MINUTES OF 8th JCRB MEETING, 5-6 MARCH 2002

1. OPENING AND WELCOME BY THE CHAIRMAN

The JCRB Chairman welcomed all those present and thanked SADCMET for hosting the 8th JCRB Meetings. He also welcomed Dr Samuel as Executive Secretary to the JCRB.

The Draft Agenda was approved, with the addition of Agenda Item 16.5 as requested by Dr Schwitz – *Availability of JCRB documents to RMO Technical Committee Members.* [The Final Agenda is given in Appendix 1, with references to working documents provided.]

2. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE REPORT OF THE 7TH MEETING HELD AT THE BIPM

The Chairman referred to Document JCRB-8/2.

ACTION 1: Secretary to forward the short and long English version and the long French version of the Calibration Certificate Statement referring to the MRA to the Committee to be used by NMIs as appropriate.

2.1 REVIEW OF OUTSTANDING ACTIONS FROM ALL PREVIOUS JCRB MEETINGS

The Chairman referred to Document JCRB-8/2(1) for review by the Meeting. No new actions were required.

3. REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN ON PROGRESS SINCE THE 7TH MEETING

The Chairman noted that most actions from the 7th meeting have been carried out, and the two *ad hoc* Working Groups have tabled reports at the 8th JCRB Meeting. He commented that he was pleased with the overall progress.

4. REPORT ON THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE KCDB

The Chairman referred to Document JCRB-8/4, which provides a lists of CMCs on the database. The Chairman noted that the requirements for the database are almost at the limit of what is technically possible using current Microsoft software.

- In the area of chemistry for gases, there is a searchable database that is to be extended to provide for all other CMCs. Dr Kaarls informed the Committee that during the CCQM Working Group discussions, it was agreed that the large matrix of bilateral degrees of equivalence now appearing in results of key comparisons is to be deleted, retaining only the single column of degrees of equivalence. A formula will be provided to allow the calculation of bilateral terms.

The Chairman noted that initially the difference between the values obtained by NMIs rather than between an NMI and the reference value had been thought to be the most important issue but now it is clear that the reverse is the case.

- One key comparison final report is coming in per week and being put into Appendix B.
- The Chairman announced that there is to be a new publication in *Metrologia* : a web-only Technical Supplement which is to come online (back-dated) from 1st Jan 2002 to provide results of CIPM and RMO KCs (key comparisons) and SCs (supplementary comparisons) and pilot studies. At present, the final report of these comparisons in the BIPM database is not easily citeable. Now, when the final report of a KC comes in, the abstract will appear almost simultaneously on the web Technical Supplement with a link to the database for the full report. The Technical Supplement will use the *Phys Rev* Journal's form of reference – i.e., no page number, just an article number. An Editorial will come out shortly in *Metrologia* concerning this.

ACTION 2: Chairman to send a copy of the *Metrologia* Editorial on the Technical Supplement to all Chairmen of CC Working Groups.

- Given the hundreds of CMCs in electricity, Dr M Reedtz has suggested a 3-dimensional matrix of uncertainties to reduce the number of CMCs by a factor of 10. This will be implemented in the second round of electricity CMCs now being prepared.
- A new search engine for Ionising Radiation is being developed.
- It is not possible to identify a majority of the visitors to the KCDB, since many come through service providers.
- A revised version of the MRA/KCDB leaflet has just been printed and copies are available. The BIPM, thanks to NIST, will be occupying part of the NIST booth at PITTCON, in March 2002.

ACTION 3: Secretary to distribute the revised BIPM leaflet to all RMOs.

Dr Issaev noted that COOMET's AUV submission is not mentioned in the report – this was sent in Oct 2001.

ACTION 4: Secretary to check on status of COOMET's AUV submission and to arrange for its inclusion on the database.

5. REPORTS BY RMO REPRESENTATIVES TO THE JCRB

APMP: Dr Imai

Dr Imai referred to Document JCRB-8/5(1).

ACTION 5: APMP to amend its' *Status of CMCs* document and re-send it to the JCRB Secretary.

ACTION 6: The Director of NMIJ to send a formal letter to the JCRB Chairman to inform him that HECTEF is nominated by Japan as a designated institute.

COOMET: Dr Belotserkovskiy

Dr Belotserkovkiy referred to Document JCRB-8/5(4).

ACTION 7: COOMET to forward Appendix 3 of its' RMO report to the Secretary.

Clarification was sought of the Rules of Procedure with regard to disputes regarding an RMO CMC review. The Chairman responded that issues that arise are to be discussed directly with the originating NMI, not with the RMO. Dr Schwitz added that, where a discrepancy is only editorial, then the RMO can make the amendment.

COOMET suggested that it would be useful if a representative from each RMO participates in all CCs. The Chairman noted that this is appropriately addressed by CCs, which ensure that there is proper regional representation. In addition, notification of CC meetings is provided on the BIPM CC webpages.

Dr Castelazo informed the meeting that he had recently received an invitation from the Chairman of CCM to designate one of the attendees from SIM as representing the RMO, so that she had the authority to speak about CMC reviews and comparisons.

ACTION 8: Chairman to ask Executive Secretaries of CCs to invite RMO Representatives to the JCRB to nominate which CC member is authorised to represent the RMO at CC meetings.

EUROMET: Dr Schwitz

Dr Schwitz referred to Document JCRB-8/5(2). He pointed out that EUROMET's *Status of CMCs* document does not include photometry and radiometry.

ACTION 9: EUROMET to amend its' *Status of CMCs* document and re-send it to the Secretary.

The Chairman informed EUROMET of the request from the BIPM that EUROMET Guidance Document No. 3, the "EUROMET Guideline on Conducting Comparisons", include the requirement that all EUROMET-initiated comparisons are notified to the Executive Secretary of the relevant Consultative Committee. This is necessary to

keep track of activities as well as ensure that the appropriate CC protocols are being followed. The CCRI has produced a questionnaire to address this requirement.

ACTION 10: Dr Schwitz to ensure that EUROMET Guidance Document No. 3 explicitly states that EUROMET-initiated comparisons are to be notified to the Executive Secretary of the relevant CC.

Dr Hengstberger requested a flow chart to identify the steps to be taken to register an RMO key or supplementary comparison.

ACTION 11: Secretary to draw up a flowchart/document indicating the steps needed to register an RMO Key or Supplementary Comparison and to forward this to Committee Members.

The Chairman reminded the Committee that, in order for a CMC to be included in Appendix C, the originating body needs to be a designated institute with its name in Appendix A.

Dr Sacconi expressed concern that the MRA uses the word "designated" to refer to institutes nominated by the government, however the ones to which Dr Quinn referred are not necessarily in this category. For example, an Italian law has *designated* 3 institutes, but each NMI may nominate others. He considered that these other institutes should be referred to differently in the MRA.

ACTION 12: Dr Sacconi to write a discussion paper giving his preferred terminology in the MRA for "designated institutes" in cases where the nominating body is not the relevant government. This proposal is to be tabled at the Directors' Meeting in April.

SADCMET: Dr Hengstberger

Dr Hengstberger referred to Document JCRB-8/5(3).

ACTION 13: ALL RMOs to send updated *Lists of Contacts* to Secretary when changes have been made.

Dr Hengstberger commented on the present status of SADCMET CMCs:

- SADCMET.L – EUROMET has asked for the CMC intra-regional review report. SADCMET has requested APMP to provide this.

ACTION 14: APMP to send SADCMET its intra-regional review report on SADCMET.L, which SADCMET is to then forward, with the CMC, to the JCRB Secretary to be sent on to EUROMET for review.

- SIM is providing the intra-regional review of SADCMET.PR.

ACTION 15: All RMOs, except SIM, to consider reviewing SADCMET.PR and to send their responses to the JCRB Secretary.

