

“Challenges for full integration of DIs within EURAMET”

Workshop: 18 to 19 February 2016, Lyngby, Denmark

CONCLUSIONS

Drafted by J. Drnovšek, M.Chambon, B.Jeckelmann, J.Petersen, W.Schmid
30 March 2016



BACKGROUND

The initiative to hold a workshop dedicated to Designated Institutes (DI) dates back to December 2013, when the EURAMET chairperson, at that time Kamal Hossain, addressed the NMI and DI directors to comment the document “**Role of Designated institutes within the CIPM MRA**”. The document was published as EURAMET Guide No.2 in January 2015.

The workshop, entitled “Challenges for full Integration of Designated Institutes within EURAMET” was realised on 18 and 19 February 2016, hosted by the Danish National Metrology Institute DFM in Kongens Lyngby (Denmark). The main objectives of the workshop were to enhance the full integration of DIs into the EURAMET community and its activities, and to stimulate their role to actively participate and contribute to metrology developments at the national level.

The event was organised primarily for DIs, but also addressed representatives from National Metrology Institutes (NMIs), national designating and financing authorities and EURAMET Technical Committee chairs. There were 55 participants from all over Europe representing DIs, NMIs and designating/financing authorities (see attached list in the annex).

All the presentations at the workshop are available on the EURAMET website
<http://www.euramet.org/event-diworkshop2016>.

The programme of the workshop addressed the following topics, arranged in four sessions:

- Organisation of EURAMET, opportunities and benefits for participation in EURAMET committees and R&D programmes (EMPIR)
- CIPM MRA, CMC processes, QMS, accreditation
- Success stories of EURAMET members
- Round table discussion and conclusions

There were two main “boundary conditions” of the workshop. Although closely associated with the discussions and presentations of the DIs, these are beyond EURAMET responsibility and are either a responsibility at the national level or a responsibility of other organisations:

- The landscape of NMIs and DIs varies a lot and there are different models and solutions from country to country. EURAMET can provide guidance, advice on good practices but cannot interfere with national decisions.
- There are numerous relations between NMIs and DIs on one side and NABs, NASBs, BIPM, etc. on the other side.

Nevertheless, it is of prime EURAMET interest, that all EURAMET members, NMIs and DIs perform as effectively and efficiently as possible, in order to assure their progress and full compliance with relevant requirements. This is a prerequisite for the development towards an integrated European metrology landscape.

CONCLUSIONS

During the presentations and related discussions, the following key topics were identified and related comments and actions were formulated:

- **Conclusions regarding quality systems**

Each EURAMET member has implemented a quality system in line with the ISO EN 17025 standard, they are either accredited or self-declared/peer reviewed. Nevertheless, they all have to demonstrate their quality systems for the TC-Q, which is considered by some of those who are accredited as unnecessary duplication of work.

It is suggested that efforts should be made, to align the CIPM MRA quality management requirements with accreditation assessment and to improve communication and mutual understanding with respect to quality management between NABs and EURAMET TC-Q. EURAMET is taking immediate steps in this direction by closer cooperation with EA, in particular with EA LC (laboratory committee).

Furthermore, a more effective communication between the TC-Q contact persons (in most cases coming from the NMIs) and the DIs is desirable and needed in some cases, in order to improve the DIs understanding of TC-Q requirements within the process of QMS approval.

- **EMRP/EMPIR including financing**

Several DIs reported on difficulties to follow the yearly EMPIR calls, due to limited human resources. The system is more suitable for larger laboratories and NMIs.

There were also comments on unused resources for Researcher Mobility Grants and other EMPIR instruments due to specifics/non-compliances of national legislations with the requirements of EMPIR.

Considerable differences in fulfilling national commitments were identified. Presenters were advised to resolve problems at the national level, while MSU will continue with its supportive role.

- **Sustainability of DI activities**

It was emphasised that establishment and maintenance of national measurement standards and other metrology activities within a DI is typically based on national needs and governmental decisions. Therefore, it is very important and should be consequently funded (co-funded) by the governments, thus creating financial stability and sustainability for DIs as is the case for NMIs. Governments should have a clear view in which fields institutes are designated based on a national concept and strategy for metrology. Scope of the designation should not be too narrow.

