Bank, IFC, and ISO. I have also represented Australia at the APLMF for a year. I have strong experience in budget management and preparation, and in setting, monitoring and reporting from a management and financial accounting perspective. These budgets have ranged from around 3–17 million Australian dollars, which is the equivalent of about 2–14 million US dollars, including fee-for-service revenues.

My experience in legal metrology ranges from operational to strategic. In the operational sense, I have led teams managing trade management inspections, laboratory, administrative, post-market surveillance, compliance, and enforcement functions. On the strategic side, as I mentioned previously, my current role is to review Australia's measurement law and framework, which was a process we went through in great detail. I also have experience in testing and certification. I have contributed to Australia's input to the new OIML Certification System (OIML-CS) through the CSPG a number of years ago, and have also worked on developing Australia's National Instrument Test Procedures (NITP) which are the post-market verification activities we undertake. In terms of committee work, a number of my staff have participated in numerous TCs and SCs of the OIML, and also Australia has led two secretariats for which my team has been responsible. These are TC 12 on electricity meters and TC 7/SC 5 on multi-dimensional measuring instruments.

Dr Schwartz gave a detailed overview of the process of appointment, but my motivation for applying for the position was that I see it as a unique opportunity – one that doesn't come up very often – to lead an inter-governmental organisation at the forefront of standards development. This includes the strategic agenda of the OIML through the CIML, the CIML President, Vice-Presidents and Member States. I would like to cultivate new and augment existing relationships and partnerships, and to foster a culture of inquiry, collaboration and cooperation – especially among organisations in liaison and new Member States. I want to lift the profile of the OIML as an integral body in the international rule-based system, and ultimately, through this, to drive membership and increase the reach and strategic value of the OIML to the international community.

In terms of the environment in which we are operating at the moment, I am acutely aware that the OIML has an increasingly important role to play in demonstrating its impact and worth to the international community and economy, bringing metrology thinking to more people, both in the community and in the standards-setting environment. The OIML has a critical role to play in elevating discussion, enhancing productivity and economic growth and through this, contributing to a better quality of life and access to opportunities. We must encourage trust, promote fairness and confidence to allow the market to do what it does best, and not to unnecessarily create barriers at a global level that hamper harmonised trade, but rather remove them. As has been touched on in a number of presentations, the constant evolution of metrology is an important issue, especially when looking at the drivers of industry 4.0, and looking at how metrology, and in particular legal metrology can add value.

If I am appointed as the BIML Director, the way I will operate is to positively lead the BIML and support its staff, continuing to build upon the excellent legacy of the existing BIML Director, Stephen Patoray. I must take this moment to reflect on and to respect the work that Stephen has done in driving the organisation and making a real substantial, effective, and meaningful change over his time. He certainly will be missed. I would like to be an active and forward-thinking ambassador for the OIML. I want to continue to build upon and advance relationships with organisations in liaison, especially the BIPM, IEC, ISO, and ILAC/IAF. I want to continue to raise awareness of CEEMS and the OIML Pilot Training Centres (OPTCs) and to work to promote their benefits and achievements with the international community, and that goes beyond the legal metrology community. I also want to promote the OIML-CS and its uptake among Member States, and importantly, with industry. A core focus will be to grow the number of OIML Member States and to articulate the value and importance of being a full member of the OIML. Maintaining the visibility of the OIML worldwide is an important role for the BIML Director. I would achieve this through communicating with key stakeholders, including RLMOs.

In leading the BIML, I will establish, document and communicate priorities, work plans and key deliverables with all staff in the Bureau in line with the priorities set by the CIML. I want to utilise the expertise and experience of the Bureau staff, and the level of depth, knowledge, and forethought that members of the BIML staff bring to each and every event and interaction never ceases to amaze and surprise me in a lot of ways. I like to operate using team strategy, priority, and operational meetings, assessing performance on an ongoing basis against key metrics. I would like to foster a culture of creative thinking and deriving solutions – where can the Bureau add value to OIML operations. As part of this, looking at a project management methodology for all Bureau projects, and possibly working with the CIML to agree to a similar framework for the operation of TCs and SCs, and I think this aligns very closely with Dr Schwartz's vision for the organisation, and the vision towards 2023.

So my priorities would be to engage and consult with OIML Member States, RLMOs, and other stakeholders, to do it early, to do it transparently, and to do it collaboratively. To provide support for the most efficient and effective development and delivery of technical documentary standards. Having evaluation programmes upfront and at the end to look at the TC/SC/PG development process, so that we ensure that we take lessons from each and every standard we develop, and each and every project, and apply these to make the work more efficient. Working

to elevate the profile of metrology and legal metrology through the redefinition of the SI and working closely with BIPM. And again, as we have heard over the last couple of days, to explore the development of the OIML quality assurance and infrastructure initiatives along the metrology continuum. Some of that is looking at the post-market surveillance activities and verification, which are clear components of what we all do, and looking at the best ways of having integrated and harmonised ways of doing that. I will work with the CIML to determine the feasibility of redrafting the OIML Strategy, B 15, which is the strategy document for the OIML which again ties in with the 2023 strategy. Obviously this would include working closely with the CEEMS AG on the revision of OIML D 1. A key component of my task, if I am selected, and that of the BIML Director more generally, is to support the CIML, the President and Member States to implement the OIML vision.

I have broken this down into five key areas. These are leadership, trust, fairness, confidence and communication.

On leadership, to re-iterate some earlier points: to engage Member States and BIML staff on all key matters. In an organisation as small as the BIML, each team member plays a leadership role. To grow the OIML membership. Strategy development: bottom-up and top-down. I would like to empower staff to explore new concepts to derive efficiencies in what they do and efficiencies for the entire organisation.

Moving onto trust, my role, if I am successful, will be to provide support to Member States, CIML Members, the CIML President and Vice-Presidents. Ensure the best-practice management of an inter-governmental organisation is employed at all times, and again, to utilise the expertise of the Bureau staff, CIML Members and metrology experts. Adhering to processes and policies is also a key component of this.

Moving onto fairness, ensuring impartiality, transparency and probity is upheld at all times and to ensure that all activities align with the Convention and policy documents to ensure that the authorising environment is there for what we do and that we don't step outside of that.

Confidence is needed to drive the implementation of the strategic vision for the OIML as set by the President, and responding to the needs of Member States, including very importantly at the Conference. Consistently conveying the vision, objectives, purpose and defining the role of the BIML, ensuring alignment with these objectives and establishing through this a culture of risk assessment and risk management. Maintaining the reputation of the OIML is paramount to me, and to the organisation, and managing risk but working within policy and procedure documents helps maintain that reputation.

Lastly communication. Listening to the needs of Member States, CIML Members, President, Vice-Presidents, CEEMS, OIML training centres, and basically anyone we talk to, that will reflect in communicating the vision, articulating the roadmap and providing guidance to practically realise the vision.

In summary I have a genuine desire to develop and grow the organisation. I believe I have a good match of both technical and non-technical skills, gained, as I have said, through approximately ten years with NMIA, and about twenty years within our parent department. I am flexible and open to change, but adherence to policy and procedure is important to me. I have a commitment to the role of metrology. I think I have advanced diplomatic, international and representational experience, and I feel that I am adaptable, agile and resilient.

Moving on to my family, if the selection committee's report is endorsed by the CIML, we look forward to the next phase of our life in Paris. We have a strong desire and interest in advancing our French language skills and proficiency. We have already shortlisted some schools for our children which will meet their educational and language needs, although we have not yet made any commitments.

Lastly, progress to date. Time periods as outlined by the President have been arranged. Some hand-over arrangements are in place with the current Director and the staff, and I will

participate at the CGPM meeting regarding the re-definition of the SI. I have been undertaking French language study at an Australian university since earlier this year, and I am already at level A1.3. This will continue, to enable bilingual communication with the BIML team and others. If the selection committee's report is endorsed by the CIML, I am able to assume the role of Director Designate from 1 November 2018, in order to overlap with the current BIML Director until the end of December 2018, and will be ready to officially take over as Director at the beginning of January 2019.

I thank you for the opportunity to be with you today, and I thank you for your patience and attention in listening to what I have to say.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Donnellan for his presentation and asked the Committee if there were any questions before the closed session at which both his report and Mr Donnellan's presentation would be discussed. He pointed out that nominating a candidate for a new post was always a sensitive issue. He said that during the coffee break he had already been asked why Mr Donnellan's CV had not been circulated. He explained that in his experience at the PTB, circulating CVs and more detailed personal information was always a very sensitive issue, and he had been reluctant to circulate, even on a restricted basis, more than the letter he had sent to them prior to the meeting because they had to consider the possible adverse effects on the candidate. He hoped that delegates understood why they had not received more information, but that they nevertheless had trust in the process he had described, and again he asked delegates if they had any questions for the candidate.

Dr Klenovský (Czech Republic) asked if he had understood correctly that Mr Donnellan had a degree in economics.

Mr Donnellan confirmed that this was correct. He added that he had an undergraduate degree in economics and a master's in public policy and post graduate qualification in management communication.

Mr Awosola (United Kingdom) said he had noticed that Mr Donnellan had mentioned his plans to grow OIML membership. He wondered if he could expand on this by giving more details of how he intended to achieve this. He asked if he was implying that he would try to target Corresponding Members, to get them more involved in the technical work of the organisation, or was he simply saying that he intended to increase the membership.

Mr Donnellan replied that his initial response would be that there were, he believed, multiple strategies to try and increase the membership, which he considered for an international organisation had a very strong global reach and penetration which he wanted to emphasise at the outset. He acknowledged the existence of this element, and stressed that it was always the intention of the OIML and other organisations to convert Corresponding Members to Member States. He believed that this would be to the benefit of, and in the interest of, both Member States and Corresponding Members to participate more through that process. He also thought that another strategy would be to demonstrate to those economies that were neither Corresponding Members nor Member States the value of being part of the OIML, and that work was multi-stranded in terms of helping to harmonise international trade, opening up markets through quality infrastructure programmes of which legal metrology was a key component, and also ensuring that their voice was heard on a global scale. He believed there was some work that could be done to articulate this value proposition, and another strategy was to work with Corresponding Members, to listen to what their needs were, and to ensure that the organisation met those. There were multiple ways of doing this and demonstrating that the work that TCs, SCs and Project Groups did was of value to those economies now and into the future.

4.3 Discussion by the CIML (closed session)

Dr Schwartz noted that there were no more questions for the candidate. He thanked Mr Donnellan again for his presentation and suggested that the Committee now went into closed session where they would go into more detail without the candidate present. He also asked that any participants who were not CIML Members or Members of Honour leave the room; he hoped for no longer than twenty minutes, and said that they would be informed when the closed session was over. During this closed session, he mentioned that the next item, on the renewal of the contract of Ian Dunmill would also be considered.

5 Renewal of the contract of Mr Ian Dunmill, BIML Assistant Director

[BIML note: Discussions under this item were conducted in closed session. Please refer to item 15 for the CIML resolution on the outcome.]

6 Report by the BIML Director on BIML activities

Dr Schwartz reconvened the meeting and asked delegates to consider Item 6 *Report by the BIML Director on BIML activities*. He noted that the meeting was slightly behind schedule and hoped that this item could be considered reasonably quickly, as there were other important issues that needed to be discussed the following day. He asked Mr Patoray to make his report.

Mr Patoray greeted the President, Dr Schwartz, and all his colleagues. He expected to be emotional during his report because this would be his last CIML meeting. He hoped that overall, the Bureau had done a good job for Members, and that he was leaving the Organisation in a little better condition than it had been eight years ago. Accepting that there was a limited amount of time, he agreed to make his presentation short. He indicated that it may not be the BIML Director's report delegates were expecting, and mentioned that he would be leaving with a plea for help in one area, but also feeling good about some of the accomplishments he and the BIML team had made. He asked delegates to "go on a journey" with him.

Addressing Dr Schwartz, he paid tribute to the excellent job he and his team had done in the organisation of this meeting, in particular he joked, regarding the weather, which he said had been wonderful, and much warmer than they had expected. He continued that the organisation of this meeting had been a little more complex than for some previous meetings, due to the organisation of the various workshops and tours. He thanked Dr Schwartz for the work they had completed together during the past year. It had been "quite a journey" and they had been through "quite a bit". He recognised that they did not always agree, but pointed out that they both respected each other very much.

He stated that the staff of the BIML were all in attendance at the meeting, with the exception of Florence Martinie, who was currently on medical leave. He knew that delegates had been in contact with some of the staff already, but encouraged them to approach the staff with any questions, and in particular the website.

He specified that Patricia could help with any membership questions. He reported that the Bureau currently had both a secondee and a contractor working with the current members of staff. He said that Guo Su had joined them several months ago as a secondee, and observed that his enthusiasm was contagious! He was an excellent person, with no fear, who had moved to France with as "little help as he had ever seen". He thanked the People's Republic of China for their support in this secondment, as he said that getting a secondment started had been something he had wanted to do. He also wanted to acknowledge the BIPM's assistance in this matter. He said that they had a lot of experience in secondments and they had taught the BIML how to go about it. He also wanted to thank the French government, as they had been involved in the secondment at all levels, from the local level, up to the

Foreign Ministry. He said the BIML had learned a great deal about the process, so that next time they would be able to do it a little bit better.

Mr Patoray indicated he would now take a quick look back over the past eight years. He said at the time of his appointment, at the 45th CIML Meeting in Orlando, there had been some problems and a period of transition. He explained that at the time the BIML had been moving from cash to accrual accounting. A management audit had also been ongoing, which Mr Johnston had initiated. The staff pensions for certain categories of BIML staff were also under debate, and he reminded delegates that the first few accounts he had reported on were somewhat confusing, with estimations being made for the changes in the pension arrangements, and the change to accrual accounting changing the way figures were presented. He also recalled that under his directorship there had also been a significant focus on teamwork at the BIML. He stated that this was all in the past, and he believed they had made great accomplishments in these areas. He drew delegates' attention to three other significant changes, reminding them of the major renovations which had been a large feature in the accounts for three or four years, the upgrading of the information technology systems, and also the complete overhaul of the website and the database. He re-iterated that a significant amount of investment, capital and time had gone into these items, which now laid the foundation for the growth of the organisation.

However, he remarked that overall the most important work had been the work on CEEMS. He considered that when he arrived there had been some confusion about what to do with developing countries. He said the situation had been described as “you come to me with a silver platter with nothing on it”. Now, with the focus on CEEMS, they had the ability to set up “training centres”, and reported they had helped support two courses in the past year. He pointed out that these were improving as they went along and were growing. He emphasised that the enthusiasm in the CEEMS Advisory Group was contagious as well, and added they expected great things from CEEMS in the future.

He continued that there had been a revision of B 6, which had produced a very good final version after several drafts, and input from a number of participants. He reminded delegates that they would be hearing more about convener training for which the CIML had allocated funding during the current budget period. As well as the complicated revision of B 6, there had also been a complete revision of the OIML Certification System, resulting in a much better system, which could be promoted to countries around the world that needed it in their own metrology systems.

He confessed that he was a little disappointed that during the last eight years they had only added five Member States but nevertheless it was an achievement.

Mr Patoray went onto to say that in 2013, the subscription fee had been reduced by 3 %, which he emphasised, although it did not sound like a large number overall, was nevertheless a reduction. This reduction, combined with the fact that during the last eight years there had been no increase in subscription fees, was significant. Since inflation over the last eight years had amounted to around 10 %, in reality, the subscription fees had reduced in real terms by 10 %. He added that the total net assets had increased by 60 %, a lot of which was related to the infrastructure investment made in the building, but also because of the cash coming as a result of the five new Member States. So the cash at the end of the year, including the reserves and the surplus had increased by € 570 000 by the end of the year.

He reported that the OIML logo had been submitted for registration as an international trademark, which had taken some investment. The World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO), to which many of delegates' countries were signatories, had 97 members at present, 53 of which had granted the OIML logo as a trademark. Some 35 had not responded so far. He said they had only had four refusals, and part of the reason for this was that they had had to learn how to submit such a request. The next step would be to submit the OIML-CS logo to the same process, which he hoped would be smoother this time.

Mr Patoray confirmed that more recently they had published and implemented B 6, and he asked delegates to recall the significant changes that had been made to B 6 the previous year. He reminded delegates that they had delivered training to the secretariats and conveners, and said delegates would hear more about this later in the meeting. He emphasised that they had supported the technical work. He reported that they now had a standard format for comments on publications under consultation, and

could automatically collate all the comments that were returned. The OIML-CS had been launched that year. He added that they had also continued to support CEEMS and that its section of the OIML website had also been greatly improved and developed. In addition there had also been various meetings on CEEMS and the OIML-CS, both of which delegates would hear more about later in the meeting. Lastly, the BIML had tried to support the President as much as possible.

Mr Patoray considered that the organisation was in a good financial condition, which again delegates would hear more about the following day.

With regard specifically to the website, Mr Patoray hoped that most of delegates had seen the changes to the home page, and in particular the section labelled “My Access”. He commented that this allowed delegates to get where they wanted to go a little bit quicker. He knew that the BIML team would continue to improve Members’ access to the information on the website. He said they had implemented the requirements of B 6, which included enabling the current state of voting to be displayed during a vote, even though most votes are cast within the last two days before the deadline. He emphasised that delegates could now change their votes right up to the deadline if they wished, although he added that no one had yet done so. He remarked that the improvements to the CEEMS section had been highlighted earlier in the meeting and more information on this would be given during the CEEMS presentation.

The OIML-CS had been launched, and again he noted that there would be a report on this later in the meeting. He mentioned that they were also continuing to translate website pages into French as well as making some additional progress in translating the Recommendations and Documents. He added that the backlog had been reduced since he had arrived. He showed delegates a slide indicating the complete list of what had been done to the website. He said they would all have access to this information at the end of the meeting, but also highlighted that in particular for the meeting the following day, he had asked that his presentation be uploaded to the “Additional Meeting Documents” page, so that if delegates could not see the screen very well, they would be able look at the PDFs of these Additional Meeting Documents. He said he also wanted delegates to focus on the second item in blue – the clone – which was a secondary website which allowed anyone from the Bureau to simulate what any other registered user of the website would see when they were logged in. This facility was also used during the convener training sessions. He explained that what each member saw when they logged in to the website was personalised according to their role and what technical work they were involved in.

The BIML had also continued their work with liaison organisations, and in particular with the BIPM on World Metrology Day. He commented that he had sat in with the CCU, and the last discussion they had had regarding the recommendation to the CIPM on the revision of the SI. He said that the OIML had also been the chair of the DCMAS Network, which would be changing its name to INetQI by the end of the year. He re-iterated that Dr Schwartz had mentioned the quadripartite meeting and the MoUs with ILAC/IAF and the IEC. The BIML had also continued its cooperation with UNIDO, and this would be mentioned again under item 9.2.

Mr Patoray concluded that these had been some of the more important achievements over the past eight years. He continued that he did not wish to criticise or offend anyone, but this is where he wanted to make a plea for help as Director before leaving. He said what followed were his thoughts but they had been inspired by Mr Gilles Vinet, the contractor he had mentioned earlier in the presentation. He thought that sometimes when you move forward you have to go back, and suggested that delegates looked at the Convention and what it gave as the core values of the organisation. Article I listed eight items:

- 1 To set up documentation and information systems, which he considered was the primary purpose of the Organisation. He said that the OIML had a large amount of publications: Recommendations, Documents, Basic Publications, Expert Reports, etc., all of which were available, but which were sometimes not up-to-date, which was particularly important in the case of Recommendations. Mr Patoray then reminded delegates that the Convention had been written in 1955, and said that it had to be interpreted in the present, with regard to modern technology. He said the Convention made reference to concerns with inspection, checking of measuring instruments, and being subject to regulation. This was all related to the “post-market” area that the Organisation did not really become involved in. Each individual country was of course involved in inspections, but he maintained that the Convention stated that the

OIML should also be involved in it internationally, possibly helping the individual countries. In the revision of R 76 they had decided to explore the addition of another section to cover verification and inspection.

- 3&4 With regard to “determining the general principles of legal metrology, the problems of legal metrology and solutions of international interest”, Mr Patoray said that he thought this could refer to measuring instruments other than those used in trade, where the OIML was most commonly involved. He maintained that the Organisation was not sufficiently involved in medical or environmental measuring instruments. However, Mr Patoray felt that these were current problems facing the world today and that they were definitely metrology-related, so he questioned how the OIML could contribute based on this 1955 document.
- 5 This point was about establishing “model draft laws”, which he said covered the work on developing Recommendations. He said he thought this was the sort of work the OIML was supposed to be doing.
- 6 Concerning the point about “a model service for inspection and checking measuring instruments””, he compared this with the OIML’s work on conformity to type (CTT). He suggested it was up to delegates to interpret what it said.
- 7 The next point mentioned the “necessary and adequate characteristics and standards to which measuring instruments must conform in order for them to be approved by Member States”, and this he argued could be seen as the OIML-CS. He said when the Convention had been written such a system had not been thought of, but it was interesting to see that there was a provision covering what had now been created.
- 8 Lastly the Convention also said to “promote closer relationships between departments of Weights and Measures and other departments”. Again Mr Patoray argued that this included medical and environmental weighing instruments. He insisted that most countries have different departments for these items. A lot of metrology was involved in petrol pumps, and retail scales, but the Organisation should be considering more than this, and he suggested this was where the OIML needed to be encouraging more cooperation between government departments at the national level. He said they should be invited to the meetings and that they should be more involved in what the Organisation was doing, and the QI in particular was a way of doing that.

Mr Patoray continued that he now wanted to get a little bit more personal about what the Organisation was doing. He noted that the OIML had 148 different publications. They had recently cancelled 15 projects, so there were currently 40 active projects revising or developing new publications. Of the total number of publications, only about 45 % had been revised during the last ten years.

Mr Patoray asked delegates to think about technology ten years ago, and he gave the example of the iPhone, which he said was just coming out then, and cited it as an example of how technology had changed in the last ten years. Whilst he acknowledged that they would reach a situation where all of the publications had been reviewed in the last five years, and he gave the example of B 1, the OIML Convention, which he said was unlikely to be revised, he submitted that the percentage of documents being revised should be much higher. He emphasised that B 6 stated the Organisation was supposed to review publications every five years. It also indicated a time frame which was supposed to be followed. This stated that within six months of starting a project, a Working Document or Committee Draft was supposed to have been produced. It also stated that the Project Group should send their final CD to the BIML within three years of the Project’s start. This was just the CD, after which it would still have to go through the CIML Preliminary Ballot, and CIML approval stages to be finished. However, he stressed that the average time that PGs had been working on their projects was six and half years, confirming that this statistic included the projects that had been approved the previous year. He acknowledged that the graph describing this looked quite good, but asked delegates to remember that they had just cancelled 15 projects. He underlined that there was a net gain of one project on the list he was showing delegates, of PGs which had not issued any documents within the last three years, making a total of 12 out of 40 Project Groups which had not produced any documents in the last three years.

This was a cry for help. He pointed out that 77 % of the Organisation’s projects exceeded the three year expectation by 200 %, which he judged meant the work was “not getting done”.

Mr Patoray said Dr Schwartz had mentioned project management. Mr Patoray explained that he had been a project manager for 15 years, and remarked that it took special people to manage projects. He said they were not always technical people, as technical people could do technical work, but could not necessarily manage projects. He felt that the Organisation needed help with this. They needed more ability, which is what he said Dr Schwartz had been talking about in his vision for 2023. He judged that training was not enough. He indicated that the project to add hydrogen dispensers to R 139 had just completed its work in two years and said he would talk about this more later. He said they had managed this because they had had a clearly defined term of reference, they had a clearly defined roadmap, and they had had a dedicated small group of conveners that had been really able to “get their work done”. He confirmed that they had also been trained. He mentioned that George Teunisse from the Netherlands had been one of the conveners and that conveners had also needed the support of the BIML. A standard template for comments had been created, which also helped in collating the comments received, which was otherwise a long process. However, he explained that the BIML had a limited amount of resources and there were also aspects of project development that were out of their control. He knew that conveners had other jobs, and that budgets and priorities changed. People sometimes become unexpectedly unavailable, so that you could not always predict what would happen to the project. However, he emphasised that the BIML should know about this, and the Project Groups’ members should be communicating with the BIML. Mr Patoray went on to suggest that in some cases, conveners may not be effective – they may be the wrong people to be a convener. They may be very technically capable but not able to run the project. Mr Patoray said Mr Vinet had inspired the Organisation with a systematic approach. Co-convenerships had also proved to be a very good thing. When there were two people working together, he considered that two heads were better than one. He encouraged delegates to look for help so that they could work in a more systematic way, because he considered it would make the project work easier.

Mr Patoray was also of the opinion that changing the convener might sometimes be a useful approach, since in some cases the current convener was just not inspired to get the work done. In general, the Organisation needed more countries to get involved. At present, only 16 out of 62 Member States held secretariats or convenerships, which he considered was not a very good percentage. He stated that if there were more people involved, they would have more ability to get things done. Above all, he confirmed that everyone must be treated with respect and fairness. They had to have a fair approach – one that was consistent overall, and with regard to all of the processes. He believed that better data was now available than when he had arrived, and the Presidential Council could now monitor this data. He highlighted that a systematic approach was necessary, and they had one example: a red flag criterion for those Project Groups which had not issued any document within twelve months of the Project Group’s formation. He specified that 8 out of the 40 Project Groups had not issued any document within twelve months, and reminded delegates again that B 6 stated that this should happen within six months.

Mr Patoray continued by saying that Dr Schwartz had mentioned priority projects, and he emphasised that out of the eight projects he had just cited, two of them were considered priority projects. Within the last 18 months, no CDs had been issued at all for these projects. Out of the priority projects, three of these had issued documents. He said that several CDs had been issued but nothing had been approved for more than six years. There were three projects like this at the current time, fortunately none of which were a priority. He stated that the Organisation needed to make improvements in this area, which was why he was making this plea for help, and he said it was an area he thought Members needed to focus on because although he would no longer be part of the OIML, the Members would.

Changing the topic entirely and looking back, Mr Patoray said some of them had met in Orlando, and he showed delegates a photograph of himself with some of them that had been taken at that time. He thanked them for the confidence they had expressed in him eight years ago when they had appointed him as BIML Director. He said that together they had come a very long way and achieved a great deal. He confirmed that he had not done this on his own. His staff had been absolutely fantastic and he also pointed out that they had had excellent leadership in the past from the Members of Honour. He said he was totally confident that this Organisation would be fully capable of meeting all of the challenges that

were “out there”, mentioning specifically the new QI toolkit, and the developments in e-learning. They also now had a secondment at the BIML to focus on the CEEMS environment. In general there were many things going on, and he was very proud of what had taken place in the last few years. He reiterated that this was his last CIML meeting, following which he was planning to return to North Carolina with his wife Sonja, to be with his daughter, five grandchildren and two great grandchildren. He stated that he had spent 45 years in metrology, in industry, in federal government, in the regulatory field, and in auditing. A lot of it had been spent in recent years on standards, but he said the last eight years had been the most rewarding of his career. He acknowledged the support he had had from his wife Sonja. He said there was always somebody behind him to “push him along” and said she was very dedicated to what the OIML did, having helped him all along the way. He concluded by thanking delegates again for the opportunity they had offered him, and finally finished his presentation with the phrase he said he often used when talking to delegates “may all their measurements be accurate”.

Dr Schwartz acknowledged the delegates’ applause. He thanked Mr Patoray for his comprehensive report, which he said had been in part provoking, and which had indicated where Mr Patoray thought the weak points were. This was necessary if improvements were to be made, and at the end of Mr Patoray’s report, he considered that he had finished on an optimistic note. He congratulated Mr Patoray and his team on the achievements over the past eight years. He said it was good to know that there was enough room and space to further improve on the weak points which Mr Patoray had identified and which he said he had also already touched on in his own report. That way they would know what to do in the future and that with regard to the problems, they would all support each other and remain motivated. They had a good team they could rely on, and said it would be a pleasure for him to consider the points Mr Patoray had mentioned.

He asked if delegates had any questions. He realised it had been a long day with many discussions and delegates were probably looking forward to the evening, but he wanted to give them time to comment if they wished.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Patoray for keeping his report as short as possible, and for keeping to time. He drew delegates’ attention to the draft resolution on the screen:

The Committee,

Notes the report given by the BIML Director on the activities of the Bureau, and

Expresses its appreciation for the work undertaken by the BIML Director during his time in office.

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments on the wording of the resolution. There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was adopted unanimously.

7 Report by the BIML Director on Member States and Corresponding Members

Mr Patoray greeted delegates and wished to thank Dr Schwartz for the previous evening’s reception, in particular the magicians who had performed during the evening and who had been amazing. He said he had not been able to see through any of the illusions and it had been quite an experience. He also very much appreciated the gifts that he had received, and even though they were all very special, he said Dr Schwartz knew that the special characteristics of the shiny ball which he had received, which was a representation of the silicon sphere for the mol, was particularly special for him. He remarked that they had talked about the work of the PTB and the shiny ball for a number of years now, and so to actually have one was very special.

Mr Patoray stated that item 7 was not very complicated. He said there had been no change in the Member States since the meeting the previous year, so there were still 62 Member States. This was not the best

news for delegates, but it was the fact. He said that some negotiations were currently taking place and he hoped that they would see some progress in the number of Member States very soon, but nothing had been confirmed yet. He stated there were currently 65 Corresponding Members, including one new Corresponding Member, but that three Corresponding Members had been delisted for non-payment during the past year. He said that this was all he had to say on this item, and asked delegates if they had any questions. There were no questions.

Mr Dunmill said that since there were no new Member States, the relevant resolution was simply one welcoming the new Corresponding Member. He read:

The Committee,

Welcomes Kiribati as a new Corresponding Member.

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments on the wording of the resolution. There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was adopted unanimously.

8 Report by the BIML Director on financial matters

8.1 Approval by the CIML of the 2017 accounts

Mr Patoray said this report would be a little more involved, with a little more detail. He commented that some delegates had experienced his reviews of the accounts in previous years, and these always followed a similar format, with his presentation adding details to the figures. He wanted to mention that in some of the presentation he would be making during the course of the morning, the numbers and text on the presentation may be a little too small for some delegates, and indicated that delegates could find PDFs of his slides amongst the Additional Meeting Documents on the OIML website. He added that at the end of the meeting, all presentations would be made available as usual. Despite this, he had taken the time to ask the staff to add these slides to the Additional Meeting Documents because of the setup in the room.

He showed delegates a statement from the independent auditor indicating that the OIML met all the requirements of the IPSAS standards. He said there was an English translation for all those who were not proficient in French, but basically it said that the final accounts for 2017 provided an accurate picture of the financial situation of the OIML, and were in conformity with the IPSAS standards and also with the resolutions that had been passed by the organisation itself. He specified that the statement was signed by the chartered accountant.

Mr Patoray said his first graph showed the total charges. The graph showed the budget going through to 2020 in blue, and the actual expenses in red. The orange lines indicated the budget years, so delegates could see where the budget periods fell, and the green line indicated his time at the Bureau. The actual expenses were slightly lower than the budget, and he felt they were doing reasonably well.

The second graph showed the total amount spent on meetings, travel and accommodation. In this case, the expenditure had been slightly above the budget. This was partly due to the amount he had travelled in 2017, which he said he had already mentioned. It was also due to the amount of travel that had been carried out promoting the OIML-CS.

The next slide showed the total net assets, and he indicated that these had increased substantially since he had arrived in 2011. They were now stabilising, because the work on the building had been completed and he would therefore expect that the net assets would now remain the same, or drop slightly, as the cash in the reserves was reduced.

The next slide showed the year-end cash. He emphasised that this included all the cash. This was not just the reserves, but included all the cash in the bank. It included all the funds that had come in to the Bureau during the last quarter and had not yet been spent, and any surplus from the previous years that

had built up in the cash accounts, in addition to the reserves. He specified that the reserves were currently set at about € 1.2 million, a sum that had been set at the last Conference. This was relevant to the discussion to be held under item 8.5.1 on the budget surplus and the reserves. He said the cash had been increasing since 2008, even though the intention had actually been to reduce it during this period. He explained that this had been the time at which the MAA had been under development, and the funds to pay for the extra people involved in the MAA had come out of the cash.

The next slide showed the full accounts from 2017 and he admitted that this was a slide that delegates might find difficult to read, and for which they may like to refer to the copy provided as an Additional Meeting Document. He said he would now go through each section separately. Regarding the results, he said that for delegates who were interested in the bottom line, he had again not spent all of the funds in the budget for 2017. He said that this was not just due to his natural cautiousness, but also due to the fact that they had had a little more cash income than they expected. For those delegates who were not familiar with the budget which had been passed by the Conference in 2016, he drew attention to the fact that there was an intentional negative number. This was the sum of € 100 000 allocated in the current year to pay for the training of conveners and secretariats. The amount of € –92 700 included the amount of € –100 000, so in summary, the budget for 2017 was supposed to be € –92 700, but in fact the result had been only € –44 488.

Looking at the results in more detail, Mr Patoray first detailed the income. With regard to Member States, and with the change to accrual accounting, the amount expected to be received is the same as the value of the invoices sent out, and since there had been no change in the number of Member States, it would be expected that there would be no change in the income. The number of Corresponding Members had increased by one, so there had been a slight increase in the income from this additional fee. He drew delegates' attention to the fact that the large increase in income was due to certification, since the fees that had come in 2017 had been substantially higher than expected. In his opinion this was because the Basic Certificate System and the MAA had been shutting down. Manufacturers had known this, and had tried to push as many certificates through in 2017 as they could. The laboratories had done a tremendous job pushing that many certificates through which had resulted in an increased income of € 30 100. The total income had therefore been € 27 311 more than expected.

Mr Mathew (Switzerland) intervened. He said he did not understand what the line labelled “total coefficient” referred to.

Mr Patoray replied that this referred to the way in which Member States were classified to decide what their contribution should be. The Convention specified four classes according to population. Each class then pays a different number of “base contributory shares” of the overall budget: countries in class 1 pay one share, those in class 2 pay two shares, those in class 3 pay four shares, and those in class 4 pay eight shares. The “total coefficient” figure indicated the total number of base contributory shares for each year, which varied depending upon the number of Member States and their classifications.

Mr Patoray continued by specifying the charges. He reported that in 2017 they had still had a contracted person instead of a permanent Assistant Director, so the fees for this position had not been as high as he had anticipated in planning the budget. They had therefore not quite spent the total amount allocated for the active staff. Also, with regard to the pension system, one of the members receiving the pension had died, so they were no longer receiving a pension. He said he had also planned for inflation to impact the pension amount, and in France inflation had been very low, so it had not had the impact he had anticipated. The total staff costs had been € 48 034 less than anticipated.

In the area of running costs, they had spent a little more than anticipated. These costs included those to keep the building operating such as water, electricity, and expenses of that nature. He indicated that although the renovation of the building had been completed, there was still some maintenance being carried out and these charges had been higher than anticipated. With regard to the administrative costs, these had been reasonably in line with the budget. He specified that these costs included supplies, maintenance related to administration, documentation, phones and other fees. He indicated that there were sub-accounts under each of these headings, some of which had their own sub-accounts. They therefore had a detailed account of what was being spent on each of these items. The expenditure on

communications had also been close to the budget. He specified that there had been a substantial increase in the amount spent on the website because of the increasing use and capability of the website.

With regard to the amount of money spent on meetings, it had been very close to the budget. The meeting in Cartagena had been the first one where the OIML had paid for the entire meeting, and this had included a seminar to present the then new OIML-CS. He re-iterated that the costs of travel and accommodation had been greater than budgeted. He repeated that this had been due to his own travel, as well as the work that Mr Mason had been finishing. It had also been due to the travel deemed necessary in order to promote the OIML-CS. The miscellaneous costs had been a little higher than anticipated. As miscellaneous costs rose, he said they tried to identify what they were and where they should be located, because he did not think there should be this amount under this heading. He hoped that by next year the amount to report under the miscellaneous heading would be much less.

In the search for the new Assistant Director, they had not spent anywhere near what had been anticipated. In particular, the anticipated travel costs had not been as high as expected. In the special funds, they had been able to spend a little bit more than had been anticipated in the budget for that year. This had been the first time that the CEEMS budget had been overspent since the time it had been set up five years ago. He highlighted that the main expense had been a regional OIML Training Course (OTC) Mr Dunmill had organised in Kenya at the end of the previous year. The OIML had also received very significant support from the PTB. This was the way when the organisation was dealing with what would have been called developing countries in the past, countries that did not have a lot of money, that the OIML was able to provide some funding as well as the PTB which had provided a substantial amount of funding to able to set up this event, and get the experts there.

In the case of the training for technical work, € 100 000 had been budgeted and only € 63 882 had been spent. The cost of Mr Vinet's work as a contractor was included in this expense. During the training they had found that it had been much easier and more economical for two people to travel to a region and gather people in a region than it had been to bring people to Paris. In this way, the participants had few costs as they did not have to travel. In many cases, even when they had come to Paris, participants had not charged the OIML anyway. They had insisted it was easier to claim their travel expenses from their own organisations instead of having the OIML reimburse them. This had been one of the major reasons they had spent less than anticipated. He underlined that this would be accommodated in the forecast.

With regard to depreciation, Mr Patoray said they were "running a bit high". There had been the cost of the protection of the OIML logo which had been put under capital expenditure when he had expected it to be classed as an expense. In addition, they had not lost any Members, so all the uncollected fees were also included under the heading of depreciation.

He understood that some delegates were interested in the costs related to the OIML-CS. He repeated that the revenue had been greater than anticipated because more certificates had been registered. He added that the costs of the OIML-CS in the current year had also been much higher, mainly because of all the promotional and travel expenses, as well as BIML staff members' time at the start of the OIML-CS, such as for setting up the website. He underlined that these costs would not continue to be so high, and it had been useful that additional revenue had been generated by certificates.

To summarise, Mr Patoray said that the staff costs had been greater than anticipated, but overall the costs had been relatively in line with the budget, with the exception of the travel and accommodation, mostly due to the promotional activities of the OIML-CS. In total, a little more had been spent than had been anticipated. In all about € 50 000 less than had been anticipated in total for 2017.

This concluded Mr Patoray's presentation, and he asked if there were any questions. There were no questions. Mr Patoray joked that this was either really good or really bad. He hoped that it was a really good sign. He said he had tried to provide a little more detail with extra drop downs, and on the PDF this would be one sheet. He said he had tried to provide more detail on this occasion so that delegates could understand the reason for the over- or under-spending.

Dr Schwartz considered that everyone was happy with the detailed, comprehensive, and clear report that Mr Patoray had given. He re-iterated the remark he had made during his report: Members had the

impression that the global financial health of the Organisation was good. He thanked Mr Patoray for his achievements in bringing the finances back to a good situation.

Mr Dunmill stated that there had to be an approval of the 2017 accounts, and read:

The Committee,

Noting the accounts for 2017 and the BIML Director's comments,

Considering the external auditor's approval of the 2017 accounts,

Approves the 2017 accounts, and

Instructs its President to present them to the 16th OIML Conference in 2020.

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments on the wording of the resolution. There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was adopted unanimously and the accounts for 2017 were approved.

8.2 Discussion by the CIML regarding the appointment of the financial auditor

Mr Patoray said this item had been included on the agenda without a lot of detail in the Working Document. This was being considered in line with the OIML's financial regulations, B 8 *OIML Financial Regulations* and Article XXI of the Convention, which indicated that the financial statements of the Organisation, prepared by the Director, should be audited by an independent chartered accountant. He explained this was a designation for individuals who had special credentials and who were authorised to both audit and sign the audit. The Article stated that the chartered accountant should be selected from a list prepared by the regional professional association of chartered accountants.

He observed that in 1955 this had been a physical list on paper which was held by the regional professional organisation, whereas today they were available on the internet. Article XXI also said that the independent chartered accountant should be appointed by the CIML upon a recommendation made by the BIML Director, and that the appointment was renewable for a term of four years. Mr Patoray indicated the appropriate website and said that delegates could find the list of chartered accountants there if they wished.

He stated that the current expert accountant, Mr Frederic Fischer, had started in 2011, when Mr Patoray himself had started at the Bureau, but that he had been hired by the previous director during the time of transition from cash to accrual accounting. Mr Patoray stated that Mr Fischer had the credentials required by the Convention, and he found him to be a very efficient and proficient auditor. He had skills with Sage, the accounting package used by the Bureau, and he had also developed some tools specific to the Bureau.

In the first four years of working with Mr Fischer, a lot of adjustments had had to be made, and it had been very beneficial for him to be auditing the accounts with his expertise in Sage together with the ability to understand the changes that had to be made in order to move from cash to accrual accounting. Mr Patoray said this had been complicated by the changes in the pension arrangements and the re-evaluation of the building. The past four years had been much more stable, and Mr Fischer had been able to dig deeper into the accounts.

Mr Patoray said there were differing opinions on appointing an auditor. One was that you should change an auditor fairly regularly, so that there were new eyes, a fresh look, and a different approach to the accounts. The other opinion was that once you had found a good auditor, they could dig down into your accounts and the system, and understand it better, so they could provide better guidance to you and suggest improvements to make your system better. Mr Patoray said that as an auditor himself in the past, he had enjoyed repeat audits because he had been able to understand the system and been able to dig down and find those issues that might not be visible on the surface.

Mr Patoray felt that Mr Fischer had provided an excellent service over the years and he had complete confidence in him. He said he therefore strongly favoured maintaining Mr Fischer as auditor, because his team would be able to do a more thorough job and provide suggestions for improvements.

In the case of the special accounts for training, for example, they now had a special account with China for the secondment position, which needed to be accounted for. Mr Fischer and his firm had the ability to understand those changes. He would not expect a new accountant to be able to understand all of this for at least two years. Mr Patoray stated that the OIML was also in the process of appointing a new BIML Director and it might not be the right time to have a new accountant as well. Mr Patoray therefore recommended that Mr Fischer be reappointed for the term of four years according to B 8 *OIML Financial Regulations*. He asked if there were any questions, but there were none. Mr Patoray added that there would be a resolution approving this, which would be included in the group of resolutions to be approved after his various presentations.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Patoray for his presentation. He noted that they had received a clear recommendation, which he fully supported considering also the appointment of a new BIML Director, as he thought it was important to use the experience of the current accountant.

Mr Dunmill read:

The Committee,

Having regard to article 21.4 of OIML B 8:2012 *OIML Financial Regulations*,

Following the recommendation of the BIML Director,

Appoints “LG Audits & Conseils” as the independent chartered accountant of the Organization for a four-year term from 1 January 2019.

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments on the wording of the resolution. There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was adopted unanimously.

8.3 Overview of the arrears of Member States and Corresponding Members

Dr Schwartz asked delegates to consider item 8.3 and asked Mr Patoray to give an overview of the arrears of Member States and Corresponding Members.

Mr Patoray observed that those delegates who had participated in CIML meetings in previous years knew of his passion for the Convention, and Article XXVI, which indicated very clearly that contributions should be paid at the beginning of the year. To be very blunt, he said that was not happening.

