



## REPORT ON THE TWENTIETH MEETING OF THE JCRB

Held on 1-2 May 2008, in Wellington, New Zealand

Item	Page
Participants.....	3
Delegations .....	3
Guests 3	
1. Welcome by the Chairman and changes to the Agenda .....	4
2. Report by the Chairman on progress since the 19th JCRB meeting, including reports on the: 96th CIPM meeting, 23rd CGPM, and March 2008 meeting of the Bureau of the CIPM. ....	4
3. Presentations to the JCRB by representatives from the Gulf region: .....	4
3.1 The GCC Standardization Organization (GSO) and its plans for regional metrology coordination.....	4
3.2 The National Metrology and Calibration Laboratory (NMCL).....	4
3.3 The Emirates Authority for Standardization and Metrology (ESMA)..	4
3.4 The Qatar General Organization for Standards and Metrology, Department of Central Laboratories and Calibration (QGOSM) .....	5
4. NMI reports on progress since the CIPM MRA workshop in South Africa, and report on plans for a second workshop in Bangladesh .....	5
5. Report on the 2008 RMO-RCAB meeting.....	5
6. Approval of the Minutes and discussion on matters arising from the report of the 19th meeting held at Ottawa, Canada. (Closed session).....	6
7. Discussion on the overlaps between the RMO quality system review processes and the process used by accreditation bodies on NMIs, and opportunities for further collaboration .....	8
8. Discussion on the process to be used to welcome new RMOs to the CIPM MRA process.....	8
9. Discussion on proficiency tests as a means of disseminating traceability, and ISO Guide 43 .....	10
9.1 On the use of ISO Guide 43 for CIPM MRA related comparisons ....	10
9.2 Proficiency tests as a means of disseminating traceability.....	10

10.	Discussion on: .....	10
10.1	The re-review period for CMCs (see document JCRB-14/12, section 5.6).....	10
10.2	The implications of the current lack of a historical record in the KCDB.....	11
11.	Review of the document “ <i>Guide to the implementation of the CIPM MRA</i> ” and a proposal for a new document numbering system .....	11
12.	Report on status of the KCDB.....	12
13.	Report on current CMC inter-regional reviews and matters arising from meetings from the CC working groups on CMCs.....	12
14.	RMO reports to the JCRB .....	12
14.1	BIPM report .....	12
	14.1.1. IAEA report.....	13
14.2	APMP report .....	13
14.3	COOMET report.....	13
14.4	EURAMET .....	14
14.5	SADCMET.....	15
14.6	SIM report.....	15
15.	Other JCRB business .....	15
15.1	Presentation of LNM, Morocco .....	15
15.2	Materials Metrology .....	16
15.3	JTG-RAP.....	16
16.	Next meetings.....	16
16.1	Next meeting: BIPM, Sèvres, France (suggested dates, 24-25 September 2008).....	16
16.2	First 2009 meeting (COOMET’s turn to host).....	16
17.	Meeting closure .....	17

## Participants

### Delegations

Name/email	RMO
<a href="#">Dr William Anderson</a> .....	SIM
<a href="#">Mrs Ajchara Charoensook</a> .....	APMP
<a href="#">Dr Kwang Hwa Chung</a> .....	(Representative) APMP
<a href="#">Dr Stanislav Ďuriš</a> .....	COOMET
<a href="#">Dr Pedro Espina</a> .....	(Executive Secretary) BIPM
<a href="#">Mr Hernando Florez</a> .....	SIM
<a href="#">Dr Yoshio Hino</a> .....	APMP
<a href="#">Mr Keith Jones</a> .....	APMP
<a href="#">Dr Robert Kaarls</a> .....	CIPM
<a href="#">Dr Woo Gab Lee</a> .....	APMP
<a href="#">Dr Wynand Louw</a> .....	(Representative) SADC MET
<a href="#">Mr Peter Lukáč</a> .....	COOMET
<a href="#">Mr Donald Masuku</a> .....	SADC MET
<a href="#">Mr Stanislav Musil</a> .....	COOMET
<a href="#">Mr Luis Mussio</a> .....	(Designated Executive Secretary) BIPM
<a href="#">Mrs Fiona Redgrave</a> .....	(Representative) EURAMET
<a href="#">Dr Claire Saundry</a> .....	SIM
<a href="#">Dr Angela Samuel</a> .....	APMP
<a href="#">Dr Alan Steele</a> .....	SIM
<a href="#">Prof. Andrew J. Wallard</a> .....	(Chairman) BIPM
<a href="#">Dr Claudine Thomas</a> .....	(KCDB coordinator) BIPM

