
Twelfth International Conference
of Legal Metrology

Berlin (Germany)

26–29 October 2004

MINUTES



OIML Secretariat:

Bureau International de Métrologie Légale
11, rue Turgot - 75009 Paris - France

Telephone: 33 (0)1 48 78 12 82

Fax: 33 (0)1 42 82 17 27

E-mail: biml@oiml.org

Internet: www.oiml.org

Twelfth International Conference
of Legal Metrology

Berlin (Germany)

26–29 October 2004

MINUTES



ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE
DE MÉTROLOGIE LÉGALE

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION
OF LEGAL METROLOGY

CONTENTS

General information	4
Summons and invitations	5
Attendance	6
Agenda	14
1 Organization of the meeting	17
1.1 Opening	
1.2 Roll-call - Verification of credentials - Quorum	
1.3 Voting procedures during Conference sessions	
1.4 Election of the President and Vice Presidents of the Conference	
1.5 Adoption of the agenda	
1.6 Constitution of Working Commissions	
1.7 Establishment of the schedule	
1.8 Approval of the minutes of the Eleventh Conference	
1.9 Report on activities by the President of the International Committee of Legal Metrology	
2 Member States and Corresponding Members	27
2.1 New Members - Expected accessions	
2.2 Situation of certain Members	
3 Long-term policy	31
3.1 Report on actions carried out since the Eleventh Conference	
3.2 Guidelines for 2005–2008	
4 Liaisons with international and regional institutions	37
4.1 Report on liaisons	
4.2 Addresses by Representatives of Institutions	
4.3 Discussions and conclusions (Liaisons)	
5 Work of OIML Technical Committees and Subcommittees	53
5.1 Work undertaken - State of progress	
5.2 Implementation of Recommendations by OIML Members	
5.3 Formal sanction of Recommendations already approved by the Committee in 2001, 2002 and 2003	
5.4 Draft Recommendations directly presented for sanctioning by the Conference	

6	OIML Certification, Mutual Acceptance and/or Recognition	59
6.1	OIML Certificate System for Measuring Instruments	
6.2	Mutual Acceptance Arrangement (MAA)	
6.3	OIML Certification - other arrangements	
7	Developing Countries	65
7.1	Report on activities on Developing Countries for the period 2001–2004	
7.2	Guidelines for future activities on Developing Countries	
8	Administrative and financial matters	71
8.1	Examination of the management of the budget from 2001 to 2003 and the estimates for 2004	
8.2	Decisions related to the debts of certain countries	
8.3	Revision of the OIML Financial Regulations	
8.4	Bureau staff and retirement scheme	
8.5	Budget for the financial period 2005–2008	
8.6	Status of OIML Publications	
9	Other business	79
10	Closure	83
10.1	Adoption of Decisions and Resolutions of the Conference	
10.2	Date and place of the next Conference	
	Decisions and Resolutions	87

GENERAL INFORMATION

Date and place of the Twelfth Conference

In accordance with the provisions of Article X of the *Convention Establishing an International Organization of Legal Metrology*, the Conference shall meet at least every six years on the summons of the President of the International Committee of Legal Metrology.

In 2001, the Committee received an invitation from Germany to hold the Twelfth Conference in Berlin in 2004.

Consequently, the Acting President of the International Committee of Legal Metrology convoked the Twelfth Conference which was held from 26 to 29 October 2004 at the BMWA in Berlin.

Organization of the Conference

The Conference was organized by the Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt (PTB), Germany, and the International Bureau of Legal Metrology.

Secretariat - Interpretation

Secretariat services were provided by the Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt and the International Bureau of Legal Metrology.

Discussions were held in English and French with simultaneous interpretation.

Festivities outside Conference hours

The Participants at the Conference were invited to attend a reception on the Mark Brandenburg ship hosted by the German Government, a technical visit to the PTB Berlin laboratories in Charlottenburg followed by a reception there, and also a reception given by the OIML at the Crown Estate of Bornstedt. A sightseeing tour was also organized.

SUMMONS AND INVITATIONS

The Acting President of the International Committee of Legal Metrology summoned the Member States of the Organization to the Conference, and invited Corresponding Members and certain International and Regional Institutions to attend; lists of those invited are given below.

Member States

ALBANIA	DENMARK	KAZAKHSTAN	SAUDI ARABIA
ALGERIA	EGYPT	KENYA	SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO
AUSTRALIA	ETHIOPIA	DEM. P. REP. OF KOREA	SLOVAKIA
AUSTRIA	FINLAND	REP. OF KOREA	SLOVENIA
BELARUS	FRANCE	MACEDONIA, THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF	SOUTH AFRICA
BELGIUM	GERMANY	MONACO	SPAIN
BRAZIL	GREECE	MOROCCO	SRI LANKA
BULGARIA	HUNGARY	NETHERLANDS	SWEDEN
CAMEROON	INDIA	NEW ZEALAND	SWITZERLAND
CANADA	INDONESIA	NORWAY	TANZANIA
P. REP. OF CHINA	ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN	PAKISTAN	TUNISIA
CROATIA	IRELAND	POLAND	UNITED KINGDOM
CUBA	ISRAEL	PORTUGAL	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
CYPRUS	ITALY	ROMANIA	VIETNAM
CZECH REPUBLIC	JAPAN	RUSSIAN FEDERATION	

Corresponding Members

ARGENTINA	GABON	MALTA	RWANDA
BAHRAIN	GHANA	MAURITIUS	SEYCHELLES
BANGLADESH	GUATEMALA	MEXICO	SINGAPORE
BARBADOS	HONG KONG, CHINA	MOLDOVA	SYRIA
BENIN	ICELAND	MONGOLIA	CHINESE TAIPEI
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA	JORDAN	MOZAMBIQUE	THAILAND
BOTSWANA	KUWAIT	NEPAL	TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO
BURKINA FASO	LATVIA	NICARAGUA	TURKEY
CAMBODIA	LIBYA	OMAN	UKRAINE
COMORES, ISLAMIC FED. REP. OF	LITHUANIA	PANAMA	URUGUAY
COSTA RICA	LUXEMBURG	PAPUA NEW GUINEA	UZBEKISTAN
ESTONIA	MADAGASCAR	PARAGUAY	
FIJI	MALAYSIA	PERU	

Observer Countries

BHUTAN	GUINEA-BISSAU	MALI	UNITED ARAB EMIRATES
BOLIVIA	IVORY COAST	NIGERIA	VENEZUELA
CONGO	JAMAICA	SENEGAL	ZAMBIA
ECUADOR	KYRGYZSTAN	TOGO	ZIMBABWE
GUINEA	D.P.R LAOS	UGANDA	

International and Regional Institutions

APLMF, BIPM, CECIP, EMLMF, European Commission (DG Enterprise), ILAC/IAF, SADC MEL, UEMOA, UNIDO, WELMEC

Attendance

Member States

ALBANIA

Mr. Bashkrim Koçi	CIML Member, GDMC, General Directorate of Metrology and Calibration of Albania
Mrs. Majlunda Hoxha	GDMC, General Directorate of Metrology and Calibration of Albania
Mr. Agron Laçi	GDMC, General Directorate of Metrology and Calibration of Albania

ALGERIA

Pr. Djaballah Belkacemi	Direction de la Normalisation et de la Protection industrielle
Mr. Samir Drissi	ONLM, Office National de la Métrologie Légale
Mrs. Nadira Hamiham	ONLM, Office National de la Métrologie Légale

AUSTRALIA

Dr. Grahame Harvey	CIML Member, NMI, National Measurement Institute
Dr. Judith Bennett	

AUSTRIA

Dr. Arnold Leitner	CIML Member, BEV, Bundesamt für Eich- und Vermessungswesen
Dr. Gerald Freistetter	BEV, Bundesamt für Eich- und Vermessungswesen
Mr. Wolfgang Mikovits	BEV, Bundesamt für Eich- und Vermessungswesen

BELARUS

Dr. Nikolai Zhagora	State Committee for Standardization, Metrology and Certification
---------------------	--

BELGIUM

Mr. Romain Eggermont	CIML Member, Service de la Métrologie
----------------------	---------------------------------------

BRAZIL

Mr. R. Luiz de Lima Guimarães	CIML Member, INMETRO, Instituto Nacional de Metrologia, Normalização e Qualidade Industrial
-------------------------------	---

BULGARIA

Mrs. Ani Todorova	CIML Member, SAMTS, State Agency for Metrology and Technical Surveillance
Ms. Kristina Petkova	SAMTS, State Agency for Metrology and Technical Surveillance

CAMEROON

Mr. H. Ela Essi	CIML Member, Direction des Prix et de la Métrologie
Mr. Liman Maloum	Direction des Prix et de la Métrologie

CANADA

Mr. Alan E. Johnston	CIML Member, Measurement Canada
Mr. Gilles Vinet	Measurement Canada

CHINA

Mr. Wang Qinqing	CIML Member, AQSIQ, State General Administration for Quality Supervision and Inspection and Quarantine
Mr. Han Jianping	AQSIQ
Mr. Huang Yaowen	AQSIQ
Mr. Xuan Xiang	AQSIQ
Mr. Zhong Xinming	AQSIQ
Mr. Zhou Lunbin	AQSIQ

CROATIA

Mr. Molnar	
Mr. Vladimir Pasagic	State Office for Standardization and Metrology

CUBA

Mr. Martin Antunez Ramirez	CIML Member, NBS, National Bureau of Standards
----------------------------	--

CZECH REPUBLIC

Mr. Pavel Klenovský	CIML Member, CMI, Czech Metrology Institute
Mr. Vladimir Ludvik	Czech Office for Standards, Metrology and Testing
Mr. Alexander Safarik-Pstrosz	Czech Office for Standards, Metrology and Testing

DENMARK

Mr. P. Claudi Johansen	CIML Member, DANAK, The Danish Accreditation and Metrology Fund
------------------------	---

EGYPT

Dr. Mahmoud Eisa	CIML Member, EOS, Egyptian Organization for Standardization and Quality Control
------------------	---

ETHIOPIA

Mr. Arego Fikremariam Woldegiorgis	Quality and Standards Authority of Ethiopia
------------------------------------	---

FINLAND

Mr. Tuomo Valkeapää	CIML Member, TUKES, Safety Technology Authority
Mr. Veli Viitala	Ministry of Trade and Industry

FRANCE

Mr. Gérard Lagauterie	CIML Member, SDM, Sous-Direction de la Métrologie DARPMI
-----------------------	--

GERMANY

Pr. Manfred Kochsiek	CIML Acting President, PTB, Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt
Mr. Thomas Ernst	Federal Ministry of Economy
Mrs. Susanne Ludwig	PTB, Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt
Dr. Wilfried Schulz	PTB, Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt
Dr. Roman Schwartz	PTB, Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt
Dr. Eberhard Seiler	PTB, Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt
Dr. Sommer	PTB, Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt

HUNGARY

Dr. P. Pákay	CIML Member, OMH, Országos Mérésügyi Hivatal
Mr. K. Schmalhofer	OMH, Országos Mérésügyi Hivatal
Mr. Josef Szebenyi	OMH, Országos Mérésügyi Hivatal

INDIA

Mr. Ketan Zhukla	Embassy in Germany
------------------	--------------------

INDONESIA

Mr. Hari Prawoko Directorate of Metrology

IRAN

Mr. Mohammad Ali Akhavan Behabadi ISIRI, Institute of Standards and Industrial Research of Iran

IRELAND

Mr. P. Farragher CIML Member, NSAI, Legal Metrology Service

ISRAEL

Mr. Timor Zarin
Ms. Hanah Tiri
CIML Member, Ministry of Industry and Trade
Ministry of Industry and Trade

ITALY

Prof. Paolo Vigo University of Cassino

JAPAN

Dr. Mitsuru Tanaka
Mr. Tatsuya Daigo
Mr. Toru Kojima
Ms. Akemi Nishio
Dr. Masahiro Okaji
Dr. Akira Ooiwa
Mrs. Hiroe Sakai
Mr. Ryoji Uchida
CIML Member, NMIJ, National Metrology Institute of Japan
METI, Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry
NMIJ, National Metrology Institute of Japan
METI, Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry
NMIJ, National Metrology Institute of Japan
NMIJ, National Metrology Institute of Japan
NMIJ, National Metrology Institute of Japan
METI, Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry

KAZAKHSTAN

Ms. Zauresh Tasmaganbetova RSE, Kazakhstan Institute of Metrology

KENYA

Mr. Isaac M. Ngatia
Dr. John M. Masila
CIML Member, Ministry of Trade and Industry
Ministry of Trade and Industry

D.P.R. KOREA

Mr. Choe Chang Jin
Mr. Ri Man Ho
SAQM, Metrology Department, State Administration
for Quality Management
SAQM, Metrology Department, State Administration
for Quality Management

REP. KOREA

Mr. Yoo-Tae Jun
Dr. Jong Oh Choi Kriss
Mr. Oh Yong Kwon
Mr. Ha-Uk Nam
CIML Member, KATS, Metrology and Measurement Division
Korea Research Institute of Standards and Science
Korea Machinery Meter and Petrochemical Testing and Research Institute
KATS, Metrology and Measurement Division

MACEDONIA (The Former Yugoslav Republic of)

Mr. Danco Pendovski
Mr. Risto Josifovski
CIML Member, Ministry of Economy
Ministry of Economy

MONACO

Mr. Rainier Imperti Embassy in Berlin

MOROCCO

Mr. Yahyaoui Brahim Ministère de l'Industrie du Commerce et de la Mise à niveau de l'Economie

THE NETHERLANDS

Mr. C.J. Van Mullem
Mr. Pieter Van Breugel
Ms. Anneke Van Spronsen

CIML Member, Verispect B.V.
NMI Certin, Nederlands Meetinstituut Certin B.V.
Ministry of Economic Affairs

NEW ZEALAND

Mr. John Barker

CIML Member, MAPSS, Measurement and Product Safety Services

NORWAY

Dr. Helge Kildal

CIML Member, Justervesenet, Norwegian Metrology Service

POLAND

Ms. Barbara Lisowska

CIML Member, GUM, Central Office of Measures

PORTUGAL

Mr. J. N. Cartaxo Reis

CIML Member, IPQ, Instituto Português da Qualidade

ROMANIA

Mr. F. Iacobescu

CIML Member, B.R.M.L., Bureau Roumain de Métrologie Légale

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Prof. L. K. Issaev
Dr. Vladimir Krutikov
Dr. Sergey Kononogov
Dr. Vasily Mardin
Dr. A. Vishenkov
Mrs. Vytolskaya

CIML Vice-President, VNIIMS, Russian Research Institute for Metrological Service
Federal Agency for Technical Regulation and Metrology
VNIIMS, Russian Research Institute for Metrological Service
VNIIMS, Russian Research Institute for Metrological Service
VNIIMS, Russian Research Institute for Metrological Service
VNIIMS, Russian Research Institute for Metrological Service

SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO

Mr. Z. M. Marković

CIML Member, ZMDM, Bureau des Mesures et Métaux Précieux

SLOVAKIA

Mr. Jozef Orlovský
Mr. Jaromir Marković
Mr. Ivan Mikulecky

CIML Member, SLM, Slovak Legal Metrology
SLM, Slovak Legal Metrology
Slovak Office of Standards, Metrology and Testing

SLOVENIA

Dr. Ivan Skubić
Ms. Natasa Mejak Vuković

CIML Member, MIRS, Metrology Institute of the Republic of Slovenia
MIRS, Metrology Institute of the Republic of Slovenia

SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. Stuart H. Carstens
Mr. T. Chesolokile
Mr. Tom Scriven

CIML Member, SABS, South African Bureau of Standards, Legal Metrology Department
SABS, South African Bureau of Standards, Legal Metrology Department
SABS, South African Bureau of Standards, Legal Metrology Department

SPAIN

Mr. J.A. Robles
Dr. Carmen Sevilla Anton

CEM, Centro Español de Metrología
CEM, Centro Español de Metrología

SRI LANKA

Mr. K.A. Gunasoma

CIML Member, Measurement Units, Standards and Services Department

SWEDEN

Mr. Kari Björkqvist
Mr. Ingolf Berg

CIML Member, SWEDAC
Ministry, Employment and Communications

SWITZERLAND

Mr. Bruno Vaucher
Pr. Wolfgang Schwitz

CIML Member, METAS, Office Fédéral de Métrologie et d'Accréditation
METAS, Office Fédéral de Métrologie et d'Accréditation

TANZANIA

Mr. A. H. M. Tukai

CIML Member, Weights and Measures Bureau

TUNISIA

Mrs. Ghaïet-El-Mouna Annabi

CIML Member, Direction Générale de la Qualité et du Commerce Intérieur

UNITED KINGDOM

Dr. J.W. Llewellyn
Mr. Martin Birdseye

CIML Member, NWML, National Weights and Measures Laboratory
NWML, National Weights and Measures Laboratory

UNITED STATES

Dr. Charles D. Ehrlich
Dr. Jane Cowley
Dr. Richard Kayser
Mr. Henry Oppermann
Mr. Stephen Patoray
Dr. Claire Saundry

CIML Member, NIST, National Institute of Standards and Technology
Bureau of International Organization Affairs
NIST, National Institute of Standards and Technology
NIST, National Institute of Standards and Technology
NTEP, National Type Evaluation Program
NIST, National Institute of Standards and Technology

VIETNAM

Mr. Pham Ngoc Tran
Mr. Bui Quy Long

CIML Member, STAMEQ, Directorate for Standards and Quality
STAMEQ, Directorate for Standards and Quality

Corresponding Members

ARGENTINA

Mr. Gustavo Ranguini

Ministerio de Economia

BENIN

Mr. Loukoumanou Osséni

Direction de la Qualité et des Instruments de Mesure

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Mr. Zijad Dzemic
Mr. Esad Tuzovic

Institute for Standards, Metrology and Intellectual Property
Institute for Standards, Metrology and Intellectual Property

BURKINA FASO

Mr. Oumarou Yankine

Direction Générale des Prix, des Instruments de Mesure et du Contrôle

CAMBODIA

Mr. Ho Kadeb

Department of Metrology

CHINESE TAIPEI

Mr. Brain C.S. Shu
Dr. Jay-San Chen

M.O.E.A., Bureau of Standards, Metrology and Inspection
M.O.E.A., Bureau of Standards, Metrology and Inspection

COSTA RICA

Mr. B.F. Adrian Solano Mena

Oficina Nacional de Normas y Unidades de Medida

GABON

Mr. Fernand Koutana	Direction des Instruments de Mesure
Mr. Dieudonné Lewamou/Ho Obissa	Direction des Instruments de Mesure
Mrs. Diane Mpolo Mpoungou	Direction des Instruments de Mesure

GHANA

Mr. Kwasi Owusu Boadu	Ghana Standards Board
-----------------------	-----------------------

LATVIA

Ms. Brigita Dragune	Latvian National Metrology Centre Ltd
Mr. Juris Maurans	Latvian National Metrology Centre Ltd
Ms. Inese Velina	State Metrological, Inspection of the Republic of Latvia

LITHUANIA

Mr. O. Staugaitis	State Metrology Service
Mr. Viktoras Zabolotnas	State Metrology Service

LUXEMBURG

Mr. Mike Halsdorf	Administration des Contributions
Mr. J. Kirchen	Administration des Contributions

MALAYSIA

Mr. Mohd Ismail Bin Md Yunus	Ministry of Domestic Trade and Consumer Affairs
Mr. Abdul Rashid Zainal Abidin	SIRIM Berhad, National Metrology Laboratory

MALTA

Mr. Francis E. Farrugia	Malta Standards Authority
-------------------------	---------------------------

MONGOLIA

Mr. Damdin Sharafdorj	MASM, Mongolian Agency for Standardization and Metrology
-----------------------	--

NEPAL

Mr. Shree Krishna Shrestha	Nepal Bureau of Standards and Metrology
----------------------------	---

RWANDA

Dr. Tito Migabo	Office Rwandais de Normalisation
-----------------	----------------------------------

SYRIA

Mr. Khaled Osman	The Syrian Arab Organization for Standardization and Metrology
Mr. Hassan Sahloul	The Syrian Arab Organization for Standardization and Metrology

THAILAND

Mr. Songklod Ubolsing	Department of Internal Trade
-----------------------	------------------------------

UKRAINE

Mr. Rostyslav Domnystkyy	The State Committee of Ukraine on the Matters of Technical Adjustment and Consumer Policy
Mr. Paulo Neyezhmakov	The State Committee of Ukraine on the Matters of Technical Adjustment and Consumer Policy
Dr. Oleh Velychko	The State Committee of Ukraine on the Matters of Technical Adjustment and Consumer Policy

UZBEKISTAN

Mr. Abdurauf Abdukayumov	Uzstatestandard, Uzbek State Center for Standardization, Metrology and Certification
--------------------------	--

Observer Countries

BHUTAN

Mr. Sahabir Gurung

Ministry of Works & Human Settlement

BOLIVIA

Mr. Juan Carlos Castillo Villaroel

Mr. Gerson Vallejos Silva

Instituto Boliviano de Metrologia

Instituto Boliviano de Metrologia

CONGO

Mr. Kanama Viki Mbuya Ir.

