

VSL  
Netherlands

INM  
Romania

PTB  
Germany

INRIM  
Italy

**Executive Report of EURAMET.EM-S26**  
**Supplementary Comparison**  
**Inductance measurements of 100 mH at 1 kHz**  
**EURAMET project 816**

Editor: Erik Dierikx

Date: December 12, 2011

VSL, Dutch Metrology Institute  
P.O. Box 654  
NL-2600 AR, Delft  
The Netherlands

## Table of contents

|     |                                    |    |
|-----|------------------------------------|----|
| 1.  | SMD, Belgium .....                 | 3  |
| 2.  | DANIamet-MI-Trescal, Denmark ..... | 4  |
| 3.  | PTB, Germany .....                 | 5  |
| 4.  | MKEH, Hungary .....                | 6  |
| 5.  | NSAI NML, Ireland .....            | 7  |
| 6.  | IAI SL, Israel .....               | 8  |
| 7.  | VSL, The Netherlands .....         | 9  |
| 8.  | GUM, Poland .....                  | 10 |
| 9.  | IPQ, Portugal.....                 | 11 |
| 10. | INM, Romania .....                 | 12 |
| 11. | SIQ, Slovenia .....                | 13 |
| 12. | NMISA, South Africa .....          | 14 |
| 13. | METAS, Switzerland.....            | 15 |
| 14. | UME, Turkey .....                  | 16 |
| 15. | UMTS, Ukraine.....                 | 17 |
| 16. | NPL, United Kingdom .....          | 18 |

## **1. SMD, Belgium**

We, SMD, confirm that our CMC claims are in agreement with the results of this comparison (EURAMET.EM-S26).

Jacques NICOLAS

FPS Economy, DG Quality and Safety, Metrology(SMD) - National Standards

17 November 2011

## **2. DANIAmet-MI-Trescal, Denmark**

We, DANIAmet-MI-Trescal (DANIAmet DPLE at the time of the measurements), have compared our results reported for this comparison (EURAMET.EM-S26) against our CMC capability entries and, with our comment given in the final draft B report in mind, found that they are consistent.

Torsten Lippert  
DANIAmet-MI-Trescal  
13 October 2011

### **3. PTB, Germany**

We, PTB, have compared our results reported for this comparison (EURAMET.EM-S26) against our CMC capability entries and found that they are consistent.

Axel Kölling  
PTB  
21 October 2011

## **4. MKEH, Hungary**

We, MKEH, checked our results against the CMC claims, and we have found that they do not support the claims in the database.

We attempted to clarify the reasons for the differences, but we were not able to reconstruct all the important circumstances because there was in the Office a lots of changes. In the meanwhile, the person who made the measurements has passed away, his fields were taken over by a new person, the laboratory for inductance measurements had to move in another building, and our institute bought new device for inductance measurements.

That is why we intend to make soon a bilateral comparison with one of the laboratories participated in EM-S26 comparison successful.

Miklós Telepy  
responsible for inductance measurments  
Hungarian Trade Licensing Office  
Budapest  
6 December 2011

## 5. NSAI NML, Ireland

Impact of EUROMET Supplementary Comparison EUROMET.EM-S26 on the calibration and measurement capabilities (CMCs) of NSAI NML

| Participant | CMC claims supported or not supported | Comments<br>(including measures to be taken to remove inconsistency, if applicable)  |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|--|
|             | 100 mH, 1kHz                          |  |
| NSAI NML    | supported                             | NSAI NML's published CMC value for inductance measurements at 100 mH and 1 kHz (Service Identifier: 125) is 0.02 mH. The results of comparison EUROMET.EM-S26 for measurements carried out on the mean date 2 Oct 2007 showed a difference of +0.0078 mH between the value reported by NSAI NML and the reference value. The expanded uncertainty, given with 95% coverage probability, associated with this difference was 0.023 mH. This result supports NSAI NML's CMC for this quantity. |

Oliver Power  
NSAI NML  
30 September 2011

## **6. IAI SL, Israel**

IAI SL, currently, has no published CMC entries in the field of inductance measurements.



## **7. VSL, The Netherlands**

We, VSL, have checked our results in this comparison, EURAMET.EM-S26, and found that the reported results are in agreement with the reference values.

The uncertainties reported by VSL in this comparison are significantly lower than our CMC entries. The measurements in this comparison were meant to demonstrate our improved uncertainties. With these results, the uncertainties in the CMC list for inductance calibrations can be reduced.

Erik Dierikx  
VSL  
5 October 2011

## **8. GUM, Poland**

The results of "EURAMET.EM-S26 Inductance comparison" have improved our best measurement capability of 100 mH. This was included in the tables of CMC 2010 and accepted in 2011.

