

FINAL DRAFT
BASIC PUBLICATION

Draft 7

48th CIML Meeting

Ho Chi Minh City 2013

INFORMATION

Revision of B 6-1

Directives for OIML technical work.

Part 1: Structures and procedures for the development
of OIML publications



ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE
DE MÉTROLOGIE LÉGALE

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION
OF LEGAL METROLOGY

OIML Ad-hoc working group “Directives for OIML technical work”

Amendment of OIML B 6-1:2012

Structures and Procedures for the Development of OIML Publications

Version / Date: v7 / 5 June 2013
Contact person: Roman Schwartz
Organization: P.T.B.
e-mail: Roman.Schwartz@ptb.de

Compilation of comments / responses and proposals

Remarks

- 1. The table below refers to the new version of B 6-1:2012 that has recently been published by the BIML.**
- 2. Regarding the large number of comments received from the ad-hoc group the following procedure is proposed:**

Step 1: For the amendment to be proposed to the CIML in 2013 consider only those comments that seem to require urgent action and have unanimous support of the ad-hoc group (e.g. the CIML preliminary ballot issue in section 6.5.4 a). The respective actions are marked bold in the table below (see column “Responses and proposals for amendment of B 6-1:2012).

Step 2: Discuss the remaining comments and proposals, and how to best proceed, at the Presidential Council meeting prior to the CIML 2013 meeting, and inform the CIML Members accordingly at the CIML 2013 meeting.

By this procedure we should be able to get the most important points approved by the CIML without the risk of stepping into controversial discussions at the CIML 2013 meeting.

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal	Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
List of terms and abbreviations	JP	<p>The ‘<i>List of terms and abbreviations used in this publication</i>’ on page 5 explains the ‘CIML preliminary ballot’ simply as “<i>Approval of a Draft Publication (DD, DR or DV) to become a Final Draft Publication (FDD, FDR or FDV)</i>”, and the clause 6.5 mentions the rules of the ballot. However, there is <u>no comprehensive explanation</u> about the <u>fundamental roles and objectives of the preliminary ballot</u>.</p> <p>We tentatively understand that this ballot is a kind of preliminary and on-line survey before an official ballot (CIML approval) and it is not directly connected with the final result of approval. We also understand that only if the preliminary ballot has passed based on the rules in 6.5.4, the official ballot will follow that is conducted on-line or at the CIML. We are afraid that such objectives may not be clear for many CIML members. We therefore propose that the present sentence about ‘<i>Preliminary Ballot</i>’ in the ‘<i>List of terms ...</i>’ will be <u>revised to explain the roles and objectives more clearly and comprehensively</u>.</p>	This is considered as a “step 2” issue to be discussed at the next Presidential Council meeting.
	JP	<p>‘Terms of Reference (ToR)’ is used frequently in 4.3, 4.5, 4.8, 5.2.1, 5.2.10, 5.4.1, 5.7, 5.13.1 and Annex C.1. However, the <u>practical meaning (or contents) of ‘ToR’ as a specific term used in the Directives is ambiguous</u>. Generally, it might be difficult to understand ‘ToR’ for the members who do not use English as the primary language. We therefore propose that the present explanation about ‘ToR’ in the ‘<i>List of terms ...</i>’ on page 5 will be revised to explain the practical meaning more clearly.</p>	This is considered as a “step 2” issue to be discussed at the next Presidential Council meeting.
	FR	OK with both proposals from Japan.	Noted.

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal	Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
	NL	<p>In a the second step to implement:</p> <p>More detailed information on the issue of preliminary ballot as requested by Japan may be useful, including some historical overview.</p> <p>Some explanation on ToR</p>	Confirmation of «step 2».

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal	Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
1 Scope	JP	<p>In the 14th OIML Convention, we had a discussion about the scope of Basic (B) Documents covered by the Directives and sanctioned at the Convention. The discussion showed a possibility in which some of B Documents, such as B 3 and B 10, could fall within the scope of B 6 in the future.</p> <p>In connection with the above discussion, we consider that there could ideally be <u>another new set of Directives (B xx)</u> that describes procedures to draft and publish <u>important and non-technical OIML publications</u> including Basic Documents. However, it is confusing and not realistic to establish other Directives. Therefore, we recommend <u>extending the scope of the present Directives</u> in order that the important and non-technical publications would be also covered.</p> <p>Based on above consideration, we request that some <u>important Basic Documents</u>, which are closely related basic structure and management rules of OIML, shall be <u>included in the scope of the Directives</u> even if they do not have technical contents. The B Documents to be included in the scope are proposed in Table 1.</p>	This is considered as a “step 2” issue to be discussed at the next Presidential Council meeting.
	NL	<p>Applying the B6 procedures to several of the B documents might be useful however B6 has only been published yet and there is yet too little experience in the practical consequences of the changes in B6. Therefore it is not supported to widen the scope of B6 to apply to other B documents until the consequences of its implementation have been evaluated.</p> <p>Table 1: OIML Basic Documents to be included in the scope of the Directives (B6) as a proposal from Japan</p>	Confirmation of « step 2 »