Département Métrologie et Contrôles Techniques

ECUADOR

Mr. René Chanchay

Instituto Ecuatoriano de Normalizacion

GUINEA

Mr. El Hadj Mamady Conde

INNМ, Institut National de Normalisation et de Métrologie

GUINEA-BISSAU

Mr. Alfonso Herrera Djeme

IVORY COAST

Mr. Georges Gbougui Kore

LANEMA, Laboratoire National d'Essai de Qualité
de Métrologie et d'Analyses

JAMAICA

Mr. Mitchell Tweedsmuir

Bureau of Standards

KYRGYZSTAN

Mr. Salmorbek Asanaliev

Mr. Talaibek S. Dusheev

National Institute for Standards and Metrology

National Institute for Standards and Metrology

D.P.R LAOS

Mr. Sisomphet Nhoibouakong

MALI

Mr. Maharafa M. Tounkara

NIGERIA

Mr. Issoufou Salifou

Direction du Développement Industriel

SENEGAL

Mr. Amadou Niang

Direction du Commerce Intérieur

TOGO

Mr. Afolé A. Eklou

SCCPIM, Service de Contrôle du Conditionnement des Produits
et des Instruments de Mesure

UGANDA

Mr. Terry Kahuma

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

Mr. Mohammed Ahmad Abdulqader Al Mulla Dubai Central Lab, Dubai Municipality

VENEZUELA

Dr. Haygas Kalustian

ZAMBIA

Mr. Kimon Zulu

Zambia Weights and Measures Agency

ZIMBABWE

Mr. Francis B. Karani

Ministry of Industry and International Trade

Liaisons

Mr. John Anthony
 Dr. Ismael Castelazo
 Mrs. Suzanne Höke
 Dr. Otto Loesener
 Mrs. Veronika Martens
 Mr. Daniel Pierre
 Mr. Abdou Seyni
 Mr. Martin Stoll

CECIP, Comité Européen des Constructeurs d'Instruments de Pesage
 BIPM, Bureau International des Poids et Mesures
 CCE - DG Enterprises, Commission of the European Community
 UNIDO, United Nations Industrial Development Organization
 CECIP, Comité Européen des Constructeurs d'Instruments de Pesage
 ILAC, International Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation
 UEMOA, Union Economique et Monétaire Ouest Africaine
 CECIP, Comité Européen des Constructeurs d'Instruments de Pesage

Guests

Mr. Gerard Faber
 Mr. John Birch

CIML Immediate Past President
 CIML Honorary Member

BIML

Mr. Jean-François Magaña
 Mr. Ian Dunmill
 Mrs. Régine Gaucher
 Mr. Chris Pulham
 Mrs. Patricia Saint-Germain
 Mr. Attila Szilvássy

Bureau International de Métrologie Légale
 Bureau International de Métrologie Légale

AGENDA

1 – ORGANIZATION OF THE MEETING

- 1.1 Opening
- 1.2 Roll-call - Verification of credentials - Quorum
- 1.3 Voting procedures during Conference sessions
- 1.4 Election of the President and Vice Presidents of the Conference
- 1.5 Adoption of the Agenda
- 1.6 Constitution of Working Commissions
- 1.7 Establishment of the schedule
- 1.8 Approval of the minutes of the Eleventh Conference
- 1.9 Report on activities by the President of the International Committee of Legal Metrology

2 – MEMBER STATES AND CORRESPONDING MEMBERS

- 2.1 New Members - Expected accessions
- 2.2 The situation of certain Members (see also Item 8.2)

3 – LONG-TERM POLICY

- 3.1 Report on actions carried out since the Eleventh Conference
- 3.2 Guidelines for 2005–2008

4 – LIAISONS WITH INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS

- 4.1 Report on liaisons
- 4.2 Addresses by Representatives of Institutions
- 4.3 Discussions and conclusions (Liaisons)

5 – WORK OF OIML TECHNICAL COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES

- 5.1 Work undertaken - State of progress
- 5.2 Implementation of Recommendations by OIML Members
- 5.3 Formal sanction of Recommendations already approved by the Committee in 2001, 2002 and 2003
- 5.4 Draft Recommendations directly presented for sanctioning by the Conference

6 – OIML CERTIFICATION, MUTUAL ACCEPTANCE AND/OR RECOGNITION

- 6.1 OIML Certificate System for Measuring Instruments
- 6.2 Mutual Acceptance Arrangement (MAA)
- 6.3 OIML Certification - Other arrangements

7 – DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

- 7.1 Report on activities on Developing Countries for the period 2001–2004
- 7.2 Guidelines for future activities on Developing Countries

8 – ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL MATTERS

- 8.1 Examination of the management of the budget from 2001 to 2003 and the estimates for 2004
- 8.2 Decisions related to the debts of certain countries
- 8.3 Revision of the OIML Financial Regulations
- 8.4 Bureau staff and retirement scheme
- 8.5 Budget for the financial period 2005–2008
- 8.6 Status of OIML Publications

9 – OTHER BUSINESS

10 – CLOSURE

- 10.1 Adoption of Decisions and Resolutions of the Conference
- 10.2 Date and place of the next Conference

DECISIONS AND RESOLUTIONS

1 – ORGANIZATION OF THE MEETING

1.1 Opening

Mr. Kochsiek, in his double capacity as Host and Acting President, welcomed Delegates and Colleagues to the 12th OIML International Conference in Berlin. He first expressed his pleasure at the presence of a record number of Delegates at the Conference: there were more than 250 Delegates from over 100 countries. He then voiced his delight at the presence of Professor Göbel, President of the PTB, the German Metrology Institute. Mr. Kochsiek was also very pleased to welcome Mr. Tacke, State Secretary of the Federal Ministry of Economics and Labor, who had always been most supportive of work done in the field of legal metrology.

The Vice Minister Mr. Tacke delivered his opening speech.

**Dr. Alfred Tacke,
State Secretary, Federal Ministry of Economics and Labor, Germany**

Professor Kochsiek, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Welcome to Berlin and to the Federal Ministry of Economics and Labor for the 12th Conference of the International Organization of Legal Metrology. The fact that the Conference is being held in Germany for the first time since the establishment of the organization in 1955 is for me especially, as representative of the BMWA, a reason for joy. In fact, in our Ministry we have always esteemed the OIML and your work - and indeed, its economic and political importance must not be underestimated, but more about that later.

In choosing Berlin as your venue, you have chosen a city which has developed impressively since the reunification in 1990. Today, Berlin is a city full of energy, life and culture. This evening at the state reception, you will have the opportunity to acquire a first-hand impression of the city from on board a ship. I hope the Conference program will leave you enough time to explore Berlin in more depth.

This week you are meeting in the official seat of the Federal Ministry of Economics and Labor. It is situated directly on the former border between East and West Berlin and its history is just as changeable as that of the city of Berlin. In 1747, by order of the Prussian King Friedrich II, the foundation stone was laid for the oldest buildings of this complex, the so-called invalid houses; the facility served as lodgings for soldiers disabled because of the war.

Then as now, relieving the budget and promoting trade played important roles. A rather large property belonged to the invalid houses. This enabled the facility to be financially independent and not encumber the state. To promote trade, some years prior to this in what was then Prussia, initial steps were undertaken to unify the measuring system: the Berlin measurement unit was introduced in all provinces, i.e. among others, the Berlin bushel and the Berlin ell or cubit.

Let us return to the official seat of the BMWA: at the beginning of the 20th century an imperial academy for prospective military physicians was accommodated in this building. However, this building has also seen inglorious times: for example, in the days of the Berlin Wall the Supreme Court of the GDR was in session here. Numerous show trials were held here, of which many people have retained terrible memories. Surely you all know the depiction of the Roman goddess Justitia as a symbol of justice with a blindfold and a measuring instrument - a pair of balances. To judge without respect of persons: this basic principle was violated in the extreme in these show trials.

Today, this expensively reconstructed building complex houses the Federal Ministry of Economics and Labor and I encourage you to take a closer look at it in the next few days.

The competencies of the BMWA extend from economic policy and the labor market policy over technology and energy policies to foreign trade policy. The predominate goal of our policy is the creation of favorable general conditions for faster growth and a higher level of employment. Important vertices of our reform policy are thus global harmony, mutual acceptance, removal of trade barriers, and reduction in administrative expenditure and costs. These instruments are also familiar to you in the OIML.

We would also like to improve the general conditions concerning legal metrology in Germany. Now that the European Measurement Instrument Directive is in force, transposing it into national law stands in the foreground. In this connection, we are preparing to modernize legal metrology and our goal is the sustainable structuring of legal metrology. For example, one of the most important challenges is the technical development of measuring instruments culminating in software-controlled measuring systems. Also in view of this development, we would like to ensure the safeguarding of fair competition and the protection of the consumer.

Indeed, the importance of legal metrology is not to be underestimated: the OIML assumes that measurements are undertaken for the exchange of goods and energy in a value of up to 10 % of the gross national product of a country; measurements are necessary, e.g. for importing natural gas from Russia - not forgetting the background of rising energy

prices. For Germany, we are speaking of a total of approximately 150 billion at 10 % of the gross national product. This value alone proves the necessity of adapting legal metrology to the new challenges.

In our role as host of the 12th Conference, we would like to affirm our support for the activities of the OIML. We expressly welcome the commitment of the Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt - Germany's National Metrology Institute - and its Vice President, to the OIML. Through your outstanding research in the field of legal metrology you are laying the foundation for the decisions of the BMWA. We encourage you to continue on this course. I wish your consultations and the Conference much success.

Mr. Göbel then welcomed delegates to the Conference with the following opening speech.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Dear Colleagues,

Dear Friends,

It is now my pleasure and actually an honor to welcome you on behalf of the PTB. We are grateful and indeed honored that the OIML has chosen Berlin for this year's Conference.

We are also very grateful to the Federal Ministry of Economics and Labor, represented by Vice Minister Dr. Tacke, for hosting the Conference in this beautiful environment.

As you know, the PTB is in a very fortunate situation in that it covers all major activities related to metrology: fundamental metrology, metrology for industry, legal metrology and - last but not least - international aspects of metrology.

Fundamental metrology relates to the realization, maintenance and dissemination of the SI units and indeed the PTB is putting considerable effort into improving the International System of Units and its realization, for example by investigating the need to trace the SI units back to fundamental constants as is the case, for example, in the international "Avogadro" cooperation.

With regard to industrial metrology, the PTB is cooperating with many of Germany's bigger companies as well as with many small and medium sized companies to find out their metrological challenges and contribute to their solutions.

Furthermore, the PTB has established close technical and scientific links to the German Calibration Service (DKD), the accreditation body of calibration laboratories as requested by last year's General Conference of the Metre Convention, renewed again this year by the CIPM Meeting. Let me point out, however, that due to various internal organizational changes DKD is an independent entity and thus its impartiality is nevertheless guaranteed.

I do not have to explain to you that legal metrology has a long-standing tradition in our country and is in charge of the verification authorities of the federal states, and the PTB.

This system, with its shared responsibilities, has proved to be reliable and functions well. With the changes coming into force with the European Measuring Instruments Directive, the responsible federal Ministry, the PTB, the verification authorities and the measuring instrument manufacturers have the responsibility to ensure that the high level of security and protection is maintained.

Finally, our engagement in matters of international metrology refers not only to active participation in international metrology organizations such as the OIML but also to the support we are providing to our partners in the technical cooperation projects, which are financially also supported by the federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development.

I wish you now a very interesting and pleasant Conference and an enjoyable stay in this beautiful building and in Berlin and I look forward to a fruitful meeting.

Thank you very much.

1.2 Roll-call – Verification of credentials - Quorum

Mr. Kochsiek called upon Mr. Magaña to take the roll call, which was duly done. 55 Member States were present. The number necessary for a quorum was 40 so the quorum was met.

1.3 Voting procedures during Conference sessions

Mr. Magaña reminded Members that they had among their papers a summary of the established OIML Convention voting procedures: there had to be a quorum of two thirds of the Members, so at least 40 members had to be present; of these, four fifths had to vote, and decisions had to be passed by a majority of four fifths of these. So with 55 Member States present, there had to be a minimum of 44 votes cast, i.e. not more than 10 abstentions; and among the 44 votes, 36 had to be positive, i.e. no more than 8 negative votes. For each vote, the Bureau would keep a note of countries which had abstained and voted “no”.

1.4 Election of the President and Vice Presidents of the Conference

Mr. Kochsiek presented Mr. Röhling for approval as Conference Chairman. Mr. Röhling was very familiar with metrology; he had just retired from his position as General Director of the Federal Ministry of Economics and Labor and had been on the one hand the President of the Advisory Board of the PTB and on the other, for several years German Representative in Paris at the OECD. He not only spoke excellent English and French but also a good knowledge of metrology, especially legal metrology. Mr. Kochsiek invited those present to elect Mr. Röhling, which was duly done.

Two Conference Vice Presidents then had to be elected. Mr. Kochsiek proposed Mrs. Annabi, hitherto President of the now defunct Development Council; and Mr. Zhagora, currently President of the State Committee for Standardization, Metrology and Certification of Belarus. Two regions would thus be represented. The two Vice Presidents were also elected.

Mr. Röhling accepted the Presidency of the Conference with great pleasure and thanked Members for giving him the opportunity to learn more about metrology, on which he was less expert than Mr. Kochsiek had implied; though it was true that he had indeed for some years had to deal with the subject. He had had contacts with Messrs. Kochsiek and Magaña in the last few weeks and this had convinced him that Conference had been well prepared and should not present too many difficulties. Voting procedures had been explained; he therefore intended to pass directly to the next item on the Agenda.

1.5 Adoption of the Agenda

This had already been discussed in the CIML Meeting. Mr. Röhling therefore handed the floor to Mr. Magaña. Mr. Magaña reminded Members that they had received the Agenda prior to the Conference; and that the CIML had accepted it without changes. He therefore asked the Conference to accept it as it stood, which was duly done.

1.6 Constitution of Working Commissions

He then explained the purpose and functions of the Technical and Financial Commissions. These Commissions were open to any Members who wished to attend; their informal meetings would be conducted in English without translation. The object of the Technical Commission was to examine and review the Technical Documents which the Conference was to approve. The object of the Financial Commission was to examine the reports on the management of the Bureau in the previous four years, the budget proposed for the following four years, and the proposed alterations in the accountancy procedure, preparatory to the Conference votes on all these matters. He asked Bureau Staff to draw up a list of Delegates wishing to attend these meetings, which was duly done.

Mr. Kochsiek said that Mr. Alan Johnston of Canada had been proposed as Chairman of the Financial Commission and Mr. Tanaka from Japan the Technical Commission. These names were agreed. Mr. Kochsiek then asked Mr. Magaña to introduce the following item.

1.7 Establishment of the schedule

Mr. Magaña pointed out that the schedule was tight; he proposed closing the current session at 16.30 and not 16.50 as previously intended, and to reserve Item 4 for the next session. However, international presenters and anyone who could not stay for the next session could make their presentations in the current session. He gave further details of the schedule, reminding Members that all the important votes would be taken on Friday; a quorum was essential and no proxy votes were permitted in the Conference.

Questions and comments were invited but none were forthcoming; the Conference therefore passed to the next point.

1.8 Approval of the minutes of the Eleventh Conference

Mr. Röhling reminded Members that the minutes had been sent out some months after the end of the Conference. As there had been neither objections nor abstentions, the minutes were approved unanimously.

1.9 Report on activities by the President of the International Committee of Legal Metrology

Mr. Kochsiek reminded Members that it was the responsibility of the CIML President to present a report on the OIML situation and activities since the last Conference. The purpose of this report was to enable the Conference to determine to what extent the decisions had been implemented and which current and future objectives it would be necessary to focus on in order to set the guidelines to be followed by the OIML in its strategy over the forthcoming years.

Mr. Kochsiek said he would begin by describing the present situation of the OIML and by indicating some items for comparison with the situation four years previously, at the time of the 11th Conference in London. After this, on the basis of discussions held with the CIML and the Presidential Council, he would indicate which objectives he believed the OIML should focus on in order to fulfill its role in an international community affected by the ever increasing trend towards globalization.

In order to put these objectives into perspective, the OIML must consider whom they were working with and for. Three distinct audiences could be identified; there had been no real change since the London Conference, but the matter still merited a mention:

- Firstly, there was the audience from OIML Members themselves, who were essential to an Inter-governmental Organization, since the human and financial resources of the latter emanated from its Member Countries. Since the last Conference, the number of OIML Members had steadily increased, from 105 to 109, now comprising 59 member States and 50 Corresponding Members. This progression was satisfactory on the whole, even though it would have been even better if the number of Member States had increased more quickly than the number of Corresponding Members. It should, however, be accepted that any country or economy which showed an interest in OIML work might not be able, for whatever the reason, to become a full Member State. More than five new countries were in discussion with the OIML at present, so that in the future there would be a further increase in the number of Members;
- The second audience was from the numerous International and Regional Organizations whose activities were related to those of the OIML. In the context of globalization, with which Delegates were familiar, and were confronted, the OIML was under the obligation to generate maximum efficiency out of its limited resources, both human and material. It was in fact essential for the various International and Regional Organizations pursuing similar activities to cooperate closely together and consult each other in order to avoid duplication of work. From this point of view, Mr. Kochsiek considered that the last four years had been extremely profitable for the OIML. In particular, its capacity as an observer at the WTO, in the Committee on Technical Barriers to Trade, now enabled the OIML to participate in certain activities of that Committee, notably in Seminars and Workshops concerning the implementation of international standards, with a view to eliminating technical barriers to trade. OIML representatives were in contact with their counterparts from the major International Organizations who were active in the fields of economy, commerce, development and standardization. Mr. Kochsiek would return later to this item. Cooperation

between the OIML and certain of these worldwide Organizations was also progressing, and not only bilaterally; Mr. Kochsiek mentioned in particular the work of the JCDCMAS.

At the same time as cooperating at a world level, the OIML was also continuing to experience increased and extremely promising cooperation at Regional level, as Members had heard in the last hour. At present, many parts of the globe were covered by Regional Legal Metrology Organizations, either independent or operating within a wider framework, for example that of development and economic cooperation. CIML policy concerning this was clear: to encourage and propagate development of regional cooperation by observing the activities of these RLMOs and by informing them of the corresponding OIML activities. This important topic had, however, already been very fully covered in the course of the Conference, and Mr. Kochsiek did not wish to dwell further upon it at this juncture.

- There was a third category of bodies which were extremely interested in OIML work, and whose cooperation with the OIML might be essential: these were the manufacturers and users of measuring instruments, including consumers, who might be considered users in a larger sense, since the conditions in which they lived, whether economic, social or environmental, were in large part dependent upon measurements. At the previous Conference, Mr. Faber had announced more than ten years of implementation of the OIML Certificate System. At that time, more than 700 Certificates had been issued. During the intervening four years, nearly 600 more Certificates had been issued, and the total number of Certificates was now approaching 1300, and would exceed this number before the end of the year. This was an extremely positive aspect of OIML activity.

In general, following on from the report of the previous President in 2000, Mr. Kochsiek had to say that the finances of the Organization were well ordered, and there were skilled and dedicated staff in the Bureau. The alterations to the BIML offices would begin in November; this was part of the ongoing project to provide additional space for the expanding activities of the Bureau; Mr. Magaña would provide more details on this.

Mr. Kochsiek would now move on to more detailed strategic, organizational and technical aspects. Concerning the OIML long term policy, he would like to mention four events or reports which had had a major influence on OIML policy and work.

- In 1998, the so-called Braunschweig seminar, *The Role of Metrology for Economic and Social development*;
- Also in 1998, the Birkeland Report, *Legal Metrology at the Dawn of the 21st Century*;
- In 2002, the seminar in St Jean de Luz, *Legal Metrology in 2020*; and
- In 2003, the Birch Study, *Benefit of Legal Metrology for the Economy and Society*.

Mr. Kochsiek considered that these four studies, these four events, should be re-examined from time to time, in order to reflect upon what was going on in the world and what should be included in the OIML's strategy and Action Plan. The evaluations for long term policy and the Action Plan for the coming year were not yet finished, and would be based on a number of key elements, which he would now summarize:

- The implementation of the MAA: following adoption of the framework the previous year, there had been much discussion during the current week, and it was hoped that before the end of the week a positive solution would be arrived at during the Conference, so that implementation could begin in the course of the following year;
- Regarding cooperation with Regional and International Organizations, the CIML President and/or the Director or one of the Assistant Directors had taken part in most of the meetings during the previous year, and indeed over the last four years. For instance, Mr. Faber, the immediate Past President, had attended the General Conference on Weights and Measures and also a Metrology Conference the previous year in the Gulf States; Mr. Magaña and the two Assistant Directors participated in almost all the RLMO meetings; and Mr. Kochsiek himself had had the pleasure and honor to be present two weeks previously at the APLMF Meeting in San Diego;
- In connection with the Permanent Working Group on Developing Countries, set up following the decisions of the 38th CIML Meeting in Kyoto in 2003, the Group was chaired by Mr. Seiler of the PTB on behalf of Mr. Kochsiek himself because the latter's unexpected elevation to the CIML Presidency made it impossible for him to fill both posts simultaneously. This group would advise the OIML President and the CIML, which would receive a report from Mr. Seiler later in the Conference;

- Concerning Developing Countries, the report on the Verification of Commercial Weights by Mr. Gupta had now been published and had already been mentioned. The Bureau had sent an inquiry to Member States and Corresponding Members about the need for similar technical papers which experts might produce and the Bureau would then hire recommended experts to produce them;
- Mr. Kochsiek also mentioned the Forum and Poster Sessions taking place throughout the week;
- JCDCMAS, which had already been mentioned, comprised the OIML, the Metre Convention, ILAC, IAF, ISO, IEC, ITU-T, IMEKO, ITC and UNIDO. Its aim was to promote consistency of technical assistance in the fields of metrology, accreditation and standardization and raise awareness of these issues. Various awareness documents were being developed, a database on the needs and offers of technical assistance was being set up, and the JCDCMAS Secretariat was held in the current year by the IEC and in 2005 would pass to the BIML.
- An Information Letter had been started in January 2004 in order to provide Members with better information on the life of the Organization. Four issues of this Letter had been published to date, which might be downloaded from the Members page of the OIML web site. If Members found this information useful, they should contact Mr. Kochsiek or Mr. Magaña so that the Letters might be continued;
- In May of the current year, the BIML had sent out a survey to Member States and Corresponding Members about the state of implementation of OIML Recommendations, and about translations of OIML publications into different national languages. The information obtained from this would be made available to all Members. In order the better to promote the use of OIML publications, it was proposed that all these, except joint publications with other organizations, would be available free of charge on the OIML web site from 2005, or sooner if possible;
- The OIML web site had been provided with online facilities for consulting databases of Member addresses and of publications. This had recently been extended to allow the consultation of TC/SC data such as membership, projects and so on, and would soon be further extended to enable consultation of OIML Certificates, and to other issues. This web site would also shortly include interactive pages which could be used as forums for TCs and SCs, Working Groups and so on. These pages would allow administrators to upload working documents and participants to upload comments and contributions and all of these could be consulted online;
- Another important point was the election of a new CIML President and First Vice President. Immediately after this, discussions would begin on OIML strategy and the new Action Plan for the coming years;
- Mr. Kochsiek also wished to encourage States, especially in Developing Countries, to become Corresponding Members, and for the latter to become full Member States.
- Mr. Kochsiek's last point was the preparations for the 50th OIML Anniversary and the 40th CIML Meeting in Lyon in June 2005. This event was being held in conjunction with the International Metrology Congress, which would have a special session for legal metrology, for which the OIML already had a number of issues for discussion.

In conclusion, Mr. Kochsiek told delegates that the 12th International Conference should mark a stepping stone for the Organization. Having entered the 21st Century, the OIML had received much input from the outside; but everyone was living in a world in which many kinds of development seemed to be more influenced by financial considerations than by well thought out policy decisions. This resulted in a lowering of the influence which Governments might urge over certain essential aspects of the life of societies, and in a tendency towards deregulation. At the same time, there was a tendency to consider metrology as being one of the numerous technical aspects of free trade, instead of recognizing that in fact it played an essential role in improving the quality of trade, and helped the environment and other aspects of human activity. He appealed to Members to make decisions which would allow the OIML to anticipate events and adapt strategy to their repercussions, thus enabling adequate preparation for the future.

Mr. Röhling thanked Mr. Kochsiek and invited questions or comments from the floor.

Mr. Kildal pointed out that Mr. Faber, when President, had drawn up an Action Plan with the BIML, which had been a very useful tool for following the work of the BIML and its priorities. He had felt its lack recently. He had understood from Mr. Kochsiek's report that it was intended to produce an updated Plan; he asked for clarification on this.

Mr. Kochsiek replied that his report had shown how the actions of recent years had been in accordance with that Action Plan; the Presidential Council had decided that for the one year when Mr. Kochsiek had been Acting President there would be no new Action Plan. But as soon as a new President had been elected, a new Action Plan would be drawn up and disseminated to Members.

Mr. Safarik-Pstrosz thanked Mr. Kochsiek for his comprehensive report. He commented on two points: the OIML's international cooperation and the implementation of Recommendations. On the first point, he suggested to Members that there should be more cooperation with the Economic Commission for Europe of the United Nations, which had a relevant regulatory body for trade and enterprise development, Working Party 6. Three reasons for OIML to cooperate with this body were:

- Metrology was part of the program of Working Party 6;
- For market surveillance strengthening, mentioned earlier in the current meeting; Working Party 6 had a special body dealing with this.
- The Working Party had developed a document called International Model for Good Regulatory Practice; this was already being implemented and the OIML should seek to become involved in it.

On the implementation of OIML Recommendations, the Czech Republic commented that the results of the questionnaire on this subject among Members could be used to establish priorities in this area.

Mr. Magaña thanked Mr. Safarik-Pstrosz for his pertinent comments; concerning the UN-ECE, and, indeed, also the UN Economic Commission for Africa, the Bureau already played an active part in various ongoing tasks being undertaken by this Committee. This was due to be mentioned in a report later in the Conference.

Regarding the questionnaires, there were plans to report on the results and apply them; this did, however, depend on the willingness of Members to respond quickly, which unfortunately was not always the case when questionnaires were sent out.

Mr. Lagauterie raised the point that any Action Plan needed to be sanctioned by the CIML, which would be difficult if, as had been stated, it would only be drawn up after the election of the new President and therefore after the end of the CIML Meeting.

Mr. Kochsiek replied that this was indeed the case. He then asked Mr. Magaña to introduce the next Item.

2 – MEMBER STATES AND CORRESPONDING MEMBERS

2.1 New Members – Expected accessions

Mr. Magaña said that six countries had been in contact with a view to becoming Member States and another six wished to become Corresponding Members; this was very encouraging.

2.2 Situation of certain Members

This Item, which related to the arrears of some countries, had already been discussed in the Finance Commission and would come up again under Item 8.2 Decisions related to the debts of certain countries.

3 – LONG-TERM POLICY

3.1 Report on actions carried out since the Eleventh Conference

Mr. Röhling said this Item would also include discussion of long-term recommendations and asked Mr. Magaña to deliver his report.

Mr. Magaña said that the London Conference had asked to approve the Action Plan drawn up by the Committee which covered the period up to 2002, and had voted to extend it until 2004. Members of that Conference had also asked for a report on the implementation of that plan to be made to the current, 12th Conference. Members had received a summary of these actions, which he presented under the following topic headings:

A1 To improve and accelerate the technical activity of TCs/SCs:

- The use of electronic mail had been developed;
- A Working Group had been set up to revise the *Directives for Technical Work*; and
- Some Secretariats had been reallocated to other countries, particularly those which had not previously had responsibility for any project.

A2 To develop the OIML Certificate System:

- This system had been extended to allow Certificates to be issued for modules of instruments, families of instruments and families of modules. This was in the process of being put in place for every Recommendation;
- The number of OIML Recommendations had risen from 30 in 2000 to 39 at present, with others imminently expected;
- A database of OIML Certificates had been set up on the OIML web site and would shortly be searchable.

B Promotion of acceptance of measurement results in international trade:

- Document B 10-1, the MAA, including B 10-2 Checklists, had been approved by the CIML in Kyoto in 2003; this would be discussed under other headings;
- TC 3/SC 5 had undertaken to produce Guides for the application of accreditation standards for pattern evaluation;
- Work was in progress on Guides for accreditation of inspecting bodies, which had been asked for, and a first Committee Draft was expected shortly;
- Revision and publication of OIML R 87 on pre-packages was another important element.

C To promote Legal Metrology in OIML Member States, Corresponding Members and all countries:

- Mr. Birch's study had been published;
- Regional, National and International Conferences, Seminars and Workshops had been organized, which were too numerous to list;
- The Joint Committee for Technical Assistance to Developing Countries had been set up the previous year and played an important part in this work, bringing together the OIML, the Metre Convention, and Standardization and Accreditation Organizations; it was a broad but coherent group;
- OIML publications had been made more accessible; virtually all of them were now available on the web site to Members and Corresponding Members;
- Other improvements had been made to the web site, which would soon also have interactive pages;

- Expert Reports were also being made available on line, together with mutual information which could be circulated.

C To modernize and improve the work of the Bureau:

- The *BIML Staff Regulations* had been revised and adopted;
- The *OIML Financial Regulations* had been revised and would be submitted to the Conference;
- There had been excellent relationships with RLMOs and cooperation with all other Organizations and contacts;
- The Permanent Working Group on Developing Countries had brought a welcome dynamism to work in this sphere, and had organized the Forum in which many Members had recently participated;
- There was a plan, which had been discussed at the CIML Meeting, to bring out a new OIML General Brochure, which would possibly be a joint brochure with the Metre Convention, a single brochure on international metrology, presenting in an agreed and coherent way the work of both Organizations. This plan would very shortly be put to the Committee.

Mr. Magaña reminded Members that this had been just a brief summary and referred them to the paper on the subject which had been circulated, if they required further detail. He invited questions and comments.

Mr. Röhling thanked Mr. Magaña for his report, which had contained several new topics which might give rise to discussion. The joint brochure with the Metre Convention seemed to him an excellent idea, to summarize all the information for non-professionals.

There was a comment that OIML Test Report Formats were only available in PDF format; might it be possible to have them in Word?

Mr. Magaña agreed that this would be useful when revision was required; however, there was a technical problem in that the PDF was generated by Quark Xpress, designed for printing out, and Quark did not offer a Word format. The Word copies in the possession of the Bureau were only used up to the stage of initial editing.

3.2 Guidelines for 2005-2008

Mr. Röhling explained that this was an opportunity to add to and discuss the ideas for the future which Mr. Magaña had already outlined. Members were invited to suggest ideas and proposals for discussion.

Mr. Magaña said that Members' suggestions for the future direction in which the OIML should move would be welcomed and noted, and would be taken into consideration when the Action Plan was drawn up, following the election of a new President at the end of the CIML Meeting.

Mr. Röhling said suggestions could be made orally now, or later in writing.

Mr. Schwitz referred to the initiative of the French Foreign Ministry some years previously to move closer to inter-governmental Organizations on metrology. As was well known, this objective had not been achieved; at the same time, it was becoming difficult for countries to be members of at least two international and two Regional Metrology Organizations. Demands on metrology were becoming more significant, but at the same time metrology was getting less recognition. He asked the OIML to consider adopting as an aim in the next four years to try to move closer to other Metrology Organizations.

Mr. Magaña reminded Delegates that indeed the President, Director and Bureau had been asked a few years before to examine the possibility of working towards amalgamating the two Metrology Organizations. The two Presidents and the two Bureau Directors had been in contact, but in the end it was the Metre Convention which had passed a resolution saying the amalgamation would not be of interest. The two Organizations already worked very closely together, with excellent relationships between the Directors of the two Bureaus, which had not always been the case in the past, and there was much cooperation between the two. They aimed to present a common front: joint proposals included:

- The proposal for a joint international brochure instead of separate ones;
- A simple and inexpensive plan to have a joint web site portal for international metrology, from where internet users would pass on to the web site they needed;
- Joint work on Developing Countries;
- The Joint Committee on Guides in Metrology.

In every way, therefore, the two Organizations were working to present a coherent and coordinated common front. It appeared that if a merger was to take place, each of the Organizations would continue to carry out its own appointed tasks; the BIPM's laboratories would not be replaced by the OIML agents, nor vice versa; there would thus have been virtually no financial saving, except, perhaps, the telephone switchboard and the gardener. So if it was too expensive for any Member to join one Organization, it would be even more costly for them to join a single combined one. There was a risk that if a merger took place both Organizations would lose Members. Moreover, separate Committees for weights and measures and for legal metrology would have to continue, because the subjects were quite different, and new international treaties would be necessary, which would be both lengthy and time consuming. Day to day joint work was ongoing; a geographical rapprochement might raise problems for the premises, especially as the BIPM was on a site of historical interest where it was difficult to obtain building permission. On the other hand, the OIML could always use meeting rooms at the BIPM if its own were not large enough for a particular occasion. Thus the disadvantages of merger outweighed its advantages.

Mr. Kochsiek added that the CIML had taken a decision not to merge the Organizations because the conditions offered were not favorable, and it was not possible to proceed unless they altered their decision; nevertheless, the suggestion had been noted and could be put on the Agenda for the Friday afternoon discussions of the Presidential Council Meeting.

Mr. Schwitz appreciated that the proposal had moved on from the theoretical to the practical level; he hoped that as a result of the present close collaboration it might come up again.

Mr. Röhling added that the matter had also been discussed in the German Government, where Ministers failed to understand the need for two Organizations, both in Paris and working on what appeared to be closely related subjects; he asked that the matter be re-examined with the Metre Convention now that there had been some changes in personnel in both Organizations. Metrology would be able to present a much better case to the world if it spoke with one voice.

Mr. Kildal realized that there were difficulties in a complete merger but suggested that joint meetings held by the two Organizations might constitute a first step.

Mr. Magaña said that he had already raised the possibility of joint meetings and even perhaps Conferences with the BIPM Director. The difficulty would be that this would result in two weeks of meetings for Delegates without a break and this would be too long for many of them. On the other hand, there were many joint meetings: for example, there was the joint annual meeting of the Presidencies of the OIML, BIPM and ILAC, which had proved to be very useful and which had resulted in the launch of several joint projects. There were already joint meetings on the subjects of the Guides; Vocabulary; Developing Countries; and further cooperation was hoped for and expected.

As there were no further comments the Conference passed on to the next Item.

4 – LIAISONS WITH INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS

4.1 Report on liaisons

Mr. Magaña reminded Delegates that they had received a report on contacts between the OIML and other Organizations; he would give a brief overall picture of these, following which representatives of international groups would inform Members about their recent activities.

The first point to be made was that, at the request of the Committee, a General Policy Document on contacts between the OIML and other Organizations had been prepared. This document had been approved by the CIML in Kyoto and laid out guidelines for relationships between the OIML and other Organizations, which were now systematically observed by the Bureau.

- The OIML's most frequent collaborator was the Metre Convention, which had been for the last ten years more or less a sister organization. There were frequent informal meetings between the Directors of the two Organizations, and an excellent relationship. Collaboration on several subjects was well under way, and there were various active joint committees, such as the Joint Committee on Guides in Metrology. Work was being done on terminology, on the Guide to Uncertainties, and the OIML Document D 1 Law on Metrology, was being looked at jointly by the two Organizations, with the cooperation also of ILAC and UNIDO. Relations with the Metre Convention, therefore, were very fruitful; a joint web portal on international metrology, with joint brochures and web space, was envisaged for the future. These projects would be submitted to the President and the Committee in due course.
- Other frequent contacts were with ILAC and the IAF and they had worked together on the Metrology Law, for Developing Countries, and of course on the MAA, where links with Issuing Authorities would become ever closer.
- There was cooperation also with Organizations for International Standardization such as ISO and the IEC, with which they had joint standards for certain categories of instruments and on-going mutual exchange of information.
- The OIML was also in contact with ISO CASCO, the branch of ISO with responsibility for Conformity Assessment and Certification and ISO DEVCO, the branch responsible for Developing Countries.
- Also worthy of mention was the Technical Barriers to Trade Committee of the WTO, where the OIML, as an Organization issuing International Standards, was a permanent Observer at all meetings, and with which the OIML had organized several joint actions, such as organizing regional seminars to spread information to Developing Countries. Such seminars had been organized in Peru and Mozambique and, at the wish of the WTO, others were planned for the future.
- A special contact was JCDCMAS; this was the Joint Committee for Coordination of Technical Assistance to Developing Countries, set up in association with all the Organizations with which the OIML had contacts in relation to Developing Countries in the areas of metrology, accreditation and standardization. This Committee had been on an informal and experimental basis initially, bringing together the OIML, the Metre Convention, Issuing Authorities, ILAC and IAF, the Standardization bodies ISO, IEC, ITU for telecommunications, and UNIDO, of which Mr. Loesener would speak later, which took a very active part. JCDCMAS had been set up with formal terms of reference, adopted by the CIML the previous year in Kyoto. The CIML had examined these terms of reference with great care and the General Conference on Weights and Measures had also discussed and adopted them. The statutes of the OIML did not make it necessary for these terms of reference to be submitted to the Conference; the Committee had the power to decide. The aim of this Joint Committee was to promote and demonstrate coherence between the activities of metrology, standardization and accreditation in development programs, and thus to demonstrate to all interested parties that a program of development could not stand on one foot; it needed a sound base to stay upright. The task of the JCDCMAS was to prepare documents, to spread information about the nature of its constituent organizations, the need for coordination of development programs and of the different aspects of the work. A joint information document had been completed and a joint presentation was nearing completion by all the metrology, standardization and accreditation organizations in the group; and from now on any one of the participating organizations could represent the others; a common language was sought.
- Contact with UNIDO was also important, as were relations with Regional Organizations seeking to apply European norms; the OIML remained aware of what was happening in WELMEC. CEN and CENELEC had contacted the Bureau for help in avoiding conflict over the application of the European Directive, which

recommended making reference to OIML Documents; the European Economic Commission of the United Nations, UN-ECE; the African Economic Committee of the UN; both of these bodies had plans involving metrology.

