Report of the 25th Meeting of the JCRB

Held on 21-22 September 2010

Sharm al Sheik, Egypt

Item Page

Participants

BIPM-CIPM

Prof. Andrew J. Wallard ..... (Chairman) BIPM
Prof Michael Kühne ..... BIPM
Dr. Robert Kaarls ..... CIPM
Mr Luis Mussio ..... (Executive Secretary) BIPM
Mr Omer Altan ..... BIPM

Delegations

Dr Wynand Louw ..... (Representative) AFRIMETS
Mr Donald Masuku ..... AFRIMETS
Mr Omar Berrada ..... AFRIMETS
Mr Dennis Moturi ..... AFRIMETS
Dr Yadong Yu ..... (Representative) APMP
Mrs Ada Cai Juan ..... APMP
Mrs Ajchara Charoensook ..... APMP
Dr Yoshio Hino ..... APMP
Dr. Ilya Budovsky ..... APMP
Dr Pavel Neyezhmakov ..... (Representative) COOMET
Dr Sergey Korostin ..... COOMET
Ms Natalia Sedova ..... COOMET
Dr Anna Chukovnina ..... COOMET
Dr Leslie Pendrill ..... (Representative) EURAMET
Dr Wolfgang Schmid ..... EURAMET
Mr Luc Erard ..... EURAMET
Ms Maguelonne Chambon ..... EURAMET
Dr Alan Steele ..... (Representative) SIM
Dr William Anderson ..... SIM
Dr Claire Saundry ..... SIM

1. Welcome by the Chairman and approval of the agenda.

The Chairman welcomed the delegates and thanked the National Institute of Standards (NIS) and Prof. Ahmed El-Sayed, in particular, for the organization of the meeting.

Participants were then asked to introduce themselves.

The agenda of the 24th JCRB Meeting was approved without amendments.

2. Approval of the minutes and discussion of matters arising from the report of the 24th meeting BIPM.

The chairman made a reference to the question on page 3 of the report, concerning the publication of the reports of the BIPM-WMO seminar, noting that while the presentations from the seminar are available, the final report is still in preparation and yet to be released.

The chairman then noted that the results of the discussion about authorship of reports of comparison results will be taken before the CIPM at the October meeting.

A. Steele requested that the issue should be included in the agenda of the next meeting of the JCRB taking into account the developments on the subject resulting from the CIPM meeting before any decision is put in force.

After a short discussion, the point was agreed.

3. Report by the Chairman on progress since the 24th JCRB meeting. (DOC 25.03)

A. Wallard presented the report.

M. Kuehne noted that the convocation for the 2011 CGPM meeting, including the program of work and proposed budget will be sent out before the end of 2010. He also noted that a pre-meeting of the CGPM is planned for May 2011 to discuss budgetary issues. This meeting would need to be approved by the CIPM.

For clarification, it was reiterated that the planned meeting will not be a budget committee meeting but a CGPM pre-meeting.

On the subject of reports from recent BIPM seminars, A.Wallard commented that report from the WMO workshop is expected before the end of 2010 and that the reports from the seminars on Physiological Quantities and Metrology at Nanoscale are already available on the BIPM website.

3.1. Liaison with IAEA.

The Chairman summarized the present status of ongoing negotiations with IAEA. There is a proposal to have a meeting for the review of IAEA's quality system in conjunction with the JCRB meeting to be held in Vienna in September 2011.

SIM stated the position that if there are to be extra costs involved in attending the proposed review meeting, these costs should be covered by IAEA, noting that it was an IAEA decision not to go through any particular RMO.

After some discussion the following action was agreed:

Action 25/1: The BIPM is to arrange with IAEA the details of a QS review meeting, taking into account the points expressed by the delegates.

4. Report from the CIPM

R. Kaarls presented an oral report, including the following points.

- Changes in the integration of the CIPM.

- Agenda items for the CIPM meeting, including:

Possible exclusion of Member states remaining in arrears for along period.

Cooperation with other IGOs, such as pharmacopeia.

Proposals for new CMCs, i.e. moisture of grains.