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal				Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
		No.	Title	Year	Proposal	
		B 1	OIML Convention	1955	Out of the scope	
		B 3	OIML Certificate System for Measuring Instruments	2011	In the scope	
		B 6-1	Directive for OIML technical work. Part 1: Structures and procedures for the development of OIML publications	2012?	In the scope	
		B 6-2	Directive for OIML technical work. Part 2: Guide to the drafting and presentation of OIML publications	2012?	In the scope	
		B 7	Staff Regulations	2004	Out of the scope	
		B 8	OIML Financial Regulations	2012	Out of the scope	
		B 10	Framework for a Mutual Acceptance Arrangement on OIML Type Evaluations	2011	In the scope	
		B 10 Amend	Framework for a Mutual Acceptance Arrangement on OIML Type Evaluations - Amendment to 2011 ed.	2012	In the scope	
		B 11	Rules governing the translation, copyright and distribution of OIML Publications	2007	Out of the scope	

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal				Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
		B 12	Policy paper on liaisons between the OIML and other bodies	2004	Out of the scope	
		B 13	Procedure for the appointment of the BIML Director and Assistant Directors	2004	In the scope	
		B 14	Procedure for the election of the CIML President and Vice-Presidents	2006	In the scope	
		B 15	OIML Strategy	2011	In the scope	
		B 16	Terms of reference for the Presidential Council	2011	Out of the scope	
		B 17	Policies and rules for the reimbursement of travel expenses incurred by CIML Members of Honor and invited guests in attending OIML events	2012	Out of the scope	
	JP	<p>If it is not appropriate to make an explicit distinction for each of the Basic (B) Documents with the table 1, we propose an alternative and flexible method. There is a simple rule how to deal with Basic Documents in the clause 1.2 of B 6-1 in which B Documents follow the Directives only '<u>if CIML so decides</u>'. However, this rule does not mention <u>practical procedures</u> required in order to make B Documents follow the Directives. For examples, who is allowed to submit a proposal to include a B Document? Is it approved at a CIML or an online ballot? How long is the decision effective? More practical procedures should be added to enable necessary B Documents be covered by the Directives.</p>				This is related to the other proposal above, to be discussed.

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal	Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
2 Introduction			
3 Types of OIML technical publication	<div>JP</div> <div>FR</div>	<p>We consider that Expert Reports (E) shall be always approved by the President or Director. Therefore, the <u>words ‘<i>as appropriate</i>’</u> shall be deleted in the item b) of 3.6 as shown below.</p> <p><i>3.6 Expert Reports (E)</i></p> <p><i>a) not covered by these Directives,</i></p> <p><i>b) developed by experts and approved by the CIML President or BIML Director as appropriate,</i></p> <p>We assume that any publication bearing an OIML logo is considered by the member states as a message which expresses <u>an official view of OIML</u>. There are important documents even in the Expert Reports that may lead future directions of legal metrology such as E 1 (<i>Legal Metrology at the Dawn of the 21st Century</i>), E 2 (<i>Benefit of Legal Metrology for the Economy and Society</i>) and E 6 (<i>Guidance on the selection and implementation of performance requirements for utility meters containing additional functionalities</i>).</p> <p>OK with Japan.</p>	<div>Agreed as proposed. This is considered as “step 1” issue.</div> <div>Noted.</div>
	NL	Support JP and FR	Confirmation of « step 1 »

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal	Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
4 OIML structures ...	JP	In 4.2, " <i>It meets every four years</i> " should be corrected as " <i>It meets at least every six years</i> " or " <i>It meets every four years usually</i> " in compliance to the Article X of the Convention.	Considered as "step 2" issue to be discussed. The current text does not contradict to the Convention.
	FR	OK with usually 4 in compliance.	Noted.
	NL	Considered no need for amending while the Convention prevails and B6 is not in conflict. Moreover B6 should indicate the actual practice	Confirmation of « step 2 »
5 Operation of Technical ...	JP	In the processes of voting and submission of comments, the CIML member or a person in charge in each member state may not receive a notification from TC/SC/PG or BIML correctly. In addition, a reply from the member state may sometimes not be transferred to the TC/SC/PG or BIML correctly due a problem in communication. In order to avoid such a possibility of accident, new processes of confirmation should be introduced as shown below. a) Periodical confirmation of contact persons with contact information in each member state which is conducted <u>at least once a year</u> . BIML or secretary / convener of TC/SC/PG are responsible of this confirmation process. b) Confirmation of <u>reception of vote / comments</u> from each member state. The secretary / convener of TC/SC/PG or BIML are responsible of this confirmation process. Note: Some of these processes are expected to be realized with an automated web-system.	This seems to be covered already by B 6-1 No 5.10 "Communication". In addition, the proposal seems not to have unanimous support from the ad-hoc group, and is hence considered as a "step 2" issue.
	FR	(The above proposal) seems too heavy for convenors of TC, SC, PG	Noted, see response above.

