

## Report of the 30<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the JCRB

Held on March 19-20, 2013

BIPM, Sévres

<b>Item</b>	<b>Page</b>
Participants.....	2
1. Welcome by the Chairman and approval of the agenda .....	3
3. Report by the Chairman on progress since the 29 <sup>th</sup> JCRB meeting .....	3
4. Report from the CIPM .....	4
5. Highlights of the RMO reports to the JCRB .....	4
6. KCDB report.....	5
7. Status of CMCs submission and review / Issues from Consultative Committees....	5
9. Discussion on outcomes of Workshop “Best practices in CMC reviews” .....	7
10. Brief update on ILAC issues .....	8
11. Any Other Business.....	8
12. Next Meetings .....	8
13. Meeting closure .....	8
14. Resolutions, Recommendations & Actions .....	9

## Participants

### BIPM-CIPM

Dr Martin Milton..... (Chairman) BIPM  
 Dr Robert Kaarls..... CIPM  
 Dr Claudine Thomas ..... BIPM  
 Mr Andy Henson..... BIPM  
 Mr Chingis Kuanbayev ..... (Executive Secretary) BIPM

### Delegations

Dr Wynand Louw ..... (Representative) AFRIMETS  
 Mr Mourad Ben Hassine..... AFRIMETS  
 Mr Mohammed Berrada..... AFRIMETS  
 Mr Dennis Moturi ..... AFRIMETS  
 Dr Ilya Budovsky ..... APMP  
 Dr Toshiyuki Takatsuji..... APMP  
 Dr Jongseon Park ..... APMP  
 Prof. Vladimir Krutikov ..... (Representative) COOMET  
 Prof. Nikolai Zhagora ..... COOMET  
 Dr Pavel Neyezhnikov..... COOMET  
 Dr Martin Halaj ..... COOMET  
 Ms Natalia Sedova ..... COOMET  
 Dr Kamal Hossain.....(Representative) EURAMET  
 Dr Pavel Klenovsky.....EURAMET  
 Dr Maguelonne Chambon .....EURAMET  
 Dr Wolfgang Schmid .....EURAMET  
 Dr Claudia Santo .....(Representative) SIM  
 Dr Alan Steele .....SIM  
 Dr Claire Saundry .....SIM  
 Dr James Olthoff .....SIM  
 Dr Gregory Kyriazis .....SIM

### Guests

Dr Sergey Komissarov..... COOMET

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

The chairman, M. Milton, welcomed the delegates.

Members of the JCRB delegations were then asked to introduce themselves.

The agenda of the 30<sup>th</sup> JCRB meeting was approved without amendments.

### **2. Approval of the minutes of the 29<sup>th</sup> meeting of the JCRB and a review of pending actions.**

The minutes of the 29<sup>th</sup> meeting of the JCRB were approved without amendments.

M. Milton reviewed the actions agreed upon at the 29<sup>th</sup> meeting noting that the outcomes of Action 29/5 and Action 29/6 would be reported under agenda item 9 (Discussion on outcomes of Workshop “Best practices in CMC reviews”).

M. Milton informed the JCRB that the CIPM had approved the changes to the document CIPM MRA-G-01 that involve the updating of references to other CIPM MRA Documents and CIPM MRA-D-05 concerning the amending the procedure to monitor the impact of comparisons.

### **3. Report by the Chairman on progress since the 29<sup>th</sup> JCRB meeting**

M. Milton presented the report on developments at the BIPM since the 29<sup>th</sup> meeting of the JCRB. Important points in the report included:

- The restatement of mission, role and objectives of the BIPM;
- BIPM contribution and planning related to the strategy developments;
- The BIPM scientific activities;
- The appointment of Mr. Carlos Maggi (appointed as Quality, Health and Safety Manager of the BIPM since February 18, 2013);
- New members of the BIPM and Associates to the CGPM and new signatories to the CIPM MRA.

M. Milton also informed JCRB regarding World Metrology Day (WMD), a joint initiative with OIML celebrating 20<sup>th</sup> of May anniversary of the signing of the Metre Convention. The theme for 2013 is "Measurements in daily life" and the poster has been produced in conjunction with UME Tubitak (Turkey). The websites will be live before the end of March. The first poster for WMD originated from NMI of South Africa, but in recent years the poster design has been supported by PTB Technical Cooperation. PTB TC had decided that, whilst it would still support “in country” initiatives related to WMD and no longer wished to support the poster development. UME Tubitak had kindly stepped in for 2013.