As of September 2018, just before the CIML meeting, Member States still owed € 724 020 to the Organisation, and Corresponding Members owed € 58 913. This made a total of € 782 933 still owed to the OIML as they entered the final three months of the year.

He noted that as metrologists, delegates liked numbers, and although percentages were not always the best way of presenting something, he stated that 35 % of Member States’ membership contributions had still not been paid by the last three months of the year. Currently 19 Member States still owed their contributions for 2018, which represented 31 %. Four Members still owed membership contributions from before 2018. He said he had sent personal letters to those that owed money the previous year on two separate occasions, in addition to other reminders sent by the Bureau. As a result, the total sum owed had decreased, but the total owed by the four Member States which had not paid by the end of the previous year was € 80 320. He added that unfortunately, one Member State would be de-listed if no payment was received by the end of 2018.

At least two Member States had contacted the Bureau about slow payments, so they could anticipate that they would not be receiving funds from these countries in the immediate future, but at least the Bureau knew they were working to readjust their budgets. There was a similar, but even less attractive

picture with regard to Corresponding Members. 65 % of Corresponding Members' fees were still owed in the last three months of the current year. Out of a total of 65 Corresponding Members, 24 still owed their fees, which corresponded to 37 %. Thirteen Corresponding Members still owed more than their fees for 2018, and five would be de-listed at the end of the current year due to this lack of payment.

He drew delegates' attention to the fact that three Corresponding Members had been de-listed the previous year. From a payment standpoint this was not at all encouraging. He remarked that participation in this meeting was very good, great new systems were being put in place, and there was a lot of enthusiasm, but the OIML was struggling to recover contributions throughout the year. He said he understood that many delegates had budgets which did not run from January to January, so some delays in payment were understandable. Some delegates had a budget that started in October, so they may not be able to pay until the final quarter of the year, and if the BIML knew this, it could be anticipated in the OIML's budgeting. When they did not know, it was difficult to know when they were going to receive the payment.

At this point, Mr Patoray said he could only repeat that € 782 933 was still owed, and he emphasised that the past quarter had featured the lowest level of payments received that he had known in the entire time he had been Director, although he confessed he did not understand why. He would like to understand what the problems were, and stated there were provisions in the Convention to allow for Members who had problems. This was one of the reasons for the reserves, so that the Organisation could accommodate any problems. He asked delegates if they had any questions.

Mr Dixit commented that the previous day it had been reported that in the last five years, five new Member States, and approximately five Corresponding Members had joined the OIML. However, he observed that if regular payments were not being received, and Members were being de-listed, in the three years overall, there was no actual achievement.

Mr Patoray said he understood Mr Dixit's statement. He said they had not actually de-listed a Member State while he had been Director. He repeated that there was currently one Member State which could be de-listed at the end of the current year if payment was not received, and the Bureau was trying to work with them to understand what the problems were, and to see if the situation could be resolved, but unfortunately this Member was not participating in this meeting.

He acknowledged that Mr Dixit was correct. If they reported they were adding Members, but the fees were not being collected, it was not really a benefit. In the end, most Members had paid their contributions the previous year, and most of the Corresponding Members had paid their fees in the previous years, although not all. He confirmed that eventually, most Members paid, but they did not pay on time even though each Member State government normally received its budget at the start of the year. The money was there for delegates' organisations to spend throughout the year, and they tried to spend the money evenly throughout the year. However, in the case of the Bureau, Mr Patoray noted that they theoretically had all the money coming in at the beginning of the year since this was stated in the Convention, but in reality, the fees came in slowly throughout, and in the current year it had been very slow. He wanted delegates to be aware of this, and he wanted to draw attention to the relevance of this problem to item 8.5, the issue of the surplus and the reserves. He added that he expected all Member States and Corresponding Members to pay by the end of the year, and stressed that right now there was a big shortfall and what he called "slow pay".

Dr Schwartz asked if there were any further comments and remarked that they had a similar discussion at the previous CIML meeting in Colombia, and they had taken resolution 2017/8, which reminded Member States of their obligation under Article XXVI of the Convention which stated that, *inter alia*, contributions should be "paid at the beginning of the year to the Director of the Bureau".

He said he was not sure what to do about this, but suggested that delegates should remind the responsible persons in their ministries of this problem, and try their best as CIML Members to take care that their obligations as Member States were taken seriously.

Mr Dixit commented that there was a need for some promotional events. He said the Organisation participated in a lot of events throughout the world during the year, but when these events were being held they were not reminding those responsible for the finances of Member States. This would be one

way to get in touch with these countries which did not make the regular payments. He said that he felt this may be a way to address those Member States which were not paying their contributions.

Mr Patoray agreed. He said Mr Dixit had made a very good point. His idea was that he was raising awareness at this particular meeting, but that at individual meetings during the year, he always asked the individual Members that owed money to pay. He said he had been to the relevant embassies in Paris to make sure that they understood their country's obligations and request payment. He confirmed that others who travelled to various meetings also make requests for payment. He added that he had also sent personal letters with specific invoices to both CIML Members and embassy staff at the end of the year for those countries had not yet paid. He added that there had been a strong push to get Members to meet their obligations but it was just a struggle, and he felt they could be doing better things with their time if they were not having to chase people to meet their obligations.

Dr Schwartz felt this item was concluded. Mr Dunmill read:

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, and

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

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments on the wording of the resolution. There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was adopted unanimously.

8.4 Report by the BIML Director on the 2018 budget forecast

Dr Schwartz asked delegates to consider item 8.4, which was about the budget forecast for 2018.

Mr Patoray started his presentation by drawing delegates' attention to the "REV 3" written in red on his first slide. He said this was because he had amended this information several times trying to keep up with the data coming in from the accounting as well as the quarterly audits that were run at the Bureau to see how they were progressing. This represented the most up-to-date information he had.

He said it obviously did not include all of the costs, and was only a forecast, which was an estimate of what might happen between the present time and the end of the year. He added that those who had sat through his forecast before would probably find him very pessimistic in this forecast. He reminded delegates that generally he overspent in his forecast, but sometimes costs were lower than predicted. He reported that he was not trying to make light of this, and reassured delegates that he was being serious in his attempt to predict the budget accurately, but in the previous year, he had underspent the budget by € 50 000.

He added that whilst this indicated that the Organisation was being wise about what it was spending the money on, the money was there, and they should be fulfilling their obligations with the money which had been allocated by the CIML. He stated that in the current year, it would appear that he was going to overspend by nearly € 90 000 euros [*BIML note: the actual figure is € 89 630*]. Since the budget period was four years, the surplus that had been left from the previous year, of nearly € 50 000 [*BIML note: the actual figure is € 44 489*] was still available to spend this year. The Organisation had not spent it all the previous year, and as an example he mentioned that they had not spent as much on training as they had intended to, but he wanted to highlight the fact that the next BIML Director may well be reporting final figures that were over what had been anticipated. With regard to the question of how this had happened, he explained that the biggest change in the income had been that they were now well below the target number of registration fees for OIML certificates in 2018. He judged that manufacturers had pushed to get their instruments type approved before the end of the MAA and the Basic Certificate System. It took time to create instruments that manufacturers could have confidence in sending to a laboratory where they would have to spend a lot of money, and of course they would

like to them to pass the testing. He considered that there was going to be a gap in certificate income, and said that this was what they had seen in the first six to nine months of this year. He reported that they had noticed a slight increase in certificate income during the previous month, and hopefully this would carry on until the end of the year. However, this left them about € 14 516 below the amount they had anticipated.

He called delegates' attention to the fact that the previous year the income had been substantially higher than anticipated. He reported that there had been no change in the number of Member States. One Corresponding Member had also paid their debt in order to re-join, which was where the € 6 300 had come from.

Mr Patoray showed delegates a slide of the charges forecast for 2018. He said he had not broken this down into so much detail as he had for the income. However, he particularly highlighted the staff costs and the costs of the active staff. He explained that they had hired the new Assistant Director, and this had had an impact. He added that they would also have a new Director, who would be taking up his post as Director Designate in November, and this had been something he should have anticipated in the budget, but which he had forgotten.

These two items made up most of the indicated € 39 540 overspend. He remarked that although the secondment was not a charge which would be repeated, in bringing Guo Su into the Bureau there had been associated charges. P.R. China had taken on the majority of the charges for the two-year period, but the OIML had paid charges involved with Guo Su's moving, finding places for his children in schools, and preparing for living in Paris for two years. Mr Patoray said he believed the OIML had an obligation to support secondments. He stated that since this was not a regular expense, delegates would not see this charge in 2019, and he anticipated that the costs would be less. In summary, Mr Patoray said there was an over-expenditure of € 61 466 in staff costs, so over the year there was a little less income and a little more staff cost.

With regard to the other numbers, Mr Patoray said that some were under, and some that were over the budget, but all were fairly small, and all reasonably close to the budget. Mr Patoray stated that the depreciation was always a bit higher than the sum he anticipated, saying that he was not very good at this projection, but he indicated that the depreciation would be decreasing during the next few years because there would not be the large costs involved in the renovation of the building.

The total charges resulted in a positive € 5 917. He said that he was pleased about the amount which would have been spent on training, having anticipated € 70 000 euros this year, but hopefully actually spending € 90 000 so that they would make up a little bit of what had not been spent during the previous year. The end result, because there was less income than expected, and higher charges than expected (in particular with regard to the active staff) would be € 89 630 this year, of which € 50 000 had not been spent the previous year. Overall it looked as though he was going to achieve a milestone in his last year as Director in controlling the OIML's budget and they may spend more money than they had anticipated. He indicated that he was not proud of this, but it was just the way things had worked out taking last year's expenditure and combining it with this year's.

With regard to the OIML-CS, Mr Patoray said that the income from certificates would be less than anticipated. The costs would be higher than expected because of promoting the system, and the travel involved in its promotion. He did not therefore expect there would be net zero outcome for the current year 2018. He asked delegates if they had any questions on the forecast, but there were none.

Dr Schwartz remarked that it had been a very clear report and everybody had understood the figures.

Mr Dixit asked about the plan for the following year with regards to the savings Mr Patoray had made during the present year.

Mr Patoray replied that he did not have a plan for the following year, and suggested that Mr Dixit should ask the next Director this question.

Mr Dixit replied that Mr Patoray was the current representative of the various nations, and therefore questioned whether he might have made some plans on how the Organisation could be run in a better way, which he could give his successor in terms of a better picture of the Organisation. They should be

considering what difficulties they were facing, so that these difficulties did not get in the way. Mr Dixit said if they had surplus money, this should be spent to boost the moral and the technical knowledge of Member countries where metrology was not well developed.

Mr Patoray said he now understood what Mr Dixit meant. He confirmed this information would be provided under item 8.5.1.

Dr Schwartz responded that Mr Dixit's question made an excellent transition to the next item, where they would be looking at how the surplus could be best spent.

Mr Khedir thanked Dr Schwartz. He said he had a comment about the report. It had stated that the ratio between the salaries and the total annual charges was about 67 % for 2019 against 65 % in 2018. This ratio had increased, so he wondered whether there were procedures in place to reduce this sum, which appeared to him to be rather high.

Mr Patoray replied that the short answer was “no” because there was a set number of staff, and that would not change. They would not be able to do the work without the current number of staff. Two things would be different in 2018. Firstly, he repeated that he had made a mistake in not having included the two months of salary for the Director Designate, and secondly, there had been the very pleasant surprise that the request for a secondment had been fulfilled. The figure of € 40 000 in the staff costs was where he had put this expense in the forecast, although in the final accounts it might be put elsewhere. The € 40 000 would not be there in the future, so the ratio would be reduced, but Mr Patoray said it would not change substantially.

As the administrative arm of the OIML, the Bureau had two main costs: the staff and its related expenditure including salaries and benefits, and travel and meetings. The staff level was currently at a minimum, and he considered there was no way of reducing these costs. With regard to the travel, it was possible to examine this in more detail, but he stated they had anticipated the need for more promotion work, such as promoting the OIML-CS, the QI toolkit and CEEMS. In many cases, travel was predetermined, since there was an expectation that a member of the Bureau would be present at OIML technical meetings and at RLMO meetings. If they had a real problem with the budget, these could be re-examined and reduced, but he did not think the staff itself could be reduced. In his opinion, certain core functions were necessary in the Bureau, which he would not recommend contracting out. For an organisation such as the OIML, he judged they needed an in-house core group of people that were flexible and capable of meeting Members' needs on an instant basis. When things were contracted out, he pointed out that a central organisation handled things, and as a client, the OIML would always seem to be waiting in line for something to get done. He submitted that the Bureau was able to react quickly, but Members paid for this benefit in the staff costs.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Patoray and suggested they moved onto the next item, 8.5.1, which was the budget surplus, and which was related to the results.

Mr Dunmill read:

The Committee,

Notes the report on the budget forecast for 2018 given by the BIML Director.

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments on the wording of the resolution. There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was adopted unanimously.

8.5 Initial discussions on budget surplus and status of Corresponding Members

8.5.1 Discussion on future budget surpluses and level of reserves

Mr Patoray commenced his presentation by stressing that the main word on his first slide was “initial” which was written in blue and bold. He confirmed that he was not expecting a decision to be made at present. He explained that he would present his thoughts on this topic, but acknowledged there would

be many other opinions, mainly because it had to do with money. All budgets were tight, and in most countries, governments were trying to reduce costs, and specifically trying to reduce costs in relation to international treaty organisations such as the OIML. He recognised that national governments always questioned whether there was merit in the way they were spending their money, and whether it was worth their time and effort, or whether it would benefit their own people more if it were spent in another way. He stressed that discussing what to do with money was always a sensitive topic.

This presentation would consider his experience with the accounts at the Bureau, his experiences with Members, and the ability of the organisation to take the next step. He emphasised that it was only an initial discussion, was only the opinion of one individual, and acknowledged that Members had important opinions on this topic. He said they could be expressed before the Conference in 2020. His presentation would include some “numbers”, and he added that he particularly liked accounting and considered it was part of his obligations to maintain the financial condition of the organisation in a solid fashion.

He explained that at the 15th Conference in Strasbourg in 2016, a resolution had been passed giving the Committee a policy for the reserve funds and the purpose for which they should be used. Although this was a simple resolution, it would require a complicated answer. He listed some of the things the organisation should consider. These included the fixed four-year budget and associated subscription fees, which the Convention clearly stated could not be changed during that period. He said that new Members might always join the OIML, so additional funds might become available during a given budget period, and added that the Convention did not address this at all. It did not say that fees from other Members should be reduced as a consequence of a new Member joining, it just said the Organisation had additional funds, which would then be “surplus” during that budget period.

However he said that, as they had already discussed, one or more Member States could just decide to leave the OIML, or just stop paying for a year or two, or they might not be able to pay for other reasons. The years 2008 and 2009 had been disastrous for most countries around the world, but there were also countries with problems right now, due to political or environmental issues which they faced every day meaning that they did not have the funds to pay this Organisation. He stressed that they needed to be able to accommodate this, whilst being sensitive to the issues. Mr Patoray said they knew that Members did not all pay at the beginning of the year, which he referred to as “slow pay”, but which is in fact termed “arrear”.

He also drew Members’ attention to the ongoing expenses of the OIML, which included salaries, maintenance of the building and the other costs to keep the Organisation running. He stated that most of these costs were fixed and planned in advance. Items such as salaries were obviously included in this, but so were the costs of the meetings, and here he pointed out that the Bureau was already having to put down deposits for the 2020 meeting.

To keep the websites and servers running the fibre into the building had to be maintained and the servers had to be kept running.

He recognised that when it came to travel there could be more flexibility.

Mr Patoray remarked that there was no penalty for Members that did not pay. He declared that if your electricity bill was not paid on time, usually there was a fee or a penalty to pay as a consequence, or maybe the electricity would be shut off, but in the case of the OIML, after three years of non-payment, a Member State or Corresponding Member would be de-listed. There was no possibility of making up non-payments from other Members. He stated that there were some organisations in which, if one of its Members did not pay in a given year, their subscription fee was re-allocated in the next year to all of the other Members to make up for the loss. If the Member failed to pay the following year, then again the fees were re-assessed to adjust for this. This made for a complicated system, but the reality was that this Organisation did not do this, based on its Convention. Mr Patoray went on to underline that there was no other source of funds. He added that they were not a division of some larger organisation as was the case for certain specialised agencies of the UN, where money could be taken from one place and put it in another if required. Lastly, the Convention stated that the OIML could not borrow money.

Mr Patoray went on to discuss the reserves. He stated that it was up to the Conference to decide for a particular financial period. The overall credit was the subscription fees paid by Members, based on the € 14 000 that had been decided as the “base contributory share”. There was then an annual amount to be placed in reserve to meet essential emergency expenses, which covered what he called the “slow pay”. He highlighted that this quarter, if the Bureau did not receive the outstanding € 560 000, the Bureau would be faced with not being able to pay its costs, so the money would have to come from the reserves. In addition, the reserves covered the situation of the income proving insufficient, for example if a large Member State failed to pay.

Article XXV of the Convention stated that the Director was authorised to undertake and make payments on his own authority in respect of the Organisation’s operating expenditure, but he could not pay extraordinary expenses, and he said that Peter Mason and himself had had long conversations about the expenses on the building, but also he was not authorised to draw money from the reserve in case of “slow pay” without obtaining consent from the President. So the Organisation always had oversight of the reserves, based on consent from its President. If this happened during the year before the CIML Meeting, then the President had the responsibility to authorise that type of payment.

In 2017, they had not spent € 50 000 of what they had expected in the budget. This was a surplus for this budget period, and would remain available, which was why he could roll it into the current year, and spend it in the current year. However, at the end of the financial period, the Conference had to decide what to do with any surplus. The amount of the surplus might permit corresponding reductions in the fees (here he reminded Members that there had been no increase in the fees in the past eight years), or might be placed in the reserve fund. Mr Patoray said this is what had happened in 2016, when € 276 000 had been placed in the reserves, but there had also been an authorisation to spend € 250 000 on training.

He went on to state that the reserve was for insufficient receipts resulting from the situation of a Member being de-listed for not paying, in which case, the Organisation could draw from the reserve funds. Mr Patoray continued that the Convention mentioned the reserves quite a bit. He said he had previously mentioned that the OIML had around € 1.8 million in the bank. At the beginning of October 2018, it was not quite this much because of the “slow pay” during the past quarter, but it was reasonably close to this number. In previous discussions, Mr Patoray said he had indicated that according to his training, a reserve of 50 % of the total expenses budget is standard in organisations such as the OIML. He recognised that they had heard suggestions that it could be as little as 10 %, and admitted that some organisations could operate that way had if they had little risk, and the ability to acquire funds from other places. He said there were also examples where there were up to three years of expenses in reserve. He reported that there was an accounting rule that said you could not have more than three years.

There was no single answer to this, as each organisation had to address their own issues, risks and capabilities. Mr Patoray said he appreciated the input of Mr Johnston, who had helped and guided him, and who had many years of accounting experience with the OIML to draw on.

Looking at the budget period from 2017 to 2020, the average total yearly charges (expenses) were € 2 276 640. As of December 2017, there were € 1 775 165 of liquid assets. This meant there was 78 % of current cash verses expenses. This was a bit higher than the Organisation had had in the past. Mr Patoray showed delegates a slide indicating the quarterly payments by Member State. He explained that the horizontal blue line indicated the average quarterly expenses. He suggested this showed that in the first quarter of each year, the organisation received enough to cover the expenses, and sometimes more. In the second quarter, they did not receive as much as in the first quarter, but could use the funds received during the first quarter. However, taking last year as an example, € 80 000 had not been paid. He added that by the end of the year, they received most of the money, but the problem was when was it received, and where would the Organisation get the funds from if the payments were not received, or if a Member State decided not to pay.

The next slide showed the payments by quarter. The green horizontal line at the top of this graph indicated the total expenses for the year. If all the Members paid in January, then € 2.2 million would be received in the first quarter, and he suggested that if this happened in reality, they would not be having this conversation.

The next slide showed the quarterly payments by Member State, which Mr Patoray referred to as the “worst case of the worst case”. He indicated that the current quarterly payments of € 238 000 had been the worst for receiving funds in his experience, and pointed out that the worst case expense during any quarter had been € 680 460. He admitted that this had probably been at the time when they had been carrying out the Bureau renovations, but that was also the “worst case of the worst case” as far as expenses were concerned. He wanted to point out that if those two “worst case” scenarios ever coincided, they would need at least € 442 460 in the bank to cover that quarter. The next slide indicated what had happened in 2017. In June of 2017, there had been € 1 828 172 in the bank, but by September of that year, there was only € 1 496 517. There had been a total change in cash of € 331 655 during that quarter. Mr Patoray submitted that this would give delegates some ideas about the magnitude of the numbers. It was not as much as 50 %, which would be close to a million euros, and they did not have that much fluctuation, but it was greater than 10 %. He thought that this could provide the basis for a discussion about how much there should be in reserve to meet essential emergency expenditure and to ensure the execution of the budget in the event of the income proving insufficient. He said there was not a right answer to this problem, and that each Member would have different opinions, based on their own government’s policies within their own countries, but there must be enough reserves for the Organisation to deal with insufficient funds and emergencies.

Mr Patoray said it was his belief that they could put the Organisation’s funds to better work. He said that the previous year they had made the decision to put the budget surplus into the reserve, but then the reserve funds had been made available for training purposes. He considered that this should be a guide for Members for the future. This had been a way of investing the Organisation’s excess funds in the future, and he suggested this answered the question Mr Dixit had asked.

He commented that they could continue the convener training, which in his opinion had proven beneficial with regard to blood pressure meters. Many Members had been waiting for the revision of the Recommendation on blood pressure meters for some time. He added that CDs had just been posted that week. The convener training they had held two months prior to the current meeting had helped provide assistance for technical work in the area of project management, which Mr Patoray said delegates had heard Dr Schwartz mention during his presentation. He also questioned whether more support could be provided to CEEMS. He also suggested various online training modules and e-learning opportunities may also be created, but added that this would take a lot of money and follow up. He said these were very exciting times for the OIML, and observed that he was sad he would not be a part of it. He considered that investing in the future with the available funds would be one of the best things the Organisation could do, but qualified his statement by reminding delegates that they could not reduce the reserves to zero, as they needed the ability to meet the problem of insufficient funds coming in throughout the year.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Patoray for his introduction. He recognised that they now understood much better what the Convention said and the framework within which they could take a decision. He said Mr Patoray’s presentation had been very helpful, adding that it was actually quite a comfortable situation that the Organisation found itself in, in as much as they would be able to explore the various options for spending the money. Often he said, it was the opposite way round, where they might have to consider the problems of not having enough money. He added that they should be considering how best to invest this surplus in the future of the Organisation. He said his recommendation would not be to think about an appropriate percentage level, be it 40 %, 50 % or 60 %, but suggested rather that they first thought about how to best invest the 78 % they had at the moment. He acknowledged that Mr Patoray had made some proposals at the end of his presentation, with which they could start the discussion.

Dr Schwartz wondered whether delegates had any short questions they wished to ask. He reminded them that during his presentation, he had mentioned the Task Group 2023, which may be put together at the Presidential Council meeting in March 2019, and the options available to the Organisation would be a subject which this Group could certainly consider in detail.

Dr Ehrlich wanted to express his appreciation for this presentation, and the effort put into it by Mr Patoray and Dr Schwartz. Dr Schwartz asked the said they looked forward to the continued discussion.

Dr Schwartz noted that there were no further questions.

8.5.2 Discussion on contributory classes for Corresponding Members

Mr Patoray said that item 8.5.2 was also a subject in the initial stages of discussion. It had been based on a comment made by Dr Schwartz in his presentation about establishing four distinct classes for Corresponding Members. He started his presentation by stating that some Members may not recall what the OIML meant in referring to a “class”. He explained that Article XXVI of the Convention stated that there were four classes of Member State contributions, based on population. Member States then paid subscription fees of 1, 2, 4, and 8 times the base contributory share according to their class. The Organisation also could lower a Member State by up to three classes if they were suffering poor economic conditions. The only mention of Corresponding Members in the Convention was in Article V.

Mr Patoray then showed delegates a slide indicating what the Convention recognised as a Corresponding Member, and how they could, or could not, participate during a Conference. The 13th Conference in 2008 had set the annual Corresponding Member fee at 10 % of the base contributory share for Member States. This had been introduced in steps, and had finally been achieved in 2012. Mr Patoray stated that at present, there was only one class for all Corresponding Members, and added that for the current budget period of 2017–2020, all Corresponding Members would therefore pay the same amount of € 1 400.

Mr Patoray then showed delegates a slide which indicated what Corresponding Members could do. He specified that they could access all parts of the website, could download all publications freely, and could receive all relevant circulars and announcements. They could also participate in the Conference and CIML meetings as observers, and could also participate in OIML TCs/SCs/PGs as O-members, and thus make comments. They could also participate in the OIML-CS as Associates, and lastly, they could also participate in the OIML-CS Management Committee as observers, and make comments.

He then showed delegates a slide indicating what Corresponding Members could not do, which put simply meant they could not vote, they could not hold an office within the OIML, could not issue OIML Certificates, and could not host a CIML meeting.

The current question which was being raised was whether the OIML should have different classes for Corresponding Members. He repeated that the classes for Member States were based on population. Mr Patoray showed delegates a slide indicating the population and GNI/capita figures from the World Bank. In more detail, he stated that there were 65 Corresponding Members, and from this chart, delegates should note that 53 of them would still be in class 1, and thus be at the lowest contribution rate. This would leave nine Corresponding Members in class 2 having to pay twice the base fee, two Corresponding Members in class 3 having to pay four times the base fee, and only one Corresponding Member would pay eight times the base fee.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Patoray for his introduction. He added that in the past they had had good reasons for treating all Corresponding Members the same and charging them all the fee of 10 % of the Member State base contributory share, but he thought that now was the time to look at the question of whether this was still appropriate, or whether it was now more appropriate to introduce four distinct classes for Corresponding Members as they had for Member States. He added that if they did decide to introduce four classes, they would then have to discuss the fees as a separate issue. He asked if there were any questions or comments.

Mr Mateus (Brazil) said that when he had studied the documents before the meeting, he had noted that there was a small list of countries on which he realised there were some numbers in red. He asked what these red numbers meant.

Mr Patoray replied that this was how he kept track of what he was trying to accomplish in his analysis. He said it was internal analysis rather than anything significant. He said he had used different colours for countries that were in different classes; in this way, he could go back and find the information he was looking for.

Dr Schwartz enquired whether Mr Mateus was referring to the World Bank gross or net income figures.

Mr Mateus questioned whether there were any conclusions or remarks regarding the numbers.

Mr Patoray repeated his earlier conclusions that there were 53 Corresponding Members that would end up in class 1, nine that would be in class 2, two that would be in class 4, and one that would be in class 8. He said the colours were all that he used to trigger his own thinking when he was going through the analysis.

Dr Schwartz said that looking at these figures, a large majority (53 out of 65) of Corresponding Members would end up with a coefficient of 1, and only twelve would be treated differently. This was the final result of the first analysis that had been carried out by the Director. The question was then whether it was worth looking at those 12 Corresponding Members at the moment. Would it be worth differentiating between them, and applying different coefficients to the different Corresponding Members for so little to change. Dr Schwartz said he did not see any further questions from delegates, so he suggested this was discussed during the coffee break, and concluded the session by thanking Mr Patoray again for his comprehensive reports and for the excellent overview he had given together with the details.

Mr Dunmill said they had left the possibility for a resolution to be taken on this item, but it had been decided that no resolution was necessary at this stage. The draft would not be completed now and there would not be a resolution on this item.

On the possibilities for consideration in the future, they had also left the possibility of a resolution but again there would not be a resolution on this item.

9 Liaisons

9.1 Report by the RLMO Round Table Chairperson

Dr Miki reported that there had been 40 participants in the RLMO Round Table meeting, which had taken place on the morning of Tuesday 9 October. Six RLMOs had been represented:

- AFRIMETS (Intra-Africa Metrology System);
- APLMF (Asia-Pacific Legal Metrology Forum);
- COOMET (Euro-Asia Cooperation of National Metrological Institutions);
- GULFMET (Gulf Association for Metrology);
- SIM (Inter-American Metrology System); and
- WELMEC (European Cooperation in Legal Metrology).

He showed delegates the agenda, which had included updates from RLMOs and how the OIML Certification System (OIML-CS) concerned RLMOs, as well as administrative matters.

Reports on activities which had taken place during the year by each RLMO were made by the following representatives:

- AFRIMETS by Ms Himba Cheelo (Zambia);
- APLMF by Mr Stephen O'Brien (New Zealand);
- COOMET by Dr Peter Ulbig (Germany);
- GULFMET by Mr Omar Kanakrieh (Saudi Arabia);
- SIM by Dr Juan Carlos Mateus Sanchez (Brazil); and
- WELMEC by Mrs Corinne Lagauterie (France).

The topics covered in these presentations had included the following items:

- training courses and e-learning modules supported by the MEDEA project (APLMF);
- joint APMP-APLMF metrology web portal <http://metrologyasiapacific.com> (APLMF);

- e-Learning modules which can be shared with other RLMOs: possibility to be hosted in the context of the e-learning system on the OIML website (APLMF);
- a seminar under the umbrella of an OIML pilot training centre had been held from 27 November – 1 December 2017 in Nairobi, Kenya (AFRIMETS);
- need for support on human resource development, utilization of equipment, and raising awareness (AFRIMETS);
- several projects: Harmonization of regulations and norms in legal metrology, technologies of measuring devices and systems in legal metrology, and legal metrology control (COOMET);
- how to deal with the topic of digitalization such as Industry 4.0 (COOMET);
- several technical committees established, including a new committee for legal metrology (GULFMET);
- GSO/GULFMET certification scheme being revised to be consistent with the new OIML-CS (GULFMET);
- INMETRO launched two ship units on the Amazon river to perform legal metrology inspections (SIM);
- many training courses had been held. INMETRO is willing to host an OIML Training Centre (SIM);
- main products are more than 60 guidance documents, some of which are referred to by the MID (WELMEC); and
- the WELMEC website included information and downloadable documents (WELMEC).

Concerning the OIML-CS, a presentation had been made by Dr Schwartz which had covered the topics of:

- awareness-raising;
- identifying technical experts to assess potential OIML Issuing Authorities;
- encouragement and support for Utilizers and Associates;
- observers on the OIML-CS MC; and
- intercomparisons or proficiency testing.

A presentation by Mr Cock Oosterman also mentioned the many awareness-raising events which had taken place in 2017 and 2018. He had also highlighted that almost half of the OIML Member States were OIML Issuing Authorities or Utilizers, but only a few OIML Corresponding Members were Associates.

The discussion which had followed these presentations had highlighted the need for more awareness-raising activities, which should include an explanation of the benefits of becoming a Utilizer or Associate. It was also felt that there was a need for assistance and practical examples of the process of becoming a Utilizer or Associate.

Dr Miki explained that the other items discussed by the Round Table had included the possibility of sharing e-Learning materials developed by the APLMF on the OIML e-Learning platform. He concluded his report on the Round Table with information on the OIML-RT website which he operated (<https://www.rlmo-rt.org/RT>), including details of how to log in.

Dr Schwartz thanked Dr Miki for his excellent report, and for keeping to time, and asked if there were any questions.

Mr Khedir thanked the President. He said that his comments comprised three parts. The first part concerned the Vice-President's presentation on RLMOs, and he would like to suggest the inclusion of an evaluation of the proposals made at previous RLMO Round Table meetings. He thought it would be useful to know what they had been able to accomplish, and what had they not, as well as the reasons why. Secondly, in his opinion, they should add an item on the relationships between RLMOs, for example between AFRIMETS and WELMEC. He also wanted to know more about the relationships

within RLMOs, for example within AFRIMETS or within MAGMET. He wondered how these relationships were being developed, and whether there were any concrete proposals for making improvements in this area. Thirdly, he remarked that there had been training centre activities in China and elsewhere, but since 2016 Tunisia had been proposing the creation of an African training centre, for francophone and Arab countries. He wanted to suggest that Tunisia be the site for this training centre for CEEMS and for the OIML-CS.

Dr Miki thanked Mr Khedir. Regarding his first question, and what actions had been undertaken as a result of the proposals, he said he could make this clearer, but that it had been difficult due to the time constraints of his presentation. However, he stressed that the Round Table was only used for sharing information and discussion. It also promoted loosely connected relationships, so participants were not there to make rigid decisions, but just to gather and share information. However, he said it would be possible to clarify their proposals and any follow-up, specifically on how they had or had not been realised. He saw the Round Table proposals as provisional, but they could be circulated, at least amongst the Members, so he could of course send the proposals to Mr Khedir.

With regard to the relationship between the RLMOs, he re-iterated that the Round Table meetings just gathered and shared information, and it was really up to each RLMO to decide what kind of relationships they had with others and within their own organisation. With regard to training centres, there was a very close relationship, and some overlap, between them and the CEEMS activities, and he pointed Mr Khedir in the direction of the CEEMS secretariat, observing that they would probably be very happy to discuss this with him.

Mrs Lagauterie underlined that during the report on the OIML-CS, they had heard that there were not enough Utilizers. She therefore suggested that each RLMO circulated the information that they had been given during the meeting within their region in order to try to improve the situation.

Dr Miki said he was not sure he fully understood from the translation.

Dr Schwartz summarised, saying that Mrs Lagauterie was proposing that the RLMOs themselves should be responsible for disseminating the feedback from the RLMO Round Table meetings to their members. He thought this was a valid proposal.

There were no further questions. He thanked Dr Miki again and added that he had personally found the Round Table meeting very interesting, with excellent presentations, and he thought it was very worthwhile for the RLMOs to meet to share information without the need to take any decisions, or to make any recommendations. He said that 40 people had attended the RLMO Round Table meeting, and he was grateful that they had been able to offer the RLMOs this opportunity to share their information, and for each to see what the others were doing.

Mr Dunmill read:

The Committee,

Notes the report on the RLMO Round Table meeting given by its Chairperson.

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments on the wording of the resolution. There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was adopted unanimously.

9.2 Report by the BIML on activities with organisations in liaison

Dr Schwartz said that delegates had received Additional Meeting Document 15 on the liaison activities, and so he did not expect the presentation to cover all the details in this document. He asked Mr Dunmill to present a short report.

Mr Dunmill also drew delegates' attention to the information in the Additional Meeting Document. He wanted to highlight a few points, and to focus on one particular last-minute item of information. The AMD was split into reports on those international organisations with which the Bureau had a liaison

activity, and the regional organisations, and here he was not referring to RLMOs, as they were dealt with elsewhere.

Firstly he referred to the work with the BIPM. As stated in the report, the BIML held regular multilateral and bilateral meetings with the BIPM in March each year, and there was a close cooperation between the directors and between several members of staff of each organisation. This year had been special because of the revision of the SI, which had resulted in various discussions, but he also stated that he worked very closely with Mr Andy Henson on a number of activities, especially to do with the CEEMS work, and promotion of the OIML and BIPM at different events. He added that during the current year both of them had taken part in a well organised UNIDO event publicising World Metrology Day in Nigeria. On the same occasion, they had also participated in a television program about metrology, and the importance of metrology in quality infrastructure, and had given interviews which had been broadcast on the Nigerian evening news. It had been a good opportunity to publicise metrology as a whole. In the future, the BIPM would be closely involved in the revision of OIML D 1, which would be discussed when they talked about the projects later.

Secondly, with regard to the DCMAS Network of international organisations working in the field of metrology, accreditation and standardisation, Mr Dunmill reported that the OIML had chaired this group during the period 2016–2018, and would be handing over to ILAC and ISO/CASCO who would hold the chair for the next period. One of the most important things which had come out of the time the OIML had chaired this group had been the discussions (again in part due to a UNIDO-led initiative) to agree on a common definition of “quality infrastructure”, because this term was used by many different organisations with slightly different meanings, so it had been good to come together and agree upon a common definition. He acknowledged that there was always room for improvement in definitions, but at least there was now a common definition between the organisations working in the field. Following on from this discussion, the DCMAS Network (where the DC had originally stood for Developing Countries and second part, MAS, for Metrology, Accreditation, and Standardisation) had decided to widen its remit, and was now proposing to change its name to the “International Network on Quality Infrastructure”, or INetQI, which indicated that the “developing countries” part is being dropped from the name, but that the remit was being widened to include conformity assessment activities in particular, in which some of the organisations were heavily involved, especially the IEC. Unfortunately, due to conflicting timetables, the Network’s meeting this year would be taking place in November. However, in view of this wider remit, they had had a lot of interest from the World Bank and the WTO, and both of these organisations now intended to join this network. As those delegates who had been present since the beginning of the week for the seminar would know, the World Bank had been working on a document on quality infrastructure accompanied by a toolkit for its evaluation.

As far as ISO was concerned, Mr Dunmill wanted to highlight the fact that last year they had held their General Assembly in Berlin with the theme of “open minded, open for change” and at this meeting there had been a lot of discussion on how technical work within ISO should be conducted in the future. Following on from this, during the next two years they were now starting a pilot study of a virtual standards development platform to look at ways of using technology to carry out online collaboration during the development of standards. Mr Dunmill said that he considered this was something the OIML would follow closely to see how some of the aspects in ISO’s work could feed into improving the OIML’s own technical work. At the September 2018 ISO General Assembly, they had been complaining about the time of two years it took ISO technical committees to produce a standard, and Mr Dunmill said the idea was to improve on this by the use of online collaboration. He added that he thought this was definitely something that was worth taking note of.

With regard to UNIDO, he said that he had mentioned before that he had taken part in an event with them for World Metrology Day in May, and the cooperation would continue this year with an OIML-CS seminar which they also wanted to organise in Nigeria.

The World Trade Organisation would, as he had already said, be joining the INetQI in November, and they were increasingly interested in quality infrastructure matters. Mr Dunmill reported that both he, and Mr Henson or one of his team from the BIPM, attended the WTO Technical Barriers to Trade Committee meetings, at which the interest in metrology fluctuated, but they had noticed a generally

increasing interest in quality infrastructure matters, and an appreciation that metrology was at the root of this.

Finally, the last-minute piece of information was about the liaison they had had with the World Health Organisation. In the past this liaison had not been very active - the OIML sent them information, but had never received any in return. He had made several attempts to contact the WHO to forge a closer relationship, and just the previous Sunday, Mr Dunmill had managed to make successful contact with someone who was responsible for their medical devices division in Geneva, and he should be able to meet with them in November or December this year to discuss possible future collaboration between the two organisations. Their interest really was on the regulation of essential medical devices to ensure that all countries had access to safe, accurate measuring instruments, at least for the basic kinds of instrument, so it could well be a sound basis for cooperation with the OIML's technical work on medical instruments.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Dunmill for his comprehensive report. He said that before inviting questions he wanted to add three points. With regard to the BIPM, he said they had just added the Joint Declaration on Metrological Traceability to the Additional Meeting Documents. This was going to be signed by the BIPM, the OIML, ILAC and ISO. He said delegates had received the draft declaration as an annex to Additional Meeting Document 6. Secondly, he wanted to mention the European Commission and WELMEC Working Group 8, which were mentioned in the written report. He thought they needed a mechanism for detecting that the normative documents identified by the European Commission, and published in their Official Journal, were out of date. The example of water meters (R 49) had been mentioned, and he said they needed a mechanism to trigger an update of the information published in the Official Journal. The European Commission itself did not know if a Recommendation was out of date, and he thought there should be a process that could be followed, he suggested through WELMEC. He was not sure of the solution, but considered that it was in the interests of the OIML that those Recommendations that were mentioned in the Official Journal were up to date. He wondered whether Mrs Lagauterie had a proposal or comment on this point.

Mrs Lagauterie explained that within WELMEC, when OIML Recommendations were revised, they continuously identified changes which might be necessary to the appropriate "corresponding tables" published by WELMEC, and the table for R 49 *Water meters*, was currently under revision and should be adopted and published in the Official Journal before the end of the year.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mrs Lagauterie for this good news. He said that he had not been aware of this, and thought that Members would be interested to know that this would be properly taken into account. He added that the last point he wanted to mention was the representation of the OIML on the Joint Committee for Guides in Metrology (JCGM). He said there were two Working Groups, JCGM-WG1, which dealt with the Guide on Uncertainty in Measurement (GUM), and JCGM-WG2, which dealt with the International Vocabulary of Metrology (VIM). He informed delegates that he had sent a letter to CIML Members asking for nominations for more representatives for both working groups, because the OIML could nominate three people to each committee. Currently, Dr Ehrlich and Mr Mussio represented the OIML on JCGM-WG1 and Dr Jerzy Borzyminski (Poland) and Dr Ehrlich represented the OIML on JCGM-WG2, with Dr Ehrlich acting as this group's convener. He reported that he had received four nominations for WG1, from Germany, Russia, India, and Japan. He had received three nominations for WG2 from Germany, Russia, and India. He continued that they had discussed this at the Presidential Council meeting which had been held on the Sunday before the CIML meeting. He considered that each of the nominees had sufficient expertise, and said that they had considered the letters of motivation, and letters of support from the respective CIML Members. They had come to the conclusion that the most appropriate candidates would be, for WG 1, Dr Tanaka from Japan, and for WG2 they had accepted the Russian proposal of Dr Anna Chunovkina. He added that Dr Chunovkina had a good background in metrology, vocabulary, and politics. He wanted to thank all the countries that had nominated representatives, especially Japan. He suggested that delegates take a resolution later in the meeting to confirm these nominations. He added that as this was related to the OIML's liaison activities, he had wanted to put forward these proposals under this item. He asked if there were any questions either about the report from Mr Dunmill, or the proposals and additional remarks he had made.

Mr Dixit stated that one term that had been used was “quality infrastructure” and he considered that various organisations defined this word in different ways. He hoped that for legal metrology, the OIML along with the BIPM, were ensuring that was defined in a way that was relevant and valuable in the field of legal metrology.

Mr Dunmill replied that this had been precisely why the DCMAS Network, as it had still been called at the time, which consisted of ten international organisations working in the field of metrology, accreditation, standardisation and conformity assessment, had got together with UNIDO and the World Bank to discuss this, and had come up with a common definition, so that there was not a divergence between the different organisations in their use of the term.

Dr Schwartz asked if there were any other comments. There were no more questions so he asked Mr Dixit if he wanted to make a final comment.

Mr Dixit said they were developing a vocabulary of legal metrology and the term quality infrastructure should also be defined, and he considered this should be carried out by OIML and the BIPM together, rather than with any other organisations. He considered it should be enough to include these two organisations, together with perhaps ISO in order to produce a definition that was workable.

Mr Dunmill reassured Mr Dixit that both the OIML and BIPM had been part of the discussions, as had been ISO, IEC, ILAC, the World Bank and UNIDO.

Dr Schwartz intervened. He said they were running a little behind time, and reassured Mr Dixit that his comment would be taken back to the INetQI. He had just been reminded that there was also a definition in the VIM. He did not think there was any need to go into this in further detail at present. He added that time was limited, and considered that they should conclude this item.