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal	Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
	NL	<p>Support to be a clear step 2 issue :</p> <p>In general one should not start changing procedures where these in practice are not maintained until the cause of the omission is clear. It could be necessary to take measures to maintain existing procedures. Only where procedures are applied that appear to be not adequate these should be amended.</p> <p>So it is suggested to first focus on the causes of the incidents. This may require some feedback mechanism like a central “database” for registration of incidents.</p> <p>Moreover it is our experience that due to the actual (still) decentralized responsibilities for keeping up lists of members and further participants to TC’s, SC’s and PG’s at the secretariats or convener level it may sometimes be quite unclear if a mailing list is complete and it might be difficult to approach all the members and participants in the way they desire.</p> <p>The understandable but rather frequently changes in “mandate” or “responsibility” of contacts and their references combined with the fact that only in a few cases a timely initiative is taken to inform a convener of these changes made, makes maintaining a correct database not to be an easy job</p> <p>It therefore may happen that someone announced to be the contact or representative is incidentally not directly (immediately) informed.</p> <p>It is expected that the revision of databases at BIML will diminish the risk on such omission</p> <p>Although this topic really needs attention it may be beyond the scope of B6.</p>	Confirmation of « step 2 »

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal	Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
<p>5.4.3 Procedure for approval of a project</p> <p><u>Current text:</u></p> <p>Within one month, the BIML shall send details of the proposal and the ToR to all CIML Members, asking whether they approve the project, and whether they approve the allocation of the project to the TC or SC concerned. The BIML shall also inform CIML Members whether or not the secretariat of the TC or SC wishes to take on the convenership of the new Project Group and if not, the BIML shall ask for volunteers for that position. Three months shall be given to reply to this enquiry.</p>	US	<p>Our immediate concern here is that CIML Members are being asked to vote on the proposal for a new project without first having opportunity to see the comments (if any) from other CIML Members. It is our feeling that, just as is done for the first Committee Draft in TCs/SCs/PGs, where there is no vote taken, but rather only comments are submitted, so as to give the others opportunity to see each other's comments before voting, the same principle should be applied.</p> <p>We see at least three possible solutions here:</p> <p>i) Three months (or perhaps only two months) can still be given, but for providing comments only. Then all comments provided can be made openly available for all CIML Members to see, and another period (one month?) can then be given for providing votes (or the decision could be made at the next CIML meeting);</p> <p>ii) Comments that are submitted can be made openly available for all CIML Members to see as the comments are submitted and the voting is taking place during the three-month reply period;</p> <p>iii) Before submitting the proposal for a new project to CIML Members, first circulate the proposal for comment (and vote?) within the appropriate TC/SC. The comments could then be made available to all CIML Members during the CIML phase of the voting. We prefer the first solution (see our proposed revised text below).</p> <p>Concerning the more general matter of making comments available to CIML Members prior to, or during, other voting occasions (e.g., the Preliminary Ballot), we propose that B 6:2011 be modified accordingly in all of those places (e.g., 5.2.3, 6.5.3, 6.7.3.3, other?).</p>	<p>There is no unanimous support for that proposal by the ad-hoc group which is therefore considered as a "step 2" issue requiring further discussion or more experience with the application of the current version of B 6.</p> <p>To be discussed, see above.</p>