Mr. Magaña said that in a later presentation he would speak of contacts with Regional Legal Metrology Organizations. He told Mr. Röhling that he had now finished his own presentation; three speakers would address the Conference on the subject of liaisons with other Organizations: ILAC/IAF, BIPM and UNIDO.

4.2 Addresses by Representatives of Institutions

ILAC/IAF

Mr. Pierre (ILAC Chairman), who spoke first, told the Meeting that he was pleased to be addressing the OIML once again on behalf of the two accreditation Organizations, ILAC, which was responsible for laboratories and testing establishments, and IAF, which was responsible for Issuing and Inspecting bodies.

Mr. Pierre would concentrate on explaining what was meant by accreditation and the main tasks it involved. As his presentation had had to be somewhat shortened, he recommended Delegates to visit the web sites of both Organizations, where they would find how they were organized, who their members were and, most importantly, the list of Signatories to International Agreements. Certain specific changes had been made very recently in IAF; in the last two weeks, its Mutual Recognition Agreement had been extended from its original brief of accreditation of quality systems, to include accreditation of Issuing Authorities for environmental management and product management.

Mr. Pierre began with accreditation itself. Some of those listening would have heard this before, but it might be new to others. The points he wished to make were:

- Accreditation was the second, and higher, level of verification in the attestation of conformity. It was fundamental, since its aim was to give confidence in declarations of conformity. There was no higher level of testing: nobody checked up on those doing the accreditation. Accreditation itself therefore had to be totally trustworthy;
- Accreditation operated both in the voluntary and in the regulatory sectors. In all the areas where conformity was attested, the organization operated. There was certain controversy regarding some areas, but this was neither the place nor the time to enter into that matter. Accreditation was present in the sectors of calibration, testing, inspection and certification;
- As previously stated, for accreditation to be trusted, it had to be both independent and impartial. How could this be achieved? By satisfying all the demands of international standards, notably the new ISO Series 17011, which had been published in September and would be obligatory from 1 January 2006. Accreditation organizations would not have to offer actions which were deemed accredited. There must also be transparency: the activities of accreditation authorities must be open to scrutiny and available to all, always providing, of course, that the body requesting it satisfied the relevant demands as regards standards;
- Accreditation offered international recognition of certificates of compliance.

Mr. Pierre then went on to speak of the main tasks of ILAC/IAF in their function as international accreditation Organizations, which were:

- Firstly and importantly, harmonizing the practices of their member accreditation bodies. Even though every accreditation body was obliged to keep to international standards, it could still happen that these standards led to different interpretations, and guides had to be produced in order to ensure that procedure was the same in all accreditation bodies. In all cases where multilateral recognition agreements were set up, it was essential to make sure that all accreditation bodies applied the standards in the same way and were genuinely equivalent;
- Secondly, and equally importantly, perhaps the most fundamental task of all, was to establish International Recognition Agreements, which could also be consulted on the web sites. These depended on peer evaluations, which were essential to create confidence in International Recognition Agreements because compliance with international standards could be tested. Accreditation could of course not be a commercial operation: it had to be a service in the general interest; there was therefore no need for advertising. It was

essential for laboratories and other bodies seeking accreditation, and also for their customers, be they industry or public authorities, to understand what accreditation meant and what its uses were; it was therefore important to spread information;

- The third task was help to Developing Countries to set up validation bodies.

Mr. Pierre told Members that he would expand further on two of the above subjects: facilitation of international exchanges and help to Developing Countries.

On the facilitation of international acceptance the aim of accreditation was to reduce the need to assess qualifications; they were working towards a single, universally recognized standard and certification system. Accreditation allowed measures and measurement systems to be transferred. It was increasingly being recognized and demanded by industry and also known to official bodies, to regulatory bodies in different countries. This was the case on a national, and also on a European level, where there was a Memorandum of Understanding between EA, the European Accreditation Organization, and the EU Commission in Brussels, and EFTA.

Accreditation also collaborated efficiently with ISO and the IEC; a Memorandum of Understanding had been signed with these two Organizations, which permitted operational collaboration and the exchange of information when problems arose over standards.

As regards the final point, support to Developing Countries, ILAC and IAF worked together on this; they had set up a Joint Committee, and allocated a modest budget (10 000 USD in 2004) to this work. It was perhaps only a drop in the ocean but it was significant, because ILAC and IAF themselves operated on a low budget and depended on Members' fees. A certain number of countries had already received assistance, and help was planned for others. Mr. Pierre drew attention to the fact that the two Organizations were not unsupported; two weeks before this Meeting, UNIDO, ILAC and IAF had signed a tripartite Memorandum of Understanding for cooperation on assisting Developing Countries to set up systems of accreditation. In Europe, EA was also working on projects in this area. Accreditation bodies were very aware of the needs of Developing Countries in the matter, and were doing everything in their power so make it possible for everyone to benefit from accreditation.

Mr. Pierre concluded by saying that although accreditation was not a universal panacea, nevertheless its use aided recognition of compliance agreements and international exchanges just because it was no longer necessary to repeat tests, calibrations and certification which had already been carried out elsewhere.

Mr. Pierre thanked his listeners and invited questions.

Mr. Magaña pointed out that the OIML had been represented by Mr. Carstens at ILAC's recent General Assembly, as was the practice at all important gatherings of this type.

Mr. Röhling then invited the second speaker, Mr. Loesener of UNIDO, to take the floor.

UNIDO

Mr. Loesener thanked the OIML, Mr. Kochsiek and the BIML for the invitation to address them. UNIDO, he informed Delegates, fought poverty by facilitating access to and diffusion of knowledge, information and skills. By assisting Developing Countries to enhance this type of capabilities, UNIDO helped them to fight poverty and foster social advance through technological progress and productivity growth. Within this framework, UNIDO was keen to work together with the OIML with a view to making substantive progress in building the institutional and technical underpinnings of trade capacity. Developing Countries faced the challenge of narrowing the productivity gap between them and the advanced industrial countries, for which they needed to put into place consistent policies along the lines of the Millennium Development Goals, including, among others, for innovative employment development, particularly towards the rural economy, which harbored the overwhelming majority of people beneath the poverty line, thus helping to breach sharp gaps between the formal and informal sectors.

Another aim was to improve the dissemination of environmentally sound technologies so as to forge decisive progress towards regenerative approaches to the relationship between productive activities and nature, and to strengthen the participation of the role of Developing Countries in the flow of international trade and investment, by enhancing their ability to assimilate, adapt, develop and disseminate technology, and to

comply with sanitary requirements as well as with standards and technical regulations influencing flows of goods and services. It was in this context that UNIDO was providing vital trade related technical assistance and capacity building. According to the OECD WTO database, in the last few years UNIDO had implemented almost 200 projects related to trade development and trade policy and regulations, amounting to 35 000 000 USD.

The video in the background, Mr. Loesener explained, showed the metrology and food testing facilities which had been established and which had played a key role in the access of Ugandan fish to foreign markets. Similarly, in West Africa, the fishing sector was currently being upgraded to avoid a ban which might have had serious socio-economic consequences for these countries.

Also in the context of the trade capacity building initiative, UNIDO was supporting development of legal metrology in Afghanistan, selected Central American countries, Cambodia, Laos, Ecuador and also in the Maldives and Bhutan.

In conclusion, he said that in order to make progress required that the work should be done by UNIDO in conjunction with others, joining hands and each one contributing from the sector where their best skills lay. The overall approach required cooperation with a key group of international actors, represented by the specialist Organizations which operated at global level in areas immediately relevant to the trade capacity building initiative, such as the OIML and the BIPM in metrology, ILAC and IAF in accreditation and ISO and IEC in standards, through a series of MoUs which UNIDO had recently signed, as mentioned by Mr. Pierre from ILAC, and the joint work on the JCDCMAS as mentioned by Mr. Magaña at the beginning of the Conference. Taking this into consideration, the adoption of the OIML Document Law on Metrology, to which UNIDO had also contributed, would allow better support to be given to Developing Countries in their endeavor to participate in the multilateral trading system. In this respect, UNIDO appreciated very much the support which the OIML had provided in the past and looked forward to strengthening cooperation between the Organizations.

Mr. Röhling thanked Mr. Loesener, and invited questions. There being none, he invited Mr. Castelazo, BIPM, to take the floor.

BIPM

Mr. Castelazo passed on the regrets of Professor Andrew Wallard, who had been unable to attend due to his busy schedule.

Mr. Castelazo went on to explain that the BIPM was the sister Organization of the OIML and the two worked very closely together, with similar structures consisting of an International Committee that managed and oversaw the duties of the main Bureau, which in the case of the BIPM was located on the outskirts of Paris, in international territory donated by the French Government, which was a signatory to the Metre Convention, and it had about 65 employees. Its original objective had been to maintain the two main prototypes that existed in 1875, the kilogram and the meter. The kilogram still represented a working standard today, being the international standard type; the meter was a historical artefact which no longer served any metrology purpose. The BIPM had evolved over the years to cover many more areas. In the 1920s it had begun to cover electricity; in the ensuing decades it had evolved to other areas; one of the most important developments had been in the 1990s, when chemistry had been included among its Consultative Committees. The mission of the BIPM was essentially to promote uniformity of measurements; delegates would probably agree that this was an essential element for underpinning many other activities in conformity assessment. It was the essential element to underpin agreements in accreditation, in technical regulations, to provide a technical basis for product specifications, national and international regulations, to reduce technical barriers to trade and of course to underpin scientific research.

At the 22nd General Conference of Weights and Measures, in 2003, a budget for the period 2005-2008 had been approved, in the order of 10 000 000 Euros per year with the first substantial budget increase in the last 40 years; it represented about 5 %. That increase would allow the BIPM to increase its activities in international collaboration - the BIPM was now seen much more as a coordination body rather than the original depository of international prototypes - and also to increase its work in the field of chemistry, which had been identified as one of the key areas. Two major scientific projects were being undertaken: one was the watt balance, which was being configured as one of the best to take over finally as a substitute for the kilogram; and the other was

a calculable capacity, which would allow the BIPM to support the National Metrology Institutes in the field of electricity.

On 1 January 2004, Professor Andrew Wallard had formally taken up office as Director of the BIPM, succeeding Terry Quinn, who had been Director for fifteen years. One of the major developments in the last few years had been the Mutual Recognition Agreement. This was a result of a request from the accrediting bodies, who were asking the Metre Convention how confidence could be placed in the declarations of the National Metrology Institutes. In the present state of affairs, first party declarations were not very popular. So the Mutual Recognition Agreement had been developed and NMIs who participated in the MRA had their calibration and measurement certificates accepted once they had gone through review by their peers first in the Regional Metrology Organizations and then in International inter-regional reviews. They were accepted if they were supported by the results of key comparisons; they were supported by the presence of Quality Management Systems based on ISO 17025 or ISO Guide 34 for producers of reference materials. Other scientific and technical evidence such as knowledge of technical activities, participation in IMO projects and mutual visits, would also support applications. Currently the MRA had resulted in a list of calibration and measurement certificates that was recognized internationally. This was available on the BIPM web site and was called the KCDB, which was an acronym for Key Comparison Data Base. This was not very descriptive, because it was not only the database of key comparisons but the database of the CMCs. This was where it was possible to see what capabilities for calibration the NMIs had. There were 15 000 entries, or CMCs (Calibration & Measurement Capabilities) from 53 countries, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Institute for Reference Materials and Measurements of the European Union. It was the only database of NMI calibration services that assured traceability to the SI.

As previously mentioned, this work needed to be done in collaboration with other Organizations. No single Organization could do it alone. The BIPM understood this fact, and worked most closely with the OIML and ILAC and also, very importantly, with other Organizations in Joint Committees, to which Mr. Castelazo would refer again shortly. Through the MRAs, the CIPM assured confidence in National Metrology Institutes and in the services these offered, and, through the ILAC MRA, the International Community could have confidence in certificates from the accredited laboratories.

However, Mr. Castelazo continued, the BIPM was moving on to new areas of activity. Very important among these were medicine, food, health and the environment, which had not been included in traditional metrology, which had been involved mainly with physics and engineering. There was evidence, as would be seen from an example which Mr. Castelazo would give delegates, that these areas had tremendous impact upon society and upon the well-being of people. The example mentioned was this: in 1986 the accuracy for clinical tests of cholesterol were in the order of 6 %; with improved reference materials, by the year 2000 the accuracy had been improved to around 3 %. That meant that, before the improvement, there had been a bias of 3 %, which had resulted in 10 % of those tested being wrongly treated. Not only was there a social impact of this, which was of course the most important element, but also the cost of unnecessary treatment in those three years was in the region of 100 000 000 Euros a year.

Another important contemporary problem was drug testing in sports. There was no world wide agreement on treatment procedures. The IOC (International Olympic Committee) did not always use fully accredited laboratories, and the concentrations of drugs, which were usually important for sports testing, were extremely small and could exist in blood or urine and the percentage inaccuracies of the measurements were very large for an area where “yes” or “no” answers were required. People in the clinical area were concerned that important decisions, with tremendous impact upon the lives of sports people, were based on a testing system in which there was not full confidence.

Food was another very important area. Genetically modified organisms (GM) was a major trade issue; Europe was one of the regions of the world which was most concerned about this. In the European Union, it was compulsory for food to be labeled as GM derived if there was more than 1 % material. In Australia the limit was 2 % and in Japan it was 5 % - there was no agreement. The current reference materials and materials were not adequate at the moment. This was another area where there was not yet consensus on how to analyze the foods and fruits and agricultural products that were being exchanged internationally. Much work needed to be done in this field.

In all these areas, the BIPM and other Metre Convention Organizations were currently looking at working with international collaborations, Joint Committees with the OIML, ILAC, ISO, the International Federation for Clinical Chemistry. One very important Joint Committee was the Joint Committee for Traceability in

Laboratory Medicine, which had developed a list of SI traceable reference material that could be used to satisfy the European In Vitro Diagnostics Directive. The considerable amount of work towards this objective was being done in conjunction with other Committees. There was also joint work with ILAC, with the WHO, and with the World Meteorological Organization to meet specific needs. The BIPM also wished to extend the CIPM MRA to meet the needs of trade regulation in these new areas. There would be a need for much work on the part of Technical Committees and Working Groups to set the rules and decide how best to obtain traceability in these difficult new areas of medicine and health.

The effect of all the foregoing would be to create opportunities internationally so that the NMIs could develop at the national level. The BIPM was promoting collaboration, and the result of this collaboration should ideally be reflected year by year by better national structures that really reached the primary objective, which was to benefit people and society.

Mr. Röhling thanked Mr. Castelazo for his report, which had touched on a number of questions currently under discussion, such as drugs and chemistry. He invited comments and questions from the floor.

Mr. Kildal referred to discussions at the BIPM with a view to establishing a Consultative Committee on Materials. He pointed out that this might potentially have some relationships with the OIML. He asked for information on the status of this proposal.

Mr. Castelazo replied that a meeting had recently been held at the NPL. There was interest in these areas because that field was not properly covered by the existing Consultative Committees. The area was materials measurement, not only the chemical properties which were normally dealt with in the Consultative Committee for Amount of Substance, but all the other properties: electrical conductivity, mechanical strength, etc., and his understanding was that at that point a working group was being set up. He suggested that perhaps the CIPM President, who was present, should make a more informed statement on this point.

Mr. Göbel, CIPM President, stated in reply that the Working Group was not yet in existence; there had been a proposal to ask the stakeholders promoting this materials metrology CC, to specify the needs and problems. The next step should be to investigate whether the existing CCs could take care of that problem or whether new CCs should be found. But that decision had been postponed for the next CIPM Meeting.

Mr. Röhling thanked Mr. Göbel for his comments and Mr. Castelazo for his interesting report.

WELMEC

For WELMEC, Mr. Freistetter (WELMEC Chairman) said he was honored to be attending the OIML Conference. The first Conference he had attended had been 20 years previously, in Helsinki, early in his career in the Ministry, and this was his fourth.

Mr. Freistetter would be giving the latest information about WELMEC and also about the new European Measuring Instruments Directive. Everyone present knew that legal metrology had to do with fair trade, protection of consumers, safety, health, the environment and many other topics. In the OIML there was a very long list of existing International Recommendations concerning legal metrology. The slide he was showing listed only a few of these, but when one looked at weighing instruments, for instance, it could be seen that there were many international regulations covering these, especially when extended to gas meters, heat meters and so on. The new European legislation would cover at least ten different types of measuring instruments subject to legal control all over the world.

Mr. Freistetter showed a slide which illustrated the position of WELMEC in Europe before May 2004; since ten more countries had joined Europe, the position was now changed, and there were 28 countries within WELMEC, within the European Economic Area, and Bulgaria and Romania were applicant countries on the brink of joining the European Union. This would result in 30 countries forming a single market, which shared a lot of common legal framework. Mutual recognition was a very important part of this. For a common approach in legal metrology it was important for there to be the same directives in legal metrology and a common interpretation all over Europe.

When speaking of Europe, the MID was one of the most important Directives for legal metrology in Europe and Members would see that it would soon affect not only Europe but the whole world. Before speaking of WELMEC, Mr. Freistetter said, he would like to give some information about the MID, because it was of direct

importance to the work to establish European cooperation in legal metrology. The MID could now be found on the internet in every European Union language; it concerned European trade in measuring instruments, parts of measuring instruments, repair, services and measurement of results, so its main importance was the free movement of goods and services by the use of measuring instruments covered by legal metrology control requirements in Europe. And, as Mr. Freistetter had pointed out before, the measuring of test results for these purposes was also quite important.

But what did it mean for a measuring instrument to have to comply with this Directive? It would affect worldwide trade, because when for example water meters were being produced for European purposes they had to fulfill this requirement. Worldwide manufacturing of measuring instruments would thus be affected also. Ten kinds of measuring instruments were covered by this Directive, starting with water meters, gas meters, electricity meters, heat meters and measuring systems for liquids other than water. Then there were automatic weighing instruments, taxi meters, material measures, length measurements and exhaust gas analyzers. If delegates were asking themselves why only automatic weighing instruments, the answer was that there had already been a European Directive for nonautomatic weighing instruments, so these were already covered by the MID.

The MID was very long, extremely detailed and complex. Its scope and aim was that for the ten categories of measuring instruments with which it was concerned, putting them on the market for the first time and putting them into use for the first time was regulated; after that, national law was applicable. The requirements for measuring instruments were fulfillment of:

- Essential overall requirements;
- Instrument-specific requirements; and
- Conformity assessment procedures.

When measuring instruments had fulfilled all these requirements, they received conformity certificates. The modules of the global approach were thereby used, but modified to the needs of measuring instruments.