Mr Dunmill read:

The Committee,

Notes the report on activities with organizations in liaison given by the BIML.

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments on the wording of the resolution. There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was adopted unanimously.

Moving on to the JCGM, and following the supplementary information that Dr Schwartz had given delegates, the following resolution had been written. Mr Dunmill read:

The Committee,

Noting the information from its President concerning the OIML’s participation in JCGM WG1 and WG2,

Approves the nominations of Dr. Hideyuki Tanaka (Japan) for WG1 and Dr. Anna Chunovkina (Russian Federation) for WG2, and

Requests the BIML Director to inform the JCGM secretary of this decision.

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments on the wording of the resolution. There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was adopted unanimously.

9.3 Updates by organisations in liaison

Dr Schwartz said they there were three high level representatives from IEC, ILAC and IAF who he would like to make their presentations before lunch under this item. Firstly he invited Mr Frans Vreeswijk, the General Secretary and CEO of IEC to make his presentation on the highlights of the IEC’s current work.

IEC

Mr Vreeswijk greeted the President and delegates. He said it was a great pleasure and honour to be at the CIML meeting and to explain the work of the IEC to them, and he looked forward to future collaboration between the two organisations, because that was really what they were aiming for.

As he was sure all delegates would know, “IEC” stood for International Electrotechnical Commission, but what not all of them may know so well was that the IEC had two main activities. Since 1906, when they were founded, they had been developing International Standards, but since 1974, the IEC had been operating global certification services, starting with electronic components. The IEC was an international organisation, with a central office as well as regional offices, which were now spread across six continents.

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 in more situations. The IEC always looked at safety, interoperability, electromagnetic interference, responsible use of hazardous substances, waste management, and the environment.

At present, economic growth directly depended on the ability of industry to successfully sell within a country, and increasingly beyond a country. Manufacturers and suppliers must not only satisfy consumer needs and regulatory requirements, but also the requirements of other manufacturers and suppliers in business-to-business transactions. To create confidence and acceptance, all of this entailed testing and verification, which the IEC systems enabled. Without standards and verification, it would be impossible to ensure quality, safety, and overall risk management.

The IEC’s sister international organisation was ISO, and both developed international standards using similar procedures. Whilst the IEC mainly developed international standards in the electrotechnical domain, and ISO mainly developed international standards for quality management systems, they also sometimes worked together, such as for the ISO/IEC 17000 series of international standards on conformity assessment. The IEC did more than this though. Unlike ISO, the IEC had two pillars. It developed international standards, and it operated global conformity assessment services. The IEC recognised the value of standards, but it also recognised that in most cases, using standards equated to doing conformity assessment. When a manufacturer, an end user, or an independent third party used a standard to check a product or service, they were performing conformity assessment. In this way, standards and conformity assessment were like two sides of a coin, neither having value without the other. Only together did standards and conformity assessment create the greatest the value.

The IEC helped industry to get access to foreign markets. It did this by operating international certification schemes, and products were tested and services were assessed by commercial conformity assessment bodies anywhere in the world, and the results were recognised anywhere in the world. An IEC conformity assessment (CA) system certificate was like a passport to the world. Mr Vreeswijk explained that the IEC had four global conformity assessment systems, which were IECEE, IECEx, IECQ, and IECRE.

The most recent one was the IECRE system, where “RE” stood for “renewable energy”. This covered the wind, marine and solar PV markets. The market driver for the existence of this CA system, was the trillions of dollars that were being invested in renewable energy. The investors and insurers wanted to manage their financial risk by ensuring that the world’s best practices were being used. They considered that the IEC CA systems’ operation model was the world’s best practice at this time.

The oldest of the IEC’s four systems was the IECEE, for electrotechnical goods. The main scheme was the CB scheme, and the main market driver was facilitating access to the market for manufacturers and suppliers. Its main activity was type testing, and issuing certificates based on test reports.

IECQ, where “Q” stood for “quality” was a global conformity assessment service for supply chain qualification in the electronics sector. IECQ helped industry, including for example the LED lighting industry, the automotive industry and the avionics industry, to efficiently manage their electronic

component supply chains. Mr Vreeswijk said that delegates all travelled around the world in aircraft that were made safer because of IECQ.

Lastly, but certainly not least, was IECEx. This was the system for equipment used in explosive environments. It ran four schemes, which Mr Vreeswijk indicated on a slide. These four certification schemes included not only testing, but also facility inspection, quality management, process assessment, personal confidence certification, and more. Mr Vreeswijk said that in 2011, the United Nations Economic Committee for Europe (UNECE), had published its Common Regulatory Objectives. This had been a model for the Ex sector, and had endorsed IECEx as the world's best practice. This clear message from the UNECE had placed a formal recommendation on Member States that were considering new or revised regulations in the field of equipment or services for explosive atmospheres to use the IEC as well as ISO international standards, supported by IECEx certification. This had resulted in some regulators amending their regulations, including the United States Coast Guard, who require foreign-flagged vessels entering US waters to have IECEx certified equipment, as an alternative to their US national approvals; the UAE, who had made amendments to their domestic regulations to accept IECEx; and Australia which had made an amendment to formally accept the IECEx in areas including underground coal mining and the petrochemical industry.

These were all examples where the UNECE Common Regulatory Objective publication had been put into practice. Mr Vreeswijk said it was the operational model of the IEC global CA systems which was considered to be the world's best practice. This created a framework, into which professional certification bodies, testing labs, inspection bodies, auditing bodies and so on, from around the world, would be able to work together in a team structure.

The IEC itself did not do the testing, nor the certification, professional bodies did that. This was very similar to the way in which standards were developed by ISO. Neither organisation itself wrote the standards, which were developed by volunteer technical experts. The subject matter experts, who participated in the writing of the standards, also carried out the testing. The fundamental value of the IEC global CA systems they created was consistent and comparable to conformity assessment resources anywhere in the world. This was achieved through two activities. Firstly, all participants came together to determine a common understanding and interpretation of the standards, which they then documented, as well as common rules and methodologies for testing and assessment. Secondly, they conducted peer assessments, to ensure that the common interpretation was correctly understood, and more importantly that the common rules and methodologies were being applied. Thirdly, full transparency of operation procedures was there. In some areas, such as IECEx, certificates were available online, which helped in identifying counterfeit certificates. These all led to the achievement of a consistent, comparable CA result worldwide.

Mr Vreeswijk stated that the OIML and the IEC were similar. They both replied to societal needs. Legal metrology was an essential activity which helped to ensure fair trade, and which facilitated commerce. The IEC's CA activities were also essential in the facilitation of world trade. Both organisations had extensive experience in establishing, operating and creating value, using global conformity assessment schemes. The two organisations were also very complementary. For this reason, the updated MoU, which was going to be signed at the current meeting, sought to open opportunities for possible collaboration between the two organisations in the area of conformity assessment activities, where synergies could be achieved. As a tangible step towards this goal, Dr Schwartz and Mr Dixon had both attended the IECEx management meetings held in Cannes in September, at which the IECEx had agreed to propose to the OIML the establishment of a joint ad hoc working group, to pursue joint discussions on practical conformity assessment methods in the field of Ex, noting that there were measuring instruments that fell under the scope of both the IECEx scheme and the OIML-CS scheme, for instance petrol dispensers, flow meters, etc.

Mr Vreeswijk said that the IEC was very encouraged by the fact that the international Ex community had agreed to propose this initiative to the OIML, and he hoped the CIML would also support this. They anticipated the achievement of a win-win cooperation, which would create value for their respective stakeholders, and he said they foresaw a long and productive collaboration together. He thanked delegates for their attention.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Vreeswijk for his comprehensive and interesting report on the IEC's outlook on improved and closer cooperation. He asked if there were any questions or comments.

Dr Klenovský asked whether closer cooperation on measuring instruments, such as DC electricity meters, and charges for electromobility, could be assumed between the OIML and the IEC.

Mr Vreeswijk replied that this could definitely be the case. He suggested that they started small, looking at the first pilot project, to ensure that collaboration is possible, but he was sure there were many more areas where it would fit, and certainly they could work others out, and develop them, assuming that things went well in the future.

Dr Schwartz suggested that the probable order of events would be the signing of the MoU and the agreement on a joint working group, and then they would identify possible subjects which were suitable for a pilot project, and he considered that the DC electricity meters were certainly a good example to start this collaboration as a pilot project.

Since this concluded Mr Vreeswijk's report, Dr Schwartz thanked him again, stating that he was looking forward to the signing ceremony. He added that delegates had received more detailed information about the cooperation with the IEC, not only in the report that had been provided by Mr Dunmill in Additional Meeting Document 15, but also in Additional Meeting Document 16, which had been prepared by Mr Dixon. This report also contained a draft resolution, which Dr Schwartz said he wanted to show to delegates now. This touched on the proposal to establish a joint working group. He wanted to read this resolution in order that it could be approved later:

“The Committee,

Noting the proposal from the IECEx management committee,

Decides to establish a joint working group with the IECEx, to explore synergies and opportunities for cooperation,

Requests one or two representatives of the OIML to serve on the joint working group,

Requests the OIML representative to report to the CIML on the activities,” and so forth...

A proposal had been discussed when he and Mr Dixon had attended the IECEx Management Committee meeting in Cannes two weeks prior to the current CIML meeting which had suggested that the two representatives could be Mr Dixon, in his function as OIML-CS Executive Secretary, and for the time being, in order to start the discussions, himself as the convener. He also wanted to mention that the revised MoU had been circulated to delegates as Additional Meeting Document 2. He stated that this was the document that would be signed later, before lunch. He concluded that this was all the information he wished to convey regarding the cooperation with the IEC. He verified that there were no more comments.

Dr Schwartz suggested delegates now listened to the update from ILAC. The ILAC chairperson, Ms Merih Malmqvist Nilsson, was going to make this presentation.

ILAC

Ms. Malmqvist Nilsson introduced herself. She said she was attending this meeting in her role as the ILAC chair, but added that she had a parallel life, in which she worked for the Swedish accreditation body, which was also the regulating authority for legal metrology. She stated that her first encounter with legal metrology had been in 1985, when she had been a young engineer, aged 32, and she had been supposed to speak to a group of businessmen from all over Asia, about new SI units. It had been at a time when the British had said they were “becoming metric inch by inch”, which meant that it had been a long time ago!

What she had not realised was that there was a concept called “legal metrology”, because one of the gentlemen had asked how much of this was regulated, and she said she had replied “Regulated? We don't regulate how the industry works, they calibrate to their needs.” The response to this had been negative, and thus she had realised there was the concept of legal metrology, where things were

regulated, and she remarked that this was something which should be brought into the training of engineers in universities, so they learned about the BIPM, the OIML, metrology, traceability, and legal metrology.

Unfortunately, she considered there was still a long way to go in this direction. In 1993, SWEDAC had become the regulating authority in this field. Ms. Malmqvist Nilsson continued that ILAC was an organisation which organises all the accreditation bodies in the fields of laboratory tests, calibrations, inspection bodies, but also proficiency testing, as well as reference material producers. She said ILAC's product was a Mutual Recognition Arrangement (MRA), and their vision was that accreditation in one country would have acceptance all over the world. She added that ILAC's members proudly stated that they accept each other's accreditations, reports, and certificates issued by accredited bodies, if they were signatories of the same multilateral agreement.

However, at the end of the day it was the market that did the acceptance. Whether they accepted each other was irrelevant for the market, so what they had to do was to make sure that they did their best by preparing for the mutual recognition of certificates and reports in the market by users, and this was the end goal, the vision they were working towards.

She showed delegates a map of the coverage of the ILAC MRA, and commented that the dark blue parts indicated places where there were accreditation bodies which were signatories of the MRA. This meant they would have gone through a peer evaluation process by their regional bodies, and then the regional body itself had gone through a peer evaluation, an evaluation process through ILAC, and IAF. Ms. Malmqvist Nilsson said that before she had come to this meeting, she had compared this map from 2018 with the one from 2014, and there were some new countries that had changed their status and become signatories to the MRA, which had made ILAC very happy. This coverage now meant that they had 99 ILAC MRA signatories, representing 102 economies. At the present time there were almost 68 000 accredited laboratories, and 9 500 inspection bodies covering testing, calibration, and inspection, and the signatories represent 95 % of global GDP. All in all, they were a network of members including 155 accreditation bodies from 126 economies, and of these, 99 were full members, which meant they were MRA signatories, 14 were associates, 12 were affiliates, 24 were stakeholders, and there were 6 regional cooperations.

Ms. Malmqvist Nilsson said that she knew delegates had received a more detailed report about the latest developments so she was not going to repeat this, but for the purposes of this presentation, she would keep to a more abstract level. She indicated to delegates the logos of ILAC's regional organisations, those that were recognised by both ILAC and IAF, as well as those that were recognised only by ILAC, or only by IAF. This was historical since some of them worked only within the remit of certification and accreditation, and others worked in all areas of conformity assessment, so this was why there was some overlap between the two global organisations that harmonise accreditation activities. The hard work of peer evaluation was carried out by the regional organisations, and she indicated these to delegates on a slide, but she said ILAC evaluated the regions for the purposes of global recognition.

Ms. Malmqvist Nilsson said that ILAC, like many organisations, had a world accreditation day, which was held on 9 June every year. She pointed out that there was a mistake on her slide, which should have referred to World Accreditation Day 2017 on the theme of *Delivering confidence in construction*. In 2018 the theme was *Delivering a safer world*. Ms. Malmqvist Nilsson said they tried to encourage all members to celebrate this day, as it gave an opportunity for the economy to become acquainted with the concept of accreditation as a way of achieving acceptable results in testing, calibration, and inspection. The global accreditation system was being used by many organisations, and Ms. Malmqvist Nilsson added that ILAC, IAF, ISO, IEC, INetQI and IIOC had decided to cooperate in making accreditation visible to those who were not acquainted with how it could be used. Examples of usage, both on the regulatory side, and on the business side, could be found on the two links that were indicated on her slide, and which delegates could look up later.

Ms. Malmqvist Nilsson said that ILAC also had a number of MoU partners, and some of them were very high profile organisations, such as the OIML itself, and the World Anti-Doping Agency, the clinical chemists, as well as IEC, ISO and so on.

At this stage, Ms. Malmqvist Nilsson said she wanted to return to the subject of cooperation with the OIML. She stated that the two organisations had had an MoU for a number of years, and added that they were going to sign a revised version of it later during the current meeting. She said that the goal of the MoU was firstly “to mutually acknowledge our roles in the global quality infrastructure”. The second goal of the MoU was to make sure that they “encourage and promote the use of competent conformity assessment bodies in legal metrology services”. Finally, they also wanted to “emphasise the importance of the OIML Certification System and of the ILAC Mutual Recognition Arrangement”. In this way they could serve the businesses of today around the world.

Ms. Malmqvist Nilsson said that ILAC also had a joint working program with the OIML, the main goal of which was to make sure that they decreased or eliminated unnecessary burdens on economic actors. To this end, they had a joint assessment procedure in the field of legal metrology, and here she highlighted the recent developments. She said this had been revised in January 2018 to take account of the new OIML Certification System. The revised procedure had been published in February, and ILAC would now be asking their MRA signatories for nominations for team leaders and technical experts that wished to participate in the OIML peer assessment procedure.

ILAC representatives had also attended the first meeting of the OIML-CS Management Committee which had taken place in March 2018, and there was a scheduled review in progress of OIML D 10 / ILAC G24.

Finally, Ms. Malmqvist Nilsson discussed the joint declarations with the BIPM and the OIML. These promoted the use of the three existing multi-lateral or mutual recognition arrangements, as well as the declaration on metrological traceability. She specified that the latter was built on the 2006 tripartite statement, and presented the principles that should be used when demonstrating metrological traceability for international acceptance. This document had been revised during 2018 and would be published in the near future. Ms. Malmqvist Nilsson said that she had known some of the people at this meeting for a long time, for example she had met Dr Schwartz over 20 years ago when he had been chairing a WELMEC working group. She commented that at the time she had not known much about legal metrology, but had done a lot of learning since then! What she had realised, having listened to the discussions which had taken place during the day, was that global organisations had the same problems, such as what to do about unpaid dues, and complaints about the organisation spending too much, or too little. In summary, she said organisations appeared to be “damned if you do and damned if you don’t”, and noted that the OIML and ILAC were struggling with similar problems. She also added that the complaints about the costs of administration, and of secretariats, were also common to international organisations, but reminded delegates that the secretariats of global organisations were their institutional memories. She remarked that Presidents and chairs came and went, and joked that even Directors came and went, but the secretariats remain, and without them there would not be an institutional memory, and they would not receive the service they were used to getting on an everyday basis. This was the continuity that the organisation had.

She thanked delegates for their attention and for the invitation to make a presentation. She added that it had been a pleasure to be present and reiterated her thanks, specifically to her friends, colleagues and the management of the CIML, BIML and OIML.

Dr Schwartz thanked Ms. Malmqvist Nilsson for her report, which he noted had been submitted before the meeting so they had been able to supply it to delegates as Additional Meeting Document 9. He asked if delegates had any questions.

Mr Khedir thanked Ms. Malmqvist Nilsson for her presentation, which he had found very interesting. He said he had two points that he wanted her to clarify if possible. The first concerned the ISO/IEC 17025 standard and its impact on OIML Recommendations as well as the work and output of organisations involved in legal metrology. He asked if there was a common program between the OIML and ILAC. He pointed out that if there were similar common points, could this be connected with his proposition that Tunisia could hold a seminar on this subject. The second point concerned scientific metrology and the BIPM and was a question which had been raised in AFRIMETS. He said that if a laboratory, for example in Tunisia, wanted to submit CMCs to the BIPM for inclusion in their KCDB, it must be audited by auditors designated by an NMI and not by auditors designated by the accreditation

body. In Tunisia, their laboratory was accredited by TUNAC, the national accreditation council. This laboratory had been audited by an auditor from a laboratory which was not an NMI. AFRIMETS had therefore recommended to carry out a peer review. He said he did not understand this approach – on one hand they were recognised, and on the other hand they had been obliged to repeat the audit using an auditor from an NMI.

Ms. Malmqvist Nilsson thanked Mr Khedir for his question and verified that it would be acceptable to him if she answered in English. With regard to his first point, Ms. Malmqvist Nilsson said that as soon as there was a new version of a standard, they planned to re-issue any declaration they had which referred to the old version of the standard. This was ongoing with ISO, and she was sure it would be ongoing with the OIML and the BIPM and all those involved in the traceability arena. In particular with ISO because they had a declaration relating to ISO 9001, and the extent to which ISO/IEC 17025 adhered to the principles of ISO 9001 would be reviewed. However, she stressed that this type of work took time, so there was no new version available at the moment. With regard to Mr Khedir's point regarding training, she said that usually ILAC did not arrange training programmes for its members at that level. The training programmes were usually arranged by the regional organisations, and local accreditation bodies, so if there was a need for a training on ISO/IEC 17025:2017, this would be undertaken by the local accreditation body or by the regional bodies, but not necessarily by ILAC. Having said that, Ms. Malmqvist Nilsson said she wanted to add that they had a joint committee between ILAC and IAF for developing countries, and during its meetings this committee sometimes organised short reviews of the differences between the old and new versions of standards. She added that she did not think there was anything stopping ILAC, together with the OIML, having a training programme if that was requested by members in general.

With regard to Mr Khedir's final point regarding the BIPM, Ms. Malmqvist Nilsson stated that these were two parallel systems, and national metrology institutes were not globally recognised unless their CMC's had been through the evaluation process of the BIPM. Otherwise, they could still be an actor in the market, competing with all other accredited calibration laboratories, and apply for accreditation. Their traceability might not be to the BIPM, but it had to be acknowledged globally, so they had to find some way of obtaining that, and being an accredited calibration laboratory did not mean that they were recognised as a national metrology institute by the BIPM.

Dr Schwartz considered that these answers had been very comprehensive, and since they were running out of time, he just wanted to make a comment on Mr Khedir's first question which had been about the impact of the change, and the revision of ISO/IEC 17025 on OIML Recommendations, which of course was very important for the OIML-CS. He pointed out that D 30 is currently being revised to align with ISO/IEC 17025:2017. He again thanked Ms. Malmqvist Nilsson, adding that it had been a pleasure to have her at the meeting and saying that he was looking forward to the signature of the MoU.

IAF

Dr Schwartz invited the chairperson of the IAF, Xiao Jianhua, to give his report.

Mr Xiao Jianhua noticed that his was the final report before the signing ceremony and lunch. He said he was pleased to have been invited to attend this CIML meeting, adding that it was not the first time he had attended an OIML meeting. He said that the previous year he had attended the OIML-CS seminar in Shanghai, which had been helpful to his understanding of the new OIML-CS. Actually this was the main area in which the IAF supported the activities of the OIML. He continued that IAF and ILAC were sister organisations for accreditation, with different scopes. He said there were a lot of similarities between IAF and ILAC and said that Ms. Malmqvist Nilsson had already described a lot of the joint activities between them, so he would not repeat this, which demonstrated the co-operation between the two organisations.

The IAF was concerned mainly with accreditation in the field of certification, validation and verification. The main objective of the IAF was to operate a worldwide mutual recognition arrangement among accreditation bodies, for the global acceptance of certification, validation and verification so as to facilitate trade, support regulators, protect consumers and the environment, and also to facilitate

sustainable development. Also, as Ms. Malmqvist Nilsson had already said, accreditation bodies of the IAF family were deemed competent through a peer evaluation process based on relevant ISO/IEC conformity assessment standards and also on IAF/ILAC requirements. The signatories of the IAF family must also recognise certificates and test results issued by conformity assessment bodies accredited by other IAF family signatories as equally reliable. In the same way as ILAC, the IAF family was structured as a global network to build on existing and developing regional mutual recognition arrangements.

Currently there were six regional groups, which he said Ms. Malmqvist Nilsson had also mentioned, as there was a lot of overlap in membership. The IAF family recognised five of these six regional accreditation groups, based on peer evaluations. Currently IAF had 107 members, of which 68 were MRA signatories, which had accredited more than 7400 certifications of verification bodies. Regarding the coverage of the IAF family Mr Xiao said that it currently it covered the four main scopes with nine subscopes. They had two levels. For the main scopes there was one for management system certification, product certification, certification of persons, and also greenhouse gas validation and verification. At the next level the subscopes were for specific certification or verification schemes. Currently the subscopes covered management systems certification based on ISO standards for quality, the environment, food safety, information security, energy, and the quality of medical devices, as well as for those private international schemes for feed safety, agricultural products, and also management system auditors. There would be more subscopes, specific certification schemes, added in the near future.

Currently IAF was in the process of establishing IAF CertSearch, which was a global database for accreditation management system certification. It would provide a single source for all accreditation certifications issued by certain bodies accredited by IAF accreditation body members. It was expected that this database would be operational around the end of 2018.

In co-operation with ILAC, ISO, IEC and also relevant international certification body associations, the IAF had established two specialised websites to showcase the value of relevant standards, accreditation, and conformity assessment. He added that Ms. Malmqvist Nilsson had also already mentioned these two websites, but wanted to emphasise this was one of the examples of collaboration between the relevant global actors in quality infrastructure, to jointly promote the development of the interrelated components of quality infrastructure which served the needs of globalisation and sustainable development. He added that cooperation with other relevant international organisations was very important, and said he had always attached great importance to this cooperation and they were very pleased to maintain a long-term partnership with the OIML in the field of legal metrology.

IAF alone, or jointly with ILAC, had actively engaged with other international organisations including in the fields of standardisation, trade, economic cooperation, and in industrial development, as well as those organisations operating international certification or verification schemes. He remarked that these included the electrical and electronics industry, information and telecommunications industry, automotive industry, aerospace industry, food and agriculture and feed industry and also forest industry – so a lot of international organisations having their own international certification schemes. The IAF family had contributed to the worldwide operation of these conformity assessment schemes. Regarding cooperation with the OIML, Mr Xiao Jianhua commented that this was very important for the IAF. He said they would shortly be signing the updated MoU, and he reflected that the first MoU between IAF/ILAC and the OIML had been signed in 2010, then updated again in 2014, in Vancouver. He added that the IAF and ILAC had a similar MoU with IEC, which also supported the IEC conformity assessment systems, so he commented that this demonstrated they were all inter-related actors in the global quality infrastructure that cooperated with each other to collectively maximise the value of quality infrastructure as a whole.

In order to support the new OIML-CS, the OIML and IAF were working together to develop a joint IAF/OIML assessment procedure in the sphere of legal metrology. In this regard Mr Dixon had made a great effort, and he added that Mr Dixon had attended several meetings of relevant IAF working groups as well as a committee, so as to push forward the development of this joint procedure.

Last, but not least, he wanted to thank Dr Schwartz again for the support and cooperation between the OIML and the IAF. He said that the IAF/ILAC joint assembly would be held on 29 October the

following year in Frankfurt, Germany, and he invited Dr Schwartz to attend this. He thanked delegates for their attention.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Xiao Jianhua for his report and asked if there were any comments or questions, but there were none.

BIPM

Dr Schwartz welcomed the Director of the International Liaison Communication Department at the BIPM, Mr Henson.

Mr Henson thanked Dr Schwartz, and thanked the CIML for the opportunity to speak to them. He added that of course, the liaison with the OIML, their sister organisation for metrology, was one the most important liaisons that the BIPM had, and it was always a pleasure to come and see so many faces that he knew well, as well as new ones. He thought they were familiar enough with the BIPM that he did not really need to describe their mission in any detail. He highlighted that he had found the CIML discussions very interesting, because the OIML was currently having a debate on the role of capacity building, and the BIPM had also gone through this process. The way the BIPM considered this was that their mission was underpinned by their capacity building activities. This meant that these activities were not an objective in their own right, but rather underpinned the other elements of their mission. For the BIPM, Mr Henson reported that membership was going well, and they now had 60 Member States as well as 42 Associates. Even looking at the current year alone, Ethiopia, Kuwait, Uzbekistan and Tanzania had joined them as an Associates; Montenegro and Ukraine, previously Associate States, had acceded and become Member States. He reported that it was very pleasing to see Associates becoming Member States. However, he commented that it had not all been successful, as they had had to exclude one state at the beginning of the year for persistent non-payment of its subscriptions as an Associate, and he said it was quite likely that they would lose a Member State in November, at the General Conference, for the same reason.

Mr Henson considered that delegates were all aware of the CIPM MRA, and added it was probably one of their most important outreach initiatives, which was linked very strongly with ILAC, who then enabled metrological traceability to be ensured down to the “workface”. He added that delegates would be aware that the CIPM had been reviewing the operation of the MRA, and that this review was now broadly complete, adding that they had implemented many of the changes. Some elements were still being implemented, such as the new database which should come online in late 2019. He stated that overall things were very well advanced, and they were pleased with the results, especially since it had led to a reduction in the workload. He said there had been a lot of redundancy in the reviews, which they were trying to remove, as well as planning more strategically what they did in terms of the comparisons.

The big focus for the BIPM, and he commented that it felt like “day and night focus” right now, was the 26th General Conference on Weights and Measures, which would take place in the middle of November. It would be in the same location as it had been the previous time, in the Palais des Congrès in Versailles. He said they had five draft resolutions, which had been circulated to the Member States back in February, but the one that was catching all the headlines was of course the revision of the SI, the International System of Units, including redefinition of four of the base units, which was now being proposed after many years of scientific work. He considered that there was now scientific agreement on this revision, and it now only required the diplomatic decision at the CGPM in order to actually adopt the changes. At the General Conference, their key partners would be speaking, notably the OIML, represented by Dr Schwartz, ILAC represented by Ms. Merih Malmquist Nilsson, and ISO represented by Mr Sergio Mujica their Secretary General, amongst other notable speakers. He also noted that, whilst the General Conference was a closed diplomatic event, the Friday morning, when the decision on the revision of the SI would be made, would be open and delegates could apply for a ticket to be there, although availability would depend on how many people wanted to attend. He also pointed out that they would be streaming the event live on YouTube, so metrologists (or anyone else who was interested) anywhere in the world would be able to watch the couple of hours of keynote speeches, including Nobel prize winners, as well as the actual decision process. He joked that he was not sure it was going to be

that riveting for the outside world, but added that there had been a lot of interest from the press, including television stations. He said he did not intend to spend a lot of time on the revision of the SI, because he and others had covered the salient points many times, and many OIML people were intimately involved, but it was easily the biggest and most significant change since the inception of the SI back in 1960, and it was very pleasing that the very hard work had reached a conclusion. Mr Henson said there was information explaining the proposed changes on the BIPM website, and for most people it was hard to explain that on the one hand nothing much changes, and on the other everything changes. He said he tended to describe it as being a bit like a relay race. When you hand the baton over, the runners have to be at the same velocity at that moment, but the new baton holder has fresh new legs to run off into the future. Mr Henson noted that although the decision would be taken in November 2018, the adoption would only come into force on 20 May 2019, primarily because of small changes in the values of the electrical units. This really only had an impact at the SI level, and for one or two top level manufacturers, so it did not have a wide impact. Mr Henson said he was often asked why it was necessary to define the SI units at all, and why they had been revised now. He said he wanted to show delegates two diagrams, which he thought indicated something quite interesting. The first diagram showed the actual mass CMCs declared by two of the leading NMIs. Delegates would see that the lowest uncertainty was, not surprisingly, where they defined the unit of one kilogram. So when NMIs claimed how good they were at mass, what they really meant was that they were good at mass at one kilogram.

Mr Henson continued that when measurements were needed at values other than one kilogram, as people in this community would well understand, multiples and submultiples were needed, and these would add to the uncertainty each time, so very quickly the uncertainty increased. On the upper end of the scale, this was not really a problem because they had the precision they needed, but there was enormous interest now in reducing these uncertainties at the micro-, and even at the sub micro-level. The new definitions allow for the possibility to develop technology to do this, since values other than a kilogram could be defined. They could start to look at using Watt balances, or even some other technology, at microgram level or at whatever level the technology could work at. This was opening up possibilities for significant improvements in uncertainty in the future.

Mr Henson said that the second diagram was the logarithmic improvement, over about 100 years or so, in the traditional temperature scale, and this had improved by a factor of about ten. He pointed out that the bluish dots, which were not joined up, showed the reduction in the uncertainty of the Boltzmann constant. This showed a massive improvement, to the point where they were now able to do much better with the Boltzmann constant than they were with traditional temperature scales. In summary this indicated that they now had better ways of doing things than the traditional ways. So these were two good explanations of why they wanted to revise the SI at all, and why now was a good time to make the change.

Mr Henson said he also particularly wanted to mention World Metrology Day, which was a joint project with the OIML, and the staff of the BIPM worked very closely with him on this, notably Mr Pulham. This annual event had increased in importance over the years, and was particularly of interest to those countries in the early stages of establishing their metrology systems because they could use World Metrology Day as an event to raise awareness. Mr Henson noted that he had visited the laboratories of some of those present on, or around World Metrology Day, and had attended events with ministers, press, TV interviews and so on. He said he would encourage those delegates that had not so far organised anything for WMD to do so, because it was a really good opportunity, and they should think about it in the future. Mr Henson reported that each year, a different Regional Metrology Body was their partner, on a rotational basis, and for 2019, the Asia Pacific region, represented by Hong Kong (China) was the partner. They had developed a draft poster, and had nearly finalised the strapline for it, which meant that he hoped this project would be quite advanced by the end of the year.

Mr Henson stated that capacity building had been a major theme for the BIPM, as it had been for the OIML, and he said he had already given a more detailed presentation about this during the CEEMS Advisory Group meeting, so he said he was now going to be quite brief. He added that the BIPM faced many of the same challenges as the OIML. They had too few of their Member States carrying too much of the burden, which was equivalent to the OIML struggling to find conveners, and for the BIPM this

applied to chairs, and leaders of comparisons, so they needed to broaden the pool of people who were prepared to do these things. Doing capacity building helped to do that, and they also needed the new arrivals to engage effectively in the system. Mr Henson explained that at the moment the BIPM had no funding at all for capacity building. Everything they had done had been on a sponsorship basis, but he did not consider this was sustainable in the long run. The BIPM considered that its core activities, the things which were necessary to make the CIPM MRA operate effectively, should fall inside the funded envelope, and for that reason they were asking for a small increase in the dotation in November, to help them to implement this. They had been very fortunate that NIST (USA) had given the BIPM a very significant grant to enable activities to get under way, but they could not be expected to do this for every cycle. Many other NMIs had also provided support. Mr Henson added that he thought that in the same way as training OIML Project Group conveners was core to the OIML activities, training technical committee chairs and so on was core to the BIPM's activities. He said that if they received the additional money, the BIPM would be able to carry out all the core activities in a funded way, although they would continue with the sponsor-based activities addressing specific topics of interest. He added that he would be happy to answer any questions from those CIML delegates who would be in the delegations at the General Conference on Weights and Measures in November.

He said there was a long list of things on which the BIPM and OIML collaborated, and he commented that his slide on this subject was probably not even complete. He said they had a really good working relationship, and he specifically mentioned the many projects he carried out in conjunction with Mr Dunmill. He specifically mentioned the work they had carried out in Nigeria with senior representatives from that country, but also the work with the WTO, as well as general information exchanges, adding that they helped each other out quite a lot. He said he had not included a picture of it in his presentation, but said they had produced a joint brochure on *The role of metrology in support of the Sustainable Development Goals*, which had been published by UNIDO, but which had been written by largely by the BIPM with input from the BIML, and which delegates could download from the UNIDO website, saying that it had been used quite widely. He said for the BIPM, this close relationship was very effective, and indeed in their draft work program, where they talked about the liaison department, which was his department, they had written that they considered this to be an increasingly close relationship in recent years, recognising that although the missions of the two Organisations were complementary, they were not the same mission.

However, cooperation meant that they were able to present a much more integrated view to the outside world, particularly in the context of Quality Infrastructure. With regard to some questions that had been asked earlier at this meeting, he wanted to make it clear that the BIPM and the BIML/OIML had played a very significant role in getting this joint definition of Quality Infrastructure agreed, and whilst the wording was not necessarily exactly as they would have written it, it was pretty close, and they now had a way to describe quality infrastructure without different approaches being taken by ten international organisations, which included intergovernmental organisations, and the World Bank, and he thought that was a really big step forward.

Mr Henson said that wanted to float an idea which was currently still work in progress to delegates because of a discussion he had had with Dr Schwartz. Mr Henson said that at times he considered that the two Organisations really needed to speak separately about scientific metrology, industrial metrology, and legal metrology as this was the most appropriate approach. However, this was not always the best way of doing things, and there were also occasions when they needed to realize that it was all metrology, even though it had different applications which were dealt with in different ways by the two Organisations. Mr Henson drew delegates' attention to a new slide he had created, which he said he could have presented in various ways. He said it was not quite right yet, but he had included it here to float the ideas it expressed. When the Organisations were talking at high political levels, it was not helpful to fragment the subject of metrology into its scientific, industrial and legal components. Politicians needed to understand that metrology was important for a whole variety of reasons, so sometimes they needed a more combined message about the importance of metrology. Finally he highlighted that he had submitted a written report to the BIML, which of course went into more details, as well as giving some facts and figures. He concluded that he was happy to answer any questions as best as he could.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Henson for his interesting report, which had pointed out the many fields where there was already good cooperation between the OIML and the BIPM, and where there could be even closer cooperation in the future. He commented that it was interesting to see the new slide which encouraged people not to think so much about the separate fields of metrology, but to consider the importance of taking a holistic approach, and looking at matters jointly. He went on to say that Mr Henson had mentioned his written report, and he informed delegates that since Mr Henson had provided this before the CIML meeting it had been submitted as Additional Meeting Document 10. He also wanted to thank Mr Henson for already addressing the subject of the new SI, and said that although they would come back to this under item 12.4, they did not have much to say under that particular item. He stressed that it was also important that Mr Henson had discussed, at least in his written report, the CCU definition of the term “unit”. He said that a questionnaire had been circulated asking the OIML about its opinion concerning the definition of “unit”, which had been a hot discussion topic at the CCU. He informed the Committee that the OIML had abstained because there had been different opinions from different Member States.

Mr Henson summed this up this subject by saying that an alternative proposal had appeared in the draft ninth edition of the SI Brochure. There had been some discussions about this, and after canvassing the views of the membership of the CCU, the decision had been made to remain with the existing definition of “unit” from the current eighth edition of the SI Brochure. They would not be seeing a change at this time but the matter would continue to be discussed.

Mr Dixit asked Mr Henson to explain the BIPM’s capacity building programme, and asked how often they arranged capacity building training programs. He also asked how people could participate, and whether it was paid or voluntary.

Mr Henson replied that as he had said, the BIPM currently had no funding to allocate to its capacity building activities, so it relied on finding a sponsor. The different courses were therefore held on a different basis, depending on the agreements they had been able to make with the sponsors, which varied. In some cases they had been able to pay all costs for the participants, whereas in other cases the sponsors had supported only some of the participants’ costs. He said that he hoped that in the future, a small part of those courses relating to the CIPM MRA would be able to be funded from the BIPM dotation, but this was dependant on how the discussions on the BIPM dotations went in November.

Mr Dixit asked whether there were any grants for the development of laboratories. He asked whether a proposal could be made that officers could be trained at the BIPM for mass and length metrology, and for the dissemination of time. He said they were prepared to pay for this.

Mr Henson replied that the BIPM was not fundamentally a training organisation, but if Mr Dixit, or more broadly any of delegates, had an idea, they should it to send the BIPM, and they would give it the best consideration, bearing in mind that the BIPM had many ongoing projects.

Dr Schwartz noted there were no more questions or comments so he again thanked Mr Henson and concluded this item.

CECIP

Dr Schwartz asked delegates to listen to the final report presented by Mr Nater from the European Weighing Instruments Manufacturers Association (CECIP). He added that Mr Nater was the President of the International Cooperation Group (ICG) of CECIP and that he was looking forward to his report.

Mr Nater greeted delegates and thanked them for the opportunity to present CECIP. He was sure that most delegates knew about CECIP and what they did, so he did not want to go into great detail about everything, but would make a short summary.

CECIP had about 14 members, and 11 of these were full members, by which he meant countries which had national associations. They also had organisations and companies which did not have an association in their country, but who could join as individual companies, and he gave the examples of companies in Spain and Sweden. He said they were also in negotiation with Turkey to see if they were going to join as an association or as individual companies. He said the mission of CECIP was to reduce barriers

to trade and to promote fair trade. They promoted high quality harmonised standards, and he stressed that high quality was very important, even when there was a lot of discussion about the standards. They also cooperated with each other with the aim of having one voice at the OIML/CIML. This was a big issue because in the past CECIP's views had been primarily European, since it had been a European federation, but European manufacturers were just a few of the weighing instrument manufacturers that existed in the world, so he joked that they had created a “baby”, which he had learnt you could do in metrology from the workshop he had participated in on Monday!

He continued the analogy saying their “baby” was two years old, and it was called the International Cooperation Group (ICG). It did not cover the whole world, but worked closely with not only Europe through CECIP, but also with the Americas, through the SMA, with China through the CWIA, and with Japan through the JMIF. He said that they met frequently, although of course since they were competitors they did not discuss prices. They followed a code of conduct, and when someone in the group did not feel comfortable, they were able to bring the conversation to a close. He emphasised how frequently they came together, and stated that they had met in Japan two weeks prior to this meeting where they had met with the Chinese and Japanese associations. They had exchanged mostly information about what regulations were being implemented in their various countries, what was new and what trends were developing. In the ICG and in CECIP they had discussed about twenty five topics, amongst which were risk assessment, the cloud, digitalisation and industry 4.0. However, he said he was going to talk about one small example: NAWIs. In Europe, there were 27 countries with 27 regulations that were not necessarily the same. For example, they could consider Germany, which had 16 federal states, and although there was only one regulation, there were 16 interpretations of it. He continued by stressing this was the reality and asked delegates to imagine how difficult it was for a manufacturer to handle all these interpretations, so that was why they focused on one issue.

He showed delegates a map of Europe which indicated the different periodic reverification requirements, and stated that this also created difficulties. In those countries coloured in red, reverification was carried out by the authorities which he remarked was about half of the countries. In those countries coloured in green, reverification was carried out by private companies, so companies or service providers could do reverification work. In countries coloured in orange, which included the UK and the Netherlands, there was no requirement for periodic reverification. He added that they did not have enough information from Iceland and other countries, so the diagram was not complete but it gave delegates an overview of what they were struggling with as manufacturers. Regarding the situation in China, he said there were 31 provinces and everything was done by the authorities, so for manufacturers it was much easier to handle. In Japan there were 47 prefectures which had very good regulations, and again everything was done by the authorities, so for manufacturers it was very clear. With regard to the US, he said he had obtained his information from his colleagues in the SMA, and they had 50 independent states, in some of which NTEP certificates were required, which were a kind of type approval, whereas in other states there was no need for this. He showed delegates a map of the US, and added that companies in those states that were coloured in green had to complete a registration, then obtain an authorisation, following which they could offer the service. In the other states there was not this option, and either the government carried out these functions, or nobody did.

Mr Nater re-iterated that the ICG concentrated on harmonisation because it was very complicated for manufacturers to be compliant in a non-harmonised system, and he repeated that their biggest target was to be fully compliant in the market. The mission of the ICG, which was the umbrella organisation of the weighing manufacturers, was firstly to reduce barriers to trade. Secondly that there should be one authorisation valid for the whole region or country such as China, Japan, or the US, over which the same requirements apply. He welcomed the proposal in the revision of OIML R 76 to develop a new part describing verification and reverification procedures since this would improve harmonisation.

As some delegates knew, he had recently retired after 37 years in metrology, but his wish was for more harmonisation. This would include harmonisation of the verification systems, firstly in Europe, but also worldwide, and he suggested that this was not only his wish, but those of the manufacturers. He said that the OIML-CS was a very good example in this area, which was why, for them, it was time for an OIML verification system. He joked that he knew it was just a wish, but it was OK to share his wishes

with them. It would mean that they would have the same requirements everywhere and he knew that this was an enormous target.

He re-iterated that he had worked in metrology for 37 years, and ten years ago he had moved to legal metrology from scientific metrology. He concluded his presentation by joking that he could now do without metrology by moving to meteorology and showed a slide of himself and a colleague from New Zealand on a sailing boat competing in the Americas Cup whilst they were competing against Switzerland.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Nater for his report and observed that as Mr Nater had mentioned the key word “retirement”, he wondered whether this would be his last report as President of the ICG at CECIP. Dr Schwartz congratulated him on his plans for retirement and added that he appreciated the views of stakeholders and said they appreciated the efforts CECIP had taken towards closer international cooperation in the field of weighing, because he said the OIML really needed input from their stakeholders, and it was even better if CECIP reached out to other partners, as in this way the OIML would get an even broader view from its stakeholders.