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal	Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
5.4.3 (cont.)	US (1)	<p><u>Proposed revised text:</u></p> <p>Within one month, the BIML shall send details of the proposal and the ToR to all CIML Members, asking whether they approve the project, and whether they approve the allocation of the project to the TC or SC concerned. The BIML shall also inform CIML Members whether or not the secretariat of the TC or SC wishes to take on the convenership of the new Project Group and if not, the BIML shall ask for volunteers for that position. Three months shall be given for CIML Members to provide comments on this enquiry. All comments shall then be made openly available for all CIML Members to see. A one month period shall then be given for providing votes on the proposal.</p>	To be discussed, see above.
	US (2)	<p>Additional comment (20 May 2013): I now agree that there is enough difference of opinion on the details to keep this as a "step 2" proposal. In fact, besides the comments already provided on 5.4.3, including that this should also be extended to other voting and commenting activities of the CIML (i.e., in 5.2.3, 6.5.3, 6.7.3.3, etc.), I would like to add another idea for future consideration, which is to extend the UK approach (concurrent commenting and voting, with comments being available to all as they are submitted online) to include the possibility for a CIML Member to change their vote and comments any time during the voting period (there is currently nothing in the Directives about being able to change a vote, but the BIML practice has been not to allow this). This would allow for the flexibility of a more informative and dynamic voting process and, as we have been told, the BIML has already sometimes allowed for votes to be changed anyway. - We will provide additional comments ... at a later time (well before the next Presidential Council meeting), but these will be on "step 2" activities, which are not as urgent.</p>	Confirmation of « step 2 »
	PL	<p>We suggest a minor modification of text proposed by the US. In our opinion it would be rational and practical to define certain periods of time for providing comments on this enquiry (2 months), making available comments (one month) and providing votes (one month).</p> <p>We also agree with the proposal of making comments available and to modify Directives in p. 5.2.3 Procedure for establishing a TC and SC and p. 6.5.3 CIML Preliminary Ballot.</p> <p>Approval of the CD by the Project Group and CIML are important steps in the procedure of drafting the OIML publications. On one hand they need transparent exchange of information, sometimes discussion and through consideration of comments. On the other hand the PG convenor has to have a set of options as for how to react to the received comments. The US seem to give good indications how to do that in more appropriate way than it has been done so far.</p>	To be discussed, see above.
		11 / 28	

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal	Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
	JP	<p>Among the three proposals i), ii) and iii) by USA, we support i) and iii), and particularly prefer the scheme i).</p> <p>Regarding the proposal i), in which three months period would be allowed to collect comments by all CIML members then wait additional one month for voting, we believe that this scheme will encourage more CIML members to vote on the project proposal. In the present scheme, sufficient information about the project is not always provided before the voting and therefore some members may decline to vote.</p> <p>The proposal iii), in which the comments from the respective TC/SC are collected and shared before the voting by all CIML members, will be also effective because the TC/SC members usually have much concern / knowledge about the project rather than other CIML members.</p> <p>Regarding the method to share the comments by other members, we request that a summary of comments would be sent by email directly to all CIML members. It is possible to share the comments using a member's website. In this method however, some CIML member may not notice the comments uploaded on the website before the vote.</p>	To be discussed, see above.
	FR	OK to have 2 months for the comment exchange and one month more to decide	To be discussed, see above.
	UK	<p>The UK would prefer the existing text rather than the US proposal which adds one month to the process and includes a second step. We are supportive of openness so could BIML introduce a system where the comments are immediately available on the web site in the same way that the votes are? This would allow Members to see comments, have a full three months to consult, and keep the process simple.</p>	To be discussed, see above.

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal	Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
	NL	<p>To make received comments immediately available at the central level is supported</p> <p>(The actual available electronic means - hardware and software- at the BIML are expected to be capable for supplying such services.)</p> <p>The suggested additional step and/or introducing the one month delay is not supported.</p> <p>Please don't make the procedures too complex keeping in mind that:</p> <p>“Simplicity is a prerequisite for reliability”</p> <p>Moreover it may be expected that the CIML members will make use of their internal (national) network to gather sufficient information for commenting and voting on the proposal. A second reason would be that in practice a project proposal (including ToR ?) often will origin from the applicable TC or SC.</p> <p>Where it concerns extensive projects one could decide to introduce an inception phase in the starting phase of the project, just after its approval. This phase could be used to fine tune details on basis of the ToR and to provide CIML with report including an estimation of the global time schedule.</p> <p>I ask myself whether it would not it be a rather unlikely case where CIML would approve a new project and the TC, SC or PG would not support.</p> <p>= Subject for discussion</p>	Confirmation of « step 2 »
5.6.1, 5.8.4 and 5.13.1	JP	In 5.6.1 a) and 5.13.1 c), change " <i>3 months</i> " to " <i>three months</i> ". In 5.8.4, change " <i>12 months</i> " to " <i>twelve months</i> ".	Agreed as proposed, considered as “step 1” issue (editorial).
	NL	Support JP	Confirmation of « step 1 »

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal	Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
5.16 Disbanding Project Groups	BIML	<p>In 5.16, it does not give specific criteria for acceptance. It could be the same as for approving a project.</p> <p><u>Proposed revised text :</u></p> <p>Project Groups normally exist ... to the CIML. If the proposal is accepted, the BIML shall inform the Project Group's convener, ...</p>	<p>Agreed and considered as a “step 1” issue”. It is suggested to refer to the criteria mentioned under 5.4.4 as follows:</p> <p><u>Proposed revised text:</u></p> <p>“... to the CIML. If a majority of CIML Members votes in favour of the proposal, the BIML...”</p>
	NL	Support BIML	Confirmation of « step 1 »
6 Development of a publication			

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal	Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
<p>6.4.2.1 CD approved by the project group</p> <p><u>Current text:</u> The convener of the Project Group shall improve the CD by taking account of the comments (as long as these are only editorial) and forward it to the BIML for registration as a Draft publication and for CIML preliminary ballot. In order to speed up the work of the BIML, it is strongly recommended that the Project Group sets up an editing committee selected from amongst the Project Group's members to prepare this final version. This editing committee should include fluent English speakers.</p>	US	<p>It has been our experience that, in the past, there has been a lot of flexibility given to TC/SC Secretariats (and now PG Conveners) concerning what improvements can be made to a CD (based on comments received from TC/SC/PG members during the last round of voting, or at a meeting) before the CD is submitted to the BIML as a Draft publication. Sometimes the improvements go beyond being strictly editorial, but are nonetheless considered necessary to include, based on the comments received. If the improvements are too substantial, the Secretariat/Convener may decide that another round of voting and commenting at the TC/SC/PG stage is warranted, even if the vote passed the prior stage. While it is solely up to the Secretariat/Convener to decide what to propose for inclusion in the improved CD (Draft publication), it is necessary that the improved CD, along with the comments that were received on the last CD and the Secretariat's/Convener's responses to the comments, be circulated to the TC/SC/PG members so that any remaining issues can be identified and handled prior to the Draft publication being posted for CIML Members' comment and vote.</p> <p>We therefore propose deleting "as long as these are only editorial," and instead recommend that substantial amendments to the text are to be minimized, since otherwise a significant amount of time can unnecessarily be lost in moving a CD forward to the Draft publication (preliminary ballot) stage.</p>	<p>There is no unanimous support for that proposal by the ad-hoc group which is therefore considered as a "step 2" issue requiring further discussion or more experience with the application of the current version of B 6.</p> <p>To be discussed, see above.</p>

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal	Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
6.4.2.1 (cont.)	US	<p><u>Proposed revised text:</u></p> <p>The convener of the Project Group shall improve the CD by taking account of the comments (as long as these are only editorial). It is recommended that substantial amendments to the text be minimized between the CD and Draft publication stages of development.</p> <p>The convener of the Project Group shall then distribute to all its members the comments, the responses to the comments, and the Draft publication, and shall also forward it the Draft publication to the BIML for registration as a Draft publication and for CIML preliminary ballot.</p> <p>If the PG convener decides that substantial (non-editorial) amendments to the text are needed to adequately address all the comments received (and to more fully improve the CD), the convener, in consultation with the PG, may choose to prepare a further CD instead of a Draft publication.</p> <p>In order to speed up the work of the BIML, it is strongly recommended that the Project Group sets up an editing committee selected from amongst the Project Group's members to prepare the Draft publication. this final version. This editing committee should include fluent English speakers.</p>	To be discussed, see above.

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal	Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
6.4.2.1 (cont.)	PL	We support the amendments proposed by the US	Noted.
	JP	We agree this proposal by USA. Where, we recommend that the terms <u>'Draft Publication'</u> and <u>'Final Draft Publication'</u> would be defined more clearly in the ' <i>List of terms and abbreviations used in this publication</i> ' on page 5. We understand that 'Draft Publications' generally include DD, DR, DV, DB and DG, and similarly to the 'Final Draft Publications'.	To be discussed, see above.
	FR	I am afraid the proposed version by US will lead to late modifications on issues already discussed and not accepted and I am not in favor of changing the text. In any case if such a proposal is accepted all changes even considered editorial shall be apparent and justified in the version circulated (in addition to some technical problems I have at least 2 experiences of fluent English speakers who wanted editorial changes which had an influence on the meaning of the requirement).	To be discussed, see above.
	UK	We prefer the original text. If the PG members have voted to accept the CD then technical changes or 'minimized ... substantial changes' will invalidate the voting result.	To be discussed, see above.

