



**Agenda item 4:**

**Minutes of the 54th CIML Meeting**

# 54th CIML Meeting

**Bratislava, Slovak Republic  
22–25 October 2019**

## Draft Minutes



INTERNATIONAL BUREAU OF LEGAL METROLOGY (BIML)

11, RUE TURGOT – F-75009 PARIS – FRANCE

TEL: 33 (0)1 48 78 12 82 / FAX: 33 (0)1 42 82 17 27

[biml@oiml.org](mailto:biml@oiml.org) / [www.oiml.org](http://www.oiml.org)





# **International Organization of Legal Metrology**

*Secretariat:*

BUREAU INTERNATIONAL DE MÉTROLOGIE LÉGALE (BIML)

11, RUE TURGOT – 75009 PARIS – FRANCE

TEL: +33 1 48 78 12 82

FAX: +33 1 42 82 17 27

[biml@oiml.org](mailto:biml@oiml.org)

[www.oiml.org](http://www.oiml.org)



**Fifty-fourth meeting of the  
International Committee of Legal Metrology**

**Bratislava, Slovak Republic**

**22–25 October 2019**



The International Committee of Legal Metrology was convened by its President, Dr Roman Schwartz, and met from 22–25 October 2019 at the Hotel Doubletree by Hilton, Bratislava, Slovak Republic.





## Contents

<b>Opening speeches .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Roll call .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Approval of the agenda .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>1 Approval of the minutes of the 53rd CIML Meeting .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>2 General report by the CIML President.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>2 Presentation by the candidates for the CIML Second Vice-President .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>4 BIML matters and activities.....</b>	<b>30</b>
4.1 Report by the BIML Director.....	30
4.2 Report on training activities .....	35
<b>5 Member States and Corresponding Members .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>6 Financial matters .....</b>	<b>38</b>
6.1 Approval of the 2018 accounts .....	38
6.2 Forecast budget realization for 2019.....	44
6.3 Arrears of Member States and Corresponding Members.....	45
<b>7 Liaisons and Regional Legal Metrology Organizations (RLMOs) .....</b>	<b>47</b>
7.1 Report by the BIML on activities with organizations in liaison .....	49
7.2 Report by the RLMO Round Table Chairperson .....	51
7.3 Update by the Bureau International des Poids et Mesures (BIPM) .....	53
7.4 Update on the work of the Consultative Committee for Units (CCU).....	57
7.5 Updates by other organizations in liaison .....	58
<b>8 Countries and Economies with Emerging Metrology Systems (CEEMS).....</b>	<b>66</b>
8.1 Report by the CEEMS Advisory Group Chairperson .....	66
8.2 Report by the BIML on activities in connection with CEEMS matters.....	74
<b>9 OIML Certification System (OIML-CS).....</b>	<b>74</b>
9.1 Report by the OIML-CS Management Committee Chairperson .....	74
<b>10 OIML publications and projects .....</b>	<b>79</b>
10.1 Items for approval by the CIML .....	79
10.2 Items for information .....	94
10.3 Articles for the OIML Bulletin .....	97
<b>11 Election of the CIML Second Vice-President .....</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>12 Presentation of OIML Awards.....</b>	<b>103</b>
12.1 OIML Medals.....	103
12.2 OIML Letters of Appreciation .....	106
12.3 OIML CEEMS Award .....	107
12.4 Presentation by the OIML CEEMS Award Winner 2018.....	109



<b>13</b>	<b>Preparation of the 16th International Conference (2020).....</b>	<b>110</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>Future meetings .....</b>	<b>111</b>
14.1	55th CIML Meeting and 16th International Conference (2020 – P.R. China).....	111
14.2	56th CIML Meeting (2021).....	112
<b>15</b>	<b>Other matters.....</b>	<b>116</b>
	<b>Closing remarks by Dr Schwartz .....</b>	<b>116</b>
	<b>List of Participants in the 54th CIML Meeting.....</b>	<b>118</b>

*BIML note:*

*The agenda items are transcribed in these minutes in the order of the agenda,  
which is not necessarily the order in which they were discussed.*

**Fifty-fourth meeting of the  
International Committee of Legal Metrology**

**Bratislava, Slovak Republic  
22–25 October 2019**

**– DRAFT MINUTES –**

**Opening speeches**

**Dr Schwartz, CIML President**

Following some preliminary announcements concerning the organisation of the week's meetings, Dr Schwartz gave his opening speech.

Ladies and Gentlemen, dear Colleagues and Friends, distinguished guests,

It is my great pleasure to welcome you to the Fifty-fourth Meeting of the International Committee of Legal Metrology. Welcome to Slovakia – welcome to Bratislava!

Thank you to our hosts and thank you all for coming!

Again we have an excellent participation with about 150 attendees, with more than 50 Member States present or represented, with 15 Corresponding Members, with several organisations in liaison and manufacturers' associations.

We will again have a very busy Committee meeting with a number of important items and decisions on the agenda, for instance, the election of the CIML Second Vice-President.

It is now my pleasure to extend a special welcome to a distinguished guest, namely Dr Vojtech Ferencz, first State Secretary of the Ministry of Economy of the Slovak Republic, who has kindly agreed to give us an opening address today.

Beforehand let me briefly introduce Dr Ferencz.

- He studied economics at the respective universities in Prague, Bratislava and Košice, received a Master degree in 1995, and a PhD in Business Economics in 2010.
- His political career started in 2007, when he became Director General of the Strategy Section of the Ministry of Economy of the Slovak Republic.
- In 2010 he became Deputy Director for Economy of the Slovak Water Management Enterprise in Košice, and in 2012 State Secretary of the Ministry of the Environment.
- Since 2016 he is the First State Secretary of the Ministry of Economy of the Slovak Republic.

Dr Ferencz, we feel very honoured having you with us today. May I now invite you to the stage, please, to address our meeting.

Dr Ferencz thanked Dr Schwartz for his introduction.

Mr President, Mr Director, ladies and gentlemen,

As the State Secretary of the Ministry of Economy of the Slovak Republic, I am very pleased to be taking part in the opening of the Fifty-fourth meeting of the International Committee of Legal Metrology, which is being held this year in my beautiful country.

On behalf of the Slovak Government I would like to welcome all members of the CIML, with their delegations, together with the representatives of major co-operating organisations, and associations.

The government of the Slovak Republic is aware of the importance of metrology and all its pillars (scientific, legal, and industrial metrology) for all areas of the national economy. The goal of metrology, as well as of the Slovak Republic, is to ensure protection within trade relations, health, and environmental protection, transportation safety, and protection in other areas of human activities, for the benefit of citizens, the environment, state and business entities.

Slovakia is an export orientated country focused on industrial production, where the automobile industry represents an especially important sector. Therefore, Slovakia needs to have internationally accepted metrology, both in the field of calibration of measuring instruments, and in the field of metrological verification of measuring instruments. To secure the functioning of metrology, the Slovak Republic has established a separate office, the Slovak Office of Standards, Metrology, and Testing, that is directly sub-ordinated to the government of the Slovak Republic. The office submits draft legislative regulations to the government of the Slovak Republic, and issues binding technical regulations and decrees in the field of metrology.

Ladies and gentlemen I wish you a very beneficial event, fruitful discussions, either here at the meeting, or during personal meetings, many new interesting findings in the field of metrology, and of course I wish you a pleasant stay in the capital city of the Slovak Republic here in Bratislava, and in the whole of Slovakia which certainly has a lot to offer. Thank you very much.

Dr Schwartz thanked Dr Ferencz. He told delegates that he understood that Dr Ferencz had a very tight schedule, so he would have to leave the meeting straight away. Before proceeding with the roll call of participants he concluded the opening addresses by thanking Dr Ferencz again for coming, and wishing delegates a successful meeting, with fruitful discussions, and of course with good decisions.

## **Roll call**

Dr Schwartz asked Mr Dunmill, BIML Assistant Director, to proceed with the roll call.

Before proceeding with the roll call Mr Dunmill asked delegates to use their microphones and to introduce themselves by their name and country when they wished to intervene because it was difficult to capture what they said on the recordings if they did not, and therefore difficult when writing the minutes.

Mr Dunmill said he would be carrying out a roll call to establish that there was a quorum and which Member States were present in the room. He requested that if delegates had to leave the room at any time during the meeting for a prolonged period, they inform a member of the BIML staff at the back of the room, so that a record could be maintained of which Members were present in the room.

Mr Dunmill proceeded with the roll call:

Albania..... present  
Algeria ..... not present  
Australia..... present  
Austria..... present  
Belarus ..... present  
Belgium..... present  
Brazil..... present  
Bulgaria..... present  
Cambodia ..... present  
Canada ..... not present (proxy given to Australia)  
Colombia..... not present (proxy given to Germany)  
Croatia..... present  
Cuba ..... present  
Cyprus ..... not present (proxy given to France)  
Czech Republic ..... present  
Denmark..... not present (proxy given to Sweden)  
Egypt..... present  
Finland ..... present  
France..... present  
Germany..... present  
Greece ..... not present (no proxy)  
Hungary ..... not present (no proxy)  
India ..... present  
Indonesia..... present  
Iran ..... not present (no proxy)  
Ireland ..... present  
Israel..... not present (proxy given to Germany)  
Italy ..... present  
Japan ..... present  
Kazakhstan..... present  
Kenya ..... present  
Korea (R.) ..... present  
Macedonia..... present  
Monaco ..... not present (proxy given to France)  
Morocco ..... not present  
Netherlands ..... present  
New Zealand..... present  
Norway..... present  
P.R. China..... present  
Pakistan..... not present (no proxy)  
Poland ..... present  
Portugal..... present  
Romania ..... present

Russian Federation..... present  
Saudi Arabia..... present  
Serbia ..... present  
Slovakia ..... present  
Slovenia ..... present  
South Africa ..... present  
Spain ..... present  
Sri Lanka..... present  
Sweden..... present  
Switzerland ..... present  
Tanzania..... present  
Thailand ..... not present (reported to be arriving at 3 pm)  
Tunisia ..... not present  
Turkey..... not present (no proxy)  
United Kingdom..... present  
United States ..... present  
Viet Nam..... present  
Zambia ..... present

Mr Mussio announced that out of the 61 Member States, 46 were present and 6 had given proxies, which gave a total of 52 Member States present or represented. The required quorum of 46 Member States was therefore achieved.

## Approval of the agenda

Dr Schwartz requested that the agenda be approved.

He stated that the Draft agenda (version 2) had been made available on the OIML website, but he wanted to propose two slight amendments:

- 1) Under agenda item 10.1, he said he had been informed at very short notice that the revision of OIML R 117 *Dynamic measuring systems for liquids other than water* had made very good progress, and so he wanted to consider the possible approval of the Final Draft Recommendation under agenda item 10.1.1.
- 2) The other suggestion was that during the Presidential Council meeting a project proposal put forward by the United States had been discussed concerning the revision of OIML B 11 *Rules governing the translation, copyright and distribution of OIML Publications*. He suggested that this be treated as an additional project proposal, to be considered under agenda item 10.1.2. He requested the Bureau to ensure that the respective information was uploaded to the website as a last very last minute Additional Meeting Document before this item was discussed on Thursday.

He said that he hoped that delegates would agree to adding these items to the agenda. Dr Schwartz asked if there were any objections to the proposed agenda. There were none.

The agenda was approved unanimously.

Dr Schwartz informed delegates that regarding the timing of the meeting, there were only four sessions allocated for this year's CIML meeting, as there were two technical visits. This would mean that they would need to focus today, and he suggested that they dealt with items 1 to 6. He suggested that the following day they dealt with items 7 to 10, Thursday the technical items 10 to 12, and Friday the

remaining items 13 to 16. He informed delegates that the group photo would be taken on Friday morning, before the roll call, and just before the resolutions were approved.

## **1 Approval of the minutes of the 53rd CIML Meeting**

Dr Schwartz asked delegates to consider item 1 *Approval of the minutes of the 53rd CIML Meeting* in Hamburg.

He stated that the minutes had been made available for download on the OIML website several months previously and was therefore sure that delegates would have already read them. He thanked the BIML team responsible for compiling the minutes and asked if there were any comments or proposals for changes or amendments. Noting that there were no comments from delegates, he requested the Bureau to amend the spelling of some German names on page 132.

Since there were no further comments he said they could consider the first draft resolution, 2019/1:

“The Committee

Approves the minutes of the 53rd CIML meeting with some minor editorial corrections.”

There were no objections to this formulation. There were no negative votes, so the minutes were approved unanimously subject to the editorial corrections.

## **2 General report by the CIML President**

Dr Schwartz stated that the next item was the general report by the CIML President, and pointed out that a written report had been made available on the website.

Dear Colleagues,

Once more, a warm welcome to Bratislava. This will be my report on the past year’s activities.

Since the 53rd CIML Meeting in Hamburg, our Organisation has been involved in many legal metrology activities and initiatives around the globe. In addition, we have managed a couple of important changes, all of which means that I again have a lot to report on! In fact there is so much to report that I have had to shorten my oral report and therefore sometimes I will be referring to my comprehensive written report, which has been submitted as Additional Meeting Document 2.

Probably the most important change for the Organisation, for me as President, but also for the BIML staff, was the change in directorship of the BIML, with Mr Anthony Donnellan taking up his function as the new BIML Director in January 2019.

I am pleased to report that from the very beginning, cooperation with the new BIML Director has been excellent, and I am in regular close contact with Mr Donnellan. We have had a couple of fruitful personal meetings to discuss important matters, and we always reach an agreement quickly. It is a real pleasure to note his great commitment and dedication to the Organisation, with activities ranging from confidence-building with the BIML team, travelling a lot to meet and support CIML Members, Corresponding Member Representatives and Regional Legal Metrology Organisations, and to seek opportunities to promote the OIML to potential new Members. Last, but not least, Mr Donnellan has been very diligent and successful in learning French: he has already successfully completed the language level B1, and is close to level B2, which means that after less than one year he is already able to communicate in French! I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr Donnellan on this achievement.

I refer to the comprehensive report Mr Donnellan has provided in Addendum 4 to this meeting, and his personal report which he will be providing under item 4 of our agenda.

In my report last year, I spoke of my vision and goals for the Organisation and announced a strategic meeting of a “Task Group 2023” (TG23), which was so named as it was my personal objective to achieve during my term as President. This was held in conjunction with the Presidential Council meeting in March 2019. My intention was for TG23 to look at strategically important questions for our Organisation, based on our Convention and our strategy, as laid down in OIML B 15:2011, and to come up with proposals on how to adapt the OIML to best address the key challenges of the 21st century. I am very pleased to report that we had an excellent, very productive and fruitful TG23 meeting, followed by an equally productive Presidential Council meeting in March this year. In my report I shall focus on the outcome and proposals from these two meetings.

However, before I do so, let me mention the changes in membership of our Committee.

I am pleased to welcome the following new CIML Members:

- Mr Valentin Tataritsky, Belarus
- Mr Dirk Bils, Belgium
- Mr Marco Trevisan Vasconcellos, Brazil
- Mr Pitou By, Cambodia
- Mr Juan Camillo Duran Tellez, Colombia
- Mr Arman Shakkallyev, Kazakhstan
- Dr Wan Bin Im, Republic of Korea
- Mr Mohammed Benjelloun, Morocco
- Prof Radoslaw Wisniewski, Poland
- Ms Dorina Florianela Achim, Romania
- Mr Jaco Marneweck, South Africa
- Mr Fethi Fadhi, Tunisia

Unfortunately, we lost one Member State during the past year, Cameroon. We hope that this country will soon be able to be reinstated as a Member State.

I am pleased to welcome Kyrgyzstan as a new Corresponding Member, but must also report that over the past year five Corresponding Members had to be delisted for non-payment of their subscription fees.

Let me repeat that the BIML Director, the BIML team, and myself will continue to do our best to maintain the high level of interest in our Organisation, and to promote the benefits of full membership to potential new Member States.

I will now come to the TG23 meeting and the related Presidential Council meeting. TG23 met on 12 March 2019 and consisted of the First Vice-President Dr Charles Ehrlich, Presidential Council Members Mrs. Corinne Lagauterie, Mr Bill Loizides and Dr Bob Joseph Mathew, the BIML Director Mr Anthony Donnellan, the two BIML Assistant Directors, Mr Ian Dunmill and Mr Paul Dixon, and myself.

I am grateful to each member of TG23 for having taken the time for fruitful strategic discussions.

The Presidential Council then met from 13–15 March 2019, the three days after the TG23 meeting, focusing on exactly the same strategic items and proposals that were put forward by TG23.

As regards the Presidential Council membership, there was only one change since the 2018 CIML meeting: Mr Qin Yizhi, Vice-Minister of the State Authority of Market Regulation (SAMR) and CIML Member for P.R. China, accepted my invitation to join the Presidential Council.

Let me now address the various items discussed by TG23 and supported by the Presidential Council. According to the OIML Strategy laid down in OIML B 15:2011, the technical work, i.e. the development (and regular update) of Recommendations and related Documents for use by legal metrology authorities and industry, is the first and, from my point of view, the most important objective, or “pillar” of our work. Effectiveness of the technical work, and topicality of our publications, are most important for the relevance, and reputation of our Organisation.

Fortunately, we have made significant progress in recent years. I refer to several positive examples mentioned in the written report. However, looking at the many existing OIML Recommendations, Documents, and other publications, and looking at almost 50 current projects to revise or develop technical publications, we have to accept that our resources, especially those of the BIML, are limited. This means we have to prioritise, to identify the most relevant publications and projects, and focus on these. With this background, TG23, and the Presidential Council reflected on some fundamental questions, for example:

- How can we prioritise and identify the most relevant OIML Publications?
- How can we keep these most relevant publications up to date?
- How can we reduce the lead-time for projects from their start to the end?
- Are there any “best practices” for good project management we can learn from (e.g. from ISO/IEC)?
- Are there possibilities to better support Project Group conveners?

I am pleased to report that TG23 came up with some very good proposals, which were supported by the Presidential Council, which I want to summarise as follows:

- 1) A set of criteria has been developed to prioritise and identify the most relevant OIML publications. The complete list of criteria is provided in Addendum 10.1.3.2, and they will be presented and explained under agenda item 10.1.
- 2) It is proposed to include the OIML Certification System (OIML-CS) Management Committee (MC) in the periodic review process for OIML Recommendations and Documents that are of relevance to the OIML-CS, in order to speed up and improve the effectiveness of the review process.
- 3) The BIML, with input from the OIML-CS MC, has developed a detailed proposal for a revised periodic review process (see Addendum 10.1.3.2) which is based on an initial concept developed by TG23 and supported by the Presidential Council. The CIML will be asked to approve this revised process, with the aim of amending OIML B 6-1 *Directives for OIML technical work*.
- 4) It is proposed to identify and focus on the “top-10” priority projects using the criteria mentioned above. The complete list of the “top-10” priority projects identified is provided in AMD 10.2 and will be presented under agenda item 10.2.
- 5) Having identified the “top-10” priority projects, the BIML has agreed to consider how it can provide additional support to the respective conveners to ensure best possible progress. The BIML Director, in conjunction with the BIML Assistant Directors, will define BIML resource needs, and any additional support that may be required.
- 6) It is recommended to apply the rule defined in OIML B 6-1, and for the BIML to conduct a rolling re-approval of secretariats and conveners, based on the prioritised list of projects.
- 7) Regarding convener training, it is appreciated that the training courses over the past years have benefitted participants; however, it is proposed to determine the impact of the training courses that have been held with a view to making future training courses more effective. The BIML has agreed to consider ways of how to determine the impact of the training.



These are the proposals put forward as regards the first “pillar”, which is the technical work.

Now I come to the OIML-CS. According to our Strategy document OIML B 15, the second objective of our Organisation is to provide mutual recognition systems, which reduce trade barriers and costs in a global market. Hence, the OIML-CS can be considered the second important “pillar” of our work, besides the technical work. A lot has been achieved since the launch of the OIML-CS on 1 January 2018. I would like to take this opportunity to express my thanks and appreciation to all those who are very active and who take responsibility in this field. However, the final objective for the OIML-CS, namely to reduce trade barriers and costs in a global market, can only be fully realised if more OIML certificates are issued and accepted, by a significant number of Utilizers and Associates, for as many categories of measuring instrument as possible. Against this background TG23 discussed the following questions:

- What has been achieved since the launch with regard to status, feedback received and impediments to participation?
- How can we better promote the OIML-CS to manufacturers, and potential Utilizers and Associates?
- How do we want to develop the OIML-CS in the future?

The proposals made by TG23 were as follows:

- 1) The President, the Vice-Presidents, PC members and all CIML Members should take any opportunity they have to explain the benefits of the OIML-CS to potential Utilizers and Associates, and of course to industry.
- 2) OIML Issuing Authorities should actively promote the OIML-CS to their clients.
- 3) Regional “champions” are needed to help new participants join the system. We have just had the meeting of the Regional Legal Metrology Organisations (RLMO) Round Table, and have also discussed the relationship of the RLMOs to the OIML-CS. I was very happy to hear that there is support from the Regions for the system, and I think we need to offer help for potential new users. Although we have a very good website, with a lot of information and a lot of forms produced and uploaded, the first step is always the most difficult one, and we need “champions” that have gone through all the procedures, to help others in becoming Utilizers or Associates, or of course OIML Issuing Authorities.
- 4) For OIML Issuing Authorities with a broad scope, effective assessment procedures should be established.
- 5) Developing the OIML-CS into a full conformity assessment system, including product verification and surveillance, should be considered by the OIML-CS MC. This is an interesting point. Some years ago we decided to restrict ourselves to the phase before instruments are put onto the market. Meanwhile there were some proposals and some preliminary discussions of the OIML-CS MC to broaden the scope and so I think it is worthwhile for the OIML-CS MC to at least consider the possibilities and implications to extend the OIML-CS to a full system, and we are looking forward to what will be discussed.

We are looking forward to the report of the OIML-CS MC Chairperson, Mr Cock Oosterman, under agenda item 9.1.

I would like to now come to the third “pillar” of our activities, which is our activities related to Countries and Economies with Emerging Metrology Systems (CEEMS). According to our Strategy document OIML B 15, this is another important objective. The aim is to promote and facilitate the exchange of knowledge and competencies within the legal metrology community worldwide, hence our activities related to CEEMS can now be considered as a very important “pillar” of our work. This has been confirmed by the Presidential Council. A lot has been achieved in recent years, and I again refer to my written report, and the report that will be

provided by the CEEMS Advisory Group Vice-Chairperson, Mr Peter Mason, under agenda item 8. The following challenges and strategic questions were discussed by TG23:

- Are we happy with the existing “rules” for the CEEMS Advisory Group?
- Do we need a more “systematic approach” for our CEEMS activities?
- Should we have more joint activities and cross-representation with the BIPM, especially in capacity building and Quality Infrastructure (QI) activities?
- Are there possibilities / options for the BIML to better support the CEEMS Advisory Group and CEEMS activities?
- What is the long-term effect and “return on investment” of our CEEMS training activities?
- Do we need a kind of “impact assessment” for CEEMS activities?
- How can we make the most of the e-learning concept?

Again, TG23 came up with some good proposals, which I want to summarise as follows:

- 1) There was a discussion on the support that the BIML can give to CEEMS, e.g. through the creation of a “CEEMS Executive Secretary” like there is for the OIML-CS. The BIML Director has agreed to consider how best to organise BIML support for CEEMS activities.
- 2) There was a discussion relating to the Internet of Things (IoT) and digitalisation in legal metrology. It was considered that this is an area that needs to be addressed by the OIML, preferably in a joint approach with the BIPM. A good opportunity would be for the OIML to support an international workshop on “Digital Transformation of Legal Metrology” that will be held on 27–28 May 2020, at the PTB in Berlin, Germany.
- 3) In order to learn more about e-Learning and to facilitate a decision on whether the OIML should do more work in this area, an OIML Seminar on e-Learning was proposed to address the three questions:
  - What can we learn from others about existing approaches and material?
  - What are the needs of our Member States, and potential new members?
  - What should we do with the given resources, maybe together with other organisations?

I am very pleased that a Workshop on e-Learning took place on the day prior to this CIML meeting, and I would like to thank everyone who supported this event, and contributed with presentations, discussion points, and proposals. Especially I would like to thank the organising team consisting of Dr Bob Joseph Mathew from Switzerland, Dr Peter Ulbig from Germany, and Mr Ian Dunmill from the BIML, and for the support provided by the BIML. It was a very successful Workshop and delegates will hear a report about this later.

Now I would like to consider international cooperation. Strategy document OIML B 15 defines two objectives for our Organisation as regards international co-operation:

- to represent the interests of the legal metrology community within international organisations and forums concerned with metrology, standardisation, testing, certification and accreditation (objective no 3), and
- in cooperation with other metrology bodies, to raise awareness to the contribution that a sound legal metrology infrastructure can make to a modern economy (objective no 5).

Cooperation with other international organisations is very important, if not indispensable, to support all the other work we are doing. I am pleased that we have excellent relationships with the other international organisations in the field of metrology, standardisation and accreditation.

However, again we have limited resources, and cannot do everything that is considered useful or necessary. With this background, TG23 discussed the following questions:

- Which international organisations do we consider to have key importance for us with regard to our technical work, the OIML-CS, and CEEMS activities?
- Do we have to readjust our representation in meetings of international organisations?
- Do we have to focus or concentrate on certain relationships?
- Do we need a more coordinated approach between the BIML and the RLMOs?

There was a general feeling that the cooperation with other international organisations is of high importance, where a prioritisation is really difficult, with one exception which is the BIPM, our sister organisation dealing with scientific metrology. This leads onto the next proposals made by TG23.

I would like to congratulate the BIPM on having successfully launched the revised International System of Units, the SI, which is now based on seven fundamental constants with fixed values. The 26th General Conference on Weights and Measures (CGPM) in Versailles in November 2018 really was an historic event, and I was glad to be part of it. As CIML President, I was invited to give a presentation on “Developing a common vision for scientific and legal metrology: from the OIML perspective”. I was very pleased to receive a lot of positive feedback, and the unanimous support of TG23 and the Presidential Council, for my proposal to create a joint task group with the BIPM. The aim of this task group will be to explore opportunities for closer cooperation towards the development of a common vision and a common concept to promote scientific, industrial and legal metrology as an important element of the quality infrastructure of a country. I am pleased to report that the new CIPM elected in March has officially agreed to this proposal, and I look forward to more strategic discussions with representatives of the BIPM and the CIPM, which should take us beyond the already existing excellent cooperation on the operational level.

One example of this is the joint preparation for World Metrology Day (WMD) each year. This year WMD was an outstanding event in many countries, as the CGPM decided that the revised SI would come into force on 20 May 2019. I was glad to have been part the WMD event held in Lisbon, Portugal, on the invitation of Isabel Godinho. Thank you very much for inviting me, it was a pleasure to attend.

The next cooperation deals with ILAC and IAF. Concerning the cooperation with these two accreditation organisations, the revised MoU was signed at last year’s CIML meeting in Hamburg. Based on that, BIML Assistant Director Mr Paul Dixon will develop a joint work programme with the ILAC/IAF liaison officer.

With regard to cooperation with the standardisation organisations, a proposal was made for the BIML to propose a review and update the MoU with ISO. Both ISO and ILAC will be asked if they wish to participate as observers in OIML projects.

Concerning the IEC, the revised MoU was also signed at last year’s CIML meeting in Hamburg. Concerning the cooperation with IECEx, I refer to CIML resolution no. 2018/13, and the decision to establish a Joint Working Group (JWG) with the IECEx to explore synergies, and opportunities for cooperation, with Mr Paul Dixon and myself representing the OIML. I am pleased to report that the first JWG was successfully held in conjunction with the IECEx Management Committee meeting in Dubai on 25 September 2019. A report will be given by Mr Paul Dixon under agenda item 7.1.

Concerning cooperation with UNIDO there is a tri-lateral UNIDO-BIPM-OIML MoU, that should or could be revised in light of the CEEMS activities.

Regarding cooperation with the World Health Organisation (WHO) concerning medical devices with a measuring function, Mr Ian Dunmill attended a global forum in December 2018, where the WHO expressed its interest in working with the OIML. The Presidential Council

supported continued dialogue with the WHO, and Mr Ian Dunmill has been tasked to arrange a meeting with the WHO, and to include the CIML Member for Portugal Mrs. Isabel Godinho and Dr Dana Rosu from the PTB's medical devices division to start some activities in this field.

The next point relates to the work of the Bureau. As I stated at the beginning of my report, the cooperation with the new Director and all his team at the BIML is running very smoothly, efficiently and trustfully. Nevertheless the change in BIML Director, and the new challenges, seem to be a good occasion to reconsider the work and responsibilities of the BIML. TG23 also discussed some strategic questions:

- Is there the potential, or even the need, to further improve the efficiency and transparency of the BIML's operations?
- Is there a need to readjust the responsibilities of the BIML staff?
- Is there a need for additional external support for the BIML team?

And here are the proposals:

- In the summary of the discussions, the BIML Director, the BIML Assistant Directors, and Mr Luis Mussio have been tasked with developing a concept for possible realignment of roles based on the three pillars of our work, i.e. technical work, OIML-CS, and CEEMS activities.
- This concept needs to take into account international cooperation, the possibility of stopping some activities, and the possibility of utilising external support.
- Within the frame of the given resources, the BIML expressed its willingness to provide additional support to conveners in technical work, taking into account the high priority projects.

The next slide is about the communication strategy where just two questions were discussed:

- Who are our customers and stakeholders?
- How should we address them, using the website, using social media, the OIML Bulletin, quarterly reports, or a newsletter?

Here are the proposals. In summary the following has been agreed and this will also refer to the report that Mr Donnellan will be providing under 4.1:

- The BIML conducted a survey of CIML Members regarding the Bulletin. The survey identified that there was clear support for electronic, meaning PDF, versions to be published quarterly, and for just one printed OIML Bulletin to be published annually. This is more in line with what we are now used to. As an example, the BIML receives many online newsletters and not that much paper nowadays. Adopting the same strategy will also lead to significant cost-saving, which would seem to be a win-win situation.
- We definitely need more technical articles for the Bulletin, therefore a special item has been included on the agenda to discuss how to obtain more articles and stimulate contributions, and to ask CIML Members to take responsibility for producing an appropriate number of good quality articles to be published in the OIML Bulletin. This will be discussed later under agenda item 10.3. It is really something for which I would like to express my support and eagerness to do something about. The Bulletin is such a good opportunity, and we do such a lot of good work, but we sometimes forget about writing a short report and submitting it to the BIML for publication. We all have so much to do on a daily basis that we sometimes forget, and we shouldn't.
- The Presidential Council identified the need to conduct a stakeholder mapping exercise to influence the communication strategy, and Dr Bobjoseph Mathew from Switzerland has agreed to support Mr Chris Pulham of the BIML in the development of such an exercise.

- The BIML has also agreed to develop a social media presence for the OIML using LinkedIn. A number of postings have already been made on key events attended by BIML staff over the month and we will hear more about this in the report of the BIML Director.
- Concerning the status of IT, databases, the Project Group workspaces, etc., it was noted that some Project Group conveners still struggle with using the PG workspace although generally users are now becoming more familiar with the website and are using it better than they had done previously. The BIML has agreed to review and improve the PG workspace.

The next part of this report is to do with the financial situation and strategy.

In my report last year I stated that the overall financial situation of the Organisation was good, although it was necessary to keep a close watch on the cash position. There was a discussion about how to best use the surplus which had built up in the accounting period 2013–2016, and the appropriate level of reserves that the Organisation should hold. Unfortunately, this year I have to report that the financial situation of the Organisation has considerably changed, which became evident only in February 2019 after completion of the audited accounts for 2018. The new BIML Director and myself have identified that we are confronted with an unexpected overspend, which exceeds the deliberate overspend that had previously been agreed, notably to cover secretariat and convener training. This has led to a significant, but not critical, reduction of the reserves. We do not have a problem with cash flow, however we now find ourselves in the position of having reduced freedom regarding the funding of CEEMS activities, OIML Training Centres, training events, and training courses for conveners. The BIML Director will provide details and conclusions under agenda item 6.1.

The summary of the discussions with TG23 and the Presidential Council concluded that the overriding aim of the BIML Director and myself is to implement effective controls and to prevent a similar situation from occurring in the future. A concept for identifying and implementing new revenue streams should be developed, for example by charging for the use of the OIML logo on individual instruments, of course subject to appropriate legal advice, and to develop sound financial figures and the budget for the 2021-2024 accounting period, for presentation at the Conference next year in China.

In conclusion, I can state that the financial position of the Organisation is under full control, and I would like to thank Mr Donnellan for successfully managing his first major test as the BIML Director.

TG23 also discussed the role of the Vice-Presidents and Presidential Council Members, and whether they should have more responsibility within the Organisation, and visibility outside the Organisation.

In summary, I can report that I am ready to share responsibilities with the two Vice-Presidents and with Presidential Council Members, and I am grateful for any support. This was why we added a sentence to the call for candidates for the position of the Second Vice-President, relating to expectations and commitments, and it will be very interesting to receive respective information from the five candidates in their presentations under agenda item 3.

The election of the Second Vice-President will be a very important decision for the Organisation, and indeed for myself. I ask you to seriously consider your criteria before you vote. Our Organisation deserves experienced, highly motivated, and strongly committed leaders, both in the Presidency, and in the Presidential Council. In concluding my report, I would again like to extend my deepest appreciation for the support I have received from many colleagues. First of all from the two Vice-Presidents, Dr Charles Ehrlich and Dr Yukinobu Miki, from all Members of the Presidential Council, especially the members of TG23, from the BIML Director, Mr Anthony Donnellan, and his staff over the past year, and of course from the past President Mr Peter Mason. It has been a challenging year, but I am glad that with your support we have accomplished a great deal in many fields. Looking forward and looking at the

many motivated and dedicated BIML staff members, CIML Members, Corresponding Member representatives, experts and conveners in the various Technical Committees and Subcommittees, Project Groups, and committees of the OIML-CS, and the CEEMS Advisory Group, I am very confident that our Organisation is well prepared for future challenges. I hope you share my optimism, and look forward to heading into 2020 and the following years.

Finally, please allow me a personal remark. Next year will be an important and special one for me because it will be the year of my retirement from the position of PTB Vice-President. However, this will not be a one hundred percent retirement. I have the full support of the President of the PTB and also of our Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (BMWi) to continue to work for the PTB and the OIML within an official working contract. I am saying at the moment I have two jobs, one is the PTB Vice-President, and the other one is the CIML President, and from next year on I am looking forward to only having one job, and to dedicate more time to the Organisation, but I will still be working for the PTB on an official contract. So, if you agree with my interpretation of the Convention, and if you are satisfied with my Presidency up to now, I will be more than happy to continue as your President until the end of my six-year term in 2023. Thank you for all your support up to now. Of course I am happy to take any questions.

Dr Schwartz asked delegates to consider the next draft resolution, 2019/2:

“The Committee

Notes the report given by its President, thanks the members of the Task Group 2023 and the Presidential Council for their work, and supports the proposals put forward by the President in his report.”

Dr Schwartz verified that delegates were happy with the wording of this resolution. There were no abstentions and no votes against the resolution, so it was unanimously approved. Dr Schwartz thanked delegates for their support.

## **2 Presentation by the candidates for the CIML Second Vice-President**

Dr Schwartz requested delegates consider the next item. He reminded them that at the last CIML Meeting, Dr Miki had declared that he would step down, and that he was ready to pass on the responsibility to someone else, because the current meeting would be his last CIML meeting. Dr Schwartz thanked Dr Miki for having informed them early enough, at the beginning of this year, so that they had been able to send out a call for candidates just in time. The call for candidates for the election of the CIML Second Vice-President had been sent out on 15 March of the current year. By the deadline of 17 June, five candidacies had been received. As shown in Addendum 3, in alphabetical order of family name, the candidates are:

- Dr Sergey Golubev from Russia,
- Mr Robert Lambregts from the Netherlands,
- Mr Bill Loizides from Australia,
- Dr Bob Joseph Mathew from Switzerland, and
- Mr Yizhi Qin from China.

Dr Schwartz reported that unfortunately, at very short notice, he had received notice that Mr Qin could no longer stand as a candidate for procedural reasons, which meant they now had only four candidates. However, he felt this remained a comfortable situation to be in, and he added his sincere thanks to all the candidates for having submitted their candidacy for the post of the Second Vice-President. Dr Schwartz stated he would quickly explain the procedure to delegates, as it had been agreed beforehand with all the candidates. They had agreed that each candidate would give a short presentation, to last a maximum of ten minutes, which should focus on the following points:

- a demonstration of knowledge and experience of legal metrology;
- the motivation for the candidacy; and
- the personal expectations and commitments to support the CIML President in the implementation of the OIML strategy, and to represent the OIML.

Dr Schwartz emphasised that as there were four candidates, each one was kindly requested to keep strictly to the time limit of ten minutes, in order to allow sufficient time for CIML Members to ask questions after their presentations. The election would take place under agenda item 11, which would most probably be discussed on the morning of Thursday 24 October. Dr Schwartz suggested that all four presentations were given in one block, which would mean that the coffee break would probably be a little later than expected. He explained that he would prefer to have all the presentations before the coffee break in order to allow the possibility for Members to discuss the candidates after they had seen all the presentations. In the order of the presentations provided in Addendum 3, Dr Schwartz invited Dr Sergey Golubev to make a start and give his presentation.

### ***Dr Sergey Golubev***

Bonjour mesdames et messieurs, Good afternoon dear ladies and gentlemen.

It is my great honour to stand here today as a candidate for the position of the Second Vice-President of the CIML, the intergovernmental global metrological organisation, with more than 60 years of history.

My name is Sergey Golubev, and at the present time, I am Deputy Head of the Federal Agency of Technical Regulations in Metrology of the Russian Federation, called ROSSTANDART. I am also the CIML Member of the Russian Federation, and COOMET Vice-President. Because of the time limits, I have to do a very short presentation about my personality, including my activities, motivation, and expectations. For better understanding, I structured my talk as recommended by the CIML President, so you can follow my speech on the slides.

I got a master's degree in physics from Moscow State University, the best Russian University, but during the latest period of my life I also brought a huge amount of practical knowledge in the field of administration and management. Moreover I have basic knowledge in legislation. I have a Master of Government Administration degree, which is the same as an MBA, but for governmental officials. I am responsible for the metrological part of the Russian quality infrastructure, I have done BIPM courses for ISO 17025 and 17034, and there are many other issues which I have had to explore. As a metrologist I have a PhD in the field of nanoscale length measurement. I have worked in metrology for about 15 years. I started in the position of a junior scientist, and have progressed to a position where I am now responsible for all aspects of metrology in the Russian Federation.

I represent the Russian Federation in COOMET, OIML, and Metre Convention events. I should mention here that COOMET activities include not only legal metrology but also other aspects of metrology. As with some other candidates who submitted their candidacy for this high post, I had to agree my nomination with the Government of the Russian Federation. Currently within Russia I am responsible for more than 15 000 people in organisations depending on ROSSTANDART and influence more than 100 metrologists in social and commercial centres in Russia. It is a very wide field of responsibility, which is why I am going to underline only three key points in my presentation.

The first one is that under my leadership, the national strategy on measurement uniformity up to 2025 was developed, agreed with all the organisations involved, signed by the Russian Government, and now is being executed. This high level of establishing tasks implies a corresponding level of responsibility. This document was controlled annually for the last three years, and the fact that I am still here means that I have been successful!

The second point is, as some of you know, that in Russia we actually have seven NMIs, and we are going to decrease this number. As a result we want to have one National Metrology Institute. Coordination of this task is very complex, involving more than 5 000 people, a budget of about 100 million dollars, property rights for more than 250 buildings, and so on. We started this project in 2017, and at the beginning of January 2020 we will complete the first step, we will have four institutes instead of seven, but most importantly, we will not lose people, money, or property, nor I hope CMC lines.

The third point is digitalisation. Yesterday, we discussed in detail the topic of e-learning, but it is only a part of the topic of digitalisation in society, and digitalisation of metrology. In Russia we decided to have all information about every measuring instrument in the area of legal metrology area. It is necessary to exclude all paper certificates and documents and everything should be done in an online information system – metrological big data. I am sure that the usage of this data, in the near future, will change the procedures of verification and calibration.

But what is very important for our community is the realisation that this mechanism in legal metrology demands serious changes in our basic law, the Russian law of Measurement Uniformity. This we did: we prepared the changes, agreed it with the Russian community, now it is in our congress, and we are expecting it to be signed by the President of the Russian Federation before the end of this year. I suppose that this experience will allow me, of course if I am elected, to contribute to improvement of Documents such as D 1, and others in this field.

This morning we had the RLMO Round Table. Here we were speaking about the position of the Second Vice-President of the CIML. It is very important to underline that I have been involved in COOMET activities for many years, and during the last year, I have been not only Russia's representative, but also the Vice-President of COOMET. With this experience, if I am elected, I will be able to continue the tasks of Dr Miki, I hope, with the RLMOs. COOMET is an organisation with very different countries as participants, and they at a very different level of metrology. Because of this, I, as a representative of Russia, feel a special mission to represent here all the Russian-speaking metrological community.

I think I have already spoken enough about my work at a national level, but from the OIML point of view I have been involved in the organisation of different events. All of them were successful from my point of view, and participants got a lot of practical and useful experience from them. Moreover, we are planning to extend our participation in organising OIML and CIML events. My principle is that we change our world step by step, and gradually make it more modern and developed, and here I am doing my best.

I hope I have a good understanding of the role of legal metrology in economic development, human life and so on, and I have a strong wish to make my contribution to develop it. I suppose that my experience and knowledge in legal, applied and scientific metrology, as well as resources which are available for me and my team of experts, would support me in all activities, will allow me to make progress in the OIML tasks described on this slide. I want to focus specifically on the realisation of the OIML Strategy, which leads me to my expectations.

If elected I will support the President's policy in general, and particularly in the implementation of B 15, concerning the effective legal metrology infrastructure for worldwide mutual confidence, and for relevant consumer protection.

I will represent OIML interests within international and regional organisations, and forums, and coordinate closer cooperation with RLMOs. I will also promote the relevance of metrology in economies through their national quality infrastructure using the OIML's experience in work with CEEMS and the OIML-CS.

In conclusion, I consider it worthy to note that, being a candidate from Russia, a country with its unique geographical position, I will be able to serve as a kind of a bridge between European and Asian metrology centres.



