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Key questions posed:

- What outcomes do your NMI and your stakeholders require from the CIPM MRA?
- What is the value of the CIPM MRA to you and your stakeholders?
- What changes to the CIPM MRA would increase that value?
- What are your views on proposals for changes to the CIPM MRA made by other bodies?
Outcomes sought from MRA:

- Confidence for national and international stakeholders in all matters that depend on traceable measurement due to worldwide acceptance of calibration reports provided to clients
- Ability to satisfy ILAC Policy P10
- Enhancement of international collaboration with RMOs and other NMIs
- Contribution to assuring public safety through measurements with high reliability and transparency
Value:

- Greater confidence of stakeholders in the national measurement and conformity assessment system
- Access by clients to local and/or international services that are internationally recognised
- Justification to national decision-makers of the importance of participation in the international measurement system
- Support for adoption of international standards by economies
- Improvements to capabilities of NMIs due to peer review activities
- Support elimination of technical barriers to trade
- Improvements to product quality for industry by using traceable measuring instruments
Suggested changes:

- More rapid progress from establishment of a service for clients to publication of services in KCDB
- Increasing accessibility and useability by stakeholders (outside the metrology community) of CMCs in Appendix C of the KCDB
- Improved promotion of both CIPM and ILAC MRAs
- Expansion of traceability to areas such as health and environment
- Improved cross-referencing between the ILAC and CIPM MRAs to enable regulators and industry, etc., to understand their relationship
- Maintaining the reliability of data in CIPM MRA while lowering the cost of maintenance
- Reduction of workload on NMI staff, e.g. shifting CMC process from proof-based to confidence-based; use of third-party accreditation as evidence in intra- and inter-RMO review process, reducing time for CMC review
Views on proposals tabled to date:

- Concern regarding proposed removal of inter-RMO CMC review process,
  - Possible adverse impact and disadvantage to RMOs with narrower range of expertise
- Support suggested improvements to KCDB including alert mechanism and improvements of search engines
- Concern regarding proposal to reduce no. of KC participants to reduce time for comparisons: potential barrier to entry for participation unless RMOs can fill the gap
- Agree with shift from ‘proof’ to ‘confidence’ as a basis for CMC acceptance, e.g., use of peer-review reports in CMC-review process
- Support for reduction KCs focussing on core capabilities
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