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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
<th>TERM ENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Tim Tyson</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman-Elect</td>
<td>Kurt Floren</td>
<td>Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTEP Committee Chair</td>
<td>Randy Jennings</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Richard Cote</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Membership - Western</td>
<td>Brett Saum</td>
<td>San Luis Obispo County, California</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Membership - Central</td>
<td>Ronald Hayes</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Membership - Southern</td>
<td>Stephen Benjamin</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Membership - Northeastern</td>
<td>Michael Sikula</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large</td>
<td>Mark Coyne</td>
<td>City of Brockton, Massachusetts</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large</td>
<td>Stephen Langford</td>
<td>Cardinal Scale Manufacturing, Co.</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Membership</td>
<td>Gordon Johnson</td>
<td>Gilbarco, Inc.</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary NCWM President</td>
<td>Dr. Patrick D. Gallagher</td>
<td>NIST, Director</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Secretary</td>
<td>Carol Hockert</td>
<td>NIST, Weights and Measures Division</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Don Onwiler</td>
<td>NCWM Headquarters</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors Advisor</td>
<td>Gilles Vinet</td>
<td>Measurement Canada</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTEP Administrator</td>
<td>Jim Truex</td>
<td>NCWM Headquarters</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### National Type Evaluation Program Committee (NTEP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
<th>TERM ENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Chair</td>
<td>Randy Jennings</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Tim Tyson</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Brett Saum</td>
<td>San Luis Obispo County, California</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Michael Sikula</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Kurt Floren</td>
<td>Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTEP Administrator</td>
<td>Jim Truex</td>
<td>NCWM Headquarters</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Finance Committee

<table>
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<tr>
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<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
<th>TERM ENDS</th>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Committee Chair</td>
<td>Tim Tyson</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Gordon Johnson</td>
<td>Gilbarco, Inc.</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Richard Cote</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Kurt Floren</td>
<td>Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Don Onwiler</td>
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<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
<th>TERM ENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Chair</td>
<td>John Gaccione</td>
<td>Westchester County, New York</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Joe Benavides</td>
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<td>2011</td>
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<tr>
<td>Member</td>
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<tr>
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<td>Montana</td>
<td>2015</td>
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<tr>
<td>Associate Membership Representative</td>
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<td>Petroleum Marketers Association of America</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Technical Advisor</td>
<td>Lance Robertson</td>
<td>Measurement Canada</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIST Technical Advisor</td>
<td>David Sefcik</td>
<td>NIST, Weights and Measures Division</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIST Technical Advisor</td>
<td>Lisa Warfield</td>
<td>NIST, Weights and Measures Division</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Professional Development Committee (PDC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
<th>TERM ENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Chair</td>
<td>Stacy Carlsen</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Dale Saunders</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Cheryl Ayer</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Membership Representative</td>
<td>Steven Grabski</td>
<td>Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Liaison</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIST Technical Advisor</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Specifications and Tolerances Committee (S&T)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
<th>TERM ENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Chair</td>
<td>Steve Giguere</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Douglas Deiman</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Kenneth Ramsburg</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Paul Moyer</td>
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<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Brett Gurney</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Technical Advisor</td>
<td>Ted Kingsbury</td>
<td>Measurement Canada</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIST Technical Advisor</td>
<td>Tina Butcher</td>
<td>NIST, Weights and Measures Division</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIST Technical Advisor</td>
<td>Steven Cook</td>
<td>NIST, Weights and Measures Division</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Nominating Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
<th>TERM ENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Chair</td>
<td>Randy Jennings</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Judy Cardin</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Charles Carroll</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Thomas Geiler</td>
<td>Barnstable Regulatory Services, Massachusetts</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Joe Gomez</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Maxwell Gray</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Steven Malone</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Credentials Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
<th>TERM ENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Chair</td>
<td>James Cassidy</td>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Richard Lewis</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Mahesh Albuquerque</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>Vicky Dempsey</td>
<td>Montgomery County Weights and Measures, Ohio</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appointive Officials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
<th>TERM ENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chaplain</td>
<td>Stephen Langford</td>
<td>Cardinal Scale Manufacturing, Co.</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentarian</td>
<td>Louis Straub</td>
<td>Fairbanks Scale, Inc.</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Officer</td>
<td>Nicholas Brechun</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Officer</td>
<td>Tim Chesser</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Officer</td>
<td>Rachelle Miller</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding Officer</td>
<td>Jack Walsh</td>
<td>Town of Framingham</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeants-at-Arms</td>
<td>Randy Jones</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeants-at-Arms</td>
<td>Don Reimer</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Associate Membership Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
<th>TERM ENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Robert Murnane, Jr.</td>
<td>Seraphin Test Measure</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>Christopher Guay</td>
<td>Procter and Gamble, Co.</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary / Treasurer</td>
<td>Darrell Flocken</td>
<td>Mettler-Toledo, Inc.</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Kathleen Madaras</td>
<td>Fuel Merchants Association of New Jersey</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Paul Hoar</td>
<td>AgriFuels, LLC/NBB</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Darrell Flocken</td>
<td>Mettler-Toledo, Inc.</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Michael Gaspers</td>
<td>Farmland Foods, Inc.</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Paul A. Lewis, Sr.</td>
<td>Rice Lake Weighing Systems, Inc.</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Robert Murnane, Jr.</td>
<td>Seraphin Test Measure</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Steven Grabski</td>
<td>Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Christopher Guay</td>
<td>Procter and Gamble, Co.</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Thomas McGee</td>
<td>PMP Corporation</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Rob Underwood</td>
<td>Petroleum Marketers Association of America</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## NTETC Belt-Conveyor Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Bill Ripka</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher Scientific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
<td>John Barton</td>
<td>NIST, Weights and Measures Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTEP Administrator</td>
<td>Jim Truex</td>
<td>NCWM Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Tina Butcher</td>
<td>NIST, Weights and Measures Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Ken Jones</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Rafael Jimenez</td>
<td>Association of American Railroads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Technology Center, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Lars Marmtsater</td>
<td>Merrick Industries, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Peter Srrico</td>
<td>Thayer Scale/Hyer Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Thomas Vormittag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## NTETC Grain Analyzer Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Cassie Eigenmann</td>
<td>Dickey-john Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
<td>John Barber</td>
<td>J B Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
<td>G. Diane Lee</td>
<td>NIST, Weights and Measures Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTEP Administrator</td>
<td>Jim Truex</td>
<td>NCWM Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Randall Burns</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Tina Butcher</td>
<td>NIST, Weights and Measures Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Karl Cunningham</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Thomas Hughes</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Richard Pierce</td>
<td>USDA, GIPSA Technical Services Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Edward Szesnat</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Cheryl Tew</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>James Bair</td>
<td>North American Miller's Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Martin Clements</td>
<td>The Steinit Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Victor Gates</td>
<td>Shore Sales Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Andrew Gell</td>
<td>Foss North America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Charles Hurburgh, Jr.</td>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>David James Krejci</td>
<td>Grain Elevator and Processing Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Jess McCluer</td>
<td>National Grain and Feed Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Thomas Runyon</td>
<td>Seedburo Equipment Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>AFFILIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Michael Keilty</td>
<td>Endress + Hauser Flowtec AG, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
<td>Tina Butcher</td>
<td>NIST, Weights and Measures Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTEP Administrator</td>
<td>Jim Truex</td>
<td>NCWM Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Dennis Beattie</td>
<td>Measurement Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Jerry Butler</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Michael Frailer</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>James (Steve) Hadder</td>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Dan Reiswig</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Marc Buttler</td>
<td>Emerson Process Management - Micro Motion, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Rodney Cooper</td>
<td>Tuthill Transfer Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Mike Gallo</td>
<td>Cleanfuel USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Paul Glowacki</td>
<td>Murray Equipment, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Gordon Johnson</td>
<td>Gilbarco, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Dmitri Karimov</td>
<td>Liquid Controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Yefim Katselnik</td>
<td>Dresser Wayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Douglas Long</td>
<td>RDM Industrial Electronics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Andrew MacAllister</td>
<td>Daniel Measurement and Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Wade Mattar</td>
<td>Invensys/Foxboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Richard Miller</td>
<td>FMC Technologies Measurement Solutions, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Andre Noel</td>
<td>Neptune Technology Group, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Henry Oppermann</td>
<td>Weights &amp; Measures Consulting, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Johnny Parrish</td>
<td>Brodie International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Richard Tucker</td>
<td>RL Tucker Consulting, LLC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## NTETC Software Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Norman Ingram</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>James Pettinato</td>
<td>FMC Technologies Measurement Solutions, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
<td>Doug Bliss</td>
<td>Mettler-Toledo, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Teri Gulke</td>
<td>Liquid Controls, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTEP Administrator</td>
<td>Jim Truex</td>
<td>NCWM Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Dennis Beattie</td>
<td>Measurement Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>William Fishman</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Michael Frailer</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Edward Payne</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>John Roach</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Ambler Thompson</td>
<td>NIST, Weights and Measures Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>John Atwood</td>
<td>Tyson Foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Kevin Detert</td>
<td>Avery Weigh-Tronix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Cassie Eigenmann</td>
<td>Dickey-john Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Andre Elle</td>
<td>Endress + Hauser Flowtec AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Andrew Gell</td>
<td>Foss North America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Keith Harper</td>
<td>Gencor Industries, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Tony Herrin</td>
<td>Cardinal Scale Manufacturing Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Gordon Johnson</td>
<td>Gilbarco, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Paul A. Lewis, Sr.</td>
<td>Rice Lake Weighing Systems, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Michael McGhee</td>
<td>Itron, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Richard Miller</td>
<td>FMC Technologies Measurement Solutions, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Michael Parks</td>
<td>Vulcan Materials Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Mike Roach</td>
<td>VeriFone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Robin Sax</td>
<td>CompuWeigh Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Scott Szurek</td>
<td>Emerson Process Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>David Vande Berg</td>
<td>Vande Berg Scales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>AFFILIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Darrell Flocken</td>
<td>Mettler-Toledo, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
<td>Steven Cook</td>
<td>NIST, Weights and Measures Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTEP Administrator</td>
<td>Jim Truex</td>
<td>NCWM Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>L. Cary Ainsworth</td>
<td>USDA, GIPSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>William Bates</td>
<td>USDA, GIPSA, FGIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Luciano Burtini</td>
<td>Measurement Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Tina Butcher</td>
<td>NIST, Weights and Measures Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Terry Davis</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Fran Elson-Houston</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Ken Jones</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Jack Kane</td>
<td>Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Edward Payne</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Dan Reiswig</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Member</td>
<td>Juana Williams</td>
<td>NIST, Weights and Measures Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Steven Beitzel</td>
<td>Systems Associates, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Greg Bredahl</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher Scientific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Neil Copley</td>
<td>Thurman Scale Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Mitchell Eyles</td>
<td>Flintec, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Robert Feezor</td>
<td>Scales Consulting and Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Scott Henry</td>
<td>NCR Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Sam Jalahej</td>
<td>Totalcomp, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Rafael Jimenez</td>
<td>Association of American Railroads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Technology Center, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Stephen Langford</td>
<td>Cardinal Scale Manufacturing, Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Paul A. Lewis, Sr.</td>
<td>Rice Lake Weighing Systems, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>L. Edward Luthy</td>
<td>Stock Equipment Company / Schenck Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transport N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Nigel Mills</td>
<td>Hobart Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Louis Straub</td>
<td>Fairbanks Scales, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Jerry Wang</td>
<td>A&amp;D Engineering, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Member</td>
<td>Walter Young</td>
<td>Emery Winslow Scale Company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Western Weights and Measures Association (WWMA)  [www.westernwma.org](http://www.westernwma.org)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Alaska</th>
<th>Colorado</th>
<th>Montana</th>
<th>Oregon</th>
<th>Wyoming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contact**

Kristin Macey  
California Department of Food and Agriculture  
(916) 653-6649  
kmacey@cdfa.ca.gov

**Annual Meeting**

Date: TBD  
Location: TBD

## Central Weights and Measures Association (CWMA)  [www.cwma.net](http://www.cwma.net)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Illinois</th>
<th>Kansas</th>
<th>Missouri</th>
<th>Ohio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contact**

Celeste Bennett  
Michigan Department of Agriculture  
(517) 655-8203  
bennette9@michigan.gov

**Annual Meeting**

May 16 - 19, 2011  
Grand Rapids, Michigan

**Interim Meeting**

Date: TBD  
Location: TBD

## Southern Weights and Measures Association (SWMA)  [www.swma.org](http://www.swma.org)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Alabama</th>
<th>Florida</th>
<th>Maryland</th>
<th>South Carolina</th>
<th>Virginia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>U.S. Virgin Islands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contact**

Stephen Benjamin  
North Carolina Department of Agriculture  
(919) 733-3313  
steve.benjamin@ncagr.gov

**Annual Meeting**

Date: TBD  
Location: TBD

## Northeastern Weights and Measures Association (NWMA)  [www.newma.us](http://www.newma.us)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Connecticut</th>
<th>New Hampshire</th>
<th>Pennsylvania</th>
<th>New Jersey</th>
<th>Rhode Island</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contact**

Robert McGrath  
Boston ISD Weights and Measures  
(617) 635-5328  
robert.mcgrath@cityofboston.gov

**Annual Meeting**

May 9 - 12, 2011  
Saratoga Springs, New York

**Interim Meeting**

Date: October 12 - 13, 2011  
Location: Norwich, Connecticut
General Conference Information

Introduction

This document contains the Board of Directors and Standing Committee agendas for the Interim Meeting of the National Conference on Weights and Measures, Inc. (NCWM) scheduled for January 23 - 26, 2011, at the Fairmont Dallas, Dallas, Texas. To reserve a room, call Fairmont Reservations at (800) 441-1414 and ask for the National Conference on Weights and Measures meeting rate of $107 single or double, plus tax. To obtain this special rate, call no later than Wednesday, December 22, 2010. The rate is available on a first come, first served basis as space is limited.

Agenda items to be addressed by the Standing Committees are assigned Reference Key numbers as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Reference Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
<td>100 series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laws and Regulations</td>
<td>200 series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifications and Tolerances</td>
<td>300 series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Committee</td>
<td>400 series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Type Evaluation Program Committee</td>
<td>500 series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominating Committee</td>
<td>800 series</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subject matter listed on each Standing Committee’s agenda will be open for discussion as noted. Each Committee may also take up routine or miscellaneous items brought to its attention after the preparation of this document. At its discretion, each Committee may decide to accept items for discussion that are not listed in this document.

The agendas:

1. include items brought to the attention of the Standing Committees prior to the submission deadline of November 1, 2010, and approved for inclusion in their agendas by the Committees; and

2. serve as the basis for the Standing Committee Interim Reports (to be printed in the Program and Committee Reports of the National Conference on Weights and Measures 96th Annual Meeting, NCWM Publication 16). The final reports of the Committees will be published in the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Special Publication, “Report of the 96th National Conference on Weights and Measures” (Annual Report), following the Annual Meeting in 2011, scheduled for July 17 - 21, 2011, at the Holiday Inn Downtown at the Park, Missoula, Montana.

The Committees have not determined whether the items presented will be Voting or Informational in nature; these determinations will result from their deliberations at the Interim Meeting.

Special Meetings

Several Annual Committees and other organizations are conducting meetings concurrently with the Standing Committees of the Conference.

Joint Meetings for All Committees

A joint meeting for all Committees will be held on Sunday, January 23, and Wednesday, January 26, 2011. On Wednesday, each Standing Committee will highlight the major decisions made during the week, and the Nominating Committee will present its report.
Participation

Sunday meetings are scheduled for Committee members to review their agendas (see the particular Committee/Task Group agenda for details). Although the sessions are open to all delegates, participation in discussions during agenda reviews is normally limited to Committee members. Comments and input are welcome when specific topics are scheduled in the Committee agendas.

All sessions of NCWM meetings are normally open to members of the Conference. If a Committee chairman recognizes a special situation involving a proprietary issue (e.g., NTEP appeals) or sensitive issue or other substantive need, that portion of the session dealing with the special issue may be closed, provided that: (1) the Conference chairman (or in his absence, the chairman-elect) approves; and (2) announcement of the closed meeting is posted on or near the door to the meeting session and on the announcement board at the registration desk. If at all possible, the posting will be done at least a day prior to the planned closed session. Please note that the one day notice will not always be possible if a closed meeting is called on Sunday. Since Sunday is a day for agenda reviews and participants may make their travel reservations in order to observe these agenda reviews, if a closed meeting becomes necessary on Sunday, every effort will be made to limit such a meeting to only part of the day.

To request an appearance with a Standing Committee, contact the appropriate technical advisor by December 31, 2011:

Board of Directors  Don Onwiler  (402) 434-4880
Laws and Regulations Committee  David Sefcik or  (301) 975-4868
                  Lisa Warfield  (301) 975-3308
Specifications and Tolerances Committee  Tina Butcher or  (301) 975-2196
                          Steve Cook  (301) 975-4003
Professional Development Committee  Stacy Carlsen  (415) 499-6700
National Type Evaluation Program Committee  Randy Jennings  (615) 837-5150

You may also contact the Executive Secretary at the following address and telephone number:

Weights and Measures Division
National Institute of Standards and Technology
100 Bureau Drive, STOP 2600
Gaithersburg, MD  20899-2600
Telephone:  (301) 975-4004

Contact for More Information

If you have questions about the program, registration, lodging, or meeting arrangements, contact NCWM Headquarters at the following address and telephone number:

National Conference onWeights and Measures
1135 M Street, Suite 110
Lincoln, NE  68508
Telephone:  (402) 434-4880

Reports

There will not be a transcript made of the proceedings of the Interim Meetings. Each Committee will prepare its report to the NCWM containing its recommendations based upon the presentations, discussions, and deliberations on all matters on its agenda that were addressed during the Interim Meetings. These reports will be published in the “Committee Reports for the 96th Annual Meeting,” NCWM Publication 16, to be posted to the NIST WMD website at www.nist.gov/pml/wmd/index.cfm and to the NCWM website at www.ncwm.net in early April. Printed copies of Publication 16 will be distributed to meeting attendees at the Annual Meeting in July.
96th Annual Meeting of the National Conference on Weights and Measures

The National Conference on Weights and Measures 96th Annual Meeting will be held at the Holiday Inn Downtown at the Park, Missoula, Montana, from July 17 - 21, 2011. The room rate for the Annual Meeting will be $104 per night (rates are subject to change January 1, 2011), single or double, plus tax. For reservations, please call the hotel at (800) 399-0408 ext. 509. To obtain this special rate, call no later than Friday, June 10, 2011, and identify the group name of the National Conference on Weights and Measures.

Units of Measurement

In keeping with the provisions of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988, which establishes the metric system as the preferred system of measurement for commerce and trade, units of the metric system have been used in this document, except where industry has not yet converted from the inch-pound system. In some instances, submitted proposals quoted in the Committee agendas may appear in inch-pound units only.
## 2011 NCWM Interim Meeting

**January 23 - 26, 2011**

**The Fairmont Dallas ♦ Dallas, Texas**

### Schedule of Events

*(as of November 5, 2010)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saturday, January 22</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>NCWM Board of Directors Meeting</strong></td>
<td>State Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sunday, January 23</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:30 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.</td>
<td><strong>Coffee Service</strong></td>
<td>Gold Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>Registration and Exhibits</strong></td>
<td>Gold Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:30 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.</td>
<td><strong>Industry Committee on Packaging &amp; Labeling</strong></td>
<td>Royal Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>NCWM Board of Directors Meeting</strong></td>
<td>State Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:00 p.m. - 1:00 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>Lunch on your own</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:00 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>Joint Meeting for all Standing Committees</strong></td>
<td>Gold Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|               | 1:30 p.m. - 4:00 p.m. | **Technical Meetings**
|               |               | **Task Group on Retail Motor Fuel Dispenser Price Posting**
|               |               | and Computing Capability                               | Oak Room       |
|               |               | **Task Group on Printer Ink and Toner Cartridges**     | Continental Room|
|               |               | **Fuels and Lubricants Subcommittee**                   | Far East Room  |
|               |               | *(NOTE: The times for Technical Meetings may be extended)*
|               |               | *if the Standing Committees have completed their agenda review before arriving to the Interim Meeting.)* |
|               | 4:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. | **STANDING COMMITTEES’ AGENDA REVIEW**                 | Continental Room|
|               |               | **Laws & Regulations Committee**                        |                |
|               |               | **Professional Development Committee**                 | Far East Room  |
|               |               | **Specifications & Tolerances Committee**               | Oak Room       |
|               |               | **Board of Directors**                                  | State Room     |
|               |               | **NTEP Committee**                                      |                |
|               | 5:30 p.m. - 7:00 p.m. | **Chairman’s Reception**                               | Parisian Room  |
Monday, January 24

7:30 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.  Coffee Service  Gold Foyer
7:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.  Registration and Exhibits  Gold Foyer
8:30 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.  **OFFICIAL SESSION - OPEN HEARINGS**  Gold Room

*(NOTE: Times of hearings are not firm; when one committee finishes, the next committee will begin.)*
Laws & Regulations Committee
Specifications & Tolerances Committee
Professional Development Committee
Board of Directors
NTEP Committee

11:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.  Lunch on your own

12:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.  **OFFICIAL SESSION - OPEN HEARINGS CONTINUED**  Gold Room

*(NOTE: Times of hearings are not firm; when one committee finishes, the next committee will begin.)*
Laws & Regulations Committee
Specifications & Tolerances Committee
Professional Development Committee
Board of Directors
NTEP Committee

Tuesday, January 25

7:30 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.  Coffee Service  Gold Foyer
7:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.  Registration and Exhibits  Gold Foyer
8:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.  **OFFICIAL SESSION - OPEN HEARINGS (if necessary)**  Gold Room

*(NOTE: Times of hearings are not firm; when one committee finishes, the next committee will begin.)*
Laws & Regulations Committee
Specifications & Tolerances Committee
Professional Development Committee
Board of Directors
NTEP Committee
*(NOTE: Each committee will begin their individual work sessions at the conclusion of the Open Hearings/Technical Session.)*

12:00 p.m. - 1:00 p.m.  Lunch on your own

1:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.  **COMMITTEE WORK SESSIONS**  Gold Room
Laws & Regulations Committee  Continental Room
Professional Development Committee  Far East Room
Specifications & Tolerances Committee  Oak Room
Board of Directors  State Room
NTEP Committee

5:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  **Associate Membership Committee**  Gold Room
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:30 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Coffee Service</td>
<td>Gold Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Registration and Exhibits</td>
<td>Gold Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>COMMITTEE WORK SESSIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laws &amp; Regulations Committee</td>
<td>Continental Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development Committee</td>
<td>Far East Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specifications &amp; Tolerances Committee</td>
<td>Oak Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTEP Committee</td>
<td>State Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.</td>
<td>JOINT MEETING – ALL STANDING COMMITTEES</td>
<td>Gold Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(NOTE: 2011 Interim Meeting schedule of events is tentative and subject to change.)*
Report of Board of Directors

Tim Tyson
Director
Kansas Department of Agriculture
Weights and Measures Division

100 INTRODUCTION

The Board will hold its quarterly Board of Directors meeting on Saturday and Sunday, January 22 - 23, 2011, and continue that meeting during work periods throughout the remainder of the Interim Meetings. Unless posted otherwise, all meetings are open to the membership. The Board of Directors and National Type Evaluation Program (NTEP) Committee will hold open hearings at the Interim Meeting and members will be invited to engage in dialogue with the Board on issues the Board and NTEP Committee have on their agenda. The Board of Directors is currently working on the following issues: membership services, web hosting, website and newsletter improvements, National Conference on Weights and Measures (NCWM) efficiency and effectiveness as an organization, providing additional services to regional weights and measures associations and strategic planning. In addition to these items, the Board Agenda contains two appendices that cover the Activities of the International Organization of Legal Metrology (OIML) and Regional Legal Metrology Organizations (Appendix A) and the Interim Agenda of the Associate Membership (AMC) (Appendix B).
100-1 Membership and Meeting Attendance

The Board continues to assess avenues for improving membership and participation at Interim and Annual Meetings. Membership and attendance are driven to some degree by the items on the agendas and by the economy. NCWM actively reaches out to potential stakeholders of agenda items that may be of interest and warrant their attention. This effort is believed to have had a positive effect on both membership and meeting attendance in the past two years.

The attendance for the 2010 Interim Meeting was exceptional, exceeding 2009 attendance with 148 registered attendees. Likewise, the attendance for the 2010 Annual Meeting exceeded the 2009 attendance with a total of 237 attendees. However, membership has not rebounded from the drastic budget cuts occurring throughout the country.

The following is a comparison of NCWM membership levels for the past six years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Assoc.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Gov’t.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIST</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Gov’t.</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Gov’t.</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int’l. Gov’t.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1970</strong></td>
<td><strong>1967</strong></td>
<td><strong>1962</strong></td>
<td><strong>2307</strong></td>
<td><strong>2190</strong></td>
<td><strong>2097</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100-2 The NCWM Newsletter and Website

The Board continuously considers ways to monitor and improve the content of the newsletter and website. Members are encouraged to bring ideas and articles forward for inclusion in newsletters. Of particular interest are articles that would be pertinent to field inspectors and the service industry.

The new NCWM website has been very well received. The e-commerce feature with an online shopping cart has been a great success for fast and easy membership renewals, publication orders, and meeting registrations. Improvements will continue as the website evolves to serve members and customers more effectively. The following are descriptions of more recent additions and improvements on the NCWM website.

**Online Position Forum:** There will be a live demonstration of this new feature at the 2011 Interim and Annual Meetings. An announcement will go to all members when the polling period opens for the month of May 2011. At that time, all members, active and associate, will have the opportunity to log in, view Committee agenda items, enter positions, comments, and even upload supporting PDF documents for each and any Standing Committee or Board of Directors agenda items.
The Position Forum is not a voting system. It is simply a method to present positions, opinions, and supporting documents. After selecting an item, the user would select one of the following positions:

- Support.
- Support with comments.
- Oppose with comments.
- Neutral.
- Neutral with comments.

During the month of June 2011, members will be able to view positions, comments, and supporting documents by others as a means of preparing for the deliberations and voting at the Annual Meeting in July 2011. This will give stakeholders the ability to come into the Annual Meeting more informed on the issues and with a better idea of positions others may have.

Social Networking: Social networking has quickly expanded into business and customer networking as businesses reach out to the new generation of handheld devices and Internet networking to increase public awareness of their services and increase customer base. In the fall of 2010, NCWM opened accounts in LinkedIn, FaceBook, and Twitter to improve our outreach. By opening these accounts, NCWM is now more visible in Internet search engines and will be more identifiable to younger, more tech-savvy stakeholders.

E-Commerce for NTEP Maintenance Fees: As of October 1, 2010, holders of NTEP Certificates of Conformance can now pay their annual maintenance fees online. It is quick, easy, and especially important for international customers who traditionally have suffered bank fees to wire funds electronically. As with other e-commerce products offered on the NCWM website, this new offering has been very well received.

The website continues to be a work in progress. Many good suggestions have been offered and incorporated into both the NCWM site and the regional sites that are hosted and maintained by NCWM. Ms. Lindsay Hier, Project Coordinator for NCWM, serves as the Webmaster. Comments and suggestions for improvements to the newsletters and website should be directed to NCWM at (402) 434-4880 or via e-mail at info@ncwm.net.

National Certification Program: Now that the National Certification Program has launched with its first exam, NCWM has created a fast and easy method to place orders to take the exam through our website. The exams are ordered through the online shopping cart and www.ncwm.net. Members who log in will receive member pricing, which is currently set at no charge for taking the exam. Non members will be assessed a fee of $75.00 per exam. Applicants will receive an email from NCWM staff providing them the credentials to log into the test site to take the exam online.

100-3 Meetings Update

Interim Meetings
January 23 - 26, 2011 The Fairmont Dallas, Dallas, Texas
January 22 - 25, 2012 Monteleone, New Orleans, Louisiana
January 27 - 30, 2013 Charleston, South Carolina

Annual Meetings
July 17 - 21, 2011 Holiday Inn Downtown at the Park, Missoula, Montana
July 15 - 19, 2012 Holiday Inn by the Bay, Portland, Maine
July 2013 TBD in the Southern Region

NCWM meetings are known for long days filled with important business. NCWM strives to plan meetings in locations that offer comfortable rooms and a variety of entertainment and dining options close by so our attendees
can break away for a couple hours in the evening to relax and enjoy their surroundings. The following is a brief description of future planned events.

The 2011 Annual Meeting will be at the Holiday Inn Downtown in Missoula, Montana. The hotel is adjacent to the Clark Fork River and within easy walking distance to the downtown district, where attendees can enjoy food and entertainment that cater to tourists, the college crowd, and locals.

The 2012 Interim Meeting will be held at the Monteleone in New Orleans, Louisiana. The Monteleone is a member of Historic Hotels of America and rests within the New Orleans French Quarter offering something for everyone in the newly revitalized city. From there we go to the Holiday Inn by the Bay in Portland, Maine, for the 2012 Annual Meeting. This hotel has successfully hosted NCWM previously. It is within blocks of the charming Old Port, a working waterfront and the Arts District.

The 2013 Interim Meeting will be at the Francis Marion Hotel in historic downtown Charleston, South Carolina. It is truly a beautiful hotel situated perfectly for attendees to get the full Charleston experience. The 2013 Annual Meeting will be held at a location to be determined in the Southern Region.

Looking down the road, the Board of Directors would like to make the 2015 Annual meeting a very special event. In addition to addressing the business of the organization, NCWM will be celebrating its 100th Annual Meeting 110 years after our first meeting in 1905. Traditionally, NCWM rotates locations for its Annual Meetings among the four regions. The normal rotation for 1915 would place this meeting in the western region, but the Board is considering a deviation in the normal rotation by holding this meeting in the Washington, DC area; the city that hosted the first meeting in 1905 and for many years thereafter.

The Board will work with the Central Weights and Measures Association (CWMA) for a host city for the 2014 Annual Meeting. The region should provide two or three cities where they believe a successful meeting could be held, taking into consideration the location, ease and cost of air travel, a selection of hotels with sufficient rooms and meeting space, etc. Members are not asked to provide specific hotels and are not to enter into negotiations with them. However, NCWM’s site selection criteria is available upon request from Ms. Shari Tretheway, NCWM Office Manager, at (402) 434-4880 or e-mail to shari.tretheway@ncwm.net.

### 100-4 Participation in International Standard Setting

The International Committee of Legal Metrology (CIML) Meeting was held at the Doubletree Hotel in Orlando, Florida, September 20 - 24, 2010. Dr. Charles Ehrlich invited NCWM Chairman Tim Tyson to provide a keynote address on September 21 to welcome the assembly and on September 23, NCWM Executive Director Don Onwiler presented an overview of the United States legal metrology system. NTEP Administrator, Mr. Jim Truex was also on hand throughout the week to answer questions and discuss issues with the various CIML members. The meeting was a valuable opportunity for NCWM to gain a fuller understanding of the CIML.

Dr. Ehrlich will brief the Board of Directors and NCWM members on key activities of OIML and regional legal metrology organizations during open hearings of the 2011 Interim Meeting (see Appendix A).

### 100-5 Efficiency and Effectiveness

The Board is examining methods of efficient use of NCWM resources that will promote effective service to its members and stakeholders. The Board welcomes member feedback on ideas to increase the effectiveness of the Conference.

### 100-5A Regional Support

**Regional Website Hosting and Maintenance**: For several years, NCWM has hosted the websites for the Southern and Central regions. Recently, the Western and Northeastern regions accepted an offer from NCWM to host their websites as well at a cost to NCWM of $4,000 for each region. All four regional associations’ websites are now
hosted through NCWM. While the regional sites are very similar in layout, each region has the ability to customize menu options and page content.

NCWM absorbs the cost in hosting fees and assesses an annual charge of $200 per year to each region for unlimited staff time to update the content of the websites. This fee for unlimited updates replaces the previous method of hourly billing for staff time in hopes that regions will be more proactive in keeping information up to date on the sites. Each region has designated one person who is authorized to make requests to NCWM for updates and changes to their respective websites. Additionally, NCWM staff will contact these representatives each quarter as a reminder to review their web pages for necessary updates. This process is outlined in NCWM Policy 3.1.6. Regional Website Hosting and can be viewed or downloaded from the policy manual on the NCWM website.

**Shopping Cart Service for Regional Websites:** Last year, NCWM received bids from its web service provider to add shopping cart services to each of the regional websites for online membership dues and meeting registrations. The estimated cost was $3,500 per region at the region’s expense. The Western region accepted this offer and the shopping cart was in place in time to receive registrations for the 2010 Western Weights and Measures Association (WWMA) Annual Meeting this past fall. The actual cost for implementation for the Western’s shopping cart services was only $1,200; far less than the original estimate. Cost will vary according to the complexity of the project.

The Western region reported to the NCWM Board of Directors that the online meeting registrations worked very well for them. It provides a means for WWMA members to pay dues and meeting registrations with credit cards. The transaction is processed through the NCWM PayPal account and NCWM transfers the funds to the region’s bank account, less credit card fees of about 3.5%.

If other regions are interested, please contact NCWM for details (info@ncwm.net or (402) 434-4878).

**Administrative Support to the Regions:** NCWM developed a fee schedule that would apply to regions who request NCWM administrative services for membership invoicing, meeting registration, database maintenance, and monthly reporting. These services, including credit card processing, are available whether or not a region elects to add the shopping cart feature to their website as mentioned above. The shopping cart feature would simply be an added enhancement to the administrative process and customer convenience. At this time, none of the regions have requested additional administrative services using the new fee structure. For more information, please contact Ms. Shari Tretheway, NCWM Office Manager, at (402) 434-4880 or e-mail to shari.tretheway@ncwm.net.

**100-5B Standing Committees**

At the fall 2009 Board Meeting, a small group was formed to review ideas and options on structure in an effort to ease the workload and improve the process for developing difficult agenda items. This work group reported back to the Board at the 2010 Interim Meeting. The report included a review of the past Committee workload. The work group noted that the format of the Interim Meeting was modified in recent years to be a day shorter and to have consecutive open hearings instead of concurrent open hearings. These format changes reduced the amount of time the Committees have to develop their agenda items. The Board also discussed the use of Informational and Developing status for items, noting that it may be helpful to set out some guidelines in how these categories of items are applied. The Committee structure was left unchanged, but the following steps have been taken to assist and support the important work of Standing Committees.

**Committee Orientation:** In September 2010 newly elected NCWM officers and directors were invited to NCWM headquarters for orientation into the Board of Directors. It proved to be a success and the concept was immediately expanded to include a separate orientation program for new Committee chairs and new Committee members. The first NCWM Committee Orientation took place in November 2010 at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) offices in Gaithersburg, Maryland, to facilitate participation of all NIST technical advisors. The program presented by NCWM Chairman, Tim Tyson and Executive Director, Don Onwiler included a half-day session for Committee chairs followed by a full day for the new Committee members. The focus included leadership, administrative processes, roles and responsibilities, and review of the NCWM Committee Member
Handbook. Additionally, the Committee chairs and NIST technical advisors reviewed agenda items for the new members so that they would be prepared in advance for the technical discussions and open hearings.

**Status of Agenda Items:** The Board of Directors has discussed a need for clarification and guidance regarding the status that committees assign to agenda items. The options are Voting, Informational, Developing, or Withdrawn. If not implemented properly, items may not receive the best due process and expedient development. After much discussion, the following clarification has been presented in the NCWM Committee Member Handbook to provide guidance and ensure proper handling of items so that they do not fall through the cracks.

**Voting:** These are items that the Committee believes are fully developed and ready for final consideration of the voting membership. There may be occasion when the Committee does not fully support an item, yet they may reach agreement (consensus) that it is ready for Voting status to let NCWM membership decide. The Committee has the ability to remove items from the voting agenda at the Annual Meeting by changing the status prior to a vote of the NCWM membership. The Committee may amend Voting items during the course of the Annual Meeting based on additional information received following the Interim Meeting and testimony received at the Annual Meeting. These items may also be amended by the voting membership during the voting session of the Annual Meeting following the procedures outlined in the NCWM Bylaws.

**Informational:** These items are deemed by the Committee to have merit. They contain a proposal to address the issue at hand and a meaningful background discussion for the proposal. However, the Committee wants to allow more time for review by stakeholders and possibly further development to address concerns. The Committee has taken the responsibility for any additional development of Informational items. At the Annual Meeting, the Committee may change the status of the items, but not to Voting status because the item has not been published as such in advance of the meeting.

**Developing:** These items are deemed by the Committee to have merit, but are found to be lacking enough information for full consideration. Typically the item will have a good explanation of the issue at hand, but a clear proposal has yet to be developed. By assigning Developing status, the Committee has sent the item back to the source with the responsibility of further development. The Committee Report will provide the source with clear indication of what is necessary to move the item forward for full consideration. The item will be carried in the Committee Agenda in bulletin board fashion with contact information for the person or organization that is responsible for the development. Since the Committee is not required to receive testimony on Developing items, this status should be carefully implemented so as not to weaken the standards development process.

**Withdrawn:** These are items that the Committee has found to be without merit based on overwhelming lack of support by NCWM stakeholders. The Committee's determination to Withdraw should not be based on the Committee's opinion alone, but on the input received from stakeholders. The Committee's report will contain an explanation for the withdrawal of the item.

**Task Groups:** Task groups have been used sparsely as a means of addressing particularly difficult issues. Sometimes these work groups have been more successful than others. The Board believes task groups can be a very effective tool for committees that are struggling with particularly difficult items on a Committee agenda so NCWM is becoming more proactive in creating and supporting the work of these task groups.

Last year, two new task groups were created by then NCWM Chairman, Randy Jennings. He appointed Jeff Humphreys, Los Angeles County, California, to chair the NCWM Task Group on Retail Motor Fuels Price Posting and Computing Capabilities. This task group reports directly to the Specifications and Tolerances (S&T) Committee. The second is the NCWM Task Group on Printer Ink and Toner Cartridges, chaired by Maureen Henzler, Kansas. This task group reports directly to the Laws and Regulations (L&R) Committee.

Resources offered by NCWM to these task groups include meeting space at Interim and Annual Meetings, conference calling services, dedicated e-mail listservs, a web page for posting and archiving documents related to their work, and broadcast e-mail services to reach targeted audiences. Additionally, NIST offered technical advisors and web meeting forums.
100-5C  Meeting Format

The formation of task groups creates a need for meeting space. It is best for task groups to have an opportunity to meet prior to open hearings of the Interim and Annual Meetings so that they can present updated reports and recommendations to their respective Standing Committees during open hearings. Beginning with the 2011 NCWM Interim Meeting, the schedule for Sunday afternoon has been modified. Standing Committees are asked to complete their agenda review in advance of traveling to the meeting via conference call or web meeting. This frees up meeting rooms on Sunday afternoon for task groups to meet and for stakeholders to observe and even participate in those meetings. NCWM has reserved the hour of 4:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. for Standing Committees to have the meeting space if they need additional agenda review before open hearings commence. If this need does not exist, the task groups will be allowed to extend the length of their meetings.

The Board of Directors envisions many opportunities for training and technical work on the Sunday afternoons preceding Interim and Annual Meetings using the space that was formerly occupied by Standing Committees for agenda review sessions.

100-6  Bylaws Amendment: Article I, Section 2 – Tax Exempt Status

Purpose: Update the NCWM Bylaws to recognize NTEP revenues as a significant source of revenue.

Item under Consideration: Amend NCWM Bylaws Article I, Section 2 as follows:

Section 2 - Tax Exempt Status

This Corporation is organized as a not-for-profit business league under section 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code exclusively for not-for-profit purposes, including but not limited to improvement of business conditions, higher business standards and better business methods; promotion of uniformity in weights and measures laws, regulations, and practices; and sponsorship of educational and scientific programs. Such purposes are described in the Article II, “Goals,” in these Bylaws. The Corporation is authorized, for not-for-profit purposes, to make distributions to organizations that qualify as exempt organizations under § 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code, or the corresponding section of any future tax code. The Corporation is primarily supported by membership dues, and registration fees paid by members to attend meetings of the Corporation and by fees for certification of weighing and measuring devices under the National Type Evaluation Program.

No part of the net earnings of the Corporation shall inure to the benefit of, or be distributed to its members, directors, officers, or other private persons, except that the Corporation shall be authorized and empowered to pay reasonable compensation for services rendered and to make payments and distributions in furtherance of the purposes set forth in the Articles of Incorporation. No substantial part of the activities of the Corporation shall be the carrying on of propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation, and the Corporation shall not participate in, or intervene in (including the publication or distribution of statements) any political campaign on behalf of or in opposition to any candidate for public office. Notwithstanding any other provision of these Bylaws, and the Articles of Incorporation, the Corporation shall not carry on any other activities not permitted to be carried on (a) by a Corporation exempt from Federal income tax under section 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code, or the corresponding section of any future Federal tax code, or (b) by a corporation, contributions to which are deductible under the Internal Revenue Code as a trade or business expense ordinary and necessary in the conduct of the Corporation's business.

Discussion: In 1997, NCWM formed into a nonprofit corporation. At that time, NTEP was administered by NIST. In 2000, NCWM assumed administration of NTEP and, thus, began collecting fees for the program such as application fees and annual maintenance fees. Article I, Section 2 of the NCWM Bylaws defines the primary or significant revenue sources for NCWM under our tax exempt status with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). The section has never been updated to recognize revenues received from NTEP.
100-7  **Bylaws Amendment: Article X, Section 6 – Committee Reports**

**Purpose:** Simplify the procedures required in order to request removal of an item from the voting consent calendar of committee reports at the Annual Meetings.

**Item under Consideration:** Amend NCWM Bylaws Article X, Section 6 as follows:

**Section 6 - Committee Reports**

Alternatives that may be used in voting on the reports:

A.  vote on the entire report;

B.  vote on grouped items or sections; or

C.  vote on individual items; according to

1.  committee discretion; or

2.  on request by a voting delegate, with the support of 10 others.

**Discussion:** Each Standing Committee has the option of placing what they believe to be noncontroversial items on a voting consent calendar to expedite the voting process at the Annual Meeting. There are many reasons why a member may wish to have an item removed from the consent calendar. A member may wish to cast a vote in opposition to an item without opposing the other items on the consent calendar. A member may want an opportunity to comment on a specific item before a vote is cast. A member may simply want a separate vote tally for an individual item for the record.

Current Bylaws require that at least 10 voting delegates support such a motion before an item may be removed from the consent calendar for individual consideration. However, this requirement has not been consistently enforced in past years. Committee chairs and NCWM parliamentarians have typically honored any request from the floor to remove items from the committee consent calendar. Members are asked to consider whether the Bylaws should be followed as written or modified as proposed in this item to reflect recent practice.

It is important to note that current Bylaws also stipulate that voting delegates are the only ones permitted to request that an item is removed from the consent calendar. This also has not been consistently enforced during voting sessions at Annual Meetings. The Board of Directors would appreciate comment on the proposed language to determine the most appropriate amendments, if any, that should be considered for this section.

100-8  **Bylaws Amendment: Article X, Sections 9A and 9B – Voting**

**Purpose:** Provide clear definition of voting rights for the House of General Membership in accordance with Article X, Section 3 of the Bylaws.

**Item under Consideration:** Amend NCWM Bylaws Article X, Sections 9A and 9B as follows:

**Section 9A - Voting - Technical Issues**

At the conclusion of debate (if authorized) on a motion, there shall be a call for the vote by voice vote, a show of hands, standing, or electronic count.

A.  **Motion Accepted If:**

1.  a minimum of 27 members of the House of State Representatives votes Yea.
And If

2. a majority of the members of the House of Delegates votes Yea (a minimum of 27 Yea votes required).\(^1\)

And, in the case of motions relating to business items, If

3. a majority of the members of the House of General Membership votes Yea (a minimum of 27 Yea votes required).\(^1\)

B. Motion Rejected If:

1. a minimum of 27 members of the House of State Representatives votes Nay

And If

2. a majority of the members of the House of Delegates votes Nay (a minimum of 27 Nay votes required).\(^1\)

And, in the case of motions relating to business items, If

3. a majority of the members of the House of General Membership votes Nay (a minimum of 27 Nay votes required).\(^1\)

C. Split Vote:

When a split vote is recorded or the minimum number of votes supporting or opposing an issue is not obtained in the House of State Representatives, the issue is returned to the Standing Committee for further consideration, except when there is a split vote on approval of the biennial report for filing with the Nebraska Secretary of State. In the case of a split vote on the filing of the biennial report, the vote of the Chairman on the filing of the report shall prevail.

Except for the biennial report, the Committee may drop the issue or reconsider it for submission the following year. The issue cannot be recalled for another vote at the same Annual Meeting.

Section 9B - Voting - Business Issues

At the conclusion of debate (if authorized) on a motion, there shall be a call for the vote by voice vote. In the event that a voice vote is too close to be determined in the opinion of the Chairman, there shall be a show of hands, standing vote, or machine (electronic) vote count.

A. Motion Accepted If:

1. a majority of those members present and voting vote Yea.

B. Motion Rejected If:

1. a majority of those members present and voting vote Nay.

C. Tie Vote:

In the case of a tie vote, the vote of the Chairman shall prevail.

Discussion: Section 9A – Voting – Technical Issues makes several references to the vote in the House of General Membership. According to Article X, Section 3, this house cannot vote on technical items. Section 9A also makes reference to a split vote of the biennial report which is the election of officers and directors. That is a business item and should not be referenced in Section 9A.

The proposal strikes all references of the House of General Membership from Section 9A as well as references to approval of the biennial report. All business items are adequately addressed in Section 9B – Voting – Business Issues.

---

\(^1\) If the minimum number of votes required to pass or fail an issue is not cast in the House of Delegates or the House of General Membership, the issue will be determined by the vote of the House of State Representatives.
100-9 Strategic Planning

At the fall 2010 Board of Directors meeting, the Board reviewed a report on progress and measures for the goals and strategies of the NCWM Strategic Plan. In January 2011, the Board will review the plan in detail and update the goals and strategies as appropriate. The purpose of the strategic plan is to ensure the organization is moving forward and in the right direction. The plan is available on the NCWM website at www.ncwm.net under the “Members Only” tab.

Five primary goals are contained in the strategic plan.

1. Enhance the NCWM as a national and international resource for measurement standards development.
2. Promote uniform training for individuals involved in weights and measures.
3. Continue to improve the National Type Evaluation Program (NTEP).
4. Expand the role of the NCWM as a resource for state and local weights and measures programs.
5. Ensure financial stability of the NCWM.

National Certification Program: The Board is continuing to refine the strategies and measurements for meeting these goals. One of the strategies for the second goal is the implementation of a National Certification Program for weights and measures officials. This strategy has been placed as a top priority. In the fall of 2010, the Board received a proposal from an individual, to contract services to NCWM as the Certification Exam Coordinator working with the Professional Development Committee (PDC). The Board deliberated over the proposal in a conference call in October and is working out the details of a possible contract for services.

Viable Support for NTEP Laboratories: Another strategy of high priority is to maintain viable support for NTEP laboratories under the third goal. The Board will be monitoring the number of full-time employees associated with the authorized laboratories and will continue to track evaluation time and backlog statistics to ensure that NTEP evaluations can be completed in a timely manner.

Online Position Forum: The project is scheduled for completion by December 2010 and a live demonstration is planned for the 2011 Interim and Annual Meetings. Please see agenda Item 100-2 for more details.

100-10 Financial Report

The NCWM operates on a fiscal year of October 1 through September 30. Budgets are set to be conservative on projected revenues and realistic on anticipated expenses.

The Executive Director was asked to provide a graphic view of NCWM finances before and after NCWM hired its own staff and opened a headquarters office. Prior to that, NCWM contracted for the services of an association management company. Below is a graphic view of the past 10 fiscal years. The spike in expenses in 2008 reflects the cost of the management transition. The management company was still under contract that year while NCWM hired employees and procured office space, furniture, computers, etc. The graph shows significant savings in the following years of 2009 and 2010 even though NCWM invested significantly in new initiatives during that time. Those initiatives of the past two years include the new website with improved functionality, implementation of e-commerce, new regional association websites, the National Certification Program, and other improvements to services.
10-Year Financial Analysis

- 2000 Assets: $550,827.00
- 2007 Assets: $683,113.00
- 7-Year Gain: $132,286.00
- 2008 Loss in Transition: ($113,227.00)
- 2008 Assets: $569,886.00
- 2010 Assets: $936,223.00
- 2-Year Gain: $366,337.00
The following is the balance statement as of September 30, 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSETS</th>
<th>September 30, 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Assets</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking/Savings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Member Fund</td>
<td>6,614.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of Deposit</td>
<td>792,770.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking</td>
<td>36,715.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>170,510.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Checking/Savings</td>
<td>$ 1,006,611.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>8935.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Current Assets</td>
<td>58,342.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Assets</td>
<td>7,002.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ASSETS</td>
<td>$ 1,080,892.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIABILITIES &amp; EQUITY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Liabilities</td>
<td>137,708.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Liabilities</td>
<td>137,708.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Net Assets</td>
<td>784,771.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
<td>158,413.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Equity</td>
<td>943,184.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LIABILITIES &amp; EQUITY</td>
<td>$ 1,080,892.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Tim Tyson, Kansas, NCWM Chairman
Mr. Kurt Floren, Los Angeles, CA, Chairman-Elect
Mr. Randy Jennings, Tennessee, NTEP Chairman
Mr. Richard Cote, New Hampshire, Treasurer
Mr. Michael Sikula, New York, Northeastern Regional Representative
Mr. Ron Hayes, Missouri, Central Regional Representative
Mr. Stephen Benjamin, North Carolina, Southern Regional Representative
Mr. Kirk Robinson, Washington, Western Regional Representative
Mr. Stephen Langford, Cardinal Scale, At-Large
Mr. Mark Coyne, Brockton, Massachusetts, At-Large
Mr. Gordon Johnson, Gilbarco, Associate Membership

Mr. Gilles Vinet, Measurement Canada, Advisory
Ms. Carol Hockert, Chief, NIST, Weights and Measures Division, Executive Secretary
Mr. Jim Truex, NTEP Administrator
Mr. Don Onwiler, NCWM, Executive Director
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Appendix A

Report on the Activities of the
International Organization of Legal Metrology (OIML)
and Regional Legal Metrology Organizations

Weights and Measures Division, NIST

INTRODUCTION

The Weights and Measures Division (WMD) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) is responsible for coordinating U.S. participation in the International Organization of Legal Metrology (OIML) and other international legal metrology organizations. Learn more about OIML at the website (www.oiml.org) and about NIST Weights and Measures Division at the WMD website (www.nist.gov/owm). Dr. Charles Ehrlich, Group Leader of the International Legal Metrology Group (ILMG), can be contacted at charles.ehrlich@nist.gov or at (301) 975-4834 or by fax at (301) 975-8091.

Please note:

- OIML publications are available without cost at http://www.oiml.org.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Key Number</th>
<th>Title of Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Report on the Activities of the OIML Technical Committees</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Report on the 45th CIML Meeting in Orlando, Florida, September 2010</td>
<td>A5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Future OIML Meetings</td>
<td>A7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Regional Legal Metrology Organizations</td>
<td>A8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table B**

**Glossary of Acronyms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIML</td>
<td>International Bureau of Legal Metrology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Basic Publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Committee Draft&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIML</td>
<td>International Committee of Legal Metrology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR</td>
<td>Committee on Participation Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>Draft Document&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Draft Recommendation&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoMC</td>
<td>Declaration of Mutual Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td>Draft Vocabulary&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEC</td>
<td>International Electrotechnical Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILMG</td>
<td>International Legal Metrology Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>International Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWG</td>
<td>International Work Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAA</td>
<td>Mutual Acceptance Arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Measurement Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIML</td>
<td>International Organization of Legal Metrology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Technical Subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Technical Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USNWG</td>
<td>U.S. National Work Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> CD: a draft at the stage of development within a Technical Committee or Subcommittee; in this document, successive drafts are numbered 1 CD, 2 CD, etc.

<sup>2</sup> DD, DR, and DV: draft documents approved at the level of the Technical Committee or Subcommittee concerned and sent to BIML for approval by CIML.

<sup>3</sup> WD: precedes the development of a CD; in this document, successive drafts are number 1 WD, 2 WD, etc.

---

**Details of All Items**

*(In Order by Reference Key Number)*

### I. Report on the Activities of the OIML Technical Committees

This section reports on recent activities and the status of work in the OIML Technical Committees (TCs) and Technical Subcommittees (SCs) of specific interest to members of the NCWM. Also included are schedules of future activities of the Secretariats, the U.S. National Work Groups (USNWGs), and the International Work Groups (IWGs) of the Committees and Subcommittees.

**TC 3/SC 5 “Conformity assessment” (United States)**

The Subcommittee held a meeting in Paris, France in October 2010 to discuss the revision of the documents B 3 (Certificate System) and B 10 (Mutual Acceptance Arrangement). A 2 CD of B 3 and a first CD of B 10 were sent to TC 3/SC 5 members in December 2009 with responses due by the end of April 2010. International comments on a new document entitled “The role of measurement uncertainty in conformity assessment decisions in legal metrology” have been received and are being used by the Secretariat to develop the 2 CD. Please see the Mutual Acceptance Agreement (MAA) section in the NTEP report of this publication for more details on the activities of TC 3/SC 5. For more information on the activities of this Subcommittee, please contact Dr. Charles Ehrlich at (301) 975-4834 or at charles.ehrlich@nist.gov.

**TC 5/SC 1 “Environmental conditions” (Netherlands)**

The Secretariat has started the revision cycle of D 11 “General requirements for electronic measuring instruments,” and a working draft should be available in 2011. This is a very important document in the OIML system and is used by all of the OIML TCs as a general reference for technical and testing requirements on all electronic instruments. The OIML Expert Report E 5 “Overview of the present status of the Standards referred to in OIML D 11 – General
Requirements for Electronic Measuring Instruments” (first edition, 2004; second edition, 2008) has just been revised again, and was published in February 2010. The document updates all of the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) references for testing requirements in D 11. Please contact Mr. Ralph Richter at (301) 975-3997 or at ralph.richter@nist.gov, if you would like further information on this project.

TC 5/SC 2 “Software” (Germany and BIML)
The new OIML Document D 31 “General requirements for software-controlled measuring instruments” was published in December 2008 and will serve as guidance for software requirements in International Recommendations by OIML TCs. The United States participated in the technical work on this document. A new project on software verification was also approved by the CIML, and the United States is waiting for the first draft of this document. The ILMG participated in the NCWM Software Sector meeting in Sacramento, California, in March 2010. Please contact Dr. Ambler Thompson at (301) 975-2333 or at ambler@nist.gov, if you would like to discuss OIML software efforts.

TC 6 “Prepackaged products” (South Africa)
A project to develop an OIML International Quantity Mark, referred to as an IQ Mark, is still ongoing. The IQ Mark is intended to eliminate the need for redundant inspections for compliance with legal metrology requirements for labeling and net contents. Receiving countries want imported packages to meet all of their legal metrology requirements – and packers in exporting countries want to ensure prepackages will not be rejected or require additional inspections after arriving in the destination country. The initial proposal for the program would require that participating packagers meet specific requirements in order to participate in a program for quantity control and labeling of prepackaged goods. The United States is participating in a work group that is developing guidelines on good manufacturing practices that would be used in the IQ Mark’s accreditation programs. Earlier in this project, members of TC 6 sent questionnaires to current stakeholders, including industry and federal/state agencies seeking input on specific questions. NIST WMD surveyed U.S. industry, including the largest manufacturers of packaged goods, and found no support for U.S. participation in the IQ Mark program. The United States believes the effort to manage and certify quality control systems will add unnecessary extra costs to all participating suppliers. Even though there is significant opposition to the IQ Mark effort from several countries (including the United States, Denmark, Switzerland and Canada), TC 6 continues to move forward with this project under the premise that such a voluntary system would be of value to developing countries. The United States voted “no” on the 2 CD of the IQ-mark document in May 2010 and encouraged the Secretariat to stop the project in favor of devoting resources to revising and updating other TC 6 recommendations.

NIST is assisting TC 6 in another important project by initiating a comprehensive review of the statistical requirements and sampling plans contained in OIML R 87 “Quantity of Product in Prepackages” (the OIML equivalent to NIST Handbook 133 “Checking the Net Contents of Packaged Goods”) and has sent preliminary comments to the Secretariat highlighting several shortcomings identified in the initial review. Please contact Mr. Ken Butcher at (301) 975 4859 or at kenneth.butcher@nist.gov, if you would like more information about the work of this Subcommittee or to participate in any of these projects.

TC 8 “Measurement of quantities of fluids” (Switzerland)
The CIML has approved projects to revise the following TC 8 documents: R 63 “Petroleum measurement tables” (1994) and R 119 “Pipe provers for testing of measuring systems for liquids other than water” (1996). Both of these documents are important for other OIML Recommendations involving liquid measurement. Please contact Mr. Ralph Richter at (301) 975-3997 or at ralph.richter@nist.gov, if you would like copies of the documents or to participate in any of these projects.

TC 8/SC 1 “Static volume and mass measurement” (Austria and Germany)
Two revised Recommendations, OIML R 71, “Fixed storage tanks,” and R 85, “Automatic level gages for measuring the level of liquid in fixed storage tanks,” were published in 2009. The United States, however, had serious opposition to the inclusion of specialized tanks (including pressurized tanks and non-vertical tanks) in the scope statements of both R 71 and R 85 because the requirements in the Recommendations did not fully reflect this inclusion. The United States now chairs an International Work Group (IWG) that is drafting new sections of R 71 and R 85 that will include the specific requirements for specialized tanks. OIML R 80-1, “Road and rail tankers, metrological and technical requirements,” was published in May 2009. OIML R 80-2, “Road and rail tankers, test methods,” is being developed. The revisions to R 71 and R 85 and the development of R 80-2 were discussed at a
Subcommittee meeting in Vienna, Austria, in October 2009. Please contact Mr. Ralph Richter at (301) 975-3997 or at ralph.richter@nist.gov, if you would like copies of the documents or to participate in any of these projects.

TC 8/SC 3 “Dynamic volume and mass measurement for liquids other than water” (United States and Germany)
Subcommittee work is continuing on the development of OIML R 117-2, “Dynamic measuring systems for liquids other than water. Part 2. Test methods,” and R 117-3 “Test report format.” Meetings of the IWG for the development of R 117 were held in Boras, Sweden, in January 2010; and at NIST in Gaithersburg, Maryland, in May 2010. The IWG for the development of R 117 has also held several international webinars to accelerate the work on this high priority document. A first committee draft of R 117-2 is planned for late 2010. If you have any questions or would like to participate in the next phases of this project, please contact Mr. Ralph Richter at (301) 975-3997 or ralph.richter@nist.gov.

TC 8/SC 5 “Water Meters” (UK)
OIML, ISO, and CEN are working together to harmonize requirements for water meters using OIML R 49 “Water meters intended for the metering of cold potable water and hot water” Parts 1, 2, and 3 as the base document. The Joint Working Group of these three organizations distributed the 1 CD of the harmonized document in December 2009. This document was circulated to interested U.S. parties, and U.S. comments were sent back to the Secretariat in April 2010. International comments on the 1 CD were discussed at a joint meeting of the three organizations in April 2010 in Paris, France. The American Water Works Association (AWWA) Committee on Water Meters is assisting in these efforts. Please contact Mr. Ralph Richter at (301) 975-3997 or ralph.richter@nist.gov, if you would like copies of documents or to participate in this project.

TC 8/SC 6 “Measurement of cryogenic liquids” (United States)
Members of the Subcommittee and U.S. stakeholders decided that there is sufficient justification for revising R 81, “Dynamic measuring devices and systems for cryogenic liquids.” Responses received by the Secretariat indicated that a revision of R 81 was justified to update: (1) electronic tests in accordance with the latest edition of OIML D 11 (2004) and/or the latest IEC and ISO standards; (2) technical requirements to include new developments in hydrogen measurements; (3) Annex C to include current recommendations for density equations; and (4) existing sections into three distinct parts similar in format to recently-developed OIML Recommendations. The Secretariat will ask members of TC 8/SC 6 and the USNWG to review and formally comment on the first draft of the revised R 81. To obtain more information or to participate in this project, please contact Ms. Juana Williams at (301) 975-3989 or juana.williams@nist.gov.

TC 8/SC 7 “Gas metering” (Netherlands)
The Secretariat has distributed the first committee draft (1 CD) of OIML R 137-1 and R 137-2, “Gas meters; Part 1: Metrological and Technical Requirements, and Part 2: Metrological controls and performance tests.” U.S. comments were developed in cooperation with the measurement committees of the American Gas Association (AGA) and returned to the Secretariat in February 2010. This document is especially important to U.S. interests because the ANSI B 109 Committee on gas measurement is using OIML R 137 to create a new performance-based standard for gas meters in the United States. Meetings of the working group that is developing this new standard “ANSI B 109.0zero” were held in Tucson, Arizona, in February 2010 and Kansas City, Missouri in September 2010. A meeting of TC 8/SC 7 to discuss international comments on the 1 CD of R 137 was held in June 2010 in the Netherlands. The Secretariat distributed the 2 CD of R 137 for international comment in September 2010. Please contact Mr. Ralph Richter at (301) 975-3997 or ralph.richter@nist.gov, if you would like to obtain a copy of any gas measurement documents or if you would like to participate in the work of this Subcommittee.

TC 9 “Instruments for measuring mass” (United States)
The CIIML has approved a new work item to begin revision of OIML R 60:2000 “Metrological regulation for load cells.” It is anticipated that this revision will cover everything from the basic principles of R 60 (e.g., tolerances and accuracy classes) to exploring the addition of new requirements. The United States plans to send a new working draft of R 60 to TC 9 members for comment in 2010. For more information on these efforts, please contact Mr. John Barton at (301) 975-4002 or john.barton@nist.gov.

TC 9/SC 2 “Automatic weighing instruments” (United Kingdom)
The Recommendation R 134-1, “Automatic instruments for weighing road vehicles in motion – total load and axle weighing,” has been approved by the CIIML and was published in October 2009. U.S. comments concerning
terminology and document scope were incorporated in the document. The test report format of this document, R 134-2, has been approved by the Subcommittee and was also published in October 2009. Both OIML R 134 and an ASTM standard will be used to help develop a new section in NIST HB 44 on in-motion weighing systems for the pre-screening of road vehicles. To receive a copy of the OIML documents or to obtain more information on this work, please contact Mr. Richard Harshman at (301) 975-8107 or at harshman@nist.gov.

The DR of OIML R 106 Parts 1 and 2, “Automatic rail-weighbridges,” is close to final approval. U.S. vote and comments on a revised DR of R 106 were returned to the Secretariat in April 2010. To receive copies of these documents or to obtain more information on the work of this Subcommittee, please contact Mr. John Barton at (301) 975-4002 or john.barton@nist.gov.

The Secretariat is in the process of revising OIML R 50 “Continuous totaling automatic weighing instruments (belt weighers).” The US returned comments on the 3 CD of this Recommendation in July 2010, and plans to participate in a meeting on R 50 in Teddington, United Kingdom, in April 2011. For more information on this efforts, please contact Mr. John Barton at (301) 975-4002 or john.barton@nist.gov.

TC 17/SC 1 “Humidity” (China and United States)
The Co-secretariats are working with a small IWG to revise OIML R 59 “Moisture meters for cereal grains and oilseeds.” All drafts have been distributed to the USNWG, which for the most part is a subset of the NTEP Grain Sector. The 5 CD of OIML R 59 was distributed to the Subcommittee in February 2009. A preliminary 6 CD was developed based on international comments received on the 5 CD, and a meeting of TC 17/SC 1 was held in September 2010 in Orlando, Florida. Please contact Ms. Diane Lee at (301) 975-4405 or at diane.lee@nist.gov if you would like to participate in this IWG.

TC 17/SC 8 “Quality Analysis of Agricultural Products” (Australia)
This Subcommittee was formed to study the issues and write a working draft document “Measuring instruments for protein determination in grains.” Australia is the Secretariat. At a TC 17/SC 8 meeting hosted by NIST, the Subcommittee discussed comments concerning the maximum permissible errors (MPEs) and harmonization of the TC 17/SC 8 Recommendation for protein with the TC 17/SC 1 Recommendation for moisture. The Secretariat distributed a 2 CD of the document in February 2010. International comments on the 2CD were received and compiled. These comments were discussed at a meeting of TC 17/SC 8 in September 2010 in Orlando, Florida. Please contact Ms. Diane Lee at (301) 975-4405 or at diane.lee@nist.gov, if you would like to participate in this IWG.

OIML Mutual Acceptance Arrangement (MAA)
The report on the OIML MAA can be found in the NTEP section of this document. For further information on the MAA and its implementation, please contact Dr. Charles Ehrlich at charles.ehrlich@nist.gov or at (301) 975-4834 or by fax at (301) 975-8091.

II. Report on the 45th CIML Meeting in Orlando, Florida in September 2010

The International Committee of Legal Metrology (CIML) opened with an address given by Mr. Alan E. Johnston, CIML President.

The Committee expressed its appreciation for the strong level of interaction and cooperation between the BIML and the International Bureau of Weights and Measures (BIPM). The Committee asked the Director of the BIML to prepare a report on the relationship between the two Organizations to be presented to the 46th CIML meeting with a view to making key decisions on the relationship with the BIPM at the 14th Conference in 2012. This report should be mainly strategic in nature and should consider the point of view of the stakeholders of both organizations.

The Committee expressed its appreciation for the continued cooperation with the International Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation (ILAC) and the International Accreditation Forum (IAF). The Committee instructed the Bureau to pursue the joint work with ILAC and the IAF, also considering the future needs related to OIML acceptance and certification systems.
The Committee noted the OIML liaison with ISO and the IEC. The Committee also instructed the Bureau to pursue cooperation with ISO, to set up similar working relations with the IEC, and to convey relevant information on these issues to CIML Members.

The Committee noted the report on the liaison with the Technical Barriers to Trade Committee (TBT) of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and instructed the Bureau to maintain appropriate contacts with this Organization and to convey relevant information on TBT issues to OIML Members.

The Committee noted a report on the liaison with CODEX Alimentarius (the international food code) and instructed the Bureau to: (1) continue to work towards ensuring consistency of OIML publications with those of CODEX; (2) examine additional fields of cooperation with CODEX other than prepackages; and (3) consult CIML Members before submitting any proposals to CODEX.

The Committee supports the organization of a seminar on the subject of Conformity to Type (CTT) and strongly encourages all member nations to actively contribute to this seminar. The Bureau was instructed to facilitate an electronic working group, chaired by the Member for New Zealand, with the objective of preparing the program for that seminar, taking into account the issues raised and the comments received by member nations. The United States will serve on this working group. The CIML postponed a decision on a proposal for a new subcommittee on Conformity to Type until after the conclusions of the seminar on CTT are made available.

The Committee noted the re-confirmation of the following OIML Publications by their respective Technical Committees and Subcommittees (the United States serves as Secretariat for all of the technical committees responsible for these Recommendations):

- OIML R 92:1989 Wood moisture meters – Verification methods and equipment: general provisions;
- OIML R 127:1999 Radiochromic film dosimetry system for ionizing radiation processing of materials and Products;
- OIML R 131:2001 Polymethylmethacrylate (PMMA) dosimetry systems for ionizing radiation processing of materials and products;
- OIML R 132:2001 Alanine EPR dosimetry systems for ionizing radiation processing of materials and products; and

The Committee instructed the Bureau to submit the Draft Revision of R 100 “Atomic absorption spectrometers for measuring metal pollutants in water” to direct CIML online approval.

The Draft Revision of OIML D 16 “Principles of assurance of metrological control” was submitted to the CIML for online ballot, but it did not receive sufficient support to be approved. Considering the comments made by the Netherlands and Norway as part of the online voting, the CIML requested that OIML TC 3/SC 2 prepare a revised Draft Revision of OIML D 16 with the assistance of the Netherlands and Norway; this revised Draft Revision will then be submitted for direct CIML online approval.

The Committee approved the project to revise:


The Committee approved the withdrawal of the OIML TC 11/SC 2 project on standardized thermocouples.
The ad-hoc working group for the revision of the Directives for the technical work (OIML B 6-1), after several meetings, has not been able to reach consensus on a number of key issues. Considering the negative comments made by some member nations (especially comments from the United States) on several drafts of the revision of OIML B 6-1, the CIML instructed the Bureau to consult all CIML Members by way of an inquiry on their position with regard to specific issues, such as: the structure of the technical work, the proposed Technical Management Committee, and the voting procedures for the adoption of OIML Publications. The plan is that a new Draft Revision will be available to be considered for adoption by the CIML at its 46th Meeting.

The Committee took note of the information provided by the BIML Director concerning the report of the BIML financial and management audit that was done in February 2010 and the actions taken by the Bureau. The Committee instructed its President to send the report of this audit and the BIML Director’s comments on that report to all CIML Members and to continue to follow up on this issue. The Committee instructed the Bureau to continue its efforts to increase the efficiency of its finances and management.

The Committee took note of the report on the pension system and of the comments made by Mr. Peter Mason, United Kingdom, and Dr. Philippe Richard, Switzerland. The Committee noted that the re-evaluated assets of the BIML cover much more than the value of the pension rights acquired and that there will be no need to call for any additional Member State contributions to face this liability.

The Committee elected Mr. Peter Mason as its new CIML President. His six-year term will start at the opening of the 46th CIML Meeting in October 2011.