- The meeting agreed to accept SADCMET.RI.part2.

ACTION 16: Chairman to post approval of SADCMET.RI.part2 on the website.

- A short exchange on SADCMET.RI.part1 is required between SADCMET and the EUROMET reviewer. Dr Castelazo informed the Committee that a meeting was held within SIM in November to discuss these CMCs. Therefore, the progress regarding this CMC awaits further discussion between SIM, EUROMET and SADCMET.

ACTION 17: Secretary to pursue the status of the SADCMET.RI.part1 CMCs in one month (i.e., by the first week of April 2002).

- EUROMET is currently reviewing SADCMET.T.

Dr Hengstberger informed the Committee that a Regional Metrology Conference for East Africa will take place from 27-30 May in Nairobi (Kenya).

SIM: Dr Castelazo

Dr Castelazo referred to Document JCRB-8/5(5).

ACTION 18: Secretary to note that SIM CMC communications are to be sent to Dr Castelazo and copied to Dr Semerjian and Ing Mussio.

Dr Castelazo noted the importance of informing developing country NMIs of the difference in scale of expense between participating in the MRA as a member of the Metre Treaty and as an Associate to the CGPM: i.e., 50,000 Euros compared with 5,000 Euros.

He also informed the Committee that:
- SIM has recently sent in its EUROMET Thermometry review.
- There is to be a SIM symposium on Quality Systems on July 30.

He inquired about the situation of an RMO key comparison in which there are no direct linking laboratories. The Chairman confirmed that the MRA does not exclude this, provided an indirect link exists and appropriate uncertainties are included. This indirect link may be provided by NMIs who have taken part in comparisons that include participants in CIPM key comparisons.

Dr Hengstberger inquired whether the RMO database maintained by NIST is linked with the BIPM database. The Chairman replied that this is not yet the case but that a formal protocol has been agreed with NIST. He noted that for RMO databases it is preferable to have a link to the BIPM database rather than copying it, in view of the large amount of work otherwise required by the RMO.

The Chairman also noted that results of pilot studies are not on the KCDB but will be put on the webpages of each CC.

ACTION 19: Dr Castelazo to report back to the JCRB Secretary within 2 weeks (i.e., by 22 March 2002) on whether SIM will review COOMET.T.

If SIM is not doing this review, then it will be posted on the website for approval and only SADCMET is entitled to comment.

6. THE JCRB WEBSITE: DISCUSSION ON ITS OPERATION

(NOTE: This Agenda Item was discussed at the preliminary meeting held on Monday 4 March.)

The Chairman highlighted the need for notification from RMOs of what action they will take when they are notified of the presence of a CMC.

ACTION 20:
It was agreed that:

1. **If, for example, three RMOs agree to review a CMC and two do not then these two have abandoned their prerogative to review the CMC at any later stage.**
2. **RMOs are to provide the following:**
   - **acknowledgement of the receipt of the CMC, *plus***
   - **the date by which they will review the CMC, *plus***
   - **the reviewer's name. This will, in most cases, be a TC Chairman. The name of the reviewer is to be provided so that reviews can be followed up.**
3. **An automated reminder will be sent to all RMOs if no acknowledgement of a CMC is received within 3 weeks.**
4. **The Secretary will send out a reminder after 3 weeks of the review deadline given by an RMO. This will be sent to both the individual responsible *and* the RMO contact.**
5. **A log book will be set up to sit behind each CMC to provide an "at a glance" synopsis of the status of the CMC. This will be accessible to RMO reviewers to allow them to provide information on the status of the review.**
6. **If an RMO review deadline has to change, it is the reviewer's responsibility to notify the JCRB Chairman.**

7. **Every 3 months, the Executive Secretary will send out a summary document of the status of all CMCs.**

ACTION 21: RMOs to inform the Executive Secretary of any additional information they require in the 3-monthly *Status of CMCs* summary.