Also in the Directive was the presumption of conformity; there were two ways for manufacturers to attain this: either

- To follow harmonized mandated European standards; or (importantly for OIML)
- To use OIML Recommendations.

There were mechanisms for recognizing either of these standards; it was virtually unique in a European Directive for other potential sources of presumption of conformity to be mentioned.

CEN and CENELEC and the OIML had started talks. CEN had been invited to propose a Working Program on Standards for the MID and this Working Program would include European Standards, either existing or proposed, on the one hand, and on the other, OIML Recommendations.

Mr. Freistetter asked whether it would be easy to acquire e-marking for measuring instruments in the future. In principle, yes, was the answer, but on the other hand there was a lot of work for the manufacturers and for the notified bodies. The manufacturer could choose which kind of conformity assessment procedure he wished to apply for a measuring instrument; then he had to go to the so-called notified bodies - the technical bodies doing the surveillance and testing work - and then the e-marking could be obtained. The procedure looked quite simple but in general there was a lot of work for both manufacturers and notified bodies in order for all the requirements of the Directive to be fulfilled.

Delegates would already know the e-marking, which indicated that the manufacturer had the right to declare conformity with the Directive of the simple CE, but for measuring instruments there would be an additional metrology marking, and the notified body number would be found on each measuring instrument; this would be important CE marking in the future.

The pillars of the MID, Mr. Freistetter explained, were:

- The manufacturer - important with the quality of the measuring instruments;
- Surveillance - a notified body responsible for testing and surveillance quality management systems; and, last but not least,
- The Member States, with responsibility for market surveillance.

The present position was that the Directive had now been adopted in February 2004, and the last date for national implementation was 30 April 2006. October 2006 would be the starting date for the common application of the MID in Europe.

Members would want to know how the Directive affected WELMEC: many of them had seen in Kyoto the updated organization chart; there was also now a very important Working Group for information exchange, which would be thinking about the exchange of information regarding the type of certificates issued by notified bodies all over Europe, and also the Utility Meters Group and the Software Group. Mr. Freistetter showed a slide of which groups were affected by the MID. The MID sign would appear in all the Working Groups except the Pre-package Working Group. So it was important to see that the MID affected WELMEC work.

The current year had been an important one for WELMEC, because they had set up close cooperation with the Commission; WELMEC would work with the European Commission on topics such as market surveillance, conformity assessment, operation of notified bodies, identification of relevant OIML Recommendations for European use, development of Guidance Documents; and WELMEC was forming the administrative cooperation between the leading metrology authorities in Europe.

It was important to know that WELMEC Guidance Documents did not include additional technical requirements. Their documentation would be found on the web site, so Mr. Freistetter would not go through all the documents on the present occasion.

The WELMEC Type Approval Agreement was based on OIML Recommendations, and it would be necessary to find out how the new MAA requirements would affect this Type Approval Agreement. They would watch the beginning of its operation and how many countries participated.

Mr. Freistetter concluded by saying that the future of WELMEC lay in supporting the implementation of the MID, identification of unclear areas, cooperation with the Commission, application of software requirements, and the organization of seminars and workshops.

Mr. Röhling thanked Mr. Freistetter for his interesting and topical presentation on the MID and asked for reactions from the floor.

Mr. Magaña added that CEN was in the process of preparing a proposal for a joint work program with WELMEC, in which context CEN Representatives had visited the OIML to inform themselves about the OIML's work, so that this could be taken into account in this work program.

There were no further comments; Mr. Röhling then invited Mr. Ooiwa of the APLMF to speak.

APLMF

Mr. Ooiwa (APLMF Chairman) expressed his pleasure at being invited to speak on topics concerning the APLMF. Some Members might have heard his earlier remarks, at the Forum.

He began his report on the APLMF's activities by explaining that its main tasks are capacity building in developing countries in the Asia-Pacific region, as well as trying to achieve harmonization of legislative systems among nations.

The APLMF worked closely with the Sub Committee for Standards and Performance and with the OIML and other Regional Legal Metrology Organizations to develop a strategy for international harmonization of legal metrology. The majority of activities were carried out in Working Groups.

There were 26 Member Economies and a very wide area was covered. Some of the countries were very small; several were not OIML Members. There were eight Working Groups. The main task was training, and also the topics of packaging; the MAA; utility meters; medical measurements; and agricultural measurements. A Legal Metrology Working Group had recently been established, and also Pattern Compliance, this last being chaired by Australia.

The reason for introducing these new Working Groups was the introduction of the MAA. Weighing instruments and peer assessment had recently been introduced for this reason.

The Working Group on Traceability in Legal Metrology had encountered some serious problems in traceability. In legal metrology, the word traceability had been acquiring a symbolic significance in the global mutual recognition traceability data, as one of the important bases of metrology confidence. In this aspect, legal metrology was a supplier of measurement confidence to the market, and also a customer for measurement traceability to decide measurement standards. Metrologists had to establish a linkage between legal metrology and scientific standards so as to fulfill the new task in the global market.

It was easy to talk of establishing traceability, but to do so in practice was very difficult. The working plan of the Working Group on Traceability in Legal Metrology was therefore to apply the demands of legal metrology to scientific metrology. Mr. Ooiwa wondered what type of traceability was sought for legal metrology; the APLMF was not sure. They sought to solve metrology problems in each of the Economies and to distribute information among Member Economies using actual models of how to achieve traceability in certain cases: the last item was only under consideration, since policing of the system was a very difficult subject.

Another new Working Group was on Pattern Compliance. The background was measuring instruments used in legal metrology. Each instrument under verification was supposed to be in compliance with pattern approval but there was no actual rule to maintain pattern compliance of the instruments in use. The working program was preparing a study for areas of greatest need, to prepare a study and consider establishing vehicles for reception and dissemination of information. This was an interesting task but consideration had to be given to how it could be funded. The main task of the APLMF was capacity building therefore his principal task was seeking funding from APEC and other international bodies.

Mr. Ooiwa spoke of the APLMF training program for 2005, mentioning prepackaging, sphygmomanometers, nonautomatic weighing instruments and their new course on electricity meters. For that year, six training courses were planned. For the following few years, their program would be concentrating on problems of practical implementation.

Mr. Ooiwa gave some details of the content and participation in courses held over the last year. He finished by giving the information that the next APLMF meeting would be held in October 2005 in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Mr. Ooiwa thanked Delegates for their attention.

There being no questions, Mr. Röhling thanked him and then invited Mr. Lagauterie to give his presentation on the EMLMF.

EMLMF

Mr. Lagauterie (EMLMF Chairman) reported that the last EMLMF meeting had been held in Malta at the end of June 2004 in conjunction with a seminar on the MID, jointly organized by MSA and PTB. The opening address had been given by the Maltese Minister with responsibility for metrology; this demonstrated the interest which Malta took in this cooperative effort and in metrology itself. The EMLMF currently had 13 active members, three of which had joined since the previous year: Turkey, Syria and Morocco. Algeria was expected to join in the near future. There was also one Corresponding Member.

On the technical side, work had comprised presentations on the key points of the recognition of type approvals and initial verifications; these were followed, as was logical, by a debate about the MAA to show to what extent the MAA would bring answers in the matter of recognition of type approvals.

On the administrative and strategic side, the President had been re-elected and Mrs. Annabi had been elected Vice President. But the main business of the Forum had been the definition of its own future. The conclusion had been that the Forum must act as a source of information on the application of the MID and on the work of WELMEC, because this was very important for the non-European countries in the Forum.

In conclusion, he drew the Meeting's attention to the fact that the Forum could not have taken place without the hospitality and organizing skills of MSA and the help of the PTB. He thanked Messrs. Kochsiek and Magaña for their support and encouragement, and the Meeting for their attention.

Mr. Röhling thanked Mr. Lagauterie and since there were no questions he asked Mr. Carstens to make the next presentation, on the subject of SADCMEI.

SADCMEL

Mr. Carstens reported on the past year's activities of SADCMEL on behalf of its Chairman; he himself was Regional Representative. SADCMEL had been set up with the aim of harmonizing regulations in the legal metrology field by the year 2008. Membership was currently at 13: Angola; Botswana; Democratic Republic of Congo; Lesotho; Malawi; Mauritius; Mozambique; Namibia; South Africa; Swaziland; Tanzania; Zambia; and Zimbabwe. Seychelles had withdrawn but Madagascar was believed to be interested in joining.

In Mauritius in April 2004, there had been a SQUAMEG (Standards, Quality Assurance, Accreditation and Metrology Executive Group Meeting), which Mr. Magaña had attended on behalf of the OIML. All the specialized groups within the Association had held meetings during this gathering. The SADCMEL Workshop had held a seminar on the document which had been drafted on the subject of tolerances, which had been identified in April 2003 as a new project. All the documents which had been handed over to the SADCMEL body for publication as Regional Standards were now in the final stages and had been put out for comment. These would be published shortly as National Standards and could be adopted and promulgated by each Member State.

Progress had been made in the assistance of Angola and Mozambique, including translation into Portuguese of the Technical Regulations and, with the help of PTB, assistance in this endeavor had been provided. A meeting in Namibia was planned for November 2004, during which the Tolerance Document would be finalized and a Workshop on the D 1 Document would be held. They hoped to be able to put together an ideal Legal Metrology Act which would be adopted by all Member States. Mr. Carstens thanked the PTB for its assistance in getting all the Members to attend the November Meeting.

The SADCMEL Resources for Metrology Education had also held a Meeting this year, in Lesotho, where all the Member States had appointed representatives, and work would now start on getting a resource centre together for Metrology Education for the SADCMEL grouping.

Mr. Röhling thanked Mr. Carstens. There were no questions. He introduced the next speaker, Mr. Anthony, from CECIP.

CECIP

Mr. Anthony expressed his pleasure at being at the present gathering and being able to tell delegates about the functions and future plans of CECIP. CECIP was the European Manufacturers' Association, and represented Manufacturer Federations from its 15 Member Countries.

In the four years since the last OIML Conference, CECIP was pleased to have welcomed Federations from the Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary, Russia and Slovakia.

Delegates who had read the OIML Bulletin would realize that CECIP had just held its 54th General Assembly. This made them slightly older than the OIML (though Mr. Anthony assured delegates that he had not been around at that time!). CECIP had long supported the OIML and would continue to do so. Good legal metrology was good for everyone, and certainly this was so for those in the world of business. CECIP was an active participant in the OIML, dealing with many OIML Recommendations; in fact anything the OIML did which was connected with weighing instruments had CECIP's attention. They were very active in the ongoing revision of R 76, and also in the soon to be sanctioned R 61. They would continue to play a part in projects of this kind. They also had contacts with the European Commission and with WELMEC, and, again, they were pleased to be involved.

As manufacturers, the members of CECIP had one major aim, or long term vision for the future: they wanted to see a single type approval that operated throughout the world. It was a vision which Mr. Anthony believed was shared by some of those present. He himself was approaching retirement and he did not think this vision would be achieved in his working life, but he thought it was a vision for the future which should be aimed for. He did not know whether this goal could ever be achieved: but a step had been made towards it with the MAA.

The manufacturers thought there were certain things that the OIML could do. These had been discussed in London in 2000. Mr. Anthony remembered that on that occasion Mr. Magaña had made a proposal concerning modularity and the approval of modules. CECIP had supported that proposal; it did not yet look as though any work had been done in that field. CECIP still thought it was a way forward. With R 60, giving approval

for Certificates for load cells, some progress had been made; but there were other aspects of weighing instruments and certainly other aspects of other measuring instruments which could benefit from similar processes.

On the subject of the MAA, Mr. Anthony and CECIP had listened with great interest to the debates in the last few days about the MAA. He could say at once that there was nothing in the MAA Document that CECIP objected to. It was very good. But he felt obliged to say that when manufacturers considered the existing OIML Certificate System and the plans being put forward for implementation of the MAA, which would add to costs for them, they struggled to see where the added value came from. There was nothing in the MAA Document that encouraged, compelled or coerced Member States which did not at present accept OIML Certificates to do so in the future. Without an increase in the number of Member States which accepted OIML Certificates, especially those representing the very large markets that CECIP wished to see available to them, there was little added value for manufacturers in the scheme. CECIP was a little disappointed that the MAA allowed the recognition of additional or extra test requirements over and above the OIML Recommendations. It was to be hoped that that was only a transition stage towards single, unified adoption of OIML Recommendations everywhere. CECIP considered that this might give support to those Member States which wished to stay outside the complete OIML Certificate Scheme; so they were not so sure whether an MAA which encouraged and allowed additional requirements was good for manufacturers in the long term.

CECIP was also disappointed by the way in which the OIML planned to implement the MAA. They were saying to OIML Member States which decided they did not want to join a Declaration of Mutual Confidence, that they could no longer issue an OIML Certificate. Many times, manufacturers wanted such a Certificate, not for type approval purposes, but for other purposes; indeed, the existing OIML System had been so successful that in many cases customers were actually requesting such Certificates, even though there were no plans for them to use them in other markets. But what the OIML was now saying to manufacturers was that if they wanted a Certificate of Conformity to an OIML Recommendation for customer support or marketing, for example, they would have to go to an Organization that had joined a Declaration of Mutual Confidence. Why? Why not distinguish between the two Certificates? There would be an extra logo on Certificates issued under a Declaration of Mutual Confidence. Why not simply allow States which did not wish to use the logo to continue to issue Certificates of Conformity in the style of the existing ones?

Mr. Anthony assured the OIML that they had had a great vision for the future and made a great start. He begged them not to throw it away. The manufacturers were the OIML's customers for Certificates under the MAA. They asked for hope; and for added value. Perhaps they were being too presumptuous at the moment; perhaps they needed to see the MAA in action. There was an OIML Certificate System that worked at the moment; the OIML planned to bring that to an end and introduce the MAA. He thought they were moving too fast and that it would be better to slow down and allow the two systems to run in parallel for a while. He asked the OIML to bear in mind the English saying, and not to "throw out the baby with the bath water". The present Certificate System was the "bath water" and the "baby" was the wide acceptance of Certificates, which should not be put in peril.

Mr. Anthony had one further point to make: several Conference speakers had mentioned pattern compliance. The Organization had been talking of this for at least eight years. CECIP and other Manufacturers' Organizations had urged them to move forward on this; and he so urged them once again. No reputable manufacturer had any objection to a compliance approval program. No reputable manufacturer would object to a production meets type assessment. How it was done was a matter for the OIML; but Mr. Anthony begged them to do it properly; they must not bring it into disrepute. The opportunity was there; at the moment the OIML looked at instruments as they reached the marketplace. The OIML had got to the stage where it looked at it and said, "yes, the type approval is good; the type, the design, everything works"; and then walked away from it and left it to the enforcement officers, who did not have the resources, the expertise, the skills or the time to make sure that what they were verifying was actually what OIML had type approved. Mr. Anthony believed that the OIML needed to take note of these comments and he would like to see this happen during the next four years. CECIP and very many of its members would enjoy playing a major part in the program for the next Conference in four years' time.

Mr. Anthony assured the President that he had not intended to sound critical. He was very honored by the Award he had received earlier in the week; he thought that made him a friend; and, as a friend, he hoped that the OIML would allow him gently to chide and criticize, but would know that he did it with the best of intentions and with the best will in the world for the OIML's continued success. He hoped Members would enjoy the rest of their Conference, and congratulated the organizers and all the staff involved.

Mr. Röhling thanked Mr. Anthony for his interesting talk, remarking that he had touched on several items of critical interest for the OIML, some of which would be raised for discussion later in the Conference.

Mr. Röhling invited delegates to make remarks or ask questions.

Mr. Kildal wondered whether Mr. Anthony thought the MID would take care of compliance approval, or whether this would still be lacking.

Mr. Anthony replied that in the existing Nonautomatic Weighing Instruments Directive, as known in Europe, there were requirements for market surveillance, and indeed WELMEC had made some attempts at a tentative step down the road to market surveillance. This had not really had a resounding impact on the market. The MID probably offered WELMEC an opportunity to go further and to develop programs. Mr. Anthony would certainly like to see WELMEC do that on a European basis. CECIP would be encouraging them and supporting them to do so. But it needed to be done, not just on a European basis but world wide. The OIML might perhaps learn lessons from the experience that WELMEC had had. There was always room for cross pollination and exchange of ideas and information. He hoped this would go forward.

Mr. Lagauterie said that he had understood Mr. Anthony to say that the old type Certificates would continue to offer some advantages vis-à-vis the MAA, and he wished to ask for which applications Mr. Anthony believed the old Certificates would continue to be important.

Mr. Anthony replied that at the moment the existing OIML Certificate System had some benefits for manufacturers; it was incorporated as part of the type approval process, and could be submitted at the same time as for type approval and for little extra cost. At the moment manufacturers could go to the many type approval bodies to get that information. Under the MAA, they would have to go to those bodies which wanted to join the Declaration of Mutual Confidence. Mr. Anthony was not sure at the moment that many of such Organizations would wish to do so. There was a bureaucracy involved with the MAA; it might be said that this was necessary, but nevertheless it might prevent many people from moving forward. There was also a cost involved, for those organizations which wished to do so, not just in terms of money, but also in time and effort, and in providing experts to look at other Organizations. So Mr. Anthony was not sure that the number of people wishing to join the Declaration of Mutual Confidence would be as large as the number of those who were prepared at the moment to issue OIML Certificates of Conformity. Also, as he had said previously, manufacturers often did not want these Certificates merely for the purpose of gaining type approval elsewhere; the OIML's scheme had been successful. Manufacturers had major customers who said, "Yes, you've got a type approval; everybody's got a type approval; have you got an OIML Certificate of Conformity?" Customers did not realize that these are based on the same thing but they want it. And, when faced with a large customer who wanted to buy one, two or three thousand weighing instruments, a manufacturer would decide to get him an OIML Certificate of Conformity, whether it added value to the product or not. Opportunities existed for manufacturers to make use of the Certificates not just for type approval purposes and Mr. Anthony was a little concerned that that opportunity might be taken away from manufacturers, no value would be added, and bureaucracy and delay would be brought into the system which were absent from the existing scheme. Mr. Anthony recommended that the two schemes be run in parallel for a year or two so that there was an opportunity to learn from experience and see what the problems were with the MAA. There were bound to be problems, difficulties and lessons to learn. Nothing ever worked perfectly the first time it was tried. The OIML needed to find out whether manufacturers were going to support this new scheme, and where its added value might lie. Once this had been done, the old scheme could be phased out or integrated into the new one.

Mr. Röhling thanked Mr. Anthony.

European Commission

Mrs. Höke, from the European Commission, said she was glad that Mr. Freistetter had had already talked about the MID; this showed how fruitful the cooperation was between WELMEC and the Commission.

The two Commission activities which Mrs. Höke considered were most of interest for the OIML were the MID and the role played in it by OIML Recommendations; and the field of prepackaging. The news on prepackaging was very brief: the Commission had on Monday adopted a proposal on nominal quantities and pack sizes of pre-packaged goods. Basically this would deregulate requirements for such sizes, with the exception of very few sectors, of wine, spirits, soluble coffee and sugar. So the overall idea was to deregulate pack sizes for the EU, and the exceptions would be maintained for twenty years.

The other field, which was probably of more interest to the OIML, was the review of metrology requirements for pre-packaged goods. There were regulations which were not in place, but that was about to be reviewed. Her colleagues had prepared a Working Document which intended to bring the existing requirements also into line with OIML Recommendation R 87 in its revised form. This Working Document would be made available on the Commission web site, probably in December, and then there would be a three month consultation period, during which they would be glad to receive comments from all interested parties; this was not limited to the EU: anyone might comment.