### Guests

<a href="#">Mr Nawaf Ibrahim A. Al-Mana</a> .....	Qatar Standards
<a href="#">Mr Mohammed Ahmed A. Qader Al Mulla</a> .....	ESMA
<a href="#">Mr Adil A. Alyahya</a> .....	SASO
<a href="#">Dr Mohamed Berrada</a> .....	LPEE
<a href="#">Mr Alan Squirell</a> .....	ILAC

## **1. Welcome by the Chairman and changes to the Agenda**

The Chairman welcomed the delegates and thanked the IRL-MSL for hosting the meeting. He introduced the reasons why guests from the Gulf Region were present for the open part of the meeting as well as the presence of a representative of ILAC. The Chairman then asked the participants to introduce themselves. The Chairman invited changes to the Agenda explaining why it was proposed to have two separate sessions: an open session with the presence of guests and a closed session for the RMO delegations only (see [JCRB-20/01](#)). The Chairman also proposed to move the IAEA report to item 14 of the agenda. With this change, the Agenda was approved.

## **2. Report by the Chairman on progress since the 19th JCRB meeting, including reports on the: 96th CIPM meeting, 23rd CGPM, and March 2008 meeting of the Bureau of the CIPM.**

The Chairman presented the report which covered the following points (see [JCRB 20/02](#)).

## **3. Presentations to the JCRB by representatives from the Gulf region:**

### **3.1 The GCC Standardization Organization (GSO) and its plans for regional metrology coordination**

Omar Kanakrieh, Metrology Coordinator of GSO, gave a presentation about the strategic plan for a Regional Metrology Organization of the Gulf Countries. After the presentation, A. Wallard noted that once there is a clear plan of action for the region, then the JCRB will discuss what rules should be considered by the CIPM for the acceptance of new RMOs (see [Item 8](#) of the present minutes). He also noted that it is important to clarify that participants in the CIPM KCs must be NMIs from Member States and must have the competence at the higher level of metrology, so making it necessary to have at least one laboratory in the region with the level of competence to participate in these activities.

### **3.2 The National Metrology and Calibration Laboratory (NMCL)**

Presentation made by Adil A. Alyahya, Director NMCL, SASO, Saudi Arabia (see [JCRB 20/03.2](#)).

### **3.3 The Emirates Authority for Standardization and Metrology (ESMA)**

Presentation made by Mohammed Ahmad A. Qader Al Mulla, Director of Metrology Department, ESMA, United Arab Emirates ([JCRB 20/03.3](#)).

### **3.4 The Qatar General Organization for Standards and Metrology, Department of Central Laboratories and Calibration (QGOSM)**

Presented by Nawaf Ibrahim A. Al-Mana, Director of Central Laboratories and Calibration, QGOSM, Qatar (JCRB 20/03.4).

A. Wallard closed this part of the meeting by thanking the guests for their interesting presentations and stating that this information will help the JCRB with its discussions during the meeting.

### **4. NMI reports on progress since the CIPM MRA workshop in South Africa, and report on plans for a second workshop in Bangladesh**

The report was presented by Pedro Espina (JCRB 20.4) including a summary of the present status of the six participants in the CIPM MRA workshop in South Africa:

DZM – Croatia ([JCRB 20/4.DZM](#))

KazInMetr – Kazakhstan ([JCRB 20/4.KazInMetr](#))

KEBS – Kenya ([JCRB 20/04.KEBS](#))

LACOMET – Costa Rica ([JCRB 20/04.LACOMET](#))

NIS - Egypt ([JCRB 22/04.NIS](#))

VIM – Vietnam ([JCRB 22/04.VIM](#))

It was proposed that, for the future, the workshops should be tied to a regional TC meeting and not to the JCRB.

Due to organizational problems, the workshop planned to be held in Bangladesh had to be cancelled.

### **5. Report on the 2008 RMO-RCAB meeting**

Presented by Alan Squirrell, ILAC–BIPM liaison, ILAC Secretariat ([JCRB 20.05](#)).

The main topics of the report were:

- General overview of BIPM / ILAC cooperation. RMOs–RCABs meeting.
- The CMC issue – current situation and future actions by ILAC and BIPM.
- Accreditation and Peer Review Process (RCAB/RMO).

C. Thomas commented that in the CCM there was a discussion of the service categories used in the KCDB and that there is a desire to change them, particularly in the pressure area where the categories are going to be oriented to the different kind of instruments that are normally used.

A. Steele mentioned that the CMC–BMC panel is going to be part of one of the NCSLI sessions and invited ILAC to participate in the panel. A. Squirrell thanked A. Steele for the invitation and said that he will take the proposal back to ILAC, as well as upload the information on the ILAC website.

S. Musil asked if ILAC has disseminated the information about the new CMC definition and if the NABs have this information. A. Squirrell replied that the definition was presented to the ILAC General Assembly, there is a circular with the new definition and it is also on the ILAC website.

A. Wallard commented that the new definition was also published on the BIPM website.

On the flowcharts presented relating the accreditation process and the CIPM MRA process, it was commented that a closer relation is needed between the two processes, and that some “feedback loops” should be implemented between them.

## **6. Approval of the Minutes and discussion on matters arising from the report of the 19th meeting held at Ottawa, Canada. (Closed session)**

Discussion led by Andrew Wallard, Chairman ([JCRB 20/06](#)).

B. Anderson commented on Action 19/3, that presenting a full report of each NMI of the RMO to the other RMOs would not add value. After a brief discussion, SIM (B. Anderson) moved a motion to modify Action 19/3 by adding the word “summary”.

SADCMET (W. Louw) seconded.

The motion was unanimously accepted.

**Action 20/1 (Modification of Action 19/3) The RMO reports to the JCRB will include only a summary of the status of the Quality Systems in their RMO. (This will require a modification of JCRB 18/03.7.) (Executive Secretary)**

*Comments on action 19/4: Keep the status of KC current in the KCDB by sending the latest information to the KCDB Office. It is suggested that the RMOs do this at least prior to each JCRB meeting. (RMOs)*

C. Thomas commented that she receives information about KCs from the CCs, and that at the RMO level the contact is from the pilot laboratories.

After a short discussion it was agreed that responsibility for the registration and tracking of Regional Comparisons lies with the RMOs.

P. Espina presented the list of actions from the 19th meeting, noting that Actions 11 and 12 related to LACOMET’s need for comparisons were not accomplished. A. Steele agreed that these actions were not accomplished, and that no comparisons had been initiated, but LACOMET had sent a communication with its needs to other NMIs in the region.

On action 19/13, *RMOs are to nominate members for the new CCTF WG on CMCs. (RMOs)*. Not all the nominations were received.

**Action 20/2 RMOs are to nominate members for the new CCTF WG on CMCs. (RMOs)**

Comments on Recommendation 19/4, *The JCRB recommends that for purposes of publishing CMCs in the KCDB the following guidelines on traceability be followed:*

A. Wallard gave a brief summary of the discussion on this issue at the RCABs –RMOs meeting.

After some discussion, the following conclusions were reached:

- Recommendation 19/4 should be part of a general document (see [Item 11](#)).
- An NMI should be able to get traceability from another NMI that does not have primary methods, or realization of the unit, thus a modification of the first paragraph is needed.
- The last paragraph should be modified to make it clearer, or it should be deleted.