7. INTER-REGIONAL REVIEW OF CMCs

7.1 KEY COMPARISONS AND CMCs THROUGH THE SAME RMO:

The Chairman reminded the Committee that if, for example, an NMI takes part in a EUROMET key comparison, then it should not submit its CMCs through APMP.

Dr Castelazo agreed that this is generally the case but may not always be true so should not be stated formally. COOMET supported this view and it was agreed that there should be some flexibility to this.

7.2 INTER-REGIONAL HARMONISATION OF CMC REVIEW PROCESS

Dr Schwitz inquired about what should be expected to accompany the report on the CMC from the RMO. He proposed that commentary should be provided on how the list of criteria in the Rules of Procedure have been addressed. The Chairman agreed that a checklist should form part of the main report.

ACTION 22: RMO CMC submissions should include the report on the intra-regional review. Inter-regional review reports should then include a checklist indicating which of the items in the list of criteria provided in (what is now) Document JCRB-8/13(1b), *Criteria for acceptance of data for Appendix C*, have been addressed, with associated comments.

7.3 ACCEPTABLE EVIDENCE FOR CMCs DURING TRANSITIONAL MODE OF MRA

APMP tabled its Position Paper, Document JCRB-8/7(3).

The Chairman noted that the Rules of Procedure do not currently mention traceability of national standards to another NMI that has participated in KCs. During this meeting, the relevant section of the Rules of Procedure was amended to take Recommendation (i) of the APMP Position Paper into account.

The revised document (see also discussion under Agenda Item 13.1) became Document JCRB-8/13(1b).

It was agreed that Recommendation (ii) of the paper is implied.

Dr Seta informed EUROMET that APMP will be forwarding the results of NIMT's participation in bilateral comparisons.

7.4 NAMING OF RMO CMCs

ACTION 23: Secretary to delete obsolete CMCs (e.g., EUROMET.AUV.part1) and discuss appropriate actions with RMOs when duplications occur.

7.5 RMO REVIEW DEADLINES

This issue is to be re-considered once the new system discussed under Agenda Item 6 is in place.

7.6 CMCs from IAEA

The Chairman proposed that the IAEA CMCs should be accepted. Dr Hengstberger commented that SADCMET had also reviewed these and only had minor remarks. Dr Kaarls noted that, before these could be accepted, information is required on the status of IAEA's quality systems.

ACTION 24: The BIPM (Dr Allisy-Roberts) to coordinate the preparation of a report, in consultation with COOMET and NMIJ, on the Quality Systems status of IAEA to be provided to the JCRB Chairman to accompany the IAEA CMC submission. The final report will be circulated to the JCRB Committee.

7.7 ROLE OF EXECUTIVE SECRETARY IN MANAGING PROCESS

ACTION 25: The Executive Secretary to provide a *Status of CMCs* document a few weeks before each JCRB meeting.

8 CHEMISTRY CMCs

8.1 UNCERTAINTY IN CHEMISTRY CMCs

Dr Kaarls informed the Committee that discussion is going on regarding the relationship between uncertainties of CRMs and the capabilities that the institute delivering the CRM normally provides the customer. Therefore there could be two uncertainties stated for one institute, one for the assigned value of the reference material (determined using different technologies, which can lead to smaller uncertainties) and another for the analysis capability (i.e., the measurement capability normally offered to customers). The final results of this discussion will be reported back to the JCRB.

ACTION 26: Dr Kaarls to provide the JCRB with a report on the outcome of the discussions on uncertainty in chemistry CMCs.

8.2 CRITERIA FOR ACCEPTANCE OF CRMs in CMC CLAIMS

Dr Kaarls referred to Document JCRB-8/8(2). There has been discussion in the CCQM for nearly 2 years on the acceptability of CRMs in Appendix C, and on what type. It is not intended to be a full catalogue of all available CRMs. What will be included is the capability of NMIs in this area, but not other organisations that may produce CRMs. The problem is that a lot of NMIs sell CRMs that they don't characterise themselves – e.g., IRMM, in which 50% of BCR reference materials are not characterised by the IRMM or another NMI. It is clear that in many cases there is no traceability. Therefore, the outcome is that only CRMs that have been characterised by an NMI or IRMM can be included. Also, only the uncertainty of which the NMI is capable is what can be provided. The JCRB's opinion is now sought and the CCQM is then looking for the CIPM to approve this policy.