5. Highlights of the RMO reports to the JCRB (full reports are to be tabled):

5.1. SIM (DOC 25.05.1)

A. Steele presented the SIM report. W. Anderson presented a report on the activities of SIM QSTF.

A brief discussion was held on the relation between the SIM QSTF reviews and the technical review of CMCs. A. Steele explained how this interaction works in SIM to ensure the validity of published CMCs.

R. Kaarls asked about the status of the CMCs of the Chilean laboratories that suffered damages in the recent earthquake.W. Anderson replied that he had contacted the laboratories a month after the earthquake and that all the laboratories were operational.

5.2. EURAMET (DOC 25.05.2.1 and DOC 25.05.2.2)

L. Pendril presented the EURAMET report.

On the policy for on-site reviews, L. Erard informed the JCRB that the policy and procedure is included in the new EURAMET QMS Review Procedure, which is in the final draft stage (This document has been circulated among the JCRB members.)

5.3. COOMET (DOC 25.05.3)

P. Neyezhmakov presented the COOMET report.

5.4. APMP (DOC 25.05.4)

A. Cai Juan presented the APMP report and A. Charoensook presented the APMP QMS committee report.

R. Kaarls, noted that there appears to be differences between the regions in the criteria applied to QS reviews and that this point may need discussion.

A. Steele commented that the CMC review is a two stages process and the intra regional part is entirely to the discretion of the regions. However these differences are balanced

during the inter-regional review and because of this, there are no inconsistencies in the KCDB due to the differences in the intraregional treatment of QS reviews.

5.5. AFRIMETS (DOC 25.05.5)

W. Louw presented the AFRIMETS report.

R. Kaarls asked about the AFRIMETS requirement for accreditation, in particular if all NMIs will follow this path.

W. Louw replied that the preferred route is 3rd party accreditation, but in exceptional cases a peer review process can be used, which must include visits for on-site technical review.

6. KCDB report. (DOC 25.06)

Luis Mussio presented the KCDB report on behalf of C. Thomas.

A. Wallard noted the importance of the KCDB newsletter as a tool for the dissemination of information relevant to the CIPM MRA.

A procedure for the permanent deletion of greyed out CMCs was discussed.

6.1. Status of greyed out CMCs. Procedure for deleting greyed out CMCs with more than 5 years.

Resolution 25/1: For CMCs greyed out for more than 5 years, the process for deletion will be:

- when the 5 year period is reached a reminder will be sent by the BIPM (JCRB Executive Secretary) to the RMO and the NMI;

- a second reminder will be sent three weeks after;

- if there is no reply in three weeks, the CMCs will be deleted from the KCDB and a confirmation will be send to the RMO and NMI.

In both cases, the mail should be send to the RMO, copied to the other RMOs and the implied NMI.

On the present status of CMCs greyed out for more than five years, EURAMET informed that all EURAMET CMCs in that status should be permanently deleted.

Action 25/2: To delete all EURAMET CMCs that have been greyed out for more than five years.

A. Steele requested that for monitoring the process, the JCRB Executive Secretary keeps track of the occurrences of these events and periodically inform the JCRB.

7. Review of pending actions

The following pending actions were discussed.

Action 24/1: The Chairman of the JCRB will contact IAEA for:

- establishing a date for the review of the IAEA QS;

- defining needs for on site peer review;

- suggesting IAEA to attend the regular meetings of RMOs Quality Systems review committees;

- current position of IAEA to support people to attend the review.

This point was discussed in item 3.1.

After some discussions on the point, the Chairman proposed to continue the negotiation with the IAEA taking into account the opinions expressed by the participants.

SIM also requested the revision of CIPM MRA – G -03 to include the approval by the JCRB of the panel of experts that perform the review of an IGO QS.

Action 25/3: Review document CIPM MRA – G – 03 according to what was expressed in the meeting.

Action 24/2: JCRB Executive Secretary to circulate the document related to the QS review of IGOs (CIPM MRA-G-03) among the RMOs. (DOC 25.07.2)

The discussion of the document was deferred for consideration at the next meeting.

Action 24/7: EURAMET will establish its position in regards of the character of the document on "Accreditation of NMIs", whether this should be an ILAC or joint ILAC – BIPM document and report back in the next JCRB meeting.