**Action 20/3 Modify Recommendation 19.4 item 3, removing the word “major”. Disseminate Recommendations 19.1, 19.2, 19.3; they should be included in the CIPM MRA guidance document being prepared by the BIPM.**

Comments on Recommendation 19/1.

R. Kaarls pointed to the problem of how the treatment of an anomalous result, for example, may lead to an increase of the uncertainty in the related CMC.

A. Steele said that in the case of KCs, a physical explanation is looked for whenever possible, and a new bilateral comparison is performed, but having a bias in a result should not necessary lead to an increase of uncertainties. For the case in which many participants have anomalous results, there may be other actions, but those are particular to each case.

F. Redgrave noted that the increase may be the result of adding factors that were not taken into account initially.

A. Wallard noted that this is an issue more appropriately discussed in the CCs or in other technical forums, rather than the JCRB.

The results of this discussion will be used in a general document of KCs ([see Item 11](#)).

**Action 20/4 Modify Recommendation 19.1 per the request of the CCRI WG RMO. (Executive Secretary)**

## **7. Discussion on the overlaps between the RMO quality system review processes and the process used by accreditation bodies on NMIs, and opportunities for further collaboration**

L. Mussio presented the flowcharts ([JCRB 20/07](#)) concerning the process for the acceptance and publication of CMCs, including the accreditation process, giving information on the discussion that has taken place during the RMOs–RCABs meeting and the proposals that had been made.

K. Jones commented that the proposed process is almost exactly what APMP does at present.

W. Louw commented that in SADC MET, it is not possible to wait for the simultaneous publication of CMCs by the AB and in the KCDB because CMCs cannot be submitted without prior accreditation.

B. Anderson commented that the process in SIM is different and does not rely so much on accreditation. As an example, the QS of a DI that had its accreditation granted by a recognized AB was not approved at QSTF because it lacked some principal components, such as a procedure for nonconformities.

F. Redgrave said that there may be a danger of duplicating the processes.

A. Steele said that the main question is how to build trust between the two processes.

A. Wallard stated that the participants in the CIPM MRA process should be able to be confident to feed back their concerns and problems to the accreditation world.

R. Kaarls noted that, in his view, it is unacceptable to have different CMCs in the accreditation scope and in the KCDB for the same laboratory, and also pointed out that in his experience of “on-site peer reviews”, the review of the quality systems is not completely similar in both processes.

After the discussion it was decided that these comments shall be used as inputs for the JTG-RAP work.

**Action 20/5      Bring the discussion on section 7 (as recorded in the Minutes) to the attention of the JTG-RAP. (BIPM)**

## **8. Discussion on the process to be used to welcome new RMOs to the CIPM MRA process**

A. Wallard gave an introduction to the subject taking the new “Gulfmet” as an example and presented the proposed procedure ([JCRB 20/08](#)) that shall be presented to the CIPM in October 2008.

He also pointed out the following:

- Once an RMO is recognized by the CIPM it has a vote in the JCRB thus giving it a position of influence;
- It is important not to give negative signs to the new RMOs, but to have a “staged process” to encourage them to become part of the system;
- No existing RMO should be left out. The process has to be consistent with the change from SADC MET to AFRIMETS.

The following comments were made:

- The document suggests that the RMO must have, at least, one full member of the BIPM, but it seems that it would be advisable to have at least two;
- No RMOs are foreseen in the future besides the Gulf region, but those that are not members of any of the existing RMOs may want to create a smaller RMO and this is a potential danger;
- The case in which a big RMO splits in two or more smaller RMOs should be considered;
- There are no examples of “regional institutes” as referred to in the proposed document (“*an RMO is formed by national or regional metrology institutes*”);
- Separate what is needed by an RMO to have a “voice” and what is needed to have a “vote”;
- It is important to define the size of the RMOs;
- Define responsibilities (a new RMO should abide by the existing rules); and
- A transition period may be needed until an RMO has full rights in the JCRB.

On the right to vote on CMCs the following comments were made.

W. Louw mentioned that if expertise in a certain field exists in a region, the region must be able to vote on CMCs in that field, and not only if they have CMCs published in that field.

R. Kaarls agreed, because if you can only vote if you have CMCs published, this may create a problem in those areas where there are no CMCs, and so one should consider either having CMCs or proven expertise in the field.

A. Steele pointed out that there is the possibility that all the members of a RMO take traceability from external NMIs, meaning that no laboratory in the RMO may be operating at the CC KC level, but the document requires them to be at CC level. Care must be taken not to make the document too prescriptive.

**Action 20/6**      **The document on “How to Welcome New RMOs” will be modified and distributed to the RMOs for comments within 60 days of the meeting. (BIPM)**

## **9. Discussion on proficiency tests as a means of disseminating traceability, and ISO Guide 43**

### **9.1 On the use of ISO Guide 43 for CIPM MRA related comparisons**

R. Kaarls presented the documents and gave a description of the Guide 43.

After a short discussion it was agreed that the document is not applicable to the CIPM MRA process.

### **9.2 Proficiency tests as a means of disseminating traceability**

R. Kaarls explained how the NMIs provide traceability in the field of metrology in chemistry, either providing CRMs or providing reference values for PT schemes. As the process of measuring and assigning the value may be different, the laboratory needs to know the final application of the samples.

After some discussions it was agreed that PTs should not be considered a means of disseminating traceability.

## **10. Discussion on:**

### **10.1 The re-review period for CMCs (see document [JCRB-14/12](#), section 5.6)**

A. Wallard summarized the situation, stating that the current policy for re-reviewing CMCs every five years is not applied universally, and a solution is required in order to maintain the trust of external users of the KCDB.

A. Steele said that this is an opportunity to send this problem to the CCs, as there have been questions on this. It is not simply related to re-reviewing the CMCs, but also to a new round of KCs and other related issues.

P. Espina noted that in the CCs there is a general desire to re-review the CMCs, but there are difficulties to get people on board to do it.

A. Steele said that there should be some activity where one can go back and ensure that the CMCs are still valid. For example, QS reports could provide a possible mechanism to do it.

R. Kaarls noted that this is a kind of self-assessment, and may not be acceptable to the accreditors. A. Steele said that the accreditors have a short re-review period because of the fast turnover of personnel in accredited laboratories, while NMIs are much more stable.

K. Jones pointed out that there are signs that, in the background, NMIs have processes that assure the integrity of CMCs. These processes assure that the services are still valid.

B. Anderson pointed out that CMCs are included as part of the five-yearly SIM QS reviews, and so SIM can honestly say that it is doing the review. The CCs may say that something must be redone, but will not be able to do everything again.

C. Thomas informed the JCRB that she changed data in the KCDB because she receives mails requesting the deletion of CMCs from KCDB, because they correspond to services that are no longer available.

A. Wallard asked if a recommendation to the NMIs should be put in a resolution that the communication to the BIPM of the validity of CMCs should be part of their QS.

F. Redgrave agreed with the general view and also agreed that a communication reminding the NMIs would be acceptable.

R. Kaarls said that it is one point if the CMCs are still published, but quite another to ensure that the technical capability is still there.

No resolution was taken on this subject.

## **10.2 The implications of the current lack of a historical record in the KCDB**

P. Espina gave an introduction showing the possible problems that may arise due to the lack of historical records in the public part of the KCDB.

After a brief discussion it was agreed that this was not a real problem. In the rare case that an accredited laboratory needs historical information to prove the validity of a certificate (issued for example before a CMC was deleted), the information can be requested from the NMI, who can in turn make contact with the BIPM.

## **11. Review of the document “*Guide to the implementation of the CIPM MRA*” and a proposal for a new document numbering system**

L. Mussio presented the documents [JCRB 20/11.01](#) and [JCRB 20/11.02](#). It was decided to have a discussion via e-mail in the following 30 days. L. Mussio will send a reminder in 3 weeks.

L. Mussio also proposed that prior to applying a numbering system to the present documents of the JCRB, it is necessary to have a general review and consolidate the documents. The proposal was accepted.

<b>Action 20/7</b>	<b>Consolidate CIPM MRA documents by category and reformat and number the documents according to the BIPM internal QS procedures. (Executive Secretary)</b>
--------------------	---

## 12. Report on status of the KCDB.

C. Thomas presented the report ([JCRB 20/12](#)) on the status of the KCDC. After the report she was asked whether there is a need to change the name of KCDB because it does not include only KC but also CMCs and other complementary data.

A. Steele said that the name KCDB has been “branded” for over a decade and it needs to be noted that there is a market presence for the name KCDB.

C. Thomas noted that changing the name KCDB would be a huge project. She also noted that the nomenclature “Appendix A, B or C” on the KCDB website does not have a real meaning and that these have already been renamed

A. Wallard informed the group that articles and contributions to the KCDB newsletter are welcome and asked the participants to disseminate this information within the regions.

## 13. Report on current CMC inter-regional reviews and matters arising from meetings from the CC working groups on CMCs

P. Espina presented the report. The report was updated with the information provided by the RMOs and will be published on the JCRB website ([JCRB 20/13](#)). No resolutions or actions arose from the report.

## 14. RMO reports to the JCRB

### 14.1 BIPM report

A. Wallard presented an oral report, which covered the following points.

BIPM uncertainties are to be published on the BIPM website. The results of an internal working group are going to be presented to the CIPM in October 2008. The CMCs will be presented to the CCs for review.

W. Anderson asked if the resolution of stating BIPM uncertainties with  $k = 1$  is still valid. A. Wallard replied that  $k = 1$  will be used and that this will be clear on the website.

BIPM Quality System: as a result of the extended sick leave of the BIPM Quality Manager, Michael Streak is helping to put back in place the system of internal and external audits with the intention of making a presentation by March 2009.

Pedro Espina will finish his term as Executive Secretary of the JCRB after this meeting and Luis Mussio will take his place. The Chairman thanked NIST and LATU for these secondments.

Pedro Espina will stay at the BIPM for a further period and will act as a liaison with intergovernmental organizations. He will participate in the planning and execution of international events, in particular the WMO/BIPM symposium.

As there are no important issues to report for this year, the Directors' meeting will be postponed to May 2009, to make it coincident with the World Metrology Day and a symposium about the 10 years of CIPM MRA.

Michael Streak will act as a liaison with developing countries, the JCDCMAS secretariat and the link to AFRIMETS.

The group of P. Espina, M. Streak and L. Mussio will also be working on the criteria to be used by the CIPM in assessing whether an Associate of the CGPM should be encouraged to become a signatory of the Metre Convention.

As was discussed during the KCDB status report, there have been discussions about the name of the KCDB. Most people are not interested in the KC information but rather the CMCs, so CMCDB or BIPMCMCDB would be a more appropriate name. A. Wallard asked the RMOs to provide feedback on the name.

#### **14.1.1. IAEA report.**

P. Espina presented the IAEA report ([JCRB 20/14.1](#)), which was prepared following the EURAMET format.

A. Wallard welcomed the report and opened the floor for questions.

There were no comments on the report.

#### **14.2 APMP report**

The report ([JCRB 20/14.02](#)) was presented by K.H. Chung.

A. Samuel complemented the report with the following information:

- The CIPM MRA Workshop in Bangladesh will now be an APMP event rather than the 2nd BIPM-coordinated Workshop;
- The Symposium in Bangladesh is no longer a JCDCMAS Symposium but an Awareness-Raising Symposium aimed at the host economy;
- APMP participated in the 1st meeting of the APEC Sub-Committee on Standards and Conformance (SCSC) in Lima in February 2008. In association with this, APMP coordinated the Workshop of the APEC Specialist Regional Bodies (SRBs: APLAC, APLMF, APMP, PAC & PASC) held just before SCSC I in Lima, at which the SRBs updated their SRB Strategic Plan and made progress with a number of other regional standards and conformance initiatives.