At the very end of my talk, I want to use this opportunity to thank all of my team which supports me, and especially Professor Alexander Kuzin, the Director of the National Russian Legal Metrology Institute, who is unfortunately not here today, and Lev Issaev, Member of Honour who constantly shares his experience and knowledge with me. Thank you very much for your attention.

Dr Schwartz thanked Dr Golubev very much and asked delegates if they had any questions for him.

Mr Dmitry Bartashevich (Belarus) stated that the legal metrology organisations of COOMET supported Dr Golubev's candidacy for CIML Second Vice-President.

There were no more comments or questions.

Dr Schwartz thanked Dr Golubev again, wished him good luck, and invited the next candidate, Mr Robert Lambregts from the Netherlands, to give his presentation.

### ***Mr Robert Lambregts***

Mr President, Vice-President and CIML Members, dear colleagues,

It is an honour for me to be one of the candidates to be considered for the position of Second Vice-President. Firstly, I would like to say that the OIML should be proud that there are so many excellent candidates, today, here in Bratislava, and that each candidate probably has his own qualities, each willing to serve and assist the President and to act as Second Vice-President. This means that here at this CIML meeting, we all have a real and important choice to make.

Of course I would like to take the opportunity to introduce myself, and hope that this speech can help you in the decision-making process which, as the President said, will be quite difficult over the coming days because of the excellent candidates. Of course, last but certainly not least, I should and would like to convince you of my commitment, and suitability for the task of Second Vice-President, and that your vote, of course a vote for me, is a well spent vote.

Behind me in a minute you will see a word cloud that says something about me. The most important part is in the story, and the words of the story, which can be seen in the word cloud.

First I would like to introduce myself. My name is Robert Lambregts. I am from the Netherlands, but maybe you can hear that! I am married, I am 52 years old and I have two, already fully grown children, who have recently left home. I am a senior coordinating advisor, working at the Radiocommunications Agency, which is an agency of the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate Policy. Currently, for the last say five years, I have spent most of my time on legal metrology, and later in the speech I will tell you why.

Let me first tell you something about my educational background. I am not a technician, I have a master's degree in economics, and a master's degree in law and legislation. Although I have no technical degree, I have been fascinated by technology for at least 30 years, and in my spare time my hobby is electronics. I started to work at the Agency about 25 years ago, again not as a technician, but because they were searching for an economist who could design a special new type of auction, an auction for licences for mobile telephone applications, now known as GSM. This was quite new, because never before had such an auction been organised in Europe, so it was a big and daunting job for me, as it was also the first time that I had to be a project leader, to implement the scheme I was designing myself. To make a long story short, the auction was quite successful, the revenue was about 2 billion guilders, which would now be about 1 billion euros, and more importantly, I learned a lot from this big and daunting job. This is how I became employed at the agency at the Ministry of Economic Affairs about 25 years ago.

Since then I have had several positions. I did a lot of project management for other projects, but also worked on policy making, as well as a few years advising at the strategic level. Just before my current position, as Coordinating Advisor, I was the head of the supervision policy department of the agency. That was a position where I more or less bumped into legal metrology. This was due to a reshuffling within the Dutch Government. From one moment to

another, as the Radiocommunications Agency, we also had to deal with legal metrology, so I had a department now, which I had to lead, which also had to deal with legal metrology. Luckily, I had as a new employee George Teunisse, who I think most of you know. He is really a legal metrology veteran, and he introduced me swiftly to the field of legal metrology, so I owe a lot to him.

As I said, I am currently a Coordinating Advisor and spend most of my time on legal metrology, but I also deal professionally with evolving topics like the energy transition, digitalisation, like the Internet of Things, and cybersecurity, to mention a few. This typical blend of topics that I have around me is very relevant to mention here, because in my humble opinion, these topics are not only relevant for telecommunications and economics in general, but clearly, they are becoming more and more relevant for the field of metrology. Yesterday, those who attended the excellent Workshop on e-learning will know that a topic like software is high on the list in all kinds of developments within legal metrology. In my opinion this is just the beginning. In the future we will see that digitalisation, and also maybe energy transition, will have a large impact on legal metrology. This was my introduction.

Moving back to metrology, since my introduction to legal metrology, I have followed the OIML B 6 training in Paris, attended R 76 meetings, and in the past years I did some work for the OIML, but also for WELMEC, the RLMO in Europe, which does a lot of guidance work.

About two years ago, my predecessor as the Netherlands' CIML Member, Anneke van Spronssen was going to retire, and I felt that was the time for me to take up the glove, and that was how I became her successor as the CIML Member for the Netherlands. I just missed the meeting in Cartagena, but last year in Hamburg, I attended, and it felt quite good. Also this year I attended the R 117 meeting in Cape Town, which was planned to finalise the revision of R 117, so I am happy to see, as we have just heard, that R 117 is not only successfully finalised, but I was proud that I could help there, and it is actually on the agenda now. I did not expect that by the way, but I am happy because we also, as CIML Members, unanimously voted for that beautiful project. I am also happy to see that other important documents like D 31, again on the subject of software, are on the agenda. As CIML Member, I visited this group when they met in Dordrecht, and I saw how hard working and dedicated to results the group was, and how hard they worked to finalise D 31, so again a product to be proud of.

As CIML Member this year, I also visited the OIML-CS Management Committee meeting and gave a presentation on “Legal metrology and the Internet of Things”. Last but not least, I have also attended the WELMEC Committee meetings for the last two years, and am an active member of Working Group 5.

With these examples, I hope to have shown you my dedication on the one hand, and my commitment to legal metrology on the other hand. Let's not forget, we do important work, and if I can contribute to that important work even more, not only as a CIML Member, but also as a Second Vice-President I would be honoured. When I was preparing this candidacy, and later this speech, it was clear for me the President has a full, and sometimes even over-full agenda, and that a Second Vice-President should assist the President, and if possible also the First Vice-President and the Presidential Council, not only on a practical level but also on a more conceptual level, bearing in mind the current OIML strategy, the importance of the OIML-CS, and of CEEMS. I believe I have the knowledge and the experience to fulfil these tasks, both at the practical and conceptual level as Second Vice-President.

As my time is almost done, I will recap by saying that I have experience not only as a manager but also as a project leader on many projects. I have skills from the time I was a policy maker and strategist, and it is my job now to connect the dots, to see the world from different perspectives, and scout and implement relevant opportunities, and currently the focus in my organisation is both on the digitising world and on legal metrology, and these worlds, as I said, are more and more connected. My educational background as an economist and legal specialist, and the technical work field I have been in for the last 25 years, mainly telecoms, but also legal metrology, and the broad experience I have in several positions, including legal metrology, in

recent years, brings in my opinion the right mix to be able to bring added value to the President and the CIML as the Second Vice-President.

So for the above contemplations and reasons, I took the liberty earlier this year of presenting myself as a candidate for Second Vice-President. For these same reasons and contemplations, I am now here in the beautiful city of Bratislava at this CIML meeting, standing here and delivering this speech to you. I hope that I have convinced you of my motivation, my skills, and my ability to serve as the Second Vice-President, and hope you will vote for me. Dear colleagues thank you for your kind attention and support.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Lambregts for his presentation. He asked delegates if they had any questions. Dr Schwartz remarked that Mr Lambregts seemed to have addressed all the criteria very well. There were no questions. Dr Schwartz wished Mr Lambregts good luck and invited the next candidate, Mr Bill Loizides from Australia, to give his presentation. He commented that Mr Loizides was very well known to many of delegates because of his activities on the OIML-CS MC amongst others.

***Mr Bill Loizides***

Thank you Mr President.

To the Vice-Presidents, the BIML Director, and the other candidates, I am in a very esteemed field and good luck to all of you as well.

Before I start I just want to acknowledge the Second Vice-President, Dr Miki. When I first joined this Organisation, he took the time to mentor me, to tell me the tricks of the trade, to talk to me about negotiations, the simplicity of the language that is required to get your point across, because for a lot of Members, their native language is not English, so thank you Dr Miki.

I want to show you a one-minute video about my organisation because I am but a person. A Second Vice-President not only relies on the colleagues in this room, but an infrastructure that helps that person in their daily work, to be able to contribute effectively to this Organisation.

[A short video followed]

That was our Lindfield site, my head office, in Sydney Australia. I am the General Manager for legal metrology in Australia, and I am one of the few countries or Members (although Sergey just mentioned that he is in the same situation) that has direct line of sight, from the Metre Convention, which we are all part, through the development of the Recommendations through this forum, their adoption and application, into our economy in Australia, and the enforcement of those Recommendations in the field with the community that we regulate. I have that direct line of sight of that whole body of work, which adds value to the decisions that we make. In a number of forums, I ask how this applies to the real people – the manufacturers, the traders and the consumers.

I have over thirty years of experience in a number of strategic policy posts at economy level in regulatory compliance, legal, and obviously a number of communication, and change-management activities, and this Organisation is going through a change-management process. The other important thing that I am doing at the moment, and I have been discussing this during a number of coffee breaks, is that I am reviewing the laws in Australia, and it is interesting that a number of you around this table are grappling with that same thing. What will the new laws look like? We heard in the RLMO Round Table that a number of economies are also undertaking this particular task. We appoint third-party verifiers, we have, as I said, the inspectorate across all of Australia, we develop test procedures, and I hope some of those test procedures will form part of the new Recommendations as we go forward, as there is already an intention to introduce a new section on these.

My government has appointed me to be the CIML Member for Australia, which is an ongoing commitment that my government makes to this Organisation. Here you will see a photo of my team, and I am only as good as the team that underpins a lot of the work that we undertake.

Concerning my current roles: at the invitation of the President I am a Member of the Presidential Council. I was elected as the deputy chair of the OIML-CS, one of the pillars the President was talking about. I chair the Maintenance Group within that Single Certificate System, I am a CEEMS Advisory Group Member, I was also again invited to be on the Task Group 2023 with a number of colleagues, and I also direct and coordinate Australia's participation as secretariat of TC 7/SC 5, TC 12, and TC 17/SC 8, as well as convener of their PGs.

We are also P-members of 31 other Technical Committees and Subcommittees and 25 active projects. I mention this because it is important to demonstrate the commitment that I have as a representative to this Organisation, as well as my government's commitment.

The support to the President is very important. If elected, I look forward to supporting the vision and the work of the President, in outlining some of the "three pillars", etc., and some of the Task Group 2023 strategic discussions that we will be having. We will continue to streamline the technical work that we do, which was the prioritisation work that the President mentioned earlier. I will continue to serve as the OIML-CS MC Chair, that is up for renewal next year, and I look forward to putting my name forward again for that.

I remain a very strong advocate of the CEEMS work, and support those activities, in particular in our region of the Asia-Pacific, where we have a number of emerging economies. The B 6 publication is something that is relevant and we need to update that, the online e-Learning programmes that we heard about yesterday in the workshop, which was run by Bobjoseph, with an excellent outcome, and Australia is committed to assisting in that programme. Hopefully we will be uploading our R 117 course for you to consider. As for the way forward, well I am sorry to tell you, but we are already behind the ball. This morning, we heard at the RLMO Round Table from my Czech colleague about digitisation, metrology clouds, and so on. The technology is changing faster than we can write Recommendations, so how do we grapple with that body of work? That again is about prioritisation and expertise. The fourth industrial revolution, e-metrology, and the conference that is being proposed in Germany will address and probe into these activities. There is no answer yet, but I am willing to help and bring my expertise in developing strategies to address these things.

Obviously I look forward to continuing the good work of the OIML-CS. It has a fantastic base, and I thank all the colleagues that have participated in helping to develop that, and obviously it is the empowerment of the CEEMS economies, and other OIML Members, in the practical support that not only I, but my economy can provide in the virtual training, secondment and exchanges. Guo Su was mentioning this yesterday as an idea, and we have started this in Australia. We are already acting as a host country, to help train people in some of the expertise that we have. We put forward, just yesterday, a pre-market surveillance programme where the President again was asking whether the OIML should start entering into the compliance space. So we would develop a programme that we will be presenting at the APLMF meeting in November for ratification and working together with our colleagues.

I think I will leave it at that. I hope I know a number of you. If I don't know you, please come and say hello, and ask me some questions if you can't ask me them in this forum. I will be happy to respond and provide an answer. That's all. Thank you Mr President.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Loizides for this introduction and asked if there were any questions.

Mrs Lagauterie (France) had a question, and Mr Loizides joked that he did not speak French.

Mrs Lagauterie replied that her question was not to do with the French language, even if she did know the answer in advance. She wished to make a general comment, so it was not a question directly to Mr Loizides. Last year the CIML recruited a Director who came from Australia, and from the same organisation as Mr Loizides. She admitted that she was therefore surprised to see the candidature of the

Australian CIML Member. She stressed that this was not directly connected with the competence of the people; there were plenty of competent people in this meeting, but she thought it was important to underline that the OIML is not a business. The OIML is an International Organisation, and it would seem appropriate that a certain equilibrium was maintained in the positions of responsibility held by different Member States. For this reason, she said she was surprised by this candidacy, continuing that in the case of France, while for many years the Director of the Bureau had been French, during this time it was never considered appropriate that, supported officially by the French Government, a French candidate might be presented for the post of President or Vice-President.

Dr Schwartz asked if there were any other questions.

Mr Loizides wished to respond. He thanked Mrs Lagauterie. He said he understood the point, but in Australia they recruited the best person for the job. He understood that there needed to be an international representation, but he hoped the skills and abilities he could bring forward as Second Vice-President supporting the President, supporting the Presidential Council, and supporting CIML Members, were independent of the country he came from. Mr Loizides acknowledged that the Director was Australian, commenting that he had done a fantastic job, but said that the Director of the BIML did not represent Australia, he represented CIML Members, as Mr Loizides himself hoped to do.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Loizides and asked if there were any further questions. He added that there was the opportunity to ask bilateral questions to the candidates. He thanked Mr Loizides again.

He asked then candidate number four, Dr Bobjoseph Mathew, CIML Member for Switzerland to give his presentation.

#### ***Dr Bobjoseph Mathew***

Good afternoon. Dear President, dear Vice-Presidents, dear colleagues. *Cher Président, chers Vice-Présidents, chers collègues,*

I am very happy to stand here in front of you today to present my candidacy. *Je suis très fier et très heureux de vous présenter ma candidature.*

Let me introduce myself to you. I used a picture, just to reflect a little bit my educational, as well as my professional background. I am the Vice-Director of METAS, and head of legal metrology. I have more than 15 years of experience in senior executive roles, be it in the public or in the private sectors. I have worked in start-ups, management consulting, telecommunication, in both regulation and the business area. I did a doctorate in international trade law, focusing on the WTO agreements in telecommunications. Besides this, I did a postgrad on IT Systems, which helps me today a lot, tackling the new challenges we are facing as a community in digitalisation.

But I would also like to say more about me as a person. I speak several languages; I am multi-lingual. I am fluent in English, German, French and Malayalam, which probably no one here knows, which is an Indian language. I have a multi-cultural heritage, and still have very strong links to Asia. As for my knowledge and my experience in legal metrology, as I initially said, I am the head of legal metrology and Vice-Director of METAS, the Swiss institute of metrology. I cover a broad area of responsibilities in my daily job: development of metrological regulations, be it technical documents or revisions of law, influencing, improving, and working on taking WELMEC guides further, OIML publications. This always may be either me personally, or with the team at METAS. I oversee, and am also responsible for, the work on type approvals, conformity assessments, as well as verification in Switzerland. Last but not least, also market surveillance is a part of my job. I would say in summary that the scope of my work spans the lifecycle of a measuring instrument. But I would also like to stress that I can contribute a lot with my hands-on experience, in areas of digitalisation, health and environment, be it from my experience in the telecommunications sector, where I really worked on IoT and M2M, these kind of new technologies that we are today facing as a challenge, but also with our

experts in health and environment, and I think these are topics that we need to tackle as a community together.

I had several occasions also to present as a speaker, or an expert. I also like to extend, that I really like doing this, because I think it is very important in our role, whoever it is, being in the Presidential Council, the President, or us as a community, to share our knowledge, and to create new opportunities for ourselves. So I have the chance for instance to participate in the OIML APLMF seminar. Yesterday I had the chance to moderate the seminar on e-Learning. I had several occasions where I presented for UNIDO on the topic of quality infrastructure with experts from METAS, and for the Swiss Minister of Justice, to whom I report, I always have to present the revisions of law or projects that we have in this area. She also supports my candidacy. Last but not least, I would like to show that I am an active Member within this community. I am on the Presidential Council, I am a member of the Review Committee, the Management Committee, I am part of the Task Group, the WELMEC Committee, as well as its working groups.

What is the motivation for my candidacy? I believe that the OIML plays a pivotal role in international legal metrology. I believe that our technical work is essential to promote mutual confidence through the OIML-CS, and I believe that we should all work together, work and combine out diverse cultural environments. I would like to share my technical expertise with all of you, and also just to contribute to everything, and I believe that we can do it. I think that the OIML should build on its strengths, but most importantly, I am passionate about our work.

As for my commitments and expectations, I commit 100 % to work towards achieving the six strategic objectives. Firstly, we should still focus on improving the efficiency of our technical work, we should promote the OIML-CS, especially to gain more participants to make it grow. I would like to be an ambassador for the OIML towards other organisations, and ministries, in order to seek cooperation in areas where it's useful to the Organisation.

We should continue exchanging technical expertise with emerging economies, raise awareness of our contribution to legal metrology infrastructure, in order to attract new Members, and that is one of my expectations as well. We should work as a team with the President, Vice-President, the Presidential Council, but most importantly with you, because you are our important base, you should tell us what we should do, and we should achieve these goals together. I believe we should row together in the same direction, and I fully support the strategy to which we have committed.

So do I “walk the talk”? I believe what you do has a far greater effect than what you say, so I want to close with some examples of my personal involvement. Today for instance until now I was contributing, supporting technical work either personally or with my teams from METAS. I stated before I had the chance for instance to present at the OIML/APLMF seminar on the OIML-CS to share knowledge. The work on the Task Group is another area. Yesterday I was here moderating, with the support of many people, the e-Learning seminar.

Last but not least I would also like to stay focusing on digitalisation in my daily work, which can definitely also be fruitful for our Organisation to help us move forward. IoT software, metrology clouds, etc., are also daily topics in my work.

I would like to close with some words from Abraham Lincoln. He said that “Commitment is what transforms a promise into reality” so I hope I could demonstrate with the examples I have just given you that my commitment will transform my promises that I made just a minute ago into reality. Thank you very much.

*Merci pour votre attention.*

Dr Schwartz thanked Dr Mathew and asked if there were any immediate questions from the audience. He commented that he had also addressed the criteria very well. There were no questions, so Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Mathew again.

He added that they were almost on time and suggested that delegates break for coffee.

## 4 BIML matters and activities

Dr Schwartz asked delegates to consider item 4 of the agenda which dealt with BIML matters and activities. He informed delegates that the BIML Director had provided a written report in both English and French and this could be found in Addendum 4 to the Working Document. Before listening to the oral report, he suggested that they should make sure that those countries which were not present at the roll call had now arrived.

Mr Dunmill verified the following:

Algeria .....not present

Morocco .....not present

Thailand .....present

Tunisia .....not present

Dr Schwartz welcomed the newly arrived CIML Member and asked Mr Donnellan to give his report.

### 4.1 Report by the BIML Director

Mr Donnellan thanked Dr Schwartz and delivered the following report.

*Bonjour à tous les participants et à nos distingués invités.*

*Chers collègues et amis de la métrologie, bienvenue à la belle ville de Bratislava pour la 54ème réunion du CIML. C'est ma première réunion du CIML en tant que Directeur du BIML, et c'est un plaisir d'être avec vous tout le long de cette semaine. J'ai hâte de participer à nos discussions et de travailler ensemble pour obtenir des bons résultats, grâce au travail et grâce à l'implication des Membres de l'Organisation à travers le travail du Président et celui du Bureau. Nous allons avoir un programme riche et complet. Je vais maintenant poursuivre ma présentation en anglais.*

Just one reminder for the participants, and the speakers, to please try to speak slowly and clearly for the interpreters, so that they can translate accurately and efficiently. Please continue to respect this throughout the meeting.

A very warm welcome to Bratislava, and the 54th CIML Meeting. I wish to thank, and I certainly appreciate, the involvement and the hard work and dedication of all those involved in putting the meeting together. In particular, I wish to thank the CIML President, Dr Roman Schwartz, and the staff of the BIML. A special thanks to Mr Peter Adam, and all members of the Slovak Metrology Office, the Government of the Slovak Republic, and to all CIML Members, Members of Honour, delegates and representatives of other organisations. Welcome, and I look forward to a very productive and fruitful week with you.

I have divided my update into a number of different areas and I have entitled my presentation "A year of calibration". We have heard a number of different matters throughout the last couple of days about the Organisation maturing and involving, and moving onto the next stage, and I have tried to reflect that in my presentation.

In particular, the BIML has looked at how we work, and how we align our activities with the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of the United Nations. As an international organisation, it is critical for us to report on, and contribute to these SDGs. We continue to honour French as the official language of the organisation by continuing to translate publications into French, and we look forward to doing so in the weeks, months, and years ahead. We are evolving and deepening our relationships with organisations in liaison and with partner organisations. We are looking to the future of our IT strategy, with an increased focus on the long-term needs of the organisation, looking at future technologies and approaches to problems, beyond the conventional approach. In doing so, we are transitioning the organisation to a more digital-based strategy. We continue to try to align our activities with those of our

regional legal metrology partners, and look forward to ways in which we can enhance that relationship, and bridge any divide between what happens regionally and what happens internationally. As you heard from the CIML President, we are in the process of examining and deepening a number of our MoUs and considering those that might be useful in the future.

In terms of membership and engagement, we have identified potential new members of the Organisation, and we have worked with a number of Corresponding Members to enhance and assist their transition to become Member States. This year we welcome Kyrgyzstan as a returning Corresponding Member, and we welcome them back into the broader legal metrology family. Throughout 2019 we have reduced the risk of losing any additional Members in 2020, through regular contact and financial and debt management. I am pleased to say that we have had commitments from two Corresponding Members to pay their outstanding arrears, which will prevent their being delisted next year, so we are scheduled to lose no one next year. We are helping organisations in reviewing their metrology needs, and providing assistance from the context of an international organisation in this area. We are monitoring debt from a financial perspective, and we are implementing reforms and initiatives within the Bureau, to place the Organisation in a more financially sustainable setting.

I would now like to move on to the highlights of our liaison activities, which are a key aspect of our work as an International Organisation, and one which I know that myself, the team, the Presidential Council, and the Presidency of the Organisation really strive hard to achieve. We are looking at deepening our engagement in this area in a more coordinated way, which is consistent with what we have heard a number of times over the last day or so concerning the subjects of coordination and avoiding duplication. We continue to work very closely with our sister organisation the BIPM, and I am very glad to see Martin Milton here at the moment.

The OIML continues to play a key role in the International Network on Quality Infrastructure (INetQI). Those that were here yesterday will have already heard that UNIDO is also a key member of that group, and applauds the work of the INetQI. On the screen you will see just some of the partner organisations that we deal with on a regular basis, quite often behind the scenes as part of our day-to-day activities.

Concerning our governance, we are looking at improving the systems within the Bureau and the Organisation, especially in finance and a number of other operational systems. We are looking at better ways to do our work, so as to safeguard and provide quality assurance in what we do. This will include subjects such as business continuity, travel, procurement, translations, and so on. We are looking at obtaining the best value for money for Members, which will possibly involve doing things differently in some instances. We have continued to implement austerity measures, and prudent management in a number of aspects of our operations, with our publications, and in other areas. We have started work on mapping our stakeholders, understanding exactly who they are, what they want, and what we need to provide. Only in doing this can we understand exactly who they are, and what importance they play, and so to tailor our communication. We have embarked on e-learning, and those of you who participated in the workshop yesterday hopefully you enjoyed it. I found it a very enriching experience. We have a road map ahead of us to deliver on a number of these matters, and I am confident that we can do it together.

Clearly, World Metrology Day is a key aspect of the work that we do, again in conjunction with the BIPM, and it is our national and international world day where we celebrate all things metrology.

Concerning the OIML's World Intellectual Property Organisation application, I am pleased to inform the Committee that we embarked on a new process this year to register the OIML logo. This was started in July, and we have already been successful in registering the OIML logo. This was a new process under the Paris Convention for International Organisations, as opposed to the previous application under the Madrid protocol.



In reflecting on my past nine months in the role of BIML Director, I looked back on some of the key achievements. The year started with TG23, led by the CIML President and involving a number of Members, which the President referred to in his opening speech. In that meeting we were able to seek clarity and direction on a number of matters for the Organisation, one of which was the initiation of a review and prioritisation procedure for OIML publications, to identify our core publications based on criteria, and based on the needs of Members, and you will hear more about this soon.

We are continuing to look at the entire legal metrology and metrology spectrum, not just measuring instrument type approval. We will consider including aspects of verification and other quality assurance mechanisms, including conformity to type, in our procedures in the future. This is important because the Organisation is charged with looking at all legal metrology systems, and with developing studies and systems to assist Member States. We have dedicated significant resources this year to the promotion, implementation, and uptake of the OIML-CS, and you will hear more on that shortly.

Some of the other key aspects of an organisation that is maturing and changing are reflected in some of our key publications, such as D 1, and it is very pleasing to see the progress made on the revision of this fundamental publication. The collaboration with the BIPM on this Document, which guides all aspects of metrology, was one that I was very keen to hear about yesterday. There is also interest from Members and other organisations in training on D 1. You will hear more about that from Peter Mason over the coming days, but it is interesting to reflect on the role of metrology within the broader quality infrastructure framework, and the reforms to D 1 will touch on that, amongst other things. We are also looking at legal metrology's role in the broader quality infrastructure, and looking at the value that it can deliver.

As you have heard previously, the BIML is also redesigning the OIML e-Learning platform.

From an operational perspective, things remain relatively stable within the Bureau. Staffing levels and individuals at the Bureau have remained unchanged throughout 2019. Existing secondment arrangements continue, and we are looking at the possibilities of new secondment arrangements from Member States and Corresponding Members. We are examining our structure, as you heard from the CIML President, and working with other organisations to deliver the best outcomes for Member States. We are continuing to emphasise our governance, and the way we operate, to ensure that there are appropriate checks and balances in place, and in doing so we are aligning the work of the BIML with that of the OIML's three pillar policy strategy.

In terms of some of the finer details, the website continues to be one of our main outreach mechanisms, and one of the main portals for our engagement. We're averaging approximately 15 000 visitors to the website per month. The CEEMS section attracts several hundred visitors per month, and the OIML-CS, unsurprisingly with people looking at certificates, which is very pleasing to see, averages between 4 000 and 5 000 distinct visits per month. As for social media, a number of the events attended by BIML staff have been posted on LinkedIn. We continue to work with other platforms, including Facebook, as well as exploring other options. Notably, in the six months that the Organisation has been actively working on LinkedIn, I am pleased to report that we have had approximately 18 500 page impressions, from 22 posts. We have also seen a 40 % increase in the number of people who are following the OIML.

Touching on the Bulletin, you will recall that earlier this year we undertook a survey of Member States and Corresponding Members, asking for their views on moving to a predominately digital strategy for the Bulletin. The response was overwhelmingly positive, and we have transitioned to that strategy. The Bulletin, and the ongoing need for articles continues to be a challenge for the Bureau. We have predominately filled the Bulletin this year with articles on the Bureau's activities, but that is unsustainable, and you will hear more about this shortly.

As previously touched on by the President, 2019 was a record year for visits to the WMD website, with over 19 000 distinct visits in May this year. Again, from the operational side of things, which is not necessarily always visible to all Member States, we have added a number of publications that have been translated into different languages onto the translation section of our website. We have improved a number of behind-the-scenes activities, and have continued to work on the INetQI website, which has been revised on behalf of the members of the INetQI, and we have overhauled the liaison section of the OIML website. Similarly, we have undertaken a number of other behind-the-scenes activities to support you in your project work as CIML Members, Member State representatives and conveners. We have replaced our servers, which has also brought associated cost-saving. In doing so, we are able to respond nimbly to changes, and replace hardware on an ongoing basis as needed, depreciating it over time. However, as I said, as an organisation we should not just continue with what we have always done, we need to look at better, more innovative solutions, and our IT is one of those.

Moving on to some of our technical work, which is one of the key pillars for our Organisation, the Bureau has continued to provide enhanced levels of support to our Technical Committees, Subcommittees and Project Groups. We have made good progress in monitoring technical projects, keeping many of them on track this year. 2019 has been the second highest of the last five years regarding the number of Committee Drafts issued. We have developed and improved the periodic review procedure, and we have refined the project proposal template to obtain more accountability from project proposers. We have developed a new project management timeline tool to align with B 6 to help conveners stay on track. We have developed an exemplar of a project proposal, so that others can follow it, based on a project that has worked successfully, and effectively, and delivered on time. We have developed a methodology with TG23 and with the Presidential Council to review high priority publications. It is also pleasing to see the uptake in co-convenership opportunities, and you will hear more on training under the next agenda item. We are continuing to examine the automation of reporting functions, and are initiating remedial action where the performance of Project Groups has been sub-optimal.

We currently have 46 Project Groups within the Organisation. Despite a dip in March 2018, when 15 Project Groups were disbanded due to lack of activity, the number increased last year, reflecting the new projects that were approved. In terms of the number of years since a Project Group started its work, this figure is trending upwards slightly, averaging at the moment 6.4 years. We are monitoring this situation, and are extending enhanced levels of support, where requested and where necessary. However, in terms of the number of Project Groups which have not issued any documents over the last three years, this figure pleasingly is continuing to decline. In the 12 months since September last year, this figure had reduced by only three, but the trend is downwards, which is pleasing. Similarly, concerning the compliance with the time frames in B 6, which state that a Project Group must send a Draft Publication to the Bureau within three years, this deadline had been exceeded by more than 200 %, but you will see that the figure has dropped, and currently stands at 49 %. Projects which have not yet entered into that three year period will continue to be monitored.

In terms of pillar two, CEEMS, we continue to engage and support the CEEMS priorities and projects. We monitor the impact of CEEMS through the CEEMS Advisory Group, and its secretariat located in the Bureau. We have translated part of the website into French, to make it more accessible in our official language. We have published the list of CEEMS experts, and training material from courses is available online. We have the opportunity going forward to inject new momentum into the CEEMS initiative. Since it is one of our pillars, we need to dedicate the appropriate level of resources from within the Organisation to promote it. In CEEMS, we are looking at better coordination with a number of our partner organisations, to bring enhanced levels of engagement, to avoid duplication, and to bring efficiencies to those that need it the most.

Moving onto pillar three, the OIML-CS, this year we have seen methodical and sustained promotion of the OIML-CS through specific events around the world, in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and South America. This year I am very pleased to announce that we have

welcomed six new Utilizers to the system: Czech Republic, Kenya, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sweden and Tunisia. We also welcome two new Associates: Kiribati and Rwanda. During the last three quarters of 2019, the number of certificates has increased by 18 %, based on year-on-year calculations. The system is growing, with new Utilizers, new Associates, and more certificates, but we need to do more work in that space. We are also working on recovering debt, as well as what that might mean in the future.

Under the banner of matters for consideration, as an organisation I believe we need an integrated, meaningful, and outcome-producing promotion of the OIML-CS, not just at an international level, but at regional and national level, and so on. We rely on Member States and industry to participate in the scheme with us. We are very willing to give presentations to explain the system and its operational and procedural documents to Member States, Corresponding Members and prospective Members. I think another challenge for the Organisation is ensuring that our Recommendations are fit for purpose, reflecting the needs of our Members, of industry and the community. Through the work of TG23, the Presidential Council, and the input from each and every one of you, we can make those Recommendations fit for purpose.

We must also look at subscription rates for the Organisation. We will need to approve a new budget year next year, and will need to consider the budget implications of the relationship between Member States and Corresponding Members.

Finally, the core roles of the BIML remain unchanged. We are applying a forward-looking approach and strategy to every aspect of the work that we do. We are continuously seeking new ways to improve our work, and we are happy to take feedback on that. However, our core role remains the same: to support the Organisation in achieving its objectives, under the *OIML Strategy* publication, under the work of TG23, under the guidance of the Presidential Council, and naturally that of CIML Members. We continue to support the President, the Presidency, and you, the Members of the CIML, and with that I close. Thank you.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Donnellan very much for his comprehensive and encouraging report. He remarked that it was impressive to see how quickly he had adjusted to his new position, with great commitment and enthusiasm, within a very short time. He thanked him again for his report, and wondered whether there were any immediate questions or comments. There were no questions so he asked delegates to consider the respective draft resolution 2019/3, which was very simple:

“The Committee

Notes the report given by the BIML Director.”

Ms Lagauterie asked whether it could be added that they appreciated the fact that the report had been made available in two languages, and in any case, she wanted to thank the Director for this.

Dr Schwartz asked if this meant they should amend the draft resolution. He concluded not, but thanked Mrs Lagauterie for her comment. He asked if there were further comments, but there were none. There were no negative votes or abstentions. The resolution was unanimously passed.

Dr Schwartz noted that in fact the resolution had been amended to take up the comment from France. The amended resolution now included:

“Thanks the BIML Director for providing his report in English and in French.”

There were no objections to the new wording, no abstentions or negative votes, so the resolution was unanimously passed.

## 4.2 Report on training activities

Dr Schwartz asked delegates to consider the next item – the report on training, which would be provided by Mr Dunmill.

Mr Dunmill stated that it would be a very short report since delegates had already received a report in Additional Meeting Document 4.2, with a lot of details on the training, and at this point he just wanted to highlight some of the points in that Additional Meeting Document.

Mr Dunmill reported that as in previous years, the BIML had been conducting a series of training courses, which had initially aimed to improve conveners' and secretariats' knowledge of the rules for developing OIML publications. These had started with a pilot training course, which Mr Dunmill had run on his own in June 2016 at the PTB in Braunschweig, because Germany has many project conveners. Then, with the assistance of Mr Vinet, who had been engaged on a limited contract with the BIML, they had run ten training courses between June 2017 and July 2019 in different parts of the world. This figure included two courses in 2019: one in Ottawa in April, which Mr Vinet had run on his own, and one which Mr Dunmill had run on his own at the PTB in Berlin, in July. Mr Dunmill stated that this was due to financial constraints which meant that it was only possible for one person to conduct each of those courses. A total of 192 people had now been trained through these courses, and Mr Dunmill explained that this was obviously more than the number of OIML conveners. This was because when they were running a course in another country, as opposed to at the BIML, it was possible to include more people from that country who were connected with OIML work, or involved as experts and so on. There was one more course, which was going to take place in November in the UK, which Mr Dixon would be carrying out, also on his own, so that again it would be at minimal cost to the OIML.

Mr Dunmill showed delegates a full list of the courses they had run and added that again these details had been included in the Additional Meeting Document, which they had received. The figures showed that the number of trainees had varied from nine at one of the courses to 48 at another, so there had been a very wide range of participation. The courses which had been held in Paris had covered only conveners, future conveners, and CIML Members. The courses conducted in other countries had, as he had just said, been expanded to include conveners, potential conveners, experts and others that may be involved with OIML work. Mr Dunmill showed a couple of graphic representations to complete his presentation indicating that up to October 2019, they had trained 35 conveners, who might also be secretariats of TCs or SCs, five secretariats who are not conveners, and then 151 other people, which had included CIML Members, Assignees, experts, possible future conveners, local staff and so on. Mr Dunmill commented that this was quite an impressive number, and meant that of the 62 secretariats, representing 48 different individuals, 63 % had now been trained, and for the conveners of the 47 Project Groups, representing 35 different individuals, 71 % had been trained. He observed that for each course they had organised, some people who should have attended had been ill, or the dates had not fitted with their agenda, and a number of conveners had been replaced by new personnel, which meant that it was unlikely that 100 % would be trained.

Mr Dunmill commented that the feedback they had received from the courses had been very good. He observed that they had received a lot of interaction, as well as a lot of comments and questions from the trainees during the courses, which had certainly helped them to progressively improve the course content. Several trainees had also sent himself or Mr Vinet emails after the courses to ask questions, and also to make comments that they had been helped in their work by having attended the training. There had been one significant case, for two Chinese projects which had not been advancing very well, and for which a new convener had been appointed just before they had run a training course in China. Almost immediately following the course, she had managed to do some quite significant work on the existing Committee Drafts, and had sent them to the BIML, following the correct procedures which she had just learnt about, so it had certainly had a very good effect on those two projects. Additionally, the two new German conveners for one of the projects which had been approved the previous year, and who had attended the course in July, had made a lot of progress on their project.

Mr Dunmill reiterated that there had been ten training courses over the last two years, which he considered to be a very intensive rate of training. He remarked that they could not keep up this level of training with the resources which were available, but this completed the initial phase of trying to get as many people following the rules of B 6 as quickly as possible. Obviously, there would still need to be some kind of “maintenance training”, either when new staff were appointed, when B 6 changed, or just for refreshing knowledge. Since nobody did all of the actions and procedures in B 6 every day, there would still be a need for people’s knowledge to be refreshed over time, so the BIML was looking at how that might best be done, whether through physical courses or possibly making use of the OIML’s e-Learning facility. Mr Dunmill again reminded delegates that there were more details in the AMD, and that delegates could ask him any questions they may have during the week.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Dunmill for providing this report with its impressive numbers. He wanted to reiterate the point he had mentioned in his report, that the Task Group had been interested in getting an impression of the impact of this training. It was obviously good to have training, and the CIML had decided to put money and resources into this area. Personally, he considered that it had been really worthwhile, but he wondered whether it would also be possible to measure the impact the training had had. Had the project work speeded up, or were there other criteria which could be used to measure the training’s effect? He asked Mr Dunmill if he had any immediate reply.

Mr Dunmill replied that the current assessment of the training’s impact was simply from the anecdotal evidence of the number of questions they received, and the way that certain projects had advanced. He repeated that because of the fact that it often took many months for projects to move from one stage to another, it was difficult to give an exact answer right now, but there was definitely an improvement in the number of Project Groups that were respecting the B 6 time scales. There were improvements, but they did not have numbers to put to this at the moment.

Dr Schwartz asked if Mr Dunmill had already prepared something in order to support even better project management in the future, perhaps for conveners to follow a stricter project management roadmap for example, at least for the projects which were of higher importance, such as the top ten high priority projects. He asked if any preparatory work was being done to support conveners.

Mr Dunmill replied that several improvements had been made since they had been running these training courses, such as the fact that new project proposals were now required to include a preliminary project roadmap, giving some key dates which were expected to be met. There would also be a proposal which would be discussed later in the meeting, on obtaining some engagement from conveners’ CIML Members to make available the resources necessary for these key dates to be achieved. This was because feedback from conveners indicated that they have to do the OIML work in addition to other tasks, so often they did not have enough time allocated to their work as conveners of an OIML project.

Mr Dunmill indicated that later on in this meeting there would be a brief summary of the situation of the top ten projects, which the BIML would be following more closely. Obviously, with the resources the BIML had, they could not follow up every single project in great detail, but they would be paying much more attention to the high priority projects.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Dunmill again and asked if there were any further questions.

Ms Vuković (Slovenia) thanked Mr Dunmill for his very comprehensive report. She thought that Mr Dunmill had mentioned in his last sentence something about a digital course. She commented that it would be very useful to have something of this kind, because it would enable costs to be reduced, and asked if Mr Dunmill had anything more to say about this.

Mr Dunmill replied that delegates who had been present the previous day would have seen the current OIML e-Learning facility. The existing convener training courses had taken place over two days, and used a comprehensive set of PowerPoint slides, as well as live use of the OIML website to demonstrate all the facilities that were available, in addition to responding to questions from participants, such as how to post a Committee Draft. He wanted to look at how difficult it would be to translate this face-to-face course to an e-Learning package. He considered that it would not be so difficult, but it was

more a question of finding the resources and time to do it. Alternatively, some financial commitment would be needed to hire someone from outside the Bureau to do it. Not only would such a course result in a reduction in cost for training people, but trainees could also go back to it. For example, if they forgot how to do something in particular on the workspace, they would be able to go back to the training course and use the workspace module to see how to do what they wanted to do. He felt that this would be a good investment in time and effort.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Dunmill again and checked that there were no further comments. He asked delegates to consider draft resolution 2019/4 which read:

“The Committee,

Notes the report given by the BIML on the training courses relating to OIML Technical Work, delivered since the 53rd CIML Meeting,

Thanks the BIML for organising the training, and

Thanks the participants for their efforts to harmonise the technical work of the Organisation.”

Dr Schwartz drew delegates’ attention to the addition to this text when compared to that in the Working Document they had already received. He wanted to suggest the following amendment to take up the proposals from TG23 and the Presidential Council meetings, and he read:

“...

Encourages the BIML to continue to support technical training activities in the future as financial provisions allow, and

Requests the BIML to examine the effect the training has on the conduct of OIML technical work.”

Dr Schwartz asked if there were any comments concerning the wording of the resolution. There were no comments. There were no negative votes or no abstentions. This resolution was unanimously passed.

## **5 Member States and Corresponding Members**

Dr Schwartz asked the BIML Director to give a short overview of the status of membership within the Organisation.

Mr Donnellan stated that the total membership of the Organisation currently stood at 122 members, evenly split between 61 Member States and 61 Corresponding Members. One Corresponding Member, Kyrgyzstan, had returned in 2019 and he welcomed them back.

He reported that in January of the current year, unfortunately one Member State and five Corresponding Members had been delisted as a result of non-payment in previous years, in accordance with the rules. The good news was that through their regular contact with Member States and Corresponding Members, chasing debts, renewing the database with correct contact details, and so on, they were scheduled to lose no Member States and no Corresponding Members in the following year.

There was a risk of losing two Corresponding Members the following year but the BIML had received a commitment from both that they would not only pay the current year, but also pay their outstanding debt, which would prevent them from being delisted from the Organisation at the beginning of 2020. He commented that it was very positive news that membership of the Organisation would remain stable the following year.

A significant effort had been made in the current year to avoid any delisting due to non-payment, which could occur for a variety of reasons. In doing so, they had spent a considerable amount of time preparing tailored correspondence which had been sent both directly to the country, and by diplomatic channels, through the embassies represented in Paris, to both prospective new Member States and existing Corresponding Members who were interested in becoming Member States. He reported that although the BIML was actively working with a number of Corresponding Members and prospective new

Member States, it took some time for this to happen, due to the processes required in each country, but he assured delegates that there were several countries that intended to become Member States very soon. In doing this, they had worked directly with economies at a national level, to assess, and help identify solutions to their metrological infrastructure needs. They had also worked at a regional and pan-regional levels to develop strategies and contribute to policy development at the regional level, which involved both membership of the Organisation, and the role that legal metrology, and metrology as a whole, could play in regional trade policies. Naturally, the BIML had also worked at the international level to engage in quality infrastructure initiatives with their partner organisations, who had complementary objectives to those of the OIML, to advance membership of the Organisation. Mr Donnellan highlighted in the current year in particular, they had worked to have this enshrined in recommendations, studies and reports, so as to ensure that there was a clear action plan which prospective Member States could work towards.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Donnellan for his report on the status of Membership and Corresponding Membership. He asked delegates if they had any comments. There were none. Dr Schwartz asked delegates to consider draft resolution 2019/5. Dr Schwartz read:

“The Committee,

Welcomes Kyrgyzstan as a returning Corresponding Member.”

Dr Schwartz checked that there were no comments. There were no negative votes or abstentions. The resolution was unanimously passed.

## **6 Financial matters**

### **6.1 Approval of the 2018 accounts**

Dr Schwartz invited Mr Donnellan to take the floor.

Mr Donnellan highlighted that item 6.1 was to detail the accounts from the previous year, 2018. As part of the normal process of the transparency for any organisation, the OIML accounts were audited by an independent auditor. He drew delegates’ attention to the screen, explaining that they would note initially in French, and in English on the second slide, the auditor’s statement confirming the conformity of the 2018 accounts with international standards and his assessment.

Mr Donnellan said that throughout this presentation of the previous year’s accounts, he would break down the information into income received by the Organisation and additional costs. He added that they had endeavoured to make this information as large as possible on the screen, but naturally it would be made available to delegates in two forms. It had already been provided in an Addendum which had been circulated in July 2019 in order to give people time to review the accounts. In addition, this presentation would be made available online, on the CIML meeting website. The total income of the Organisation in 2018 had been slightly lower. The good news in 2018 had been that the revenue from certificate fees had been broadly in line with expectations and budgeted figures. Income had been reduced slightly due to financial interaction with the reserves.

Turning to the costs, Mr Donnellan explained that he had broken these down into 12 sub-items, which were detailed on the screen. These were items such as staff, communications, meeting costs, depreciation, and so forth, and he said he would detail each one of them in his presentation.

In relation to the 2018 staff costs, as delegates could see on the screen there had been an overspend. This had been due to a number of reasons in that year, but primarily due to costs associated with moving a member of staff from secondment arrangements to becoming a full staff member of the Bureau.

There had also been costs associated with an additional secondee to the Bureau, and some additional costs associated with the change of directors which had not been budgeted for when the budget had

been approved in 2016. Mr Donnellan observed that the overarching comment he would make, on a number of the costs, was that they did not necessarily reflect the ongoing increase in costs of operating the Bureau. He felt that when the budget had been set and approved in 2016, it might have been set at a lower level than was realistic in practice. The results were reflected in both the audited figures for the previous year and in future years.

In terms of the running costs, there had been a marginal overspend, predominately associated with the OIML-CS, of approximately € 6 000. Mr Donnellan stated this was important to note as they continue to work on promoting the OIML-CS, and as they transitioned it to a full cost recovery initiative, which would take time.

Regarding administrative costs, again there had been an overspend of € 9 638. He observed that as delegates could see, in previous years there had been underestimate or overspend dating back to the 2012–2016 budget cycle of approximately € 10 000, which could be seen on the screen. This had unfortunately continued in 2018. Communication costs were again slightly higher in 2018, at € 12 702. This figure had changed considerably in the current year, and he pointed out that he would be coming to the 2019 budget forecast in a later agenda item. The change reflected a number of different policies operating within the BIML and the Organisation as a whole.

Moving on to meeting costs, Mr Donnellan said that for the 2018 CIML meeting in Hamburg the costs had exceeded the budgeted figure by € 66 815. Mr Donnellan added that it should be noted, however, that a reimbursement of approximately € 16 000 had been made to the Bureau by the PTB in relation to costs associated with that meeting, but this would only appear in the 2019 accounts.

Regarding the costs for travel and accommodation, which did not necessarily always just involve Bureau staff, Mr Donnellan reported that these were globally on target in 2018, with a marginal overspend of € 473. However, the costs for travel and accommodation related to the OIML-CS were higher, due to increased promotion of the OIML-CS, particularly in its first year of operation. Mr Donnellan remarked that that figure would continue.

In relation to miscellaneous expenses, which covered various operational costs, he indicated on the screen that the overspend was € 8 701. Mr Donnellan asked delegates to note that this overspend had also been recorded in previous years, and this problem again reflected the need for an accurate budget to be developed for the 2021–2024 period which would reflect the true costs. In terms of the search for the Director and Assistant Director, Mr Donnellan drew delegates' attention to the budgeted items on the screen that had not been needed, so they had actually underspent on a number of the costs associated with both the search for the Assistant Director, and the Director in 2018, so this had come out with a positive figure.

Turning to costs associated with CEEMS, Mr Donnellan said that the Organisation continued to devote resources to CEEMS activities. In 2018 approximately € 20 000 had been spent, which was less than the amount which had been budgeted for, resulting in a € 14 734 underspend in this area.

For training costs, the audited figure for the previous year had been € 119 999. Mr Donnellan referred to the presentation delegates had just heard on the training, and how well it had been received, but pointed out that this had resulted in an overspend in 2018 of € 44 999.

Moving on to depreciation, Mr Donnellan said that this continued to run high, and the reason for this was that a lot of work and effort had been undertaken to improve the assets of the Organisation. The BIML office building in Paris continued to increase in value, and that increase was directly related to the improvement works that had been done. That work had decreased during the current year, and stopped in many instances, and this would continue to slow and stop in a number of other instances. However, the result of the additional work undertaken on the building, and on the IT infrastructure, increased the level of depreciation, which came off the bottom line of the Organisation. Mr Donnellan stated that in 2018, this difference had been approximately € 64 851. He commented that this was a large figure, but that it only reflected the work that had already been done, and the depreciation over the coming years, continued to add value to the building.



Another contributor to the budget overspend in 2018 had been the provision for uncollected funds from Member States. This had been budgeted at € 14 000 in 2018, but had come in at € 58 700, and covered the funds that the Organisation would not receive from Members that have left the Organisation.

Regarding the total charges for the organisation, Mr Donnellan showed delegates the figures broken down from 2016–2018 and showing the voted amount and the actual amount. He remarked that for 2018 there were actually five figures: the voted figure, the forecast provided at the 2018 CIML meeting, the actual audited figure, the difference between the forecast and the actual, and the difference between the voted and the actual. This resulted in an overspend of € 311 970.

In terms of the budget projection, Mr Donnellan explained that delegates could see on the slide a blue moving figure, which was the budget for the Organisation as approved by the CIML. The orange figure represented the actual amounts, and the green dotted line was the projection for the current year. He indicated that there was a large change from the actual figure for 2018 to the budget approved for 2019. Mr Donnellan then remarked that there were several things to note on this slide. One was that the blue line continued to trend upwards, commencing on the slide in 2008 (he read this from the slide in case it was too small for delegates to read). Mr Donnellan continued that delegates could see that the approved budget had increased steadily until 2012. From 2012–2016 it had continued to increase steadily, and from 2016 to 2017, there had also been an increase. However, in 2017, 2018 and 2019, delegates could see an operational budget flat line, in fact decreasing the following year, whereas costs continued to increase, and risks of non-payment continued to prevail. Mr Donnellan added that he would, however, explain the initiatives that had been undertaken in the current year, to bring the budget back under control, which had been represented graphically by the green dashed line.

Mr Donnellan reported that the result for the Organisation, as audited by the financial auditor the previous year, was € 323 737 difference between the voted budget deficit and the actual budget deficit in 2019. On analysis there were five key items which constituted 95 % of this budget overspend. They were:

- depreciation,
- CIML meeting costs,
- staffing costs,
- the training which had been delivered, and
- uncollected funds.

These five items alone constitute 95 % of the budget overspend.

Moving on to the OIML-CS sub account, Mr Donnellan presented on the screen the result for operating the OIML-CS, which showed an overspend of approximately € 90 000 against the projected voted figures. This figure reflected the cost to the Organisation of operating the OIML-CS, and the costs had been broken down on the slide.

In terms of the year-end cash, the Organisation's cash reserves had decreased to € 1 403 176 in 2018. These cash reserves were for the ongoing cash flow and operation of the Organisation. At the end of the previous year, with the cash as it had been, that figure had reflected approximately six months' operation of the Organisation. Mr Donnellan said this ended his presentation on this agenda item, and welcomed any questions.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Donnellan for his financial report on the 2018 accounts and asked if there were any comments.

Mr Klenovský (Czech Republic) commented that these financial figures obviously raised concerns, and if as a matter of course if they were not able to take any steps to change this situation, they would not be able to carry on like this in future. He added that he was a little concerned about these developments.

Mr Alhammadi (Saudi Arabia) said he had been wondering about the voted figures for the year 2017. The voted amount had been about € 120 000, while the actual amount spent had been € 170 000. This was a large difference, and he wondered how this had come about. He asked if Mr Donnellan could

explain this situation, and wondered whether there had been any wrong considerations regarding the evaluation and the needs of the Organisation, or if some additional costs had come out during the year.

Mr Donnellan replied that he would do his best to answer the question concerning the figures for 2017. His general response would be, as he had already mentioned, that the operational budget for the Organisation had not necessarily reflected some of the true costs. The difference between the voted figure and the realised figure was the difference that had actually occurred in operational expenditure, as audited by the auditor. What needed to happen in his view was that they should look at setting a realistic budget for the future which reflected the true costs for the Organisation. Setting the budget for the OIML was somewhat challenging because the Organisation had a four-year budget cycle, and the budget figures could only be accurately managed if there were no fluctuations within that four-year period. This was a challenge because many items may have been unforeseen at the time the budget was set, or may change during the budget cycle, such as Members leaving the Organisation, and therefore not paying fees.

There were also costs associated with other activities which had not necessarily been included in the budget, but the 2017 accounts had been approved by this Committee the previous year, and what was being put forward under this agenda item was the 2018 accounts for approval during the current meeting. The 2019 figures, which would reflect improvements in the situation, would be detailed in one of the next agenda items.

Dr Schwartz asked if there any further comments.

Mr Johnston (Member of Honour) stated that as a past CIML President he was not representing Canada, and the questions he was going to ask were his own personal questions, and did not reflect the Canadian government's position. He said that Mr Donnellan had indicated in his presentation that he had put, or would be putting into place some procedures to ensure this problem did not happen again. He said he would like to know more about this, in light of the fact that he had also mentioned that he was going to take a look at subscription fees, he presumed in time for the next Conference. Mr Johnston said that as an observer, he would like to make sure that the resolution was not simply to increase fees and continue doing what had been done in the past. He emphasised that he was concerned, particularly when he saw a € 45 000 overspend on training. Even though he had heard that this training had been well received, it was still € 45 000 over the amount which had been planned.

Mr Donnellan replied that he understood the question. He said Mr Johnston had made a couple of points, and he would first address the point on training. There had been an audited overspend in 2018, against the allocated figure for 2018. The overall approved budget for training conveners had been € 250 000, and by the end of this year, approximately € 200 000 had been spent, so overall, the training budget would be underspent. It would have been on target for the budgeted amount of € 250 000, but they had elected to deliver the training using only one trainer in 2019. It had also been delivered more efficiently in 2019 because the Organisation had not subsidised the costs of some of the participants. If they had continued with the previous spending on training, the approved budget of € 250 000 would have been spent, and they would have been close to the target. The figure for 2018 had only been higher than the amount apportioned for that year.

Mr Donnellan summarised the other aspects of Mr Johnston's question as being about the additional measures being proposed. He replied that they were looking at reforming the way that the budget was prepared and monitored within the Organisation. They were also looking at employing new systems and new monitoring tools for this, and some measures had already been put in place. Some of this concerned debt management, which he had already touched on. This meant that Member States and Corresponding Members should not only pay their fees, but pay them on time where possible. There was also a significant amount of debt associated with late payment of certificate registration fees under the OIML-CS, and there were a number of OIML Issuing Authorities and applicants who owed a significant amount of money. Improvements in both these areas would assist the cash flow as well as the realised budget figure. Mr Donnellan reassured Mr Johnston that there was no distinct proposal at this stage to increase any fees. What would need to be considered by the Committee was the fairness and equity of the relationship between Member States and Corresponding Members. In doing that,

adjustments might need to be made to Corresponding Member fees. Mr Donnellan stated that this would not be decided at this meeting, nor under this agenda item.

Ms Vuković asked whether Mr Donnellan was going to prepare a paper for the Conference the following year on the issue he had mentioned. She indicated that she supported what he had said, that there should be some consideration about the difference between Corresponding Members and Member States.

Mr Donnellan replied that the answer was yes, but he would also ask the President to answer this question. Some preliminary forecasting work had already been done, but he asked the President to comment on why this had not been tabled at the current meeting.

Dr Schwartz replied that this was just one aspect of the Corresponding Membership fees, which they had already discussed. Last year they had been in a different situation, since they had been talking about how best to spend the surplus, and at that time he had felt that it was not really appropriate to think about increasing membership fees for Corresponding Members. As the situation had now changed, it would certainly be taken up as one option, and that was exactly why he had suggested the drafting of a second resolution on financial matters, saying:

“The Committee

Noting the accounts for 2018 and the comments from its President and from the Director,

Instructs the BIML Director to implement effective measures to monitor the budget, and

Instructs the BIML Director to investigate alternative revenue streams with a view to increasing the income of the Organisation.”

Dr Schwartz said that this reflected the safeguards they wanted to see, so that the situation would not occur again, and was general enough in that it covered the option of increasing membership fees, but also covered possible other revenue streams. For example, they could look at the use of the OIML logo on individual instruments, and other possible revenue streams. This was why he suggested that they had two draft resolutions to consider under item 6.1. He hoped this addressed Ms Vuković’s point.

Ms Buckley (Ireland) said she had one question on the five matters that had led to the overspend. She appreciated that some of them were difficult to predict, particularly the new initiatives, but in relation to depreciation and staff costs, she asked if Mr Donnellan had anything in mind, in the future forecasting, that could help for these particular issues, because these should be more predictable than events or training. She asked for an assurance that such matters within the control of the Bureau would be better managed in the future.

Mr Donnellan replied that he would broadly concur that those two items could be better predicted by the Bureau. Certainly, with regards to depreciation, in looking at the figures being used to prepare the 2021–2024 budget, they would be depreciated in accordance with the schedule in OIML B 8 *OIML Financial Regulations*. One of the contributing factors to the fluctuation in the depreciation figure, as he had previously mentioned, had been that additional work on the building had occurred after the budget had been set in 2016 in Strasbourg. It appeared that this may not have been factored into the depreciation figure and schedule listed there. Mr Donnellan continued that in the future, he and the staff at the Bureau had put a moratorium on all non-essential spending during the current year and the following year, which would reduce the depreciation figure, as new depreciable items would not be added to the accounts and the schedule. However, they still had a number of investments and works that would depreciate over a longer period of time. What they had noticed in the third quarter forecast for the current year was that depreciation was beginning to decline, and the reason for this was that more items were leaving the depreciation schedule, and 2019 and 2020 will be better still in this respect. Mr Donnellan added that for the future, the Bureau would be looking at the appropriate depreciation schedule, and ensuring that everything had been captured in this.

Moving on to staff costs, Mr Donnellan explained that these had been relatively stable within the Organisation. Some additional costs had been due to staff moving from secondment to full staff arrangements, and these had not been included in the budget figures in 2016. He did not anticipate that

this would happen in the next budget cycle. The high staff cost was also attributable to additional secondees costs, which again had not been budgeted for at the time, as well as some additional staffing costs and contracts, which had been entered into after the 2016 budget had been approved. Mr Donnellan said he did not expect any staff to move from secondment to full staff arrangements in the next two years, nor necessarily beyond that, but this was something they could build into the budget. He commented that they needed to look at existing secondment arrangements, and whether the OIML was going to pay for secondees working at the Bureau, as they did at present. This would need to be built into the budget or negotiated differently. Thirdly, he reported that he was not anticipating any additional staffing or contractor costs in the remainder of the current budget period. He observed that there should be more stability moving forward, but could assure delegates that they would all be factored into the preparations for the 2021–2024 budget.

Dr Schwartz asked if there were any further comments. He noted that Dr Ehrlich, CIML First Vice-President had a comment.

Dr Ehrlich (United States) said he was speaking not as First Vice-President, but as the US CIML Member. He remarked that the US could support both of the resolutions. He highly encouraged the institution of these additional forecasting measures, and wanted to add something to the second part of the resolution to continue investigating what the appropriate level of reserves should be. He asked that this subject was studied and a draft policy developed on this.

Dr Schwartz verified that delegates were ready to consider the first draft resolution, number 6, and the 2018 accounts.

He read

“The Committee,

Noting the accounts for 2018 and the comments from its President and from the BIML Director,

Considering the external auditor’s approval of the 2018 accounts,

Approves the 2018 accounts, and

Instructs its President to present them to the 16th OIML Conference in 2020.”

There no comments on the wording. There were abstentions from the Czech Republic and Spain. There were no negative votes, so the resolution was passed.

Dr Schwartz asked delegates to consider the other resolution (number 2019/7) which at the moment read:

“The Committee,

Noting the accounts for 2018 and the comments from its President and from the BIML Director,

Instructs the BIML Director to implement effective measures to monitor the budget,

Instructs the BIML Director to investigate alternative revenue streams with a view to increasing the income of the Organisation,

Instructs the BIML Director to continue to examine an appropriate level for the OIML’s reserves, and

Instructs the BIML Director to present information on these to the 55th CIML Meeting in 2020.”

Dr Schwartz reminded delegates that there had been a request from the US to amend this resolution concerning the proper level of reserves.

There was a short break due to a technical difficulty in putting the amendment on the screen. During the break Dr Schwartz assured delegates that he had spent a lot of time on discussions with the new

Director and with the financial auditor, Mr Frederic Fisher, to understand and analyse the situation, to get the full picture, and to do anything possible to prevent such a situation occurring again. Dr Schwartz reassured delegates that the situation was far from being critical since the Organisation has enough reserves. The reserves had dropped to six months, but were increasing again now, after having chased and obtained payment of some unpaid membership fees, so they were now back at a reserve of nine months, which was a comfortable situation. Nevertheless, he stressed that they still needed membership fees to be paid on time, without any delay, and would like to remind CIML Members that contributions must be paid at the beginning of each year, according to the Convention. He knew it was difficult, because it sometimes depended on ministries' policies, but they should pay close attention to this. He added that he hoped the amendment was now ready. Dr Schwartz did not think it was necessary to repeat all the wording to draft resolution 2019/7, so he just read the last phrase:

“Instructs the BIML Director to continue to examine an appropriate level for the OIML's reserves.”

He clarified with Dr Ehrlich that this was what he had been expecting.

Mr Loizides (Australia) asked whether it added value to the resolution to ask the Director, or to instruct the Director to present, at the Conference, these alternative revenue streams for consideration.

Dr Schwartz felt that it made sense to add some wording to this effect.

Mr Dunmill asked whether the change should apply to the whole resolution or just to one part or the other. Dr Schwartz suggested that the changes should apply to everything in the resolution, the revenue streams and level of reserves as a package, which would all be presented together to the Conference the following year. He added that delegates would all receive the final draft resolutions before the end of the meeting, so that they would have enough time to read the final wording before they then went through all the resolutions on Friday.

Mr Dunmill made the suggested amendments. Dr Schwartz read the second of the added phrase:

“Instructs the BIML Director to present information on these to the 16th Conference in 2020.”

Dr Schwartz stated that they could probably improve the wording, so this may be preliminary, but he thought everyone understood the meaning, and were hopefully ready to take a vote on it.

There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. This resolution was unanimously passed.

## **6.2 Forecast budget realization for 2019**

Dr Schwartz asked Mr Donnellan to report on this item.

Mr Donnellan said that as mentioned in the 2018 budget realisation presentation under item 6.1, he would now move on to the forecast for 2019.

He reported that in the six months, or thereabouts, of the current year that they had been aware of the 2018 audited budget figures, a number of savings measures had already been employed across the Organisation. Savings had been made including, but not limited to, efficiencies regarding training, developed and delivered, which he reminded delegates he had already touched on before, in terms of more efficient ways of delivering the training, prioritised participation in international fora and therefore reduced travel costs for the BIML, but also for other OIML participants.

The Bureau continued to transition to a digital strategy, which included a number of savings associated with moving away from hard copy publications. Operational savings were also being made in relation to the building itself, which he pointed out again was the OIML's asset, and continued to appreciate. He said they continued to work with other agencies and funding partners for operational efficiency in delivering the core OIML objectives. Mr Donnellan stated that savings had been made with the IT infrastructure, again to deliver savings in the services provided to Members, and contractor costs and other service fees had been reduced. Where the objectives of the OIML had aligned with those of other international organisations, we had been able to derive some revenue from those operations in 2019, to

supplement the certificate revenue. Mr Donnellan stated that this resulted in a projected forecast 2019 figure of a budget deficit of approximately € 32 000, against a voted budget deficit of € 73 407, and a total budget deficit forecast of € 105 950. He submitted that this differed from the previous year because there was an improvement in the bottom line in operational efficiency. He stressed that these measures had only been taken over the last six months, since March. Projecting these savings from the last six or seven months, they had projected year-on-year savings, until the end of the year, of approximately € 291 194. He informed delegates that there was a projected forecast improvement in the budget bottom line, to be achieved in the nine months from March until 31 December 2019, of close to € 300 000.

Mr Donnellan showed delegates a slide indicating that this had resulted in the OIML reserves currently standing at € 1 758 000. They had reversed the decline in the cash reserve situation, which had been becoming critical. In the previous year the reserve had reached only six months of operation. Mr Donnellan emphasised that if the absolute number from July 2018 to December 2018 had continued into this year, and if spending had continued the in same way, and if the BIML had not made savings, the Organisation would have reached approximately only three months of operational reserves. He continued that this was the question that would be before the Committee next year, according to the resolution that they had just approved, in terms of what the Committee thought was an appropriate reserve policy and level for the Organisation. If the Committee and Conference believed that 12 weeks was appropriate for an International Organisation's reserve then they would be able to create a budget and cash flow situation that reflected that. If it believed that 12 weeks was not appropriate, or six months was not appropriate, then the budget and the policy would reflect that. Mr Donnellan stated that this closed the subject of the budget forecast for 2019.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Donnellan for this forecast. He asked if there were any questions or comments, but there were none. He requested that delegates looked at the draft resolution 2019/8, and he read:

“The Committee,

Notes the report on the budget forecast for 2019 given by the BIML Director.”

Dr Schwartz confirmed that this had been the wording provided in the respective Addendum. He suggested the following amendment as an appreciation of the efforts the BIML Director had made, and he read:

“Expresses its appreciation to the BIML Director for his efforts in bringing the budget under control within a short space of time.”

Dr Schwartz observed that he thought it was really impressive to see that in such a short time, only six months, they had come back to parity, from a situation which had been difficult, and he would be pleased if the Committee could support this additional phrase in draft resolution 2019/8.

Dr Schwartz asked if there were any comments on this proposed draft resolution as written on the screen. There were no comments on the wording. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was unanimously passed.

### **6.3 Arrears of Member States and Corresponding Members**

Dr Schwartz asked Mr Donnellan to report on this, the last item for this session of the meeting.

Mr Donnellan hoped that Members would be relieved that this was both the last item, pending the chair's decision, and also the last financial matter to be dealt with in detail in the current session.

Regarding Member State arrears, Mr Donnellan referred to the screen, stating that as delegates could see, the total arrears at the same time the previous year had stood at € 782 933. This was money owed to the Organisation by Member States and Corresponding Members. In 2018 the figure had been € 724 020 for Member States, and he commented that the good news for 2019 was that that figure had been reduced to € 409 950. For Corresponding Members, during this period the previous year the arrears had been € 58 913, and this year the figure had been reduced to € 31 290. He indicated that as

delegates could see, the total arrears for both Member States and Corresponding Members had been reduced from € 782 933 to € 441 240. This positive result was not just something that happened, it was a reflection of all the work his team had done in chasing arrears to result in a 44 % improvement in the amounts outstanding for the last 12 months. There was still a large amount of money owed by Member States and Corresponding Members, but as he had already mentioned, a 44 % decrease over a 12 month period was promising. Finally, Mr Donnellan reminded delegates that Member State contributions and Corresponding Member fees for 2020 would be due at the beginning of 2020, as they were every year. The invoices would be issued later in the current year for payment at the beginning of 2020 according to the OIIML Convention. Mr Donnellan stated this closed item 6.3.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Donnellan for his presentation and for his efforts in chasing Member States and Corresponding Members with outstanding arrears, and asked if there were any comments. There were none. He asked delegates to consider the respective draft resolution, number 9. Dr Schwartz read:

“The Committee,

Notes the report given by the BIML Director,

Encourages the BIML to continue its efforts to recover outstanding arrears of its Member States and Corresponding Members,

Requests those Members with arrears to bring the situation up to date as soon as possible.”

Dr Schwartz added that he would like to suggest an amendment again, which would read:

“Requests the BIML Director to investigate financial strategies for collecting membership fees in a timely manner, according to the OIIML Convention, with the aim of presenting concrete proposals to the 16th Conference in 2020.”

Dr Schwartz added that, as he had said already, the Organisation very much depended on the timely payment of membership fees and he considered that they needed to think about strategies for collecting these in a timely manner. He suggested the idea of an “early bird” option for those who paid early and on time, and at the same time perhaps they could think about a small penalty for those who were late, or in any case, some incentive to pay on time. He clarified this was why he wanted to suggest this amendment to the draft resolution. He asked if there were any comments on the amended draft resolution.

Mrs Lagauterie remarked that she did not know whether, in the framework of an international organisation, it was possible to give reductions to people who paid in advance, because they would then have difficulties with other Member States saying that they had paid their normal fee and there was not enough money because others had received a reduction. She remained cautious about such an approach. Furthermore, she had the impression that even with the goodwill of the BIML Director, they were not going to find a solution to late payment by certain countries in the strategy of the OIIML. She added that in the current year, she had herself, for the first time, been unable to pay the fee right at the beginning of the year as usual, because there had been a lot of questions due to their restricted budget. Of course, they had paid before the end of the first semester. She did not think the BIML Director could set a policy to resolve this, as it was more due to internal problems within a particular state. At least this was what she could say from her own experience, although she was not sure whether other states had the same challenges. She doubted whether any action taken by the BIML Director would be able to change anything.

Dr Schwartz asked if there were any other comments, particularly if there were any in support of the comment made by France.

Dr Ehrlich said he would support Mrs Lagauterie’s point of view. It would unfortunately be difficult for many CIML Members to affect the timing of payment.

Dr Schwartz asked if there were any other comments along a similar line. He said that he felt the opposite. He confirmed that Germany had been late in paying in 2019, because they had not known who in the ministry had been responsible for the timely payment. Now they had identified the person,

they were in direct contact with them, and he hoped that the following year they would be much better, because now they understood the procedure, and the necessity to pay on time. He thought there was always the possibility for a CIML Member to contact the person in their ministry responsible for paying the membership fee, and he saw the potential of having such a direct contact, to improve the situation. He said they were not talking about delays of only one month, but delays of nine months, ten months, and even 15 or 18 months, so they were talking about membership fees due for the previous year. He was not concerned about delays of just a few months, this was not a problem, and he was talking about a much longer period. He was not sure how long the average delay in payment was, but this was why he wanted to support doing something to improve the situation. He said they would delete this additional phrase but then they all knew nothing would happen. There was the phrase “requests those members with arrears to bring the situation up to date as soon as possible” which had been in each and every resolution they had taken in previous years, and he remembered that two years ago, at the request of Austria, they had even included a reminder that according to the Convention these membership fees had to be paid at the beginning of the year, but this had not really helped. He emphasised that they needed to think about this, and although he acknowledged that “strategy” was perhaps not the right word, he urged that something should be done to ensure that Members paid their fees on time.

Mrs Lagauterie observed that Dr Schwartz had suggested that CIML Members should do something, and she was in total agreement. However, what was written in the amendment to the resolution was asking the Director of the BIML to come up with financial strategies and it was there that the problem lay. The Director of the BIML could not define a financial strategy for each state.

Dr Schwartz asked if there was a better proposal or if this was a request to delete the phrase.

Ms Lagauterie interjected that it was not.

Dr Schwartz wondered whether they could agree on better wording.

Mr Loizides agreed with the point of view put forward by France. He continued that he would just delete the word “financial” so it would read just “to investigate strategies for collecting membership fees”.

Mr Lambregts (Netherlands) also proposed that the word “strategies” could be left out, and instead a word like “incentives” could be used.

Dr Schwartz concluded that this might need to be thought about in more detail. He understood the concerns, but on the other hand, he hoped that delegates also understood that they should do something. He proposed that they could come back with a better proposal with better wording in the following days. There was still the session on Friday. He clarified that the delegates were happy to leave it as it was at the moment and not have a vote on resolution 2019/9.

There were no objections to this proposal, so Dr Schwartz thanked delegates for their participation and closed the session.

## **7 Liaisons and Regional Legal Metrology Organizations (RLMOs)**

Dr Schwartz welcomed everybody to the second session of the 54th CIML Meeting. He said they would be listening to reports on Liaisons, and Regional Legal Metrology Organisations.

The first item on the agenda was the report from the BIML on *Activities with organisations in liaison*. However, before doing so he had just been reminded by Mr Dunmill that they needed another roll call to ensure that they had the quorum to approve the draft resolutions. Dr Schwartz asked Mr Dunmill to carry this out.

Mr Dunmill greeted everyone and asked delegates to indicate their presence. He asked Mr Mussio to keep track of the numbers.



Albania..... not present at the moment  
Algeria ..... not present  
Australia..... present  
Austria..... present  
Belarus ..... present  
Belgium..... present  
Brazil..... present  
Bulgaria..... present  
Cambodia ..... present  
Canada ..... not present (proxy given to Australia)  
Colombia..... not present (proxy given to Germany)  
Croatia..... present  
Cuba ..... present  
Cyprus..... not present (proxy given to France)  
Czech Republic ..... present  
Denmark..... not present (proxy given to Sweden)  
Egypt..... present  
Finland ..... present  
France..... present  
Germany..... present  
Greece ..... not present (no proxy)  
Hungary ..... not present (no proxy)  
India ..... present  
Indonesia..... present  
Iran ..... not present (no proxy)  
Ireland ..... present  
Israel..... not present (proxy given to Germany)  
Italy ..... not present at the moment  
Japan ..... present  
Kazakhstan..... not present at the moment  
Kenya ..... present  
Korea (R.) ..... present  
Macedonia..... not present at the moment  
Monaco ..... not present (proxy given to France)  
Morocco ..... not present (no proxy)  
Netherlands ..... present  
New Zealand ..... present  
Norway..... present  
P.R. China ..... present  
Pakistan..... not present (no proxy)  
Poland ..... present  
Portugal..... present  
Romania ..... present  
Russian Federation..... present

Saudi Arabia..... present  
Serbia ..... not present at the moment  
Slovakia ..... present  
Slovenia ..... present  
South Africa..... present  
Spain ..... present  
Sri Lanka..... present  
Sweden..... present  
Switzerland ..... present  
Tanzania..... present  
Thailand ..... present  
Tunisia ..... not present (no proxy)  
Turkey..... not present (no proxy)  
United Kingdom..... present  
United States ..... present  
Viet Nam..... present  
Zambia ..... present

Mr Mussio announced that 48 Member States were present or represented in the room. Since the quorum was 46, they had achieved a quorum.

## **7.1 Report by the BIML on activities with organizations in liaison**

Dr Schwartz asked Mr Dunmill and Mr Dixon to give their reports on this agenda item.

Mr Dixon greeted delegates. He stated that Mr Dunmill and himself would be giving an update on their activities with liaison organisations. He said that more information had already been given in an Additional Meeting Document, but one of the areas he wanted to focus on was the activity with the IECEx, and the establishment of the joint working group with them.

At the CIML meeting the previous year a resolution had been passed based on a proposal from the IECEx to establish a joint working group, with Dr Schwartz and himself representing the OIML, and for them to report back to the meeting this year. At the CIML meeting the previous year they had also updated the MoU with the IEC, and following the agreement to establish the joint working group, Mr Dixon said he had held a couple of telephone meetings with Mr Chris Agius, the IECEx Executive Secretary. Based on these, they had established the joint working group, and had identified some initial proposals for its activities. The first meeting had been in September, three weeks before this meeting, and one of the key areas they had looked at was to amend the terms of reference for the joint working group, to reference the MoU they had signed with the IEC the previous year, in order to set a framework for the joint working group's activities. The current representation, as he had already mentioned, was Dr Schwartz and himself for the OIML, whereas the IECEx's entire executive group had been put forward as members, so they had 12 representatives, compared with the two from the OIML. They had agreed to try and balance the representation between the two organisations, so the OIML was proposing that the OIML-CS Management Committee Chairperson should join the joint working group, as well as a Presidential Council member, and the IECEx had agreed to review and reduce their representation, so hopefully there would be a more balanced representation in the future.

One of the activities at the meeting had been to update the other organisation on the activities and future developments of their respective certification systems. They had then explored areas for collaboration, looking at ideas for the short term, and then the medium to long term. Some of the areas that had been identified were procedures for the assessment and monitoring of certification bodies, to make sure that

they were competent to join the OIML-CS. The processes for accepting results from manufacturers' test facilities into the respective systems were to be studied, along with the possible use of the IECEx online certificate system in the future.

Other areas that had been put forward by the OIML were to look at intercomparisons and proficiency testing, the monitoring of experts that participated in accreditation and peer assessments, and a possible extension of the OIML-CS towards a full conformity assessment system. At the moment the OIML-CS only covered type approval, but they were looking at potentially extending that in the future to include verification and surveillance activities, and Mr Cock Oosterman, the Management Committee Chairperson, would be discussing that later on in the meeting.

The joint working group activities and outcomes should actually be fed into a higher level OIML/IEC joint working programme, which was something Mr Dixon said he would be taking to the IEC to develop, but one of the main outcomes of the meeting was the establishment of an initial project to consider mechanisms to assist manufacturers who require both IECEx and OIML-CS certification. Mr Dixon reported that the plan was to start a project in 2020, to invite interested manufacturer associations, for example CECIP and CECOD, as well as an individual manufacturer, Mettler-Toledo, which had expressed an interest in participating in this activity. They were also looking at inviting interested certification bodies to take part. Mr Dixon pointed out that if delegates looked at the OIML-CS and the IECEx systems, the PTB in Germany, and RISE in Sweden already operated in both systems. Both the IECEx and the OIML would actually share information regarding manufacturers that had certification, to see if there were common manufacturers across both, with a view to inviting them to participate in the project. The aim was to have a kick-off meeting for this work, probably at the PTB, early the following year.

Other actions that the joint working group had agreed to were to have standing invitations to each other's meetings, so that they could report and provide updates on a regular basis, and for the OIML to review the IECEx online certificate system with a view to the possible use of that system in the future. They also wanted to look at the IECEx approach to determining the competence of certification bodies and test laboratories through accreditation and peer assessments. Mr Dixon pointed out that they had a slightly different approach than the OIML at the moment, and they needed to look at whether they could improve on that approach. There was also an invitation for IECEx representatives to participate in an OIML-CS Management Committee working group on the assessment requirements for certification bodies and test laboratories. Mr Dixon stated that the aim was to hold another meeting of the joint working group the following year, although for the moment no specific date or venue had been set. Mr Dixon stated that this concluded his update on the work of the joint working group, and he would now hand over to Mr Dunmill, who would provide an update on some of the other liaison activities.

Mr Dunmill again directed delegates' attention to the information given in the Additional Meeting Document on liaison activities, but wanted to highlight some of these because of their importance to ongoing work.

They continued to work within the International Network on Quality Infrastructure (INetQI), which had previously been called the DCMAS Network. The previous year, he had informed delegates that the Network's name was going to change to INetQI due to the wider range of topics covered by this group. It had started out as a group of organisations mainly concerned with metrology, accreditation, and standardisation, and had aimed to coordinate their work in favour of developing countries. It had now become a wider network, with the addition of other organisations that were funding or development organisations, such as UNIDO and UNECE. The World Bank and the World Trade Organisation had joined the network the previous year, so now it had a much wider remit, covering all quality infrastructure activities. Mr Dunmill reported that the OIML continued to host the website ([www.inetqi.net](http://www.inetqi.net)) on one of its servers, and stated that it had recently been overhauled and some information added. In fact the instruction to start making this website live had only been given the previous day, so if delegates looked it up at the moment it would still not work, simply because of the

time it took for things to propagate through the internet. He added that for continuity, the dcmas.net website would continue to be active for a while, with links to explain the latest changes. The BIML had attended a meeting of INetQI in June 2019, and would attend another in December 2019, which was unusual since normally the meetings were only annual. In 2019 it had been decided to hold two meetings since the first one had concentrated mainly on establishing the Terms of Reference for the new Network, taking account of the wider remit and new members, whereas the second meeting would consider what actions they could take individually or in common. He pointed out that the whole topic of Quality Infrastructure had become more important over the last few years, and they were trying to ensure that the OIML remained involved and prominent in this area.

Mr Dunmill went on to say that UNIDO had invited the OIML to take part in a large International Quality Infrastructure Forum in Brussels in April 2019. This had focused on the importance of Quality Infrastructure in achieving the UN Sustainable Development Goals and had involved many developing countries. The BIML had also taken part in a side event, organised by UNIDO and the Swiss Aid Agency, the WTO Aid For Trade Global Review in Geneva. The BIML's contribution had focused on how legal metrology was an important part of an effective quality infrastructure since it affected everyone's lives, could be used to protect consumers, and so on. Mr Dunmill pointed out that a significant number of the hundreds of side events to the Global Review had included a quality infrastructure element.

Turning to the WTO itself, Mr Dunmill said that the BIML attended the meetings of the Technical Barriers to Trade Committee. He added that he, together with Andy Henson from the BIPM, had been asked to contribute to a half-day "Metrology 101" training course for trade delegates as part of the WTO's "Advanced TBT training course". He concluded by saying that he hoped these highlights gave a taste of how the BIML was working quite closely with a number of liaison organisations, especially in the field of Quality Infrastructure.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Dunmill for his report and asked whether there were any comments or questions on this liaison work. Seeing none, he asked delegates to consider the day's first resolution. There were no comments, and no abstentions or negative votes, so resolution 2019/10 was unanimously approved:

"The Committee,

Notes the report on activities with organisations in liaison given by the BIML."

## **7.2 Report by the RLMO Round Table Chairperson**

Dr Schwartz invited the RLMO Round Table Chairperson, Dr Yukinobu Miki, to give his report.

Dr Miki greeted everyone and stated he would be reporting on the RLMO Round Table held the previous morning.

As background information he explained that the RLMO Round Table was the place where RLMOs gather, as OIML liaison organisations, to share information and to discuss new ideas about collaborative projects. It was an informal gathering, to share information and talk about future plans. This year, an e-learning workshop and the CEEMS AG meetings had been held prior to the RLMO Round Table. These had been very fruitful and had produced clear conclusions, and these activities were closely related to the Round Table discussions, so they had had the chance to receive input from those meetings, and discuss them at the Round Table as well.

He added that although this was not in his official report, this Round Table meeting was the last one he would be chairing, as he was stepping down from his role as CIML Vice-President. He said he had served as chairperson for five years, and during this time the OIML-CS had started, and CEEMS AG activities had become more and more active, so in such circumstances he suggested it was probably time for the Round Table to think about how to proceed in the future. He thanked all the participants

who had come to the meeting, stating that there had been 41 participants from 18 Member States, including the CIML President, past Presidents, the CEEMS AG Vice-Chairperson, and members, and the BIML. He was impressed that the previous year there had been 40 participants, so it was increasing year by year. Representatives from AFRIMETS, APLMF, COOMET, GULFMET, SIM and WELMEC had attended. In addition there had been a participant from India, who had talked about the activities of SAARC in India and the surrounding area. He highlighted that they had good website, which delegates could find through Google.

Dr Miki showed delegates a slide detailing the Round Table agenda. He reiterated that the CEEMS AG had provided good input to item 3, and the e-Learning workshop, item 5. As usual, they had put the OIML-CS on the agenda as it was so important. Firstly they had had an update from each of the RLMOs. His next slide indicated the name of the RLMO, the person who had represented each of them and Dr Miki's impression of the main subject they had covered:

- Mr Jaco Marneweck, representing AFRIMETS, had talked about the steady growth of AFRIMETS both in terms of the number of members and of their activities.
- Mr Phil Sorrell from New Zealand had provided the APLMF report, and he had highlighted the APLMF's activities in producing e-learning modules, which were now available to other RLMOs.
- Mr Peter Ulbig from Germany had provided the COOMET report, and had talked about their activity in translating OIML publications and had described their huge library.
- Mr Omar Kanakrieh from Saudi Arabia had provided GULFMET's report, indicating that they covered scientific and legal metrology and had mentioned that with regard to scientific metrology they now had some CMCs.
- Mr Marco Vasconcellos had provided the SIM report, and since he was an expert in IT, he had talked about digital certificates, and Dr Miki noted that this was would probably be a technology needed in the future in legal metrology.
- Mr Pavel Klenovský had provided the report from WELMEC, indicating that they were trying to become a legal entity, and there had been some discussion about the relative merits and importance of being a legal entity.
- Dr Miki stated that as he had already mentioned, the final report had been by Mr Ashutosh Agarwal from India representing SAARC. He added that this was a new area with new activities.

Dr Miki said they had next talked about the input from the CEEMS AG and Mr Mason, its Vice Chairperson had summarised its activities. There had then been a short presentation on the pre-market surveillance project plan by Mr Darryl Hines from NMIA; Dr Miki commented that this was probably an example of future technical work among RLMOs. The discussion had then moved on to collaboration on training centres, and they were expecting more on this in the future, as well as about e-learning systems, and what the role of the OIML might be in providing this structure, which would need clarifying in the future.

