

## Template for comments and convener's observations

Date:2019-04-01

Document: B 6-1 and -2

Project: BIML\_SC3\_P2

Country Code <sup>1</sup>	Part	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/Table	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Convener's responses
0001 US	0.all	all			<p>The following is copied from the scope statement of this project (approved by the CIML):</p> <p>“The revision of B 6-1 will be limited in its scope and will only address the two recommendations made by the OIML-CS Management Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• when an OIML Recommendation that is included in the OIML-CS is revised, the relevant Project Group shall develop a comparison document (“gap analysis”), and</li> <li>• that new and revised OIML Recommendations that are to be included in the OIML-CS shall include separate type evaluation report and test report formats.”</li> </ul> <p>We note that some of the changes proposed in this 1WD exceed the “very limited scope” for revising B6 that was proposed to and approved by the CIML.</p> <p>The addition of new Section 4.8 and Section 4.9 are examples of this.</p> <p>Because it seems that the door has now been opened on a “not-limited” revision of B6 ... our comments on the 1CD will consider that the entire document has been opened for revision.</p>		Noted.
0002 PL	1			Gen.	Apart of including new part related with OIML CS we found this changes rather linguistic		Noted.
0003 US	1	1.1		ed	<p>Prefer to leave the word “Directives” in this first scope sentence.</p> <p>No need for the word “present” in this sentence.</p>		Agreed. Original wording reinstated.

<sup>1</sup> Country code (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China)

<sup>2</sup> Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial

## Template for comments and convener's observations

Date:2019-04-01

Document: B 6-1 and -2

Project: BIML\_SC3\_P2

Country Code <sup>1</sup>	Part	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/Table	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Convener's responses
0004 FR	1	1.3		ed	The word “Directives” has been replaced in 1.1. In order to be homogeneous in the used vocabulary and to introduce the word “Directives” used in 3.1.1 for example, we propose to reformulate this sentence.	Replace “Directives” by “Directives developed in the present publication”	See 0003. Not required now that “Directives” has been reinstated in 1.1.
0005 US	1	2	all	ed	We think this introduction section reads better the “old way” ... without switching everything to TC and SC and PG acronyms.		Not agreed. Technical Committees, Subcommittees and Project Groups are used in 2.1. Acronyms then used throughout the document.
0006 US	1	2.4		ed	Reference to 4.9 should be to 4.11.		Agreed.
0007 US	1	2.5		ed	Reference to 4.10 should be to 4.12.		Agreed.
0008 US	1	3		ed	Why aren't Basic Publications included (is 1.2 considered sufficient explanation)?		1.2 is considered sufficient explanation.
0009 US	1	4.4	c	ed	Add “and Expert Reports (see 3.6)” at the end.		Agreed.
0010 US	1	4.6	c	ed	Reference should be to 5.6.1 a.		Agreed.
0011 US	1	4.6	d	ed	Reference should be to 5.6.1 b.		Agreed.
0012 PL	1	4.6 CIML Member	c)	tech	As we understand, the role of the contact is replacing Main Contact in the situation when main contact is cannot perform his duties - maybe it worth to clearly describe it in OIML B6-1?		Disagreed. It is not the role Contact to replace the Main Contact.
0013 JP1	1	4.6 CIML Member	Note	Ge/ed	The note reads “a country may have different <u>representatives</u> in each TC, SC or PG”. However, the meaning of “representatives” is not clear. We consider they mean Main Contact and Contact.	Replace “representatives” with “Main Contacts and Contacts”.	Agreed.

<sup>1</sup> Country code (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China)

<sup>2</sup> Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial

# Template for comments and convener's observations

Date:2019-04-01

Document: B 6-1 and -2

Project: BIML\_SC3\_P2

Country Code <sup>1</sup>	Part	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/Table	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Convener's responses
0014 JP2	1	4.6 CIML Member (and 4.7)	c)	Ge	Explanations of “Main Contact” and “Contact” are necessary. We understand that Main Contact (person) can be different from the CIML member and a different person can be assigned to each project. Main Contact supports the CIML member regarding technical work including voting on WDs and CDs (not on DR and FDR). However, this role seems close to that of Assignee.	Propose adding a note explaining the roles and responsibilities of “Main Contact” and “Contact” including the difference from those of Assignee.	Partially agreed. The wording in 4.7 has been improved to clarify that the Assignee takes on some of the responsibilities of the CIML Member.
0015 PL	1	4.7		tech	Referring to Japan comment regarding the role of Assignee we stand in the position that describing this role (rights and obligations) of Assignee should be left to the OIML Member		Noted. See 0014 JP2.
0016 JP3	1	4.7 CIML Member Assignee		Ge	The role of Assignee seems close to that of Main Contact. We understand Assignee has higher authority than that of Main Contact, and the person can vote on DR, FDR and other matters of national policy on behalf of the CIML member (see also JP1 to 4.6).	We do not request any changes to 4.7 if an explanation of Main Contact is added to 4.6.	Noted. See 0014 JP2.
0017 US	1	4.8	a	te	Add “(O or none)” after “status”?		Partially Agreed. The term “participation” has been used.
0018 JP5	1	4.8 Correspondin g Member ...		Ge/Ed	Regarding the text “(without committing their government or administration)”, we expect that a Corresponding Member Representative usually belongs to their government or administration in legal metrology.	Delete “(without committing their government or administration)” unless there is a reason to maintain it.	Not agreed. Consistent with 4.6.
0019 JP4	1	4.8 Correspondin g Member ...	Note	Ge/Ed	The word “representative” in the note may be confused with the “Corresponding Member Representative”.	Replace “representatives” with “Main Contacts and Contacts”.	Agreed.
0020 US	1	4.9	b	ed	Reference should be to 5.6.1 c.		

