****

# Key decisions of the CCRI and CCRI Sections

This document is a compendium of the key decisions taken by the CCRI and Sections (I), (II) and (III) since 1999.

 V Gressier

 CCRI Executive Secretary

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Committee | Date | Supporting documents(where applicable) | Notes |
| CCRI | 9 June 2023 | Minutes – 29th meeting | Recommendation JCRB/46-1 (2023): Noting the availability in the KCDB of a unique and persistent identifier for each CMC (and each version of a CMC), the JCRB recommends use of these CMC identifiers by the participating NMIs/DIs (for example in their quality documentation) and asks the BIPM Headquarters to make available appropriate training material to encourage this. |
| CCRI | 9 June 2023 | Minutes – 29th meeting | - Institutes being member of 1/at least 2 Section(s) are invited to apply for, respectively, official observer/member status of CCRI by sending a letter to the BIPM director - About Sections, institutes (not individuals) will be kept on the BIPM webpages. Only two statuses will remain in Sections: member or guest (observer status no longer exists). - Number of participants to Sections meetings will be limited as follows: o Section I: 2 participants (3 when including online)o Section II: 2 participants (4 when including online) o Section III: 3 participants (+online on request) |
| CCRI | 9 June 2021 | Minutes – 28th meeting | For CCRI Section(I), the initial validity period of Key Comparisons will be increased from10 to 12 years, with an emphasis on a risk-based approach to planning Key Comparisons |
| CCRI | 9 June 2021 | Minutes – 28th meeting | All comparison reports, including RMO supplementary comparisons, will continue to be reviewed by the relevant CCRI Section, noting that this is in addition to the requirements of CIPM-MRA G-11 |
| CCRI | 7 June 2019 | Minutes – 27th meetingMinutes – 23rd meetingCCRI/12-05 | The period of validity of ionizing radiation comparisons under the CIPM MRA was reviewed and updated.A result from a comparison exercises may be used to support an application for new CMCs only for a limited time period. The time period starts from when the laboratory completed its measurement. The time period depends on the field:  Section I: 10 years (15 years in exceptional cases)Section II: 15 years (20 years in exceptional cases)Section III: 10 years (15 years in exceptional cases)The CCRI Sections will decide whether an extension can be permitted. |
| CCRI | 7 June 2019 | Minutes – 27th meeting | New service categories were adopted (see guidance documents). |
| CCRI | 7 June 2019 | Minutes – 27th meetingRMOWG/19-03 | A new interpretation of CMCs for ionizing radiation was adopted to enable broad scope CMCs to be introduced:Considering the definition of a CMC is that it is a capability available to customers under normal conditions “as published in the BIPM key comparison database” (Appendix C of the KCDB), the CCRI recognizes the importance for NMIs/DIs to be able to publish CMCs in Appendix C for any properly-validated and supported metrological service they make available to customers. Nevertheless, such availability does not preclude an NMI/DI from equally providing services to customers not published in Appendix C of the KCDB. Such providence, in order to be considered in the context of the CIPM MRA, must necessarily derive from (be traceable to) a CMC published in Appendix C, and the derivation itself must be clearly documented for the benefit of any customer. This should include description of traceability to a published CMC in an NMI’s/DI’s quality management system documentation and be made available to customers through publicly-available literature, catalogs of services or other mechanisms. Laboratories claiming traceability to quantities not published in Appendix C must similarly describe the traceability chain to the published quantities in their measurement quality system documentation.For those NMIs/DIs that intend to use the CIPM MRA logo and statement on calibration certificates for services not directly published in Appendix C but are rather demonstrated as traceable to published CMC(s), and in keeping with the spirit of CIPM-MRA D-02, the following shall be met:* The instrument listed in the relevant CMC is identified on the certificate, as is the transfer instrument used (e.g., ionization chamber, gamma-ray spectrometer, etc.) for traceability
* The traceability of the measured quantity (e.g., activity, dose rate) is within the range of the published CMC
* The measurement uncertainty is no less than that stated for the relevant CMC, and is expected to be greater due to propagation through the traceability chain
* The traceability chain is documented and reviewed as part of the quality management system

The determination of the appropriateness of a given transfer instrument for a given measurement is a responsibility of the originating NMI, with consultation as needed with experts in the RMO WG on CMCs and/or the relevant Key Comparison Working Group, and is to be agreed-upon by members of the relevant Section of CCRI.Certificates not using the CIPM MRA logo or statement fall outside the scope of this document. Nevertheless, similar guidance would be considered good practice for all metrological services performed under the auspices of the CIPM MRA. |
| CCRI | 7 June 2019 | Minutes – 27th meeting |  A new process for approval of comparison reports was adopted. The CCRI Executive Secretary will circulate Draft B reports to the relevant Section for review. Comments received will be sent to the pilot laboratory. If there are no major changes, the final report will be sent to the Section Chair for approval - if approved, the report can be published. The report will be re-circulated if there are major changes. |
| CCRI | 29-30 June 2017 | Minutes – 26th meetingCCRI/17-10 | It was agreed that the following evidence may be considered by reviewers assessing CMCs:* Results of key and supplementary comparisons
* Documented results of past CC, RMO or other comparisons (including bilateral)
* Knowledge of technical activities by other NMIs, including publications
* On-site peer-assessment reports
* Active participation in RMO projects
* Other available knowledge and experience

It was also noted that: “For CMCs in ionizing radiation measurements, particularly considering the logistical complications sometimes inherent in transporting radioactive materials across borders, all of the permissible mechanisms to support claims are a crucial component in enabling institutions to support not only their CMC claims, but also to fulfill their metrological responsibility for precise and controlled measurements. Preparers of CMCs are reminded of the need to provide supportive evidence accessible to the reviewers in order to facilitate the review process.” |
| CCRI | 17 May 2015 | Minutes – 25th meeting | Agreement given to a new on-going BIPM comparison BIPM.RI(I)-K9 for absorbed dose in medium energy x-rays. |
| CCRI | 17 May 2013 | Minutes – 24th meeting | The ‘power-moderate mean’ was adopted to evaluate key comparison reference values in Section II (Radioactivity) |
| CCRI | 31 May 2007 | Minutes – 20th meeting | The use of common values for nuclear decay data taken from *BIPM Monographie 5* (ie the Decay Data Evaluation Project) was recommended. |
| CCRI | 27 May 2005 | Minutes – 19th meeting | The generic groupings table (now called the Measurement Methods Matrix) would be adopted to enable the results for a comparison using one radionuclide to be accepted as evidence for CMCs of another radionuclide standardized using the same technique. |
| CCRI | 2 June 1999 | Minutes – 16th meeting | In radiation dosimetry:1. The BIPM standards would be used as the reference value because the BIPM standards are more stable than the differences between the standards of the NMIs
2. Bilateral BIPM-NMI comparisons may be used as a check for equivalence
3. Each NMI would compare its standards with the BIPM at least every ten years.
 |