Mrs Lagauterie wanted to make a comment. She said that regarding the USA, Mr Nater had indicated the wide use of NTEP, but if he wanted to be fair to Europe, it should also have been coloured in a single colour for the subjects of type examination and putting instruments into service, because this had been totally harmonised since 1990, and it was only the periodic verification which was not harmonised.

Mr Nater thanked Mrs Lagauterie, saying that she was absolutely correct. He added that for manufacturers, harmonisation was a big advantage. He said that in the past, manufacturers had had to go from one country to another country for all the type approvals, and this had sometimes taken months or even years, so by the time they received the type approvals they had already superseded the product, and when considering smaller countries, it had not been worth obtaining approvals. The harmonisation of type approval had made a big difference, and he thanked Mrs Lagauterie for her comment.

Dr Schwartz noted that there were no further questions or comments and again thanked CECIP, and Mr Nater personally, for the many valuable contributions they had made to the CIML over the last ten years. He observed that he remembered the first CIML meeting that Mr Nater had attended, which had been in Sydney in 2008, and he said they had discussed the topic of the acceptance of results from manufacturers’ test laboratories. Dr Schwartz added that Mr Nater had also participated in the revision of the MAA from the beginning and had made many valuable comments. He commented that they would return to this later under item 16.

Dr Schwartz stated that this concluded the reports from liaison organisations. He thanked all the people who had given reports and confirmed that the OIML very much appreciated having their partners present at the CIML meeting so that they could keep up with current developments.

The meeting then moved on to the relevant resolutions. Concerning the updates from the organisations in liaison, the first presentation had been from the IEC. Mr Dunmill read:

The Committee,

Noting the proposal from the IECEx Management Committee,

Decides to establish a Joint Working Group with the IECEx to explore synergies and opportunities for cooperation,

Requests Dr Roman Schwartz and Mr Paul Dixon to represent the OIML on the Joint Working Group, and

Requests the OIML representatives to report to the CIML on the activities of the Joint Working Group at the 54th CIML Meeting in 2019.

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments on the wording of the resolution. There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was adopted unanimously.

The next presentations had been from ILAC and IAF and the signing of the MoU. Dr Schwartz read:

The Committee,

Notes the reports made by organizations in liaison, and

Thanks their representatives for providing this information to the Committee.

Dr Schwartz asked if there were any comments on the wording of the resolution. There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was adopted unanimously.

9.4 Signature of Memoranda of Understanding

Dr Schwartz suggested that they could now proceed with the ceremony to sign the MoUs. In order that delegates knew what was going to be signed, he wanted to repeat that the new MoU with the IEC was to be found in Additional Meeting Document 2, and the revised MoU with ILAC/IAF could be found in Additional Meeting Document 7. He first invited Mr Frans Vreeswijk to come up to the table. Dr Schwartz also announced that the group photograph would be taken just after the signing of the two MoUs.

The MoU between the IEC and OIML was signed but was not recorded. Delegates showed their appreciation with a round of applause.



Signing of the renewed IEC-OIML MoU in Hamburg, 10 October 2018

Left: Dr Roman Schwartz (CIML President)

Right: Mr Frans Vreeswijk (General Secretary and CEO of the IEC)

Photo: PTB, October 2018

Dr Schwartz invited Ms. Malmqvist Nilsson and Mr Xiao Jianhua to come to the table. The MoU between ILAC/IAF and the OIML was signed but not recorded. Again delegates showed their appreciation with a round of applause.



Signing of the renewed ILAC/IAF-OIML MoU in Hamburg, 10 October 2018

Left: Dr Roman Schwartz (CIML President)

Centre: Mr Xiao Jianhua (IAF Chair)

Right: Ms Merih Malmqvist Nilsson (ILAC Chair)

Photo: PTB, October 2018

10 Countries and Economies with Emerging Metrology Systems (CEEMS)

Dr Schwartz opened the session by commenting that he now wanted to concentrate on two very important items: CEEMS matters and the OIML Certification System. He said that he hoped they would be able to finish both during this session, and invited the Chair of the CEEMS Advisory Group, Mr Mason to give his report.

10.1 Report by the CEEMS Advisory Group Chairperson

Mr Mason greeted delegates, and joked how wonderful it was not to be chairing a CIML meeting! He stated that the CEEMS Advisory Group (AG) had been functioning for several years, and he thought this was probably the third time that there had been a meeting of the AG immediately before the CIML meeting. However, he thought it was fair to say that the meeting, which had been held the previous day had been rather different from those which had preceded it. They had considered a lot of papers, they had made a lot of decisions, and there had been a lot on their agenda. As a result, they had done a lot of work in preparing a written report of the AG's activities, which had already been circulated to delegates as Additional Meeting Document 12 a couple of weeks prior to the CIML meeting. Hopefully they would have been informed that there was also a final report, which had been made available that morning. He stated that it was essentially this final report which he would be speaking about during his verbal report. He stated that they had a little under an hour for CEEMS matters, and he was sure they would be able to fill it.

Re-iterating that the 2018 AG meeting had been held the previous day, he said that when the AG had been set up, under the new B 19, they had intended to meet once a year, with most of the work being done electronically. He commented that they had an email circulation list which allowed this, and increasingly they were mastering the use of the OIML website for these purposes as well, although he added that this was still a work in progress. He observed that it was his own lack of competence as much as anything else that was holding this back!

Once again, he reported that there had been very good attendance at the AG meeting, with 21 of the 24 current AG Members present, and those who were not present providing proxies. He added that they had not needed to vote on anything, as they had been in agreement on everything. They had welcomed the CIML Members from Cuba and Kenya, who had volunteered to serve on the AG. He reminded other CIML Members that any of them could volunteer to join this group, observing that it did mean a bit of work since everyone's views were important in decision-making to ensure the quorum was achieved. This meant they did have to read the papers, but he thought that those who had chosen to join as individual members had found the experience useful, so he stressed that new Members were always welcome. He added that new representatives from WELMEC and GULFMET had attended, as had several observers. He emphasised that this was a decision-making meeting, and therefore was not generally open, but occasional observers were allowed, when they wanted to find out what the AG was doing.

The meeting had lasted 90 minutes, and they had got through the agenda which he displayed to delegates. He remarked that this agenda had been quite challenging, but gave an indication of the amount of work that had been done in the name of the AG. The first item that the AG had discussed, as mentioned in the written report, concerned the updating of the CEEMS web pages. He said that many delegates would already be familiar with these, and stated that there were now clearly identified sections explaining the history and background of the CEEMS work. There was a page dedicated to the AG itself, showing its composition and structure. There was also a list of the OIML Training Centres which had been held so far, and this would be completed and updated as events took place. There was a section on seminars and workshops, and he pointed out that there had been a number of these since the original one in Chengdu, and they took quite a wide view of what was included in this category. He considered that the workshop which had been held the previous Monday was part of this series, and expected that the outcome of that meeting would later be found on the website. He reported that there was also a page which would give details of the experts, the so-called experts database, and he said that he would explain more about this later in his presentation. He specified there were also details of the CEEMS awards, which he added would be presented later in the week. He said that crucially, they now had a repository for the actual material distributed and presented during the various training centres. This was part of a vision that the CEEMS section of the OIML website should contain a lot of material that delegates might find useful. In addition to this, the AG had agreed earlier that week that they would be signposting more clearly the e-learning material which they had discussed in previous years, a link to which could currently be found on the home page of the OIML website.

The next item on which there had been substantial discussion at the AG meeting was about what he would loosely call the CEEMS logo. On looking through the website, it had become apparent that there might potentially be some advantage in highlighting the CEEMS-related sections of the website, in order to make it easier to locate them. He mentioned that delegates had seen some of the benefits of this approach, in the way that the OIML Certification System had been using its logo, and for CEEMS this might be good not just for the website, but for promotional materials, including training centres and so forth. On the other hand, it was important that such logos did not proliferate in a way that created confusion in the minds of the OIML's stakeholders, because this might undermine the promotion of the OIML's work to the wider public. The AG meeting had been able to consider some excellent designs provided by their colleagues from the PTB. Having done so, they had recognised that it was something for which there was not an urgent need, so the AG had decided to take more time to consider this. They had therefore decided that this work would be taken forward by a new ad-hoc group, which again he would be mentioning later and which would also be looking at a wider range of training centre issues.

Mr Mason moved onto the topic of the experts database. Following the request for nominations from CIML Members, he reported they now had a database of 21 excellent experts from 10 economies, and their details would be made available on the website as soon as they had decided on the right wording for a disclaimer describing the experts' relationship with the OIML. He stressed that such a legal disclaimer was an important issue, because it needed to be made clear that these experts would typically be working on their own behalf rather than on behalf of the OIML. The OIML could not take responsibility for them, which had to be made clear. Mr Mason said that once this issue had been resolved, the database, which he recognised they had been discussing for many years, would finally be

able to go live. Mr Mason thought that in reality some of the people on the list of experts were already being approached as their willingness to do such work became more widely known.

Mr Mason stated that next he wanted to cover the various OIML training activities, adding that this was covered in the annual report made available to delegates, and he wanted to hand over to Mr Guo Su, who had been part of the AG secretariat for a number of years, but was now, as delegates would have heard, a secondee working at the Bureau. He said this arrangement was working extremely well and asked Mr Guo to make his presentation.

Mr Guo thanked Mr Mason. Firstly he wanted to take the opportunity to thank delegates, and said it was thanks to the BIML and China's cooperation that he could be on secondment to the BIML to work on CEEMS issues. He wanted to thank the BIML staff, who had given him tremendous support in settling in Paris. He added that the item detailing the training course in Kenya and the review of OPTC training would be handled by the BIML Assistant Director, Mr Dunmill.

Mr Guo said he would be providing information on the training course in China on prepackaged goods, which had been the first joint activity between the OIML and the APLMF. He specified that 70 participants from 29 economies had joined this activity, and the trainers had come from New Zealand. He highlighted that they were lucky to have Mr Phil Sorrell at this CIML meeting, who had been one of the trainers at this event, together with Mr Hans Peter Vaterlaus from Switzerland. Mr Guo reported that the training materials were now available on the OIML and APLMF websites. He showed delegates a video of this event, indicating the opening address and a class being taken by one of the trainers from New Zealand. He added that there had also been some practical sessions. He skipped through some of the video as time was short, and lastly showed a visit to the institute of metrology.

Mr Guo then talked about the training course on prepackaged goods in Havana, Cuba, which had been attended by 27 participants from 17 economies, mainly from the Caribbean area. The trainers had been from the BIML, the PTB and Switzerland, and the training material was also now available on the OIML website.

Mr Guo said that this year he had issued a survey, comprising six sections, on needs of CEEMS. However, because the final results had only been received two weeks prior to this meeting, there had not been time to carry out a comprehensive analysis, although he could highlight some of the needs that had commonly been identified. He summarised that 16 Member States had replied, and said he had discovered that some Members had not replied due to technical problems, which meant they had missed his email, so he would continue to collect further data. The survey had asked each Member to what extent their type approval and verification requirements were harmonised with OIML requirements, and Mr Guo showed some charts of the results which indicated that for verification, there was 73 % harmonisation, and for type approval there was 67 % harmonisation. Mr Guo went on to show another chart giving the results of the needs survey, which had indicated that there was a particular need for training on R 49 *Water meters for cold potable water and hot water*, R 76 *Non-automatic weighing instruments* and R 117 *Dynamic measuring systems for liquids other than water*. Moving on to the needs related to the OIML-CS, Mr Guo reported that almost 100 % of those who had replied had said that they were willing to participate in the system, although around two-thirds did not yet fully understand the system, or needed to clarify its benefits to them. The respondents had indicated that they would prefer to obtain this information through OIML seminars, or online. Showing another chart on how laboratory equipment was obtained, Mr Guo highlighted the fact that the survey had found that three countries were willing to share surplus equipment, and three were willing to donate it, and he asked delegates to talk to him during the breaks if they wanted more information on this. He reported that the survey had also expressed a need for training on D 31 *General Requirements for software controlled measuring instruments*.

Mr Guo reported that during the year they had also developed a draft framework for OIML Training Centres, which had only been completed one week before this meeting, so AG members had not yet had time to review it fully. The draft had been developed by the BIML and P.R. China, and it made use of the experience gained during previous OPTCs in China. The document had ten sections over about 14 pages, but they knew that more training models need to be included, so an ad-hoc group, chaired by

Mr Peter Ulbig, would study this question and hopefully finalise the document in 2019. Mr Guo said that this completed his part of the presentation and handed back to Mr Mason.

Mr Mason said the next item in the annual report referred to the projects for which the AG had taken responsibility. The previous year they had decided that there should be a revision of D 1 *Considerations for a Law on Metrology*, which should be carried out by a small Project Group consisting of AG members, but he thought it was right that they report to the CIML on this, since it was not within the normal Technical Committee structure. The first Working Draft had been circulated in June, and a number of comments had been received, the most important one of which was that there was a wish to make clearer the position that metrology, and in particular legal metrology, had in the wider context of a National Quality Infrastructure. This had been another theme that had emerged from the workshop the previous Monday. Mr Mason said that this reinforced messages which had been coming to him as a convener that they should actually be undertaking a more substantial rewrite of D 1 that used metrology in quality infrastructure as its starting point. From this point of view, he considered that the workshop this week, as well as some other work that he would be doing in South East Asia over the next few weeks, would be extremely helpful in developing the next stage of the work, and he expected them to be able to circulate a Committee Draft fairly soon after his return from Indonesia. He continued that this would mean that this more fundamental restructuring of D 1 would mean that it would not be possible to meet the original timetable for the project which had been approved by the CIML the previous year. Initially they had thought that they might manage to finish it by the following year, but actually he did not think it would be possible to complete the project until at least 2020, and indeed it may take longer, depending on just how many stakeholders became involved.

On the question of projects for which the AG had taken responsibility, Mr Mason said that delegates would be aware, from other papers submitted to them, that there were proposals that the AG should take responsibility for the revision of two other OIML Documents. The Committee would be asked to approve these proposals the following day. They were for the revision of D 14 *Training of legal metrology personnel* and D 19 *Pattern evaluation and pattern approval*. He was mentioning these proposals at this point because he considered it may be a more convenient time to take comments and questions about the procedure relating to those two Documents now, rather than when they came up for consideration the following day. Mr Mason added that they had been fortunate that they had been able to find conveners for both of these projects. Germany had undertaken to provide a convener for the D 14 work, and Mr Mason himself had agreed to act as convener for the D 19 project.

In summary, these were the headlines of the changes they had introduced in the workplan. This had been presented to delegates the previous year, following the 2017 AG meeting, and continued to be their core document. The papers that had been circulated during the morning involved what he thought was version 6 of the workplan. He described it as being a “living document” for the AG, and clarified that they amended it as they progressed with the work. The main items were displayed on the next two pages. The AG would continue to see work on the web pages as a priority. The work analysing the survey that Mr Guo had just described was part of the workplan, and clearly the database had to be finalised. They had also included the new work on the logo and branding, which had been added to the workplan as a result of the decisions taken at the previous day’s meeting, and the D 1 project continued to be part of the workplan. Mr Mason reflected that the strategy for the OIML Training Centres would be an important part of the workplan, but the significant change as a result of the discussions the previous day was that this would now be done by an ad-hoc group. He said they had originally asked themselves whether this should have been a Basic Publication, and thus that the CIML should have been asked to agree to the start of such a project, but said that they had not been convinced that it needed to be one at this stage. However, if they later concluded that it should be, he stated that obviously the CIML would have to approve this. He described these issues as being so important that they were likely to be put into an eventual strategy document and presented to the CIML anyway. Whilst they were developing the strategy, they still thought there was a need for further OTCs. Mr Guo had mentioned that a number of ideas had come out of the survey, and Mr Mason drew delegates’ attention to the number of offers they had already heard during this meeting about hosting OTCs, which had included offers from Brazil and Tunisia, and he said they would continue to explore these possibilities. He also thought it likely that there would be at least one more in P.R. China as well.

Regarding the rest of the workplan, Mr Mason said they would continue to produce their annual report, and he hoped delegates had found this format of reporting through a formal document and annexes endorsed by the AG helpful. The AG had added a suggestion to the workplan that they should be thinking about how they could deploy the World Bank QI toolkit, which they had heard about on the Monday prior to this meeting.

Finally, just to show that their thinking continued to evolve, a suggestion had been made by Australia that they might start to carry out a “pilot CTT audit programme”. He asked if there were any questions on what he had said so far regarding the activities to date, and what was in their workplan, adding that they would then move on to talk about the proposal from the AG that the CIML should work on a new resolution on CEEMS work to replace the one that had been adopted in Arcachon. He repeated his willingness to answer any questions on what he had already said.

Mr O’Brien thanked Mr Mason for the overview of the AG meeting held the previous day and for his leadership of it, stressing that it was really important work. Regarding the expert database, he appreciated that they would be adding some legal wording about liability, and thought that this would be very useful, but he asked whether the database would include the CVs of the experts. He felt that people may need this information to be able to make a decision on whether they wanted to take on a particular expert. Mr Mason confirmed this. He conveyed that it was one of the reasons why there was a need for something that was quite technically complicated. He specified that it would have CVs, and he thought that these would be standardised as far as possible, so people could get used to looking through them and identifying potential experts that fitted their needs. Mr O’Brien’s question had also made him think about something that he would address later when he spoke about the CTT document.

Mr Mateus referred to the beginning of Mr Mason’s presentation regarding CEEMS activities. Mr Mason had stated that it was possible to propose new AG members, and he asked that they consider Brazil as a new participant in the AG. He also wanted to propose that Brazil hosted a Training Centre. He clarified that they had had a special interest in the revision of D 1 because they had a huge team working in this field, but had had some difficulties in participating in the discussions in Germany. He suggested that Brazil would be open generally to work with the OIML to provide training that was considered important, and was prepared to discuss this further.

Mr Mason thanked Mr Mateus for this further confirmation of his interest in participating in the AG, which he added was very welcome.

Mr Khedir said that to his way of thinking, the workplan was ambitious and the work necessary for its success demanded a participatory approach with the RLMOs. He gave the example of the revision of D 1, where it would be better to include the RLMOs and even the SRLMOs, who could give their opinions. Concerning what had been described in the presentation on the survey, he observed that in 65 % of the countries, legislation was not harmonised, and he wondered whether this would be an obstacle to the application and adoption of the OIML-CS. Regarding the strategy for CEEMS, he felt that they should be seeking the opinion of “southern countries” such as those from Africa and members of MAGMET. He thought they were very much interested and affected by this matter. Lastly, he wanted to repeat his proposition from 2016 that Tunisia be supported in setting up a training centre on metrology for francophone countries.

Mr Mason thanked Mr Khedir for his questions. Taking Mr Khedir’s last point, he added that these were ideas that they wanted to follow up. He recognised that funding and organisation were crucial, and they needed to make sure that for each of the initiatives, they could put together the right package, and he confirmed that the AG would be looking into whether this was possible. Regarding the revision of D 1, Mr Mason agreed that the regional organisations had a key part to play, and in fact he said that the APLMF representative on the AG was part of the Project Group revising D 1. They knew from the APLMF/APMP Guide 1 that this region had a lot of experience in producing documents which met the needs of the whole metrology community, and he added that they wanted to draw on this experience.

There were no more questions, so Mr Mason referred to resolution 2015/10, the so-called “Arcachon resolution”. He said they had regarded this as the measure of the activities concerning CEEMS for the last three years. This year, as in previous years, they had compiled an analysis which could be found in

Annex C of the annual report, about what they had accomplished in the last 12 months relating to each of the items in the resolution. Unlike in previous years, he did not intend to go through it line by line, because he considered they had found better ways of identifying the key issues. One thing he wanted to mention, however, was that there had been specific mention in the Arcachon resolution of the desire to finalise some projects which were particularly important to the CEEMS community. One of these had been the guide on prepackaging, which had been finalised the previous year, and the other had been the Conformity to Type publication. He was pleased to say that this was very close to being ready for the CIML Preliminary Online Ballot stage. He stated that the previous Committee Draft had passed the vote, but there had been some very valuable additional suggestions, which they had felt it had been worth taking into account, and since they were clear that work on OIML Documents had to follow B 6, they had felt that there should be another Committee Draft. They were confident that this Committee Draft would pass the Project Group vote, and that they would be able to proceed immediately to a CIML Preliminary Online Ballot. If it passed this, as he was sure it would, he thought they would try to do an online approval of the Final Draft Document, and he wanted to alert all CIML Members to this on this occasion. They recognised that this process would not be easy, as one single negative vote from a CIML Member could stop a final online approval, and also it was vital that they obtained “yes” votes from 50 % of CIML Members to proceed, so he pleaded with delegates to look favourably on this when it arose since it would be nice to have the Document finalised before they met next year.

Mr Mason stated that the final recommendation from the AG was that they updated the resolution that had been passed in Arcachon. He indicated that a number of the items on it had already been addressed, there had been a number of changes, and the AG would therefore like to put before delegates an outline for a resolution, which he asked delegates to consider. He informed delegates that he would quickly describe the key elements of this proposal. He felt that a lot of it would be familiar, because a lot of what had been said three years ago in Arcachon was still valid. However, they had restructured the original resolution, so there was a more logical flow, and they had also dropped a few items. What they had not been able to identify were significant additions, so perhaps they had got it completely right in 2015, and there was nothing more to add, but the discussion on this point in this CIML meeting would be an opportunity to identify whether new things needed to be included.

Mr Mason went through the wording of the proposed resolution. He said they would obviously expect to recall what they had done previously, and he submitted that there had been significant progress on this, and of course they now had the AG to give the CIML advice. They proposed that they should continue to instruct the Bureau, in a similar language to that used previously, to participate in capacity building activities, through the OIML Training Centres and regional activities, as well as other initiatives. He referred delegates to the significant programme of BIML activities they had already heard about.

Secondly, the AG proposed to instruct the Bureau to continue their engagement with what had previously been known as DCMAS, and was now to be renamed as the International Network on Quality Infrastructure (INetQI), as well as identifying new initiatives to which the OIML could make an important contribution. They proposed that the resolution should instruct the Bureau to continue developing the website. He was sure that this work would be carried out even without this instruction, but this would give a clear indication of what the AG was expecting from the website. Rather than the previous resolution’s explicit references to B 6, which he commented had now been “put to bed” for a couple of years, they were suggesting that the instruction now should be that further development of the systems for OIML technical work should take account of the need to involve CEEMS. The AG was proposing that there was an instruction to continue, and if possible expand, the use of the OIML Bulletin and the website to facilitate the exchange of new ideas, and new approaches to legal metrology. He expected that that they could see something about the QI toolkit, certainly on the website, and quite possibly in the Bulletin in the near future, and this was the kind of thing they were referring to. Noting the fact that research continued to be an important part of the OIML’s work, the AG was suggesting that the Director should take this into account when considering projects which could be supported by the CEEMS fund, and it was fair to say that the Director had so far been very imaginative in the use that he had made of that fund.

They also had requested those who could collectively be called the “office holders” to continue their high level engagement on the importance of metrology, particularly in CEEMS countries. This list of office holders was longer than it had been, as they now had not only the President and Vice-Presidents, and the Director and Assistant Directors, they also had the Chair and the Vice-Chair of the CEEMS AG, and there was also the Chair of the OIML-CS Management Committee. He proposed that there was a role for all of them in carrying this work forward. They were repeating their request to all Technical Committees, Subcommittees and Project Groups to take note of the demands of CEEMS, so as to ensure that the Recommendations took more account of the needs of CEEMS.

There was a new request, specifically to the OIML-CS Management Committee, to ensure that the needs of the CEEMS were addressed in further developments of the OIML-CS. They urged Member States to consider what support they could give to future OIML Training Centres and other initiatives aimed at assisting CEEMS. At this point, he added that it was really important not just to acknowledge the substantial contribution that both Germany and P.R. China had made to the initiative, but also to acknowledge a number of other Member States that had stepped forward and contributed as hosts, and others who had made contributions by providing trainers. Again he urged all delegates to consider what they could do to help maintain the momentum. They continued to need Project Group conveners to produce publications of interest to CEEMS, and this included a wider range of countries, and hopefully more from the CEEMS community.

Finally he drew attention to the secondment to the Bureau, and he knew it had taken a great deal of effort to arrange this, but he remarked that delegates had seen how well it was working, although it was for a finite period, and they would like to see other Member States proposing involvement in a similar arrangement, which would be of benefit both to themselves as Member States, as well as to the OIML. This summarised the resolution he wanted to propose, and he asked if there were any questions or comments.

Dr Schwartz said that the only comment he would have was that this draft resolution had been provided in Annex D of Additional Meeting Document 12, and he verified with Mr Mason that the current wording did not differ from that in Annex D.

Mr Mason confirmed that the wording had not changed at all. He said that one or two delegates had told him they might have some comments to make, but so far he had received none. He considered that a long resolution like this might be better considered on Friday, rather than trying to finalise it now.

Dr Schwartz agreed, as it had only been submitted three weeks prior to the CIML meeting, and therefore the basic question was whether the Committee was ready to have an online vote. He added that they could make a decision to vote on it at the current meeting if they wished, but Mr Mason’s proposal was to have an online ballot on this draft resolution.

Mr Mason corrected Dr Schwartz, saying that the comment about the online ballot had referred to the CTT document. As far as this resolution was concerned, he would say that the Committee had the right to expect significant notice before they were asked to make decisions of this kind. However, he reminded the Committee that the 2015 Arcachon resolution had been presented the day after the AG meeting. There had been absolutely no notice of the text of that until the day on which it had been discussed. This situation was not ideal, but he thought they had the flexibility in the procedures to consider such a resolution, if they were happy to do so. He reflected on whether there was necessarily any urgency, and added that the resolution that had been adopted in 2015 could still form the basis of the next year’s activities, so the OIML would not lose anything if they did not modernise it, but he said they did have this opportunity to refresh the resolution, which was the core statement of what they were trying to achieve.

Dr Schwartz suggested it may help to summarise the proposal on the next steps once more.

Mr Mason said the next step would be to ask the Committee whether it was prepared to vote on such a resolution, noting that there was a precedent in what they had done three years previously. If they were prepared to vote at the current meeting, delegates would have the opportunity to further amend the resolution and vote on it amongst the final batch of resolutions.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Mason for his clarification. He asked if any delegates had objections to this proposal. There were no objections, so he suggested that they should discuss any necessary amendments so that they could vote on it on Friday.

Mr Mason stated that this concluded the report of the AG, and said that both he and the AG Chair, Mr Pu Changcheng, who had been involved in much of this work through the input of his colleagues in P.R. China, and who had given valuable advice on a number of these issues, thought they had a structure which was working extremely well, and which was capable of accomplishing a lot of important work, and he hoped he had been able to share this view with delegates during his presentation.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Mason for his comprehensive report on the CEEMS activities, as well as the BIML secondee Mr Guo.

Dr Schwartz asked delegates to consider the resolution, noting the oral report, but not including the new resolution that Mr Mason had just described.

Mr Dunmill said this was just a resolution noting the report that Mr Mason and Mr Guo had just made and he read the draft resolution. He asked if there were any comments on the wording of the resolution, and there were none. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was passed unanimously. The full resolution would then be considered on Friday.

10.2 Report by the BIML on activities in connection with CEEMS matters

Dr Schwartz said they had one minute left for the two other CEEMS items, so he joked that Mr Dunmill should please speed up. They also had the report on the OIML Certification System to consider during this session, which was also a very important item, and he hoped that delegates would not be too tired after the long day they had had.

Mr Dunmill agreed to be as quick as possible. He wanted to report specifically on the activities of the BIML regarding CEEMS. Mr Dunmill started by mentioning the e-learning platform which, as Mr Mason had said, was accessible through a link on the OIML website home page. They would be modifying the way this worked to make it clearer what it was about, and why people might use it.

The e-learning platform had been established in 2017, with the help of the ACP EU TBT Programme. This programme had helped to put the platform into place at the end of their funding period. The content was something they could change themselves, with appropriate support from outside the Bureau, because they did not have the expertise in Moodle, the language used by the platform. It had been widely used, especially in the Caribbean region (the “ACP” standing for Africa, Caribbean, and Pacific, which were the regions it had originally been created for), but anyone could use it. For the moment it existed only in English, but at the very end of the ACP EU TBT Programme’s activities, they had completed a translation into French, which had not yet been implemented. One of the reasons for this was that the BIML had started a Spanish translation of the content, and this translation process had shown up a number of errors in the English version, so rather than having a French version that was wrong as well, they would be correcting the errors in all languages so that finally there would be three language versions of this platform. They also had the possibility of expanding the range of courses, as well as the range of languages used, and as Mr Mason had said, there had been a discussion at the AG meeting and at the RLMO Round Table about other ongoing e-learning activities, especially in the APLMF region. They would be looking at the possibility of expanding this platform as an important resource for CEEMS.

Mr Dunmill said he wanted to give delegates a quick summary of the Training Centre events. Mr Guo had already mentioned the initial events in P.R. China in 2016, which had been a course on non-automatic weighing instruments, with 50 participants from 20 economies, and he drew delegates’ attention to the slide he was displaying. This course had been followed, also in 2016, by a course on legal metrology management systems, where there had been 100 participants from 16 economies. At the end of 2017 they had followed a slightly different model, in that the OIML, together with the PTB and AFRIMETS, had organised the first OIML training event outside P.R. China, which had been held

in Nairobi, Kenya, and had been attended by more than 75 participants from 26 economies. This had been followed by a prepackaging event in P.R. China, with more than 70 participants from 29 economies. Mr Dunmill drew delegates' attention to the fact that these training events attracted a large number of participants, from many regions. The last course that had been held so far had been in Cuba, in June 2018, and had been attended by 23 participants from 14 economies. He highlighted that if delegates took a closer look at the list of the economies which had participated in the Cuban and African events, there were many countries that the OIML did not come in contact with much, so it was a good way of spreading the word about the OIML and metrology issues to a wider audience. In total they had had more than 320 participants on the training courses so far, from 71 different economies. He showed delegates a map of this total represented on a slide, which indicated they were reaching people across the world.

The last item Mr Dunmill wanted to mention was the CEEMS website, which again Mr Mason had already mentioned. He stressed that they now had a number of new pages, covering details of a number of CEEMS activities as well as making available the training materials from these courses. Of course the content of this part of the OIML website would continue to evolve and follow developments within the CEEMS activities of the Bureau, CEEMS AG, or the OIML as a whole. He stated that this was all he had to say, and hoped his presentation had been short enough.

Dr Schwartz agreed it had been short and thanked Mr Dunmill. He commented that overall there was good momentum in all these activities, and a lot of enthusiasm. He thought this was very encouraging, and that it was very important that the momentum was maintained. He asked if there were any questions.

Mrs Cheelo noted that through Mr Dunmill's and Mr Mason's presentations, it was gratifying to learn about how much training had been going on and how many economies had been reached, but what she wanted to know was whether they had carried out an analysis of the impact of this training. She added that it was all very well to count the numbers, but she wondered what tangible results had been achieved. She asked whether the prepackaged goods training, for example, had enabled people to go out and do what they needed to do having received their training.

Mr Dunmill agreed with Mrs Cheelo's concerns. At the moment they only had the numbers, as the follow-up to these training courses was something they were planning to do later. He said that following the last event on prepackaging in particular they should be able to see tangible results. They had not carried out assessments immediately, such as a sheet filled in by participants while they were still at the course, precisely because they needed to go back to their countries, they needed to put something into place, and they needed to see whether the training had provided them with the tools required to improve the way the work was conducted.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mrs Cheelo for her valid point. He agreed that they needed to consider the implications and impact of the training, and should consider assessments to check whether what they were doing was sustainable, did have an impact, and was worth spending the OIML's resources on. He added that it would certainly be taken up by the CEEMS AG. He asked if there were any other comments.

Mr Khedir thought that the preoccupation of the OIML seemed to be to increase the number of members, which he thought was an objective that left him reflecting about certain possibilities. He proposed that the e-learning platform could be opened up by translating it into Arabic, which may increase the number of OIML members.

Mr Dunmill said that at the moment some OIML publications were available in Arabic, and had been translated by some of the Arabic-speaking countries, he thought by Syria and Jordan. Otherwise, the official policy of the Organisation was that it had one official language, which was French, and English was the working language, which was why those two languages were used for all publications. Regarding the content of training materials, he added that in the past they had been reluctant to use languages which they could not at least have some way of checking within the Bureau. They could consider other languages in the future, but he thought it would depend on a wider policy decision.

Dr Schwartz asked if there were any further comments.

Mr Dixit was thankful for the work carried out with CEEMS, and the support of the OIML in providing training to different economies. He requested that the training should be rotated to, and held in other economies, so that people could understand each other's economies, and the knowledge would be transferred faster.

Dr Schwartz affirmed his comment would be noted. There were no further comments, so he asked the Committee to consider the respective draft resolution.

Mr Dunmill read the resolution and asked if there were any comments on its wording. There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was passed unanimously.

10.3 Report by the BIML Director on the special fund for CEEMS-related activities

Dr Schwartz noted that item 10.3 had already been dealt with, as it had been included in the report given by Mr Patoray under item 8.1. He hoped that delegates remembered this, and did not think they needed to consider this subject again. If delegates were in agreement, he suggested that they now passed a separate resolution on this, and then move on to the next item. There were no objections to this proposal.

Before continuing he again thanked Mr Mason, Mr Dunmill and Mr Guo for their presentations.

11 OIML Certification System (OIML-CS)

Dr Schwartz asked delegates to consider item 11, adding that there might not be sufficient time during the current session to complete all of this item since they needed to finish the present day's meeting no later than 17:30 in order that delegates could prepare for the evening. He invited Mr Oosterman, the Chair of the OIML-CS Management Committee, to give his presentation.

11.1 Report by the OIML-CS Management Committee (MC) Chairperson

Mr Oosterman thanked all the people that had made it possible for this system to start on 1 January 2018. He especially wanted to thank Mr Stolz from the PTB, and the members of the Review Committee (RC), who had carried out all the work to review the applications. He described the pile of paperwork that each of the new applicants had submitted, and re-iterated that everything had had to be reviewed, acknowledging that this had been quite a lot of work which it was satisfying to have managed to complete. He said his report would consist of two items. Although the system could operate almost by itself, some items still needed approval, for example B 18 *Framework for the OIML Certification System (OIML-CS)* as well as some other documents. For that reason, he intended to start with an update of the system as it was at the moment, but there were also some resolutions, which he wanted to bring to delegates' attention, because they needed approval by the CIML. This would be in the second part, which would be presented by Mr Dixon.

Mr Oosterman started by describing various OIML-CS meetings. He said there had been a meeting of the Management Committee (MC) on 21–22 March 2018, in Sydney, Australia. NMI Australia had hosted the meeting, and there had been 41 participants, so it had been quite a large group. All 21 of the voting members had been represented during the meeting. He said that representatives from ILAC/IAF, IEC, CECIP, and CECOD had been present, and there had also been an observer from SIM. This particular participant had been considered very important, since SIM's participation could help to increase awareness of the OIML-CS, and how it could be of interest to the Americas. There had also been a representative of WELMEC.

Under the Management Committee, there was the RC. The RC had the task of reviewing applications from prospective OIML Issuing Authorities to see whether they complied with all the requirements needed to become an OIML Issuing Authority. He repeated that this had been quite a lot of work for

Mr Stolz, its Chairperson, especially as at the start of the system when all the OIML Issuing Authorities were new. Now the system was running, they would continue to have new applicants, but not all at once! An RC meeting had been held immediately before the MC meeting, and eight of the eleven RC members had been represented. There was also the Maintenance Group (MG), which maintained the documentation pertaining to the OIML-CS. As he had mentioned at the previous year's CIML meeting in Colombia, this was like climbing a mountain. When you wanted to climb a mountain, Mr Oosterman said you needed a map, and you needed your tools. This had been the first time they had climbed the mountain, so they had not known if all the materials would be appropriate. During the operation they had noticed that there were some conflicts in the documents, and some conflicts in the approach, and they had therefore they had needed to adjust the documents.

Mr Oosterman said that the RC had reviewed all the materials, but when reviews had started, there had been some questions, so first they had needed to see how to perform the reviews, how the documents could be assessed, and how decisions could be made. This had been a very difficult task for Mr Stolz at the beginning of the process. The whole operation of the RC had been discussed amongst its members, and assessments had been performed. A number of proposals had been given to the MC, which had met after the RC had started work, so that new applicants could start from 1 January 2018. This had been helped by the very useful online work carried out by the RC. One of the most important proposals that had been made to the Management Committee had been the approval of experts for participation in the system, because some of the stringent requirements could not be fulfilled by the experts, so the Management Committee had needed this feedback from the RC.

The Maintenance Group had been obliged to revise the appropriate conditions for the approval of experts in the documentation. Delegates would also note later on from one of the resolutions that the transition periods to move from scheme B to scheme A had also been reviewed because they had had a limited number of experts. This meant that it had not been possible to directly switch all the Recommendations from scheme B to scheme A. One of the major considerations in the Maintenance Group had been the revision of PD-07, because this document had needed a lot of revisions concerning the use of "old" data, and Mr Oosterman said he would return to this subject later in his presentation. The application of ISO/IEC 17065 had also come under discussion, because this was a new requirement for the OIML Issuing Authorities, and there had been a discussion on whether it was really necessary to use this standard, or whether it was too stringent for the OIML Issuing Authorities.

One of the issues still under discussion was the modular approach. Mr Oosterman said that delegates would know that under R 76 there was a possibility to approve modules, and they had discussed how this might be incorporated in the OIML-CS. Lastly they had discussed the review of Recommendations from the RC Meeting.

The main OIML-CS meeting had been the Management Committee meeting. One of the first items discussed had been the requirements for experts. Most of the experts working in metrology came from metrology institutes, so they were not directly related to an accreditation body. This meant that they did not always have accreditation skills and experience, which was one of the requirements to become an expert. The problem was that if experts in certain disciplines were not available, they would not be able to perform reviews of OIML Issuing Authorities, so no OIML Issuing Authorities would exist for that category of instrument. This obstacle had to be overcome, so they had concluded during the meeting that they should withdraw this requirement, and now when experts were reviewed, they looked at whether they had experience of ISO/IEC 17025 or ISO/IEC 17065.

Due to the fact that experts had not been available to carry out assessments, they had also needed to review whether some Recommendations could change from Scheme B to Scheme A. When a Recommendation was switched to scheme A, the OIML Issuing Authorities had to prove that they were competent to undertake work on the Recommendation. If experts were not available, an assessment could not be made on whether to allow the OIML Issuing Authorities to work in scheme A. If they switched a Recommendation from Scheme B to Scheme A with no OIML Issuing Authorities, certificates could not be issued. Mr Oosterman stated that they had had to consider a compromise, and find a way of deciding when Recommendations should move to Scheme A.

One other item which had been discussed was that currently the OIML Issuing Authorities needed to comply with ISO/IEC 17065, which covered conformity assessment systems. This meant that conformity to type was also covered, although this was not covered by the OIML-CS. Compliance with this standard would be costly, and they had questioned the need for some of its requirements in the context of OIML Issuing Authorities, and whether it was too rigorous for their needs. They had established a working group which would consider this issue. One of the resolutions that delegates would be considering was whether they could extend the transition period for self-declaration, because it may be that these requirements were too strict for the OIML Issuing Authorities, and might be too costly for OIML Issuing Authorities who issued a limited number of certificates. They therefore wanted to explore whether there were any alternatives which would be acceptable to OIML Issuing Authorities. Furthermore, they had discussed a number of improvements to the system's documents, and Mr Oosterman said he would return to this subject later as well.

They had also looked at additional categories of measuring instrument. It had appeared that there were some Recommendations which had the required three parts, and so could be part of the OIML-CS, and he said he would show delegates these candidate Recommendations. One obstacle they had met when they had started issuing certificates was that in a number of Recommendations, part three was called a "test report", some had called them a "type evaluation report", and others had used both terms. This created a difficulty in deciding who was issuing the evaluation report, and who was issuing the test report, especially considering the distinction between an OIML Issuing Authority and a Test Laboratory.

Another concern had been what to do when Recommendations were revised. As an example, Mr Oosterman mentioned R 60, for which a revision had just been published, which meant that OIML Issuing Authorities would have to re-apply to be able to issue certificates for the new edition of the Recommendation. Although it would have the same number, it could contain new requirements which could have an influence on the tests. OIML Issuing Authorities would have to demonstrate that they still complied with the requirements.

They had established a working group on R 60 under the OIML-CS, which would look at the difference between the current and the old editions of R 60. This would be especially important for the RC, because if an OIML Issuing Authority applied to issue certificates for the new edition, the RC would need guidance on the new requirements under this new edition. If they did not have this, it may lead to an unfair approach being taken by different OIML Issuing Authorities, for example, if one declared it did not have to make any changes, while another decided it had to do some additional testing.

Regarding the documentation changes, Mr Oosterman said that one of the important points for delegates to note was that they needed to make some changes to B 18. As delegates had seen in the IEC's presentation, the OIML-CS had been based on the IEC Systems. They had looked at these to see how they carried out conformity assessment and how their procedures could be carried over to the OIML-CS. This meant they would have to make reference to the IEC, acknowledging the use of their intellectual property. Furthermore, they had set requirements for who could participate in the Management Committee, but had also considered that if people or regions who were interested in participating in the Management Committee wanted to find out how it was being run, there had been no way to allow observers. So they had changed B 18 to allow observers in MC meetings. They had also needed to improve on the wording related to revised editions of Recommendations. For example, they had mentioned that documentation should always be updated to cover the latest revision of a Recommendation. However, this was not always possible, because in some countries the legislation might refer to an earlier edition of the Recommendation, so if a certificate had to refer to the new edition of the Recommendation it would not comply with the national requirements. This meant that there was still a need for OIML Issuing Authorities to be able to issue certificates based on the previous edition(s) of Recommendations.

There had also been a need for clarification on the situation that an OIML Issuing Authority might be willing to issue certificates, for example for breath analysers, but that OIML Issuing Authority was in a country where breath analysers were not regulated. In this situation, the OIML Issuing Authority wanted to become an OIML Issuing Authority for that Recommendation, but the country could not be

a Utilizer because that instrument was not regulated in the country, so they had needed to distinguish this in the documentation.

They had also needed to make some changes in the Operational Documents. Mr Oosterman said he had already mentioned they had to align with B 18 for the observers and the voting regulations. There was also a clarification that that RC Members could contribute to a recommendation on their own country application. He said they had already mentioned that, if necessary, people from the Management Committee could also participate in the Review Committee, but there was also the question of whether they would be allowed to review an OIML Issuing Authority in their own country. This was not seen to be a problem unless the person who performed the review was the same person who had performed the assessment, because they would then be assessing their own work. This situation had needed to be changed in the Operational Documents. It had been considered that the Maintenance Group, chaired by Mr Loizides, should become a permanent working group of the Management Committee, because the documents would need to be revised from time to time. It had also been necessary to include the concept of proxies, because they were not originally allowed in RC meetings. In addition, as he had mentioned earlier, Mr Oosterman said they had removed the requirement that legal metrology experts required assessment experience. Within the Procedural Documents, there had been editorial changes and a need to update it to align with B 18, especially in PD-02, where the requirements on legal metrology experts had been set. They had changed the restrictions, which meant that an expert that did not have any audit experience could still participate in an audit, as long as there was an audit team with a lead assessor. Mr Oosterman said that this situation had not been foreseen in the original document.