#### **14.3 COOMET report**

The report ([JCRB 20/14.3](#)) was presented by S. Musil.

A. Wallard highlighted the fact that the COOMET QS review process has changed from a two-step process to a one-step process. He noted the approval of the QS of the Cuban NMI and DI.

**Action 20/8 Cuban greyed-out CMCs shall be reinstated into the KCDB. (KCDB Office)**

R. Kaarls asked about the “umbrella” designation systems (see paragraph 6 in COOMET report).

A. Wallard explained that the Russian system is complicated and is composed of VNIIM and a group of laboratories that usually work at the CC levels. However, due to the size of the country it was national policy to have secondary NMIs and he had learned that they also want to submit CMCs. This is not possible under the present rules. There has to be more discussion on the structure of metrology in Russia, but it is clear that each country can only have one CMC in a particular area.

S. Musil quoted that the QS review process in COOMET is moving towards a structure similar to that in the other RMOs.

#### **14.4 EURAMET**

The report was presented by Fiona Redgrave ([JCRB 20/14.4](#)).

W. Louw asked about the Egypt situation as, with the creation of AFRIMETS, he expects Egypt to become part of AFRIMETS and that there must be some communication between the two RMOs for the recognition of the QS of Egypt. He asked if the people that are going to evaluate the annual report of the QS had been nominated.

F. Redgrave answered that there is a steering committee that reviews the QS documentation. Michael Streak is part of the committee, not representing the BIPM but cooperating as an expert.

C. Thomas made a comment about the situation of the Danish Laboratories as it is not clear which is the laboratory that provides the individual approved CMCs.

EURAMET will provide clarification on the status of designations in Denmark.

A. Wallard pointed that some actions were taken about the Hungarian situation: at the request of the EURAMET chair, the Hungarian CMCs were greyed out until he receives confirmation that the QS has been approved.

B. Anderson asked about the process for the presentation of the QS of a DI.

F. Redgrave answered that the initial presentation must be given by the institute, but in the re-review the presentation can be made by the signatory NMI.

A. Wallard asked if there are plans to create subregions in EURAMET, which may lead to changes in the way that some processes work.

F. Redgrave answered that as more countries are joining, the creation of sub regions is a possibility.

## 14.5 SADC MET

W. Louw presented a report on the activities on SADC MET and advances in the establishment of AFRIMETS ([JCRB 20/14.05](#)).

It was announced that the AFRIMETS General Assembly will take place in the first week of July 2008 in Tunisia.

P. Espina asked if MAGMET will include Libya.

W. Louw and M. Berrada answered that Mauritania and Libya are essentially part of MAGMET and will hopefully become active in MAGMET and AFRIMETS in the near future.

A. Wallard noted that AFRIMETS is not the creation of an entirely new RMO but a transformation or expansion of an existing RMO, and as such the request for AFRIMETS to take over from SADC MET as the RMO and become a member of the JCRB, should go directly to the CIPM for formal approval.

## 14.6 SIM report

W. Anderson presented the SIM report ([JCRB 20/15](#)).

There were no questions or comments on the report.

## 15. Other JCRB business

### 15.1 Presentation of LNM, Morocco

M. Berrada gave a presentation of the metrology structure in Morocco ([JCRB 20/15.01](#)). The presentation was translated to English by C. Thomas.

A. Samuel asked if there is any regional organization in legal metrology. M. Berrada answered that only Morocco has an entity working in this field.

K. Jones asked if the DEC problems will be discussed in the next meeting.

**Action 20/9 Provide an Agenda item during the 21st meeting to discuss the results of the Forum on Metrology Programmes for States in Development. (Executive Secretary)**

M. Berrada pointed out that before the end of the year, Morocco will apply to become an Associate of the CGPM and the LNM will ask to sign the CIPM MRA.

P. Espina asked if the Algerian NMI is to become a CIPM MRA signatory. Dr Berrada and Dr Louw answered that both Morocco and Algeria plan to become Associates of the CGPM and their applications will hopefully be sponsored by UNIDO.