Still on the subject of e-learning and the RLMOs, Mr Phil Sorrell had made a short presentation on the e-Learning system and training videos available in the APLMF region. A brief introduction to the work of the CEEMS AG on e-Learning guidelines had been given by Mr Mason. Dr Miki said that the discussions had identified strong common needs amongst the RLMOs, and that now, e-learning systems, training videos and resources available in one RLMO were being made available to the others.

Regarding the OIML-CS, Dr Miki stated that Mr Paul Dixon had provided an update. The previous year there had been four or five discussion items on this subject with topics such awareness raising, technical experts, etc., but this year there had been a new topic. Firstly, they had discussed technical collaboration with regard to intercomparisons. Dr Miki observed that this was closely related to the proposal from NMIA on a pre-market surveillance plan. The other subject was how the OIML-CS could be used to support regional and national type approval. During the discussion on this, it had been proposed that some RLMOs might produce useful information, for example on which countries accept which certificates. Dr Miki remarked that useful information such as this could help the operation of the OIML-CS.

With regard to future collaboration and conclusions, Dr Miki repeated that circumstances had changed, and the Round Table should consider what form it should take in the future. The attendees had shared their information and discussed possible collaboration, and these might be on e-learning modules, an OIML training centre, or surveillance on the utilisation of the OIML-CS. They had talked briefly about the next steps for the Round Table including the potential need to develop some terms of reference to enable them to communicate better with the OIML. He added that when he stepped down the next chairperson would be appointed by the CIML President, but there needed to be further discussions so the RLMO representatives would remain those to be contacted to join the discussion in the future. This concluded his presentation, and he thanked everyone for listening.

Dr Schwartz thanked Dr Miki for his excellent report summarising the Round Table discussion. He asked if there were any comments or questions, but there were none.

Dr Schwartz continued that Dr Miki had been the chairperson of the RLMO Round Table for five years and this had been the last meeting he was going to chair. On behalf of the Committee he therefore wanted to express the CIML's gratitude for his commitment and successful efforts in developing the Round Table into a really interesting and valuable platform for participants. He felt this deserved a generous round of applause.

Dr Miki remarked that without the support of the President, he would not have been able to do any of this.

Dr Schwartz said there was some good news and he was pleased to announce that Dr Miki's successor as chair of the Round table would be the CIML First Vice-President, Dr Charles Ehrlich, and he thanked him for being ready to take over the chair. He added that Dr Miki had left the terms of reference for the next chairperson to develop, but with his conclusions, had indicated a path forward.

Dr Schwartz asked delegates to consider draft resolution 2019/11 which at the moment read:

“The Committee,

Notes the report on the RLMO Round Table meeting given by the chairperson,

Thanks Dr Yukinobu Miki for his work as chairperson of the RLMO Round Table.”

Dr Schwartz suggested they now added another phrase thanking the First Vice-President Dr Charles Ehrlich for taking over the chairmanship of the Round Table and he read the additional phrase:

“Thanks its First Vice-President Dr Charles Ehrlich for taking over as the RLMO chairperson.”

Dr Schwartz commented that this would be editorially improved but asked delegates if they were prepared to vote on this resolution now.

There were no abstentions or negative votes, so the resolution was unanimously passed.

### **7.3 Update by the Bureau International des Poids et Mesures (BIPM)**

Dr Schwartz asked the BIPM Director, Dr Martin Milton, to provide an update on the BIPM's activities, adding that they were looking forward to his report.

Dr Milton started his presentation in French. He thanked the President and the Director for their generous welcome and for their invitation to participate regularly in CIML meetings.

He continued in English. He informed delegates that he wanted to speak to them about some of the highlights in the work of the BIPM, and then to finish by focusing on plans for deeper and more strategic collaboration with the BIPM.

Dr Milton stated that there are currently 61 States Party to the Metre Convention (Member States), and 41 Associate States and Economies of the General Conference. There had been quite an increase in membership during the last two years. They had been very pleased to welcome Montenegro and

Ukraine as Member States the previous year, and this year they had been extremely pleased that Morocco had become a Member State, and Ecuador had transitioned from being an Associate State. They also had four new Associate States: Ethiopia, Tanzania, Kuwait and Uzbekistan.

Dr Milton continued that it had been a very important year for them, following the 26th meeting of the General Conference on Weights and Measures, which had been held the previous November. He explained that the General Conference had elected a complete renewal of the CIPM, their International Committee, and he showed delegates a list of the eighteen members that had been elected to the CIPM. He said that they were delighted that Dr Wynand Louw from South Africa had been elected as CIPM President, Dr Takashi Usuda from Japan had been elected as CIPM Secretary, and Prof Joachim Ullrich (Germany) and Dr James Olthoff (USA) had been elected as Vice-Presidents of the CIPM. There had also been some changes amongst the chairs of their Consultative Committees. He asked delegates to consult the BIPM website to catch up with those changes.

Dr Milton said that they had a staff of 71, but a very important addition to this was staff seconded from NMIs and designated institutes worldwide. They were very pleased that at the end of the current year, they would be welcoming their 100th seconded member of staff to the organisation. He indicated that they had been operating with about 30 secondees each year, amounting to around 10 full time equivalent staff, to add to the 71 staff. He commented that he was pleased that the secondees came from a very good coverage of Member States, as indicated on the slide.

Dr Milton next talked about the BIPM's Capacity Building and Knowledge Transfer activities (CBKT), which he said they had been conducting since the previous Conference in 2014, when their Member States had expressed their interest in being active in increasing the effectiveness with which Member States and Associates engage with the worldwide coordinated metrology system. Member States had been enthusiastic, but had not increased their dotation. Nevertheless, they had continued with a very successful and growing programme, based on specific grant funding from NMIs and Member States. They were very pleased to be taking it forward in this way, which made the programme a partnership.

They had three types of capacity building activities. There were workshop-based activities, which addressed key technical topics that had been identified as benefiting the system if capacity were improved. There were laboratory-based activities, and although Dr Milton said he did not have time to describe them in full, these were areas where there was benefit to their system if states with developing metrology systems improved their capacity in particular technical areas. Finally there were knowledge transfer update type activities. He highlighted that they could now say that over 75 % of their Member States and Associates had participated in the programme, either as trainees, as lecturers, or as sponsors. He mentioned that they had a web page, which described the detailed available opportunities, and described past achievements. There was always discussion about the impact of these activities, and they now had some case studies to show this. For example, they had run capacity building training for those identified as "leaders of tomorrow". These were individuals who would be coming forward to be the next generation of chairs in their system of subcommittees and technical committees. Fourteen new TC and working group chairs, as well as 12 existing chairs had benefitted from the training. Regarding the impact, they had a lot of statistics from the database, and he said he would talk more about the database later, but he said they could look at the extent to which their processes were delayed, and voting rights forfeited, because participants were out of time. Prior to the training, around 80 % of the voting rights had been retained, in other words 20 % were lost. After the training, there had been a clear increase to 90 % retention, so they had a 10 % increase in participation in the system. In fact they had halved the amount of defaulting in the system. Since then it had gone up by another couple of percent, so they could see real benefits from capacity building, with the individuals that would participate in the system in the future.

With regard to their liaison work, a key step had been the adoption of the new definitions of the SI. Dr Milton hoped that many delegates had joined with them and the BIML in celebrating World Metrology Day on 20 May, which of course was when the new definitions had come into force. On that day, they had published the new edition of the SI brochure, and he hoped delegates had seen the new cover. It was available from the BIPM website in English and in French, and he encouraged delegates to

download it. Dr Milton observed that it was something of a “living document”. When necessary small revisions could be made to it as issues arose.

The poster for World Metrology Day 2018 had been had been created by SCL in Hong Kong, China, and for the 2019 it would be created by AFRIMETS. He said that he was very glad that following work done by Mr Henson, they were close to announcing the poster for 2020, with which he thought delegates would all be very pleased.

Dr Milton continued that he would not say anything in detail about their laboratory work, but information would be included on the slides, if delegates wished to refer to them. What he could say, looking at the services was that in their programme since 2016, they had carried out more than 400 calibrations in their laboratories, and there had been nearly 400 participations in the key comparisons they conducted. There were 85 participations every month in the calculation of Universal Coordinated Time, more than 300 participations in the capacity building workshops, 51 in laboratory-based capacity building, and they had welcomed 43 secondees in that period.

Regarding coordination work, Dr Milton said this was based around the ten consultative committees of the CIPM, and the four joint committees. They had around 4 000 participations in meetings on their site each year, which were mainly related to these consultative committees. They were also very much involved in the maintenance of three international databases. These were the Key Comparison Database, which he would say a little more about later, the database for the Joint Committee for Traceability and Laboratory Medicine (JCTLM), which was a very important database addressing the needs of a particular part of the sector of laboratory medicine and clinical chemistry, and finally a new database that they intended to exploit more, and to promote better with potential users and stakeholders, which was the International Metrology Resource Registry (IMRR). This was a database in which NMIs and DIs could register available data that would be useable by, and useful to the global community. This would create one global point where this information could be accessed.

Dr Milton then described the Key Comparison Database which can be considered to be the central point for information about the CIPM Mutual Recognition Arrangement, the MRA. The MRA now involved the work of 262 institutes. The six regions were very much involved with the BIPM in implementing the measures of the MRA. At the present time they had more than 25 000 calibration and measurement capabilities registered on the database. Of course, all of these had been peer reviewed and put through the review system organised by the regions, and then coordinated by a joint body of the regions. The basis for all of those 25 000 claims was the evidence in the 1 600 comparisons which were also on the database. This year the BIPM was launching a new Key Comparison Database after about 16 years of success with the old one. He said that software moved on, so it would look different, and Dr Milton showed delegates a slide with an example page. He added that it would have some new features, such as extended search features. For those concerned with the processes, these would not be managed through a web portal, and the old days of e-mailing Excel spreadsheets would be over. It would now be a fully web-based process. He remarked that were looking forward to launching the new KCDB at the end of the current month.

Dr Milton said that he wanted to finish by saying a few words about collaboration between the BIPM and the OIML. They had been very honoured that Dr Schwartz had come, as CIML President, to the 26th meeting of the Conference, and had given a stimulating, forward-looking, and provocative presentation, which had triggered discussion about how the two organisations could work to develop new and greater opportunities. There were ongoing discussions between the CIML President and the CIPM President, and also between himself and Mr Donnellan. Their discussions had been about increasing their collaboration, mainly in two separate areas. Firstly collaboration on representation, which was about presenting the shared interests of the two Organisations better. He added that delegates had already heard about INetQI, an important global forum for promoting the importance of quality infrastructure. The BIPM was a participant in this network, and it was very much their mission to work with the OIML to ensure that the role of metrology was best presented in that forum. They also worked together at the World Trade Organisation Committee on Technical Barriers to Trade, and as Mr Dunmill had mentioned earlier, that had recently been an opportunity for the BIPM to work with the BIML to promote the value of metrology to WTO trade negotiators. They had also been working



together with the OECD, as part of their initiative on best practice on international regulation, where metrology had a great deal to contribute. The second area he highlighted was what he called joint strategic initiatives. He considered they had worked very successfully for many years on World Metrology Day as a joint BIPM/OIML endeavour. The 2018 and 2019 World Metrology Days had been the most successful of all. He remarked that delegates knew why there had been so much worldwide attention, but they wanted to continue at that high level of web presence, and the very high benefit to Member States of sharing a focus on World Metrology Day.

One of the steps would therefore be to work, together with the BIPM, to propose to UNESCO that this should become a UNESCO World Metrology Day. This would better enable the promotion of World Metrology Day to the network of educators and globally concerned scientific policy makers, who take part in UNESCO activities. It would provide another step up for joint BIPM/OIML initiatives. He said that there was a lot of work going on behind the scenes by the BIPM and the BIPM to move this forward.

Another example of a joint strategic initiative was the involvement, which was welcomed by the CIPM President, to collaborate on the BIPM's review, updating and broadening of the scope of the important OIML publication D 1 *Considerations for a Law on Metrology*. Although he had specifically mentioned two areas, their collaboration was not limited to these two areas, and the BIPM was open to further discussions. He observed that they faced the challenges of broadening the impact of what they did in order to address the global trend towards digitalisation, and he considered there was a lot to do between the two Organisations in collaborating in this area. The two Organisations were also both learning about the scope and benefits of e-learning, which was another area where he considered they could collaborate.

Dr Milton ended by thanking delegates for the invitation to hear an update from the BIPM.

Dr Schwartz thanked Dr Milton for his excellent and interesting report. He commented that Dr Milton had picked up exactly those points that were of interest to the OIML: the Capacity Building and Knowledge Transfer programme, and the new SI. He congratulated Dr Milton on the successful launch of the new SI, which had been an exciting event in November 2018 in Versailles. He had also mentioned World Metrology Day which was also of great interest for the OIML. He also thanked Dr Milton for picking up some possible areas where they could have a stronger collaboration, and said that he would like to mention that he had taken the opportunity the previous day to speak to Dr Milton about first the meeting of the joint task group which they would like to start, and he added that there may be an opportunity in February 2020 for him to meet the CIPM President, together with Dr Milton and Mr Donnellan, to consider the next steps towards a closer co-operation. There were no questions. Draft resolution 2019/12 read:

“The Committee,

Notes the report made by the BIPM, and

Thanks its Director Dr Martin Milton for providing this information to the Committee.”

Dr Schwartz said he would like to add a phrase saying:

“Supports a stronger co-operation between the OIML and the BIPM, through a joint task group to explore opportunities for closer cooperation towards the development of a common vision and a common concept of metrology as a key element of quality infrastructure.”

Dr Schwartz said they had discussed this previously, but he thought it was now the right time to put it into a resolution. He asked delegates if they were happy with the amended text. There were no comments. There were no abstentions, and no negative votes. The resolution was unanimously passed.

## 7.4 Update on the work of the Consultative Committee for Units (CCU)

Dr Schwartz continued that related to the collaboration with the BIPM, the OIML was also involved in the work of the Consultative Committee on Units, the CCU. The OIML's representative on the CCU, Dr Radu Lapuh (Slovenia), who was also a member of OIML TC 2 *Units of measurement*, had submitted a written report which had already been made available as an Additional Meeting Document. Dr Schwartz said he was very happy that the Slovenian CIML Member, Ms Vuković, was prepared to present a short summary of this report, and he invited her to take the stand.

Ms Vuković started by saying that as delegates already knew, the CCU, the Consultative Committee on Units, gave opinions or guidance on units to the CIPM. The CIPM then took decisions and informed the JCGM of the Metre Convention's position. She reported that Dr Lapuh had circulated an enquiry to all P- and O-members of TC 2 at the end of July, seeking their views and comments on the OIML's position on topics to be discussed at the CCU Meeting on 8 October 2019. The original deadline had been at the end of August, but this had been extended by a month.

Three topics were included in this enquiry. The first was about the term “unit”, and the second was about angles and dimensionless quantities. Both these topics remained under discussion. The third was a new initiative on the SI in the digital world, and here the aim was to develop the SI system in such a way that computers would be able to interpret measurement results and quantities unambiguously. The feedback from the OIML had been rather poor, as only four countries (Austria, Germany, Slovenia and the United States) had provided opinions and comments. Unfortunately, there had been no common position, so Dr Lapuh had not been able to present a common OIML position.

During the October meeting, the CCU had discussed the term “unit” at length. Currently the term “unit” was defined as “quantity”, but it had been proposed to change it to “value of quantity”. This was now the main topic of discussion. The unit “radian”, dimensionless quantities, and the unit Hertz had also been discussed and although a consensus had been sought during the lively discussions, they had not really resolved anything. However, it had been a good opportunity to present arguments for various positions amongst the CCU members. As a consequence, it had been decided to establish a working group “The CCU working group on units”, which would provide a scientific background from the available literature, aiming at finding a consensus on definitions and descriptions of the metrological terms. The CCU working group on units would provide a written report in a year's time, which would be available to CCU members and liaison organisations in order that they could make their own consensus positions on the topic clear. These positions would be collected by the CCU and discussed at its next meeting in September 2021. The process would therefore take at least two years before the CIPM position would be officially passed to the JCGM. Additionally to these topics, as a liaison organisation, the OIML would be asked to respond to a CCU questionnaire related to SI units.

Ms Vuković said that this concluded the report from Dr Lapuh. She emphasised that there was still time to be involved in these discussions and prepare a common OIML position.

Dr Schwartz thanked Ms Vuković and asked if there were any questions.

Mrs Lagauterie stated they had received the enquiry seeking the views of the OIML, but they had not replied because France's position, as discussed with her ministry, the laboratories, and the ministry of research, had been transmitted by the French member of the CCU, so they had not thought it would be useful to pass on their position via an intermediary. Their lack of a reply was therefore not as a result of a lack of interest, as France participated in and contributed to the CCU.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mrs Lagauterie for her comment. He suggested they now looked at draft resolution 2019/13, which read:

“The Committee,

Thanks Dr Lapuh from Slovenia for representing the OIML in the CCU and for his written report,

Notes the oral report given by Ms Vuković from Slovenia on developments in the Consultative Committee for Units the CCU.”

Dr Schwartz suggested they amended this, as the discussions were continuing, by adding:

“Requests OIML TC 2 to closely observe the ongoing discussions in the CCU on the definition on the term unit, on angles, on dimensionless quantities, and the SI in the digital world, and to facilitate a common OIML position if possible.”

Dr Schwartz thought it was important for the OIML to achieve a common position if possible, and to put this forward to the CCU, because they had a “voice” in the CCU and he considered they should take this seriously. He emphasised that as they had heard, they still had time to come to a common position. He checked that everyone was happy with the wording. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes, so the resolution was unanimously approved.

## **7.5 Updates by other organizations in liaison**

Dr Schwartz stated that they had received two written reports, from ILAC and the IAF. These organisations were not represented this year, but he was happy to announce three reports, which would be given by CECIP, UNIDO, and the OECD. He added that the latter would be presented by the BIML Director, Mr Donnellan. The CECIP report would be provided by Mr Tim Hamers, who was the Secretary General of CECIP, the European Weighing Instrument Manufacturers’ Association, who was attending the CIML meeting for the first time.

### **CECIP**

Mr Hamers thanked Dr Schwartz for the opportunity to present the CECIP report to the CIML. He said that CECIP represented manufacturers and importers of weighing instruments, as well as all companies in Europe providing weighing-related services. His presentation would focus on their international work, and on three points: their experience with OIML-CS type approval certificate acceptance, the voice of industry at an international level, and the global database they were working on.

With regard to the OIML-CS, as an industry they were very happy with the scheme. It was really well supported, and everything that resulted in more harmonisation and easier trade was supported by industry, because it made the lives of their members a lot easier. They were also very happy to see that less than two years after the introduction of the system, 31 countries were already Utilizers of the system, as mentioned yesterday. They hoped this number would increase in the future, but as with any system that had only been in place a short number of years, there were a number of small points that could be improved, so he would like to share their members’ experiences. This had been discussed internally within CECIP, and there were certain issues they wanted to bring forward, which hopefully would help to make the system even better.

The first point was related to acceptance, and he showed delegates a list, which although not to be considered in detail, showed that there were many countries that accepted OIML certificates already. On both the CECIP and OIML websites, there was information on certain extra conditions for acceptance. He showed delegates a slide with an overview of this situation taken from the OIML website, saying that what he wanted delegates to understand was that sometimes this information was not available on the OIML website. CECIP could only invite OIML Member States to provide this information so that it was all available and transparent for industry. This would make it easier for them, and would avoid any problems later on in the process. Other experiences were that in many countries, the national legislation for weighing instrument type approval was aligned with OIML Recommendations such as R 76 for NAWIs, but in many cases there was also national legislation which was quite different. They understood there might be good reasons for this, but as industry they could only say that they hoped for as much alignment with OIML Recommendations as possible, which would make it easier for them because they would not have to modify their instruments to suit different countries, and they also believed that OIML Recommendations provided state-of-the-art requirements.

Another problem which some of their member companies experienced with certain Member States was that when transferring OIML certificates from one OIML Issuing Authority to another, extra documents were sometimes requested. At CECIP they believe that the main purpose of the OIML-CS was to avoid as far as possible requests for extra documents. Here again, they hoped that in the future, when there was more trust in the system, it would work better, that fewer extra documents would be requested.

Another issue that had arisen during their internal discussions was the “family” concept. Most delegates had an idea of what this was, and it was described in OIML Recommendations, but their experience was that sometimes national interpretations were slightly different. When a manufacturer who was a CECIP member went to another country, it became clear that the interpretation was not always the same, which again created problems. For example, if there were three load cells and three indicators, was this considered as one family, or maybe as nine different families which might need nine type approvals. The same difficulties arose with the terms “module”, “master type”, “commercial name”, and “series”. Everyone had an idea what these terms meant, but in practice there were sometimes different opinions, and here they would like the OIML to work on clearer interpretations which were understandable, and also acceptable, to all. This would make life far easier for industry, and also for OIML Issuing Authorities. Looking at the good points, they found that the list of countries in which OIML certificates were accepted without any additional documents was impressive. He showed delegates a slide which he said was not a full list, but had been based on a quick analysis within CECIP.

Mr Hamers then gave a short summary of OIML-CS certificate acceptance, saying that there were many countries that accepted it already. At CECIP they believed they were on the right track, and they wanted to thank the OIML for this. There were still some countries not taking part, and they invited all of them to accept the system. There were also some categories not accepted in utilising countries, but they assumed that things would continue to progress as they had over the last eighteen months, and improve in the future.

One area in which they would like to see some improvement was the definition of the family and related concepts; a clear definition, and a clear interpretation, understandable and acceptable for all. Finally, they were also open to hearing what CECIP could do, or what the weighing industry could do, to motivate countries and to encourage them to participate in the OIML-CS. He asked any delegates who had any ideas to talk to him during one of the breaks.

With regard to what CECIP had been doing, Mr Hamers commented that delegates represented authorities from all over the world, and as an industry, they were also trying to work more closely on a global level. In June they had held a meeting for the fifth year of the weighing industry associations from several countries, including Japan and the US, which had also been in Bratislava. In July they had met the association from China, and their plan was to cooperate more and more in the future on several topics. One of the main topics was to raise one voice when commenting on OIML Recommendations. This was not easy because there were a lot of diverging opinions on these matters, but they believed that it was important for them, and also for the OIML, because for many issues it was easier when only one view was put forward on behalf of industry. This would also increase support for OIML work, so they could report that they were working on this, and as a result of a conference call to prepare for this meeting they had agreed to work on a process to provide joint comments. The idea was still in the experimental phase, but the idea was that in the future, for example on OIML R 51, they would provide comments that were not just from CECIP or JMF, but were joint comments from all associations. It should be noted that this would not happen all the time, so comments would only be from all associations when this was explicitly mentioned.

The final goal would be to always provide common feedback. Mr Hamers also wanted to mention that it entailed quite a long process to obtain these comments internally, since firstly they needed to be discussed within the individual companies which added a further two months, and then the association had to work on them, so if they only provided comments just before the deadline it was not because they were not doing anything, it was because the process took a while to complete. Overall the most important thing to remember was that in the future if a Project Group convener received comments on

behalf of several industry associations, this was because they were really working on this, and they hoped to provide these in the future.

The last point concerned how manufacturers who sold products all over the world could find out what the legal requirements were. The OIML was really improving this, but there were other requirements that were not always the same in each country. So how did they obtain this information? They had worked on this matter and agreed they would work on a global legal metrology database, which was currently under development, and would hopefully be available in the near future. They already had information from some countries, and they planned to expand this to make it easier for weighing instrument manufacturers to acquire information on the requirements all over Europe.

Mr Hamers concluded that this completed CECIP's presentation on the OIML-CS acceptance, on how they hoped to provide one voice on OIML Recommendations on behalf of industry in the future, and on their work on a global database. He thanked delegates for their attention.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Hamers for his very interesting report and said that he valued the feedback he had given them. He asked if there were any questions.

Mrs Lagauterie said that she was very happy about this initiative to have a common point of view between manufacturers across world, which she said would be very positive for the work of the OIML. She thanked CECIP for having undertaken this initiative. Manufacturers were of course also consulted by national authorities during the development of Draft Recommendations. She had a comment concerning some states' specific requirements for the recognition of certificates. She thought that the information on the OIML website about countries which asked for additional information could be a source of misunderstanding, especially concerning European countries, because in the CECIP presentation Mr Hamers had given the impression that some European countries accepted certificates without extra requirements, whereas others, such as France and the United Kingdom have additional requirements. She thought that all European countries should have the same note, which concerned the documentation, which is required by the European Directive, so all Notified Bodies must have the same requirements. She felt that this information, which had either been given by the Notified Bodies, or collected by the OIML, needed to be harmonised. She stressed that the same documentary requirements concerning certificate acceptance applied to all European Notified Bodies, and it was not something which was specific to France and the United Kingdom.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mrs Lagauterie for her comments, and added that he thought it was important to harmonise the understanding and application of the "family" concept, which could be the subject of a possible e-Learning module. It should be considered and should include the respective Technical Committee responsible for weighing instruments. He also wanted to wish CECIP good luck in obtaining joint comments on Committee Drafts. He thought it was a very good development, and due to the excellent work of the international coordination group that had been founded in CECIP some years ago. He also wished CECIP good luck in the further development of a joint position and better cooperation with the US Scale Manufacturers Association, as well as with Japanese and Chinese manufacturers' associations. He felt that this international cooperation was a very interesting development.

Mr Morayo Awosola (United Kingdom) stated he was the secretariat of TC 9/SC 2 and the convener of the project group to revise R 51, as well as for other automatic weighing instruments. He said he was grateful to CECIP for providing a lot of comments on some of the work he was doing. He thought one of the ways they could address the issue of the "family" concept was if CECIP could provide some more detailed input into what they would like OIML Recommendations to include regarding this, and then they could discuss this in the Project Groups. He thought this would be one of the quickest ways to resolve this issue.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Awosola and concluded this item. He thanked Mr Hamers again.

The second report would be provided for UNIDO, and given by Mr Juan Pablo Davila Sanchez, who was Industrial Development Manager at the Standards and Quality Infrastructure Division of the Department of Trade, Investment and Innovation of UNIDO.

## UNIDO

Mr Davila greeted the President and delegates and thanked them for their invitation to speak. He started his presentation with an overview of what UNIDO did, saying that they had a systemic approach to quality infrastructure development. He said he would continue with some specific examples of what they did in the area of metrology, and more specifically in legal metrology.

He stated that UNIDO was a specialised agency of the United Nations working on industrial development, and of course many areas of industrial development required accurate measurement and the need for sustainable quality infrastructure. Their work in quality infrastructure spans from supporting member countries in developing policy in different areas through to overall quality infrastructure, and supported standardisation bodies, metrology institutes, accreditation and of course conformity assessment as well as the enterprises themselves. All this was done with the aim of having a sustainable quality infrastructure.

As had been mentioned previously, they worked in different networks, one of these being the INetQI, the International Network for Quality Infrastructure, of which the OIML and UNIDO had been amongst the founding members, although as had also been pointed out, new members were joining the network. One of the key areas for INetQI had been to develop a common approach to the definition of quality infrastructure, and the previous year, the members including BIPM, IAF, IEC, ILAC, ISO, International Trade Centre, ITU, OIML, UNECE and UNIDO had agreed on a definition of quality infrastructure to establish a common framework. Based on this, delegates could see that UNIDO, as a UN agency, aimed for the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and metrology was a fundamental pillar of quality infrastructure. It affected different SDGs on prosperity, on the planet, and on its people.

One of the activities UNIDO had carried out with the OIML and the BIPM had been to develop a brochure outlining linkages between metrology and some of the key SDGs. Goal number one “No poverty” met the needs of people through a legal metrology system which aimed to ensure a level playing field for all in many fields of measurements. This would ensure that farmers, of which there were many in the member countries where they worked, would receive the correct payment for their produce, and consumers would receive the correct amount of goods for their money. Legal metrology controls, as delegates knew, improved economic conditions for all concerned and helped in poverty reduction. On SDG 3 “Good health and well-being”, delegates were also familiar with the impact of accurate metrology in medical devices, improving the quality of health of patients, reducing false positive and false negative test results. Mr Davila remarked that he did not want to preach to the converted, but he had wanted to highlight how they linked the role of metrology to the different SDGs which were their goals as a UN agency.

In the area of development, Mr Davila observed that it “took three to tango” meaning that as a UN specialised agency, they did not have their own funds to develop projects, unlike some other development organisations. They relied on their members, and more specifically their donor members, to enable them to set up a project in a specific country or region. They worked with their member states, and when they had the support of a donor country and a recipient country, they aimed to develop projects which might be global, regional or national, but which included the three elements: the donor, the recipient, and UNIDO’s capacity. Most of the time they linked with other international specialised agencies, and as mentioned the INetQI was one related to quality infrastructure and he drew attention to the outer circle on the slide currently on the screen, which indicated some donor agency partners which had funded some of their technical assistance projects.

Their approach to quality infrastructure also aimed at the larger scale, working with different key actors in quality infrastructure. At the governmental level, they supported governments in the development of policies and regulatory frameworks. Another actor was the quality infrastructure institutions, the key pillars of metrology, standardisation, accreditation, and conformity assessment services, as well as

other quality infrastructure services such as calibration and verification. At another level, other actors were the enterprises with whom they worked to upgrade their processes and their knowledge into how to produce better quality and use the services better. A key element in this was the consumer, with the idea that consumers who were well aware of the quality required for products would demand that enterprises increase their quality, and in turn those enterprises would make use of the different quality infrastructure services, which would at the same time make use of the pillars working within the regulatory framework. The aim was that the supply and demand of quality services matched, where the supply of quality services fitted the purpose of demands in different countries. In many cases, quality infrastructure was supply-driven, and delegates could see that some of UNIDO's member countries had equipment that was not fully exploited to the benefit of their enterprises and of their population.

In the area of governance, a definition of quality policy had again been agreed within the INetQI, and UNIDO had also contributed to the development of guiding principles in the development of quality policy.

Mr Davila then went on to be more specific about collaboration with the OIML over the years. Their work together had started in 2008 when they had both signed an MoU, and from that point they had been working together. Some periods had been quite intensive, and others not as intensive as they might wish, but this was not as a result of a lack of interest, but because as he had mentioned "it took three to tango" and their projects needed funding from their member states. They had contributed to the metrology publication that he had already presented, as well as on a recent publication on which they had collaborated with the OIML on the certification of measuring instruments. This contained guidelines outlining the requirements for the application process and participation in the OIML-CS, showing how this could be used to implement a national type approval system for measuring instruments. This publication was underpinned by relevant international standards and associated management systems requirements, along with some supporting OIML publications. He said this publication was available freely on the OIML and UNIDO websites.

Another highlight, and a step forward in this age of digitalisation, was that UNIDO aimed to see better ways to transfer knowledge through e-learning. Transferring courses and guidance into e-learning platforms was another objective they had in the short term. Mr Davila said that his colleague Dorina Nati had given a presentation at the OIML workshop which had taken place on the Monday of that week on their different initiatives and tools, and on digital metrology.

With regard to the future, Mr Davila said he had already mentioned the e-learning, and they were of course open to other areas of collaboration with the OIML. They were working with INetQI, and they would continue to work within this network for the identification of different projects. As an overview of the work they had done with the OIML in recent years, they had cooperated on the development of the Intra African Metrology System (AFRIMETS) Metrology School. The first edition had been in Nairobi in 2011, aimed at industrial and scientific metrology, and the second edition which focused on legal metrology had taken place in Tunis in 2014, where they had trained 87 participants from 37 African countries. Together they had collaborated in the development of the AFRIMETS road map, and regarding more specific quality infrastructure training, the OIML had collaborated closely in the provision of various training sessions over the last six years. Mr Davila explained that when they had a project in a region, they worked with other INetQI members to convey the objectives of the different international organisations. Experts provided this training to the different regions, and he showed delegates a slide showing some examples of these: Kyrgyzstan, Poland, Mozambique, Bahrain and the Caribbean. Mr Davila showed some slides containing details of these training sessions. He explained that the Knowledge Hub was a UNIDO initiative which digitised the training modules and activities that they had delivered. They had completed e-learning modules for quality infrastructure and trade, and now had a digital version of the training they had previously conducted in the different countries.

Finally Mr Davila stated he would not go through all UNIDO's work in metrology, but he had tried to give just some examples and the full presentation would be available for distribution. They worked all across the globe, in Latin America, Africa and Asia. Some examples of their work spanned from support for policy development, to capacity building and technical assistance for different laboratories, upgrading laboratories, for example in Sri Lanka, Mozambique, Nigeria, and Iraq. They were looking

forward to increased collaboration with the OIML in different platforms, and also with UNIDO's Member States since UNIDO was a member-based organisation with many of its members also being members of the OIML. He thanked delegates again for their invitation.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Davila for his very interesting report which he said had contained a lot of useful information. He said they were grateful for this presentation as well as that given by Ms Dorina Nati who had given a presentation during the e-learning workshop on Monday. As Mr Davila had already mentioned, his report would be available for distribution on the OIML website after the meeting. He added that they were a little behind their schedule and he therefore would suggest that they had the third report, on the OECD work, after the break.

### **OECD (International Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development)**

Dr Schwartz suggested that the Committee now heard the last report, an update of the OECD work, to be provided by Mr Donnellan.

Mr Donnellan thanked the President. He explained that unfortunately Ms Kauffman, Deputy Head of the Regulatory Policy Division of the OECD, had been unable to attend the meeting but had asked that an update be provided on the work of the OECD in relation to the regulatory partnership.

Mr Donnellan stated that he intended to give delegates an overview of the regulatory partnership in which the OIML participated. He wanted to do this by giving a little more context, from an OIML perspective, in terms of why the regulatory partnership of the OECD was important to the work they undertook.

Mr Donnellan informed delegates that the regulatory partnership of the OECD had started work in 2014, and between 2014 and 2017, the Regulatory Policy Committee of the OECD had produced a number of case studies on international cooperation of international organisations. One of these, published in 2016, had been on the OIML, and Mr Donnellan observed that this had been very pleasing.

Work had continued throughout 2017, with the launch of an e-platform, and the creation of five working groups. Later in 2017 there had been a brainstorming session on working group themes, and the establishment of a network of academic friends of the international organisation partnership.

In 2018 the fifth meeting of the international organisations and partners had taken place, and in May of that year an international organisation survey exercise had been launched. This had led to the development of the first draft of a brochure, published in April 2019, an example of which Mr Donnellan showed delegates on a slide. The brochure detailed the contribution of international organisations to a rule-based international system, and had featured the work of the OIML, amongst others.

Mr Donnellan went on to describe the key features and outputs of the cooperation with international organisations, and showed a slide indicating a structured framework for some 50 international organisation secretariats to discuss the quality of international rules, including collaborative work and working groups, establishing annual meetings and brainstorming sessions. Part of this process had been to look at the ways in which international and transnational organisations could work more collaboratively, and in doing so could reduce the burden on countries, better coordinate resources, look at better mechanisms for collaboration and cooperation, and learn from a number of different economies. Some of the analytical work had included cross-cutting sectoral work on the brochure, based on unique data collection points, as well as looking at international organisations and producing case studies. Mr Donnellan reiterated that the OIML had been the subject of one of the initial case studies, and they were very pleased to hear that the BIPM, their sister metrology organisation, would also have a case study produced very shortly.

In terms of the structure of the international partnership for regulatory cooperation, Mr Donnellan described it as a somewhat "defacto" organisation. He showed delegates a slide indicating that the partnership comprised 53 secretariats of international organisations. These ranged from metrology to animal health, economic development, trade policy, and so on. It also consisted of the group of



“academic friends”, which provided research on better practices within international organisations and looked at ways in which that collaboration, and those techniques and tools, could be better deployed to advance the governance and effective operation of international organisations. The OECD provided the secretariat, and Mr Donnellan remarked that he had been pleased to see that the facilitator role had been provided by one of the OIML Members of Honour, Mr Peter Mason. Mr Mason had had a long involvement with the OECD, and its international partnership for better regulatory cooperation over a number of years, so there was a direct linkage to the OIML which needed to be acknowledged. It also needed to be acknowledged that although Mr Mason’s role was that of an independent facilitator, nevertheless, this provided direct linkage to metrology, and Mr Donnellan thanked Mr Mason for his efforts.

The partnership itself was broken into five working groups. The first working group looked at the diversity of international instruments, the second looked at the implementation of those international instruments, the third looked at stakeholder engagement, which Mr Donnellan remarked was something the OIML was embarking on, adding that the BIML was working very hard to produce a stakeholder analysis, so that they could better meet the needs of their stakeholders. The fourth working group concentrated on evaluating the variety and effectiveness of international instruments, and working group five looked at coordination. Mr Donnellan pointed out that the respective focal points were indicated under each of those working groups.

Turning to areas of focus in the future, Mr Donnellan said that the organisation was moving forward on a number of draft initiatives, including the development of a survey in 2018. In the case of the OIML, this had been finalised earlier in 2019, and the OIML had provided input. Mr Donnellan showed delegates a slide illustrating the roadmap for the development of the publication, which was entitled “Contribution of international organisations to the rule-based international system”. The OECD, the secretariat, and the international organisations participating in the work had worked collaboratively with the focal points to ensure that the key messages and high level results of the survey fed into the brochure. Mr Donnellan added there was still some information that could be further unbundled from the survey, and qualitative information that could provide references to best practices, including some that the OIML could undertake. The surveys had also highlighted gaps within the work that needed further investigation. There had been 36 respondents to the survey, two of them being the OIML and the BIPM. The classification of these organisations’ organisational structure could be seen on a chart Mr Donnellan showed delegates. Most were intergovernmental organisations (of which the OIML was one) predominately based on treaties. There were also trans-governmental networks, or TGNs, in addition to private standard-setting bodies, as well as other entities. This work had particularly looked at the various instruments to support grouping and families. He commented that they had heard about families in the previous presentation, but said that this was a different group of families, in relation to the instruments international organisations could deploy, from a governance perspective, but also on decisions and policy statements, to improve the operations of the organisation.

The results of the work with working group 1 on instruments had helped identify a number of different patterns within international organisations. Mr Donnellan said some clusters could be seen on the slide. These ranged from treaties, which in the case of the OIML meant the Convention establishing the Organisation, mutual recognition agreements, work on technical standards, incentives, policy statements, and prescriptive instruments. Different international organisations would intersect with a number of those instruments and tools at different points. Some of them would have more of a preference for some than others, and some of them would not have certain instruments as part of the family of tools they could use.

In terms of the implementation of some of the tools and instruments that international organisations could use, Mr Donnellan showed a list and commented that these included assistance mechanisms which provided support to members, and compliance mechanisms to enable an international organisation to verify the implementation of instruments and support conformity. There were advocacy mechanisms to enhance the visibility of international organisations’ instruments and foster ownership by members of those instruments, and there were monitoring mechanisms. Some international organisations worked actively to monitor the implementation and uptake of those instruments within their member states. Mr Donnellan remarked that it was interesting to look at this from an OIML

perspective, particularly the critical role that data collection could play in evaluation. If delegates looked at the hierarchy or tree structure displayed on the slide showing the various ways that international organisations could work to provide value to their members, particularly considering the context of the documentary standards that the OIML produced, there were 14 international organisations from the survey which reported formal evaluation requirements or processes. The slide indicated the different requirements and processes as well as the number of international organisations using them. There were different mechanisms that an international organisation could utilise to evaluate the effectiveness of its recommendations. One of the key factors in the international partnership for international organisations was understanding who international organisations consider to be their stakeholders. These might be other intergovernmental organisations, international NGOs, academic institutes, private sector entities, individual experts, consumers, etc. The key conclusion was that many different stakeholders were considered by transnational governmental networks and international organisations to be their stakeholders. The OIML, as he had already mentioned, was in the process of understanding who the OIML stakeholders were in a deeper and more co-ordinated way, which fits into best practice from an international organisation perspective. Delegates could see some of the ways the organisations cooperate, such as by means of soft mechanisms, written guidelines, or formal instruments such as MoUs, and others, which considered how to promote co-operation and avoid overlaps.

Lastly, the work on unbundling the information provided in the 2018 survey by the OECD would continue, and a compendium would be produced. They would also continue to build on what was considered good practice at a domestic level, and through this work with the international partnership, the OECD would work to breach the national and international divide and look at how international organisations could go beyond existing practices and anticipate better ways of doing things. Lastly, Mr Donnellan told delegates that the OECD planned to undertake its next technical meeting in November 2019, followed by its annual meeting in March 2020, where the compendium and other outputs of the international partnership would be released, to the benefit of all 53 participating international organisations. Mr Donnellan thanked delegates for their attention.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Donnellan. He suggested that because of the limited time available before the lunch break, they should now consider draft resolution 2019/14 which read:

“The Committee,

Notes the reports and presentations from the following organisations in liaison:

- CECIP,
- IAF,
- ILAC,
- OECD, and
- UNIDO.

Thanks their representatives for providing this information to the Committee.”

There were no objections to this wording. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was unanimously passed.

## **8 Countries and Economies with Emerging Metrology Systems (CEEMS)**

Dr Schwartz introduced the next item which concerned Countries and Economies with Emerging Metrology Systems (CEEMS). The report on this would be given by the CEEMS AG Chairperson, CIML Past President Mr Peter Mason.

### **8.1 Report by the CEEMS Advisory Group Chairperson**

Mr Mason thanked the President. He agreed that there was a lot to report and stated that his presentation had been extended to include the report on the e-Learning workshop which had taken place the previous Monday.

As in previous years, delegates had received a written report on the work of the CEEMS Advisory Group, which had been finalised after the meeting which had taken place on the Monday prior to the Committee meeting. He urged delegates to read it for a full account of the work which had been carried out in the CEEMS pillar of the OIML's work. He said he would refer to the headlines rather than go through it all in detail.

Mr Mason reported that the meeting of the CEEMS AG had been a large and diverse meeting with important representatives. It would not be possible to hold a meeting other than in association with the CIML meeting, but he thought this was an arrangement that had worked very well. Of the current 20 members of the Advisory Group no less than 15 had been present at this meeting, which was very encouraging. The report recorded that they kept track of their activities through a work programme, which had also been made available to delegates as Annex A of the annual report. Mr Mason wanted to concentrate on seven main areas of activity over the past year.

The first activity was the work which had been done on continuing to develop the CEEMS pages on the OIML website, which now included the database of experts who were available for consulting work. Mr Mason encouraged delegates to look at these pages, and provide any feedback or comments on areas for improvement.

