

# EURAMET Project 'Report'



Document: G-OPS-TMP-025 Version: 2.0  
Approved: Head of Secretariat 2012-02-01

1	<b>Report</b> <input type="checkbox"/> progress report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> final report	2	<b>Reference No:</b> 1286
3	<b>Subject Field</b> Q - Quality		
4	<b>Type of collaboration</b>		
4A	<b>In the case of a comparison</b> Registered as Key comparison (KC) or Supplementary Comparison (SC) in the KCDB: <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> yes If yes: No. of KC/SC:		
5	<b>Coordinator</b> Institute/Country: Radiation and Nuclear Safety Authority-STUK/ Finland Name: Antti Kosunen Phone: +358 40 5122 022 E-mail: antti.kosunen@stuk.fi		
6	<b>Participating Partners</b>		
6A	EURAMET members or associates (Institute's standard acronym with country code in brackets) as registered on EURAMET website. STUK (FI), SSM (Swedish Radiation Safety Authority, SE)		
6B	Institutes not being EURAMET members or associates (Institute's full name and country in brackets)		
6C	Change of projects partners: (Please indicate here changes of project partners compared to the previous report) New project partners Removed project partners		
7	<b>Title of project</b> Peer review of STUK		
8	<b>Progress/Final</b> STUK is a Designated Institute and maintains national metrological standards of ionizing radiation in Finland. Currently Radiation Metrology Laboratory (Dosimetry Laboratory) of STUK has 30 CMCs under CIPM MRA. The peer review was based on review of documents, interview of staff, laboratory visits and demonstrations of calibrations. The peer review visit was performed in 12 <sup>th</sup> and 13 <sup>th</sup> of November, 2013 and the report was completed in 28 <sup>th</sup> of January, 2014. The peer review covered the technical requirements of ISO/IEC 17025, the report CIPM 2007-25 paragraph 4.2 and the ionization radiation services included in the CMC tables. The peer review experts were Jan-Erik Grindborg (peer leader) and Linda Persson from SSM.  The peer review was found very useful for developing calibration activities and procedures of the Laboratory. The peer reviewers found the quality system and its implementation adequate with requirements of CIPM MRA.		

9	<b>In the case of a KC/SC comparison &amp; final report</b> Final report sent to the appropriate CC WG <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> yes Report endorsed by the CC WG <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> yes	
10	<b>Expected completion date</b> Completed in 28 January 2014	11 <b>Date</b> 2014-01-31

*Notes for completion of the form overleaf*

## NOTES FOR THE COMPLETION OF THE FORM (numbers refer to boxes overleaf)

Forms are to be sent to the EURAMET Secretariat ([secretariat@euramet.org](mailto:secretariat@euramet.org)) as word or pdf file

- by the TC Chair or
- by the proposer/coordinator of the project with copy to the TC Chair.

If the proposer/coordinator is not EURAMET TC contact person the national contact person(s) of the relevant TC(s) have to be involved in the registration process.

- 2 **Ref No:** The project reference number which has been assigned by the EURAMET Secretariat and on which progress is reported; you can find it on the EURAMET website.
- 3 **Subject Field:** The field specified in the EURAMET Project Form.
- 4 **Type of collaboration:** The field specified in the EURAMET Project Form.
- 4A **In the case of a comparison:**
  - In the case of a KC or a SC to be registered in the KCDB, the coordinator should be aware that the protocol should be sent to the appropriate CC WG for approval (KC) or for feedback (SC).
  - In the case of a KC, the comparison can take place only if its protocol has been approved by the appropriate CC Working Group.
  - The KC must be compatible and linkable to the parent CC comparison.
- 5 **Coordinator:** The Coordinator is the person who is appointed as the contact point for the project detailed overleaf.
- 6A/6B **EURAMET members or associates / Institutes not being EURAMET members or associates:**  
Please indicate here the current list of all collaboration partners. Newly assigned or removed partners should additionally be listed under 5C
- 6C **Change of projects partners:** Please indicate here the project partners which have changed since the project has been proposed or agreed or since the last reporting.
- 7 **Title:** The title given in the EURAMET Project Form.
- 8 **Progress:** A brief description of the progress should be entered in the space provided. Comments on the advantages of undertaking the work collaboratively through EURAMET would be useful. Completion of this Report is not deemed as publication of the work. Collaborators are encouraged to publish their work through normal channels, mentioning it was undertaken as EURAMET collaboration.
- 9 **Expected completion date:** If the progress of a project is being reported on this form then an estimate of the completion date should be made. If the project has now been completed then the actual date of completion should be given.
- 10 **Date** of transmission to EURAMET Secretariat.