## 15.2 Materials Metrology

A. Wallard reported on the status of Materials Metrology, noting that S. Bennett from NPL had reported to the CIPM on the problems to be tackled in this area.

Other recommendations of the Bennett report include the creation by VAMAS of a “side group” with expertise in metrology that will propose to the BIPM the particular areas where an improvement can be made through greater attention to traceability. VAMAS will in turn take this information to a specific CC and propose they look for the opportunity of carrying out pilot studies in this area.

A. Samuel asked if there is any relation established with VAMAS. A. Wallard answered that an MoU between VAMAS and the BIPM is in preparation.

## 15.3 JTG-RAP

A. Squirell asked about the results of the discussion in item 7 (closed part of the meeting). The information will be used as input for the JTG-RAP group.

On Item 9, A. Squirell informed the JCRB about the present status of the Standard 17043 to PTs.

R. Kaarls noted that the standard is basically good, but it was considered that PTs are not a way of disseminating traceability to other labs, so it is not seen as directly relevant to the CIPM MRA.

## 16. Next meetings

### 16.1 Next meeting: BIPM, Sèvres, France (suggested dates, 24-25 September 2008)

The SIM delegation requests that the meeting be moved to October/November.

A. Wallard noted that it is important to have it prior to the CIPM.

After some discussion it was decided to keep the September date with the support of all the delegations.

### 16.2 First 2009 meeting (COOMET’s turn to host).

COOMET will have an internal discussion and report to the JCRB which country will host the meeting.

**Resolution 20/1 Next JCRB meeting: BIPM, Sèvres, France on 24-25 September 2008.**

**Resolution 20/2 First 2009 meeting will be hosted by COOMET, who suggested that the meeting be held in March 2009.**

## **17. Meeting closure**

A. Wallard thanked the delegations for their continuous support to the CIPM MRA process and for their participation in the meeting. He also thanked the guests for their valuable contributions, and a particular distinction to K. Jones and his team for the arrangements for this meeting.

O. Kanakrieh thanked all the JCRB for the invitation that will help to start the new RMO, and thanked Keith Jones for the arrangements in Wellington and Angela Samuel for the Symposium held in Sydney.

Having no more further issues for discussion, the meeting was adjourned.

**ACTIONS**

Action 20/1 (Modification of Action 19/3) The RMO reports to the JCRB will include only a summary of the status of the Quality Systems in their RMO. (This will require a modification of JCRB 18/03.7.) (Executive Secretary).....6

Action 20/2 RMOs are to nominate members for the new CCTF WG on CMCs. (RMOs) 7

Action 20/3 Modify Recommendation 19.4 item 3, removing the word “major”. Disseminate Recommendations 19.1, 19.2, 19.3; they should be included in the CIPM MRA guidance document being prepared by the BIPM.....7

Action 20/4 Modify Recommendation 19.1 per the request of the CCRI WG RMO. (Executive Secretary).....7

Action 20/5 Bring the discussion on section 7 (as recorded in the Minutes) to the attention of the JTG-RAP. (BIPM) .....8

Action 20/6 The document on “*How to Welcome New RMOs*” will be modified and distributed to the RMOs for comments within 60 days of the meeting. (BIPM) ..... 10

Action 20/7 Consolidate CIPM MRA documents by category and reformat and number the documents according to the BIPM internal QS procedures. (Executive Secretary).....11

Action 20/8 Cuban greyed-out CMCs shall be reinstated into the KCDB. (KCDB Office) 14

Action 20/9 Provide an Agenda item during the 21st meeting to discuss the results of the Forum on Metrology Programmes for States in Development. (Executive Secretary) ..... 15

**RESOLUTIONS**

Resolution 20/1 Next JCRB meeting: BIPM, Sèvres, France on 24-25 September 2008. ....16

Resolution 20/2 First 2009 meeting will be hosted by COOMET, who suggested that the meeting be held in March 2009..... 17