Mr. Röhling thanked Mrs. Höke and asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Apel of the PTB stated that in 2002 a European Conference had taken place in Berlin, organized by the European Commission, with the participation of the Member States and particularly of industry. At that Conference, concern had been expressed about the function and effectiveness of the new approach, particularly in the area of the market surveillance. The audience had made a strong case to the European Commission that something should be done on a European basis towards reinforcing market surveillance activities. Mrs. Höke was asked to comment on progress on this issue.

Mrs. Höke confirmed that market surveillance was extremely important in all New Approach Directives. What was being done in all fields was to try to enforce cooperation in the field. Also ongoing was an overall review of the basic decision which laid down the New Approach basic criteria; the Commission was reviewing a number of general concepts of the New Approach and within the next year a new basic decision ironing out the New Approach criteria would be presented. Market surveillance was recognized as one of the important points for clarification. Under the MID, the Commission would also encourage as much cooperation as possible between Member States in order to provide an exchange on market surveillance.

Mr. Röhling commented that this would also be an important point for the new EU Member Countries.

Mr. Röhling asked Mrs. Höke to send detailed information to the BIML, who would distribute it to OIML Members. He thanked Mrs. Höke and wished her good luck in her work, and commented that they were in an interesting phase of the preparation of the New Approach at the moment.

Mr. Röhling asked whether there were other delegates who wished to report on Regional activities. This proved not to be the case. Mr. Röhling then gave the floor to Mr. Magaña to summarize the discussions.

4.3 Discussions and conclusions (Liaisons)

In relation with the Regional Institutions, Mr. Antúñez asked the Conference to take note of the position of Cuba with respect to Cuba's geographical and natural position. Since 1998, Cuba had been excluded from the Inter-American Metrology System. This situation limited any participation on the part of Cuba in that Regional Organization while they attempted to negotiate their re-entry to this organization through diplomatic channels. The development of metrology in Cuba was very important. He asked for support from the OIML and other international Organizations. This situation of Cuba was in fact a technical barrier to the development of metrology.

Mr. Röhling proposed that the Conference take note of the situation of Cuba, which had already been explained in detail to Messrs. Kochsiek and Magaña.

Mr. Magaña said that this situation was outside the scope of what the OIML and the Bureau could do; they could not interfere with Regional Organizations. He could however say that, as an OIML Member State, Cuba was welcome to participate in all OIML work.

Mr. Antúñez reiterated that he understood this, but he wished Conference to take note of Cuba's situation, as this was a case where international liaison was required.

In concluding the discussions, Mr. Magaña said that there had been presentations from OIML international contacts during the earlier Conference session, and, in the current session, from Regional Legal Metrology Organizations, from the European Commission, and from industry. All these were very active Organizations, and the Bureau followed these activities very closely. They attended the meetings of all the International Organizations with which they were in contact, and either a Bureau or a Presidential representative attended all the RLMO meetings. This was important, because they were able to provide the Regions with more specific information, and also report back to the Bureau.

5 – WORK OF OIML TECHNICAL COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES

5.1 Work undertaken - State of progress

Mr. Szilvássy reminded Members that technical activities were the core activity of the OIML. After the 11th Conference, several actions had been carried out to improve it. Members had the technical report among their papers, and several points had already been discussed under other headings. Mr. Szilvássy therefore intended to concentrate on the main achievements and ongoing work in technical activities:

- In 2001 the CIML had adopted a priority list of 39 ongoing projects; 21 of these had already been finalized and had already been published or were in the process of being published. Progress on several others was well under way. The Action Plan had provided for several projects by the BIML and by several TCs and SCs, and, of course, for the Presidency and the members of the Presidential Council;
- Two years previously, the Presidential Council had taken an initiative to try to accelerate technical work by several means, and this had already borne fruit;
- On the subject of the past four years' work, Mr. Szilvássy would not speak of the Recommendations, because Members would see a finalized and published list of these; but eight new or revised Documents had been approved and published and three revised Basic Publications, mainly on the MAA and the Checklists for laboratories, and, of course, very importantly, on the OIML Certificate System;
- Several OIML Technical bodies had increased the number of their meetings, which was also a sign of increasing activity. Details of ongoing projects and distribution of Technical Committees among countries could be found in the circulated paper; there were signs of people helping out in this situation; for example, South Africa had taken on the Secretariat of TC 6, and other countries were coming forward to take on Secretariats;
- Certain countries such as Japan and Canada had offered assistance in the form of offering to take over Secretariats if other countries were not able to fulfill their undertakings;
- Reviewing the work of the technical bodies was an ongoing activity in the Bureau and in the Presidential Council. The revision of the Technical Directives was also an important ongoing project in order to rationalize and simplify their work. As already mentioned, the Directives corresponded to the requirements of the TBT Committee Code of Good Practice in Standardization;
- A big step, already mentioned, had been the updating of the OIML database which now contained complete information on Technical Committees and Subcommittees and on the OIML Certificate System, and this was an ongoing development; soon there would be a forum for several Technical Committees for exchange of projects and comments;
- Coordination with other liaison Organizations was very important, principally with International Organizations such as ISO and IEC, ILAC for the MAA and Certificate System, and others.

Mr. Szilvássy concluded this section of his report by saying that it could be seen therefore that the trends in technical activity were very promising: a large number of projects were developing well, and the following year (and in the two years after that) important new and revised Recommendations would be presented for approval.

5.2 Implementation of Recommendations by OIML Members

Mr. Szilvássy then went on to say that the Convention provided for the implementation of Recommendations as a moral obligation of Member States. The 10th Conference had urged Members to implement Recommendations as national regulations or voluntary standards to the greatest extent possible. As the result of an inquiry made in 2000, a list had been published indicating the level of implementation of OIML Recommendations by 39 Member States. This list had been much appreciated by the WTO TBT Committee and the UN-ECE Working Party on Technical Harmonization and Standardization Policies. In the current year, the questionnaire had been sent out again, including an additional point on translation of OIML Recommendations and Documents. Unfortunately, only 28 out of 59 Member States - fewer than half - had so far replied; also, some questionnaires had not been very well filled in. The Bureau had decided that, in view of the low number of replies, it would not be appropriate to present a preliminary report, because each Member State was a different story and statistical conclusions could not be drawn.

As from this year, the Bureau would be indicating the status of voting and replies to questionnaires, so that every CIML Member could check on the web site whether their reply had been received and registered; for those whose replies were outstanding the web site would indicate that this was an obligation yet to be implemented. With this admonition, Mr. Szilvássy concluded his report.

Mr. Röhling thanked Mr. Szilvássy and invited Mr. Kochsiek to add a few words.

Mr. Kochsiek was seeking solutions for the two Secretariat vacancies for Technical Subcommittees. As a German Member, stated that Germany wished to give up TC 12 but was willing to take over TC 9/SC 3 from the United States. The experts from the two countries had already discussed this.

Mr. Magaña said it was pleasing to hear of countries which were willing to take over Secretariats; he believed the subject was on the Agenda of the Committee, which would make the decisions. If there were any other offers, he would be pleased to hear of them before the CIML Meeting the following afternoon.

Mr. Röhling also emphasized the importance of finding volunteers to fill these vacancies.

Mr. Vaucher said that he had mentioned the Birkeland Report earlier; this was a good analysis of the present situation and visions for future work. One of its findings had been that metrology requirements were mainly focused on measuring instruments in standardization work, frequently neglecting measuring methods. Use of instruments was of crucial importance in new fields such as applications in medical metrology and public safety. He mentioned as an example that there were six Recommendations for weighing instruments as against one for weighing. By the time the MAA was implemented this would have become a large problem, as a Declaration of Mutual Confidence would be expected for each one. His proposal was that this point should be looked at closely in the coming years and that a start should be made by combining Recommendations as far as possible while revising them.

Mr. Magaña thanked Mr. Vaucher and expressed his agreement. The OIML must indeed concern itself not only with instruments but also with measurements and ways of making them. In the Action Plan for the long-term policy, there was a point about international recognition of measurement and its results. He had mentioned in his presentation only those aspects of the Action Plan which were complete or nearing completion, for example pre-packaging. But there were other important subjects, including the measurement of unpackaged quantities for export, which were the subject of major international transactions and which merited the OIML's full attention, and where, in some cases, the OIML should take an interest in measurement methods not only by instruments but also by laboratory processes. For example, quality measurement for agricultural products was an important subject. In such cases it was important that the OIML should hold discussions and avoid being in conflict with other competent organizations, such as the FAO.

If Conference delegates were in agreement, Mr. Magaña would recommend to the Members of the Presidency, Committee and Bureau that work should be developed on different applications of measurements, results of measurements and methods of measuring.

As there were no further comments, Mr. Röhling thanked Mr. Szilvássy and urged Members to think of long term projects for discussion, assuring them also that the Bureau would go in detail into what might be done on the aspects of measurement which had been mentioned. He announced that the end of that item had been reached, and asked the Chairman of the Technical Work Commission, Mr. Tanaka, to present the next two Items.

5.3 Formal sanction of Recommendations already approved by the Committee in 2001, 2002 and 2003

5.4 Draft Recommendations directly presented for sanctioning by the Conference

Mr. Magaña explained that the formal votes for sanctioning the Recommendations would be taken the following day in the final session of the Conference, so these would not be given on the present occasion. Mr. Tanaka would report on the outcome of the meeting of the Technical Commission held the previous day.

Mr. Tanaka said that four different subjects had been discussed:

- The state of progress of the work undertaken. Most Members would be aware of this subject, which had been approved by CIML. Among these were some proposals for the improvement of technical activities, as described by Mr. Kochsiek. The proposal for prioritization of this Document did not receive sufficient support to be submitted to Conference;
- Implementation of Recommendations by OIML Members: unfortunately there had been delay in being able to collect Members' responses to the questionnaire, and the BIML was now asking Member States to respond as soon as possible, and certainly by December 15;
- Sanctioning of the Recommendations: these need not be listed in detail, but all had been approved by the Technical Commission to be offered for the sanction of the Conference. In particular, there had been discussion on the subject of treatment of the Test Report Formats; the outcome of the discussion was that it was not necessary to put the Test Report Formats up for Conference sanctioning;
- Finally, the discussion on DR1, *Instruments for measuring the area of leathers*, which had been approved by CIML postal ballot, resulted in direct submission to the Conference for sanctioning.

It had also been proposed to withdraw Recommendations R 33, *Conventional value of the result of weighing in air*, which had been converted into a new International Document by the same name and approved for publication by the CIML; and R 62, *Performance characteristics of metallic resistance strain gauges*, which had not gained conclusive postal approval.

Mr. Röhling thanked Mr. Tanaka, and asked Mr. Magaña to comment.

Mr. Magaña wished to mention one further point which had been discussed though not on the agenda: this was to know how interpretations of Recommendations could be made. For example, for a Mutual Recognition Arrangement, OIML Recommendations had to be interpreted. For such interpretations to be sufficiently substantial, they had to be the work of the responsible Technical Committee. Minor points might be discussed among participating bodies, but every point of interpretation, however minor, had to be submitted for consideration to the Technical Committee responsible. The different Working Groups would be reminded of this.

Mr. Lagauterie thanked Mr. Magaña for raising this point. He felt that perhaps the Organization should formalize this process, so that Technical Committees and Subcommittees would know how exactly they could collect these interpretations in order to create a Guide.

Mr. Magaña agreed that the point about what groups could make interpretations, where and under what conditions, should be kept in mind when the Directives for Technical Work were revised, and in all the general Documents describing OIML activities, and also in the Document relating to the MAA. This should perhaps be added to the Conference resolutions.

6 – OIML CERTIFICATION, MUTUAL ACCEPTANCE AND/OR RECOGNITION

6.1 OIML Certificate System for Measuring Instruments

Mr. Szilvássy drew the attention of Members and Corresponding Members who might be attending the Conference for the first time to a brief section about the history of these in the written report from the BIML. The System had been set up in 1991; the first Certificates had been issued in 1992; a special Task Group had been organized in order to allow further development of the System; and the 10th Conference, in Vancouver, had established the main guidelines for further development and these guidelines were still valid at the moment of speaking.

After the 10th Conference a new OIML Technical body, TC 3/SC 5 had been established, the activities of which had followed the guidelines which had been given. The 11th Conference had confirmed that the MAA recognition system had to be established; the MAA and its implementation would be the next item on the Agenda.

Since the 11th Conference there had been continuous activity to disseminate information about the System and to promote it. There was development in two directions at the moment: the Certificates themselves and the MAA. The use of Recommendations within the System had significantly increased since the 11th Conference and the number of Recommendations applicable within the System had now reached 45. There was a slight difference between categories and the number of Recommendations. For instance, R 117 and R 118 at the moment made up a single category. The Basic Publication for the Certificate System had been revised, and the new version published and the main task which now remained for the Technical Committees and Subcommittees was to include provisions for modules and families of modules in the revised Recommendations, as explained by Mr. Anthony earlier.

On the subject of the establishment of the MAA, Mr. Szilvássy would only mention that the Document had been approved by the 38th CIML Meeting. Preliminaries had been in preparation throughout the year, as had already been mentioned during the Round Table, and more would soon follow. Since TC 3/SC 5 had been established, the intention and the obligation had been to continue cooperation and retain contacts with several International Organizations in the field of conformity assessment, certification and accreditation, such as ILAC, ISO/CASCO, WTO TBT Committee, Working Party 6 of the UN-ECE and others.

Surveys had been conducted on the Certificate System, and especially this year on the forthcoming implementation of the MAA: results of these two surveys could be found in the annex to the written report. Mr. Szilvássy would return later to the conclusions.

The characteristics of the present system had already been mentioned by Mr. Kochsiek so Mr. Szilvássy would not go into them now. The important thing was that ongoing revisions for utility meters were well in advance. R 49 was being revised to include hot water meters, the Test Report Format for heat meters was being developed and for gas meters just after them. In 2005 the next Committee Draft would be ready and of course the long-standing task was advancing well for electricity and water meters.

Between the two Conferences, there had been a steady increase in the number of Certificates and Test Reports utilized by national organs for national type approvals; in Annex 2, Members could see in the replies from Member States that 40 Members had indicated that for all 11 categories the number of Certificates had increased. More than 800 national type approvals had been issued either directly based on OIML Certificates or taking these into consideration.

Replies from 60 manufacturers indicated altogether more than 100 cases where OIML Certificates had been accepted to replace national type evaluation. Another 8 manufacturers had indicated that Certificates and Test Reports had been taken into consideration in about 100 cases.

As already mentioned, a new database had been uploaded on the web site and there were search facilities. This database would be further extended to include the files of registered Certificates.

Mr. Szilvássy wished to emphasize that the files of registered Certificates already mentioned referred only to the PDF files of Certificates and not the Test Reports. The Test Reports belonged to the manufacturers or the applicants.

In conclusion, Mr. Szilvássy told Members that 48 out of 328 manufacturers had replied to the enquiry - this represented about 15 % and therefore statistically could be used. The figures indicated a good level of satisfaction on the part of manufacturers and an increase in the acceptance of Test Reports and Certificates. More details were to be found in Annex 3.

Regarding intentions to participate in the MAA, 14 Member States had indicated in the survey replies their intention to do so. In particular, for R 76, there had been 13 indications, a very good number, and for R 60, about 6. Different levels of participation could be accepted, and this was a preliminary indication that the two categories must be started separately, as previously decided. For the third stage, R 117 and R 118, regarding petrol pumps, seven Member States had indicated their intention to participate as soon as the system had been established.

One problem remained to be solved: over 40 Recommendations were applicable within the System but there were only 11 categories. At least eight Certificates would have to be issued within the existence of the System. Of course, there were new or revised Recommendations for utility meters, as already mentioned, which would improve this situation and the replies in the annex from manufacturers and Member States had indicated that these 11 categories were the most important in worldwide application. This was the present situation, but some improvement could be expected.

Mr. Szilvássy concluded by mentioning that the extension of the System to individual certification of measuring instruments would be started as soon as there was some experience with the MAA, in order to avoid problems at the beginning of implementation.

Mr. Röhling thanked Mr. Szilvássy and asked Mr. Ehrlich to report on the next two items. However, Mr. Ehrlich said that Mr. Magaña had produced some illustrative slides, and would speak first.

6.2 Mutual Acceptance Arrangement (MAA)

6.3 OIML Certification – other arrangements

Mr. Magaña began by speaking of the Workshop on the MAA, held the previous Sunday, which had provided an opportunity for a smaller group to examine the questions raised by its implementation. There had been a number of general presentations, some discussion, and at the end two main questions had emerged:

- The first was the relationship between the MAA and the existing Certificate System. Mr. Anthony had raised this same subject. The general intention was that the Declarations of Mutual Confidence and the old Certificate System would not be confusing in the long term, because it was hoped that, in the long term, all Certificates would be issued under the Mutual Confidence agreements in the MAA system. As soon as Declarations of Mutual Confidence had been signed, their signatories would issue all their Certificates under MAA conditions. This would ensure that no body was issuing two different types of Certificate, which it was thought would be confusing;
- The second subject of discussion was the fact that, once a Declaration of Mutual Confidence had been signed, after a certain time, the length of which was yet to be determined, and once there had been a certain amount of take-up, no old type Certificates outside this system should be in existence. After a time, all Issuing Authorities would have to be signatories to a Declaration of Mutual Confidence and no further Certificates would be issued outside this system.

Mr. Anthony, as well as others within the Workshop, had said that this process should not be hurried – “the baby should not be thrown away with the bath water”: the old system should not be killed off too quickly. So what had been decided was that when a Declaration had been signed, the CIML would discuss and decide upon the length of time that the transition period should last. There would not be an automatic length of time of validity of old type Certificates. The Participation Committee for this Mutual Arrangement would discuss and make a proposal and the CIML would fix the duration of the transition period. This would allow the old system to co-exist for long enough for no problems to arise. But it was hoped that in the long term all, or at least the vast majority, of Issuing Authorities would be under the umbrella of the Declarations of Mutual Confidence. This would be an important step towards Type Conformity, which could not be tackled until there was confidence in type evaluations.

These were, then, the two principal problems to be resolved which had emerged from the Workshop. As for the administrative side, Mr. Magaña clarified the fact that all Certificates which were registered at the moment and on the web site would remain registered and on the web site; obviously these would not be annulled. Certificates issued under Declarations of Mutual Confidence would be separately registered in a way that

made it possible to distinguish between one type of Certificate and the other. The OIML logo for Certificates issued under Declarations of Mutual Confidence would shortly be defined.

The financial implications of setting up the MAA had also been discussed in the Workshop and again in the previous day's Finance Committee. Mr. Magaña would not therefore enter at the present time into the details of the financing, as it would be raised again in the report of the Finance Committee in the next session.

Mr. Magaña asked Mr. Ehrlich if he had anything to add on the subject of the MAA.

Mr. Ehrlich wished to add merely that Sunday's Workshop had asked for clarification of the existing MAA Document; it was therefore anticipated that this would be revised within the next year or so to incorporate the requested additions; some of the other issues currently under discussion could also be incorporated at that point.

Mr. Magaña added that some of the points needed not only editorial clarification but also interpretation. However, it seemed preferable to undertake the revision in the light of early experiences of the system rather than immediately. The revision of the Document could probably begin early in 2006.

Mr. Röhling thanked both Mr. Magaña and Mr. Ehrlich.

Mr. van Breugel asked what the rules would be under the MAA for countries which were interested only in accepting Reports - there appeared to be some misunderstanding of this aspect.

Mr. Magaña replied that this was indeed a complex aspect of the matter. The first category of interested authorities consisted of Issuing Authorities of OIML Member States that issue OIML Certificates and Test Reports. The second category was bodies which did not issue Certificates but which did recognize them. Both Members and Corresponding Members could belong to this second category. The Committee on Participation Review (CPR) had the power of decision and would comprise only Member States, each being entitled to one representative on this CPR; Corresponding Members could sign a Declaration but were not entitled to join the CPR, though they could be Associate Members and would be kept fully informed.

Mr. Ehrlich confirmed that the Corresponding Members would receive the CPR reports but would not take part in the work of preparing the development report or have access to the information that went into it.

Mr. van Breugel then asked whether it was correct that national bodies and Corresponding Members who were only interested in accepting reports could join free of financial or any other sort of obligations.

Mr. Magaña responded that Members who only recognized test results had no obligations; Participating Members had to pay their own costs. The OIML was not levying any charges.

One delegate asked whether a scale of costs, proportional to the prosperity of the countries involved, should be implemented for the MAA as it was under the current system, to assist Developing Countries.

Mr. Magaña replied that this matter had been discussed several times in the Working Group set up in Kyoto the previous year and later in the Presidential Council. Initially it had been envisaged that Participants would pay a charge for the right to issue Certificates, and that these charges would be adapted to the degree of prosperity of the country in question, in order to make it easier for Developing Countries to take part in the scheme. But this had been perceived as seriously distorting competition, because the cost of a model approval or type test would be considerably lower in a Developing Country, assuming that this country was efficient and capable of carrying it out. It was not appropriate or even acceptable for the OIML to distort competition by setting up even greater price differences which might prove harmful to the developed countries. All Issuing Authorities should have the same administrative relationship with the OIML whatever country was involved. To arrange things otherwise would be to incite developed countries to use accommodation addresses and could lead to distortion of competition and general chaos.

7 – DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

7.1 Report on activities on Developing Countries for the period 2001-2004

Meeting of the Permanent Working Group

Prior to reporting on the work of the Permanent Working Group on Developing Countries, Mr. Seiler reminded Members that this had been set up at the CIML Meeting in Kyoto the previous year. Members of the Group had been appointed by the CIML President and the Group was formally in place by June 2004. It had met for the first time the previous Sunday; in attendance had been:

- The CIML Acting President and Past President;
- Mrs. Annabi (Tunisia);
- Mr. Ooiwa (Japan);
- Mrs. Saundry and Mr. Oppermann (USA);
- Mr. Tukai (Tanzania);
- Mr. Guimarães (Brazil);
- Mr. Castelazo as an observer (BIPM);
- Mr. Seiler (Germany) himself as Chairman; and
- Mr. Magaña and Mr. Dunmill (BIML).

The main points of discussion had concerned:

- The working procedure. It had been decided that the operation of the Group should be kept informal and that e-mail should be the preferred means of exchanging information;
- The group had then discussed what could be achieved and what could be contributed by the members of the Group. Since the Group had no budget of its own, and since the members of the Group came from different regions, each having its own Regional Legal Metrology Organization, it had been decided that an inventory should be made of what had already been elaborated by the Regions or by the Members and whether that could be made available for all interested parties. This might concern so-called simplified OIML Recommendations and verification instructions, translations of OIML Recommendations and Documents into other languages such as Spanish, Portuguese, Arabic, etc. and teaching and training materials.

The members of the Working Group had promised to check the procedures for obtaining this material and inform the Group of their findings. This information would then be put on the OIML web site, providing either links to other web sites where these documents could be found or information about how to obtain them;

- Further activities would be derived from the outcome of the Forum *Metrology Trade Facilitator – what is needed, what is offered*. The idea of organizing such an event had been developed together with the Bureau; the expectation that large numbers of delegates would participate in the International Conference and CIML Meetings would offer an excellent opportunity to make known the activities of the Permanent Working Group and to hear input from other participants.

The Forum

Mr. Seiler told delegates that since so many of them had themselves participated in the Forum, a brief report was all that was required. The main goals of the Forum had been:

- To discover the needs of Developing Countries;
- To find out what was offered in terms of support;
- To emphasize the importance of metrology as an essential part of the technical infrastructure for conformity assessment;

- To elaborate and to provide arguments why such an infrastructure should be developed with regard to the specific needs of a country or a region;
- To stimulate discussion and exchange of information; and
- To facilitate the contact between donors and Metrology Organizations looking for support.

In order to reach these objectives, speakers had been invited to report on specific subjects and a Poster Exhibition had been arranged. The first results could be summarized as follows:

- More than 150 people had attended the Forum;
- There had been nearly 20 posters informing about offers;
- There had been 40 posters informing about needs. Some of these needs could be satisfied immediately, as had been announced during the Forum. The number of requests for equipment, however, was higher than what was immediately available. Some criteria would be set up for distribution of available equipment. Countries would be kept informed of the situation and their cooperation was asked for. Support was also needed for the shipment of equipment.

All the information from the Forum, together with the posters and contributions, would be put on the OIML web site and an executive summary and list of recommendations expressed during the Forum would be prepared. It was hoped that these experts' opinions would help those who wanted to argue with their governments and political officials about support for technical infrastructure.

It had been agreed that further requests and, of course, further offers, could be accepted. These would also be put on the web site; there was no deadline for these submissions.

The needs of Developing Countries could also be analyzed in this way and would provide input for the future projects of the Permanent Working Group. The Group expected feedback from Members on whether their efforts were helpful and beneficial for Developing Countries, what else could be done, what else could be offered. This feedback would help the Group to find the right direction for their work.

The Group had decided to hold its next meeting in conjunction with the gatherings in Lyon, France, the following June. Mr. Seiler hoped that on that occasion he would be able to report on some progress.

Mr. Seiler concluded his report by expressing his thanks to all who had supported their work so far, especially in preparing the Forum, and above all to the staff members of the BIML and to his own colleagues in PTB.

7.2 Guidelines for future activities on Developing Countries

Mr. Dunmill said he would probably be repeating much that Members had already heard at the CIML Meeting. This was one of the reasons why the Organization had decided that work on Developing Countries needed to be changed in its structure.

The Meeting of the Development Council had been held on Monday, 25 October, following the Forum and the Development Council had taken note of the success of the Forum, and listened to a report from Mr. Seiler on the Permanent Working Group on Developing Countries. The Development Council had then made a set of proposals concerning future OIML work as far as Developing Countries were concerned, and delivered these proposals to the CIML Meeting.

At its meeting on 26 October, the CIML had endorsed the proposals made by the Development Council, and therefore now wanted to make a series of proposals to the Conference, to be accepted for future work on Developing Countries. These were:

- To note that the Development Council had been established by a Resolution of the 6th International Conference of Legal Metrology in 1980;
- To note that the OIML's Developing Country work could be more efficiently managed by this Permanent Working Group on Developing Countries, which should replace the existing Development Council;
- To approve the decision of the 38th CIML Meeting in Kyoto in 2003, which had created this Permanent Working Group;

- To agree that the terms of reference for the Permanent Working Group should be established by the CIML;
- To agree that that the Permanent Working Group should act as an advisory body to the President of the CIML on all aspects of the OIML's work which concerned Developing Countries.
- To cease the activities of the current Development Council, all its tasks being transferred to the Permanent Working Group;
- To ensure that the Conference thanked Mrs. Annabi for her activities as Chairperson of the Development Council since 1998.

Mr. Röhling stated that the two reports were now open for discussion from the floor; that the proposals would be put to Delegates at the end of the Meeting, and distributed in written form then also.

There were no questions or comments.

8 – ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL MATTERS

8.1 Examination of the management of the budget from 2001 to 2003 and the estimates for 2004

Mr. Röhling asked Mr. Johnston, in his role as Chairman of the Finance Commission, to give his report.

Mr. Johnston reported that discussion at the Finance Commission Meeting had been both lengthy and lively. The pleasing number of questions demonstrated that Members were willing to come forward and present their views; he would encourage them to do that both now and in the future.

8.2 Decisions related to the debts of certain countries

- Regarding the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the proposal of the Acting President was to allow this country to remain as an OIML Member State as long as its current contributions were paid and its arrears progressively reduced and reimbursed over a ten year period. Different periods of time had been discussed, but Mr. Kochsiek had checked with other International Organizations, and a ten year period seemed to be the norm;
- In the case of Zambia, this country could be admitted as a Corresponding Member provided that its current fees were paid, and its arrears progressively reimbursed over a ten year period. Readmission as a Member State could be considered once its arrears were less than three years' fees;
- Regarding Spain, the proposal from the Acting President was that the situation should be examined by the 12th Conference after Spain had given indications on the payment of the cheque sent to BIML in 1992.

At this point Mr. Robles informed Members that the papers they had received for the Conference were not very clear; it seemed as though Spain had not paid. All this had happened a long time previously. He had asked his Foreign Ministry about this, and the Foreign Ministry had stated that the cheque had in fact been sent when it was due and had appeared in their bank records as having been presented for payment. It was not therefore appropriate that Spain should have to pay again. They did not know who had received the money and it was difficult to trace it now as all this had happened so long ago.

Mr. Johnston thanked Mr. Robles and said that the matter would be reconsidered at a later stage during the Conference, and Mr. Magaña would propose a Resolution.

8.3 Revision of the OIML Financial Regulations

The Commission had expressed its appreciation for the modernization of the Financial Management and felt that these new Financial Regulations brought to the Conference a different perspective; the Commission recommended that they be approved by the Conference.

8.4 Bureau staff and retirement scheme

The Commission had noted that the OIML Retirement Scheme would be balanced for the next financial period, though needing to extend the additional endowment decided by the 11th Conference. The Commission had recommended to the Conference to instruct the CIML and the Bureau to report to the next Conference so that decisions could be made for the future of this retirement scheme considering the following points:

- The possible need to set up special assets for guaranteeing the OIML's obligations;
- That other possible alternatives such as sub-contracting the pension system be considered.

Other decisions made were:

- That the Finance Commission did not raise objections to the approval of these accounts;
- The Finance Commission directed that the President and the BIML Director be granted discharge for the financial management of the budget.

8.5 Budget for the financial period 2005-2008

The Finance Committee had not raised objections to approval of the base budget provided by the Bureau.

The Finance Commission had then discussed the financing of the MAA. Mr. Johnston asked Mr. Magaña to speak on this point.

Mr. Magaña said there had been a lively discussion about fees and the financial aspects of the Mutual Acceptance Arrangement. After long discussion and hearing various points of view, a compromise proposal on fees for the implementation of the MAA had been arrived at. The proposal of the CIML Acting President, to be included in the draft budget for voting on later in the current Meeting, was:

- That the registration fee for an OIML Certificate as it now stood, outside the Declaration of Mutual Confidence, should be raised to 150 Euros;
- That the registration fee for Certificates covered by a Declaration of Mutual Confidence, and then covered by the procedures of quality assurance and under the supervision of the Declaration of Mutual Confidence, Certificates which would bear an OIML logo as well as the Test Report, would be 500 Euros for issuing each Certificate;
- That there would be no registration fee if there was no Test Report but only a Certificate saying that the name of the manufacturer had changed; and
- That each candidate who applied to enter a Declaration of Mutual Confidence should pay a single fee, for his assessment under the Declaration of Mutual Confidence, of 1500 Euros. This would be for the work of the Bureau in the initial setting up of the Declaration of Mutual Confidence and the initial acceptance of that participant; this fee was due only by Issuing Authorities and not by participants who did not issue Test Reports. No annual fee was involved.

This compromise proposal by the CIML President would slightly modify the estimates for the budget. The additional budget for the MAA implementation was shown to Members on the screen. Income and outgoings of the MAA would be balanced by the end of the period 2005 to 2008. Several Members of the Commission had asked that the aim should be to balance the budget by the end of that period; the costs of set-up had not changed but the income would be as shown. The income would rise progressively: it was believed that there might be seven candidates in the first year, four more the next, and so on. It was hoped that in four years' time 200 Certificates a year would be issued under the Declaration of Mutual Confidence, in which case the budget would then be balanced.

It had also been said that the present phase was experimental; nobody knew exactly what the outcome might be, so the Conference should instruct the Committee to review the fee structure and if necessary amend it.

Mr. Magaña reminded Members that fees for assessment of a candidate were payable only by Issuing Authorities; those who merely recognized Certificates would not pay any fee.

Mr. Röhling thanked Mr. Johnston and Mr. Magaña. He said there were now several matters for discussion and suggested they begin with the last item, the registration fee.

Mr. Harvey said that Australia supported the compromise proposal. He felt that it was one of the strengths of the OIML that strong views could be expressed and a compromise arrived at.

Mr. Llewellyn also expressed support of the proposal, which was, in their view, very sensible, and very close to the ideas put forward on the matter the previous year.

Mr. Lagauterie said that as one of those who had most criticized the previous proposal he wished to express his firm support for this good one.

Mr. Johansen raised a question about the continuation of the old System. The original proposal had been to discontinue this, but in recent discussions a strong feeling had emerged in favor of continuing it for some time. He wished to be assured that this was within the proposal.

Mr. Magaña confirmed that the Committee would decide case by case, after each Declaration of Mutual Confidence had been signed, about how long to prolong the old system. There was no fixed length of time after which it would finish and the CIML would make such decisions.

Mr. van Breugel commented that the budget for the MAA seemed to be about double that for the old system. Manufacturers would therefore pay about twice the present costs; this was more than would have been the case under the original proposal.

Mr. Magaña answered that approximately doubled charges were inevitable because the Committee had charged him to work out a budget for the MAA which covered the cost of the additional member of staff needed to implement it. However, there was a possibility that the Committee might change its requirements in the light of experience. It was obvious that a full time employee was needed initially during the setting up of the system. But when the MAA became more established, this employee might be able to devote part of his or her time to other OIML work, assuming that other OIML resources would allow this; in this case the cost of the MAA might be reviewed.

Mr. Röhling asked if anyone wanted to raise points on other aspects of the budget.

Mr. Ehrlich wanted to raise some points on the Item "Situation of Certain Members": First, on the proposed time scale for repayments, he understood that ten years was an internationally accepted time period, but he would like clarification. He understood that a repayment amount was expected every year and would like to know what would happen if in a particular year this repayment were not received.

He would also like to know whether the Spanish bank indicated that they had paid out the money which apparently had not reached the BIML.

On the first point, Mr. Magaña said a report would be given to the Committee each year on the state of payments from countries repaying arrears and it would be up to the Committee to decide what action to take.

Concerning Spain, Mr. Magaña had understood Mr. Robles to say that the cheque had been presented and paid. It must therefore have gone missing between the BIML and the bank and been inappropriately used by someone; but it was not possible after so much time had elapsed to hold an enquiry into who might have been responsible. The sum must therefore no longer be considered a debt on the part of Spain but an exceptional loss to the OIML. The accounts for the year 2002 included risk provision for exceptional expenses, so the loss of this sum would not require them to be altered.

Mr. Safarik-Pstrosz wished it to be known that, contrary to what had been claimed, there had been objections to conclusions regarding the budget proposal for 2005-2008. His objections had concerned the evaluation of the Reserve Fund, which of course influenced the total balance of the OIML budget. There had been no response to this comment during the Financial Committee Meeting, and he had not heard a response in this Meeting either.

Mr. Magaña responded that he was not quite sure he had understood what had just been said regarding objections. He had noted two comments during the Financial Commission Meeting, one Czech and one Norwegian: one was that the supplementary deficit budget for the implementation of the MAA necessitated drawing too much upon the Reserve Fund. This had been a comment upon the supplementary MAA budget and not on the overall budget, and the answer was that it was expected to be back in balance at the end of the four year period.

The second comment which had been made during the Financial Commission Meeting had been that the graph showing the Reserve Fund decreasing to cover the costs of the MAA was not a full scale graph. It gave the impression that the Reserve Fund would be halved; in fact, however, the Reserve Fund would only go down from 1 600 000 to 1 200 000 Euros, much less than the graph appeared to show. Mr. Magaña had assumed that this explanation, given by Mrs. Bennett in the Finance Meeting, had removed the objection. He regretted that he had not made a new and correct graph.

Mr. Safarik-Pstrosz thanked Mr. Magaña for his explanations. He added that in that case the situation would be clarified if the final graph could be seen before final decisions had to be taken.

Mr. Kildal said that in the light of the new information about the Spanish debt, Norway would support a proposal to write it off. With regard to the budget, Norway supported it but there was just one point he would like clarified: there had been some discussion about what would happen if the MAA program, in the future, did very well financially. There had been a suggestion that in this case the money taken out of the Reserve Fund would be repaid to it: was this the proposal?

Mr. Magaña said that this was the normal procedure under accountancy rules. If MAA charges remained unaltered, there would probably be a surplus in its budget by 2008, and unless the CIML or the Conference

decided otherwise, this surplus would be repaid to the Reserve. However, he reminded Delegates that the CIML Members had pronounced that it was not the job of the OIML to amass too large a reserve, or to make a profit.

He offered to redraw the graph in question during the coffee break.

Mr. van Breugel said that the budget was now better balanced but was still very dependent on whether Declarations of Mutual Confidence were forthcoming in 2005. If this failed, there would be a budget deficit of about 60 000 Euros a year. This was quite a risk to take.

Mr. Magaña's reaction to this was to point out that the Members were responsible alongside the Bureau for ensuring the success of the system and thereby a balanced budget. He called on all Members to use the MAA – and thanked them in advance for so doing.

Mr. Ehrlich returned to his earlier two points: if it was understood that Spain had publicly stated that the money had been debited from the Spanish account, then the situation could be accepted. His second point was that he would prefer a clearer statement to be made in advance as to what would happen if a payment were missed, rather than for the Committee to discuss it year after year.

Mr. Magaña said it was normal practice for the Conference, which did not generally enter into much detail, to instruct the Committee to deal with this subject on a year by year basis. Obviously it would be possible to add a resolution to those of either the Conference or the Committee, to the effect that if payments were not forthcoming the Member would be expelled.

Mr. Kochsiek said he remembered similar discussions taking place when the Certificate System had begun. At that time, he had persuaded his colleagues to start within the normal budget, very simply and without unnecessary bureaucracy, and to build confidence. As members could see, this system had been very successful. Comparing this with the MAA, his feeling had been that most Delegates wished its set-up costs not to be in the normal budget but in an extra budget.

There had been differing opinions on how to levy the costs, whether to charge per Certificate or by annual fees. Mr. Kochsiek thought the present proposal was a compromise to deal with this problem. Following all the discussions, he believed that this compromise proposal should be offered later for a Decision.

Concluding the financial discussion, Mr. Röhling pointed out that formal Decisions would be taken later in the Meeting and urged Members to join the MAA and make it a success.

8.6 Status of OIML Publications

Mr. Magaña said this matter, though listed as a separate point, really came under the heading of budget. It was intended that all OIML publications should be available free to all on the web site. What was proposed was that they should cease to make paper editions of these. They would be published only in electronic format, but they would be free of charge, except in the case of joint publications with other bodies. This would allow the OIML to make all its information more readily available and to make the implementation of its Recommendations better known internationally. The budget had been drawn up in the expectation of this being accepted, but there had to be formal approval for it.

Mr. Lagauterie hoped that joint publications would still be free for Member States.

Mr. Magaña it would be possible for the OIML budget to allow for one copy of these publications per Member and Corresponding Member to be bought and distributed each time they were substantially revised.