Robert Rzepakowski

GUM

26 October 2011

## **9. IPQ, Portugal**

IPQ, currently, has no published CMC entries in the field of inductance measurements.

## **10. INM, Romania**

We, INM, state that the results from this comparison support our current CMC of 200 ppm. However, the disagreement with respect to the reference value is quite large. We have to thoroughly check the substitution method implemented for a systematic source which produces the disagreement.

Anca Nestor  
INM  
12 December 2011

## **11. SIQ, Slovenia**

We, MIRS/SIQ/Metrology, have compared our results reported for this comparison (EURAMET.EM-S26) against our CMC capability entries and found that they are consistent.

Mag. Matjaž Lindič, Assistant to TMT Director for Metrology  
SIQ, Testing & Measuring Technologies  
11 November 2011

## **12. NMISA, South Africa**

The comparison results were checked against NMISA CMC claims, and they support the NMISA CMC claims.

Alexander Matlejoane  
NMISA  
28 September 2011

## **13. METAS, Switzerland**

The CMC claims of METAS (NMI Service Identifier 38, 39, 40 and 41) are supported by the results of the EURAMET.EM-S26 comparison !

Frédéric Overney  
Federal Office of Metrology METAS  
11 November 2011

## 14. UME, Turkey

REPORT FOR RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CMC CLAIMS OF UME (TURKEY) AND THE RESULT OF EURAMET.EM-S26 INDUCTANCE COMPARISON AT 100 mH

CMC claims of UME for inductance calibration are given in the following tables:

| Calibration or Measurement Services              |                        |                           | Measurand Level or Range |               |       | Measurement Conditions/Independent variables |                 | Expanded Uncertainty |       |                 |                     |   |                                   | Comments                   | NMI Service Identifier |
|--|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------|--|-----------------|----------------------|-------|-----------------|---------------------|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| Quantity   | Instrument or artifact | Instrument Type or Method | Minimum value            | Maximum value | units | Parameter                                    | Specifications  | Value                | Units | Coverage Factor | Level of Confidence | Is the expanded uncertainty a relative one? | Uncertainty matrix                |                            |                        |
| Inductance: self inductance, intermediate values | Fixed inductor         | Maxwell-Wien bridge       | 0.001                    | 1             | H     | Frequency                                    | 60 Hz to 10 kHz | 60 to 250            | µH/H  | 2               | 95%                 | Yes   | <a href="#">Inductance_Matrix</a> | Approved on 17 August 2011 | 57.2                   |

### Inductance Matrix

|        | 60 Hz | 100 Hz | 200 Hz | 400 Hz | 1 kHz | 4 kHz | 10 kHz |
|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|--------|
| 100 µH | -     | 260    | 200    | 200    | 130   | -     | 260    |
| 1 mH   | -     | 100    | 100    | 80     | 80    | -     | 150    |
| 10 mH  | -     | 60     | 60     | 60     | -     | 100   | 250    |
| 100 mH | -     | 80     | 70     | 70     | 170   | 80    | 200    |
| 1 H    | 120   | 80     | 80     | 80     | 60    | -     | -      |
| 10 H   | 150   | 100    | 100    | 100    | 200   | -     | -      |

EURAMET.EM-S26 Inductance Comparison result of UME is given in the following table.

| Laboratory | $D_{i,1}$<br>sn.13975<br>mH | $U(D_{i,1})$<br>mH | $D_{i,2}$<br>sn. 18197<br>mH | $U(D_{i,2})$<br>mH | $D_i$<br>mH | $U(D_i)$<br>mH | $E_n$ |
|------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|-------------|----------------|-------|
| UME        | 0.00106                     | 0.00172            | 0.00117                      | 0.00185            | 0.00112     | 0.00179        | 0.6   |

**RESULT :** According to abovementioned results, CMC claims of UME for inductance calibration are supported by EURAMET.EM-S26 Inductance Comparison results.

Gülay GÜLMEZ

TÜBİTAK UME

5 October 2011



## **15. UMTS, Ukraine**

The UMTS declare that they have checked their results against their CMC claims which are supported by their results.

Oleh Velychko  
UMTS, Ukraine, Kyiv  
29 September 2011

## **16. NPL, United Kingdom**

The results of NPL in this comparison are consistent with the CMC capability entries. However the reported uncertainties are slightly lower than the CMC entries due to the entries being estimated values for typical commercial devices. In the case of this comparison the inductors were modified and temperature controlled resulting in better accuracy and measurement repeatability.

Janet Belliss  
National Physical Laboratory, UK  
29 September 2011