The Committee elected Dr. Roman Schwartz, Germany, CIML second Vice-President for a six-year term. His six-year term started immediately as the position was vacant.

The Committee appointed Mr. Stephen Patoray, former NCWM NTEP Director, as the new BIML Director. The Committee confirmed its expectation that the commitment to be proficient in French will be a condition of Mr. Patoray’s employment contract.

The Committee awarded OIML Medals to:

- Dr. Nicolai Zhagora of Belarus;
- Dr. Heinz Wallerus of Germany; and
- Mr. Brian Beard of South Africa

for their outstanding contributions to the development of international legal metrology.

III. Future OIML Meetings

The Czech Republic will host the 46th CIML Meeting in Prague, Czech Republic. The meeting is planned for October 9 – 14, 2011.

The Committee expressed its thanks to Romania for its offer to host the 14th OIML Conference and 47th CIML Meeting in 2012.
IV. Regional Legal Metrology Organizations

Meeting of the Inter-American Metrology System (SIM) General Assembly and the SIM Legal Metrology Work Group (LMWG)

The SIM General Assembly was held in Lima, Peru, during the last week of October 2009. Dr. Humberto S. Brandi, Director of Scientific and Industrial Metrology (SIM) at INMETRO Brazil, is the SIM President. Mr. Marcos Senna mjsenna@inmetro.gov.br, also of INMETRO in Brazil, serves as the Chairman of the SIM Legal Metrology Work Group (LMWG). The organization is working to build capacity in legal metrology for SIM member countries. Please contact Mr. Ralph Richter at (301) 975-3997 or at ralph.richter@nist.gov for more information.

Asia-Pacific Legal Metrology Forum (APLMF)

The 17th Meeting of the Asia-Pacific Legal Metrology Forum (APLMF) in was held September 13 – 16, 2010 in Victoria, British Columbia, Canada. The Peoples Republic of China holds the Presidency and Secretariat of the APLMF. Mr. Pu Changcheng, APLMF President and Vice Minister of AQSIQ, chaired the meeting. The APLMF activities are facilitated through its seven work groups. The most active is the work group on Training Coordination chaired by Australia.

The main objectives of APLMF are to coordinate regional training courses in legal metrology and to provide a forum for exchange of information among legal metrology authorities. There were three training courses and one Workshop given by APLMF this year. The training courses, covering requirements in select OIML Recommendations, and offered primarily to assist the developing countries in APLMF, were on gas meters, non-automatic weighing instruments (NAWIs) (weighbridges), and mass flow meters. There was also a workshop on Software Controlled Measuring Instruments. While feedback from the previously-held training courses has been positive, it is becoming clear that in order to continue to receive funding for the training, the APLMF needs to do a more thorough job of assessing and documenting the impact of the training courses on the economies that receive the training.

For 2011, APLMF is working to obtain funding for a new multi-faceted pilot project to significantly improve the accuracy and processes for metering liquid petroleum products in the Asia-Pacific region.

The United States was represented at the meeting in Victoria, British Columbia by Dr. Charles Ehrlich, who serves as Chairman of the APLMF Work Group on Mutual Recognition Arrangements, and by Mr. Ralph Richter. Dr. Ehrlich gave an extensive report and update on the OIML MAA. Mr. Richter prepared and presented the United States Country Report. The 2011 APLMF meeting is scheduled to be held in Seoul, South Korea, during the last week of September 2011.
Associate Membership Committee (AMC)
Interim Agenda
January 25, 2011

Robert Murnane, Jr.
President
Seraphin Test Measure

- Call to Order
- Approval of July 12, 2010, AMC Minutes
- Financial Condition
- NCWM Industry Representative Reports
  Board of Directors Report (Gordon Johnson)
  Professional Development Report (Steve Grabski)
  Laws and Regulations Report (Rob Underwood)
- AMC Fund Disbursement Requests
  2010 Training Funds Report
  New Training Requests
- Old Business
- New Business
- Adjournment
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200 INTRODUCTION

The Laws and Regulations (L&R) Committee (Committee) will address the following items (Table A) at its Interim Meeting. All items are listed in Table A by Reference Key Number. The first three digits of an item’s Reference Key Number are assigned from the Subject Series List below. The appendices to the report are listed in Table A under an appendix heading. The acronyms for organizations and technical terms used throughout the Agenda are identified in a glossary in Table B. The fact that an item may appear on the Agenda does not mean it will be presented to the National Conference on Weights and Measures (NCWM) for a vote; the Committee may withdraw some items, present some items for information and further study, issue interpretations, or make specific recommendations for changes to the publications identified below. The recommendations presented in this Agenda are statements of proposal and not necessarily recommendations of the Committee.

This Agenda contains recommendations to amend the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Handbook 130, (HB 130) “Uniform Laws and Regulations in the areas of Legal Metrology and Engine Fuel Quality,” (2011), and NIST Handbook 133, “Checking the Net Contents of Packaged Goods,” (2011). The “Item(s) Under Consideration” (formerly designated as “Recommendations”) are statements of proposals and are not necessarily those of the Committee. Suggested revisions to the handbooks are shown in **bold face print** by **striking out** information to be deleted and **underlining** information to be added. Additions proposed for the handbooks are designated as such and are shown in bold face print. Proposals presented for information only are designated as such and are shown in italic type. The section mark, “§,” may be used in some references in the text and is followed by the section number and title, (for example, Section 1.2, Weight).

**Note:** The policy of NIST is to use metric units of measurement in all of its publications; however, recommendations received by the NCWM technical committees and regional weights and measures associations have been printed in this publication as submitted. Therefore, the report may contain references to inch-pound units.
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231  UNIFORM PACKAGING AND LABELING REGULATION (UPLR)

231-1 HB130, Packaging and Labeling Requirements, Section 6, Declaration of Quantity: Consumer Products

Source: Northeastern Weights and Measures Association (NEWMA)
Purpose: To allow manufacturers to develop multilingual labels. This item would permit manufacturers to use approved symbols on consumer packages.

Item Under Consideration: Amend HB 130 Packaging and Labeling Regulations, Section 6: Declaration of Quantity: Consumer Packages, addition to 6.4.1. Combination Declaration:

Numerical Count

Numerical count can be expressed as either:

(a) alpha-numeric characters (Figure A); or

(b) alpha-numeric characters in conjunction with an approved symbol of the commodity from Section 6.7.1 (Figure B).

Amend HB 130 Packaging and Labeling Regulations, Section 6: Declaration of Quantity: Consumer Packages, Section 6.7.1., Symbols and Abbreviations (Figure C).

Background/Discussion: A representative of Procter and Gamble (P&G) submitted a proposal at the 2009 NEWMA Interim Meeting held in Springfield, Massachusetts. This proposal is to amend the language in HB 130 Packaging and Labeling Regulation, Section 6 that will facilitate value comparisons for a diverse set of consumers. It is proposed to amend the net content declaration of content for consumer products labeled only with a count to allow for the use of approved symbols. According to P&G, this will limit the language of net content information, especially products with multi-language declarations, making the statement more noticeable to the eye. In addition, labels that are intended towards consumers whose first language is not English will benefit from knowing the content visually versus by text. P&G states that by ensuring the net content information is more noticeable; consumers will be more likely to make value comparisons.

P&G cites 21CFR 201.15 (c)(2); this requirement formally applies to over the counter drug products, but absent guidance for other categories of products subject to the Food Drug and Cosmetic Act (FD&C Act) and Food Packaging and Labeling Act (FPLA). This provides the best guidance principles for manufacturers to develop compliant multilingual labels. P&G states that net content translation and package size considerations can make a compliant statement difficult to understand.

Language extracted from 21 CFR 201.15:

(c)(1) All words, statements, and other information required by or under authority of the act to appear on the label or labeling shall appear thereon in the English language: Provided, however, that in the case of articles distributed solely in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico or in a Territory where the predominant language is one other than English, the predominant language may be substituted for English.
(2) If the label contains any representation in a foreign language, all words, statements, and other information required by or under authority of the act to appear on the label shall appear thereon in the foreign language.

(3) If the labeling contains any representation in a foreign language, all words, statements, and other information required by or under authority of the act to appear on the label or labeling shall appear on the labeling in the foreign language.

At the 2009 NEWMA Interim Meeting held October 12 - 15, 2009, in Springfield, Massachusetts, the NEWMA L&R Committee recommended this proposal be a Developing item.

At the 2010 NCWM Interim Meeting held in Nashville, Tennessee, Mr. Chris Guay, P&G, provided an explanation that in Europe products sold by count are using pictograms in the net content declaration and the package could be considered multi-language. This system would allow for industry to develop one package that can be used in several different countries without having to develop packaging for one specific language. An official urged that this be a Developing item to see if pictograms could be acceptable.

The Committee would like to see this item go through all the regions (NEWMA, CWMA, WWMA, and SWMA) for review and comment. The Committee requested from Mr. Guay an approved set of international pictograms and further information on the labeling requirements (FPLA). The NIST Technical Advisor will also research the pictograms for any conflicts with other Federal Laws and Regulations. The NIST Technical Advisor met with the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) on February 26, 2010, to seek their assistance in reviewing this proposal. The L&R Committee agreed that this should be a Developing item.

At the 2010 NEWMA Annual Meeting held in Groton, Connecticut, in May 2010, there were no comments heard on this item. The NEWMA L&R Committee agreed that this item should remain as a Developing item until further information is made available. The NIST Technical Advisor has not heard back from FTC regarding this issue.

At the 2010 CWMA Annual Meeting held in Springfield, Illinois, in May 2010, an industry representative mentioned that there are several issues with this proposal: the Federal Drug Administration (FDA) will need to update labeling regulations, changing demographics, and international marketing of products requiring information in several languages. Regulations need to be put in place to either prohibit this practice or to establish guidelines and regulations. An inspector commented that the use of pictographs is currently in the marketplace, and it is considered a violation in their jurisdiction.

At the NCWM Annual Meeting held in St. Paul, Minnesota, on July 12 - 15, 2010, no comments were received on this item.

At the 2010 CWMA Interim Meeting held in Rock Island, Illinois, an industry representative provided an explanation that the use of pictograms is already appearing in the marketplace. Due to limited space restrictions on packages, pictographs are preferred over the use of multiple languages. It was commented that this is an acceptable practice in Europe, where several languages may be required on products. The CWMA L&R Committee recommends that the NCWM L&R seek further guidance from FDA and FTC and that this be an Informational item.

At the 2010 WWMA Annual Meeting held in Olympia, Washington, a manufacturer representative stated that several large manufacturers are currently using pictograms on packages. The representative is asking for guidance and language from the NCWM L&R as to the acceptable practice of using pictograms. A county and state official questioned how “acceptable” pictograms, if approved, would be controlled. Questions were raised on who would maintain, approve, and standardize these pictograms. They further stated that use of a pictogram should not replace current language for net quantity. The WWMA L&R Committee recommends that use of a pictogram be supplemental, if used, and not part of the net quantity statement. The WWMA L&R Committee would like to see additional information on the international use of pictograms. The WWMA L&R Committee recommends that this be a Developing item, in order for the NCWM L&R Committee to seek guidance from the FTC.
At the 2010 SWMA Annual Meeting held in Columbia, South Carolina, there were no comments heard during open hearings. The SWMA L&R Committee would like to see a database of approved pictographs and would also like to know who would be responsible for updating, maintaining, and disseminating this information to the states. The SWMA L&R Committee recommends that this item move forward as a Developing item.

At the 2010 NEWMA Interim Meeting held in Norwich, Connecticut, there were no comments heard on this item. The NEWMA L&R Committee recommends that this be a Developing item.


Source: Central Weights and Measures Association (CWMA)

Purpose: Provide clearer language to help guide industry and state officials when. Federal agencies are inconsistent in their interpretations, and this proposal provides better guidance.

Item Under Consideration:

6.12. Supplementary Quantity Declarations. – The required quantity declaration may be supplemented by one or more declarations of weight, measure, or count, such declaration appearing other than on a principal display panel. Such supplemental statement of quantity of contents shall not include any term qualifying a unit of weight, measure, or count that tends to exaggerate the amount of commodity contained in the package (e.g., “giant” quart, “larger” liter, “full” gallon, “when packed,” “minimum,” “equivalent,” “lasts the same as,” or words of similar import).

6.14. Qualification of Declaration Prohibited. – In no case shall any declaration of quantity be qualified by the addition of the words “when packed,” “minimum,” or “not less than,” “equivalent,” or “lasts the same as” or any words of similar import (e.g., “approximately”), nor shall any unit of weight, measure, or count be qualified by any term (such as “jumbo,” “giant,” “full,” or the like) that tends to exaggerate the amount of commodity.

(Amended 1998)

Background/Discussion: Manufacturers are using the terms “equivalent,” “lasts the same as” to qualify net weight statements. Clearer language is needed provide consumers with better information. Industries and state officials need better guidance for product labeling. Currently FTC does not consider the terms “equivalent,” or “lasts the same as” exaggerated or misleading.

At the 2010 CWMA Interim Meeting a state regulator presented an example of label (refer to Appendix A) that was perceived as mislabeled. It was agreed that no conflicting information regarding the net weight statement should be in the lower one-third of the principal display panel (PDP). The CWMA L&R Committee recommends that this move forward as a Voting item.

231-3 Packaging and Labeling Requirements, Section 9. Prominence and Placement: Non-Consumer Packages

Source: Western Weights and Measures Association

Purpose: Modify HB 130 – UPLR, Section 9.2. Prominence and Placement: Non-consumer packages, add a minimum height requirement.

Item Under Consideration:

Section 9. Prominence and Placement: Non-consumer Packages
9.1. General. – All information required to appear on a non-consumer package shall be definitely and clearly stated thereon in the English language. Any required information that is either in hand lettering or hand script shall be entirely clear and equal to printing in legibility.

9.2. Minimum Height of Numbers and Letters. - The height of any letter or number in the quantity declaration on a non-consumer package shall not be less than that shown in Table 1 with respect to the area of the panel and the height of each number of a common fraction shall meet one-half the minimum height standards. When upper and lower case or all lowercase letters are used in SI symbols, it is the uppercase “L,” lowercase “d,” or their equivalent in the print or type that shall meet the minimum height requirement. However, no letter shall be less than 1.6 mm (1/16 in) in height. Other letters and exponents must be presented in the same type style and in proportion to the type size used.

Background/Discussion: At the 2010 WWMA Annual Meeting a county weights and measures official commented that same requirement for consumer and non-consumer package should exist. They have found quantity declarations on non-consumer packages that were in a font size that was so small, it was easily missed. By requiring a minimum font size for the quantity declaration on these packages weights and measures officials will have an easier time being able to evaluate labels for FPLA requirements and follow-up on short measure packages.

The NIST Technical Advisor noted that under the FPLA and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) regulations, there are no minimum height requirements for non-consumer packages this proposal raises the potential for conflict, which may result in federal preemption. It was also noted that defining the term “definitely and clearly stated” by a qualifying statement that it be a minimum 1.6 mm (1/16 in) in height could nullify its meaning. It was further mentioned that the term “definitely and clearly stated” affects free area, style of type or lettering, minimum height of letters and numbers, and proportion of numbers and letters for non-consumer packages. The WWMA L&R Committee recommends that this item move forward as a Voting item.

231-4 HB 130, Packaging and Labeling Requirements, 10.4 Multi-unit Packages.

Source: Central Weights and Measures and Procter and Gamble

Purpose: Provide specific language and more than one way in defining the labeled net contents for multi-packs.

Item Under Consideration:

10.4. Multi-unit Packages. (NOTE 7, page 78) – Any package containing more than one individual “commodity in package form” (see Section 2.1. Package) of the same commodity shall bear on the outside of the package a declaration of:

(a) the number of individual units;

(b) the quantity of each individual unit; and

(c) the total quantity of the contents of the multi-unit package.

Example:

Soap bars, 6 Bars, Net Wt 100 g (3.53 oz) each
Total Net Wt 600 g (1.32 lb).

The term “total” or the phrase “total contents” may precede the quantity declaration.

A multi-unit package containing unlabeled individual packages which are not intended for retail sale separate from the multi-unit package may contain, in lieu of the requirements of section (a), a declaration of quantity of contents expressing the total quantity of the multi-unit package without regard for inner packaging. For such multi-unit packages it shall be optional to include a statement of the number of individual packages when such a statement is not otherwise required by the regulations.
Examples:

Deodorant Cakes:
5 Cakes, Net Wt 113 g (4 oz) each, Total Net Wt 566 g (1.25 lb); or
5 Cakes, Total Net Wt 566 g (1 lb 4 oz)

Soap Packets:
10 Packets, Net Wt 56.6 g (2 oz) each, Total Net Wt 566 g (1.25 lb); or Net Wt 566 g (1 lb 4 oz); or
10 Packets, Total Net Wt 566 g (1 lb 4 oz)

(Amended 1993)

(d) The net content statement for a multi-unit package may have either metric or inch pounds appear first. Since the secondary unit on the primary package is often a rounded value, the difference between primary and secondary declaration is multiplied by the number of individual units in the multi-unit package. Multi-unit product net content declarations may either multiply both primary and secondary units by the number of units in the multi-unit package or multiply the primary declarations by the number of units and convert (and round) this quantity.

(Added 201X)

NOTE 7: For foods, a “multi-unit” package means a package containing two or more individually packaged units of the identical commodity in the same quantity, intended to be sold as part of the multi-unit package but labeled to be individually sold in full compliance with this regulation. Open multi-unit retail food packages under the authority of the Food and Drug Administration or the U.S. Department of Agriculture that do not obscure the number of units or prevent examination of the labeling on each of the individual units are not required to declare the number of individual units or the total quantity of contents of the multi-unit package if the labeling of each individual unit complies with requirements so that it is capable of being sold individually. (See also Section 11.11. Soft Drink Bottles and Section 11.12. Multi-Unit Soft-Drink Bottles.)

(Added 1984)

Background/Discussion: This proposal was submitted by Mr. Guay with P&G. Mr. Guay is requesting a valid way for defining the labeled net contents for a multi-pack (multiples of the same product, packaged together). One approach allows for the inch-pound units and metric units from a single package to be multiplied by the number of packages within the multi-pack. Multiplying both values by the number of units compounds the rounding error of a single package. This would cause the content/weight statement to be inaccurate. However, this would be a consumer friendly approach.

The second approach would allow the first declaration (either inch-pound units or metric units) from a single package to be multiplied by the number of packages in the multi-pack and the primary value is converted to the secondary unit. This approach is more accurate than the first approach.

Example of the net contents for 15 pack of Tide:

15 x 1.2 L =18.0 L =18000 mL
15 x 40 FL OZ = 600 FL OZ
18 L (600 FL OZ)

Or

18000 mL x 1 FL OZ divided by 29.5735 mL = 608.653 FL OZ
18 L (608 FL OZ)

Compare the two: 18 L (608 FL OZ) vs. 18 L (600 FL OZ)
At the 2010 CWMA Interim Meeting, the submitter of this proposal submitted the language in the section “Item under Consideration.” He mentioned that they are being fined in some states for labeling issues. The CWMA L&R Committee recommends that the language submitted be considered by the NCWM L&R Committee.

At the 2010 WWMA Annual Meeting, a manufacturer stated that they have been fined by a state regarding the method used to calculate total net weight on multi unit packages. The manufacturer stated that one method is consumer friendly while the other is more accurate. The manufacturer is seeking input on the merit of this item before submitting specific language. A county official explained that whatever method is used, neither may overstate the actual net content. This historically has been the preferred method rather than requiring an exact conversion. The WWMA L&R Committee agrees that this is clearly permitted based on Section 6.13 of the UPLR, “Rounding” that states “in no case shall rounded net content declarations overstate a quantity; the packer may round converted values down to avoid overstating the net contents.” The WWMA L&R Committee recommends that this item be Withdrawn.

At the 2010 SWMA Annual Meeting and the 2010 NEWMA Interim Meeting, both of these member states voted to recommend that this item be Withdrawn because existing guidance in Section 6.13 of the UPLR is deemed sufficient to address the issue raised.

### 232 METHOD OF SALE REGULATION

#### 232-1 HB 130, Method of Sale Regulation Section 2.13.4. “Declaration of Weight”

**Source:** Western Weights and Measures Association (WWMA)

**Purpose:** Update HB 130, Section 2.13.4. to provide new density values for heavier density plastics that are currently in the marketplace.

**Item under Consideration:** Amend HB 130, Method of Sale Regulation, Section 2.13.4. as follows:

2.13.4. Declaration of Weight. – The labeled statement of weight for polyethylene sheeting and film products under Sections 2.13.1.1. Sheeting and film, and 2.13.3.1. Bags, shall be equal to or greater than the weight calculated by using the formula below. The final value shall be calculated to four digits, and declared to three digits, dropping the final digit as calculated (for example, if the calculated value is 2.078 lb, then the declared net weight shall be 2.07 lb).

For SI dimensions:

\[
M = T \times A \times D / 1000, \text{ where:}
\]

- \(M\) = net mass in kilograms
- \(T\) = nominal thickness in centimeters
- \(A\) = nominal length in centimeters times nominal width \([\text{NOTE 6, page 122}]\) in centimeters
- \(D\) = density in grams per cubic centimeter as determined by ASTM Standard D1505 68, Standard Method of Test for Density of Plastics by the Density Gradient Technique (or latest issue)

For the purpose of this regulation, **when \(D\) is not known**, the minimum density \((D)\) used to calculate the target net weight for linear low polyethylene products (LLPD) and products other than high density (HDPE) shall be 0.92 g/cm³ (when \(D\) is not known).

**For products labeled High Density (HDPE) or similar wording, the minimum density \((D)\) used to calculate the target net weight shall be 0.95 g/cm³.**
For inch-pound dimensions:

\[ W = T \times A \times 0.03613 \times D, \]

where:

- \( W \) = net weight in pounds;
- \( T \) = nominal thickness in inches;
- \( A \) = nominal length in inches times nominal width \(^{[\text{NOTE 6, page } 122]}\) in inches;
- \( D \) = density in grams per cubic centimeter as determined by ASTM Standard D1505 68, Standard Method of Test for Density of Plastics by the Density Gradient Technique (or latest issue); and
- 0.03613 is a factor for converting \( g/cm^3 \) to \( lb/in^3 \).

For the purpose of this regulation, the minimum density shall be 0.92 g/cm\(^3\). (Added 1977) (Amended 1980, 1982, 1987, 1989, 1990, and 201X)

**NOTE 6:** The nominal width for bags in this calculation is twice the labeled width.

**Background/Discussion:** It was stated at the 2009 WWMA Annual Meeting in Los Cruces, New Mexico, that manufacturers and distributors of polyethylene bags are using the calculated target weight identified in HB 130 Section 2.13.4. to understate the net quantity of their labels. The polyethylene industry recognizes a density value of 0.92 g/cm\(^3\) for linear low density polyethylene (LLDP) products. When 0.92 g/cm\(^3\) is used to calculate the target net weight of high density polyethylene (HDPE), the product may make the target net weight. However, when the appropriate density value of 0.95 g/cm\(^3\) is used to test HDPE, the product often fails to meet the calculated target net weight. Further testing reveals that one or more of the labeled width, thickness, or count statements are inaccurate. It appears that some manufacturers are aware that weights and measures officials are restricted to testing HDPE product using the 0.92 g/cm\(^3\) value because the actual density value is not stated on the product label. Existing procedural guidelines do not address HDPE materials. When testing at manufacturing locations, weights and measures officials are able to obtain information regarding the density of the product directly from the manufacturer. However, at distributor locations density information is not available and officials must test using the 0.92 g/cm\(^3\) value designated in HB 130 and HB 133 to verify the weight of the product. When the product has no net weight statement on the package, 0.92 g/cm\(^3\) is the only factor that the inspector may use to calculate the target net weight.

The 2009 WWMA Association supports the following item and recommends that it be a Voting item:

2.13.4. Declaration of Weight. – The labeled statement …

**For the purpose of this regulation, the minimum density shall be 0.92 g/cm\(^3\) (when \( D \) is not known).**

For the purpose of this regulation, the minimum density shall be 0.92 g/cm\(^3\).

Amend Section 2.13.4. Declaration of Weight as follows:

For the purpose of this regulation, when \( D \) is not known, the minimum density \((D)\) used to calculate the target net weight for linear low polyethylene products (LLDP) and products other than high density (HDPE) shall be 0.92 g/cm\(^3\) (when \( D \) is not known). For products labeled “High Density,” HDPE, or similar wording, the minimum density \((D)\) used to calculate the target net weight shall be 0.95 g/cm\(^3\).

The NEWMA L&R Committee reviewed this item at its 2009 Interim Meeting and recommends that this proposal be a Developing item.

At the 2010 NCWM Interim Meeting held in Nashville, Tennessee, the Committee heard support for the density factor changing from 0.92 g/cm\(^3\) to 0.95 g/cm\(^3\) on this item. A California county commissioner indicated that the information provided by the WWMA was data extracted from Internet searches. Manufacturers are complaining that under current practice they cannot compete fairly.

Mr. Jackelen from Berry Plastics urged the Committee to reject this proposal. Mr. Jackelen stated that 0.92 g/cm\(^3\) density currently works for manufacturers and that changing it to 0.95 g/cm\(^3\) will cause undue cost and waste. Most
manufacturers do not make high density (HD) bags, but are producing blends. According to Mr. Jackelen, another reason to reject the proposal is if the 0.95 g/cm³ bag is punctured, it continues to tear.

A state official commented that if you use the term HD, then you are bound by the 0.95 g/cm³. If you use the length x width x thickness x density to determine the net weight, then the density value needs to be added on the package labeling. A state official said that manufacturers should consider disclosing the density factor on every product as part of the labeling. It was voiced that if there are questions about an absolute 0.95 g/cm³ density, then there should be an alternative.

Another state official commented that the 0.95 g/cm³ will be factored in only when the density is not known. The Committee received letters that were reviewed on this item. The Committee recommended moving the item under consideration forward as a Voting item.

At the 2010 NEWMA Annual Meeting in Groton, Connecticut, there was concern that there appears to be a lack of data on this item. It was never reviewed by all regions and also not presented to industry to seek comments. The NEWMA L&R Committee felt that this item was not an emergency and would like to review comments received from all the regions and industry.

At the 2010 CWMA Annual Meeting in Springfield, Illinois, the CWMA L&R Committee heard no comments on this item and recommends moving it forward as a Voting item.

At the 2010 NCWM National Meeting in St. Paul, Minnesota, the Committee heard from Mr. Jackelen (refer to Appendix B) who opposed this item and requested that it be withdrawn. Mr. Jackelen believes this proposal will have a detrimental effect because can liners are made of natural gas and oil and the cost of these two items are increasing. Currently, the 0.92 g/cm³ is an established practice in industry and the marketplace and is used to set the bottom weight Changing this density will cause confusion. Mr. Jackelen clarified that high density (HD) does not mean it is a better density. There are other linear bags that have higher quality than HD. As far as sustainability, if 0.95 g/cm³ is the established requirement it will cause an additional 12 million pounds of trash to be generated.

An official countered that the intent of this proposal is to provide the inspectors with information. There is fraud in the marketplace on these types of items and additional information is warranted. A director recommends that a minor amendment be done to the item under consideration and insert “for products labeled HD when the D is not on the package label use 0.95 g/cm³. Also use a similar statement “if the packer or manufacturer does not disclose the density then use 0.95 g/cm³.” The director pointed out that it is not the role of the conference to address quality issues, but to have a level playing field for inspectors to test a product. Another official remarked that companies need to identify their product on the container, and inspectors will use what density is disclosed.

The Committee received one letter asking for the withdrawal of this proposal and California submitted material safety data sheets from several companies (refer to Appendix B). The Committee considered comments received and agreed that more work was needed so the item was changed to Informational status.

At the 2010 CWMA Interim Meeting, there were no comments heard on this item. The CWMA L&R Committee recommends that this item remain Informational.

At the 2010 WWMA Annual Meeting, a state official commented that 10 companies have filed complaints concerning products being mislabeled, where the density was unknown. A state official submitted new language to replace a portion of language within the item under consideration. Two county officials spoke in support of the amended item, which would assist weights and measures officials in the field. A county official submitted a letter of support. The WWMA L&R Committee recommends that the amended language move forward as a Voting item. The WWMA L&R Committee also recommends that additional language be inserted for SI dimensions.

Amend Section 2.13.4. Declaration of Weight as follows:

For the purpose of this regulation, when D is not labeled on the package, known, the minimum density (D) used to calculate the target net weight for linear low density polyethylene products (LLPD) and products other than high density (HDPE) shall be 0.92 g/cm³ (when D is not known). For products labeled High
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Density (HDPE) or similar wording which does not specify the minimum density (D) on the package label, the minimum density (D) used to calculate the target net weight shall be 0.95 g/cm³.

At the 2010 SWMA Annual Meeting held in Columbia, South Carolina, there were no comments heard on this item. The SWMA L&R Committee would like to seek additional comments from industry, other than material safety data sheets (refer to Appendix A in this report). The SWMA L&R Committee recommends that this item move forward as an Informational item.

At the 2010 NEWMA Interim Meeting held in Norwich, Connecticut they noted that this proposal is confusing and that additional work needs to be done to clarify the impact of the proposed changes on manufacturers and consumers. The NEWMA L&R Committee recommends this move forward as a Developing item.

232-2  HB 130, Uniform Regulation for Method of Sale of Commodities – Packaged Printer Ink and Toner Cartridges

Source: Southern Weights and Measures Association (SWMA)

Purpose: This proposal is to clarify the labeling requirements for industry, consumers and weights and measures officials.

Item Under Consideration:

2.XX. Printer Ink and Toner Cartridges Labeling.

2.XX.1 Definitions.

2.XX.1.1. Printer ink cartridges – Any cartridge or module that contains ink or a similar substance in liquid form employed in the printing of documents, papers, pictures, etc., that is used in a printing device and designed to be replaced when no longer able to supply its contents in printing.

2.XX.1.2. Toner cartridges – Any cartridge or module that contains toner, powder, or similar non-liquid substance employed in the copying or printing of documents, papers, pictures, etc. that is used in a copying device and designed to be replaced when no longer able to supply its contents in printing and/or copying.


2.XX.2.1. Method of sale, printer ink cartridges. – All printer ink cartridges kept, offered, or exposed for sale or sold shall be sold in terms of the count of such cartridges and the fluid volume of ink in each cartridge stated in terms of milliliters or fluid ounces.

2.XX.2.2. Method of Sale, toner cartridges. – All toner cartridges kept, offered, or exposed for sale or sold shall be sold in terms of the count of such cartridges and the net weight of toner substance.

(Added 201X)

Background/Discussion: Over the past several years, there has been a change in the marketplace on inkjet and toner cartridges net content statements. Currently, there is little uniformity in the marketplace on this item, and the Committee is seeing some labels with a net content or with only a page yield count (e.g., prints 1000 pages). The NIST Weights and Measures Division (WMD) pointed out that according to guidelines printed in HB 130 from the Weights and Measures Law, Section 19 “information required on packages,” these products are required to have the net contents of the ink (and toner) labeled, but manufacturers have resisted, claiming an exemption under the FPLA. The purpose of this proposal is to specifically clarify the requirements for industry, consumers, and weights and measures officials.
At the 2009 SWMA Annual Meeting in Clearwater, Florida, a Lexmark representative commented that they do not believe that a net content statement should be required, and that a page yield is sufficient. He read the main points of a letter from Lexmark to Mr. Max Gray, Director of Florida Agriculture and Consumer Services, dated March 17, 2009. The main points within the letter were: 1) the ink associated with a cartridge is a small fraction of the total cost of the print cartridge mechanism; 2) a page yield can provide a meaningful comparison to a consumer if all manufacturers employ the same estimating assumptions and techniques; and 3) International Organization for Standardization (ISO) studied this issue for years and has rejected reliance on ink volume or quantity; instead ISO has developed a yield estimating and claiming methodology that permits cartridges to be compared using a consistent yardstick. Unlike ink volume measurements, page yield measurements provide a consumer with a reliable way to compare the amount of printing that can be expected. Lexmark also stated that ink is expressly exempt from labeling as provided by the FPLA 16 CFR 503.2(a).

An industry representative believes this issue does need to be discussed and reviewed further. However, many officials believe that consumers should know what they are getting. If it is determined that page count is the quantity statement, then the page print standard should be reviewed and have tighter standards. Mr. Gray felt that more data is needed from manufacturers on this issue.

The SWMA L&R Committee recommends the item for consideration for Developing by the NCWM L&R Committee.

At the 2010 Interim Meeting held in Nashville, Tennessee, the Committee heard testimony from Mr. Matthew Barkley, Hewlett Packard, regarding how the FPLA creates an exemption for ink which extends to toner and ink cartridges. A declaration of weight and volume are not the best way for consumers to make value comparisons. Customers benefit from page count/yield. Mr. Barkely urges that this issue be withdrawn. If this issue is to proceed, it should be Informational and a review of the FPLA exemption needs to be reviewed. Page yield is widely accepted and has repeatability measures.

Mr. Paul Jeran, Hewlett Packard, submitted a white paper (refer to Appendix C) from the Information Technology Industry Council (ITI). This white paper included manufacturers from Epson, Hewlett Packard, Kodak, and Lexmark. Mr. Jeran explained that his background is with ink and toner measurement. For the same volume of ink, two different systems of the same model cartridge from two different vendors can print a different number of pages. In order to determine the page yield, they are using the ISO/IEC methodology. ISO is currently working on a photo yield standard.

A state official expressed concerns with page yield being the standard page print for quantity. There is variation based on the type of cartridge, printer, and font and if graphics/photos are being printed. There is also a concern with what ink cartridge refillers are doing. The Florida official reviewed the current practice of refillers, and they are listing on the labels the amount of ink. There are many manufactured packages in the marketplace, so value comparison to original equipment manufacturer (OEM) is critical. This is an expensive commodity and clarifications of the requirements are needed. A state official recommended that this item not be withdrawn, but made Informational so additional information can be researched on this item. It is firmly believed that there needs to be a consistency with the declaration statement on these types of items. A consumer stated that he believes the net content needs to be stated with voluntary supplemental information for page yield. Some voiced their opinion that consumers need to know page yield in order to make a value comparison. The NIST Technical Advisor stated that under the FTC regulations ink and toner cartridges were not part of the CFR. NIST met with the FTC on February 26, 2010, to request clarification of the exemption. According to the Committee, there needs to be a test procedure for verification of net content developed for ink and toner cartridges. The Committee recommends that this item be made Informational until they can receive clarification from the FTC, review ISO standards, and determine what refillers’ current practices are.

At the 2010 NEWMA and the CWMA Annual Meetings, both Associations received a presentation from Mr. Stephen Pociask from American Consumer Institute, regarding a lack of consumer information when purchasing computer printers and cartridges. Both Associations expressed that there are still many unanswered questions and would like to hear from manufacturers of ink and toner cartridges. Both Associations are recommending that this be an Informational item.
At the 2010 Annual Meeting held in St. Paul, Minnesota, Mr. Pociask, presented a study done by his organization. It was asked who initially requested the study and who funded it. Mr. Pociask stated that the study was done back in 2007, with funding by a telemarketing research company.

A Weights and Measures Official expressed concern that the study presented was not clear; is page count based on certain fill levels or declaring the weight on the cartridge itself? Mr. Pociask responded that currently Quality Logic uses the ISO standards. He also concluded that net weight is easy to enforce. Mr. Pociask stressed that his focus is to provide information that give consumers useful information in purchasing printers and the life cost of the printer, including printer ink cost.

Another official stated that the study was interesting, but would like to hear from manufacturers. There are several issues; cartridges are only for specific printers, when comparing price per page you suggest that price is static, and ink cartridge refillers need to be addressed.

Mr. Joshua Rosenberg, IT Industry Council (ITI), agreed that providing consumers with information is meaningful, however; relevant to the consumer is the number of pages that can print. The ISO standards are a good tool, but will lead to customer confusion. Mr. Rosenberg expressed that there is a lot more that needs to be discussed on this issue (refer to Appendix C).

At the 2010 Annual Meeting, the Board of Directors established a Task Group for the Printer Ink and Toner Cartridges to review and obtain additional information from all stakeholders. Ms. Vicky L. Dempsey, Chief Inspector, Montgomery County, Ohio will Chair this group and Lisa Warfield will be the NIST Technical Advisor.

At the 2010 CWMA Interim Meeting, Ms. Dempsey, Chairperson for the Task Group on Printer Ink and Toner Cartridges announced her resignation to the Association. Ms. Dempsey gave a briefing on this issue, in particular whether this particular form of ink is included in the exemption of the FPLA. It was indicated that FDA believes this exemption only applies to ink in pens, not in printer cartridges. Regulators commented that “yield” is more important for cost comparison for consumers; however, other regulators felt that “yield” is not a weights and measures issue. Another concern was that the ISO yields are based upon approximations. Discussion also included whether regulators would have to purchase printers in order to verify yield. It was generally agreed that this is a very complicated matter, and the method of sale needs to be measurable. A regulator stated he had spoken with a manufacturer and questioned how the packages are filled. The response indicated that packages are filled by volume.

The CWMA L&R Committee supports the efforts of a Task Group for the Printer Ink and Toner Cartridges to gather more information for development of this proposal.

At the 2010 WWMA Annual Meeting and the 2010 NEWMA Interim Meeting, it was announced that NCWM is seeking a chairperson for the Printer Ink and Toner Cartridges Task Group. The CWMA and WWMA are recommending that this item move forward as Informational.

At the 2010 SWMA Annual Meeting, it was announced that a chairperson is needed for the Task Group on Printer Ink and Toner Cartridges. The SWMA L&R Committee does not endorse the formation of an Ink and Toner Task Group to resolve this issue. Only within the past couple years have manufacturers changed their declaration statement to read “yield.” Allowing the declaration by yield will open the door for other commodities to change their labeling (e.g., loads of laundry). The SWMA L&R Committee recommends that these commodities be sold by volume and weight; however, they are not opposed to yield being a supplementary statement. This will allow for inspectors to verify the net contents, and also provide information for consumers to make value comparisons. The SWMA L&R Committee would like to seek additional information from industry and ink refillers. A recommendation was made that the item under consideration move forward as a Voting item.

Ms. Maureen Henzler, Kansas, is the Chairperson for the Task Group on Printer Ink and Toner Cartridges. If you are interested in participating in this task group e-mail Ms. Henzler at maureen.henzler@kda.ks.gov.
**232-3 HB 130, Pelletized Ice**

**Source:** NIST Weights and Measures Division, International Dairy Foods Association, Food and Drug Administration (FDA)

**Purpose:** Provide a method of sale for pelletized frozen desserts in accordance with FDA’s August 2010 statement.

**Item Under Consideration:**

1. **1.7.1. Factory Packaged Ice Cream and Similar Frozen Products.** – Ice cream, ice milk, frozen yogurt, and similar products shall be kept, offered, or exposed for sale or sold in terms of fluid volume.  
   (Amended 1995)

2. **1.7.2. Pelletized Ice Cream and Similar Pelletized Frozen Desserts** – A semi-solid food product manufactured at very low temperatures using a nitrogen process and consisting of small beads of varying sizes. Bits of inclusions (cookies, candy, etc.) that also vary in size and weight may be mixed with the pellets.

3. **1.7.2.1. Method of Retail Sale** – Packaged pelletized ice cream or similar pelletized frozen desserts shall be kept, offered, or exposed for sale on the basis of net weight.  
   (Note: The method of sale for pelletized ice cream shall be enforceable after April 17, 2010, and after August 2, 2011, for similar pelletized frozen desserts)  
   (Added 2010) (Amended 20XX)

**Background/ Discussion:** In a letter from the FDA (refer to Appendix D), a statement was issued that the net quantity of content statement on pelletized frozen desserts, in addition to pelletized ice cream, conform to the standards for frozen desserts in 21 CFR Part 135. Nonstandardized frozen desserts that are similar to the standardized frozen desserts in 21 CFR Part 135 should be declared in terms of net weight. The FDA expects manufacturers of these pelletized frozen desserts to revise their labels to reflect a net weight declaration during the next package printing cycle and encourage all marketers of pelletized frozen desserts to modify their labels with a net weight declaration within one year from the issue date (August 2011).

At the 2010 fall regional meetings, there were no comments heard on this item. All four Associations have recommended that this item move forward as a Voting item.

**237 ENGINE FUELS AND AUTOMOTIVE LUBRICANTS REGULATION**

**237-1 HB 130, Engine Fuel Quality Requirements for Hydrogen**

**Source:** Western Weights and Measures Association (WWMA)

**Purpose:** Adopt engine fuel quality requirements for hydrogen in HB 130 to address gaseous hydrogen refueling applications.

**Item Under Consideration:** The U.S. National Work Group (USNWG) Fuel Specifications Subcommittee (FSS) presented the following recommendation for consideration.

**Specification for Hydrogen Fuel:** The FSS identified several quality criteria where there was tentative agreement with their associated values (see properties 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14, and 16 which are highlighted in green) in the proposed Table 1. Hydrogen Fuel Quality Specification. When a quality property and numerical value (defining a maximum or minimum limit) is added to the specification, appropriate test methods must then be identified. As test methods are identified and adopted by the FSS, they will be added to column 6 (test methods) in Table 1. The FSS did not agree on all of the properties contained in the DMS proposal because there was either not enough research data or test methods available to support a decision (see properties 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, and 15 which are highlighted in...
yellow) in Table 1 below. These and perhaps other properties will receive further consideration by the FSS and may be added to the quality standard in the future when such action is supported by research.

In April 2009, at the U.S. National Hydrogen Work Group (USNHWG) meeting held in Sacramento, California, they further refined the definitions for hydrogen vehicle fuel based on input from SAE International. The definitions were modified to include more technically correct language and the text is in alignment with the widely recognized “Bosch Automotive Handbook.” In January 2010, a column was added to Table 1 to reflect the responsible standards committee and the status of the test method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Limit</th>
<th>Test Method(s)</th>
<th>Responsible Stds. Committee and Status of test method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Ammonia</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>ppm v/v</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>to be specified</td>
<td>WK 10196 under ASTM D03.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Carbon Dioxide</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>ppm v/v</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>to be specified</td>
<td>WK 10196 and WK 4548 under ASTM D03.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Carbon Monoxide</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>ppm v/v</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>to be specified</td>
<td>WK 10196 under ASTM D03.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Formaldehyde</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>ppm v/v</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>to be specified</td>
<td>WK 10196 under ASTM D03.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Formic Acid</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>ppm v/v</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>ASTM D7550-09</td>
<td>WK 10196 under ASTM D03.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Helium</td>
<td>300.0</td>
<td>ppm v/v</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>to be specified</td>
<td>ASTM D03.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Hydrogen Fuel Index</td>
<td>99.97</td>
<td>% (a)</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>to be specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Nitrogen and Argon</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>ppm v/v</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>to be specified</td>
<td>WK 4548 under ASTM D03.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Oxygen</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>ppm v/v</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>to be specified</td>
<td>WK 4548 under ASTM D03.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Particulate Concentration</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>mg/kg</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>to be specified</td>
<td>WK 9688 and WK 21611 under ASTM D03.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Total Allowable Non-Hydrogen, Non-Helium, Non-Particulate constituents</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>ppm v/v</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>to be specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Total Non-Hydrogen Gases</td>
<td>300.0</td>
<td>ppm v/v</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>to be specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Total Halogenated Compounds</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>ppm v/v</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>to be specified</td>
<td>WK 23815 under ASTM D03.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Total Hydrocarbons</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>ppm v/v</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>to be specified</td>
<td>WK 22378 under ASTM D03.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Total Sulfur Compounds</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>ppm v/v</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>to be specified</td>
<td>WK 24073 under ASTM D03.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Water</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>ppm v/v</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>to be specified</td>
<td>WK 10196 and WK 4548 under ASTM D03.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes to Table 1 –

a. Hydrogen fuel index is the value obtained with the value of total gases (%) subtracted from 100 %.
b. Total Gases = Sum of all impurities listed on the table except particulates.
c. Total Hydrocarbons may exceed 2 ppm v/v only due to the presence of methane, provided that the total gases do not exceed 300 ppm v/v.
Background/Discussion: Twenty-four states have hydrogen refueling dispensers in operation. Hydrogen stations using permanent and mobile refueling systems for automobiles, fleet vehicles (buses), forklifts, and airport totes are increasing and may go unnoticed. Many stakeholders who are not familiar with the weights and measures standards process will need to participate at this stage rather than after this is a commercial application. This effort by the USNWG for the Development of Commercial Hydrogen Measurement Standards is to ensure there are appropriate standards and test procedures in place in time for dispenser manufacturers, service agencies, and officials to educate the general public, not if, but when retail hydrogen applications become commercially available.

Existing codes do not fully address hydrogen refueling applications because of hydrogen’s properties and other technical differences in the setup and operations of dispensing systems. The development of legal metrology standards for newly emerging hydrogen technology is a necessary component of the hydrogen infrastructure. The weights and measures community must have time to consider requirements for hydrogen-refueling systems before this application is available for public access at corner service stations.

The USNWG is bringing the proposal before the weights and measures community to share this information about upcoming standards for an emerging technology. The simultaneous development of the code and corresponding test procedures will allow for input from the weights and measures and hydrogen communities, appropriate trials of the standards, and to address all areas of concerns early in the standards development process.

This item was reviewed at the WWMA and SWMA 2008 Annual Meetings and at the NEWMA 2008 Interim Meeting. NEWMA members generally discussed the “hydrogen issue” and its usage in the marketplace. It is anticipated that hydrogen at first will be relegated to “fleet vehicles” (such as compressed natural gas [CNG]), and that retail sales will be slow in coming to the marketplace. These Associations are recommending this item remain a Developing item.

At the 2009 Interim and Annual Meetings, the NIST Technical Advisor briefed the Committee on work that the USNWG FSS has done to date (refer to Appendix J in the “Report of the 94th NCWM” [SP 1099, 2009]).

There were no comments heard on this proposal at the CWMA 2009 Interim Meeting.

At the WWMA 2009 Annual Meeting held in Los Cruces, New Mexico, industry representatives acknowledged that some details of the specifications for fuel standards are in development. The WWMA L&R Committee believes it is best to be proactive on this item so that Hydrogen stations can be ready to make retail sales.

At the SWMA 2009 Annual Meeting, a state recommended that as the test methods are developed they get published. It also requested that documentation be produced on the effects of hydrogen if they exceed certain property values listed in the table “Hydrogen Fuel Quality Specification,” and why this is important in the testing of hydrogen.

NEWMA reviewed this proposal at their 2009 Interim Meeting and recommends leaving this as a Developing item.

At the NCWM 2010 Interim Meeting, the NIST Technical Advisor provided an updated Table 1. Hydrogen Fuel Quality Specification (refer to L&R Appendix B in the “Report of the 95th NCWM” [SP 1115, 2010]) that amends the chart to identify which Standards Committee is actively working on the test method under development.

At the 2010 NEWMA and CWMA Annual Meeting, no comments were received on this item and both Associations are recommending that this item move forward as an Informational item.

At the 2010 NCWM Annual Meeting in St. Paul, Minnesota, Mr. Jennings, Tennessee, informed the Conference that the American Society for Testing and Materials International (ASTM) is actively working on a hydrogen fuel...
specification. Until further developed by ASTM, there is nothing that can be done on this item. Mr. Jennings would also like to provide users with information on what the significance is of each property.

At the 2010 CWMA Interim Meeting in Rock Island, Illinois, a representative of the USNHWG provided an update on ASTM efforts to establish test methods. An industry representative provided information that some of the specifications of the SAE standard contained parameters that could not be measured by the current test methods. A ballot cannot take place at ASTM until these test methods are established, and test methods will take some time to develop. The CWMA L&R Committee recommends that the proposal be further developed by the Fuels and Lubricants Subcommittee due to their expertise in this area.

At the 2010 WWMA Annual Meeting held in Olympia, Washington, a state official, who is also a member of the USNHWG, recommended that this item be split into two separate items. One item would address: “Specifications for Hydrogen Fuel for Internal Combustion Engines and Fuel Cells.” The second item would address “Definitions” with the existing language and definitions. The state official commented that work has been done by the USNHWG on definitions and that moving this to a vote would help move the implementation and acceptance of hydrogen. It was stated that “specifications” could take years to develop. The WWMA L&R Committee agreed with the recommendation in having the definitions as a separate item (refer to Item 237-2). The WWMA L&R Committee recommends that this item remain Informational.

At the 2010 SWMA Annual Meeting, the NIST Technical Advisor informed the group that the WWMA recommended to separate the fuel specifications from the definitions. The SWMA L&R Committee was in agreement to separate these two items. The SWMA L&R Committee recommends moving this item forward as an Informational item.

At the 2010 NEWMA Interim Meeting, there were no comments heard on this item. The NEWMA L&R Committee recommends moving forward the fuel specification portion as an Informational item. The NEWMA’s L&R recommendation for the definitions is documented in Item 237-2.

Additional information on this hydrogen proposal and the corresponding hydrogen gas measuring devices code can be found at website: http://www.nist.gov/pml/wmd/lmdg/hydrogen.cfm. For additional information on this item, contact Ms. Lisa Warfield at lisa.warfield@nist.gov or (301) 975-3308.

237-2 HB 130, Definitions for Hydrogen Fuel for Internal Combustion Engines and Fuel Cell Vehicles

Source: Western Weights and Measures Association (WWMA). This item was previously within Item 237-1.

Purpose: Adopt definitions for hydrogen fuel for internal combustion engines and fuel cell vehicles.

Item Under Consideration: The U.S. National Work Group (USNWG) Fuel Specifications Subcommittee (FSS) presented the following recommended definitions for consideration.

FSS supports the proposed new definitions to address gaseous hydrogen refueling applications.


2. Definitions

1.XX. Fuel Cell. – An electrochemical energy conversion device used to convert hydrogen and oxygen into electrical in which fuel and an oxidant react to generate energy without consumption of its electrodes or electrolytes to power a motor vehicle.  
(Added 201X)

1.XX. Hydrogen Fuel. – A fuel composed of the chemical hydrogen intended for consumption in a surface vehicle with an internal combustion engine or fuel cell.  
(Added 201X)
1.XX. **Internal Combustion Engine.** – A device used to ignite hydrogen in a confined space to create mechanical energy, generate power by converting chemical energy bound in the fuel into mechanical work to power a motor vehicle.

*(Added 201X)*

**Background/Discussion:** This item was reviewed at all the fall regional meetings under Item 237-1. At the 2010 WWMA and SWMA Annual Meeting and the 2010 NEWMA Interim Meeting, the Associations made the recommendation to have the definitions for hydrogen fuel for internal combustion engines and fuel cell vehicles considered as a separate item. All of the Associations are recommending this item move forward as a Voting item.

**237-3  Engine Fuels and Automotive Lubricants Regulation, Section 3.15. Biodiesel and Biodiesel Blends**

**Source:** Southern Weights and Measures Association (SWMA)

**Purpose:** Amend Section 3.15. Biodiesel and Biodiesel Blends of the Engine Fuels and Automotive Lubricants Regulation to remove the exemption for declaration of biodiesel content on product transfer documents for biodiesel blends up to 5%.

**Item Under Consideration:** Amend Section 3.15. Biodiesel and Biodiesel Blends of the Engine Fuels and Automotive Lubricants Regulation.

**3.15. Biodiesel and Biodiesel Blends**

**3.15.1. Identification of Product.** – Biodiesel shall be identified by the term “biodiesel” with the designation “B100.” Biodiesel blends shall be identified by the term “Biodiesel Blend.”

**3.15.2. Labeling of Retail Dispensers.**

**3.15.2.1. Labeling of Grade Required.** – Biodiesel shall be identified by the grades S15 or S500. Biodiesel blends shall be identified by the grades No. 1-D, No. 2-D, or No. 4-D.

**3.15.2.2. EPA Labeling Requirements Also Apply.** – Retailers and wholesale purchasers of biodiesel blends shall comply with EPA pump labeling requirements for sulfur under 40 CFR § 80.570.

**3.15.2.3. Automotive Fuel Rating.** – Biodiesel and biodiesel blends shall be labeled with its automotive fuel rating in accordance with 16 CFR Part 306.

**3.15.2.4. Biodiesel Blends.** – When biodiesel blends greater than 20% by volume are offered for sale, each side of the dispenser where fuel can be delivered shall have a label conspicuously placed that states “Consult Vehicle Manufacturer Fuel Recommendations.”

The lettering of this legend shall not be less that 6 mm (¼ in) in height by 0.8 mm (1/32 in) stroke; block style letters and the color shall be in definite contrast to the background color to which it is applied.

**3.15.3. Documentation for Dispenser Labeling Purposes Required on Transfer Documents.** – The retailer shall be provided, at the time of delivery of the fuel, a declaration of the volume percent biodiesel shall be disclosed on all transfer documents, on an invoice, bill of lading, shipping paper, or other document. This documentation is for dispenser labeling purposes only. It is the responsibility of any potential blender to determine the amount of biodiesel in the diesel fuel prior to blending.

*(Amended 201X)*

**3.15.4. Exemption.**

(a) Biodiesel blends that contain less than or equal to 5% biodiesel by volume are exempted from the requirements of Sections 3.15.1. Identification of Product; and 3.15.2. Labeling of Retail...
Dispensers, and 3.15.3. Automotive Fuel Rating when it is sold as “diesel fuel” as required in Section 3.3. Diesel Fuel.

(b) Diesel fuel containing less than 1 % by volume biodiesel is exempted from the requirement of 3.15.3. Documentation for Dispenser Labeling Purposes.

(c) Diesel fuel containing 1 % and not more than 5 % by volume biodiesel fuel is exempt from disclosing the actual percent by volume of biodiesel as required in Section 3.15.3. Documentation for Dispenser Labeling Purposes. However, the term “Contains Biodiesel” or other similar terms shall be used.

(Added 2005) (Amended 2008 and 201X)

Background/Discussion: At the 2009 SWMA Annual Meeting held in Clearwater, Florida, a discussion over blending was presented by a FALS member. Biodiesel is being blended at many terminals across the country in concentrations up to 5 %. Marketers downstream of the terminal are then attempting to blend additional biodiesel to target levels, and finding that their product is being over-blended because they were not aware that the fuel contained any biodiesel. Per Mr. Jennings, Tennessee, at least one major truck stop operator has already voiced concerns to the FALS Chairman. This amended proposal will remove the exemption declaration of biodiesel content on product transfer documents for biodiesel blends up to 5 %. Biodiesel is blended at terminals in concentrations up to 5 %. Mr. Jennings felt it was important to start this recommendation and have the FALS Chairman vet the proposal out to all members of the FALS Committee for their comments before the NCWM Interim meeting in January 2010.

3.15. Biodiesel and Biodiesel Blends

3.15.1. Identification of Product. – Biodiesel shall be identified by the term “biodiesel” with the designation “B100.” Biodiesel blends shall be identified by the term “Biodiesel Blend.”

3.15.2. Labeling of Retail Dispensers.

3.15.2.1. Labeling of Grade Required. – Biodiesel shall be identified by the grades S15 or S500. Biodiesel blends shall be identified by the grades No. 1-D, No. 2-D, or No. 4-D.

3.15.2.2. EPA Labeling Requirements Also Apply. – Retailers and wholesale purchaser-consumers of biodiesel blends shall comply with EPA pump labeling requirements for sulfur under 40 CFR § 80.570.

3.15.2.3. Automotive Fuel Rating. – Biodiesel and biodiesel blends shall be labeled with its automotive fuel rating in accordance with 16 CFR Part 306.

3.15.2.4. Biodiesel Blends. – When biodiesel blends greater than 20 % by volume are offered by sale, each side of the dispenser where fuel can be delivered shall have a label conspicuously placed that states “Consult Vehicle Manufacturer Fuel Recommendations.”

The lettering of this legend shall not be less than 6 mm (¼ in) in height by 0.8 mm (1/32 in) stroke; block style letters and the color shall be in definite contrast to the background color to which it is applied.

3.15.3. Documentation for Dispenser Labeling Purposes. – The retailer shall be provided, at the time of delivery of the fuel, a declaration of the volume percent biodiesel on an invoice, bill of lading, shipping paper, or other document. This documentation is for dispenser labeling purposes only; it is the responsibility of any potential blender to determine the amount of biodiesel in the diesel fuel prior to blending.
3.15.4. Exemption. – Biodiesel blends that contain less than or equal to 5% biodiesel by volume are exempted from the requirements of Sections 3.15.1, and 3.15.2, and 3.15.3, when it is sold as “diesel fuel” as required in Section 3.3.

(Added 2005) (Amended 2008 and 20XX)

The SWMA Committee recommends moving this item forward to the NCWM L&R Committee Agenda as a Voting item.

At the 2010 NCWM Interim Meeting, Mr. Hayes, FALS Chairman, gave an update on the subcommittee’s work to remove the current exemption for biodiesel disclosure in diesel fuel at 5% and below on product transfer documents.

A draft of substitute language was circulated among FALS members prior to the interim meeting. This substitute expanded the disclosure of biodiesel content on all transfer documents (not limited to ones to the retailer) and for levels greater than 1% biodiesel. The substitute was an attempt to find middle ground. FALS members were more agreeable to this substitute, but many still felt more work is needed.

The L&R and FALS Committee received seven letters (refer to L&R Appendix E within the “Report of the 95th NCWM” Annual Meeting [SP 1115, 2010]) that do not support this proposal as stated. The Committee does support working on this issue and receiving feedback from industry. There is concern with the documentation and comingling of fuels. If fuel is comingled, it would need to be sampled every time, which could be quite costly.

An official would like to see this item move forward as a Voting item. This official would like the spring Regional meetings (NEWMA and CWMA) to review and further develop the language. American Petroleum Institute (API) stated there are many things to consider, such as preemption language, cost implications, commercial issue of declaring with each transaction. API has worked with marketers, but there continues to be a difference of opinion and no consensus. It was voiced by industry that all biodiesel needs to be documented on the paperwork. If not, it puts the wholesaler, retailer, and consumer at risk. There was a comment from a stakeholder that they do not agree with API’s comment and that this has been a two year battle on who gets to do the blending. Blenders are over-blending because they are not aware of what the current blend is. To prevent this situation, it would require disclosure on the transfer document.

At the 2010 NEWMA Annual Meeting in Groton, Connecticut, a comment was heard from a stakeholder that the FTC has not changed the existing posting rule. The NEWMA L&R Committee recommends that this item remain Informational.

At the 2010 CWMA Annual Meeting in Springfield, Illinois, there were several comments stating that the exact percentage of an alternative fuel needs to be known. Without the percentage being known, mislabeling can occur, which is not good for consumer, marketers, and the environment and renewable fuels. One question that needs to be addressed is: what is the downside of providing this information? A representative of the National Biodiesel Board (NBB) does not support this proposal and would like to have further discussions to seek what is best for the entire industry. They also commented that FTC declined to modify requirements for disclosure on product transfer documents for fuels containing 5% or less biodiesel. A state official disagrees that the exact percentage is necessary since it is the blender’s responsibility to test the product prior to blending. A representative of the Renewable Fuels Association would like to see the proposal expanded to include all additives and stated that the focus needs to be in broader terms instead of renewable fuels and recommends that the scope include all blending components.

It was recommended by the CWMA L&R Committee that this item move forward as an Informational item and that FALS form a task force under their guidance, to help further develop this proposal.

At the 2010 NCWM Annual Meeting held in St. Paul, Minnesota, the Committee received numerous letters (refer to Appendix E within the “Report of the 95th NCWM” [SP 1115, 2010]) and heard from fifteen stakeholders and industry representatives, supporting section 3.15.3 that requires disclosure. Several participants expressed concerns with sections of the proposal. Currently, the FTC has the authority to protect consumers and they are looking at requiring product transfer documents. Several stakeholders indicated that they expect FTC to issue a proposed rule
on biodiesel in the near future. It would be best if we stayed in line with the FTC ruling on the biodiesel issue. The very low blends seem to be the challenge.

The sections that are of concern to stakeholders are 3.15.4 (b) and (c), since it conflicts with reporting of taxes collected on biodiesel. The exact amount of the blend needs to be documented on the transfer document. The concern is when fuel is picked up from various locations and delivered; the actual amount of biodiesel is not documented. Currently blending at the terminal is not an issue.

The Committee agreed to allow time for the FALS Committee to receive additional information and further discuss this item.

At the 2010 CWMA Interim Meeting, a representative from a Petroleum Marketers Association commented that disclosure sets the tone for a chain of events for biodiesel. It was important for disclosure to be provided all the way through the distribution process because of the potential for over-blending. He believes that it is not realistic for wholesale distributors to test for biodiesel due to the cost. He supports the proposal with exception of the exemptions provided in 3.15.4 Exemptions (b) and (c). A state regulator agreed with this testimony. Another state regulator commented that the current proposal follows the same format as the ethanol regulation. A petroleum dealer mentioned that due to the RFS2, disclosure is needed in order to meet the mandates for blending.

A representative with the NBB commented that this proposal needs to be further developed by the FALS. She believes that we have not heard from all segments of the industry regarding this proposal. She also expressed concern that there will be no benefit to consumers if the cost of the extra testing of fuel is being passed on to consumers. It was mentioned that there are quick testing methods available for determining biodiesel content in the field; although, some are more accurate than others. The NBB representative also stated that the FTC believes that it is the responsibility of the blender to determine biodiesel content prior to blending.

A producer mentioned that the disclosure proposal would require terminals to purchase equipment and to do additional testing. The producer is concerned about tank stratification and the need to change bills of lading as the content varies. Cost and manpower are major concerns for producers. A marketer provided testimony that it is more efficient for terminals to purchase testing equipment as opposed to requiring all downstream blenders to purchase testing equipment. He stated that changing bills of lading is only a software change. He believes that it is the blenders’ obligation to meet the law for labeling, and it is difficult if the biodiesel content is not disclosed. The NBB representative questioned how often marketers test. A marketer responded that they do not routinely test; since they rely on transfer documents to accurately state what they are getting. Another marketer stated that producers can control what goes into their tanks and questioned if producers know how much biodiesel is in each batch. A producer responded that for barrels received by water in Savannah, Georgia, the biodiesel content is only disclosed on Plantation pipeline shipments if it is more than 5%. The CWMA L&R Committee recommends that the proposal be further developed by the FALS.

Aproducer mentioned that the disclosure proposal would require terminals to purchase equipment and to do additional testing. The producer is concerned about tank stratification and the need to change bills of lading as the content varies. Cost and manpower are major concerns for producers. A marketer provided testimony that it is more efficient for terminals to purchase testing equipment as opposed to requiring all downstream blenders to purchase testing equipment. He stated that changing bills of lading is only a software change. He believes that it is the blenders’ obligation to meet the law for labeling, and it is difficult if the biodiesel content is not disclosed. The NBB representative questioned how often marketers test. A marketer responded that they do not routinely test; since they rely on transfer documents to accurately state what they are getting. Another marketer stated that producers can control what goes into their tanks and questioned if producers know how much biodiesel is in each batch. A producer responded that for barrels received by water in Savannah, Georgia, the biodiesel content is only disclosed on Plantation pipeline shipments if it is more than 5%. The CWMA L&R Committee recommends that the proposal be further developed by the FALS.

At the 2010 WWMA and SWMA Annual Meeting, an industry representative spoke in support of keeping this item Informational and allow the FALS to further develop the requirements in light of the comments received. An industry representative stated that all shipping documents should show the exact blend of biodiesel. The Association recommends that this item remain Informational.

At the 2010 NEWMA Interim Meeting, the NEWMA L&R Committee received written comments from API (refer to Appendix E). The NEWMA L&R Committee recommends that this item move forward as an Informational item.

**237-4 HB 130, Engine Fuels and Automotive Lubricants Regulation, Section 2.1.2. Gasoline-Oxygenated Blends and 2.1.3. Gasoline-Ethanol Blends**

**Source:** Central Weights and Measures Association

**Purpose:** Modify the language in Section 2.1.2. Gasoline-Oxygenate Blends and 2.1.3. Gasoline-Ethanol Blends to be aligned with the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA’s) language in the March 2009 Growth Energy waiver request.
Item Under Consideration: FALS will need to provide recommended language. Section 2. Standard Fuel Specifications is provided below because the most recent language was not in HB 130 (2009), but was released as an amendment in August 2009 (in place of republishing HB 130 [2010]). This language, minus the proposed modifications, has been included in the HB 130 (2011).

Section 2. Standard Fuel Specifications

2.1.2. Gasoline-Oxygenate Blends. – Shall contain no more than 10 volume percent ethanol. For other oxygenates, blends shall contain no more than 2.0 mass percent oxygen except fuels containing aliphatic ethers and/or alcohols (excluding methanol) shall contain no more than 2.7 mass percent oxygen.

(Added 2009)

2.1.3. Gasoline-Ethanol Blends. – When gasoline is blended with 1 to 10 volume percent ethanol, the ethanol shall meet the requirements of ASTM D4806 and the blend shall meet ASTM D4814 with the following permissible exceptions:

(a) The maximum vapor pressure shall not exceed the ASTM D4814 limits by more than 1.0 psi for:

   (1) Only 9 to 10 volume percent ethanol blends from June 1 through September 15.

   (2) All blends of 1 to 10 volume percent ethanol from September 16 through May 31.

(b) Until May 1, 2012, or until ASTM D4814 incorporates changes to the 50 volume percent evaporated point to account for the volatility effects of up to 10 volume percent ethanol, whichever occurs earlier, the distillation minimum temperature at the 50 volume percent evaporated point shall not be less than 66 °C (150 °F) (see Notes 1and 2).

(c) Until May 1, 2012, or until ASTM D4814 incorporates changes to the vapor lock protection minimum temperature for Classes 1 - 5 to account for the volatility effects of up to 10 volume percent ethanol, whichever occurs earlier, the minimum temperature for a Vapor-Liquid Ratio of 20 for the applicable vapor lock protection class for gasoline-ethanol blends shall be as follows (see Notes 1 and 2):

   (1) Class 1 shall be 54 °C (129 °F)

   (2) Class 2 shall be 50. °C (122 °F)

   (3) Class 3 shall be 47 °C (116 °F)

   (4) Class 4 shall be 41.5 °C (107 °F)

   (5) Class 5 shall be 39 °C (102 °F)

   (6) Class 6 shall be 35 °C (95 °F)

   All gasoline and gasoline-ethanol blends sold in Area V (as shown in ASTM D4814 Appendix Fig. X1.2) shall meet the vapor lock protection minimum temperatures in ASTM D4814.

NOTE 1: The value for the 50 volume percent evaporated point noted in Section 2.1.3.(b) and the values for Classes 1, 2, and 3 for the minimum temperature for a Vapor-Liquid Ratio of 20 in Section 2.1.3.(c) are now aligned and identical to those that are being published in ASTM D4814-09b and apply equally to gasoline and gasoline-ethanol blends. In future editions of NIST Handbook 130, Section 2.1.3.(b) will be removed editorially and the reference to Classes 1, 2, and 3 in Section 2.1.3.(c) will be removed editorially. In addition, existing Sections 2.1.3. through 2.1.7. of NIST Handbook 130 will be renumbered.
NOTE 2: The temperature values (e.g., 54 °C, 50 °C, 41.5 °C) are presented in the format prescribed in ASTM E29 “Standard Practice for Using Significant Digits in Test Data to Determine Conformance with Specifications.”
(Added 2009)

Discussion/Background: The EPA will make a ruling on the March 2009 Growth Energy Waiver. When the ruling is announced, the above regulation will need to be extended to cover E15 gasoline blends. The Renewable Fuels Association (RFA) is proposing a broader approach to recognizing the authorized proportion of ethanol. RFA recommends the following language:

2.1.2. Gasoline-Oxygenate Blends. – Shall contain no more than the maximum proportion of ethanol authorized by US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under Section 211 of the Clean Air Act. 10 volume percent ethanol. For other oxygenates, blends shall contain no more than 2.0 mass percent oxygen except fuels containing aliphatic ethers and/or alcohols (excluding methanol) shall contain no more than 2.7 mass percent oxygen.

At the 2010 CWMA Interim Meeting, an update was given on the current consideration by EPA to allow higher ethanol blends in conventional vehicles. The FALS Chairperson stated that the FALS Subcommittee may be meeting to discuss this issue at the NCWM Interim Meeting in January 2011. The CWMA L&R Committee received two letters on this issue (refer to Appendix F). The CWMA L&R Committee recommends that this item be forwarded to the FALS for further work.

At the 2010 WWMA Meeting, an industry representative expressed concern on what this action will have on car warranties and potential liability issues. A representative stated that he opposed this item until an official ruling is made by the EPA. The WWMA L&R Committee recommends that this item be made developmental.

At the 2010 SWMA Annual Meeting and the 2010 NEWMA Interim Meeting, there were no comments heard on this item. The Conference would like to see a recommendation from the FALS. Both Associations are recommending that these items go to the FALS for further development.

237-5 HB 130, Engine Fuels and Automotive Lubricants Regulation, Section 2.1.4. Minimum Motor Octane Number

Source: BP Global Fuels Technology – West Coast

Purpose: Remove Section 2.1.4. Minimum Motor Octane Number since it is considered obsolete.