There had also been some duplicated requirements for Utilizers and Associates. Furthermore, PD-04 had needed to be updated to cover the new version of ISO/IEC 17025. However, the biggest change had been in PD-07. He reminded delegates that, during the meeting in Colombia, there had been questions on how data which had been obtained under the Basic Certificate System or the MAA could be used in the OIML-CS. They had discussed this item quite extensively during the Management Committee meeting, and had come to the conclusion that they could accept old data under certain conditions. One of the major conditions would be that there would need to be proof that the body had been competent to do the particular test at that time. This could be, for example, proof of accreditation, but other forms of proof could also be used.

Mr Oosterman said he now wanted to talk about the categories of measuring instruments. He said he had already mentioned that it had been very ambitious to have all Recommendations in the scheme by 2020, and added that if delegates had seen the previous OIML Bulletin, they would have seen a diagram in which he had described when a Recommendation would change from Scheme B to Scheme A, and when no further Scheme B certificates could be issued. This had been a very ambitious plan, because the necessary experts were not available, and he invited delegates to recommend experts that could perform the assessments. At the time he had created his diagram, there had not been enough experts for R 49, R 51, or R 117, so if these Recommendations had switched on 1 January from Scheme B to Scheme A, OIML Issuing Authorities would not be able to demonstrate that they were competent, so the switching of these Recommendations needed to be delayed. Mr Dixon had also discovered that there were some other Recommendations which complied with the criteria for inclusion in the OIML-CS, in that they had the necessary three parts. Mr Oosterman said he had checked the OIML website, and no certificates had been issued for these newly identified Recommendations, except for R 136 *Instruments for measuring the areas of leathers* where one certificate had been issued, so these were not Recommendations for which there was a demand for certificates, but on the other hand they complied with the criteria, so they could be included in the system.

Looking at his diagram again, he indicated that at the top there was Scheme A, and at the bottom there was Scheme B. Those categories which had been included in the MAA could directly go into Scheme A because they had already fulfilled all the requirements. These included R 46, R 49, R 51, R 117 and R 137, which were on the list to be implemented by 1 January. For R 49 this was acceptable, as they already knew from the MAA that R 49 could be moved to scheme A. However, for R 51 and R 117, there needed to be more time, as experts needed to be included in the assessment team. R 46 and R 137 would be transferred on 1 January 2020. For the other Recommendations which would move to Scheme A, they needed to delay this change until 1 January 2021. He added that this was still being

ambitious, because they really needed more experts in the system to perform these assessments. For instance, in the case of R 134, they only had one expert, so if an OIML Issuing Authority wanted to issue certificates for this Recommendation and this was their own expert, nobody else could do the assessment, so he emphasised they really needed more experts.

Finally he mentioned the list of Recommendations that Mr Dixon had discovered already complied with the criteria, and these Recommendations would move into the system on 1 January 2019 and move to Scheme A by 2021.

With regard to the current operation of the system, Mr Oosterman stated that they had approved 12 OIML Issuing Authorities, and 25 Test laboratories, including Manufacturers' Test Laboratories. No applications had been rejected, although not everybody had been approved at the same speed, since additional materials had been needed in some cases, and there had been questions from the RC. There had also been no rejections of experts, no OIML Issuing Authorities had been suspended, and there had also been no appeals. The first certificates had been issued on 2 January.

Moving on to the certificates, Mr Oosterman showed delegates a graph and commented that unsurprisingly, the most certificates had been issued for R 76, followed by R 60, then by R 137 and R 51. This indicated that weighing still constituted the major part of the OIML-CS, but this was perhaps a call to improve the Recommendations for other categories of measuring instruments. Also unsurprisingly, the number of certificates issued by the Netherlands was the greatest, and this was not so different from what they had seen before. This meant that the system was still operating as it had been before it came into effect. Mr Oosterman showed delegates a slide he said they would find in the report in their documentation, showing an overview of the OIML Issuing Authorities, including which OIML Issuing Authority was approved for which Recommendation. He showed them a similar table for Utilizers, and from this they would note which countries accepted which kinds of certificates. He added that delegates would note that this table was quite full, which indicated that Utilizers accepted quite a large number of the Recommendations, which was a good development in itself. From this table, delegates would also be able to see which countries accepted Scheme A and MAA, or Scheme B for their national approvals. He re-iterated that they had had to review the participating experts, of which there were over 60, a number which was stable at the moment, but which they still wanted to increase.

He also highlighted the cooperation between ILAC/IAF and the OIML, because if an assessment was carried out with an expert from the OIML list, then accreditation bodies should accept that expert. They had already noticed that sometimes an OIML Issuing Authority had suggested the OIML experts list, but the accreditation bodies had insisted on using their own experts. The OIML therefore needed to work jointly with ILAC/IAF to ensure that these experts were approved as being part of an assessment team.

Regarding the promotional activities, a number of seminars had been carried out, starting in P.R. China, where the event had been attended by many people from laboratories, but also by manufacturers. Here Mr Oosterman commented that Chinese manufacturers were the biggest users of the OIML-CS, so there had been about 400 people in the room, and the seminar had been very productive. They had also held a seminar in Colombia, and one at an AFRIMETS training event in Kenya. They had also introduced the OIML-CS at a WELMEC meeting in January, as well as in conjunction with the Management Committee meeting in Sydney, where manufacturers and other organisations had been invited to an event to learn more about the system. This had continued in P.R. China, where the OIML Issuing Authority had needed more support on how to improve their laboratories. He remarked that P.R. China now had four Testing Laboratories under the OIML Issuing Authority, which was more than they had had under the previous system. Thanks to Mr Ulbig, they had held an awareness training in Moscow, which had been attended by people from Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan and other Central Asian countries, as well as Cuba, Slovakia and elsewhere. They had also held training with CECIP, to explain to manufacturers how the system worked, and as a result of the first training with AFRIMETS, they had also held a second event in association with the AFRIMETS General Assembly. Finally, they had held a meeting with the notified bodies in Europe, where they had also described their participation in the system.

Mr Oosterman explained that a large amount of work had been done on the OIML-CS part of the OIML website, which was very up to date, and delegates would be able to find all the information about the OIML Issuing Authorities, such as for which Recommendations they were approved, as well as a lot of information on the Utilizers. Anyone who wanted to become an OIML Issuing Authority or a Utilizer could find very extensive documentation on the website. He remarked that he had just learned the day before that in P.R. China, everything had already been translated into Chinese, and since many manufacturers came from P.R. China, they would try to make a link to the Chinese website.

Finances had been discussed earlier, but they had also been carrying out other activities, and he emphasised the liaison work with ILAC/IAF on the development of Joint Assessment Procedures, in which Mr Dixon was involved. They were also considering OIML D 29, which was the guidance on ISO Guide 65, the predecessor of ISO/IEC 17065. There was also the D 30 guidance on test laboratories, and the proposed D xx, which was the new guide on ISO/IEC 17065. There was also a proposal that these Documents should become the responsibility of the OIML-CS Management Committee because they were Documents which would be needed by OIML Issuing Authorities and Utilizers.

With regard to the structure of OIML Recommendations, Mr Oosterman showed delegates a slide which he said would be familiar to them. He said an OIML Issuing Authority could obtain several test reports, combine them into an evaluation report, and this evaluation report would result in an OIML Certificate. However, many Recommendations, and he showed delegates the example of R 21, mentioned a “summary of type approval” report, and these included the terms “passed” and “failed”, meaning that they were “evaluation reports” rather than “test reports”. Evaluation reports should be drafted by the OIML Issuing Authorities, and test reports should be drafted by the test laboratories. In the cases he had mentioned, these two types of report were combined, which meant there was a conflict as to who should issue the report. One of the most important resolutions Mr Dixon would be talking about was that they needed to revise Recommendations so that they had a separate test report and type evaluation report.

In conclusion, Mr Oosterman stated the OIML-CS had been in operation since 1 January 2018, and was functioning. They had OIML Issuing Authorities and Utilizers, and certificates had been issued. This had been a huge success, and there had been no gap between stopping the MAA and Basic Certificate systems, and starting the OIML-CS. Experts were available to perform the audits to move from Scheme B to Scheme A, and it was good that they could use “old” data in the new system. However, he commented that he had some concerns.

One of his biggest concerns was the Recommendations. The OIML had more than 100 Recommendations, and not all of them were included in the OIML-CS, but one of the biggest worries was that a number of them were outdated. As had been pointed out by the delegate from Zambia, certificates on breath analysers and on speed meters were needed, and he emphasised that especially countries with emerging economies did not have the capabilities to test these kinds of instruments. The Recommendation on speed meters dated from 1990, which meant it only covered old radar equipment which was no longer on the market. Some Recommendations also still needed a test report format to be produced, otherwise they could not be included in the system. He also urged delegates to participate, and showed them his last slide. This indicated (in blue) the OIML Issuing Authorities, and he added that unsurprisingly, these were from the Member States that had already been in the previous systems.

He said they had new Utilizers, for example Zambia and Colombia. Mr Oosterman quoted Mr Malaver (Colombia) as having said that they “made use of quality infrastructure from other countries to improve their own quality infrastructure” and accepted certificates to issue national type approvals. Mr Oosterman went on to say about 20 % of Member States were OIML Issuing Authorities and 34 % were Utilizers. However, amongst Corresponding Members, only Namibia and Latvia were Associates. He observed that the majority of Corresponding Members were emerging economies which did not have the required test facilities, and these countries could benefit from the OIML-CS by simply accepting OIML Certificates and issuing national type approval certificates based on them. He therefore issued a final plea to use the OIML-CS. Last of all he requested updates to OIML Recommendations, and stressed that any delegates who had questions about becoming an OIML Issuing Authority or a Utilizer should contact him or Mr Dixon.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Oosterman for his comprehensive report and he asked if there were any questions or comments.

Mr Dixit asked about Recommendations in Scheme A and Scheme B. He asked why the applicable scheme could not be decided depending upon how long a Recommendation had been in force, subject to a review by the Project Group involved, and a CIML decision. He had also understood from Mr Oosterman's presentation that experts were not coming forward, and people were not attracted to the OIML-CS, so he suggested that the MC meetings were held every six months in different OIML Issuing Authorities. In this way, the MC members who attended could visit different laboratories and OIML Issuing Authorities and people would gain confidence in the Management Committee.

Mr Oosterman said this was an important point. This was the same as the IEC system, in that the OIML Management Committee did not produce Recommendations. These were produced by the experts from Member States, and he referred to what Mr Patoray had said earlier when he had expressed the opinion that the process for approving a Recommendation was quite long. If delegates looked at the existing Recommendations, many had no part three, so there were no test reports available, which meant a certificate could not be issued. So again, he emphasised that the Recommendations needed to be revised to include a part three if they were to be included in the OIML-CS.

Mrs Cheelo said that Zambia had recently become a Utilizer, as had been mentioned, but she added that in their application they had submitted a long "wish-list" under Additional National Requirements. She reported that Mr Dixon had followed this up, stating that these were not covered under the current OIML-CS. She appreciated that Mr Oosterman had explained everything very well, but from where Zambia was sitting now, it left her wondering what they were going to do going forward. For example, they had a regulatory authority in charge of road and traffic safety which had installed speed enforcement cameras, and there had been an outcry about whether they were type approved and by whom, which was the Zambia Weights and Measures Authority. So they had looked at the OIML-CS, and speed cameras were not included in the system, so in light of this fact, they had been asked about how long it took to get Recommendations put forward for CIML approval. She wondered how this kind of question could be dealt with in a practical way.

Dr Schwartz thought this question touched on exactly the work which was foreseen for the Task Group 2023 which he had mentioned earlier in his report, and which would be looking at how to speed up the technical work, and how to make it more effective. He thought they would have to consider implementing elements of project management. They were taking this very seriously, but unfortunately, at the moment they still did not have the answers.

Mr Oosterman added that what had happened with R 117 was that in the case of fuel dispensers they could make use of the test report format in R 118, but for fuel installations this was not possible because there was no test report format. So in the case of fuel dispensers, test reports had been issued, so at least there was evidence that tests had been performed, but they had not been completed with a certificate. He stated that it was not what they wanted, but that it was at least an option.

Dr Schwartz asked the Committee to consider the respective draft resolution, which was displayed on the screen.

Mr Dunmill read the resolution. He asked if there were any comments on the wording of the resolution.

Mr Loizides wanted to add that members of the Review Committee and the Maintenance Group, who were not necessarily members of the Management Committee, also be thanked for their outstanding contribution to the success to date.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Loizides for this proposal, which they would be glad to add. He asked if there were any comments on the wording of the resolution as amended. There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was passed unanimously.

Dr Schwartz closed the session.

11.2 Items for approval by the CIML (concerning the OIML-CS)

Dr Schwartz noted that during the previous session, delegates had heard a report from the OIML-CS Management Committee Chairperson, Mr Oosterman, and during the current session they would consider *Items for approval by the CIML concerning the OIML-CS*. This would be presented by Mr Dixon, the OIML-CS Executive Secretary.

Mr Dixon greeted the delegates. He referred them to the Working Document, in which the OIML-CS Management Committee had put forward a number of Recommendations, and stated that he would talk delegates through each one, although he was not sure whether they would be voting on each one as he presented them, or whether they would be considered together at the end of his presentation.

Dr Schwartz suggested that since a roll call would be needed before taking a vote, it would be better to consider them together as a package, after Mr Dixon's presentation.

11.2.1 Approval of the revision of B 18 Framework for the OIML Certification (OIML-CS)

Mr Dixon stated that the first recommendation concerned the revision of B 18. As Mr Oosterman had reported during his presentation, there is a Maintenance Group which supports the work of the Management Committee, and they had identified a number of improvements that could be made to B 18 now that the system had been launched and the documents were being used. He showed delegates a summary of these proposed improvements. They included:

- an acknowledgement, based on the updated MoU that the OIML had signed the day before with the IEC, of the fact that the IEC allowed the OIML to use their intellectual property in support of development of the OIML-CS;
- clarification of the representation on the Management Committee, which would now include an identification of the MC Member from each country who is eligible to vote, and the inclusion of observers from countries that had expressed a clear intention to participate in the OIML-CS, but that were not yet in a position to make an application to participate. Mr Dixon added here that they would like these countries to be able to see how the system worked, and to view the workings of the Management Committee, which would hopefully encourage them to participate in the system;
- improvements to the wording regarding the inclusion of the revised editions of Recommendations in the OIML-CS; and
- clarification had also been included that where there was an OIML Issuing Authority under Scheme A, the Member State did not need to designate a Utilizer when that particular category of measuring instrument was not regulated in their country.

Mr Dixon added that there were also a few other editorial and minor changes, but these were the four key changes that had been included. He said that the Final Draft had been distributed when the Working Document had been issued in July, and stated that delegates would therefore have had plenty of opportunity to review it. The Final Draft had included a clean version, a marked-up version, and the results of the voting within the Management Committee. He asked if there were any questions on the revision of B 18. There were no questions or comments.

11.2.2 Approval of the OIML-CS scope and transition periods

Mr Dixon asked delegates to consider the next recommendation from the Management Committee concerning the scope of the OIML-CS and the transition periods. He specified that an Addendum had been issued which contained all the detailed information regarding this proposal, but he would now summarise this.

The first aspect looked at maintaining previous editions of Recommendations in the system, once a revision had been issued. There had been a revision of R 60, which had been approved the previous year, and also a revision of R 61. He indicated that if delegates looked at B 18, 15.5, it stated that previous editions should be maintained in the system on the recommendation of the Management

Committee. Mr Dixon reported there had been a discussion on this topic at the meeting in March, which had prompted a discussion about a comparison table, or gap analysis, to support OIML Issuing Authorities and test laboratories in demonstrating their competence for the new edition, and he related that this was something they would talk about under item 11.2.4.

The first aspect of the recommendation from the Management Committee was that the previous editions of R 60 and R 61 be maintained in the OIML-CS. The second aspect of the recommendation looked at extending the transition periods for some of the original categories of instruments that were in the system. A number were in Scheme B, and it had been stated that they would transition after a certain period of time into Scheme A. Mr Dixon referred to Mr Oosterman's presentation the previous day, in which he had stated that although they had a number of experts, they were still looking to approve more of them to participate in accreditation and peer assessments, to enable these organisations to go from Scheme B to Scheme A. He added that even when the accreditation assessment had been carried out, there was still quite a process that the OIML Issuing Authority and Test Laboratory would need to go through. A judgement had been made that the time scales that had originally been proposed, and which had been approved by the CIML the previous year, were in most instances a bit too short. Therefore, there was a recommendation to extend most of the transition periods by between six and twelve months to allow for the OIML Issuing Authorities and Test Laboratories to complete the application process.

Mr Dixon pointed out that in the Addendum that delegates had received, the original proposal had been for R 117 to transition from Scheme B to Scheme A on 1 July 2019, but feedback from the convener of the Project Group that was currently revising R 117 indicated that in order to avoid any confusion between the publication of the next edition and the proposed transition date, the transition of R 117 should be deferred for a further period of six months. This meant a change from the documentation which delegates had received, which contained a proposal for R 117 to transition on 1 January the following year, and not on 1 July.

The final aspect of this recommendation was that when the Provisional Management Committee had been identifying the instrument categories to include in the OIML-CS, a review of the number of Basic Certificates, the number of MAA Certificates and the number of Issuing Authorities had been conducted, and this had identified the 19 instrument categories that were currently in the OIML-CS. However, as had been mentioned the previous day, looking at the other Recommendations, there were 17 which actually fulfilled the requirements for automatic inclusion in the system. He drew delegates' attention to the documentation, where he said they would find a list of the 17 Recommendations to be included, with the proposal that they came into the OIML-CS in Scheme B on 1 January 2019, and that they would then transition after 2 years into Scheme A on 1 January 2021. Since the analysis that had been carried out by the Management Committee, it had been identified that the new 2016 edition of R 59 *Moisture meters for cereal grains and oil seeds* also fulfilled the requirements for inclusion in the OIML-CS, i.e. it had the required three parts – metrological and technical requirements, test procedures, and test report format, and so there was also a proposal to include this additional Recommendation in the system on 1 January 2019.

This concluded the information on this proposal. Mr Dixon asked if there were any questions or comments regarding the recommendation and the proposal that had been submitted.

Mr Awosola asked why the Management Committee had decided not to include the latest editions of R 60 and R 61.

Mr Dixon replied that according to B 18, when a Recommendation was revised, the new edition was automatically included, and the Management Committee then only had to decide whether the previous edition should be kept in the system. So the previous editions of R 60 and R 61 would be maintained, but the new editions which had been approved the previous year would automatically be included in the system. The revision of B 18 improved this procedure and the Management Committee was making this particular recommendation to maintain the previous edition, not to request the CIML's approval of including the new edition.

Mrs Lagauterie thanked Mr Dixon for his presentation. She wanted to know whether industry had been informed about the situation concerning R 117, and whether or not it created a problem for them.

Mr Dixon confirmed that they had not yet been informed, as this had been a very last-minute proposal, which had been put forward by the convener of the Project Group revising R 117. If a six-month deferral was approved at this CIML meeting, then obviously this information would be communicated.

There were no more questions or comments.

11.2.3 Responsibility for D 29, D 30 and D xx Guide for the application of ISO/IEC 17065 to assessment of certification bodies in legal metrology

Mr Dixon stated that the next recommendation looked at the responsibility for a number of OIML Documents: D 29 *Guide for the application of ISO/IEC Guide 65 to the assessment of Certification Bodies*, D 30 *Guide for the application of ISO/IEC 17025 to the assessment of test laboratories involved in legal metrology*, and the new D xx. He stated that at the moment there was an active project under TC 3/SC 5/p 12 which was revising D 30 to align it with the 2017 edition of ISO/IEC 17025 which had been published towards the end of the previous year. There was also a current project, again under TC 3/SC 5, which was developing a new Document D xx *Guide for the application of ISO/IEC 17065*. Mr Dixon explained that this project had progressed well, and the Final Draft Document had been put forward for approval under agenda item 12.1.1, so delegates would be voting on this later on that day. He noted that if the new Document was approved, it would replace D 29, because ISO Guide 65 no longer existed, and certification bodies were now working to the standard ISO/IEC 17065. Mr Dixon commented that at the moment, D 29 and D 30 were referenced in the Certification System, where they were used to support the assessment of the competency of OIML Issuing Authorities and Test Laboratories respectively. He specified that originally the Provisional Management Committee, which had been established to get everything ready for the OIML-CS so that it could launch at the beginning of this year, had made a proposal to move responsibility for these documents and the new project from TC 3/SC 5 to the Management Committee. However, in February of the previous year, the Presidential Council had considered that they should remain under TC 3/SC 5, because they were OIML Documents. At the previous year's CIML meeting, delegates had approved a decision to revise D 1 under the responsibility of the CEEMS Advisory Group, i.e. not within a Technical Committee or Subcommittee. Mr Dixon continued that with this precedent having been set, the Management Committee had again made this proposal. The move was supported by the TC 3/SC 5 secretariat. Mr Dixon reported that he had also received a supporting statement from the Management Committee Chairperson. At its meeting in March of this year, the Presidential Council had reconsidered the proposal, and supported it, but requested that the Project Groups concerned be consulted. This consultation had resulted in support for the move. In the documents for this meeting, Mr Dixon had indicated that a negative response had been received from one member of TC 3/SC 5/p 12, but when he had asked the reason for this response, no reason had been provided, and the negative response had subsequently been changed to a positive response. The Project Groups were therefore in favour, although there had also been a comment that if these projects were moved to the Management Committee, there should be a mechanism for members of TC 3/SC 5 to be included in the Project Groups established under the Management Committee, so that the existing members of TC 3/SC 5/p 12 could participate in the project. This proposal had been discussed and supported at the Management Committee meeting held in March. The plan was therefore that D xx would hopefully be approved under agenda item 12.1.1, so that project would be completed. Responsibility for D xx and D 30 should then be moved to the OIML-CS Management Committee, and the project TC 3/SC 5/p 12 for the revision of D 30 should also be moved to the Management Committee. A working group or Project Group should be established under the Management Committee for the revision of D 30, with the OIML-CS Executive Secretary (Mr Dixon himself) as convener. Mr Dixon remarked that this would be convenient since he was already the convener of TC 3/SC 5/p 12. He reported that there would then be a call for participation in the Project Group, which would include the current members of TC 3/SC 5, and the revision of D 30 would then follow the procedures in B 6. Mr Dixon said that a roadmap had been developed, which he showed delegates. The intention was to have a Final Draft available for approval at the CIML meeting in 2020. He asked if anyone had any questions on this proposal.

Mr Edelmaier (Austria) asked about the reason behind moving only the responsibility for D 29 and D 30, and wondered about all the other Recommendations which were related to the Certification System.

Mr Dixon said that the key was that these two Documents were really aimed at test laboratories and certification bodies, and were the two key documents within the OIML-CS. It was therefore felt that the Management Committee had the expertise and knowledge on how these Documents could be applied to participation in the OIML-CS. They had also asked that existing members of TC 3/SC 5 and its Project Groups could participate in the new Project Group. Mr Dixon emphasised that they did not wish to exclude people who were already involved in the existing projects, but rather wanted to actively encourage them to participate. However, it had been felt that the importance of these Documents to the operation of the OIML-CS meant that the Management Committee was the best place to look at their content and applicability, and at any improvements that needed to be made to these Documents in the future. There were no further questions.

11.2.4 Changes to the structure of OIML Recommendations

Moving on to the final recommendation, Mr Dixon stated that delegates would have received Addendum 11.2.4 which gave a detailed background to the proposal, but he summarised that this recommendation proposed changes to the structure of OIML Recommendations. Two aspects were considered. The first was the comparison table, or gap analysis, that had already been mentioned. The requirements of B 18, 15.6 stated that when a new edition of a Recommendation was included in the Certification System, OIML Issuing Authorities and Test Laboratories had to demonstrate their competence to enable them to include this new edition in their scope. One way in which OIML Issuing Authorities and Test Laboratories could do this was to do a “gap analysis” between the previous edition of the Recommendation and the new edition, to demonstrate that they had identified any differences and additional testing that might be required as well as any requirements that were now different. The Management Committee had discussed how this could be carried out, because a consistent approach was required, so that each OIML Issuing Authority and Test Laboratory provided the same kind of evidence to the Review Committee in order for it to make a positive recommendation on their inclusion into the system for the new edition of a Recommendation.

The Management Committee had discussed a proposal that Project Groups revising Recommendations should include a comparison table in the revised Recommendation, for example as an informative annex. The purpose of the comparison table would be to identify corresponding clauses in the previous and revised editions. This would make it possible to identify where there were differences in the requirements between the two editions, and to identify where the revised edition contained new requirements. It had been considered that Project Groups were best placed to develop such comparison tables, because they could more easily identify the changes and document them as they went through the process of revising a Recommendation.

The second part of the proposal covered the structure of the Recommendations. Currently there were three parts: *metrological and technical requirements*, *test procedures*, and *test report format*, but within the OIML-CS, the OIML Issuing Authority issued a “type evaluation report” and the Test Laboratories issued “test reports”. Mr Dixon said that when Mr Oosterman had made his presentation the previous day, he had shown a diagram of how the system worked, with test reports being used to establish the type evaluation report, which in turn was the basis for issuing the Certificate. However, having looked at the Recommendations which were in the system and which would be coming into the system, some used the term “type evaluation report” for part three, some used the term “test report”, and some of them used a combination of both terms. This indicated that there was some confusion and lack of clarity over what the part three of a Recommendation was, and which sections of this part the OIML Issuing Authorities and Test Laboratories were responsible for completing. There was also a potential conflict with accreditation, in that if a test laboratory assessed pass and fail criteria within a test report, accreditation bodies would say that this was an evaluation activity and should be completed by the OIML Issuing Authority. The recommendation being put forward now was that Recommendations should have four parts: parts one and two as before, but part three would be the type evaluation report format issued by the Issuing Authority, and a new part four, which would be a test report issued by the

Test Laboratory. Splitting the type evaluation report and test report into two different parts would clearly separate the activities of the OIML Issuing Authority and the Test Laboratory, and would also then avoid the potential conflict with accreditation and which document should bear which accreditation logo and so on.

Mr Dixon also remarked that the current project for the revision of R 76 included a proposal to include an extra new “part” to cover verification procedures, so if this became a requirement for future Recommendations, it would become “part five”.

Mr Dixon drew delegates’ attention to the project proposal to revise B 6 in the Addendum, and added that although the previous day it had been said that B 6 would not be revised, this Addendum proposed that B 6 be updated to reflect this proposal. Formats for the comparison table would be developed by the Project Group, which would show Project Group conveners what format this comparison table should have and what kind of information it should include. There would also be examples of type evaluation and test report formats for Project Group conveners to use. Mr Dixon explained that the previous week he had taken the existing Recommendation R 50 and had split the part three into a new part three and a new part four. This work had not taken too long. He added that he was aware that some conveners might be concerned that they were being asked to do their technical work a lot quicker but at the same time were now being asked to produce additional comparison tables as well as parts three and four. He was sure that the examples of the report formats would support conveners in doing their jobs. Mr Dixon stated that the aim was to have a Final Draft revision of B 6 ready for approval for the 2019 CIML meeting.

Mr Mateus thought that making improvements to publications was very important. Regarding the gap analysis, he wanted to know what happened with certificates that had already been issued when a Recommendation was withdrawn. He asked whether they continued to be valid, whether they needed to be updated for the new version even though it had been withdrawn, and whether there was a certain “validity” period during which the certificates could be used. He suggested that a transition period would be needed, combined with the gap analysis, to give instrument manufacturers time to update their technologies.

Mr Dixon replied that certificates would remain valid, so an R 60:2000 certificate would remain valid even though there was a new edition of R 60. It would be up to the manufacturer to decide whether they wanted to get approval for the new edition of R 60. He emphasised that although he had previously said that the comparison table would help OIML Issuing Authorities and Test Laboratories in demonstrating their competence for inclusion in the system, the development of the comparison tables would also support manufacturers, because they would be able to easily see what new requirements there were in the new edition of a Recommendation and therefore more easily decide whether they wanted to obtain an OIML certificate to this new edition, and if so, they would know what requirements their instrument now had to fulfil.

Mr Mateus commented further that they had identified some difficulties in approving some instruments. For example they always tried to use the most up-to-date versions of Recommendations in their regulations, but sometimes the instruments could not meet the new requirements, so they had found some difficulties when approving instruments. The update for the new version of the Recommendation with an index of the tests to achieve compliance would be useful, and he suggested that perhaps a transition period for the withdrawal of these Recommendations would be a good idea.

Mr Dixon replied that it was an interesting comment, and it was certainly why the Management Committee looked at the previous edition of a Recommendation when there was a new edition. It was also why, under one of the earlier proposals, they were proposing to retain the previous editions of R 60 and R 61 in the OIML-CS. It could be that in five years’ time the Management Committee decided that they should no longer be in the OIML-CS, so it was one of the roles of the Management Committee to review the scope of the OIML-CS and to make recommendations to the CIML on the withdrawal of certain editions of Recommendation from the OIML-CS.

Mrs Lagauterie wished to return to the question of R 117. She considered they had a basic problem because industry had expected that it would be put into place on 1 January 2019. There had then been

a postponement of six months, which was already a delay for them, and now a new postponement of one year was being proposed. The method being used did not take into account the impact this would have, and did not consider industry's opinion. If she remembered correctly, even when the revision of R 117 had started, which had been a long time ago, industry had not been very pleased because these instruments had not been included, even under the previous Certificate System. At the moment, they were waiting to include them in the OIML-CS, and now they would be made to wait a further year. Mrs Lagauterie was questioning the need for this delay, as she did not believe they had consulted with the other members of the working group, nor with CIML Members, and they had not had the time to consider another delay of six months. She said that she had a serious problem with the procedures that were being used, and did not agree with them. Regarding the delay, she suggested there needed to be a study on its impact, that the proposition should be supported by the views of several persons, and at least the opinion of industry should be considered. If this problem had concerned the weighing industry, CECIP was present at this meeting and could give their opinion, but she pointed out that CECOD was not present, and she did not believe their opinion had been sought.

Mr Dixon thanked Mrs Lagauterie for her comments and said he would note them; he mentioned that this proposal had come up during the discussions with the convener of the Project Group revising R 117. He added that the convener expected to have the revision completed in the near future, and there was a concern that if the new revision were to be published the following year, then this would coincide with the transition of R 117 from Scheme B to Scheme A. There were concerns that this could cause problems for OIML Issuing Authorities and Test Laboratories, as well as for manufacturers. From a Management Committee perspective he said that he fully understood the comments and concerns that had been raised, and if the Committee felt that the change to the transition date for R 117 was not appropriate, it should revert to the original proposal. He noted that the MC Chairperson was nodding in agreement.

Dr Schwartz considered that they should treat the item regarding R 117 separately.

Mr Richter (United States) said that Mrs Lagauterie's comments concerned him as convener of the Project Group revising R 117. Currently, Scheme B Certificates could be obtained for this Recommendation, and it had not made any sense to him to transition to Scheme A if the revised Recommendation were to be approved at the 2019 CIML meeting. Scheme A certificates would then be available for just a couple of months according to the old edition, and then the Scheme A would be available for the new edition. In his opinion, this would cause confusion in the marketplace. He also had several other comments but he said he would leave those until this issue had been resolved.

Dr Schwartz noted they were running out of time, and that they should reconsider this item on R 117. He suggested delegates thought about it during the coffee break, proposing that they now conclude this item. Prior to voting on the respective draft resolutions, a roll call would be needed but before doing this he said they appreciated that the Management Committee Chairperson, Mr Oosterman, had taken the time to come to this CIML meeting. He was not sure how long Mr Oosterman would be able to stay at the meeting, so he wanted to congratulate the Management Committee Chairperson, the Executive Secretary, and all the Members of the Management Committee for all the work they had completed, and for the progress that had been made. He described the OIML-CS as being still in its infancy, adding that they needed more Certificates for more categories of instrument and more Utilizers. They faced some problems, which he was sure would be resolved progressively so he wanted to congratulate everybody that had been involved in the launch which had been only nine months prior to this meeting.

Mrs Lagauterie also wanted to congratulate the group for its work, and for the development of the OIML-CS. She suggested that when all the changes had been adopted, the group prepared a summary document showing all the modifications, because she thought it was particularly important to bring them to the attention of those countries which had declared themselves as Utilizers since the beginning of the OIML-CS, on the basis of the old arrangements.

Mr Dixon agreed completely, and the Management Committee would acknowledge this comment and produce a summary.

Mr Lambregts (Netherlands) remarked that he was happy with the progress, but asked Mr Dixon to clarify BIML guidance with respect to the templates and formats.

Mr Dixon referred back to his presentation, indicating that there were the existing Recommendations. He re-iterated that the previous week he had taken the example of R 50, for which he had developed initial proposals for templates for the proposed parts three and four, which had been a relatively quick process. He reflected that it might not always be so simple, and he had had to look at the requirements for the type evaluation report in the OIML-CS and the kind of information and content that needed to be included, but it was certainly something that the Project Group would be looking at developing to support those PG conveners who were revising Recommendations. He said they would be made available as part of the revision project.

Dr Schwartz understood that there was a full support from the BIML for the Executive Secretary to provide templates with all the respective and related information that was necessary.

Mr Dixon clarified that these would actually be provided by the Project Group.

Dr Schwartz corrected himself, and stated that his experience was that this was not an enormous task to separate these two parts of the report, and it would be a big advantage if there was a clear distinction between the type evaluation report and the test report. He maintained that there had been a lot of confusion in the past, and he really appreciated that this would be clarified in the future. He added it would take some time to for this to be adopted, but considered that it was a very important and valid step. He asked if there were any more questions.

Mr Awosola asked what would happen to the existing Recommendations once B 6 had been updated to require four parts in OIML Recommendations. He asked if the new part four was going to require a new revision or a new project to revise existing Recommendations.

Mr Dixon explained that he expected that when a Recommendation was revised, the current part three would be separated into two parts. He did not anticipate that all Recommendations would suddenly have to be revised to separate out these parts, but would be picked up as part of new project proposals.

Dr Schwartz added that once they had prioritised the Recommendations, they would be speeding up and not waiting for five years to have the part fours which were needed. He hoped they would be much quicker, at least with the most important Recommendations which would be identified.

Mr Dixit said he had three questions. Firstly, since Recommendations changed from time to time, he wanted to know whether they intended to fix the validity of certificates. Secondly, he wanted to know whether they were allowing revisions to be made to certificates which were issued under each category, and thirdly, he asked for views on what would happen if OIML Issuing Authorities did not obtain peer assessment or accreditation during the necessary time period.

Mr Dixon replied they had already explained that any OIML certificates that had been issued would remain valid. There would be no expiry date for certificates. Revisions to existing certificates could then be made while the edition of the Recommendation was still in the system and certificates issued under Scheme B would remain valid. If an instrument type then transitioned to Scheme A, there were provisions in the documentation on how a Scheme B certificate could be converted into a Scheme A certificate.

Mr Dixit was not satisfied with Mr Dixon's reply. He said that the same point had been made by Mr Oosterman. There were a lot of certificates that had been issued under the Basic Certificate System, and these had been converted to Scheme B certificates, but some Recommendations were under revision and had not been completed. The NMIs and organisations had issued those certificates on their own. He suggested that they should consider that the consumers were the utilisers, and they should not be sent in the wrong direction.

Mr Dixon replied that when a Utilizer applied to participate in the OIML-CS, they had to indicate which certificates they were willing to accept, and when new editions of Recommendations came into the OIML-CS, Utilizers could specify whether they would now only accept certificates for the new edition, or whether they would continue accepting certificates from the previous edition.

Dr Schwartz intervened saying that they would have to stop the discussion now. He asked delegates to take time during the break to bilaterally clarify any further questions. He said that the problems were understood, and they recognised the struggles and the proposals that had been made to further improve the OIML-CS. They knew that there were still some problems, but these would not be solved during the CIML meeting, noting that this was what the Management Committee was for. He asked delegates to become utilisers and take part in the Management Committee meetings to raise their questions. He requested that this item be closed, but informed delegates that before this could be done, they would need to carry out a roll call to be sure that they had a quorum to approve the draft resolutions. He thanked Mr Dixon.

Mr Dunmill took the roll call:

Albania.....	Present
Algeria	Not present
Australia.....	Present
Austria	Present
Belarus	Present
Belgium	Present
Brazil	Present
Bulgaria	Present
Cambodia.....	Present
Cameroon.....	Not present, no proxy
Canada	Present
Colombia	Not present, proxy to Cuba
Croatia	Present
Cuba.....	Present
Cyprus.....	Present
Czech Republic.....	Present
Denmark	Not present, proxy to Norway
Egypt.....	Present
Finland.....	Present
France	Present
Germany	Present
Greece.....	Not present, no proxy
Hungary	Present
India	Present
Indonesia.....	Present
Iran.....	Present
Ireland.....	Present
Israel	Not present, proxy to Ireland
Italy	Present
Japan	Present
Kazakhstan.....	Not present, proxy to Russian Federation
Kenya.....	Present
Republic of Korea.....	Present
Macedonia	Not present
Monaco	Not present, proxy to France

Morocco.....	Not present, no proxy
Netherlands.....	Present
New Zealand.....	Present
Norway.....	Present
P.R. China.....	Present
Pakistan.....	Not present, no proxy
Poland.....	Present
Portugal.....	Present
Romania.....	Present
Russian Federation.....	Present
Saudi Arabia.....	Present
Serbia.....	Not present
Slovakia.....	Present
Slovenia.....	Present
South Africa.....	Present
Spain.....	Present
Sri Lanka.....	Not present, no proxy
Sweden.....	Present
Switzerland.....	Present
Tanzania.....	Present
Thailand.....	Present
Tunisia.....	Present
Tunisia.....	Present
Turkey.....	Present
United Kingdom.....	Present
United States.....	Present
Vietnam.....	Present
Zambia.....	Present

Dr Schwartz established that they had a quorum, so they could now look at the first draft resolution under item 11.1. Mr Dunmill read:

The Committee,

Notes the report of the OIML Certification System (OIML-CS) Management Committee (MC) Chairperson, and

Thanks the members of the Management Committee, the Review Committee and the Maintenance Group for their work.

There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. Resolution 2018/17 was approved unanimously.

The next item was under 11.2.1. Mr Dunmill read:

The Committee,

Noting the recommendation of the OIML-CS Management Committee,

Approves the Final Draft revision of B 18 *Framework for the OIML Certification System (OIML-CS)*.

There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. Resolution 2018/18 was approved unanimously.

The next item was under 11.2.2. Mr Dunmill read:

The Committee,

Noting the recommendation of the OIML-CS Management Committee,

Having regard to subclause 15.5 of B 18:2017 *Framework for the OIML Certification System (OIML-CS)*,

Decides to maintain R 60:2000 and R 61:2004 in the OIML Certification System,

Having regard to subclause 15.3 of B 18:2017 *Framework for the OIML Certification System (OIML-CS)*,

Decides that the category of measuring instrument covered by R 49 will transition from Scheme B to Scheme A on 1 January 2019,

Decides that the categories of measuring instruments covered by R 51 and R 117 will transition from Scheme B to Scheme A on 1 July 2019,

Decides that the categories of measuring instruments covered by R 46 and R 137 will transition from Scheme B to Scheme A on 1 January 2020,

Decides that the categories of measuring instruments covered by R 61, R 85 and R 129 will transition from Scheme B to Scheme A on 1 July 2020,

Decides that the categories of measuring instruments covered by R 21, R 50, R 75, R 99, R 106, R 107, R 126, R 134 and R 139 will transition from Scheme B to Scheme A on 1 January 2021, and

Decides that on 1 January 2019 the categories of measuring instruments covered by R 16, R 35, R 58, R 81, R 88, R 93, R 102, R 104, R 110, R 122, R 128, R 133, R 136, R 143, R 144, R 145 and R 146 enter the OIML-CS in Scheme B and will transition to Scheme A on 1 January 2021.

Mr Dunmill added that Mr Dixon had just informed him that R 59 should have been included in the list in the final point of this draft resolution.

Dr Schwartz added that concerning the discussion on R 117, he suggested that they take this out of the current resolution so there would be time to discuss this before they came back with a separate resolution on R 117 the following day.

Mr Dunmill made the necessary editorial changes accordingly.

Mr Mateus had just realised that R 91 on speed meters would not be entering this Scheme, and asked whether there was a specific proposal on this.

Mr Dixon replied that R 91 did not fulfil the requirements to be included in the system. He reminded delegates about the comments made by Ms. Cheelo the previous day, in which she had expressed the very real desire to include this in the system. They would need the revision of R 91 which would have the required number of parts, and met the requirements of the OIML-CS to make a proposal for it to be included.

Dr Schwartz stated this was exactly why he had proposed to prioritise the Recommendations and to speed up the work on certain Recommendations which were considered very important, and which needed to be made fit for the Certification System. He summarised the changes made to the amended resolution, confirming that R 59 had been added and R 117 deleted.

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any further comments. There were none. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. Resolution 2018/19 was unanimously approved.

Mr Dunmill asked delegates to consider resolution under item 11.2.3. He read:

The Committee,

Noting the recommendation of the OIML-CS Management Committee,

Decides that responsibility for D 29, D 30 and D xx *Guide for the application of ISO/IEC 17065 to assessment of certification bodies in legal metrology* shall move from TC 3/SC 5 to the OIML-CS Management Committee (MC),

Decides that project TC 3/SC 5/p 5 (development of D xx *Guide for the application of ISO/IEC 17065 to the assessment of certification bodies in legal metrology*) will be completed under TC 3/SC 5 before responsibility for the Document is moved to the OIML-CS MC,

Decides that project 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*) shall move to the OIML-CS MC,

Instructs the OIML-CS Executive Secretary to establish a Project Group under the control of the OIML-CS MC to revise D 30 *Guide for the application of ISO/IEC 17025 to the assessment of Testing Laboratories involved in legal metrology*, and

Instructs the OIML-CS Executive Secretary to request that members of TC 3/SC 5 and members of the MC confirm their participation as P- or O-members in the Project Group and, where applicable, to nominate main contacts and contacts.

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments.

Mrs Lagauterie said she did not have any objections, but sought reassurance that when the OIML-CS took charge of this project, it would function in the same way as all the other Project Groups, and would adhere to the rules laid out in B 6.

Mr Dixon confirmed that they would be following the rules that were specified in B 6 for the development of this revision, as well as for any other similar projects in the future.

Mr Dunmill noted that there were no other comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. Resolution 2018/20 was approved unanimously.