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal	Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
	NL	<p>The issue introduced by the US is in general supported. We do have the same experiences where conveners in a late stage introduce improvements being beyond editorial. However there appears to be a great risk that some participants may not at all consider certain specific amendments to be an improvement or may even consider these to be a deterioration of the draft. Moreover since a draft in the DR stage is not made publicly available on the website (although CD's are) it may happen that the awareness on the late introduction of a disputable clause is quite low and such may be discovered only in a quite late stage.</p> <p>The first suggested amendment of the US is not considered a solution for this while it introduces in one sentence 3 “degrees of freedom” being the terms “recommended” “substantial” and “minimized” and therefore will in our view only lead to lots of discussions This additional to any discussion whatsoever on what exactly is considered to be editorial and what not. Therefore this solution is not supported.</p> <p>Alternatively instead of the suggested text: <i>“It is recommended that substantial amendments to the text be minimized between the CD and Draft publication stages of development.”</i> we suggest to apply some wording like: <i>“While not introducing controversial (non editorial) amendments”</i></p> <p>We may agree on the amendments in the next paragraph as it is our experience that after forwarding a draft publication to BIML the process of registration and actual publication on the website for preliminary voting may take some time. This unless this parallel procedure will lead to any delay.</p> <p>Concerning the third paragraph it is our perception that the convener of a PG has the responsibility for coordinating and communicating the work in a committee and does actually not <u>decide</u> on contents of draft while this is the responsibility of the representatives being p-members of a PG. (The majority decides) The person responsible for keeping the secretariat (being the convener) is obliged to implement the decisions of the PG so “in consultation with the PG” probably is a bit too weak formulated. So in principle we can support this approach.</p>	Confirmation of « step 2 »

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal	Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
6.5.4 (cont.)	JP	We agree this proposal by USA. New statement of the item a) editorially makes the US proposal clearer to mean “ <i>abstentions and failures to reply do not count as votes cast</i> ”. However, we have another fundamental concern about ‘abstention’ (see 2.9).	Agreed, see above.
	FR	Seems OK.	Noted.
	UK	We fully support the US clarification.	Noted.
	NL	Supported	Noted.

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal	Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
<p>6.5.8 CIML preliminary ballot</p> <p><u>Current text:</u> The comments received may indicate a significant difference in CIML members' points of view, but the convener may consider that all possible steps have been taken to reconcile these differences, and that no greater consensus is likely to be achieved. In this case, the convener shall, after consulting the TC or SC secretariat (if appropriate), explain the situation and the reasons for it to the BIML. The BIML shall consult with the President, supported by the Presidential Council according to OIML B 16, who will try to resolve the situation, and if necessary, make a proposal to the CIML.</p>	US	<p>We feel that 6.5.8 should be augmented to make the distinction between whether the “proposals or objections requiring substantial amendment of the text” have been discussed previously by the TC/SC/PG, or whether new issues have been identified. If the “proposals or objections requiring substantial amendment of the text” have been discussed previously by the TC/SC/PG, the resolution process in 6.5.8 might be adequate. If new issues have been identified, language might be included in 6.5.8 to indicate that the Secretariat/Convener can decide whether the submitter of the objection can be said to have entered the discussion too late for that round of voting, but the document can then be put into immediate revision so as to quickly consider the new issues that have been identified.</p> <p><u>Proposed revised text:</u> Proposals or objections received on a CIML preliminary ballot that would require substantial amendments to the text of the Draft publication should generally be decided by the convener to fall into one of the four following categories:</p> <p>a) The proposal or objection is new and is critical to immediately resolve before the Draft publication can move forward. In this case, the procedure outlined in 6.5.7 should be followed.</p> <p>b) A similar proposal or objection has already been made on an earlier Committee Draft, and the Project Group has already discussed and made a decision on the proposal or objection. In this case, the convener may decide that all possible steps have already been taken to address the proposal or objection.</p> <p>c) The proposal or objection is new and important, but is not critical to immediately resolve before the Draft publication can move forward. In this case, the convener may recommend that the document be allowed to move forward without addressing the proposal or objection, but then be considered for immediate revision after publication.</p> <p>...</p>	<p>There is no unanimous support for that proposal by the ad-hoc group which is therefore considered as a “step 2” issue requiring further discussion or more experience with the application of the current version of B 6.</p>