2.1.7. Minimum Motor Octane Number. – The minimum motor octane number shall not be less than 82 for gasoline with an AKI of 87 or greater;

Background/Discussion: In the early 90s, the Table titled “Automotive Spark-Ignition Engine Fuel Antiknock Indexes in Current Practice” was removed from the body of D4814 and placed into an Appendix in D4814. This Appendix is non-mandatory information and is not part of the specification. It is inappropriate for NIST HB 130 to continue with the 82 motor octane number minimum for the following reasons: 1) 82 motor octane number minimum is not an ASTM D4814 specification; 2) FTC regulates octane posting and has no motor octane number minimum; 3) neither the Kinder Morgan Pipeline nor the Olympic Pipeline requires a minimum motor octane number specification; and 4) the Colonial Pipeline has no motor octane number minimum for either Reformulated Blendstock for Oxygenate Blending (RBOB) or Conventional Blendstock for Oxygenate Blending (CBOB).

Recent data shows a low motor octane number is actually preferable for the current fleet of vehicles. Motor and Research octane numbers are equally important to the performance of the motor vehicle engine. A minimum motor octane number requirement offers no more protection to the consumer than the road octane number which is the average of the Motor and Research octane numbers.

At the 2010 WWMA Annual Meeting, the WWMA L&R Committee is recommending that this item be made Informational.
At the 2010 SWMA Annual Meeting and the 2010 CWMA and NEWMA Interim Meeting, the Associations are recommending that this item be made Informational and be forwarded to the FALS.

237-6 HB 130, Engine Fuels and Automotive Lubricants Regulation, Section 3.13.

Source: Central Weights and Measures Association

Purpose: Amend the Fuels and Automotive Lubricants Regulation to require detailed invoicing requirements. Some oil facilities may not deliver the advertised oil, so consumers may be receiving lower quality oil. It is being recommended that retailers that provide oil change services be required to provide consumers with a document that lists the oil’s manufacturer, brand name, SAE viscosity, and service requirements as defined in API 1509, SAE J183, or ASTM D4485.

Item Under Consideration:

3.13. Oil.


3.13.1.1. Viscosity. – The label on each container of vehicle motor oil shall contain the viscosity grade classification preceded by the letters “SAE” in accordance with the SAE International’s latest version of SAE J300.

3.13.1.2. Intended Use. – The label on each container of vehicle motor oil shall contain a statement of its intended use in accordance with the latest version of SAE J300.

3.13.1.3. Engine Service Category. – The label on each container of vehicle motor oil described from a receptacle, pump, dispenser, or storage tank shall contain the engine service category, or categories, met in letters not less than 3.18 mm (1/8 in) in height, as defined by the latest version of SAE J183 or API Publication 1509, “Engine Oil Licensing and Certification System.”

3.13.1.3.1. Exception for Quantities of One Gallon (3.785 L) or Less Inactive or Obsolete Service Categories. – The label on each container of vehicle motor oil described from a receptacle, pump, dispenser, or storage tank shall contain a plainly visible cautionary statement in compliance with SAE J183, Appendix A, for obsolete API oil categories whenever the vehicle motor oil in the container or in bulk does not meet an active API service category as defined by the latest version of SAE J183.

3.13.1.3.2. Tank Trucks or Rail Cars. – Tank trucks or rail cars that are used to deliver vehicle motor oil are not required to display the SAE viscosity grade and service category or categories as long as the bill of lading or other documentation provides that information.

Background/Discussion: At the 2010 CWMA Interim Meeting, a state regulator stated that oil changing facilities are affecting revenues from legitimate businesses by masquerading as branded facilities, while selling lower-quality oil (refer to Appendix G). The consumer believes they are receiving the advertised brand of oil. At least one branded oil company has investigated certain questionable installers, filed lawsuits, and have successfully closed those suits with installers in the area of trademark infringement and deceptive trade practices. To assist in mitigating these unlawful trade practices and to protect consumers against fraudulent activity, it is recommended that invoice be established. A state regulator questioned if businesses were using the same hose for hydraulic and motor oil, or if the hose would be flushed prior to using it for a different product. He remarked that there would be a contamination factor. The CWMA L&R Committee recommends that the item under consideration move forward to the NCWM L&R Committee for consideration.
At the 2010 WWMA Annual Meeting, an industry representative, who submitted this proposal, recommended that the term “pump” be dropped from the language. A state official questioned if checking the labeling on bulk tanks is the responsibility of weights and measures, or is it an industry issue? The Technical Advisor suggested giving consideration to mirroring this same language in the method of sale. The WWMA L&R Committee recognizes that statement of brand is required on liquid measuring devices in HB 44. The WWMA L&R Committee recommends this item be moved forward as Informational item and have it be reviewed by the FALS.

3.13. Oil.


3.13.1.1. Viscosity. – The label on each container of a vehicle motor oil container, receptacle, dispenser, or storage tank and the invoice from service on an engine that includes the installation of vehicle motor oil dispensed from a receptacle, dispenser, or storage tank shall contain the viscosity grade classification preceded by the letters “SAE” in accordance with the SAE International’s latest version of SAE J300.

3.13.1.2. Intended Use. – The label on each container of a vehicle motor oil container shall contain a statement of its intended use in accordance with the latest version of SAE J300 or J183.

3.13.1.3. Brand – The label on a vehicle motor oil container and the invoice from service on an engine that includes the installation of vehicle motor oil dispensed from a receptacle, dispenser, or storage tank shall contain the name, brand, trademark, or trade name of the vehicle motor oil.

3.13.1.3.1. Exception for Quantities of One Gallon (3.785 L) or Less. – A container of engine vehicle motor oil with a volume of 1 gal (3.785 L) or less that does not meet an active service category, as defined by the latest version of SAE J183, shall bear a plainly visible cautionary statement in compliance with SAE J183, Appendix A, for obsolete API oil categories.

3.13.1.3.4. Engine Service Category. – The label on each container of a vehicle motor oil container, receptacle, dispenser, or storage tank and the invoice from service on an engine that includes the installation of vehicle motor oil dispensed from a receptacle, dispenser, or storage tank shall contain the engine service category, or categories, met in letters not less than 3.18 mm (1/8 in) in height, as defined by the latest version of SAE J183 or API Publication 1509, “Engine Oil Licensing and Certification System.”

3.13.1.4.1. Inactive or Obsolete Service Categories. – The label on a vehicle motor oil container, receptacle, dispenser, or storage tank and the invoice from service on an engine that includes the installation of vehicle motor oil dispensed from a receptacle, dispenser, or storage tank shall bear a plainly visible cautionary statement in compliance with SAE J183, Appendix A, whenever the vehicle motor oil in the container or in bulk does not meet an active API service category as defined by the latest version of SAE J183.

3.13.1.4.2. Tank Trucks or Rail Cars. – Tank trucks, rail cars, or other types of delivery trucks that are used to deliver vehicle motor oil are not required to display the SAE viscosity grade and service category or categories as long as the bill of lading or other documentation provides that information.

At the 2010 SWMA Annual Meeting, Mr. Ferrick from API notified attendees that they were seeing a revised proposal. This revision was not presented at the 2010 CWMA and WWMA meetings. Mr. Ferrick supports this item stating that HB 130 has required that labels on motor oil packages identify the oil’s SAE viscosity and API performance level. Both of these items are important pieces of information for consumers. The changes proposed for HB 130 are intended to apply the labeling requirements for packaged motor oils to oils sold in bulk. The changes as proposed would require motor oil manufacturers and distributors to identify the oils they deliver and for installers to identify the oils they dispense. Requiring distributors to identify the motor oils they deliver to installers
will help ensure that installers know what they are dispensing, and requiring installers to do the same on their invoices will provide the same level of information for consumers. The SWMA L&R Committee reviewed the revised language submitted and agreed that the item has merit. It was also noted that the language needs to be similar for the regulations as well as the method of sale in HB 130. The SWMA L&R Committee would like to move this item forward as an Informational item.

At the 2010 NEWMA Interim meeting, a representative of API spoke in favor of the need to disclose on all motor oil storage vessels and in receipts for oil change services the motor oil information. Currently, consumers may not be sure of what motor oil product they are receiving and may be subjected to fraud. A disclosure requirement would clearly disclose to consumers what they are purchasing and help eliminate any fraud. The NEWMA L&R Committee believes this is a consumer friendly issue, and that requiring retailer invoices for oil change services to disclose the manufacturer, brand name, SAE viscosity, and service requirements is appropriate. Proposed labeling requirements should be included on the agenda as a Developing item.

260 NIST HANDBOOK 133

260-1 HB 133, Moisture Allowances Section 2.3.8. Moisture Loss for products not listed.

Source: Moisture Loss Work Group (MLWG).

Purpose: Provide additional guidance for making moisture allowances for products not listed in HB 133.

Item Under Consideration:

2.3.8. Moisture Allowances

e. How is moisture loss handled for products not listed in NIST Handbook 133?

Officials can test products for which no moisture loss guidance has been provided. If studies are a necessity they should be a collaborative effort between officials and industry. Because of the potential impact on interstate commerce, studies should be completed on a nationwide basis and not by individual jurisdictions unless circumstances justify only local consideration.

The amount of moisture loss from a package is a function of many factors, not the least of which is the product itself (e.g., moisture content, texture and density), packaging, storage conditions (e.g., temperature, humidity, and air flow), time, handling and others. If a packaged product is subject to moisture loss, officials must allow for “reasonable” variations caused by moisture either evaporating or draining from the product. Officials cannot set arbitrary moisture allowances based solely on their experience or intuition. Moisture allowances must be based on scientific data and must be “reasonable.” Reasonable does not mean that all of the weight loss caused by moisture evaporation or draining from the product must be allowed. As a result of product and moisture variability, the approach used by an official must be developed on a case-by-case basis depending on many factors to include, but not be limited to, the manufacturing process, packaging materials, distribution, environmental influence and the anticipated shelf life of the product.

NIST Handbook 130 provides a starting point for developing a workable procedure in the Interpretation and Guideline Section 2.5.6. regarding “Resolution for Requests for Recognition of Moisture Loss in Other Packaged Products.” Most studies involving nationally distributed products will require that products be tested during different seasons of the year and in different geographic locations to develop a nationally recognized moisture allowance. Some studies may require the development of laboratory tests used for inter-laboratory comparisons to establish moisture content in products at time of pack or at the time of inspection.

Moisture loss or gain is a critical consideration for any net content enforcement effort and one that, in most cases, cannot be addressed solely by a field official. If moisture loss issues are to be deliberated, it is the regulatory official’s responsibility to resolve the packer’s concern utilizing available resources and
due process procedures. To fulfill this obligation the official may be required to utilize specialized test
equipment and specific laboratory procedures. Additionally, the collection of adequate test data may
require product examination over a broad geographical area and consideration of a wide range of
environmental factors. If a national effort is required, a coordinated effort involving industry, trade
associations, weights and measures officials, and federal agencies may be required. NIST will provide
technical support upon request. If studies are a necessity they should be a collaborative effort between
officials and industry but may be very time consuming depending on the product. Because of the
potential impact on interstate commerce, studies must be completed on a nationwide basis and not by
individual jurisdictions unless circumstances justify only local consideration.

Background/Discussion: In previous years, the MLWG reviewed draft changes that were developed to revise and
update HB 133 (2005). Some of the proposed changes and recommendations were developed to improve the
guidance on making moisture allowances. At the 2010 NCWM Annual Meeting held in St. Paul, Minnesota, item
260-1 (refer to the “Report of the 95th NCWM” [SP 1115, 2010]) was voted through the Conference with the
exception of the item under of consideration.

At the 2010 CWMA Interim Meeting, a state regulator stated that HB 133 provides moisture allowance for only a
few products. The regulator provided an example where a product was claiming moisture allowance for a product
not contained in HB 133. This regulator was provided with only verbal assistance from NIST regarding what was
needed to demonstrate the request for moisture allowance. The regulator believes written procedures need to be
developed to provide guidance and a step-by-step protocol developed for determining moisture allowance in a
specific product. Another state regulator agreed and commented that determination of moisture allowance needs to
be consistent. An industry representative agreed that more guidance is needed and recommended that the proposal
include the necessary information required to demonstrate moisture loss that warrants an allowance. The CWMA
L&R Committee recommends that the MLWG continue to develop this proposal.

At the 2010 WWMA Annual Meeting, a county official expressed concern that the existing language is conflicting
and does not provide specific guidance to weights and measures officials (i.e., statements that moisture loss should
be determined on a case-by-case basis and at the same time calls for a nationwide study). It was recommended that
the MLWG focus its effort on developing a clearer criteria and process for determining moisture loss. The WWMA
L&R Committee agrees that the following language within the proposal is contradictory and vague and does not
provide specific guidance to officials.

- should be a collaborative effort between officials and industry
- should be completed on nationwide basis
- must be based on scientific data
- must be developed on a case by case basis
- may be required to utilize specialized test equipment and specific laboratory procedure"
- a coordinated effort involving industry, trade associations, weights and measures officials may be required

The WWMA L&R Committee recommends that this be a Developmental item.

At the both the 2010 SWMA Annual Meeting and the 2010 NEWMA Interim Meeting, both Associations agreed
that the item was not developed. It was recommended by both Associations that this moved forward as a
Developing item.

260-2 HB 133, Chapter 4.7. Polyethylene Sheeting - Test Procedure - Footnote Step 3

Source: Western Weights and Measures Association (WWMA)

Purpose: Update HB 133, Chapter 4.7. Polyethylene Sheeting – Test Procedure to provide new density values for
heavier density plastics that are currently in the marketplace.

Polyethylene bags labeled as High Density (HDPE) or similar language have been found to package products whose
labeled net weights meet calculated target net weights when employing a density factor of 0.92 g/cm³. When a
density factor of 0.95 g/cm³ is used, as appropriate, in the calculation for high density polyethylene materials, these
products commonly fail to meet the calculated target net weight. Further testing of these packages of polyethylene bags reveals that one or more of the labeled width, thickness, or count statements are inaccurate. HDPE product distributors that place a net weight statement on their packages based upon the Linear Low Density Polyethylene (LLDP) density value (0.92 g/cm³) have an approximately 3% advantage over the distributor that uses the correct, high density, factor.

**Item Under Consideration:** Amend the asterisked footnote below Step 3 as follows:

* Determined by ASTM Standard D 1505-98 (or latest issue) “Standard Method of Test for Density of Plastics by the Density Gradient Technique.” For the purpose of this handbook, when the actual density is not known, the minimum density used to calculate the target net weight shall be 0.92 g/cm³ when the actual density is not known. For products labeled “High Density, HDPE, or similar wording, the minimum density (d) used to calculate the target net weight shall be 0.95 g/cm³.

**Background/Discussion:** A proposal was presented at the WWMA 2009 Annual Meeting in Los Cruces, New Mexico, that manufacturers and distributors of polyethylene bags labeled as “High Density,” or HDPE, have been found to package products whose labeled net weights meet calculated target net weights when employing a density factor of 0.92 g/cm³. When a density factor of 0.95 g/cm³ is used, as appropriate, in the calculation for high density polyethylene materials, these products commonly fail to meet the calculated target net weight. Further testing of these packages of polyethylene bags reveals that one or more of the labeled width, thickness, or count statements are inaccurate.

For example, a box of HDPE has stated dimensions of 24 in x 40 in x .4 mil, and a count of 250. Using the only density factor found in HB 133, 0.92 g/cm³, the calculated target net weight, and that shown on the label, would be 6.38 lbs. If using the actual density factor for the HDPE bags of 0.95 g/cm³, the target net weight would be 6.59 lb. This means that HDPE product distributors that place a net weight statement on their packages based upon the Linear Low Density Polyethylene (LLDP) density value (0.92 g/cm³) have an approximately 3% advantage over the distributor that uses the correct, high density, factor.

When the original testing procedure was developed, HDPE bags had not yet entered the marketplace. Currently, this product is quite prevalent in the United States. Amending the test procedure will aid weights and measures inspectors in enforcing labeling requirements that allow true value comparisons and close a loophole within HB 133.

The 2009 WWMA Association supports this item and recommends that it be a Voting item.

NEWMA reviewed this item at their 2009 Interim Meeting and proposes this item be a Developing item.

At the NCWM 2010 Interim Meeting, comments were heard on this item and Item 232-1 together at the open hearings. The Committee heard support for the suggestion that the density factor should change from 0.92 g/cm³ to 0.95 g/cm³. A California official stated that the information provided by the WWMA was data extracted from Internet searches. Currently, manufacturers are complaining that under current practice, they cannot compete fairly.

Mr. Jackelen with Berry Plastics urged the Committee to reject this proposal. Mr. Jackelen stated that 0.92 g/cm³ currently works for manufacturers and that changing it to 0.95 g/cm³ will cause undue cost and waste. Most manufacturers do not make high density (HD) bags, but are producing blends. Mr. Jackelen also stated an additional reason to reject the proposal is 0.95 g/cm³ bags, if punctured will continue to tear.

A Weights and Measures Official stated that if you use the term HD, then you are bound by the 0.95 g/cm³ density. If you use the length x width x thickness x density to determine the net weight, then the density needs to be added to the package labeling. Another official stated that manufacturers should consider disclosing the density factor on every product as part of the labeling. It was voiced that if there are questions about an absolute 0.95 g/cm³ density then there should be an alternate suggestion. Another official stated that 0.95 g/cm³ will be factored in when the density is not known. The Committee received letters that were reviewed on this item (refer to Appendix B). The Committee recommends moving the item under consideration forward as a Voting item.

At the 2010 NEWMA Annual Meeting in Groton, Connecticut, there was concern that there appears to be a lack of data on this item. It was not reviewed by all regions and not presented to industry to seek comments. The NEWMA
L&R Committee felt that this item was not an emergency and would like to review comments received by all the regions and industry.

At the 2010 CWMA Annual Meeting in Springfield, Illinois, there were no comments heard on this item and the CWMA L&R Committee recommends that this item remain a Voting item.

At the 2010 NCWM Annual Meeting in St. Paul, Minnesota, an official stated that his comments were the same as he expressed in Item 232-4 (refer to the “Report of the 95th NCWM” [SP 1115, 2010]. The official stated that with the amendments recommended by another official expressed in Item 232-4, they would support this proposal. There is agreement that the role of the Conference is not to determine quality issues, but rather to set testing standards for inspectors. Moving this item to Informational status will allow time to receive additional information and data from manufacturers of polyethylene.

The Committee believes that additional work needs to be done on this item including reviewing the labeling requirement of polyethylene. This may include requiring a mandatory statement and review of ASTM standards. The status of this item was changed to Informational during the 2010 Annual Meeting.

At the 2010 CWMA Interim Meeting, there were no comments heard on this item. The CWMA L&R Committee recommends that this move forward as an Informational item.

At the 2010 WWMA Annual Meeting, a state official commented that he is in support of this item with the proposed amended changes to replace the existing language with:

* Determined by ASTM Standard D 1505-98 (or latest issue) “Standard Method of Test for Density of Plastics by the Density Gradient Technique.” For the purpose of this handbook regulation, when the actual density is not known (D) is not labeled on the package, the minimum density (D) used to calculate the target net weight for linear low density polyethylene products (LLDP) and products other than high density (HDPE) shall be 0.92 g/cm³ when the actual density is not known. For products labeled High Density, HDPE, or similar wording, that does not specify the minimum density (D) on the package label, the minimum density (D) used to calculate the target net weight shall be 0.95 g/cm³.

The WWMA L&R Committee recommends this item as amended move forward as a Voting item.

At the 2010 SWMA Annual Meeting, there were no comments heard on this item. The SWMA L&R Committee would like to seek additional information and comments from industry, other than the material safety data sheets that were submitted. The SWMA L&R Committee recommends that this item move forward as an Informational item.

At the 2010 NEWMA Interim Meeting, there were no comments heard on this item. The NEWMA L&R Committee would like this item to move forward as an Informational item.

260-3 National Pasta Association – HB 133, Moisture Allowance for Pasta Products

Source: Southern Weights and Measures Association (SWMA)

Purpose: Amend HB 133 by adopting a 3% moisture allowance for macaroni, noodle, and like products (pasta products).

Item Under Consideration: Amend HB 133, Chapters 1 and 2, Moisture allowance to be amended as follows and which will incorporate a 3% moisture allowance for pasta products, adding the language in bold below:

- Chapter 1: Why do we allow for moisture loss or gain?
  - This handbook provides “moisture allowances” for some meat and poultry products, flour, pasta products, and dry pet food.
- Test procedures for flour, **pasta products**, some meat, and poultry are based on the concept of a “moisture allowance” also known as a “gray area” or “no decision” area.

- Chapter 2: Moisture Allowances:

  - What is the moisture allowance for flour, pasta products, and dry pet food? The moisture allowance for flour, pasta products, and dry pet food is 3% of the labeled net weight.

  **Note:** Pasta products means all macaroni, noodle, and like products packaged in Kraft paper bags, paperboard cartons, and/or flexible plastic bags with a moisture content of 13% or less at the time of pack.

  - This handbook provides “moisture allowances” for some meat and poultry products, flour, **pasta products**, and dry pet food.

**Background/Discussion:** Studies indicate that moisture loss for pasta products is reasonably predictable over time. Pasta exhibits consistent moisture loss in all environments and packaging, which can vary more than 4% due to environmental and geographic conditions. Although it eventually reaches equilibrium with the surrounding atmosphere because it is hygroscopic, this balance does not occur until long after packaging and shipping.

At the 2010 Interim Meeting, the Committee heard support for this item from industry and stakeholders. If this item is approved, it will also amend the Moisture Allowance Table in HB 133 giving pasta a 3% moisture allowance. The Committee reviewed the submitted study (refer to the “Report of the 95th NCWM” [SP 1115, 2010]). The Committee recommends moving the item under consideration forward as a Voting item.

At the 2010 NEWMA Annual Meeting held in Groton, Connecticut, a representative of the pasta industry gave the group an explanation of the item and expressed support for this item as written. The NEWMA L&R Committee also supports this item.

At the 2010 CWMA Annual Meeting held in Springfield, Illinois, a representative from the National Pasta Association stated the data supports the 3% moisture allowance and currently there are no guidelines to establish the moisture loss percentage.

At the 2010 NCWM Annual Meeting held in St. Paul, Minnesota, a representative for the National Pasta Association spoke on behalf of the proposal. This item will allow for a specific moisture loss percentage to be taken. Inspectors will now have a specific number that they can apply to the pasta product. Representatives of several pasta companies spoke in support of this item stating that it is consistent with numerous studies that have been done. A state director opposes this item, since pasta is known to have moisture loss due to the type of product it is. He further explained that applying a blanket 3% moisture loss does not make sense, what may be good in Florida may not be good in New Mexico. A Weights and Measures Official stated that applying the 3% does not stop an inspector from going into a distribution or point of pack to inspect; especially if the inspectors believe the packer is under filling packages. He urged that this proposal be supported to provide a tool. Another official felt that the proposal should be voted through, it is important to recognize guidelines for consideration. A pasta association representative also agreed that this work goes back a couple of decades and that several studies were provided for consideration. Another representative explained that they pack to net weight. Pasta contains 10% to 13% moisture; if the moisture standard is lowered the product falls apart along with the product quality. This item neither passed nor failed vote at the National and was returned to the Committee.

At the 2010 CWMA Interim Meeting, a state regulator provided information regarding informal testing of pasta products in their state. The concern is pasta can gain moisture as well as lose moisture; therefore, they oppose a national moisture allowance for pasta products. It was further explained that moisture loss/gain seems to be dependent upon the type of packaging used. This regulator also commented that product is no longer warehoused for long periods of time, and that it is mostly in climate controlled stores, which would prevent the need for a
moisture allowance. Another state regulator agreed that a national standard may not be appropriate due to humidity differences from state to state. The CWMA L&R Committee is recommending that this item be Withdrawn.

At the 2010 WWMA Annual Meeting, a state official expressed support for adopting a 3% moisture allowance for pasta citing the significant work done and data provided by the National Pasta Association. The WWMA L&R Committee recommends that any additional data from studies be provided for review. The WWMA L&R Committee also recommends that this item move forward as a Voting item.

At the 2010 SWMA Annual Meeting, there were no comments heard on this item. The SWMA L&R Committee agrees that this item be Withdrawn. However; if further studies are developed, then this should be taken into consideration.

At the 2010 NEWMA Interim Meeting, the conference expressed strong reservations about this proposal. Comments were heard regarding industry practices in regards to moisture loss when packing and if there is a need to codify the moisture loss allowance at all. A member commented that if this proposal passed, other industries would now approach the conference and ask for specific moisture allowances for their products. The NEWMA L&R Committee recommends that this item be Withdrawn.

260-4 HB 133, Seed Count for Agriculture Seed

**Source:** Western Weights and Measures Association (WWMA)

**Purpose:** The WWMA calls for the NCWM to rescind action taken in adopting the provisions of NCWM 2010 L&R Agenda Item 260-2 (refer to Appendix H). The NCWM L&R Committee should undertake, or establish a work group (WG) to undertake, necessary studies, laboratory testing, field trials, and other appropriate measures to establish procedures for verification of the accuracy and repeatability of “mechanical seed counter” devices and/or to develop seed count procedures that are practical and reliable for field enforcement activities by Weights and Measures officials.

**Item Under Consideration:** Call for Reconsideration and/or Repeal of action taken at 2010 Annual Meeting of NCWM (refer to the “Report of the 95th NCWM” [SP 1115, 2010]) to amend HB 133 Sections 4.2. and to add new Section 4.11. re: Seed Count Tests.

**Background/Discussion:** At the 2010 NCWM, the L&R Agenda Item 260-2 was not appropriately presented in full for adequate consideration and review by all Conference attendees prior to discussion, debate, and voting. Late into L&R Open Hearing discussions, it was clarified that the item intended to adopt (as the mandated HB 133 testing procedure for verification of the count of packaged corn, soybean, field bean, and wheat seeds) language from Section 12 “Mechanical Seed Count” of the “Rules for Testing Seeds” of the Association of Official Seed Analysts (AOSA) (Appendix F, refer to the “Report of the 95th NCWM” [SP 1115, 2010]). The publication of an incomplete proposal and delayed clarification of the full proposal impeded abilities to fully research the proposed testing methods, associated equipment, and to develop points for discussion.

Section 12 of the “Rules for Testing Seeds” (refer to Appendix H) requires multiple, specific, highly technical steps that present significant challenges with which to comply (i.e., opportunities for non-compliant packers to challenge procedures and test results). Additionally, equipment costs are excessive and Weights and Measures officials are not trained or qualified to perform all required tests.

Examples include:

**Section 12. - Mechanical Seed Count
Concerns:**
- Requires use of a “mechanical seed counter”
- Such devices are typically permanently installed in a laboratory setting.
- Extreme care is required for transport of seed counters to the field.
- Device cost is approximately $8,000.
Section 12.1 – Requires samples of 500 grams (soybean/corn/field beans), 100 grams (wheat)
- Instructs that samples are to be “received” in moisture proof containers
- Samples must be retained in moisture proof containers “until the weight of the sample prepared for purity analysis is recorded”

Concerns:
- Above implies that samples are to be transferred to a laboratory for testing.
- Above indicates that sample is intended to be subjected to purity analysis.
- “Purity analysis” is a specific term in the seed inspection arena, requiring highly technical procedures performed by highly skilled technicians.
- Such are not procedures with which Weights and Measures officials are familiar.

Section 12.2 – Seed counter calibration
- Must manually count 10 sets of 100 seeds
- Requires visual examination to ensure that seeds are “approximately the same size and shape as the seeds in a sample being tested.”
- Combined sample of 1,000 seeds (manually counted) is passed through mechanical seed counter with device count not to vary more than ± 2 seeds from 1,000
- If not within ± tolerance, “…clean mirrors; adjust feed rate and/or reading sensitivity… Rerun until within tolerance”

Concerns:
- Reference to “sample being tested” refers to required “purity analysis.”
- Instruction to “rerun until within tolerance” includes no instruction to conduct additional trial counts for repeatability.
- Preliminary counts failing to meet tolerance could, theoretically, be unlimited.
- A single seed counter indication within tolerance may not indicate reliability.

Section 12.3 - Sample preparation  (Emphasis added)
- “Immediately after opening the moisture proof container, mix and divide the submitted sample, in accordance with section 2.2, to obtain a sample for purity analysis…”
- “Conduct the purity analysis to obtain pure seed for the seed count test”

Concerns:
- The term “divide” has specific meaning and requires very detailed procedural requirements set forth in the “Rules for Testing Seed” manual.
- Reference to “…in accordance with section 2.2…” confirms the above.
- Section 2.2. states: “A suitable type of mechanical divider (conical, centrifugal, riffle, etc.) should be used.” These procedures are not addressed in new § 4.11.
- Need for “suitable…divider” presents added expenses/device transport issues.
- Non-mechanical dividing methods permitted by the “Rules for Testing Seed” are labor intensive, very detailed, yet not incorporated into adopted Section 4.11.
- The directive to “conduct the purity analysis” is not followed by any instruction regarding how such is to be conducted.
- “Purity analysis” is a highly technical, detailed procedure with strict guidelines under “Rules for Testing Seed.”
- Weights and Measures officials are not trained to perform such analyses.

Section 12.4 - Conducting the test
- “…test the pure seed portion from the purity test and record the number of seeds in the sample.”

Concerns:
- Above specifies that the count test must be performed using “pure seed from the purity test”
- Again, Weights and Measures officials are not trained or qualified to perform purity analyses. In some states (e.g., California), licensing is required.

Summary of Concerns: The procedures adopted at the 2010 NCWM Annual Meeting require skills and expertise (seed purity analysis) for which Weights and Measures officials are not trained or qualified and the procedure
provides no instruction whatsoever regarding how a purity analysis is to be performed. Equipment required (mechanical seed counters and dividers) is very costly and not suited for transport to the field. The adopted procedures for calibrating the mechanical seed counters do not address the potential for numerous failed tests (exceeding the ± 2 tolerance for a 1,000-seed sample) followed by a single in-tolerance test and do not require repeatability testing to verify that the device is reliable. Any deviations from the mandated procedures and use of required equipment subject Weights and Measures agencies to challenges to the test findings and potential liabilities for taking enforcement actions (e.g., “hold” or “off-sale” orders) in violation of procedures. This item was prematurely approved without consideration of all concerns.

At the 2010 WWMA Annual Meeting, the WWMA L&R Committee recommended that this item move forward as a Voting item.

270 OTHER ITEMS – DEVELOPING ITEMS

INTRODUCTION

The NCWM established a mechanism to disseminate information about emerging issues which have merit and are of national interest. Developing items are those items that have not received sufficient review by all parties affected by the proposals or may be insufficiently developed to warrant review by the NCWM L&R Committee. The Developing items listed are currently under review by at least one regional association, subcommittee, or WG.

The Developing items are marked according to the specific NIST handbook into which they fall – HB 130 or HB 133. The Committee encourages interested parties to examine the proposals included in the appendices and to send their comments to the contact listed in each part.

The Committee asks that the regional weights and measures associations, subcommittees, and WGs continue their work to fully develop each proposal. Should an association, subcommittee, or WG decide to discontinue work on a Developing item, the Committee asks that it be notified. When the status of an item changes because the submitter withdraws the item, the item will be listed in a table below. For more details on items moved from the Developing items list to the Committee’s main agenda, refer to the new reference number in the main agenda.

270-1 Fuels and Lubricants Subcommittee (FALS)

Source: The Fuels and Lubricants Subcommittee (FALS)

Purpose: Update the Uniform Engine Fuels, Petroleum Products, and Automotive Lubricants Regulation in HB 130. Another task will be to update the Basic Engine and Fuels, Petroleum Products, and Lubricants Laboratory Publication.

Item Under Consideration: FALS has met since the 2007 Annual Meeting and continues its work on a number of items in addition to preparing a major revision of the Fuel Ethanol Specifications.

Background/Discussion: The Subcommittee met on January 24, 2007, at the NCWM Interim Meeting to undertake a review of a number of significant issues related to fuel standards. Their first project was to undertake a major review and update of the Uniform Engine Fuels, Petroleum Products, and Automotive Lubricants Regulation in HB 130. The Subcommittee also met at the 2007 NCWM Annual Meeting and continued its work on a number of items in addition to preparing a major revision of the Fuel Ethanol Specifications.

An additional project will be to update and possibly expand the Basic Engine Fuels, Petroleum Products, and Lubricants Laboratory Publication. The Subcommittee will undertake other projects as time and resources permit.

At the 2009 NCWM Interim Meeting and Annual Meeting, the FALS Chairman informed the Committee that FALS is working toward getting changes made to the language within the document.
At the CWMA 2009 Interim, the WWMA 2009 Annual, the SWMA 2009 Annual, and the NEWMA 2009 Interim Meetings, there were no comments heard. The Associations recommend that this proposal remain a Developing item.

At the 2010 NCWM Interim Meeting, the FALS Chairman, Mr. Hayes, informed the Committee that FALS is still working on this project. No comments were heard during the open hearings, and the Committee agrees that this item should remain a Developing item.

At the 2010 NEWMA Annual Meeting held in Groton, Connecticut, no comments were heard on this item. The NEWMA L&R Committee recommends that this item remain Developmental.

At the 2010 CWMA Annual Meeting held in Springfield, Illinois, the NIST Technical Advisor provided information that NIST has begun work on the development of a handbook for State fuel laboratories.

At the 2010 NCWM Annual Meeting in St. Paul, Minnesota, a comment from a petroleum representative stated that this item is premature and that action needs to be taken by the EPA. Mr. Hayes, FALS Chairman, clarified that this item is for a laboratory guide and that FALS supports NIST efforts to develop a handbook for state fuel laboratories. The item mentioned by the petroleum representative is for a new proposal that is being submitted through the regions modifying HB 130 as a result of a potential EPA waiver for gasoline containing more than 10 volume percent ethanol.

At the 2010 fall regional meetings, all of the Associations are recommending that this item be a Developmental item.

If you would like to participate in this Subcommittee, contact Mr. Ron Hayes, Chairman Fuels and Lubricants Subcommittee, at (573) 751-2922, e-mail: ron.hayes@mda.mo.gov, or Mr. David Sefcik, NIST at (301) 975-4868, e-mail: david.sefcik@nist.gov.

_______________________
Mr. John Gaccione, Westchester County, NY, Chairman
Mr. Joe Benavides, Texas
Ms. Jonelle Brent, Illinois
Mr. Raymond Johnson, New Mexico
Mr. Tim Lloyd, Montana

Mr. Ron Hayes, Missouri, Chairman FALS

Mr. Lance Robertson, Canada, Technical Advisor
Mr. Rob L. Underwood, Associate Member Representative

Ms. Lisa Warfield, NIST Technical Advisor: e-mail: lisa.warfield@nist.gov
Mr. David Sefcik, NIST Technical Advisor: e-mail: david.sefcik@nist.gov

Laws and Regulations Committee
Appendix A

Item 231-2: Handbook 130, Packaging and Labeling Regulation

Sections 6.12. Supplementary Quantity Declaration and
6.14 Qualification of Declaration Prohibited
THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
Michael K. Tomenga,
Esq. Neville Peterson
LLP
1400 16th Street, Suite 350
Washington, DC 20036-2227

Dear Mr. Tomenga:

This is in response to your correspondence seeking staff's opinion regarding whether Clorox's charcoal labeling meets the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act (FPLA) requirements. Specifically, you ask whether the claim on the Kingsford charcoal packaging that a 13.9 lb. bag "lasts the same as a 15 lb. bag" constitutes an exaggerated quantity statement in violation of the FPLA. According to the materials submitted, this claim appears on the principal display panel of the product to the left of the net quantity declaration.

Charcoal briquettes are subject to the labeling requirements of the FPLA and the Commission's Rules and Regulations Promulgated Thereunder. Section 500.6(b) of the Commission's Regulations under the FPLA states that:

The declaration of net quantity shall appear as a distinct item on the principal display panel, shall be separated (by at least a space equal to the height of the lettering used in the declaration) from other printed label information appearing above or below the declaration and, shall not include any term qualifying a unit of weight or mass, measure, or count, such as "jumbo quart," "giant liter," "full gallon," "when packed," "minimum," or words of similar import. The declaration of net quantity shall be separated (by at least a space equal to twice the width of the letter "N" of the style of type used in the net quantity statement) from other printed label information appearing to the left or right of the declaration . . .

Commission staff believes that the "lasts the same as" statement on the Kingsford charcoal packaging does not qualify the package's unit of weight. Consumers would likely reasonably interpret that statement as a performance claim about the product. The claim appears as a distinct item on the display panel and is separated from the net quantity declaration in accordance with the requirements of the FPLA regulations. Therefore, we would not recommend that the Commission bring a law enforcement action for violations of the FPLA based on the facts presented in your letter. Nevertheless, under Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, the company must possess and rely upon reasonable substantiation for the claim and the claim should not be deceptive. See FTC Policy Statements on Deception and Substantiation: 
http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/policyshnt/ad-decept.htm; http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/guides/ad3subst.htm. We have not evaluated Clorox's substantiation to
determine whether law violations exist.

This letter has not been reviewed or approved by the Commission or by any individual Commissioner and is given without prejudice to the right of the Commission to later rescind the advice and, where appropriate, to commence a law enforcement action. If you have any questions, you may contact me at (202) 326-3740, rspector@ftc.gov or Steve Ecklund at (202) 326-2841, seeklund@ftc.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Robin Rosen
Spector Attorney

cc: David A. Sefcik
National Institute of Standards and Technology
Weights and Measures Division
Laws and Metric Group
Stop 2600
Gaithersburg, MD 20899

Maureen Henzler
Weights & Measures Division, Kansas Department of Agriculture Program
Service Administrator II
Small Scales, Packages, and Price Verification
109 SW 9th Street
Topeka, KS 66612
Appendix A – Item 231-2: Packaging and Labeling Regulation
Appendix B

Item 232-1: Handbook 130, Method of Sale Regulation

Section 2.13.4. Declaration of Weight

Table of Contents
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FROM: A. Godwin, Ventura County, California

Specification and Tolerance Committee:

Method of sale regulations require that Polyethylene sheeting and bags be labeled with:
1. Length and width
2. Thickness in mil or micron
3. Count (bags only)
4. Net weight

The theoretical weight is used by weights and measure officials to verify the required net weight statement. The net weight for the product is determined by the dimensions stated on the label. If the thickness is missing then the net weight cannot be verified. If the count of the bags is missing, the net weight cannot be verified. However, if the label has no net weight, but is labeled otherwise in full compliance (1-3) then a theoretical net weight can be calculated.

Now, there are several misunderstandings within the plastics industry.

1. The Plastics Industry believe they have a 10% Tolerance on the net weight and
2. Weights and Measures can only test polyethylene by weight.

First there has never been a 10% or any tolerance for polyethylene products.

Second, we test by weight as a courtesy to the holder of the product. All dimensions are required to be accurate. If the bag has an inaccurate length, width, thickness or count, weights and measures can still test the product. We can open the boxes in the sample; measure the length by unrolling the product. We can destroy the bags by cutting the bags in half to measure the mil. We can test and average the dimensions of the bags and count the total bags inside the box. All of these testing procedures of coarse will render the product no longer able to go back into the original box and will increase the testing time substantially.

Several years ago TYCO plastics contacted Marianne Delperdang and inquired about the Plastics formula. At that time Marianne did not realize that there was a difference in Poly densities. She explained to TYCO about the verification formula set in HB 133. TYCO then took that formula and
used it too there advantage. If Weights and Measures can only hold us to 0.92 g/cm\(^3\) then they could have an automatic 3% advantage in their weights. For example take the following dimensions

40 in x 48 in x 0.5 mil x 500 ct HDPD Can Liners

Using 0.92 g/cm\(^3\) the net weight for this box would be 31.91 lb.
Using 0.95 g/cm\(^3\) the net weight for this box would be 32.95 lb

32.95-31.91= 1.04  \quad 1.04/32.95= .003 x 100= 3%

If the manufacturer of this product places a net weight statement on this label at 32.00 LB, then we as weights and measures officials can only hold the product to 32.00 lbs. This means that when I test the product and it averages 32.00 lbs net weight, I know the product is still short measure on one or more of the dimensions or count, since the product is not making a net weight at 32.95 lbs. As a weights and measures official, I can use this formula now to identify that this product has a shortage because I know that as a high density product this package is short on one or more dimensions. Therefore, I can start opening the boxes and measuring the product inside.

The original formula was developed when the only Poly product out there was linear low density. This is the minimum density for linear low density is 0.92 g/cm\(^3\) which is reflected in the FIB 133 formula. The formula was developed and agreed upon so that weights and measures officials would test the product without destroying the product. Unless there is a change made to the formula officially recognizing the different densities then the only option left for weights and measures officials is to test to the dimensions to ensure fair value comparisons. Allowing an unfair advantage to the HDPE Distributors is not an option. We will just use the industry recognized density factor to identify the short measure product. It is their choice to correctly label density.

Respectfully,

Angela Godwin
Deputy Sealer
County of Ventura, California
National Conference on Weights and Measures 1135 M Street
Suite 110
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
E-mail• don.onwiler@ncwm.net
Attn: Don Onwiler

RE: Proposed Changes to Handbook 130, Method of Sale Regulation Section 2.13.4. "Declaration of Weight"

Dear Don:

This letter is in reference to the proposed changes to Handbook 130, Method of Sale Regulation Section 2.13.4. "Declaration of Weight" (copy attached).

As you know, we attended the NCWM meeting in Nashville this year to present Berry Plastics' opposition to the above referenced Handbook 130 proposed changes. The purpose of this letter is to reiterate our opposition to this proposal.

Background
Berry Plastics Corporation is a leading manufacturer and marketer of HDPE and LLDPE Institutional Can Liners. Berry Plastics is a long time participant in this market and is well versed in the category mechanics and needs of stakeholders (end user, distributor and manufacturer).

Recommendation
Berry Plastics respectfully requests the NCWM Laws and Regulations Committee reject the above referenced proposal for three reasons:

1) **Blends** — Most HDPE Can Liners utilize blends of various materials (HDPE, LLDPE, LDPE and post consumer and post industrial resins as well as additives). The current use of the .92 density factor sets a bottom limit on product weight. If the .95 density factor is adopted it will require manufacturers to overstate the weight of the product.

2) **Convention** — HDPE Can Liner product weights based on the .92 density factor are well accepted in the industry and the category participants (manufacturers, distributors and end users) are very accustomed to these product weights. Instead of clarifying the issue, changing the density factor will actually lead to confusion in the marketplace.
3) **Sustainability** — The strongest reason for rejecting this proposal relates to Sustainability. The Institutional Can Liner market is untracked; however, we estimate the size of the HDPE segment at 400 million pounds per year.

a. If the .95 density factor is adopted, and if industry increases product weights an additional 12 million pounds of plastic will find its way into the waste stream.

b. Just the production of this additional plastic will generate an additional **18.5 million pounds of CO2**.

c. Additional CO2 would be generated to transport and package the heavier product.

Given the above, we strongly recommend that this proposed revision be rejected.

Don, as always we appreciate all you do for the organization and we thank you for reviewing our position on this proposal.

I look forward to seeing you in St. Paul this July. Best

regards,

Michael T. Jackelen
Vice President
Berry Plastics Corporation
1401 West 94th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55431
mikejackelen@berryplastics.com
Telephone Number — 952/885-9232

CC Lisa Warfield (lisa.warfield@nist.gov)
Material Safety Data Sheet

1. Chemical product and company identification

Product name: POLYETHYLENE (HDPE) HOMOPOLYMER
MSDS #: 0000002010
Historic MSDS #: None.
Code: 0000002010 (NAP)
Product use: Consumer products. Industrial applications.
Supplier: Innovene USA LLC
200 E. Randolph Drive
Chicago, IL 60606
Emergency phone: 1 (800) 424-8300
Outside the US: +1 703-527-3887 (CHEMTREC)

2. Composition/information on ingredients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ingredient name</th>
<th>CAS #</th>
<th>% by weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polyethylene</td>
<td>9002-88-4</td>
<td>95 - 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Hazards identification

Color: White, translucent or colorless.
Emergency overview: This product has been evaluated and does not require any hazard warning on the label under established regulatory criteria.
Handling and/or processing of this material may generate dust which may cause mechanical irritation of the eyes, skin, nose and throat.
Routes of entry: Dermal contact. Eye contact. Inhalation. Ingestion.
Potential health effects:
- Eyes: No significant irritation expected other than possible mechanical irritation. Heated material can cause thermal burns. When heated to decomposition it emits acrid smoke and irritating fumes.
- Skin: No significant irritation expected other than possible mechanical irritation. Heated material can cause thermal burns.
- Inhalation: Dust: Exposure to airborne concentrations well above the recommended exposure limits may cause irritation of the nose, throat, and lungs. Vapor: If heated to more than 300°C, the product may form vapors or fumes which could cause irritation of the respiratory tract, coughing, and shortness of breath.
- Ingestion: No significant health hazards identified.

Medical conditions aggravated by over-exposure: None identified.
See toxicological information (section 11)
4. First aid measures

Eye contact: Hot material: Flush eyes with plenty of water for at least 15 minutes. Seek medical assistance for mechanical removal of this material from the eye. The use of flush fluid, other than water, is not recommended. Cold material: flush eyes with plenty of water. Get medical attention if irritation occurs.

Skin contact: If burned by contact with hot material, flush skin immediately with large amounts of cold water. If possible, submerge area in cold water. No attempt should be made to detach polymer adhering to the skin or to remove clothing attached with molten material. Thermal burns require immediate medical attention. Cold material: Wash with soap and water.

Inhalation: If affected by fumes from heated material, remove from source of exposure and move the affected person into fresh air. If not breathing, give artificial respiration. If breathing is difficult, give oxygen. Get medical attention.

Ingestion: Do NOT induce vomiting unless directed to do so by medical personnel. Never give anything by mouth to an unconscious person. If large quantities of this material are swallowed, call a physician immediately.

5. Fire-fighting measures

Flammability of the product: May be combustible at high temperature.

Auto-ignition temperature: >343 °C

Flash point: Above 300°C decomposition occurs and flash of fumes may occur.

Products of combustion: These products are carbon oxides (CO, CO2). May also contain low levels of aldehydes, ketones, organic acids or hydrocarbons.

Unusual fire/explosion hazards: High dust concentrations have a potential for combustion or explosion. This material is not explosive as defined by established regulatory criteria.

Fire-fighting media and instructions: In case of fire, use water spray (fog), foam or dry chemicals. Do not use water jet.

Protective clothing (fire): Fire-fighters should wear positive pressure self-contained breathing apparatus (SCBA) and full turnout gear.

6. Accidental release measures

Personal precautions: IN CASE OF A LARGE SPILL: Contact emergency personnel. Eliminate all ignition sources. Granules spilled on the floor can cause slipping. Fine dust clouds may form explosive mixtures with air. Do not touch or walk through spilled material. Use suitable protective equipment (See Section: "Exposure controls/personal protection"). Follow all fire-fighting procedures (See Section: "Fire-fighting measures").

Environmental precautions and clean-up methods: If emergency personnel are unavailable vacuum or carefully scoop up spilled material and place in an appropriate container for disposal. Avoid creating dusty conditions and prevent wind dispersal. Avoid contact of spilled material with soil and prevent runoff entering surface waterways. See Section 13 for Waste Disposal Information.

Personal protection in case of a large spill: Chemical/Dust Goggles. Personnel should wear protective clothing.

7. Handling and storage

Handling: There is a risk of being splashed with molten materials. Thermal burns are the most common injury caused while processing molten material. Do not inhale fumes or vapor from molten product. Use with adequate ventilation.

When handling hot material, wear heat resistant protective gloves, clothing and face shield that are able to withstand the temperature of the heated product.

Pneumatic conveying of powder and pellets can generate large static electrical charges. Electrical discharge in presence of air can cause an explosion. Earth all equipment. High dust concentrations have a potential for combustion or explosion. To avoid fire or explosion, dissipate static electricity during transfer by grounding and bonding containers and equipment before transferring material.
8. Exposure controls/personal protection

Occupational exposure limits

Ingredient name: Polyethylene

ACGIH TLV (United States, 2005).
TWA: 10 mg/m³ 8 hour(s). Form: Inhalable fraction PNOS
TWA: 3 mg/m³ 8 hour(s). Form: Respirable fraction PNOS

Control Measures
Use process enclosures, local exhaust ventilation, or other engineering controls to keep airborne levels below recommended exposure limits. If user operations generate dust, fume or mist, use ventilation to keep exposure to airborne contaminants below the exposure limit.

Hygiene measures
Wash hands after handling compounds and before eating, smoking, using lavatory, and at the end of day.

Personal protection

Eyes
Safety glasses with side shields. Use dust goggles if high dust concentration is generated.

Skin and body
Hot material: Wear heat-resistant protective gloves, clothing and face shield that are able to withstand the temperature of the molten product.

Cold material: None required; however, use of protective clothing is good industrial practice.

Respiratory
Product processing, heat sealing of film, or operations involving the use of wires or blades heated above 300°C may produce dust, vapor or fumes. To minimize risk of overexposure to dust, vapor or fumes it is recommended that a local exhaust system is placed above the equipment, and that the working area is properly ventilated.
If ventilation is inadequate, use certified respirator that will protect against dust/mist.

Hands
Hot material: Wear heat-resistant protective gloves that are able to withstand the temperature of molten product.

Cold material: None required; however, use of gloves is good industrial practice.

Consult local authorities for acceptable exposure limits.

9. Physical and chemical properties

Physical state
Granular solid. Pellets. Powder or flakes solid.

Odor
Odorless.

Color
White, translucent or colorless.

Melting point / Range
126 to 135 °C

Specific gravity
0.93 to 0.97

Density
Pellet density: 930-970 kg/m³ (0.930 to 0.970 g/cm³)

Solubility
Insoluble in cold water.
10. Stability and reactivity

Stability and reactivity
The product is stable.

Conditions to avoid
Stable under recommended storage and handling conditions (See Section: “Handling and storage”). If heated to more than 300°C, the product may form vapors or fumes which could cause irritation of the respiratory tract, coughing, and shortness of breath. Avoid dusting when handling and avoid all possible sources of ignition (spark or flame). To avoid fire or explosion, dissipate static electricity during transfer by grounding and bonding containers and equipment before transferring material.

Incompatibility with various substances
None identified.

Hazardous decomposition products
These products are carbon oxides (CO, CO2). May also contain low levels of aldehydes, ketones, organic acids or hydrocarbons.

Hazardous polymerization
Will not occur.

11. Toxicological information

Chronic toxicity

Carcinogenic effects
No component of this product at levels greater than 0.1% is identified as a carcinogen by ACGIH or the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC). No component of this product present at levels greater than 0.1% is identified as a carcinogen by the U.S. National Toxicology Program (NTP) or the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA).

Mutagenic effects
No component of this product at levels greater than 0.1% is classified by established regulatory criteria as a mutagen.

Reproductive effects
No component of this product at levels greater than 0.1% is classified by established regulatory criteria as a reproductive toxin.

Teratogenic effects
No component of this product at levels greater than 0.1% is classified by established regulatory criteria as teratogenic or embryotoxic.

12. Ecological information

Ecotoxicity
No testing has been performed by the manufacturer.

Persistence/degradability
Not inherently biodegradable (polymer).

Mobility
This product is lighter than water and will float on the surface. This product is not likely to move rapidly with surface or groundwater flows because of its low water solubility.

Bioaccumulative potential
This product is not expected to bioaccumulate through food chains in the environment.

Other ecological information
Wildlife may ingest plastic pellets or bags. Although not toxic, such materials may physically block the digestive system, causing starvation or death.

13. Disposal considerations

Waste information
Recycle to process, if possible. Avoid contact of spilled material and runoff with soil and surface waterways. Consult an environmental professional to determine if local, regional or national regulations would classify spilled or contaminated materials as hazardous waste. Use only approved transporters, recyclers, treatment, storage or disposal facilities. Dispose of in accordance with all applicable local and national regulations.

Consult your local or regional authorities.

14. Transport information

Not classified as hazardous for transport (DOT, TDG, IMO/IMDG, IATA/ICAO)
15. Regulatory information

U.S. Federal regulations
US INVENTORY (TSCA): In compliance.
This product is not regulated under Section 302 of SARA and 40 CFR Part 355.
This product does not contain any hazardous ingredients at or above regulated thresholds.

SARA 313
Form R - Reporting requirements
This product does not contain any hazardous ingredients at or above regulated thresholds.
Supplier notification
This product does not contain any hazardous ingredients at or above regulated thresholds.
CERCLA Sections 102a/103 Hazardous Substances (40 CFR Part 302.4): This material is not regulated under CERCLA Sections 103 and 107.

State regulations
No products were found.

Inventories
AUSTRALIAN INVENTORY (AICS): In compliance.
CANADA INVENTORY (DSL): In compliance.
CHINA INVENTORY (IECS): In compliance.
EC INVENTORY (EINECS): In compliance. (Polymer, exempt from listing.)
JAPAN INVENTORY (ENCS): In compliance.
KOREA INVENTORY (ECL): In compliance.
PHILIPPINE INVENTORY (PICCS): In compliance.

16. Other information

Label requirements
This product has been evaluated and does not require any hazard warning on the label under established regulatory criteria.

HMIS® Rating :
Health 0  National Fire Protection
Flammability 1  Association (U.S.A.)
Physical 0  Specific hazard
Hazard
Personal X  protection

History
Date of issue 08/03/2005.
Date of previous issue No Previous Validation.
Prepared by Product Stewardship

Notice to reader
NOTICE: This Material Safety Data Sheet is based upon data considered to be accurate at the time of its preparation. Despite our efforts, it may not be up to date or applicable to the circumstances of any particular case. We are not responsible for any damage or injury resulting from abnormal use, from any failure to follow appropriate practices or from hazards inherent in the nature of the product.
HDPE High Density Polyethylene

Description
High Density Polyethylene (HDPE) of The Dow Chemical Company (Dow) encompasses a range of products to balance excellent impact strength, toughness and stiffness as required. The HDPE products are high-purity powders made without any hydrocarbon comonomers and contain no secondary additives.

The following technical information notes a range of product capabilities. Your Dow representative is available to answer your questions and to provide reasonable technical support.

Physical Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resin Properties</th>
<th>Test Method</th>
<th>Values¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melt Index, 110 g/10 min</td>
<td>ASTM D 1238</td>
<td>1-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density, g/cc</td>
<td>ASTM D 792</td>
<td>0.95-0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melting Point, °C</td>
<td>DSC²</td>
<td>130-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Particle Size, μm</td>
<td>Sieve²</td>
<td>&lt;300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Typical values, not to be construed as specifications. Users should confirm results by their own tests.
² Internal test method

Standard packages consist of supersacks of approximately 840 kg (1850 lb).

Spills, Disposal
Clean-up of spills is a matter of good general housekeeping. Preferred options for disposal are (1) recycling, (2) incineration with energy recovery, and (3) landfill. The high fuel value of this product makes option 2 very desirable for material that cannot be recycled.

Any disposal procedures must be in compliance with all applicable laws and other governmental enactments.

Health Hazards
The HDPE products are very low in single dose oral toxicity, may cause only minor irritation upon eye or skin contact due to mechanical effects, and are not absorbed through the skin. Therefore, they can be handled safely if reasonable care and caution are observed.

Combustibility
HDPE powders can be processed safely. The end user is responsible for hazard evaluation to ensure the compatibility of the HDPE in a specific process. Fine polyethylene dust formation or accumulation may lead to an explosive mixture with air. In addition, conveying or handling the product may cause a static ignition hazard. Refer to National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) RP77 "Recommended Practice on Static Electricity" for guidance in reducing the fire hazards associated with static electricity.
Product Stewardship

The Dow Chemical Company and its subsidiaries (Dow) has a fundamental concern for all who make, distribute, and use its products, and for the environment in which we live. This concern is the basis for our Product Stewardship philosophy by which we assess the safety, health, and environmental information on our products and then take appropriate steps to protect employee and public health and our environment. The success of our Product Stewardship program rests with each and every individual involved with Dow products — from the initial concept and research, to manufacture, use, sale, disposal, and recycle of each product.

Customer Notice

Dow strongly encourages its customers to review both their manufacturing processes and their applications of Dow products from the standpoint of human health and environmental quality to ensure that Dow products are not used in ways for which they are not intended or tested. Dow personnel are available to answer your questions and to provide reasonable technical support. Dow product literature, including safety data sheets, should be consulted prior to use of Dow products. Current safety data sheets are available from Dow.

Dow Medical Application Policy

Dow will not knowingly sell or sample any product or service (“Product”) into any commercial or developmental application that is intended for:

a. permanent (Long term) contact with internal body fluids or internal body tissues. Long term is a use which exceeds 72 continuous hours (except 30 days for PELLETHANE™ polyurethane elastomers);

b. use in cardiac prosthetic devices regardless of the length of time involved. (Cardiac prosthetic devices include, but are not limited to, pacemaker leads and devices, artificial hearts, heart valves, intra-aortic balloons and control systems, and ventricular bypass assisted devices);

c. use as a critical component in medical devices that support or sustain human life; or

d. use specifically by pregnant women or in applications designed specifically to promote or interfere with human reproduction.

Additionally, all Products intended for use in pharmaceutical applications, other than pharmaceutical packaging, must pass the current Pharmaceutical Liability Guidelines.

- For the products sold by the Plastics Portfolio, new business opportunities require a business assessment prior to sale or sampling of Dow products.
- Authorized distributors and resellers will adhere to this medical policy.
- The Dow Chemical Company does not endorse or claim suitability of their products for specific medical applications. It is the responsibility of the medical device or pharmaceutical manufacturer to determine that the Dow product is safe, lawful, and technically suitable for the intended use. DOW MAKES NO WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, CONCERNING THE SUITABILITY OF ANY DOW PRODUCT FOR USE IN MEDICAL APPLICATIONS.

Disclaimer

NOTICE: No freedom from infringement of any patent owned by Dow or others is to be inferred. Because use conditions and applicable laws may differ from one location to another and may change with time, the Customer is responsible for determining whether products and the information in this document are appropriate for the Customer’s use and for ensuring that the Customer’s workplace and disposal practices are in compliance with applicable laws and other governmental enactments. Dow assumes no obligation or liability for the information in this document. NO WARRANTIES ARE GIVEN; ALL IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE ARE EXPRESSLY EXCLUDED.

NOTICE: If products are described as “experimental” or “developmental”: (1) product specifications may not be fully determined; (2) analysis of hazards and caution in handling and use are required; and (3) there is greater potential for Dow to change specifications and/or discontinue production.

Additional Information

North America
U.S. & Canada: 1-800-441-4369
1-989-832-1426
Mexico: +1-800-441-4369

Latin America
Argentina: +54-11-4319-0100
Brazil: +55-11-5188-9222
Colombia: +57-1-319-2100
Mexico: +52-55-5201-4700

Europe/Middle East
+800-3694-6367
+32-3-450-2240

South Africa
+800-99-5078

Asia Pacific
+800-7776-7776
+60-3-7955-3392

www.dowplastics.com
Published August 2005
1. CHEMICAL PRODUCT AND COMPANY IDENTIFICATION

PE3408 (HDPE) Pipe & Fittings (Various Colors)

COMPANY IDENTIFICATION
Performance Pipe, a Division of
Chevron Phillips Chemical Company LP
2929 North Central Expressway #300
Richardson, TX. 75080

EMERGENCY TELEPHONE NUMBERS
HEALTH (24 hr): (800)231-0623 or
(510)231-0623 (International)
TRANSPORTATION (24 hr): CHEMTREC
(800)424-9300 or (703)527-3887
Emergency Information Centers
are located in U.S.A.
Int'l collect calls accepted

PRODUCT INFORMATION: (972) 705-6543

2. COMPOSITION/INFORMATION ON INGREDIENTS

100.0 % PE3408 (HDPE) Pipe & Fittings (Various Colors)

CONTAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENTS</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>LIMIT/QTY</th>
<th>AGENCY/TYE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POLYETHYLENE Chemical Name: ETHENE, HOMOPOLYMER</td>
<td>&gt; 96.00%</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS9002884</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OR

POLYETHYLENE-BUTENE COPOLYMER Chemical Name: 1-BUTENE, POLYMER WITH ETHENE
| CAS25087347 | > 96.00% | NONE | NA |

OR

Revision Number: 3 Revision Date: 11/28/00 MSDS Number: 005873
POLYETHYLENE-HEXENE COPOLYMER
Chemical Name: 1-HEXENE, POLYMER WITH ETHENE
CAS25213029  >  96.00%  none  NA

ADDITIVES INCLUDING THE FOLLOWING
LEAD CHROMATE PIGMENT
Chemical Name: C.I. PIGMENT YELLOW 34
CAS1344372  <  1.00%  none  NA

CARBON-BLACK
Chemical Name: CARBON-BLACK
CAS1333864  <  4.00%  3.5 mg/m3  ACGIH TWA
            3.5 mg/m3  OSHA PEL

COMPOSITION COMMENT:
All the components of this material are on the Toxic Substances Control
Act Chemical Substances Inventory.

3. HAZARDS IDENTIFICATION

************************** EMERGENCY OVERVIEW **********************

Colored plastic (red, white, blue, grey, black, orange)

****************************** IMMEDIATE HEALTH EFFECTS **********************

EYE:
Not expected to cause prolonged or significant eye irritation. If this material is heated, thermal burns may result from eye contact.

SKIN:
Contact with the skin is not expected to cause prolonged or significant irritation. Not expected to be harmful to internal organs if absorbed through the skin. If this material is heated, thermal burns may result from skin contact.

INGESTION:
Not expected to be harmful if swallowed.

INHALATION:
Not expected to be harmful if inhaled. If this material is heated, fumes may be unpleasant and produce nausea and irritation of the upper respiratory tract.

SIGNS AND SYMPTOMS OF EXPOSURE:
Thermal burns to the eye: may include pain, tearing, reddening, swelling, and impaired vision. Thermal burns to the skin: may include pain or feeling of heat, discoloration, swelling, and blistering. Respiratory irritation: may include coughing and difficulty breathing.

4. FIRST AID MEASURES

EYE:
If heated material should splash into eyes, flush eyes immediately with fresh water for 15 minutes while holding the eyelids open. Remove contact lenses, if worn. Get immediate medical attention.

SKIN:
If the hot material gets on skin, quickly cool in water. See a doctor for extensive burns. Do not try to peel the solidified material from the skin or use solvents or thinners to dissolve it. The use of vegetable oil or mineral oil is recommended for removal of this material from the skin.

INGESTION:
No specific first aid measures are required because this material is not expected to be harmful if swallowed.

INHALATION:
Move the exposed person to fresh air. If not breathing, give artificial respiration. If breathing is difficult, give oxygen. Get medical attention if breathing difficulties continue.

5. FIRE FIGHTING MEASURES

FIRE CLASSIFICATION:
Classification (29 CFR 1910.1200): Not classified by OSHA as flammable or combustible.

FLAMMABLE PROPERTIES:
FLASH POINT: NA
AUTOIGNITION: NA
FLAMMABILITY LIMITS (% by volume in air): Lower: NA Upper: NA

EXTINGUISHING MEDIA:
  - CO2, dry chemical, foam and water fog

NFPA RATINGS: Health 0; Flammability 1; Reactivity 0.

FIRE FIGHTING INSTRUCTIONS:
This material will burn although it is not easily ignited. For fires involving this material, do not enter any enclosed or confined fire space without proper protective equipment, including self-contained breathing apparatus.

If possible, water should be applied as a spray from a fogging nozzle since this is a surface burning material. The application of high velocity water will spread the burning surface layer.

COMBUSTION PRODUCTS:
Normal combustion forms carbon dioxide, water vapor and may produce carbon monoxide, original monomer, other hydrocarbons and hydrocarbon oxidation products, depending on temperature and air availability.

6. ACCIDENTAL RELEASE MEASURES

CHEMTREC EMERGENCY NUMBER (24 hr): (800)424-9300 or (703)527-3887
International Collect Calls Accepted

ACCIDENTAL RELEASE MEASURES:
Not applicable.
7. HANDLING AND STORAGE

Avoid contact of heated material with eyes, skin, and clothing. Avoid breathing vapor or fumes from heated material.

Improper or careless handling of these products can result in serious personal injury or possibly death, especially during loading, unloading, movement or installation. Please take all necessary precautions and follow manufacturer's published procedures for safely handling these products.

8. EXPOSURE CONTROLS/PERSONAL PROTECTION

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS:
Consider the potential hazards of this material (see Section 3), applicable exposure limits, job activities, and other substances in the work place when designing engineering controls and selecting personal protective equipment. If engineering controls or work practices are not adequate to prevent exposure to harmful levels of this material, the personal protective equipment listed below is recommended. The user should read and understand all instructions and limitations supplied with the equipment since protection is usually provided for a limited time or under certain circumstances.

ENGINEERING CONTROLS
Use in a well-ventilated area. If heated material generates vapor, or fumes, use process enclosures, local exhaust ventilation, or other engineering controls to control exposure. Ventilation requirements must be locally determined. If handling results in dust generation, special ventilation may be needed to ensure that dust exposure does not exceed the OSHA PEL for nuisance dust.

PERSONAL PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT

EYE/FACE PROTECTION:
No special eye protection is normally required. If this material is heated, wear chemical goggles and a face shield if engineering controls or work practices are not adequate to prevent eye contact.

SKIN PROTECTION:
No special protective clothing is normally necessary. If this material is heated, wear insulated clothing to prevent skin contact if engineering controls or work practices are not adequate to prevent skin contact.

RESPIRATORY PROTECTION:
No respiratory protection is normally required. If heated material generates vapor or fumes that are not adequately controlled by ventilation, wear a NIOSH approved respirator. Use the following
respirators: Organic Vapor.

9. PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL PROPERTIES

Revision Number: 3  Revision Date: 11/28/00  MSDS Number: 005873

PE3408 (HDPE) Pipe & Fittings (Various Colors)

PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION:
Colored plastic (red, white, blue, grey, black, orange)

pH: NA

VAPOR PRESSURE: NA

VAPOR DENSITY
(AIR=1): NA

BOILING POINT: NA

MELTING POINT: 122C (252F)

SOLUBILITY: Insoluble in water

SPECIFIC GRAVITY: 0.95

DENSITY: 0.95 g/cm3

EVAPORATION RATE: 0

PERCENT VOLATILE (VOL): 0%

10. STABILITY AND REACTIVITY

HAZARDOUS DECOMPOSITION PRODUCTS:
Low molecular weight hydrocarbons, alcohols, aldehydes, acids and ketones can be formed during thermal processing.

CHEMICAL STABILITY:
Stable.

CONDITIONS TO AVOID:
Do not heat without adequate ventilation.

INCOMPATIBILITY WITH OTHER MATERIALS:
May react with strong oxidizing agents, such as chlorates, nitrates, peroxides, etc. Avoid contact with organic solvents. May react with free halogens.

HAZARDOUS POLYMERIZATION:
Polymerization will not occur.

11. TOXICOLOGICAL INFORMATION

EYE EFFECTS:
The eye irritation hazard is based on data for a similar material.

SKIN EFFECTS:
The skin irritation hazard is based on data for a similar material. The acute dermal toxicity is based on data for a similar material.

ACUTE ORAL EFFECTS:
The acute oral toxicity is based on data for a similar material.

**ACUTE INHALATION EFFECTS:**
The acute respiratory toxicity is based on data for a similar material.

**ADDITIONAL TOXICOLOGY INFORMATION:**
This product contains polymerized ethylene. During thermal processing, this polymer can degrade. The three variables which control its degradation are the temperature, the length of time at that temperature, and the amount of oxygen available. Depending on the local processing conditions, a variety of low molecular weight hydrocarbons, alcohols, aldehydes, acids, and ketones can be formed. These materials are respiratory irritants. Prolonged and repeated breathing of fume components has been shown to cause other adverse health effects. Exposure to processing emissions should be minimized by following all recommendations in this MSDS.

Pigments containing carbon black, lead chromate, nickel, antimony, or titanium compounds may have been incorporated into this product. The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) has classified carbon black as a Group 2B carcinogen (possibly carcinogenic to humans) based on "sufficient evidence" in animals and "inadequate evidence" in humans. However, the pigments in this product are bound in a polymer matrix which severely limits its extractability, bioavailability and toxicity. The lead chromate pigment is also silica-encapsulated as well as bound in the polymer matrix. None of these pigments is likely to cause adverse health effects under recommended conditions of use.

---

12. **ECOLOGICAL INFORMATION**

**ECOTOXICITY:**
This material is not expected to be harmful to aquatic organisms.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FATE:**
This material is not expected to be readily biodegradable.

---

13. **DISPOSAL CONSIDERATIONS**

Contact local environmental or health authorities for approved disposal of this material.

---

14. **TRANSPORT INFORMATION**

The description shown may not apply to all shipping situations. Consult 49CFR, or appropriate Dangerous Goods Regulations, for additional description requirements (e.g., technical name) and mode-specific or quantity-specific shipping requirements.