Also listing the metrology activities in the strategic objectives of the institute is considered as relevant, in particular if the DI is part of a bigger organisation. Otherwise, DIs can hardly ensure the continuity of their work in metrology activities and delivering services at the quality level, required for national measurement standards, as expected.

- **External organisations**

DIs raised the issue regarding relations with EA, regarding accreditation, as well as with ILAC and BIPM, and with their associated bodies (i.e. Consultative Committees, JCRB, etc.). Within its possibilities of influence, EURAMET will undertake all necessary and possible measures to resolve open issues such as appropriate expertise of assessors/ technical experts, detailed uncertainty budgets associated with CMCs, relations with “low uncertainty” commercial laboratories, service categories for CMCs, etc.

- **EURAMET - NMI/DI communications and cooperation**

Fully recognising the principle of one vote per country and voting rights within the NMIs, DIs are expecting full and transparent information assured by direct communication between EURAMET and DIs, and not only through delegates/NMIs. Referring to the EURAMET Guide No.2., where it says “DIs acting at the same metrological level and under the same strict requirements as NMIs”, DIs expressed the expectation to have an open access to all professional activities of EURAMET, including participation in GA, TCs, WGs, and TGs, if feasible.

It became obvious that DIs are not always fully aware on their possibilities for participation in EURAMET. EURAMET should make a greater effort to communicate these possibilities more effectively via different channels (Secretariat to DIs, Secretariat to TC-Chairs, TC-Chairs to DIs, etc.) and to encourage active participation of DIs.

EURAMET should add to its database permanent observers in TCs or Sub-Committees (WGs); frequently those persons are coming from DIs. This will contribute to improved information and active involvement.

In particular, it was concluded that DIs should receive a direct invitation to participate in the EURAMET GA (open sessions), rather than an indirect invitation via their Delegate.

There were comments from DIs regarding their status, communications and lacking of influence to national metrology policy, and again, they were advised to resolve their problems nationally.

As a **concluding remark**, all the participants emphasised the need and importance of constant improvement of the direct collaboration between DIs and EURAMET. The participants appreciated the first EURAMET workshop for DIs and asked EURAMET to organise further DI workshops and events on a regular/continuous basis with focused topics. Such events could be organised independently or when desired and convenient associated with the yearly GA.

EURAMET is fully aware of the importance of supporting and enabling best possible operations of almost 2/3 of its membership and will therefore develop an action plan including the next steps needed to further extend the direct collaboration with DIs assuring full integration of DIs in the activities of EURAMET.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Name	Institute	Country
Robert Edelmaier	BEV	Austria
Dietmar Pachinger	BEV/E+E	Austria
Zijad Džemic	IMBiH	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Haris Memić	IMBiH	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Silvie Hoffmanova	CMI	Czech Republic
Torben Rask Licht	BKSV-DPLA	Denmark
Torsten Lippert	TRESCAL	Denmark
Jan Nielsen	DTI	Denmark
Jan Hald	DFM	Denmark
Mogens Simonsen	FORCE	Denmark
Karen Rud Michaelsen	Danish Safety Technology Authority	Denmark
Jan C. Petersen	DFM	Denmark
Erik Lorentzen	DANAK	Denmark
Erkki Ikonen	VTT and Aalto	Finland
Maguelonne Chambon	LNE	France
Jean Marc Bordy	LNE-LNHB	France
Florestan Ogheard	LNE-CETIAT	France
Jean-Pierre Vallet	LNE-LADG	France
Harald Bosse	PTB	Germany
Timo Kapp	BVL	Germany
Tobias Schäffter	PTB	Germany
Jarle Gran	JV	Norway
Hans Bjerke	NRPA	Norway
Aleksandra Kowal	INTiBS	Poland
Ryszard Broda	POLATOM	Poland
Isabel Spohr	IPQ	Portugal
Nenad Milosevic	VINS	Serbia
Janko Drnovšek	MIRS/UL-FE/LMK	Slovenia
Erika Bester	MIRS/UP-ZRS/LPOO	Slovenia
Bojan Butinar	MIRS/UP-ZRS/LPOO	Slovenia
Milena Horvat	MIRS/IJS/F-2,O-2	Slovenia
José Á. Robles	CEM	Spain
Robert Benyon	INTA	Spain
Miguel Embid Segura	CIEMAT	Spain
Linda Persson	SSM	Sweden
Hanspeter Andres	METAS	Switzerland
Silvio Koller	PMOD/WRC	Switzerland
Ricco Soder	PMOD/WRC	Switzerland
Sascha Wettstein	MBW	Switzerland
Beat Jeckelmann	METAS	Switzerland
Enver Sadikoglu	UME	Turkey
Ahmet Omer Altan	UME	Turkey
Michael Sargent	LGC	United Kingdom
Emmelyn Graham	NEL	United Kingdom
Robert Gunn	NPL	United Kingdom
Kamal Hossain	NPL	United Kingdom
Paul Matejschuk	NIBSC	United Kingdom
Wolfgang Schmid	EURAMET	
Duncan Jarvis	EURAMET	
Anne Trumpfheller	EURAMET	
Jörg Zymnossek	EURAMET	
Jutta Bender	EURAMET	
Tanasko Tasic	EURAMET	



