

## Protocol for the EURAMET.RI(II)- S7.Sm-151 Supplementary Comparison (EURAMET Project 1292)

### 1. Introduction

This work is done in relation to EMRP project Radioactive Waste Management (METRO-RWM) in Task 5.3. The same solution will be standardized in terms of activity concentration by the participants and later analyzed by mass spectrometry to determine a new value for the half-life of the nuclide.


### 2. Comparison protocol

Pilot laboratory: LNE-LNHB (France)

Participants:

LNE-LNHB (France)  
 CMI (Czech Republic)  
 IRMM (EC)  
 POLATOM (Poland)  
 PTB (Germany)  
 SMU (Slovak Republic)

### 2.1 Decay Scheme



### 2.1 Schedule

Distribution: The solution will be distributed to the participants in February 2014.

The following schedule for reporting is proposed:

Reporting dead line: 30<sup>st</sup> June 2014  
 (but **not before** LNE-LNHB has sent its result to BIPM: participants shall wait until LNE-LNHB announces that they can submit their results)

Draft A sent to participants: 30<sup>st</sup> July 2014

Draft A acceptance dead line: 1<sup>st</sup> September 2014  
Draft B sent to participants: 15<sup>th</sup> September 2014  
Draft B submission to CCRI Ex. Secr.: 30<sup>st</sup> September 2014  
Draft B acceptance by CCRI: 30<sup>th</sup> October 2014

## 2.2 Further information

The measurand for this exercise is activity concentration (activity per mass).

The costs associated with the preparation and delivery of the <sup>151</sup>Sm solution to the participants will be borne by LNE-LNHB.

All results, method of standardisation, associated uncertainties, and any additional requested information shall be transmitted to LNE-LNHB using the reporting forms provided. Prior to the receipt of results from participants, LNE-LNHB shall send a copy of its own results to the Executive Secretary of the CCRI(II) and will announce to the participants that they can submit their results.

LNE-LNHB will pilot the new comparison, collect all the results and distribute the Draft A-1. The BIPM will disclose the LNE-LNHB results for the comparison and LNE-LNHB will complete and distribute the Draft A.

Participants must provide a list and evaluation of the principal components of the uncertainty budget based on the Guide to the Expression of Uncertainty in Measurement, published by ISO. In addition to the principal components of the uncertainty, common to all of the participants, individual institutes must add any other components they consider appropriate. Uncertainties are evaluated at a level of one standard uncertainty ( $k=1$ ). A reporting form (excel file) has been created for this purpose and will be distributed together with this protocol.

## 3. Preparation of the report on the comparison

LNE-LNHB is responsible for the preparation of the report on the comparison. The report passes through a number of stages before publication and these are referred to as Draft A and Draft B.

During the comparison, as the results are received by LNE-LNHB, they are kept confidential by LNE-LNHB until all participants have completed their measurements and all the results have been received, or until the dead line for receipt of results has passed.

A result from a participant is not considered complete without an associated uncertainty and is not included in the draft report unless it is accompanied by an uncertainty supported by a complete uncertainty budget. Uncertainties are drawn up following the guidance given in the Technical Protocol.

If, on examination of the complete set of results, LNE-LNHB finds results that appear to be anomalous, the corresponding institutes are invited to check their result for numerical errors but without being informed as to the magnitude or sign of the apparent anomaly. If no numerical error is found, the result stands and the complete set of results is sent to all participants.

The draft A report is prepared as soon as all the results have been received from the participants. It includes the results, uncertainties and standardisation methods and experimental details transmitted by the participants, identified by name. The draft-A report is sent to the participants as soon as possible after the completion of the comparison to all the participants for comments, with a reasonable deadline for replies. The date at which this draft is sent to the participants is taken to be the end date for the comparison and is subsequently referred to as such.

If any controversial or contradictory comments are received by LNE-LNHB, they will be circulated to all participants and discussion continues until a consensus is reached.

Draft A is considered as confidential to the participants. Copies are not given to non-participants, and graphs or other parts of the draft are not used in oral presentations at an external conference without the specific agreement of all the participants. The results may be the subject of an internal report if they are shown in relative terms and the names of participants hidden. At this stage, a participant may publish experimental techniques of special interest or new developments of a measurement method made in the frame of the comparison, as long as no information or comments are made about the comparison results.

Note that once all participants have been informed of the results, individual results and uncertainties may be changed or removed, or the complete comparison abandoned, only with the agreement of all participants and on the basis of a clear failure of the travelling standard or some other phenomenon that renders the comparison or part of it invalid.

Once the final version of Draft A, which includes the proposed key comparison reference value and degrees of equivalence, is approved by the participants, the report is considered as Draft B.

At this stage, the results are not considered confidential and can be used to support CMCs and used for presentations and publications, except for the key comparison reference value and the degrees of equivalence which must be considered confidential until they are approved by the Consultative Committee and published in the KCDB.

After approval by the corresponding RMO committee, reports approved by the RMO must be forwarded to the CC Executive Secretary and the Chair of the relevant working group (e.g. Key Comparison or CMC Working Group) of the CC to allow for a six-week period of comment and editorial control. If at the end of the period, no objections have been raised within the working group of the CC, the final report, accompanied by a statement that the control and comment procedure has been completed, will be sent by the RMO TC Chair to the KCDB Office for publication in the KCDB. Those CCs that wish to discuss RMO supplementary comparison reports and formally approve them at the meetings of their relevant CC working groups may do so as an alternative.

Marie-Martine Bé,  
CEA – LNE-LNHB  
CE Saclay  
LNHB/602 – PC 111  
F- 91191 Gif sur Yvette