M. Milton stressed the importance of insuring WMD was representative of all of the regions of the world. So, for the future the RMOs are asked in turn to work with their regional legal metrology organizations to take responsibility for the developments of the poster (in conjunction with BIPM and OIML). Internally the RMOs are free to decide which particular member takes on the task (for example the RMO may choose to run a competition etc.). The JCRB representatives from APMP agreed to propose APMP support this task in 2014 and will confirm to BIPM as soon as they are able. AFRIMETS informally registered their interest for 2015.

#### **4. Report from the CIPM**

R. Kaarls gave a presentation that included the following points:

- New Member States of the BIPM and Associates to the CGPM;
- Outcomes from Session II of the 101<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the CIPM in October 2012;
- Outcomes from State Representatives and NMI Directors meeting in October 2012;
- Strategic planning template for CCs and CC WGs;
- Key point from the BIPM/CIPM – ILAC – ISO – OIML meetings in March 2013.

#### **5. Highlights of the RMO reports to the JCRB:**

##### **5.1. SIM**

C. Santo presented the highlights of the SIM report.

##### **5.2. EURAMET**

M. Chambon presented the highlights of the EURAMET report.

##### **5.3. COOMET**

P. Neyezhnikov presented the highlights of the COOMET report.

##### **5.4. APMP**

I. Budovsky presented the highlights of the APMP report.

##### **5.5. AFRIMETS**

W. Louw presented the highlights of the AFRIMETS report.

*The individual RMO presentations were uploaded to the restricted-access JCRB working documents webpage immediately after the meeting.*

## 6. KCDB report

C. Thomas presented the highlights of the work at the KCDB Office over the past six months. The presentation included the following points:

- 31 new sets, including 757 new CMCs and many revised ones, have been approved and published in the KCDB since the 29<sup>th</sup> meeting of the JCRB;
- Around 300 CMCs are currently greyed out, 100 CMCs of which have been greyed out since the 29<sup>th</sup> meeting of the JCRB. 22 CMCs in M (Mass Standards) from Jamaica were re-instated in the KCDB on 23 February 2013;
- Only 16 Associates over the 36 Associates who have already signed the CIPM MRA have CMCs currently published in the KCDB;
- The KCDB office has completed the work to divide the EXCEL CMC files that are made available to NMIs and RMOs on the JCRB CMC review website by category in the areas of AUV, M, RI, L and Chemistry. The EM community decided not to divide by category even though the EM CMC files are enormous and complicated, primarily because of concerns regarding the number of files that would need to be handled;
- 64% of the total 1182 comparisons (key and supplementary) have their reports published in the KCDB; about 2000 graphs of equivalence (very often extended to include results of RMO key comparisons) are currently available;
- One observes an increased rate of registration of supplementary comparisons (more than 60 new supplementary comparisons over the last year).

## 7. Status of CMCs submission and review / Issues from Consultative Committees

M. Milton informed that there were no current issues to be brought before the meeting concerning CMC submissions and reviews.

The JCRB delegates were then informed of issues referred to the JCRB by the CCs.

**Issue 1:** This issue recently raised by two CCs concerning the involvement of commercial companies in Pilot studies. In certain very special circumstances pilot studies may involve an external organization in order to learn and transfer knowledge. The results of external organizations can't be published in the KCDB and should not be used for any marketing purposes. The CIPM MRA is clear on this issue. For key comparisons and supplementary comparisons external organizations cannot participate, but there is no rule addressing Pilot studies. The JCRB confirm that it is completely unacceptable for external organizations to participate in key or supplementary comparisons. In the very special circumstances described, the external organizations must understand that they cannot use the participation for marketing. There was some discussion regarding development of a template letter to be used whenever external participation in pilot studies was proposed.

**Issue 2:** This issue has been raised during the CCM meeting in 2013 concerning the process approved on the last JCRB requiring editorial review of supplementary comparison reports.

A CCM member has proposed that the requirement for editorial review of the final report of a supplementary comparison be amended such that it applies to the Draft A or B rather than the final report on the basis that authors may have lost interest or be short of time when the report is approved. It was suggested review at the Draft stage would help ensure the final quality of the reports. After the discussion, the JCRB did not endorse the proposal, authors and RMOs should fulfill the obligations of the CIPM MRA, furthermore noting that the Draft A must be considered confidential and distributed among the participants only.