L. Pendril expressed that EURAMET is in favor of producing a joint document.

Action 25/4: BIPM to take the position of having a joint document for "Accreditation of NMIs" to the next AIC meeting.

8. Status and problems arisen with CMCs submission and review.

L. Mussio reported on the present CMCs status review. At present all reviews are running without problems.

9. Review of the CIPM MRA – Version 2 (Documents presented for information DOC 25.09)

A. Wallard reported on the status of the CIPM MRA review, noting that the proposal now is to finish and approve the "addendum" version first and afterwards start a deeper review of the document.

A. Steele suggested that the new versions of the CIPM MRA should reflect that the interregional review process is a JCRB responsibility and, although they are involved, this is not a responsibility of the CCs.

10. Feedbacks on application of the policy for traceability in the MRA. (DOC 25.10)

L. Mussio made an introduction to the discussion, noting that some complaints have been received about the traceability policy approved by the CIPM. In general, the

complaints relate to the cost of calibrations performed by manufacturers and other accredited laboratories that were providers of traceability for small NMIs.

W. Louw reminded the JCRB that AFRIMETS had raised this concern during the previous JCRB meeting, noting that for some new laboratories that have non-primary standards the costs associated with the calibrations at NMIs may be prohibitive. In some cases, the problem is that the level required is not usually provided by NMIs like NMISA.

After an extensive discussion it was decided that a review of the traceability policy is not needed.

Action 25/5: The Chairman will draft a letter in response to the complaint received from Fluke.

11. Problems due to the increasing number of DIs and CMCs. (DOC 25.11)

An extensive discussion was maintained on this issue after which it was resolved to create a task group to discuss the criteria to be fulfilled by a laboratory to be accepted as a Designated Institute within the CIPM MRA.

Problems associated with the increasing number of DIs were mentioned, i.e. extra burden for the CMC reviewers, the review of QS and the need for deeper on-site peer reviews, as well as potential problems associated with the participation of laboratories that have only few CMCs in very narrow field.

It was unanimously accepted during the discussion that the designation of a laboratory is a decision belonging to the individual states, however, there may be a need to have supplementary conditions that designated laboratories should fulfill in order to participate in CIPM MRA activities.

Action 25/6: The Executive Secretary will distribute the file with the information of the participation of the DIs in the CMCs and the RMOs will report back in the March 2011 meeting.

Resolution 25/2: To create a task group to discuss criteria to be fulfilled as designated institutes. The group will be chaired by M. Chambon, and W. Louw, Y. Hino, and P. Neyezmakov. SIM will send the name of the representative to the chairperson.

12. Harmonization of the on-site peer reviews procedures. (DOCS 25.12 and 25.07.6)

I. Budovsky presented the APMP proposal on the subject, which include:

APMP urges that the policy be based on the following basic principles:

1. There must be a regular on-site technical peer review to support CMC claims

2. The peer reviewer must be selected in accordance with the CIPM recommendations, Ref: CIPM2007-25

3. The peer reviewer must be approved by the relevant RMO TC/WG prior to the review

4. CMC submission must follow the peer review and all CMC claims must be covered by it.

A fruitful discussion was maintained on the subject and the final consensus was that there is no need to modify the present policies on this subject. It was also agreed that there is a need to further improve the dissemination of the information from the JCRB to the CCs and regional working groups.

Resolution 25/3: The information concerning the publication of documents in the JCRB open website will be published in the KCDB newsletter and mailed to the technical contacts of the RMO.

13. Documents remitted to the JCRB by the CIPM and documents to be submitted to the CIPM.

Recommendation: The JCRB recommends the CIPM the approval of the following documents:

Interlaboratory Comparisons in the CIPM MRA (CIPM MRA-D-05) – Compilation of existing procedures and policy documents (new versions) (DOC 25.13.1),

CIPM MRA-D-04 – Inclusion of traceability policy + periodic review of CMCs (DOC 25.13.2),(with the correction proposed by SIM on Section 5),

CIPM MRA-G-02 – Inclusion of the 5 year period for the review of QS. (DOC 25.13.3)

Action 25/7: After approval of the documents to be submitted to the CIPM, the RMOs should actively draw the attention of their TC chairs and members, to the documents and the importance of their full implementation. The Executive Secretary will prepare a cover letter.