The key point is that, in NIST's case, the assignment of values and characterisation is done by NIST as opposed to BCR RMs where the assignment and characterisation is often done by other laboratories whose competence is unknown. As far as quality systems are concerned, NIST has procedures that have to be fulfilled by these manufacturers, and as well NIST samples the SRMs.

ACTION 27: JCRB to note and accept rather than making a formal statement.

NOTE: Mr Mike Peet, Chairman of ILAC, was invited to join the JCRB Meeting for discussions under Agenda Items 9,11, and 16.2.

9 TRANSPORT UNCERTAINTY IN CMC CLAIMS

Dr Schwitz referred to Document JCRB-8/9. He noted that in the *ad hoc* Working Group's Report it had been agreed that CMCs are best measurements that an NMI can provide its customers under normal conditions.

Mr Peet was invited to raise ILAC's concerns with the Committee.

9.1 JCRB DEFINITION OF "CMC" FOR ILAC AND USERS OF MRA

Mr Peet stated that in the accreditation fraternity the interpretation of a BMC refers to the ideal measurement situation, rather than the best capability normally provided to customers. The concern is that different interpretations may be applied and that it is imperative that there is a common understanding between NMIs and accreditors.

Dr Castelazo noted that not everybody in SIM agreed with the recommendations of Dr Schwitz's group. There is the fear that an NMI's capability to calibrate a "nearly ideal" instrument will not be shown.

9.3 APMP PROPOSALS ON UNCERTAINTY CALCULATIONS FOR CMCs

Mr Lam then referred to Document JCRB-8/9(3). He noted that APMP has a similar position to the Working Group. Mr Kaarls pointed out that the APMP paper refers to capabilities offered to internal clients.

ACTION 28: Chairman and Secretary to write a definitive document stating what a CMC is, based on Documents JCRB-8/9 and /9(3). This should have a footnote that care must be taken that the very best instruments are not the ones to which reference is being made (i.e, taking account of the concerns raised by SIM). This document will be circulated to the Committee for agreement. When agreed, the JCRB Chairman will send the document to the ILAC Chairman and it will then be posted on the website.

The Chairman reiterated that CMCs are services that are ordinarily available.

The dialogue with ILAC is to be at the ILAC-CIPM level but this does not prevent a regional level dialogue also being instituted. The results of the ILAC-CIPM discussion could be put into the ILAC-CIPM MoU.

9.2: TRANSMISSION OF CALCULATION OF MEASUREMENT UNCERTAINTY FROM NMIs TO ACCREDITED LABORATORY NETWORK

Mr Peet stated that what is required is a working person's version of the determination of uncertainty that NMIs use. He informed the JCRB that he would pursue within ILAC the processes required for transmission of uncertainty calculations to the accredited laboratory network.

10. REVISION OF CMCs: APPROVAL OF DRAFT DOCUMENT TABLED AT 7TH MEETING

The Chairman noted that the only change to this document, JCRB-8/10, is at the beginning of c) where the words "or increase in scope" were added. The Document was approved by the Committee without further comment.

ACTION 29: Secretary to post Document JCRB-8/10 on the website as a JCRB Document.

11. INTER-REGIONAL HARMONISATION OF QUALITY SYSTEM REVIEWS

Dr Hetherington tabled Document JCRB-8/11, the Report of the *ad hoc* Working Group on Inter-regional Harmonisation of Quality System Reviews. He reminded the Committee that the role of this group was to produce guidelines on what an RMO should provide to the JCRB in terms of reviewing member NMIs' quality systems.

Ing Mussio noted that there is one case in which a SIM Member has a quality system that is not based on any written standard and that this is allowed by the MRA.