**Issue 3:** An issue has been raised during the CCM meeting in 2013. A CCM member claimed inconsistencies between CIPM MRA-D-04 (incorporating CIPM ILAC joint definition of CMCs) and ILAC-P14:12/2010 concerning the treatment of uncertainties related to the DUT. After the discussion, the JCRB stressed that whilst the wording in CIPM MRA-D-04 and the ILAC P14 document are indeed different (the ILAC document providing a more detailed explanation where it is not meaningful to address DUT uncertainty contributions) there is no inconsistency and no need to amend CIPM MRA-D-04.

**Issue 4:** This issue has been raised by a number of RMOs and NMIs. It concerns procedures for greying-out CMCs, reinstating greyed-out CMCs and deletion of CMCs greyed out for more than 5 years. This topic has been discussed at several meetings of the JCRB resulting in Resolution 25/1. However the process has never been included to the CIPM MRA–D-04. After the discussion, the JCRB agreed to the following actions to address the problem:

**Action 30/1:** The JCRB Executive Secretary will develop text on “greying-out CMCs” and reinstating “greyed-out CMCs” for CIPM MRA-D-04 for approval at the next meeting of the JCRB.

## **8. Documents to be submitted to the CIPM for approval**

A. Henson made a brief presentation on proposed changes to the CIPM/2005-06REV, CIPM MRA-D-02, CIPM MRA-G-01 CIPM MRA-D-04 and CIPM MRA-D-05, which consist of updating of reference documents, correcting cross references, to solve minor inconsistency and improve clarity of the requirements. The JCRB approved the changes.

**Recommendation 30/5:** The JCRB recommends to the CIPM to approve minor changes to CIPM MRA documentation (updating the references, cross references and resolving minor inconsistencies) as presented in JCRB-30/08.1. The changes relate to the following documents:

- CIPM/2005-06REV;
- CIPM MRA-D-02;

- CIPM MRA-G-01;
- CIPM MRA-D-04;
- CIPM MRA-D-05.

## 9. Discussion on outcomes of Workshop “Best practices in CMC reviews”

M. Milton referred to the workshop “Best practices in CMC reviews” held immediately prior to the JCRB meeting. Each RMO and CC had prepared and circulated a paper which they presented at the workshop detailing their views on improving the efficiency of inter-regional CMC review. This was supplemented by presentations from a number of CC representatives and collectively formed the input for the discussions. The outcome of the workshop were presented and reviewed by the JCRB. Following the discussion, the JCRB agreed to the following resolutions, recommendations and actions:

**Resolution 30/1:** In order to decrease the time taken for the inter-RMO review of CMCs, the JCRB resolves to revise CIPM MRA-D-04 as follows:

- The time to indicate “intention to review” will be reduced from 6 to 3 weeks (with a reminder after 2 weeks);
- The deadline for submission of the RMO review report will be made a “hard deadline” (with a reminder 3 weeks before);
- The deadline for approval of CMCs will be reduced from 6 to 3 weeks (with a reminder after 2 weeks).

**Recommendation 30/1:** The JCRB strongly encourages the CCs and the RMOs to use the BIPM Web Forum as a tool for effective information exchange and consider increased use of the “fast track” to promote more rapid processing of CMCs.

**Recommendation 30/2:** The JCRB recognizes the maturity and effectiveness of the CMC review process and the degree of trust established between the RMOs. Consequently, the JCRB strongly recommends that duplication, resulting from RMO reviewing the same CMCs during interregional review, be reduced wherever possible.

**Recommendation 30/3:** The JCRB recommends that RMOs pay greater attention to the appropriate guidelines during intra RMO review in order to improve the efficiency of the inter RMO review of CMCs.

**Recommendation 30/4:** The JCRB recommends that the CIPM regularly monitors the status of Key Comparison reports in order to minimize the number of reports experiencing significant delays.

**Action 30/2:** The RMOs should make available their guidance documents on QS and CMC review from their websites.

## 10. Brief update on ILAC issues

A. Henson gave brief information on ILAC P14 and ILAC P10. The changes were approved with more than 90% and 95 % positive votes respectively in January 2013 and they have now been successfully revised and are published and available on the ILAC website.

