**Disclaimer**

No representation is made, nor warranty given that this document or the information contained in it will be suitable for any particular purpose. In no event shall EURAMET, the authors or anyone else involved in the creation of the document be liable for any damages whatsoever arising out of the use of the information contained herein. The parties using the guide shall indemnify EURAMET accordingly.
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**Checklist for existing guidelines**

This checklist aids in the assessment and recommendation of existing guidelines for mathematics and statistics in metrology.

The assessment is done on behalf of EMN Mathmet.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Author(s) of guideline:** | Alexandre Allard, Markus Bar, Elena Barton, Johan Bunde Kondrup, Severine Demeyer, André Fiebach, Nicolas Fischer, Hermann Gross, Sebastian Heidenreich, Mark-A. Henn, Gertjan Kok, Regine Model, Dale Partridge, Nikola Pelevic, Kurt Rasmussen, Sonja Schmelter, Louise Wright |
| **Name(s) Affiliation/Institute/Employer (as appropriate) of the assessor(s):** | Gertjan Kok  VSL |
| **Date of assessment:** | 2023-04-27 |
| **Document assessed and version:** | Best practice guide to uncertainty evaluation for computationally expensive models (no version information)  Downloaded from: <https://www.ptb.de/emrp/fileadmin/documents/nmasatue/NEW04/Papers/BPG-WP2-NEW04.pdf> |
| **Declaration of interest:**  “Please state any material interest, including, for example, membership or association with the originating organisation; contribution to the document under review; contractual or other financial interest in approval of the document. If there are none, write ‘None’” | Co-Author |

| No | Topic | Yes / No / NA / Unknown / Fully Meets / Partially Meets / Does not meet | Comments |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Is the overall content of the document (for eg: based on the abstract of the document) relevant for mathematics and statistics in metrology? | **Yes** |  |
| 2 | Is the document generated by an established organization?  If yes, use the comments box to record the name of the organization (Examples include JCGM, ISO, Eurachem, EURAMET, DIs, IUPAC, CITAC, BIPM, IEC, IUPAP, OIML, IFCC, ILAC). | **Yes** | FORCE (DK), LNE (F), NPL (UK), PTB (DE), VSL (NL) |
| 3 | Has the document been independently reviewed and approved to be issued?  If yes, use the comments box to record the names of the reviewer(s)/approver(s) and affiliation, if they are known. | **Unknown** |  |
| 4 | Does the document come with appropriate metadata?   * Title * Author(s) and their affiliations * Unique Identifier or Version Number * Issuer * Review date * Keywords * Status   Record as Fully meets/Partially meets/Does not meet with your comments. | **Partially Meets** | Title: Yes  Author: Yes  Version: No  Issuer: Yes  Review date: No  Keywords :Yes  Status: Yes |
| 5 | **Copyright and Licence**  Is the document adequately protected for copyright and IP if applicable?  If the answer is yes, use the comment box to specify for the below checkpoints.   1. Copyright holder is clearly stated? 2. Any license for use and reproduction is clear? 3. Arrangements for seeking permission (if required by license) clearly given? 4. Third party copyright (eg in quoted extracts) duly acknowledged? 5. Any applicable patent rights clearly stated? | **No** | There is no information whether there is any copyright applicable or not. |
| 6 | Is the document in English?  If no, use the comments box to record the language of the document and if there is a requirement to translate to English for the purpose of assessment.  Any additional (non-English) language versions are available? If yes, use the comment box to record the same. | **Yes** |  |
| 7 | Is the scope and field of application clearly stated?   1. Does the document state the targeted audience or readership? 2. Is the content appropriate to the target audience? | **Yes** | Sec. 1.1: “The guide is aimed at metrologists, scientists, and engineers who are familiar with the basic ideas of uncertainty evaluation.”. |
| 8 | Is the conclusion (if any) clearly stated, appropriate and relevant to the content? | **No** | There is no general conclusion at all. |
| 9 | Is the acknowledgment section added appropriately? | **Yes** |  |
| 10 | Are the references appropriate? | **Yes** |  |
| 11 | Is the overall presentation of the document easy to understand for the intended readership? | **Yes** | I have only read some extracts. |

**Recommendations**

|  |
| --- |
| Select one of the following:  - Publish link/reference for information;  - Publish link/reference as recommended reading;  - Do not publish reference  - Other [please specify]  Note: In addition, add any other comments to the originating organisation for consideration. |

**End of Checklist**
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