Report of the 24th Meeting of the JCRB

Held on 16-17 March, 2010

BIPM

Item Page

Participants

BIPM-CIPM

Prof. Andrew J. Wallard ..... (Chairman) BIPM
Prof Michael Kühne ..... BIPM
Dr. Robert Kaarls ..... CIPM
Dr Barry Inglis ..... CIPM
Dr Claudine Thomas ..... (KCDB Coordinator) BIPM
Dr Janet Miles ..... BIPM
Mr Luis Mussio ..... (Executive Secretary) BIPM

Delegations

Dr Wynand Louw ..... (Representative) AFRIMETS
Dr Ahmed Ali Mohamed El Sayed ..... AFRIMETS
Mr Donald Masuku ..... AFRIMETS
Mr Joel Kioko ..... AFRIMETS
Dr Noha Emad Mahmoud Khaled ..... AFRIMETS
Dr Yadong Yu ..... (Representative) APMP
Mrs Ada Cai Juan ..... APMP
Mrs Ajchara Charoensook ..... APMP
Dr Yoshio Hino ..... APMP
Dr Pavel Neyezhmakov ..... (Representative) COOMET
Dr Sergey V. Komissarov ..... COOMET
Dr Sergey Korostin ..... COOMET
Dr Leslie Pendrill ..... (Representative) EURAMET
Dr Atilio Sacconi ..... EURAMET/CIPM
Dr Pavel Klenovsky ..... EURAMET
Dr Wolfgang Schmid ..... EURAMET
Dr Alan Steele ..... (Representative) SIM
Dr William Anderson ..... SIM
Dr Claire Saundry ..... SIM
Mr Hernando Florez ..... SIM

1. Welcome by the Chairman and changes to the Agenda

The Chairman welcomed the delegates to the BIPM and asked the participants to introduce themselves.

The agenda was approved with no changes.

2. Approval of the minutes and discussion on matters arising from the report of the 23rd meeting held at Kazan, Republic of Tatarstan. Russian Federation.

The minutes (JCRB 24/02) were approved with no further changes.

3. Report by the Chairman on progress since the 23rd JCRB meeting

The report was presented by A. Wallard (see document JCRB 24/03), making a short summary of the results of the meetings with ILAC and OIML.

A. Steele noted that in the list of countries that are potential future members of the BIPM and new Associates, there are some that are part of the Gulf region. He then asked about the present status of the creation of Gulfmet.

A. Wallard answered that there has not been any advances in the creation of this region.

A. Steele then asked how this countries are going to participate in the CIPM MRA, particularly through which RMO.

A. Wallard answered that if they become signatories, then a solution must be found for the participation through any of the existing RMOs. He also noted that one of the tasks of the new International Liaison Officer will be to re-invigorate the BIPM's contacts on the creation of Gulfmet.

P. Klenovsky asked if the presentations from the WMO-BIPM workshop will be available.

A. Wallard answered that the intention is to have them published in the BIPM website, as well as the presentations from the other seminars listed in the report.

3.1 IAEA report (see document JCRB 24/03.1)

No comments were made on the report.

A. Steele raised the point of the review of the QS of IGOs, noting the need to establish a procedure taking into account that WMO is expected to sign the CIPM MRA.

He remarked that the expectations from SIM were that the IAEA QS review follows a process similar to those used in the RMOs for an NMI.

W. Anderson suggested creating an "inter-regional" committee to make the review and approval of the QS of IGOs. The members of the committee could be nominated by the QS review committees of the RMOs.

A. Wallard noted that there may be legal problems to have a review of IGOs by an external organization.

A. Steele noted that the CIPM MRA is not legally binding, and the participation is voluntary, but if the IGO decided to be part of it, then they should follow the same rules as the other participants, and therefore they need an approval of their QS in the same sense that they have the approval of their CMCs. He remarked on the SIM position that if these organizations have CMCs then they will need to have a formal review and approval and not just a presentation of the QS.

R. Kaarls expressed his opinion that the presentation made by IAEA had the effect of an "approval" without the use of the word that could create legal repercussions.

A. Steele said that although this may have been the aim, there was not a formal voting for approval and that the people present in the meeting were not experts in quality from the RMOS.

A. Wallard then said that it may be possible to synchronize the presentations of the QS of the international organizations.

A. Steele also noted the financial problem of participation in these meetings, as the RMOs are already supporting their own QS review meeting.

P. Klenovsky suggested that it would be easy to have on-site peer reviews to the Agency.

L. Pendrill asked about the scope of CMCs from IAEA.

C. Thomas answered that all IAEA CMCs (13 in total) are in the field of dosimetry.

L. Pendrill suggested that as the September 2011 meeting of the JCRB will be held in EURAMET, he may talk with the Austrian NMI to study the possibility that an opportunity could be taken to hold all or part of the meeting at the Agency.

M. Kühne commented that there has to be a balance with the cost of having experts from all over the world, and to review a QS which covers only 13 CMCs could be a problem.

A. Steele then commented that there is confidence among the RMOs and therefore there is no need to have representatives from all the RMOs. He then noted that the rigorousness of the review should not be linked to number of CMCs, giving the example of SIM where the presentations are made by area and in many cases the presenter has very few CMCs.

A. Charoensook suggested that the procedures used in the different RMOs for the review of the QS, should be sent to IAEA for information.

A. Steele also noted that there may be CMCs that may be close to being greyed-out because of the five years cycle and the danger is that as IAEA is not really involved in the process they may not even be aware of this possibility.

R. Kaarls agreed that IAEA should be treated as any other NMI or DI, and noted that they had on site reviews but he sees no reasons for doing an onsite peer review before the 5 years required for everyone.

A. Steele stressed that the main point to establish is that, in regards to the CIPM MRA, these organizations should not be treated differently from any other NMI just because they have a special status as international organization. He also suggested that they should be encouraged to be active in any of the QS review committees of any of the RMOs.

After some discussion, the following actions were decided.

Action 24/1: The Chairman of the JCRB will contact IAEA for: **- establishing a date for the review of the IAEA QS;** **- defining needs for on site peer review;** **- suggesting IAEA to attend the regular meetings of RMOs Quality Systems review committees;** **- inquiring about current position of IAEA to support people to attend the presentation.**
Action 24/2: JCRB Executive Secretary to circulate the document related to the QS review of IGOs (CIPM MRA-G-03) among the RMOs.
Action 24/3: RMOs will send their procedures related to the review of the QS to the BIPM by end of the May.

A. Wallard gave a brief oral report on the status of the BIPM QS which included the following points:

- appointment of a new Quality Manager;
- internal and external audit program;
- review of the quality manuals;
- status of the internal temperature calibration service;
- criteria for external reviewers;
- registration of non-conformities and complains;
- surveys for customer satisfaction.

4. Report from the CIPM

R. Kaarls presented the report which included the following items.

- Changes in the CIPM members.

Dr Y. Duan has been elected as member of the CIPM.

Dr Barry Inglis will succeed Prof. Ernst Göbel as President after the CIPM 2010 meeting.

- New Members of the BIPM and Associates of the CGPM.

- A discussion was held about the terminology “Members of the BIPM”.

- The procedure to encourage Associates to become Members of the BIPM.

- The relation with VAMAS and IAEA.

- Activities of the JCTLM.

- Activities of the DCMAS

- General activities at the BIPM and preparation for the 2011 CGPM.

4.1 Rules for authorship of CIPM MRA comparisons reports

R. Kaarls made an introduction to the problem (see document JCRB 24/04.02).

He explained some of the problems that occurred in the past, and the importance that this issue may have for some NMIs.

He then expressed the view that the CIPM would like to have a guidance document from the JCRB on this problem.

J. Miles described the process used in *Metrologia*, but there is no document besides the good practices normally used.

S. Korostin said that COOMET has a guideline for comparisons that includes rules for authorship. The issue was discussed in COOMET and the decision was that the first author should be the coordinator from the pilot laboratory and authors from all the participants. However, how many from each institute is decided by the working groups (Technical Committee). He also noted that there are other examples of publications with a large number of authors, like for example in "high energy physics".

L. Pendrill said that in EURAMET there are no particular concerns on this subject.

A. Charoensook said that in the APMP guideline there is no mention on the authorship.

W. Louw said that there has been no problem in AFRIMETS and normally they follow the recommendation of the working groups. He also said that AFRIMETS position would be to have a reduced number of authors and the rest of the persons who participated should be acknowledged in the report.

A. Steele said that there is no SIM specific document but the consensus is that the authorship should be associated with the scientific contribution. He then noted the importance of this publication for the careers of the scientists in the NMIs and that doing the measurements should be considered as a scientific contribution, and the position is to have at least one author from each participating NMI. He also expressed the SIM position against the policy adopted by CCPR where the authors were limited to only the pilot laboratory. SIM position is that there is no problem in having a long list of authors if that truly reflects the contributions of the participants in the comparison, and SIM will not support a policy restricting the authorship to only the coordinating laboratories.

J. Miles remarked that in scientific publications generally just making measurements will be sufficient for qualifying as author. She also noted that some journals are asking for a description of the contributions of the authors.

A. Steele made a distinction between scientific oriented papers where a sample preparation or doing a measurement would normally be included in the acknowledgements, while in a measurement comparison paper the quality of the measurements itself is what makes the paper worthy, because these are not meant to be a research or discovery work.

C. Thomas noted that the problem of long lists of authors happened mainly in Chemistry, but in the last key comparisons reports, the list of authors has been reduced and there is also a list of acknowledgements in the first page of the report for those who actually did the measurements.

A. Sacconi said that there is no common position in EURAMET and that he would propose to draft a guideline with rules in this subject. He also proposed that the first place of the list of authors should be the coordinators, and then one should keep the acknowledgements list for those who did not contribute directly, like for example NMI directors when the local policy is also for them to appear. He also proposed that this issue should be addressed in advance by the CCs, in the protocols of the comparisons while they are in the planning stage.

A. Wallard summarized the discussion noting that the consensus is that the lead author should be from the pilot laboratory and then the list of authors should include those who are responsible for the integrity of the data (those who actually performed the measurements). Any other "second order" acknowledgment should be deal with in the traditional way at the end of the paper. He also expressed his support to A. Sacconi's position.

R. Kaarls proposed that a paper should be written, circulated in the JCRB and then send to the CIPM.

5. RMOs reports

5.1 SIM report (JCRB 24/05.21)

A. Steele presented the report from SIM.

W. Anderson noted that in the last SIM meeting, Paraguay presented its QS for the first time. He also made a summary of the procedure used by SIM to assure the vitality of CMCs.

A. Wallard asked if it possible to change the October SIM General Assembly meeting, which now coincides with the CIPM meeting, to assure that there can be a BIPM representative. He also asked if it would be possible to know in advance which parts of the meeting will be open and which will be closed.

C. Saundry answered that there are still schedule problems so this date is not yet fixed.

A. Steele answered that most of the meeting as well as the QSTF meeting will be open to representatives of other RMOs. He also said that the plan includes having at least half a day dedicated to a seminar aimed to create awareness of the MRA.

M. Kühne asked if there is any news about the participation of Venezuela.

C. Saundry answered that there are no news.

C. Thomas requested SIM for an update of the status of the greyed out CMCs.

A. Steele answered that the issue was treated in the TC committee, and he also noted that the review in SIM in done area by area, so the fact that QSs from Argentina were approved does not automatically mean that the greyed out CMCs should be reinstated.

L. Mussio asked if the NMIs from SIM could submit the QS approval certificates/information together with the CMCs.

A. Steele answered that this issue will be part of the CIPM MRA awareness seminar.

A. Wallard then asked if it is possible to have a feedback on the actions that are needed to take regarding CMCs from Chile following the recent earthquake that may have damaged the laboratories.

5.2 EURAMET report (JCRB 24/05.2)

L. Pendrill presented the EURAMET report.

A. Wallard asked what EURAMET policy is for the participation of designated institutes in the TC Quality.

P. Klenovsky answered that the policy is to have a five year re-evaluation where the QS is presented by the NMI of the country and eventually a representative of the DI.

A. Wallard commented that in past meetings the preference of the JCRB representatives was to have DI presenting the QS and not through the NMI.

P. Klenovsky proposed to have a recommendation in this sense.

A. Wallard then asked which EURAMET position is about on-site peer reviews, whether this is a “may” or a “must”.

A. Steele asked for information about the NCSLI-EURAMET MOU.

L. Pendrill answered that at present there is a draft sent by NCSLI to EURAMET and is now at consideration.

Y. Yu asked about the cooperation with “measurement and testing organizations”.

L. Pendrill answered that there is an interest from these organizations to approach the NMIs. The main topic is the role of measurement uncertainty when taking decisions in conformity assessment. At present the actions are at the level of exchanging information.

B. Inglis commented on the large number of institutes that are now under EURAMET and asked which are the procedures used to assure that these institutes have the technical competence, and how many receive review visits.

P. Klenovsky answered that there is a number of accredited ones and for those that are self-declared there is a number of projects for on-site peer reviews, which cover all the NMIs with the exception of south-east countries which are setting up a system for peer reviews. He added that in his view, by the end of the year all the NMIs, but not the DIs, will be covered by voluntary on-site peer reviews.

C. Thomas noted that the report of EURAMET includes information, for example the changes in the names of the Croatian NMI, that should be communicated to the BIPM by the countries for the update of the KCDB and the BIPM registries. She also noted the case of a Swiss laboratory that have decided not to continue in the CIPM MRA but as this information was not communicated to the BIPM, the CMCs are still in the KCDB.

P. Klenovsky noted that the information is very new and the situation is that eventually the institute will stop working as a DI but at present is still working.

R. Kaarls asked if the QS of DI is presented by the Quality Manager of the NMI and not by the DI itself.

P. Klenovsky answered that in some cases yes and some not, but also noted that most of those who are not present are accredited.

R. Kaarls commented that this may be a weak point, because the obligation to be present improves the involvement of the institute in the processes.

A. Sacconi commented that previous to the meetings, the written documentation is submitted by the institutes and then the oral presentation may be done by one representative of the country.

W. Anderson commented that in SIM it is considered very important that the DI Quality Managers present their own QS independently of the NMI because is the opportunity to ask questions directly. He also commented that this procedure is used for all DIs independently if they are accredited or not.

A. Wallard asked if in APMP the DIs must participate directly in the review meetings.

A. Charoensook answered that at present there are few DIs in APMP and they follow the same procedure that the NMIs, and make their presentations.

W. Louw said that the AFRIMETS procedure is similar to APMP.

P. Neyezhmakov commented that in COOMET the situation is different because of the "umbrella" system.

A. Steele noted that SIM comments are only a description of SIM procedures and do not imply any lack of confidence in EURAMET procedures. He also noted that the policy in SIM is not only that the DIs do their own presentations, but that they also prepare and submit the annual reports.

A. Wallard then summarized the discussion, and A. Steele moved to adopt the following recommendation, which was approved by the JCRB members.

Recommendation 24/1: The JCRB recommends that the following policy is included in CIPM MRA G 02.

The initial and periodic presentations of the QS of DI to the corresponding QS review panel of the RMOs, must be done directly by the responsible person of the DI and not through its NMI. In the same sense, the QS annual reports must be also prepared and submitted directly by the DI.

(This subject was subsequently discussed in the meeting, see end of item 11)

5.3 COOMET report (JCRB 24/05.3)

P. Neyezhmakov reported on behalf of COOMET.

L. Mussio said that the CCPR informed that there was no representation from COOMET in the last four meetings of the CMCs working group.

S. Korostin informed that the COOMET delegate to CCPR CMCs WG has recently retired and a new delegate will soon be designated.

5.4 APMP report (JCRB 24/05.4)

A. Cai Juan reported on behalf of APMP.

A. Charoensook reported on the activities related to QS.

A. Charoensook moved to include annual reports of the QS from the BIPM and IAEA in the agenda of the BIPM.

Resolution 24/1: Reports from the BIPM to the JCRB March meetings will include a summary of the status of the QS associated with its calibration and measurement services.

5.5 AFRIMETS report (JCRB 24/05.5)

W. Louw reported on behalf of AFRIMETS.

M. Kühne congratulated AFRIMETS for the success of the activities in the last two years.

A. Wallard made a remark on the need to have a standard format for the QS report. The following action was approved:

Action 24/4: Executive Secretary to prepare a template for the annual QS reports from the RMOs.

6. KCDB report (JCRB 24/06)

The KCDB report was presented by C. Thomas.

P. Klenovsky asked how the CMCs are reviewed after a key comparison and who is responsible.

L. Mussio answered that, as stated in the KC guidelines, the main responsibility is from the NMIs and this should be part of their QS.

P. Neyezhmakov asked about the status of the T&F graphs of equivalence.

C. Thomas answered that the CCTF decided that these graphs were not useful in the KCDB as many more results are available from the *Circular T*. A link to *Circular T* is given in the KCDB website.

Y. Yu asked if it is possible to register pilot studies, because many of them then become comparisons and it may be useful to see the changes.

C. Thomas answered that the decision taken was to register only comparisons, key and supplementary because pilot studies were not defined in CIPM MRA as information to support CMCs. She noted that in Chemistry, the information about pilot studies is kept by the KCWG.

A. Sacconi asked if there are historical data of the number of CMCs.

C. Thomas answered that this information is in the JCRB restricted website.

6.1 Status of greyed out CMCs. Establishment of a maximum "time to live"

A. Wallard and L. Mussio introduced the problem, stating that a decision is needed on the "time to live".

W. Anderson proposed that after five years the CMCs should be deleted.

W. Louw suggested that the RMO should be contacted before deleting the CMCs.

A. Steele noted that generally the "greying out" of CMCs is due to problems in the quality system, and therefore they can be reinstated without a technical review. He also said that the five year period of greying out, can be a trigger for the RMOs to review this CMCs.

W. Louw agreed and stated that this should be a task of the RMOs and should be included in the annual reports.

B. Inglis said that a deadline is needed because if a CMC has been greyed out for a long time, that is a sign of problems that have to be solved.

M. Kühne proposed that the information should be requested by the RMOs from the NMIs as part of the annual report of the NMIs.

A. Steele raised the problem of the need of having a tracking system and not to rely only in the follow up done by the NMIs.

L. Mussio proposed to take a decision on the policy to follow, but wait to make it mandatory until a practical procedure is established.

Resolution 24/2: CMCs that have been greyed out for more that five years will be permanently deleted from the KCDB. The procedure will be discussed in the next JCRB meeting.
Resolution 24/3: The NMIs will include the status and actions related to greyed out CMCs in their annual reports
Action 24/5: The Executive Secretary and the KCDB coordinator will explore the possibility of establishing a system for monitoring the time of greyed out CMCs.

7. Review of pending actions.

7.1 Action 23/2: The RMOs will consider the issues related with the participation of private companies in comparisons carried out under the CIPM MRA, and bring a position for the next JCRB meeting.

L. Pendrill expressed that EURAMET position is to not accept private companies participating in CIPM MRA comparisons.

A. Wallard asked if the position includes the case of doing measurements and the case of a private company providing the artefacts to be circulated.

A. Steele said it was agreed that the participation and listing of a private company should not appear in the KCDB, and therefore SIM agrees with the position stated by EURAMET.

W. Louw expressed that AFRIMETS position is that if a private company has participated in an RMO activity, the name of the company should not appear in the reports published in the KCDB.

A short discussion followed on the use of PT schemes as additional information supporting CMCs, with the conclusion that these can be taken as "other evidence" and the validity of this evidence should be established in the review process.

7.2 Action 23/1: After approval in SIM, SIM will present to the JCRB the procedure for appealing decisions of the QSTF.

W. Anderson made a brief summary of the situation in SIM that led to the need of the appealing procedure and presented the process:

"Any NMI or DI can appeal a negative decision of the QSTF regarding their QMS if they have received support of at least 35% of the votes casted, in which case the appeal goes first to the QSTF chair, and if the institute is not satisfied, the Technical Committee chair will render a final decision. In case that the appeal is brought forward by the NMI or a DI of the home country of the QSTF chair or TC chair, then one or the other should have to (1:34:56) themselves from the process"

7.3 Action 23/3: The delegates will report to their respective RMOs the discussion on the JCRB about the need for maintaining periodic on site peer reviews and report back to the JCRB in the next meeting.

P. Klenovsky said that EURAMET has now three projects for on-site peer reviews which cover about 80% of self-declared institutes. These on-site visits are done on a voluntary basis. The issue was discussed in EURAMET and the consensus was that even though it the importance of on-site peer reviews is recognized, it is better to keep them in a voluntary basis.

He also noted that the EURAMET TC will propose to the EURAMET GA a resolution in which there is stated two possible ways to assure the conformity of the QS: accreditation with special conditions or self declaration with periodical peer reviews. EURAMET will also prepare a guideline for on-site peer review.

M. Kühne asked if the EURAMET position is that on-site peer review will apply only for self declared NMIs or DIs, but not for accredited institutes.

P. Klenovsky answer that this is EURAMET position.

M. Kühne stated the importance of having clear terms of reference in the ILAC document of item 11 of the present agenda.

A. Wallard noted that in the joint meetings with ILAC, it was clearly stated that the review process under the CIPM is more open in terms of information than the accreditation process.

P. Klenovsky then stated that this is the spirit of the EURAMET documents, if the accreditors are transparent enough in the accreditation process then there is no need to duplicate visits.

L. Mussio asked if for the case of accredited laboratories, the oral presentation in the TC Q will be maintained.

P. Klenovsky answered that the five year period presentations will be maintained but the laboratories will simply inform what happened during the last period, and based on this information the laboratory may receive the approval.

W. Louw presented the AFRIMETS position, stating that the best practice requires a review of both the technical capabilities and the quality system of an NMI. In the case of third party accreditation both parts are covered. In the AFRIMETS documents it will be stated that the "paper" review will always be performed but the onsite reviews may not be required for accredited laboratories. He also stated that in the case where there is not a third party accreditation, the on site reviews should cover not only the

QS but also the technical aspects of the capabilities, and that there should be surveillance visits with a maximum period of five years.

R. Kaarls noted that in the case of NMIs undergoing the review, there is more information available than in the accreditation process, for example the information exchanged during the discussion of results of key comparisons.

P. Neyezhmakov explained that COOMET policy states that on-site peer reviews are required every five years, and as example in 2010 seven NMIs will receive visits.

A. Charoensook stated that in APMP the on-site peer review is mandatory whether they are accredited or self declared and must be performed before CMCs are submitted.

W. Louw said the AFRIMETS intention is to move accreditors to accept a five year period for reassessment of NMIs, based on the big flow of information that is available due to the participation in the CIPM MRA.

A. el Sayed commented that the NMIs will be assessed every five years using assessors from other NMIs with CMCs published.

A. Steele said that the position in SIM is that the on site reviews should consider the technical capabilities as well as the quality systems. In general, the review in SIM is done by area making the review of QS more frequent than 5 years. He also expressed that SIM policy makes no distinction between accredited or self declared laboratories and the qualifications of the onsite reviewers are subject to the same scrutiny. He also noted that in Canada an agreement was reached with the accreditation body to move to a five year cycle, and SIM is working with IAAC to make this a policy for all American ABs.

He also noted that SIM policy includes the case of large NMIs, when there is no conflict of interest in the management chain, the laboratories can make use of staff of other part of the organization provided that they have expertise in a related technical area.

A. Wallard summarized the discussion stating that the general position in the RMOS is that on-site peer reviews seems to be the best practice.

L. Pendrill explained that EURAMET has a joint working group with EA and that this subject is on the table for discussion with the objective of getting the benefits for both parts involved in these processes.

A. Charoensook added that in APMP, the bios of the assessors must be submitted to APMP before the assessment is done, for checking that requirements are fulfilled.

Action 24/6: The JCRB further notes that RMOs are moving to a common position in which on-site peer reviews are best practice, but that in some cases the RMO's policies are still under discussion. The RMOs will report on state on their internal discussion in the next meeting of the JCRB.

8. Status and problems arisen with CMCs submission and review.

L. Mussio reported that APMP.M.22.2010 was rejected by SIM for technical reasons and the case was submitted to the CCM. The resolution is pending.

9. Documents remitted to the JCRB by the CIPM and documents to be submitted to the CIPM.

L. Mussio made a summary of the changes introduced in the documents and a description of the new documents submitted.

The discussion was focused on the process described in CIPM MRA-D-04 for the periodical review of CMCs.

A. Steele described SIM position for the re-review of CMCs, in which the method for assuring the vitality of CMC should be based in the continuous evaluation of the Quality Systems and not go to a procedure that requires "declarations" or "documents" from the NMIs. He also noted that this is aligned with the resolution taken in the last JCRB meeting.

W. Louw agreed that the review process is in place based on the annual reports submitted to the QS working groups and summaries submitted to the JCRB.

M. Kühne then expressed the opinion that a positive statement is not equivalent to the absence of a negative statement.

W. Louw proposed that this can be an explicit question in the annual reports.

A. Wallard noted that it was decided that the RMOs should review the templates for annual reports to ensure that NMIs address the issue (review of CMCs).

A. Steele expressed SIM position against having a positive declaration from the NMIs that the CMCs were reviewed.

A. Wallard then summarized the discussion saying that it is the consensus of the meeting that the present processes are guaranteed enough to assure the validity of CMCs.

After some discussion the following action was decided:

Action 24/8: The Executive Secretary will circulate new drafts of documents CIPM MRA-D-04, CIPM MRA-D-05 by mid April. The RMOs will send their comments by end of June.

L. Mussio then asked the RMOs to send comments on CIPM MRA-G-02.

10. Feedback from the CCs and CC Working Groups (see document JCRB24/10)

L. Mussio presented the questions and suggestions made by the CCs.

One of the problems presented is the effectiveness of the communications of the JCRB resolutions to the Technical Committees.

W. Louw noted that sometimes is not clear when a decision is in force or a document is finally accepted. He asked to look for ways to improve the communication to and from the JCRB delegates.

L. Pendril proposed to have two versions of the minutes, one complete version and a summary that can be made public.

L. Mussio noted that this is the way it is done.

A. Steele commented on the decision of the CCPR to calculate only the unilateral degrees of equivalence. He proposed that this information should be transmitted to the CIPM to have a decision that applies to all the CCs.

L. Mussio said that, after consulting all the CCs, the subject was already discussed by the CIPM and the decision was to leave the decision of the publication at the CC level.

11. ILAC documents related to the CIPM MRA.

11.1 ILAC Guideline for the accreditation of NMIs

M. Kühne summarized the objectives and the history of the document, stating that the main objective is to help NMIs that have chosen accreditation, to avoid duplication of actions. He stated that the questions are:

- if it is important that the information from the accreditation processes is relevant to the CIPM MRA and;

- whether this document should be an ILAC P document or if BIPM should propose to make it a joint document.

M. Kühne gave his opinion that this option would give BIPM control on the document and ILAC would not be able to modify it unilaterally.

P. Klenovsky said that in the EURAMET view there may be a little more flexibility in the selection of assessors.

L. Pendrill said that the position of EURAMET is that this document should remain a solely ILAC document, because having it as a joint document this may lead to the impression that JCRB or BIPM is endorsing accreditation.

M. Kühne expressed that in his view, the document states how the accreditation may be a support for the CIPM MRA and therefore it may have the opposite effect

A. Charoensook expressed that APMP agrees on the document but would like to wait until the document is finished before deciding if this should be a joint document.

W. Louw said that AFRIMETS would prefer the option of having a joint document because in this way it will be easier to establish the conditions that the accreditation processes should follow to fulfil the requirements of the CIPM-MRA.

A. Steele said that SIM opinion is that if there is going to be participation then the position should be to make it a joint document which will allow a better control of the content. He also said that a joint document will also make it a more powerful tool in the discussion with the ABs, for those NMIs that have chosen the accreditation path.

L. Pendril then said that more discussion is still needed within EURAMET.

A short discussion was maintained about the role of Accreditation Bodies and the new European legislations concerning conformity assessment as well as the implications that this document may have.

The JCRB endorses the even-handed treatment of QS reviews in the relevant RMO bodies in conformity with the CIPM MRA requirements for NMIs that choose either

accreditation or self declaration.

For the case of NMIs that have chosen accreditation, the accreditation process can be used for the purposes of the CIPM MRA if the following conditions are fulfilled:

- use assessors that complies as a minimum with the criteria set in CIPM 2007/25 (Recommendations for on-site visits by peers and selection criteria for on-site visit peer reviewers);

- the names and qualifications of assessors must be made known to the relevant RMO committees

- that accreditation reports must be made available to the relevant committees.

Resolution 24/4: The JCRB recommends the BIPM to continue working in the ILAC AIC committee in relation to the document "Accreditation of NMIs" .

Action 24/7: EURAMET will establish its position in regards of the character of the document on "Accreditation of NMIs", whether this should be an ILAC or joint ILAC – BIPM document and report back in the next JCRB meeting.

The discussion then moved to the different approaches and procedures used in the RMOs for review and approval of the QSs (see item 5.2).

A. Steele asked if the general practice in the other RMOs for the review meetings is to have the DI making their own presentations or if they are represented by the NMI.

W. Anderson said that in the EURAMET TC-Q that he attended, some DI were not present and were represented by the NMI.

R. Kaarls said that it also happened in one on the TC-Q meetings in which he has participated.

P. Klenovsky answered that the policy is that the DIs have to make their own presentations.

W. Louw asked if according to what was said in the meeting, there are EURAMET self declared NMIs or DIs that have not received any kind of on site peer review.

P. Klenovsky answered that as expressed previously there are projects in EURAMET leading to have on site reviews, and he remarked that at present there is no rule saying that on site reviews are mandatory.

W. Louw expressed his concern that if there are institutes that have no on-site review, then the processes are not equivalent, and he noted that as expressed this is an on going process that has to be discussed.

On the subject of presentations to the TC-Q, A. Sacconi noted that initial presentations were always done directly but the DIs, but in the case of re-reviews the presentation may be done by the NMI. He also explained that the review process in Europe relied the activities of the Technical Committees, where the level of participation is much higher than in other regions.

12. Other business:

C. Thomas has presented the Excel spreadsheets now available at the JCRB restricted site / KCDB statistics, with the dates in which CMCs were greyed out. (See action 24/5).

A. Wallard announced that the call for a new Executive Secretary will be soon announced and it is expected that the person be available at the beginning of March 2011.

13. Next Meetings:

13.1 Next meetings of the JCRB:

A. El Sayed made a presentation for the hosting of the September JCRB meeting, in conjunction with AFRIMETS General Assembly. The date proposed is September 21 and 22.

14. Meeting closure

The Chairman thanked the delegations for their participation in the meeting. Having no further issues for discussion, the meeting was adjourned.

15. Summary of Actions, Resolutions and Recommendations.

ACTIONS

Action 24/1: The Chairman of the JCRB will contact IAEA for:
- establishing a date for the review of the IAEA QS;
- defining needs for on site peer review;
- suggesting IAEA to attend the regular meetings of RMOs Quality Systems review committees;
- current position of IAEA to support people to attend the review.

Action 24/2: JCRB Executive Secretary to circulate the document related to the QS review of IGOs (CIPM MRA-G-03) among the RMOs.

Action 24/3: RMOs will send their procedures related to the review of the QS to the BIPM by end of the May.

Action 24/4: Executive Secretary to prepare a template for the annual QS reports from the RMOs.

Action 24/5: The Executive Secretary and the KCDB coordinator will explore the possibility of establishing a system for monitoring the time of greyed out CMCs. (Done)

Action 24/6: The JCRB further notes that RMOs are moving to a common position in which on-site peer reviews are best practice, but that in some cases the RMO's policies are still under discussion. The RMOs will report on state on their internal discussion in the next meeting of the JCRB.

Action 24/8: The Executive Secretary will circulate new drafts of documents CIPM MRA-D-04, CIPM MRA-D-05 by mid April. The RMOs will send their comments by end of June.

Action 24/7: EURAMET will establish its position in regards of the character of the document on "Accreditation of NMIs", whether this should be an ILAC or joint ILAC – BIPM document and report back in the next JCRB meeting.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution 24/1: Reports from the BIPM to the JCRB March meetings will include a summary of the status of the QS associated with its calibration and measurement services. ..... 10~~9~~

Resolution 24/2: CMCs that have been greyed out for more that five years will be permanently deleted from the KCDB. The procedure will be discussed in the next JCRB meeting. 11

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 24/1: The JCRB recommends that the following policy is included in CIPM MRA G 02.

The initial and periodic presentations of the QS of DI to the corresponding QS review panel of the RMOs, must be done directly by the responsible person of the DI and not through its NMI. In the same sense, the QS annual reports must be also prepared and submitted directly by the DI.