## 11. Any Other Business

M. Milton referred to the workshop discussions which had been “parked” regarding suggestions to consider a web-based CMC review solution for the input and sharing of CMC declarations. Most of the attendees of the Workshop see potential merit in this type of solution. M. Milton noted that this possibility is under consideration by the BIPM, but there is currently no budget to implement such a solution. After discussion, the JCRB agreed to the following actions:

**Action 30/3:** The JCRB Executive Secretary will place the following items on the agenda of the 31<sup>st</sup> JCRB meeting:

- The performance and vitality of DIs;
- What is the purpose of the KCDB? What is its impact on NMIs and stakeholders? Who uses it and what are its successes?

**Action 30/4:** The RMOs to submit papers addressing the two agenda items listed in Action 30/3 for circulation one month prior to the 31<sup>st</sup> JCRB meeting.

## 12. Next Meetings

M. Milton noted that at the 29th JCRB meeting Prof. Yu Yadong, the APMP delegate, proposed NIM, China as the venue for the 31st JCRB meeting to be held in September 2013 and stressed that the venue is still to be confirmed.

At the same time, the COOMET delegates proposed KazInMetr, Kazakhstan as the venue for the autumn meeting of the JCRB in 2014. This suggestion was noted.

At the end of the discussion, the JCRB agreed on the following action:

**Action 30/5:** The JCRB Executive Secretary to write to NIM (China) to confirm the venue for the 31st JCRB meeting (September 18-19, 2013) and to advise RMO representatives to the JCRB accordingly.

*Note: The place and date has since been confirmed by NIM.*

## 13. Meeting closure

M. Milton thanked the delegations for their continuous support to the CIPM MRA process and for their active participation in the meeting.

Having no further issues for discussion, the meeting was closed.

## **14. Resolutions, Recommendations & Actions**

**Resolution 30/1:** In order to decrease the time taken for the inter-RMO review of CMCs, the JCRB resolves to revise CIPM MRA-D-04 as follows:

- The time to indicate “intention to review” will be reduced from 6 to 3 weeks (with a reminder after 2 weeks);
- The deadline for submission of the RMO review report will be made a “hard deadline” (with a reminder 3 weeks before);
- The deadline for approval of CMCs will be reduced from 6 to 3 weeks (with a reminder after 2 weeks).

**Recommendation 30/1:** The JCRB strongly encourages the CCs and the RMOs to use the BIPM Web Forum as a tool for effective information exchange and consider increased use of the “fast track” to promote more rapid processing of CMCs.

**Recommendation 30/2:** The JCRB recognizes the maturity and effectiveness of the CMC review process and the degree of trust established between the RMOs. Consequently, the JCRB strongly recommends that duplication, resulting from RMO reviewing the same CMCs during interregional review, be reduced wherever possible.

**Recommendation 30/3:** The JCRB recommends that RMOs pay greater attention to the appropriate guidelines during intra RMO review in order to improve the efficiency of the inter RMO review of CMCs.

**Recommendation 30/4:** The JCRB recommends that the CIPM regularly monitors the status of Key Comparison reports in order to minimize the number of reports experiencing significant delays.

**Recommendation 30/5:** The JCRB recommends to the CIPM to approve minor changes to CIPM MRA documentation (updating the references, cross references and resolving minor inconsistencies) as presented in [JCRB-30/08.1](#). The changes relate to the following documents:

- CIPM/2005-06REV;
- CIPM MRA-D-02;
- CIPM MRA-G-01;

- CIPM MRA-D-04;
- CIPM MRA-D-05.

**Action 30/1:** The JCRB Executive Secretary will develop text on “greying-out CMCs” and reinstating “greyed-out CMCs” for CIPM MRA-D-04 for approval at the next meeting of the JCRB.

**Action 30/2:** The RMOs should make available their guidance documents on QS and CMC review from their websites.

**Action 30/3:** The JCRB Executive Secretary will place the following items on the agenda of the 31<sup>st</sup> JCRB meeting:

- The performance and vitality of DIs;
- What is the purpose of the KCDB? What is its impact on NMIs and stakeholders? Who uses it and what are its successes?

**Action 30/4:** The RMOs to submit papers addressing the two agenda items listed in Action 30/3 for circulation one month prior to the 31<sup>st</sup> JCRB meeting.

**Action 30/5:** The JCRB Executive Secretary to write to NIM (China) to confirm the venue for the 31<sup>st</sup> JCRB meeting (September 18-19, 2013) and to advise RMO representatives to the JCRB accordingly.