The second area of activity had been to finalise the strategy for OIML Training Centres and OIML Training Events. This was in a Basic Publication which would be presented for approval later in the Committee meeting. Mr Mason wanted to pay tribute to Dr Peter Ulbig, who had lead the working group, supported by Mr Guo Su, who had carried out an enormous amount of work in a very short time to get that document finalised, and in a position to be approved. OIML Training Centres continued to be promoted while the strategy was being finalised. One had been held in Hangzhou earlier in 2019, which had concentrated on the OIML-CS. It had already been mentioned several times during this meeting, and had been very successful. In the report, there was also reference to an event which would be taking place in Brazil the following month, but after he had finalised the report he had been informed that this had been postponed. However, Mr Mason said he believed there was still the intention to hold it, and he added that he was extremely grateful for the enthusiasm and commitment their Brazilian colleagues had shown in taking this forward.

The fourth area of work the Advisory Group had done had been on developing the suite of e-Learning modules, and he would say more about this when he reported on Monday's workshop. This had taken the work done in the Advisory Group, and had given it a much wider scope, and stronger momentum; he repeated he would give more details about this later.

With regard to the fifth area of activity, the development of proposals for a scholarship programme for future leaders in CEEMS, Mr Mason wanted to pay a special tribute to Mr Guo Su who had spent a lot of time in developing this idea, and Mr Mason said he would give some more details about this later in his presentation.

The sixth area was work carried out with their colleagues in Australia as they developed a proposal for a pre-market surveillance pilot project, and Mr Mason pointed out that delegates had already heard

about this in the RLMO Round Table presentation. Mr Mason observed it was an interesting example of an activity which belonged at the regional level. It was being considered, and hopefully would be approved by the APLMF at its meeting later in 2019. It indicated how their Australian colleagues had been able to benefit from the advice and input of the experts the OIML brought together.

The seventh and final activity he wanted to highlight was that following the decision made the previous year, the CEEMS AG was now supervising the revision of three important Documents. Mr Mason added that he would say a little bit more about D 1 *Considerations for a Law on Metrology*, but he also wanted to report on the positions concerning D 14 *Training and qualification of legal metrology personnel* and D 19 *Pattern evaluation and pattern approval*.

The revision of D 14 had encountered a slow start because of a change in the individual that had intended to be the convener for this project. Mr Mason was pleased to report that a new convener had been found, Dr Cord Mueller of the German Academy of Metrology (DAM). He had now received his convener training and it was hoped that work on that could start very soon.

With regard to D 19, there had initially been some technical problems in setting up this project group. This was because the OIML website had not been designed to set up projects which were not supervised by Technical Committees or Subcommittees. These problems had now been solved, and when he had last looked at the website, there were eight participating members. Mr Mason said he was pleased to report there would shortly be a ninth, namely the United Kingdom, and that they had volunteered to take over the convenership, for which he had previously been responsible, which was very welcome. While they had been forming the Project Group, they had been able to do some important work on developing the Document, so there was already a Working Draft on the project's workspace, and he hoped the Project Group would find it easy to move to the Committee Draft stage quite quickly. He also wanted to record that, as in the past, the AG's work had been guided by the CIML's resolutions in this area, and the previous year the CIML had adopted a new resolution 2018/15 which guided and informed what they should be doing. As in previous years, Mr Mason said he had prepared for the benefit of the Committee an assessment of progress so far against the various elements of that resolution. He commented that it was early days, there were some areas where more progress had been made than in others, although he thought that overall they were making a very good start on what he expected to be a four- or five-year programme of activities. He encouraged delegates to look at this and said he would be happy to take any questions on it at the end.

There was also some information in the annual report about changes in the leadership of the Advisory Group, but he had agreed since that was ultimately a matter for the CIML, the President would speak on this at the end of his presentation.

At the meeting on Monday, they had managed to take forward the work which had been discussed the previous year of designing a new identity for CEEMS work. As delegates had heard, CEEMS was now seen as the third pillar of work within the OIML, and having a separate identity was something they believed would help in locating quickly the pages of relevance to CEEMS on the OIML website. They also believed that such branding would be useful in distinguishing OIML Training Centres and OIML Training Events that were supported by the OIML under the terms of the new strategy.

The previous year there had been concerns that the initial logo designs were too similar to those that had been produced for the OIML-CS, but Mr Mason was glad to report that since then there had been further work done to make the CEEMS design less likely to be confused with that of the OIML-CS. He displayed it on the screen, saying that he thought it met everything they were after, although there was still some work to be done to ensure that it was technically reproducible. Subject to this work, delegates should be seeing more of that identity as they moved forward.

The next item Mr Mason wanted to mention was the scholarship programme for future leaders in CEEMS. He reminded delegates that this was something which had been identified as a need in virtually every survey that they had carried out since 2014. It is linked to the acknowledged problems of not just getting the amount of people required to carry out the legal metrology tasks in each country, but ensuring that they had the right competencies, and crucially then being able to retain them. Mr Mason commented that they thought a scholarship programme could be an important part of addressing these

issues. He stressed it was also significant that many of the other bodies within INetQI had similar schemes, and added that they had already heard during Mr Milton's presentation about the much bigger and much more developed scheme that BIPM had been running for a few years. The CEEMS AG thought there was a need to make a connection between the CEEMS work and the work of the OIML itself. The strategy was based on those areas which involved providing services to the OIML, or giving talented individuals the opportunity to contribute to the OIML and to take part in its core work. The objectives were to increase the number of talented people, to optimise the arrangements within the OIML itself, and to promote the value to the individuals themselves of the competencies they would be developing, and then to apply these talents to the OIML's core work.

At the moment they were considering four strands of activity. One of these was to develop nominated individuals, who would be seen as the future leaders, not just within the NMI community, but also within legal metrology authorities. The second was to develop individuals who appeared to have the potential to play an important role in the OIML's technical work. The third was to develop individuals who would have the potential to participate in the work of the OIML-CS. The fourth strand was to recognise that they also needed to develop a network of champions across the CEEMS community, who themselves would be involved in developing capacity schemes within their own administrations. The proposals that had been put to the CEEMS AG on the previous Monday involved some quite detailed suggestions and ideas on the methodology that might be adopted, and they rightly identified the importance of resources being applied to a programme of this nature. Mr Mason commented that those resources would come from the host countries, often in the sense of providing assistance in kind by simply hosting visits, but sometimes also by financial commitment. What they had identified was that it really was important to "crawl before you could walk" in this area and therefore they would be looking to pilot these ideas. What they had agreed to do was to give a broad welcome to the ideas. They would not necessarily adopt the strict and detailed methodology at this point, but would ask Member States to look into opportunities for developing pilot proposals in consultation with the secretariat to see if they could make a proof of concept by getting some visits and some hosting programs off the ground on a pilot basis.

The next item Mr Mason wanted to talk about was the revision of D 1. He estimated that D 1 had been referred to more than hourly so far throughout the CIML meeting, and he emphasised it was recognised as a very important Document. Its title was currently "Considerations for a law on metrology". He said that in recognition of its broader scope and importance, they were looking to retitle it. It would still be referred to as D 1, but was now seen as being advice, primarily to policy makers, on how to develop a national metrology system, and how to develop the institutional and legislative framework needed for that system. As had already been mentioned, D 1 was also seen as a joint publication of the BIPM and the OIML, and unlike other OIML International Documents, he was already "seeing" this being published on paper with a glossy cover, rather like the publication on the SI units. It would have both BIPM's and OIML's identities equally prominent on the front cover.

In 2018 they had started on a fairly limited revision, so what he had produced at that point had aimed to clarify the relationship between voluntary standards and compulsory technical regulations in the legal metrology field. It had also attempted to face up to the fact that legal metrology was used in two completely different ways, and that different people use them in different ways. It was sometimes described as the application of legal requirements to metrology, but often as the exact opposite, the application of metrology to legal requirements. Both of these approaches were important, but Mr Mason thought there was a clearer explanation in the proposed new Document.

From the outset, they had wanted to provide a better description of the concept of a national quality infrastructure, as it had developed in recent years, and the place of metrology within that infrastructure. At the more detailed level, they had considered this had been a good point in time to consider some of the confusion around the market surveillance terminology, which he thought was often encountered in legal metrology.

Finally they had been going to tidy up some of the basic terminology, most notably the reference to a national legal metrology institute, which Mr Mason said he had never considered was a good description of any approach he was aware of, in those countries which did not give the responsibility entirely to

their NMI. Mr Mason stated that the previous year, as delegates would recall, they had been pressed to perform a more radical revision, and this had actually meant a complete rewrite. A lot of the material was still recognisable but it had been moved around completely. He explained that following an introduction, there was now a part which described the importance of metrology in terms that would make sense to policy makers. Next was a full description of the concept of a national metrology system, as it was now recognised, including not just the public authorities, as represented in this Committee meeting, but also all the private sector participants, right down to the commercial calibration laboratories and so forth.

Next, there was a description of how that national metrology system itself should be seen as part of a wider national quality infrastructure. As a separate and prominent part, there was then a short discussion of the role of government and its importance in all aspects of metrology. The Document then moved on to a description of the international dimension, and Mr Mason observed that it was curious that this was something which had not received much treatment in the 2012 edition of D 1, so they had greatly expanded this. Next, they had brought together, hopefully in neutral language, the policy options that faced governments when they were designing a national metrology system. These were not intended to be prescriptive, but rather were intended to identify the questions that each government needed to ask about how it should be proceeding. Following this there was a chapter on what they called “legislating” for metrology. This took the old considerations of the law and separated them out into three elements. One was a general discussion of what approaches were available when developing a law on metrology. They had then put into separate annexes the old “elements” – the things that had appeared in boxes in the 2012 edition. These had now all been brought together to form a kind of checklist. Then, because so many people had said that the detail of the law of metrology was still very helpful, they had retained that, and although there had not been much change in the language, it was now clearly identified as a separate annex, which some countries could use if it fitted with their approach, but did not need to.

Mr Mason continued that he had provided delegates with a list of the items which were new in D 1. He said he would not go through each of them in turn, but urged delegates to refer to the presentation to remind themselves of what to expect in the new Document that was not in the old one. Mr Mason particularly mentioned the fact that they had made a deliberate decision to look at the APLMF/APMP Guide 1, which had been a very useful source of information as an approach on how to describe the international system, and also addressed some aspects which oddly had not been included in D 1:2012 about regulation and enforcement choices. They had also been a bit more “up front” about the funding issues associated with metrology systems. Input from the BIPM meant they were now much more confident that the description of the work of NMIs, and the CIPM MRA was up to date and accurate.

In terms of the next steps, Mr Mason wanted to put on the record that they were hoping to move to the Committee Draft stage within weeks, and at that point the text would be available on the Committee Drafts part of the website. They would also invite comments from their colleagues in INetQI, as Mr Mason considered it was important that they should have the opportunity to feed into what had been done. Mr Mason thought that with some slight compression of timescales, there was a good chance of them being able to adopt a Committee Draft by March, and if that was the case, they would be able to have a full length CIML Preliminary Ballot, and the Final Draft Document would be available in time for the following year’s Committee meeting to approve it. Mr Mason added that the BIPM would have to go through a parallel process of approval, and he remarked that they were not sure whether they had quite worked out what this would look like yet. He stressed they were both aiming for approval the following October if they could possibly achieve it.

Finally, Mr Mason wanted to talk about the e-Learning workshop, which he observed many delegates had attended. It had consisted of three elements. The first had been an explanation what existed at the present time, and they had heard very interesting presentations from Phil Sorrell from the APLMF, and from Dorina Nati of UNIDO. They had also had explanations of what had been done within the IEC, and what the OIML had already done with the ACP EU TBT Programme a couple of years ago. Secondly, they had then split into 13 groups which had worked with an extraordinary level of participation, allowing them to have a very clear indication of what was seen as the needs and priorities.

They had then moved to the important question of what should be done in the future, not just at the workshop itself, but at the CEEMS AG and at the RLMO Round Table. Mr Mason showed delegates a slide of the common priorities, commenting that he did not think there were any surprises there. He submitted that the top five were probably exactly what any of the delegates would have predicted as being in the top five. Of interest in the list was that there were some similarities about the audiences for e-Learning, but some differences as well, so they would have to think in different terms about how they made e-Learning available if they followed these priorities. There had been an agreement that the outcomes would be fed back to the CEEMS AG and the RLMO Round Table, and that thereafter the CEEMS AG would probably be asked to develop a proposal which would be put forward to the Committee meeting. Following the Advisory Group meeting, the key finding was that not only should this be an area of priority for the OIML, but that in most cases it was something that they would have to do. The OIML had a particular responsibility to the rest of the worldwide legal metrology community, and it was felt that this subject was not one where the OIML could sit back and leave it to others.

The work needed to be done in five key areas:

- the first was to follow up these questions of priorities, to make sure that they were concentrating on the most important things first;
- the second was that they needed to build into the process ways of securing expert input, particularly from Technical Committees for the technical publications, but also input from others, especially as they moved into more difficult areas like software;
- the third element was that they had to work out how to collaborate with others including the RLMOs. They had very good relations with the APLMF, and New Zealand had made a very generous gesture to make their material available to put on the OIML website, but there were also other forms of collaboration that they needed to think about. It made no sense for two people to be developing the same product separately in different parts of the world;
- the fourth area was that they had to make sure that they did have a fit for purpose platform, and the technology they were currently using would allow them to do all of the things that currently seemed to be needed, including interactive quizzes and competency tests, the ability to monitor usage and to assess the competence of individuals taking the e-Learning;
- the fifth and final area was the issue of money. They recognised that it was necessary to ensure that this was something that could be funded and maintained in the long term. One of the things they had learnt from UNIDO's presentation was the difficulties of only having project funding. e-Learning should be a continuous activity, and the OIML had to find a way of building that into its budget.

Mr Mason said this concluded what they had decided. He said that he had left the slide up that had been prepared for the e-Learning seminar because he wanted to thank the participants and speakers but also particularly Phil Sorrell and Dorina Nati, as well as Ian Dunmill who had given two presentations, and also the team behind it including Bob Joseph Mathew and Peter Ulbig, who had put in an enormous amount of work to make it a very successful seminar. He emphasised that the CEEMS AG should also be thanked. The OIML could only work with the participation of a large number of the Committee members present, being able to get speakers and experts to contribute, in conjunction with a dedicated team within the BIML, and he wanted to thank Mr Donnellan for his personal commitment and also Mr Ian Dunmill and Mr Guo Su for all of the work they had done to make it possible to present this very full explanation of what they had been doing under this pillar of the OIML's work. He thanked the Committee for their attention and stated he was happy to take questions.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Mason for his comprehensive report which had touched on several important items such as the revision of D 1, the e-Learning concept, and the leadership of the Advisory Group. He wanted to express his thanks to the CEEMS AG, and in particular Mr Mason, Mr Guo, and the other members of the BIML that had made this possible. He said he had been really impressed at the level of participation in the CEEMS workshop and the resulting level of discussion indicated the importance of this third pillar of the OIML work.

Mr Rifan Ardianto (Indonesia) wanted to make a suggestion on the revision of D 1. He thought there was something missing with regard to the various chapters. He asked if it would be possible for them to consider a chapter or part on the role of society and how it could contribute to metrology, because as they knew, the government role is not only about developing metrologists, but also about how society is engaged and involved in the development of metrology.

Mr Mason thanked Mr Ardianto for his suggestion. He indicated that this subject was covered in chapter two, where the Document talked about the importance of metrology. He agreed with Mr Ardianto that they had to make sure that it would be relevant to consumers and society as a whole, and that there needed to be an understanding of what a metrology system did for the people they were there to protect. It was interesting that this had also come up on several occasions in the discussions about e-Learning. Hopefully, it could be used to inform society, and that if they understood, it would make the job of the OIML easier. Mr Mason highlighted that there were plans to build on some of the thinking that was already evident in the new D 1 during an important initiative in the ASEAN region on improving the awareness of consumers in society of the importance of metrology.

Mr Yizhi Qin thanked Mr Mason for his excellent report. The Chinese delegation wanted to express their appreciation for the progress made in the AG activities. As delegates would know, China had been deeply involved in the CEEMS AG work since 2013. Together with the OIML, the BIML, and the APLMF, they had organised seminars and offered training courses. With the support of the OIML, they had established the first OPTC in Beijing, and had also organised a new one in Hangzhou. China was continuing to support AG activities to promote the construction and development of CEEMS. China would also play an active role in the AG and would continue to conduct relevant training courses and research activities in the name of OIML training centres. In the AG team, China would continue to help draft the rules and procedures of documents, and he hoped they would be deeply involved in the revision of D 1. He hoped that the AG would have a very bright future, which China would fully support.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Qin for his comments and for the commitment he had expressed.

Mr Vasconcellos (Brazil) wanted to confirm their invitation to host a seminar in Brazil the following year, and since he would be working on this, he would like to know about any necessary arrangements.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Vasconcellos for this announcement and offer.

Mr Klenovský enquired about the source of information for the new revision of D 1 and said he had been wondering why the OIML's own Documents on *Principles of metrological supervision* and *Principles of metrological control* had not been taken into account.

A delegate from Saudi Arabia thanked Mr Mason for his work which was very much appreciated. He knew that Mr Mason was working very hard to enhance, promote and develop the CEEMS activities in order to achieve the strategy of the CEEMS AG and the Organisation, but he wondered whether there were any KPIs being taken into account in order to achieve the objectives of the strategy in order to develop and avoid weaknesses in the programmes.

Mr Mason replied that there were no specific KPIs yet and he thought it was a good idea to start thinking about that. He considered there were some informal ones, and key amongst these were the figures for membership of the OIML. The rationale for this work was that they could be seen to be relevant to and offering something to all of the 122 Member States and Corresponding Members that had signed up to participate particularly since that number had grown during the time they had been doing this work. One of the others was the level of participation, and he was not sure they were quite where they wanted to be in this area, especially in the technical work, although it had been very encouraging to see the much improved level of interest in the OIML-CS. Mr Mason suggested this could be considered a KPI. Mr Mason agreed that this point should be considered. At the moment they effectively “colour coded” the various points of the resolution, and he thought they needed something more sophisticated than that.

Dr Schwartz said that regarding the revision of D 1, Mr Mason had said that they were aiming for this to be a joint publication of the OIML and the BIPM, which he thought delegates would support. On the other hand, following on from his discussion the previous day with Dr Milton concerning the approval procedure at the BIPM, he was not so sure that the BIPM could meet the timescales they had in mind



for the project. He suggested that the objective should be to submit the Final Draft Document for approval at the next CIML meeting. Of course they welcomed the idea of a joint publication, but if it was going to take too long for the approval process to be completed at the BIPM, in order not to delay the development and approval of the revision of D 1, he would suggest that it should be published as an OIML Document, which naturally would contain an acknowledgement of the BIPM's contributions, and the support of the BIPM. There would be another opportunity for a joint publication with the next revision in two or three years' time. He wanted to caution against waiting any longer, and stated that the aim was to approve this the following year.

Mr Mason replied that his understanding was that the status of approval by the two organisations would only really affect the front cover, so it would be quite possible for it to be published as "OIML D 1", and then, if formal approval from BIPM came later, they could simply put a new front cover on the Document which indicated that it was a joint publication.

Dr Schwartz observed this was a very pragmatic approach.

Dr Schwartz continued that Mr Mason had already mentioned in his report concerning the future leadership of the CEEMS AG and that following his retirement from active duties within the Chinese administration, Mr Pu Changcheng had indicated that he would not be seeking a further term as chair of the Advisory Group. The Advisory Group had discussed its future leadership, and had put forward the recommendation that the current Vice-Chairperson, Mr Peter Mason, be appointed as Mr Pu's successor. According to the provisions of B 19, it was also suggested that Dr Peter Ulbig from the PTB be appointed as the new AG Vice-Chair. Recent discussions had also suggested that it may be helpful if B 19 contained a formal procedure for identifying or selecting candidates for the leadership positions. At the moment there were no formal procedures, which gave them a lot of flexibility, but the Advisory Group had proposed to start a revision of B 19 to include these procedures in the future. The Advisory Group also felt that, given the growing amount of activity it was now supervising, it might be desirable to consider the provision of two Vice-Chairs, and the group believed that the revision of B 19 to cover this point would also be desirable. Dr Schwartz mentioned that four draft resolutions would be put forward for approval by the CIML, covering all the aspects that Mr Mason had mentioned, as well as the leadership of the Advisory Group. Dr Schwartz suggested that delegates now considered these four draft resolutions.

Mrs Lagauterie asked if delegates could be given an idea what route the project for the revision of D 1 would be taking because they had not seen the Document yet. She asked if it would be distributed for consultation soon, as she understood they wanted a quite a short approval period.

Mr Mason said there would actually be a meeting of the Project Group that afternoon. They had been fortunate since all but one of the Project Group members were in Bratislava at the present time. Subject to the discussions at that meeting, he expected they would be able to publish a first Committee Draft at the beginning of November. As with all Committee Drafts, this would be publicly available. They would expect all Member States to be made aware of this, because of its importance. It was also something they hoped would trigger some conversations and liaison with their colleagues in INetQI. They had already had some indications from the IEC and ILAC that they would have wanted to be liaisons on this project, but he proposed that they would include them all. They could not vote on a first Committee Draft, and normally there was a three-month commenting period for Committee Drafts. Mr Mason was proposing that if they could encourage the Project Group's members to comment early, he hoped to be able to move to a second Committee Draft in time for this to be approved at a formal Project Group meeting, which they expected to hold in March. Most of the people involved would be present, or would be able to hold proxies for this meeting, which would take place in the same period as their bilateral and quadrilateral meetings with the BIPM, ILAC and ISO. If this approval was possible, this would allow them to start a CIML preliminary ballot in April, with the full three months voting and commenting period. He said they had a very capable drafting team, so any comments that were received during the preliminary ballot process would be able to be taken into account and included in the Final Draft Document. He concluded that that was the sort of timescale they had in mind.

Dr Schwartz asked delegates to consider the first draft resolution concerning the CEEMS AG no. 2019/15. He read:

“The Committee,

Notes the report on the activities of the CEEMS Advisory Group,

Welcomes the proposal to develop a scholarship scheme for leaders of tomorrow,

Encourages Member States to explore opportunities for taking part in pilot projects by acting as hosts and sponsors, and

Emphasises the importance of OIML D 1 *Considerations for a Law on Metrology* and requests the appropriate Project Group to do all in its power to produce a Final Draft Document which can be adopted at the 55th CIML Meeting in 2020.”

In order to get the full picture, Dr Schwartz suggested they looked at the other draft resolutions at the same time. He read the second one, no. 2019/16:

“The Committee,

Thanks Mr Pu Changcheng for his initiative in the establishment of the CEEMS Advisory Group, and for his leadership as its chairperson,

Noting the recommendations of the CEEMS Advisory Group,

Appoints Mr Peter Mason as the chairperson of the CEEMS Advisory Group for a three-year term, and

Appoints Dr Peter Ulbig as vice-chairperson of the CEEMS Advisory Group for a three-year term.”

Dr Schwartz continued by reading the third draft resolution, number 2019/17:

“The Committee,

Noting the discussions in the CEEMS Advisory Group on the lack of a procedure for the selection of its chairperson,

Requests the chairperson of the CEEMS Advisory Group to develop proposals for an appropriate revision of OIML B 19 *Terms of Reference for the Advisory Group on matters concerning Countries and Economies with Emerging Metrology Systems (CEEMS)*.”

Finally Dr Schwartz read draft resolution 2019/18 on the e-Learning seminar:

“The Committee,

Thanks Dr Bobjoseph Mathew, Dr Peter Ulbig, and the BIML for having organised the workshop on e-Learning which took place on Monday 21 October 2019,

Thanks Ms Dorina Nati from UNIDO and Mr Phil Sorrell from New Zealand for their excellent presentations at this workshop,

Considers that the development of an e-Learning concept for the benefit of the legal metrology community and others should be a priority activity for the Organisation.

Instructs the CEEMS Advisory Group to establish one or more ad hoc working groups to develop, with the assistance of the bureau an e-Learning concept taking into account the following elements:

- 1) a summary analyses and prioritisation of the outcomes of the e-Learning seminar,
- 2) the optimum means of capturing expert input from Technical Committees and developing and maintaining high quality content,
- 3) collaboration with other appropriate organisations,
- 4) consideration of the appropriate platform and technology for the e-Learning concept,
- 5) consideration of appropriate funding mechanisms and sources.

Instructs the BIML Director to take into account this e-Learning concept when preparing the budget in the 2021-2024 financial period to be presented to the 16th conference in 2020.”

Dr Schwartz considered this was a complex package of draft resolutions. He thought some delegates may not feel in the position to vote on them at present, and suggested they might prefer to read them carefully. He enquired whether they felt ready to vote on these four draft resolutions or whether was any reluctance to vote on them at the present time.

There were no objections so Dr Schwartz suggested they took a vote.

Before the vote, Mr Mason had a comment. In his capacity as Chairperson of the Advisory Group, he felt the Advisory Group was there to give advice and he was slightly worried about use of the word “instructs”. It was well established that the CIML instructed the Bureau to do things, but it was really more appropriate to write “requests the CEEMS Advisory Group” rather than “instructs the CEEMS Advisory Group”.

Dr Schwartz asked if delegates were happy with the wording in draft resolution 2019/15 (the first of the four draft resolutions on CEEMS activities). There were no objections to the wording. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was unanimously passed.

With regard to draft resolution 2019/16 on the leadership, there were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was unanimously passed.

With regard to draft resolution 2019/17 on the revision of B 19, there were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was unanimously approved.

Finally on the last of the four resolutions, 2019/18, there were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was unanimously passed.

Dr Schwartz thanked delegates for their unanimous support. He thanked the Advisory Group for its work, and Mr Mason for his excellent work and for his report.

## **8.2 Report by the BIML on activities in connection with CEEMS matters**

Mr Dunmill stated that there was no report to be made under this item because there had been no specific CEEMS-related activities organised by the Bureau this year due to the financial constraints. Other interactions and collaborations with other organisations had been covered under the item on liaisons earlier in the meeting, and had mainly concerned meetings on quality infrastructure.

## **9 OIML Certification System (OIML-CS)**

### **9.1 Report by the OIML-CS Management Committee Chairperson**

Mr Oosterman greeted delegates, saying he would take them on a journey through the history of the OIML-CS, since some of those present were new to it.

The OIML-CS was a system for issuing, registering, and using OIML Certificates, together with a type evaluation report and test reports, under the requirements of OIML Recommendations.

In 1992 they had started with the OIML Basic Certificate System, which operated using self-declaration for the Issuing Authorities. There was no accreditation, and CIML Members had been deemed competent to designate their Issuing Authorities.

In 2005, they had launched the OIML Mutual Acceptance Arrangement (MAA), to have more confidence in the capabilities of the Issuing Participants. The MAA had started with three Recommendations: water meters, load cells and non-automatic weighing instruments, for which Issuing

Participants needed to provide evidence of their capabilities in the form of accreditation or peer assessment.

In 2018, the OIML-CS had started because the MAA had been running in parallel with the Basic Certificate System, and to have two systems in parallel was difficult for users to understand. They had been confused about whether a certificate had been produced under the MAA or under the Basic Certificate System. There had also been a need to increase the number of Recommendations in the System, as well as for more rules and procedures, and a need for more awareness, so that more Certificates could be issued. Again, he emphasised the importance of having one single system.

Looking at the structures, under the OIML-CS they had a Management Committee, a Review Committee, a technical forum, and quite an extended documentation system. Mr Oosterman pointed out to delegates that the number of OIML Issuing Authorities was quite large compared to those under the MAA, as well as there being more test laboratories and manufacturer's test laboratories. Looking at the Utilizers and Associates, there had been a large growth in the number of participants, and recently Kiribati and Rwanda had joined the System. The current System was a single Certification System with two schemes – Scheme A and Scheme B. In due course, Scheme B would disappear, so there would only be Scheme A certificates, where OIML Issuing Authorities had to prove they were competent to do the work. Mr Oosterman reported that there had been a meeting of the OIML-CS Management Committee in the Netherlands, and he would highlight the main issues that had been covered. They had asked the Management Committee participants about their experiences, as the OIML-CS had now been running for more than a year. One of the comments had been from Colombia, which said that the result of having joined the OIML-CS had been that more than 100 OIML certificates had been transferred to national type approvals. This had been exactly what they had wanted to achieve with the OIML-CS.

There were some items to which they needed to pay more attention, especially accreditation. He added that he had spoken to some delegates that morning, who had told him they wanted to include a legal metrology expert in their assessments, but their accreditation body had not understood why they would do this, so they needed to raise more awareness about this with accreditation bodies. Manufacturers had also raised concerns about the acceptance of old test results, especially with regard to liquids and gas flow. They wanted to know whether they could still use these test results, which had been expensive to carry out. There was also the problem of whether there were enough test facilities available within OIML Issuing Authorities. Participants had indicated that they could do more work on the forum of technical experts to exchange information. OIML Issuing Authorities that had participated in the MAA had needed to report continuously about how they did their work, and there had been problems in finalising the documents on this. At the OIML-CS MC meeting, all OIML Issuing Authorities had provided their reports on time. The Management Committee had therefore been able to review their participation on time, and thus they could continue to work under the OIML-CS, which was a big improvement.

The Management Committee had also discussed additional national requirements. They knew that a number of countries had some requirements in addition to those in the OIML Recommendations, and there had been a question as to who would evaluate these. The Management Committee had agreed that the Review Committee would not be responsible for this, and that it would be up to each Member State and each OIML Issuing Authority to ascertain whether they could accept these test results or not, and to develop a procedure for these additional national requirements.

They had also discussed field testing. Mr Oosterman reminded delegates that he had already mentioned that test results for gas meters and flow meters were quite expensive due to the cost of the test facilities, and OIML Issuing Authorities did not always have technical capabilities for these tests. After the Management Committee meeting they had visited Euroloop, a gas and liquid installation in the Netherlands, and had been shown how the test data from field sites was used in the OIML-CS; they had then agreed in the Management Committee that they could use these test results. The Management Committee also had to approve legal metrology experts and OIML Issuing Authorities, and a lot of work was done by the Review Committee. It had held a meeting, chaired by Dr Harry Stolz, in conjunction with the Management Committee to prepare the voting for the Management Committee, and they had been able to vote for additional experts and participants in the OIML-CS as well as

extensions of scope. Furthermore, they had been able to continue this work after the meeting, so the Review Committee had given its advice using the workspace, and the Management Committee had been able to do their voting online. This had helped keep the OIML-CS running.

They had also worked with the Maintenance Group. They had discussed the field tests, as previously mentioned, but also the use of the same test laboratories by different OIML Issuing Authorities. This was an interesting topic, because currently test laboratories were directly related to an OIML Issuing Authority, but they had discussed whether it was possible for another OIML Issuing Authority to use test data from that same test laboratory. The discussions had revolved around whether to consider simply the competence of the test laboratory, or whether they should retain the current situation of an OIML Issuing Authority and its related test laboratory. Mr Oosterman reported they would work on a procedure for this.

They had also indicated a need to be more involved in the development of Recommendations, because in the Management Committee they knew which Recommendations needed to be developed in the future from manufacturers' requests, as Mr Dunmill had mentioned earlier. They were still receiving questions on how the OIML-CS worked. Mr Oosterman commented that UNIDO had already developed a very helpful guidance document, but there would also be a guidance document from the Management Committee to explain how the OIML-CS worked.

They had also established a working group on ISO/IEC 17065. One of the requirements in B 18 was that OIML Issuing Authorities should comply with this standard, and by 2020 they would need accreditation to this standard. They had noticed that this could be quite a burden for some OIML Issuing Authorities because a limited number of certificates were being issued, while they did have another system in place, for instance ISO/IEC 17020. They were now looking at an approach offering alternatives to ISO/IEC 17065 to reduce the burden for OIML Issuing Authorities. This would be considered at the next meeting. For the moment, the Management Committee had decided that self-declaration would be allowed to continue for an extra two years to establish what was really needed by OIML Issuing Authorities. Mr Oosterman remarked that they needed some time to develop this.

They had also performed a gap analysis, which was needed when a new revision of a Recommendation was published, in order to know whether OIML Issuing Authorities and test laboratories were prepared for it. They had prepared a gap analysis for R 60:2017 which had been provided to OIML Issuing Authorities.

Mr Oosterman reminded delegates that he had reported in a previous meeting that they had rescheduled the steps from Scheme B to Scheme A. There had been a requirement that R 60 and R 76 would move into Scheme A. This had been done, and certificates had been issued for this, so they had also stopped issuing Scheme B certificates for R 60 or R 76. R 49 had also moved into Scheme A, and Scheme B had been stopped, and more recently they had done the same for R 51 and R 117. Currently applications were already running for R 51 and R 129. The Management Committee had agreed that they needed more gap analyses, so they would know whether OIML Issuing Authorities wanting to change to Scheme A did comply with the requirements of new Recommendations.

Looking at the current operation of the OIML-CS, if they considered the number of certificates issued compared with 2018, there had been an improvement. He showed delegates another slide, observing that they could see that weighing was still the most important part of the OIML-CS, so they needed to improve on other Recommendations, such as R 117, where he thought more certificates would be issued following its transition to Scheme A. Considering transition to Scheme A, OIML Issuing Authorities had to move, and currently applications were ongoing for the Recommendations that would shift to Scheme A on 1 January. The Management Committee had also discussed the different approaches of peer assessment and accreditation. They had noticed that there was currently a difference between peer assessment, which was performed every four years, and accreditation, where annual assessments were required. If OIML Issuing Authorities expanded their activities, they needed more people to conduct their assessments. Mr Oosterman showed delegates a graph which indicated the burden this subject placed on OIML Issuing Authorities. He said that OIML Issuing Authorities might consider this as a threat and decide not to extend their scopes further, because it was getting too expensive. The experts also had to participate in this four-year cycle, so they were currently looking at whether the assessment

programme could be changed so as to reduce the burden whilst retaining trust in the OIML Issuing Authorities' competence. They had established a working group to examine this question, and had also agreed that this work would be done in liaison with the IAF, as Mr Dixon had already explained.

They had also discussed the issue of the “golden sample” and how they could ensure that production was consistent with type. Mrs Himba Cheelo (Zambia) had made the comment that “the child [the OIML-CS] has been born, but now it has to learn to walk”, explaining that a number of countries felt that they could transfer OIML certificates into national approval certificates, but regretted that afterwards, there was no system available to ensure consistency of production. Management Committee members agreed that there was a need for a conformity to type system within the OIML-CS. They had also discussed a certification mark, and the need to consider certificate validity, because technology changed with time.

They had also put a lot of effort into promotion of the OIML-CS. A lot of workshops had been held, such as a UNIDO seminar in Nigeria. GULFMET had also taken the initiative of bringing a number of countries together to become acquainted with the OIML-CS, and this had resulted in a number of new OIML Issuing Authorities and Utilizers. In WELMEC, particularly in the European Commission Working Group on Measuring Instruments, it had been acknowledged that the OIML-CS was now running. COOMET had run workshops and meetings, and in the APLMF, Mr Guo Su had organised a meeting for 20 people, but they had ended up with 150 participants. Individual countries had also initiated activities. As he had mentioned already, Colombia, which had transferred 100 OIML-CS certificates into national approvals, had held a seminar in their country to inform authorities and manufacturers.

Mr Oosterman reported that manufacturers had also become more involved in the OIML-CS. They were the users of the OIML-CS, and industry federations such as AQUA for water meters, CECOD for liquids, and CECIP for weighing had participated in the Management Committee meeting. The OIML-CS had also been promoted at manufacturers' events such as Metering China in Wuxi and Interweighing China. In Wuxi there had been 300 manufacturers of electricity meters, and they knew that in the next cycle of Recommendation transitions, electricity meters would transition into Scheme A.

They had also established a working group for raising awareness to produce materials such as e-Learning modules or interactive materials on websites to give more awareness about the OIML-CS. Mrs Lagauterie had mentioned there was one on the European approach. There were 30 countries in Europe, so they should expect there to be 30 Utilizers, but currently they only had ten. They had established correspondence tables between the OIML Recommendations and the European Directives, so in principle, all the Notified Bodies in Europe were Utilizers, but they were not registered, which was something they had addressed at the Working Group on Measuring Instruments.

Comparing the current situation with the problems identified in 2013, when there had been an unsatisfactory level of acceptance of OIML certificates, Mr Oosterman said that this had now been resolved. Concerning the level of participation, as he had previously mentioned, all of the OIML Issuing Authority annual reports were made available for the meeting, and they had been able to continue with more participants than had taken part in the MAA. There were now many more instruments covered by the OIML-CS, and they also now had a better structure, with the Management Committee, the Review Committee, and the Maintenance Group. They now had a single system with Scheme A and Scheme B, and Scheme B would disappear in time. OIML Issuing Authorities and Utilizers were now participating in the Management Committee and a lot of work had been conducted on awareness.

Mr Oosterman said that of course there could be improvements to the OIML-CS. He had already mentioned the question of the golden sample, which indicated the need for a conformity to type system. Also, they needed to review the balance of costs and trust for OIML Issuing Authorities, to ensure they continued to participate and extend their scopes. They should also consider help with the identification of which Recommendations were important for the OIML-CS, and they needed support from CIML Members through participation in the OIML-CS. They currently had no specific recommendations for the CIML. The next Management Committee meeting had been scheduled for the week of 16 March 2020 in New Delhi in India. Mr Oosterman announced that he would not be chairing that meeting, as

he was leaving NMi and moving to scientific metrology from 1 November 2019, so he would have to step down as Chair of the Management Committee but he was sure that the Vice-Chair would take over.

Before leaving he wanted to list a few items which were on his “bucket list”. Technology was changing very fast. Looking at energy meters, the European Commission had adopted a directive in which they wanted to balance the network as there was too much fluctuation in the supply grid. This meant that electricity meters needed to be able to switch provider perhaps every 15 minutes. As an example, he said that with the Internet of Things, a washing machine might wait to begin its cycle until the cheapest energy was available to it. If there was a lot of wind, there would be cheap wind energy, but when the wind dropped and the sun shone, cheaper energy would become available from solar systems. Since these forms of energy might come from different providers, the energy meters would have to switch providers, which meant that their software was very important. Mr Oosterman said he very often heard that instruments for measuring the speed of vehicles needed certification.

He had just read an article that the European Commission wanted all new vehicles in Europe to be equipped with speed control systems by 2022, in which case there may no longer be a need for speed meters at the side of the roads. He played delegates a short video by NIST, where they had developed a method to measure very tiny flows. These micro flows could be used for example to deliver the correct doses of insulin if you were diabetic. He was closely involved with a project at present to do with contraception for women. There was the oral pill or large devices implanted in women’s wombs. Current research indicated that these had an effect on women’s overall health, including on their mental health, which was affected by the hormones produced by the large devices. This increased the suicide rate by 20 percent. Using tiny flow meters, NIST had developed a method for measuring micro flows, but the question was how these could be included in the OIML-CS.

Mr Oosterman thanked delegates for their attention.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Oosterman for his excellent, very informative and lively report. Unfortunately, it had been his last report as the Management Committee Chairperson because as he had stated, he would be leaving NMi Certin at the end of October and would be taking on a new post at VSL Netherlands. Fortunately, the Deputy Chairperson, Mr Bill Loizides, was ready to step in until a new Chairperson was nominated and appointed at the next CIML meeting. There was no time for questions, so he asked delegates to consider draft resolution 2019/19. This read:

“The Committee,

Notes the report of the OIML Certification System (OIML-CS) Management Committee (MC) Chairperson,

Thanks the members of the MC, the Review Committee and the Maintenance Group for their work,

Thanks Mr Cock Oosterman for having served as MC Chairperson since the launch of the OIML-CS,

Requests CIML Members to promote the benefits of the OIML-CS to stakeholders in their country, and

Requests OIML Issuing Authorities to promote the benefits of the OIML-CS to manufacturers in their country.”

Dr Schwartz commented that the last two phrases took up the respective proposals which had been made by TG23. There were no objections to the wording. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was unanimously passed.

## 10 OIML publications and projects

Dr Schwartz welcomed delegates back. He commented that the next session would be very important as they would be electing the Second Vice-President, but before that there was the item on OIML publications and projects. Dr Schwartz said he was very happy they had received a couple of final draft publications submitted for approval by the CIML, and asked Mr Dunmill to take the floor.

### 10.1 Items for approval by the CIML

#### 10.1.1 Final Draft publications submitted for approval by the CIML

Mr Dunmill said that before going into the individual items to be approved, he needed to remind delegates of the voting rules. Recommendations, Documents, and Basic Publications were approved if:

- 75 % of CIML Members were present or represented,
- a vote was cast by at least 80 % of those CIML Members present or represented, noting that abstentions, blank, and null votes did not count as votes cast. So in the case of this meeting, they were really only concerned with the abstentions, but if delegates abstained, it was not counted as a vote cast, and
- 80 % of the votes cast were in favour.

Mr Dunmill stated they would go through each of the publications which had been put forward for approval by the CIML. In each case he would give delegates some history, the results of the voting at the preliminary ballot, and then they would be asked whether they wanted to abstain, so that they would know how many votes had been cast. They would then be asked whether they wanted to vote no, and this would give the final number of Members that had voted in favour. First, they needed to carry out a roll call to see who was present, in order to establish the correct figures and percentages for delegates who had cast votes.

Mr Dunmill proceeded with the roll call:

Albania.....	present
Algeria .....	not present (no proxy)
Australia.....	present
Austria.....	present
Belarus .....	present
Belgium.....	present
Brazil.....	present
Bulgaria.....	present
Cambodia .....	present
Canada .....	not present (proxy given to Australia)
Colombia.....	not present (proxy given to Germany)
Croatia.....	present
Cuba .....	present
Cyprus .....	not present (proxy given to France)
Czech Republic .....	present
Denmark.....	not present (proxy given to Sweden)
Egypt.....	present
Finland .....	present
France.....	present
Germany.....	present



Greece ..... not present (no proxy)  
Hungary ..... not present (no proxy)  
India ..... present  
Indonesia ..... not present at the moment  
Iran ..... not present (no proxy)  
Ireland ..... present  
Israel..... not present (proxy given to Germany)  
Italy ..... present  
Japan ..... present  
Kazakhstan..... not present at the moment  
Kenya ..... present  
Korea (R.) ..... present  
Macedonia..... present  
Monaco ..... not present (proxy given to France)  
Morocco ..... not present (no proxy)  
Netherlands ..... present  
New Zealand ..... present  
Norway..... present  
P.R. China ..... present  
Pakistan..... not present (no proxy)  
Poland ..... present  
Portugal..... present  
Romania ..... present  
Russian Federation..... present  
Saudi Arabia..... present  
Serbia ..... not present at the moment  
Slovakia ..... present  
Slovenia ..... present  
South Africa ..... present  
Spain ..... present  
Sri Lanka..... present  
Sweden..... present  
Switzerland ..... present  
Tanzania..... present  
Thailand ..... present  
Tunisia ..... not present (no proxy)  
Turkey..... not present (no proxy)  
United Kingdom..... present  
United States ..... present  
Viet Nam..... present  
Zambia ..... present

Mr Dunmill announced that 81 % of Members were present or represented, so the voting could take place at this meeting because more than 75 % of Members were present or represented.