**DOT SHIPPING NAME:** NOT DESIGNATED AS A HAZARDOUS MATERIAL BY THE FEDERAL DOT

**DOT HAZARD CLASS:** NOT APPLICABLE
15. REGULATORY INFORMATION

SARA 311 CATEGORIES:
1. Immediate (Acute) Health Effects: NO
2. Delayed (Chronic) Health Effects: NO
3. Fire Hazard: NO
4. Sudden Release of Pressure Hazard: NO
5. Reactivity Hazard: NO

Revision Number: 3
Revision Date: 11/28/00
MSDS Number: 005873

PE3408 (HDPE) Pipe & Fittings (Various Colors)

REGULATORY LISTS SEARCHED:

01=SARA 313
02=MASS RTK
03=NTP Carcinogen
04=CA Prop 65-Carcin
05=CA Prop 65-Repro Tox
06=IARC Group 1
07=IARC Group 2A
08=IARC Group 2B
09=SARA 302/304
10=PA RTK
11=NJ RTK
12=CERCLA 302.4
13=MN RTK
14=ACGIH TWA
15=ACGIH STEL
16=ACGIH Calc TLV
17=OSHA PEL
18=DOT Marine Pollutant
19=Chevron TWA
20=EPA Carcinogen
22=TSCA Sect 5(a)(2)
23=TSCA Sect 6
24=TSCA Sect 12(b)
25=TSCA Sect 8(a)
26=TSCA Sect 8(d)
27=TSCA Sect 4(a)
28=Canadian WHMIS
29=OSHA CEILING
30=Chevron STEL

The following components of this material are found on the regulatory lists indicated.

CARBON-BLACK
is found on lists: 02,08,10,11,13,14,17,28,
C.I. PIGMENT YELLOW 34
is found on lists: 01,03,04,05,10,11,28,

16. OTHER INFORMATION

NFPA RATINGS: Health 0; Flammability 1; Reactivity 0;

HMIS RATINGS: Health 0; Flammability 1; Reactivity 0;
(0=Least, 1=Slight, 2-Moderate, 3-High, 4=Extreme, PPE: Personal Protection Equipment Index recommendation, *- Chronic Effect Indicator). These values are obtained using the guidelines or published evaluations prepared by the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) or the National Paint and Coating Association (for HMIS ratings).

REVISION STATEMENT:
This revision updates Sections 1 and 3.

ABBREVIATIONS THAT MAY HAVE BEEN USED IN THIS DOCUMENT:
TLV - Threshold Limit Value
TWA - Time Weighted Average
Prepared according to the OSHA Hazard Communication Standard (29 CFR 1910.1200) and the ANSI MSDS Standard (Z400.1) by the Toxicology and Health Risk Assessment Unit, CRTC, P.O. Box 1627, Richmond, CA 94804

The above information is based on the data of which we are aware and is believed to be correct as of the date hereof. Since this information may be applied under conditions beyond our control and with which we may be unfamiliar and since data made available subsequent to the date hereof may suggest modification of the information, we do not assume any responsibility for the results of its use. This information is furnished upon condition that the person receiving it shall make his own determination of the suitability of the material for his particular purpose.

THIS IS THE LAST PAGE OF THIS MSDS
PTT Chemical Public Company Limited
123 Suntowers Building B, 31st - 35th Floor, Vibhavadi Rangsit Rd.,
Chomphon,Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel. +66 (0) 2265 8400  Fax. +66 (0) 2265 8500

MATERIAL SAFETY DATA SHEET

SECTION 1 – CHEMICAL PRODUCT AND COMPANY IDENTIFICATION

Product: InnoPlus HDPE Black Compound  
Chemical Name and Synonyms: High Density Polyethylene Black Compound Mixture  
CAS No.:  
Company Identification/Supplier: - PTT Chemical Public Company Limited  
14 I-1 Road, Tambon Map Ta Phut, Amphoe Mueang Rayong, Rayong 21150, Thailand  
- Bangkok Polyethylene Public Company Limited  
Maptaphut Industrial Estate 4-I-10 Rd., Maptaphut, Muang, Rayong 21150 Thailand  
Emergency Telephone No: +66(0)-3892-1191

SECTION 2 – COMPOSITION/INFORMATION ON INGREDIENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>CAS NO.</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polyethylene</td>
<td>9002-88-4</td>
<td>&lt; 100% weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Black</td>
<td>1333-86-4</td>
<td>&lt; 3% weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>&lt; 3% weight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE:  
This product is not considered a hazardous material at temperatures below the melting point as determined in Section 9.

SECTION 3 – HAZARDS IDENTIFICATION

PHYSICAL/CHEMICAL HAZARDS:  
This product has been evaluated and does not require any hazard warning on the label under established regulatory criteria. High dust concentrations have a potential for combustion or explosion.

HUMAN HEALTH HAZARDS:  
Not classified as dangerous. Handling and/or processing of this material may generate dust which may cause mechanical irritation of the eyes, skin, nose and throat.

ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARDS:  
Not classified as dangerous.
EFFECTS AND SYMPTOMS:

Eyes
No significant irritation expected other than possible mechanical irritation. Heated material can cause thermal burns. When heated to decomposition it emits acid smoke and irritating fumes.

Skin
No significant irritation expected other than possible mechanical irritation. Heated material can cause thermal burns.

Inhalation
Dust: Exposure to airborne concentrations well above the recommended exposure limits may cause irritation of the nose, throat, and lungs.
Vapor: If heated to more than 300°C, the product may form vapors or fumes which could cause irritation of the respiratory tract, coughing, and shortness of breath.

Ingestion
No significant health hazards identified.

SECTION 4 – FIRST AID MEASURES

EYE CONTACT
Flush eyes with running water immediately while holding the eyelids open. Remove contact lens, if worn, after initial flushing, and continue flushing for at least 15 minutes. Get medical attention.

SKIN CONTACT
Molten resin: If molten material comes in contact with the skin, cool under ice water or running steam of water. Do not attempt to remove the material from the skin. Remove could result in severe tissue damage. Get medical attention.

INGESTION
If swallowed, do not induce vomiting. Give a person a glass of water or milk to drink and get immediate medical attention. Never give anything by mouth to an unconscious person.

INHALATION
Move the exposed person to fresh air. If not breathing, give artificial respiration. If breathing is difficult, give oxygen. Get medical attention if breathing difficulties continue.

SECTION 5 – FIRE FIGHTING MEASURES

SUITABLE EXTINGUISHING AGENTS: Water haze, Foam, Chemical powder.

FOR SAFETY REASONS UNSUITABILITY EXTINGUISHING AGENTS: Water jet.

SPECIAL HAZARDS:
Caused by the material, its product of combustion or resulting gases: In case of fire it can release: Water (H₂O), Carbon dioxide (CO₂), and when lacking oxygen (O₂), Carbon monoxide (CO). The products of the burning are dangerous.

PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT:
Use a mask with universal filler. Use self-contained breathing apparatus within confined rooms.
SECTION 6 – ACCIDENTAL RELEASE MEASURE

PROTECTIVE MEASURES: Eliminate all sources of ignition in vicinity of spilled material. Wear appropriate personal protective equipment when cleaning up spills.

SPILL MANAGEMENT: Avoid creating dust clouds. Shovel, sweep up or use industrial vacuum cleaner to pick up. Place in container for proper disposal. Reduce airborne dust and prevent scattering by moistening with water. Stop the source of the release if you can do it without risk. Contain release to prevent further contamination of soil, surface water or groundwater. If heated material is spilled, allow it to cool before proceeding with disposal method.

SECTION 7 – HANDLING AND STORAGE

INFORMATION FOR SAFE HANDLING:
No special requirements necessary, if handled at room temperature. Avoid spilling the product, as this might cause falls. Potential toxic/irritating fumes may be evolved from heated material. Provide appropriate ventilation for such processing conditions. Take precautionary measures against explosion risks, as all types of polymers may develop dust during transporting or grinding of granules.

REQUIREMENTS TO BE MET BY STOREROOMS AND CONTAINERS:
Take precautionary measures to prevent the formation of static electricity. Do not smoke. Ground equipment electrically.

INFORMATION ABOUT STORAGE IN ONE COMMON STORAGE FACILITY:
Not required.

FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT STORAGE CONDITIONS:
Protect from heat and direct sunlight. Store under dry conditions.

SPECIFIC APPLICATIONS:
For safe stacking follow the storage recommendations specific for this product.

SECTION 8 – EXPOSURE CONTROLS/PERSONAL PROTECTION

ENGINEERING CONTROLS:
Use in a well-ventilated area. If handling results in dust generation, special ventilation may be needed to ensure that dust exposure does not exceed the OSHA PEL for nuisance dust. If heated material generates vapor or fumes, use process enclosures, local exhaust ventilation, or other engineering controls to control exposure.

PERSONAL PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT:
Respiratory system
Product processing, heat sealing of film or operations involving the use of wires or blades heated above 300°C may produce dust, vapor or fumes. To minimize risk of overexposure to dust, vapor or fumes it is recommended that a local exhaust system is placed above the equipment, and that the working area is properly ventilated. If ventilation is inadequate, use certified respirator that will protect against dust/mist.
Skin and body
Hot material: Wear heat-resistant protective gloves, clothing and face shield able to withstand the temperature of the molten product.
Cold material: None required; however, use of gloves is good industrial practice.

Hand
Hot material: Wear heat-resistant protective gloves able to withstand the temperature of the molten product. Cold material: None required; however, use of gloves is good industrial practice.
The correct choice of protective gloves depends upon the chemicals being handled, the conditions of work and use, and the condition of the gloves (even the best chemically resistant glove will break down after repeated chemical exposures). Most gloves provide only short time of protection before they must be discarded and replaced. Because specific work environments and material handling practices vary, safety procedures should be developed for each intended application. Gloves should therefore be chosen in consultation with the supplier/manufacturer and with a full assessment of the working conditions.

Eyes
Safety glasses with side shields. Use dust goggles if high dust concentration is generated.

SECTION 9 – PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL PROPERTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL STATE:</td>
<td>Pellets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOR:</td>
<td>Slight waxy odor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOR:</td>
<td>Black.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREEZING POINT:</td>
<td>Not Applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELTING POINT:</td>
<td>125 – 135 °C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOILING POINT:</td>
<td>Not Applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLASH POINT:</td>
<td>Not Applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENSITY:</td>
<td>0.955 – 0.980 g/cm³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIFIC GRAVITY:</td>
<td>Not Applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTOIGNITION TEMPERATURE:</td>
<td>Not Applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLOSIVE PROPERTIES:</td>
<td>High dust concentrations have a potential for combustion or explosion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT VOLATILE:</td>
<td>Not Applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAPOR PRESSURE:</td>
<td>Not Applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER SOLUBILITY:</td>
<td>Insoluble.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 10 – STABILITY AND REACTIVITY

CHEMICAL STABILITY:
This material is considered stable under normal ambient and anticipated storage and handling conditions of temperature and pressure.

CONDITIONS TO AVOID: Not Applicable.

INCOMPATIBILITY WITH OTHER MATERIALS:
May react with oxygen and strong oxidizing agents, such as chlorates, nitrates, peroxides, etc.

HAZARDOUS POLYMERIZATION: Hazardous polymerization will not occur.

HAZARDOUS DECOMPOSITION PRODUCTS:
Low molecular weight hydrocarbon, carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide, unidentified organic compounds.
SECTION 11 – TOXICOLOGICAL INFORMATION

PRIMARY IRRITANT EFFECT:
ON THE SKIN: No irritant effect.
ON THE EYES: No irritant effect.
SENSITIZATION: No sensitizing effect known.

ADDITIONAL TOXICOLOGICAL INFORMATION:
When used and handled according to specifications, the product does not have any harmful effects according to our experience and the information provided to us.

SECTION 12 – ECOLOGICAL INFORMATION

MOBILITY AND BIOACCUMULATION POTENTIAL:
Floats on water. There is no bioaccumulation.

OTHER INFORMATION:
This product is not biodegradable.

GENERAL NOTES:
The product is not toxic, small particles can have physical effects on water and Soil organisms.

SECTION 13 – DISPOSAL CONSIDERATIONS

DISPOSAL CONSIDERATION/WASTE INFORMATION:
Recycle to process, if possible. Avoid contact of spilled material and runoff with soil and surface waterways. Consult an environmental professional to determine if local, regional or national regulations would classify spilled or contaminated materials as hazardous waste. Use only approved transporters, recyclers, treatment, storage or disposal facilities. Dispose of in accordance with all applicable local and national regulations.

SECTION 14 – TRANSPORT INFORMATION

TRANSPORT/ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:
According to national and international guidelines, which regulate the road-, rail-, air- and sea-transport, this product is classified as not dangerous.

SECTION 15 – REGULATION INFORMATION

U.S. Federal Regulations; Inventories;
US INVENTORY (TSCA) : In compliance.
AUSTRALIAN INVENTORY (AICS) : In compliance.
CANADA INVENTORY (DSL) : In compliance.
CHINA INVENTORY (IECS) : In compliance.
EC INVENTORY (EINECS) : In compliance.
JAPAN INVENTORY (ENCS) : In compliance.
KOREA INVENTORY (ECL) : In compliance.

SECTION 16 – OTHER INFORMATION

Date of issue: Feb-2008
Prepare by: Technical Support, Polymer VC, PTT Chemical PLC.
NOTICE: This Material Data Sheet has been based upon data considered to be accurate at the time of its preparation. Despite our efforts, it may not be up to date or applicable to the circumstances of any particular case. We take no responsibility for inappropriate use, processing and handling by purchasers and users of the product.

InnoPlus
MATERIAL SAFETY DATA SHEET

SECTION 1  PRODUCT AND COMPANY IDENTIFICATION

PRODUCT
Product Name: PAXON CROSS-LINKABLE HDPE - All Colors Except Red
Product Description: Polymer, see Section 16 for applicable grades.

Intended Use: Rotational molding

COMPANY IDENTIFICATION
Supplier: EXXONMOBIL CHEMICAL COMPANY
P.O. BOX 3272
HOUSTON, TX. 77253-3272 USA

24 Hour Health Emergency (800) 726-2015
Transportation Emergency Phone (800) 424-300 or (703) 527-3887 CHEMTREC
Product Technical Information (281) 870-6000/Health & Medical (281) 870-6884
Supplier General Contact (281) 870-6000

SECTION 2  COMPOSITION / INFORMATION ON INGREDIENTS

No Reportable Hazardous Substance(s) or Complex Substance(s).

NOTE: The product may contain varying levels of additives such as slip and anti-blocking agents, anti-oxidants, stabilizers and processing aids.

SECTION 3  HAZARDS IDENTIFICATION

This material is not considered to be hazardous according to regulatory guidelines (see (M)SDS Section 15).

POTENTIAL PHYSICAL / CHEMICAL EFFECTS
High dust levels may create potential for explosion. Spilled pellets present a slipping hazard on hard surfaces.
Thermal burn hazard - contact with hot material may cause thermal burns. Material can accumulate static charges which may cause an ignition.

POTENTIAL HEALTH EFFECTS
Material is essentially non-toxic. However, if dust is generated, it could scratch the eyes and cause minor irritation to the respiratory tract. When heated, the vapors/fumes given off may cause respiratory tract irritation.

NFPA Hazard ID: Health: 1 Flammability: 1 Reactivity: 0
HMIS Hazard ID: Health: 1 Flammability: 1 Reactivity: 0

NOTE: This material should not be used for any other purpose than the intended use in Section 1 without expert advice. Health studies have shown that chemical exposure may cause potential human health risks which may vary from person to person.
SECTION 4  FIRST AID MEASURES

INHALATION
In case of adverse exposure to vapors and/or aerosols formed at elevated temperatures, immediately remove the affected victim from exposure. Administer artificial respiration if breathing is stopped. Keep at rest.

SKIN CONTACT
Wash contact areas with soap and water. For hot product: Immediately immerse in or flush affected area with large amounts of cold water to dissipate heat. Cover with clean cotton sheeting or gauze and get prompt medical attention.

EYE CONTACT
Flush thoroughly with water. If irritation occurs, get medical assistance.

INGESTION
First aid is normally not required. Seek medical attention if discomfort occurs.

SECTION 5  FIRE FIGHTING MEASURES

EXTINGUISHING MEDIA
Appropriate Extinguishing Media: Use water fog, foam, dry chemical or carbon dioxide (CO2) to extinguish flames.

Inappropriate Extinguishing Media: Straight Streams of Water

FIRE FIGHTING
Fire Fighting Instructions: Assure an extended cooling down period to prevent re-ignition. Evacuate area. Prevent runoff from fire control or dilution from entering streams, sewers, or drinking water supply. Firefighters should use standard protective equipment and in enclosed spaces, self-contained breathing apparatus (SCBA). Use water spray to cool fire exposed surfaces and to protect personnel.

Unusual Fire Hazards: High dust levels may create potential for explosion.

Hazardous Combustion Products: Smoke, Fume, Aldehydes, Oxides of carbon, Flammable hydrocarbons, Acetic acid

FLAMMABILITY PROPERTIES
Flash Point [Method]: 343°C (649°F) [Estimated ASTM E136]
Flammable Limits (Approximate volume % in air): LEL: N/D  UEL: N/D
Autoignition Temperature: 343°C (649°F) [Estimated]

SECTION 6  ACCIDENTAL RELEASE MEASURES

NOTIFICATION PROCEDURES
In the event of a spill or accidental release, notify relevant authorities in accordance with all applicable regulations. US regulations require reporting releases of this material to the environment which exceed the applicable reportable quantity or oil spills which could reach any waterway including intermittent dry creeks. The
National Response Center can be reached at (800)424-8802.

**SPILL MANAGEMENT**

**Land Spill:** Spilled pellets present a slipping hazard on hard surfaces. Prevent dust cloud. Small Dry Spills: With clean shovel place material into clean, dry container and cover loosely, move containers from spill area.

**Water Spill:** Stop leak if you can do it without risk. Confine the spill immediately with booms. Skim from surface.

Water spill and land spill recommendations are based on the most likely spill scenario for this material; however, geographic conditions, wind, temperature, (and in the case of a water spill) wave and current direction and speed may greatly influence the appropriate action to be taken. For this reason, local experts should be consulted. Note: Local regulations may prescribe or limit action to be taken.

**ENVIRONMENTAL PRECAUTIONS**

Prevent entry into waterways, sewers, basements or confined areas. For Large Spills: Cover spill with plastic sheet or tarpaulin to minimize spreading.

### SECTION 7  HANDLING AND STORAGE

**HANDLING**

Avoid conditions which create dust. Avoid elevated temperatures for prolonged periods of time. Eliminate all ignition sources (no smoking, flares, sparks or flames in immediate area). Use proper bonding and/or ground procedures. However, bonding and grounds may not eliminate the hazard from static accumulation. Prevent small spills and leakage to avoid slip hazard. DO NOT handle, store or open near an open flame, sources of heat or sources of ignition. Protect material from direct sunlight. Material can accumulate static charges which may cause an electrical spark (ignition source). Care should be taken when storing and handling this product. Apart from the specific nature of the polymer product, conditions such as humidity, sunlight, and temperature have an influence on the way the product behaves during storage and handling. Special attention should be paid to avoid inappropriate stacking of palletized bags or other package units. Indeed, polymer products may be dimensionally unstable under certain conditions. Avoid conditions generating heat during transfer operations.

**Loading/Unloading Temperature:** 20°C (68°F) [Ambient]

**Transport Temperature:** 20°C (68°F) [Ambient]

**Transport Pressure:** 101 kPa (15 psia) [Ambient]

**Static Accumulator:** This material is a static accumulator.

**STORAGE**

The container choice, for example storage vessel, may effect static accumulation and dissipation. Store in a cool, dry place with adequate ventilation. Keep away from incompatible materials, open flames, and high temperatures. Do not store in open or unlabelled containers.

**Storage Temperature:** 20°C (68°F) [Ambient]

**Storage Pressure:** 101 kPa (15 psia) [Ambient]

**Suitable Containers/Packing:** Boxes; Bags; Hopper Cars

### SECTION 8  EXPOSURE CONTROLS / PERSONAL PROTECTION
Exposure limits/standards for materials that can be formed when handling this product: For dusty conditions, OSHA recommends for particulates not otherwise regulated an 8-hour TWA of 15 mg/m³ (total dust), 5 mg/m³ (respirable fraction); ACGIH recommends for insoluble and poorly soluble particles not otherwise specified an 8-hour TWA of 10 mg/m³ (inhalable particles), 3 mg/m³ (respirable particles).

NOTE: Limits/standards shown for guidance only. Follow applicable regulations.

ENGINEERING CONTROLS

The level of protection and types of controls necessary will vary depending upon potential exposure conditions. Control measures to consider:

Adequate ventilation should be provided so that exposure limits are not exceeded. SPECIAL PRECAUTIONS: Should significant vapors/fumes be generated during thermal processing of this product, it is recommended that work stations be monitored for the presence of thermal degradation by-products which may evolve at elevated temperatures (for example, oxygenated components). Processors of this product should assure that adequate ventilation or other controls are used to control exposure. It is recommended that the current ACGIH-TLVs for thermal degradation by-products be observed. Contact your local sales representative for further information.

PERSONAL PROTECTION

Personal protective equipment selections vary based on potential exposure conditions such as applications, handling practices, concentration and ventilation. Information on the selection of protective equipment for use with this material, as provided below, is based upon intended, normal usage.

Respiratory Protection: If engineering controls do not maintain airborne contaminant concentrations at a level which is adequate to protect worker health, an approved respirator may be appropriate. Respirator selection, use, and maintenance must be in accordance with regulatory requirements, if applicable. Types of respirators to be considered for this material include:

Particulate air-purifying respirator approved for dust / oil mist is recommended.

For high airborne concentrations, use an approved supplied-air respirator, operated in positive pressure mode. Supplied air respirators with an escape bottle may be appropriate when oxygen levels are inadequate, gas/vapor warning properties are poor, or if air purifying filter capacity/rating may be exceeded.

Hand Protection: Any specific glove information provided is based on published literature and glove manufacturer data. Glove suitability and breakthrough time will differ depending on the specific use conditions. Contact the glove manufacturer for specific advice on glove selection and breakthrough times for your use conditions. Inspect and replace worn or damaged gloves. The types of gloves to be considered for this material include:

If product is hot, thermally protective, chemical resistant gloves are recommended. If contact with forearms is likely, wear gauntlet style gloves.

Eye Protection: If contact is likely, safety glasses with side shields are recommended.

Skin and Body Protection: Any specific clothing information provided is based on published literature or manufacturer data. The types of clothing to be considered for this material include:
If product is hot, thermally protective, chemical resistant apron and long sleeves are recommended.

Specific Hygiene Measures: Always observe good personal hygiene measures, such as washing after handling the material and before eating, drinking, and/or smoking. Routinely wash work clothing and protective equipment to remove contaminants. Discard contaminated clothing and footwear that cannot be cleaned. Practice good housekeeping.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROLS
See Sections 6, 7, 12, 13.

SECTION 9 PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL PROPERTIES

Typical physical and chemical properties are given below. Consult the Supplier in Section 1 for additional data.

GENERAL INFORMATION
Physical State: Solid
Form: Pellet, Powder
Color: Variable
Odor: Odorless
Odor Threshold: N/D

IMPORTANT HEALTH, SAFETY, AND ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION
Relative Density (at 60 F): 0.95 - 0.953
Flash Point [Method]: 343°C (649°F) [Estimated ASTM E136]
Flammable Limits (Approximate volume % in air): LEL: N/D UEL: N/D
Autoignition Temperature: 343°C (649°F) [Estimated]
Boiling Point / Range: N/A
Vapor Density (Air = 1): N/A
Vapor Pressure: N/A
Evaporation Rate (n-butyl acetate = 1): N/A
pH: N/A
Log Pow (n-Octanol/Water Partition Coefficient): N/D
Solubility in Water: Negligible
Viscosity: N/A
Oxidizing Properties: See Hazards Identification Section.

OTHER INFORMATION
Freezing Point: N/A
Melting Point: 126°C (259°F) - 132°C (270°F)
Hygroscopic: No

SECTION 10 STABILITY AND REACTIVITY

STABILITY: Material is stable under normal conditions.

CONDITIONS TO AVOID: Avoid elevated temperatures for prolonged periods of time. High dust concentrations. Do not heat above flashpoint.

MATERIALS TO AVOID: Strong oxidizers, Fluorine
HAZARDOUS DECOMPOSITION PRODUCTS: Material does not decompose at ambient temperatures.

HAZARDOUS POLYMERIZATION: Will not occur.

### SECTION 11 TOXICOLOGICAL INFORMATION

#### ACUTE TOXICITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route of Exposure</th>
<th>Conclusion / Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inhalation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxicity: Data available.</td>
<td>Minimally Toxic. Based on test data for structurally similar materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritation: Data available.</td>
<td>Negligible hazard at ambient/normal handling temperatures. Based on test data for structurally similar materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ingestion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxicity: Data available.</td>
<td>Minimally Toxic. Based on test data for structurally similar materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skin</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxicity: Data available.</td>
<td>Minimally Toxic. Based on test data for structurally similar materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritation: Data available.</td>
<td>Negligible irritation to skin at ambient temperatures. Based on test data for structurally similar materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eye</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritation: Data available.</td>
<td>May cause mild, short-lasting discomfort to eyes. Based on test data for structurally similar materials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CHRONIC/OTHER EFFECTS

For the product itself:
- Dust may be irritating to the eyes and respiratory tract.
- Elevated temperatures or mechanical action may form vapors, mists or fumes which may be irritating to the eyes and respiratory tract.

Contains additives that are encapsulated in the polymer. Under normal conditions of processing and use the encapsulated additives are not expected to pose a health hazard, however, grinding of the polymer is not recommended.

Contains:
This material may contain carbon black inextricably bound in a polymer. Certain carbon blacks have proved carcinogenic in animal studies. Inhalation animal studies of high concentrations resulted in chronic inflammation, lung fibrosis and lung tumors. Epidemiology studies of workers include findings of bronchitis, pneumonia, emphysema and excess cancer. Carbon black inextricably bound in a polymer or other matrix should present little or no hazard.

Additional information is available by request.

The following ingredients are cited on the lists below: None.

---REGULATORY LISTS SEARCHED---

1 = NTP CARC
2 = NTP SUS
3 = IARC 1
4 = IARC 2A
5 = IARC 2B
6 = OSHA CARC
SECTION 12  ECOLOGICAL INFORMATION

The information given is based on data available for the material, the components of the material, and similar materials.

ECOTOXICITY
  Material -- Not expected to be harmful to aquatic organisms.
  Material -- Not expected to be harmful to terrestrial organisms.

MOBILITY
  Material -- Low solubility and floats and is expected to migrate from water to the land. Expected to partition to sediment and wastewater solids.

PERSISTENCE AND DEGRADABILITY
Biodegradation:
  Material -- Expected to be persistent.
Hydrolysis:
  Material -- Transformation due to hydrolysis not expected to be significant.
Photolysis:
  Material -- Transformation due to photolysis not expected to be significant.
Atmospheric Oxidation:
  Material -- Transformation due to atmospheric oxidation not expected to be significant.

BIOACCUMULATION POTENTIAL
  Material -- Potential to bioaccumulate is low.

SECTION 13  DISPOSAL CONSIDERATIONS

Disposal recommendations based on material as supplied. Disposal must be in accordance with current applicable laws and regulations, and material characteristics at time of disposal.

DISPOSAL RECOMMENDATIONS
  Suitable routes of disposal are supervised incineration, preferentially with energy recovery, or appropriate recycling methods in accordance with applicable regulations and material characteristics at time of disposal.

REGULATORY DISPOSAL INFORMATION
  RCRA Information: The unused product, in our opinion, is not specifically listed by the EPA as a hazardous waste (40 CFR, Part 261D), nor is it formulated to contain materials which are listed as hazardous wastes. It does not exhibit the hazardous characteristics of ignitability, corrosivity or reactivity and is not formulated with contaminants as determined by the Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP). However, used product may be regulated.

SECTION 14  TRANSPORT INFORMATION

LAND (DOT): Not Regulated for Land Transport

LAND (TDG): Not Regulated for Land Transport
SEA (IMDG): Not Regulated for Sea Transport according to IMDG-Code

AIR (IATA): Not Regulated for Air Transport

SECTION 15 REГULATORY INFORMATION

OSHA HAZARD COMMUNICATION STANDARD: When used for its intended purposes, this material is not classified as hazardous in accordance with OSHA 29 CFR 1910.1200.

NATIONAL CHEMICAL INVENTORY LISTING: TSCA

EPCRA: This material contains no extremely hazardous substances.

CWA / OPA: Plastic pellets are defined by the US EPA under the Clean Water Act (40CFR122.26) as a "significant material" which requires any industrial plant that may expose pellets to storm water to secure a storm water permit. Violations of the rule carry the same penalties as other Clean Water Act violations. Pellets found in storm water runoff are subject to EPA regulations with the potential for substantial fines and penalties.

SARA (311/312) REPORTABLE HAZARD CATEGORIES: None.

SARA (313) TOXIC RELEASE INVENTORY: This material contains no chemicals subject to the supplier notification requirements of the SARA 313 Toxic Release Program.

The following ingredients are cited on the lists below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chemical Name</th>
<th>CAS Number</th>
<th>List Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CARBON BLACK</td>
<td>1333-86-4</td>
<td>1, 4, 10, 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--REGULATORY LISTS SEARCHED--

1 = ACGIH ALL
2 = ACGIH A1
3 = ACGIH A2
4 = OSHA Z
5 = TSCA 4
6 = TSCA 5a2
7 = TSCA 5e
8 = TSCA 6
9 = TSCA 12b
10 = CA P65 CARC

11 = CA P65 REPRO
12 = CA RTK
13 = IL RTK
14 = LA RTK
15 = MI 293
16 = MN RTK
17 = NJ RTK
18 = PA RTK
19 = RI RTK

Code key: CARC=Carcinogenic; REPRO=Reproductive

SECTION 16 OTHER INFORMATION

N/D = Not determined, N/A = Not applicable

THIS SAFETY DATA SHEET CONTAINS THE FOLLOWING REVISIONS:

Revision Changes:
Section 06: Notification Procedures - Header was modified.
Section 10 Stability and Reactivity - Header was modified.
Section 13: Disposal Recommendations - Note was modified.
Section 08: Personal Protection was modified.
Section 08: Hand Protection was modified.
Section 07: Handling and Storage - Handling was modified.
Section 07: Handling and Storage - Storage Phrases was modified.
Hazard Identification: Physical/Chemical Hazard was modified.
Section 07: Loading/Unloading Temperature C(F) was modified.
Section 07: Transport Temperature C(F) was modified.
Section 07: Transport Pressure kPa was modified.
Section 07: Storage Temperature C(F) was modified.
Section 07: Storage Pressure kPa was modified.
Section 05: Hazardous Combustion Products was modified.
Section 06: Accidental Release - Spill Management - Water was modified.
Section 09: Relative Density - Header was modified.
Section 09: Autoignition Temperature was modified.
Section 08: Hand Protection was modified.
Section 08: Eye Protection was modified.
Section 14: Sea (IMDG) - Header was modified.
Section 14: Air (IATA) - Header was modified.
Section 14: LAND (TDG) - Header was modified.
Section 14: LAND (DOT) - Header was modified.
Section 15: List Citation Table - Header was modified.
Section 14: LAND (DOT) - Default was modified.
Section 14: LAND (TDG) Default was modified.
Section 14: Sea (IMDG) - Default was modified.
Section 14: Air (IATA) - Default was modified.
Section 16: Materials Covered was modified.
Section 08: Exposure limits/standards was modified.
Section 15: OSHA Hazard Communication Standard was modified.
Section 11: Toxic Table - Header was modified.
Hazard Identification: OSHA - May be Hazardous Statement was modified.
Section 06: Notification Procedures was modified.
Composition: Footnotes was modified.
Section 09: Oxidizing Properties was modified.
Section 11: Chronic Tox - Product was added.
Section 01: Product Code - Header was deleted.
Section 11: Chemical Name - Header was deleted.
Section 11: CAS Number - Header was deleted.
Section 11: List Citation - Header was deleted.
Section 11: Toxic List Cited Table was deleted.

THIS MSDS COVERS THE FOLLOWING MATERIALS: Crosslinkable HDPE grades for which the grade name consists of a base polymer followed by a suffix referring to an additive package. Paxon 7203 and 7204 are black colored only (carbon black). Applicable designations follow. | Base polymers: | PAXON 7000X | PAXON 7003 | PAXON 7004 | PAXON 7203BLK (Black) | PAXON 7204BLK (Black) | Possible additive packages for PAXON 7003 and PAXON 7004: | BGE | BLK | BLU | BRN | DGR | GRY | JGD | NAT | ORG | PEL | RWK | WHT | YEL

PRECAUTIONARY LABEL TEXT:

This warning is given to comply with California Health and Safety Code 25249.6 and does not constitute an admission or a waiver of rights. This product contains a chemical known to the State of California to cause cancer.
Caution! Excessive exposure to dust may cause irritation of the nose and throat, and mechanical irritation of the eyes. Avoid generating dust. Use adequate ventilation under dusty conditions to keep airborne levels below recommended exposure limits. If inhaled and symptoms develop, remove to fresh air and get medical attention.

The information and recommendations contained herein are, to the best of ExxonMobil's knowledge and belief, accurate and reliable as of the date issued. You can contact ExxonMobil to insure that this document is the most current available from ExxonMobil. The information and recommendations are offered for the user's consideration and examination. It is the user's responsibility to satisfy itself that the product is suitable for the intended use. If buyer repackages this product, it is the user's responsibility to insure proper health, safety and other necessary information is included with and/or on the container. Appropriate warnings and safe-handling procedures should be provided to handlers and users. Alteration of this document is strictly prohibited. Except to the extent required by law, republication or retransmission of this document, in whole or in part, is not permitted. The term, "ExxonMobil" is used for convenience, and may include any one or more of ExxonMobil Chemical Company, Exxon Mobil Corporation, or any affiliates in which they directly or indirectly hold any interest.

Internal Use Only
MHC: 0, 0, 0, 0, 0
DGN: 4401772KUS (1007663)

Copyright 2002 Exxon Mobil Corporation, All rights reserved
Appendix C

Item 232-2: Handbook 130, Method of Sale

Section 2.13.4. Declaration of Weight
Packaged Printer Ink and Toner Cartridges
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March 17, 2009

Mr. Max Gray
Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services
Bureau of Weights & Measures
3125 Commer Blvd. Lab 2
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1650

Dear Mr. Gray:

Thank you for providing the inquiry from cartridge refiller Dr. Ink, Inc., as well as the link to Tom Coleman’s newsletter article dated March 2005. As we discussed briefly, Lexmark does not believe that the packaging for inkjet print cartridges is required to display the volume of ink contained within those devices. Lexmark also believes that despite some superficial appeal, such labeling is more apt to be misleading than illuminating to consumers.

Background

An inkjet print cartridge is not remotely similar to a bottle of milk or a tube of toothpaste; rather, it is one of the most technologically advanced micro-machines in commerce today. In fact, most of the sophisticated technology that comprised a printer in prior technologies is now contained within the print cartridge itself. Not surprisingly, then, the cost of the ink associated with a cartridge is a very small fraction of the total cost of the print cartridge mechanism and much of the price the customer pays for the cartridge is attributable to the micro-machinery, not the ink. Moreover, the capabilities of various cartridge models vary drastically in terms of print speed, print quality, drop size and resolution, and yield so a comparison of those machines based upon the quantity of ink they contain is an apples to oranges comparison. And as explained below, such a comparison could well mislead consumers into buying cartridges that will cost them more, not less, per print. Treating these sophisticated machines as though they were mere containers for ink is inappropriate.

Ink Exemption

Ink is expressly exempt from labeling as provided by the U.S. Fair Packaging and Labeling Act. See 16 C.F.R. 50.3.2(a), attached hereto. The exemption for ink has been consistently observed and applied for decades by the State of Florida, as well as every other state in the union. This is clearly demonstrated by the fact that during this period literally billions of ink pens, markers and highlighters have been sold without any labeling whatsoever as to the quantity of ink these devices contain. It cannot plausibly be denied that during the nearly 40 years the exemption has been in effect, enforcement officials of the Bureau have personally purchased a multitude of such
products and cannot possibly have failed to notice that none of them disclosed the quantity of ink.\(^1\)

Yet it does not appear that the Florida or any other state is currently considering requiring labeling of pens, markers and highlighters even though there is no principled way to treat them more leniently than print cartridges. Were the Bureau to abruptly change its longstanding policy regarding the ink, it would constitute a watershed change in Florida law that would encompass the entirety of two large industries that for decades have reasonably believed they were exempt. Any such unannounced deviation from established policy would create significant due process issues for the writing implement and printer companies affected.

**Labeling Would Cause Confusion**

As mentioned during our brief conversation, contrary to the objective of permitting meaningful comparisons of products, labeling ink volume of printing devices is more likely to cause confusion and in many cases, could cause consumers to make perfectly incorrect decisions. The ratio of the amount of ink contained in a cartridge versus the amount of printed pages a cartridge can produce is markedly different among various cartridge models. For example, a cartridge model that ejects relatively large drops of ink will consume far more ink to produce a given print than one with very fine drops and, ironically, the quality of the fine drop print will be better. Thus a consumer who chooses large-drop technology cartridge because it contains more ink than an equally priced fine-drop technology cartridge, will actually end up be paying more for each print, and obtain poorer print quality to boot.

In contrast, page yield estimates can provide a meaningful comparison of value to a consumer, at least if all manufacturers employ the same estimating assumptions and techniques. In this regard, the International Standards Organization (ISO), an independent, worldwide standards-setting body which is also interested in promoting accurate comparisons by consumers, has rejected reliance on ink volume or quantity. Instead, ISO, after studying for years the specific issue of inkjet cartridge performance and the consumer’s need for meaningful comparative information, has developed a yield estimating and claiming methodology that permits cartridges to be compared using a consistent yardstick. Unlike ink volume measurements, these page yield measurements provide consumers a reliable way to compare the relative amount of printing that can be expected from competitive models of printers and their associated cartridges.

**Coleman’s Newsletter Article**

Last, I would like to address Mr. Coleman’s March 2005 newsletter article. To be honest, I am not entirely certain what this document is intended to be, but a non-regulatory agency employee’s opinion set forth in a newsletter cannot possibly have the effect of countermanding the official Federal Trade Commission regulations that establish the exemption for ink. That regulation has the full force and effect of law and is recognized by all other states. Mr. Coleman’s newsletter article simply is not an authoritative document that could formulate the basis for the sweeping regulatory change that Dr. Ink seeks.

\(^1\) Inkjet print cartridges have similarly been sold for in every state at least 25 years.
Moreover, Mr. Coleman’s article does not address the ink exemption discussed above. Nor does it consider or discuss the lengthy and uniform custom and practice by the Federal government and every state government relating to ink products. It does not address the matter of whether billions of pens, markers and highlighters must, as a direct consequence of his position, must also be labeled. In this regard, there is not a single reason Mr. Coleman cites in support of his opinion that does not apply with equal force to the billions of pen, marker and highlighter packages that also do not display liquid volumes.

Although during our brief conversation you mentioned that the high cost of inkjet cartridges distinguishes them from pens, there is absolutely no provision in any packaging laws or regulations that exempts inexpensive items or provides a higher level of regulation for more highly priced items. If anything, pens, markers and highlighters are dramatically closer to being mere bottles of ink (like milk cartons) than the sophisticated micro-machines that comprise inkjet cartridges. There simply is no conscionable way for the Bureau to require the marking of high-tech ink delivery devices while permitting low-tech ink delivery devices such as pens and markers (which are purchased by more consumers and far more often) continue to be unmarked.

Conclusion

Lexmark very much hopes that based on the foregoing, the Bureau will deny Dr. Ink’s request. However, if the Bureau is inclined to change its policy of nearly four decades upon which at least two huge industries have relied in good faith, Lexmark hereby requests that it do so only after giving Lexmark and all other members of the both affected industries notice and a formal opportunity to be heard regarding the complex set of regulatory and compliance issues presented by the change desired by Dr. Ink.

Very truly yours,

Charles S. Krattner
Associate General Counsel
§ 503.2 Status of specific items under the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act.

Recent questions submitted to the Commission concerning whether certain articles, products or commodities are included under the definition of the term “consumer commodity”, as contained in section 10(a) of the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act, have been considered in the light of the Commission's interpretation of that term as set forth in § 503.5 of this part as follows:

(a) The Commission is of the opinion that the following commodities or classes of commodities are not “consumer commodities” within the meaning of the Act:

- Antifreeze.
- Artificial flowers and parts.
- Automotive accessories.
- Automotive chemical products.
- Automotive replacement parts.
- Bicycle tires and tubes.
- Books.
- Brushes (bristle, nylon, etc.).
- Brooms and mops.
- Cameras.
- Chinaware.
- Christmas light sets.
- Cigarette lighters.
- Clothespins (wooden, plastic).
- Compacts and mirrors.
- Diaries and calendars.
- Flower seeds.
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Footwear.
Garden tools.
Gift ties and tapes.
Glasses and glassware.
Gloves (work type).
Greeting cards.
Hand tools.
Handcraft and sewing thread.
Hardware.
Household cooking utensils.
Inks.
Jewelry.
Luggage.
Magnetic recording tape.
Metal pails.
Motor oil (automobile).
Mouse and rat traps.
Musical instruments.
Paintings and wall plaques.
Photo albums.
Pictures.
Plastic table cloths, plastic placement and plastic shelf paper.
Rubber gloves (household).
Safety flares.
Safety pins.
School supplies.
Sewing accessories.
Silverware, stainless steelware and pewterware.
Small arms ammunition.
Smoking pipes.
Souvenirs.
Sporting goods.
Toys.
Typewriter ribbons.
Woodenware.
(b) The Commission is of the opinion that the following commodities or classes of commodities are "consumer commodities" within the meaning of the Act:
Adhesives and sealants.
Aluminum foil cooking utensils.
Due to the discussion of inkjet cartridges, over the NIST W&M list server, WMD has investigated this situation. WMD concludes that inkjet cartridges need a net quantity statement in liquid measure to comply with Handbook 130 requirements. Our analysis is below and further discussion is welcomed.

Inkjet and Printer Cartridge Considerations

The model weights and measures law contains several relevant sections that apply to ink cartridges.

Weights and Measures Law, Section 19. “Information Required on Packages:”
Except as otherwise provided in this Act or by regulations promulgated pursuant thereto, any package, whether a random package or a standard package, kept for the purpose of sale, or offered or exposed for sale, shall bear on the outside of the package a definite, plain, and conspicuous declaration of:
- the identity of the commodity in the package;
- the quantity of contents in terms of weight, measure, or count;
- the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor, in the case of any package kept, offered, or exposed for sale, or sold in any other place other than on the premises where packed.

Weights and Measures Law, Section 17. “Method of Sale:”
The method of sale shall provide accurate and adequate quantity information that permits the buyer to make price and quantity comparisons, except as provided by established trade custom and practice. While trade custom and practice is a consideration in some instances... the burden to provide “accurate quantity information” by means of a designated “method of sale” is the responsibility of the manufacturer.

Count alone does not fulfill this requirement.

A declaration of quantity in terms of count shall be combined with appropriate declarations of the weight, measure, and size of the individual units unless a declaration of count is fully informative.

Packaging and Labeling Regulation, Section 6.4. – “Terms:” If there exists a firmly established general consumer usage and trade custom with respect to the terms used in expressing a declaration of quantity of a particular commodity, such declaration of quantity may be expressed in its traditional terms, provided such traditional declaration gives accurate and adequate information as to the quantity of the commodity. Any net content statement that does not permit price and quantity comparisons is forbidden.

Weights and Measures Law, Section 15. – “Misrepresentation of Quantity:” No person shall represent the quantity in any manner calculated or tending to mislead or in any way deceive another person. If “accurate quantity information” is not provided, consumers are certainly being mislead or deceived and cannot possibly make price and quantity comparisons.

The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) has informed us that the following commodities (partial list only - similar products) are excluded from FTC jurisdiction.

Ink
Fountain Pens
Kindred Products (ball point pens, lead pencils, lead refills, etc.)
School Supplies
Stationery and Writing Supplies
Typewriter Ribbon
Printer Cartridges* 

*While printer cartridges are not listed specifically in Handbook 130, FTC has indicated to NIST that commodities of this nature do not fall under their jurisdiction.

L&R - C8
Metric “Only” Labeling:
Since the labeling of printer ink cartridges fall under state labeling regulations, dual unit labeling is not required. Hence, these packages may be labeled in only metric units.

Packaging and Labeling Regulation, Section 11.33. “Inch-Pound Units, Exceptions – Consumer Commodities:”
The requirements for statements of quantity in inch-pound units shall not apply to packages that bear appropriate International System of Units (SI). This exception does not apply to foods, drugs, or cosmetics or to packages subject to regulation by the FTC, meat and poultry products subject to the Federal Meat or Poultry Products Inspection Acts, and tobacco or tobacco products.

NIST Handbook 133 has been prepared as a procedural guide for compliance testing of net content statements on packaged goods. The gravimetric test method (outlined in Chapter 2) uses weight measurement to determine the net quantity of contents of packaged goods. The handbook provides general test methods to determine the net quantity of contents of packages labeled in terms of weight and special test methods for packages labeled in terms of fluid measure or count. Gravimetric testing is the preferred method of test for products, such as inkjet and other types of printer cartridges. Therefore, the test method to verify the net contents of ink in printer cartridges exists. However, NIST recognizes the difficulties associated with determining the net content of these cartridges, such as, density determination, product cost, tare verification (cartridge), the cleaning of tare and standards, and finally, inspection lot size. Unless the products are checked at the plant or warehouse, it may be difficult to find a sufficient “retail” lot, adequate in size to obtain an appropriate sample.
January 21, 2010

Attn: Mr. Don Onwiler, Executive Director
National Committee on Weights and Measures
1135- "M" Street, Ste. 110
Lincoln, NE  68508

Sent by E-mail: info@ncwm.net

Re: Citizen comment on
270-9 HB 130- Uniform Regulation for Method of Sale of Commodities—Packaged Ink and Toner Cartridges

Dear Mr. Onwiler:

On 01-19-10 I spoke with Ms. Lisa Warfield this morning and she directed me to certain print sources pertaining to the upcoming NCWM meetings, including the subject of Packaged Printer Ink and Toner Cartridges. Furthermore, she recommended I might speak with Mr. Ed Williams in Sacramento regarding these anecdotal experiences and observations.

I then spoke with Mr. Williams and he felt I should direct the following commentary to you for possible inclusion as citizen input in your upcoming committee meeting report.

I don't do this much and I have a propensity for HOT AIR…hope this isn't too bad.

After having done my homework by reading Publication #15, Item 270-9, I shall first respond to certain comments made in Lexmark’s Fox in the Henhouse letter to Mr. Max Gray, dated, March 17, 2009 supporting the current ISO-developed standard for Toner-Ink measurement methodology; then offer a personal experience to illustrate the current standard’s shortcomings; then a few observations and unsolicited recommendations; and lastly, a closing comment on the need for furthering a new design paradigm and how your NCWM Conference can do something about it!

Item 1 -- It is irrelevant that the Ink/Toner component is a small part of the overall cost of a new or replacement cartridge—what matters is that the ink/Toner requires a costly and complex cartridge container for delivery. THEY ACT AS A UNIT! Lexmark’s implication that the relatively low cost of the Ink/Toner alone renders proper regulatory scrutiny unnecessary is totally spurious.

In fact, the opposite is true—the Ink/Toner and Cartridge combination is an EXTREMELY EXPENSIVE Ink/Toner Delivery System because Content and Container act as a unit which, furthermore, is uniquely designed (with certain patent protection) to fit the corresponding printer model(s). Whether an OEM or lower-priced Name Brand cartridge, the Unit is surprisingly expensive!

Items 2, 3 --Re standards for Page Yield and current ISO solutions—“yield estimating and claiming methodology that permits cartridges to be compared using a consistent yardstick”:
My layman’s opinion is that the “consistent yardstick” approach alone is inadequate. It prevents quantification of the contents—the essential ingredient inside the cartridge. Why not require the OEM Ink/Toner Cartridge/Printer industry to comply with freshly conceived DESIGN CRITERIA with at least one goal being to provide the consumer with a simple, yet accurate “back-up indicator” of a cartridge’s actual toner content?

Personal observations:
The purpose of the foregoing recommendation would be to empower the consumer with a GUARANTEE for DELIVERY of the ENTIRETY of the purchased Ink/Toner.

This approach is meant only to supplement, not replace, the simpler, more convenient ISO-approved Page Count approach. The secondary consumer benefit would be to eliminate the “wiggle room”-based dealer responses to Ink/Toner shortage customer complaints as not many consumers are inclined to pry toner cartridges apart or properly argue issues of equity in the event of suspected shortages.

Whether by software revisions or hardware re-design, mandated new performance-based criteria can provide the consumer with a long-overdue checks-and-balances Tool to level the manufacturers’ playing fields.

Solutions can take many forms—whether alpha-numeric via existing LCD windows or by color bar chart display graphics or even by adoption of primitive “clear plastic” toner cartridges. At the very least, the consumer would then have some kind of needed VERIFICATION TOOL.

Naturally, Lexmark’s letter to Mr. Gray fails to address any constructive new solutions as none were previously required by any regulatory agency. To illustrate the need for the foregoing, consider my particular frustration which occurred because of the absence of a Verification Tool:

My personal experience (Haven’t we all had them?):
The following sequence occurred in my design office. We purchase Brother or Staples TN-350 Toner Cartridges for my Brother MFC 7420 desktop laser printer (purchased several years ago), which has generally been lightly used (average 3-15 copies daily) since purchase:

EVENTS IN MY OFFICE:

- Periodically, the printer shuts down and will not print any longer…until a replacement Toner Cartridge is purchased and inserted into the printer!
  
  NOTE:
  - No easily noticeable, if any, Print Counter capability on the cartridge or the printer. The Toner Cartridge is a proverbial “Black Box”.
  - Printer shutdown appears to occur SIGNIFICANTLY BEFORE the estimated 2500 pages of usage.
  - No warning whatsoever of the pending total shutdown, i.e. printing quality drop-off or fade-out.
  - All printed copies 100% perfect prior to shutdown.

- Printer LCD Display Message then appears, saying something like “Out of Toner” or “Replace Toner Cartridge”
Printer cannot be cajoled into operating again without a new replacement cartridge, i.e. pushing the rocker switch to OFF, waiting 30 seconds, then back to ON; rocking toner cartridge; sliding the corona wire; etc.

EVENTS FOLLOWING AT THE STORE:

- I take "suspect" cartridge to office supply dealer (where I purchased the printer, cartridges and all office supplies). A question and complaint is planned prior to purchasing a new replacement cartridge.
- The Store Manager recites the manufacturer’s mantra about the difficulty of estimating toner consumption, varying printed text/page densities, etc.
- I then suggest we investigate the circumstances together—we remove End Cap from cartridge and…guess what….a SIGNIFICANT amount of toner spills out!
- The Store Manager then claims “Equipment Malfunction” may be responsible—did I purchase a Warranty? Ultimately, he reluctantly offered me a new replacement cartridge at half-price—but it was like pulling teeth from a donkey!.

EPILOGUE:
Was I satisfied? Yes and No

- Yes, because of the Manager’s offer—I didn’t feel like a total idiot.
- No, because of the repair disruption and the waste of my time.
- No, because of my uncertainty of a future repeat experience.
- No, because of the lack of final problem resolution—was the printer the real culprit or was it a batch of poorly designed Ink/Toner cartridges? Without the benefit of a built-in Diagnostic or Verification Tool(s)—either answer might be wrong. Will I, in the future, prematurely purchase again one or both of this manufacturer’s products?

To avoid that risk of becoming a true idiot (the second time burn), will I switch manufacturers to avoid that possibility?

- Probably yes. What a shame, because otherwise, the printer offers excellent value!

Final Thoughts/Conclusions:
The cartridge Page Yield Estimate, purportedly reflecting quantity of content, provides inadequate consumer protection without at least one additional design feature (in mechanism or software) to deliver to, and assure, consumer of full usage of the cartridge’s Ink/Toner contents.

Should not better Consumers Protection apply to the design of COMPLEX or PERMANENTLY SEALED CONTAINERS (i.e. Ink/Toner Cartridges)? These devices, during design, should trigger design compliance with additional new standards and regulations, generated by the appropriate agency, to assure the customer of:

1. Quantity of container’s Contents
2. Delivery of Entirety of Contents, as is practical.
3. Provide consumer with a Print Count or Ink/Toner quantity verification tool, (on Cartridge or Printer Display Screen) as offered in larger printers.
WHICH COMPARISON IS MORE APT?
Consider the comparison of a sophisticated, complex, injection-molded Ink/Toner Cartridge vs. an old-fashioned Burlap Bag for Grain or Paper Bag for Cement, where measurement can be easily confirmed because of the container’s scale, flexibility and negligible weight --after all, it’s just a BAG!

Now consider the same Toner Cartridge vs. a craftily-designed rigid Magician’s Box with a false bottom (designed by the Magician or Manufacturer), which by accident or design, conceals a portion (i.e.30%) of the grain--which remains unused and ultimately is then unknowingly discarded by the Consumer. Is that right?

Throughout history, did not the science of measurements ultimately evolve in most every society so as to identify and prevent the proliferation of deceptive and/or irregular measurement practices (whether for government tax gain or for the public’s protection)?

So Why Not Now?

EXAMPLE OF THE NEW PARADIGM--REFILL THE REFILL:
The job of providing “replacement toner” could be done just as well with a Refill-the-Refill design. An affordable, small, lightweight, saltshaker-sized, two-ounce $3.00 Ink/Toner refill snap-on module or squeeze-dispenser bottle enabling a customer to conveniently refill an empty toner cartridge (purchased in $18.00 six-packs instead of buying one $50.00 traditional cartridge on six separate trip occasions). When do we “outlaw” UNAFFORDABLE, LARGE, HEAVY, PACKAGED, PALLETED and TRANSPORTED cartridges produced and sold in the usual way?

A side-by-side Energy Audit of the two approaches would indicate at least NINE BILLION DOLLARS OF WASTE and FAR MORE IN UNNECESSARY ENERGY COSTS in the ten billion dollars per year Ink/Toner Cartridge Industry. Did I read ten billion somewhere?

In closing, the Ink/Toner cartridge is only one of countless ethically-challenged manufactured products cluttering and consuming our environment. My experience, though very minor in the big scheme of things, again illustrates the range of social and environmental losses resulting from the current license manufacturers often have to legally harvest unearned profits and waste substantial energy in the process of producing these small-scale consumer products. The public suffers.

Respectfully,

Gary J. Neville

cc: Lisa Warfield, Ed Williams
Printer Toner and Ink Cartridges:

Best Practices for Conveying Yield Performance to the consumer

This paper has been prepared by the Information Technology Industry Council (ITI). ITI is the premier voice, advocate, and thought leader for the information and communications technology (ICT) industry. ITI is widely recognized as the tech industry’s most effective advocacy organization in Washington D.C., and in various foreign capitals around the world. ITI’s members include the leaders of printer manufacturing technologies including Epson, Hewlett Packard, Kodak, and Lexmark, among others.

Executive Summary:

The ultimate goal of any product measure is to provide information to a customer that facilitates an informed purchase decision. At first glance, comparing the volume or weight of ink or toner would seem to be a good proxy for the page yield. For a host of reasons this is often not the case. Toner and ink cartridges are complex mechanisms designed to deliver a consistent customer experience and because of this, ink or toner can be used in different amounts when printing and for purposes other than printing. All of this is highly dependent on the design of the larger printing system of which the cartridge is a critical but not independent part.

The printing industry realized the difficulty of presenting cartridge performance information to the customer and because of this voluntarily chose to develop several standards for measuring yield performance. These standards are developed specifically for these devices and use standard test patterns and methods to provide accurate and repeatable measurement. Moreover, the standards include protocols for clear and consistent communications to users regarding cartridge yields. The industry wholly believes that these test procedures provide a more reliable means of measurement and a more accurate method for consumers to determine value than comparing the volume or weight of ink or toner.
Printer Toner and Ink Cartridges:

Best Practices for Conveying Yield Performance to the consumer

Objectives of weights and measures regulations include facilitating value comparisons and providing a standard of fairness in the marketplace. When it comes to selecting printer hardware and replacement supplies, these objectives dictate that weights and measures criteria that could lead the consumer to making economically incorrect decisions regarding value should not be implemented.

Some customers are interested in making comparisons on the relative value between printing supplies, both at the initial printer purchase and afterwards when purchasing additional supplies. In addition to cost, product reliability, brand reputation and print quality another important measure considered by some customers during the supply purchase is page yield. At first glance, comparing the volume or weight of ink or toner would seem to be a good proxy for the page yield. Unfortunately this is often not the case. This paper will outline the drawbacks of using weight or volume as a proxy for page yield and highlight the reasons why all major printer manufacturers use a set of ISO/IEC standards to measure and communicate printer yield.

Depending on the printing technology, the use of ink or toner can be impacted by several factors.

The amount of toner applied in printing pages compared to the amount of toner supplied in the cartridge is dependent on many factors and that a simple measure of the weight of the toner will not give a clear indication of ultimately how many pages can be printed. In electro-photographic (laser) printers, different toner formulations will use different amounts of toner when printing the same page. This is due to charge, particle size and formulation variation between toners. These attributes are engineered and varied by each cartridge vendor to provide what they feel to be the best experience to their customers. Some customers prefer thin sharp lines and fine detail, others prefer thick bold lines. Depending on the choices that a given manufacturer makes in toner formulation (base polymer, particle size, charge distribution and charge control agents), the amount of toner used to print the same page may vary. Additionally, the amount of toner cleaned and deposited in the waste hopper depends on several variables including the job size, coverage environment and printer design. Finally, the bulk densities of toners are not the same; for a given volume of toner, there can be significant differences in weights. All of these factors result in the reality that two different toner supplies of the same weight will not necessarily deliver the same number of pages.

Similar to laser printers, inkjet printer cartridge vendors manipulate several variables in their ink formulation to meet the needs they identify as important for their customers. Some of the variables that manufacturers consider and apply include: different ink formulations; dye vs. pigment inks, actual loads of pigment or dye in the ink formulation, and drop size. Different combinations of these ink content characteristics will result in substantially different ink consumption rates while printing the
same page. In addition, all inkjet systems perform routine servicing, and those servicing routines may be driven by a number of factors such as the ink formulation, usage and content. In addition, changes to non-ink materials by the inkjet cartridge manufactures or during remanufacture can affect the amount of ink that can be used in printing pages. Finally, for the same volume of ink, two different systems or the same model cartridge from two different vendors can print a different number of pages.

Ultimately what matters to many customers is answering the question, “How much can I print with a cartridge in a given printer?” Page yield reported using the ISO/IEC methodology better addresses this question than weight or volume. ISO/IEC JTC1 SC28 identified this as a consumer need in 2000 and started working on a family of standards that address this customer need. Standards now published measure yield for monochrome laser printers (ISO/IEC 19752), color laser and color inkjet printers (ISO/IEC 19798 & ISO/IEC 24711) using a common test suite (ISO/IEC 24712). Currently under development are standards to measure photo yield consisting of a methodology for inkjet printers (ISO/IEC 29102) and a photo test suite for any printing technology (ISO/IEC 29103). These standards are based on common design philosophies and change their methods slightly, depending on the technology being measured. The following attributes are endemic to each standard:

1. **Use of a well defined consumer type document for printing** – Coverage can vary depending on how it is measured and depending on what choices are made in defining coverage; the same “coverage” page can perform differently. For the ISO/IEC standards, the test pages were defined so that a consumer can more easily relate them to their work stream. These pages are freely available so customers can view and understand what the standard is based on. These test pages can be found at [www.iso.org/jtc1/sc28](http://www.iso.org/jtc1/sc28).

2. **Testing of multiple printers and cartridges to account for printer and supply variation** – There is manufacturing variation not only with how much ink or toner is put in a supply, but how effectively a printing system uses that ink or toner. This usage is also impacted by the specific printer used during test; some printers of the same model will use more or less ink or toner. For this reason, the ISO/IEC standards require a minimum of three cartridges to be used on a minimum of three printers (minimum of 9 cartridges tested). The yield information from these 9 cartridges is reported using a lower 90% confidence bound (LCB) on the mean. This gives a reliable estimate of lowest predicted average yield with 95% statistical confidence. The LCB not only takes into account the average performance of the cartridges tested, but also the breadth of variation in the cartridges and printers tested. The goal is to try and characterize the end user experience taking into account some of the normal variations in printers and supplies.

3. **A well controlled printing environment** – The environment that a printing system operates in can have an impact on the number of pages printed for a given amount of ink or toner. For laser systems both temperature and humidity can impact the amount of toner used. For this reason both the temperature and humidity are controlled for toner yield testing. For inkjet,
temperature is the main environmental driver for ink usage, so only temperature is controlled during testing.

4. **A well defined end of life criteria** – For the purposes of the ISO standards, end of life is defined in one of two ways. First, when the printer stops printing and reports that the supply should be changed. The other method requires a visual assessment of elements on the test targets. This visual assessment is defined as a visually significant fade in the target elements greater than 3mm as compared to the 100th print for that cartridge. These two methods are meant to represent the two common criteria that users would choose to determine if a supply has to be changed.

When the publication of the first yield standard occurred in the summer of 2004 it was accepted by industry and consumer’s groups as the best method for conveying one attribute of cartridge performance that was of interest to customers. Building on this acceptance, ISO/IEC JTC1 SC28 created additional standards for yield; these have been met with similar market acceptance as the original.

Because well established methods for the measure of cartridge yield exist and weight and volume are not as useful or meaningful in making value comparisons, this group recommends that cartridge performance information be conveyed to customers using the developed ISO/IEC yield standards.

Footnotes to press releases and reception of ISO yield standards:

http://www.pcmag.com/article2/0,2817,2183955,00.asp


August 10, 2010

Mr. Don Onwiler, Executive Director
National Committee on Weights and Measures
1135- “M” Street, Ste. 110
Lincoln, NE 68508

Via Email

Subject: NCWM Proposal for Uniform Regulation for Method of Sale of Commodities-
Packaged Printer Ink and Copier Toner

Mr. Onwiler,

On behalf of the Information Technology Industry Council (ITI) and its members¹, I welcome the
opportunity to offer these comments on the issue above for consideration at the 2010 National
Conference on Weights and Measures (NCWM) Annual Meeting.

ITI agrees with the main objective of this proposal which is to provide consumers with a
meaningful measurement of value. In this case, the most relevant measurement criterion for
consumers is the number of pages that they can obtain from a given printer cartridge. The
ISO/IEC standards for yield provide a common, well accepted basis for consumers to
understand and compare different cartridge options.

However, ITI’s members believe that volume and weight are a poor proxy for value. This
measurement does not directly relate to the number of pages that a consumer can print from a
cartridge and its use may lead consumers to draw incorrect conclusions regarding their choice
of supplies.

¹ ITI is the premier voice, advocate, and thought leader for the information and communications
technology (ICT) industry. ITI’s members include the leaders of printer manufacturing technologies
including Epson, Hewlett Packard, Kodak, and Lexmark, among others.
We continue to support the use of ISO/IEC yield measurement standards, which provide a clear, managed basis to measure and declare the yield of a specific cartridge. These standards rely on a test suite of pages relevant to consumer output that are freely available to consumers to review.

For color inkjet and laser printers, the industry supports yield declarations based on the normative testing described in ISO/IEC 24711 and ISO/IEC 19798. For monochrome laser printers, the industry supports yield declarations based on the normative testing described in ISO/IEC 19752. These three ISO/IEC measurement methods are widely accepted and are in practice by the industry. ITI would not encourage the use of any other value measurement as part of a mandatory or supplemental labeling requirement.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. We recognize that this is a complex issue and look forward to continuing to work with the NCWM and with the working group being created under the L&R Committee. Please let me know if you have any questions or require further information.

Sincerely,

Josh Rosenberg
Director, Global Policy

cc:
John Gaccione
Chairman
Laws and Regulations Committee
National Committee on Weights and Measures

Lisa Warfield
NIST Technical Advisor
Laws and Regulations Committee
National Committee on Weights and Measures
L&R Committee 2011 Interim Agenda
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Item 232-3: Handbook 130, Method of Sale Regulation

Section 1.7.1. Factory Packaged Ice Cream and Similar Frozen Products
AUG 02 2010

Cary Frye
Vice President
Regulatory Affairs
International Dairy Foods Association
Milk Industry Foundation
National Cheese Institute
International Ice Cream Association
1250 H Street NW, Suite 900
Washington, DC 20005

Dear Ms. Frye:

This is in response to your April 2 and May 14, 2010 letters to the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) seeking FDA’s position on the appropriate net quantity of contents declarations for pelleted frozen desserts, other than ice creams. You requested FDA’s confirmation on its position prior to the National Conference on Weights and Measures meeting to be held on July 11, 2010 so that the regulations on the method of sale may be appropriately amended at this meeting.

You stated in your letter that FDA clarified its position in the April 17, 2009 letter to the International Ice Cream Association (IICA) that net quantity of contents statements for pelleted ice creams should be expressed in terms of weight, not volume. You also stated that IICA believes that it is reasonable to assume that the same rationale that led FDA to this determination would support a position that labels of other pelleted frozen desserts should also include declarations expressed in terms of weight.

In a letter dated April 17, 2009 to IICA, FDA concluded that pelleted ice cream is a unique and totally new ice cream product that has emerged in the market place and because it is a semisolid food, and in accordance with 21 CFR 101.105(a), the net quantity of content declaration for this type of product would be net weight. In addition, FDA concluded that since there is not a firmly established general consumer usage and trade custom of expressing the quantity of contents declaration in terms of volume on pelleted ice cream, net weight would be appropriate.

Like pelleted ice cream, other similar pelleted frozen desserts are unique and new frozen desserts that are emerging in the marketplace. Because they are semisolid foods, in accordance with 21 CFR 101.105(a), and consistent with the net quantity for pelleted ice cream, the appropriate net quantity of content declaration for these products would be net weight. In addition, there is not a firmly established general consumer usage and trade custom of expressing the quantity of contents declaration in terms of volume on other similar pelleted frozen desserts.
As you stated, pelletized frozen desserts are manufactured at very low temperatures using a nitrogen process and consists of thousands of small beads of water ice, sherbet or other frozen desserts of varying sizes that are quick frozen. Moreover, because there is variation in the diameter of the pieces, settling in the package, and the absence of a test procedure, FDA believes that a net quantity of content declaration using a volume measurement would be difficult for manufacturers to determine and confirm and for regulatory officials to test.

FDA believes that a net weight approach would eliminate the need to develop a new test procedure that could be time consuming and require expensive test equipment. It appears that because of the uniqueness of these products, a net weight declaration would be an easier measurement to test than a volume declaration. Therefore, FDA believes that the net quantity of content statement on pelletized frozen desserts, in addition to pelletized ice cream, that conform to the standards for frozen desserts in 21 CFR part 135 and nonstandardized frozen desserts that are similar to the standardized frozen desserts in 21 CFR part 135 should be declared in terms of net weight. We would expect manufacturers of these pelletized frozen desserts to revise their labels to reflect a net weight declaration during the next printing cycle and encourage all marketers of pelletized frozen desserts to modify their labels with a net weight declaration within one year from the issue date of this letter.

If you have additional questions, do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely yours,

Geraldine A. June
Supervisor
Product Evaluation and Labeling Team
Office of Nutrition, Labeling, and Dietary Supplements
Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition
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Handbook 130, Item 237-3: Engine Fuels and Automotive Lubricants Regulation

Section 3.15. Biodiesel and Biodiesel Blends
September 7, 2010

Fuels and Lubricants Subcommittee
c/o Ronald G. Hayes, Chairman
National Conference on Weights and Measures PO Box 630
1616 Missouri Boulevard
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Re: Publication 16: 237-3 — Engine Fuels and Automotive Lubricants Regulation, Section 3.15
Biodiesel and Biodiesel Blends

Dear Fuels and Lubricants Subcommittee:

I write today to clarify and expand on comments made in a January 20, 2010 email to the FLS regarding changes to Handbook 130 Section 3.15 Biodiesel and Biodiesel Blends. The comments also reflect and expand upon API positions that were orally presented during the July 2010 NCWM Annual Meeting.

API Position

API agrees with NCWM that consumers must be protected from unknowingly purchasing diesel fuel containing greater than 5 percent biodiesel by volume. However, API opposes requirements on fuel suppliers to determine and convey the exact percentage of biodiesel in ASTM D975 diesel fuel. API supports with caveat the amended proposal included on L&R 24 in Publication 16 and opposes the draft substitute on L&R 25 in Publication 16. API would like to see the amended proposal on L&R 24 in Publication 16 further amended to say,

3.15.3. Documentation Required on Transfer Documents. The retailer shall be provided, at the time of delivery of the fuel, a declaration of the volume percent biodiesel on an invoice, bill of lading, shipping paper, or other document. It is the responsibility of any potential blender to determine the amount of biodiesel in the diesel fuel prior to blending.

3.15.4. Exemption.
(c) Diesel fuel containing not more than 5% by volume biodiesel fuel is exempt from disclosing the actual percent by volume of biodiesel as required in Section 3.15.3. However, the term "May contain up to 5% biodiesel" shall be used.

API offers the following arguments in support of our request that NCWM not require fuel producers and suppliers to provide the percent biodiesel by volume in D975 diesel fuel to retailers:
percent biodiesel by volume and up to 20 percent biodiesel by volume, then the fuel is to comply with ASTM D7467, Standard Specification for Diesel Fuel Oil, Biodiesel Blend (B6 to B20).