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal	Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
6.5.8 (cont.)	US	<p>d) The proposal or objection is either not important or not persuasive.</p> <p>In this case of b), c), and d) (above), the convener shall consult with the TC or SC secretariat (if appropriate), explain the situation and the reasons for it to the BIML, and recommend a resolution. The BIML shall consult with the President, supported by the Presidential Council according to OIML B 16, who will try to resolve the situation, and if necessary, make a proposal to the CIML.</p>	To be discussed, see above.
	PL	If the suggestions regarding CIML Preliminary Ballot (p. 6.5.8) are considered as needed to improve current version of B6, we may support them too.	Noted.
	JP	<p>We agree the proposal by USA that clarifies the procedure after a CIML preliminary ballot when it is accompanied with a comment requiring a substantial amendment. Where, we recommend adding the underlined sentence shown below in the new item b) in order to explain the situation more clearly.</p> <p><i>b) A similar proposal or objection has..... In this case, the convener may decide that all possible steps have already been taken to address the proposal or objection <u>and that no greater consensus is likely to be achieved.</u></i></p> <p>In addition, the meaning of the words “<i>and recommend a resolution</i>” added by USA in the last paragraph shown below seems not clear.</p> <p><i>In this case of b), c), and d) (above), the convener shall consult with the TC or SC secretariat (if appropriate), explain the situation and the reasons for it to the BIML, <u>and recommend a resolution.</u></i></p> <p>We understand the words mean “<i>the convener provide the (best) resolution and propose the resolution to BIML</i>”. If our understanding is correct, who is primarily <u>responsible in making the resolution</u>?</p>	To be discussed, see above.
		22 / 28	

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal	Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
	FR	OK with Japan.	Noted.
	UK	We actually prefer the simplicity of the existing text. The existing text will allow for any scenario not just those listed as ‘a’ to ‘d’ in the proposal.	Noted.
	NL	<p>First of all in our perception a secretariat is not a person and a convener is. Formally speaking the secretariat merely has the responsibility for coordinating and communicating the work in a committee and does actually not decide on contents of draft while this is the responsibility of the representatives being p-members of a PG. The person responsible for keeping the secretariat (being the convener) is obliged to implement the decisions of the PG.</p> <p>Therefore it would be quite a deviating policy if the convener would <u>decide</u> on 1 of 4 different processes on basis of substantial (probably technical) comments received. In such a case one would expect the convener to only make a suggestion to the PG of the track to be followed.</p>	Noted.

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal	Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
<p>6.11 Review</p> <p><u>Current text:</u></p> <p>6.11.1 All OIML publications are subject to periodic review. Five years after publication, the BIML shall organise an enquiry amongst members of the appropriate TC or SC, with a three month voting deadline, to decide if a publication should be</p> <p>a) re-confirmed in its existing form,</p> <p>b) revised, or</p> <p>c) withdrawn.</p> <p>6.11.2 The BIML shall report on the outcome of the review to the CIML, which shall make a decision, based on the result of this vote, whether the publication should be</p> <p>a) reconfirmed, ..., or</p> <p>b) revised, ..., or</p> <p>c) withdrawn, ...</p>	US	<p>There does not seem to be any indication of what the voting rules to be used are in this case, either at the TC/SC level (reference 5.12.2.2?), or at the CIML level (reference 6.7.2 or 6.7.3?). The TC/SC voting information should be provided in 6.11.1, and the CIML voting information should be provided in 6.11.2.</p> <p>Also, at present, when a document has been reconfirmed there is no indication of the date of that reconfirmation, either on the cover page of the document or on the OIML web site. The Directives should reflect that the date of the reconfirmation is to be included in both places.</p> <p><u>Proposed revised text:</u></p> <p>6.11.1 All OIML publications are subject to periodic review. Five years after publication, the BIML shall organise an enquiry amongst members of the appropriate TC or SC, with a three month voting deadline (using the voting rule given in 5.12.2.2), to decide if a publication should be</p> <p>a) re-confirmed in its existing form,</p> <p>b) revised, or</p> <p>c) withdrawn.</p> <p>... (continued, see below)</p>	<p>Agreed in principle, voting rule written in full and considered as a “step 1” issue”.</p>

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal	Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
6.11 (cont.)	US	<p><u>Proposed revised text (continued):</u></p> <p>6.11.2 The BIML shall report on the outcome of the review to the CIML, which shall make a decision, based on the result of this vote, whether the publication should be reconfirmed, in which case the BIML shall amend the publication and references to it on the OIML web site to indicate this, and notify all CIML Members, or revised, in which case the BIML shall develop a project proposal (according to 6.2) with the appropriate TC or SC secretariat for CIML approval, or withdrawn, in which case the procedure in 5.15.2 shall be applied.</p> <p>The BIML shall report on the outcome of the review to the CIML, which shall make a decision (using the voting rule given in 6.7.2 or 6.7.3), based on the result of this the TC/SC vote, whether the publication should be</p> <p>a) reconfirmed, in which case the BIML shall amend the cover page of the publication and references to it on the OIML web site to indicate this both the original date of publication along with the latest date of the reconfirmation, and notify all CIML Members, or</p> <p>b) revised, in which case the BIML shall develop a project proposal (according to 6.2) with the appropriate TC or SC secretariat for CIML approval, or</p> <p>c) withdrawn, in which case the procedure in 5.15.2 shall be applied.</p>	<p>Agreed as prosed and considered as a “step 1” issue”.</p>
	PL	<p>If the suggestions regarding Review (p. 6.11) is considered as needed to improve current version of B6, we may support them too.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal	Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
	JP	We support this proposal by USA. Putting a record on the document is important when it is reviewed periodically. It is just like a seal attached on a measuring instrument after a periodical verification.	Noted.
	FR	OK with Japan.	Noted.
	UK	We fully support the US clarification	Noted.
	NL	Support the US suggested amendments	Noted.
7 Reporting on progress			
8 Appeals			
Annex A	PL	Please note that if the above proposal (<i>refer to 6.5.4</i>) is accepted, it will be necessary to change the Annex A.5, which also includes the rules about required majorities.	Agreed, see under 6.5.4. Also Annex B to be checked.
	NL	Supported	Noted.