He moved on to the first publication for approval.

**D 31 General requirements for software controlled measuring instruments**

Mr Dunmill stated that a CIML preliminary online ballot had taken place on this Document, with a deadline of early July 2019. They had received 31 responses out of the 61 Member States, all of which had been in favour. This Document had been developed on an extremely tight timescale and the turn-around by the convener following each round of voting had been extremely quick and efficient, but in the last stages, there had still been a number of comments. Delegates would see in a moment that there was a proposal for a new project to continue with this revision, but the convener had felt it important to draw a line, so that something could be published and used, but to propose an immediate revision to continue to deal with the comments received. At the moment, delegates were being asked to approve the Document as it had been presented to them in July 2019, and then later they would be asked to consider a new project for this continuing work.

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments on the proposed approval of this revision. There were none. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The Document was approved unanimously.

**New Document: *Reference standard liquids – Newtonian viscosity standard for the calibration and verification of viscometers***

Mr Dunmill reported that the CIML preliminary online ballot had been completed in January 2019. They had received 36 responses from the 61 Member States. There had been three abstentions, which if he remembered correctly, had been mainly due to countries feeling they did not have the necessary expertise to give an opinion because this subject was not regulated in their countries. There had been 33 yes votes, and again there had been no negative votes.

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments. There were none. There was an abstention from the UK. There were no negative votes. The Document was approved.

**New Document: *Conformity to Type (CTT) Pre-market conformity assessment of measuring instruments***

Mr Dunmill reported that the CIML preliminary online ballot had closed in March 2019. They had received 34 responses from the 61 Member States, and all of these had been positive.

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments on the proposal to approve this new Document. There were none. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The Document was approved unanimously.

**New Basic Publication: *Rules for the use of OIML logos***

Mr Dunmill reported that the CIML preliminary online ballot had closed at the end of April 2019. They had received 35 responses from the 61 Member States, all of which had been in favour. Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments of the proposed new basic publication.

Mr Marcin Mikiel (Poland) stated that Poland was in favour of this publication, but their proposal was that it should become a brand book in the future.

There were no further comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The Basic Publication was approved unanimously.

**New Basic Publication: *Framework for OIML Training Centres and OIML Training Events***

Mr Dunmill said that this publication set out a set of rules for the events they had been running now for some years on an ad hoc basis, trying out different models for setting up the training events and training centres. This publication would set out some rules to add formality to the procedures. There had been a CIML preliminary online ballot which had closed in July 2019. They had received 36 responses from the 61 Member States, which had all been positive.

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments on this proposed new Basic Publication. There were none. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. This new Basic Publication was also approved unanimously.

### **Revision of R 117 *Dynamic measuring systems for liquids other than water***

Mr Dunmill reported that the CIML preliminary online ballot had just closed in September 2019, and at the beginning of this CIML meeting, the President had asked for this to be put on the agenda. Mr Dunmill added that he knew the US wanted to make a short presentation and make some comments on R 117.

Dr Ehrlich said he wished to make some introductory comments and would then ask Mr Richter to elaborate further on the situation regarding R 117. He hoped that delegates had had an opportunity to look at the documents that had been posted on the OIML website pertaining to R 117. He apologised for the late submission of this, but the feeling of the USA was that since R 117 had made very good progress during the course of the year, and because of its importance as a high priority project, and since in July it had also entered Scheme A in the OIML-CS, they considered it would be useful to have it approved at this CIML meeting so that certificates could be issued based on the latest version, rather than on the previous version. Dr Ehrlich asked Mr Richter to explain what had happened with R 117 during the course of the year.

Mr Richter (United States) said that he was the convener of the R 117 Project Group. At the time of the previous CIML meeting in Hamburg, the 2CD package had been in the middle of being finalised for voting and commenting. It had gone out in December 2018, and had closed in March 2019. The 2CD had passed the Project Group voting with 100 % consensus, and participation had been very high from the 25 P-members in the Project Group. However, as anticipated, this huge document, which was almost 700 pages long, had received 50 pages of non-editorial comments. They had already anticipated this, and had scheduled a meeting in Cape Town, South Africa, in March 2019, just a couple of weeks after the 2CD voting had closed. Their gracious hosts had held a four-day meeting, at which, because they had had so many comments on so many different items, they had split up into project teams. He showed delegates a slide of some of the team leaders from all over the world. Following the new rules in B 6 which explained how to deal with a significant number of non-editorial comments on an approved CD, they had created a 3CD at the meeting, which they had then had voted on and approved, because they had had a significant number of attendees and proxies. The 3CD had been approved with 100 % consensus at that meeting. The 700-page Draft Recommendation had then been prepared, and had left the Project Group to undergo CIML Preliminary Ballot.

Mr Pulham and Mr Mussio from the BIML had helped significantly with turning the 3CD into a Draft Recommendation. The CIML Preliminary Ballot had started in June 2019 for the required three-month period, and had closed towards the end of September. It had received 100 % votes in favour. Even though a couple of pages of comments had been received, in the end only two minor editorial changes had been made following the preliminary ballot. Mr Richter stated it was his position that now, since they had had three rounds of 100 % yes votes on the 2CD, the 3CD, and the CIML Preliminary Ballot, this draft was ready for publication, and that it would not really benefit anybody to send it for another round of voting. In conclusion, Mr Richter said he would also like to thank many of delegates in the room, who had significantly assisted with this project over the last couple of years, either through having their staff participate and send comments, or having their staff attend the meetings. He had also sent a few e-mails out to ask for proxies, and he had been very happy with the responses. He again expressed his gratitude to the BIML editorial team, who had done an excellent job in a very short time.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Richter for giving delegates this background information. He wanted to remind everybody that all the relevant information, including the PowerPoint slides just presented, had been uploaded by the BIML as Additional Meeting Documents two days previously. In his opinion, this Committee meeting was a very good opportunity to have this high priority Recommendation approved, and he hoped the Committee was ready and willing to vote on the revised R 117. They had learnt from the e-Learning seminar the previous Monday that this was one of the most important Recommendations besides R 76. They could always resort to an online vote after the meeting, but there was a certain risk

that this would not be successful due to poor response levels, and therefore a risk that it would be delayed for a further year. He hoped the Committee felt ready and willing to vote on the revised R 117 during this meeting.

Mr Dunmill stated that two decisions needed to be made. Firstly, a decision on whether the CIML accepted to vote on this considering it was not within the normal procedures, and secondly on the approval itself.

He asked if there were any comments on the procedure for putting this forward for a vote at this meeting. There were no comments and so the decision to accept the proposal to vote on the Final Draft Recommendation revision of R 117 at this meeting was approved unanimously under resolution 2019/20, which Mr Dunmill read:

“The Committee,

Considering the remarks made by its President,

Considering the report by the USA on the status of the project to revise R 117 *Dynamic measuring instruments for liquids other than water*,

Decides to accept the proposal to vote on the Final Draft Recommendation revision of R 117 at this meeting.”

Mr Dunmill confirmed that this meant that the Members would be happy to vote on the approval of the Final Draft itself. There were no comments.

Mr Dunmill continued that as usual with the approval of technical items, as the Committee would consider one single resolution on the complete list of the Recommendations, Documents, and Basic Publications he had just presented to delegates. He explained they would now be asked to take one formal decision to approve all of these Final Draft publications. Since they had had no comments or abstentions so far, except the one from Poland, Mr Dunmill verified that delegates were happy with the wording of the resolution on the screen.

Dr Schwartz wanted to mention that the BIML had begun to show its appreciation of the work of successful Project Groups by writing an official letter to the Project Group conveners. He thought this was a very good idea and should be continued, and he would like to suggest they added a thank you to the Project Group conveners to this resolution because they, and all their Project Group members, had done excellent work. He particularly mentioned D 31 and R 117, but included all the other finalised Final Draft publications. He hoped delegates would agree to this being added to the wording of the draft resolution.

There was a short pause while Mr Dunmill added this to the wording of the draft resolution 2019/21, which now read:

“The Committee,

Approves the following Final Draft Publications:

- Revision of D 31 *General requirements for software-controlled measuring instruments*,
- New Document *Reference standard liquids (Newtonian viscosity standard for the calibration and verification of viscometers)*,
- New Document *Conformity to Type (CTT) - Pre-market conformity assessment of measuring instruments*,
- New Basic Publication *Rules for the use of OIML logos*,
- New Basic Publication *Framework for OIML Training Centers and OIML Training Events*,
- Revision of R 117 *Dynamic measuring instruments for liquids other than water*,

Thanks the relevant Project Group conveners and members for their work in completing these projects.

He continued by asking again whether delegates had any comments on the resolution. There were none. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. That list of publications was therefore approved unanimously.

Mrs Lagauterie commented that she thought it would be useful to record the fact that the decision that had been taken by the Committee to vote on R 117 did not respect the procedure laid down in B 6. She emphasised that it was important to register this as a CIML decision.

Mr Dunmill clarified that Mrs Lagauterie would like this to be a separate resolution.

Dr Schwartz suggested that they drafted a resolution that could be considered the following day<sup>1</sup>.

Mr Dunmill confirmed that the following day, they would be considering all the resolutions they had taken, and in almost all the cases they had already been approved. To his recollection, there was only one so far that they needed to come back to, but they would all be read out, and if they had not been voted on they could be officially approved at that time.

### **10.1.2 New projects for approval by the CIML**

Mr Dunmill stated that the next item concerned consideration by the CIML of new projects submitted for approval.

#### **10.1.2.1 Revision of D 31 *General requirements for software controlled measuring instruments***

The first of these was the revision of D 31. As he had just mentioned, there had still been technical comments when the last round of voting had taken place on D 31. He observed it was clearly a field where things changed very quickly. The convener, in the interests of the efficiency of running the project, and to complete some form of revision so that people had something concrete to work on, had decided to reject some of the technical comments in the later stages, in order to conclude the project. He had suggested that the best idea would then be to start a new revision straight away, and his opinion, based on the way the project had run so far, was that this may end up being an ongoing project. He would be considering the comments already received, working through a number of new CDs, and was anticipating that during that time, the same situation may arise, just because software was a very quickly evolving field. This was why he had put forward a proposal for a new project. The convenership would be with Germany again. Mr Dunmill verified that Germany had nothing to add.

Mr Dunmill said there was a proposed resolution on this and he read draft resolution 2019/22:

“The Committee,

Approves as a new project, under the responsibility of OIML TC 5/SC 2, the revision of D 31 *General requirements for software controlled measuring instruments*, to be conducted as specified in the project proposal provided in Addendum 10.1.2.1 to the Working Document for this meeting.”

Mr Dunmill asked if anybody had any comments either on the project proposal or on the resolution. There were none. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The project was approved unanimously.

#### **10.1.2.2 New publication: R 87 *prepackage template***

There was a proposal for a new project to develop an electronic template for the control of prepackages. Delegates had received the details of this in an Addendum. This proposal had come from South Africa, who had been responsible for R 87. Mr Dunmill asked if the South African delegate wished to comment.

Mr Marneweck (South Africa) explained that the need for developing such a template had been highlighted to them through the various OIML Training Centres at which an OIML technical specialist had presented training on prepackages. These various OIML Training Centres had identified that there

---

<sup>1</sup> BIML note: Resolution 2019/20 is included in the text above in order to group together the decisions of the Committee under the respective topic headings, for subsequent ease of reference.

was a need, especially for CEEMS, who did not have expertise in developing statistical methods, for such a template to determine statistically the compliance of prepackage sampling results. They had approached Mr Marneweck as the secretariat of TC 6 *Prepackages* about such a need, which had then been relayed in this submission to the CIML.

Mrs Lagauterie asked if this document should be a revision of R 87 or perhaps a guide for the application of R 87.

Mr Dunmill noted that since the project proposal had actually been put forward, at the last minute before the full package of documentation had been put to the CIML three months prior to the CIML meeting, a comment had been received that the final title and form of the document would not necessarily be quite the same as was being presented at the current time. There had been other projects where the final title or even the type of publication had been left to the Project Group to consider, so at the present time it was not clear, as Mrs Lagauterie had suggested, whether it should be a Guide or an amendment to R 87. He asked if Mr Marneweck had any further comments.

Mr Marneweck stated that it would definitely not be a revision of R 87. This would be a guide for the interpretation of the statistical method, to make a template available for CEEMS to use when they carried out prepackage inspections, in order to decide on the compliance or non-compliance of the sample that would then be selected for testing. It was basically an inspection template which they could use and which could be trusted and utilised without needing to have a high level of expertise.

Mr Dunmill added that it was a little bit of a departure from other publications, in that there was an electronic aspect to this. They would produce a PDF file, as they usually did, but there would also be a spreadsheet as far as he had understood, which would enable the calculations to be made. The actual form, title, and type of document, would be something that would be decided during the project's development.

There were no further comments.

Mr Dunmill read draft resolution number 2019/23:

“The Committee,

Approves as a new project, under the responsibility of TC 6, a new publication, provisionally titled *R 87 prepackage template*, to be conducted as specified in the project proposal provided in Addendum 10.1.2.2 to the Working Document for this meeting.”

There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The project was approved unanimously.

Mr Dunmill realised he had forgotten to display the text on the screen, but referred delegates to the details of the project that had been provided in the Addendum which they had been given in July. It would take place as a normal project under TC 6 and would be convened by South Africa.

### **10.1.2.3 Revision of R 142 *Automated refractometers: Methods and means of verification***

Mr Dunmill stated that the details of this proposed project had been given in an Addendum. He added he did not have any more details on this project and asked Mr Mussio if he knew anything more about it.

Mr Mussio said he did not know anything beyond the proposal.

Mr Dunmill read draft resolution number 2019/24:

“The Committee,

Approves as a new project, under the responsibility of TC 17/SC 2, the revision of R 142 *Automated refractometers: Methods and means of verification*, to be conducted as specified in the project proposal provided in Addendum 10.1.2.3 to the Working Document for this meeting.”

There were no comments on this project proposal. Four Member States: Colombia, Germany, Israel and the UK abstained. Mr Dunmill stated that this result was still within the number of allowed abstentions. There were no negative votes. The project was approved.

**10.1.2.4 New publication: *Rotary viscometers – Determination of dynamic viscosity – Verification method***

Mr Dunmill stated that he did not have any other details on this project other than those delegates would already have seen in the Addendum which had been presented in July. The proposal had been a project put forward by Iran, which was not present, so they could not obtain any supplementary information from the project proposer.

Mr Dunmill read draft resolution number 2019/25:

“The Committee,

Approves as a new project, under the responsibility of TC 17/SC 5, a new publication *Rotary viscometers - Determination of dynamic viscosity - Verification method*, to be conducted as specified in the project proposal provided in Addendum 10.1.2.4 to the Working Document for this meeting.”

There were no comments on the proposal. There were three abstentions from Germany and via proxies to Germany from Colombia and Israel. There were no negative votes. The project was approved.

**10.1.2.5 Revision of B 11 *Rules governing the translation, copyright and distribution of OIML Publications***

Mr Dunmill stated that finally, as had been mentioned by the President at the beginning of the meeting, there was a proposal for new project, the details of which could be found in an Additional Meeting Document which delegates would have received two days prior to the current discussion. It had been posted on the OIML website, and delegates had been informed by e-mail about this. Mr Dunmill asked if anyone wished to make any comments.

Dr Ehrlich stated he wanted to provide some background. He apologised for the late submission of this project proposal and said he would explain the reason for this. B 11 was a very short publication, and it allowed other standards organisations to take OIML Recommendations in their entirety and publish them, but it did not say what should happen when a national or regional organisation did not want to use the whole Recommendation, but rather use most, or part of the Recommendation.

Dr Ehrlich continued that in the US they were working with one of the national standards development organisations to harmonise US requirements with one of the OIML Recommendations. In the negotiations, especially with the legal department of the standards organisations, they were finding that it would be highly desirable to have some safeguards put in the OIML policy on copyright. These would be safeguards for both the standards developing organisation and for the OIML, and did not exist at the moment in B 11.

Dr Ehrlich said this project proposal would revise B 11 to provide those additional safeguards. He pointed out to delegates the box on his slide labelled “Why should the publication be developed?” and said he had just addressed this. As far as the terms of reference and time frame were concerned, the proposal was to put forward a 1CD directly to the PC very soon, in the following month. Since this was a Basic Publication, there was the flexibility to do this, since the full B 6 process did not need to be applied, and in particular, this was really more of an OIML policy publication, so it made sense to go directly to the CIML. The 1CD was almost ready to send, and Dr Ehrlich anticipated that, based on discussions the following day with the Presidential Council, they would finalise it the following month, and would like to see the project completed the following year, hopefully before the following year’s CIML meeting, so they could continue the process in the US. He thanked delegates for their understanding, and said he would be happy to answer any questions.

Dr Schwartz added that they had discussed this at the Presidential Council meeting prior to the current Committee meeting, and the Presidential Council had been in support of putting forward this last minute

project proposal because it was in the interests of the OIML that its publications were used as much as possible, and they could not demand from standardisation organisations or others that the Recommendations or Documents were used completely “one to one” with the same content as they were published by the OIML. He thought they should open the door to using parts of OIML Recommendations, of course with an appropriate acknowledgement and reference to the original OIML publication.

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments on the proposal itself, and there were none. He then asked delegates if they were happy to vote on this project proposal, on principle; did they allow this departure from the normal procedures? The question currently was whether delegates were happy with the procedure to allow a vote on this.

Mr Dunmill read draft resolution number 2019/26:

“The Committee,

Considering the remarks made by its President,

Considering the report by the USA on the status of the project to revise B 11 *Rules governing the translation, copyright and distribution of OIML Publications*, and

Decides to accept the proposal to vote on the project to revise B 11 at this meeting.”

There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no votes against voting on the project proposal.

Mr Dunmill stated that they could therefore move to voting on the draft resolution to approve this new project. It would be a new project under the responsibility of the BIML and the USA, to revise B 11 as stated in the Additional Meeting Document which delegates had received two days previously.

Mr Dunmill read draft resolution number 2019/27:

“The Committee,

Approves as a new project, under the responsibility of the BIML and the USA, the revision of B 11 *Rules governing the translation, copyright and distribution of OIML Publications*, to be conducted as specified in the project proposal provided in Additional Meeting Document 10.1.2.5.”

There were no comments. There were no abstentions.

Dr Schwartz said that as he had been anticipating a comment from France, he thought they should add that they were happy with taking a vote on this project proposal, although they had deviated from the rules, so there should be some wording should be included in this resolution to say that the CIML had confirmed that it was happy to vote on this last minute proposal.

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any other comments. He asked if there were any abstentions and there were none. There were no negative votes. The project proposal was approved unanimously.

### **10.1.3 Revision of B 6 Directives for OIML technical work**

#### **10.1.3.1 Revision of B 6 to implement Resolution 2018/21**

Mr Dunmill stated that there would be a short presentation by Mr Dixon on this matter.

Mr Dixon greeted delegates. At the previous year’s CIML meeting, the OIML-CS Management Committee had put forward recommendations to change the structure of OIML Recommendations, and also that when Recommendations were revised they should include a comparison table, or gap analysis, to show the differences between the previous edition of a Recommendation and the new edition.

A project had been undertaken, led by himself from the BIML, to update both parts of B 6 to implement this recommendation, and the related resolution that had been approved by the CIML the previous year. Both parts of B 6 had been updated to require that Recommendations had a “part 3”, which would be a test report format to be used by test laboratories under the OIML-CS, and also a new “part 4”, which



would be a type evaluation report format for use by OIML Issuing Authorities under the OIML-CS. There was also the requirement for the comparison table or gap analysis to be included.

The Project Group had also taken the opportunity to make some editorial improvements to B 6, to ensure consistency, to improve and clarify some of the wording, and to align B 6-1 and -2 with current practice to account for the implementation of the workspaces and Project Groups. Some omissions had also been found in the text, and they had added some new subclauses (4.8 and 4.9) relating to the responsibilities of the Corresponding Member Representatives and the liaison organisation officer. They had also added a new Annex D to incorporate resolution 2017/17.

Dr Ehrlich had picked up on this when he had earlier mentioned that the CIML had agreed that B 6 was only applied to the development of Basic Publications where the CIML specifically decided that it should. Mr Dixon wanted to stress there were no technical changes relating to the operation of the TCs, SCs or PGs, or to the development and approval of the technical publications, so there were no changes to the voting rules or time scales.

In addition to this work, they had also developed some templates for the new parts 3 and 4, and these templates would be made available to Project Groups to help with their work. Additional Meeting Document 10.1.3.1 had also been uploaded, and it had been decided to add a note into each of the templates in B 6-1 because occasionally these had to be updated to make improvements, and they wanted to avoid having to constantly update B 6 itself if the forms changed. The latest version of these forms would be available on the workspaces for secretariats and conveners to make use of. This was the slight addition they wished to make to the document that had been presented to delegates in Addendum 10.1.3.1.

Mr Dunmill asked if there were any comments on what delegates had just heard and the proposals made. He informed delegates that there would be one resolution at the end of this item, as there was another item to consider yet. There were no comments.

#### **10.1.3.2 Amended periodic review procedure for OIML publications**

Mr Dunmill stated that item 10.1.3.2 was linked to what Mr Dixon had just been talking about. There was also an amended periodic review procedure, about which delegates had already received an Addendum, and an Additional Meeting Document which concerned the reviews of OIML publications which had taken place in the past. Mr Dunmill said that Mr Dixon also had a short presentation to make about this item.

Mr Dixon said he would talk about the background to the Addendum and the work that had been taking place. He said there had been a lot of talk about TG23, and the activities they had undertaken at the meeting in March. One of the discussions at that meeting had been about how to improve the effectiveness of OIML technical work, which was one of the main pillars of the Organisation. Concerns had been raised regarding the time that was sometimes needed to develop new or revised OIML publications. As part of Mr Donnellan's report, delegates would have seen the timescales that were typically required to develop Recommendations. There had also mainly been inconclusive outcomes of previous periodic reviews when the appropriate TC/SC had been asked whether a particular publication should be reconfirmed, revised, or withdrawn, so they had been left in limbo as to what to do with a particular publication. During the discussions held by TG23 and by the Presidential Council, it had been agreed to establish a set of criteria to help in prioritising publications which were of importance to the Organisation, and then to prioritise the projects accordingly. As part of this presentation, Mr Dixon said he was going to talk specifically about the prioritisation of publications, and Mr Dunmill would then talk about the prioritisation of projects.

A set of criteria had been discussed and established, and he showed delegates these on a slide. The first one was Recommendations with relevance to the OIML-CS in order to make sure they were maintained, up to date, fit for purpose, and aligned with the latest developments in technology. They had then looked at publications where demand was expected in the future, for example R 91 on speed meters, which was not currently included in the OIML-CS, but they already knew that there was a high demand for this Recommendation to be revised so that it could be included in the OIML-CS.

There were also generic Documents, applicable to a wide range of instruments, such as D 11 which covered the environmental and electromagnetic conditions for testing, and D 31 on software, which they had already spoken about during the current CIML session. There were then publications with relevance to the Organisation, such as B 6 *Directives for the Technical Work*, D 30 *Guide for the application of ISO/IEC 17025 to the assessment of Testing Laboratories involved in legal metrology*, and R 111 on weights, vocabularies, and so on.

Finally, there were publications with relevance to Regional Legal Metrology Organisations. They knew that in Europe OIML Recommendations were used as normative documents, to demonstrate conformity with the essential requirements of the European Metrology Directive. Having established these criteria, the plan was for the Presidential Council and the BIML to monitor them to ensure they were still fit or purpose, and the aim was to use the criteria to identify the top ten priority publications for the Organisation, and separately, the top ten projects for the Organisation. The aim was for these top ten publications to be subject to a more frequent periodic review. At the moment, periodic reviews took place every five years, and as they had heard, technology changed very quickly. This meant that they could not necessarily wait five years to decide what to do with a publication, let alone then actually implement a project to update it.

Mr Dixon explained that the list delegates could see on the screen was a provisional list, which had been put together based on the discussions held in March. They were listed in alphabetical and numerical order and this provisional list would be reviewed by the Presidential Council and the BIML, and put to delegates at future CIML meetings for review and approval. The CIML could then confirm to the BIML, to Project Groups, and to the secretariats that were responsible for these publications, that they were a priority for the Organisation. There was also a proposal that this amended process should differentiate between the situation when a publication needed a full technical revision to cover the implementation of requirements for new technology, and the situation when a more minor update of a publication was needed, which might be only editorial, or cover a minor technical update. An example would be when a standard which had been referenced in a test procedure was updated by the IEC, so the OIML publication needed to make reference to a new standard or a new edition of the standard.

The amended periodic review process would have four options to replace the current three, which were reconfirm, revise or withdraw. The proposal was to offer a fourth option, which would be to update. It had also been agreed that the OIML-CS Management Committee should play an active role in the process for publications that were of relevance to the OIML-CS. The organisations, countries, and economies represented in the Management Committee had a vested interest in making sure that Recommendations were up to date and fit for purpose. They were OIML Issuing Authorities, but they were also Utilizers and Associates, so they needed to make sure that publications were up to date. In addition, the reasons for whether to reconfirm, revise, update or withdraw should be clearly identified as part of the periodic review process. At the moment, the BIML asked members of the relevant TC/SC whether they should reconfirm, revise, or withdraw the publication. There was no particular information given as to why a particular outcome should be achieved, which had produced inconclusive results. In the new proposal, the high priority publications would be reviewed two years after reconfirmation or approval, compared to the standard five years for all other publications. For publications of relevance to the OIML-CS, the Management Committee, with input from the secretariat and members of the relevant TC/SC would select a particular option from the four available. For other publications, the TC/SC secretariat, with input from its members, would be responsible for selecting the option. The selected option, with a rationale, would then be put to the CIML for approval. If the proposal was to revise a publication, a project proposal would be put forward, and the Project Group would be under the responsibility of the relevant TC/SC as was currently the case. The processes and timescales would be the same as at present, as defined in B 6. However, if the proposal was to update a publication, in the case of those of relevance to the OIML-CS a working group would be established under the responsibility of the Management Committee, and the Management Committee would then go through the development and internal approval process, and then the Final Draft of that publication would be submitted to the CIML for approval. In the case of the update of a publication that was not relevant to the OIML-CS, a new simplified revision process had been developed for inclusion in B 6. Mr Dixon highlighted changes that would allow a Project Group to vote on a first Committee Draft, which was

not currently permitted. If this vote was successful, then it would immediately be followed by CIML approval. There would be no need for a CIML Preliminary Ballot. The current three-month consultation period would also be reduced to two months. Mr Dixon stressed that an update was only for editorial and minor changes. If the changes were significant, and a revision was required, then the existing processes still applied, so they were not trying to change the normal processes. With regard to implementation, the Presidential Council considered that the amended procedure, if it was approved at the present meeting, should be implemented with immediate effect. The initial idea had been to start a new project to revise B 6 to include the relevant text. However, text for B 6-1 had already been developed and included in Addendum 10.1.3.2, Annex B, and a new flowchart had been included in Annex C. The recommendation was to include the text and the flowchart into the revised B 6 which had been considered under item 10.1.3.1, in order to avoid the need to conduct another revision of B 6.

Mr Dixon then pointed out that there was a slight change from the text that delegates had seen in Addendum 10.1.3.2, Annex B. He explained that at the Presidential Council meeting earlier that week, it had been considered that although the TC/SC secretariat and TC/SC members would be involved in the process, additional wording should be included, which he said was highlighted in red on his slide, to make it explicit that TC and SC members would be included in the consultation process on whether to reconfirm, revise, update or withdraw the publication, and in the case of publications of relevance to the OIML-CS, that the relevant TC/SC secretariat would have a vote within the Management Committee. Under the current rules of the OIML-CS, the relevant TC/SC secretariats participated in Management Committee meetings as observers, but in this particular instance, they wanted TC/SC secretariats to have a vote.

Mr Dixon stated that this was an overview of what had been proposed, and he was happy to take any questions.

Mr Edelmaier (Austria) asked Mr Dixon to explain the difference between a technical revision and a minor technical update. How would they be differentiate between them, and would there be some rules given on this?

Mr Dixon replied that a full technical revision would be for example to cover completely new technology that had to be implemented into a particular Recommendation, such as for R 91, which currently covered radar speed measurement systems only, and was now being revised to cover all the different technologies for speed measurement that were available. A minor technical update might be where an international standard on EMC testing was updated, and represented a fairly minor change to the test procedure.

Mr Edelmaier added that from his personal point of view, the implementation of a new EMC standard was not a minor technical update!

Mr Dixon replied that it would be a change to the Recommendation, but it was something they felt could be put through relatively easily, compared to the incorporation of a completely new technology into a Recommendation.

Dr Schwartz commented that many Recommendations referred to ISO or IEC standards, for example in electromagnetic compatibility tests or endurance tests, and he thought that this was what was meant when referring to an update, so they could then adapt to the new state of the art as regards these ISO and IEC standards. Finally, the updated or revised publication would always be presented to the CIML for approval, so the CIML would always have the final vote. He thought delegates all understood the intention, which was to speed up the process, especially in those situations where the full revision procedure did not really seem appropriate. He agreed with the comment from Austria, in that it would sometimes be difficult to decide on the borderline between a revision and an update, but again this would be discussed in the Management Committee, together with the TC or SC secretariats, who were invited and had observer status on the Management Committee.

Mr Dixon backed up this comment. The CIML would be responsible for approving the option that would be taken, so if the CIML did not consider an update was appropriate and would prefer a revision

to take place, then the CIML would have the ability to make that decision. Two levels of approval were required, firstly the direction to take: whether to revise or update a publication, and secondly to approve the amended or revised publication. There would be two opportunities for the CIML to contribute to the process.

Mr Loizides (Australia) stated that as delegates' representative on the Management Committee, he could confirm that they had held a debate about the concerns raised by Mr Edelmaier, and the tipping point of when a revision or an update was appropriate. This was why the TC/SC secretariat was absolutely critical to the process, and they, as well as TC/SC members, would be considered the experts in that particular area. As interim chair of the OIML-CS Management Committee, Mr Loizides said he would be supporting the view of secretariats on whether to undertake an update or a revision, even if it was just a minor reference to a particular ISO standard. They were the experts, and their views should carry appropriate weight in this determination.

Mr Awosola said he had a question regarding B 6. He wondered whether projects that had started before this approval of the revised B 6 needed to produce a Recommendation that conformed to the proposed new B 6 requirements, for example his project on arched chute automatic weighing instruments, which was at the 3CD stage.

Mr Dixon replied that the answer to this was ideally "yes". This was why they had developed templates for Project Group conveners to use. In the existing Recommendations, part 3 was a mix of test report information and type evaluation report information. The test report format comprised the individual test sheets for each test, and the type evaluation report was a checklist. The information was already included in current Recommendations, as well as those under development. The purpose of changing the structure was to clearly separate those elements of the current part 3 which related to the test reports for test laboratories, and the type evaluation report used by OIML Issuing Authorities. Mr Dixon stated that the information was already available in Mr Awosola's 3CD, it was just a matter of how it would be presented in the version in the future. The BIML would be able to provide support to Project Group conveners in this matter. One of the things they had spoken about was how the BIML could provide additional support to conveners, and obviously this was one area where they could help, in creating the new parts 3 and 4. Mr Dixon hoped this gave Mr Awosola some reassurance that he would be helped with this work.

Mr Awosola requested further clarification. He said that one of the Recommendations he was working on was likely to be approved soon because it was undergoing voting on the 3CD. If they needed to conform to the new requirements of B 6, he wondered whether this would mean that they would need to amend the CD and send it out again to the Project Group for another ballot, even if it might have been approved as a 3CD.

Dr Schwartz suggested a pragmatic approach. He thought they should implement some flexibility for current projects. His recommendation was that they should be flexible, and it should be up to the Project Group convener, in consultation with the BIML, to decide whether it was worthwhile delaying a project to implement the new rules, or perhaps better to continue to finalise the project, and then to start the next revision process.

Mr Dixon added that it was an editorial and presentational change rather than a technical change. If the 3CD was approved, they could still look at making the necessary changes ready for when it was distributed as a Draft publication for the preliminary ballot. As Dr Schwartz had said, the BIML would work with conveners on a case by case basis.

Dr Schwartz repeated that with some pragmatic thinking, they would be able to manage the interim period.

Mrs Lagauterie thanked Mr Dixon for his clarification on the role of the CIML, but said she understood the concerns of other delegates, and she was certain that secretariats of TCs/SCs would have a number of questions and concerns about the proposals. She felt that the CIML should give them some explanations to reassure them. It was good that the secretariat of the appropriate TC/SC would have the right to vote on the Management Committee, but she did not think this was sufficient. The CIML should

be informed if the TC/SC secretariat had expressed some disagreement with the vote, so that they could investigate and understand why there was this disagreement.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mrs Lagauterie for her valid comment. From the beginning they had wanted B 6 to be updated regularly in the light of experience gained, which he thought had been a good decision. They had made an update of B 6 at almost every CIML meeting, so he would strongly request they acquired experience with the proposals put forward by Mr Dixon. He thought it would be worthwhile looking at the review process, and he thought they would find a way to take account of the opinions of TC/SC secretariats. He agreed that they would have to explain to them what was expected, and make it clear that they did not want to “push them aside”. He supported the proposals in order to speed up the review process, and if they found there was a problem with the TC/SC secretariats, they would be ready to adapt the procedures. It was not the intention that the Management Committee would take over roles that the TC/SC secretariats and members had had in the past.

Ms Vuković said she supported the presentation given by Mr Dixon. She asked for a clarification, saying that if she had understood correctly, he had shown delegates a list of the top ten projects. She had understood this would be preliminary so that they would be voting on this list. She wanted to know more about the plan to establish the list.

Mr Dixon pointed out that this was a new idea for the Organisation. It had been discussed by TG23 and the Presidential Council in March 2019. The criteria had been established, and based on those criteria they had developed the provisional list he had shown. They had wanted to present this to the Committee for their feedback and their approval of this approach. Assuming that approval was granted to the approach being adopted, then the Presidential Council and the BIML would review the criteria to make sure that they were still fit for purpose. Based on these criteria, they would then identify the top ten publications, and these would then be put to the Committee each year for approval.

Mr Dunmill stated that Mr Dixon had presented a list of the top ten publications, not projects. He reminded delegates that these were two slightly different things. The publications were those that had already been approved, and decisions had to be made on whether they needed to be revised. The same criteria would also be used to establish a list of the top ten projects, which were those where a publication was already being revised or developed, and they would discuss this later under “items for information”.

Mr Richter asked if Mr Dixon could show delegates slide number seven again. He considered he was speaking on behalf of a lot of TC/SC secretariats, who were often not present for CIML meetings. Following on from the comments by his colleague from France, he said he had fairly significant concerns over this change. Firstly, decisions were going to be made in the OIML-CS Management Committee, where now the secretariat would now have one vote out of, he believed, 22 votes, so the secretariat would not have a very loud voice. He also understood from his colleague from Australia that frequently they would not even be in the room for these votes, but would have their votes heard through someone else. What also concerned him was that if there was a decision to do an update, it seemed that that process was different. The process would not be a project proposal that would go before the CIML, and it seemed that that update would just start. He wanted to know if this was correct. His second point was that this was a radical departure in the development of OIML publications, in that all of a sudden, for the first time, these technical publications, Recommendations and Documents would be able to have technical content changed not by a Project Group, not by a TC/SC, but directly by the OIML-CS Management Committee. He understood this would be the case only for minor technical changes, but he considered there was definitely potential for a “grey area” or “slippery slope”. His second question was whether he understood correctly that technical changes made to a publication under the update process would be done solely by the Management Committee.

Mr Dixon replied that the update would not automatically start. As he had mentioned, the proposed review option would be put to the CIML for approval; a proposal would still be put forward as to whether to reconfirm, revise, update or withdraw a publication, and would have to be approved by the CIML. This had been covered by the final bullet point on the previous slide, which described this particular situation. If an update had been chosen as the preferred option, it would not be automatically started; a proposal would first be put to the CIML for approval. If an update was approved, and it

concerned a publication of relevance to the OIML-CS, then yes, the Management Committee would have responsibility for doing that work. Mr Dixon continued that an example was the revision of D 30, which had been transferred the previous year from TC 3/SC 5 to the Management Committee. This project had now been completed under the responsibility of the Management Committee, but members of the original TC/SC had been given the option to participate in that Project Group, and were participating. They were not trying to exclude the TC/SC from this work, but rather saying that responsibility for managing the project would now fall under the Management Committee in the case of updates. In the case of revisions, these would still be done under the responsibility of a Project Group under the appropriate TC/SC. There was no proposal to change that existing process. They were only talking about editorial or minor technical updates to a publication. Mr Dixon hoped this answered both of Mr Richter's questions.

Dr Schwartz added that these were all very valuable comments, and he hoped that the proposal was now clear so they could take the vote. Dr Schwartz asked Mr Dunmill to read draft resolution 2019/28. Mr Dunmill read:

“The Committee

Noting the result of the 1CD revision of B 6 *Directives for OIML technical work*,

Noting the recommendation in Addendum 10.1.3.2 to the Working Document,

Approves the amended periodic review procedure detailed in Annex A of Addendum 10.1.3.2 to the Working Document for this meeting,

Approves the inclusion of the revised text detailed in Annex B. together with the flowchart given in Annex C of Addendum 10.1.3.2 to the Working Document, and includes the revision of that text in the final draft basic publication of B 6 .1 which is presented in 10.1.3.1,

Approves the Final Draft revision of B 6,

Decides that the amended periodic review procedure, including the changes regarding TC/SC secretariats, should be implemented immediately,

Supports the provisional list of criteria and list of high priority publications and projects developed by Task Group 2023, and

Requests the Presidential Council to review these and make proposals for approval at the 55 CIML meeting in 2020.”

Mr Richter said he did not have the exact wording for what he would like changed at this time, but he wondered if some kind of note that could be added to this resolution, that would address his concerns that the TCs and SCs were given a high priority of participation in these review procedures, and the possible process of an update.

Mr Dunmill asked if Mr Richter did not feel it was covered by the middle of the resolution which included a note about the TC/SC secretariats, and which earlier on, in discussion with the President, they had included to try to cover this point.

Dr Schwartz asked the First Vice-President to make a comment on this.

Dr Ehrlich thought that last phrase “decides that the amended periodic review procedure including the proposed changes shall be implemented immediately” was intended to address the new words that had been added as Mr Dixon had indicated. He asked Mr Richter if he thought this should go further than that.

No audible response could be heard, but Dr Ehrlich conveyed that he had received a positive response saying “yes” and continued that in this case, this could be approved.

Mr Richter intervened offering to assist before this resolution was finally voted on the following day.

Dr Schwartz asked if this meant that if they came back to the proposed changes that had been indicated by Mr Dixon, the two amendments that had been shown and read.

Mr Richter again intervened offering to assist during the break and have it ready after the break.

Dr Schwartz asked other CIML Members for their comments. He said there were already two amendments marked in red in the proposal under 6.12.3 and 6.12.5, and the draft resolution already addressed these two marked amendments. He therefore thought that the draft resolution could not be improved further, because this already took up the concerns to closely include the TC/SC secretariats in the process, and to give them a vote on the Management Committee on relevant publications. He said he was sorry, but he did not think there was any room for further improvement.

Dr Schwartz said he would like the Committee to vote on this now, and he also wanted to suggest that they continued with the items for information and the discussion on the OIML Bulletin the following morning before item 13, so that they could now have the coffee break before voting on the election of the Second Vice-President and having the awards. He asked if the Committee was happy with this proposal. He noted that Past President Mr Peter Mason had requested to speak, but asked if he could keep it short because he would like to take the vote and the coffee break now.

Mr Mason said he would keep his comments short. He commented that it was the wording in 6.12.5 that was absolutely crucial in this instance. He wondered, given the importance of input from the TC/SC secretariats to changes in the publications they were responsible for, whether the answer was rather than giving them just one vote among many at the Management Committee, instead to give them a veto at those discussions. He wondered if this simple change might address the concerns expressed.

Dr Schwartz waited while Mr Dunmill made the appropriate change.

Mr Dunmill confirmed he had correctly understood the suggestion from Mr Mason and that the resolution, instead of saying “the appropriate TC/SC has a vote” should say “has a veto”.

Mr Mason agreed, although he suggested there may be more elegant ways of putting it, but that would be the effect.

Mrs Lagauterie reminded the Committee that earlier she had expressed her concerns about the understanding that those responsible for TC/SCs might have. They did a lot of work at the moment, and she felt that that the comments made by her colleague from the United States firmly indicated this worry. She thought it was absolutely necessary to clarify the situation because it would help CIML Members in assisting TC/SC members to understand that they did not wish to reduce their power but that it was a practical procedure which would help the operation of the review process, and to which they would be associated, but for which they did not need to worry that this procedure would allow their work to be overturned, and for example allow something to be included which had been refused in an earlier revision.

Dr Schwartz suggested they delayed the vote on this draft resolution while they tried to improve the wording that had been proposed, and return to it the following day when they considered all the draft resolutions. He said he wanted to finish item 10 for the present and continue with it the following day before they considered item 13, so that they would have enough time for the election and awards after the coffee break and before lunch. He reminded delegates that the election procedure would be a closed session for CIML Members only, but Members of Honour were also invited to attend because he wanted to ask them to assist in handling the ballot papers.

## **10.2 Items for information**

Dr Schwartz asked Mr Dunmill to make the presentation he had prepared.

Mr Dunmill stated that during the past year, there had not been many general information activities to report. There had been one change of convenership, in the case of the revision of R 134. This project had been approved the previous year under the convenership of the Netherlands, but due to changes in staff they had not felt they could take this project on, so it had been transferred to the United Kingdom.