- Blenders of biodiesel should be responsible for confirming the biodiesel content of the finished fuel and that the fuel complies with the appropriate ASTM specification.

- 16 CFR 306 - Automotive Fuel Ratings, Certification and Posting - explicitly states that "biodiesel blends and biomass-based diesel blends that contain less than or equal to 5 percent biodiesel by volume and less than or equal to 5 percent biomass-based diesel by volume, and that meet American Society for Testing and Materials ('ASTM') standard D975 ('Standard Specification of Diesel Fuel Oils') are not automotive fuels covered by the requirements of [16 CFR 306]."

- If a party desires tax and/or RIN credits for blending biodiesel, then they should be responsible for determining the biodiesel content of the fuel that they are blending.

- Due to the nature of how fuels are delivered to terminals, it is unrealistic to expect terminal operators to provide exact biodiesel content of each transport of fuel being transferred.

- The requirement to disclose the exact biodiesel content on all transfer documents places an undue burden on the distribution system and does not allow for the flexibility needed by the operators of these systems.

**Quality Assurance**

Product integrity and quality assurance are essential for API member companies to ensure customer satisfaction. API members assure consumers that branded diesel containing up to 5 percent biodiesel by volume sold from their retail stations meets the ASTM D975 specification as required by law. If a party, who is authorized to do so, chooses to materially change the properties of the fuel offered by suppliers by adding biodiesel downstream of their fuel receipt from their supplier, it is the responsibility of that party to ensure that every gallon of the biodiesel blend offered to consumers meets the ASTM D975 specification and/or is in compliance with federal, state and local laws and regulations.

Requiring suppliers to determine the specific volume percentage of biodiesel in the fuel they offer to marketers who wish to then alter the fuel places an unreasonable burden on suppliers. If marketers wish to blend biodiesel into fuel, they should be the responsible party for determining the biodiesel content of the fuel.

**Federal Trade Commission Regulation**

16 CFR 306 - Automotive Fuel Ratings, Certification and Posting - explicitly states that "biodiesel blends and biomass-based diesel blends that contain less than or equal to 5 percent biodiesel by volume and less than or equal to 5 percent biomass-based diesel by volume, and that meet American Society for Testing and Materials ('ASTM') standard D975 ('Standard Specification of Diesel Fuel Oils') are not automotive fuels covered by the requirements of [16 CFR 306]." Therefore, refiners, importers and producers are not required to "determine" automotive fuel ratings for D975 diesel fuel before they transfer it. Additionally, refiners, importers and producers are not required to
Additionally, 16 CFR 306.4 states that, “no State or any political subdivision thereof may adopt or continue in effect...any provision of law or regulation with respect to such act or omission, unless such provision of such law or regulation is the same as the applicable provision of this title.” In other words, the FTC regulation preempts state laws that are not the "same" as FTC rules. Thus, any NCWM efforts to require the determination and/or certification of the automotive fuel ratings for D975 diesel fuel would be advancing efforts that would be in violation of 16 CFR 306.4.

**Tax Benefits**

Some supporters of requiring that the percent biodiesel by volume in D975 diesel fuel be included on transfer documents cite tax benefits that are allowed to blenders based on the amount of biodiesel per gallon of diesel. These same supporters also cite the Renewable Identification Number (RIN) credit retailers can receive for blending biodiesel downstream of the supplier. These benefits that encourage biodiesel blending reward the party performing the blending, which API supports. However, it should not be the responsibility of a third party, namely fuel suppliers, to aid a downstream blender's assessment of their tax benefit without compensation; nor should it be that third party's responsibility to assure the quality of the final product made in the interests of receiving that credit. This is an undue burden and by no means equitable treatment.

**Implementation Concerns**

Adequate timing to test and determine the percent biodiesel by volume is an issue that may hinder implementation of a requirement to certify exact biodiesel content for D975 diesel fuel. Some terminals do not necessarily know that their D975 diesel fuel receipt contains up to 5 percent biodiesel because all D975 diesel fuel containing up to 5 percent biodiesel by volume is fungible product and thus may be mixed with other D975 diesel fuel without the need to retest for quality. In some terminals, fungible D975 diesel fuel containing up to 5 percent biodiesel by volume can enter a terminal without the terminal operator's knowledge because it warrants no attention.

D975 diesel fuel, with up to 5 percent biodiesel by volume, may be placed in the same storage tanks as other D975 diesel fuel shipments potentially creating an amalgamation of D975 diesel fuel with differing amounts of biodiesel concentrations. To be clear, this would never result in a D975 diesel fuel surpassing 5 percent by volume in the storage tank. Should the terminal operator be aware of the biodiesel content, the shipment would still be placed in storage with other fungible D975 diesel fuel for efficient use of available storage tank capacity, rather than devoting an existing tank to the D975 diesel fuel with known biodiesel content or constructing a new tank for this purpose. Terminal tank space is currently at a premium, and any efforts to require additional tank space will be opposed by API members. Terminal operators do not have spare capacity to devote to different blends of fungible product nor the acreage to build new tanks. In short, because they optimize their use of existing storage tanks consistent with ASTM standards and Federal code, terminal operators, with the exception of those in jurisdictions with regulations requiring a specific biodiesel volume percentage in the diesel fuel offered, do not know the precise biodiesel content of D975 diesel fuel offered.

There are two ways a terminal operator could determine the biodiesel content of D975 diesel fuel before sale; both of which are costly and time-consuming. The method of greatest burden and cost involves testing the D975 diesel fuel in storage after each delivery to obtain an up-to-date accounting of the biodiesel content. The density of D975 diesel will vary between different fuel deliveries and will often leave different strata of D975 diesel fuel blends within the tank. A stratified tank means that a
terminal operator would not be able to determine the biodiesel content of a tank by performing a simple weighted average calculation. Physical testing would be required to determine the specific biodiesel concentration at substantial burden and cost to the terminal operator. Further, the frequency with which some terminals receive deliveries of diesel fuel could require testing more than once daily.

Some tanks have stirring capabilities which would alleviate the potential stratification of D975 diesel fuel, but these capabilities are rarely installed on tanks holding fungible grade fuels. Tank stirrers are very expensive and, once installed, require a time consuming process to operate.

The second method requires the terminal operator to test each load delivered to the tank truck. This method requires the time and expense to complete the test, both of which result in no benefit to the fuel supplier.

It is for all of the reasons above that API supports the disclosure of ranges of biodiesel content consistent with the FTC pump labeling rules: (1) up to 5 percent biodiesel by volume, (2) greater than 5 percent and up to 20 percent biodiesel by volume, and (3) greater than 20 percent biodiesel by volume. However, until FTC amends the Automotive Fuel Ratings, Certification and Posting rule (16 CFR 306) to allow for certification of automotive fuel ratings for biodiesel in these ranges, the NCWM cannot enact a similar change consistent with the requirements of FTC’s preemption authority (16 CFR 306.4). Should FTC amend their regulation to reflect API’s preferences for disclosure of biodiesel content in accordance with the ranges above, API would urge the NCWM to amend Publication 16 to mirror the FTC regulation consistent with the requirements of 16 CFR 306.4.

**Documentation Flexibility**

Regarding Section 3.15.3, API opposes efforts to mandate the disclosure of biodiesel content on all transfer documents. Fuel providers need the flexibility to determine on which document this information will be included given that the recipient of the order knows which document contains the information. Requiring disclosure on all transfer documents is entirely too inclusive and would be burdensome to fuel providers with no identified benefit.

**Conclusion**

There are many issues associated with requiring fuel suppliers to determine and label the amount of biodiesel in D975 diesel fuel. In summary, API supports NCWM efforts to inform retailers that D975 diesel fuel may contain up to 5 percent biodiesel by volume, but API opposes requirements to convey the exact percentage under or equal to 5 percent. Additionally, API supports the original wording of 3.15.3 which allows the fuel supplier flexibility in determining on which document to disclose biodiesel content.

Thank you very much for your consideration of our comments. I’d be happy to answer any questions the Fuels and Lubricants Subcommittee may have.

Sincerely,

Brian Knapp
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ASTM Specification
Change Process

Lewis M. Gibbs
Chevron Global Downstream LLC
May 5, 2010

ASTM D4814
Specification for Automotive Spark-Ignition Engine Fuel

- Currently Applies to All +50 Vol % Ethanol Blends
- Maximum Ethanol Content Limited by EPA Waiver
- If E15 Receives a Waiver, it is Automatically Covered by D4814
- Volatility Classes A, B, and C have a T50 Minimum of 170°F for ED and Would Apply to E15
- Volatility Classes D and E have a T50 Minimum of 150°F for All Fuels (ED, E10, and Would Apply to E15)
- All Volatility Classes for E1 to E10 have a T50 Minimum of 150°F
- API Blending Study Showed:
  - Only 1/4 of 8% 8 Volatility Classes AA, A, B, and C Samples Mot 170°F T50 Minimum
  - All E15 Classes D and E Samples Mot 150°F T50 Minimum

ASTM D4814 Cont'd.

- Partial Waiver May Require Discussion in Scope
- Balloting by ASTM Would Be Required to Extend 150°F T50 for All Volatility Classes for E15
- Typical Timing to Make a Change in ASTM is 14 Months Without Persuasive Negative Votes
- Emergency Timing is 6 Months with No Negative Votes at Both Subcommittee and Committee Levels. Requires Approval of Committee D02 Chairperson
  - If Any Negative Vote Is Cast, Process Starts Over
  - Negative Votes are a Concern Since There Are Minimal Driveability Data for E15
  - Data Will Be Available from CRC/Altitude and CRC/ASTM Hot-Fuel Handling Programs

Federal

- Vapor Pressure Allowance
  - Current EPA Regulations Allow 1.0 psi Higher Vapor Pressure for Gasoline-Ethanol Blends Containing 9 to 10 volume % Ethanol from May Through September 15 Than Those of Phase II (1992) Vapor Pressure Regulations for the Same Period, Except for Fuels Banned to Meet the Complex Model Regulations.
  - The Regulation Will Need to be Extended to Cover E15 Involving Changes to the Clean Air Act (211(h)(4))
- Revision to the Complex Model for Federal RFG (plus deform) of anti-icing sliding rule-making for Conventional Gasoline
  - Registration of E15 as New Fuel
- Certification of Detergent Additives in E15

ASTM Committee D02 Research Report D02: 1347 on Reformulated Spark-Ignition Engine Fuel will Require Revision

NCWM

- The National Conference on Weights and Measures Issues NIST Handbook 130 Which Contains Model Laws for Fuels and Lubricants
- Follows ASTM D4814 Except for:
  - Provides Federal 1.0 psi Allowance for 9 to 10 volume % Ethanol Blends for May 1 Through September 15 and 1.0 psi Allowance for Remainder of the Year for 1 to 10 Volume % Ethanol
  - Volatility Classes 4, 5, and 6 T5V=20 Limits are Less Restrictive for Up to 10 volume % Ethanol
- Action
  - Can't Initiate Action Until Federal Vapor Pressure Allowance is Extended to Cover E15
- Timing

State Implementation

- Adopt D4814
  - 37 States and One County
  - Specify Latest Version
    - Latest Version on ASTM Web Site
    - Latest Version Published in Annual Book of ASTM Standards
    - Specify Specific Versions
      - Range From 1989 to 2009
- Own Specification
  - 8 States (Some Based on D4814)
  - No Specification
    - 5 States and DC

Source: Herman & Associates
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Implementation Cont’d.</th>
<th>ASTM D4806</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Specify 1.0 psi Vapor Pressure Allowance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– 16 States – 9 to 10 Volume % Ethanol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– 10 States – NIST Handbook 130 (9 to 10 Volume %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– 5 States – Up to 10 Volume %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Modify State Air Pollution Regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– E.g. California Predictive Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Process to Change State Regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Emergency Regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Hearings and W &amp; M or APCD Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Legislative and Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Herman & Associates

ASTM D4806
Specification for Denatured Fuel Ethanol for Blending with Gasolines for Use as Automotive Spark-Ignition Engine Fuel

• For E15 a Higher Level of Ethanol will be in the Finished Automotive Spark-Ignition Engine Fuel
• Some Property Limits May Need Reducing to Ensure Proper Vehicle Performance
  – Chlorides
  – Sulfates
  – Acidity
  – Copper
L&R Committee 2011 Interim Meeting
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Renewable Fuels Association
- National Trade Association for the domestic ethanol industry promoting policy, regulations, research and development for the industry.
- History of the Association
  - Organized in 1981
  - Ethanol Producers constitute the Board of Directors
  - Representing domestic production
  - Leader in legislative and technical efforts of industry

Historical U.S. Ethanol Production

E10 Penetration – 2007
% of state gasoline blended with ethanol

E10 Penetration – 2010
% of state gasoline blended with ethanol

Renewable Fuels Standard (RFS)

Note: 2010 GHG reduction for conventional biofuel applies only to new construction.
The Bottom Line

- EISA requires consumption of 36 billion gallons of renewable fuels annually by 2022
- Ties a carbon intensity to motor fuels
- Most of the renewable fuel will be ethanol (~33-34 billion gallons)
- What will be the fuel mix?
  - ~34 billion gallons = 27% of 2022 projected gasoline use

Transportation Fuels Today

- 147 billion gallons a year gasoline
  - 12.5 billion gallons a year ethanol
- Industry considerations:
  - E10 saturation,
    - Currently >90% E10 in the US
  - Declining fuel use in 2008
  - Federal Highway Administration 2009 demand -0.1%

Ethanol as a Fuel & Fuel Additive

- E10 (10% ethanol by volume)
  - Approved for use in all vehicles and engines
  - ~98% of ethanol consumed as E10
  - ~90% of U.S. gasoline blended with ethanol
- E85 (70-85% ethanol by volume)
  - For use in flex-fuel vehicles (FFVs) only
  - 7+ million FFVs; ~2,200 retail outlets
  - <2% of ethanol consumed as E85
  - Mid-level blends (20, 30, 40% ethanol by volume)
    - For use in FFVs only
    - Dispensed by "blender pumps" (<250 stations)

Moving beyond E10?

- Existing fuel pool
  - Limited to 10% volume ethanol
    - Market conditions/ regulatory requirements
    - Gasoline saturation
    - Infrastructure/ throughput saturation
- Future fuel pool
  - Fuel waiver application for E15 submitted
    - Not a mandate, this would be voluntary

E15 Partial Approval/ Partial Denial

- March 6, 2009 waiver submitted to US EPA to increase the allowable ethanol content in gasoline to 15% volume.
- US EPA received >78,000 comments from the public.
- EPA responded October 13, 2010 with partial approval, partial denial
  - Approved for Vehicle MY2007 and newer
  - Denied for Vehicles MY2000 and older
  - Punted for vehicles MY2001-2006 until later date
  - Initiated Proposed Rulemaking for labeling and Complex Model modifications
  - See: [http://www.epa.gov/otaq/regs/fuels/additive/e15/](http://www.epa.gov/otaq/regs/fuels/additive/e15/)
Legislative & Regulatory Issues for E10+

- EPA approval of higher ethanol content as a fuel additive in gasoline is only step 1.
- As stated in EPA’s recent update on the E15 waiver application:
  - “It’s also important to remember that there are a number of additional steps that must be completed — many of which are not under EPA or DOE control — to allow the sale and distribution of E-15. These include but are not limited to: testing on dispensing equipment, changes to state laws to allow for the use of E15, and completion of the fuels registration process by industry.”

Remaining Impediments for E10+ Fuels*

- Health effects testing/fuel registration
- State regulatory issues
- ASTM/ NIST HB130 specification
- Octane certification
- #1 waiver for vapor pressure
- Fuel detergent certification
- Fire code and UL issues
- Automaker warranties
- Misfueling liability
- Safety and emergency response


NCWM

- The National Conference on Weights and Measures issues NIST Handbook 130 which contains model laws for fuels and lubricants
- Follows ASTM D4814 except for:
  - Provider Federal 1.0 psi Allowance for 9 to 10 volume % Ethanol Blends for May 1 through September 16 and 1.0 psi Allowance for Remainder of the Year for 1 to 10 Volume % Ethanol
  - Volatility Classes 4, 5, and 6 TVL=20 Limits are Less Restrictive for Up to 10 volume % Ethanol
  - Action
    - Can’t Initiate Action Until Federal Vapor Pressure Allowance is Extended to Cover E15
  - Timing

State Implementation

- Adopt D4814
  - 37 States and One County
  - 25 Specify Latest Version
  - Latest Version Published in Annual Book of ASTM Standards
  - 12 Specify Specific Versions
  - Range From 1999 to 2009
  - Own Specification
  - 8 States (Some Based on D4814)
  - No Specification
  - 5 States and DC

State Implementation Cont’d.

- Specify 1.0 psi Vapor Pressure Allowance
  - 16 States – 9 to 10 Volume % Ethanol
  - 10 States – NIST Handbook 130 (9 to 10 Volume %)
  - 5 States – Up to 10 Volume %
  - 1 State – Up to 10 Volume % or Any Percentage Specifically Authorized in an EPA Waiver
  - 1 State – Over 1 Volume % Ethanol
- Modify State Air Pollution Regulations
  - E.g. California Predictive Model
- Process to Change State Regulations
  - Emergency Regulations
  - Hearings and W & M or APCD Action
  - Legislative and Governor

Source: Herman & Associates

EERC

- Public and Private Industry coming together to provide much needed emergency response information.
- New environmental response information available on website:
  - Ethanol Emergency Response information available:
  - www.ethanolresponse.com
### Summary of Auto/Oil E10+ Test Program for Highway "Non-FFV" Vehicles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fuel Storage and Handling</td>
<td>CRC AVFL-15</td>
<td>AVFL-15 preliminary work is underway; more funding needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Base Engine Durability</td>
<td>CRC CM-136-09</td>
<td>The initial phase of this program is underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>On-Board Diagnostics (OBD) Evaluation</td>
<td>CRC E-90</td>
<td>The pilot phase of E-90 is complete; more data needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tailpipe Emissions for SULEV Vehicles and at Cold Ambient Temperatures</td>
<td>CRC E-92</td>
<td>Planning for future work is ongoing pending available funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Catalyst Durability and Degradation</td>
<td>CRC E-87</td>
<td>The course and fate of this program is currently unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Evaporative Emissions Durability</td>
<td>CRC E-91</td>
<td>This program is underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Emissions Inventory and Air Quality Modeling</td>
<td>A-67 / A-73</td>
<td>A-67 results to be released in early 2010 and A-73 is planned for a completion late in 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Exhaust Emissions on Vehicles Aged On Mid-Level Ethanol Blends</td>
<td>CRC New Project</td>
<td>Portions of this work will be addressed under A-73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The industries understand system components for E10 and also for E85, but it is unclear at what level of ethanol content above 10% that E10-rated parts fail. The objective of AVFL-15 is to determine the durability of wetted fuel components/systems. Fuel storage and handling is studied in component/systems durability testing. Resource constraints limit the scope of AVFL-15, preventing a definitive program, hence additional testing is required.

The industry knows what is required to upgrade engine components for E22, E85 and E100. Some automakers have done internal testing and have found sensitivity to intermediate ethanol blend levels for non-FFV vehicles. The testing for base engine durability (base refers to the actual machinery as opposed to the sensors, controls, and the like) is embodied in CRC RFP No. CM-136-09. The initial round of vehicle testing is nearing completion.

The automakers have a good understanding of the theoretical effects of ethanol on OBD. The issue is how OBD systems actually work in a fleet of aged production vehicles. The initial phase of vehicle data collection has been completed and the final report is on [www.crcao.org](http://www.crcao.org). Two additional phases are planned for 2010.

Starting with the 2010 model year automakers have to meet Non-Methane Hydrocarbon (NMHC) emissions at a 20F start temperature. Automakers have had to meet stringent SULEV emissions at a 50F start temperature for many years. The enlenment due to oxygen in ethanol and the low volatility of the ethanol portion of the fuel blend at low temperature gives concerns that existing and planned vehicles designed for federal and California emissions test fuels will not meet their required emissions standards when operated on mid-level ethanol blends. This program does not envision vehicle aging, however limited funding has delayed the start of this test program.

The issue of accelerated catalyst aging with intermediate ethanol blends was well-documented in the Orbital research study conducted in Australia. DOE found that 44% of vehicles they tested had the same control architecture as those that had problems with E20 in Australia and their data, when combined with CRC E-87-1, data indicate that 35-45% of the US fleet will have this sensitive control architecture. E-87-1 was funded by CRC and the report is on [www.crcao.org](http://www.crcao.org). Durability testing to identify this phenomenon is the scope of follow-on testing which is underway generating data through DOE funding with minor support funding from CRC.

As reported in previous intermediate ethanol blend research coordination meetings, CRC has conducted research projects under E-65 and E-77 on the effects of ethanol on evaporative emissions. However, these tests have all looked at the effects of short exposures. This project is defined in CRC RFP No. E-91. The contract has been awarded, test vehicles have been acquired, and initial data collection is underway for the 2010-2011 program.

The CRC Atmospheric Impacts Committee is leading this effort in coordination with other stakeholders. A-67 (Estimating Ozone from Fuel Reformulation) and A-73 (Emissions Modeling and Air Quality Modeling) are the two CRC programs that will address this subject. These efforts will rely on obtaining emissions data from the other CRC programs above.

A good collection of aged vehicle data will be acquired as part the overall program effort. These data will be used to assess direct emissions impacts from intermediate ethanol blends and for conducting air quality modeling evaluations.
CRC Projects/ Reports [www.crcao.org]

1) E-65-3 Fuel Permeation from Automotives
   a. Conventional vehicles tested on E0, E6, and E20
   b. Flex fueled Vehicle tested on E85
   c. Project complete; final report on CRC website

2) E-67 Effects of Ethanol and Volatility Parameters on Exhaust Emissions
   a. E0, E6 and E10 fuels
   b. Project complete; final report on CRC website

3) E-74 Effect of CO and RVP on Exhaust Emissions of In-Use Fleet
   a. E0, E10 and E20 fuels
   b. Project complete

4) E-77 In-Use Evaporative Emissions
   a. Pilot program complete (E0 testing only); final report on CRC website
   b. E0, E10, and E20 fuels
   c. E-77-2 main program testing ongoing

5) E-80 Exhaust and Evaporative Emissions Testing of Flex-Fueled Vehicles
   a. Pilot program: E6, E85, 50/50 mix
   b. Main program E9, E32, E66 and E85
   c. Project testing in progress

6) E-84 Review of Prior Studies of Fuel Effects on Emissions
   a. Limited data above 10% ethanol reported
   b. Project complete; final report on CRC website

7) E-87 Mid Level Ethanol Blend Catalyst Durability Study
   a. E0, E10, E15 and E20 fuels
   b. Project testing in progress

8) E-89 EPAct Light Duty Vehicle Fuel Effects
   a. E0, E10, E15 and E20 fuels
   b. Project testing by EPA in progress

9) CRC Report No. 629 Coordinating Research Council, Inc., 2002 Hot Fuel Handling Program
   a. E0, E3, E6, E10 fuels
   b. Project complete; final report on CRC website

    a. E0 to E10 fuels only
    b. Project complete; final report on CRC website

    a. E0, E5, E10 and E20 fuels
    b. Project complete; final report on CRC website

12) CRC Report No. 652 Coordinating Research Council, Inc., 2008 Cold Start and Warm-up Driveability Program
    a. E0, E10, E20, and E85 (fuel-flexed vehicles only)
    b. Project complete; final report on CRC website
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a. Low Temperature Combustion (LTC) fuel effects being investigated in a research engine running in HCCI (Homogeneous Charge Combustion Ignition) mode
b. Fuels blended from 4 refinery streams to represent wide range of fuel properties of real world fuels
c. Ethanol effects tested up to E30
d. Testing complete; data analysis in progress

14) AVFL-15 E20 Fuel System and Fuel Component Durability Study
a. E0, E10, and aggressive E20 fuels
b. Aggressive E20 fuel used a modified J1681 design in order to keep sulfur and other parameters within both ASTM 4814 specification and J1681 targets
c. Project testing in progress

Outside Projects/Reports

15) "Market barriers to the uptake of biofuels study: A testing based assessment to determine impacts of a 10% and 20% ethanol gasoline fuel blend on non-automotive engines-2000hrs material compatibility testing," Orbital Engine Company. (2003, May)
a. Report to Environment Australia.
16) "Issues Associated with the Use of Higher Ethanol Blends (E17-E24)", NREL/TP-510-32206 (October, 2002)
17) "The Effects of E20 on Elastomers Used in Automotive Fuel System Components", Bruce Jones, Gary Mead, Paul Steevens and Chris Connors Minnesota Center for Automotive Research at Minnesota State University, Mankato (Feb., 2008)
a. Contact: Department of Automotive Engineering Technology, Minnesota State University, Mankato
b. ASTM Fuel C, C(E10)A, C(E20)A
18) "The Effects of E20 on Plastic Automotive Fuel System Components", Bruce Jones, Gary Mead, and Paul Steevens, Minnesota Center for Automotive Research at Minnesota State University, Mankato (Feb., 2008)
a. Contact: Department of Automotive Engineering Technology, Minnesota State University, Mankato
b. ASTM Fuel C, C(E10)A, C(E20)A
19) "The Effects of E20 on Automotive Fuel Pumps and Sending Units", Nathan Hanson, Thomas Devens, Colin Rohde, Adam Larson, Bruce Jones, Gary Mead, and Paul Steevens, Minnesota Center for Automotive Research at Minnesota State University, Mankato (Feb., 2008)
a. Contact: Department of Automotive Engineering Technology, Minnesota State University, Mankato
b. ASTM Fuel C, C(E10)A, C(E20)A
20) "The Effects of E20 on Metals Used in Automotive Fuel System Components", Bruce Jones, Gary Mead, Paul Steevens, and Mike Timanus, Minnesota Center for Automotive Research at Minnesota State University, Mankato (Feb., 2008)
a. Contact: Department of Automotive Engineering Technology, Minnesota State University, Mankato
b. ASTM Fuel C, C(E10)A, C(E20)A
21) "Demonstration and Driveability Project to Determine the Feasibility of Using E20 as a Motor Fuel", David Kittleson, Andy Tan, and Darrick Zarling, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55414, (Oct. 2007)
a. E0 and E20 fuels
22) "An Examination of Fuel Pumps and Sending Units During a 4000 Hour Endurance Test in E20", Gary Mead, Bruce Jones, Paul Steevens, Nathan Hanson, Joe Harrenstein, Minnesota State University, Mankato, (publication pending)


   a. EO, E10, E15, E20
   [http://www.epa.gov/otaq/regs/fuel/additive/jan91.pdf]
27) "Technical Paper On The Introduction of Greater Than E10-Gasoline Blends", Ranajit Sahu, Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, (June 2007)
29) "Optimal Ethanol Blend Level Investigation", Richard Shockey, Ted Aulich, Energy & Environmental Research Center, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND, Bruce Jones, Gary Mead, and Paul Steevens, Minnesota Center for Automotive Research, Minnesota State University, Mankato, (Nov. 2007)
30) "Determination of the Potential Property Ranges of E10+ Blends", API
   a. E0, E10, D12.5, E15, and E30 fuels
   b. Base stocks are pump gasolines and BOBs taken from all U.S. PADDS
   c. Fuel analysis in progress

Standards and recommended practices
31) SAE J312: Automotive Gasoline
32) SAE J905: Fuel Filter Test Methods
33) SAE J1297: (R) Alternative Automotive Fuels
34) SAE J1537: Validation Testing of Electric Fuel Pumps for Gasoline Fuel Injection Systems
35) SAE J1681: Gasoline, Alcohol, and Diesel Fuel Surrogates for Materials Testing
36) SAE J1747: Recommended Methods for Conducting Corrosion Tests in Hydrocarbon Fuels or Their Surrogates and Their Mixtures with Oxygenated Additives
   a. Modifies ASTM D471 to make it fuel-testing specific
38) SAE J1832: Low Pressure Gasoline Fuel Injector
39) SAE J1862: Fuel Injection System Fuel Pressure Regulator and Pressure Damper
40) SAE J2260L Nonmetallic Fuel System Tubing with One or More Layers
42) SAE's Automotive Fuels Reference Book (2nd ed., 1995)- RVP Impact of blending ethanol into gasoline
43) ASTM D 256-06 Standard test methods for determining the Izod pendulum impact resistance of plastics
44) ASTM D 412: Vulcanized Rubber and Thermoplastic Elastomers- Tension
45) ASTM D 471: Rubber Property- Effect of Liquids
47) ASTM D 618: Standard Practice for Conditioning plastics for Testing
48) ASTM D 638: Standard test method for tensile properties of plastics
49) ASTM D 2240: Standard test method for rubber property-durometer hardness
50) ASTM D 3183: Rubber- Preparation of Product Pieces for Test Purposes from Products
51) ASTM D 4806: Denatured Fuel Ethanol for Blending with Gasolines for Use as Automotive Spark-Ignition Engine Fuel
52) ASTM D 4814: Automotive Spark-Ignition Engine Fuel
53) ASTM D 4815: Determination of MTBE, ETBE, TAME, DIPE, tertiary-Amyl Alcohol C₁ to C₄ Alcohols in Gasoline by Gas Chromatography
54) ASTM D 5500: Vehicle Evaluation of Unleaded Automotive Spark-Ignition Engine Fuel for Intake Valve Deposit Formation
55) ASTM G1: Preparing, Cleaning, and Evaluating Corrosion Test Specimens
56) ASTM G31: Laboratory Immersion Corrosion Testing of Metals
57) Physical Properties of Gasoline/ Alcohol Blends, Bartlesville Energy Technology Center, Department of Energy, Bartlesville, OK, (Sept. 1979)
58) Ethanol Fuel Modification for Highway Vehicle Use, Final Report, Science and Technology Division, Union Oil Co. of California, Brea., (Jan. 1980)
60) "Determination of the Potential Property Ranges of Mid-Level Ethanol Blends", API, (April 23, 2010)
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I. Executive Summary

Renew Energy, Siouxland Ethanol LLC, Sire, and Western Plains Energy, LLC. The request to allow E-15 is further supported by the additional parties and organizations noted on the cover of this application, Ford Motor Company, and numerous leading scientists that have signed a letter supporting introduction of higher ethanol blend fuels. The applicants and supporters of this application seek accelerated renewable fuel use, increased energy security, enhanced economic development, creation of American jobs, reduced transportation costs, and environmental benefits from increased use of ethanol through approval of up to a fifteen percent base blend of ethanol. Importantly, recent and extensive research demonstrates that use of higher ethanol blends will significantly benefit the environment by reducing greenhouse gas emissions, reducing harmful tailpipe emissions, reducing smog, using less energy for an equivalent amount of fuel, and protecting natural resources.

---

See February 20, 2009 Letter from Susan M. Cischke of Ford Motor Company to Jeff Broin of POET noting that "Ford endorses efforts to increase base level blends up to E-15 and collaborate with key stakeholders to overcome challenges with introducing these higher levels of ethanol in the base fuel blend used by all vehicles in the near term."

See, e.g., Improvements in Life Cycle Energy Efficiency and Greenhouse Gas Emissions of Corn-Ethanol, by Adam J. Liska et. al. ("Nebraska Study") (Yale Journal of Industrial Ecology, January 2009) at 9 (demonstrating, on a life-cycle basis, that corn-based ethanol production and use reduces greenhouse gas emissions 48-59 percent compared to gasoline production and use); Greenhouse Gas Impacts of Expanded Renewable and Alternative Fuels Use, EPA Office of Transportation and Air Quality, EPA420-F-07-035 (April 2007) (finding that cellulosic ethanol production and use will reduce greenhouse gas emissions by more than 90 percent compared to gasoline).

1 See sections IV through VI infra.

Ethanol-blended fuels generally, and E-15 specifically, reduce vehicle tailpipe emissions of carbon monoxide and volatile organic compounds, both of which are smog-
Pursuant to the Clean Air Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") may grant a waiver allowing use of a fuel additive upon application by a fuel manufacturer that establishes that use of the fuel additive "will not cause or contribute to the failure of any emission control device or system." This application seeks approval to increase the ethanol portion of the ethanol-gasoline blend to up to fifteen percent. Extensive experience with use of ethanol-gasoline blends, similarities of E-15 to ethanol-gasoline blends containing ten percent ethanol (hereinafter "E-10"), and multiple recent studies involving a range of ethanol and gasoline fuel blends at fifteen percent ethanol and higher forming emissions. See section IV infra. Ethanol has been the preferred fuel to meet Clean Air Act reformulated gasoline requirements to reduce ozone and many states credit ethanol-blend gasoline with significantly reducing urban ozone levels. The American Lung Association of the Upper Midwest similarly credits ethanol-blend fuels with reducing smog and has embraced ethanol-blend fuels as part of its Clean Air Choice Initiative. Clean Air Choice website, available at http://www.cleanairchoice.org/news/.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture reports a net energy balance for ethanol production of 1.67 on average. By contrast, the U.S. Department of Energy reports that gasoline refining has a negative energy balance and every unit of energy expended in its production results in just 0.79 energy units in the form of gasoline. The 2001 Net Energy Balance of Corn-Ethanol, prepared by U.S. Department of Agriculture and Agricultural Research Service (2001); The Complete Lifecycle Energy Picture, prepared by the U.S. Department of Energy's Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (2005).

Increased substitution of gasoline with ethanol will better protect natural resources by reducing the need to drill for oil in environmentally sensitive areas, such as oceans, critical habitats, and wildlife refuges. Ethanol has low toxicity, is miscible with water, is easily biodegraded in the environment greatly reducing the potential for contamination of surface and ground water compared to oil and gasoline, and produces fewer air emissions when used than gasoline. See, generally, Glenn Ulrich, Ph.D., "The Fate and Transport of Ethanol-Blended Gasoline in the Environment" (Oct. 1999, prepared for the Governors' Ethanol Coalition), available at www.n1c.state.ne.us/epubs/E5700/B055-1999.pdf.
support that use of E-15 will not cause or contribute to the failure of any emission control device or system.

Ethanol has been widely used in the United States as a gasoline component as a fuel extender due to gasoline shortages, as an effective octane booster (to prevent early ignition, or "engine knock"), and as an oxygenate (to prevent air pollution from carbon monoxide and ozone). Congressional amendments to the Clean Air Act have encouraged the widespread use of ethanol as a fuel additive, including the Reformulated Gasoline Program ("RFG"), the Oxygenated Gasoline Program, and the Renewable Fuels Standard ("RFS"). E-10 ethanol-gasoline blends have been approved by EPA for more than 30 years, and since 1980, more than 44.5 billion gallons of fuel ethanol have been produced in the United States.

In fact, ethanol has been used as fuel in the United States for over a century: Henry Ford's Model T was designed to run on either gasoline or ethanol. Renewable Energy Has An icon: Henry Ford, ASSOCIATED PRESS, Thurs., Oct. 12, 2006.

8 The RFG program requires the sale of "reformulated" gasoline in numerous areas to reduce pollutants, specifically those that contribute to ground level ozone, better known as smog. See Clean Air Act, § 211(k). Reformulated gasoline that meets the performance criteria set by the CAA can be reformulated in a number of ways, including the addition of oxygenates to the gasoline. Ethanol has been the primary source of oxygenates used under the RFG program.

9 This program requires the sale of oxygenated motor fuels during the winter months in certain major metropolitan areas to reduce carbon monoxide pollution. See id. § 211(m). As with the RFG program, ethanol has been the primary source of oxygenates for this program.

7 This national program imposes requirements with respect to the amount of renewable fuel produced and used. See id. § 211(o). The Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 modified the required amounts of renewable fuel to 7.5 billion gallons by 2012, rising to 36 billion gallons by 2022.

the vast majority of it (over ninety-nine percent) blended to form E-10 and used in all types of vehicles and engines.

E-15 is similar in composition to E-10. The sole difference between E-10 and E-15 is the addition of five percent more ethanol in place of gasoline. E-15, like E-10, is comprised primarily of gasoline and the chemical composition of the gasoline and ethanol used in both fuels is the same. E-10 and E-15 have essentially identical lead and sulfur levels. The additional ethanol in E-15 results in approximately five percent fewer hydrocarbons and two percent more oxygen in the blended fuel than E-10. The volatility of the two fuels also is essentially identical:

---

12 Based on ASTM D 4806 Standard Specification for Denatured Fuel Ethanol for Blending with Gasolines for Use as Automotive Spark-Ignition Fuel, the quality of the ethanol used to produce E-10 and E-15 should be identical.

13 By calculation, the reduction in hydrocarbons should be equal to the hydrocarbons in the gasoline that ethanol displaces. The increase in oxygen content is arrived at by calculation based on the assumption that the same ethanol quality, denaturant (content and composition) and moisture content are used with E-10 and E-15.

14 Issues Associated with the Use of Higher Ethanol Blends (E17-E24), prepared by National Renewable Energy Laboratory (October 2002) ("NREL Study") at 11-13. As the NREL Study explains, ethanol on its own has a low volatility (as measured by Reid Vapor Pressure or "RVP") of 2.3 psi, compared to 7-15 psi for motor gasoline. However, in some ethanol blends, blending ethanol with gasoline does not lower vapor pressure, but instead causes the blend's RVP to increase. The increase in RVP is highest at about five volume percent ethanol, raising the RVP slightly over 1 psi from the level of the original 9 psi of the base gasoline. However, as ethanol content increases, the increase in RVP falls gradually. In a 20 vol. % blend, the volatility is lower than a 5 vol. % blend. ld. The result of this curve is that the volatility of E-10 and E-15, measured by RVP, are almost identical, with the intervening blends showing a very slight rise and fall in RVP. For example, Table 3-1 in the NREL Study gives the following volatility levels for ethanol blends between E-10 and E-20: E-10 (9.15 psi), E-12 (9.28 psi), E-14 (9.19 psi), E-17 (9.06 psi), and E-20 (9.02 psi).
E-15 also is similar in performance to E-10. Recent and extensive studies by federal and state government agencies and private groups have evaluated the use of a range of ethanol-gasoline fuel blends. These recent studies are discussed in sections IV through VII below and included in the Appendix to this application. Virtually all of these studies have been undertaken for ethanol-gasoline blends that have an ethanol content of at least E-15, and the majority of studies have evaluated ethanol-gasoline fuel blends at ethanol concentrations higher than fifteen percent. While ongoing studies are anticipated to support use of ethanol-gasoline fuel blends containing twenty percent ethanol or more, the similarity of E-10 to E-15 and studies that have been completed to date provide information necessary for approval of the requested E-15 waiver. As summarized in the application below, available data and multiple recent studies regarding the impact of various intermediate blends on emissions, materials compatibility, durability, and driveability were completed on extensive and representative test fleets, provide a reliable comparison to certification conditions, and demonstrate that use of E-15 will not cause or contribute to a failure of any emission control device or system to meet its certification emissions standards. In sum, these studies find no statistically significant difference in performance between not only E-10 and E-15, but also between E-10 and E-20, which confirms the similarities of ethanol-gasoline blends with less than twenty percent ethanol, and provides further assurance through testing at higher ethanol concentrations that E-15 will not cause or contribute to the failure of emission control devices or systems.
Significantly, not only are today's vehicles capable of successfully using E-15, existing fuel dispensation infrastructure in use for decades with E-10 is similarly capable of dispensing E-15. Underwriters Laboratories ("UL"), which independently tests and certifies products, including automotive fuel dispensers, expressly supports the use of existing UL listed fuel dispensation infrastructure with automotive fuel containing up to a maximum of fifteen percent ethanol. The data UL has gathered as part of the organization's ongoing research to investigate the impact of using higher ethanol blends in fuel dispensing systems supports that existing dispensers may be used successfully with ethanol blends up to E-15.

Accordingly, based on the similarity of E-10 to E-15 and recent and extensive work completed by governmental and private third-party researchers, and the results of those studies that are included as part of this application, Growth Energy and the ethanol manufacturers that submit this application request EPA grant the requested waiver.

---

15 Press Release, Underwriters Laboratories Announce Support For Authorities Having Jurisdiction Who Decide To Permit The Use Of Existing UL Listed Gasoline Dispensers With Automotive Fuel Containing Up To A Maximum Of 15% Ethanol (February 19, 2009), available at [http://www.ul.com/newsroom/newsrel/nr021909.html](http://www.ul.com/newsroom/newsrel/nr021909.html). Indeed, UL certification has long defined the term "gasoline" as gasoline with up 15 percent ethanol: "[t]he term "gasoline" includes gasoline with small amounts of additives such as detergents, solvents for detergents, and anti-icing chemicals and gasoline with up to 15 percent ethanol or methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE)." UL 330, Hose and Hose Assemblies for Dispensing Flammable Liquids, at 111.1. See also UL 25, Meters for Flammable and Combustible Liquids and LP-Gas, at 111.2 (defining "Flammable and Combustible Liquids" as including "gasoline/alcohol blends up to 15% Ethanol."); UL 79, Power-Operated Pumps for Petroleum Dispensing Products, at 111.5 (defining "Petroleum Products" as including "gasoline/alcohol blends up to 15% Ethanol.").
H. Requested Waiver

This application seeks a waiver pursuant to Clean Air Act section 211(f)(4) for the introduction into commerce of an alcohol-gasoline blend containing up to fifteen percent ethanol by volume in unleaded gasoline ("E-15").

III. Statutory Authority and Standard for Approval of Requested Waiver

Title H of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. §§ 7521-7590) establishes a comprehensive scheme for regulation of motor vehicle emission and fuel standards for the prevention and control of air pollution. 42 U.S.C. § 7545 ("Section 211" of the Clean Air Act), part (f)(1)(B) provides that effective upon November 15, 1990, it shall be unlawful for any manufacturer of any fuel or fuel additive to first introduce into commerce, or to increase the concentration in use of, any fuel or fuel additive for use by any person in motor vehicles manufactured after model year 1974 which is not substantially similar to any fuel or fuel additive utilized in the certification of any model year 1975, or subsequent model year, vehicle or engine under section 206 of the Act.

Under section 211(0)(4) of the Clean Air Act, the Administrator of the EPA may waive this prohibition where the Administrator determines that an applicant has established that the fuel or fuel additive, and the emission products thereof, will not cause or contribute to a failure of any emission control device or system.

---

16 For purposes of this application the term "ethanol" shall refer to the definition of "ethanol" contained in ASTM D 4806 Standard Specification for Denatured Fuel Ethanol for Blending with Gasolines for Use as Automotive Spark-Ignition Fuel.
(over the useful life of the motor vehicle, motor vehicle engine, non-road engine or non-road vehicle in which such device or system is used) to meet its certification emissions standards.\textsuperscript{17} By statute, EPA must take final action to grant or deny an application for a section 211(f)(4) waiver, after public notice and comment, within 270 days of the receipt of such an application.\textsuperscript{18}

EPA guidelines\textsuperscript{19} and past EPA waiver decision documents, as well as court decisions regarding waivers under section 211(0(4), provide guidance as to the appropriate content of waiver applications and the standard and scope of EPA's review of such applications. Based on the foregoing, a waiver request should contain "data relating to a fuel additive's emissions effects which are derived from vehicle testing," and the data should provide a "reliable basis for comparison with the conditions under which vehicles are certified."\textsuperscript{20} Where an applicant does not have sufficient test data, the applicant may instead provide a reasonable theory which predicts the emission effects of an additive, and need only conduct a sufficient amount of testing to demonstrate the validity of such a theory.\textsuperscript{21} In addition to presenting data on emissions, a waiver application should include information regarding the proposed fuel's compatibility with materials used in

\textsuperscript{17} Clean Air Act, § 211(0(4), 42 U.S.C. 7545(0(4).
\textsuperscript{18} Id.
carburetors or fuel systems to demonstrate that the fuel will not impair the materials to the point that emissions are adversely affected. \(^{22}\) Similarly, applications should include information regarding a vehicle's driveability on the waiver fuel to better ensure that emissions control devices or systems will not be removed or rendered inoperative because of their impact on performance. \(^{23}\)

In evaluating a waiver request, EPA may "look at all of the available data, including data provided by persons other than the applicant" \(^{24}\) as well as preexisting studies. \(^{25}\) Federal case law indicates that waiver decisions are to be "based on one criterion: a fuel additive's effect on emission standards," and EPA's role is "to assess whether the additive's emission products 'causes or contributes' to an emission control device's ability to comply with the Act's emission standards." \(^{26}\) Emissions increases below applicable emissions standards and emission of non-regulated compounds are not relevant to the waiver process. \(^{27}\)


\(^{26}\) Ethyl Corp. v. EPA, Si F.3d 1053, 1058 (D.C. Cir. 1995).

\(^{27}\) id. (holding that EPA Administrator exceeded her authority by denying waiver application on basis of public health concerns); see also Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass ’71 of U.S. v. EPA, 768 F.2d 385, 390 (D.C. Cir. 1985) ("[B]oth the plain language of the Act and its legislative history support the EPA's view that the Administrator is not required under section 211(0(4) to adopt a "no increase" standard and may grant a waiver as long as the fuel does not cause or contribute to a failure to achieve compliance with emission standards."). See also Petro-Tex Chemical Co., Denial of Application for Fuel Waiver
Recognizing that it would be "virtually impossible" to test all vehicles and emission control systems, EPA and the courts have long recognized that statistical sampling and emissions evaluations based on a representative fleet are sufficient to support that a fuel under consideration for a section 211(0(4) waiver would not cause or contribute to a significant failure of emission standards by vehicles in the national fleet.\textsuperscript{28}

IV. Recent Comprehensive Studies Support The Requested E-15 Waiver.

Recent, significant, and comprehensive studies involving over one-hundred vehicles, eighty-five vehicle and engine types, and thirty-three fuel dispensing units have been completed to evaluate the affects of ethanol-gasoline blends above ten percent ethanol, including, specifically, E-15 and blends as high as E-85. These studies include a yearlong driveability test and over 5,500 hours of materials compatibility testing. In direct support of this waiver application, Growth Energy submits the following recent scientific studies that collectively demonstrate that use of E-15 will not cause or contribute to the failure of any

\textsuperscript{28} ARCO; Grant of Application for Fuel Waiver for Arconol (TBA, 0-7%), Decision Document, 44 Fed. Reg. 10,530 (Feb. 21, 1979); Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass'n, 768 F.2d at 392 (agreeing with EPA that "actual 50,000-mile durability testing may not be always required to make the requisite determination that a fuel will not cause a vehicle to exceed emission standards over its useful life").
emission control device or system to meet its certification emissions standards:

1. *Effects of Intermediate Ethanol Blends on Legacy Vehicles and Small Non-Road Engines, Report 1*, prepared by Oak Ridge National Laboratory for the U.S. Department of Energy (October 2008) ("DOE Study") (peer-reviewed report studied the effects of E-15 and E-20 on motor vehicles and small non-road engines and concluded that when E-15 and E-20 were compared to traditional gasoline, there were no significant changes in vehicle tailpipe emissions, vehicle driveability, or small non-road engine emissions as ethanol content increased);

2. *Optimal Ethanol Blend-Level Investigation, Final Report*, prepared by Energy & Environmental Research Center and Minnesota Center for Automotive Research for American Coalition for Ethanol (October 2007) ("ACE Study") (report studied the effects of ethanol blends ranging from E-10 to E-85 on motor vehicles and found that exhaust emissions levels for all vehicles at all levels of ethanol blend were within the applicable Clean Air Act standards);

   a. *The Effects of E20 on Metals Used in Automotive Fuel System Components* ("Metals Study") (study compared the effects of E-0, E-10 and E-20 on nineteen metals and found that the metals tested were compatible with all three fuels);
   b. *The Effects of E20 on Elastomers Used in Automotive Fuel System Components* ("Elastomers Study") (study compared the effects of E-0, E-10 and E-20 on eight elastomers and found that E-20 caused no greater change in properties than E-0 or E-10);
   c. *The Effects of E20 on Plastic Automotive System Components* ("Plastics Study") (study compared the effects of E-0, E-10 and E-20 on eight plastics and found that there was no significant difference in the properties of the samples exposed to E-20 and E-0);
   d. *The Effects of E20 on Automotive Fuel Pumps and Sending Units* ("Fuel Pumps Study") (study compared the effects of E-0, E-10 and E-20 on the performance of twenty-four fuel pumps and nine sending units and found that E-20 has similar effect as E-10 and E-0 on fuel pumps and sending units);
e. Demonstration and Driveability Project to Determine the Feasibility of Using E20 as a Motor Fuel ("Driveability Study") (study tested forty pairs of vehicles on E-0 and E-20 and found no driveability or operational issues with either fuel)

(Collectively, "Minnesota Compatibility/Driveability Study");

4. Fuel Permeation from Automotive Systems: E-0, E-6, E-10, E-20 and E-85, prepared by the Coordinating Research Council, Inc. (CRC Report No. E-65-3) (December 2006) ("CRC Permeation Study") (study evaluated effects of E-0, E-6, E-20 and E-85 on the evaporative emissions rates from permeation in five newer California vehicles and found that there was no statistically significant increase in diurnal permeation rates between E-6 and E-20);

5. Report to the US Senate on E-20 Ethanol Research, prepared by the Rochester Institute of Technology (October 2008) ("RIT Study") (study evaluated effects of E-20 on ten legacy vehicles; initial results after 75,000 collective miles driven found no fuel-related failures or significant vehicle problems and documented reductions in regulated tailpipe emissions when using E-20 compared to E-0);

6. Use of Mid-Range Ethanol/Gasoline Blends in Unmodified Passenger Cars and Light Duty Trucks, prepared by Minnesota Center for Automotive Research (July 1999) ("MCAR Study") (one-year study evaluated the effects of E-10 and E-30 in fifteen older vehicles in "real world" driving conditions; found no effect on driveability or component compatibility from either fuel and found that regulated exhaust emissions from both fuels were well below federal standards);

7. Blending of Ethanol in Gasoline for Spark Ignition Engines: Problem Inventory and Evaporative Measurements, prepared by Stockholm University et. al. (2004-05) ("Stockholm Study") (study tested and compared evaporative emissions from E-0, E-5, E-10, and E-15 and found lower total hydrocarbon emissions and lower evaporative emissions from E-15 than from E-10 and E-5).

---

29 The RIT Study is a draft summary of results to date in an ongoing study of E-20 fuel vehicle driveability, vehicle exhaust, and vehicle maintenance in gasoline vehicles owned and operated by Monroe County, New York.
V. Testing with E-15 Demonstrates Both That It Has No Significant Effect On Regulated Emissions As Compared To E-0 And That It Will Not Cause Or Contribute To The Failure Of Any Emission Control Device Or System To Meet Applicable Certified Emissions Standards.

Recent comprehensive studies make clear that use of E-15 will not have a significant effect on regulated emissions or cause the failure of any emission control device or system. Specifically, the recent DOE Study provides results from a broad testing program initiated by the U.S. Department of Energy ("DOE"), in partnership and consultation with various other organizations including the Coordinating Research Council ("CRC") and the EPA, to evaluate the impacts of using E-15 and E-20 in vehicles and other engines. The DOE study submitted with this application tested conventional vehicles and small non-road engines ("SNREs") for regulated exhaust emissions, exhaust and catalyst temperatures, SNREs engine components temperature, and observable operational issues. Significantly, for the purposes of this application, the DOE Study found that for conventional vehicles, "regulated tailpipe emissions remained largely unaffected by the ethanol content of the fuel."30

The DOE Study was designed to determine the extent to which ethanol in fuel has an immediate effect on regulated emissions, selected aldehyde emissions, and fuel economy for the "average" light-duty vehicle. DOE designed its test procedures and vehicle samples with guidance and consultation from EPA.31 A

30 DOE Study at xvii. 31

Id. at xvi, 2-2.
fleet of sixteen test vehicles\textsuperscript{32} was selected, after a 2007 national database characterization, to include vehicles from four groups of emission regulation requirements (based on age) reflecting a range of engine sizes and manufacturers, and including several of the highest selling vehicle models and several models considered most likely to be sensitive to ethanol content in gasoline.\textsuperscript{33} This fleet of test vehicles thus provided a good representation of the national fleet likely to use E-15 pursuant to a waiver.

Each vehicle was tested on four fuels of varying ethanol content, E-0, E-10, E-15 and E-20, and emissions were determined using the LA92 drive cycle\textsuperscript{34} (on EPA's recommendation).\textsuperscript{35} The test parameters thus allowed for a reliable comparison with the conditions under which the test vehicles have been certified. Once the test results were obtained, they were statistically analyzed to determine whether sufficient evidence existed in the data to conclude that ethanol concentrations of up to twenty percent in the fuel changed emissions or fuel economy, either when averaged across all vehicles or for a majority of vehicles.

\textsuperscript{32} Results from thirteen of the vehicles are reported in the DOE Report; results from the other three vehicles are expected in 2009.

\textsuperscript{33} DOE Study at 2-2 to 2-4.

\textsuperscript{34} "LA92 Drive Cycle" refers to the California Air Resources Board LA92 Dynamometer Driving Schedule. It was developed as an emission inventory improvement tool using 1992 test data from Los Angeles. Compared to the Federal Test Procedure (FTP 75), the LA92 has a higher top speed, a higher average speed, less idle time, fewer stops per mile, and a higher maximum rate of acceleration (generally representing a more aggressive urban driving style).

\textsuperscript{35} DOE Study at 2-2. See Appendix A of the DOE Study for a detailed discussion of the test equipment, procedures, and emissions standards used.
The DOE study concluded that regulated tailpipe emissions remained largely unaffected by the ethanol content of the fuel. More specifically, no statistical differences were seen among all ethanol blends regarding emissions of non-methane organic gases ("NMOG"), non-methane hydrocarbons ("NMHC"), carbon monoxide ("CO"), and oxides of nitrogen ("NO_x"). When the higher ethanol blends were compared to E-0, the following statistical differences in regulated emissions were noted: (1) at a ninety-five percent confidence level, lower NMHC at E-10 and E-20 and lower CO at E-10 and E-15; and (2) at a ninety percent confidence level, lower NMHC at E-15 and lower CO at E-20. The following chart from the DOE Study displays these results:

### Estimated change (% or mg/mi in emissions and fuel economy relative to E0 with ±95% confidence limit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission (unit)</th>
<th>E-10</th>
<th>E-15</th>
<th>E-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NMOG (%)</td>
<td>-3.99 ± 7.90</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>14.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMHC (%)</td>
<td>-10.09</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>-11.85 ± 12.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO (%)</td>
<td>44.87 ± 17.36</td>
<td>43.52 ± 17.36</td>
<td>-12.58 ± 13.67b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx (%)</td>
<td>-3.61 ± 20.87</td>
<td>-1.78 ± 22.43</td>
<td>12.96 ± 17.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel economy (%)</td>
<td>-3.88 ± 0.51'</td>
<td>-5.03</td>
<td>1.21'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethanol (ng/mi)</td>
<td>2.31 ± 1.51'</td>
<td>5.43 ± 1.51'</td>
<td>6.76 ± 2.87a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetaldehyde (mg/mi)</td>
<td>0.21 ± 0.08</td>
<td>0.39 ± 0.08</td>
<td>0.45 ± 0.13'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formaldehyde (ng/mi)</td>
<td>0.11 ± 0.06</td>
<td>0.08 ± 0.08</td>
<td>0.09 ± 0.10b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Statistically significant at the 95% confidence level (shaded).
b Marginally significant at the 90% confidence level.

---

36 DOE Study at 3-1.
37 Id. at 3-1. See DOE Study, section 3, for a detailed explanation of the findings. Similarly, a study published by the Society of Automotive Engineers International (SAE) examined the influences of ethanol fuel on spark engine emissions and concluded that ethanol results in a reduction of NOx and THC emissions as compared to E-0 and that "ethanol is an effective fuel for lowering exhaust emissions." The Effect of Ethanol Fuel on a Spark Ignition Engine, SAE Technical Paper No. 2006-01-3380, at 7 (2006). 38 DOE Study at 3-3, Table 3.1.
The DOE Study also includes emissions data for SNREs that further supports this waiver request. The DOE Study compared regulated emission levels from a comprehensive and nationally representative fleet of twenty-eight SNREs fueled by E-0, E-10, E-15, and E-20 (providing a reliable comparison to certification conditions). The study found that overall, regulated emissions are generally no worse with E-15 (or E-20) than with E-0. Accordingly, for the purposes of this waiver request, the DOE Study provides sufficient data to establish, for vehicle exhaust emissions, that E-15 does not cause or contribute to a failure of any emission control device or system to meet its certified emissions standards.

The ACE Study, also included as part of this application, further supports this conclusion. The primary objective of the ACE Study was to investigate a fuel economy-based optimal ethanol blend level as well as to acquire Highway Fuel Economy Test ("HWFET") tailpipe emission data for all the ethanol-blend fuels surveyed. For this purpose, eight different ethanol blends were used — E-10, E-20, E-30, E-40, E-50, E-60, E-70, and E-85. Fuel economy and emission testing was performed by the Minnesota Center for Automotive Research ("MCAR") using a

---

39 Id. at xix, 3-19 to 3-20.

40 As determined by the Highway Fuel Economy Test ("HWFET"), at which measured miles per gallon is greater than predicted based strictly on per-gallon fuel Btu content. ACE Study at iv.

41 See ACE Study at 3 for a more detailed description of the fuels used in this study.
California Analytical Instruments dilution system to measure vehicle tailpipe emissions.\textsuperscript{42}

The ACE Study found that exhaust emissions levels for all vehicles at all levels of ethanol blend, obtained from both the FTP-75 and the HWFET driving cycles, were within the applicable Clean Air Act standards.\textsuperscript{43} Because the ACE study included testing at lower and significantly higher ethanol blends than E-15 and produced emissions within applicable limits, it is expected that E-15 will render analogous results and satisfy all emission standards.\textsuperscript{44}

This conclusion is consistent with emissions testing conducted on another higher blend, E-30, as part of a 1999 study conducted by MCAR.\textsuperscript{45} The MCAR Study evaluated the effects on fuel economy, emission characteristics, driveability, and component compatibility of in-use light duty vehicles running on blends of thirty percent and ten percent ethanol. The tests included fifteen vehicles of

\textsuperscript{42} This system includes five specific parts: the SuperFlow AC motor-driven chassis dynamometer, the critical flow venturi, the drive cycle and driver's trace monitor, the FTP-75 driving cycle and the HWFET driving cycle, and the gas analyzers.

\textsuperscript{43} ACE Study at 18-21. There was one exception: the flex-fuel Chevrolet Impala exceeded the NMOG standard for the FTP-75 on E-20 and Tier 2 gasoline at 0.120 grams/mile and 0.152 grams/mile, respectively.

\textsuperscript{44} See Gas Plus, Inc.; Interpretation of Grant of Application for Fuel Waiver for 0-10% anhydrous ethanol ("gasohol"), 47 Fed. Reg. 14,596 (Apr. 5, 1982) (concluding, on the basis of ethanol's chemical properties, that waiver approval of E-10 also applied to all blends between E-0 and E-10).

\textsuperscript{45} Use of Mid-Range Ethanol/Gasoline Blends in Unmodified Passenger Cars and Light Duty Trucks, prepared by Minnesota Center for Automotive Research (July 1999) ("MCAR Study").
various makes and models, ranging in model years from 1985 to 1996.\textsuperscript{46} MCAR measured exhaust emission levels of HC, CO and NO\textsubscript{x} for E-10 and E-30 fuels in accordance with EPA test procedures.\textsuperscript{47} The study revealed no significant difference in emissions when comparing the vehicles fueled with E-10 and E-30 and, consistent with the ACE Study, found emission levels from both fuels were low and below applicable federal standards.\textsuperscript{48}

Accordingly, the results of both the ACE Study and the MCAR Study are consistent with the DOE Study and further support that intermediate ethanol blends, including E-15, do not significantly affect regulated vehicle exhaust emissions.

Available information also supports that no long-term emissions increases will result from use of E-15. Consistent with past agency decisions, long-term exhaust emissions testing (50,000-Mile durability testing) is not necessary for approval of the requested waiver. For example, in the decision document granting Sun Refining’s waiver for fuel containing up to fifteen percent methyl tertiary butyl ether ("MTBE") in unleaded gasoline, EPA determined that 50,000-mile durability testing was not required because the agency was "unaware of any long-

\textsuperscript{46} MCAR Study at 2.

\textsuperscript{47} All the MCAR tests run on the dynamometer were based on the Federal Test Procedure as described in the Federal Register Part 86, Subpart B.

\textsuperscript{48} MCAR Study at 7.
term deteriorative effects on exhaust emissions associated with oxygenates.\(^\text{49}\) EPA explained that "[t]he vast majority of data indicate that the effect of oxygenates on exhaust emissions over time has not been a significant issue."\(^\text{50}\) EPA noted that "reasonable theoretical judgments as to the emission effects of the fuel may be utilized as an alternative to direct testing of vehicles" and that fuel volatility specifications, limited durability emissions testing, and data regarding materials compatibility and driveability could be considered in making such judgments.\(^\text{51}\) This approach was upheld by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.\(^\text{52}\)

Based on emissions testing completed as part of the DOE, ACE and MCAR studies, materials compatibility studies completed as part of the Minnesota Compatibility/Driveability Study (and discussed in detail in section VI below), and E-15's compositional similarities to E-10, the effect of which upon long-term emissions is well known and has been widely considered acceptable for thirty


\(^{50}\) Id. at 14; see also ARCO; Grant of Application for Fuel Waiver for Arconol (TBA, 07%), Decision Document, 44 Fed. Reg. 10,530 (Feb. 21, 1979) (granting waiver for fuel containing up to 7% of the oxygenate tertiary butyl alcohol and determining that that 50,000-mile durability testing was not required because, "upon examination of the available data on material compatibility and the chemistry of Arconol," a reasonable estimate of the test vehicle's emissions performance on Arconol can be obtained using back-to-back emission test data").

\(^{51}\) Id. at 10-11.

years, E-15 is not anticipated to result in any adverse changes in regulated long-term emissions.

This conclusion is further directly supported by a recent study by the Rochester Institute of Technology. The RIT Study examined the effects of E-20 (as compared to E-0) on ten legacy vehicles with significant mileage (between 30,000 and 120,000 miles), which together consumed 5,000 gallons of E-20 fuel over 75,000 miles of driving under real world conditions. Exhaust emissions testing was conducted in accordance with FTP-75 standards with state-of-the-art testing equipment, including specialized vehicle and engine emissions equipment.

Specifically, the RIT Study showed the following significant results for vehicles using E-20 (as compared to E-0):

- CO emissions decreased in nine of the ten vehicles tested, and all vehicles fell well within the EPA full useful life standards for the individual vehicle requirements;
- Average tailpipe NOx emissions decreased by 2.4 percent, with all vehicles well below EPA's NOx requirements;
- Average total hydrocarbons emissions decreased 13.7 percent, with nine of ten vehicles decreasing the THC.\(^5\)\(^3\)

Accordingly, the RIT Study results are consistent with the ACE, MCAR, and DOE studies and further support that intermediate ethanol blends, including E-15, do not significantly affect regulated vehicle exhaust emissions on a short-term or long-term basis. Consistent with EPA's prior conclusions that ethanol as an

\(^5\) The RIT Study also summarized the effects of the use of E-20 on vehicle driveability and vehicle maintenance during this initial phase and found no fuel-related failures or significant vehicle problems. RIT Study at 1.
oxygenate is unlikely to have "long-term deteriorative effects on exhaust emissions," and based on extensive emissions and materials compatibility testing that demonstrates that blends up to E-20 will not have a significant deteriorative effect on applicable vehicle parts, EPA has sufficient information to grant this waiver.

Based on the similar volatility of E-10 to E-15 and the results of recent studies, E-15 also is not anticipated to result in any discernable increase in any evaporative emissions compared to commercially available fuels and may, in fact, result in fewer evaporative emissions. This conclusion is supported by two recent studies that evaluated the effect of higher ethanol blends upon evaporative emissions.

A December 2006 study by the Coordinating Research Council found that there was no statistically significant increase in diurnal permeation" rates between E-6 and E-20. The study tested five newer California vehicles using six ethanol blends: E-0, E-6 (5.7% ethanol), E-6Hi (5.7% ethanol with increased aromatics content), E-10, E-20 and E-85. Of the five vehicles, two were from 2000 and

---

54 CRC Permeation Study at 2. The CRC Permeation Study explains that there are three mechanisms responsible for evaporative emissions: permeation from automotive systems, leaks (liquid and vapor), and fuel tank venting (canister losses). Id at 1. Of these, permeation is the most relevant to understanding the effect of ethanol on evaporative emissions. This is because ethanol's effect on leaks and fuel tank venting is unlikely to vary from that of non-ethanol-gasoline. Leaks are an anomaly and "not thought to be sensitive to gasoline composition," and gasoline vapor release due to ethanol via non-permeation mechanisms such as fuel tank venting is countered by lowering the RVP of the base gas. Id. at 62

55 Id. at 2.
2001 (Rigs 1 and 2) subject to a 2.0 gram/day diurnal emissions standard, and two were newer "near zero" and "zero" vehicles (Rigs "11" and "12") with enhanced evaporative emissions technology, subject to California's "LEV H" requirements (which dropped the limits to 0.5 g/day for a three-day diurnal and 0.65 g/day for the two-day test). The fifth vehicle was a recent "flex fuel" vehicle (Rig "14"). The tests were conducted using the Sealed Housing for Evaporative Determination ("SHED") method for evaporative emissions.

All of the vehicles, when using any of the ethanol fuel blends, met the standard for which the vehicle had been certified. Importantly, the testing also confirmed no statistically significant increase in evaporative emissions between E-6 and E-10 or between E-10 and E-20. This information indicates that evaporative emissions from E-15, like E-20, should be no worse than those of widely available commercial fuels and within applicable emissions limits.

An additional study prepared by the University of Stockholm ("Stockholm Study") further supports that E-15 will have the same or lower evaporative emissions.

---

56 Id. at 5.  "
57 Id. at 17.  
58 Id. at 2.  
59 E-6 (in fact, E-5.7 in this study) contains approximately 2% oxygen and is thus considered a "substantially similar" for which no waiver is required. See 73 Fed. Reg. 22277, 22281 (Friday April 25, 2008). Likewise, E-10 has been allowed by waiver for 30 years. See Gas Plus, Inc.; Grant of Application for Fuel Waiver for 0-10% anhydrous ethanol ("gasohol"), Decision Document, 44 Fed. Reg. 20,777 (Apr. 6, 1979).
60 Blending of Ethanol in Gasoline for Spark Ignition Engines: Problem Inventory and Evaporative Measurements, prepared by Stockholm University et al (2004-05) ("Stockholm Study") at 4. At the time of the study, all gasoline sold in Sweden contained
emissions than commercially available fuels. The Stockholm Study found that E-15 had lower evaporative emissions of total hydrocarbons than both E-10 and E-5.

The Stockholm Study included SHED testing of evaporative emissions from two "summer" gasoline fuels, with Reid Vapor Pressures of approximately 9.14 psi and 10.15 psi, respectively, which were blended with varying percentages of ethanol: 0%, 5%, 10% and 15%, for a total of eight different fuel blends. For reference purposes, E-85 also was measured. All tests were performed at the AVL MTC Motor Test Centre in Haninge, Sweden using a VT Shed gas-proof test container normally used for testing whole cars. The test procedure involved placing a specially prepared fuel container containing the particular blend being tested into the VT Shed, leaving it sealed in the VT Shed for a two hour period at a consistent temperature of forty degrees Celsius, and

---

five percent ethanol, with approximately 65,000 m³ produced domestically (from wheat and cellulose) and around 165,000 m³ imported from Brazil. Id. at 7.

61 The RVPs of the base fuels used in the study were expressed in metric units as 63 kPa and 70 kPa, respectively. See Id. App. 2 at 6 and 7 for detailed specifications of the base fuels.

62 Id. App. 2 at 3.

63 Id. App. 2 at 5. The AVL MTC test center is an accredited laboratory for automotive testing that has been in operation for approximately fifteen years. The center has experience of more than ten years of testing for the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency and the Swedish National Road Administration.

64 Id. App. 2 at 5. This container is called a "VT shed" as both its volume and temperature are controlled.

65 Id. The VT Shed includes a Flame Ionization Detector ("FID") for measuring the total emitted hydrocarbons. This instrument, along with an air sense mass spectrometer, was used for the Stockholm Study's evaporative emission tests.
measuring the change in concentration over time of total hydrocarbons as well as 
selected specific hydrocarbons.

The study found that with both base fuels (9.14 psi and 10.15 psi), the E-15 
blends had fewer evaporative emissions of total hydrocarbons than the 
corresponding E-10 and E-5 blends.\textsuperscript{66} The study also tested for specific 
hydrocarbons. When blended with the 10.15 psi base fuel, E-15 had fewer 
evaporative emissions of benzene, butane, toluene, and xylene, when compared to 
E-10 and E-5.\textsuperscript{67} Similarly, when blended with the 9.14 psi base fuel, E-15 had 
fewer evaporative emissions of these same compounds when compared to E-5, and 
fewer evaporative emissions when compared to E-10 for all but toluene and 
xylene, for which the E-15 emissions were minimally greater.\textsuperscript{68} Finally, the study 
measured the Reid Vapor Pressure for each fuel blend tested and found that E-5, 
E-10 and E-15 had similar vapor pressures.\textsuperscript{69}

Taken together, the CRC Permeation Study and the Stockholm Study 
demonstrate that the evaporative emissions of E-15 will be lower or no greater 
than those of commercially available fuels such as E-10 and E-5, and will be 
within applicable emissions limits.