Moving on to item 11.2.4, Mr Dunmill read the draft resolution:

The Committee,

Noting the recommendation of the OIML-CS Management Committee,

Decides that when an OIML Recommendation that is included in the OIML-CS is revised, the relevant Project Group shall develop a comparison table (“gap analysis”),

Decides that new and revised OIML Recommendations that are to be included in the OIML-CS shall include separate type evaluation report and test report formats, and

Approves as a new project under the responsibility of the BIML, the revision of B 6 *Directives for OIML technical work*, to be conducted as specified in the project proposal provided in Addendum 11.2.4 to the working document for this meeting.

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments on the wording of the resolution.

Mrs Lagauterie asked after what date this resolution would be applied, because if there was a Recommendation which was currently under revision, or just about to be approved, this would be extra work which would have to be carried out immediately. This might slow down the approval of a Recommendation, and she added that obviously she was particularly thinking of R 117.

Mr Dixon said that the project would start immediately, and although he understood that the question related to existing projects revising Recommendations, he was not sure he was the correct person to answer this.

Dr Schwartz added that he was not in the position to answer this question at present, but said that he would reconsider it. He said he could not see all the implications at the moment and asked if anybody else had any advice.

Mr Richter stated that he had earlier been going to ask a similar question to the one that Mrs Lagauterie had just asked, but that the comments period had been shut down abruptly. He thanked Mr Dixon for acknowledging that what was being asked here was extra work for conveners and for Project Groups. It was not a small amount of work, especially when dealing with a very large document. He would very much like to know whether this was going to be expected immediately for all projects. He said there were several projects which had been underway for several years, so comparing earlier editions to the revision was not just a case of looking at two different drafts, it could be looking at many different drafts where extensive changes had been made. As far as the separation of type evaluation reports and test report formats was concerned, he also agreed that this was a good idea, but in many cases it was not going to be a small amount of work, so in addition to the French CIML Member's question on whether this was going to apply only to new projects or whether it would apply to existing projects, yet another nuance would be that some of the Recommendations had multiple editions which were still being used in the Certification System. For example, in the case of R 117, certificates were still being issued to the 1995 and 2007 editions, and would soon also be available to the 2019 edition. He questioned whether a gap analysis would be necessary which compared all three editions. These were all questions that he considered needed to be addressed.

Dr Schwartz said that following a quick discussion, he would say that this just concerned new projects and would not affect current projects. He would recommend that each and every project that was currently running should be completed as soon as possible according to the rules in the existing B 6. Conveners should not wait, and delay the technical work, just to wait for a revised version of B 6. If this meant that the revised R 117 had only three parts and lacked a gap analysis for the time being, this could always be added as an addendum or amendment. He said that he would recommend not to delay any projects by waiting for a new revision of B 6, which he considered would probably be revised several times, and he hoped that this helped to clarify the situation.

Dr Schwartz asked if delegates were now ready to vote on the resolution on item 11.2.4.

Mr Dunmill noted that there were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. Resolution 2018/21 was approved unanimously.

Dr Schwartz thanked everyone for all the work that had been successfully accomplished, for the progress that had been achieved, and thanked the Management Committee.

Mr Dixon thanked delegates for their support.

12 Technical activities

Dr Schwartz said they would move onto item 12 on technical activities, and asked Mr Dunmill to take the lead.

12.1 Technical items for approval by the CIML

Mr Dunmill stated that the first item they had under technical activities covered the items which needed approval by the CIML. He indicated that they could continue with this as they had just taken a roll call.

12.1.1 Approval of Final Draft Recommendations and Documents

The first item was the approval of the Final Draft Recommendations and Documents that had been put before the Committee. Mr Dunmill reminded delegates that the voting rules for the approval of Recommendations required that at least 75 % of CIML Members be present or represented for the vote. He indicated that as they would have seen from the figures announced by Mr Patoray after the roll call,

this requirement was satisfied. On each item, a vote must be cast by at least 80 % of those Members present or represented (abstentions not counting as votes cast). Finally, 80 % of the votes cast had to be in favour. They would be carrying out the voting in a similar fashion to how they had proceeded previously, in other words, he would be asking if there were any comments, abstentions, or negative votes. Finally the votes would be counted to see whether the approval had been given or not.

R 139 *Compressed gaseous fuel measuring systems for vehicles*

The first item was the revision of R 139 *Compressed gaseous fuel measuring systems for vehicles* which had been submitted to a Preliminary CIML Online Ballot with a deadline of 14 June 2019. 35 responses had been received from a total of 62 CIML Members. Two abstentions had been given, there were no negative votes, and 33 yes votes. He asked whether there were any further comments on this revision. There were none. There were no abstentions to the approval of this revision. There were no negative votes. The revision of R 139 was approved unanimously.

New Document: *Guide for the application of ISO/IEC17065 to the assessment of certification bodies in legal metrology*

The second item was a new Document *Guide for the application of ISO/IEC17065 to the assessment of certification bodies in legal metrology*. There had been a Preliminary CIML Online Ballot with a deadline of 18 July 2018. 42 responses had been received out of the 62 CIML Members and there had been no abstentions and no negative votes received during that ballot, with 42 yes votes.

Dr Schwartz wanted to explain the situation regarding this Document so that the right decision could be taken. This Final Draft Document had been uploaded ten days after the three-month period that was normally given to CIML Members, so strictly speaking it was late. He wanted to clarify whether Members were happy with this situation, or whether they objected to voting on this Final Draft Document because of the delay, and although he hoped that nobody would object because this would delay the publication further, he had wanted to address this situation and make them aware of it. There were no objections to the vote being held at the current time despite the small delay.

Mr Dunmill noted that there were no further comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The Document was approved unanimously.

Mr Dunmill added that for both of the Documents which had just been approved, one recurring problem that he wanted to mention once again was the low level of response for online CIML voting. As he had indicated, there had only been 35 responses for the first Final Draft Document, and 42 responses for the second. This gave the Bureau a lot of trouble in gauging the level of support for Recommendations, so he wanted to once again request that Members vote within the deadlines when a Draft was put to them for Preliminary Online Ballot or for CIML online approval (as stipulated in OIML B 6).

Mr Dunmill stated there was one resolution, as he had already mentioned. He read the resolution; there were no objections. There were no negative votes and the resolution passed unanimously.

12.1.2 Approval of new projects

Mr Dunmill stated that they would now consider the new project proposals.

12.1.2.1 Revision of R 51 *Automatic catchweighing instruments*

Firstly there was a proposal for a new project on the revision of R 51 *Automatic catchweighing instruments*. He stated that the details had been provided to delegates in Addendum 12.1.2.1 and asked if anyone had any comments. He read the relevant resolution; again he asked for comments on the proposal or the resolution. There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. Resolution 2018/23 was passed unanimously.

12.1.2.2 Revision of R 134 Automatic instruments for weighing road vehicles in motion and measuring axle loads

The next project was a proposal for the new project on the revision of R 134 *Automatic instruments for weighing road vehicles in motion and measuring axle loads*. He added that the details could be found in Addendum 12.1.2.2. He read the resolution:

The Committee,

Approves as a new project, under the responsibility of TC 9/SC 2, the revision of R 134 *Automatic instruments for weighing road vehicles in motion and measuring axle loads*, to be conducted as specified in the project proposal provided in Addendum 12.1.2.2 to the working document for this meeting.

Mrs Lagauterie said she had two comments related to this project. Firstly, it was indicated in the proposal that there would be a requirement for measuring the speed of vehicles. She said she was very surprised to see this in a project for a Recommendations on weighing, since speed measurement was the subject of a completely different Subcommittee, under which there was a current project on the development of R 91 *Radar equipment for the measurement of the speed of vehicles*. She considered that this subject should not therefore form part of the revision of R 134.

Secondly she wanted to comment on the statistical aspects. She said that, during the course of the year, she had been made aware of presentations on this system of weighing at high speeds which showed that there were attempts to develop this equipment, which might very well be suitable for the screening of vehicles, but which should under no circumstances be used for legal metrology applications, which might result in prosecutions, fines, or perhaps even imprisonment of the driver. This was because the instruments were based on a statistical approach, under which the measurement results showed that they were within the appropriate tolerances only 80 % of the time. For her, this meant that these instruments could not be used in legal metrology. She had also seen presentations which had stated that these instruments were, for example, very sensitive to the condition of the road surface in which they were installed, to temperature variations, ice, etc. Mrs Lagauterie considered that it was very important that these subjects should be carefully examined, because if such instruments were allowed for legal metrology purposes, they needed to function correctly in real-world conditions, and one should not have to consider such issues as these for each and every measurement. She therefore felt it was important to draw attention to the scope of this proposed revision, and to the fact that at its current state of development, the technology for high-speed weighing was not suitable for measurements in a legal metrology situation. However, she reiterated that for her, the most important thing was the question of speed measurement, which she felt had no place in this Recommendation.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mrs Lagauterie for her comments, and asked the BIML to respond since they had made the project proposal.

Mr Dunmill replied that the proposal had been put forward by the BIML following a request from CECIP, because the industry had been keen to address the inadequacy of the existing R 134 to current technology, which had moved very fast, so the existing R 134 was considerably out of date. There had also been various other moves to develop new standards that bypassed the OIML Recommendation. CECIP had expressed a keen interest in ensuring that the OIML Recommendation remained the international standard in this field. Mr Dunmill fully understood the concerns Mrs Lagauterie had expressed, but felt that they should be considered as part of the technical considerations which would be under taken during the development of the project.

Dr Ehrlich had noted that in the Addendum no convener had been specified, and he wondered whether there was more information about this.

Mr Dunmill said he had forgotten to mention this matter. The project had been put forward quite late, which was why it had been a BIML proposal rather than coming from a Member State. CECIP had made the initial approach to the BIML because, as he had said, they felt it was an important area in which the OIML should be at the forefront. In the meantime, they had identified that the Netherlands would be prepared to take on the convenership. This was because, although the UK had the first option

on the convenership as secretariat of TC 9/SC 2, they had not been able to take on the convenership given the other projects which were already underway in the field of automatic weighing instruments. It had therefore been agreed that someone from the Netherlands would become the convener for this project.

Mrs Lagauterie clarified that she was not against the development of a revision of R 134, but for her this should not include a speed measurement, which was in a completely different Subcommittee, and she wanted to draw attention to some technical problems when certain technologies were used in legal metrology. However, she agreed that these could be considered during the technical work, in which they would certainly be participating.

Mr Dunmill added that he appreciated the concerns Mrs Lagauterie had expressed, but felt that the concerns could be noted for the moment, and would be forwarded to the convener, to be taken into account during the development of the project. He noted that CECIP had a comment, as did Switzerland.

Mr Nater stated that the reason CECIP had asked for a revision of this Recommendation had been the various developments in several countries. They had thought it was essential to revise R 134 so that the situation could be harmonised again, and an OIML Recommendation could be developed which could be followed all over the world again. He considered that there was no speed measurement involved, or at least they could discuss this, as had been suggested by Mrs Lagauterie, during the technical work.

Mr Mathew wanted to reassure Mrs Lagauterie that what she was saying would definitely be taken into account, because someone from METAS would be in the Project Group, and it was clear that this was a good example of “cross-functional measurements”. He was not sure if this term existed as such, but the point was that her comments would definitely be taken into account.

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any other comments on this item. There were none. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. Resolution 2018/24 was approved unanimously.

Dr Schwartz suggested that it was now time for a break, but before closing this session, he informed delegates about a change to the proposed agenda. He suggested that before the technical tour took place after lunch, they would first have the awards session. So he was proposing that item 16 be moved up the agenda¹ to the next session following the coffee break, in which case they would continue with item 12.1.2.3 the following morning. There were a number of awards to make at this meeting, and Dr Schwartz wanted to allow for enough time to present them. There were no objections from delegates. Dr Schwartz thanked them for their understanding.

Dr Schwartz said it was his pleasure to open the last session of the CIML meeting. He commented that it was excellent that they had the quorum, but before approving the resolutions they were going to take a roll call, and he asked Mr Dunmill to carry this out.

Albania.....	Not present
Algeria	Not present, no proxy
Australia.....	Present
Austria	Present
Belarus	Not present
Belgium	Present
Brazil	Present
Bulgaria	Not present, proxy to Croatia
Cambodia.....	Present
Cameroon.....	Not present, no proxy
Canada	Present

¹ BIML note: For ease of reference, the items are presented in these minutes in the order of the Agenda and not in the order in which they were taken in Hamburg.

ColombiaNot present, proxy to Cuba
CroatiaPresent
Cuba.....Present
Cyprus.....Present
Czech Republic.....Present
DenmarkNot present, proxy to Norway
Egypt.....Present
FinlandPresent
FrancePresent
GermanyPresent
Greece.....Not present, no proxy
HungaryPresent
IndiaPresent
Indonesia.....Present
Iran.....Present
Ireland.....Present
IsraelNot present, proxy to Ireland
Italy.....Present
JapanPresent
Kazakhstan.....Not present, proxy to Russian Federation
Kenya.....Present
Republic of Korea.....Present
MacedoniaNot present
MonacoNot present, proxy to France
Morocco.....Not present, no proxy
Netherlands.....Present
New Zealand.....Present
NorwayPresent
P.R. China.....Present
Pakistan.....Not present, no proxy
PolandPresent
Portugal.....Present
Romania.....Present
Russian Federation.....Present
Saudi ArabiaPresent
SerbiaPresent
SlovakiaPresent
SloveniaPresent
South Africa.....Present
SpainPresent
Sri Lanka.....Not present, no proxy
Sweden.....Present
SwitzerlandPresent
Tanzania.....Present

Thailand.....	Not present
Tunisia	Present
Tunisia	Present
Turkey.....	Present
United Kingdom	Present
United States.....	Present
Vietnam	Present
Zambia	Present

Mr Patoray summarised the roll call. Ten countries were not represented. From a total of 62 Members there were 52 countries represented (the quorum was 47).

Dr Schwartz reminded delegates that the last item they had discussed the previous day had been item 12.1.2.2, the revision of R 134 *Automatic instruments for weighing road vehicles in motion and measuring axle loads*, and they had approved the respective draft resolution. He commented that there were quite a number of new projects presented for approval, and he thought this indicated that there was a lot of activity with regard to revisions as well as new Recommendations. Dr Schwartz then asked Mr Dunmill to explain the next proposal.

12.1.2.3 Revision of D 14 *Training and qualification of legal metrology personnel*

Mr Dunmill explained that D 14 *Training and qualification of legal metrology personnel* was a slightly strange Document, in that the existing version had actually been developed by a working group of the old OIML Development Council, the predecessor to the current CEEMS Advisory Group. It had thus never been the responsibility of a specific Technical Committee or Subcommittee. It was proposed that its revision, as delegates would have noted from the terms of reference in the Addendum, would be under the responsibility of the CEEMS AG. Germany had volunteered to take on the convenership, but if the project was approved at the current meeting, when the call for members was launched, all Member States and Corresponding Members would be able to nominate experts to take part in this Project Group. Mr Dunmill remarked that CEEMS countries frequently asked for advice on how to train legal metrology personnel. He therefore considered it was an important Document to bring up to date, especially as the existing version was now well outside the five-year review period.

Dr Schwartz clarified that if approved, this project would follow the procedures of B 6. He asked if there were any questions or comments.

Mr Dixit stated that India was ready to participate in this project, and would register for the Project Group. They would co-operate with the chairperson from Germany.

Mr Dunmill added that if this project was approved, there would be a call for participation, as there would be with all of the projects, so that at that time delegates could register their country as a member of the Project Group. For each project proposal, the decision at the moment was whether the project would be approved. The BIML would then handle the administrative procedure of a call for participation in each of the new Project Groups. Mr Dunmill went on to note that there were no further comments on the wording of the resolution, nor comments on the project itself.

There were no abstentions or negative votes. The resolution was approved unanimously.

12.1.2.4 Revision of D 19 *Pattern evaluation and pattern approval*

Mr Dunmill continued that the next project proposal was also a common problem for CEEMS – guidance on pattern, or type, evaluation. The existing edition of D 19 was called *Pattern evaluation and pattern approval* because it was rather old, so this would be updated and the title would be examined when the project was under way. It was also proposed that this project be under the responsibility of the CEEMS AG, and the terms of reference could be found in Addendum 12.1.2.4. This resolution was slightly different in that the revision of D 19 was already included in an existing project, so this proposal

was to start a new project, specifically to revise D 19, but at the same time to cancel the existing project of which it was part. Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments.

Mrs Lagauterie asked if it was expected that this Project Group would work with the OIML-CS Management Committee, because a parallel system of certification should not be developed.

Mr Dunmill replied that they would work together but could not specify how that would be registered formally.

Mr Mason added that, as made clear in the terms of reference, he would be acting as convener for this Project Group, and he emphasised that it was certainly his intention that a representative from the OIML-CS Management Committee would be able to participate. He commented that they expected many of the countries that were active in the OIML-CS Management Committee would also wish to participate, and it would not be surprising if the experts were, in many cases, the same as those on the OIML-CS Management Committee, but he could reassure Mrs Lagauterie that there would be a full integration between this project and the work of the OIML-CS Management Committee.

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any other comments.

Mr Khedir stated he had a general comment for the Project Group. He proposed that as the work progressed, this group reported on their progress to CIML Members, so that they could follow the evolution of the work, and give the group their opinions. Certain Members may not wish to participate in the Project Group for one reason or another, and in this way they could at least follow its work. He also wondered whether there was a correlation between the revision of D 19 and the separation, in the OIML-CS, of the test reports and type evaluation reports. He felt that this was the case, and said they should take the necessary precautions.

Mr Dunmill remarked that as far as participation was concerned, all Member States could be P- or O-members of this project. He would suggest that when the call for participation in the Project Group was made, Member States that were interested in it registered as P-members in order to participate actively in the work, or as O-members if they wished simply to follow the work. He added that all Corresponding Members could also register as O-members for any project. As far as Mr Khedir's second point was concerned, he thought that the participation of members of the OIML-CS Management Committee in the work would ensure a coherent approach was taken to the issue of the type evaluation and test reports.

Mr Loizides replied to his colleagues from France and Tunisia. Australia was the deputy chair of the OIML-CS Management Committee, and was also a Member of the CEEMS Advisory Group, and could therefore help to ensure there was harmonisation, and to support the deputy chair of the CEEMS Advisory Group.

Mr Dunmill confirmed that there were no other comments.

There were no abstentions or negative votes. The resolution was approved unanimously.

12.1.2.5 New Recommendation *Instruments for measuring the vehicle exhaust soot particle number (PN)*

Mr Dunmill introduced the next project as one that concerned a new Recommendation on *Instruments for measuring the vehicle exhaust soot particle number (PN)*. He added that the details had been given in Addendum 12.1.2.5. He informed delegates that this was something that Germany would be taking the lead on, and he therefore asked Dr Schwartz to describe the project in more detail.

Dr Schwartz said that this project proposal dealt with the measurement of the soot particles number in vehicle exhausts during periodical technical inspections. He added that delegates might have been aware that there were some ongoing discussions in Germany, and he was sure also in other countries, about the proper measurement of gases and particles in the exhaust gas of cars, and that there was a lot of research being carried out at the moment. With this project proposal, they would like to ensure that this work was not only carried out nationally, and in conjunction with European Directives, but also from an international viewpoint. He had therefore asked his colleagues to think about a project proposal,

which would extend the scope of R 99, or would perhaps be a new publication. He added that R 99 was ten years old now, and dealt only with gas measurements in vehicle exhaust periodical technical inspection schemes, and there was no OIML Recommendation which dealt with soot particle number in exhaust gases, which was especially important for diesel cars. This was a proposal to think about a project in that field, which would be necessary for the measurement the exhaust gases for diesel cars in the future. He described this as the background to this project, and stated that Germany was prepared to take on the convenership. He asked if there were any questions.

Mrs Lagauterie responded that France was in favour of the development of this project. She considered it was important for the automobile industry, and for the OIML in playing its part in influencing the health of citizens worldwide. She wanted to comment on the reference text mentioned, which mentioned a regulation dating from 2007 which had already been extensively modified, and she drew attention to other texts which could be taken into account, notably regulation 83/CEE/ONU and the European Directive from 2014, which it would be appropriate to consider for more up-to-date information.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mrs Lagauterie for her comment.

Mr Lambregts commented that they completely agreed with France and offered a co-convenership, as they held the secretariat for TC 16/SC 1.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Lambregts for his comment. He added they had already spoken to their Dutch colleagues, and had made sure that this was in line with their responsibilities, since they held the secretariat. He confirmed that they would be very happy to have a co-convenership with the Netherlands. He added that his proposal would be that they took up the suggestions from Mrs Lagauterie with regard to the terms of reference, and they would adjust the terms of reference accordingly before they were sent out to Members to decide whether they would like to join the project as P- or O-members. In addition they would propose a co-convenership between Germany and the Netherlands.

Dr Ehrlich wished to remind delegates that R 99 had been developed in conjunction with ISO, so he would encourage the conveners to look at whether ISO had anything in this area with which they should be coordinating.

Dr Schwartz reassured Dr Ehrlich that they would certainly take this into consideration. He noted that ISO 27891 was already mentioned in the terms of reference, and reiterated they would look closely at what already existed. He asked whether delegates would now be prepared to vote on this proposal.

Mr Dunmill confirmed there were no further comments on the wording of this proposal.

There were no abstentions or negative votes. The resolution was approved unanimously.

12.1.2.6 New Document *Surveillance of utility meters in-service on the basis of sampling inspections*

Mr Dunmill stated that the next project was for the creation of a new Document on *Surveillance of utility meters in-service on the basis of sampling inspections*, and the details were in Addendum 12.1.2.6. This new project was effectively a revision of the existing G 20, which had been approved the previous year. The proposal had come from Germany with the suggestion that the UK take the convenership for this project. He asked if there were any comments.

Dr Schwartz confirmed that this was a follow-up to the last CIML meeting in Colombia where, in resolution 2017/26, the Committee had requested the secretariat of TC 3/SC 4 (Germany), to make a proposal to this meeting concerning the further improvement of G 20, which had been approved the previous year as a guidance document, to enable it to be published as a new OIML Document. In preparing this meeting, they had been in contact with their colleagues from the UK, and especially with the new UK CIML Member, Richard Sanders, who had kindly proposed his colleague Mr Leighton Burgess as the convener of this Project Group, which would deal with further improvement to G 20. Dr Schwartz pointed out that they had added to the terms of reference a description of new intelligent sampling procedures, which provided for flexible verification periods, depending on previous knowledge of measuring instruments. In Germany they now used this approach, and he considered other countries would also probably be interested in having flexible verification periods, especially when

considering smart meters. They had a lot of information which could be used, so it was to a great extent previous knowledge, and this could be used for legal metrology purposes. He concluded that this was the background information, and asked if there were any comments or questions.

Mrs Lagauterie confirmed that France was in favour of the project proposal because when voting for the Guide last year, they had only voted in favour because it had been confirmed that it would not have the same force as a Recommendation, which would have posed problems in applying it in France, as it would have also in other Member States. Moving on to the second point, concerning smart meters and the data which could be obtained, she thought that it was necessary to be careful. She felt that obtaining information on the validity of controls could only be considered valid if they were part of the legal metrology certified elements of the instrument. This was because these smart meters could have software which included many functions which are not guaranteed in the legal metrology context, and if the data were needed for legal metrology, then they needed to be included in the certified part. She therefore suggested that this Project Group looked at what needed to be added to the criteria applied to these instruments so as to certify the parts of the software and the data they produced which might be used in this flexibility of verification periods.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mrs Lagauterie for her comments, and responded that they would certainly consider them. He continued that they had just wanted to make sure that this aspect would not be overlooked when the revision of G 20 was considered, because they had to think about the future. He reassured her that they had to take into account the fact that all software relevant to legal metrology purposes was completely under “legal control”. He asked if there were any other comments before taking a vote.

Mr Khedir commented that the revision of this publication was very important, and agreed with Mrs Lagauterie, because it was of great importance to Tunisia, where they were starting to conduct surveillance of this type of meter. They were in the middle of implementing this in Tunisia and they would like to propose themselves as the secretariat for this work.

Dr Schwartz replied that the project proposal would be circulated and Mr Khedir would have the possibility to register his interest at that point.

Mr Dunmill noted that there were no further comments.

There were no abstentions or negative votes. The resolution was approved unanimously.

12.1.2.7 New Document *Petroleum measurement tables*

Mr Dunmill explained that the next project proposal was for a new Document on *Petroleum measurement tables*. He continued that delegates would see from Addendum 12.1.2.7 that there was an existing Recommendation on this subject, and there had been a project approved to revise this Recommendation about nine years ago. However this had been put on hold, waiting for the revision of the relevant ISO standard. This ISO standard had now been revised, so the existing TC 8/p 5 convener had proposed that a Document was established by the OIML instead of the existing Recommendation, so this project was effectively a revision of the Recommendation, but included republishing it as a Document instead. The proposal was a technicality to cancel the existing project on the revision of the existing Recommendation, and to publish this as a new Document. Since the existing project was very old, this would give the Organisation the chance to completely refresh the membership of the Project Group. Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments on the proposal either from Japan, who was proposing to take on the convenership, or from anyone else, but there were none.

There were no abstentions or negative votes. The resolution was approved unanimously.

12.1.2.8 New Document *Pipe provers for testing of measuring systems for liquids other than water*

Mr Dunmill introduced the next proposal for a project, under the responsibility of TC 8, to develop a new Document on *Pipe provers for testing of measuring systems for liquids other than water*. The

details were in Addendum 12.1.2.8, and again this was a new Document to replace the existing R 119 which had the same title. Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments on the project proposal.

Mr Matsumoto (Japan) introduced himself as the TC 8 secretariat. He said they wished to change the title of the project by removing the words “other than water” because they wanted to expand the scope of this Document to cover all liquids, both oils and water.

Mr Dunmill apologised, acknowledging that Mr Matsumoto had already made this comment at the beginning of the meeting, and that he had forgotten to remove it. The title of the proposed Document should read *Pipe provers for the testing of measuring systems for liquids*. He asked if there were any other comments on the proposal.

Mr Khedir thought that they should not change the title because the title of R 119 included the words “other than water”.

After a short discussion away from the microphone, Dr Schwartz replied that he did not think they needed to change anything in the second paragraph. They were about to approve the cancellation of the existing project, which referred to R 119, so they should not change the name of the existing project they were going to cancel.

Mr Mason clarified, for the sake of his colleague from Tunisia, that as he understood it, the proposal was that when this Document was presented to the CIML for approval, it may very well suggest that R 119 be withdrawn, so therefore this project proposal cancelled the project to revise R 119, anticipating its replacement by the new Document.

Dr Schwartz asked Tunisia to confirm that this was a correct summary of what Mr Khedir had said. In that case he stated that the CIML would consider the possible withdrawal of the old R 119, when the new Document with a broader scope was approved. He thanked Mr Mason for this clarification. He asked if they could move onto the vote.

Mr Dunmill confirmed there were no other comments on the resolution itself.

There were no abstentions or negative votes. The resolution was approved unanimously.

12.1.2.9 New Recommendation *Ophthalmic instruments – non-contact tonometers*

Mr Dunmill continued that the next project concerned a new Recommendation on *Ophthalmic instruments – non-contact tonometers*. This was a new project under TC 18, the details of which could be found in Addendum 12.1.2.9 to the Working Document. This would either be a completely new Recommendation, or a revision of the existing R 145 *Ophthalmic instruments – Impression and applanation tonometers*. This choice would be left to the convener and the Project Group during the development of the project. Mr Dunmill asked whether Germany had anything further to add since this was their project proposal.

Dr Schwartz replied that he did not really have anything further to add as he was not an expert in contact tonometers, but he had been informed by his colleagues that the existing R 145 applied only to contact tonometers, and the much more important non-contact tonometers were not yet covered. The proposal was therefore to take them into consideration, either by inclusion in the existing Recommendation, or by the development of a new Recommendation. This would be then be decided by the Project Group during the course of the project’s development.

Mr Dunmill confirmed that there were no comments on the project proposal.

There were no comments on the resolution. There were no abstentions or negative votes. The resolution was approved unanimously.

Mr Dunmill stated that that completed the list of project proposals for this meeting and Dr Schwartz stated that this completed Item 12.1.

12.2 Technical items for information

Dr Schwartz asked Mr Dunmill to outline these items.

Mr Dunmill reported that this was a brief summary of what delegates had already received in AMD 17. The BIML had proposed 15 projects for cancellation through an electronic vote in May of the current year, with a deadline of 3 August, indicating that delegates could see a list of the projects on the screen. He added that these were all projects which were either extremely old, or which had become inactive and were deemed by their conveners to no longer be appropriate. He explained that the previous year, he had given delegates the justification for this, and the proposals had been put to an electronic vote during the year. They had thus been considered by the previous year's CIML meeting, and had all now been cancelled because all of the votes had been in favour of cancelling these projects.

Mr Dunmill continued that the next point for information was that the OIML had a huge number of Recommendations and Documents, across all categories of OIML publications, which were very out-of-date. The responsibility for initiating the review process for these publications had been transferred to the BIML in the latest revision of B 6 *Directives for OIML technical work*. During the current year, the BIML had looked at all of the Recommendations which had been more than five years old, and which were not currently under revision, and had prioritised them. He remarked that this was because it would obviously be unreasonable to propose that all the out-of-date Recommendations were reviewed by CIML Members at the same time. It would represent a huge amount of work for them to decide whether each one should be revised, withdrawn or reconfirmed, so a prioritisation had been made in terms of the OIML-CS.

Recommendations which were already in the OIML-CS, which were more than five years old, and not currently being revised, were deemed to be the highest priority. Seven of these had been put to the appropriate Technical Committees and Subcommittees during 2019, and the deadline for these reviews was around Christmas of the current year. For each one, the Technical Committee or Subcommittee was being asked to decide whether to reconfirm, revise or withdraw the Recommendation. The outcome of these reviews would be put to the CIML for a vote, with a three-month deadline. This would be done electronically. He summarised that at the beginning of the following year, there would be a proposal on the review of each of these high priority Recommendations, which he showed on the screen. Once this batch had been considered, they would be progressing further with this process.

The BIML had already identified the next batch of Recommendations which were in the OIML-CS, were over five years old and were not currently under revision. Following these, there would be an ongoing programme to progressively review all of the existing out-of-date Recommendations. He emphasised that there was nothing to stop people coming forward in the meantime with project proposals for the revision of Recommendations which were deemed to be urgent. Otherwise, they would be making a prioritisation as they went along. Of course, this was all very well, but as CIML Members, delegates should consider that resources needed to be made available if proposals were made to revise existing Recommendations. Somebody had to do the work, somebody had to be the convener, and of course all Member States may be interested in registering as P-members on all the new projects that resulted from these reviews. Some consideration needed to be given to the amount of resources which were available, and therefore the number of Recommendations that it was viable to revise at any one time. He concluded that that was all he had to say unless there were any questions.

Mrs Lagauterie said she shared Dr Schwartz's wish for Recommendations to be brought up to date as soon as possible, which was really necessary, but she warned that they also needed to be very careful not to overstretch the technical work. If there were too many projects, they could not be managed effectively and it would not be good for the OIML. She considered that a prioritisation of the projects would be useful. She was not sure what word they had used in English but the translation had used the French word *perimée* [BIML translation: *expired, obsolete*], and she pointed out that a Recommendation which was more than five years old was not necessarily and automatically considered *perimée* just for that reason. A Recommendation that was older than five years could be still valid, and she did not think it was a good idea to give the impression that these were obsolete because they were

five years old. They should of course be reviewed, according to the Directives, but they were not necessarily obsolete, nor in need of change every five years.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mrs Lagauterie for her clarification. He added that this was exactly the point he had wanted to make in his report at the beginning of this Committee meeting, when he had spoken about the prioritisation of the revision of Recommendations. He had not meant that they should revise each and every high priority Recommendation every two years, but just that they should consider whether those Recommendations were up to date, rather than just waiting five years before even considering this question. This would mean that they would regularly check the high priority Recommendations, and if they felt they were still up to date then of course they would not start a revision project.

Dr Schwartz also wanted to take this opportunity to make a proposal, since this was probably the right agenda item under which to raise it with the Committee. He said that delegates had just received information about fifteen cancelled projects, and he was wondering whether they would be interested in receiving more information about the status of current projects. There were now 40 active projects, and adding the nine new projects the Committee had just approved, there were 49 projects in total. He wondered whether the Committee would be interested in receiving a short summary of the current state and progress of the current projects. Mr Vinet was at this meeting, and he had produced a “dashboard” report on the projects, which they had just considered at the Presidential Council meeting. He wondered whether delegates would also be interested in this. He added that it would not be possible to inform them in detail of all 49 projects, but just to identify those projects that were running smoothly, such as the one they had heard about the previous day on the revision of R 139, which had been an excellent example of a project that had run very quickly and smoothly. There were also projects which were not on time, and quite a number that were not progressing. He stressed that his proposal had no intention to “name and shame” any conveners, hoping that he had made clear in his earlier speech that he really appreciated the work the conveners were doing, often in addition to, or even in competition with, their daily work. His motivation was to identify problems and to look for possible assistance for conveners, from the BIML for example. This was something he wanted to put forward, and he would like to invite short comments on this proposal on whether they would like to have summarised, condensed information as they had seen in the Director’s report.

Mr Richter had a comment on Mr Dunmill’s slides. He wanted to confirm his understanding that the BIML was going to ask for thoughts on revising all of these publications. He asked whether the secretariats of the TCs and SCs responsible for all these publications could be consulted and asked to give their thoughts on the package that would be sent out by the BIML. He felt that it seemed as though more information should be provided than just a simple question.

Mr Dunmill replied that for each of these Recommendations, a review was currently underway at the TC/SC level. All registered P-members of each Technical Committee and Subcommittee concerned should have received notification that this review was underway, which would of course include the country that held the secretariat for each one. It was worth stressing that this was a review at the moment, not a revision, especially since France had also commented that the available resources needed to be considered before undertaking revisions, and Recommendations may not actually be out of date. This was the point of these reviews, which posed three questions:

- Should the publication be reconfirmed as it was?
- Should it be revised?
- Should it be withdrawn?

It was perfectly admissible to reconfirm the Recommendation if there was no need to make a change to it. It was just that each Recommendation needed to be reconsidered after five years to see whether it was still valid. This was the first time the BIML had used this online process for this, so if delegates thought that there was something which they had not received and which they should have, Mr Dunmill asked delegates to let the BIML know, because they had used a new database query for this process. The review process was in two stages, and the first one was to consult all the members of the appropriate Technical Committees and Subcommittees, since this was where the responsibility for the publication lay once they were published. Obviously, in each case, if the outcome of this TC/SC consultation stage was that there was proposal to revise the Recommendation, then they would then have to look for a

country to convene the project, talk to the appropriate secretariat, and then put forward appropriate project proposals to the CIML. First, they had to progress through this TC/SC stage of the review process, the results of which would then be made known to the CIML so that it could decide whether it agreed with the TC/SC's proposal. There would then be project proposals if it was decided to revise a particular publication.

Dr Schwartz asked if there were any more comments on this item.

Mr Dixit thought there were running projects such as R 51, R 106, R 107 and R 137. He thought that these were the most important projects which, if required, India would be interested in co-chairing.

Dr Schwartz said this would be noted.

Mr Valkeapää (Finland) said that concerning Dr Schwartz's proposal, having a concise list of the progress of the projects would be highly appreciated. He thought it was a very good proposal. He added that delegates also had to remember that on the OIML website there was also information on the state of each project. He commented that it had not always been up to date, but this process was going to improve this situation, adding that the reviews would be done in five-year intervals, which would add value to those Recommendations which continued to be valid after the five-year review. Thus he hoped that the information on the internet would be improved.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Valkeapää for his comment. He noted that there were no other comments, and added that this item could therefore be concluded.

12.3 Report by the BIML on TC/SC secretariat and PG convener training

Mr Dunmill invited Mr Vinet to give the presentation on this item. He added that Mr Vinet and himself had been conducting the training sessions, which had been approved by the CIML. The idea behind this had been to invest some of the money which the Organisation had in its reserves in training people for participation in the technical work of the organisation.

Mr Vinet said he would provide delegates with a brief summary of what had been accomplished. He said this had started with a one-day pilot training provided by Mr Dunmill in 2016 in Germany. At the 2016 CIML meeting in Strasbourg, the CIML had instructed the BIML to devote some time, and some of the reserves, to providing training for TC/SC secretariats and Project Group conveners. As a result of that they had extended the pilot to a two-day training workshop, which covered the OIML structure and organisation for technical work, and the rules and procedures set out in B 6 *Directives for OIML technical work*. It basically covered what secretariats and conveners needed to know to fulfil their OIML responsibilities. It also included a component on project management, which had been added to the training following Dr Schwartz's presentation at a course held at the BIML in Paris, with regard to his experiences as a convener during the revision of R 76, and the lessons learnt during this project. Since this course, they had included this component in all the training sessions.

The training also covered the OIML website, how to use the Project Group workspace, and the online tools that conveners and secretariats needed to do their work. Three main groups had been invited to the training sessions:

- the first group was the current secretariats and conveners. For this group all expenses had been covered (travel, hotel and meals) and the only condition placed on their participation was that their CIML Member should approve their participation;
- the second group had been potential future secretariats and conveners, and this group also had all their expenses paid. Their participation also needed to have been approved by their CIML Member, and another condition was that there needed to be space available on the course they wanted to attend, although in practice they had not had to refuse anyone in this category;
- the third group had been other individuals involved in OIML work, and these had been essentially from the countries hosting the training sessions. No travel expenses had been paid

for these individuals, although they had been provided with meals. They could also only attend if there was sufficient space on the course.

The first session had been carried out in St Petersburg, Russian Federation, in June 2017, where 24 people from Russia had been trained. In December 2017, they had conducted a session in Paris, where 12 people from four different countries had been trained. In January 2018 they had gone to Sydney, Australia, and in March they had gone to Bratislava, Slovakia, where they had trained people from several countries. They had then carried out another training course at the Bureau in March 2018, in June they had gone to Tokyo to train people from Japan and a few weeks prior to the meeting they had gone to Beijing, China, to train people from China. He wanted to thank all the host countries who had helped them for their cooperation and support in organising the training sessions. There was another session planned for South Africa, a few weeks after the current meeting, and this would be for around 40 people.

With regard to those who had been trained so far, Mr Vinet said he had given delegates an idea of the numbers involved, but he added that 21 conveners had been trained, and that of course many of those conveners also held a secretariat. Nine individuals had been trained who were not conveners, but held a secretariat, as well as another 93 people had been trained who were CIML Members, Assignees, future conveners, and local staff. In fact, a lot of the people they had trained were now becoming new conveners.

Mr Vinet continued that at the moment there were 65 TC/SC secretariats, and 57 % of these had been trained. Of the 40 Project Group conveners, 67 % had been trained. Mr Vinet commented that these numbers may seem low, but for example there was one convener who did not really need the training, having been involved in revising B 6 and running five or six Project Groups. There had also been one person who had been unable to come because of last-minute conflicts, who held four secretariats, all of which meant they were only one or two people short of 100 % coverage of the convenerships. Mr Vinet concluded that this report gave delegates an overall picture of what had been carried out. He thought it had been a very successful year, and had fulfilled the CIML's request to provide training.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Vinet for his encouraging, positive report. He thanked Mr Vinet and Mr Dunmill for carrying out this important work, which had really helped the conveners to do a better job, and asked if there were any comments.

Mrs Lagauterie also wanted to thank Mr Vinet and Mr Dunmill for the training, which had been very much appreciated by her colleagues in France. She also wanted to thank the OIML, and the BIML for having opened these sessions to people who were not actually conveners, but who had been able to attend and who had obtained a very good impression of the OIML's work thanks to the training, and who now better understood the usefulness of the OIML meetings, the comments that were made during them, and the sharing of people's experience, and who would therefore be more active in the future in OIML technical work. She wanted to encourage the continuation of this initiative for the benefit of the technical work of the OIML.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mrs Lagauterie for her statement of support.

Mr Patoray also wanted to thank Mr Vinet and Mr Dunmill for conducting these training sessions and for preparing all of the information. He said that it took a lot of work, and stated that Mr Vinet was doing this in his semi-retirement and on a part-time basis, but he had been able to provide a very good service. He hoped that they would be able to continue his contract in the future. The other point Mr Patoray wanted to make was that he wanted to name and praise Russia as an example, where the training had taken place almost a year and half prior to this meeting, and where they had made very good progress on several of their projects and were moving some things forward. He also wanted to mention that during this meeting, they had received new CDs for the project to revise R 16 on sphygmomanometers from China, who had only received the training a few weeks prior to this meeting, and this had been one of the projects which had not been making good progress before the training. He commented that from these examples, it could be seen that the training was making a difference with the conveners.

The other point was that he would recommend that the CIML made this training mandatory for all conveners, at least within a certain period of time. This did not need to be a yearly commitment as things did not change that much, but Mr Patoray felt that a convener needed to have this basic training, as no matter what they thought they knew there were always some things that they did not know. He added that there would be a follow-up for all those that had not yet participated in the training. Mr Patoray emphasised that the thing to consider for the future was “capacity building”. How would they get more secretaries and conveners? He continued that if Members and their staff understood the processes, and understood the criteria, they may be more willing to propose themselves to hold at least co-secretariats or co-convenerships. At present they had limited the training to just the current secretaries and conveners, but he suggested it should be opened up to others who had an interest in it, and in particular, he reported that he had heard some interest in particular in Central and South America and the Caribbean regions, where they would like to be involved in some kind of training because they were interested in participating more in the work of the OIML. Considering the original resolution and funding, they had not been able to do this so far.

He concluded that he would like to suggest the future consideration of the continuation of such training, which would need funding, and that the CIML should consider opening this up in the interests of capacity building, and be able to bring more people into this very significant work. As the delegate from France had pointed out, if they had 40 projects, and they had just approved nine more at this meeting, and they may yet approve a further seven following the reviews which were underway, they needed people to do this work. They needed conveners to be able to lead the work, and could not achieve this with the current 16 Member States who were holding convenerships.

Mr Henson (BIPM) added that the experience Mr Patoray was describing almost exactly mirrored the situation that the BIPM had found themselves in, and that they had been through at the BIPM. The conclusion was really quite clear; these complex international systems could not be operated effectively unless support was given to the people that would carry the leadership positions in the future. He reported that they had also been through a catch-up situation. They were already seeing a significant improvement in the quality of what was being done now there were more people trained in the positions they held. The BIPM had run a specific “Leaders of tomorrow” course which covered exactly the point Mr Patoray had made, to try and broaden the base of those who could take committee chair positions, and also work in the Consultative Committees. These courses had proved to be very popular, feedback was first class, and just like the OIML, this kind of work needed to become systemic to ensure that both organisations really performed at the professional level that was expected of them nowadays.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Henson for this information.