During the past year there had not been any major changes in the Project Groups. In the past couple of years Mr Dunmill said he had reported that a series of projects that had not been progressing had been

cancelled, and various structural changes had been made. Since nothing major of this kind had happened this year, they had been considering how to monitor the technical work, and how to help those conveners who were having problems in making progress with their projects. A full review of all the projects was undertaken at the Presidential Council in March each year. The PC looked at the status of all projects and considered any that were not progressing as well as expected. As delegates had heard the previous day from Mr Dixon, they were now trying to identify the top ten publications and projects in order to formalise this process. As a result of discussions in the Presidential Council and in TG23, they had identified a provisional list of top ten projects, and the intention was to give a short report to the CIML on these each year. This year the list was provisional because the CIML had not approved it, but the criteria that Mr Dixon had mentioned the day before had still been used to establish it. This list would obviously change as projects came to an end, and new ones would be identified to take their place.

Mr Dunmill said he would now briefly describe each of the top ten projects and their current status.

In the case of D 1, Mr Dunmill reported that this project had been approved in 2017 under the responsibility of the CEEMS AG, and a number of Working Documents had been discussed this year. There had been a delay in starting the project, but now good progress had been made and a short meeting had been held the previous day on this subject. A first Committee Draft of the revision would be issued by November, and it was planned to put forward the Final Draft Document revision of D 1 to the CIML the following year.

The revision of D 30 *Guide for the application of ISO/IEC 17025 to the assessment of Testing Laboratories involved in legal metrology* was a project under the responsibility of the OIML-CS Management Committee. The project had been approved the previous year, and again it had made good progress. There had been two Committee Drafts, one of which was currently being voted on, and the intention was again that it would be put forward to the CIML the following year for approval.

The project for the revision of D 31 *General requirements for software-controlled measuring instruments* had been approved in 2016. It too had made good progress, and a number of Committee Drafts had been produced in an extremely short time. The Final Draft had been approved the previous day, and the Document had immediately been put back into revision to address technical developments and outstanding comments. The Committee had approved both the new Document and the project to revise it again. Software was an important subject and this project would therefore remain on the top ten list.

The next project was the revision of R 23 *Tyre pressure gauges for motor vehicles*. These instruments were considered to be extremely important from a safety point of view in many parts of the world. The revision was a joint project between the Netherlands and Kenya. Originally, under another convenership, the project had not made good progress so there had been a change to a co-convenership, and this year they had planned to produce a second Working Document or First Committee Draft. This Committee Draft had not yet been produced, so the BIML would be working with the conveners to make sure that progress was made as promised during the following year.

With regard to the revision of R 51 *Automatic catchweighing instruments*, under TC 9/SC 2 with a UK convenership, the project had been approved the previous year, a Working Document had been issued during 2019, and a meeting was being planned for the following year, so progress was being made on this project.

The project on the revision of R 76 *Non-automatic weighing instruments* under TC 9/SC 1 had a co-convenership between France and Germany. There had been a meeting in December 2017, which had set up a number of subgroups to deal with the different aspects of the revision of R 76. It was hoped to issue a first Working Draft during 2019. The BIML had been in contact with the conveners of this project to try to ensure progress was made on the revision.

With regard to the revision of R 91 *Radar equipment for the measurement of the speed of vehicles* under the responsibility of Slovenia, the project had been approved in 2014, but had not been making progress as fast as had been hoped, and the convenership had been transferred to Slovenia in 2016. This year a Working Document had been issued, and they were now making better progress.



Mr Dunmill said he did not need to go into the details of the revision of R 117, as the Final Draft Recommendation had been approved the previous day, so it would be taken off the list in the future.

There was a new Recommendation under the responsibility of Germany, for which a project had been approved in 2018, on *Instruments for measuring the vehicle exhaust soot particle number (PN)*. The conveners of this project had both been new to OIML technical work. They had both followed the convener training course in June 2019, and had organised a meeting to be held in November to discuss the first proposals on this subject.

Finally the revision of R 134 *Automatic instruments for weighing road vehicles in motion and measuring axle loads* had been delayed due to the convener not being available, and the convenership had been transferred to the UK at the beginning of October, after having consulted with TC 9/SC 2. It was hoped some progress would be made on it during the following year.

Mr Dunmill said this was the kind of information which they would be presenting each year, following the top ten projects. He asked if anyone had any comments on the projects themselves, and asked if they found the information useful in this format or whether they would prefer it to be presented in a different manner.

Mr Sanders (United Kingdom) thanked Mr Dunmill for his comprehensive description and proposals for improvements. He had been very interested towards the start of his presentation, when he had stated they needed to look at how these projects were progressing. He wondered if it would be useful to have a simple document which covered all OIML projects, but which had a simple traffic light system where green would indicate “no problem, on target”, amber “a project with some issues”, and red could flag up “project that needed attention”.

Mr Dunmill replied that this was something they had been working on. During the time after Mr Kool’s death, they had received some external assistance from Mr Gilles Vinet to help in following the technical work. He had started to develop what they had called a “dashboard”, which had been a summary spreadsheet of all the projects. At the beginning, this had been extremely complicated, because of the number of projects, and assessing whether the criteria being used to do that traffic light system were actually good. It had now been refined, and with the smaller number of projects today Mr Dunmill observed they were getting to the stage where they would be able to use something like that in the future. It was not quite ready to circulate widely at the moment, although it was already used at the BIML. In a slightly simpler form than used at the moment, it would be something that would be very good to distribute to the CIML. He reiterated that the projects were all followed up at the Presidential Council, where two documents were used. One was a thick document giving full details of all the projects, which was too much to read through at the meeting, so they used a smaller document which highlighted the successes and the problems. The only controversial element was how close to being “on track” got a green light, because if somebody was one month outside the allowed three months, it might appear worse for them than it really was. This was therefore something they had already, and it was undergoing further refinement and automation, so they did not have to keep manually reviewing its data. It was certainly something they would look at circulating more widely.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Sanders for his good proposal. He thought they needed this kind of tool to improve the Organisation’s project management, certainly with a focus on the top ten projects, where the BIML had agreed to try to do their best to help project conveners obtain the support they might need.

Dr Schwartz asked if there were any further comments and hoped delegates found this format useful. It concentrated on the most important projects, so it was very condensed, but he thought it gave the information they expected on the running of the high priority projects.

Mr Mason remarked that in terms of the formal transfer of convenerships, he had mentioned during his presentation that they had also agreed with the UK delegation that the UK would take over the convenership of the Project Group for the revision of D 19. He thought it might be useful for this to be recorded in this part of the CIML meeting.

Mr Dunmill replied that the only reason it had not been included was because they did have to ask other members of the Project Group whether they objected to this. If it had been arranged, that was good because they did not have to ask for volunteers to take on the convenership, but in the case of R 134 they had circulated the proposed change to the Subcommittee to check that everybody had been happy with it. This was why D 19 had not appeared on this list.

Dr Schwartz asked delegates to consider draft resolution 2019/29. He read:

“The Committee,

Supports the criteria used to identify high priority publications and projects developed by Task Group 2023,

Supports the provisional lists of high priority publications and projects as presented at the Meeting, and

Requests the Presidential Council and the BIML to review these and make proposals for approval at the 55th CIML Meeting in 2020.”

Mr Richter said that Mr Dunmill had shown delegates the list of high priority projects, but this was very different from the list of high priority publications. He asked if there was a list of high priority publications.

Dr Schwartz pointed out that this had been shown to delegates the day before during the presentation provided by Mr Dixon. He said they could show delegates the list again, but they had discussed this the previous day, together with the criteria that had been used to identify these high priority publications. During the current session, they wanted to concentrate on the high priority projects, which had not been mentioned the previous day. He indicated that if Mr Richter wanted to see the list of high priority publications again he did not think this would be a problem.

Mr Dixon confirmed it had been part of his presentation the previous day under agenda item 10.1.3.2, where he had listed the criteria and then the provisional top ten list of publications. He showed delegates the relevant slides again, indicating on the first slide the criteria that had been established earlier in the year by TG23 and the Presidential Council, and on the second slide the provisional list of top ten publications.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Dixon and emphasised that all this information would be put on the CIML meeting website, together with all the other updated reports as soon as possible after the meeting.

Dr Schwartz asked if there were any other comments on the wording of the resolution. He pointed out that it emphasised they would deal with provisional lists for the time being until the final lists could be approved the following year.

There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was approved unanimously.

### **10.3 Articles for the OIML Bulletin**

Dr Schwartz stated they could now move onto the next item from the previous day, and asked Mr Pulham to take the floor.

Mr Pulham greeted delegates and introduced himself as the Editor and Webmaster at the BIML. He thanked Dr Schwartz for having added this item to the agenda. Initially it had not been on the agenda, but had been added following discussions between Dr Schwartz and the BIML about the situation the Bulletin was in. He indicated that he was going to give a short presentation, and then Dr Schwartz would open a debate on the subject.

Mr Pulham asked delegates to raise their hands if they regularly downloaded the Bulletin and read it. He confirmed that only a small number of delegates had raised their hands.

Mr Pulham said the Bulletin had been going since 1960, and he had been editor since 1996, adding that he had been responsible for nearly 100 editions. However, there was now a problem and the Bulletin had been going through a difficult period because there were not enough good quality technical articles. These articles were generally contributed by Member States, and various employees in their national authorities, some of whom had made regular contributions. For reasons that they were currently analysing, these contributions had slowed down considerably.

As both Dr Schwartz and Mr Donnellan had already mentioned, the Bulletin was now only available online, apart from one hardcopy edition produced every January, because they had carried out a survey in which 98 % of CIML Members who had expressed an opinion had voted for this arrangement. This was in line with the BIML's digitalisation policy, as all the other publications were only available online now. This strategy had led to some considerable cost-savings over the year, which would be carried forward into the next budget period. On the subject of downloads, there were about 3 000 downloads of the Bulletin per month, which Mr Pulham observed was quite good. This was not confined to the most recent edition; they had also noted that many of the previous editions of the Bulletin were also regularly downloaded. They were encouraged that people were still downloading and reading it.

Recently, most of the reports published in the Bulletin had been written by BIML personnel. The objective of the debate would be to see how notably Member States, but also Corresponding Members, could be encouraged to contribute more articles to ensure that the Bulletin could continue to be published. They did not want to stop publishing it, but as delegates could see from the slide showing the last four Bulletins, they had only published two "Technique" and four "Evolutions" articles over the last year, which Mr Pulham commented was not very much. Although they had published 26 "update" articles, these had mainly been contributed by BIML personnel, including several articles on the OTC events. It was a problem if the BIML had to write all the articles. There had been a lot of technical meetings for which they had written accounts, and these had included various seminars and other visits where BIML staff had been in attendance. They had written reports, not just for the Bulletin but also for the OIML LinkedIn and Facebook pages. However, Mr Pulham reiterated that it was not sustainable for the BIML to write 26 "update" reports over two Bulletins. They were happy to write reports on the events they attended, and would continue to do so, but if they did not have regular source of technical articles, this would mean that the BIML may have to transform the Bulletin into a kind of newsletter. Mr Pulham emphasised that this was not necessarily the objective, but was one potential solution, if they could not resolve this situation.

For the October Bulletin, the one indicated on the slide with a question mark, Mr Pulham had only received one short report, so there was not yet enough material to make an edition of the Bulletin, which was a situation that needed to be addressed urgently. Mr Pulham concluded that they were asking for delegates' support in order to be able to continue producing the OIML Bulletin. Mr Pulham said he had analysed the previous editions over the last four years or so. He showed delegates a slide with the results of this analysis, explaining that the blue bars indicated the "Technique" articles, the orange bars were "Evolutions" articles, and the grey bars were "Update" articles. In the last two editions there had been 11 and 12 "Update" articles. The whole of the January edition had included an extremely long and detailed account of the Hamburg CIML meeting, but if they had not published this in the January edition, there would not have been enough material to produce that edition of the Bulletin.

Mr Pulham thanked delegates for their time, and said he would now hand back to Dr Schwartz who would start the discussion, in which he hoped delegates would participate.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Pulham for his update on the status of the OIML Bulletin. He remarked that from the graph they could clearly see the need for more technical articles.

He wanted to open the discussion with a question. He asked whether the Committee was in favour of continuing a Bulletin which included technical articles, or were they of the opinion that they should go in the direction of producing a newsletter, with perhaps one technical Bulletin a year. There were various options, but he personally thought that they dealt with too many interesting technical items. For example in May 2019, TC 12 had had a meeting in Helsinki on smart metering, which included software

requirements. He had already announced that there would be a workshop on the digital transformation of legal metrology in May 2020 in Germany, which he had suggested could be an OIML seminar. There was also the QI toolkit and CEEMS matters, and they had heard about the UNIDO Sustainable Development Goals. There were many interesting fields apart from the purely technical items such as developments in weighing instruments. Dr Schwartz thought they would like to have enough material to publish very interesting articles for all the legal metrology community. He added this was his personal view; he would very much like to continue with the Bulletin as a technical Bulletin which included interesting technical articles, but this depended on the support of delegates. There may be other ways of maintaining a sustainable constant flow of articles. They needed some long-term planning rather than searching constantly for the next edition. He asked for delegates' views and comments.

Dr Toshiyuki Takatsuji (Japan) said he was afraid he had a rather specific situation related to their institute. Sometimes the workers in legal metrology in Asia had their performance evaluated by the number of publications they had produced for peer-reviewed journals, so he wanted to know about the review process of a paper or article in the OIML Bulletin.

Mr Pulham replied that currently there was no formal review or peer review system, as for example there was for *Metrologia*, the technical journal of the BIPM. They made sure there was a disclaimer in the Bulletin that the articles were the responsibility of their authors and the views that they expressed were not the responsibility of the OIML. He added they could instigate such a process, but it would require a significant volume of articles to warrant it. Historically, they used to have so many articles that there had been an internal review panel with the editor and engineers in the BIPM. Mr Dunmill and Mr Pulham had been part of this about 15–20 years ago. They had reviewed the papers internally, but there was no outside review and they assumed that authors took responsibility for their views.

Dr Schwartz verified that he had correctly understood that Dr Takatsuji was suggesting that a review process should be introduced in order to make the submission of technical articles more attractive.

Dr Takatsuji replied with a “yes” and a “no”. He understood that the articles submitted to the OIML Bulletin underwent a strict review process, which was very useful for many audiences, but again the existence of a peer reviewed journal in the field of legal metrology would be very important and useful for some in the community.

Dr Schwartz commented that perhaps they should have refereed articles, which of course would be a bigger incentive for an engineer or a scientist to submit something.

A delegate from P.R. China agreed that the OIML Bulletin was very important to the OIML's work when it was compared to other international organisations in the field of standardisation, certification, and accreditation. He thought they should improve the contents of the Bulletin, and agreed that this should not just be the task of the BIPM, but rather of all the OIML, including the Member States. He saw that nowadays they lacked technical articles, so Member States and national institutes of metrology should offer to produce articles. He suggested that the BIPM could produce a typical guide for Member States, so they could see what kind of articles were needed, and Member States and national metrology institutes could offer articles on legal metrology in their nation. He said they would try their best to offer technical articles to support the continuation of the Bulletin.

Dr Schwartz thanked China for this very good proposal and support for continuing the Bulletin as a technical publication. He thought they could take up this proposal to issue some guidelines and proposals about the expectations for technical articles. He thought they could perhaps think of a two-year list for the next eight issues of the Bulletin. This could perhaps identify a team to think about the common subjects for the next Bulletins, such as flow measurement, or temperature measurement, and then to ask for articles on these themes.

Mr Pulham added that they had published many Bulletins with themes, and for the last three editions of the Bulletin, Mr Donnellan had helped in forming plans for each. They had used the subject of RLMOs, with extensive accounts of RLMO meetings, adding that it was always good to spread the news of what the regional organisations were doing. They had also included a lot of information on CEEMS, as well as many articles written by Mr Dixon on the OIML-CS, so they were doing OK as far as articles went on non-technical subjects. They had also been trying to focus on specific themes, so this was a very

good suggestion, but for some reason the technical articles has not been as forthcoming as they had been in the past. It might be a good idea for the BIML to decide on themes for the next few Bulletins, and then ask Member States whether they had experts who could contribute articles on those themes. The other repercussion of carrying out such an exercise would be that in the “old days” they used to get feedback to articles, and counter-articles in response to a given article, which had then generated discussion. This was the objective of the whole Bulletin: to allow countries to see what others were doing and to comment, criticise, and copy, in ways that would help them professionally.

Dr Schwartz suggested that they considered a timetable for the next two years, identifying the themes that might be interesting, and identifying mentors for these themes, preferably from the Presidential Council but also from the membership of the Committee. In this way, they would be able to plan more in the long term, and share responsibilities for certain issues, each mentor having responsibility for two articles on a given theme. They would also consider the proposal put forward by Japan to look at the possibility of reviewing articles, which could be an incentive for authors to submit them.

Mr Rifan Ardianto (Indonesia) suggested that the problem in sending technical articles was that they needed the Bulletin to have international recognition, for example in the Scopus index. He asked if it was possible that the OIML Bulletin could, as the next step, undertake some accreditation, or certification to be listed on the Scopus index so that published technical articles would have a higher rank.

Mr Donnellan thanked Mr Ardianto for his comment. He thought they had an opportunity to recraft the Bulletin to what they would like for the future as an Organisation, and to do that collectively. The existing structure of the Bulletin, with technical articles, updates and so on, could be refined in the future. From his notes, some of the options that could be looked at included peer review and recognition of the articles of a technical nature in international indexes and other bulletins. All of those things were possible for the future, but at the moment they were at a fairly critical point. To be frank they would have had no Bulletins this year if it had not been for articles produced by the BIML. As delegates could see from the graph, this was not an exaggeration, it was a fact. Their initial thoughts were that it would be useful to at least generate and stimulate articles to begin with. In the future, peer review and impact assessment were possibilities, but in the first instance they had to develop a plan, through mentors, to restart the flow of articles. The comment made by Mr Ardianto had been a valid one, and would be considered as part of the evolution of the Bulletin.

Mrs Lagauterie commented that she was not going to make a technical proposal, but one in relation to what was written in the Convention, to the work on D 1, and to the work on quality infrastructure. She wondered if they could not ask every CIML Member, when they were able, to write an article on the organisation of metrology, accreditation and quality in their countries. They each had different organisations and structures, and it would useful to have information disseminated via the Bulletin on what happened in each Member State of the OIML.

Dr Schwartz replied that this was a good proposal, and could be one of the themes. He concluded the discussion by inviting Members to send any other ideas they might have to Mr Pulham at the BIML, who would take them up in order to collect together enough articles for the next Bulletins. He asked delegates to consider draft resolution 2019/30 and read:

“The Committee,

Supports the proposal of Task Group 2023 and the Presidential Council to identify “mentors” for the OIML Bulletin, who will take responsibility for sustainably increasing the number of technical articles in the OIML Bulletin for the benefit of the legal metrology community, including legal metrology practitioners,

Requests CIML Members to consider becoming a “mentor” for the OIML Bulletin, and

Requests that CIML Members make any possible efforts in order that more technical articles are submitted for publication in the OIML Bulletin.”

Dr Schwartz asked if there were any comments, and specifically whether the request was too demanding.

Ms Vuković replied that she did not think it was too demanding, but she was asking herself whether anything would change, as the resolution seemed very vague. She asked how they planned to identify the mentors, as she was afraid that they would continue to be in the same situation in 2020. She said she had written an article for the Bulletin many years ago, and her personal experience had been that she had received no recognition for her article from her fellow CIML Members let alone others. She had written in her free time, and it had been a difficult task. She considered that if potential authors of articles did not receive much encouragement in their own environment, they would not be motivated to write articles in their own time for no recognition.

Dr Schwartz asked whether she meant recognition within her organisation, or no response from possible readers of the article.

Ms Vuković replied that she meant both of these. By her own environment she meant that it was very important that CIML Members encouraged their staff and created an environment where articles were written. There had also been no response to the article; it had been as though nothing had happened.

Mr Sanders commented on the word “supports” in the first paragraph of the resolution. At the end it said “for the benefit of the legal metrology community”, and he wanted to report that the Bulletin was actually read by quite a few of their inspectors. This had not been evident from the vote at the start, but the feedback they had was that some of the technical articles were very theoretical and very appropriate for people working at the highest levels. However, probably the largest number of people working in the legal metrology community were the inspectors, and he would like to suggest that some of the articles might come from them, with practical examples of how to do verification in the field, so he asked if they could add “including inspectors” after “legal metrology community”.

Dr Schwartz replied that they did not have a problem with this, but this also had given him the idea that they should probably do a stakeholder mapping exercise, and that they could also send out a questionnaire to obtain feedback on the general expectations for the Bulletin’s content. He said they would take this up at the Presidential Council meeting.

Mr Pulham replied firstly to the comments made by Ms Vuković. He knew that a lot of authors were not as prepared to contribute as before because of time and resources being limited. They did not receive payment for their articles, and through his contacts with authors, he was aware that many were writing articles in their own time because they were self-motivated, but he agreed it was an issue. In answer to Mr Sanders, he agreed and said they had always stressed the fact that practically-orientated articles were much better received, because people could make comparisons with their own practice, and may well have found a solution to a problem that had been highlighted. They could then write an article about how they had corrected the problem. He absolutely agreed that sometimes when they received articles which had many pages of theory, it was good because some scientists were interested in the theory but as the editor, he preferred practical articles as well. The key question, as Dr Schwartz had said, was how they could encourage people to submit this kind of article.

Dr Schwartz concluded that he hoped, with these valuable additional comments, they could now vote on this resolution.

Mr Mikiel added that in his opinion they should consider the broad scope of the readers going forward. Maybe they should consider crossing out the word “legal” leaving “for the benefit of metrology” because if they put the word “legal” and “customers” it seemed quite detailed to him. Perhaps they should consider a more general profile to the Bulletin, thus keeping the more technical articles, but also mixing them with technical, strictly scientific, and more general papers about the NMIs and other general issues.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Mikiel. He said they would take up all the comments and develop a plan to improve the situation in the medium to long term in addition to helping Mr Pulham, the BIML Editor, to acquire enough articles in the short term. He continued that following the comment from the UK, they had added the wording “including legal metrology practitioners” instead of “inspectors” because

the term “inspectors” was not used in every country. He asked if delegates were happy with this wording. He did not think they needed to include the words “stakeholder” or “customers” as he thought it was clear what they meant. Again he asked if they could now vote on the resolution.

There were no further comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. Resolution 2019/30 was unanimously approved.

Dr Schwartz added that they would come up with a proposal by the next meeting, or perhaps even before, because a year was a long time, and they needed to fill four issues of the Bulletin in that time. He thanked Mr Pulham.

## 11 Election of the CIML Second Vice-President

Dr Schwartz reiterated that this item would be discussed in a closed session, which meant that everyone except CIML Members and Members of Honour should leave the room until the item after this, which would be the OIML awards. The current item would not be recorded. He asked Mr Dunmill to remind delegates of the rules relating to the election of Vice-Presidents according to Basic Publication B 14.

*[session intentionally not recorded]*

Following the closed session Dr Schwartz said it was his pleasure to announce the result of the election, and he wanted to congratulate Dr Bobjoseph Mathew, CIML Member for Switzerland, on being elected as CIML Second Vice-President. Dr Schwartz invited Dr Mathew to address the Committee.

Dr Mathew greeted the President, the Presidential Council and other delegates in English and in French. He thanked them all for the trust they had put in him, and said he now had a clear task to take up, and he would be very happy to do so. He thanked all the Member States, but also the Corresponding Members who were dear to his heart, because he thought it was also important that they felt he would also be representing them in the future. It had been a very special week for him so far. He also thanked the other candidates, with whom he had been “competing”, although he felt that it had not actually been a competition as there had been a really good atmosphere between the four of them, and he wanted to thank them for their support. Together he thought they could achieve new heights within the OIML.

Dr Schwartz thanked Dr Mathew, and said he was looking forward to working with him in his new position. He also wanted to thank the three other candidates for having stood for this position. They had been excellent candidates, and it had been difficult to take a decision, but he hoped for their continued support. He said they had to consider the respective draft resolution, number 2019/31, and asked Mr Dunmill to display it on the screen.

Dr Schwartz read:

“The Committee,

Noting the procedure for the election of the CIML Second Vice-President in OIML B 14:2013,

Selects Dr Bobjoseph Mathew (Switzerland) as its Second Vice-President for a six-year term with immediate effect.”

Dr Schwartz had one remark on the words “immediate effect”. He said Dr Miki had already asked him if he would have to change seats. Dr Schwartz suggested that Dr Miki remained in the position of Vice-President until the end of the current Committee meeting, and joked that it did not literally mean “immediately”.

Dr Schwartz asked delegates if they were happy with the wording of the resolution. There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was unanimously passed.

## 12 Presentation of OIML Awards

### 12.1 OIML Medals

Dr Schwartz announced that three nominations for OIML medals had been received this year.

#### **Dr Jerzy Borzyminski**

Dr Schwartz said he was very pleased to announce that the first medal would go to Dr Jerzy Borzyminski, from Poland, who had served in the field of legal metrology for more than 25 years, and who had been active in OIML TC 1 for a long time. He asked Dr Borzyminski to come to the stage while he explained why they had chosen him as the first recipient of an OIML medal this year.

Dr Schwartz said that Dr Borzyminski worked at the Central Office of Measures, which is abbreviated to GUM, in Poland. Dr Borzyminski had been dealing with legal metrology since the very start of his career at GUM in 1994. He had been involved in OIML activities as a contact person on OIML TC 2, TC 3, and TC 4 in his position as Director of the general metrology department, and also as director of the information policy and foreign relations office at GUM. Since the beginning, OIML terminology had been his specialist area of activity, and since April 1997 – so for more than 20 years – he had served as the secretariat of OIML TC 1 *Terminology*, and as convener of its Project Groups. During these years he had been an editor for two editions of the International Vocabulary of Legal Metrology, the VIML, which had been published in 2000, and in 2013, and under his supervision, and thanks to his outstanding personal commitment, both editions had been translated into Polish. Since 2008, he had also represented the OIML on Working Group 2 of the Joint Committee for Guides in Metrology, the JCGM, on the International Vocabulary of Metrology (the VIM). It had also been of note that Dr Borzyminski had been a founding member of the Polish Association of Measurement, Automation and Robotics, which had been founded in 1992. In recognition of his personal achievements and distinguished contributions to metrology in general, and to legal metrology in particular, Dr Borzyminski had been selected to receive an OIML medal. He asked delegates to show their appreciation with a generous round of applause.

Dr Schwartz presented Dr Borzyminski with his medal.

Dr Borzyminski greeted the President and other delegates. He said the OIML medal was a great honour, and he was grateful that they had awarded it to him. The unexpected knowledge that he had been granted this high distinction had been an extremely pleasant experience. During many years of his work in legal metrology, he had been particularly involved in matters of metrological terminology, and in this regard he wanted to emphasize that it had been an honour for him that for over 22 years he had been able to cooperate with the excellent specialists from OIML Member States, the excellent specialists from the BIML, as well as the specialists on the JCGM working group for the International Vocabulary of Metrology. He had learnt a lot from all these people, and he was very grateful to them for the support they had given him in performing his tasks in this area. Due to the mission of the OIML and its important role in the global economy, uniform metrological terminology was also very important, because it formed the basis for the coherence of the many publications of the OIML, to which so many international organisations, and so many users refer. The OIML had been the initiator of the extensive international cooperation in international metrological terminology, and 2019 marked the 50th anniversary of the publication by the OIML of the first International Vocabulary, which had given rise to the series of other International Vocabularies, known as the VIM and the VIML. He hoped that in the future the OIML would continue its activities in this area, and that he would be able to continue to do something useful for legal metrology. He thanked the Committee once again for the medal.

#### **Mrs Corinne Lagauterie**

Dr Schwartz said this brought them to the second medal, revealing that it was being awarded to Mrs Corinne Lagauterie. He added that this would be a long laudation, but nevertheless he asked Mrs Lagauterie to come to the stage.



Dr Schwartz said Mrs Lagauterie was Head of the Bureau de la Métrologie in France. She had studied mathematics and physics at high school, and from 1978 to 1981 she had attended the Metrology Engineering School in Paris. She had obtained her Civil Engineering Diploma in 1981. Since then she had been a civil servant at the ministry in charge of industry in Paris. Her first activity had been as a non-automatic weighing instruments and weights type approval engineer at the Central Office of Legal Metrology. Her experience with OIML work had begun in 1986, with a German co-secretariat for what he joked was “the most important Recommendation they had”, R 76. Her OIML teacher and mentor at that time had been Professor Volkmann, and Dr Schwartz added that some delegates may remember his PTB colleague from that time. He said that he had also worked with her for many years, and added that it had always been a pleasure. Her career had been at the highest level, and she had always been willing to take on new challenges, such as certification of measuring instruments, drafting of resolutions, laboratory and private verification body assessment, the preparation of the non-automatic weighing instruments directive, and various European standards. In 2001 she had been appointed deputy head of the Bureau de la Métrologie, and had taken over as its head in 2011. This role had involved her supervising all the legal metrology activities in France, and she had managed a team of 12 people in Paris, plus around 130 in the regions. She had made contributions to industrial metrology, regulatory contributions to scientific metrology, and to the control of the LNE, the Laboratoire National de Métrologie et d’Essais in France. Mrs Lagauterie had also been an active member of several WELMEC working groups since the beginning of WELMEC in the 1990s. Since the year 2000, she had been France’s representative on the WELMEC Committee, a Member of the Chairperson’s Group, and also deputy chair of WELMEC for six years. Dr Schwartz added that he remembered some of the reports she had given to the RLMO Round Table in this role. Coming back to the part Mrs Lagauterie had played in the OIML, she had been France’s representative on several key TCs and SCs, and since 2011, she had been the CIML Member for France and France’s representative at the OIML Conference. Dr Schwartz said that most delegates would remember that she had been President of the OIML Conference in Strasbourg in 2016. He said he was grateful to her for the support she had provided as a member of the Presidential Council, and he knew she had regular contact with the BIML. Dr Schwartz said he would stop there, but in recognition of Mrs Lagauterie’s personal achievements and distinguished contributions to metrology in general, and to legal metrology in particular, she had been selected to receive an OIML medal. He trusted that delegates would support the award and show their appreciation with a generous round of applause. He added that this would be Mrs Lagauterie’s last CIML meeting, and he wanted to thank her both personally and on behalf of the Committee for all the support she had given him and the Organisation. He wished her and her husband, whom he said many delegates also knew, and who had also received an OIML medal some years previously, a very happy retirement, saying that he hoped they could stay in touch with each other.

Dr Schwartz presented her with her medal.

Mrs Lagauterie thanked Dr Schwartz. She addressed herself to Presidential Council members, BIML staff and her colleagues. She said it was a very emotional day for her, as it was her last CIML meeting, so on this occasion she would not speak French. The medal meant a lot to her, as it symbolised her entire career. She had started in metrology when she was young, and had thoroughly enjoyed it. She emphasised how she had enjoyed working in this field which was very important for society, with its benefits to health, trade, the environment, and many other important developments in industry and scientific work. It was a very interesting technical field, because new technologies were always being invented, there was progress in testing facilities, progress in the industrial world, and in scientific research, and it was never boring. It was very interesting because of the relationships they could build together, relationships with a very wide range of people, of course international colleagues such as themselves. She also worked with colleagues in the regions and with industry and the unions, federations of manufacturers, federations of repairers, and all their colleagues in the field – the technicians and inspectors, whom they were representing and who she had felt she was representing at these meetings. She stressed how much she had enjoyed her work in legal metrology. She would remember all of the delegates, and in some cases their predecessors, as she had met many of them due to her long career, and she would also remember many of their colleagues in the technical working groups, because she had also been involved in many working groups, and she wished the Organisation a long life and success. She added that she was sure it was in brilliant hands, and with the support of all

delegates, it would develop and respond to the needs of society for the rest of the century at least. She thanked everyone again, and said she would be looking forward to meeting everyone in the next session and perhaps on other occasions. She added that she would officially be retiring in mid-summer 2020, so she would still have the opportunity to meet at least her European colleagues the following year. Again thanking everyone she asked them to “be happy”.

Dr Schwartz mentioned that “be happy” was the motto they had learnt from one group during the e-Learning seminar, and he had liked it very much. This was a good motto to maintain your health. As far as he had understood, Mrs Lagauterie would be retiring in the summer of the following year so she would of course be invited to attend the Presidential Council in March 2020.

### **Dr Yukinobu Miki**

Dr Schwartz continued that the BIML had prepared a third medal and a third certificate, and this would be awarded to the outgoing Second Vice-President Dr Yukinobu Miki. He asked Dr Miki to come to the stage.

Dr Schwartz stated that Dr Miki had served at the National Metrology Institute of Japan for thirty years or more as an official expert and manager in various positions. He had an MSc in physics and a PhD in engineering, both from the University of Tokyo. Dr Miki was currently Director General of NMIJ, a post he had taken up in 2010, and was senior Vice-President of the National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology, AIST, in Japan. At NMIJ, he had taken charge of the legal metrology section in 2004. Dr Schwartz said he had known and worked with Dr Miki over the years and had found him to have a sincere, open minded, and thoughtful personality, and accordingly he was respected by many colleagues at NMIJ, AIST, and of course in other organisations, including in the OIML. He had been the CIML Member for Japan since 2005, which had also been Dr Schwartz’s first CIML meeting, and a member of the Presidential Council since 2007. He had been CIML Second Vice-President since 2013. Between 2017 and 2018, he had become acting CIML First Vice-President for a year, but had stepped back to be Second Vice-President for the last year. Since 2014 he had taken responsibility as the chairperson of the RLMO Round Table, and under his chairmanship it had developed significantly, and had become a very valuable platform, with increasing participation year by year. Dr Schwartz added that since this would also be his last CIML meeting, he wanted to thank him both personally and on behalf of the Committee for his many years of dedication, his hard work in supporting the OIML, and in particular for keeping them headed towards the future. He wished him a very happy retirement, and asked the Committee to show their appreciation with a generous round of applause.

Dr Schwartz presented Dr Miki with his medal.

Dr Miki thanked the President, Vice-Presidents, BIML staff, and all his colleagues. He said he had been thanked by the RLMO Round Table the day before, which had been a surprise, but this was a really big surprise! He wondered how they had acquired his CV, and said he had one correction: he had not been the NMIJ Director for the last three years now. He observed that life was very interesting and full of many coincidences. He had started his career with the OIML as CIML Member in 2005, at the CIML meeting in Lyon, and the first CIML Member he had met had been Mr Gerard Lagauterie, and now he was leaving the OIML at the same time as Mrs Corinne Lagauterie! He had said yesterday that he could not have done anything without the support of other CIML Members, and especially from his Japanese colleagues, both the Japanese delegation at this meeting, and those back in Japan. As delegates knew, the Japanese were good at working together in groups, and he especially wanted to thank them. He believed that one of the cornerstones of the OIML, and one of its key parts was quality infrastructure, and as he was stepping down from his position in the OIML at the same time as Mrs Lagauterie in the summer of the following year, he would also be able come to the Presidential Council meeting. He wanted to take some time to relax when he retired, but would also like to continue to contribute to Japanese metrology and legal metrology, so he hoped to be able to support the very important work of the OIML, and hoped he would see them at least one or two more times, perhaps in Asia or Japan. He wished the OIML success.

The first resolution, 2019/32 was on the OIML medals and Dr Schwartz read:

“The Committee,

Congratulates this year’s recipients of an OIML Medal,

- Dr Jerzy Borzyminski
- Mrs Corinne Lagauterie
- Dr Yukinobu Miki

for their contribution to the work of the OIML.”

There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was approved unanimously.

Dr Schwartz then announced that he felt that the work of the Second Vice-President Dr Miki deserved a separate resolution, number 2019/33, and he read:

“The Committee,

Thanks Dr Yukinobu Miki for his contribution to the work of the OIML in his roles

- as CIML Member for Japan since 2005,
- as member of the Presidential Council since 2007,
- as Second CIML Vice-President since 2013,
- acting First Vice-President from 2017-2018, and
- as Chairperson of the RLMO Round Table since 2014.”

Dr Schwartz added that Dr Miki had made an enormous contribution to the work of the OIML and deserved a special appreciation.

There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The two resolutions were approved unanimously.

## **12.2 OIML Letters of Appreciation**

Dr Schwartz said they now came to the next item which was the Letters of Appreciation. He thought they had all been impressed by the report the OIML-CS Management Committee Chairperson had given them the previous day, so it was his pleasure to announce that the one and only Letter of Appreciation this year went to Mr Cock Oosterman. He asked Mr Oosterman to come to the stage.

Mr Oosterman had started his career in metrology at VSL, the Dutch metrology institute, in 1985. He had been a metrology researcher. In 1993 he had taken on the position of international project manager with the responsibility for the development of metrology, accreditation, standardisation, and quality infrastructure in developing countries. His career in legal metrology had begun in 2003 when he had joined NMi as manager of the type approval department, and in 2009 he had become head of the NMi certification body. In this role he had participated actively in the work of the OIML as a member of the Committee on Participation Review under the OIML Mutual Acceptance Arrangement, and he had played a significant role in the development of the OIML-CS. Having participated in the OIML-CS Provisional Management Committee, he had been appointed chairperson of the new OIML-CS Management Committee. He started this role on 1 January 2018, and Dr Schwartz thought they could all agree that Mr Oosterman had shown exemplary leadership, and demonstrated a great personal commitment to promoting and supporting the OIML-CS. At the 54th CIML Meeting in Bratislava, he had announced that he would be leaving NMi to take up a new position at VSL, so he was going back to his roots, and he would therefore be resigning from his role as the OIML-CS Management Committee Chairperson, which Dr Schwartz commented they accepted with regret. Dr Schwartz concluded that it was his great pleasure to congratulate Mr Oosterman on his achievements, and to thank him on behalf of the OIML for his contribution to legal metrology and especially for his involvement in the successful implementation, operation and expansion of the OIML-CS. His knowledge, passion, and enthusiasm would be greatly missed. He thought this deserved an OIML Letter of Appreciation, and asked the Committee to show its appreciation with a generous round of applause.

He presented Mr Oosterman with his Letter of Appreciation.

Mr Oosterman thanked the President and said he had not prepared for this. It had not been an easy decision to stand down as OIML-CS Management Committee chair. He thought the OIML-CS was ready to grow much further and with new technologies being developed and new countries participating in the OIML-CS. He also thought there was a really good chance for the OIML-CS to grow much further than at the present time. He remarked that he would be going back to his roots, to VSL, but he would be working in metrology, so he would not be far away, and would always be happy to answer questions, and to support the system in any way. He observed that it may be strange, but he wanted to thank his parents who had always supported him to grow. He also wanted to thank all the people who had participated in the OIML-CS to make it what it was now, and said he would miss them all.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Oosterman again, wished him all the best in his new position at VSL, and hoped to stay in touch. He suggested that once Mr Oosterman had settled into his new position, he might be happy to have some work to do in the legal metrology field, at least he hoped so.

Dr Schwartz read draft resolution 2019/34:

“The Committee,

Congratulates this year’s recipient of a Letter of Appreciation, Mr Cock Oosterman, and

Thanks him for his contribution to the development of the OIML Certification System (OIML-CS) and as Chairperson of the Management Committee since the launch of the OIML-CS.”

There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was approved unanimously.

### **12.3 OIML CEEMS Award**

Dr Schwartz stated that they now came to the next item, the OIML CEEMS Award, which had previously been called the “OIML Award for Excellent Achievements in Legal Metrology in Developing Countries”. Unfortunately, the nominations they had received this year had not met the criteria, so he had to announce that there would be no CEEMS Award given in 2019. He thought they should keep the quality level high, so they had taken the decision not to give an Award this year. He hoped they would receive some nominations the following year, and highlighted they had already received some very good nominations.

They would normally finish this item with the presentation by the previous year’s CEEMS Award winner, Professor Carlos Augusto de Azevedo from Brazil, but looking at the time, Dr Schwartz suggested to Mr Vasconcellos, the CIML Member for Brazil, that they postponed this presentation the following day, as they would have more time then.

Mr Vasconcellos agreed.

Dr Schwartz concluded this session.

Dr Schwartz called the Committee to order and thanked their hosts for the very enjoyable reception that had been held at the wonderful Bratislava Castle the previous evening.

Dr Schwartz said that this would be the last session of the 54th CIML Meeting. There were some items that they had not had time to complete the previous day. The first of these had been item 10.1.3.2 on the amended periodic review procedure for OIML publications. He reminded delegates that despite some discussion, they had delayed the decision until this session. In the meantime he, together with the First Vice-President, Dr Ehrlich, the BIML Director and the two BIML Assistant Directors, had gone through all the draft resolutions, including the resolution on this item. He was pleased to announce that

this, together with some background discussions, had resulted in an agreement on a draft resolution which he hoped they could now vote on, but before doing so they needed a new roll call.

Mr Dunmill carried out the roll call:

Albania.....not present at the moment  
Algeria .....not present (no proxy given)  
Australia.....present  
Austria.....present  
Belarus .....present  
Belgium.....present  
Brazil.....present  
Bulgaria.....present  
Cambodia .....present  
Canada .....not present (proxy given to Australia)  
Colombia.....not present (proxy given to Germany)  
Croatia.....present  
Cuba .....present  
Cyprus.....not present (proxy given to France)  
Czech Republic .....present  
Denmark.....not present (proxy given to Sweden)  
Egypt.....not present at the moment  
Finland .....present  
France.....present  
Germany.....present  
Greece .....not present (no proxy)  
Hungary .....not present (no proxy)  
India .....present  
Indonesia.....present  
Iran .....not present (no proxy)  
Ireland .....present  
Israel.....not present (proxy given to Germany)  
Italy .....present  
Japan .....present  
Kazakhstan.....not present  
Kenya.....present  
Korea (R.) .....present  
Macedonia.....present  
Monaco .....not present (proxy given to France)  
Morocco .....not present (no proxy)  
Netherlands .....present  
New Zealand.....present  
Norway.....present  
P.R. China .....present  
Pakistan.....not present (no proxy)  
Poland .....present

Portugal..... present  
Romania ..... not present at the moment  
Russian Federation..... present  
Saudi Arabia..... present  
Serbia ..... not present at the moment  
Slovakia ..... present  
Slovenia ..... present  
South Africa ..... present  
Spain ..... present  
Sri Lanka..... present  
Sweden..... present  
Switzerland ..... present  
Tanzania..... present  
Thailand ..... not present at the moment  
Tunisia ..... not present (no proxy)  
Turkey ..... not present (no proxy)  
United Kingdom..... present  
United States ..... present  
Viet Nam..... present  
Zambia ..... present

Mr Dunmill stated for the record that Romania and Egypt were now present, and announced that 49 Member States were either present or represented, therefore the quorum was achieved.