Further, and consistent with past agency practice, to ensure no increases in 
evaporative emissions above applicable standards, Growth Energy proposes that

\textsuperscript{66} Id. App. 2 at 10.
\textsuperscript{67} Id. App. 2 at 11-19.
\textsuperscript{68} Id. App. 2 at 16.
\textsuperscript{69} Id. App. 2 at 19.
this waiver be granted with a condition requiring E-15 to conform to ASTM fuel volatility specifications for the area and time of year where it is used. EPA has repeatedly granted section 211(0(4) waivers without requiring any testing for evaporative emissions,7 For example, in considering the waiver application by Synco 76 for E-10 plus a proprietary stabilizer, EPA granted the waiver without any evaporative emissions testing, stating: "controlling the volatility of the finished fuel within ASTM volatility specifications should adequately control evaporative emissions, and they should be no worse than those of commercially available fuels." EPA also has consistently stated that it "would be discriminatory to require the applicant's fuel to meet a more stringent volatility limit in order to control evaporative emissions than is characteristic of commercially available fuels."72

7 See, e.g., ARCO; Grant of Application for Fuel Waiver for Arconol (TBA, 0-7%), Decision Document, 44 Fed. Reg. 10,530, 10,532 (Feb. 21, 1979) (approving waiver without SHED testing where ARCO demonstrated that when Arconol-fuel conforms to ASTM volatility specifications its evaporative emissions performance is "no worse than the evaporative emissions of the commercially available fuels of similar volatility"); ARCO; Grant of Application for Fuel Waiver for MTBE (0-7%), 44 Fed. Reg. 12,242, 12,245 (1979); Sun Refining and Marketing Co.; Conditional Grant of Application for Fuel Waiver for 15% MTBE, Decision Document, 53 Fed. Reg. 33,846 (Sept. 1, 1988) (finding no SHED testing required when Sun: (1) conducted limited testing and found that fuels blended with its additive will have final volatility characteristics similar to present commercially available gasoline; and (2) Sun agreed to have the final fuel conform to ASTM fuel volatility standards); ARCO; Grant of Application for Fuel Waiver for Methanol/GTBA (up to 3.5% oxygen), Decision Document, 46 Fed. Reg. 56,361 (1981).


Based on the similar volatility of E-10 to E-15, recent testing regarding evaporative emissions for E-15 and for blends with an even greater percentage of ethanol than E-15, and recent materials compatibility testing, no increase in evaporative emissions is anticipated. Accordingly, and consistent with past agency decisions, EPA may grant this waiver based on the information provided in this application.

VI. E-15 Is Compatible With Materials Such That It Will Not Cause Or Contribute To The Failure Of Vehicles To Meet Applicable Certified Emissions Standards.

Recent studies conclusively support that E-15 will not impair the materials used in fuel systems to the point that emissions are adversely affected. The Minnesota Compatibility/Driveability Study supports that even at ethanol concentrations as high as E-20 there are no materials compatibility problems for automotive or fuel dispensing equipment. The Minnesota Compatibility/Driveability Study examined the effect and performance of E-20 on a wide variety of motor vehicle engines and engine components. The study generated four separate and distinct materials compatibility reports (and one driveability report, discussed in section VII below) regarding metals (the "Metals Study"), elastomers (the "Elastomers Study"), plastics (the "Plastics Study"), and common fuel sending unit and fuel pump combinations (the "Fuel Pumps Study") that are currently used in automotive, marine, small engine and fuel system
dispensing equipment." The study used nationally recognized standards, including Society of Automotive Engineers ("SAE") and American Society of Testing and Materials ("ASTM"), as recommended by both automotive and fuel industry experts. The E-20 and E-10 test fuels selected for the research were specifically formulated to present a worst-case-scenario fuel (using "aggressive ethanol") that would still be acceptable under applicable fuel standards. Together, the four materials compatibility reports conclude that E-20 results in no problems for automotive or fuel dispensing equipment.

The Metals Study compared the effects of E-0, E-10 and E-20 on nineteen metals selected for the study following reference to literature reviews and manuals, recommendations from fuel systems and engine manufacturers, and peer review by system engineers from several Original Equipment Manufacturers ("OEMs") and Tier I and II suppliers (suppliers to OEMs). The metals samples were prepared using SAE and ASTM standards and exposed to E-0, E-10, and E-20 fuel at an elevated temperature for 2,016 hours. Eighteen of the nineteen metals tested were found to be compatible with all three fuels and did not show

---

74 Minnesota Compatibility/Driveability Study: Executive Summary at 2.

75 The "aggressive ethanol" used in the study contained impurities found in fuel grade ethanol including sulfuric acid, acetic acid, water, and sodium chloride in the following proportions: synthetic ethanol 816.00 g, de-ionized water 8.103 g, sodium chloride 0.004 g, sulfuric acid 0.021 g, and glacial acetic acid 0.061 g.

Materials used in fuel systems of Flex Fuel Vehicles ("FFV") were accepted as proven compatible and not included in this study.
signs of pitting, loose corrosion by-products in the test fuel, or have a mass loss that exceeds a rate that would cause a failure within a twenty-year life cycle.\textsuperscript{76}

The Elastomers Study compared the effects of E-0, E-10 and E-20 on eight elastomers selected for the study following reference to literature reviews and manuals, recommendations from fuel systems and engine manufacturers, and peer review by system engineers from several OEMs and Tier I and II suppliers. The elastomer samples were prepared using SAE and ASTM standards and exposed to E-0, E-10, and E-20 fuel at an elevated temperature for 500 hours. The study measured several properties of the elastomer samples, including volume, weight, appearance, tensile strength, ultimate elongation, and hardness. In a substantial majority of cases, E-20 caused no greater change in properties than E-0 or E-10.\textsuperscript{77} Where a greater change in properties was caused by E-20, the study concluded that the magnitude of the change was not great enough to represent a concern.\textsuperscript{78} In sum, the differences between E-0, E-10, and E-20 were small and statistically insignificant.

The Plastics Study compared the effects of E-0, E-10 and E-20 on eight plastics selected for the study following reference to literature reviews and

\textsuperscript{76} Metals Study at 8. The study considers and minimizes the finding regarding one metal found to be incompatible, Zamak 5. The Zamak samples used in the study were not plated — as it often is to increase corrosion resistance for fuel applications — which is believed to be a reason for the corrosion problems found in the study and not found on automobiles being used with E-10. \textit{Id.}
\textsuperscript{77} Elastomers Study at 10.
\textsuperscript{78} \textit{Id.}
manuals, recommendations from fuel systems and engine manufacturers, and peer review by system engineers from several OEMs and Tier I and II suppliers. The plastics samples were prepared using SAE and ASTM standards and exposed to E-0, E-10, and E-20 fuel at an elevated temperature for 3,024 hours. The study analyzed several properties of the plastics samples, including mass loss/gain, volume, tensile strength, tensile elongation, and impact resistance. The study concluded that there was no significant difference in the properties of the samples exposed to E-20 and E-10.79

Finally, the Fuel Pumps Study compared the effects of E-0, E-10 and E-20 on the performance of twenty-four fuel pumps and nine sending units. The fuel pumps were selected to include a variety of manufacturers, model years, and common pump designs representative of those used in a high volume of vehicles currently making up today's automotive fleet. The sending units were similarly selected; however, fewer sending units were necessary due to the similarity in design in the manufacture of sending units. The study found that E-20 has a similar effect as E-10 and E-0 on fuel pumps and sending units.80 In total, these materials compatibility studies demonstrate that the effects of blended fuel

---

79 Plastics Study at 7-8.
80 Fuel Pumps Study at 4.
containing up to twenty percent ethanol present no problems for current automotive or fuel dispensing equipment.\textsuperscript{81}

\section*{VII. E-15 Will Result in No Difference In Driveability As Compared to E-O}

Recent studies also support that E-15 will result in no difference in driveability compared to E-O. The Driveability Study presents data to support that E-15 will cause no driveability issues and will not lead to "removal or rendering inoperative of [emissions control] devices or systems" based on negative impacts on performance.\textsuperscript{82}

The Driveability Study tested a fleet of forty pairs of vehicles in which one vehicle of each pair was fueled with E-O and the other E-20.\textsuperscript{83} The vehicles were driven for a full calendar year by lay drivers, each of whom recorded driver logs.

\textsuperscript{81} In fact, evidence shows that blended fuels containing up to eighty-five percent ethanol present no problems for fuel dispensing equipment and engine components. The American Coalition for Ethanol fueled a regular, non-FFV vehicle (a 2000 Chevy Tahoe) on E-85 for 98\% of the 105,496 miles driven before disassembly and inspection of the fuel dispensing equipment and engine components. An examination of these parts showed normal or better than normal wear than similar or identical parts used in a vehicle with high-80,000 mileage fueled on non-E-85 fuel. No engine parts or emission control devices were rendered inoperable by the use of E-85 (or otherwise) in the Chevy Tahoe. Video: American Coalition for Ethanol, available at http://www.ethanol.org/video. See also, Use of Mid-Range Ethanol/Gasoline Blends in Unmodified Passenger Cars and Light Duty Trucks, prepared by Minnesota Center for Automotive Research (July 1999) (finding no materials compatibility problems after testing E-30 on fifteen in-use cars and light duty trucks with model years ranging from 1985 to 1996).


\textsuperscript{83} Driveability Study at 4.
Additionally, each vehicle was tested quarterly (once each season: fall, winter, spring, summer) by trained driveability raters using industry standard driveability tests.\textsuperscript{84}

The Driveability Study found that E-20 provided similar power and performance to E-0 throughout the year and that the test fleet operated satisfactorily on both E-0 and E-20 with no obvious differences between the fuels.\textsuperscript{85} In fact, maintenance records of the forty vehicles fueled by E-20 showed only two instances of vehicle operability failure during the study, neither of which were deemed to be fuel-related. Accordingly, the Driveability Study supports that fuel blends up to E-20 present no driveability concerns with respect to this E-15 waiver request.

The RIT Study also supports the Minnesota's Study's driveability findings. The RIT Study examined the effects of E-20 (as compared to E-0) on ten legacy vehicles with significant mileage (between 30,000 and 120,000 miles), which together consumed 5,000 gallons of E-20 fuel over 75,000 miles of driving under real world conditions.\textsuperscript{86} Tested vehicles were equipped with a wireless vehicle management system that provided real-time connection to the engine control unit and maintenance information including diagnostic trouble codes.\textsuperscript{87} The RIT

\textsuperscript{84} Id. at 5.

\textsuperscript{85} Id.

\textsuperscript{86} RIT Study at I.

\textsuperscript{87} Id. at 5.
Study found that the tested vehicles ran as well or better on E-20 than on E-0.\textsuperscript{88} Significantly, the study found that no malfunction (check engine) light illuminated and drivers did not detect any performance degradation. As for engine part durability, the study found no fuel or engine part failures and no abnormal maintenance was required. In sum, the vehicles "operated normally" when fueled with E-20.\textsuperscript{89}

The MCAR Study achieved similar results after a driveability analysis of fifteen in-use cars and light duty trucks, with manufacturing dates ranging from 1985 to 1996, operating on E-10 and on E-30.\textsuperscript{90} Over the duration of MCAR's one-year study, study participants recorded data on cards with choices of words and phrases, which could be used to best describe abnormal performance. The Study reported no driveability complaints, no reports of cold starting, vapor lock, or hard starting conditions, and no reports of hesitation with the E-30 blend of fuel.\textsuperscript{91}

The DOE Study\textsuperscript{92} also supports the findings of the Minnesota Study, the RIT Study, and the MCAR Study. The DOE Study found no operability or

\textsuperscript{88} Id. at 4-5.

\textsuperscript{89} Id. at 5.

\textsuperscript{90} Use of Mid-Range Ethanol/Gasoline Blends in Unmodified Passenger Cars and Light Duty Trucks, prepared by Minnesota Center for Automotive Research (July 1999) at 7.

\textsuperscript{91} Id.

\textsuperscript{92} Effects of Intermediate Ethanol Blends on Legacy Vehicles and Small Non-Road Engines, Study 1, prepared by Oak Ridge National Laboratory for the U.S. Department of Energy (October 2008).
driveability issues with any of the ethanol blends used in that study, including E-15 and E-20.\textsuperscript{93} In the relevant part, the study found:

- None of the vehicles displayed a malfunction indicator light as a result of the ethanol content in the fuel;
- No fuel filter plugging symptoms were observed;
- No cold start problems were observed in 75F and 50F laboratory conditions; and
- No fuel leaks or conspicuous degradation of the fuel systems were observed.\textsuperscript{94}

The DOE Study also supports that use of E-15 will not have a discernable impact on the performance and operability of SNREs. The DOE Study tested a range of SNREs to "full useful life" on E-0, E-10, E-15, and E-20 to determine how engine operation changed over time with exposure to various levels of ethanol.\textsuperscript{95} The DOE Study concluded that it is not possible to isolate the effects of ethanol on the operability of SNREs because of the great variance in performance among SNREs, regardless of the fuel used, and concluded that no obvious materials compatibility issues were observed during testing.\textsuperscript{96}

\textsuperscript{93} DOE Study at xviii.

\textsuperscript{94} Id.

\textsuperscript{95} Id.

\textsuperscript{96} Id. at xix.
VIII. Conclusion.

This waiver request includes recent comprehensive independent third-party studies by both governmental and private groups. This data builds on existing studies and over thirty years' experience with use of ethanol-gasoline fuel blends.97 Recent studies included in this application include data regarding exhaust emissions and evaporative emissions, materials compatibility and vehicle driveability based on use of ethanol-gasoline blends for both E-15 as well as for blends with significantly higher ethanol content than E-15. Information provided in this application and available data makes clear that E-15 will not cause or contribute to the failure of any emission control device or system and supports EPA approval of the requested waiver.

September 7, 2010

Ms. Jonelle Brent  
Illinois Department of Agriculture  
P.O. Box 19281  
Springfield, IL 62794-9281

Dear Ms. Brent:

We need to prepare our existing infrastructure and standards for likely changes to blending specifications of renewable fuels. Congress passed laws requiring that 36 billion gallons of renewable fuel be used annually by 2022 in the Renewable Fuels Standard (RFS) in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, and expanded the RFS in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. The RFS provides incentives for investment in the production and infrastructure of biofuels to reduce America’s use of fossil fuels and dependence on foreign oil. Accelerated renewable fuel use required by the RFS also guarantees that higher fuel blends will be essential to meet the goals.

NIST Handbook 130 §2.1.2 specifies that Gasoline-Oxygenate Blends shall contain no more than 10 volume percent ethanol. Recently the Renewable Fuels Association, (RFA) submitted Form 15 to the National Conference of Weights and Measures suggesting the removal of the limit to 10 percent ethanol content while proposing replacement wording for consideration. RFA’s proposal read such that blends “…shall contain no more than the maximum proportion of ethanol authorized by United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) under Section 211 of the Clean Air Act.”

RFA’s proposal recognizes U.S. EPA’s authority to allow new fuel and fuel additives to be approved for use while providing specific guidance to the states by providing clear expectations for these new fuel and fuel additives. As you know, U.S. EPA currently is considering a March 2009 waiver application pursuant to Clean Air Act §211(f)(4) to blend ethanol with gasoline up to 15 percent (i.e., E15). If the EPA approves this waiver, as it stands NIST Handbook 130 would prevent gasoline marketers from introducing E15 into commerce.

We urge you to advocate passage of this proposed amendment in an effort to broaden the authorized proportion of ethanol for model regulations.

Sincerely,

Charles J. Spencer  
Director Government Affairs  
Phone: 309-557-6343/Fax: 309-557-7279  
E-mail: cspencer@growmark.com

CS/jw

cc: Tom Jennings, Director, Illinois Department of Agriculture
September 14, 2010

Jonelle Brent
Illinois Department of Agriculture
P.O. Box 19281
Springfield, IL 62794

Dear Jonelle:

The U.S. Congress established the Renewable Fuels Standard (RFS) in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, and expanded the RFS in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, requiring that 36 billion gallons of renewable fuel be used annually by 2022. The RFS provides meaningful incentives for investment in the production and infrastructure for biofuels in the U.S. to reduce America’s use of fossil fuels and dependence on foreign oil. Accelerated renewable fuel use required by the RFS also guarantees that higher fuel blends will be essential. Therefore, we need to prepare existing infrastructure and standards for progressive changes in blending specifications.

NIST Handbook 130 §2.1.2 specifies that Gasoline-Oxygenate Blends shall contain no more than 10 volume percent ethanol. Recently the Renewable Fuels Association submitted Form 15 to the National Conference of Weights and Measures suggesting the removal of the limit to 10% ethanol content while proposing replacement wording for consideration. RFA’s proposal read such that blends

“...shall contain no more than the maximum proportion of ethanol authorized by United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) under Section 211 of the Clean Air Act.”

RFA’s proposal recognizes EPA’s authority to allow new fuel and fuel additives to be approved for use while providing specific guidance to the states by providing clear expectations for these new fuel and fuel additives. As you know, EPA currently is considering a March 2009 waiver application pursuant to Clean Air Act §211(f)(2)(2006) to blend ethanol with gasoline up to 15 percent (i.e., E15). If the EPA approves this waiver, the current NIST Handbook 130 would prevent gasoline marketers from introducing E15 into commerce.

We urge you to advocate passage of this proposed amendment in an effort to broaden the authorized proportion of ethanol for model regulations.

Sincerely,

Tim Lent, President
Illinois Corn Growers Assn

Raymond E. Diefenbaugh, President
Illinois Renewable Fuels Assn

Philip Nelson, President
Illinois Farm Bureau
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Presentation from Dennis Bachelder, API’s Engine Oil Licensing and Certification System

Good morning. I am Dennis Bachelder from API’s Engine Oil Licensing and Certification System, and I want to thank the Chair and members of the Northeastern Weights and Measures Association Law and Regulations Committee for this opportunity to recommend a change to Handbook 130 section 3.13.1, Labeling of Vehicle Motor Oil.

Handbook 130 has for many years required that labels on motor oil packages identify the oil’s SAE viscosity and API performance level. Both of these items are important pieces of information for vehicle owners and operators and maintenance personnel entrusted with the responsibility of selecting the right motor oil for a car or truck.

While section 3.13.1 continues to meet this need for motor oil packages, it does not address bulk motor oils, the manner by which many motor oils are distributed and installed today. Over the last two decades, the distribution and installation of motor oils has undergone a radical change, shifting from a do-it-yourself process with oil installed by vehicle owners from bottles to a do-it-for-me system where the oil is installed by service providers from tanks filled by distributors. According to Kline and Company, do-it-for-me installed more than 60 percent of passenger car motor oil last year. Consumers who once scrutinized motor oil labels in auto parts stores before installing them in their cars or trucks now travel to auto dealers, quick lubes, or service centers and wait while their vehicle’s oil is changed with motor oil from a bulk oil tank. These consumers might be selecting a specific oil for their vehicle, but many are probably trusting that the service provider is installing a quality bulk oil recommended for their car or truck. API samples and tests motor oils purchased from bulk oil installers annually, and I can say that this is often the case. However, API has also found the opposite to be true. Bulk oil installers don’t always know the identity of the oil in their tanks, and in some cases they actually consciously or unconsciously misrepresent what they’re installing. More than once API sampling has found installers claiming they are dispensing one brand of oil when in fact they are installing another brand. To complicate matters further, many times the customer receipt does not identify what’s been installed. Imagine how many of these types of transactions occur every day.

The changes proposed for Handbook 130 are intended to apply the labeling requirements for packaged motor oils to oils sold in bulk. These changes as proposed would require motor oil manufacturers and distributors to identify the oils they deliver and installers the oils they dispense. Requiring distributors to identify the motor oils they deliver to installers will help ensure that installers know what they’re dispensing, and requiring installers to do the same on their invoices will provide the same level of information for consumers.

I urge the Laws and Regulations Committee of the Northeastern Weights and Measures Association to amend Handbook 130 section 3.13.1 as API has proposed.
**Presentation from Kevin Ferrick, Manager of API’s Engine Oil Licensing and Certification System**

Good morning. I am Kevin Ferrick, Manager of API’s Engine Oil Licensing and Certification System, and I want to thank the Chair and members of the Southern Weights and Measures Association Law and Regulations Committee for this opportunity to recommend a change to Handbook 130 section 3.13.1, Labeling of Vehicle Motor Oil.

Handbook 130 has for many years required that labels on motor oil packages identify the oil’s SAE viscosity and API performance level. Both of these items are important pieces of information for vehicle owners and operators and maintenance personnel entrusted with the responsibility of selecting the right motor oil for a car or truck.

While section 3.13.1 continues to meet this need for motor oil packages, it does not address bulk motor oils, the manner by which many motor oils are distributed and installed today. Over the last two decades, the distribution and installation of motor oils has undergone a radical change, shifting from a do-it-yourself process with oil installed by vehicle owners from bottles to a do-it-for-me system where the oil is installed by service providers from tanks filled by distributors. According to Kline and Company, do-it-for-me installed more than 60 percent of passenger car motor oil last year. Consumers who once scrutinized motor oil labels in auto parts stores before installing them in their cars or trucks now travel to auto dealers, quick lubes, or service centers and wait while their vehicle’s oil is changed with motor oil from a bulk oil tank. These consumers might be selecting a specific oil for their vehicle, but many are probably trusting that the service provider is installing a quality bulk oil recommended for their car or truck. API samples and tests motor oils purchased from bulk oil installers annually, and I can say that this is often the case. However, API has also found the opposite to be true. Bulk oil installers don’t always know the identity of the oil in their tanks, and in some cases they actually consciously or unconsciously misrepresent what they’re installing. More than once API sampling has found installers claiming they are dispensing one brand of oil when in fact they are installing another brand. To complicate matters further, many times the customer receipt does not identify what’s been installed. Imagine how many of these types of transactions occur every day.

The changes proposed for Handbook 130 are intended to apply the labeling requirements for packaged motor oils to oils sold in bulk. These changes as proposed would require motor oil manufacturers and distributors to identify the oils they deliver and installers the oils they dispense. Requiring distributors to identify the motor oils they deliver to installers will help ensure that installers know what they’re dispensing, and requiring installers to do the same on their invoices will provide the same level of information for consumers.

I urge the Laws and Regulations Committee of the Southern Weights and Measures Association to amend Handbook 130 section 3.13.1 as API has proposed.
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ELIZABETH BOEHM-MILLER
Marketing Manager, Shell
Agenda

- Situation Overview
- The Problem
- Trade & Loyal Installer Programs
- Consumer Education Campaign
- Promoting Quality
Situation Overview

• Today’s Realities
  – Recession is driving negative behavior
    • Demand is causing some customers to buy cheap oils
    • Some installers involved with deceptive trade practices
      – Advertising one brand while selling another
The problem

- Installers are stealing volume by masquerading as PQS-branded facilities
- Estimated loss of $58 mln nationally in PQS sales revenue
- It's an industry issue – see NOLN articles
- Violates Federal and State Laws
- Creates unfair advantage in marketplace
- Erodes consumer confidence and trust
- Introduces potential liability through engine warranty or claim issues

Pennzoil annual gallons lost ~6 mln
Quaker State annual gallons lost ~2 mln
Customers Matter to Shell

• Conducting Local Market Events
• Created Comprehensive programs to support installers
  – Trade activities
    • Legal actions
    • Publicizing efforts
    • Enhanced sales training
    • New Installer Programs
    • Product Quality Testing
    • Certified Installers

Shell is protecting consumer and our brands, but also how we want to help protect installers business, the consumers (our joint end-users) developed a comprehensive, two-pronged program designed to support our loyal installers.

The first phase, which is and will remain out of consumer view, is our aggressive focus on combating trade deception:
- We are taking aggressive legal action: pursing the installers misrepresenting the brands
  - Escalating efforts to investigate & file lawsuits against violators
  - Legal actions range from sales rep counseling to filing law suits
  - Won those awarded damages, signs are coming down – successfully concluded 10 lawsuits – settled in Shell’s favor
- filing an additional 10 lawsuits, with investigations underway
- Conducted several 50+ investigations regions spanning across the US
- Legal activity is resource intensive and takes time to get the results we are committed to pursuing blatant offenders
- We are publicizing our activities & intentions through advertorials in NOLN, Motor Age
- Brand enforcement initiatives have been developed such as signage policies & procedures. Installers desiring to feature P2L QS brands with permanent signage they will be required to fulfill purchase requirements & these are requirements will be enforced.
Quality does Matter

- Brands like Shell, Pennzoil, Quaker State
  - Invest in R&D
  - Partner w/ OEMs & NASCAR teams
  - Offer strong claims backed by 300k mile warranty
- All oils are NOT the same – proved w/ quality testing
  - 53% of PLs off spec or tested poorly
  - Low temp flow 32%
  - Volatility 11%
  - High metals 21%
  - Shear stability 11%

Most oils contain several additives and base oils to do all the things needed in an engine - high quality oils even go further to provide added value.

Using the wrong oil, or even an oil that admittedly does not meet requirements, will void the warranty and leave the engine exposed to potential problems.

Shell invests A LOT in knowing how to build high quality oils. With research centers around the world and continuous learning from taxi fleets (5mln miles annually) and professional racing

We tested some low-quality oils – 53% were off spec or tested poorly.

If you look at some of the off brand oils in the marketplace, you'll notice that some admittedly don't meet the latest industry specifications. Even more, some of the off brands we tested failed to meet some of the basic requirements for the latest industry specifications.

Area of concern: we tested oils with poor volatility. In high temperatures, lower quality motor oil with poor volatility could be more prone to evaporate and generate an oily mist, which can dirty other parts of your engine and exhaust system.
Consumer Education Campaign

- Full-scale public relations effort
  - Raising awareness of quality distinctions
- Utilizing celebrity spokespeople
  - Alan Taylor, Car and Driver, radio host
  - Motor sports properties
- Supporting installers – PR kits
- Collaborating with industry organizations
- Working with governmental agencies to change regulations re: consumer invoicing

Our second phase is designed to educate consumers and to provide our loyal installers, with tools and programs designed to help them stand out in the eyes of consumers:

we launched the certified installer program. It’s an additional way for consumers to identify installers as a trusted facility that pour quality, branded motor oils

To help educate consumers about the value of quality, branded motor oils and the vital role they play in keeping their cars running right – an especially important topic considering today’s economic situation and the realities of people holding on to their existing cars longer – we’ve created MotorOilMatters.org, - is a web site we’ve designed as an educational site for consumers to better understand the differences in motor oils. This interactive site will educate consumers about the vital role quality, branded motor oils play in the longevity and performance of their vehicles, and will also help drive consumers to our loyal installers via links to installer locators. For now, this site is our site, however, we are also working with trade and industry organizations to create a consortium for the cause and to expand the information and offerings on this site.

We are also launching a public relations effort surrounding each of the motor oil matters tours to promote the differences in motor oils message and the web site a source for information on the benefits of quality branded motor oils in each market.

importance of consumers to do the right thing by their car and ask specifically for quality, branded motor oils like Pennzoil or Quaker State at a reputable, trustworthy installer.

We are utilizing other celebrity spoke people, like Alan Taylor – car & drive radio, Bill Goldberg, motor sports personalities

Created PR kits for our installers to help spread the motor oil matters message

Connecting with groups like API and ILSAC to join forces to spread the quality message
MotorOilMatters.org

Consumer education website screen shot
Motor Oil Matters '09 Results

- National PR launch yielded 35 mln impressions
- 1,100 + stories - TV, Radio, Print
- Shell recognized for their efforts
- Trade association adoption

Shell established a leadership position – is viewed as a leader in this area

established Shell as leader – jobber world “first it was Shell announcing clamping down on quality…” Tom Glenn

Lube Report/Lubes & grease – great article – Luis interview as a result of MOM launch – now just this week – publisher noted our efforts – Shell Slams motor oil shams

Motor Oil Matters Tours – detroit, dallas, ny

Product Quality Program – installer sampling program launched

Consumer education - MotorOilMatters.org 50k+ hits since launch date first week July

Created excitement within trade orgs  API/AOCA – participated in Dallas event

Multiple letters endorsing MoM.
Generating adoption of the cause - protecting consumers, customer and the brands

Motor Oil Matters Targets

"On ILSAC's behalf, I congratulate you on your efforts..." 
"Your program to protect the integrity of our brands, and the quality of our products... is also protecting consumers' automobiles... Thank you for your concern and attention to this important area." - Jim Linden, ILSAC Chair

"The American Petroleum Institute applauds the Motor Oil Matters initiative. Consumers need to pay attention when they purchase motor oil for their gasoline and diesel-powered vehicles - asking by name for a quality product that meets or exceeds the API's Engine Oil Quality standards and bears the API Service Symbol 'Donut' and Certification Mark 'Starburst'." - Kevin Ferrick, manager, engine oil licensing, API.

"Our customers know and trust the Pennzoil brand; it's the number one brand in passenger car motor oil and we are proud to pour it in all 352 of our service centers. Our customers expect the best when they buy Pennzoil, and so do we. We applaud Shell's efforts to protect the integrity of the Pennzoil brand and we support their work to ensure that every customer receives 100% genuine Pennzoil product." - Eric Glover, Heartland COO in Lubes & Greases

Examples of trade and customers who support the efforts
industry organizations interested and customers activate is critical. Using spokespeople as advocates and consumer awareness groups will strengthen our message

These are our Motor Oil Matters targets
to date API, ACOA, ILSAC, AMRA expressed support and interest in joining the cause
AIADA – American International Automotive dealers association
Auto alliance – 11 manufactures: (GM, Ford, Chrysler, BMW, MB, etc…)
AIAM – association of int’l auto manufacturers – voice of int’l auto manufacturers – DC
AAA – American Automobile Association
AAIA – automotive aftermarket industry association - APPEX
Help protect consumers and installers

- Require quick lubes, car dealers (any oil change facility) to provide the following information on invoices re: motor oil service:
  - Brand
  - Manufacturer
  - SAE viscosity grade
  - Service requirements or specifications
    - API
    - ILSAC

Consumers have no way of verifying what oil they receive. Currently many invoices simple state “bulk oil” or 5w30 oil
Consumers should know what oil is going into their vehicles
August 6, 2009

Luis Guimaraes
General Manager – Marketing
Shell Lubricants North America

Mr. Guimaraes,

The International Lubricant Standardization and Approval Committee (ILSAC) (General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, and JAMA) recently learned about Shell’s new initiative to monitor lubricant quality in the market (reference the attached Lube Report article by George Gill of LNG Publishing). On ILSAC’s behalf, I congratulate you on your efforts to ensure that consumers are receiving the quality of oils they are expecting and paying for, and that their Owners Manuals are recommending. ILSAC, in partnership with the Oil and Additive industries, expends considerable time, effort, and money in developing the specifications for good quality oils that our mutual customers need for use in their automobiles. However, if the consumer is supplied with oils of questionable or poor quality, your industry and mine both suffer, along with the wronged consumer. Your program to “…protect the integrity of our brands, and the quality of our products…” is also protecting consumers’ automobiles by helping to keep high quality lubricants available, and as such, is applauded by the automobile manufacturers. Thank you for your concern and attention to this important area. ILSAC extends an offer to you personally or a Shell representative to meet with the ILSAC to review the findings of your product quality program. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Jim Linden, Chair ILSAC

General Motors Research and Development
586-986-1888, 248-321-5343 (mobile)
james.l.linden@gm.com

C: Scott Lindholm
Shell Goes After Off-brand Lubes

By George Gill

A third-party independent laboratory began testing motor oil samples from Shell installers in Detroit this month, part of a Shell Lubricants campaign to crack down on installers who substitute off-brand or out-of-specification lubricants for the branded products they claim to use.

The product quality program went into effect in Detroit July 1 in conjunction with a local-market customer appreciation tour. Shell plans to launch the program in New York City and Dallas in a couple of weeks. “We expect by the end of the year it’s probably going to be up to around the 50 top cities where we have the program going,” Luis Guimaraes, general manager for Shell Lubricants’ North America marketing, told Lube Report.

Pennzoil, Quaker State and FormulaShell installers are automatically enrolled in the product quality program, according to Shell’s program brochure, and it is conducted at no cost to them.

Guimaraes noted that over the last couple of months, Shell Lubricants had noticed some growth in people using its signage and the Pennzoil-Quaker State brands to promote their businesses. “When we were checking that, they were not always using Pennzoil-Quaker State products,” he said. “We see that’s probably driven by the recession and by some people trying to cut corners in order to keep their business running, which in the end doesn’t help them and doesn’t help the consumer – people are not getting what they are paying for. We decided it was time to really step in, and make that very clear to consumers and to all our loyal customers, that we will protect the integrity of our brands, and the quality of our products, and do it practically.”

Shell uses a special marker in the motor oil, rather than a colored dye, Guimaraes continued. “It’s a kind of identity print, as we have as human beings,” he explained. “You can trace the marker back to our core formulation, the core components, and really make sure that this is our product. We have done over 100 [sample tests] already, so we’re very confident we can really identify the different type of oils vis a vis our own products, including when the products are mixed.”

The marker enables Shell to trace the concentrations of the different components used in the motor oil. “On Pennzoil we [track] the cleaning agents that are unique to our formulations; therefore, that component is identifiable because no other company uses that,” he cited as one example.

If the product sampling shows the installer is not complying with product standards, he said, Shell Lubricants is taking action, which can include signage removal, or other legal action.

“We have done that a couple of times already, in different parts of the country – in all of them we have been successful,” Guimaraes stated. “It’s a very simple proof: You’re selling Pennzoil or Quaker State, and then you are installing a different product. And for the ones that are
really doing what they are promising, there is a thank-you for their business, and we are supporting them with additional tools and support.”

After launching the product quality program in Detroit, New York and Dallas, Shell plans to progressively roll it out to other areas. “We think it will be good to focus on the areas that have a stronger propensity to have this type of problem,” he explained. “We thought it would give us a good combination of understanding how the program works, and how it’s going to help us roll out to some additional cities as we progress across the country.”

Guimaraes said the product quality program is part of a three-tier campaign that also includes an upcoming new “certified installer” program, and a consumer education program whose main component includes a web site, www.motoroilmatters.org.

The site provides basic consumer education about motor oils in general, including terminology, and emphasizes the importance of using quality motor oil brands that meet key specifications and requirements. “We have tested several low-quality products that don’t have the basic qualities a motor oil should have, like starting temperature in cold climates, or even meeting basic GF-4 specifications,” he added.

He added that the company is working to bring aboard commercial associations and consumer protection groups such as the Better Business Bureau. Shell Lubricants is also working with the legislatures in some states on simple steps to help protect consumers.

“For example, a motor oil product and its specifications aren’t obliged to go on the invoice,” Guimaraes pointed out. “So people can put ‘motor oil, 10W-30,’ and that’s it. It’s very difficult for the consumer to trace, and make sure [the installers] have used the oil the consumer paid for.”

Shell is discussing with some legislators the benefits of requiring that the invoice show the motor oil brand, viscosity and specification, he continued, so the consumer is assured that the installer used the brand and type of motor oil promised. “If it hasn’t, he can really go after that specific installer and complain,” Guimaraes said. “We want to make sure we implement practical ideas that are going to help the consumer, the owner/installer and the industry overall.”

The new certified installer program, which will be launched later this year, will highlight participants on both the Pennzoil and Quaker State web sites. It will also promote them with a seal of approval program that will help consumers identify Shell Lubricants certified installers.
November 2, 2009

Elizabeth Boehm-Miller
Growth Manager, US
Shell Lubricants North America
700 Milam
Houston, TX 77002

Dear Ms. Boehm-Miller:

The American International Automobile Dealers Association would like to commend Shell Lubricants for their Motor Oil Matters initiative and ongoing efforts to educate consumers about the vital role of quality motor oils. AIADA represents the more than 10,000 international automobile franchises and their more than 500,000 employees in the United States.

AIADA recognizes the need to make consumers aware of the importance of using quality motor oil and how it can help extend engine life and improve overall engine efficiency. An efficient engine can result in lower emissions and increased fuel economy. Low quality motor oils that do not meet a vehicle manufacturer's requirements or industry standards can potentially damage a vehicle's engine or void the manufacturer's warranty, costing the consumer in the long run.

AIADA is dedicated exclusively to the economic and political interests of America's international nameplate automobile dealers. The manufacturers of the vehicles our dealers sell and service have spent considerable time and money to design and build engines with the fuel economy and performance that consumers demand. Quality motor oils that meet the stringent requirements manufacturers recommend are vital to the proper operation of these engines in a variety of conditions and can help to ensure a long life of reliable performance. We laud your Motor Oil Matters initiative for educating consumers to specifically request quality motor oils, as well as encouraging any facility that changes oil to do their part to help consumers receive the quality of oil they need to protect their vehicles.

Thank you for bringing this important message to vehicle owners.

Best regards,

Cody Lusk
President

American International Automobile Dealers Association
211 N Union Street, Suite 300, Alexandria, Virginia 22314
T: 703.519.7800 • F: 703.519.7810
www.aiada.org
October 21, 2009

Elizabeth Boehm-Miller
Growth Manager, US
Shell Lubricants North America
700 Milam
Houston, TX  77002

Dear Ms. Boehm-Miller,

On behalf of the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, I am writing to applaud Shell’s efforts to reduce the use of poor quality motor oils in the marketplace. The Alliance is an association of 11 vehicle manufacturers including BMW Group, Chrysler LLC, Ford Motor Company, General Motors, Jaguar Land Rover, Mazda, Mercedes-Benz USA, Mitsubishi Motors, Porsche, Toyota and Volkswagen.

The Alliance shares your goals of ensuring that consumers understand the benefits of good quality motor oils and receive the quality of oil they need to protect their cars. The benefits can range from better vehicle durability to lower emissions and higher fuel economy. When poor quality oils are used instead, both consumers and the environment can suffer.

Automakers build vehicles designed to last for more than a decade of driving under a variety of conditions. Accomplishing this goal in the real world requires the use of good quality motor oils that meet manufacturer recommendations. Automakers spend considerable resources to define good oil quality and to improve oil specifications over time. Motor Oil Matters is an important program because it will help both consumers and oil change facilities do their part to provide proper vehicle care after the vehicle leaves the manufacturer.

Thank you for undertaking this important initiative.

Sincerely,

Ellen L. Shapiro
Director, Automotive Fuels and Lubricants

Cc: Luis Guimaraes, Shell Lubricants
    Geoffrey Phelps, Coyne Public Relations
Ms. Elizabeth Boehm-Miller
Growth Manager, US
Shell Lubricants
700 Milam
Houston, TX 77002

Dear Ms. Boehm-Miller:

The National Automobile Dealers Association congratulates Shell Lubricants for launching the Motor Oil Matters program. NADA represents more than 17,000 new-car and -truck dealers, both domestic and international.

We take the reputation of our dealers very seriously and appreciate that Shell Lubricants has taken the initiative to help consumers make informed choices about the quality of motor oils and what it can mean for their vehicles in terms of engine life and efficiency and fuel economy. This is especially important in light of the current economic climate.

Thanks to Shell Lubricants for providing this useful resource filled with clear, concise and insightful information about motor oil and for bringing attention to this important issue. Please keep us informed as this valuable initiative moves forward.

Best regards,

David Hyatt
Vice President and Chief Public Affairs Officer
Shell Goes After Off-brand Lubes
By George Gill

A third-party independent laboratory began testing motor oil samples from Shell installers in Detroit this month, part of a Shell Lubricants campaign to crack down on installers who substitute off-brand or out-of-specification lubricants for the branded products they claim to use.

The product quality program went into effect in Detroit July 1 in conjunction with a local-market customer appreciation tour. Shell plans to launch the program in New York City and Dallas in a couple of weeks. “We expect by the end of the year it’s probably going to be up to around the 50 top cities where we have the program going,” Luis Guimaraes, general manager for Shell Lubricants’ North America marketing, told Lube Report.

Pennzoil, Quaker State and FormulaShell installers are automatically enrolled in the product quality program, according to Shell’s program brochure, and it is conducted at no cost to them.

Guimaraes noted that over the last couple of months, Shell Lubricants had noticed some growth in people using its signage and the Pennzoil-Quaker State brands to promote their businesses. “When we were checking that, they were not always using Pennzoil-Quaker State products,” he said. “We see that’s probably driven by the recession and by some people trying to cut corners in order to keep their business running, which in the end doesn’t help them and doesn’t help the consumer—people are not getting what they are paying for. We decided it was time to really step in, and make that very clear to consumers and to all our loyal customers, that we will protect the integrity of our brands, and the quality of our products, and do it practically.”

Shell uses a special marker in the motor oil, rather than a colored dye, Guimaraes continued. “It’s a kind of identity print, as we have as human beings,” he explained. “You can trace the marker back to our core formulation, the core components, and really make sure that this is our product. We have done over 100 [sample tests] already, so we’re very confident we can really identify the different type of oils vis a vis our own products, including when the products are mixed.”

The marker enables Shell to trace the concentrations of the different components used in the motor oil. “On Pennzoil we [track] the cleaning agents that are unique to our formulations; therefore, that component is identifiable because no other company uses that,” he cited as one example.

If the product sampling shows the installer is not complying with product standards, he said, Shell Lubricants is taking action, which can include signage removal, or other legal action.

Continued on page 2
Continued from page 1

"We have done that a couple of times already, in different parts of the country – in all of them we have been successful," Guimaraes stated. "It’s a very simple proof: You’re selling Pennzoil or Quaker State, and then you are installing a different product. And for the ones that are really doing what they are promising, there is a thank-you for their business, and we are supporting them with additional tools and support."

After launching the product quality program in Detroit, New York and Dallas, Shell plans to progressively roll it out to other areas. "We think it will be good to focus on the areas that have a stronger propensity to have this type of problem," he explained. "We thought it would give us a good combination of understanding how the program works, and how it’s going to help us roll out to some additional cities as we progress across the country."

Guimaraes said the product quality program is part of a three-tier campaign that also includes an upcoming new "certified installer" program, and a consumer education program whose main component includes a web site, www.motoroilmatters.org.

The site provides basic consumer education about motor oils in general, including terminology, and emphasizes the importance of using quality motor oil brands that meet key specifications and requirements. "We have tested several low-quality products that don’t have the basic qualities a motor oil should have, like starting temperature in cold climates, or even meeting basic GF-4 specifications," he added.

He added that the company is working to bring aboard commercial associations and consumer protection groups such as the Better Business Bureau. Shell Lubricants is also working with the legislatures in some states on simple steps to help protect consumers.

"For example, a motor oil product and its specifications aren’t obliged to go on the invoice," Guimaraes pointed out. "So people can put ‘motor oil, 10W-30,’ and that’s it. It’s very difficult for the consumer to trace, and make sure [the installers] have used the oil the consumer paid for."

Shell is discussing with some legislators the benefits of requiring that the invoice show the motor oil brand, viscosity and specification, he continued, so the consumer is assured that the installer used the brand and type of motor oil promised. "If it hasn’t, he can really go after that specific installer and complain," Guimaraes said. "We want to make sure we implement practical ideas that are going to help the consumer, the owner/installer and the industry overall."

The new certified installer program, which will be launched later this year, will highlight participants on both the Pennzoil and Quaker State web sites. It will also promote them with a seal of approval program that will help consumers identify Shell Lubricants certified installers.
Shell Slams Motor Oil Shams

With do-it-for-me oil changes rapidly approaching 75 percent of all oil changes in the U.S. private sector, what assurance do we drivers have that we're getting what we pay for? Until recently, not much.

But last month Shell Lubricants publicly launched a three-part campaign to crack down on U.S. installers who substitute off-brand or off-spec lubricants for the Shell-branded products they claim to use. Shell is testing motor oil samples from Pennzoil, Quaker State and FormulaShell installers for the special markers in their oil. Noncomplying installers face tough sanctions, including signage removal and other legal action, Shell said.

The other elements of Shell's product quality program are a new "certified installer" program and a consumer education program, including the web site www.motoroilmatters.org. George Gill, who broke this story in our July 15 Lube Report (www.LubeReport.com), will give you an update in next month's Lubes'n'Greases.

Kudos to Shell—owner of the best-selling Pennzoil-Quaker State brands, as well as owner of Jiffy Lube and Pennzoil 10-Minute Oil Change, the top U.S. quick-lube chains—

for going public with its quality program. If I'm buying Pennzoil or Quaker State at a quick lube or other oil change store, it's reassuring to know someone is checking to make sure that's what I'm getting.

Wonder where to find information like the percentage of do-it-for-me versus do-it-yourself oil changes, or which quick-lube chain is biggest? If you're a subscriber to the print edition of Lubes'n'Greases, enclosed with this issue you received the first edition of our new annual Lubricants Industry Factbook.

This handy reference answers the questions our editors are asked most often about the U.S. and global lubricant markets. Data on market size, trends, pricing and more are graphically displayed in the Factbook.

For information on ordering copies of the Factbook, please visit our website, www.LNGpublishing.com/Factbook/index.cfm.

And while you're on the web, be sure to check out the completely updated online Lubricants Industry Sourcebook at www.LNGSourcebook.com.

Nancy J. DeMarco
nancy@LNGpublishing.com
Protecting consumers. Protecting our brands.

MOTOR OIL MATTERS

is making an impact

Powered by our lubricant technologies, Pennzoil-Quaker State Company drives to deliver high quality products that protect engines of all kinds – for many kinds of consumers. This year we’ve gone further to prove and protect our products through a bold new program, Motor Oil Matters.

First, we’ve taken legal action against installers who illegally display and advertise Pennzoil® and Quaker State® trademarks, yet fail to deliver those motor oil brands to consumers. We’ve been successful in stopping many of these violators from misusing our brand names and deceiving consumers.

Then we rolled out a product quality program that involves testing of motor oil samples from installer locations.

And, we’ve introduced “Motor Oil Matters” to consumers to explain why it’s important to ask for high quality motor oil and to explain the effects a lower quality oil – that may not meet specifications – can have on their engines, their finances and the environment.

Finally, a nationwide consumer education and public relations campaign is going on now, urging consumers to ask for motor oils that meet this higher standard, such as Pennzoil® and Quaker State®. Supporting this outreach is www.MotorOilMatters.org, a resource for consumers.

Is anyone listening?
They’re not only listening, they’re talking. Take a look at the quotes. The American Petroleum Institute’s (API) Engine Oil Program applauded our efforts to raise consumer awareness. A Jiffy Lube franchisee offered support for the program – and a prominent trade publication publisher praised the effort on behalf of consumers.

Join in!
Take advantage of the Motor Oil Matters message in your business. Support your reputation for quality by delivering the quality motor oils that today’s engines need and your customers expect.

What others are saying about Motor Oil Matters
“Our customers know and trust the Pennzoil brand; it’s the number one brand in passenger car motor oil, and we are proud to pour it in all 392 of our service centers. We applaud Shell’s efforts to protect the integrity of the Pennzoil brand, and we support their work.”

Eric F. Glover, COO, Heartland Automotive Services, Inc., Jiffy Lube franchisee

“The American Petroleum Institute’s Engine Oil Program applauds the Motor Oil Matters initiative. Consumers need to pay attention when they purchase motor oil for their gasoline and diesel-powered vehicles – asking by name for a quality product that meets or exceeds the API’s Engine Oil Quality standards and bears the API Service Symbol ‘Donut’ and Certification Mark ‘Starburst’.”

Kevin Ferrick, Engine Oil Program Manager, API

“Kudos to Shell – owner of the best-selling Pennzoil [and] Quaker State brands, as well as [franchisor of] Jiffy Lube and [licensor of] Pennzoil 10-Minute Oil Change, the top U.S. quick-lube chains – for going public with its quality program. If I’m buying Pennzoil or Quaker State at a quick lube or other oil change store, it’s reassuring to know someone is checking to make sure that’s what I’m getting.”

Nancy J. DeMarco, publisher, Lubes ‘n’ Greases

*According to a study by global consultant and research company Kline & Company
© 2009 SGPUS Products. All Rights Reserved.

Printed in November issues of: National Oil & Lube News and Motor Age
INDUSTRY EXPERTS APPLAUD
MOTOR OIL MATTERS

The American Petroleum Institute’s (API) Engine Oil Program applauds the “Motor Oil Matters” campaign because it encourages consumers to be aware of the oil that goes into their engines.

"Consumers need to pay attention when they purchase motor oil for their gasoline and diesel-powered vehicles. They should ask by name for a quality product that meets or exceeds the API's Engine Oil Quality standards and bears the API Service Symbol ‘Donut’ and Certification Mark ‘Starburst’," according to Kevin Ferrick, Engine Oil Program Manager at API. These marks are meant to help assure consumers they are getting quality engine oil installed in their vehicles.

Motor oils that do not meet industry standards or the vehicle manufacturer’s requirements could cost consumers in the long run by potentially damaging the vehicle’s engine or possibly voiding the manufacturer’s warranty.

As part of the Motor Oil Matters campaign, Pennzoil-Quaker State Company (PQS) continues to take aggressive legal action against trademark infringers to protect the public’s trust in its quality branded motor oils. Each day, more deceptive signage is coming down due to these efforts. And, more installers who say they’re delivering high quality oils but in fact are pouring something else are being stopped, by judicial action when necessary.

Getting the products and quality consumers expect

Motor Oil Matters promotes integrity in the market place. PQS wants to assure its brands stand for high quality motor oils, and to educate consumers about the vital part motor oil plays in extending the life of their vehicle.

For installers, having products with the quality that consumers expect is simply good business – as more and more people learn that motor oil really does matter.

www.motoroilmatters.org

Printed in October issues of: National Oil & Lube News and Motor Age
Honesty... One Gallon at a Time.

by Tammy Williams
NOLN Staff Writer
tammy.williams@noln.net

Editor's Note: This is the first of a two-part series on motor oil fraud, a touchy subject if ever there was one. This month, we explore the various ways that motor oil manufacturers, distributors and fast lube operators can engage in misrepresenting the products they sell — or outright defrauding their customers. Next month, we'll discuss ways that lube operators can protect themselves and make sure the bulk motor oil they think they're purchasing is really what it claims to be.

In a perfect world, your bays would always be full, ticket averages would be skyrocketing and the oil flowing from your guns would be exactly what you and your customers expect it to be.

In case you haven't taken a look around lately, we're not in a perfect world. Our world is full of news of tough times, bailouts and lawsuits. One lawsuit that hit home for the fast lube industry appeared a couple of years ago in this very magazine.

To sum up the article that appeared in our June 2007 issue, Windward Petroleum and Jackson Oil faced a class action lawsuit in a western Tennessee district court. The lawsuit alleged that Windward Petroleum and Jackson Oil "began improperly and unlawfully mixing, blending, commingling and misbranding different brands, weights and qualities of motor oils and petroleum lubricants at the West Memphis, Arkansas facility." That case is still pending, with a court date tentatively scheduled for next month.

This incident of alleged fraud certainly raised some eyebrows. After all, who really knows that the bulk oil being pumped into a tank is what it's supposed to be?

Tom Glenn, president of Petroleum Trends International, a market research and consulting firm, said there are different categories of misrepresentation that a few dishonest bulk jobbers — rotten apples in a barrel of mostly honest companies — might be guilty of.

"I think there are probably several different levels of concern," Glenn said. "One would be fraud, where something is being sold as A, and it is not. It is B, and B is a lower quality product than A. That would be fraudulent; the product is being sold as something it is not.

"Then there is the next level — a product is openly being sold as unlicensed. If I'm buying that, and I'm told if tested it would meet SM and GF-4 specifications, I think that falls into a gray area. The seller has not tested it, but is representing it as meeting the spec if it were tested. So the operator says, 'Okay, I hear what you're saying. You've been up front about it. I don't have the financial resources to test it; therefore, I can't, but I'm going to trust you.'

"Then there's the third level, where I'm going to sell you something that doesn't meet specifications. It may or may not, I'm actually not sure, but I know you need a low-price product. You as a buyer say 'I'm willing to take the chance. I don't think anything bad will happen.'

Distributor Fraud

Bulk oil fraud is not limited solely to the fast lube industry. Bob Winnill of Winnill Equipment, a distributor of construction equipment in New Hampshire and Vermont, shared two stories of potential oil fraud with National Oil & Lube News.

Winnill said he has one customer who he believes has spent close to $100,000 in repairs that were probably due to improper oil installed in three pieces of equipment. Two loaders and one excavator had failures, and in two machines the hydraulic oil turned black as coal.

"We made the customer aware that there was a problem," Winnill said. "We called (the distributor), and they made a big noise. They were going to drop off some product. At the time we needed at least 200 gallons, and they dropped off a couple of drums, but they didn't have enough so they dropped off all these pails. The pails were not labeled as
the same product contained in the drums. We immediately notified the distributor and told them you can't go mixing this stuff. They said, 'It's close enough; that stuff's all the same.' At which point we shipped all the product back and found a different source for the product."

"As much as we might want to deny that there are some bad apples out there, the quick lube industry has to be careful and be cognizant of the fact that there are some who are going to cheat and cut corners. And they can give the industry a bad name."

Tom Glenn
Petroleum Trends International

Winmill also recalled another incident that happened at New England's largest coal-fired power plant.

Winmill Equipment had been leasing some equipment to this facility, and they were there to do repairs.

"We were looking at different things, and we saw there were these drums that had been refilled," Winmill said. "It was quite obvious they had been refilled because they had an original (branded) sticker on them, and there was another label slapped on there with a more recent date. So we asked the fuel supervisor (at the plant) what they were using for oil. He said they buy (the branded oil) from their distributor. I asked him if he knew the drums were being refilled. 'Absolutely not,' he said, 'we get fresh oil.'"

Winmill talked to his supplier and found out the seals on drums that come directly from the oil company are supposed to be white, while the ones at the power plant looked like they were galvanized.

"We were quite sure they were not drums direct from (the oil company). We told them, 'Look, you have no idea what is actually in those drums,'" he said.

Consumer Fraud
As much as we don’t like to consider it, some operators may be carrying on fraudulent activities themselves. We had an industry insider contact us about one of these cases.

A former employee of a major oil company told NOLN that a Midwest fast lube chain was using fraudulent practices, promoting a major oil that was not always in their tanks and, in turn, not always being installed in customers' vehicles.

"My job as a field territory manager was to protect my employer's investment (the contract with the fast lube chain), including agreements that required percentages of usage and volume, and to monitor whether those were being adhered to," the source said. "This chain would buy whatever they could get, from other major oils to local private-label products."

Consumer fraud rears its ugly head here because these stores were claimed to sell a major brand of oil, with this oil even being prominently displayed on their signage, but not always providing that brand of bulk oil to customers.

"I've made somewhat regular phone calls or visits to their stores since I left just to keep tabs on what they use," the source said. "It's interesting the comments that employees of their stores will make when you inquire about what their oil is. They'll call it everything from (brand A) to (brand Z). Who knows what it is on a day-to-day basis? I see different oil distributors' and vendors' trucks backed up to their doors from time to time. There's never any consistency. I have to believe this has gone on for years. A customer's assumption is they are going to get the featured brand. If they don't inquire about the brand and they drive out after they've paid the bill, I'm confident a vast majority of them assume what they've gotten is (the major oil brand touted on their signage) when it really might not be."

Unlicensed Products
In addition to misrepresenting the type of lubricant brand that's being delivered or sold, some lubricant jobbers — and even a few less-than-honest lube shops — sometimes delve into the gray area of selling unlicensed products.

"What I've seen in the marketplace is that, especially as times get harder and oil prices go up, a lot of lube shops purchase oil as cheap as they can get it," said Scotti Lee, Ph.D., operator of Oil Change Express in New Castle, Del-
aware. "There was one operator in Florida, when everybody was paying $8 and $9 a gallon for oil, he was buying it for about $4 a gallon. It was non-spec oil. The distributor was selling oil that just didn't meet any specifications at all. The lube operator didn't care; he had insurance. As long as a car's engine is running it becomes very hard for someone to tell you (as an operator) that you put the wrong oil in the car. A number of things can go wrong with an engine. Obviously, the operator probably would have pointed to all those factors before blaming the unlicensed oil."

Lee has tested samples of oil from across the United States as part of his work as a technical advisor to the Automotive Oil Change Association, and he doesn't believe the selling of unlicensed product is an isolated incident.

"I personally went out and acquired samples of oil at my own expense," Lee said. "From one company that has blenders all across the United States you might get a batch that met the very minimum requirements of what was called for, while some of the batches had large gaps in the spec requirements. That's the price you pay for buying oil on the cheap."

**Cutting Corners**

Lube operators need to stay alert because oil distributors may be trying to make an extra buck as well. When a delivery truck unloads oil into your tanks, is it the proper brand? Is it the correct viscosity? If it were not, would you really ever find out?

"Let's face it, when a truck backs up to our shops, unless we know the distributor has a good reputation, you don't know what you're getting down that hose," Lee said.

And what's coming down that hose is of much importance to operators. Luckily, Glenn has some insight on this subject.

"Here's the challenge," Glenn said. "Let's say I'm a fast lube. I buy my favorite major brand oil and that's the only thing I ever buy. It's been in my tanks all the time. But my distributor slips in a load of something else from time to time. Then, the next load received was the correct oil, but my tank wasn't totally empty."

Is there a test you can do to tell what is really in your tank?
"It depends when you test the oil, and what you test for," Glenn said. "It'd be a challenge — an expensive challenge — to prove that what was in my tank wasn't 100 percent my favorite major brand oil. As the percentage left in the tank gets lower, the challenge gets bigger."

For the most part, the chemical makeup of modern motor oil is the same; however, there are a few companies out there that can tell if the oil is theirs.

"I think one or two majors use chemical markers," Glenn said. "There are special markers they can use to detect if it is their oil, but for the most part companies in the lubricants business don't use them."

Some oil manufacturers may be looking to produce cheaper motor oil, and Glenn explained some places they could cut corners.

"The most likely place for a blender or distributor to cut corners is in the area of volatility, which is burn-off that occurs when oil gets hot, causing high oil consumption and emissions."

"They might take a chance on the volatility because it's a relatively expensive test, and it's unlikely anyone will look at it," Glenn said. "Moreover, if there's a problem with volatility, it is more an issue of a compromise of fuel economy, which is so small that a consumer would likely never see it. You might see it in a test laboratory, but you're not going to see it as a consumer. If I don't put any additives in my oil, there is a noticeable problem. But with some of these other issues, such as volatility, they're more related to meeting EPA specifications."

Additives signatures can potentially be forged, as handwriting can be, and some inexpensive tests can decipher the basics of the signature. But beyond that, it's hard to tell.

"Without the use of expensive testing, depending upon how good you are at replicating the signature of that oil it could be challenging to say it is or isn't a certain oil unless a marker was used," Glenn said.

A manufacturer probably isn't going to cut corners on viscosity, however, because viscosity variations can easily be detected with an inexpensive test, Glenn said.

**Integrity**

The issues of fraud and misrepresentation pretty much come down to integrity. Is the oil manufacturer or blender creating a lubricant product that meets the specifications it claims to? Is the lubricant distributor or jobber delivering the product the fast lube is actually paying for? And is the fast lube operator filling customers' vehicles with the name-brand lubricant they believe they're buying?

"As much as we might want to deny that there are some bad apples out there, the quick lube industry has to be careful and be cognizant of the fact that there are some who are going to cheat and cut corners," Glenn said. "And they can give the industry a bad name. It only takes one Geraldo Rivera to go into a fast lube with his hidden camera and put something on national TV that scares everybody. I'm not suggesting that's going to happen, but it has happened in the past (in other industries)."

Glenn said in today's tight economy, it can be very tempting — for both jobbers and lube operators — to buy the lowest-priced product or stretch the product in their tanks by mixing in a lower quality lubricant.

"I would say just be careful that you get what you pay for," he said. "If it's too good to be true, maybe it's not true. So protect yourself."

At the retail level, it's up to each individual operator to decide whether or not they're going to genuinely provide the products their customers believe they are purchasing, or cut corners. Sure, you might make an extra buck or two, but is it worth the potential legal liability — people have gone to prison for consumer fraud, after all — and, worse, giving the entire industry a black eye that could affect the fortunes of the tens of thousands of men and women who are making an honest living in the industry? Here's hoping everyone who reads this has the integrity to choose the honest path.
Oil's Well?
Ensuring the Oil You Pay For Is the Oil You Get

by Garrett McKinnon and Tammy Williams
NOLN Staff Writers
garrett.mckinnon@noln.net
tammy.williams@noln.net

Editor's Note: Last month, in the first of a two-part series, we discussed the issue of bulk oil fraud and identified the problem on several levels: Bulk oil distributors misrepresenting a product as "branded" when it is not; distributors "co-mingling" different grades or weights of bulk motor oil; or distributors selling an unlicensed motor oil and representing it as licensed. We also noted that these same issues occasionally occur at the retail level, with some lube facilities using the same or similar tactics with their customers. This month, we look at the steps the industry has taken to ensure the integrity of bulk motor oil.

You can't see it. That's the problem in a nutshell. Bulk motor oil goes from blending plant to bulk storage tank to tanker truck to a somewhat smaller bulk storage tank to a delivery truck to a still smaller bulk storage tank, then through a fast lube's hoses/reels and into the crankcase of a customer's vehicle. And in all that time, no one ever lays eyes on the product.

And even if you could lay eyes on it, would you know what to look for? How many people can, just by looking at a beaker of motor oil, say, "Yep, that's XYZ Brand's 5W-20"?

Looking Out For You
Fortunately, many groups with connections to the bulk motor oil distribution industry have taken steps to ensure that the bulk oil you have in your tanks is exactly what you paid for. One such group is the American Petroleum Institute (API), which is also responsible for licensing motor oil to ensure it meets minimum protective requirements.

"We've been monitoring bulk products since 1999," said Kevin Ferrick, manager of Engine Oil Certification at API.

According to Ferrick, API collects approximately 200 samples of bulk oil each year from facilities that are dispensing licensed oil. Agents who collect samples are required to ask the facility what oil they are dispensing, then they purchase a small sample and test it. API only collects and tests products that claim to be licensed.

"Our goal is to monitor API-licensed companies and make sure the oil meets API standards," Ferrick said.

From the results of its testing, Ferrick said that while API finds some problems with bulk products, the rate of noncompliance is not significantly higher than is found with bottled motor oil. Most of the time, product that is tested does meet API requirements.

"There's been a shift from packaged goods to bulk product in the marketplace, and our concern is to protect consumers and installers, making sure each group gets what they expect from their bulk motor oil," Ferrick said.

New this year, API is pulling off two samples, one of which undergoes a "quick test." The results of this test are usually known within a week, whereas the full sample testing, a traditional "blind" scientific method, can take several weeks to perform. The quick test allows API to evaluate bulk oil samples very quickly and notify installers and blenders of any problems discovered.

In instances where a particular sample is tested and found not to meet API minimum standards, the group will contact the licensee responsible for blending the formula and ask for a response. Ferrick said API would like to see an oil blender offer an explanation for the failure and a plan for remediating the problem.

"We work with the licensee, but we expect a response," Ferrick said. "If no progress is made, we might have to
the distributor only mixes API-licensed products together, however, the non-branded bulk oil will be fine. However, as previously mentioned a distributor who changes suppliers frequently will make it difficult for an operator to track down any problems.

Ackley cautioned that distributors and operators alike should never co-mingle different grades/weights of oil, however, as doing so can cause serious performance issues in the oil.

"Customers have a right to know what you’re putting in their cars," she said. "At our shops we live by the motto that we won’t put anything in our customers’ cars that we wouldn’t put in our own."

Like Ferrick, Ackley said if an operator has suspicions about bulk motor oil, they should have the oil tested, a process that can cost as little as $9 per sample. "If you ever believe that a product you’ve received isn’t what you paid for, have it tested," she said.

A Branded Crackdown
Perhaps no group has more at stake when it comes to bulk motor oil integrity than the oil manufacturers/marketers themselves. After all, it’s usually their name on the hose reel.

One such company is taking definitive action against installers who might be misrepresenting the products they sell to customers.

"Pennzoil-Quaker State and Shell Oil Company have been vigorously taking action against unethical installers who are violating our trademarks and the trust of consumers," said Luis Guimarães, vice president of Marketing for Shell Oil.

Guimarães said the company is stepping up enforcement of its brand protection on several levels this year.

"We are enlisting our national sales force and independent distributors to help identify installers who advertise our brands but do not install them," he said. "We will continue to escalate legal actions against violators. These practices are illegal at the federal and state levels, and our company has already filed and successfully concluded several such lawsuits."

According to Guimarães, Shell maintains a strict Distributor Product Quality Assurance Program that ensures installers that purchase Pennzoil, Quaker State or Shell motor oils from an authorized distributor can trust that they are receiving genuine product.

"We are taking aggressive action because our loyal customers are being forced to compete with installers pouring counterfeit oils," he said. "We devote considerable resources to research and development in order to provide consumers with quality motor oils, and consumers count upon our products to protect their vehicles. It is therefore very important that we protect the trust that consumers place in our brands."

Guimarães said he hopes that other companies will move to protect their brands, as well, in a "concerted effort to end a practice that can tempt the unscrupulous in these difficult economic times."

Monitor and Test
Even though oil marketers and license groups like API conduct some limited testing, the testing is not widespread enough to completely eradicate the problem of bulk oil fraud. In the end, operators themselves have to be vigilant about the bulk oil product coming into their facilities.

"In the states of North and South Carolina, the government monitors bulk oil. They take samples and test," said Tom Glenn, president of Petroleum Trends International, a market research and consulting firm. "In most other states, unless there is a complaint, there is no routine testing."

Which is why, Glenn said, operators should take steps to ensure the integrity of the products they’re selling.

"If you’re concerned, the first thing you should do is ask for documentation that specifically states the oil spec, such as API SM/ILSAC GF-4. Second, if I were running a quick lube, when they filled my tank I would take and retain a sample. Just collect a two-ounce sample of whatever they put in my tank. I would go through at least reasonable protocol to make sure the driver was aware I was sampling. If the driver protests and asks why you’re taking samples, or if the distribu-
take more drastic measures like cancelling the license or even conducting a product recall."

API can, to a limited extent, test for brand identity. Companies that apply for a license with API are required to supply a sample of the formula. This formula allows API to "fingerprint" a collected sample. However, problems arise whenever two brands of oil are co-mingled.

"Co-mingling of two licensed products — same viscosity grade and API performance level — should not cause a problem in terms of performance, but it could make it more difficult to fingerprint the sample," Ferrick said. "In order to fingerprint a sample, we have to at least know whose product it is supposed to be."

One thing API testing can determine, however, is whether different grades or weights of oil have been co-mingled.

"You could have issues whenever you mix, say, 5W-20 and 10W-30 together," Ferrick said. A co-mingled oil sample would likely show up in some of the tests API performs, like those used to measure an oil's cold temperature properties. Installers should make sure viscosity grades and performance levels are not mixed.

Ferrick had a few recommendations for lube operators with concerns about their bulk motor oil.

"You need to demand proof that the product is licensed. Ask for documentation proving that what you're getting is what you asked for," he said. "When you ask for proof of licensing, it puts the onus on the oil marketers and distributors. I'd do that every single time."

If an operator does suspect that his distributor is "fudging" things a bit, Ferrick said there are several options. The first would be to have a sample of the oil tested at an independent laboratory. These are low-cost procedures that can determine the oil's basic properties and are usually good indicators if something is amiss. Unfortunately, a full test of the oil will likely require in-depth bench testing and maybe even engine testing, procedures that are time-consuming and more expensive.

However, Ferrick said operators can contact API if they believe an initial test indicated problems. He also recommended contacting the oil company in charge of blending the product.

"Ultimately it is up to the oil marketers to remedy any situation at the distributor level," he said. "API-licensed oil marketer are responsible for the quality of their products."

A Unique Point of View

Sue Ackley is in a unique position. As owner of several Oil Change Plus facilities in the St. Louis, Missouri, area, Ackley is a longtime lube operator and past-president of the Automotive Oil Change Association. However, Ackley also works as a sales representative for Energy Petroleum Company, a multi-brand lubricants distributor in St. Louis. This gives her the unique position of being both a buyer and seller of bulk motor oil.

"The biggest key in protecting yourself from bulk motor oil fraud is to make sure the people you're doing business with are reputable," she said. "Ask for references. Talk with their other customers to find out how the distributor does business. Ask if the distributor switches suppliers a lot, because if you're using a non-branded motor oil and you run into problems, it will be tough to pin down which oil caused the problems. As a distributor, we try to stick with the same suppliers for at least a year at a time."

Ackley said branded bulk oil is usually checked by the manufacturer/blender to ensure its integrity, and as such is rarely co-mingled.

"The blenders come around from time to time and check the brand," she said. "All the majors put various trace elements in their oil, and they can tell from a small sampling whether that oil is what it is supposed to be. But the only way they can tell a difference is from the trace elements. Most branded oil looks the same."

On the non-branded side, co-mingling is a bigger problem. Distributors who change suppliers will likely still have some older product in their bulk tanks, as Ackley said distributors rarely let their bulk tanks run completely empty. As long as
or even if you don’t and just want to monitor the bulk oil — take samples and store them or have them tested.