Mr Qin (China) thanked the OIML and the BML for the training course on OIML technical work. He thought that these training courses were very important, and were a fundamental basis to enable representatives in OIML Member States to understand the basic rules and procedures of TCs, SCs, and how to run projects. He added that, as delegates would know, in China they had had more than 40 metrology mirror committees, and they also had several conveners, so this kind of training course helped China in training both for national and international work. He said they would try their best to concentrate and contribute to these training courses. He said they had had the first OIML Pilot Training Centre in China, so he added they would give more resources to this Training Centre, and organise more and more training courses, not only for the Chinese but also for other developing Members.

Mr Golubev (Russia) thanked the BML for the training in Russia. He commented that Mr Vinet’s presentation had shown they had been the first, and he wanted to point out that he was in agreement with Mr Patoray. In Russia, the training had taken place more than a year ago, and he remembered there had been some discussion as to how many people should be on this training. It had finally been decided to train a few more people than were currently needed, and he thought that this decision had helped them to form some sort of “reserve” of conveners, and people who may be involved in the procedures of the OIML and the CIML, so that was why he could recommend this training to other delegates. He concluded that it had been the right decision, and it was his opinion that a reserve for the future needs was very necessary, certainly for Russia and perhaps for others.

Mr Mateus agreed that South American countries needed to be included. He added that the OIML was an international organisation, and some South American countries were very active with regard to adopting OIML Recommendations. When they received Recommendations, and they could not participate in the review or in the process of writing them, in some cases they did not entirely adopt the Recommendations. If they were able to participate, if they could be conveners, they could stimulate other countries in the region to participate and to help to develop these Recommendations. He added that this would enhance the possibility that OIML Certificates would be accepted by these countries. He concluded that he really appreciated Mr Patoray's suggestion that this programme should be extended to South American countries that were utilisers of certificates and Recommendations. It was very important, and he added that they would support and contribute actively to enhance the Recommendations.

Dr Schwartz reassured delegates that these helpful comments would be noted. After this meeting they would be holding a Presidential Council meeting, in March, and he said they would take up all these proposals and comments and look at them to see what could be proposed to the Committee at the next meeting.

Mr Dunmill added that, as Mr Vinet had said, they had had a wide range of people trained including many national experts as well as conveners and secretariats. He pointed out that even though they had conducted the training, people would still have questions, and there would still be things that people did not do every day, so he emphasised if there were any doubts about what to do, or any questions, then people should contact the BIML for help. He realised that most of delegates at this meeting were not conveners but asked them to pass on this message to those who had been trained, and to the conveners in their countries. It was obvious they were going to have to keep doing these training sessions because of changes in personnel, changes in procedures, and so on. He added that the BIML was in the same situation: they did not post Committee Drafts every day, they did not put Drafts online for CIML Preliminary Online Ballot every day, so they also had to consult the procedures, and to think about how to do things. He concluded that they perfectly understood if there were any questions, and suggested that, rather than doing something and then making mistakes, delegates should contact the BIML for help.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Vinet for his report and suggested that they should probably add a resolution concerning this item, noting the reports, and thanking Mr Vinet and Mr Dunmill for the successful training. He verified that delegates would be in agreement with such a resolution to be added on agenda item 12.3. There were no objections to this, so he concluded that during the coffee break they would think about the appropriate draft resolution for this item.

Mr Dixit said he supported this idea but added that there was an issue regarding a financial matter. The training had been provided free of charge, and he felt that all P-member countries should be given a chance to take part in it. He also stated his view that those who had already participated should not undergo further, repeated, training.

Mr Dunmill explained that, as Mr Vinet had reported, the training had been offered free of charge, with all expenses being covered for those who were conveners and secretariats. They had extended the training to potential conveners and secretariats. The extra experts within the countries that had hosted the training sessions had been paid for by the country concerned, so for example when they had gone to China, the OIML had paid for anyone who was a convener or was a secretariat. When China also sent a lot of national experts to the course, this had been at their own expense. As for repeating training, obviously there would be a need for repeated training in the longer term, as knowledge would need to be refreshed.

Dr Schwartz suggested that this item was now concluded and indicated that they would think about an appropriate draft text for the resolution which would be shown to delegates after the coffee break.

12.4 Update on the revision of the *Système international d’unités* (SI)

To conclude item 12, Dr Schwartz gave some up-to-date information on the revision of the International System of Units. He mentioned that delegates had received information in AMD 8. He said that this item had already been addressed in the oral report and presentation given by Mr Henson under item 9.3, and did not need to repeat what Mr Henson had already explained, which had included the helpful remark on the CCU enquiry on the definition of units. He added that what he did want to address was the representation of the OIML on the CCU, stating that the OIML had previously been represented on the CCU by Mr Richard and Mr Dudle from Switzerland, but since Mr Dudle had now become the WELMEC chairperson and was also no longer the CIML Member for Switzerland, they would need to look for a new representative on the CCU. The Technical Committee dealing with units, TC 2, had conducted an enquiry amongst its membership to find a person who was available to represent the OIML on the CCU, and he was happy to announce that the result had been that Mr Rado Lapuh from Slovenia had been put forward by TC 2. Since he was not a CIML Member, he would be representing the OIML in the CCU, and would provide an annual written report, which would then either be provided by the Slovenian CIML Member, or by the Austrian CIML Member, because Austria held the secretariat for TC 2. This was the proposal, so he suggested they could change the draft resolution to introduce Mr Lapuh’s name since this was now known. Dr Schwartz said he would also like to make a small addition to the words thanking Mr Dudle for his work in recent years, and said they would come back with the precise wording after the coffee break. He asked if there were any comments regarding this proposal. There were so comments, so he suggested the meeting break for coffee.

13 Election by the CIML of the CIML First Vice-President

14 Decision by the CIML on the appointment of the new BIML Director

15 Decision by the CIML on the renewal of the contract of Mr. Ian Dunmill, BIML Assistant Director

Dr Schwartz asked that delegates now considered three important agenda items, 13, 14 and 15, which would require secret ballots. He did not think a closed session would be necessary as they had already discussed the presentations by the candidates, and he asked delegates to confirm this view. There were no objections. He stated that the candidates would have to leave, except for item 13, where the candidate for the post of the CIML First Vice-President, Dr Ehrlich, was a CIML Member, and he considered it was not appropriate to ask him to leave while they had the vote. He hoped everybody agreed. He asked Mr Dunmill to explain the procedure first for the election of the CIML First Vice-President, which was according to B 14.

Mr Dunmill stated that B 14 said that the candidate should make a presentation of their candidacy, which they had done under item 3 of the agenda. Then, since there was only one candidate, CIML Members would be asked either to vote “yes” or to abstain by secret ballot. The candidate would then be elected if 50 % or more of the total number of CIML Members voted “yes”. Mr Dunmill added that there were 62 Member States, so the candidate was required to obtain at least 31 “yes” votes. Mr Dunmill checked that this was clear.

Dr Schwartz asked Mr Dunmill to carry out a roll call to ensure they had the necessary quorum.

Albania.....Present
AlgeriaNot present
Australia.....Present
AustriaPresent
Belarus.....Present
BelgiumPresent

Brazil	Present
Bulgaria	Present
Cambodia.....	Present
Cameroon.....	Not present, no proxy
Canada	Present
Colombia	Not present, proxy to Cuba
Croatia	Present
Cuba.....	Present
Cyprus.....	Present
Czech Republic.....	Present
Denmark	Not present, proxy to Norway
Egypt.....	Present
Finland	Present
France	Present
Germany	Present
Greece.....	Not present, no proxy
Hungary	Present
India	Present
Indonesia.....	Present
Iran.....	Present
Ireland.....	Present
Israel	Not present, proxy to Ireland
Italy.....	Not present
Japan	Present
Kazakhstan.....	Not present, proxy to Russian Federation
Kenya	Present
Republic of Korea.....	Present
Macedonia	Present
Monaco	Not present, proxy to France
Morocco.....	Not present, no proxy
Netherlands.....	Present
New Zealand.....	Present
Norway	Present
P.R. China.....	Present
Pakistan.....	Not present, no proxy
Poland	Present
Portugal.....	Present
Romania.....	Present
Russian Federation.....	Present
Saudi Arabia	Present
Serbia	Present
Slovakia	Present
Slovenia	Present
South Africa.....	Present

SpainPresent
Sri Lanka.....Not present, no proxy
Sweden.....Present
SwitzerlandPresent
Tanzania.....Present
Thailand.....Present
TunisiaPresent
Turkey.....Present
United KingdomPresent
United States.....Present
VietnamPresent
ZambiaPresent

Mr Patoray stated that seven Member States were absent, and 55 Member States were present or represented by proxies. The quorum was 47, so they had the necessary quorum, but he asked that if anyone had to leave the room during the voting, that they notify a member of the BIML.

Dr Schwartz asked the new Members of Honour, Mr Mason and Mr Johnston, to handle the ballots. He reminded delegates that they had two options which were either to say “yes” or to abstain.

The ballot papers were distributed. Dr Schwartz then informed delegates that while the ballot papers for the First Vice-President were being collected, the ballot papers for the next vote would be distributed. He asked the candidate for the post of new Director, Mr Donnellan, to leave the room and was informed that he had already done so. Dr Schwartz then asked Mr Dunmill to explain the procedure for the next vote which was different.

Mr Dunmill said this was a decision taken on the basis of normal CIML decisions:

- Three quarters of the CIML Members had to be present or represented. Since there were 62 Member States, this meant that at least 47 CIML Members had to be represented.
- A vote then had to be cast by at least 80 % of the CIML Members present or represented, and abstentions, blank, and null votes did not count as votes cast.
- Of the votes cast, equal to or greater than 80 % had to be in favour.

That would be the basis of the next two decisions. He checked that that was clear. To confirm the numbers he added that he had already said that more than three quarters of the CIML Members were present or represented as they had 55 present and were required to have at least 47 for the quorum. Votes had to be cast by at least 80 percent of the CIML Members present or represented and that meant at least 44 CIML Members had to cast a vote and 80 % of those votes cast had to be in favour, which meant that at least 36 of the votes had to be favour.

[BIML note: the recording was stopped during voting on the Director and Assistant Director.]

Dr Schwartz congratulated Mr Donnellan on his appointment. He said they were really looking forward to working with him as the new BIML Director.

Dr Schwartz also congratulated Mr Dunmill on the extension of his contract, and remarked that he was also looking forward, as were the staff of the BIML, to continuing to work with him over the next five years.

Mr Dunmill said he would read the texts of the resolutions concerning these items.

For the First Vice-President(item 13) , Mr Dunmill read:

The Committee,

Noting the procedure for the election of the CIML First Vice-President in B 14:2013,

Selects Dr Charles Ehrlich (USA) as its First Vice-President for a six-year term with immediate effect, and

Thanks Dr Yukinobu Miki for fulfilling the role of CIML First Vice-President for the last year.

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments on the wording of the resolution. There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was adopted unanimously.

On the decision on the appointment of the new BIML Director (item 14) Mr Dunmill read:

The Committee,

Having regard to clause 4, second bullet point, of B 13:2004 *Procedure for the appointment of the BIML Director and Assistant Directors*,

Considering the proposal made by its President,

Considering the report by the Chairperson of the Selection Committee established under Resolution 2017/3 of the 52nd CIML Meeting,

Considering the presentation made by the candidate,

Considering the comments made by its Members,

Appoints Mr Anthony Donnellan as Director Designate of the BIML with effect from 1 November 2018, and as Director of the BIML for a five-year term with effect from 1 January 2019.

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments on the wording of the resolution. There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was adopted unanimously.

The next resolution concerned the extension of his own contract (item 15). Mr Dunmill read:

The Committee,

Having regard to clause 4, first bullet point, of B 13:2004 *Procedure for the appointment of the BIML Director and Assistant Directors*,

Having regard to its Resolution 2017/32,

Considering the proposal made by its President,

Considering the comments made by its Members,

Extends the contract of BIML Assistant Director Mr Ian Dunmill for a five-year term with effect from 15 March 2019.

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments on the wording of the resolution. There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was adopted unanimously.

16 Presentation of OIML Awards

16.1 OIML Medals

Dr Schwartz described this session as a special one. He considered it was a very special and pleasant situation when they could award many colleagues who had been able to achieve so much for the Organisation. He added that it was his great pleasure to start the awards session with the presentation of OIML medals. He said these were given to recognise outstanding contributions of individuals to the development of legal metrology.

Ms Anneke van Spronssen

It was with great pleasure that he announced that the first OIML medal would go to Ms Anneke van Spronssen. He joked with her that she would first have to listen to a short laudation before receiving her medal. He said she had been nominated for this award by the CIML Member for the Netherlands, Robert Lambregts.

Ms Van Spronssen had actively contributed over several decades to international legal metrology. She had represented the Dutch government in many CIML meetings and conferences, had been the CIML Member and a member of the Presidential Council during the last few years. During this period, she had continuously made a valuable contribution, both during and outside meetings, and had been inexhaustible in her efforts and dedication to achieve co-operation and consensus. Another aspect of her commitment to legal metrology had been demonstrated by her long-lasting membership of the WELMEC Committee and her acceptance of the role as its chairperson during a six-year tenure, playing a long-lasting role in the development of European cooperation in the field of legal metrology. For these reasons, he hoped delegates would congratulate her. Delegates showed their appreciation by a round of applause, and she was presented with her award. He wished her all the best for her future.

Ms Van Spronssen thanked the CIML for this honour. She added that when Dr Schwartz had informed her that she had been invited to the meeting, he had told her she would be getting a small award, and she had replied that she had not been expecting it because she had thought a letter of appreciation would be good enough, but this award was marvellous, and she thanked the Committee again. She felt that the award showed that if you did your job with pleasure, you might achieve more than you might expect! She added that she had never thought she was important.

Dr Schwartz again wished her all the best, and added that they were pleased that she had been able to attend for the whole week.

Mr George Teunisse

Dr Schwartz declared that the next medal went to Mr George Teunisse, also from the Netherlands. He added that the new CIML Member for the Netherlands had been very active in promoting his Dutch colleagues, but with good reason! Dr Schwartz added that it was his great pleasure to award Mr Teunisse his medal, but again before doing so, he wanted to explain to the Committee the motivation behind this nomination.

Mr Teunisse's focus had always been on the technical work, and his contribution to OIML technical work had always been exceptional. He had served on several Technical Committees, Subcommittees and Project Groups over many years. He had also provided very valuable input to the revision of B 6 *Directives for OIML technical work*, and he said he had personal experience of this because they had worked closely together on that particular project. Dr Schwartz said Mr Teunisse had been, and still was, one of the key users of the new Project Group workspace. He said that Mr Teunisse's last project had been the revision of R 139 *Compressed gaseous fuel measuring systems for vehicles*, which had been revised to include hydrogen measuring systems under TC 8/SC 7/p 7. He said that this project had been very important, and Mr Teunisse had co-convened it with Mr Takatsuji from Japan. It had been a very successful team and this was just one example of the many projects in which he had been involved. Dr Schwartz continued that in his introduction he had said they would like to introduce more project management, adding that Mr Teunisse had combined good project management with a good technical background, and had managed the project in a given timeframe. He thought this in particular had been a great achievement, and was a good example of all the work that Mr Teunisse had done in the many projects in which he had participated. He added that BIML staff had also spoken to him of their appreciation of his untiring help, advice, and assistance in many aspects of the day-to-day technical work, including bug-finding on the website, which the staff had always been relieved to resolve. In other words, he had sustained good relations with the BIML as well. He congratulated Mr Teunisse.

Mr Teunisse said that like Ms Van Spronssen, he had been very surprised to receive his award because, again like her, he considered that he had simply been doing his job. It was for this reason that he had been working in metrology for quite a long time, and what he thought was important was the

cooperation with people. He said many people had helped him; for example with his last project, the revision of R 139, a lot of preparation had been carried out by Japan, and therefore it had only required a simple piece of coordination and project management. He wanted to thank Japan for that, and he also wanted to thank the Bureau for their cooperation in this work.

Dr Schwartz added that he had been very happy that they had been able to approve the result of this project before Mr Teunisse's retirement. He had understood that Mr Teunisse was going to retire in the next month, but suggested that there may be the possibility of Mr Teunisse supporting the OIML at a future date under special conditions, as a good project manager of OIML project work was always highly respected and very welcome, but this would be for consideration later.

Mr Stephen Patoray

Dr Schwartz stated that this almost completed the awards, but joked with Mr Patoray that there was still one left, asking him to check with his colleagues who it was for. Dr Schwartz revealed that it was in fact for Mr Patoray himself. Although he was the current Director, his successor would be taking over at the end of the year, so it was time for him to receive his medal. Dr Schwartz commented that it was the last but not the least, and added that it was his great pleasure to present the medal to Mr Patoray. This was in recognition of his merits and achievements as BIML Director from 2011–2018. Dr Schwartz recognised that when Mr Patoray had become Director, as some of delegates might recall, the Organisation and the Bureau were in a difficult situation. Mr Patoray had succeeded in stabilising this situation, and indeed had turned it round, putting the finances of the Organisation back on a firm basis, and in the process he had significantly improved the notion of teamwork at the Bureau. Dr Schwartz said he was sure delegates would have seen the results of this over recent years. He added that OIML medals were given to recognise outstanding contributions of individuals to the development of international legal metrology, and there was no doubt about the important contributions that Mr Patoray had made during his eight-year term as BIML Director:

- 1) First he wanted to emphasise his contribution to team-building. As he had already mentioned, Mr Patoray had significantly improved the way the staff in the Bureau worked. His strategy had been to put the responsibility onto team members, once he explained what he expected of them, and he had personally described his own style as “management from a distance”. However he was sure the staff would confirm that he was always available to guide them when needed, without interfering, and by acting in this way he had encouraged long-standing autonomy, but with a good degree of bottom-up reporting. Overall Dr Schwartz considered he was leaving a group whose team spirit was well anchored.
- 2) Secondly, regarding internal procedures, Dr Schwartz considered that Mr Patoray had analysed and set up illustrated internal procedures, aiming at transparency, and documentation in the sense of good quality management, and he had in fact set up teams to write these procedures. Dr Schwartz thought that this had been very successful.
- 3) Thirdly, Dr Schwartz drew attention to the major refurbishment of the BIML headquarters. He observed that delegates had seen many pictures of this refurbishment at various meetings, and reported that under the directorship of Mr Patoray, the building in rue Turgot had been significantly repaired, renovated and improved, including a new seminar facility, offering the possibility of holding meetings. He re-iterated that in this way Mr Patoray had brought the staff together, as many of them had played a key role in getting this work done in order to create a pleasant and motivating working environment, not only for themselves, but also for guests such as the Presidential Council, and even for the BIPM and other organisations.
- 4) Fourthly, Mr Patoray had overseen a complete overall of the IT structure and equipment. Under his directorship, the whole computer system had evolved to being “in house”. The new database system had been implemented, and there had been a total revamp of the OIML website, which now provided real support to Project Groups. Dr Schwartz here again drew attention to the huge team effort to improve the tools the Bureau made available for the OIML technical work.
- 5) Fifthly, focusing on the budget, Dr Schwartz said he had already mentioned that Mr Patoray had put the finances of the organisation back on a firm basis, which he expressed had been achieved with sound analysis, breakdown and study of the expenses and income. Dr Schwartz

commented that Mr Patoray had done this by closely observing the cash-flow to avoid dangerous situations, an example of which had been indicated in the report Mr Patoray had given at this meeting, and by ensuring regular reminders were sent out to late payers. In this way, Mr Patoray had managed to free up funds to invest in the building and infrastructure while maintaining a constant budget level.

- 6) Finally, Dr Schwartz focussed on international cooperation. He explained that, although Mr Patoray's clear focus during his term as Director had been the five points he had already mentioned, he had also considered cooperation with the BIPM as being of great importance. He explained that under Mr Patoray's direction, work with the BIPM had become closer: they had had regular formal and informal contacts with the BIPM Director but also group visits, exchanges and representation, notably with regard to the preparation of World Metrology Day, which now ran very smoothly as a joint OIML-BIPM team project.

Dr Schwartz concluded that, in recognition of all these significant achievements during his eight-year term as Director of the BIML, it was his great pleasure to congratulate Mr Patoray on his merits, and to thank him on behalf of the OIML, and also on behalf of the staff for his contribution to international legal metrology. He wished him and his family the very best for the future, hoping that from time to time he would stay in touch, and wished him a happy retirement, which he would start at the end of the year.

Dr Schwartz presented Mr Patoray his medal. Delegates showed their appreciation with a round of applause.

Mr Patoray remarked that he was definitely surprised, although he had had some idea since he had been asked to go away when the awards had been laid out that morning, but acknowledged that Patricia Saint-Germain and the BIML team had done a very good job of keeping it a secret. He commented that Dr Schwartz's summary had not been very different from his own presentation given earlier in the meeting, but hearing it from someone else was important. He confessed that he felt a little emotional, and acknowledged the huge contribution of the staff of the BIML, who he said had supported him, which included the secondees and those to whom they had contracted out work recently. He said that delegates had also supported that work. He declared that the Organisation had spent almost one million euros on all the capital investments and expenses for the building, the computer systems, database, etc. Despite this, they were still in a strong financial position, and in fact had to determine what to do with about one million euros. Overall, he said that his priority had been his financial duty in order that the Organisation could continue to carry out its work. He considered that he had achieved this very successfully, in addition to some of the other points Dr Schwartz had mentioned. He thanked delegates for the eight years he had worked with them, and he hoped that they would have success in the future. They had a sound base and foundation, and they had selected the next Director, so they could continue to make more progress in the current areas of work, and perhaps move into other areas, for example CCTs. He re-iterated his thanks for the medal, and said he would put it together with some of the other things he had been given as mementos for his retirement.

16.2 OIML Letters of Appreciation

Mr George Teunisse and Mr Toshiyoku Takutsuji

Dr Schwartz then asked Mr Teunisse to stay at the podium, as he said a medal had not been considered sufficient, adding that this was the first time a letter of appreciation had been combined with a medal! He explained that this was specifically related to the last project that had already mentioned, and which Mr Teunisse had managed alongside Mr Toshiyoku Takutsuji from Japan, who he also asked to come forward. Dr Schwartz specified that they had been a team, and he therefore wanted to give both of them a letter of appreciation. He said they had provided the best example of good project management and the OIML wanted to acknowledge this with a letter of appreciation. Dr Schwartz read one of the letters, saying that the text was the same for both the letters, apart, of course, from the names. He read:

This letter is in recognition of Mr George Teunisse's work as co-convener, with Mr Toshiyuki Takatsuji (Japan), of the OIML Project Group TC 8/SC 7/p 7 Revision of R 139 *Compressed gaseous fuel measuring systems for vehicles*.

This project was approved by the CIML at its 51st Meeting in 2016 to amend the existing R 139 to apply to fuel dispensers used to provide compressed gaseous hydrogen fuel for motor vehicles.

Within six months, a first Committee Draft had been developed, followed quickly by a second Committee Draft six months later. Once this had been accepted by members of the Project Group, a Draft Recommendation was made available for CIML preliminary online ballot in March 2018, and the Final Draft Recommendation was submitted for approval at the 53rd CIML Meeting in Hamburg.

In recognition of the efficient and timely completion of this project, it is my great pleasure to congratulate Mr Teunisse and Mr Toshiyuki Takatsuji on their achievements, and to thank them, on behalf of the OIML, for their contribution to International Legal Metrology.

Dr Schwartz summarised that this had been a very speedy project with excellent project management and in recognition of this the OIML was happy to give them both this letter of appreciation.

Mr Jaco Marneweck

Dr Schwartz announced that the next letter of appreciation was for Mr Jaco Marneweck, a well-known colleague from South Africa. He explained that Mr Marneweck had been unable to attend this meeting, although many delegates would know him from previous Committee meetings, and of course from other meetings related to prepackaged products. He read:

Mr Jaco Marneweck has spent his career of 31 years working in legal metrology at the National Regulator for Compulsory Specifications in South Africa. For many years, he has been responsible for the secretariat of OIML TC 6 *Prepackaged products*. In this Technical Committee, he has been responsible for the convenership of the Project Groups to revise two very important OIML Recommendations in this area:

R 79 *Labeling requirements for prepackages*, published in 2015, and

R 87 *Quantity of product in prepackages*, published in 2016.

He has also led the project which resulted in last year's publication of OIML G 21 *Guidance for defining the requirements for a certification system for prepackages*. The development of this significant Guide involved difficult and complicated negotiations to achieve sufficient consensus in this highly important field, and Mr Marneweck demonstrated exemplary leadership and perseverance to complete the project.

It is my great pleasure to congratulate Mr Marneweck on his achievements, and to thank him, on behalf of the OIML, for his contribution to International Legal Metrology.

Dr Schwartz asked the CIML Member for South Africa, Mr Madzivhe, to accept the letter on Mr Marneweck's behalf.

Dr Schwartz stated that the next award was another letter of appreciation, commenting that the fact that there were so many of them was very encouraging, and indicating that there was a lot of support for international legal metrology work.

Ms. Galina Bitjukova

He announced that the next letter of appreciation went to a colleague from Russia, Mrs Galina Bitjukova. Dr Schwartz read:

Ms. Galina Bitjukova works for the Russian metrology institute, VNIIMS, as lead engineer in the Department of International Cooperation, which focuses on promoting national metrology to international and regional organizations.

She has coordinated OIML technical work in Russia for about seven years, monitoring and coordinating OIML activities in seven Rosstandart metrology institutes across Russia – the Urals, Siberia, the Volga Region, the cities of St. Petersburg and Moscow, and the Moscow Region. Galina has coped easily with the substantial changes which have occurred in OIML technical work during this time and has willingly explained these changes to the other Russian specialists involved.

Galina has contributed significantly to the Russian translation of the VIML, several OIML Recommendations, as well as other publications (D 1:2012, G 19:2017, G 21:2017, R 87:2016, etc.), annual CIML and OIML meeting documents, World Metrology Day messages, etc. By monitoring information in OIML Bulletins, and translating such material, she promotes OIML activities among metrology specialists in Russia.

Having taken part in the BIML convener training workshop in June 2017, on how better to conduct OIML technical work with the facilities available now, she is sharing this information with Russian metrologists involved in the development or revision of OIML publications.

Her activities facilitate the execution of work by Russian metrologists, thus contributing overall to the OIML's technical work.

It is my great pleasure to congratulate Ms Bitjukova on her achievements, and to thank her, on behalf of the OIML, for her contribution to International Legal Metrology.

He asked the CIML member for Russia, Mr Golubev, to accept the letter of appreciation on her behalf.

Mr Roland Nater

The next award was a further letter of appreciation. He observed that it was not for someone who was a Member of the Committee, but it was his pleasure to announce it was for somebody from CECIP – Mr Roland Nater. Dr Schwartz drew attention to the fact that delegates had heard Mr Nater's report on behalf of CECIP the previous day and that he would now be receiving the next letter of appreciation. Dr Schwartz again read:

Mr Roland Nater worked for Mettler Toledo AG as Metrology Manager from 1999–2009, when he became head of legal metrology with Mettler Toledo International. As a member of the Board of the European Weighing Industry Association (CECIP), he first participated in the 2008 CIML meeting, and has provided input to the OIML's technical work in the field of weighing technology.

Contributions from industry are extremely important to ensure the relevance of OIML publications to all stakeholders in legal metrology and the OIML is grateful for his considerable contribution on the part of the weighing industry.

Between 2008 and 2013, he supported and helped in the development of the “rules” for the acknowledgement of manufacturers' test data under controlled supervision. He generously invited interested CIML Members to Switzerland to see how an accredited and supervised Manufacturer's Test Laboratory (MTL) functions. With his support, it became possible for MTLs to be included in the MAA, and now the OIML-CS, as recognized test laboratories.

As CECIP's representative, Mr Nater supported the review of the MAA, as well as the development of the new OIML-CS, in a very constructive manner throughout the period between 2013–2018. He attended the first ad hoc Working Group meeting in Gaithersburg in 2014, provided valuable input from the manufacturer's point of view, and helped to develop a practical new Certification System that takes stakeholders' needs into account.

He also significantly promoted international cooperation in the industry, especially in the field of legal metrology. He promoted the foundation of a new International Cooperation Group (ICG) within CECIP, and became its first President in 2016. In this role, he successfully initiated a new era of international cooperation in the weighing industry.

It is my great pleasure to congratulate Mr Nater on his achievements, and to thank him, on behalf of the OIML, for his contribution to International Legal Metrology.

In reply, Mr Nater stated that, as delegates would have seen the previous day, he liked metrology, but he also loved sailing. He said that what he would miss from metrology, and from the OIML, were the moments which they spent together, where they "fought together", and where he had made so many friends worldwide. He admitted that it would hurt a little bit to leave this all behind.

Dr Schwartz stated that this completed the letters of appreciation.

16.3 OIML CEEMS Award

Dr Schwartz moved onto the next award which they now called the "OIML CEEMS Award", but which had originally been called the "OIML Award for Excellent Achievements in Legal Metrology in Developing Countries". It had been decided it was time to change the name now they had the new CEEMS Advisory Group, so it was now called the "OIML CEEMS Award". He acknowledged the name had been had changed without asking the Committee, but hoped they were in agreement.

2017 OIML CEEMS Award

In 2017 this award had been made to the *Superintendencia de Industria y Comercio* in Colombia, whose representative had already made a presentation, as he had also organised the last CIML meeting. In the same year, the award had also been made to some individuals from Malaysia: Dr Osman Bin Zakaria, Senior Director of the National Metrology Institute of Malaysia, Mr Dato' Roslan Bin Mahayudin, Director of Enforcement Division of the Ministry of Domestic Trade, Co-operatives and Consumerism, and Mr Haji Ibrahim Bin Hamzah, Executive Chairman of the Metrology Corporation Malaysia (MCM). Dr Schwartz stated that the tradition was that one of the representatives of the award winners would give a presentation at the next year's meeting. As they had been able to come to Hamburg, he asked one of the representatives to come forward and receive the award from the previous year.

Dr Mohd Azhar Haji Yahua came forward and Dr Schwartz introduced him as the Secretary General at the Ministry of Energy, Science, Technology, Environment, and Climate Change in Malaysia. Dr Schwartz welcomed him, and thanked him for representing these three award winners.

Dr Mohd Azhar Haji Yahua greeted delegates. He thanked the Committee for selecting Malaysia as one of the recipients of the 2017 CEEMS Award. He acknowledged the support of the Asia Pacific Legal Metrology Forum (APLMF) and their colleagues at the PTB for their nomination for this award. Dr Mohd Azhar Haji Yahua explained that the National Metrology Institute of Malaysia, and the Ministry of Domestic Trade and Consumer Affairs had jointly developed training courses for inspectors, verification officers, repairers and industry personnel, adding that together they had hosted five regional training courses under the PTB's MEDEA project. In the near future, the National Metrology Institute of Malaysia planned to establish a national working committee for the legislation on non-trade measurement, and another initiative was to promote the national quality infrastructure. The Ministry of

Domestic Trade and Consumer Affairs would provide ministries with legal metrology assistance and use technology to improve enforcement. They were also looking forward to working more closely with the OIML for their mutual benefit. He concluded his presentation by expressing his appreciation for this award on behalf of the government of Malaysia and the Ministry of Energy, Science, Technology, Environment, and Climate Change.

Dr Schwartz showed the award to delegates and described it. He presented Dr Mohd Azhar Haji Yahua with the award on behalf of the three colleagues he had mentioned.

2018 OIML CEEMS Award

Dr Schwartz moved onto the announcement of the current year's OIML CEEMS Award. He reported that they had received a number of nominations, and it had been difficult to decide between them, but there had finally been one nomination that had stood out from the rest, and that was from Brazil. He said it was his pleasure to invite Dr Juan Carlos Mateus Sánchez to accept the Award on behalf of Professor Carlos Augusto de Azevedo, President of INMETRO. Dr Schwartz also said that he judged that the Award was also for many members of INMETRO, who had developed something very special. Dr Schwartz explained that the panel had been very impressed by the video that had been produced as part of the nomination. Brazil was a big country with many regions that were difficult to reach, so they had invented a special boat that acted as a floating mobile verification laboratory, which meant they were able to bring verification equipment to places that were more difficult to reach. Dr Schwartz remarked that this was an idea that could be used not just in Brazil's neighbouring countries and the region, but also by other countries in the world, and he added that they would be looking forward to a presentation on this initiative the following year, when they could find out more about this floating verification laboratory. Dr Mateus Sánchez accepted the Award on behalf of Professor Azevedo. He thanked delegates for the Award and for the recognition. Professor Azevedo had planned to be at the meeting, but because of many internal issues and problems that he needed to solve, he had finally been unable to attend. Professor Azevedo had been involved in the project to bring legal metrology to remote areas, and he had realised that legal metrology was an instrument of citizenship.

Dr Schwartz stated that this concluded the awards session.

17 Future meetings

17.1 54th CIML Meeting (2019 – Slovak Republic)

Mr Peter Adam (Slovakia) greeted delegates. On behalf of the President of the Slovak Office of Standards, Metrology, and Testing, Mr Adam said that it was his pleasure to invite the CIML to Slovakia, and to tell them something about his country, as the host of the 54th CIML Meeting in 2019.

Slovakia was a special country in the centre of Europe. Even though it covered such a small area, delegates would find everything from natural treasures and historical monuments, to a rich culture, and modern entertainment in the busy city streets. He was sure delegates would enjoy the beauty, and the unique atmosphere that Slovakia had to offer. Slovakia was also known as an industrial country. It was well aware of the importance of metrology and its constituent parts: legal, scientific, and industrial. He continued that they had been developing their metrological system, starting as part of the Czechoslovak Republic since 1918. In 1955, Czechoslovakia had become a Member State of the OIML, and they had continued this Membership since 1993, when Slovakia became an independent state.

Slovakia made use of the benefits of membership of the OIML. Through Slovak Legal Metrology, Slovakia had become a member of the OIML-CS, and was one of the few countries taking an active part in the creation of the OIML-CS. Slovakia had never hosted a CIML meeting before, and it would be a great honour for them to be able to host the 54th CIML Meeting from 20–25 October 2019. They were able to provide all the logistical support needed by the Organisation for the event, and he wished to reassure delegates that Slovakia was fully prepared to host this important event.

The meeting would take place in the capital city, Bratislava, he continued. This city was also known as “the beauty on the Danube”. The city not only had an interesting history, but was also at the centre of the most dynamically developing region of central Europe at present. Bratislava had a population of more than 400 000, and is situated in the South West of Slovakia, near the Austrian border, and stretched along both banks of the Danube river. Thanks to this favourable position, it had always been a commercial centre. Bratislava was one of the youngest capitals in the world, and its population was also very young. The modern metropolis is open to Europe and to the world, as proved by the increasing number of foreign visitors, from many different countries. Mr Adam said delegates would see more about Bratislava in a short video, and at the end of the video they would also be able to see the venue where the meeting would take place – the DoubleTree by Hilton Hotel.

Mr Adam showed the video, after which he concluded that it was his pleasure to invite delegates to Bratislava for the CIML meeting in 2019.

He said he would like to make one special invitation on behalf the President of the Slovak Office of Standards, Metrology, and Testing, and he read:

Dear Mr Stephen Patoray,

We believe that the participants of the 53rd CIML Meeting will approve Bratislava as the host city of the next CIML meeting. As the BIML Director, you have expressed your kind interest in your ancestors’ country, and in the development of legal metrology in the Slovak Republic. We have not met personally yet, but my colleagues appreciated, and highly rated meeting you in person. Your personal participation at the Slovak Forum of Metrologists, which has a long tradition, was a very good occasion for many of the participants to meet you, and to discuss the state of play and the development of metrological systems in the world. It also provided moral support and incentive for those associating a professional career with metrology. Next year will be the first year when you will not be in charge of the organisation of the CIML meeting, so you can dedicate your time to your own interests. Still, let me ask you for the great honour of your presence, and invite you to Slovakia, for the occasion when our country will be hosting the 54th CIML Meeting in Bratislava. It would be a very good occasion to get know you, and to exchange experience in fruitful discussions, about the development of the metrological infrastructure. At the time of the conclusion of your time in the office as the BIML Director, let me wish you every success both in your professional and personal life.

Your sincerely

Mr Pavol Pavlis

Mr Adam also presented Dr Schwartz with a personal invitation as CIML President.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Adam for his kind invitation to hold the next CIML meeting in Bratislava. He said the CIML was really looking forward to going to Slovakia, and the video, the hotel and meeting room looked nice.

17.2 55th CIML Meeting and 16th International Conference (2020 – People’s Republic of China)

There was a short announcement for the 2020 CIML meeting, which would be held in combination with the 16th International Conference. The Chinese delegation wanted to give a brief presentation of where the meeting would be held. Dr Schwartz invited Mr Qin to come to the stage.

Mr Qin greeted the President and delegates. He said he appreciated this opportunity to make a presentation on behalf of the State Administration for Market Regulation of the People’s Republic of China. He wanted to announce that China was willing to host the 55th CIML Meeting and the 16th OIML Conference in Suzhou in Jiangsu province, in October 2020.

He said that Suzhou was both an ancient city with a long history and a dynamic modern city of vitality. It was located to the South of the lower reaches of the Yangtze river and Taihu Lake is nearby. Suzhou was situated at the junction of Hangzhou and Shanghai and had convenient transportation. Since Suzhou had an excellent road system, it was only one hour to Shanghai. In recent years Suzhou had hosted a lot of important meetings such as the summit of the China and Central and Eastern European countries, the China-Europe high-level principal party forum and the 31st IUBS Conference of Biological Science and Bio-industry.

Suzhou was able to provide all the supporting services necessary for a successful OIML international meeting, based on its thousands of years of history, its modern urban infrastructure, and its top class hotels. He remarked that almost all Chinese people know the old Chinese saying “up above there is paradise and down below there are Suzhou and Hangzhou”! He welcomed the OIML family to test this saying for themselves, and more importantly to create a positive future for legal metrology and the OIML.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Qin for his invitation.

18 Other matters

Dr Schwartz continued that there was one more item to cover under “Any other matters”. He verified that the Committee had no other subjects to raise. He said that this concluded the meeting.

Before making his closing remarks, Dr Schwartz said he wanted to give Mr Patoray the opportunity to address the Committee before giving the new Director the opportunity to make a short address.

Stephen Patoray

Mr Patoray thanked Dr Schwartz. He joked that delegates who knew him, knew that he was always ready to talk, although sometimes he could not complete what he wanted to say due to his emotions but he would do what he could.

First of all, he said it had been a pleasure to work with Dr Schwartz in the past year and it had also been a pleasure to work with the Committee for the past eight years. He said all the staff were present at the meeting (with the exception of Mrs Martinie). He named the members of staff that were present and thanked them for all their dedicated work. He said he would be ready to make his journey back to North Carolina, and added that he appreciated the invitation to next year’s meeting. He said delegates would love Bratislava, and he urged them also to visit the High Tatra mountains if they had time, as they were absolutely beautiful. Mr Patoray continued that in a short time he would be passing on the baton, but that they had an excellent individual taking over, and he had an excellent staff that would be supporting him. He also had an excellent group of CIML Members who had shown him over the past eight years that they could really step up and take on challenges. The Organisation needed all of them to keep working, even though it appeared that sometimes they had been working since the beginning of mankind!

Anthony Donnellan

Mr Donnellan said it was an honour to stand before the Committee. He said that, like Mr Patoray, he always liked to talk, and he always liked to listen, and he firmly believed that listening was the way forward for all of them. Sitting in the room for the last four or five days, and having the honour and privilege to meet a number of new friends, to talk to old friends, and make new acquaintances and to listen, he had learnt a lot. His commitment to them was that he would continue to listen to each and every one of them, to understand their needs and their concerns, and their priorities as Member States and to work through the excellent leadership of this Organisation, through the CIML, its Vice-Presidents, its Presidential Council, and of course under the esteemed leadership of Dr Schwartz, to progress the Organisation.

He continued that it was also his privilege to thank Mr Patoray for his leadership of the BIML in getting it to where it was, and in doing so, he had reflected slightly, and he had thought about a journey forward. He thought that a journey forward was only promising, and only had potential, if the past was honoured, respected, and acknowledged. The Committee had his commitment to do that, to understand and to continue with all of the good work, but also to forge new relationships, and to develop new frontiers for legal metrology. With that, he wanted to re-iterate that they had his commitment as the new BIML Director and also the staff of the BIML, which he was very privileged to lead. He had known a number of the staff for several years, as he had a number of delegates in the room, and said they would work together to take the Organisation where it needed to go. He thanked the Committee for the opportunity again; it was an honour he did not take lightly, and it was an honour he would try to respect.

19 Review of meeting resolutions

Dr Schwartz suggested that the Committee now considered the resolutions before finishing with the last items on the agenda. He asked delegates to consider agenda item 19, and then to look at items 17 and 18, so he confirmed that there was a slight change in the order of the items on the agenda.

He asked Mr Dunmill to review the meeting's resolutions. Before doing so he had a question for the BIML staff: He said that he had talked to Mr Pulham before the coffee break about whether it would be possible to have hard copies of the draft resolutions. This had not been possible in the 25 minutes available to the BIML staff, and he hoped delegates understood. However, the draft meeting resolutions had now been uploaded as an Additional Meeting Document called "Draft resolutions", for which he thanked Mr Pulham. All delegates should have wifi access, so Dr Schwartz asked them to look at this Additional Meeting Document, which would also be displayed on the screen. He emphasised that this would save paper, and although it would be the first time the resolutions had been handled in this way, he hoped delegates were in agreement.

Mr Dunmill said they would be going through the resolutions using the file which Dr Schwartz had just mentioned. Most of these resolutions had been accepted as they had gone through the appropriate items on the agenda. There were one or two resolutions where there had been small changes, or that they had not yet covered and so would need to be voted on, but really this item was to review the wording and ensure that there was nothing to add.

During the meeting they had taken certain items out of order, and had taken votes, for example on the Director, the Assistant Director, and the Vice President, at an earlier stage in the meeting. These items had all now been put back into the original agenda order for the purposes of this review. For each resolution, the related agenda item could be seen on the right hand side of the screen (*BIML note: The text of the final approved resolutions can be found at the end of these minutes*).

Resolution no. 2018/1 (Agenda item 1) had already been approved.

Resolution no. 2018/2 (Agenda item 2) had already been approved.

Resolution no. 2018/3 (Agenda item 6) had already been approved.

Resolution no. 2018/4 (Agenda item 7) had already been approved.

Resolution no. 2018/5 (Agenda item 8.1) had already been approved.

Resolution no. 2018/6 (Agenda item 8.2) had already been approved.

Resolution no. 2018/7 (Agenda item 8.3) had already been approved.

Resolution no. 2018/8 (Agenda item 8.4) had already been approved.

Resolution no. 2018/9 (Agenda item 9.1) had already been approved.

Resolution no. 2018/10 (Agenda item 9.2) had already been approved.

Resolution no. 2018/11 (Agenda item 9.2) had already been approved.

Resolution no. 2018/12 (Agenda item 9.3) had already been approved.