Challenges for full integration of Designated Institutes within EURAMET

Kongens Lyngby, Denmark

Thursday 18th and Friday 19th February 2016

PROGRAMME

Thursday 18th February 2016 (14h00 - 17h30)

Opening

EURAMET Chairperson Beat Jeckelmann (METAS, Switzerland) & Host Jan Petersen (DFM, Denmark)

Session 1

Organisation of EURAMET, opportunities and benefits for participation in EURAMET committees and R&D programmes (EMPIR)

- EURAMET structure of NMIs and DIs: legal and practical aspects
Wolfgang Schmid, EURAMET
- Mission of NMIs/DIs, relation to Metre Convention
Janko Drnovsek, EURAMET Vice-Chairperson (GA), MIRS/UL, Slovenia
- EURAMET cooperation with NMIs and DIs. Responsibility for representing the national metrology system to EURAMET, participation in EURAMET life and work
José Robles, CEM, Spain
- Practical relevance for the DIs, like participation in EMPIR
Duncan Jarvis, EURAMET

Discussion

Coffee 15h30 – 16h00

Session 2

CIPM MRA, CMC processes, QMS, accreditation

- CIPM MRA: general introduction and implementation (CMC, QMS, ILC)
Beat Jeckelmann, METAS, Switzerland
- Difference between CIPM MRA and accreditation
Silvie Hoffmannova, EURAMET TC-Quality Secretary
- TC-Q QMS reviewing
Enver Sadikoglu, EURAMET TC-Quality Chair
- CIPM, EURAMET and national responsibilities and authorities
Maguelonne Chambon, LNE, France

Discussion



Friday 19th February 2016 (9h00 – 12h30)

Session 3

Success stories of EURAMET members

- Successful coordination at the national level (two or three DI's view; benefit of their activities at national and international level for R&D, services, participation in TCs, CIPM MRA matters, trainings, relations with their NMIs and designating authorities, etc...), exchange with the attendees.
 - Danish system
Jan Nielsen, ARHUS – Daniamet, Denmark & Jan Hald, DFM, Denmark
 - French System
Jean-Marc Bordy, LNE-LNHB / CEA, France
- Optimizing the Spanish National Metrology infrastructure by enhancing the strengths and mitigating the weaknesses of a distributed national measurement system on behalf of the *Comisión de Laboratorios Asociados of the Consejo Superior de Metrología* of Spain
Robert Benyon, INTA, Spain
- Presentation of some case studies/success stories to demonstrate various possible solutions
Mike Sargent, LGC, UK & Milena Horvat, MIRS/IJS, Slovenia
- Success of EMRP ENG58 MultiFlowMet
Emmelyn Graham, NEL, UK

Discussion

Coffee 10h15 – 10h45

Session 4

Round table. Facilitators: Jan Petersen, DFM, Denmark & Janko Drnovsek, MIRS/UL, Slovenia

- How DIs and NMIs can contribute in making the cooperation in EURAMET sustainable on the long-term.
- Expectations / wishes

Session 5

Conclusions/recommendations

Round table to capture possible improvements and immediate actions that DIs and NMIs would like to see from EURAMET as an RMO, suggestions for optimization of operations.