For more information about independent laboratories that conduct ASTM tests on motor oil (D5800 NOACK volatility, D5293 cold crank and D2886 total base number are some of the more common tests), visit: www.astm.org

---

Independent Labs Specializing in Oil Testing:

ANA Laboratories
www.analaboratories.com

Analytical Testing Services
www.wetestit.com

Bently Tribology Services
www.bentlytribology.com

Galbraith Laboratories
www.galbraith.com

Petro-Lubricant Testing Laboratories
www.pltlab.com

Phoenix Chemical Laboratory
www.xnet.com/~pclincl
Identifying Performance of Engine Oil Dispensed in Bulk

Central Weights and Measures Association
May 2010

Kevin Ferrick

Need for Changes to NIST 130

- API has sampled licensed oils sold in bulk since 1999
  - Bulk products showed higher rate of noncompliance over 4-year average
- Testing by companies showed similar results
- Over a decade of sampling products, several items make sampling of bulk oils difficult
  - Identification of bulk oils as API licensed
  - Identification of brand
  - Inconsistency in methods used to safeguard and identify chain of custody
Need for Changes to NIST 130

- API has considered in the past implementing some type of chain-of-custody program to address bulk oils
- Shell introduced Motor Oil Matters in 2009
  - Motor oil quality and integrity program
  - Recognized need to inform consumers of importance of using quality oils meeting API performance requirements
  - Addressed trade deception
  - Recognized need to take Motor Oil Matters industry-wide
  - Last week, API announced intention to assume leadership of Motor Oil Matters
- Chain-of-custody program now being considered by API
- NIST 130 needs to be changed to protect consumers

Current NIST 130 Language


3.13.1.1. Viscosity. — The label on each container of vehicle motor oil shall contain the viscosity grade classification preceded by the letters “SAE” in accordance with the SAE International’s latest version of SAE J300.

3.13.1.2. Intended Use. — The label on each container of vehicle motor oil shall contain a statement of its intended use in accordance with the latest version of SAE J300.

3.13.1.3. Engine Service Category. — The label on each container of vehicle motor oil shall contain the engine service category, or categories, met in letters not less than 3.18 mm (1/8 in) in height, as defined by the latest version of SAE J183 or API Publication 1509, “Engine Oil Licensing and Certification System.”

3.13.1.3.1. Exception for Quantities of One Gallon (3.785 L) or Less. — A container of engine vehicle motor oil with a volume of 1 gal (3.785 L) or less that does not meet an active service category, as defined by the latest version of SAE J183, shall bear a plainly visible cautionary statement in compliance with SAE J183, Appendix A, for obsolete API oil categories.
California Regulations

• California has extensive regulations covering distribution and sale of engine oil
  - Engine oils must meet SAE J300 and J183
  - Containers must show SAE/API service classification
  - Labeling requirement for engine oil containers, receptacles, pumps, dispensers and inlet pipes
  - Label required to provide product name, brand, trademark, or trade name and viscosity (service classification not included in this list)
  - Containers 1 gallon or less must include statement indicating suitability for auto model years or condition of service

North Carolina Regulations

• Brand name must be displayed unless labeled “Lubricating Oil No Brand”
• Misrepresentation of brands for sale prohibited (labels or signage must reflect lubricating oil available for sale)
• Mixing different brands for sale under specific brand name prohibited
• Testing of lubricating oil by state permitted
• Retailers required to keep copies of invoices or delivery tickets for 1 year (no specific requirement for SAE viscosity grade or API performance level)
• Transporters of lubricating oil required to have in possession invoice or bill of lading
Incorporating Bulk into NIST 130

- Require API performance level and SAE viscosity grade on containers, receptacles, pumps, dispensers, and storage tanks
- Also require API performance level and SAE viscosity grade on invoice from sale of motor oil dispensed from receptacles, pumps, dispensers, and storage tanks
- Exclude delivery vehicles from requirement (tank trucks and rail cars) as long as bill of lading or other documentation provides API performance level and SAE viscosity grade

Other Possible Changes

- Cite J183 in 3.13.1.2, not J300
  - J300 = viscosity grade
  - J183 = performance level
- Require identification of obsolete performance levels (for example, API SA, SB, SC) on containers, receptacles, pumps, dispensers, and storage tanks (end 3.13.1.3.1 exception)
- Include J183 warnings on obsolete products
  - "This oil is rated API SA. It contains no additives. It is not suitable for most gasoline-powered automotive engines built after 1930. Use in modern engines might cause unsatisfactory engine performance or equipment harm"
  - Similar language for other obsolete API performance levels
Incorporating Changes into NIST 130

- API Lubricants Group considering suitable wording for NIST 130
- Possible changes to recognize motor oils sold in bulk (in red)
  - 3.13.1.3. Engine Service Category. – The label on a vehicle motor oil container, receptacle, pump, dispenser, or storage tank and the invoice from the sale of vehicle motor oil dispensed from a receptacle, pump, dispenser, or storage tank shall contain the engine service category or categories, in letters not less than 3.18 mm (1/8 in) in height, as defined by the latest version of SAE J183 or API Publication 1509, “Engine Oil Licensing and Certification System.”
  - 3.13.1.3.1. Inactive or Obsolete Service Categories. – The label on a vehicle motor oil container, receptacle, pump, dispenser, or storage tank and the invoice from the sale of vehicle motor oil dispensed from a receptacle, pump, dispenser, or storage tank shall bear a plainly visible cautionary statement in compliance with SAE J183, Appendix A, whenever the vehicle motor oil in the container or in bulk does not meet an active API service category as defined by the latest version of SAE J183. [removed 1-gallon exception]
  - 3.13.1.3.2. Tank Trucks or Rail Cars – Tank trucks or rail cars that are used to deliver vehicle motor oil are not required to display the SAE viscosity grade and service category or categories as long as the bill of lading or other documentation provides that information.

Thank You

Contact information
Kevin Ferrick
Manager, Engine Oil Licensing and Certification System
Diesel Exhaust Fluid Certification Program
1220 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
USA
ferrick@api.org
1-202-682-8233
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November 30, 2010

John Gaccione
Chairman, NCWM Laws & Regulations Committee
c/o Westchester County Dep’t of Weights & Measures
112 East Post Road, 4th floor
White Plains, NY 10601

Re: Seed Count Rule for Agricultural Seeds

Dear Mr. Gaccione:

The American Seed Trade Association (ASTA) is writing to express opposition to the pending petition from the Western Weights and Measures Association to rescind the seed count rule for agricultural seeds in Handbook 133 that was adopted by the National Conference of Weights and Measures (NCWM) in July 2010. We are deeply concerned by this proposal because of the uncertainty it will cause for our members and the inconsistency it will create for the regulatory community. The seed count rule adopted by NCWM is a validated, consistent, and practical means of verifying labeled seed counts for agricultural seeds. It would be detrimental to regulators and farmers if the rescission petition moves forward.

Benefits of the Seed Count Rule

At its annual meeting in 2010, the Conference adopted a rule regarding agricultural seed count that harmonized Handbook 133 with the provisions for verifying seed count that are used throughout the seed regulatory community. This action gave regulators an important tool to ensure the accuracy of labeled net quantity of contents statements on large bags of agricultural seed, which increasingly include a statement of count. This was particularly important for regulators in agricultural states because, prior to adoption of the seed count rule, there was no effective means for weights and measures regulators to verify labeled statements of count.

The adopted procedures incorporated the seed count rules that the Association for Official Seed Analysts (AOSA) developed as a result of many years of careful study and consideration. AOSA is a professional organization of seed laboratories whose members include state and federal seed regulators. Because AOSA’s rules are used by seed regulators when they verify labeled statements of count, NCWM’s action created uniformity in the laws for determining seed count for corn, soybean, field bean and wheat seed. Without this uniformity, certain states would apply different procedures and MAVs depending on whether the seed regulators or weights and measures inspectors were verifying the accuracy of seed count labeling.
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The adopted procedures provide benefits to weights and measures regulators, farmers, and seed companies. Weights and measures regulators now have an effective and practical method to verify labeled seed count. This increases their ability to regulate labeling of these important commodities effectively. Farmers now have assurance that the seed they buy is accurately labeled. Seed companies now have assurance that a uniform testing procedure is in place for both weights and measures and seed regulators.

**Concerns with the Recission Proposal**

The pending proposal would remove the seed count rule from Handbook 133 and establish a working group to consider next steps. Specifically, the working group would be directed to undertake “necessary studies, laboratory testing, field trial, and other appropriate measures to establish procedures for the verification of the accuracy and repeatability of ‘mechanical seed counter’ devices and/or to develop seed count procedures that are practical and reliable for field enforcement activities by Weights and Measures officials.” These steps are unnecessary and would be duplicative of the validation efforts already conducted by AOSA when the seed count rule was initially promulgated. Indeed, it is our understanding that the Conference originally rejected proposals to address this issue more than a decade ago due to the absence of the validating research that was subsequently undertaken by AOSA.

AOSA’s method verifies seed count with a mechanical seed counter. This method is widely used to verify seed count and was validated by the seed regulatory community. The rule is practical, straight forward, reliable, replicable, and cost effective. AOSA plans to submit to the Conference a white paper regarding the validation of its method. It is important to recognize that the procedure does not require any specialized knowledge or expertise to apply. Although its wording may sound technical, implementation is not. For example, the “purity analysis” in the rule simply requires separation of seeds from any debris such as sticks, rocks, and bugs that may be in the sample.

Although there may be concerns about the cost of mechanical seed counters, this does not justify rescission of the rule. There is no mandate to buy such equipment and, for states that do not expect to conduct inspections of seed count (i.e., non-agricultural states), it would not be worthwhile to do so. For states that do expect to do such inspections, purchase of seed counters will be a resource allocation issue that must be determined on a jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction basis. It is important to note, however, that most seed regulators and state seed laboratories already have mechanical seed counters that could be shared with their weights and measures colleagues. Furthermore, the Conference voted to adopt the seed count rule after discussing and debating cost concerns.

If the Conference adopts this proposal, it will rescind an efficient, practical, and effective means that weights and measures regulators have to verify seed count. Because the rule currently in place is validated and effective, efforts from a working group would be unnecessarily duplicative of AOSA’s previous work.
Implementation Assistance

Many of the concerns in the rescission proposal are appropriately addressed through training programs, as all new procedures inherently require training to ensure effective implementation. AOSA has offered to work with the Conference or interested states to disseminate training materials and also would welcome the opportunity to hold training webinars for interested states or regulators. Although no specialized knowledge is required to implement the seed count rule, such training programs will ensure that regulators have first hand knowledge of how the procedure works. Training, not amendments to Handbook 133, provide the traditional and appropriate vehicle for addressing implementation concerns.

In conclusion, ASTA opposes the petition to rescind the seed count rule because it would be a step backwards for the Conference. Keeping the rule in place is in the best interest of weights and measures regulators, seed regulators, farmers, and seed manufacturers.

If we may be of assistance or you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Andrew W. LaVigne
President & CEO
American Seed Trade Association

cc: Lisa Warfield, NIST
    Don Onwiler, NCWM
AOSA Rules for Testing

(1) Coated or encrusted seed: seed that has been covered by a layer(s) of materials that obscure the original shape and size of the seed resulting in a substantial weight increase. The addition of biologicals, pesticides, identifying colorants or dyes, and/or other active ingredients including polymers can be included in this process. Refer to sections 3.8 and 6.8 I.

(2) Film-coated seed: film-coated seed retains the shape and the general size of the raw seed with a minimal weight gain. The film coating may contain polymers, pesticides, biologicals, identifying colorants or dyes, and other additives. The coating should result in a more or less continuous covering that eliminates or minimizes product dust-off.

(3) Inoculated seed: seed that has received a coating of a commercial preparation containing a microbial product, e.g. *Rhizobium* sp.

(4) Pelleted seed: seed that has been covered by a layer(s) of materials that obscure the original shape and size of the seed resulting in a substantial weight increase and improved plantability or singulation. The addition of biologicals, pesticides, identifying colorants or dyes, and/or other active ingredients including polymers can be included in this process. Refer to sections 3.8 and 6.81.

(5) Raw seed: seed that is free of any applied materials.

(6) Treated seed: seed with a minimal covering of various materials whose primary objective is to reduce or control certain disease organisms, insects or other pests attacking the seed or seedlings growing therefrom and that contains identifying colorants or dyes.

22 Obtaining the working sample

The working sample on which the actual analysis is performed shall be taken from the submitted sample in such a manner that it will be representative. A suitable type of mechanical divider (conical, centrifugal, riffle, etc.) should be used. To avoid damage when dividing large-seeded crop kinds such as beans, peas, etc., prevent the seeds from falling great distances onto hard surfaces. When dividing coated, encrusted, and pelleted seeds, mechanical dividers may be used only if the distance of the fall does not damage the applied materials.

For seed moisture determination, sub-samples must be drawn quickly to avoid exposing the seeds to the ambient air. Mechanical dividers are not appropriate for this purpose. Refer to section 2.2 b (3).

a. Mechanical dividers. — This method is suitable for most kinds of seeds. The apparatus divides a sample into two approximately equal parts. The submitted sample is mixed by passing it through the divider, recombining the two parts and passing the whole sample through a second time and similarly a third time. After
mixing, the sample shall be reduced by passing the seed through the divider repeatedly, removing half the sample on each occasion. This process of successive halving is continued until a working sample of approximately, but not less than the minimum weight(s) stated in Table 2A is obtained.

Use of compressed air or a vacuum is highly recommended for cleaning mechanical dividers.

(1) Centrifugal divider (Garnet type): This divider is suitable for all kinds of seed though it is not recommended for oilseeds (such as rapeseed, canola, mustards, flax) and kinds susceptible to damage (such as peas, soybeans, etc) and the extremely chaffy types.

The divider makes use of centrifugal force to mix and scatter seeds over the dividing surface. The seed flows downward through a hopper onto a shallow rubber cup or spinner. Upon rotation of the spinner by an electric motor the seeds are thrown out by centrifugal force and fall downward. The circle or area where the seeds fall is equally divided into two parts by a stationary baffle so that approximately half the seeds fall in one spout and half in the other spout. The centrifugal divider tends to give variable results when not carefully operated, and therefore the following procedure must be used:

(a) Preparation of the apparatus:
   (i) Level the divider using the adjustable feet.
   (ii) Check the divider and four containers for cleanliness. Note that seeds can be trapped under the spinner and become a source of contamination.

(b) Sample mixing:
   (i) Place a container under each spout.
   (ii) Feed the whole sample into the hopper; when filling the hopper, the seed must always be poured centrally.
   (iii) After the sample has been poured into the hopper, the spinner is operated and the seed passes into the two containers. Turn off spinner.
   (iv) Full containers are replaced by empty containers. The contents of the two full containers are fed centrally into the hopper together, the seed being allowed to blend as it flows in. The spinner is operated.
   (v) The sample mixing procedure is repeated at least once more.

(c) Sample reduction:
   (i) Full containers are replaced by empty containers. The contents of one full container are set aside and the contents of the other container are fed into the hopper. The spinner is operated.
   (ii) The successive halving process is continued until the working sample(s) of not less than the minimum weight(s) required stated in Table 2A are obtained.
(iii) Ensure that the divider and containers are clean after each mixing operation.

(2) Soil/Riffle divider: This divider is suitable for most kinds of seed. For round-seeded kinds such as Brassica species, the collection containers should be covered to prevent the seeds from bouncing out.

This divider consists of a hopper with attached channels or ducts, a frame to hold the hopper, four collection containers and a pouring pan. Ducts or channels lead from the hopper to the collection containers, alternate ones leading to opposite sides. Riffle dividers are available in different sizes for different sizes of seed. The width and number of channels and spaces are important. The minimum width of the channels must be at least two times the largest diameter of the seed or any possible contaminants being mixed.

This apparatus, similar to the centrifugal divider, divides the sample into approximately equal parts.

(a) Preparation of the apparatus:
   (i) Place the riffle divider on a firm, level clean surface. Ensure the divider is level.
   (ii) Ensure that the divider and the four sample collection containers are clean. Check all channels, joints and seams of the divider and collection containers to ensure there are no seeds or other plant matter present before each use.
   (iii) Two clean empty collection containers shall be placed under the channels to receive the mixed seed.

(b) Sample mixing:
   (i) Pour the whole sample into the divider by running the seed backwards and forwards along the edge of the divider so that all the channels and spaces of the divider receive an equal amount of seed.
   (ii) The two full containers shall be replaced with two clean empty containers.
   (iii) The contents of one full container shall be poured into the divider by holding the long edge of the pan against the long edge of the riffle hopper and then rotating the bottom up so that the seeds pour across all channels at the same time, followed by the other full container using the same procedure.
   (iv) This process of mixing the entire submitted sample shall be repeated at least one more time before successive halving begins.

(c) Sample reduction:
   (i) The contents of one full container are set aside. Empty containers are placed under each channel, and the contents of the other container is poured into the hopper by holding the long edge of the pan against the
(a) Preparation of the apparatus: Ensure that two trays, spatula and spoon are clean.

(b) Sample mixing:
   (i) The sample is poured uniformly over a tray with a side to side swinging motion.
   (ii) The receiving pan should be kept level.
   (iii) This mixing procedure is repeated a minimum of three times.

(c) Sample reduction:
   (i) A tray, a spatula and a spoon with a straight edge are required. After the preliminary mixing, pour the seed evenly over the tray with a side-to-side swing, alternately in one direction and at right angles to it. The depth of the seed in the pan shall not exceed the height of the vertical sides of the spoon. Do not shake the tray thereafter.
   (ii) With the spoon in one hand, the spatula in the other, and using both, remove small portions of seed from not less than five random places on the tray.
   (iii) Sufficient portions of seed are taken until the working sample(s) of not less than the minimum weight(s) required stated in Table 2A are obtained.

(2) Hand-halving method: This method can be used when a proper mechanical divider is not available.

   Procedure:
   (a) Seed is poured evenly onto a clean smooth surface.
   (b) The sample shall be thoroughly mixed using a flat-edged spatula and placed into a pile.
   (c) The pile shall be divided in half using a straight edge or ruler.
   (d) Each half portion is divided in half.
   (e) Each of the portions is divided into half again. There are now eight portions.
   (f) Arrange the eight portions into two rows of four.
   (g) Alternate portions should be combined to obtain two halves e.g. combine the first portion from row I with the second portion from row 2. Remove the remaining four portions.
   (h) Repeat steps (a) to (g) until sufficient portions of seed are taken to constitute a working sample(s) of not less than the minimum weight(s) required stated in Table 2A are obtained.

(3) For seed moisture determination, mix the submitted sample by tumbling or shaking the submitted sample bag, then open bag and use a spoon to remove portions from several random locations within the bag to obtain the appropriate working weight for one replicate. Place seeds in a moisture testing container. Repeat the procedure of mixing and sampling for the second replicate. Do not expose the sample to ambient air for more than one minute.
SECTION 12: MECHANICAL SEED COUNT

The following method shall be employed when using a mechanical seed counter to determine the number of seeds contained in a sample of soybean (*Glycine max*), corn (*Zea mays*), wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) and field bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris*).

12.1 Samples.

Samples for testing shall be of at least 500 grams for soybean, corn and field beans and 100 grams for wheat and received in moisture proof containers. Samples shall be retained in moisture proof containers until the weight of the sample prepared for purity analysis is recorded.

12.2 Seed counter calibration.

The seed counter shall be calibrated daily prior to use.

(a) Prepare a calibration sample by counting 10 sets of 100 seeds. Visually examine each set to insure that it contains whole seeds. Combine the 10 sets of seeds to make a 1,000 seed calibration sample. The seeds of the calibration sample should be approximately the same size and shape as the seeds in a sample being tested. If the seeds in a sample being tested are noticeably different in size or shape from those in the calibration sample, prepare another calibration sample with seeds of the appropriate size and shape. Periodically re-examine the calibration samples to insure that no seeds have been lost or added.

(b) Carefully pour the 1,000 seed calibration sample into the seed counter. Start the counter and run it until all the seeds have been counted. The seeds should not touch as they run through the counter. Record the number of seeds as displayed on the counter read out. The seed count should not vary more than ±2 seeds from 1,000. If the count is not within this tolerance, clean the mirrors, adjust the feed rate and/or reading sensitivity. Rerun the calibration sample until it is within the ±2 seed tolerance. If the seed counter continues to fail the calibration procedure and the calibration sample has been checked to ensure that it contains 1,000 seeds, do not use the counter until it has been repaired.

12.3 Sample preparation.

Immediately after opening the moisture proof container, mix and divide the submitted sample, in accordance with section 2.2, to obtain a sample for purity analysis and record the weight of this sample in grams to the appropriate number of decimal places (refer to section 2.3 a). Conduct the purity analysis to obtain pure seed for the seed count test.
RULES FOR TESTING SEEDS

12.4 Conducting the test.

After the seed counter has been calibrated, test the pure seed portion from the purity test and record the number of seeds in the sample.

12.5 Calculation of results.

Calculate the number of seeds per pound to the nearest whole number using the following formula:

\[
\text{Number of seeds per pound} = \frac{453.6 \text{ g/lb} \times \text{no. of seeds counted in d.}}{\text{weight (g) of sample analyzed for purity}}
\]

12.6 Tolerances for results from different laboratories.

Multiply the labeled seed count or first seed count test result by four percent for soybean samples, two percent for corn (round, flat or plateless) samples, five percent for field bean samples and three percent for wheat samples. Express the tolerance (the number of seeds) to the nearest whole number. Consider the results of two tests in tolerance if the difference, expressed as the number of seeds, is equal to or less than the tolerance.

Example:

Kind of seed: Corn
Label claim (1st test): 2275 seed/lb.

Lab Test (2nd test): Purity working weight = 500.3 g
Seed count of pure seed = 2479 seeds

\[
\text{Number of seeds per pound} = \frac{453.6 \text{ g/lb} \times 2479 \text{ seeds}}{500.3 \text{ g}} = 2247.6 \text{ seeds/lb}
\]

Rounded to the nearest whole number = 2248 seeds/lb

Calculate tolerance value for corn:

multiply label claim by 2%
2275 seeds/lb x 0.02 = 45.5 seeds/lb; rounded to the nearest whole number = 46 seeds/lb

Determine the difference between label claim and lab test:

2275 seeds/lb — 2248 seeds/lb = 27 seeds/lb

The difference between the lab test (2nd test) and the label claim (1st test) is less than the tolerance (27 < 46); therefore, the two results are in tolerance.
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NIST HANDBOOK 133
New Procedure for Testing Seed Count

A Call for Repeal of
Action Taken at 95th Annual Meeting of
National Conference on Weights & Measures
Re:
Testing Procedures for Seed Count

Presented By
Kurt Floren
Director of Weights & Measures
County of Los Angeles, California

Association of Official Seed Analysts
“Rules for Testing Seeds”

AOSA: Official nationwide association of
seed analysts, formed in 1908 in response
to actions by individual states to develop
seed laws.
Members include state, federal &
university seed labs of U.S. and Canada.
Primary Functions:
• Establish AOSA Rules for Testing Seeds,
  adopted by most states as seed rules
• Contribute to refinement & modification
  of rules and procedures for seed testing
• Ensure procedures are standardized
  between analysts and between labs
• Influence and assist in enforcement
  of appropriate seed legislation at state and
  federal levels

Procedure does NOT start with
simple count of 10 groups of 100

To secure a representative sample, equal
portions shall be taken from evenly
distributed parts...

...a probe or trier... shall be used...
able to remove an equal volume... from
each part of the container...

Each probe, trier, or handful... is considered
a primary sample. Each should be visually
checked for uniformity...

determine the most appropriate tool and
technique. Manual sampling tools should
be able to reach all portions of the
container and have openings at least 2½
times the maximum diameter of... seed
and possible contaminants...

Procedure does NOT start with
simple count of 10 groups of 100

For lots of one to six containers, sample each...
take at least five primary samples.

For lots of more than six containers, Sample five... plus at least 10% of the
number of containers in the lot.
(up to 30 primary samples)

Samples are drawn to form
composite sample.
All of this is required for
Purity Analysis.
Procedure Requires Lab Analysis

After an appropriate number of primary samples are drawn and combined into the composite sample, the entire sample is submitted to the laboratory.

As you will see, the procedure adopted into Hdbk 133 requires Purity Analysis testing by a seed analysis laboratory.

Why be concerned with portions not adopted into Hdbk 133?

This entire handbook shall be considered part of the Rules and its use is required for determination of classification of the kind of seed under consideration and classification of weed and crop seed contaminants or purity testing.

Purity Testing is a requisite part of procedure adopted by NCWM.

Seed Count Testing Procedure References AOSA “Rules” § 2.2

The laboratory analysis for law enforcement, labeling...should determine the following:

1. purity composition
2. rate of noxious-weed seeds
3. percentage germination...

By making reference to Section 2.2 all of Section 2 must be followed to ensure that seed count verification testing is defensible under legal challenge. (i.e., defense in prosecution)

Seed Count Testing Procedure References AOSA “Rules” § 2.2

The working sample...shall be taken from the submitted sample. “Submitted sample” means that submitted to the seed laboratory (recall Section 1.5).

A suitable type of mechanical divider (conical, centrifugal, riffle, etc.) should be used.

Mechanical dividers are costly, sensitive pieces of equipment that Weights & Measures agencies do not possess.
Examples of Mechanical Dividers

Preliminary research cost of Centrifugal Divider:
$2400 - $3000

Centrifugal divider photos from AOSA presentation to IPSA

Riffle Divider: ~ $400 - $700
Boerner Divider: ~ $1500 - $1600

Purity Analysis: Only The Basics

...purity analysis... determine the physical composition of the working sample.
The analysis shall include the identification of the kind... of seed under consideration, and all contaminating species and inert matter.

The purity working sample shall be separated into the following components:
1. kind or cultivar to be considered pure seed
2. other crop seed
3. inert matter, and
4. weed seed

Requires seed identification expertise not possessed by most W&M officials

Purity Analysis: Only The Basics

The analysis shall include the identification of the kind... of seed under consideration, and all contaminating species and inert matter.

The purity working sample shall be separated into the following components:
1. kind or cultivar to be considered pure seed
2. other crop seed
3. inert matter, and
4. weed seed

Requires seed identification expertise not possessed by most W&M officials

Pure Seed Sample: Required for Count Testing

The pure seed shall include all seed units of each kind or each kind and cultivar under consideration...

Identification / determination of a PURE SEED sample is critical to the procedure and to demonstration of compliance with the Hdbk 133 procedure...

Are W&M field officials trained, qualified, certified?

Can’t we just count 1,000 seeds?

The entire handbook shall be considered part of the Rules and its use is required for determination of classification of the kind of seed under consideration and classification of weed and crop seed contaminants for purity testing.

The procedure adopted by NCWM specifically requires calibration of mechanical seed counter using seed from a Pure Seed sample....

Section 12.4: “After the seed counter has been calibrated, test the pure seed portion from the purity test.”
Section 12 of “Rules for Testing Seeds” Directly Adopted in NCWM Action

For Field Bean and Soybean:
- Seed with at least a portion of the seed coat attached
- Broken seed larger than one-half the original size with at least a portion of the seed coat attached
- For Fabaceae (includes Field Bean & Soybean): Cotyledons that are broken apart but held together by the seed coat shall be classified as pure seed. Cotyledons that have separated and are not held together by the seed coat are regarded as inert matter irrespective of whether or not the radicle-plumule axis and/or more than half of the seed coat may be attached.
- Wing, when present, is removed and considered inert matter.
- Chalcid-damaged seeds in Fabaceae that are puffy, soft, or dry and crumbly are considered inert matter.

Weights & Measures officials should have no trouble... Right?

Examples of “Pure Seed” Criteria

For Corn:
- Multiple floret, with or without awn, provided a caryopsis with some degree of endosperm development can be detected (either by slight pressure or by examination over light).
- Caryopsis or piece of broken caryopsis larger than one-half the original size

Special Consideration:
- A fertile floret attached to another fertile floret shall be separated
- Attached glumes and empty florets shall be removed and classified as inert matter.

Again, the average W&M official can do this... Right?

Purity Analysis: Seed Identification

When a purity analysis is conducted, the following shall be reported under Purity Analysis:
1. Weight of purity working sample
2. Percentage of pure seed, other crop seed, inert matter, and weed seed...
3. Scientific name, or common name, or both, of all other crop seed or weed seed found...

Seed Analysts typically work 4-5 years in a seed laboratory to gain expertise to independently conduct seed analyses...

What percentage of Weights & Measures officials are qualified? ANY?
Other Concerns: Repeatability?

Prepare a calibration sample by counting 10 sets of 100 seeds. Combine...to make a 1,000 seed calibration sample.

Calibration procedure mandates no steps to verify repeatability. Out-Of-Tolerance runs could be unlimited.

Results may result in enforcement action: Defensible?

Prepared种子 count should not vary more than ±2 seeds from 1,000.

If not within this tolerance, clean...mirrors, adjust...feed rate and/or reading sensitivity.

Rerun it until it is within the ±2 seed count tolerance.

Mechanical Seed Counter

(PHOTO FROM AOSA PRESENTATION TO IPSA)

Seems one? Own one?

Not subject to transportation on front seat of a pickup truck!

PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE: $8,000

Example of 100-Seed Sampling

(from AOSA presentation to IPSA)

Preparing calibration sample

Does this look like a field activity?

Preparing calibration sample

Use of mechanical seed counter is clearly not a field operation.

Equipment and analysis procedures are laboratory activities.

Other Concerns: Equipment Access? Portability?

Loading and running calibration sample.

(PHOTOS FROM AOSA PRESENTATION TO IPSA)
Call for Repeal of NCWM Adoption

Acknowledgement:

1st: We do need an accurate, reliable, consistent procedure for testing seed count.
   - Seed count is an important factor in farming to manage input costs & to meet needs of modern planting equipment
   - Packers/Manufacturers are increasingly placing supplemental count statements on seed packages due to customer demand
   - A procedure is needed by W&M to regulate labeled count accuracy

2nd: AOSA standards are well developed and are in wide use by seed labs.
   - Procedure was prematurely adopted by NCWM.
     - Procedure provides little assurance of counter accuracy.
     - We have adopted a test procedure that few, if any, can actually perform!

Call for Repeal of NCWM Adoption

But,

New NIST Hdbk 133 sections 4.2 and 4.11
   - Require expertise not held by W&M inspectors
   - Require equipment not suitable for field use
   - Require equipment that is cost restrictive
   - Require steps that, if not precisely followed, subject W&M agencies to legal challenges and, potentially, litigation exposure for taking off-sale action.

Recommendation

WWMA should call on NCWM to:

Recognize that:
   - State & local W&M agencies do not have required equipment
   - State & local W&M agencies do not have required seed analysis expertise (licensing/certification)
   - State & local W&M agencies are highly unlikely to have time (years for certification as seed analysts) or resources ($$) to meet requirements
   - Adopted procedures do not facilitate field tests of seed count
   - Adopted procedures will not result in enhanced enforcement due to all of above.

Recommendation

WWMA should call on NCWM to:

Take the following actions:
   - Rescind action taken to adopt amendments to Hdbk 133 Section 4.2 and to add Section 4.11 et seq
   - Direct NCWM Laws & Regulations (L&R) Committee to establish a working group to conduct appropriate studies, field trials, laboratory testing, and other measures to establish procedures for verification of repeatability of Mechanical Seed Counter devices (at a minimum)
   - Direct NCWM L&R Committee to establish a working group to research, develop, and recommend alternative seed count testing procedures that are practical and reliable for field applications (preferred)
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300  INTRODUCTION

The Specifications and Tolerances (S&T) Committee (Committee) will address the following items at its Interim Meeting. All items are listed below in Table A by Reference Key Number. The headings and subjects apply to National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Handbook 44, “Specifications, Tolerances, and Other Technical Requirements for Weighing and Measuring Devices.” The Appendices to the Agenda are listed in Table A. The acronyms for organizations and technical terms used throughout the agenda are identified in a glossary in Table B. In some cases, background information will be provided for an item. The fact that an item appears on the Agenda does not mean that the item will be presented to the Conference for a vote. The Committee will review its Agenda at the Interim Meeting and may withdraw some items, present some items for information meant for additional study, issue interpretations, or make specific recommendations for change to NIST Handbook 44 which will be presented for a vote at the Annual Meeting.

The “Item(s) Under Consideration” (formerly designated as “Recommendations”) are statements of proposals and are not necessarily those of the Committee. Suggested revisions to the Handbook are shown in bold face print by striking out information to be deleted and underlining information to be added. Requirements that are proposed to be nonretroactive are printed in bold-faced italics.

Note: The policy of NIST is to use metric units of measurement in all of its publications; however, recommendations received by the National Conference on Weights and Measures (NCWM) technical committees and regional weights and measures associations have been printed in this publication as submitted. Therefore, the report may contain references to inch-pound units.
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**Appendix A – Developing Items**

- Part 2.20. Weigh-In-Motion Vehicle Scales for Law Enforcement – Work Group
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCS</td>
<td>Belt-Conveyor Scales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Certificate of Conformance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWMA</td>
<td>Central Weights and Measures Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPO</td>
<td>Examination Procedure Outline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>NTETC Grain Analyzer Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIPSA</td>
<td>Grain Inspection Packers &amp; Stockyards Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 44</td>
<td>NIST Handbook 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 130</td>
<td>NIST Handbook 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMD</td>
<td>Liquid-Measuring Device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPG</td>
<td>Liquefied Petroleum Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>NTETC Measuring Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCWM</td>
<td>National Conference on Weights and Measures, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWMA</td>
<td>Northeastern Weights and Measures Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH₃</td>
<td>Anhydrous Ammonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIST</td>
<td>National Institute of Standards and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTETC</td>
<td>National Type Evaluation Technical Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW&amp;SA</td>
<td>National Weighing and Sampling Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEM</td>
<td>Original Equipment Manufacturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub 14</td>
<td>NCWM Publication 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMFD</td>
<td>Retail Motor-Fuel Dispenser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>International System of Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>Scale Manufacturers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWMA</td>
<td>Southern Weights and Measures Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>Work Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMD</td>
<td>NIST Weights and Measures Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS</td>
<td>NTETC Weighing Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWMA</td>
<td>Western Weights and Measures Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USNWG</td>
<td>NIST/OIML U.S. National Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTM</td>
<td>Vehicle-tank Meters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: NIST does not imply that these acronyms are used solely to identify these organizations or technical topics.

Details of All Items
(In Order by Reference Key Number)

310 GENERAL CODE


Source: 2010 Carryover Item 310-1. This item originated from the Southern Weights and Measures Association (SWMA) Committee and first appeared on the Committee’s 2008 Agenda.

Purpose: The purpose of the proposed changes is to clarify what is considered an effective method of sealing metrological features and what information is required to be indicated and recorded when a device is in a metrological adjustment mode.

Item Under Consideration: The Committee is currently waiting for the Weighing Sector (WS) recommendations to amend the procedures for evaluating sealing requirements in the weighing devices section in NCWM Publications 14 before taking further actions on the following proposal to amend General Code paragraph G-S.8. and subsequent subparagraphs.
G-S.8. Provision for Sealing Electronic Adjustable Components. - A device shall be designed with provision(s) for applying a security seal that must be broken, or for using other approved means of providing security (e.g., data change audit trail available at the time of inspection), before any change that detrimentally affects the metrological integrity of the device can be made to any electronic mechanism. That is:

(a) It shall not be possible to apply a physical security seal to the device while it is in the calibration and/or configuration mode nor to access the calibration and/or configuration (adjustment) mode when sealed; or

(b) The calibration and/or configuration adjustments are protected by an approved method for providing security (e.g., data change audit trail).

A device may be fitted with an automatic or a semi-automatic calibration mechanism. This mechanism shall be incorporated inside the device. After sealing, neither the mechanism nor the calibration process shall facilitate fraud.

During any mode of operation in which adjustments can be made, devices shall not provide indications that can be interpreted, transmitted into memory, or printed as a usable (legal) measurement value. *(Added 1985) (Amended 1989, and 1993, and 201X)*

[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 1990]

G-S.8.1. Adjustment Mode Indication. For electronic devices protected by an approved means for providing security (e.g., data change audit trail), the device shall clearly and continuously indicate and print, if equipped with a printer, that the calibration and configuration adjustment modes are enabled.

[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 201X]

Renumber subsequent paragraphs.

Add applicable definitions to Appendix D from a white paper on the “Metrological Requirements for Audit Trails” adopted by NCWM in July 1993.

Adjustment mode. An operational mode of a device which enables the user to make adjustments to sealable parameters, including changes to configuration parameters.

Adjustment. A change in the value of any of a device's sealable calibration parameters or sealable configuration parameters.

Background/Discussion: At its fall 2007 meeting, the SWMA received a proposal to address inconsistent application of the requirements in paragraph G-S.8. by the National Type Evaluation Program (NTEP) weighing labs by modifying paragraph G-S.8. to ensure that: (1) a device could not be sealed in the configuration mode and continue to operate normally; and (2) to require devices to:

- clearly indicate (and print when interfaced with a printer) that it is in an adjustment mode;
- not operate (present usable measurement values); or
- exit the adjustment mode after 60 minutes.

The proposal, as submitted in the Committee’s 2008 Interim Agenda, only required that a device continuously indicate when access to the set-up mode was enabled.

At the 2008 Interim Meeting, the Committee received comments during the open hearing supporting the intent of the proposed language. However, some expressed concern that automatically exiting the adjustment(s) mode after 60...
minutes is not a workable solution due to numerous examples where either it could used fraudulently during the 60 minute period, or the 60 minute period was not enough time to complete necessary adjustments during calibration.

The Committee agreed that to comply with paragraph G-S.8., a device must be equipped with an approved audit trail or that a physical seal is required to be broken before any metrological adjustments can be made.

The Committee also believed that an indication that the adjustment mode is in operation is only necessary for devices with approved electronic methods of sealing. Additionally, the adjustment mode indicator should not be operable during normal weighing or measuring operations. The Committee agreed that if a device designed for commercial applications is capable of being “sealed” and still allows external or remote access to the calibration or configuration mode, then that device is clearly in violation of the current provisions in G-S.8. Provision for Sealing Electronic Adjustable Components and G-S.2. Facilitation of Fraud and, therefore, no change to the existing language in paragraph G-S.8. is needed.

In 2008, the Committee amended the proposal due to continuing concerns raised about inconsistent interpretations of G-S.8. by NTEP participating laboratories.

At the 2008 Annual Meeting, the Committee heard comments from the Weights and Measures Division (WMD) noting that the alternate language submitted by the Scale Manufacturers Association (SMA) would require that all devices provide the operator with indications that a device is in the calibration mode. This would encompass mechanical and electronic devices and devices that use Category 1 physical seals. Additionally, WMD suggested the Committee consider that a device does not need indications that it is in a calibration or configuration mode if it is incapable of providing indications that can be interpreted, printed, or transmitted to a memory device as a correct measurement value.

The Committee agreed with comments from the 2008 Central Weights and Measures Association (CWMA) Annual Meeting and from WMD and amended paragraph G-S.8.1. to:

- delete the references to the sealing categories since they are not consistently referenced in all codes;
- clarify printing requirements; and
- include an option that the device not operate or provide metrological indications that can be interpreted or transmitted into memory or to recording elements while in the adjustment mode.

Just prior to the 2008 voting session, the Committee noted that the revised language in G-S.8.1.(a) was inadvertently changed to where it could be literally read that the physical seal itself disabled access to the adjustment mechanisms, instead of preventing access to the mechanism. Consequently, the Committee changed the status of the item from Voting to Information. The Committee believed that the intent of the recommendation is to ensure that the access to the calibration and configuration modes is disabled.

The Committee redrafted the language in paragraph G-S.8.1. in an attempt to clarify the intent of the proposal and submitted the revised draft to the regional Weights and Measures associations and other interested parties for further review and consideration.

During the 2009 NCWM Interim Meeting, the Committee reviewed comments from the fall 2008 Western Weights and Measures Association (WWMA), CWMA, and Northeastern Weights and Measures Association (NEWMA) meetings that supported the language submitted to the regional Weights and Measures associations and other interested parties. At its fall 2008 Annual Meeting, the SWMA recommended that: (1) additional work is needed before the item is ready for a vote; (2) the NCWM S&T Committee may wish to consider at least incorporating interpretations and guidelines for the existing language in its reports; and (3) this item should remain an Information item on the NCWM S&T agenda. After considering these comments, the Committee recommended that this item move forward as an Information item to allow further review, comments, and recommendations.

WMD added that it had received comments questioning how the application of a physical seal (as recommended by the manufacturer and listed on the Certificate of Conformance [CC]) ensures that the calibration and configuration
modes are disabled. Specifically, what does that presence of the physical seal (pressure sensitive or lock and wire) do to the device that disables the calibration and configuration modes?

In considering these comments, WMD suggested that the Committee consider the following changes:

- Modify G-S.8. Provision for Sealing Electronic Adjustable Components to reduce the potential for misinterpreting the paragraph by outlining the different requirements between physical seals and electronic seals (audit trails);
- Add new specifications for externally and remotely configurable devices since remotely configurable devices are required to have an audit trail in several codes;
- Amend G-UR.4.5. Security Seal to require the user to verify that the device is correctly configured to disable the external configuration feature to deter service agents from leaving a device configured with external access to the adjustments;
- Add definitions from the white paper on the “Metrological Requirements for Audit Trails” adopted by NCWM in July 1993 since there is some confusion on the meaning of “adjustment” and “adjustment mode;” and
- Add a new definition for “externally configurable (external and on the device)” to distinguish it from “remotely configurable (external but not part the device).”

Mr. Steve Patoray, Consultants on Certification, LLC, expressed concerns that the language proposed in the 2009 Interim Agenda would require a manufacturer to design a device where the application of the physical seal (e.g., lock and wire, pressure sensitive, etc.) would disable external access to the configuration mode. He believes that the language in the proposal would force the manufacturer to redesign access covers to devices so that the cover disables the external adjustment capability. Consequently, the application of the security seal secures the cover in place and then, if broken, provides an indication that the device may have been adjusted.

The Committee also received a comment from Mr. Will Wotthlie, Maryland, stating that he was concerned with the language that requires that the physical seal “shall ensure” that external access to the configuration mode is disabled. He provided examples of mechanical automatic temperature compensation (ATC) elements where a specially designed sealing pin had to be installed before the physical seal could be applied and where electronic motor-fuel devices have a specially designed cover plate where the closing of the cover plate disables the electronic configuration. The manufacturer has the option under this proposal to either specially design the device with a physical seal as a method of sealing (e.g., a specially designed sealing pin on the aforementioned mechanical ATC element) or design the device with an electronic method of sealing (i.e., an approved audit trail).

Several manufacturers stated that this proposal was not ready and that designs for the method of providing security to the metrological adjustments should be left to the manufacturers. Mr. Flocken, Mettler Toledo, added that the intent of the proposal is that the manufacturer can either design a device so that a security seal cannot be applied without placing the device into the proper mode or design the device so that it has an approved audit trail.

The Committee agreed with the comments that the proposal is not ready to become a Voting item and suggested that further development to the proposal address the following subjects:

1. Avoid language that allows the indication of usable metrological values while a device is in the adjustment mode for devices that do not have an event logger.
2. Recognize that more than one method of sealing is acceptable on a single device; for example, using a lock and wire seal for the mechanical adjustments and an audit trail for electronic adjustments.
3. Delete or modify references to specific “categories of devices” since the sealing category criteria differ among the specific codes and not all HB 44 codes have such criteria.
4. Require an obvious indication when a device is being adjusted if its method of sealing is a physical security seal.

5. Clarify that the application of a physical security seal to a specially designed and sealable plate or cover that disables external access to the configuration and adjustment mode is not the only method to seal adjustable components.

At its spring 2009 meeting, the CWMA received a comment from the SMA along with a revised version of its previous recommendation that removed the word “adjustment” where appropriate; added the word “modes;” and removed the reference to “Category 1, 2, and 3” in G-S.8.1.(b). The CWMA supported the intent of the SMA proposed language from its 2009 spring meeting and believed that the specific wording should be thoroughly reviewed and that the terms “calibration and configurations modes” are not widely understood. The CWMA suggested that the definitions for the word “adjustment” and “adjustment mode” from the 1993 white paper on Audit Trails be included in HB 44 by incorporating some of the definitions into HB 44.

Mr. Patoray submitted comments to the NCWM and NEWMA S&T Committees providing additional background information on how some devices can have external access to the adjustment mode after the application of a physical seal (and not equipped with an audit trail). In his May 2009 letter to the Committees, he added that the NTEP lab evaluators believe that the method described above does not provide a truly “effective method of sealing.” Mr. Patoray stated there may be nothing wrong with the current G-S.8. wording as part of the general code and this issue does need to be addressed in each of the individual or specific codes. There may be several solutions for newly designed devices, but it is not the role of HB 44 to attempt to actually put design constraints on manufacturers, only to place requirements that must be met by some type of design solution.

At its spring 2009 meeting, NEWMA supported the intent of this item. However, NEWMA is concerned that this item is getting over-complicated and asks the Committee to consider requiring a simple enunciator indicating the device is in “cal mode.” NEWMA also reviewed comments from the SMA 2009 spring meeting supporting the intent of the item submitted in its revised proposal to the Committee.

During the 2009 NCWM Annual Meeting, the Committee received comments during the open hearing that no action may be needed and that the existing language in HB 44 is sufficient. Oregon and Maryland believe that requirements for sealing are needed by the NTEP labs and field officials in order to consistently interpret and apply sealing requirements.

The Committee believes that all parties agree with the intent of the proposal, which is to prevent metrological adjustments to weighing and measuring devices without breaking a physical seal, or indicate through other approved means (e.g., audit trail) that adjustments have been made while providing flexibility for manufacturers. Both the WMD and SMA proposals included language that restates the existing language in G-S.8., but is essentially reformatted for clarification. Additionally, both proposals included new requirements for providing indications when a device is in adjustment mode. WMD included further language to address devices that may have more than one method of sealing.

After assessing the comments and discussing the issue, the Committee agreed that the proposal was not ready for a vote and, consequently, did not include proposed language in its Interim and Annual Reports. However, the Committee agreed to keep this item on its Agenda as an Information item with the expectation that proposed language would be submitted for the 2010 Interim Meeting.

At its 2009 meeting, the NTETC Weighing Sector (WS) reviewed the comments from the S&T Committee, the background information in the NCWM 2008 Annual and 2009 Interim Reports, and the summary of proposals provided by the NIST Technical Advisor. The WS believes that existing language in HB 44 is sufficient. The WS has amended its evaluation procedures so that a physical seal will not be accepted as the means to secure metrological adjustments if the scale allows external access to the adjustment mode after an adjustment has been accepted by the device. In these cases, the device must be designed with a data change audit trail. The WS amended Pub 14 for digital electronic scales to require that devices equipped with:
1. provision(s) for applying a physical security seal that must be broken before any change that detrimentally affects the metrological integrity of the device can be made to any electronic mechanism; or

2. other approved means of providing security to document any change that detrimental affects the metrological integrity of the device can be made to any electronic mechanism (e.g., data change audit trail available at the time of inspection).

At its fall 2009 meeting, the CWMA commented that the Committee’s redrafted language in the 2009 NCWM Interim Report still had some contradictory language. However, the CWMA did not define what is considered “a clear indication” of a device’s calibration or configuration status. The CWMA recommended this item remain Informational in 2010, and amended the NCWM Committee’s recommendation by limiting the indication that the device is in the adjustment mode only to devices with approved electronic method of sealing (e.g., audit trails). Devices with an effective security seal would not have to indicate or print that it was in the adjustment mode.

During the fall 2009 WWMA Annual Technical Conference, Mr. Flocken, Mettler Toledo, speaking as chairman of the WS, reported the Sector’s position as stated above, and noted that the Sector can develop additional guidance in NCWM Pub 14 to ensure uniform interpretation of the requirement during type evaluation. Mr. Lou Straub, Fairbanks Scales, representing SMA, stated that SMA supported the intent of the proposed changes, but had presented specific suggestions for modifying the language to the NCWM S&T Committee as noted in the 2009 CWMA Annual Meeting discussions. Mr. Straub noted that SMA had not met since prior to the 2009 NCWM Annual Meeting, so SMA would need to reconsider any additional thoughts presented during that meeting and the August 2009 WS meeting.

The WWMA reviewed this issue and expressed concerns about a device which could be sealed in a mode that would allow access to calibration or configuration changes without breaking a seal. The WWMA agreed with the position of the NCWM S&T Committee that the current language in paragraph G-S.8. requires that a security seal be broken before a metrological change can be made to a device (or other approved means of security, such as an audit trail provided). Thus, once a security seal is applied, for example, it should not be possible to make a metrological change to the device without breaking that seal. Since this philosophy addresses provisions for protecting access to metrological adjustment, the philosophy should be applied consistently to all device types. Therefore, the Committee recommends this remain an Informational item.

At its October 2009 meeting, the NTETC Measuring Sector agreed that Measuring Devices with NTEP CCs have been evaluated to either:

1. not function in the calibration or configuration mode;

2. not be sealed in the calibration or configuration mode; or

3. clearly indicate the device is in the calibration or configuration mode.

The NTETC Measuring Sector (MS) agreed that these options reflect the intent of paragraph G-S.8. and, because the intent of the paragraph is understood and appropriately applied by the measuring community, the Sector recommends that no changes be proposed to paragraph G-S.8.

At its fall 2009 Annual Meeting, the SWMA recommended that this proposal be made an Information item. The SWMA agreed that a device should be designed so that it can either not operate or not be capable of indications that might be interpreted as a valid measurement while it is in the calibration or configuration mode. The SWMA S&T Committee is concerned that a device left to operate while in this mode may facilitate fraud since adjustments might be inadvertently or intentionally made to metrologically significant features.

The SWMA is interested in the input the NCWM S&T Committee receives from the fall 2009 Technical, Industry, and Regional Weights and Measures Association meetings on this issue for the 2010 NCWM Interim Meeting. The SWMA Committee recommended that the final modifications to the General Code ensure that the intent of the requirement is clear and is uniformly interpreted.
NEWMA supported this item remaining as Informational at its fall 2009 meeting.

At the 2010 NCWM Interim Meeting, the Committee received testimony from the SMA restating its November 2009 position that supported the conclusions of the 2009 Weighing and Measuring Sectors recommending that no change to HB 44 is required as the wording of G-S.2. and G-S.8. is sufficient. WMD states that it remains concerned about devices which could be sealed while allowing access to calibration or configuration changes without breaking that seal. WMD agreed with the position of the NCWM S&T Committee that the current language in paragraph G-S.8. requires that a security seal be broken before a metrological change can be made to a device (or other approved means of security such as an audit trail provided). Thus, once a security seal is applied, it should not be possible to make a metrological change to the device without breaking that seal. Since this philosophy addresses provisions for protecting access to any metrological adjustment, the philosophy should be applied consistently to all device types. WMD encouraged the Committee to reiterate in its Interim and Final Reports the correct interpretation of G-S.8. as the Committee and the MS have done in the past, and as demonstrated in more recent actions by the WS.

The Committee agreed with comments that no changes are needed to paragraph G-S.8. and that type evaluation procedures have been amended in applicable sections of NCWM Pub 14 to address the issues of incorrectly applying the requirements in G-S.8. The Committee also noted that there was some confusion regarding the meaning of the terms “adjustment” and “adjustment mode” in the CWMA Annual Meeting reports.

The Committee received no comments addressing potential inconsistent interpretations of the requirements by field officials, requirements for adjustment mode indications, and limitations on metrological indications while in the adjustment mode in any proposals. Consequently, the Committee developed a revised proposal that:

1. did not change the existing text in G-S.8.;
2. added language that restates the intent of G-S.8.;
3. added language to address metrological (legal for trade) measurements while in an adjustment mode;
4. added a new paragraph G-S.8.1. that requires an indication and, recorded representations (if equipped with a printer) while in the adjustment mode; and
5. added new definitions for “adjustment” and “adjustment mode” from the white paper on the “Metrological Requirements for Audit Trails” adopted by NCWM in July 1993 to facilitate a common understanding of the terms.

The Committee also recommended that the amended proposal be given Informational status to allow interested parties sufficient time to analyze and comment on the most recent language that appears in the “Item Under Consideration.”

**Key Points Considered by the Committee:**

- All agree that the intent of the proposal is that metrological adjustments shall be secured with: 1) physical seals that must be broken to access metrological adjustments; or 2) other approved means (e.g., data change audit trails) that indicator that metrological adjustments have been made.

- Devices must be equipped with either an approved audit trail or designed such that a physical seal is required to be broken before performing metrological adjustments.

- For devices with approved electronic method of sealing, an indication that the adjustment mode is in operation is necessary unless the device does not operate or provide metrological indications that can be interpreted or transmitted into memory or to recording elements.

- Devices that use physical seals to secure metrological adjustments are clearly in violation of G-S.8. if they allow external or remote access to metrological adjustment modes without breaking a physical seal.
Any changes to General Code paragraph G-S.8. should ensure that the intent of the requirement is clear and is uniformly interpreted.

At NEWMA’s May 2010 Annual Meeting open hearing, Mr. Flocken, speaking as chairman of the NTETC Weighing Sector, stated that the Sector concluded at its August 2009 meeting that existing language in HB 44 is sufficient and that the Sector has established a small work group (WG) to review existing type evaluation criteria to suggest procedures in Publications 14 to verify that devices are designed with effective means to ensure compliance with HB 44. Consequently, NEWMA stated that it will await the WS recommendations for changes to Pub 14 before taking a position on this item.

At its spring 2010 annual meeting, the CWMA agreed with a proposal from Mr. Paul Lewis, Rice Lake Weighing, to delete the subparagraph (a) in the item under consideration since it restates the language in G-S.8.

At the Committee’s 2010 NCWM Annual Meeting open hearings, Mr. Flocken, Mettler Toledo, speaking as chairman of the NTETC Weighing Sector restated his report from the spring 2010 NEWMA Meeting. Mr. Straub, Fairbanks Scales, speaking on behalf of the SMA stated that SMA opposes this item and recommends that this item be Withdrawn. The SMA believes that the current wording is a step back from previous proposals. The SMA continues to support the recommendation from the 2009 Weighing and Measuring Sectors stating that no change to HB 44 is required because the wording of G-S.2. and G-S.8. is sufficient.

WMD suggested that it might be appropriate for the Committee to consider withdrawing the item. In its comments to the NCWM in 2008, WMD stated that its interpretation of G-S.8. and S.1.11. Provision for Sealing, in the Scales Code, clearly does not allow a device to be “sealed” in a mode that allows a change that detrimentally affects the metrological integrity of the device without breaking that “seal.” WMD suggested that the Pub 14 procedures for evaluating the method of sealing in the checklist for electronic scales be amended to more closely align it with the procedures in the liquid-measuring devices (LMD) checklist Section 9 which states:

Measuring elements shall be designed with adequate provisions to prevent changes from being made to the measuring element or the flow rate control (if the flow rate control affects the accuracy of deliveries) without evidence of the change being made. These provisions can be an approved means of security (e.g., data change audit trail) or physically applying a security seal which must be broken before adjustments can be made. When applicable, the adjusting mechanism shall be readily accessible for the purposes of affixing a security seal.

The Committee agreed that the current language in paragraph G-S.8. requires that a security seal be broken before a metrological change can be made to a device (or that other approved means of security such as an audit trail be provided). Thus, once a security seal is applied, for example, it should not be possible to make a metrological change to the device without breaking that seal. Since this philosophy addresses provisions for protecting access to metrological adjustment, the philosophy should be applied consistently to all device types.

The Committee is concerned about a device which could be sealed in a “mode” that would allow access to calibration or configuration changes without breaking a seal. Since the NTEP tests and procedures are based on interpretations of HB 44, the Committee supports the efforts of the WS and is recommending that this item remain and Information item until the WS can review and revise (as needed) Pub 14 type evaluation procedures to verify compliance with G-S.8. provisions for sealing consistent with the Committee’s interpretation of G-S.8. stated in the previous paragraph.

At its August 2010 Annual Meeting, the WS: 1) reviewed the sealing procedures in Pub 14 Scales type evaluation checklist and procedures; 2) compared them with similar type evaluation criteria in Pub 14 for LMD; and 3) reviewed applicable HB 44 sealing requirements in the General, Scales, and LMD codes. Prior to the 2010 meeting of the WS, a small WG was formed to develop more detailed procedures for determining compliance of the methods for sealing and requested the WS to consider its recommendations for Pub 14, DES Section 10. The WS reviewed the recommendations and was asked to determine whether the guidance in the WG recommendation ensures uniform interpretation of sealing requirements during type evaluation.
During the discussions, Mr. Flocken, WS Chairman, reported that the goal is to add additional guidance in Pub 14. Mr. Jim Truex, NTEP Administrator, stated that NTEP has received numerous reports of scales found left in the calibration/configuration mode with physical seals intact. Mr. Nigel Mills, Hobart Corp., added that the use of the phrase “clearly indicate” in the first paragraph of the WG recommendation is ambiguous without additional clarification and is subject to incorrect interpretations. The WS discussed various examples of indications intended to clearly indicate that a device is in a calibration/configuration mode. Some of the examples were considered by the WS to be acceptable while other examples were deemed unacceptable (e.g., flashing weight indications or blanking units of measure). Mr. Truex suggested that as a starting point a small list of acceptable and unacceptable means of providing clear indication be developed by the WS. Mr. Steve Cook, NIST Technical Advisor, volunteered to develop a short list as a starting point before the conclusion of the meeting. The WS reviewed the list and discussed additional acceptable and unacceptable indications. Mr. Cook noted that the list should not be limiting or all inclusive and that other indications may be acceptable. Mr. Flocken suggested that the WG recommendation, with suggestions from the WS, be forwarded to the S&T Committee and SMA for consideration prior to the 2011 NCWM Interim Meeting.

The WS agreed with the revised proposal to amend Pub 14 Scale Section 10 and recommended it be forwarded to the S&T Committee and SMA for consideration prior to the 2011 NCWM Interim Meeting. The WS also agreed to forward the amended language for Pub 14 to the S&T Committee with a recommendation that the S&T item be withdrawn from the Committee’s Agenda. In summary, the recommendation to amend Pub 14 Scale Section 10 includes new language in the introduction of Section 10 to read as follows:

**Sealing - General**

In addition to satisfying the physical security sealing requirement; the presence of a physical seal shall clearly indicate that the setup or configuration mode (any mode permitting access to any or all sealable parameters based upon the application of the Philosophy for Sealing in Pub 14) of the device cannot be accessed without additional actions (e.g., removal of a jumper, pressing a key or switch, etc.) only possible after the removal of the seal.

If the use of a physical seal is the only approved method of sealing, it shall not be possible to apply the physical seal with the device in the setup or configuration mode (any mode permitting access to any or all sealable parameters based upon the application of the Philosophy for Sealing in Pub 14) unless the device has a clear indication that the device is in this mode. See the list of acceptable and unacceptable indications below.
Indications representing that the device is configured with the setup or configuration mode enabled (i.e., any mode permitting access to any or all sealable parameters)

This list is not limiting or all-inclusive; other indications may be acceptable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptable Clear Indications</th>
<th>Indications NOT Acceptably Clear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unusable weight indications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C100.05E</strong></td>
<td><strong>C 100.05 lb</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“not HB 44” annunciator</td>
<td>Any digit in the weight differentiated by size, shape, or color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“CAL” annunciator (single or mixed case)</td>
<td>Weights w/o units Example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Set-up” annunciator (single or mixed case)</td>
<td>Flashing weight value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Config” annunciator (single or mixed case)</td>
<td>Weight with no annunciators displayed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weight with all annunciators displayed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, checklist language was recommended to document the procedures for entering the calibration/configuration mode procedures for exiting the calibration/configuration mode (e.g., momentary pushbutton, jumper, slide/toggle switch, etc.), and to verify that the procedures comply with the proposed “General Sealing” paragraphs above. The WS also recommended that the procedures for entering and exiting the calibration/configuration modes be documented on the NTEP CC in the section on “Sealing” so that a field official is able to verify that metrological adjustments are not accessible.

At its fall 2010 Interim Meeting, the CWMA Committee stated that the item has been on the agenda since 2008 and has had sufficient time for development. The CWMA noted that no comments were received during its open hearing. Therefore, the CWMA S&T Committee believes that this should be moved forward as a Voting item. (The CWMA did not have a quorum to vote on its agenda).

During the fall 2010 WWMA Annual Technical Conference, Mr. Flocken, Mettler Toledo, speaking on behalf of the SMA, restated its position that this item be withdrawn. Mr. Flocken, speaking as chairman of the WS restated the history of the issues that initiated the original proposals. At the August 2009 WS meeting, it was noted that there were problems at the NTEP weighing labs due to insufficient guidance in Pub 14. Mr. Cook, NIST Technical Advisor to the WS, speaking on behalf of the WS, provided the WWMA with a brief review of the WS recommendations to amend the weighing devices section of Pub 14 at its 2010 meeting. The WWMA recommended that this remain an Information item until the NCWM S&T Committee confirms that the WS recommendations comply with the previous Committee’s interpretation of General Code paragraph G-S.8.

During its fall 2010 Annual Meeting, the SWMA heard comments from Mr. Straub, Fairbanks Scales, and Mr. Gordon Johnson, Gilbarco, indicating that no changes are needed to paragraph G-S.8. The SWMA S&T Committee also received information from the WWMA and the WS regarding work being done in the Weighing Sector to refine criteria in Pub 14 relative to the interpretation of paragraph G-S.8. Ms. Tina Butcher, NIST WMD, and members of the WS, including Mr. Straub and Mr. Truex, reported that the WS has made progress on developing proposed changes to the Scales Checklist in Pub 14 and anticipates forwarding those changes to the NTEP Committee for possible inclusion in the next edition of Pub 14. In anticipation that the Sector’s work will bring closure to this issue and encourage consistent interpretation of paragraph G-S.8., the SWMA S&T Committee agreed to recommend that this remain an Information item to allow this work to be completed.

See the 2008, 2009, and 2010 NCWM Annual Reports for additional background information.
310-2 G-S.1. Identification. – (Software)

Source: 2010 Carryover Item 310-3. This item originated from the NTETC Software Sector and first appeared on the Committee’s 2007 agenda as Developing Item Part 1, Item 1.

Purpose: This proposal is intended to amend the identification marking requirements for all electronic devices manufactured after a specified date by requiring that metrological software version or revision information be identified. Additionally, the proposal suggests listing methods, other than “permanently marked,” for providing the required information.

Item Under Consideration: Amend G-S.1. Identification and G-S.1.1. Location of Marking Information for Not-Built for-Purpose, Software-Based Devices as follows. (Note that this language incorporates the March 2010 Committee acceptance of the 2010 NTETC Software Sector recommendation and the Committee’s suggested language to address SMA concerns with the requirements in G-S.1. where it states that “all equipment . . . shall be permanently marked . . .” and G-S.1.1. that allows alternate methods, other than “permanently marked,” to identify software-based devices.):

G-S.1. Identification. – All equipment, except weights, and separate parts necessary to the measurement process but not having any metrological effect, and software-based devices covered in G-S.1.1. Location of Marking Information*, shall be clearly and permanently marked for the purposes of identification with the following information:
[*Nonretroactive as of January 1, 201X]

(a) the name, initials, or trademark of the manufacturer or distributor;

(b) a model identifier that positively identifies the pattern or design of the device;

(1) The model identifier shall be prefaced by the word “Model,” “Type,” or “Pattern.” These terms may be followed by the word “Number” or an abbreviation of that word. The abbreviation for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., No or No.). The abbreviation for the word “Model” shall be “Mod” or “Mod.” Prefix lettering may be initial capitals, all capitals, or all lowercase.
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2003]
(Added 2000) (Amended 2001)

(c) a nonrepetitive serial number, except for equipment with no moving or electronic component parts and not-built-for-purpose software-based software device;
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 1968]
(Amended 2003)

(1) The serial number shall be prefaced by words, an abbreviation, or a symbol, that clearly identifies the number as the required serial number.
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 1986]

(2) Abbreviations for the word “Serial” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “S,” and abbreviations for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., S/N, SN, Ser. No., and S. No.).
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2001]

(d) the current software version or revision identifier for not-built-for-purpose software-based electronic devices;
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2004]
(Added 2003) (Amended 201X)
(1) The version or revision identifier shall be prefaced by words, an abbreviation, or a symbol, that clearly identifies the number as the required version or revision.  
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2007]  
(Added 2006)

(2) Abbreviations for the word “Version” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “V” and may be followed by the word “Number.” Abbreviations for the word “Revision” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “R” and may be followed by the word “Number.” The abbreviation for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., No or No.).  
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2007]  
(Added 2006)

(e) an NTEP CC number or a corresponding CC Addendum Number for devices that have a CC. The CC Number or a corresponding CC Addendum Number shall be prefaced by the terms “NTEP CC,” “CC,” or “Approval.” These terms may be followed by the word “Number” or an abbreviation of that word. The abbreviation for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., No or No.).  
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2003]

The required information shall be so located that it is readily observable without the necessity of the disassembly of a part requiring the use of any means separate from the device.  

G-S.1.1. Location of Marking Information for Not-Built-For-Purpose all Software-Based Devices. – For not-built-for-purpose, software-based devices, either:

(a) The required information in G-S.1 Identification. (a), (b), (d), and (e) shall be permanently marked or continuously displayed on the device; or

(b) The CC Number shall be:

(1) permanently marked on the device;

(2) continuously displayed; or

(3) accessible through one or, at most, two levels of access, an easily recognized menu and, if necessary, a submenu. Examples of menu and submenu identification include, but are not limited to, “Help,” “System Identification,” “G-S.1 Identification,” or “Weights and Measures Identification.”

(i) For menu based systems, “Metrology,” “System Identification,” or “Help.”

(ii) For systems using icons, a metrology symbol “(MJ),” “(SI),” or a help symbol (“?,” “i,” or an “i” within a magnifying glass).

Note: For (b), clear instructions for accessing the information required in G-S.1. (a), (b), and (d) shall be listed on the CC, including information necessary to identify that the software in the device is the same type that was evaluated.  
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2004]  
(Added 2003) (Amended 2006 and 201X)

Background/Discussion: In 2005, the Board of Directors (BOD) established an NTETC Software Sector. One of the Sector’s tasks, is to recommend HB 44 specifications and requirements for software incorporated into weighing and measuring devices, which may include tools used for software identification.
During its October 2007 meeting, the Sector discussed the value and merits of required markings for software. This included the possible differences in some types of software-based devices and methods of marking requirements. After hearing several proposals, the Sector agreed to the following technical requirements applicable to the marking of software:

1. The NTEP CC Number must be continuously displayed or hard-marked;
2. The version must be software-generated and shall not be hard-marked;
3. The version is required for embedded (Type P) software;
4. Printing the required identification information can be an option;
5. Command or operator action can be considered as an option in lieu of a continuous display of the required information; and
6. Devices with Type P (embedded) software must display or hard-mark make, model, and S.N. to comply with G-S.1. Identification.

After the 2008 NCWM Annual Meeting, the Committee received the Software Sector’s Proposal to amend G-S.1. Identification and/or G-S.1.1. Location of Marking Information for Not-Built-for-Purpose, Software-Based Devices in the Committee’s 2008 Interim Report. The proposal listed “acceptable” and “not acceptable” methods for presenting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NTEP CC number</th>
<th>Serial Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make</td>
<td>Software Version/Revision Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the 2009 NCWM Interim Meeting, SMA commented that it has consistently opposed having different requirements between embedded and downloadable/programmable software-based devices and added that it continues to support the intent of the proposal and will continue to participate in the Software Sector discussions to develop alternate proposals for the marking of software-based devices. Several Weights and Measures officials expressed concerns that the proposed language does not specify how the identification information is to be retrieved if it is not continuously displayed, noting this could result in several ways to access the information (e.g., passwords, display checks, dropdown menus). SMA added that the identification location information on the NTEP CC will become outdated anytime a manufacturer changes the way the information can be retrieved. SMA suggested that a limited number of methods to access the identification information be developed and specified as the only acceptable methods to retrieve identification information. This would make it easier for the inspector to verify the required identification information.

WMD noted that in 1992, the NCWM adopted S&T Committee agenda Item 320-6, S.6.3. Marking Requirements; Capacity by Division and recommended that Tables S.6.3.a. and S.6.3.b. (Note 3) be interpreted to permit the required capacity and scale division markings to be presented as part of the scale display (e.g., displayed on a video terminal or in a liquid crystal display), rather than be physically marked on the device. WMD agrees with the interpretation and suggested that this interpretation could be expanded to other marking requirements (e.g., flow rates, capacity, interval, etc.) and codes on a case-by-case basis, and that specific language (based on the above interpretation) be added to the applicable sections in HB 44.

Software Sector Co-chairman Mr. Jim Pettinato, FMC Technologies, stated that the Software Sector recommended that this item remain Informational to allow conference members to further study the proposal in order to develop a consensus on the format for Table G-S.1. Identification in its 2009 meeting summary.

At its spring 2009 meeting, NEWMA received similar comments from SMA and the Software Sector and took no position on this item pending its member review of the Software Sector’s report.
At the 2009 NCWM Annual Meeting, the Committee reviewed the recommendations and comments from the Software Sector, SMA, and others, which may be reviewed in greater detail in the 2009 NCWM Annual Report:

The Committee agreed that this item remain an Information item and that the regional Weights and Measures associations review the above information and provide the Committee with comments and recommendations.