Dr Kaarls proposed that the scope of accreditation should also be provided, and that having the accreditation report would be an additional element in building confidence.

Dr Seta sought clarification of the second last paragraph of the Working Group's report

> *"In the case of a QS, which has not been assessed by an accreditation body or has not been reviewed by peers, the report should detail any evidence, which exists that provides the RMO with full confidence in the claimed QS."*

as to what sort of report is necessary and what sort of evidence is expected.

Dr Hetherington summarised this and further discussion by proposing that the RMO should be asked to state on what basis it made the judgement regarding an NMI's Quality System.

It was agreed that, along with the names of assessors, the Quality System report should identify the part of the scope each assessor was asked to accredit.

Dr Castelazo added that Dr Semerjian has requested more time to discuss this paper.

ACTION 30: Dr Hetherington to discuss Document JCRB-8/11 further with Dr Semerjian of NIST. Dr Hetherington to then revise the paper taking these comments into consideration as well as the discussions today and re-send the document to the Secretary.

11.1 INITIATION PROJECT

Dr Sacconi referred to Document JCRB-8/11(1) and noted that the website for this project is www.initiation.nl.

ACTION 31: Dr Sacconi to request that the INITIATION Project Leader provides a summary report (rather than a full report) to the JCRB.

11.2 COOMET RECOMMENDATION ON THE EVALUATION OF QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS OF NATIONAL METROLOGY INSTITUTES

COOMET noted that Document JCRB-8/11(2) is for information only.

11.3 REGULAR MEETINGS OF TECHNICAL ASSESSORS/REVIEWERS EMPLOYED IN EVALUATING THE TECHNICAL COMPETENCE OF NMIS (WITH ILAC PARTICIPATION)

Dr Kaarls informed the Committee that ILAC is seeking a mechanism to harmonise the views of accreditors/NMIs.

It was agreed that if necessary ILAC would be invited to RMO TC Meetings where issues arose in the accreditation of NMIs and that, correspondingly, ILAC would invite TC members to such ILAC meetings when necessary. No action is required by the JCRB.

11.4 INFORMATION ON APPROACHES TO CLAUSE 7.3 ON BIPM MRA WEBSITE

This Agenda Item was not discussed at this time.

ACTION 32: Secretary to request that the *ad hoc* Working Group on Inter-regional Harmonisation of Quality System Reviews considers the ILAC request for information on how NMIs have addressed Clause 7.3 to be made available on the MRA Website, and provides comments for discussion at the 9th JCRB Meeting.

12. NOTIFICATION OF DESIGNATED INSTITUTES

The Chairman reminded the Committee that NMIs that wish CMCs of other designated institutes to be included in Appendix C need to notify the Director of the BIPM that these are officially designated institutes.

The Chairman raised for the Committee's awareness the issue that when a designated institute is a commercial company there appear to be problems of commercial advantage. The concern is what is the status of the products produced by this company when one of its laboratories is a designated institute but its products are sold worldwide.

Dr Kaarls responded that as long as the company has a unique position in their market this is acceptable but when there are competitors there may be complaints. There have been two such cases over the last months. If this becomes a WTO case, for example, how strong is the CIPM MRA to maintain this?

The Chairman replied that the individual countries would be held responsible. Neither the CIPM nor the MRA itself could be criticised.

ACTION 33: BIPM Director to raise the issue of cases where designated institutes are commercial companies at the April Directors Meeting, with the suggestion that Directors try to ensure that activities identified in the MRA are separated from the institutes' commercial activities.

Dr Hengstberger noted that in SADCMET a lot of countries are forming institutes, so it would be helpful to draft a position paper to provide guidelines and examples of the issues of which to be aware. This was agreed.

Dr Castelazo objected that it is not the role of the JCRB to discuss the advisability of having commercial companies maintaining national standards.

ACTION 34: BIPM Director to draft a position paper on guidelines regarding designated institutes that are commercial companies, to be raised with the CIPM. Drs Schwitz and Kaarls to assist.