1 Country code (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China)

2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial

## Template for comments and convener's observations

Date:2019-04-01

Document: B 6-1 and -2

Project: BIML\_SC3\_P2

Country Code <sup>1</sup>	Part	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/Table	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Convener's responses
0021 JP6	1	4.9 Liaison organization officer	Note 1	Ge/Ed	The meaning of “representative” in the note 1 is not clear.	Replace “representatives” with “Main Contacts and Contacts”.	Agreed.
0022 US	1	4.10	e	ed	References to 4.9 and 4.10 should be to 4.11 and 4.12.		Agreed.
0023 US	1	4.10	i	ed	Reference to 6.4 should be to 6.5.		Agreed.
0024 US	1	4.10	k	ed	Reference to 6.5 should be to 6.6.		Agreed.
0025 JP7	1	4.10 BIML	c)	Te/Ed	Our understanding is that “Work Area” is a generic name of the PG Workspace on the OIML website. Although many OIML members may understand it, a simple explanation is needed.	Add an explanation of “Work Area” as a new note.	Not agreed. Decision previously taken to use generic term “work area” so as not to restrict use of alternatives to “Workspaces” in the future.
0026 UK	1	5.5, 5.6.1, 5.5.6, etc		ed	“PG work area...” is mentioned	Propose changing to “PG workspace” as this is wording on the OIML website	See 0025 JP7.
0027 US	1	5.13	A	te	A first draft in six months ...  I can see that this might be fairly reasonable for a <u>revision</u> to an existing document ...  ... but six months is NOT at all reasonable if the document will be fairly complex and the PG is starting from a blank sheet of paper.  (“Red light” on the dashboard.)		Noted.
0028 UK	1	5.13e)		ed	The statement seems incomplete:  “a PG should send a final CD to the BIML for...”	For consistency with 6.5.1.1 and Annex A4.1 (1) regarding who in the PG sends a CD to the BIML, propose to add the text “convener” :	Agreed.

<sup>1</sup> Country code (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China)

<sup>2</sup> Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial

## Template for comments and convener's observations

Date:2019-04-01

Document: B 6-1 and -2

Project: BIML\_SC3\_P2

Country Code <sup>1</sup>	Part	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/Table	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Convener's responses
						“...a PG convener shall send a final CD to the BIML for...”	
0029 US	1	6.3  6.5.1.1		te	Share the thoughts and concerns of France on Section 6.3.  The French concerns about “timing” are also applicable to ne language written into section 6.5.1.1.		See 0030 FR.
0030 FR	1	6.3		te	There are new directives about the parts of an OIML Recommendation and the comparison table. They are now new directives. The revision of some recommendations are already on progress. When this new structure will be applied?		The new structure will be applied following CIML approval of the revised B 6-1 and -2.
0031 FR	1	6.3		te	The comparison table between versions of a recommendation is a new directive of B6. In the case of a recast of a recommendation, is it possible to provide a simplified comparison (summary of the recast).	Add a sentence “in the case of an entire recast of a recommendation, it is possible to do a simplified comparison.	Agreed.
0032 JP8	1	6.3 OIML Recommendations		Ed	The third sentence is not clear.	We propose rephrasing the sentence as shown below assuming we understood correctly.  <i>An optional part <u>relevant to the measuring instrument category</u> (Part 5 - Verification and Inspection Procedures) may be included <del>when relevant to the measuring instrument category</del> and when <u>it is specified in the Terms of Reference of a project to for developing a new or revised version of an existing Recommendation.</u></i>	Agreed.
0033 US	1	Annex A.4 (2)		ed	Box in middle should say “Go to Annex A.4 (3)”		Disagreed. Reference to A.4 (2) is correct.
0034 US	2	2.5		ed	Suggested edit	Change to "native speakers of English"	Agreed.
0035 US	2	3.1.1 3.1.7		ed	If underlined elements of 3.1.1 are “mandatory” ... do not wait to advise this until section 3.1.7.		Agreed. Subclause moved.

<sup>1</sup> Country code (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China)

<sup>2</sup> Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial

## Template for comments and convener's observations

Date:2019-04-01

Document: B 6-1 and -2

Project: BIML\_SC3\_P2

Country Code <sup>1</sup>	Part	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/Table	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Convener's responses
0036 FR	2	4.15.1		te	The text refers to “on-site” verification and inspection to check compliance.... It seems to introduce the fact that all these verifications are to be performed “on site” which is usually understood as the place of installation and use. Many verifications starting with the initial for new instruments as well as the verification after repair can be performed on the manufacturer’s or repairer’s premises or factory or in a specific laboratory. In addition even for periodical verification some can or even (have to) be performed in a laboratory (example: utility meters, breath analysers ...). Only some instruments like weighbridges or fuel dispenser need to be verified on site when they are installed, repaired or for periodical verification.	Delete “on-site” or explain that it is not systematically the place of installation and use but can be another place	Agreed.

<sup>1</sup> Country code (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China)

<sup>2</sup> Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial