



**CECIP Address given at the 13th OIML Conference
Sydney, Australia, 2008**

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen,

CECIP - the federation of European weighing industry - is a grown-up lady now. This year it has its 50th anniversary. It was founded in 1958 by 5 members. Since then it has steadily grown. Today it comprises the weighing federations of 16 European countries, and with Russia and the Ukraine having joined CECIP a few years ago, the borders of the Europe Union are even exceeded.

Today I want to thank you, Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, for letting CECIP participate in the work of OIML and for giving me the opportunity for this address.

Last year in Shanghai, we spoke about the importance of the International Recommendations R76 for non-automatic weighing instruments and R51 for certain automatic weighing instruments. We kindly asked the BIML to undertake everything that these two important recommendations could be published with highest priority, because they were needed so urgently. And indeed, a few days before Christmas, I received an email from the BIML informing me and others that R76 had been published still in 2007: a real Christmas present! On this occasion let me thank you very much for this, Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen. I hope you will continue with this tradition, therefore I have brought with me a new wish list for the upcoming Christmas season.

Now that the OIML R76 has been published, the standardization organizations in some OIML member countries have started to implement this recommendation into national law. Also in Europe this process has started with the official participation of manufacturers, that means with representatives of CECIP members. Our clear goal is to adopt the requirements of R76 word by word, and to limit certain exceptions from R76 to the absolute necessary minimum. I hope that we will soon be successful with this in Europe, and I hope, too, that in line with the needs of globalization and the OIML convention, other OIML member countries outside Europe are aiming at the same goal.

In this context it should be necessary to take care of harmonization of the requirements for the import of measuring instruments with those that are valid inside a country. Only by this equal treatment and correctly operating market surveillance can be ensured and quality is supported.

This brings me to the second point that is important for CECIP. We support market surveillance that functions well all across the globe. To achieve this it is necessary to build up competence for this important task in the countries themselves if it is not yet available there. Building up competence cannot be done or forced from outside a country. The respective expertise must go beyond the simple assessment of plates and markings, rather technical expertise and know-how must be built up and should play the major role in market surveillance.

I am sure that only such an approach can solve the actual problems and can contribute to a globally harmonized quality standard which is a major goal defined by OIML.

Unfortunately, the contrary approach seems to be the spirit of today, i.e. a growing reliance on formalities rather than on the conformity of a product with the respective essential quality requirements. As a matter of fact, we find such a trend not only in legal metrology but in all parts of our life. Both aspects are important, of course. However, the major priority as regards market surveillance should always be given to technical quality aspects, i.e. the assessment of the correct functioning of an instrument, rather than on marking and labeling aspects.

The last subject I would like to address is the MAA and in this case the acceptance of manufacturer's test results. Today's state of the art is that some manufacturers have testing and calibration laboratories in compliance with ISO/IEC 17025. The test and calibration certificates issued by these labs are officially recognized worldwide within the scope of ILAC. The labs meet all the requirements of ISO/IEC 17025, the focus being on the professional competence.

But ISO/IEC 17025 also requires the contractual guarantee of a manufacturer that the staff of his test lab is objective and independent in its decisions. Several manufacturers and assessing authorities have experience with that. Therefore, it should also be permitted under the MAA that an issuing authority uses and evaluates the test results of such an ISO/IEC 17025 test lab and provides a certificate based on this. The issuing authority, of course, is responsible for monitoring this laboratory. Moreover, when issuing an OIML certificate, this authority takes responsibility for the competence and reliability of the laboratory performing the testing.

We also think the OIML should go a step further, Mr. President, and ladies and gentlemen. It should be a goal of OIML to promote the establishment of such competent ISO/IEC 17025 testing laboratories at manufacturers. Otherwise, how else can a manufacturer start and maintain production in a qualified way that ensures consistence and long-term conformance of his instruments with the certificates if he doesn't built up competence and runs such a laboratory? The combination of manufacturers' ISO/IEC 17025 testing labs with an issuing authority for OIML certificates is the ideal partnership to built up competence and will strengthen quality and conformity on the markets.

Mr. President, and ladies and gentlemen, let me shortly summarize my wish list to the OIML for next Christmas:

- Supporting the goal to adopt R76 without changes in the member countries as far as possible and to harmonize the requirements for import and in the country itself
- Supporting a qualified market surveillance in the countries
- Support of manufacturer's ISO/IEC 17025 testing labs in order to support quality and to accept their test results evaluated by an issuing authority under the MAA

Thank you very much.