



NATIONAL
LABORATORY
ASSOCIATION
SOUTH AFRICA

What will the 'new GUM' mean for 'old GUM' laboratories

Steve Sidney

Chair – ILAC Laboratory Committee

BIPM Workshop on Measurement Uncertainty
15 – 16 June 2015

The view from an ISO17025 lab



Introduction

Context

Differences

Impact

What might ILAC do

Wrap up

BIPM UM Workshop 15-16 June 2015



The True Size of Africa

A small contribution in the fight against rampant *Immappancy*, by Kai Krause

Graphic layout for visualization only (some countries are cut and rotated)
But the conclusions are very accurate: refer to table below for exact data

COUNTRY	AREA x 1000 km ²
China	9.597
USA	9.629
India	3.287
Mexico	1.964
Peru	1.285
France	633
Spain	506
Papua New Guinea	462
Sweden	441
Japan	378
Germany	357
Norway	324
Italy	301
New Zealand	270
United Kingdom	243
Nepal	147
Bangladesh	144
Greece	132
TOTAL	30.102
AFRICA	30.221



Top 100 Countries

Area in square kilometers, Percentage of World Total
Sources: Britannica, Wikipedia, Almanac 2010



In addition to the well known social issues of *illiteracy* and *innumeracy*, there also should be such a concept as "*immappancy*", meaning *insufficient geographical knowledge*.

A survey with random American schoolkids let them guess the population and land area of their country. Not entirely unexpected, but still rather unsettling, the majority chose "*1-2 billion*" and "*largest in the world*", respectively.

Even with Asian and European college students, geographical estimates were often off by factors of 2-3. This is partly due to the highly distorted nature of the predominantly used mapping projections (such as *Mercator*).

A particularly extreme example is the worldwide misjudgement of the true size of *Africa*. This single image tries to embody the massive scale, which is larger than the *USA*, *China*, *India*, *Japan* and all of *Europe*..... combined!

The view from an ISO17025 lab



- Difficulties
 - Modelling
 - Small number of repeat measurements
 - Identifying uncertainty contributors
 - Accreditation Bodies
 - Regulators
 - Sustainability

Context



Accredited Laboratories
ISO/IEC 17025
ISO15189
 $\approx 50\ 000$

NMI's & Reference
Labs

Context



Comparison



Steps	GUM 1993	GUM 2015
Model	✓	✓
Repeat Measurements	$\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}$ or $\frac{s}{\sqrt{(n-1)}}$	$\frac{\sqrt{(n-1)}}{\sqrt{(n-3)}}$
Evaluate and if Model Linear	✓	✓
$(V_{\text{eff}}, k) \quad U = k \cdot u(y)$	✓	N/A
PT	✓	✓

EA 4/02 Supplement 2

Eg 2 – Calibration of 10 kg weight



Key	Values
s	25 mg
n	4
v_{eff}	80
k	2,02
u (GUM 1993)	28,45 mg
u (GUM 2015)	33,49 mg
U (GUM 1993)	57 mg
U (GUM 2015)	67 mg
Difference	17,5 %

Reporting results – 1



- Four laboratories A, B, C and D
 - same equipment
 - same linear measurement model
 - same result $y=100$
 - Evaluate the same uncertainty $u(y) = 5$ either by calculation or by MCM

Reporting results – 2



- Lab A reports that y is in the interval $100 \pm 22,4$ with a probability of at least 95 % **assuming no particular PDF**
- Lab B reports that y is in the interval $100 \pm 14,9$ with a probability of at least 95 % **assuming a symmetric PDF**
- Lab C reports that y is in the interval 100 ± 10 with a probability of 95 % **assuming a Gaussian PDF**
- Lab D reports that y is in the interval $[92;112]$ with a probability of 95 % **on the basis on a state-of-knowledge PDF**

Impact



Standards



Accreditation



Regulators



ILAC – what to do ?



- Will they need to evaluate all uncertainty “budgets” for linearity – then what?
- When major contribution $n < 10$ – then what?
- Current guidance – what comes first?
- Transition period – (1 to 10 years)?

Considerations



Recognise the progress that has been made

Build on it

Don't ignore the 80:20 rule



Wrap up



Thank you