13 DISCUSSION ON REVIEW OF MRA DUE FOR 2003

13.1 END OF TRANSITION PERIOD OF MRA

Initial discussion under this Agenda Item took place during the Preliminary Meeting held on Monday 4 March. Further discussion was held during the JCRB meeting proper, resulting in the paper, Document JCRB-8/13(1), provided in Appendix 3(a). The policy in this document was agreed by all RMO Representatives and the Chairman undertook to present it to Directors at the Directors Meeting in April.

ACTION 35: Document JCRB-8/13(1) to be tabled by the JCRB Chairman for discussion at the April Directors Meeting.

Additional actions that arose from this discussion were:

ACTION 36: BIPM Director to formalise the role of CC WGs on KCs in reviewing relevant CMCs each time a new key comparison is completed.

Dr Hetherington noted that CMCs also need to be reviewed on completion of supplementary comparisons and bilateral comparisons and that this is the responsibility of RMOs.

Dr Castelazo noted that the WGs on KCs are also meant to be looking at the likely CMCs to be supported by the results of each KC as they are identified.

ACTION 37: Chairman and Secretary to draft a document on the criteria that would lead to a review of CMCs already in Appendix C.

Dr Kaarls added that a review of the quality system should be part of this, so that RMOs can monitor changes in staff.

One of the actions that came out of Document JCRB-8/13(1) was that the JCRB Rules of Procedure also needed to be revised. The revised document is provided in Appendix 3(b) as Document JCRB-8/13(1b). It was agreed that this document only applies until the end of the transition period.

ACTION 38: Based on paragraph H of Document JCRB-8/13(1), the *ad hoc* Working Group on NMIs Quality Systems is to draw up criteria to be used in the monitoring of the operation of quality systems under Paragraph 7.3(b). The draft criteria are to be circulated to the JCRB by the *ad hoc* Working Group before the next JCRB meeting, i.e., before October 2002.

Dr Hengstberger was added to the existing *ad hoc* Working Group which now comprises: Dr Hetherington (Convenor), Dr Semerjian, Dr Seta, Dr Kaarls and Dr Hengstberger.

Dr Sacconi noted that, in Europe, there is at least one case in which Clause 7.3(a) has been taken literally as only requiring an assessment rather than requiring an accreditation. Dr Kaarls stated that it is clear that the implication of 7.3(a) is accreditation and it is dangerous to interpret it differently.

It was agreed that the text of Clause 7.3(a) actually means 3rd Party accreditation.

13.2 SCOPE OF JCRB RESPONSIBILITIES

Dr Castelazo noted that one aspect that should be re-considered is the involvement of regulators in the MRA.

14. TIMETABLE FOR FUTURE SUBMISSIONS FOR APPENDIX C

No actions required due to notifications on website.

15. CMC APPROVAL ON THE JCRB WEBSITE

This was discussed under Agenda Item 6.

16.1 PUBLICITY

ACTION 39: Secretary to regularly draft a one-page summary of activities and to distribute this to the JCRB as well as post it on the website to be used for publicity purposes by individual RMOs and NMIs.

Dr Schwitz noted that there is to be a session on the CIPM MRA at CPEM 2002.

ACTION 40: Secretary to add SIM publication, *INFOSIM*, to list of publications.

ACTION 41: Secretary to send out MRA/KCDB posters to RMO Representatives and arrange for these to be available electronically.

16.2 ILAC-BIPM MoU

ILAC has requested a list of appropriate assessors/reviewers. Members of the JCRB Committee had expressed concern at the Preliminary Meeting that this could imply some kind of personnel certification. Mr Peet informed the Committee that the objective is to ensure that the same assessments are being made no matter who is doing them.

The Chairman proposed that the Directors of NMIs be asked to provide this list. The next step would be for the relevant NMI Director and Accreditation Body to discuss details.

Mr Lam informed the Committee that the APLAC MRA Council maintains a list of "evaluators", which includes identifying suitable assessors from NMIs at a national level to be referenced at the regional level.