14. Feedback from the CCs and CC Working Groups

Noting the different approaches to the CMC review process among different CCs, it was proposed that a workshop on this subject may be useful as an interdisciplinary discussion and a sharing of experience among the CCs.

Action 25/8: The BIPM to prepare a draft program for a “Workshop on the best practice for the review of CMCs” to be presented at the next meeting.

15. Report from ILAC Liaison

The Chairman made a summary of the recent activities with ILAC, where he highlighted the following question from ILAC:

- How does the system verify that certificates issued before a CMC is greyed out are valid?

It was agreed that this is a problem of the NMI in relation to its clients and should be resolved at that level.

The position of the JCRB will be taken to the ILAC – BIPM bilateral meeting and to the AIC meeting.

16. Other business:

- Use of logo in calibration in stickers. The chairman informed that he received the question about the use of the CIPM MRA logo in calibration stickers.
- Frequency of JCRB meetings. The issue was discussed and it was agreed to maintain the present schedule of two meetings per year.

17. Next Meetings:

Resolution 25/4: The next meeting of the JCRB will be held: March 21 (9:00 to 17:00) and 22 (9:00 to 13:00), 2011, at the BIPM. The following meeting will be held on September 14-15 (two full days), 2011, and will be organized by EURAMET.

18. Meeting closure

With no further issues to discuss, the meeting was adjourned.

19. Actions

Action 25/1: The BIPM to arrange with IAEA the details for QS review meeting taking into account the points expressed by the delegates.

Action 25/2: To delete all EURAMET CMCs that have been greyed out for more than five years.

Action 25/3: Review document CIPM – G – 03 according to what was expressed in the meeting.

Action 25/4: BIPM to take the position of having a joint document for "Accreditation of NMIs" to the next AIC meeting.

Action 25/5: The Chairman will draft a letter in response to the complain received from Fluke.

Action 25/6: The Executive Secretary will distribute the file with the information of the participation of the DIs in the CMCs and the RMOs will report back in the March 2011 meeting.

Action 25/7: After approval of the documents to be submited to the CIPM, the RMOs should actively draw the attention of their TC chairs and members, to the documents and the importance of their full implementation. The Executive Secretary will prepare a covering letter.

Action 25/8: The BIPM to prepare a draft program for a "Workshop on the best practice for the review of CMCs" to be presented in the next meeting.

20. Resolutions

Resolution 25/1: For CMCs greyed out for more than 5 years, the process for deletion will be:

- when the 5 year period is reached a reminder will be sent by the BIPM (JCRB Executive Secretary) to the RMO and the NMI;

- a second reminder will be sent three weeks after;

- if there is no reply in three weeks, the CMCs will be deleted from the KCDB and a confirmation will be send to the RMO and NMI.

Resolution 25/2: To create a task group to discuss criteria to be fulfilled as designated institutes. The group will be chaired by M. Chambon, and W. Louw, Y. Hino, and P. Neyezmakov. SIM will send the name of the representative to the chairperson.

Resolution 25/3: The information concerning the publication of documents in the JCRB open website will be published in the KCDB newsletter and mailed to the technical contacts of the RMO.

Resolution 25/4: The next meeting of the JCRB will be held: March 21 (9:00 to 17:00) and 22 (9:00 to 13:00), 2011, at the BIPM.The following meeting will be held on September 14-15 (two full days), 2011, organized by EURAMET.

21. Recommendations

Recommendation 25/1: The JCRB recommends the CIPM the approval of the following documents:

Interlaboratory Comparisons in the CIPM MRA (CIPM MRA-D-05) – Compilation of existing procedures and policy documents (new versions) (DOC 25.13.1),

CIPM MRA-D-04 – Inclusion of traceability policy + periodic review of CMCs (DOC 25.13.2),(with the correction proposed by SIM on Section 5),

CIPM MRA-G-02 – Inclusion of the 5 year period for the review of QS. (DOC 25.13.3)