

**Rules of Procedure
for the
Key Comparison Working Group
of the
Consultative Committee for Acoustics, Ultrasound and Vibration**

October 2013

1 Purpose of this Document

This document states the typical procedure applied by the Key Comparison Working Group (KCWG) to fulfill its responsibilities within Consultative Committee for Acoustics, Ultrasound and Vibration (CCAUV). The information given here is complementary to the guidelines given by the International Committee for Weights and Measures (CIPM) in CIPM-MRA D-05, *Measurement comparisons in the CIPM MRA* [1], to be applied within the Consultative Committee for Acoustics, Ultrasound and Vibration (CCAUV).

These responsibilities of the KCWG are:

- To review of technical protocols (TPs) for future CCAUV and Regional Metrology Organization (RMO) key comparisons and supplementary comparisons.
- To approve the TPs on behalf of the CCAUV.
- To review Draft B reports from CCAUV and Regional Metrology Organization (RMO) key comparisons and supplementary comparisons before submission to the CCAUV for approval.

2 Procedure

The procedure for TPs and reports is equivalent with slightly different effort involved and different final decisions; therefore, in the subsequent description the term document is used as a generic term for both.

1. The document is submitted by the pilot laboratory or author to the Executive Secretary of the CCAUV.
2. The Executive Secretary submits the document to the Chairperson of the KCWG and proposes a time-frame for the review.
3. The Chairperson of the KCWG distributes the document to the members of the KCWG for review, setting a deadline for the submission of comments of typically 3 to 4 weeks ahead.
4. At the deadline, the Chairperson of the KCWG merges the received comments. If modifications are requested, the Chairperson transmits a summary of the comments to the pilot laboratory or the author **and** to the Executive Secretary.
5. The pilot laboratory or author subsequently prepares a revised document and re-submits it to the Chairperson of the KCWG **and** to the Executive Secretary.
6. The Chairperson of the KCWG checks the revised document for compliance with the requested changes. In the case of compliance the chair approves the document on behalf of the KCWG.
 - **In the case of TPs** the document is approved for the performance of the comparison. The approved TP is distributed to the CCAUV by the Executive Secretary for *information* and *comments*. Comments should be considered by the chair of the KCWG. The Executive Secretary submits the TP to the KCDB for publication.
 - **In the case of a Draft B** report the report is submitted by the Executive Secretary to the CCAUV for its approval.

In case of questions concerning compliance, the chair may discuss the specific points with the original commenter and decides on the need for further revision. This process may be iterated in a loop between steps 5 and 6 until final approval is achieved.

NB: If the chair of KCWG is the author of the document, another member of the KCWG should be involved in the steps 5 and 6 of the process.

3 References

[1] CIPM MRA – D-05, *Measurement comparisons in the CIPM MRA*,