COOMET suggested that candidates from RMOs should be agreed by the COOMET Technical Committee of Quality Forum.

Dr Castelazo proposed that the SIM Working Groups could be asked to provide the list.

Dr Schwitz suggested that the JCRB could help identify criteria to be fulfilled by assessors/reviewers so that NMIs know what they should look for.

ACTION 42: Chairman to ask Directors at the Directors meeting in April whether they are willing to put forward a list of assessors that can be provided to ILAC. The Chairman to also draft a short list of criteria to be met by assessors.

Dr Schwitz noted that it is against the policy of some accreditors to reveal the names of assessors. Mr Peet agreed that this was a problem and had been the subject of recent discussion. He undertook to inform the JCRB Chairman of the outcome of these discussions.

The Chairman noted that there were no other items for discussion here.

16.3 ASSISTING PARTICIPATION BY DEVELOPING COUNTRY NMIs IN THE MRA

The Chairman noted that Document JCRB-8/16(3) is more a matter for the CIPM and NMI Directors.

He then informed the Committee of the UNIDO-ISO-ILAC-CIPM collaboration and the forthcoming meeting on April 24 2002 at the BIPM. The meeting will involve: ISO, ISO CASCO, ISO DEVCO, BIPM, UNIDO, ILAC and IAF – i.e., organisations providing a link between donors and developing states. It is aimed at setting up an

MoU with UNIDO and working together on a harmonised approach to the WTO to tackle the issue of standards for developing countries. This is to be undertaken with equal responsibility by all participants.

In addition, ISO has received funding to undertake a project with the WTO on metrology, accreditation and standards. There will be a meeting on 28 September 2002 to discuss this.

Dr Hengstberger noted that SADC is also much involved in these activities in its region. He added that UNIDO is not a donor but an *implementing* body.

ACTION 43: Dr Castelazo to inquire about OAS participation (Dr Oscar Harasic) in the meeting with UNIDO on 24 April 2002 at the BIPM and Dr Seta to inquire about APMP DEC/APEC SCSC involvement. The responses are to be forwarded to the Chairman.

ACTION 44: Chairman to discuss the joint meeting with UNIDO on 24 April 2002 at the April Directors Meeting.

16.4: LINKS WITH MRA DATABSE

The Chairman noted that these are to be inward links, not outward links.

(NOTE: A new Agenda Item was added.)

16.5: THE AVAILABILITY OF JCRB DOCUMENTS TO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Dr Schwitz commented that TC chairs would like to obtain RMO reports.

ACTION 45: Secretary to arrange for a new website to be established to be open to RMOs and their Committees. Secretary to forward password to JCRB Committee Members.

ACTION 46: At the end of JCRB meetings, the Committee is to identify papers to be put onto the open RMO website.

ACTION 47: Secretary to put up the following documents from the 8th JCRB Meeting on the open RMO website:

8/4;
8/5(1)-(5) – A*PMP (Dr Seta), EUROMET (Dr Schwitz) and SIM (Dr Castelazo) to amend their reports then forward to Secretary to be posted on web.*
8/7(3)
[not 8/8(2) yet]
8/9 – *Convenor of Working Group (Dr Schwitz) to combine this with JCRB-8/9(3) then forward to Secretary to be posted on web.*
8/10
8/11 – *Convenor of Working Group (Dr Hetherington) to amend then forward to Secretary to be posted on web*
8/11(2)
(not 13.1 – goes to Directors meeting)

17. DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the JCRB is on 3-4 October 2002 at the BIPM.

The next meeting to take place outside the BIPM will be in one year (March 2003) in Tsukuba, Japan. The provisional dates are 3-4 March. NMIJ/AIST is intending to hold a workshop/seminar in conjunction with this meeting to mark the 100-year anniversary of the foundation of the former NRLM.

18. CLOSE

The Chairman closed the meeting and thanked the hosts SADCMET and NML-CSIR.