Dr Schwartz asked delegates to consider the reworded draft resolution on item 10.1.3.2, number 2019/28, which delegates had not voted on the previous day. He read:

“The Committee,

Noting the result of the vote on the 1CD of the Revision of B 6 *Directives for OIML technical work*,

Noting the recommendation in Addendum 10.1.3.2 to the Working Document for this meeting,

Approves the amended periodic review procedure detailed in Annex A of Addendum 10.1.3.2 to the Working Document for this meeting,

Approves the inclusion of the revised text, detailed in Annex B as amended during the meeting, together with the flowchart given in Annex C of Addendum 10.1.3.2 to the Working Document for this meeting, in the Final Draft Basic (FDB) Publication Revision of B 6-1 presented in 10.1.3.1, and

Approves the FDB Revision of B 6.”

He asked if everybody was happy with the new wording, reminding delegates that they were referring to the inclusion of the revised text as amended during the meeting.

There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was approved unanimously.

## **12.4 Presentation by the OIML CEEMS Award Winner 2018**

Dr Schwartz reminded delegates that they had not made a CEEMS Award for 2019, so there was no resolution under agenda item 12.3. In 2018 the CEEMS Award had been awarded to Professor Azevedo

from Brazil, and he invited the CIML Member for Brazil, Mr Vasconcellos, to give a short presentation on behalf of Professor Azevedo about the background to this project.

Mr Vasconcellos greeted the President and the other delegates. He said he had called his presentation “Metrology over the river”. His first slide showed the network of institutes that worked with INMETRO. They had 26 Institutes, and one of them was in Amazon State in the northern region of Brazil. His presentation included just five slides, that were part of a presentation from the federation of industry of the State of São Paulo, which would give a glimpse of what the Amazon was. He pointed out that Amazon State and Amazonia were a little different, which he wanted to illustrate.

He showed delegates Amazon State compared with Amazonia. This was the region that was covered by the Amazon rainforest and corresponded to 61 % of Brazil’s territory, or 5.2 km<sup>2</sup>. It included several states, one of them being Amazon State. Amazonia was classed legally as a biome formed by the influence of the rainforest. The legal Amazonia was practically the size of Western Europe, and was 84 % covered by the rainforest. He showed delegates some statistics about Amazonia. Amazon State was a very large state covered by rivers, and had so few roads that people had to travel by river, and a lot of its population lived by the rivers.

The project INMETRO had launched used boats to carry out verifications and surveillance. He showed delegates some photos from outside and inside the boats, which had laboratories to carry out prepackage and other metrological verifications. He showed the staff of the boat carrying out a fuel station verification, as there were fuel stations on the river for boats. Two such units carried out not only metrological services on the Amazon, but also provided other services for the population such as services for civil rights and citizenship. They even performed marriages and baptisms, as well as carrying out metrology and research about the fauna and flora of Amazon State. In the first six months of operation, they had had verified more than 2 000 instruments. He also showed delegates a photo of a prepackage verification, and concluded by saying that the project was operational, and was introducing legal metrology in Amazon State as well as giving citizenship to the people along the rivers.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Vasconcellos for his interesting presentation and congratulated him once more on the achievements. The award had gone to Professor Azevedo, but he was sure he had a big team behind him, and he thought it was an excellent idea, which could probably be taken up by other countries which had a lot of water. It had been a good idea and a good model which was exactly what they were looking for when they looked for nominations for CEEMS awards.

Dr Schwartz asked that they consider the respective resolution, number 2019/35, and he read:

“The Committee,

Thanks Mr Marcos Trevisan Vasconcellos (Brazil) for his presentation on behalf of Prof. Carlos Augusto de Azevedo, winner of the 2018 OIML CEEMS Award.”

There were no comments. There were no abstentions . There were no negative votes. The resolution was approved unanimously.

## **13 Preparation of the 16th International Conference (2020)**

This agenda item was considered under item 14.1.

## **14 Future meetings**

### **14.1 55th CIML Meeting and 16th International Conference (2020 – P.R. China)**

Dr Schwartz said that item 13 was related to the item on future meetings, so he thought they could combine items 13 and 14.1. He invited the delegation from P.R. China to give a presentation, and said they had been looking forward to it.

Mr Qin greeted the President and the Committee. On behalf of the State Administration for Market Regulation of P.R. China, he wanted firstly to warmly congratulate the 54th CIML Meeting on its success. He said that they sincerely thanked their Slovak colleagues for their contribution to this meeting.

During the week they had learnt a lot from the meeting so that they could prepare better for the 16th OIML Conference and 55th CIML Meeting to be held in October 2020 in Suzhou, P.R. China. He described Suzhou and Shanghai as close neighbours, the distance between them being about 100 kilometres. The weather was quite mild and pleasant in October and would be much like they had had in Bratislava.

Suzhou was an ancient city, with over 2 500 years of history, and was known as the Venice of the East, due to its famous criss-crossing waterways, grand lakes, scenic rivers and stone bridges, which were still in used by its inhabitants in the present day. Its well preserved classical gardens, which dated back to the 11 century, and its grand canal, with over 1 000 years history, were both UNESCO World Cultural Heritage sites. Kunqu opera, which was the origin of the other Chinese opera styles, and the art of playing the Guzheng, an ancient Chinese musical instrument, were among UNESCO's list of tangible cultural heritages of humanity. Suzhou was also a treasure house for arts and crafts. As the silk capital of China, it produced the finest silk and had once provided high quality silk embroidery for the royal family. Delegates might also like to taste typical Suzhou snacks, which were one of the four most popular snacks in China. Suzhou was a city where history met modernity. It had historically been a centre of commercial success and now it was one of the fastest growing major cities in the world, with thriving high tech industries. In recent years it had become one of the new engines of growth in China, and with impressive economic output, it was also notable for its far-reaching industrial parks in the central city districts, and the surrounding townships with great potential for growth.

During the Conference and the CIML meeting, they would arrange technical tours so that delegates could better appreciate Suzhou's industry and its traditional culture, as well as understanding better how metrology supports China's economic and social development. The State Administration for Market Regulation of China would work closely with their colleagues in Suzhou and the Jiangsu province, and utilise all other available resources to prepare for the events. They would also be ready to offer coordination and assistance to facilitate transport, visa applications, etc. for attendees. He added that as the Chinese saying went "up in heaven there is paradise, down on earth there are Suzhou and Hangzhou". Suzhou, the paradise on earth, will be coming towards them! Suzhou, the paradise on earth will spread the OIML's mission to more countries and more persons! The paradise on earth welcomes all of them to attend the Conference and the CIML meeting. He said he would be waiting for them there, and he asked them not to miss it. He then showed delegates a short video.

Dr Schwartz thanked Mr Qin and the Chinese delegation for their kind invitation and warm welcome to the following year's OIML Conference and CIML meeting in Suzhou. He thought they had all been impressed to see the facts about the next venue, and added they were very much looking forward to it, and were grateful for the kind invitation. He also thanked Mr Qin for saying he would support the visa applications, as securing visas on time would be very important, because proxies were not allowed for OIML Conferences, so in order to reach the quorum they needed Members to come to Suzhou. He had spoken to Mr Qin beforehand about this, and thanked him again for mentioning this subject in his presentation and invitation.



Dr Schwartz asked delegates to consider the respective resolution, number 2019/36, which read:

“The Committee,

Notes the information provided on the organisation of the 55th CIML Meeting and 16th International Conference in 2020,

Thanks the People’s Republic of China for its invitation to host the 55th CIML Meeting and 16th International Conference in 2020, and

Instructs the Bureau to make the necessary arrangements to organise the 55th CIML Meeting and 16th International Conference in 2020.”

There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was approved unanimously.

## **14.2 56th CIML Meeting (2021)**

Dr Schwartz said the next item to be considered was the 56th CIML Meeting, which would be held in 2021. The Working Document for the current meeting said the venue for the meeting in 2021 would be announced here in Bratislava. It was his pleasure to inform delegates that a decision had been taken at the Presidential meeting in March to put forward the proposal to accept the invitation from the Russian Federation to host the 56th CIML Meeting in 2021. A formal invitation had been received from Russia, so he now wanted to invite Dr Golubev to provide some information.

Dr Sergey Golubev (Russia) greeted delegates. On behalf of the Federal Agency for Technical Regulation and Metrology it was his pleasure to suggest a venue for the 56th CIML Meeting in 2021. The last time Russia had hosted the meeting had been in 2001 for the 36th CIML meeting 18 years ago, when the venue had been Moscow. A lot of time had passed since then, and therefore he was especially pleased to announce the suggestion to hold the 56th CIML Meeting in 2021 in Saint Petersburg, a city that was known for its many cultural, scientific, and metrological traditions. It was a city where the prominent Russian researcher, Dmitri Mendeleev, who discovered the periodic law of chemical elements, had lived and worked. He had published the periodic table, and initiated the metric systems of weights and measures and units in Russia. The metrology institute in Saint Petersburg carried his name, which some delegates might recognise: VNIIM, which had previously been the main chamber of weights and measures in Russia. The Agency assured OIIM Members they would have the chance to visit one of the most beautiful cities, experience its hospitality, and work efficiently. He concluded by saying he hoped to see them all there in 2021.

Dr Schwartz thanked Dr Golubev for his kind invitation. They had already spoken about a possible week of meetings, and he asked Dr Golubev if they would be able to accommodate this.

Dr Golubev replied that his suggestion was the last week of September, for reasons of the weather, which was a little bit better then, but certainly no later than the first week of October, because the later it got, the less he could guarantee the weather, although he joked he could not actually do this at all!

Dr Schwartz confirmed that the provisional dates would be between 27 September and 1 October 2021.

Due to a technical problem, Dr Schwartz said he could not show delegates the respective draft resolution, but they would come back to it when they looked at all the resolutions at the end of the meeting. He announced that it was now time for the group photograph.

Dr Schwartz asked that delegates now consider all the draft resolutions. He hoped they would still maintain the quorum because some delegates had left already and so they needed to take a roll call. He asked Mr Dunmill to carry this out.

Albania.....not present (proxy to Macedonia)  
 Algeria .....not present (no proxy given)  
 Australia.....present  
 Austria.....present  
 Belarus .....present came in while roll call being taken  
 Belgium.....not present  
 Brazil.....present  
 Bulgaria.....not present (proxy given to Macedonia)  
 Cambodia .....present  
 Canada .....not present (proxy given to Australia)  
 Colombia.....not present (proxy given to Germany)  
 Croatia.....present  
 Cuba .....present  
 Cyprus.....not present (proxy given to France)  
 Czech Republic .....present  
 Denmark.....not present (proxy given to Sweden)  
 Egypt.....not present at the moment  
 Finland .....present  
 France.....present  
 Germany.....present  
 Greece .....not present (no proxy)  
 Hungary .....not present (no proxy)  
 India .....present  
 Indonesia.....present  
 Iran .....not present (no proxy)  
 Ireland .....present  
 Israel.....not present (proxy given to Germany)  
 Italy .....present  
 Japan .....present  
 Kazakhstan.....present  
 Kenya .....present  
 Korea (R.) .....not present  
 Macedonia.....present  
 Monaco .....not present (proxy given to France)  
 Morocco .....not present (no proxy)  
 Netherlands .....present  
 New Zealand.....present  
 Norway.....present  
 P.R. China .....present  
 Pakistan.....not present (no proxy)  
 Poland .....present  
 Portugal.....present  
 Romania .....present  
 Russian Federation.....present

Saudi Arabia..... present  
Serbia ..... not present at the moment  
Slovakia ..... present  
Slovenia ..... present  
South Africa ..... present  
Spain ..... present  
Sri Lanka..... present  
Sweden..... present  
Switzerland ..... present  
Tanzania..... present  
Thailand ..... not present at the moment  
Tunisia ..... not present (no proxy)  
Turkey ..... not present (no proxy)  
United Kingdom..... present  
United States ..... present  
Viet Nam..... present  
Zambia ..... present

After verification, the number of countries present or represented was 48 so the quorum was maintained.

Mr Dunmill checked that delegates at the back of the room could read the screen. He explained that some of the resolutions had already been approved, but editorial changes had been made to some of the resolutions and there was one which had not been approved.

**Resolution 2019/1 (agenda item 1)** No change to the text as it had been approved during the meeting.

**Resolution 2019/2 (agenda item 2)** No change to the text as it had been approved during the meeting.

**Resolution 2019/3 (agenda item 4.1)** No change to the text as it had been approved during the meeting.

**Resolution 2019/4 (agenda item 4.2)** No change to the text as it had been approved during the meeting.

**Resolution 2019/5 (agenda item 5)** No change to the text as it had been approved during the meeting.

**Resolution 2019/6 (agenda item 6.1)** No change to the text as it had been approved during the meeting.

**Resolution 2019/7 (agenda item 6.1)** There was a small editorial change because there had been a copy and paste error. The resolution had been split into two parts, and the information that the Director must present was not to the Conference because this would be to do with proposals for the reserves and new revenue, which was to be reported to the CIML. It therefore read “should be presented to the 55th CIML in 2020”.

There were no comments. The resolution had already been approved.

**Resolution 2019/8 (agenda item 6.2)** An “s” had been missing from one of the words, which should have read “its” instead of “it”.

There were no comments.

**Resolution 2019/9 (agenda item 6.3)** had not been approved. Some changes had been made to the way it had been presented and so it now needed to be reconsidered:

“The Committee,

Notes the report given by the BIML Director,

Encourages the BIML to continue its efforts to recover outstanding arrears and to consider additional mechanisms for prompt payment by Member States and Corresponding Members,

Requests those Member States and Corresponding Members with arrears to bring their situation up to date as soon as possible, and

Requests Member States and Corresponding Members to ensure prompt payment of membership fees.”

There were no comments about the wording. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was approved unanimously.

**Resolution 2019/10 (agenda item 7.1)** No change to the text as it had been approved during the meeting.

**Resolution 2019/11 (agenda item 7.2)** No change to the text as it had been approved during the meeting.

**Resolution 2019/12 (agenda item 7.3)** No change to the text as it had been approved during the meeting.

**Resolution 2019/13 (agenda item 7.4)** There was an editorial change to spell out the abbreviation for the CCU the first time it was mentioned, and taking the full name out the second time it was mentioned.

There were no comments.

**Resolution 2019/14 (agenda item 7.5)** The resolution had not listed the liaison organisations and some of the organisations, some of which had presented information at the meeting, and some of which had provided a written report beforehand, so they had changed the wording to read “Notes the report and presentations from the following organisations” and then listed those that had either supplied a report or presented at the meeting.

There were no comments.

**Resolution 2019/15 (agenda item 8.1)** No change to the text as it had been approved during the meeting.

**Resolution 2019/16 (agenda item 8.1)** No change to the text as it had been approved during the meeting.

**Resolution 2019/17 (agenda item 8.1)** No change to the text as it had been approved during the meeting.

**Resolution 2019/18 (agenda item 8.1)** There had been a small editorial change to spell out “Technical Committees and Subcommittees”. In addition, at the end there was an instruction to the BIML Director to take into account the e-Learning concept when preparing the budget for the 2021–2024 financial period and the words “to be presented to the Conference” had been deleted at the end. Mr Dunmill explained that the instruction had been that the Director would take this information into account when developing the budget, and that budget would be presented and discussed at the CIML meeting and then put forward to the Conference, so they did not think it was appropriate to have this text at the end. It was not going to be presented directly to the Conference.

There were no comments.

**Resolution 2019/19 (agenda item 9.1)** There had been a couple of editorial changes to explain the abbreviations and then use them.

There were no comments.

**Resolution 2019/20 (agenda item 10.1.1)** No change to the text as it had been approved during the meeting.

**Resolution 2019/21 (agenda item 10.1.1)** There was an editorial change saying “The Committee thanks the relevant Project Group conveners and members for their work in completing these Projects.” This had been to make sure that Project Group members had been included in the thanks as well as the Project Group conveners.

There were no comments.

**Resolution 2019/22 (agenda item 10.1.2.1)** No change to the text as it had been approved during the meeting.

**Resolution 2019/23 (agenda item 10.1.2.2)** No change to the text as it had been approved during the meeting.

**Resolution 2019/24 (agenda item 10.1.2.3)** No change to the text as it had been approved during the meeting.

**Resolution 2019/25 (agenda item 10.1.2.4)** No change to the text as it had been approved during the meeting.

**Resolution 2019/26 (agenda item 10.1.1)** This resolution had not been considered during the meeting, although there had been a decision to allow the vote on B 11. It had been read and agreed but the text had not been displayed on the screen.

**Resolution 2019/27 (agenda item 10.1.2.5)** No change to the text as it had been approved during the meeting.

**Resolution 2019/28 (agenda item 10.1.3)** No change to the text as it had been approved during the meeting.

**Resolution 2019/29 (agenda items 10.1.3 and 10.2)** No change to the text since it had been approved that morning.

**Resolution 2019/30 (agenda item 10.3)** No change to the text since it had been approved that morning.

**Resolution 2019/31 (agenda item 11)** No change to the text since it had been approved that morning.

**Resolution 2019/32 (agenda item 12.1)** No change to the text since it had been approved that morning.

**Resolution 2019/33 (agenda item 12.1)** No change to the text since it had been approved that morning.

**Resolution 2019/34 (agenda item 12.2)** No change to the text since it had been approved that morning.

**Resolution 2019/35 (agenda item 12.4)** No change to the text since it had been approved that morning.

**Resolution 2019/36 (agenda item 14.1)** No change to the text since it had been approved that morning.

**Resolution 2019/37 (agenda item 14.2)** Had not been presented due to a technical problem, so it needed to be approved.

There were no comments. There were no abstentions. There were no negative votes. The resolution was approved unanimously.

Mr Dunmill said that this completed the review of the resolutions for the meeting. He concluded that the BIML would finalise them as quickly as possible and publish them as usual on the OIML website.

Dr Schwartz checked that there were no further comments of the resolution. There being none, this concluded the review of the resolutions.

## **15 Other matters**

Dr Schwartz asked delegates whether they wished to raise any other matters. There were none.

## **Closing remarks by Dr Schwartz**

Dr Schwartz said this brought them to the closing remarks. He really wanted to thank Committee Members, the representatives of Corresponding Member States, and the Members of Honour for their participation, and for the contributions they had made to the meeting. He thought it had again been a very successful and fruitful meeting. They had taken some important decisions, partly strategic decisions, with relevance to the future of their Organisation. He wanted once again to extend his sincere

congratulations to the new Second Vice-President, Dr Bobjoseph Mathew, CIML Member for Switzerland, and said he was looking forward to even closer cooperation with him in the future, as well as with the First Vice-President, Dr Chuck Ehrlich. He especially wanted to thank their hosts from the Slovak delegation. He had already spoken to Mr Pavel Pavlis, the President of the Slovak Office of Standards, Metrology, and Testing, and of course he wanted to thank all the organisational team, mentioning in particular Dr Markovic and Mr Peter Adam. He thought they had done an excellent job, and added that everyone had really appreciated the warm hospitality as well as the technical and laboratory tours. It had all been organised very well and had made the meeting very successful and enjoyable.

Dr Schwartz added that he was sure they had all enjoyed the city of Bratislava, and had learnt a lot about the country and its capital. They had received a lot of information, and only the previous day they had been very impressed by the performance at the Host Country Reception. He was sure they would all have good memories of the meeting.

He thanked the organisers of the e-Learning seminar that had been held on the Monday prior to the CIML meeting. He said it felt like it had been weeks ago! He thought this had also been a very successful meeting, and he thanked the organising team Dr Bobjoseph Mathew, Dr Peter Ulbig and the BIML team. They would take note of all the proposals that had been made by the 13 teams during the breakout session, and see what they could do to follow them up. Dr Schwartz said he had mentioned the BIML team, and he wanted to give them a very special thank you, particularly to Mrs Patricia Saint-Germain. He described her as the motor behind it all, and invited her to come to the stage to receive a small token of his appreciation.

Delegates showed their appreciation with a round of applause.

Dr Schwartz also wanted to thank the interpreters, who had again provided excellent interpretation. He thought they always did a remarkable job, and asked delegates to give them a round of applause.

Dr Schwartz continued that this would be the last CIML meeting for some of their colleagues. He had already mentioned this would be the case for Mrs Lagauterie and Dr Miki, but it would also be the last meeting for some other long-standing participants and supporters of the OIML who were not CIML Members. He particularly wanted to mention Mr Johann Fischer, the Director of the Berlin Brandenburg Verification Authority, who had represented the German Association of Verification Authorities for 13 years since the 2006 CIML meeting in Cape Town. He had a small token of his appreciation to give him, and would be seeing him later on that day. He wanted to wish him a very happy retirement. He said he would probably be seeing Mrs Lagauterie and Dr Miki at the Presidential Council the following year, but on behalf of the Committee he wanted to wish them a happy retirement too.

He wished all delegates a safe journey home, and said he was looking forward to seeing them the following year at the 55th CIML meeting and 16th Conference in Suzhou, P.R. China.

Dr Schwartz declared the 54th CIML Meeting closed.

\*\*\*

\*\*

\*

## **List of Participants in the 54th CIML Meeting**

## CIML Meeting 2019

Total number of participants: 159Member States: 47Number of delegates: 111

## ALBANIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Stilian Habibi	<input type="checkbox"/> Director	stilian.habibi@dpm.gov.al	0
Mr. Frrok Coku	<input type="checkbox"/> Director	frrok.coku@dpm.gov.al	0

## AUSTRALIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Bill Loizides	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Manager of Legal Metrology	bill.loizides@measurement.gov.au	0
Mr. Darryl Hines	<input type="checkbox"/>	darryl.hines@measurement.gov.au	0

## AUSTRIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Robert Edelmaier	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Vice President of BEV	robert.edelmaier@bev.gv.at	1

## BELARUS

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Dzmitry Bartashevich	<input type="checkbox"/> Deputy Chairperson of Gosstandart	coomet@belgim.by	0
Mr. Maksim Shabanov	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of department	coomet@belgim.by	0
Mr. Valery Hurevich	<input type="checkbox"/> Director		0

## BELGIUM

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Dirk Bils	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conseiller General, Responsable de la Division Metrologie	dirk.bils@economie.fgov.be	0

## BRAZIL

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Marcos Trevisan Vasconcellos	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Director of Legal Metrology	mtvasconcellos@inmetro.gov.br	0

## BULGARIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Paun Ilchev	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acting President	p.ilchev@bim.government.bg	0
Mr. Valentin Starev	<input type="checkbox"/> General Director	v.starev@bim.government.bg	0



# CIML Meeting 2019

**Total number of participants: 159**

## CAMBODIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Pitou BY <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	President of NMC	bypitou@yahoo.com	0
Mr. Ousa Khlaut <input type="checkbox"/>	Director of Department of Legal Metrology	ousa_mime@yahoo.com	0
Mr. Polineavith Ngì <input type="checkbox"/>	Director of Department of Industrial Metrology	ngipolineavith@gmail.com	0

## CROATIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mrs. Brankica Novosel <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	General Director	brankica.novosel@dzm.hr	0

## CUBA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Eng. Fernando Antonio Arruza Rodriguez <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Director of Metrology	arruza@ncnorma.cu	0

## CZECH REPUBLIC

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Pavel Klenovský <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Director General	pklenovsky@cmi.cz	0
Mr. Zbynek Veselak <input type="checkbox"/>	Director of Department of Legal Metrology	veselak@unmz.cz	0

## EGYPT

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Eng. Abdallah Ahmed Mohamed Moantasser <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Chairman	aamontaser23@gmail.com	0
Eng. Maha Ramadan <input type="checkbox"/>	Technical Manager	maha.a63@yahoo.com	0

## FINLAND

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Tuomo Valkeapää <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Chief Engineer	tuomo.valkeapaa@tukes.fi	0
Ms. Sari Hemminki <input type="checkbox"/>	Senior Adviser	sari.hemminki@tukes.fi	0

## FRANCE

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mrs. Corinne Lagauterie <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Chef du Bureau de la Métrologie	corinne.lagauterie@finances.gouv.fr	1

# CIML Meeting 2019

**Total number of participants: 159**

## GERMANY

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Roman Schwartz	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Vice-President PTB	roman.schwartz@ptb.de	1
Dr. Peter Ulbig	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of Division Legal and International Metrology	Peter.Ulbig@ptb.de	1
Mr. Johann Fischer	<input type="checkbox"/> Director	Johann.Fischer@lme.berlin-brandenburg.de	0
Mrs. Katharina Gierschke	<input type="checkbox"/> Legal expert	Katharina.Gierschke@bmwi.bund.de	0

## INDIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Ashutosh Agarwal	<input type="checkbox"/> Deputy Director Legal Metrology	ashutosh.agarwal13@nic.in	0
Mr. Amit Mehta	<input type="checkbox"/> Joint Secretary	js-ca@nic.in	0

## INDONESIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Rusmin Amin	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Director of Metrology	rusmin.amin@kemendag.go.id	1
Mr. Rifan Ardianto	<input type="checkbox"/> Deputy Director	rifan.ardianto@gmail.com	0

## IRELAND

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Ms. Mairead Buckley	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Director	mairead.buckley@nsai.ie	0

## ITALY

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Prof./Dr. Giuseppe Capuano	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dirigente	giuseppe.capuano@mise.gov.it	0

## JAPAN

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Yukinobu Miki	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Director of National Metrology Institute of Japan	y.miki@aist.go.jp	0
Mr. Takashi Kawabata	<input type="checkbox"/> Deputy Director, Metrology Policy Office	kawabata-takashi@meti.go.jp	0
Dr. Toshiyuki Takatsuji	<input type="checkbox"/> Director, Research Institute for Engineering Measurement	toshiyuki.takatsuji@aist.go.jp	0
Dr. Tsuyoshi Matsumoto	<input type="checkbox"/> Associate Manager, NMIJ Int'l Cooperation Office	ty-matsumoto@aist.go.jp	0

## CIML Meeting 2019

**Total number of participants: 159**

Mr. Hajime Nemoto	<input type="checkbox"/>	Principal Research Manager, Research Institute for Engineering Measurement	h-nemoto@aist.go.jp	0
-------------------	--------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------	---

### KAZAKHSTAN

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Toktabek Tokanov	<input type="checkbox"/> General Director	smanova@kazinmetr.kz	0

### KENYA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Michael Nyamwamu Onyancha	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Director of Weights and Measures	weightskenya@gmail.com	1

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Elias Mwangi	<input type="checkbox"/> CIML meeting	m.eliasmburu@yahoo.com	0
Ms. Florence Njihia	<input type="checkbox"/> CIML Meeting	florencewamutu@gmail.com	0

### KOREA (R.)

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Sungmin Cho	<input type="checkbox"/> Assistant manager	csm@kasto.or.kr	0
Dr. Dong Jin Lee	<input type="checkbox"/> Researcher	ldj9874@korea.kr	0
Dr. Jee Hoon Lee	<input type="checkbox"/> Researcher	jeehoon@korea.kr	0
Mr. Jin Ki Hong	<input type="checkbox"/> Deputy Director	jinkihong@korea.kr	0
Mr. Seung Hyun Ko	<input type="checkbox"/> Principal Engineer	shko@krc.re.kr	0

### NETHERLANDS

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Robert Lambregts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coordinating Senior Advisor	robert.lambregts@agentschaptelecom.nl	1

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Matthijs Van der Wiel	<input type="checkbox"/> senior advisor - assigne	matthijs.vanderwiel@agentschaptelecom.nl	1

### NEW ZEALAND

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Phil Sorrell	<input type="checkbox"/> Team Leader Compliance and Inspection	phil.sorrell@mbie.govt.nz	0

### NORWAY

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Geir Samuelsen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Director General	gsa@justervesenet.no	0

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mrs. Eli Mogstad Ranger	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of Department	emr@justervesenet.no	0

# CIML Meeting 2019

**Total number of participants: 159**

## P.R. CHINA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Yizhi QIN <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Vice Minister	zhenghuaxin@samr.gov.cn	0
<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mrs. Yuhan Wang <input type="checkbox"/>	officer	wangyuhan@samr.gov.cn	0
Mrs. HuaXin Zheng <input type="checkbox"/>	Director	zhenghuaxin@samr.gov.cn	0
Mrs. Changqing Cai <input type="checkbox"/>	Researcher	caichangqing@nim.ac.cn	0
Mr. JianPing Han <input type="checkbox"/>	Deputy Director General	hanjianping@samr.gov.cn	0
Mr. Jian Wang <input type="checkbox"/>	Researcher	wangjian@nim.ac.cn	0
Mr. Jun Xie <input type="checkbox"/>	Director General	zhenghuaxin@samr.gov.cn	0

## POLAND

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Marcin Mikiel <input type="checkbox"/>	Chief Specialist	marcin.mikiel@gum.gov.pl	0
Mrs. Aleksandra Lewicka <input type="checkbox"/>	Chief Specialist	aleksandra.lewicka@gum.gov.pl	0
Dr. Jerzy Borzyminski <input type="checkbox"/>		marcin.mikiel@gum.gov.pl	0

## PORTUGAL

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Isabel Godinho <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Director	igodinho@ipq.pt	0

## REPUBLIC OF NORTH MACEDONIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mrs. Merita Mustafai <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Director	merita.mustafai@bom.gov.mk	1

## ROMANIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Dimlitru Dinu <input type="checkbox"/>	Deputy General Director	dinu_dumitru_dga@yahoo.com	0

## RUSSIAN FEDERATION

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Sergey Golubev <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Deputy Head	sgolubev@gost.ru	0
<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Ms. Ksenia Kasina <input type="checkbox"/>	lead engineer of International Department	kasina@vniims.ru	0

## SAUDI ARABIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Tamis Alhammadi <input type="checkbox"/>	Vice Governor for Standards and Laboratories	t.hammadi@saso.gov.sa	0

## CIML Meeting 2019

**Total number of participants: 159**

Mr. Bader Alfaiz	<input type="checkbox"/>	Director of metrology standards Dept.	b.faiz@saso.gov.sa	0
Mr. Ali Alharbi	<input type="checkbox"/>	Conformity certificates dept. manager	a.harbi@saso.gov.sa	0
Eng. Mohammed Alzughaibi	<input type="checkbox"/>	Legal metrology project staff	m.zughaibi@taqyees.sa	0
Eng. Faisal Aljohani	<input type="checkbox"/>	Legal metrology project staff	f.johani@taqyees.sa	0
Dr. Ismail AlFaleh	<input type="checkbox"/>	Vice director general of National Measurement and Calibration Center	i.faleh@saso.gov.sa	0
Eng. Ahmad Alzuwair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Legal metrology project staff	a.zuwair@taqyees.sa	0

### SERBIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Cedomir Belic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acting Director	cedomirbelic@dmdm.rs	0

### SLOVAKIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Zbynek Schreier	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of Department of Metrology	zbynek.schreier@normoff.gov.sk	0
Dr. Jaromir Markovic	<input type="checkbox"/> General Director	markovic@slm.sk	0
Mr. Peter Adam	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of Metrological workplace	adam@slm.sk	0

### SLOVENIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mrs. Natasa Mejak Vukovic	<input type="checkbox"/> Advisor to Director	natasa.mejak-vukovic@gov.si	0

### SOUTH AFRICA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Jaco Marneweck	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Manager - Legal Metrology (acting)	jaco.marneweck@nracs.org.za	0
Mr. Elvis Phoshoko	<input type="checkbox"/> Observer	hennie.ferreira@nracs.org.za	0
Mr. Hendrik Petrus Ferreira	<input type="checkbox"/> General Manager		0

### SPAIN

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Jose Manuel Bernabe Sanchez	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Director, CEM	jmbernabe@cem.es	0
Ms. M <sup>a</sup> Teresa López	<input type="checkbox"/> Director of División	mtlopez@cem.es	1

# CIML Meeting 2019

**Total number of participants: 159**

## SRI LANKA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. S.N. Akuranthilaka <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Director	dir@measurementsdept.gov.lk	0

## SWEDEN

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mrs. Renée Hansson <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Deputy Head of Legal Metrology Dept	renee.hansson@swedac.se	0

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Schmidt Mikael <input type="checkbox"/>	Head of legal metrology department	mikael.schmidt@swedac.se	0

## SWITZERLAND

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Bobjoseph Mathew <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Vice Director, Head of Legal Metrology	bobjoseph.mathew@metas.ch	0

## TANZANIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Ludovic Manege <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Chief Executive Officer	ludovic.manege@wma.go.tz	0

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mrs. R.H. Stella Kahwa <input type="checkbox"/>	Director of Technical Services, WMA	sterwega@hotmail.com>	0

## THAILAND

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Whichai Phochanakij <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Director General	whichaip@dbd.go.th	0

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Goranij Nonejuie <input type="checkbox"/>	Senior Trade Officer	benjamas.winya@gmail.com	0

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Surachai Sungzikaw <input type="checkbox"/>	Director of Bureau of Weighing Instrument Supervision	benjamas.winya@gmail.com	0

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mrs. Benjamas Winya <input type="checkbox"/>	Weights and measures professional officer	benjamas.winya@gmail.com	0

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Ms. Wipawee Wanapongs <input type="checkbox"/>	Minister Counsellor (Commercial)	thaicom@iol.cz	0

## UNITED KINGDOM

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Richard Sanders <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Assistant Director - Standards & Accreditation	richard.sanders@beis.gov.uk	0

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Mannie Panesar <input type="checkbox"/>	NMO Technical services	mannie.panesar@nmo.beis.gov.uk	0

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Morayo Awosola <input type="checkbox"/>	Office for Product Safety and Standards	morayo.awosola@beis.gov.uk	0

# CIML Meeting 2019

**Total number of participants: 159**

## UNITED STATES

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Charles D. Ehrlich <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Group Leader, International Legal Metrology Group	charles.ehrlich@nist.gov	1
Mr. Ralph Richter <input type="checkbox"/>	Engineer	ralph.richter@nist.gov	0

## VIET NAM

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Ms. Thi Tuyet TRAN <input type="checkbox"/>	Director of Organization and Personnel Department	tranthituyet@tcvn.gov.vn	0
Ms. Thi Tuyet Lan NGUYEN <input type="checkbox"/>	Deputy Director of Planning and Finance Department	Nlan_tckt@tcvn.gov.vn	0
Ms. Kim Thanh NGUYEN <input type="checkbox"/>	Deputy Director of Planning and Finance Department	nguyenkimthanh@tcvn.gov.vn	0
Mr. Van Luong NGUYEN <input type="checkbox"/>	Acting Director-General	nguyenvanluong@moha.gov.vn	0
Mr. Quoc Dung TRAN <input type="checkbox"/>	Deputy Director of Vietnam Certification Center	dzungtq@quacert.gov.vn	0
Mr. Minh Tam LE <input type="checkbox"/>	Deputy Director in charge of Quality Training Center	letam@qtc.gov.vn	0
Mr. Minh Hiep HA <input type="checkbox"/>	Deputy Director-General	haminhhiep@tcvn.gov.vn	0
Mr. Hung Diep NGUYEN <input type="checkbox"/>	Director of Metrology Department	diepnhbdl@tcvn.gov.vn	0
Mr. Cong Tuc PHAM <input type="checkbox"/>	Official of Planning and Finance Department	pctuc_tckt@tcvn.gov.vn	0

## ZAMBIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Ms. Himba Cheelo <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Chief Executive Director	hcheelo@gmail.com	0

# CIML Meeting 2019

**Total number of participants: 159**

**Corresponding Members: 12**

**Number of delegates: 23**

## ANGOLA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Homar Simao	<input type="checkbox"/> Deputy Director	homar.simao@ianorq.co.ao	0

## BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Nedim Hodzic	<input type="checkbox"/> Expert Associate	nedim.hodzic@met.gov.ba	0
Mr. Zijad Dzemic	<input type="checkbox"/> General Director	zijad.dzemic@met.gov.ba	0
Ms. Mirjana Sucur	<input type="checkbox"/> Deputy Director	mirjana.sucur@met.gov.ba	0

## CHINESE TAIPEI

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Jiunn-Haur Shaw	<input type="checkbox"/> Division Director	Jiunn-haur.shaw@itri.org.tw	0
Mr. Yuan-Ping SUN	<input type="checkbox"/> Senior Technical Specialist	deric.sun@bsmi.gov.tw	0
Ms. Linda,L.H. CHEN	<input type="checkbox"/> Deputy Director General	metrology@bsmi.gov.tw	0

## GHANA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. George Omane-Twumasi	<input type="checkbox"/> Director of Metrology	omanetwumasi@yahoo.com	0

## JORDAN

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Mohammad Al-Alwan	<input type="checkbox"/> Head	mohammad.alalwan@jsmo.gov.jo	0
Mr. Abdalla Bani Khalid	<input type="checkbox"/> Head	Abdalla.Banikhalid@jsmo.gov.jo	0

## MEXICO

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Congo Conejo Andreas	<input type="checkbox"/>		0

## MONTENEGRO

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Goran Vukoslavovic	<input type="checkbox"/> Assistant of Director	goran.vukoslavovic@gmail.com	0
Prof./Dr. Vanja Asanovic	<input type="checkbox"/> Director	vanja.asanovic@metrologija.gov.me	0

## NAMIBIA

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Simasiku Matali	<input type="checkbox"/> Head Metrology	WasserfallC@nsi.com.na	0
Mrs. Chie Wasserfall	<input type="checkbox"/> Chief Executive Officer	Wasserfallc@nsi.com.na	0



# CIML Meeting 2019

**Total number of participants: 159**

## SUDAN

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Ms. Mona Babikir	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of Metrology Dep.	xrf@hotmail.com	0

## UKRAINE

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Sergej Tsiporenko	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of mass measurement Department	s_tsiporenko@ukrcsm.kiev.ua	1
Mr. Iurii Kuzmenko	<input type="checkbox"/> Deputy General Director	jkuzmenko@ukrcsm.kiev.ua	1

## UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
S.E. H. E. Abdulla Al Maeeni Al Maeeni	<input type="checkbox"/> Director General	abdulla@esma.gov.ae	0
Eng. Amina Albastaki	<input type="checkbox"/> Director of Metrology Department	azainal@esma.gov.ae	0
Mr. Abdulla Khalaf Alhossani	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of Legal Metrology Unit	akhoosani@dm.gov.ae	0

## ZIMBABWE

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Christopher Ngwenya	<input type="checkbox"/> Superintendent of Trade Measure	chngwenya@yahoo.com	0
Mr. Farai Taruwona	<input type="checkbox"/> Inspector		0

## Honorary Members: 1

**Number of delegates: 5**

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Prof./Dr. Manfred Kochsiek	<input type="checkbox"/> Past CIML Acting President, Member of Honor	manfred@kochsiek.com	0
Mr. Alan Johnston	<input type="checkbox"/> Past CIML President, Member of Honor	johnstoa@gmail.com	1
Mr. Gerard Faber	<input type="checkbox"/> Past CIML President, Member of Honor	gerard.j.faber@gmail.com	1
Mr. John Birch	<input type="checkbox"/> Member of Honor	jabirch@bigpond.com	1
Mr. Peter Mason	<input type="checkbox"/> Chairperson CEEMS, Member of Honor	peter.mason@oiml.org	1

# CIML Meeting 2019

**Total number of participants: 159**

**Liaison: 5**

**Number of delegates: 7**

## AFRIMETS

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Jaco Marneweck	<input type="checkbox"/> Vice-Chair AFRIMETS Legal Metrology	Jaco.Marneweck@nracs.org.za	0

## BIPM

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Dr. Martin Milton	<input type="checkbox"/> BIPM Director	martin.milton@bipm.org	0

## CECIP

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Karlheinz Banholzer	<input type="checkbox"/> President CECIP LMG	karlheinz.banholzer@sartorius.com	0
Mr. Roland Nater	<input type="checkbox"/> President CECIP IPG	roland.nater@mt.com	0
Mr. Tim Hamers	<input type="checkbox"/> Secretary General	tim.hamers@cecip.eu	0

## GSO

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Abdulelah Qarnas Alqarnas	<input type="checkbox"/> GSO Secretary	alqarnas@gso.org.sa	0

## GULFMET

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. Omar Kanakrieh	<input type="checkbox"/> Gulfmets Secretary	okanakrieh@gso.org.sa	1

**Individual: 1**

**Number of delegates: 6**

<i>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>E-Mail</i>	<i>Acc. persons</i>
Mr. GUO SU	<input type="checkbox"/> OIML Secondement	su.guo@oiml.org	0
Ms. Marika Fricova	<input type="checkbox"/> Assistant		0
Mr. Marc Potentier	<input type="checkbox"/> Interpreter	garry-hutton@hancock-hutton.com	0
Mr. Garry Hutton	<input type="checkbox"/> Interpreter	garry-hutton@hancock-hutton.com	0
Mr. Cornelis Oosterman	<input type="checkbox"/> Chairperson OIML-CS	cock.oosterman@oiml.org	0
Ms. Laura Gruberova	<input type="checkbox"/> Assistant		0

**CIML Meeting 2019****Total number of participants: 159****BIML: 1****Number of delegates: 7****BIML**

<i><b>Delegate (ticked if CIML Member)</b></i>	<i><b>Position</b></i>	<i><b>E-Mail</b></i>	<i><b>Acc. persons</b></i>
Mrs. Patricia Saint-Germain	<input type="checkbox"/> Administrator, Members	patricia.saint-germain@oiml.org	0
Mr. Anthony Donnellan	<input type="checkbox"/> BIML Director	anthony.donnellan@oiml.org	0
Mr. Chris Pulham	<input type="checkbox"/> Editor - Webmaster	chris.pulham@oiml.org	0
Mr. Ian Dunmill	<input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Director	ian.dunmill@oiml.org	0
Mr. Jalil Adnani	<input type="checkbox"/> Database Systems Management	jalil.adnani@oiml.org	0
Mr. Luis Mussio	<input type="checkbox"/> Engineer	luis.mussio@oiml.org	0
Mr. Paul Dixon	<input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Director	paul.dixon@oiml.org	0