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal	Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012								
Annex B	JP (1)	Table: When calculating a fraction (50 %, 2/3, 3/4 or 80 %) of positive votes, definition of the denominator is ambiguous in the three items correspond to the clauses 5.12.1, 5.4.4/5.5.1 and 5.2.3. In these items, what “P/CIML Members” practically indicates? Does it mean a <u>total number of the registered members</u> , or <u>members attended</u> the meeting, or <u>members cast a vote</u> ?	Agreed. It is suggested to a) bring the table (first three rows) in line with the wording of 5.12.1 and 5.12.2 as follows (= editorial, i.e. « step 1 ») : <table><tr><th>Rule</th><th>Reference in B 6-1</th></tr><tr><td>≥ 50 % of total number of TC's/SC's/PG's P-members</td><td>5.12.1.1</td></tr><tr><td>≥ 2/3 of votes cast by TC's/SC's/PG's P-members (abstentions and failures to reply do not count as votes cast)</td><td>5.12.2.2</td></tr><tr><td>≥ 2/3 of total number of TC's/SC's/PG's P-members</td><td>5.12.1.2</td></tr></table>	Rule	Reference in B 6-1	≥ 50 % of total number of TC's/SC's/PG's P-members	5.12.1.1	≥ 2/3 of votes cast by TC's/SC's/PG's P-members (abstentions and failures to reply do not count as votes cast)	5.12.2.2	≥ 2/3 of total number of TC's/SC's/PG's P-members	5.12.1.2
	Rule	Reference in B 6-1									
≥ 50 % of total number of TC's/SC's/PG's P-members	5.12.1.1										
≥ 2/3 of votes cast by TC's/SC's/PG's P-members (abstentions and failures to reply do not count as votes cast)	5.12.2.2										
≥ 2/3 of total number of TC's/SC's/PG's P-members	5.12.1.2										
JP (2)	Additional comment and clarification (31 May 2013) : Regarding the table of Annex B, there were unclear expressions in our comments on the fraction of positive votes. In this table, there are several rows which simply say that ">= 50 % of P-members" or ">= 50 % of CIML Members have voted in favor". Regarding these items, we concern the number of denominator used to calculate the fraction (50% etc.). From the present expression, we cannot find out whether the denominator corresponds to the total number of P (or CIML) members "who are registered in the OIML database" or "who cast a vote" or "who are present at the meeting".	b) clarify sections 5.2.3, 5.4.4 (5.5.1) and 5.16 as to what we mean by « ≥ 50 % of CIML Members”, and to amend 5.2.3, 5.4.4, 5.16, and the table, accordingly. It is therefore suggested to consider this as “step 2” issue.									
	NL	Annex B (5.2.3) may need an additional row, while the clause does not only concern voting at the CIML meeting	This should be discussed under b) (see above), i.e. « step 2 issue ».								

B 6-1:2012	Country	Comment and/or proposal	Responses and proposals for amendment of B6-1:2012
General remarks	JP	<p>This is a simple note that we may need a further consideration about another implicit meaning of vote ‘abstention’. Some states may vote ‘abstention’ due to a political reason after a deep consideration. Some of them may imply that “<u>it is premature to submit a vote</u> and need more time for discussion (or they may respond at the next round of inquiry)”.</p> <p>We understand that abstention is not counted as a vote cast and it is considered as a ‘failure to vote’ as stipulated in the articles VIII and XV of the Convention. ISO/IEC has a similar rule that excludes abstention from the vote cast (see 3 Reference).</p> <p>Nevertheless, we consider that a state who takes a practical action by submitting a simple message ‘abstention’ <u>should be evaluated and considered</u> in comparison with those who have never responded. Taking a note to the definition in the Convention, we propose that the practical meaning of ‘abstention’ would be reconsidered. It seems not the same with a failure to vote.</p>	This is considered as a “step 2” issue to be discussed.
	FR	Agree (with the proposal from Japan above).	Noted.