Mr. Röhling said that at the beginning of the meeting there had been some misunderstanding regarding the budget of the Metre Convention. He wanted to give Mr. Castelazo the opportunity to clarify this point.

Mr. Castelazo said that in his talk he had implied that the BIPM budget had received a real increase of 5 %, approved by the last General Conference of Weights and Measures. He had been trying to summarize and he had neglected to say that only 3.5 % had been approved for the period 2005-2008, and that the General Conference had only approved that an additional 1.5 % would be a contribution from those Member States which decided to make it: only the 3.5 % increase was compulsory. He also wished to mention that it was only in presentations such as he had given earlier that percentages were used. The Resolution was available on the

BIPM web site, where Members could see that its text did not at any point mention percentages. The absolute values of the budget, in Euros, were given there, and all Members could consult that Resolution.

Mr. Röhling added that the previous year's decision on the BIPM budget had been a difficult one, and that Mr. Castelazo had now clarified the matter considerably.

Mr. Röhling thanked Mr. Castelazo and asked Mr. Magaña to speak about the budget and about the revised graph which he had drawn up.

Mr. Magaña showed the detailed provisions of the proposed budget on the screen. Changes to the version which Members had received earlier were shown on the screen in yellow. For the old type Certificates, taking into account the fact that the charge was rising from 50 Euros to 150 Euros, it was now predicted that receipts from these would be 20 000 Euros a year from 2005 to 2008. He had not computed numbers very exactly; but it was probable that these projected figures would be reached; in any case, this did not constitute a large proportion of the total budget.

Skipping over the unchanged figures, on the supplementary budget, as could be seen, the deficit was expected to be wiped out by the end of the period 2005-2008. The Reserve fund curve could now be seen full scale. On the basic budget, without the MAA budget, the reserve, which had gone down a little, would remain stable at 1 200 000 Euros; in fact it would rise a little, because there would be a very slight surplus on the basic budget. Taking into account the deficit in the supplementary budget for setting up MAA, and taking the two budgets together, the reserve would go down a little more and would stabilize at about 1 000 000 Euros, so that the decrease was quite limited, as a result of the proposed Decisions.

There were no questions and comments and Mr. Röhling said that everyone appeared to be satisfied on that point and that other points could now be dealt with.

9 – OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Magaña said the Bureau had no points to be raised under this heading. There were no points from the floor either.

10 – CLOSURE

10.1 Adoption of Decisions and Resolutions of the Conference

A second roll call was taken to ensure that there was a quorum and what number of abstentions and negative votes could be allowed. 53 Member States were present. This meant that the quorum, which was 40, was reached; 43 votes cast had to be recorded for each decision with a maximum of 10 abstentions. If there were 43 votes cast there could be no more than 8 negative votes; if all 53 voted, there could be no more than 10 negative votes. In every case where there were no more than 8 “no” votes, the motion would be passed; if there were between 8 and 10 “no” votes, the number of abstentions would be checked. It was also noted that observers were present from Corresponding Members, other Organizations, the immediate Past President and five Bureau Staff. Contrary to the practice in the CIML, for the Conference no proxy votes were allowed by the Convention.

10.2 Date and place of the next Conference

It had been decided to wait two years, until 2006, to see whether any Member offered to host the Conference. If this had not happened by then, the BIML would organize a Conference in France.

Mr. Röhling thanked all those who had contributed to the success and pleasant atmosphere of the Conference, notably Mr. Magaña and the Bureau; Mr. Kochsiek and the Committee; PTB staff for their help; and the interpreters.

Mr. Kochsiek thanked Mr. Röhling for chairing the Conference so well.

Mr. Magaña thanked all the BIML staff members present and Mr. Röhling declared the Twelfth International Conference of Legal Metrology closed.

DECISIONS AND RESOLUTIONS

TWELFTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE of LEGAL METROLOGY

Berlin, 26–29 October 2004

DECISIONS and RESOLUTIONS

1 Organization of the Meeting

- 1.1 The Conference took note of opening and welcome addresses delivered by Dr. Tacke, Vice-Minister of the Federal Ministry of Economics and Labour, Dr. Röhling, Pr. Göbel, President of the PTB, and Pr. Kochsiek, CIML Acting President.
- 1.2 The roll of Delegates was called and it was found that 54 Member States were present out of a total of 59; the statutory quorum of two-thirds was therefore reached.

The Conference also noted the participation of Observers from certain OIML Corresponding Members, observer countries and International and Regional Liaison Organizations, the CIML Immediate Past-President, one CIML Honorary Member and members of BIML Staff.

- 1.3 Information concerning voting procedures during Conference sessions was given.
- 1.4 The Conference unanimously elected Dr. Röhling as Conference President with Pr. Kochsiek (Germany) standing in as and when required, and Mrs. Annabi and Dr. Zhagora as Conference Vice-Presidents.
- 1.5 The Conference adopted the proposed agenda without modification.
- 1.6 The Conference established two Working Commissions, one for Financial Matters and one for Technical Work.
- 1.7 The Conference adopted the proposed schedule.
- 1.8 The Conference approved the Minutes of the Eleventh Conference without modification.
- 1.9 The Conference took note of a report presented by the President of the International Committee of Legal Metrology describing the activities of the Organization for the period 2001–2004.

2 Member States and Corresponding Members

2.1 New Members - Expected accessions

The Conference noted that the number of OIML Members had significantly increased since the Eleventh Conference, although a number of Corresponding Members had been delisted for not having paid their subscriptions for over three years. The Conference noted that certain Corresponding Members were envisaging joining as Member States and that a number of countries/economies were expected to join as Corresponding Members.

2.2 The situation of certain Members

The Conference noted that Zambia had been struck off the list of Member States for not having complied with the requirements laid down by the Eleventh Conference.

It was also noted that the situation of two Member States would first be examined by the Finance Commission, which would then report to the Conference under Item 8.2.

3 Long-term policy

3.1 Report on actions carried out since the Eleventh Conference

The Conference took note of a report presented by the BIML Director.

3.2 Guidelines for the period 2005–2008

The Conference noted that most of the information concerning the actions carried out since the Eleventh Conference, including the development of an Action Plan for 1999–2002 with extension to 2004, had been given in the report on activities delivered by the CIML Acting President. The Conference also noted that the Long-Term Policy and the Action Plan shall be revised under the supervision of the newly elected CIML President, and requested the CIML to monitor its implementation.

4 Liaisons with international and regional institutions

4.1 Report on liaisons

The Conference took note of a report presented by the BIML Director.

4.2 Addresses by Representatives of Institutions

The Conference also noted the reports presented by the representatives of:

- ILAC/IAF, Mr. Pierre
- UNIDO, Dr. Loesener
- BIPM, Dr. Castelazo
- WELMEC, Dr. Freistetter
- APLMF, Dr. Ooiwa
- EMLMF, Mr. Lagauterie
- SADCMEI, Mr. Carstens
- CCE, DG Enterprise, Mrs. Höke
- CECIP, Mr. Anthony.

4.3 The Conference took note of a report presented by the BIML Director concerning the main aspects of cooperation between the OIML and certain International and Regional Organizations. It was noted that a number of matters should be considered in order to globally improve OIML activities in fields connected with, for example, market surveillance, increased use of the work of other international or regional bodies, etc.

The Conference expressed its appreciation for the work carried out jointly with other Organizations.

The Conference invited the CIML President and BIML Director to work actively towards an even closer cooperation with the Metre Convention and a common presentation of international metrology to the public.

As a conclusion, the Conference requested the CIML to duly consider all the comments and proposals put forward during the Conference and to take appropriate measures in order to implement those that are considered as being most appropriate to improve OIML activities.

5 Work of OIML Technical Committees and Subcommittees

5.1 Work undertaken - State of progress

The Conference took note of a report concerning the activities of OIML Technical Committees and Subcommittees and requested the CIML to continue to monitor the situation and to find solutions in order to ensure a better distribution of technical responsibilities amongst OIML Member States.

5.2 Implementation of Recommendations by OIML Members

The Conference took note of information given by the Bureau concerning the implementation of OIML Recommendations in national regulations or voluntary standards. It noted that due to the low level of responses, no comprehensive report could be given.

Member States that had not yet replied to the BIML inquiry were requested to do so urgently. The Conference encouraged the Bureau to convert this information and inquiries into a permanent interactive facility on the OIML web site.

5.3 Formal sanction of Recommendations already approved by the Committee in 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004

The Conference decided that OIML Test Report Formats, which are of an informative nature concerning their implementation in national regulations, shall be approved by the CIML according to the rules applicable to International Documents, without having to be sanctioned by the Conference.

The Conference sanctioned those new or revised Recommendations already approved by the Committee in 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004.

Recommendations approved in 2001:

- R 16-1 *Mechanical non-invasive sphygmomanometers* (Edition 2002)
- R 16-2 *Non-invasive automated sphygmomanometers* (Edition 2002)
- R 75-1 *Heat meters. Part 1: General requirements* (Edition 2002)
- R 75-2 *Heat meters. Part 2: Type approval tests* (Edition 2002)
- R 133 *Liquid-in-glass thermometers* (Edition 2002)

Recommendations approved in 2002:

- R 84 *Platinum, copper, and nickel resistance thermometers (for industrial and commercial use)* (Edition 2003)
- R 134-1 *Automatic instruments for weighing road vehicles in motion. Total vehicle weighing* (Edition 2003)

Recommendations approved in 2003:

- R 48 *Tungsten ribbon lamps for the calibration of radiation thermometers* (Edition 2004)
- R 49-1 *Water meters intended for the metering of cold potable water. Part 1: Metrological and technical requirements* (Edition 2003)
- R 49-2 *Water meters intended for the metering of cold potable water. Part 2: Test methods* (Edition 2004)
- R 52 *Hexagonal weights - Metrological and technical requirements* (Edition 2004)
- R 61-1 *Automatic gravimetric filling instruments. Part 1: Metrological and technical requirements - Tests* (Edition 2004)
- R 87 *Quantity of product in prepackages* (Edition 2004)
- R 135 *Spectrophotometers for medical laboratories* (Edition 2004)

Recommendation approved in 2004 by CIML postal approval:

- R 111-1 *Weights of classes E_1 , E_2 , F_1 , F_2 , M_1 , M_{1-2} , M_2 , M_{2-3} and M_3 , Part 1: Metrological and technical requirements* (Edition 2004)

5.4 Draft Recommendations directly presented for sanctioning by the Conference

The Conference sanctioned one new Recommendation *Instruments for measuring the area of leathers* (R 136). The Conference also decided to withdraw OIML Recommendations R 33 and R 62.

6 OIML Certificate System for Measuring Instruments

6.1 Report on the situation of the System

The Conference took note of a report describing progress made with this activity since the establishment of the System in general and since the 11th Conference in particular, including the results of recent inquiries carried out among OIML Members and manufacturers.

6.2 Mutual Acceptance Arrangement (MAA)

The Conference expressed its appreciation to the CIML for the setting up of the Mutual Acceptance Arrangement, and took note that this System will be implemented in 2005.

The Conference took note of proposals concerning the operation of the MAA and of the Certificate System. The Conference instructed the Committee to take appropriate decisions on these proposals and to begin a revision of this document once experience has been gained following its implementation.

6.3 Other developments

The Conference took note of a report concerning the results of various inquiries carried out by the BIML in order to ascertain the views of manufacturers and CIML Members concerning advisable developments of the System.

The Conference confirmed the urgency of addressing the problem of conformity to type of measuring instruments.

7 Developing Countries

7.1 Report on activities for the period 2001–2004

The Conference took note of a report concerning the Development Council meeting held on 25 October and expressed its appreciation to the Chairperson for the work accomplished.

The Conference noted in particular the report concerning the Forum: *Metrology – Trade Facilitator* held on 25 October 2004 and expressed its appreciation to the German Authorities for having organized this event.

7.2 Guidelines for future activity

The Conference noted the Committee's report that, notwithstanding Resolution 7.2 of the 6th International Conference of Legal Metrology which established the OIML Development Council, the OIML's work on Developing Country matters could be more efficiently managed by the establishment of a Permanent Working Group on Developing Countries (PWGDC), which would replace the Development Council.

The Conference therefore approved the decision of the 38th CIML Meeting to create a PWGDC, the terms of reference of which shall be established by the Committee. This Permanent Working Group shall act as an advisory body to the President of the Committee on aspects of the OIML's work relating to Developing Countries.

The Conference also decided to cease the activities of the current Development Council.

8 Administrative and financial matters

8.1 Examination of the management of the budget from 2000 to 2003 and the estimates for 2004

The International Conference of Legal Metrology,

HAVING EXAMINED the report on the management of the budget for the years 2000, 2001, 2002 and 2003;

NOTING that the budget was managed in conformity with the expenses necessary for carrying out the work of the Bureau and that the accuracy of the report has been certified by annual audits;

NOTING that the respective functions assigned by the Convention to the President of the International Committee of Legal Metrology and to the Director of the International Bureau of Legal Metrology have been fulfilled;

GIVES ITS DEFINITIVE DISCHARGE to the President of the Committee and to the Director of the Bureau for their management of the budget during the years mentioned above.

8.2 Decisions related to the debts of certain countries

The Conference adopted the following Resolution:

The International Conference of Legal Metrology,

HAVING EXAMINED the report on the management of the budget for the years 2000, 2001, 2002 and 2003;

NOTING that a large part of the holdings on December 31, 2003 consisted of debts owed by Member States;

URGENTLY REQUESTS that those Member States that are in arrears with their contributions pay their debts as soon as possible;

HAVING NOTED a report by the Director of the Bureau on the situation of certain Member States in arrears with their contributions,

MAKES the following decisions:

* D.P.R. of Korea is permitted to remain an OIML Member State providing that:

- its current contributions are paid, and
- its arrears are progressively reimbursed over 10 years.

The International Committee of Legal Metrology is requested to annually examine the situation of this Member State and take appropriate action in the event that these conditions are not met.

- * The outstanding contribution of Spain related to the year 1992 is considered to have been paid by this country.
- * Zambia will be permitted to become an OIML Corresponding Member providing that:
 - its current Corresponding Member fees are paid, and
 - its arrears are progressively reimbursed over 10 years.

The conditions for the readmission of Zambia as a full Member State will be reconsidered when its arrears amount to less than 3 years' contributions.

The International Committee of Legal Metrology is requested to annually examine the situation of this country and take appropriate action in the event that these conditions are not met.

- * The International Committee of Legal Metrology is requested to annually examine the situation of any other Member State which might become more than three years late in the payment of its contributions and to report back about this at the Thirteenth Conference.

8.3 Revision of the OIML Financial Regulations

The Conference approved the revised *OIML Financial Regulations* as established by the Committee.

8.4 Bureau staff and Retirement scheme

The Conference took note of a report given by the BIML Director on this issue.

The Conference noted that the OIML Retirement scheme will be balanced for the period 2005–2008 without an additional endowment from the Organization being necessary.

The Conference noted that additional studies are necessary for assessing the rights of the Staff and the commitments of the Organization concerning the Retirement scheme and for examining how these commitments must be recorded in the Organization's accounts.

The Conference instructed the CIML to undertake these studies and to report and make proposals to the Thirteenth Conference.

8.5 Budget for the financial period 2005–2008

The Conference accepted (with one abstention) to consider the budgetary proposals as a whole and not in separate components.

The Conference adopted the following Resolution:

The International Conference of Legal Metrology,

ACCEPTING the budgetary proposals of the Director of the International Bureau of Legal Metrology for the financial period beginning January 1, 2005 and ending December 31, 2008;

APPROVES the fee structure and the budget for the Organization's expenses annexed to these Decisions and Resolutions;

INSTRUCTS the International Committee of Legal Metrology:

- to annually review the MAA fee structure approved above, and

- to amend it as necessary in order to ensure a fair implementation of the MAA, without compromising the balance of implementation costs and income.

INSTRUCTS the International Committee of Legal Metrology to take the necessary measures (such as calling for voluntary additional contributions or amending certain elements of the budget - with the exception of the Member State base contributory share and the Corresponding Member lump sum subscription fee) in the event that the inflation rate in France differs in a significant manner from the value used for determining the budget (i.e. 2 %) or in the event that other factors render a revision of the accepted budget appropriate;

INSTRUCTS the International Committee of Legal Metrology to annually review the situation of those Member States that benefit from a lower contributory class and requests the Committee to reallocate those Member States concerned to their normal contributory class as soon as their economic situation permits it.

8.6 Status of OIML Publications

The Conference approved the proposal to make all OIML Publications, except those which are published jointly with other Organizations, available free of charge in electronic format on the OIML web site and to cease publishing them on paper.

9 Other business

10 Closure

10.1 Adoption of the Decisions and Resolutions of the Conference

A second roll call of delegates was called and it was found that 53 Member States were present; the statutory quorum of two-thirds as fixed by the Convention was therefore reached.

The Twelfth International Conference adopted the above-mentioned Decisions and Resolutions (*Note: the sanctioning of International Recommendations and the adoption of Resolution 8 were made through nominal votes*).

10.2 Date and place of the next Conference

The Conference decided that it would wait for a period of up to two years, i.e. until 2006, to establish whether any Member State was willing to host the Thirteenth Conference in 2008. If no Member State was forthcoming, then the BIML would organize the Conference in France. ■

Annex: 2005–2008 Budget

Approved by the 12th International Conference of Legal Metrology

(a) Fee structure approved by the Conference

Year	2005	2006	2007	2008
Base Member State contributory share	12 620 €	12 880 €	13 130 €	13 400 €
Corresponding Member Fee	1 020 €	1 020 €	1 020 €	1 020 €
Registration fee for OIML Certificates outside DoMCs	150 €	153 €	156 €	159 €
Registration fee for OIML Certificates covered by a DoMC	500 €	510 €	520 €	530 €
Fees for examination of the candidacy of an Issuing Authority for a DoMC	1 500 €	1 530 €	1 560 €	1 590 €

(b) Base Budget

Year	2005	2006	2007	2008
Operating charges approved by the Conference (*)				
Staff	874 k€	913 k€	947 k€	960 k€
Premises	51 k€	52 k€	52 k€	54 k€
Offices	69 k€	62 k€	62 k€	63 k€
Bulletin	44 k€	45 k€	45 k€	47 k€
Printing	14 k€	15 k€	15 k€	16 k€
Documentation	16 k€	16 k€	17 k€	18 k€
Correspondence	43 k€	43 k€	44 k€	46 k€
Meeting costs	156 k€	162 k€	168 k€	175 k€
Travel	52 k€	53 k€	53 k€	55 k€
Bonuses and miscellaneous	6 k€	7 k€	7 k€	8 k€
Total operating charges	1 325 k€	1 368 k€	1 410 k€	1 442 k€
Financial charges approved by the Conference				
Financial charges	0 k€	0 k€	0 k€	0 k€
Exceptional charges approved by the Conference				
OIML 50 th Anniversary	180 k€			
Expert studies	30 k€	30 k€	30 k€	30 k€
Others				
Total exceptional charges	210 k€	30 k€	30 k€	30 k€

(*) Subject to the agreement of the CIML President, the BIML Director is allowed to operate compensations between the operating charges other than staff charges as far as the total operating charges do not exceed those approved by the Conference.

(c) Additional budget (MAA implementation)

Year	2005	2006	2007	2008
Charges approved by the Conference				
Staff costs for one additional staff member	82 k€	84 k€	91 k€	93 k€
Operating costs for one additional staff member	25 k€	25 k€	26 k€	26 k€
Total operating charges of the additional budget	107 k€	109 k€	117 k€	119 k€