Resolution no. 2018/13 (Agenda item 9.3.1) had already been approved.

Resolution no. 2018/14 (Agenda item 10.1) had already been approved.

Concerning Resolution 2018/15 (Agenda item 10.1), Mr Mason thanked the committee for the opportunity to come back to this draft resolution. He emphasised this was a draft resolution because it was the first one in the review on which there had not already been a vote. He reminded the Committee that when the CEMMS report had been made, earlier in the meeting, it had been pointed out that the resolution which had been adopted in Arcachon was the basis for the CEEMS work over the previous three years. The CEEMS Advisory Group (AG) had recommended that the CIML should refresh this statement of the OIML's approach to CEEMS matters.

Because of the timing of the CEEMS AG meeting, they had not been able to give the normal three months' notice for this resolution. Having said that, as they had also discussed earlier, there was certainly a precedent for the Committee to adopt resolutions of this kind during a CIML meeting in that the Arcachon resolution itself had been proposed, discussed and adopted during the Arcachon CIML meeting, as a result of the CEEMS seminar which had taken place immediately before. In this case, they had been able to give the Committee three or four weeks' notice of the text of the proposed resolution by circulating it as an Additional Meeting Document. He had said they would come back to the question of whether the Committee was happy to consider, and to vote, on the proposed resolution during this, the last session of this meeting. He confirmed that he had had the opportunity to talk to a number of CIML Members, and everyone that he had spoken to had been in support of them making such a resolution. Mr Mason emphasised that something they decided to do in 2018 was more relevant than something they had decided to do in 2015, so he hoped for the support of the Committee in considering this resolution.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Mason for his explanation, and stated that the first question to the Committee was whether it was happy to take a decision at this meeting. He asked if there were any objections to considering the update of the Arcachon resolution at this meeting. There were no objections.

This being the case, Mr Mason stated that they could go through the proposed resolution line by line, although he was not sure this was necessary, as Mr Dunmill had already started that process. He said that a small number of comments had been made to him, which he proposed to mention during this process, in order to seek the views of the Committee.

Dr Schwartz said they would try to show the changes on the screen.

While this was being done, Mr Mason indicated that the first point that had been raised with him was whether it was correct to describe what they had done during the last three years as "significant progress". He said everyone recognised that they had certainly progressed a great deal since 2015, but was it right to say that this was "significant", bearing in mind that as they knew, there was so much more to do? His view was that he would like to give encouragement to everyone who had stepped forward over the last three years, and he emphasised that this was his reason for preferring to keep this wording, but if there was a strong feeling that they were exaggerating what had been done, then perhaps this was the way that they could be more modest.

Dr Schwartz summarised that it was not a big change, and the proposal was just to delete the word "significant" as far as he understood.

Mr Mason added that he had received one suggestion that they did his, although his preference would be to leave it in.

Dr Schwartz responded that they were looking for support to keep the word "significant" in the draft resolution.

China, Netherlands, New Zealand, Tanzania and many other members clearly supported leaving the word "significant" in the draft resolution.

Mr Mason continued that the second possible change was purely a drafting change, but it clarified something that had also been in the 2015 resolution. About half-way down the amendment, there was a paragraph which began “instructs the Director to take this into account ...”. This should run on from the previous paragraph which began “Noting the particular contribution that research can play ...” so that they became one sentence.

Mr Mason continued that the next alteration was a more significant change, and it was the wording “Requests relevant Technical Committees, Subcommittees and Project Groups ...”. Mr Mason said he had received two comments about this. The first was that actually there were probably no Technical Committees, Subcommittees, or Projects Groups doing work which was not relevant to the needs of CEEMS, and therefore they should simply take out the word “relevant”. Mr Mason recognised that one of the things they had heard during the day about the range of technical work that was going on would confirm this view, so he suggested that they remove it. He also thought that where they had previously described “Recommendations”, again as they had seen that morning, it was often the case that other publications were also relevant, and so he wanted to suggest that after “Recommendations” they added “and other publications”.

Mr Dunmill suggested that they took out the words “Recommendations and other” as these were included in the term “publications”. Mr Mason replied that he would prefer the word “Recommendations” to stay, as he felt that there was something very specific about Recommendations. He thought this reflected all of the comments he had received to date, adding that it was quite significant that there had been no suggestions for the addition of additional elements to the resolution, so he would be happy if a vote was now taken.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Mason, He thought these were minor but important changes. He asked Mr Dunmill to read the resolution again.

Dr Schwartz then asked whether, in the brackets in the last but one paragraph, it was correct that they referred to the seminars organised in 2015.

Mr Mason said this could be taken out now, and indeed one of the other things he had been wondering about was whether to make specific reference to the training programme, which continued to exist for potential conveners. He thought there was a very clear link, and perhaps it might be worth adding some wording on that.

Mr Dunmill verified whether they would delete the references to seminars held in 2015. Dr Schwartz confirmed this because the subject had been important three years ago, but many more training activities and training centres had taken place in the meantime.

Mr Mason thought they could add the wording “and to take advantage of the training which is available for potential conveners”.

Dr Schwartz thought this read, and reflected what they had discussed, much better.

Mr Mateus asked whether the last paragraph “the opportunities to second staff” could be explained in more detail.

Mr Mason said they had wondered about whether to keep this particular item in the resolution, because they already had a secondee from the People’s Republic of China working in the Bureau under the previous provision of the 2015 resolution. He felt that this did not mean to say that no other country should be willing to look at these possibilities, even at the same time that the Bureau had a secondee. Certainly all of these arrangements were time-limited, so he thought that the encouragement to Member States to take advantage of this opportunity should continue. He said they would hope that this resolution itself would have a life of three or four years, so even after the arrangement with their Chinese colleagues came to an end, they could look for another opportunity. This was why he had thought it was worth keeping this in the resolution.

Mrs Lagauterie said that this decision revisited all the policies they were currently operating with regard to CEEMS. A proposition as detailed as this should have been presented earlier, so that they could have had the time to think about the details. Even if a precedent had been set once before, it should not

become the normal procedure. She added that it also appeared rather imbalanced, because they were giving a lot instructions to the BIML, and asking things of Member States, but on the other hand they were not asking a lot of CEEMS countries, who were themselves perhaps already Corresponding Members of the OIML, and who did not demonstrate a large amount of activity, notably when it came to participating in Project Groups, or to being Utilizers under the OIML-CS. Perhaps not this year, because it was too late to write another resolution on this theme, but in the following years, it would be necessary to encourage CEEMS to participate more in OIML technical work, and to use the OIML-CS more.

Dr Schwartz hoped he had understood correctly, and summarised Mrs Lagauterie's comment as having proposed to encourage CEEMS to participate more, to urge them take advantage of what they already had, and to play a more active role, especially since they already theoretically benefitted from many things as Corresponding Members.

Mr Dunmill replied that it might not be appropriate to add something to that at the moment, but he wanted to reassure Mrs Lagauterie that this was partly covered by the fact that the BIML was encouraged to do a number of things in this resolution. The African representatives present at the meeting could certainly confirm that, for example when he attended AFRIMETS or SADCMEEL meetings, the need for more participation was something that he always emphasised in his presentations. It was all very well to pay the €1 400 to be a Corresponding Member, but to take advantage of this membership, they needed to actually participate.

Dr Schwartz added that the other part of Mrs Lagauterie's request had been that such a long resolution should be provided on time. He thought they could ask the CEEMS AG to consider an update of this resolution for the next CIML meeting, and to take advantage of the next CIML meeting to address what Mrs Lagauterie had said, and to reconsider this long draft resolution in the light of experience gained during the coming year.

Mr Mason agreed with this very good suggestion. He added that with the experience of the year, they would be looking to make sure that draft papers on CEEMS matters were circulated three months prior to the CIML meeting. They needed to do a bit more planning, and obviously this meant that it was likely that amendments would have to be made to what they would circulate in July, but nevertheless, they would try to circulate papers in July the following year, which they had been unable to do this year.

Dr Schwartz asked if they were now ready to vote on this draft resolution.

Mr Khedir had a remark regarding the second page of the resolution. He proposed to insert some words to say that the OIML should support the creation of training centres. His second comment was that this training should be targeted.

Mr Dunmill replied that two aspects of this suggested support to training centres were fully covered by the fact that this paragraph asked Member States to consider what support they could give to training centres, where the funding was coming from Member States, and there was also the point that was asking the BIML Director to consider the projects that were supported by the special fund, although this point did not specifically mention training centres.

Mr Mason agreed that it did not mention them. He continued that this option had been considered, but was not necessary, because they already knew that the special fund was being used to do this. He thought that the use of the fund for research was something which they had still not developed quite as much as they had hoped to. The resolution was an encouragement to continue with an area of work which had not been as active as they had hoped, but he thought they could already recognise that training centres had already been supported by the special fund.

Mr Mikiel (Poland) remarked they should think about which countries were considered as "CEEMS", because he was not sure whether all those that were being included really had "emerging metrology systems". As an example, he mentioned the enquiry which had been sent out this year, which had been sent to some European countries, and he was not sure that they should be included in this category.

Mr Mason replied that he had touched on this in his remarks on Monday during the workshop. He said they had taken a deliberate decision that members of the CEEMS community should be self-identifying,

and you were a member of that community if you felt that you were engaged in making significant changes to your metrology systems, and would like to benefit from the work which was being carried out at the OIML. There were still some countries that he thought under any definition would fall outside this. There were several countries that were very satisfied with the way their systems were operating, but he thought they had decided that CEEMS activities should take into account all countries that were making significant changes. This did not mean to say that financial support was available to all those countries, which again was something that was to be considered on a case-by-case basis. He felt this was the right balance, that they tried to do something for every country that felt it could take advantage of what was on offer, although when it came to financial assistance they continued to concentrate on the countries that need that assistance most.

Ms. Vukovic said her colleague from Poland had mentioned the survey which she thought had been sent to all OIML Members and she wanted to know about the results of this survey and when they would get any feedback.

Mr Mason responded that they had seen a presentation on this from Mr Guo during the CEEMS report on Wednesday. As they had said at the time, there was more work to be done, and part of this analysis was concentrating on the countries with the strongest needs for support and development of their systems. He said he could not give an exact timescale, but thought they would want to share their developing thinking with the Committee throughout the year, and certainly by this time the following year they would have not just a clearer understanding of what had been found in the survey, but also would be able to report on what they had done, guided by the results of that survey.

Dr Schwartz checked that there were no more comments and asked again if they Committee was now ready to approve Resolution no. 2018/15 (Agenda item 10.1):

The Committee,

Recalling its resolution 2015/10 detailing the OIML's commitment to activities directed at countries and economies with emerging metrology systems (CEEMS),

Recognizing the significant progress which has been made in efforts to assist in building the capacity of legal metrology institutions and their staff in the CEEMS community,

Noting the reports and advice from the Advisory Group on matters concerning Countries and Economies with Emerging Metrology Systems,

Instructs the Bureau to continue its efforts to promote and participate in capacity building activities, both through the program of OIML Training Centers, and through training courses and regional activities organized by other organizations,

Instructs the Bureau to continue to work with the constituent bodies of the International Network on Quality Infrastructure (INetQI – previously DCMAS Network), in particular the BIPM, to identify new initiatives where the OIML can make a direct contribution,

Instructs the Bureau to continue developing the OIML website so that it provides up-to-date information on capacity-building initiatives, including training materials, and to maintain the database of experts available to contribute to such work,

Instructs the Bureau to ensure that the further development of its systems supporting OIML technical work takes account of the need to involve CEEMS in such work,

Instructs the Bureau to continue using the OIML Bulletin and the OIML website to facilitate the exchange of new ideas, and in particular new approaches to legal metrology,

Noting the particular contribution that research can play in promoting and evaluating new approaches to legal metrology, instructs the Director to take this into account when considering projects which can be supported by the special fund created by the 14th Conference,

Requests its President, Vice-Presidents, the Chair and Vice-Chair of the CEEMS Advisory Group, the Chair of the OIML-CS Management Committee, and the Bureau to take particular

account of the needs of CEEMS during involvement in activities related to Objective 5 in the *OIML Strategy* (OIML B 15:2011),

Requests Technical Committees, Subcommittees and Project Groups to take note of the demand from CEEMS to ensure Recommendations and other publications take more account of the needs of CEEMS,

Requests the OIML-CS Management Committee to ensure that the needs of CEEMS continue to be addressed in the further development of the OIML Certification System,

Urges Member States to consider what support they can give to future OIML Training Centers or other initiatives aimed at assisting CEEMS,

Urges Member States to be ready to propose conveners for projects to produce other documents of interest to CEEMS and to take advantage of the training which is available for potential conveners, and

Urges both Member States and Corresponding Members to consider opportunities to second staff to the Bureau in order to develop the skills and experience of appropriate individuals.

Mr Dunmill noted that there was one abstention from Slovenia. There were no negative votes. The resolution was approved.

Resolution no. 2018/16 (Agenda item 10.2) had already been approved.

Resolution no. 2018/17 (Agenda item 11.1) had already been approved. Dr Schwartz added that this reflected the proposal from Australia.

Resolution no. 2018/18 (Agenda item 11.2.1) had already been approved.

Resolution no. 2018/19 (Agenda item 11.2.2) was the one in which the Committee had discussed R 117, and the text for this had reverted to the text delegates had received in the Working Document. Mr Dunmill indicated that R 117 had been included in the section in which it had been included in the Working Document and that it would transition from Scheme B to Scheme A on 1 July 2019. The vote had previously been taken with R 117 having been removed from this resolution so the Committee needed to vote again. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was approved unanimously.

Resolution no. 2018/20 (Agenda item 11.2.3) had already been approved.

Resolution no. 2018/21 (Agenda item 11.2.4) had already been approved. Dr Ehrlich made a comment that he wanted this resolution to include the same sentence they had included in some of the later resolutions concerning “taking note of comments made by Members”, as there had been some important discussions raised by France that had clarified the wish that the gap analysis should not slow down certain projects. He would like this resolution to take into account the Committee’s discussion to make sure that the work did not get delayed. Dr Schwartz asked delegates if they had any objections to the same sentence being added to this resolution. After adding the requested wording, he asked Dr Ehrlich if he was happy with the amended text. Dr Ehrlich confirmed the amendment was satisfactory for him. Mr Richter said that while they were revising this resolution, he felt that, instead of making a generic statement noting the comments, he would prefer that it specified that the proposals applied to new projects only, and not to existing projects. Dr Schwartz thought they had already discussed this, and the Committee had been happy with this resolution, which they had already approved. He thought it was enough to amend it with just the generic reference to the comments which had been made. This was a reference to the minutes, and he hoped this would suffice, and that it would address Mr Richter’s concerns and his proposal. He would prefer not to re-open the discussion on an item they had already closed, and he hoped Mr Richter would agree. Mr Dunmill confirmed that before moving on the Committee was happy with the generic wording referring to the comments made by its members being added to this resolution as well. There were no further comments.

Resolution no. 2018/22 (Agenda item 12.1.1) had already been approved.

Resolution no. 2018/23 (Agenda item 12.1.2.1) had already been approved.

Concerning Resolution no. 2018/24 (Agenda item 12.1.2.2), Mrs Lagauterie commented that it bothered her that the resolution should be written in this way, as it gave the impression that the Committee had approved the project proposal that had been created in order to support the project. There had been a number of comments concerning this project, and although they would be noted in the minutes of the meeting, they did not appear in the project proposal. The problem was that in the future, the people who would develop the project would base their work on this because it was this document which was referenced in the resolution. She thought it was necessary to make at least a note about the comments that had been voiced by the Committee during their discussion. Dr Schwartz agreed there should be some indication in the draft resolution that there would be some amendments to the terms of reference. He noted that Mr Dunmill was making an alteration that he hoped would address Mrs Lagauterie's concerns. Dr Schwartz read the alteration that had been made: “**noting** the comments made by its Members on the details of the terms of reference included in addendum 12.1.2.2.” He asked if this would be appropriate. There were no further comments. He thought this now reflected the discussions held during the meeting. Mr Dunmill asked for confirmation that this satisfied Mrs Lagauterie, who confirmed that this was sufficient. Mr Dunmill stated that since the resolution had changed they would need to take another vote. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was approved unanimously in its amended form.

Resolution no. 2018/25 (Agenda item 12.1.2.3) had already been approved.

Resolution no. 2018/26 (Agenda item 12.1.2.4) had already been approved.

Concerning Resolution no. 2018/27 (Agenda item 12.1.2.5), Dr Schwartz suggested that the same text be added to this resolution as they had added to the previously amended resolution, as they had had some discussion about this project proposal as well, and similarly this discussion should be reflected in the resolution. He did not remember the details but there had been a request to consider other documents from ISO for example. Mr Dunmill amended the resolution appropriately. Since this had altered the resolution slightly, another vote would be necessary. He verified that there were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was approved unanimously in its amended form.

Concerning Resolution no. 2018/28 (Agenda item 12.1.2.6), Dr Schwartz asked whether delegates wanted a similar amendment to be made to this resolution to those that had been made to the other two concerning project proposals which had been discussed in detail. Mrs Lagauterie confirmed she would like to add a similar remark. Dr Schwartz confirmed that since they had also had some discussion about this resolution, the discussion should be referred to in the resolution. Mr Dunmill added the appropriate sentence to the resolution. Again the resolution would need to be voted on. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was approved unanimously in its amended form.

Resolution no. 2018/29 (Agenda item 12.1.2.7) had already been approved.

Resolution no. 2018/30 (Agenda item 12.1.2.8) had already been approved.

Resolution no. 2018/31 (Agenda item 12.1.2.9) had already been approved.

Concerning Resolution no. 2018/32 (Agenda item 12.3), Dr Schwartz added that as he had remarked before the coffee break, he had proposed writing this draft resolution as there had been many Committee Members who had appreciated the work that Mr Vinet and Mr Dunmill had carried out and would be doing in the future, and this resolution reflected these discussions. Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments of the resolution. Mr Valkeapää commented that he saw this as a very positive development in the OIML and so he wanted to propose adding wording to the resolution such as “recognising the positive impact already seen in the progress of the OIML technical work”. Mr Dunmill amended the wording of the resolution. He asked if there were any further comments on the wording. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was passed unanimously.

Concerning Resolution no. 2018/33 (Agenda item 12.4), Dr Schwartz intervened saying that he had been informed by the delegate from Slovenia that Mr Rado Lapuh was in fact a doctor, so this should be amended. Mr Dunmill observed that this was the same for Dr Gregor Dudle and made the necessary amendments to the resolution. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was approved unanimously.

Resolution no. 2018/34 (Agenda item 13) had already been approved.

Resolution no. 2018/35 (Agenda item 14) had already been approved.

Resolution no. 2018/36 (Agenda item 15) had already been approved.

Concerning Resolutions nos. 2018/37 (Agenda item 16.1), 2018/38 (Agenda item 16.2) and 2018/39 (Agenda items 16.2 and 16.3) Mr Dunmill added that although the Awards and Letters of Appreciation had been made under agenda item 16, resolutions had not been taken at that time and so they would now be voted on. There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolutions were all approved unanimously.

Concerning Resolution no. 2018/40 (Agenda item 17.1), which had not previously been voted on, Mr Dunmill commented that it had been announced the previous year that Slovakia had proposed to host the 2019 CIML meeting. Delegates would shortly listen to a presentation on this. Dr Schwartz added they were looking forward to the presentation, and verified that delegates would be happy to approve this resolution even though they had not yet seen the presentation from Slovakia, as he would like to conclude the resolutions before moving onto the presentation. Mr Dunmill verified that there were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was approved unanimously.

Concerning Resolution no. 2018/41 (Agenda item 17.2), Mr Dunmill continued that it had not yet been announced who was proposing to host the 55th CIML meeting and 16th International Conference in 2020; this was addressed by resolution 2018/41. Dr Schwartz reported that there had been an invitation from The People's Republic of China, and they were looking forward to a very short presentation after they had seen the presentation from Slovakia. Dr Schwartz confirmed that the Committee was ready to vote on this. Mr Dunmill noted that there were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was passed unanimously.

Dr Schwartz said this concluded item 19 on the agenda. He informed delegates that the BIML staff would upload the amended version of the document as soon as possible onto the additional meeting documents web page.

Closing remarks by Dr Schwartz

Dr Schwartz commented that he would now make his closing remarks.

He would like to thank all the Committee members, the representatives of Corresponding Members, the Members of Honour, the representatives of liaison organisations from the BIPM, CECIP, IEC, ILAC and IAF and all those that had participated in the seminar and in the meeting. He thanked them again for participating and for coming to Hamburg. He said he was really honoured that there had been such an excellent level of participation this year. It had been a great pleasure to be their host, and he hoped that they would not only remember the meeting but also retain some good memories of Hamburg itself.

He thought it had been a good and productive meeting, and thanked them all for the constructive discussions and considered that they had taken a number of important decisions. They had taken a decision on the first Vice-President's post, and he again wanted to congratulate Dr Ehrlich, and said he was looking forward to working with him.

They had also taken the decision on the new Director and he said they wished Mr Donnellan and his family all the best for their future, which would now mean moving from Australia to Europe and Paris, and finding the right school and house, and he was sure he would have the full support of the BIML team so that he would feel at home as soon as possible, and learn the language which he had heard was much easier to learn if the children also spoke the language, so they looking forward to hearing positive progress in this area.

They had decided on the renewal of the contract of Mr Dunmill, and he was looking forward to working with him for the next five years. They had also considered the CEEMS activities, the OIML-CS, and

many other new projects, and so he commented that there was a lot of enthusiasm and he appreciated it a lot.

He also wanted to thank the team that had organised the meeting in Hamburg. On the German side these included Haide Hormann, Ute Schultz and Christina Werner, supported by Susanne Ludwig. He said he was sure they were working at the moment but he asked delegates to thank them with a round of applause. He added that there had also been two drivers from the PTB present all the week and there had also been the photographers and his colleagues Daniel Bohme and Mrs Bischoff. They had also had all the media designers who had prepared all the banners and he had been really impressed with the support from the PTB.

Of course, the whole meeting had not been possible without the full co-operation of the BIML team. They had prepared the meeting starting 18 months ago with a first visit from Mrs Saint-Germain and he wanted to thank her in particular and all of the BIML team for their hard work in preparing the documents and for all their efforts behind the scenes both before and during the week.

They had also held a seminar on *Legal Metrology in Practice* and he wanted to repeat the fact that it had been excellent and they were very grateful that the Verification Authority North, especially the office in Hamburg had given them an opportunity to see how taximeters and other important measuring instruments under legal control were verified in Hamburg. Dr Schwartz said he particularly wanted to thank Dr Herbert White who was the technical director of Verification Authority North, Mr Seidel and Mrs Lemke, and all their other colleagues who had supported this event including his colleagues from the legal metrology department at the PTB. Dr Schwartz asked delegates to show their appreciation to their colleagues from the verification authority North with a round of applause.

He continued that there had also been the workshop on the QR Toolkit, which was part of the CEEMS activities, but which had been prepared by his colleague Barbara Siegmund and her team from the International Technical Co-operation department at the PTB. He said they had been very grateful for this workshop, and he drew attention to the fact that that World Bank representatives had attended this meeting and had given presentations.

He also wanted to thank the technicians from the company KFP. He asked the representative from KFP to thank all his colleagues.

The interpreters, Marc Potentier and Garry Hutton, had again done a great job and he thanked them for their excellent work.

He added that they appreciated the generous financial support of his parent Ministry, the Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy and he asked Mrs Gierschke to pass on their thanks to Dr Janssen who had given the opening speech.

In conclusion, he thought this had been a successful and enjoyable meeting and he hoped delegates shared this view and he wished them all a safe journey home and said he was looking forward to seeing everyone in Bratislava.

He declared the meeting closed.

**

*

List of Participants in the 53rd CIML Meeting

CIML Meeting 2018

Total number of participants: 175

Member States: 51

Number of delegates: 106

ALBANIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Frrok Coku	<input type="checkbox"/> General Director	frrok.coku@dpm.gov.al	0
Eng. Stilian Habibi	<input type="checkbox"/> Director of Scientific and Industrial of Metrology	stilian.habibi@dpm.gov.al	0

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"/> Vice President of BEV	robert.edelmaier@bev.gv.at	0

BELARUS

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Valery Hurevich	<input type="checkbox"/> Director of NMI	valery.hurevich@gmail.com	0
Mr. Maksim Shabanov	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of legal metrology department, NMI	shabanov@belgim.by	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	0

BRAZIL

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Juan Carlos Mateus Sánchez	<input type="checkbox"/> OIML Assignee	jcsanchez@inmetro.gov.br	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	1
Mr. Valentin Starev	<input type="checkbox"/> General Director	v.starev@bim.government.bg	0

CAMBODIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Ms. Vorleaks Peou	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> President of National Metrology Center	p.vorleaks@gmail.com	0

CIML Meeting 2018

Total number of participants: 175

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Sophors EM	<input type="checkbox"/> Deputy Director	emsophors@gmail.com	0
Mr. Vannbeth YIN	<input type="checkbox"/> Chief of Office	emsophors@gmail.com	0
CANADA			
<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Ms. Diane Allan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measurement Canada President	diane.allan@canada.ca	0
<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Carl Cotton	<input type="checkbox"/> Vice-President, Program Development	carl.cotton@canada.ca	0
CROATIA			
<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mrs. Brankica Novosel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Director	brankica.novosel@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
CYPRUS			
<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Loizos Loizides	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Controller of Weights and Measures	lloizides@mcit.gov.cy	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	0
<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 Metrology	veselak@unmz.cz	0
EGYPT			
<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Eng. Abdallah Ahmed Mohamed Moantasser	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chairman	aamontaser23@gmail.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

CIML Meeting 2018

Total number of participants: 175

GERMANY

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Roman Schwartz	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Vice-President PTB	roman.schwartz@ptb.de	1
Dr. Olaf Kühn	<input type="checkbox"/> Director	Olaf.Kuehn@tlv.thueringen.de	0
Dr. Peter Ulbig	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of Division 9 - Legal and international metrology	peter.ulbig@ptb.de	1
Mr. Johann Fischer	<input type="checkbox"/> Director	Johann.Fischer@LME.Berlin-Brandenburg.de	1
Mrs. Katharina Gierschke	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal expert	katharina.gierschke@bmwi.bund.de	0
Mrs. Susanne Ludwig	<input type="checkbox"/> OIML Office at PTB	susanne.ludwig@ptb.de	0

HUNGARY

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Peter Gal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Head of the Section of Electrical, Thermophysical and Optical Measurements	gal.peter@bfbkh.gov.hu	0

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	dirwm-ca@nic.in	2
Mr. Amit Mehta	<input type="checkbox"/> Joint Secretary Government of India	js-ca@nic.in	2

INDONESIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Rusmin Amin	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Director of Metrology	rusmin.amin@kemendag.go.id	0
Mr. Rifan Ardianto	<input type="checkbox"/> Head	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.gov.ir	1

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>
Prof./Dr. Giuseppe Capuano	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dirigente	giuseppe.capuano@mise.gov.it	0

CIML Meeting 2018

Total number of participants: 175

JAPAN

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Yukinobu Miki	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Director of National Metrology Institute of Japan	y.miki@aist.go.jp	0
<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Takashi Kawabata	<input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Science and Technology Policy and Environment Bureau	kawabata-takashi@meti.go.jp	0
Dr. Toshiyuki Takatsuji	<input type="checkbox"/> Director, Research Institute for Engineering Measurement	toshiyuki.takatsuji@aist.go.jp	0
Dr. Tsuyoshi Matsumoto	<input type="checkbox"/> Associate Manager, NMIJ International Cooperation Office	ty-matsumoto@aist.go.jp	0
Mr. Hajime Nemoto	<input type="checkbox"/> Principal Research Manager, Research Institute for Engineering Measurement	h-nemoto@aist.go.jp	0
Mr. Hideaki Kawahara	<input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Science and Technology Policy and Environment Bureau	kawahara-hideaki@meti.go.jp	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"/> Director of Weights and Measures	weightskenya@gmail.com	1
<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. John Ngugi Mwaura	<input type="checkbox"/> Delegate	michaelonyancha15@gmail.com	0

KOREA (R.)

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. HongHo Shin	<input type="checkbox"/> Manager(Market Surveillance of MIs and Prepackages)	hhshin99@daum.net	0
Mr. KwangMin Park	<input type="checkbox"/> Researcher(Pattern approval and verification)	legend618@krc.re.kr	0
Mr. SeungHo Bae	<input type="checkbox"/> Research Official	baesh1219@korea.kr	0
Mr. Sung Beom Hwang	<input type="checkbox"/> Senior research official	bum2487@korea.kr	0

MACEDONIA (F.Y.R.)

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mrs. Merita Mustafai	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Director	merita.mustafai@bom.gov.mk	1
<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Mihajlo Mishkovski	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of department	mihajlo.miskovski@yahoo.com	0

CIML Meeting 2018

Total number of participants: 175

NETHERLANDS

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Robert Lambregts <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	coordinating advisor of Enforcement Policy and Sanctions	robert.lambregts@agentschaptelecom.nl	1

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. George Teunisse <input type="checkbox"/>	Senior advisor metrology	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

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Phil 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. Geir Samuelsen <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Director General	gsa@justervesenet.no	0

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Ms. Eli Mogstad Ranger <input type="checkbox"/>	Head of Departement	emr@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. Yizhi QIN <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Vice Minister	hanjp@aqsic.gov.cn	0

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mrs. Wei Gao <input type="checkbox"/>	Chief	gaowei@nim.ac.cn	0
Mrs. HuaXin Zheng <input type="checkbox"/>	Director	zhenghuaxin_aqsic@163.com	0
Mrs. Changqing Cai <input type="checkbox"/>	Vice Researcher	gaowei@nim.ac.cn	0
Mr. Jun Xie <input type="checkbox"/>	Director General	Zhangtp@aqsic.gov.cn	0
Mr. JianPing Han <input type="checkbox"/>	Deputy Director General	hanjp@aqsic.gov.cn	0
Mr. Jian Wang <input type="checkbox"/>	Vice Researcher	gaowei@nim.ac.cn	0
Mr. Guang Zhao <input type="checkbox"/>	Deputy Director	Zhangtp@aqsic.gov.cn	0
Mrs./Mr. Chunjing Zheng <input type="checkbox"/>	Director	zhengcj@aqsic.gov.cn	0
Mr. Xiang Fang <input type="checkbox"/>	Director	gaowei@nim.ac.cn	0

POLAND

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Marcin Mikiel <input type="checkbox"/>	Chief Specialist, Bureau of Strategy	marcin.mikiel@gum.gov.pl	0

CIML Meeting 2018

Total number of participants: 175

Mrs. Paulina Olszewska	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chief Specialist, Bureau of Measurement	marcin.mikiel@gum.gov.pl	0
------------------------	--------------------------	---	--------------------------	---

PORTUGAL

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Isabel Godinho	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Director	igodinho@ipq.pt	0

ROMANIA

<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	1

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	0

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Ms. Ksenia Kasina	<input type="checkbox"/> Lead engineer of International Department	kasina@vniims.ru	0

Dr. Alexander Kuzin	<input type="checkbox"/>	Director	kuzin@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	governor@saso.gov.sa	0

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Eng. Ali Alomar	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal Metrology Project	a.omar@taqyees.sa	0

Mr. Ali Alharbi	<input type="checkbox"/>	Conformity certificates dept manager	a.harbi@saso.gov.sa	0
-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------	---

Mr. Bader Alfaiz	<input type="checkbox"/>	Director of metrology std. dept.	b.faiz@saso.gov.sa	0
------------------	--------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------	---

Mr. Mohammed Alshahrani	<input type="checkbox"/>	Governor's secretary	m.sahab@saso.gov.sa	0
-------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------	---------------------	---

Dr. Ismail AlFaleh	<input type="checkbox"/>	Vice director general of the national measurements and calibration center	i.faleh@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>
Mrs. Jasmina Zukan Banovic	<input type="checkbox"/> Metrologist in Chemistry	jasminazbanovic@dmdm.rs	0

SLOVAKIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Jaromir Markovic	<input type="checkbox"/> General Director	markovic@slm.sk	0

Mr. Peter Adam	<input type="checkbox"/>	Head of Metrological workplace	adam@slm.sk	0
----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------	---

CIML Meeting 2018

Total number of participants: 175

Mr. Zbynek Schreier	<input type="checkbox"/>	Head of Department of Metrology	zbynek.schreier@normoff.gov.sk	0
---------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	---

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"/> Legal Advisor	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: Legal Metrology	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. Tshupo Modiba	<input type="checkbox"/> Manager	tshepo.modiba@nracs.org.za	0
Mr. Tumelo Matsomela	<input type="checkbox"/> Principal Inspector	tumelo.matsomela@nracs.org.za	2

SPAIN

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mrs. María Teresa López	<input type="checkbox"/> Director of Division of Apply and Legal Metrology	mtlopez@cem.es	0

SWEDEN

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mrs. Renée Hansson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Deputy Head of Legal Metrology Dept	renee.hansson@swedac.se	0

SWITZERLAND

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Bobjoseph Mathew	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Vice Director, Head of Legal Metrology	bobjoseph.mathew@metas.ch	0

TANZANIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Ludovic Manege	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chief Executive Officer	ludovic.manege@wma.go.tz	0

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Ms. Stella R.H. Kahwa	<input type="checkbox"/> Director of Technical Services, Weights and Measures Agency	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. Chatchai Saksilapachai	<input type="checkbox"/> Deputy General Director	benjamas.winya@gmail.com	0
Mr. Jarin Suttanara	<input type="checkbox"/> Director	benjamas.winya@gmail.com	0
Mr. Surachai Sungzikaw	<input type="checkbox"/> Director of Weighing Instrument Supervision	benjamas.winya@gmail.com	0

CIML Meeting 2018

Total number of participants: 175

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 Général	dg@anm.nat.tn	1
Mrs. Souad BOUAZIZ <input type="checkbox"/>	Director Of Legal Metrology	souad.bouaziz@anm.nat.tn	1

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

UNITED KINGDOM

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Morayo Awosola <input type="checkbox"/>	Project Manager	Morayo.Awosola@beis.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
Eng. Ralph Richter <input type="checkbox"/>	Engineer	ralph.richter@nist.gov	0

VIET NAM

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Giau Tran Quy <input type="checkbox"/>	Deputy Director	tranquygiau@tcvn.gov.vn	0
Mr. Hung Nguyen Manh <input type="checkbox"/>	Head of Planning and Cooperation Division	hungnm@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	hcheelo@gmail.com	0

CIML Meeting 2018

Total number of participants: 175

Corresponding Members: 16

Number of delegates: 26

ANGOLA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Homar Simao	<input type="checkbox"/> Metrology Department Head	homar.simao@ianorq.co.ao	0

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Ms. Mirjana Sucur	<input type="checkbox"/> Deputy of Director	mirjana.sucur@met.gov.ba	0
Mr. Zijad Dzemic	<input type="checkbox"/> General Director	zijad.dzemic@met.gov.ba	0
Mr. Haris Memic	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of Department for Legal Metrology	haris.memic@met.gov.ba	0

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	1

CHINESE TAIPEI

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Chang-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
Mr. Bo-Chang Su	<input type="checkbox"/> Section Chief, Fourth Division	Bc.Su@bsmi.gov.tw	0

GEORGIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Davit Tqemaladze	<input type="checkbox"/> Director General	geostm@geostm.ge	0
Ms. Nino Mikanadze	<input type="checkbox"/> Director of Metrology	ekalabadze.ge@gmail.com	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 Megal Metrology	omanetwumasi@yahoo.com	0

LATVIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Valdis Gedrovics	<input type="checkbox"/> Acting Head	valdis.gedrovics@latmb.lv	0

MALAYSIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Haji Ibrahim Bin Hamzah	<input type="checkbox"/> Chairman Executive	ibrahimhamzah@hotmail.com	0
Prof./Dr. Osman B. Zakaria	<input type="checkbox"/> Senior General Manager	osman@sirim.my	0

CIML Meeting 2018

Total number of participants: 175

Mr. Datuk Seri Dr. Mohd Azhar Haji Yahua	<input type="checkbox"/>	Secretary General	osman@sirim.my	1
---	--------------------------	-------------------	----------------	---

MEXICO

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Andres Conejo Vargas	<input type="checkbox"/> Technological support irector	aconejo@cenam.mx	0

MONTENEGRO

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Goran Vukoslavovic	<input type="checkbox"/> Assistant of Director	goran.vukoslavovic@metrologija.gov.me	0
Prof./Dr. Vanja Asanovic	<input type="checkbox"/> Director	vanja.asanovic@metrologija.gov.me	0

MOZAMBIQUE

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Alfredo Filipe Siteo	<input type="checkbox"/> Director	alfredositeo@innoq.gov.mz	0
Mr. David Armando Magaia	<input type="checkbox"/> Director of Metrology	asiteo1961@gmail.com	0

NEPAL

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Dinanath Mishra	<input type="checkbox"/> Chief Inspector	dn_mis@yahoo.com	0

SUDAN

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mrs. Izdihar Abdalla	<input type="checkbox"/> Deputy Manager of Measurement and Calibration	izdiharahmed@yahoo.com	0

UGANDA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Emmanuel Opio	<input type="checkbox"/> Senior Legal Metrologist	betty.shana@unbs.go.ug	0

UKRAINE

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Turii Kuzmenko	<input type="checkbox"/> Deputy General Director	jkuzmenko@ukrcsm.kiev.ua	1
Mr. Sergii Tsiporenko	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of mass measurements department	s_tsiporenko@ukrcsm.kiev.ua	1

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Eng. Abdulla Alhosani	<input type="checkbox"/> head of legal metrology unit	akhoosani@dm.gov.ae	1

CIML Meeting 2018

Total number of participants: 175

Honorary Members: 1

Number of delegates: 5

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Alan Johnston	<input type="checkbox"/> Member of Honor	alan.johnston@canada.ca	1
Mr. Gerard Faber	<input type="checkbox"/> Member of Honor	gerard.j.faber@gmail.com	1
Mr. John Birch	<input type="checkbox"/> Member of Honor	jbirch@bigpond.com	1
Mr. Peter E. Mason	<input type="checkbox"/> Member of Honor	peter.mason@oiml.org	1
Prof. Manfred Kochsiek	<input type="checkbox"/> Member of Honor, Guest	manfred@kochsiek.com	1

CIML Meeting 2018

Total number of participants: 175

Liaison: 7

Number of delegates: 9

BIPM

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Andy Henson	<input type="checkbox"/> Director Intl Liaison & Com.Dept	ahenson@bipm.org	1

CECIP

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Luis Cachon	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of Legal Metrology	Luis.Cachon@mt.com	0
Mr. Karlheinz Banholzer	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal Metrology Group	Karlheinz.Banholzer@sartorius.com	1
Mr. Roland Nater	<input type="checkbox"/> ICG Group	roland.nater@mt.com	1

GSO

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Abdulelah Alqarnas	<input type="checkbox"/> Senior Metrology Researcher	alqarnas@gso.org.sa	0

GULFMET

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Omar Kanakrieh	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of Metrology Division	okanakrieh@gso.org.sa	0

IAF

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Jianhua Xiao	<input type="checkbox"/> Chair of IAF	xiaojh@cnas.org.cn	0

IEC

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Frans Vreeswijk	<input type="checkbox"/> IEC General Secretary and CEO	fgs@iec.ch	0

ILAC

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Ms. Merih Malmqvist Nilsson	<input type="checkbox"/> Chair of ILAC and Guest	Merih.MalmqvistNilsson@swedac.se	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. Romulo Salguero	<input type="checkbox"/> Jef de Centro nacional de metrologia	rsalguero@mineco.gob.gt	0

CIML Meeting 2018

Total number of participants: 175

Individual: 1

Number of delegates: 19

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Marc Potentier	<input type="checkbox"/> Interpreter	garry-hutton@hancock-hutton.com	0
Ms. Lisa Kuhle	<input type="checkbox"/> Host Country Organization	haide.hormann@ptb.de	0
Ms. Haide Hormann	<input type="checkbox"/> Host country Organization	haide.hormann@ptb.de	0
Ms. Christine Werner	<input type="checkbox"/> Host country Organization	christine.werner@ptb.de	0
Ms. Carolin Gross	<input type="checkbox"/> Host Country Organization	haide.hormann@ptb.de	0
Ms. Anneke van Spronssen	<input type="checkbox"/> Guest	jspronssen@gmail.com	0
Mr. Daniel Bohme	<input type="checkbox"/> Host Country Organization	haide.hormann@ptb.de	0
Mrs. Susanne Bischofs	<input type="checkbox"/> Photographer	haide.hormann@ptb.de	0
Ms. Uta Schulze	<input type="checkbox"/> Host country Organization	uta.schulze@ptb.de	0
Mr. Su Guo	<input type="checkbox"/> Secondee BIML	guos@oiml.org	0
Mr. Frank Kahlecke	<input type="checkbox"/> Driver	haide.hormann@ptb.de	0
Mr. Daniel Schiller	<input type="checkbox"/> Host Country Organization	haide.hormann@ptb.de	0
Mr. Cornelis Oosterman	<input type="checkbox"/> Chairperson OIML-CS	cock.oosterman@oiml.org	1
Mr. Anthony Donnellan	<input type="checkbox"/> Australia	anthonydonnellan@hotmail.com	0
Dr. Torsten Sevecke	<input type="checkbox"/> Privy Cousellor for Economy, Traffic & Innov.	haide.hormann@ptb.de	0
Dr. Ole Janssen	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of Subdivision Innov. & Techn. Policy	haide.hormann@ptb.de	0
Dr. Joachim Ullrich	<input type="checkbox"/> President	haide.hormann@ptb.de	0
Mr. Garry Hutton	<input type="checkbox"/> Interpreter	garry-hutton@hancock-hutton.com	0
Mr. Diether Ohland	<input type="checkbox"/> Driver	haide.hormann@ptb.de	0

CIML Meeting 2018

Total number of participants: 175

BIML: 1

Number of delegates: 9

BIML

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mrs. Patricia Saint-Germain	<input type="checkbox"/> Administrator, Members	patricia.saint-germain@oiml.org	0
Mr. Stephen Patoray	<input type="checkbox"/> BIML Director	stephen.patoray@oiml.org	1
Mr. Paul Dixon	<input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Director	paul.dixon@oiml.org	0
Mr. Luis Mussio	<input type="checkbox"/> Engineer	luis.mussio@oiml.org	0
Mr. Jean-Christophe Esmiol	<input type="checkbox"/> BIML IT Systems Management	jean-christophe.esmiol@oiml.org	0
Mr. Jalil Adnani	<input type="checkbox"/> Database Systems Management	jalil.adnani@oiml.org	0
Mr. Ian Dunmill	<input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Director	ian.dunmill@oiml.org	1
Mr. Chris Pulham	<input type="checkbox"/> Editor - Webmaster	chris.pulham@oiml.org	0
Mr. Gilles Vinet	<input type="checkbox"/>	gilles.vinet@oiml.org	0