At its fall 2009 meeting, the CWMA had lengthy discussions about providing the required identification information in a single uniform method. Some of the topics addressed were:

- A single operation or button is needed to view all software version information.
- Use a single function key to access or continuously display software version information.
- Electronic data for both Type U and Type P devices could be hard marked, continuously displayed or accessed by command (operator action).
- The data is useless if it is not easy to access in the field.
- Concern about the cost of requiring a single designated button to access software version information.

The CWMA recommended this remain Information item with changes to the Committee’s recommendations in its 2009 Interim Report as shown in the 2009 S&T Committee Annual Report and summarized as follows:

1. In proposed paragraph G-S.1.1.(a), add “or accessed by a command (operator action)” and delete subparagraph G-S.1.1.(b) (3).

   G-S.1.1. Location of Marking Information for Type U (Not-Built-For-Purpose), Software-Based Devices. – For Type U not-built-for-purpose, software-based devices manufactured prior to January 1, 201X, either:

   (a) The required information in G-S.1. Identification, (a), (b), (d), and (e) shall be permanently marked or continuously displayed on the device or accessed by a command (operator action);

   (b) The CC Number shall be:

   (1) permanently marked on the device; or

   (2) continuously displayed.

2. Delete Note 8 in “Table G-S.1. Notes on Identification.”

3. Amend “Table G-S.1. Identification . . .” by deleting the three references to “via menu display,” “Print Option (8),” adding “by command (operator action),” and deleting the language at the bottom of the table.

During the open hearings at the fall 2009 WWMA Annual Technical Conference, Mr. Straub, speaking on behalf of SMA, indicated SMA continues to oppose this item, referring to comments made in conjunction with Item 310-2. He also noted that even if the designations of Type U and Type P were adopted, SMA would continue to oppose the proposed changes to G-S.1., noting that requirements should apply equally to the two different device types described. The WWMA also heard from Mr. Johnson, Gilbarco, who agreed with SMA’s assessment. He also indicated that it would be desirable to have the option of using a menu to provide information, citing increasingly limited space in which to provide marking information, and noted it would be virtually impossible for their company to provide a full time display.

Based on the comments received and its position relative to corresponding definitions for the device types developed by the Software Sector, the WWMA recommended that this remain Information item until the Software Sector has
had an opportunity to review comments from the 2009 NCWM Annual Meeting and any comments made at subsequent regional Weights and Measures association meetings.

At its fall 2009 meeting, the SWMA agreed that the Software Sector should continue to work on the proposal until it arrives at some final language for amending paragraphs G-S.1. Identification and G-S.1.1. Location of Marking Information for Not-Built-For Purpose, Software-Based Devices. The Software Sector should work with manufacturers in its development of the requirement, and any table or other tools should provide further clarity on the intent of the marking requirements.

During its fall 2009 meeting, NEWMA stated that it supports the Committee’s decision to keep this item Informational to have sufficient time to consider the most recent comments from the regional Weights and Measures associations and other interested parties.

At the 2010 NCWM Interim Meeting, the Committee received comments from Mr. Straub, speaking on behalf of the SMA, reiterating SMA’s spring 2009 position opposing any requirements for software that are different between types of devices and recommending that this item be withdrawn from the Committee’s agenda. Mr. Straub added that SMA comments are based on the proposed “Item Under Consideration” in the Interim Agenda and not the alternate proposal submitted by the software sector after its 2009 spring meeting. Mr. Lewis, Rice Lake Weighing, stated that metrologically significant software should have the same version number marking requirements in Type P (fixed hardware and software) devices or in Type U software (not built-for-purpose) devices. The Software Sector chairman responded that the only difference in the sector’s proposed language is that software identification requires version numbers and not serial numbers. In addition to the comments regarding the “hard marked” terminology presented at the 2009 Annual Meeting, WMD noted that devices with only Type U software are not required to have serial numbers. However, WMD asks the Sector to clarify its position on marking devices with both Type U and Type P software. Are devices required to have a serial number if it uses both Type P and Type U software?

Mr. Truex, NTEP Administrator, asked the members of the NCWM to provide direction to the Software Sector and the Committee for what is needed during field verification of software-based devices in order to determine that the software used in weighing and measuring devices represents the devices that were certified during type evaluation. What does a field inspector need to know about the software version in vehicle scales, electronic indicators, electronic cash registers interfaced with weighing and/or measuring devices, controllers with metrological software, etc.

Ms. Julie Quinn, Minnesota, reported that the state has problems because its officials find software versions that appear to be older than the version listed on the CC. Ms. Quinn added that NTEP evaluates software in these devices to verify that the accuracy of the first indication of the final weight is presented.

Mr. Bryce Wilke, GIPSA, stated that most of the livestock investigations and other regulatory issues most commonly involve software that has not been developed by the original device manufacturer. He noted that any language in HB 44 and NTEP Pub 14 will help GISPA.

Mr. Ross Andersen, New York, stated that there is still some confusion about where the scope of NTEP ends and Weights and Measures’ jurisdiction ends. He cited an example on a vehicle scale where a typewriter is used to issue the printed ticket. Weights and Measures still has the authority to regulate the way that measurement is used to accurately or inaccurately represent the transaction. Weights and measures authority still exists when the measurement takes place in one jurisdiction and is recorded and subsequently invoiced through a software system in a different jurisdiction.

Ms. Judy Cardin, Wisconsin, stated that NTEP is required if the software can change the measurement result and NTEP should evaluate software up to the point that the first indication of the final weight is presented.

Mr. Steve Malone, Nebraska, added that every electronic weighing and measuring device evaluated by NTEP has software and that the software is needed to make the device work. The problem is that the field inspector has no way of determining if the software in the device is the same as the software evaluated by NTEP without having to
carry a hard copy of the CC with them. Nebraska and other states within the CWMA would like to see a simple and
standardized method an inspector could use to obtain the relevant software identification and version information.

Mr. Truex thanked the members who commented and reminded them that the Software Sector is not proposing to
reopen the “first final” discussion, but to develop recommendations to help field officials to verify that software in a
weighing or measuring device represents the type of software covered by an NTEP CC. The Committee concurs
with Mr. Truex’s comments. The Committee agreed to replace the agenda language in the “Item Under
Consideration” with the Software Sector’s 2009 proposed language in the Committee’s Interim Report. The
Committee appreciates the work of the Sector and asks that it review the discussions on this item from the reports
from regional Weights and Measures associations, as well as comments in writing from interested parties and from
the open hearing during the 2010 Interim Meeting.

The Committee agreed that the status of this item should remain as Informational and asks for additional input from
the Software Sector after it has reviewed these and other comments received since its last meeting.

Additional background information on this item can be reviewed in the Committee’s 2008 and 2009 Final Reports.

In response to comments heard during the 2010 NCWM Interim Meeting, the Software Sector (at its March 2010
meeting) proposed changes to the language shown in the NCWM S&T Committee’s 2010 Interim Report
Item 310-3. These revisions removed the differentiation between types of software (Type P and Type U) while still
managing to achieve the Sector’s objective of simplifying the process of locating required marking information.

In summary, for S&T Item 310-3 the Sector recommended amending the 2010 item under consideration by
removing the proposed words “and manufactured after January 1, 201X” from the first sentence in paragraph
G-S.1 and added that the remainder of the proposal remains unchanged. The Sector agreed that the added words are
not necessary since the current proposal to amend G-S.1 includes applicable nonretroactive dates for the amended
subparagraphs.

The Software Sector also initiated discussion on two new concepts, which may eventually result in additional
recommendations to amend G-S.1. It should be noted that these new ideas are in the developmental stage, and are
included here by request of the Sector, since comments from the regions and other interested parties would be
appreciated by the Software Sector members.

First, the Sector sees merit to requiring some “connection” between the software identifier (i.e., version/revision)
and the software itself. The proposal was to add a new sub-subparagraph (3) to G-S.1.(d) to read as follows (with
the expectation that examples of acceptable means of implementing such a link would be included in Pub 14).

“The version or revision identifier shall be directly and inseparably linked to the software itself. The
version or revision identifier may consist of more than one part, but at least one part shall be dedicated to
the metrologically significant software.”

Second, it seems that at each meeting of the Sector, state weights and measures officials reiterate the problems they
have in the field locating the basic information required when the CC number is marked via the rather general
current HB 44 requirement of ‘accessible through an easily recognizable menu, and if necessary a sub-menu
[G-S.1.1. (b)(3)]. States have indicated that this is too vague and field inspectors often cannot find the certificate
number on unfamiliar devices.

The sector would like feedback on the proposal to specify a limited number of menu items/icons for accessing the
CC number (it is not hard-marked or continuously displayed) in subparagraph (c) as follows:

(b) The CC Number shall be:

(3) accessible through one or, at most, two levels of access.

(i) For menu-based systems, “Metrology”, “System Identification”, or “Help”. 
(ii) For systems using icons, a metrology symbol (“M” or “SI”), or a help symbol (“?,” “I,” or an “i” within a magnifying glass).

Note that this is not suggested to be the final list of valid options for locating the point of access for the CC number; the Software Sector would like to have feedback specifically on other acceptable menu text/icon images that identify how to access the CC number on software-based systems. The Software Sector agreed that a reasonable list of acceptable options is not as much of an issue as the fact that the list is finite. The sector realizes this may affect manufacturers so feedback from associate members and representative groups is also appreciated.

At its spring 2010 meeting, NEWMA recommended leaving this item informational to allow review of the software Sector’s newly proposed language from its March 2010 meeting.

During the 2010 Annual Meeting, the SMA stated that the proposal from the Software Sector addresses one of the SMA’s concerns dealing with the use of the term “not built for purpose;” however, it still has concerns with the requirement in G-S.1. stating that the software version or revision identifier must be clearly and permanently marked. The SMA recommends that the Software Sector and the S&T Committee review and correct what appears to be conflicting requirements as stated in G-S.1. and G-S.1.1. dealing with the marking requirement.

The Committee also received a summary of the 2010 meeting of the NTETC laboratories where some of the NTEP evaluators were concerned that the revised language could be interpreted such that no markings are required on a device. These evaluators expressed concern that an inspector would have to guess which of the eight methods recommended in the Software Sector Summary is to be used to find the CC number and questioned whether this would mean that a weighing or measuring device might not be marked with any identifier markings including the manufacturer.

The Committee amended the item under consideration based on the recommendations of the Software Sector at its March 2010 meeting. The Committee agreed to clarify and document the SMA concerns with the requirements in G-S.1. where it states that “all equipment . . . shall be permanently marked . . .” and G-S.1.1. that allows alternate methods, other than “permanently marked,” to identify software-based devices. Consequently, the Committee revised the first paragraph of G-S.1. to read as shown in the “Item Under Consideration” in the 2011 NCWM Interim Agenda.

At its 2010 fall Interim Meeting, the CWMA S&T Committee stated that it believes that this item should be moved to a Vote and suggested an editorial change on G.S.1.1. (b) (3), to read “no more than two levels of access” instead of “one or, at most, two levels of access.”

During the fall 2010 WWMA Annual Technical Conference, Mr. Cook, NIST Technical Advisor to the WS, provided an update to the Committee. Mr. Cook also discussed the conflicting language between G-S.1. and G-S.1.1. identified by the SMA and the NCWM S&T Committee’s solution to eliminate the conflict. The WS reviewed the list of acceptable abbreviations and icons as requested by the Software Sector and agreed that the abbreviation “SI” should not be included in the list since “SI” is also the abbreviation to the International System of Measurement.

The WS also noted that the icon “M” with the green fill should not be used since it is used by the European Union as a metrology mark for all devices, not just for metrological software identification.

Mr. Flocken, speaking on behalf of the SMA, restated its April 2010 position based on the conflicting language in paragraphs G-S.1. and G-S.1.1. He added that the revised language for G-S.1. in the S&T Agenda should also be reviewed by the Software Sector. Mr. Johnson, Gilbarco, added that their current Retail Motor-Fuel Dispenser (RMFD) software cannot display alpha characters in or for software version identification which is problematic since the latest version of the proposal includes software identification for all software based devices. Mr. Johnson added that a possible solution would be to allow the software version to be reported on the NTEP CC.

The WWMA recommended the following amendment to G-S.1. (d)(2) that addresses Gilbarco’s comments on devices with limited character sets such as RMFD without alpha displays and/or annunciators to read as follows:
(d) the current software version or revision identifier for software-based devices;
   [Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2004]
   (Added 2003)
   (1) . . .

(2) *Except for devices with limited character sets (e.g., primary indications without alpha characters or
    annunciators*) the version or revision identifier shall be prefaced by words, an abbreviation, or a
    symbol, that clearly identifies the number as the required version or revision.

(WMD Technical Advisor Note: After the WWMA meeting, WMD noted that it believes there is a need
to address the exception by adding language to address the method for identifying the version or revision
number for devices with limited character sets. For example: Add a new sentence at the end of (2) such as
“For devices with limited character sets, the instructions to identify the version or revision identifier
shall be listed on the NTEP CC.”)

The WWMA believes that the above changes to the proposal sufficiently address all issues identified during the
open hearings and that this should remain an Information item to allow the Software Sector an opportunity to
comment on the revisions proposed by the NCWM and WWMA S&T Committees.

At its 2010 Annual Meeting open hearing, the SWMA heard from Mr. Johnson, Gilbarco, restating his concern
about how this proposal would apply to some simpler devices that may have a limited display capability; while these
devices may be able to display a software version number, they aren’t able to display a designation that defines it as
a “version number.” Mr. Johnson also noted that the WWMA modified the proposed language to provide an
exception for devices with limited character sets and encouraged the Committee to review this language.
Mr. Straub, Fairbanks Scales, speaking on behalf of SMA stated that SMA, at its 2010 spring meeting, opposed this
item. Mr. Straub also pointed out that there appears to be a conflict with regard to the required permanence of the
marking, noting that G-S.1. refers to “permanently marked,” whereas G-S.2. makes reference to “continuously
displayed” markings.

The SWMA S&T Committee considered whether or not the proposal is ready to be adopted. Based on the variety of
comments heard, comments opposing the item, and the alternatives presented, the Committee did not feel it could
make a recommendation at this time. The Committee felt that the Software Sector should be given the opportunity
to review the input and comments made on this issue since the last meeting of the Sector. Consequently, the
Committee felt that the item should remain as an Information item on the NCWM S&T Committee’s agenda.

At its fall 2011 Interim Meeting, NEWMA states that the WWMA proposed revision to the “item under
consideration” and questions raised have merit. NEWMA recommends this remain an Information item to give the
Weighing Sector and the NCWM S&T Committee time to evaluate the new language.

310-3  G-A.6. Nonretroactive Requirements (Remanufactured Equipment)

Source: WWMA and SWMA 2010 Carryover Item 310-4.

Purpose: Clarify the intent of the 2001 NCWM position on the application of nonretroactive requirements to
devices which have been determined to have been “remanufactured.”

amending subparagraphs (a) and (b) as follows:

G-A.6. Nonretroactive Requirements. – “Nonretroactive” requirements are enforceable after the effective
date for:

   (a) devices manufactured and remanufactured within a state after the effective date;
(b) both new, and used, and remanufactured devices brought into a state after the effective date; and

c) devices used in noncommercial applications which are placed into commercial use after the effective date.

Nonretroactive requirements are not enforceable with respect to devices that are in commercial service in the state as of the effective date or to new equipment in the stock of a manufacturer or a dealer in the state as of the effective date.  

[Nonretroactive requirements are printed in italic type.]  
(Amended 1989 and 201X)

Background/Discussion: WMD received an inquiry from a state Weights and Measures Director regarding whether or not a nonretroactive paragraph in the LMD Code of HB 44 would apply to a remanufactured device. In researching this inquiry, WMD discovered an unintended gap in the General Code requirements relative to remanufactured equipment.

- Paragraph G-S.1.2. Remanufactured Devices and Remanufactured Main Elements is a non-retroactive requirement for marking a device with the remanufacturer’s information and was enforceable on a nonretroactive basis as of January 1, 2002. WMD believes that this paragraph was intended to apply to remanufactured devices and remanufactured main elements that have been placed into commercial service as of the effective date of the requirement, which was January 1, 2002.

- Paragraph G-A.6. Nonretroactive Requirements. (which provides the various conditions in which nonretroactive requirements apply) does not include references to “remanufactured devices” or “remanufactured main elements.” Subparagraph (a) (of G-A.6.) references and applies to “manufactured” devices within a state. Appendix D of HB 44 defines a “manufactured” device as any commercial weighing or measuring device shipped as new from the original equipment manufacturer (OEM). Subparagraph (b) could be applied to remanufactured devices that are brought into a state, but could not be applied to those devices installed by a remanufacturer or distributor operating within the state. Subparagraph (c) applies to devices placed into commercial service that had previously been used in noncommercial applications.

Research into past NCWM Conference Reports indicates that a proposal to change the HB 44 definition of “manufactured device” was adopted by the NCWM in 2001. The definition was amended and new definitions for “remanufactured” and “repaired” devices were added; these changes were made based on the recommendations of the NCWM Remanufactured Devices Task Force to provide a recommendation to distinguish remanufactured devices from repaired devices and, thus, give the field official tools to determine what requirements apply to both types of devices. The previous definition, shown below and identified as the “2001 HB 44 definition,” included text that WMD believes was intended to include remanufactured devices. The new definition deleted the text “new device or any other device” to the extent that the definition from 2002 forward only applies to devices shipped as new from the OEM.

2001 HB 44 Definition

manufactured device. – Any new device or any other device that has been removed from service and substantially altered or rebuilt.

2002 HB 44 Definition

manufactured device. – Any commercial weighing or measuring device shipped as new from the original equipment manufacturer.

It should be noted that the definitions for repaired and remanufactured devices were also adopted to provide guidance to officials to determine if a device has been remanufactured to “be made to operate like a new device of
the same type” or repaired to bring it “back into proper operating condition” (see the “Report of the 86th NCWM” Annual Report S&T Item 310-1, page S&T - 5).

If paragraph G-A.6. were interpreted as being silent with respect to remanufactured devices and remanufactured main elements, G-S.1.2., in WMD’s opinion, could not be applied. This was clearly not the intent since, as indicated by its title, it was designed to apply to “remanufactured” equipment.

Because remanufactured devices compete with newly manufactured devices, WMD believes the intent of G-A.6. Nonretroactive Requirements is intended to include such equipment in the scope of the paragraph. That is, remanufactured devices and remanufactured main elements should have to comply with the most current nonretroactive requirements in effect as of the date the devices or elements are remanufactured.

A change is needed to G-A.6. to clarify the application of G-S.1.2. and other nonretroactive requirements, which WMD believes should apply to remanufactured devices and remanufactured main elements.

An additional reason to adopt the proposed language is that the proposed modification to G-A.6. would clearly support their actions in the event that Weights and Measures officials are challenged regarding the application of G-S.1.2. or other nonretroactive paragraphs.

It should be noted that device owners and remanufacturers may experience difficulty in complying with applicable nonretroactive requirements in instances where states have not previously applied them to remanufactured equipment. The extent to which this has occurred may become more evident as this issue is discussed within the regional Weights and Measures and industry associations and alternatives to alleviate this burden on existing equipment could be considered.

While developing this proposal, WMD contacted two RMFDs OEMs and representatives from those companies both indicated that remanufactured RMFD’s should comply with the most recent HB 44 nonretroactive requirements in effect as of the date they are remanufactured.

WMD also contacted the chairman of the Remanufactured Device Task Force that was formed by the NCWM BOD in 1999. The chairman indicated that to the best of his recollection, there was no conscious discussion from the task force of how nonretroactive requirements were to apply to remanufactured equipment. He believes that different states may be enforcing nonretroactive requirements differently with respect to remanufactured equipment.

The following is a brief history of paragraph G-S.1.2. Remanufactured Devices and Remanufactured Main Elements:

- 1997 – A proposal to add a new paragraph addressing the required marking on RMFD’s that had been resold for placement into service first appeared as an Informational item on the NCWM Specifications and Tolerances Committee agenda.

- 1999 – The NCWM appoints a task force to examine the required marking issues of remanufactured equipment. The primary responsibility of the task force was to develop a marking requirement proposal for the NCWM consideration.

- 2001 – The task force proposed to add several new definitions and a General Code requirement (G-S.1.2.) to HB 44. The task force also proposed changing the existing HB 44 definition of “manufactured device.” Of importance, the proposal removed language from the definition that linked devices that had been substantially altered or rebuilt to G-A.6.

- 2002 – The marking requirement for remanufactured devices and remanufactured main elements first appeared in HB 44 along with new definitions for “remanufactured devices (and elements)” and “repaired devices (and elements).”

The proposed change in the “Item Under Consideration” will clarify how nonretroactive paragraphs apply to remanufactured equipment.
WMD notes that the issue of applying paragraph G-A.6. to remanufactured equipment is separate from that of determining when a device or element has been “remanufactured.” Definitions found in Appendix D of HB 44 along with guidance developed by the NCWM Remanufactured Equipment Task Force can be used to assist jurisdictions in determining when a device or main element has been “remanufactured.” The proposed change does not suggest changing these tools or their application. The proposed change is only to clarify the application of G-A.6. to devices that have been determined to have been “remanufactured.”

Even if the proposed direction of solving this problem is not supported as written, WMD believes that some alternate language needs to be added to G-A.6. to clarify its application to remanufactured equipment.

At its fall 2009 meeting, the CWMA suggested that this item be given Developmental status. The CWMA requested that a number of questions regarding how devices are categorized as “remanufactured” be addressed prior to considering this as an Informational item.

During their fall 2009 meetings, the WWMA and SWMA agreed that nonretroactive requirements are applicable to remanufactured equipment that is remanufactured after the effective date. The WWMA believed these devices are competing with new and used devices and should, therefore, be subject to the same requirements. The WWMA and SWMA recommended the proposal be included as a Voting item with some modifications on the Committee’s 2010 Agenda.

At its fall 2009 meeting, NEWMA stated it does not support this proposal because it is not clear what problem the proposal is trying to solve and suggested that the proposal is redundant, since a remanufactured device is considered a new device with its own CC and, therefore, already has to meet code requirements.

At the 2010 NCWM Interim Meeting, the Committee received comments from Mr. Straub, Fairbanks Scales, speaking on behalf of the SMA, who supported the item as proposed in the WWMA recommendation. Some other industry members, including at least one device remanufacturer testified that they have not had sufficient time to review and analyze the impact of the proposal which is intended to clarify existing language. Others stated remanufactured devices need to be treated as new and that they compete with new devices manufactured after the nonretroactive date of new and amended requirements in effect after the device was remanufactured. Mr. Andersen, New York, stated that this proposal should not be part of “Application” paragraphs.

The Committee agreed that the proposed amendment is supported by the intent of the NCWM Remanufactured Devices Task Force when it recommended making a distinction between repaired and remanufactured devices since such a distinction may impact applicable tolerances, NTEP status, and fair competition when a remanufactured device is represented as “good as new.” The Committee also believes that many of the questions raised by the CWMA are answered in the 2000 Report of the NCWM Remanufactured Device Task Force in Appendix A of the 86th NCWM Annual Report page S&T - 58 through S&T - 69. The Committee also noted that not all remanufactured devices are required to have a new CC and are still traceable to the original CC as noted in the “List of Examples” in the task force report in pages S&T - 64 through S&T - 66.

The Committee recommended that this item, as amended by the WWMA, move forward as a Voting item.

At its 2010 spring Annual Meeting, NEWMA recommended that this item remain an Information item until questions raised during the discussion at its open hearing have been addressed.

At its 2010 spring Annual Meeting, the CWMA recommended that the nonretroactive requirements should be applicable to all new devices. That is, the requirement would apply to remanufactured devices defined in HB 44 as being made to operate like a new device of the same type (i.e., work done to a device or element to the extent that it is required to be marked as “remanufactured” in the Remanufactured Task Force table of scenarios.). The CWMA further recommends that this item be made an Information item to address some of the concerns raised by manufacturers and to review the Task Force guidelines. The CWMA also recommended that the list be posted on the NCWM and/or WMD websites according to the recommendation in the 2002 NCWM Annual Report.

S&T Committee 2011 Interim Agenda
At the 2010 NCWM Annual Meeting, the Committee received several comments from remanufacturers requesting the item be made an Information item to give the device remanufacturers additional time to evaluate the impact of the proposed amendment to G-A.6.

During the open hearing, the Committee also received a letter from Mr. Thomas McGee, PMP Corporation in Appendix C, stating that he disagrees with WMD that the proposed changes to G-A.6 is a clarification of the intent of the Remanufactured Devices Task Force. As it currently reads in the 2010 version of HB 44, G-A.6 Nonretroactive Requirements applies to new devices based on the “Original Manufacturing Date” as compared to the effective date of a requirement. Therefore, a device originally manufactured in January 2002 and remanufactured January 2007 would need to meet all nonretroactive requirements added to the handbook up to and including January 2007. In his letter, Mr. McGee provided an example of a RMFD removed from an installation and remanufactured. In this example, the dispenser was disassembled and checked for wear, and a new mechanical computer and new outer skins were installed. The dispenser was checked for accuracy and everything checked out per HB 44. Because this dispenser was out of production prior to the adding of the nonretroactive marking requirement specifying that the CC number be clearly marked on the dispenser, it could be rejected by a state and not allowed to be installed.

Mr. McGee added that, as stated in the discussion of the item, NIST makes a direct comparison between a new device and a remanufactured device indicating they directly compete with each other. This is true as far as competing in the same market as a whole, but not if you factor in technology, features, warranty, etc. Sometime in the 1990s the Remanufactured Task Force recognized that Remanufacturing has been going on for a long time and is just part of the business. The remanufactured devices do not directly compete with new devices, but they do fill a void. A smaller low volume operation can buy remanufactured devices at a reduced price, which keeps them competitive with the large volume operations. It provides a means to extend the life of equipment that maybe has gone out of production but is still very accurate and reliable. Mr. Mc Gee recommended that this be moved back to an Information item or removed from the agenda. If made an Information item it would give all of those companies that could be impacted by the change to review and comment on this issue. He added that this is not just a clarification. It is clearly a change in the philosophy of applying Nonretroactive Requirements. A complete copy of Mr. McGee’s letter (less extracts of HB 44 and above background information) can be viewed in Appendix A of this Report.

Mr. Don Graff, Graffco Inc., submitted a list of remanufacturers of LMD in Appendix C that may be impacted by the enforcement of nonretroactive requirements on remanufactured devices and requested that this item be given Information status. A complete copy of Mr. Graff’s letter can be viewed in Appendix A of this Report.

The Committee also received a letter of support for this item from Mr. R. Michael Carlson, President, Dresser Wayne North America (see Appendix C). Mr. Carlson expressed his company’s concerns about a growing trend to extend the lifecycle by refurbishing or “remanufacturing” the equipment after its removal from the original site and then placing it back into the stream of commerce without first bringing it into compliance with current NTEP standards. This failure to meet applicable NTEP certification standards increases the chances of errors, misuse, and fraud and puts consumers as well as station owners at risk. The current practice of extending the usable life of fuel dispensers without a system of checks and balances to help ensure that, at the time of sale, such used and remanufactured equipment meets current NTEP standards results in inconsistency in the marketplace and an unacceptable risk of error.

Mr. Carlson added that the consistency and accuracy of fuel-dispensing equipment is an issue of critical and growing importance. For decades the industry has been able to safely and reliably operate within a fueling and payment infrastructure that remained relatively stable. However, the last few years have brought significant changes to the marketplace, including the following:

- Payment security including:
  - Increasing threats of fraud through sophisticated fuel and identity-theft schemes;
  - Credit card industry mandates for increasingly rigorous payment-security standards; and
  - Dispenser manufacturers have enhanced fuel-meter technology and associated electronics to deter tampering with measurement and calibration.
- Fuel evolution including:
  - Ultra-low-sulfur diesel (ULSD) and diesel exhaust fluid (DEF) have taxed the capabilities of dispensers' hydraulic systems; and
  - Higher levels of ethanol in today's fuels require specially fabricated seals and components.

- Communications interface (and security) including:
  - Download of dispenser software from remote sources; and
  - The potential for automatic meter-calibration.

Thus, Dresser Wayne supports maintaining item 301-4 G-A.6. as a Voting item at the National Conference on Weights and Measures in July 2010 and noted that it is in the best interest of the general public, station owners and the fuel-dispensing industry in general. A complete copy of the letter can be viewed in Appendix A of this Report.

Mr. Andersen, New York, stated that one of the primary issues that led to the marking requirements was original manufacturers’ concern over warranty and liability concerns when devices were remanufactured with unauthorized parts. Mr. Lewis, Rice Lake Weighing, expressed concern about a remanufacturer’s ability to remanufacture a device without the original manufacturer’s blueprints and parts lists. Additionally, Mr. Lewis stated that VCAP should also be applicable to remanufacturers that work on devices subject to testing for influence factors.

The SMA stated its support for this item during the open hearings. WMD reiterated that the current issue was proposed because paragraph G-A.6. does not specifically reference “remanufactured” devices and elements and that WMD has received questions on how or if nonretroactive requirements are to be applied to “remanufactured” devices and elements. WMD believes that it was the intent of the 2001 and 2002 Committees that remanufactured devices would be subject to nonretroactive requirements according to the definition for “remanufactured devices” in Appendix D. Other OEMs have also stated that they remanufacture their own devices and, typically, remanufacture them to the current applicable nonretroactive devices.

WMD also provided the Committee with the following “real life” examples outlining when a device is considered as “repaired” or “remanufactured.”

**Weighing Devices**

**Example 1:** A scale service agency replaces all of the load cells of a vehicle scale’s weighing/load-receiving element with load cells of a different manufacture that are metrological equivalent cells and of the same basic type. The replacement cells have been issued an NTEP CC and are replaced without any modification to the load cell mounting assembly.

The associated guideline adopted by the NCWM in 2002 is “Guideline Item” 9-W, Section I Examples of Repaired Devices/Repaired Elements (no metrological change).

**According to the guideline, this is an example of a repaired device.** The weighing/load-receiving element would still be traceable to the original NTEP CC and would not be required to comply with the most recent nonretroactive requirements.

**Example 2:** A scale service agency completely rebuilds a used retail-computing scale that they acquired from a grocery store that had had it in service for over 15 years. The scale is completely disassembled, parts inspected for wear, and all worn parts replaced with remanufactured parts that are not OEM, but are the same design. The load cell, found to still be functioning satisfactorily, is not replaced. The scale is then reassembled and sold to a delicatessen located within the same state as the service agency.

The associated guideline adopted by the NCWM in 2002 is “Guideline Item” 3-W, Section II Examples of Remanufactured Devices/Remanufactured Elements (no metrological change).

**According to the guideline, this is an example of a “remanufactured” device.** The scale would still be traceable to the original NTEP CC, but would need to be marked in accordance with paragraph
G-S.1.2. Remanufactured Devices and Remanufactured Main Elements and also would be required to comply with the most recent HB 44 nonretroactive requirements in effect as of the date the scale is installed in its new location. For example, if the remanufactured scale were installed July 1, 2010, it would need to comply with paragraph G-S.1., bullet (e) which requires an NTEP Certificate of Conformance (CC) or CC Addendum Number for devices that have a CC be permanently marked. This particular requirement is nonretroactive as of January 1, 2007.

Measuring Devices

**Example 1:** A used equipment dealer replaces a meter that cannot be brought into proper calibration with a used meter of the same model taken from a used dispenser. This work is performed at the used equipment dealer’s shop. The replacement meter is recalibrated after installation and then placed back into service.

The associated guideline adopted by the NCWM in 2002 is “Guideline Item” 8-M, Section I Examples of Repaired Devices/Repaired Elements (no metrological change).

**According to the guideline, this is an example of a “repaired” device.** The device is still traceable to the original NTEP CC and would not be required to comply with the most recent nonretroactive requirements in effect as of the time this work was completed.

**Example 2:** A remanufacturer of dispensers completely disassembles a RMFD and replaces the meter with the same model meter remanufactured by another firm. They then fix and replace all other parts as needed, reassemble the dispenser, and offer it for sale as a “remanufactured” dispenser.

The associated guideline adopted by the NCWM in 2002 is “Guideline Item” 6-M, Section II – Examples of Remanufactured Devices/Remanufactured Elements (no metrological change).

**According to the guideline, this is an example of a “remanufactured” device.** It would need to be marked in accordance with paragraph G-S.1.2. Remanufactured Devices and Remanufactured Main Elements and also would be required to comply with the most recent HB 44 nonretroactive requirements in effect as of the date the dispenser is installed into commercial service. For example, if a 15 year old dispenser were remanufactured and returned to service on July 1, 2010, it would need to comply with Liquid-Measuring Devices Code, paragraph S.4.4.2. Location of Marking Information; Retail Motor-Fuel Dispensers, which is nonretroactive as of January 1, 2003.

The Committee considered the following points:

- If it was not the intent of the NCWM in adopting the definitions and marking requirements for “remanufactured” devices and elements to subject remanufactured devices to Nonretroactive requirements, then how should G-S.1.2. be applied since the “remanufactured” marking requirement in G-S.1.2. was adopted as a nonretroactive requirement?
- The terms “manufactured” and “remanufactured” have distinct definitions in that manufactured devices are shipped as new and remanufactured devices are made to operate as new as defined in HB 44 Appendix D.
- Paragraph G-A.6. is currently silent with respect to remanufactured devices and elements.
- There is a lot of misunderstanding of the original findings and recommendations of the original task force.

After considering these points and the comments received on this issue, the Committee agreed to designate this as Information item to allow interests parties to review the report of the Remanufactured Task Force and associated table of scenarios. The Committee also requested that the NIST Technical Advisor contact the NTEP Administrator to discuss the potential impact of VCAP on remanufacturers with regard to how these guidelines would be integrated into the VCAP system.

At its fall 2010 Interim Meeting, the CWMA received comments during its open hearing to adopt the proposal as written and move it forward for a Vote. Members of the CWMA believe that remanufactured devices also need to
be traceable to an NTEP CC. The CWMA also received comments concerning unfair competition between original manufacturers and remanufacturers due to the use of non-OEM replacement parts. The CWMA S&T Committee recommends that this item be moved as a Voting item for the reasons stated above. All new and remanufactured device types to be used in trade or commerce must be traceable to an NTEP CC.

During the fall 2010 WWMA Annual Technical Conference, Mr. Cook, NIST Technical Advisor, provided the WWMA a handout “Summary of 2010 HB 44 General, Scales, and Liquid-Measuring Devices Codes Nonretroactive Requirements” to help the WWMA assess the impact these requirements might have on remanufactured devices and elements in Appendix B. Mr. Cook added that he will discuss with Mr. Truex, NTEP, Administrator, how the VCAP requirements will impact this issue if VCAP addresses “production meets type” policies and guidelines for devices that have been remanufactured by parties other than the OEM. Mr. Flocken, speaking on behalf of the SMA, supported this proposal. Mr. Johnson, Gilbarco, also supported this proposal.

The WWMA S&T Committee considered the effect of applying nonretroactive requirements to devices which have been determined to have been “remanufactured” expressing concern that this General Code revision may have an unanticipated impact on certain devices. The WWMA S&T Committee reviewed the list provided by Mr. Cook and found that some requirements seemed to be metrologically insignificant, with minimal benefit to users and/or consumers. The WWMA S&T Committee is uncertain if VCAP polices and guidelines should be considered when devices are required to be retested for compliance with influence factor requirements. The WWMA requested that the NIST Technical Advisor contact Mr. Truex, NTEP Administrator, and ask if VCAP policies and guidelines are also applicable to NTEP devices and elements subject to influence factor requirements that are remanufactured (and still traceable to the original CC).

The WWMA agrees that while the “Examples of Repaired Devices/Repaired Elements” in Appendix B were sufficiently developed, they need to be readily available to remanufacturers and field officials.

The WWMA agrees that the item should continue as an Information item, allowing other regions and industry to provide input.

At its fall 2010 Annual Meeting, the SWMA S&T Committee considered the effect of applying nonretroactive requirements to devices which have been determined to have been “remanufactured.” Based on some of the comments heard during its open hearings, the Committee was not clear how the proposed changes might impact some remanufactured equipment. The Committee reviewed a summary of nonretroactive requirements prepared by Mr. Cook, NIST WMD. The Committee agreed with the WWMA’s assessment that some requirements seemed to be metrologically insignificant, with minimal benefit to users and/or consumers. The SWMA S&T Committee agreed with the WWMA that while the examples of repaired and remanufactured devices and elements were sufficiently developed, they need to be readily available to remanufacturers and field officials. For example, referenced in HB 44 Appendix D Definitions, and published in NIST Handbook 112, and on NCWM and WMD websites.

The SWMA agreed that the item should remain an Information item to allow for input from stakeholders on the impact of the proposal. The Committee noted that, to assist field officials and industry in correctly applying the HB 44 requirements, modification should be made to G-A.6. to clearly define whether nonretroactive requirements do apply or do not apply to remanufactured equipment.

At its 2010 fall Interim Meeting, NEWMA heard from Mr. McGee, PMP Corporation. He stated his opposition to this item. He believes the current language in the HB 44 already covers remanufactured devices by virtue of the use of the term “used” in General Code paragraph G-A.6. (b) Nonretroactive Requirements. He stated that any devices that are remanufactured, repaired, reconditioned, refurbished, or rebuilt are used equipment. Therefore, they are required to comply with nonretroactive requirements if brought into a state. Hence, there is no pressing need to change the wording to include “and remanufactured” in G-A.6.(b).

Discussion from the group restated the position that NEWMA does not see a need for this item when devices are serviced to such an extent that they are required to be marked as “Remanufactured” and must comply with nonretroactive requirements. NEWMA continues to question the purpose of this item if remanufactured devices are already considered as new devices in HB 44.
After receiving the report from NEWMA, Mr. Cook, NIST Technical Advisor, contacted Mr. McGee to clarify his reasons for opposing this item. He responded by questioning, as a practical manner, whether a weights and measures official would reject a specific model delicatessen scale if a grocery store chain moved it from one of their stores in one state to one of their stores in another state just because the imported scale did not have a CC number marked on the scale label, especially if it was the exact same model as the scales already in the store. Similarly, he questioned whether a weights and measures official was going to reject a retail motor fuel device brought into a state from another state to replace one hit and damaged beyond repair by a motorist because it did not have the CC number marked on the dispenser label, or the name plate or the label was not placed at the required proper height. This is especially an issue in stations with dispensers manufactured by firms that are no longer in existence.

### 320 SCALES

#### 320-1 T.N.4.5.1. Time Dependence: Class II, III, and IIII Non-automatic Weighing Instruments

**Source:** 2010 NTETC Weighing Sector

**Purpose:** To reduce the inconsistency between full load time dependence (creep) and return to zero return requirements in T.N.4.3. Zero Return: Non-automatic Weighing Instruments (creep recovery).

**Item Under Consideration:**

T.N.4.5.1. **Time Dependence: Class II, III, and IIII Non-automatic Weighing Instruments.** – A non-automatic weighing instrument of Classes II, III, and IIII shall meet the following requirements at constant test conditions. During type evaluation, this test shall be conducted at 20 °C ± 2 °C (68 °F ± 4 °F):

(a) When any load is kept on an instrument, the difference between the indication obtained immediately after placing the load and the indication observed during the following 30 minutes shall not exceed 0.5 e.

   (iii) 0.5 e for Class II and IIII devices,

   (iv) 0.5 e for Class III devices with 4000 or fewer divisions,

   (v) 0.83 e for Class IIII devices with more than 4000 divisions.

However, the difference between the indication obtained at 15 minutes and the indication obtained at 30 minutes shall not exceed 0.2 e.

For multi-interval or multiple range instruments, when any load is kept on an instrument, the difference between the indication obtained immediately after placing the load and the indication observed during the following 30 minutes shall not exceed 0.83 eᵢ (where eᵢ is the interval of the weighing segment or range).

(b) If the conditions in (a) are not met, the difference between the indication obtained immediately after placing the load on the instrument and the indication observed during the following 4 hours shall not exceed the absolute value of the maximum permissible error at the load applied.

(Added 2005) (Amended 2006 and 2010)

**Background/Discussion:** During the 2010 Annual Meeting, the NCWM voted to amend the language in T.N.4.5.3. Zero Load Return: Non-Automatic Weighing Instruments. Hobart Corporation reported that the changes to scale tolerances for time dependence in HB 44 adopted in 2005 are still not consistent with the intent to harmonize load cell and scale performance requirements. In 2009 the WS addressed creep recovery on return to zero but there is still an extremely tight 0.5e requirement (Scales Code paragraph T.N.4.5.1.(a)) for the change in indications in 30 minutes. This requirement makes the recent changes to the scale zero return (creep recovery)
specification of minimal value since the amount of creep at capacity is related to a load cells’ ability to return to zero. The WS agreed with the intent of the proposal submitted by Hobart Corporation and agreed to submit the above proposal to amend HB 44 Scales Code paragraph T.N.4.5.1.(a) to the NCWM S&T Committee and regional weights and measures associations.

At its fall 2010 CWMA Interim Meeting, the CWMA S&T Committee recommended this item be further developed by the WS since there was no one to speak on behalf of the proposal.

At its 2010 fall WWMA Annual Technical Conference, Mr. Flocken, Mettler Toledo and Mr. Straub, Fairbanks Scales stated their support for this item. There were no comments in opposition. The WWMA agreed that this item is sufficiently developed for the NCWM Agenda as a Voting item.

During its open hearings at the fall 2010 SWMA Annual Meeting, the SWMA S&T Committee heard support for this item from Mr. Straub, Fairbanks Scales. Mr. Straub noted that the industry was aware of the need for these changes when other, related changes were adopted for paragraph T.N.4.5.1. in July 2010. However, rather than attempting to address these changes all at that time, industry felt additional time should be given to allow industry and weights and measures officials to study additional changes to the paragraph. The SWMA heard no comments in opposition to the proposal and felt that the proposed change is reasonable. Additionally, the SWMA recognized that the issue has received technical review from the members of the WS. Thus, the SWMA recommends that the item be included on the NCWM S&T Committee’s agenda as a Voting item.

At its fall 2010 NEWMA Interim Meeting, the NEWMA S&T Committee recommended this item remain an Information item since there was no one to speak on behalf of the proposal.

320-2 T.N.4.7. Creep Recovery for Load Cells

Source: 2010 NTETC Weighing Sector

Purpose: To eliminate the conflict in load cell creep recovery tolerances between Class III and III L load cells by increasing the creep recovery tolerance for Class III L load cells by the same factor (5/3) as was used in 2009 when the creep recovery tolerances for Class III load cells were amended.

Item Under Consideration:

T.N.4.7. Creep Recovery for Load Cells During Type Evaluation. – The difference between the initial reading of the minimum load of the measuring range (D_{min}) and the reading after returning to minimum load subsequent to the maximum load (D_{max}) having been applied for 30 minutes shall not exceed:

(a) 0.5 times the value of the load cell verification interval (0.5 v) for Class II and III load cells;

(b) 0.5 times the value of the load cell verification interval (0.5 v) for Class III load cells with 4000 or fewer divisions;

(c) 0.83 times the value of the load cell verification interval (0.83 v) for Class III load cells with more than 4000 divisions; or

(d) 2\frac{5}{4} \times\quad \text{the value of the load cell verification interval} (2\frac{5}{4} v) for Class III L load cells.

(Added 2006) (Amended 2009 and 201X)

Background/Discussion: At the 2010 Annual Meeting of the WS, Avery Weigh-Tronix reported that HB 44 Creep Recovery tolerances for Class III load cells with n > 4000 divisions in Scales Code paragraph T.N.4.7., is now greater than creep recovery tolerances applicable to Class III L load cells. In terms of mV/V equivalency, a Class III/III L load cell can now pass Class III and fail Class III L creep recovery tolerances.

Prior to 2009, the tolerance for Class III load cells was 0.5v. This was increased by a factor of 5/3 to arrive at the 0.83 v tolerance in the current requirement. This recommendation proposes to increase the existing 1.5v tolerance
for Class III L load cells by the same 5/3 factor. Thus the new tolerance would be 1.5v x 5/3 or 2.5v.

The following is an example of a 50 000 lb load cell marked with both III and III L accuracy classes that illustrates the problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class III:</th>
<th>Class III L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n_{max} = 5000</td>
<td>n_{max} = 10 000v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v_{min} = 10 lb</td>
<td>v_{min} = 5 lb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current Class III creep recovery tolerance is 0.83v (0.83v x 10 lb/v = 8.3 lb)
The current Class III L creep recovery tolerance is 1.5v (1.5v x 5 lb/v = 7.5 lb)
The proposed Class III L creep recovery tolerance is 1.5v x 5/3 = 2.5v (2.5v x 5 lb/v = 12.5 lb)

The NIST Technical Advisor to the WS provided the Sector with a summary of creep recovery test results from October 1, 2007, through August 12, 2010, for Class III L load cells from the NIST Force Group that shows that Class III L load cell creep recovery type evaluation compliance rate is 76% using existing tolerances. The compliance rate for Class III load cells over the same time period is 69% using the expanded tolerance adopted in 2009. Mr. Kevin Fruechte, Avery Weigh-Tronix, explained to the WS the need to amend the creep recovery tolerances for Class III L load cells based on the example provided by the NIST Technical Advisor. A WS member stated that using the 5/3 factor would reconcile the differences between U.S. Class III L creep recovery tolerances with comparable OIML R 60 Class C load cell tolerances. The WS agreed to submit the language to amend paragraph T.N.4.7 to the S&T Committee and regional weights and measures associations as shown in the item under consideration.

At its fall 2010 CWMA Interim Meeting, the CWMA S&T Committee recommended this item be further developed by the WS since there was no one to speak on behalf of the proposal.

At its 2010 WWMA Annual Technical Conference, Mr. Flocken, Mettler, Mettler Toledo, and Mr. Straub, Fairbanks Scales, stated their support for this item. There were no comments in opposition. The WWMA agreed that this item is sufficiently developed for the NCWM Agenda as a Voting item.

During its open hearings at the 2010 SWMA Annual Meeting, the SWMA S&T Committee heard no comments in opposition to the proposal and felt that the proposed change is reasonable. The Committee also noted that there was industry support for the proposal at the WWMA based on the WWMA addendum sheets.

At its fall 2010 NEWMA Interim Meeting, the NEWMA S&T Committee recommended this item remain an Information item since there was no one to speak on behalf of the proposal.

### 321 BELT-CONVEYOR SCALE (BCS) SYSTEMS

#### 321-1 N.3.1.3. Check for Consistency of the Conveyor Belt Along Its Entire Length

Source: 2010 Carryover Item 321-1. This item originated from the 2008 WWMA Meeting. (This item first appeared on the 2008 Committee’s Developing Items Section of its agenda as Item 360-2 Part 3 Item 2.) At the 2010 NCWM Annual Conference, this item was changed to a Developmental item at the request of the submitter since the NIST/OIML U.S. National Working Group (USNWG) believed that the item needed additional development and was intended to be moved to item 360-2 Developing Items Part 2.21. Belt-Conveyor Scale Systems – Item 1. After the NCWM Annual Meeting, the Committee received a request from the USNWG stating that the language in the Committee’s 2010 Interim Report was further developed and recommended that the revised “Item Under Consideration” is ready to be added to the Committee’s 2011 Interim Agenda.

The NIST Technical Advisors added that they believe that the request satisfies the criteria for inclusion in the Committee’s agenda according to HB 44 Introduction Sections H and I, and that the WWMA, at its fall 2011 Annual Technical Conference, voted to add this item to the NCWM Committee’s agenda pending approval of the
Purpose: The BCS WG agrees that the existing language in N.3.1.3. results in an excessive allowance for the variation in the totalizers for a belt with larger minimum division sizes. Conversely, the three division requirement can impose an excessively narrow restriction for BCS with smaller minimum divisions. The proposed amendment corrects the issue and makes the allowable variation independent of division size.

Item Under Consideration: Amend NIST HB 44, Section 2.21. Belt-Conveyor Scales (BCS) Systems Code, paragraph N.3.1.3. as follows:

N.3.1.3. Check for Consistency of the Conveyor Belt Along Its Entire Length. – During a zero-load test with all operational low-flow lockout disabled, the total change indicated in the totalizer during any complete revolution of the belt shall not exceed the absolute value of 0.12 % of the minimum totalized load. After a zero load test with flow rate filtering disabled, the totalizer shall not change more than plus or minus (± 3 d) 3.0 scale divisions from its initial indication during one complete belt revolution.

Note: The end value of the zero-load test must meet the ± 0.06 % requirement referenced in the “Test for Zero Stability.”

(Added 2002) (Amended 2004 and 201X)

Background/Discussion: At its fall 2007 Annual Technical Conference, the WWMA received a proposal from the Belt-Conveyor Scale WG (BCS WG) to amend paragraph N.3.1.3. The BCS WG stated that existing language in N.3.1.3. results in an excessive allowance for the variation in a belt. However, for belt-conveyor scales that can benefit from a smaller minimum division, the three division requirement can impose an excessively narrow restriction. It should be noted that variations in belt weight tend to be sinusoidal. In other words, the error caused by belt variations would be canceled if the material test were conducted using complete revolutions. The maximum belt variation would occur at 0.5, 1.5, 2.5, etc., revolutions. However, material tests are rarely conducted using complete revolutions of the belt.

During the 2009 NCWM Interim Meeting, the Committee heard a comment from Mr. Bill Ripka, Thermo Ramsey, supporting the proposal as written in the Committee’s recommendation and adding that the current language in HB 44 stating the current three scale interval deviation from an initial indication can lead to significant errors in scale accuracy. The Committee agreed with the comments from Mr. Ripka and recommended this item move forward as a Voting item.

At the 2009 NCWM Annual Meeting, the Committee received comments and recommendations from the February 2009 meeting of the BCS WG. The members of the WG came to general agreement that with regard to these systems, the conveyor belt needs to be uniform (minimum variations in the weight per unit of length of the belt), but the proposal as it exists in the Committee’s Interim Report is not well understood. The variation during a revolution of the belt is most important and will exhibit the most impact for BCS applications that may use a portion of a belt revolution to deliver a weighment (e.g., 2.5 belt revolutions). This could occur when loading individual trucks or railcars, or in some cases, with the quantity of material used for material tests. For larger quantities, such as loading a unit train, the error becomes insignificant.

The BCS WG reported that, after their meeting adjourned, an extended session of the meeting took place with a smaller group. The smaller group developed an amended proposal. However, the smaller group recommended that this item not go forward as a Voting item, but be given Informational status to allow more time to consider developing a revised proposal and to conduct additional research on the appropriate tolerance. The entire BCS WG was polled on the smaller group’s recommendation on the amended proposal and its proposed status. The majority of the responses agreed with the recommendation that this item needs further review and development, and its status should be made Informational.

During its open hearing at the 2009 NCWM Annual Meeting, the Committee received comments from Mr. Ripka, Thermo Ramsey and NIST WMD supporting the recommendation from the BCS WG. The Committee agreed with
the WG that more time is needed to conduct additional research on this item to determine the appropriate tolerance and revise the proposal. The Committee agreed to keep this item on its agenda as Informational.

At the 2010 NCWM Interim Meeting, the SMA submitted a comment supporting the intent of this item and encourages additional research to determine the correct allowable value to verify suitable belt consistency. The Committee agreed to keep this item on its agenda as an Informational item.

At its February 2010 meeting, the UNSWG on BCS discussed its carryover item. There was much discussion on the original purpose of the existing language that was adopted into HB 44 in 1985 as part of the revised BCS Systems Code (developed by the BCS Task Force). The WG did not reach a consensus on this item and will continue its work to develop a consensus position.

At the 2010 NCWM Annual Meeting, Mr. Ripka, Thermo-Fisher, provided the Committee with a letter regarding the status of the WG. Based on the progress of the sub-committee, and the pending receipt of actual field information as it relates to belt consistency, the sub-committee of the National BCS WG requests the National S&T committee to consider moving the Belt Consistency proposal from informational to developing. The sub-committee expects to have data ready for the fall 2010 regional conferences, or if data is slow in being provided, by the NCWM interim meeting in January, 2011. A complete copy of the letter can be viewed in Appendix A of this Report.

The Committee agreed with the recommendation to give this item Developmental status and move it to the list on Developmental items on the Committee’s 2011 Interim Agenda.

During the 2010 WWMA Annual Technical Conference open hearings, Mr. Ripka, Thermo Scientific, speaking on behalf of the sub group of the BCS WG, reviewed the contents of the letter they submitted to the NCWM S&T Committee on September 9, 2010. (The letter from Thermo Fisher Scientific may be reviewed Appendix C S&T Item 321-1.) He recommended this proposal to be moved forward as a Voting item. Mr. Ripka added that a small survey was conducted at thirteen BCS installations to verify that these installations would fit within the new wording. He reported that twelve of the thirteen installations easily complied with the proposed requirements; the remaining scale was a non-commercial device. Mr. Ripka, speaking on behalf of Thermo Scientific, suggested deleting the last sentence of the proposal because the end value of the zero load test is already covered in paragraph N.3.1.2. Test of Zero Stability. Mr. Cook, NIST Technical Advisor, reported that the recommendations of the sub group were submitted to the entire BCS WG with a recommendation that the item be upgraded to the NCWM S&T Committee agenda as a Voting item.

The WWMA agreed with the recommendation of the sub group pending approval of the entire BCS WG in its letter ballot prior to January 2011 NCWM Interim Meeting. In response to the recommendations from Thermo Fisher, the WWMA did not feel comfortable supporting Mr. Ripka’s suggested changes to delete the last sentence of the above proposal and suggested that this change be supported by the USNWG.

During the 2010 SWMA Annual Meeting, the SWMA received no comments on this issue during its open hearings. The SWMA S&T Committee heard from the NIST Technical Advisor and observed in the WWMA addendum sheets that the USNWG anticipates finalizing a recommendation on this issue in the near future. The SWMA supports the efforts of the USNWG and looks forward to considering future recommendations on this issue.

(See also the Committee’s 2008 Annual Report for additional background information in Developing Item 360-2 Part 3 Item 2.)
331 VEHICLE-TANK METERS (VTM)

331-1 S.2.6. Thermometer Well, Temperature Determination.

Source: 96th NCWM S&T Committee, CWMA, WWMA, SWMA, and NEWMA

Purpose: To provide a means for inspectors and service personnel to determine the temperature of the product at the meter and, thus, enable them to apply paragraph N.5. Temperature Correction for Refined Petroleum Products.

Item Under Consideration: Add a new paragraph S.2. Design of Measuring Elements of the Vehicle-Tank Meters Code to section 3.31 VTM code to read as follows:

S.2.6. Thermometer Well, Temperature Determination - For test purposes, means shall be provided (e.g., thermometer well) to determine the temperature of the liquid either:

(a) in the liquid chamber of the meter, or
(b) in the meter inlet or discharge line immediately adjacent to the meter.
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2012]

Background/Discussion: During discussions of proposed changes (which were adopted in July 2010) to the tolerances for VTMs equipped with automatic temperature compensating systems (paragraph T.2.1.), meter manufacturers expressed concerns about how to ensure that consistent and appropriate test procedures and equipment be used by weights and measures officials during inspections of VTMs. WMD revised the EPOs for VTMs and presented this information during a training seminar in April 2010. In the process of revising and presenting the procedures, WMD received comments indicating that many VTMs are not equipped with means for determining the temperature of the product at the meter. Thus, the inspector is unable to properly apply paragraph N.5. Temperature Correction for Refined Petroleum Products, which states:

N.5. Temperature Correction for Refined Petroleum Products. – Corrections shall be made for any changes in volume resulting from the differences in liquid temperatures between the time of passage through the meter and the time of volumetric determination in the prover. When adjustments are necessary, appropriate petroleum measurement tables should be used.
(Added 2007)

In order for inspectors and service personnel to determine the difference between the temperature of the product at the meter and at the prover, some means is needed for determining the temperature of the product as it passes through the meter. Inspectors have reported that few VTMs are equipped with provisions such as a thermometer well at the meter that would enable them to determine the temperature of the product at the meter using a traceable thermometer. Consequently, the inspector is not able to make adjustments to the indications for changes due to temperature between the meter and the prover. Failing to account for differences in product temperature can, in some instances, introduce errors into the testing process, possibly resulting in the acceptance of a meter that is actually out of tolerance or the incorrect rejection of a meter that may actually be performing within applicable tolerance.

While the inspector could apply General Code paragraph G-UR.4.4. Assistance in Testing to require the installation of a thermometer well or other provision for determining the temperature of the product at the meter, the S&T Committee believes it is more cost effective to require this to be incorporated into the equipment purchased by the user. To minimize the impact on manufacturers and device owners, the S&T Committee proposes that this paragraph be applied nonretroactively.

Gasoline products expand/contract by a factor of about 0.00069 for every degree Fahrenheit change in temperature. Diesel fuels expand by a factor of about 0.00050 for every degree Fahrenheit change in temperature. NOTE: These values are approximations and the exact API/ASTM correction factors for the product being dispensed should be used in actual testing.
Consider the impact of a one degree temperature difference between the meter and prover on a 100-gallon test draft:

\[
\begin{align*}
1 \text{ degree difference} \times 0.00069/\degree \text{F} \times 100 \text{ gallons} &= 0.069 \text{ gallons} = 15.9 \text{ cubic inches for gasoline} \\
1 \text{ degree difference} \times 0.00050/\degree \text{F} \times 100 \text{ gallons} &= 0.05 \text{ gallons} = 11.6 \text{ cubic inches for diesel}
\end{align*}
\]

If acceptance tolerance applies, the tolerance on a 100-gallon draft of a VTM meter would be 0.15 %, which is 0.15 gallons or 35 cubic inches. This means that almost half of the allowable tolerance is taken up by the effects of a one degree temperature difference on gasoline and about a third of the tolerance on diesel.

The LMD Code (Section 3.30.) already includes a paragraph (S.2.6. Temperature Determination - Wholesale Devices) requiring means for taking the temperature of the product at the meter for larger, wholesale meters and the Liquefied Petroleum Gas and Anhydrous Ammonia LMD Code (Section 3.32., paragraph S.2.5. Thermometer Well) requires this for all LPG & NH\text sub{3} meters. This proposed change to the VTM Code would also promote alignment of these codes.

Estimated Costs:

This could result in additional costs for equipping some meters with a thermometer well. However, at least one manufacturer indicated that the meters they produce for this application are already designed with the option for thermometer wells. According to one manufacturer, a new meter equipped with thermometer wells would cost a device owner approximately $150 more than one without. No additional reasons against have emerged.

Because a thermometer well will enable inspectors and service personnel to determine the temperature of the product at the meter, this will encourage the use of corrections for temperature differences between the meter and the prover during the testing process. As a result, this will promote more consistent calibration and verification of meter accuracy and improve uniformity in measurements from company to company.

The weights and measures community may wish to review other measuring codes for consistency and the possible inclusion of similar requirements in a future proposal(s).

At its 2010 WWMA Annual Technical Conference, the WWMA received comments on this item during its open hearings suggesting that this was another attempt at temperature compensation. The WWMA S&T Committee disregarded those comments in their deliberation because they were inaccurate. The Committee voted to recommend that this item move forward as a Voting item on the NCWM S&T Committee Agenda.

At its 2010 SWMA Annual Meeting, the SWMA heard no comments on this issue during its open hearings. In reviewing the background and history for this item, the SWMA S&T Committee agreed that, given the potential impact of temperature differences between the meter and the prover for test drafts of the magnitude of those used in VTM testing, the proposed change is appropriate. The SWMA S&T Committee also agreed that the proposed paragraph should be nonretroactive as of January 1, 2012. Consequently, the Committee recommends that the item be forwarded to the NCWM S&T Committee as a Voting item as originally proposed by the S&T Committee.

At its fall 2010 Interim Meeting, NEWMA received a comment on the item during its open hearing that this proposal is not an automatic temperature compensation issue and that the temperature is used to correct for thermal expansion (or contraction) between meter and prover, which are calibrated to 60°F by state metrology labs. Before it can support the proposal, NEWMA wants to see more data on the potential impact to justify a need for this requirement.

**331-2 T.4. Product Depletion Test**

**Source:** Northeast Weights and Measures Association (NEWMA). This item was originally part of the 2010 Agenda Item 360-3 – Developing Items Part 3.31., Vehicle-Tank Meters - Item 1.

**Purpose:** Modify the VTM code to base the product depletion test tolerances on the meter’s maximum flow rate (a required marking on all meters), rather than the meter size. This will enable more consistent application of the
tolerances for older meters, which are not required to be marked with the meter size, and address an unintentional gap which allows an unreasonably large tolerance for smaller meters.

**Item Under Consideration:** Amend paragraph T.4. as follows:

**T.4. Product Depletion Test.** – The difference between the test result for any normal test and the product depletion test shall not exceed one-half (0.5 %) percent of the volume delivered in one minute at the maximum flow rate marked on the meter. Tolerances for typical meters are tolerance shown in Table T.4. Test drafts shall be of the same size and run at approximately the same flow rate.

[Note: The result of the product depletion test may fall outside of the applicable test tolerance as specified in Table 1. Accuracy Classes and Tolerances for Vehicle-Tank Meters]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meter Size</th>
<th>Maximum Flow Rate</th>
<th>Maintenance and Acceptance Tolerances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to, but not including, 50 mm (2 in)</td>
<td>114 Lpm (30 gpm)</td>
<td>1.70 L (104 in³)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.57 L (0.15 gal) (34.6 in³)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 50 mm (2 in) up to, but not including, 75 mm (3 in)</td>
<td>225 Lpm (60 gpm)</td>
<td>2.25 L (137 in³)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 L (0.30 gal) (69.3 in³)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 mm (3 in) or larger</td>
<td>378 Lpm (100 gpm)</td>
<td>3.75 L (229 in³)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9 L (0.5 gal) (115 in³)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>758 Lpm (200 gpm)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8 L (1.0 gal) (231 in³)¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Based on a test volume of at least the amount specified in N.3. Test Drafts.

(>Table Added 2005) (Amended 201X)

Alternatively, NEWMA proposed the following modifications to paragraph T.4., with larger tolerances for smaller meters.

**T.4. Product Depletion Test.** – The difference between the test result for any normal test and the product depletion test shall not exceed one-half (0.5 %) percent of the volume delivered in one minute at the maximum flow rate marked on the meter for meters rated higher than 378 Lpm (100 gpm), or six-tenths (0.6 %) percent of the volume delivered in one minute at the maximum flow rate marked on the meter for meters rated 378 Lpm (100 gpm) or lower. Tolerances for typical meters are tolerance shown in Table T.4. Test drafts shall be of the same size and run at approximately the same flow rate.

[Note: The result of the product depletion test may fall outside of the applicable test tolerance as specified in Table 1.]
Table T.4.
Tolerances for Typical Vehicle-Tank Meters on Product Depletion Tests, Except Milk Meters
Refer to T.4 for meters with flow rates not listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meter Size</th>
<th>Maximum Flow Rate</th>
<th>Maintenance and Acceptance Tolerances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to, but not including, 50 mm (2 in)</td>
<td>114 Lpm (30 gpm)</td>
<td>1.70 L (104 in$^3$) $^1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.57 L (0.18 gal) (41.6 in$^3$) $^1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 50 mm (2 in) up to, but not including, 75 mm (3 in)</td>
<td>225 Lpm (60 gpm)</td>
<td>2.25 L (137 in$^3$) $^1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 L (0.36 gal) (83.2 in$^3$) $^1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 mm (3 in) or larger</td>
<td>378 Lpm (100 gpm)</td>
<td>3.75 L (229 in$^3$) $^1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9 L (0.6 gal) (139 in$^3$) $^1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>758 Lpm (200 gpm)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8 L (1.0 gal) (231 in$^3$) $^1$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$ Based on a test volume of at least the amount specified in N.3. Test Drafts.

(Table Added 2005) (Amended 201X)

**Background/Discussion:** This item was submitted to NEWMA at its 2008 Interim Meeting as an alternative to Item 331-1 (S.5.7. Meter Size) in 2008 NCWM Annual Report. This alternative would base the tolerances for the product depletion test on a percentage of the maximum flow rate rather than meter size. Justification provided to NEWMA by the submitter is as follows:

The NCWM S&T Committee received a proposal in 2008 to add new marking requirements to provide inspectors with a basis on which to assess tolerances since the meter size in inches is not currently marked on meters used in VTM systems. This solution would add a new marking requirement non-retroactively, which will not solve the problem until the entire fleet of meters presently in use are replaced with new meters. This could take a very long time, since VTMs can see many years of service. In addition, the compromise made when this item originally passed did not address the possibility that smaller meters, (e.g., down to ¼ in) could be mounted on a vehicle and thus, subject to these tolerances. Allowing the smallest current tolerance (104 in$^3$) on a ¼ in meter delivering 2 gpm would be 22.5 % relative error for one minute of flow due to air passing through the meter. Even at 20 gpm for a 1 in meter, the relative error only drops to 2.25 %. That seems unconscionable. New York recommends going back to the 0.5 % of 1 minute of flow at the maximum rated flow rate for the meter that was part of the original proposal. The max flow rate must be marked on every meter under current HB 44 requirements, thus, the inspector will have the information necessary to correctly apply the tolerance. It is further recommended that the table provide tolerances for the common meter sizes which will handle most cases encountered in the field (i.e., 1¼-, 1½-, 2- and 3-inch meters with maximum flow rates of 30, 60, 100 and 200 gpm, respectively).

There may be concern that users will move to larger meter sizes to take advantage of the larger tolerances. It is not thought that this will happen since these systems cannot deliver much over 100 gpm without damaging storage tanks. In fact, most systems we have seen delivering heating oil are actually delivering at less than 80 gpm. If they move to a 200 gpm, 3-inch meter, rated at 40 to 200 gpm, they will then have to meet acceptance tolerances all the way down to 60 gpm which it is not believed that to be achievable on a consistent basis. We believe the typical 2-inch system will remain the mainstay of the industry.

Graphs of the relationship of typical meter ratings to pipe cross section area show that positive displacement flow rates are clearly a function of pipe size. Any tolerance that does not reflect that relationship is fundamentally flawed in our view. For comparison, we have included a graphic comparison of the proposed tolerances.
The submitter also noted the following:

We recognize that the tolerances proposed will reduce the tolerances for meter sizes 2 inches and under. We could support some compromise to recognize diminishing returns on smaller meters, thus allowing a slightly larger tolerance (e.g., 0.6 %) at or below 100 gpm rated flow rate. At 0.6 % for a 2 inch (100 gpm) meter, the tolerance would be 139 in³, virtually identical to the existing tolerance.

The submitter also provided the following supporting graphics:

Option 1 – 0.5 % across the board:

Option 2 – 0.6 % up to and including 100 gpm and 0.5 % thereafter:

In its initial review of this item in 2008, NEWMA did not feel the proposed change was justified. As a result of discussions at subsequent meetings, NEWMA has since determined that this item is ready to be elevated for considerations by the NCWM S&T Committee.

At the 2010 NCWM Annual Meeting, the Committee heard comments from Mr. Andersen, New York, reiterating NEWMA’s request to place this item on the Committee’s 2011 Interim Agenda. The Committee agreed to NEWMA’s request and included this item on its 2011 Interim Agenda and submitted it to the 2010 fall regional weights and measures association meetings.

At its 2010 fall Interim Meeting, the CWMA S&T Committee recommended that this item remain a Developing item as one of the committee members was concerned that the conversion of the metric value may have been incorrectly or inconsistently rounded or truncated in the proposed amendments to Table 4.

At its 2010 Annual Technical Conference, the WWMA recommended that this item move forward as a Voting item. The WWMA believes the proposed amendments to Table T.4. will reduce the unnecessarily large tolerances for meters under 60 gpm (2 in meters) and more closely reflects existing tolerances of larger meters. The WWMA also recommends removing paragraph S.5.7. Meter Size since the language was adopted in 2009 to facilitate the application of the correct product depletion test tolerances, which were based on meter size. Since the item under
consideration uses meter size to calculate product depletion tolerances, the WWMA believes that paragraph S.5.7. is no longer necessary. During the voting session, Mr. Kurt Floren, Los Angeles County, California, commented he had no issue with the intent of the proposal, but asked that the NCWM Committee look into the mathematical agreement in the metric conversion listed in Table T.4. It was also suggested that it may be more appropriate to list the “inch-pound” (gpm) before the SI units in Table T.4.

At its 2010 Annual Meeting, the SWMA S&T Committee stated that it does not object to considering modifications to the tolerance to better address the product depletion test. However, it feels that additional time is needed for industry and weights and measures officials to study the proposed changes. The SWMA S&T Committee noted that the product depletion tolerance was amended only five years ago and a new marking requirement was added to correspond to that requirement a few years later in 2009. The SWMA S&T Committee feels that, before making yet another change, thoughtful consideration needs to be given to ensure that any changes are appropriate. The SWMA agreed with the SWMA’s S&T Committee’s justification and its recommendation that this item be made an Information item on the NCWM Committee agenda.

At its 2010 Annual Meeting, NEWMA restated its support for this item and looks forward to input from the other regional weights and measures associations and other interested parties.

336 WATER METERS

336-1 Appendix D- Definition of Utility Type Water Meters

Source: Western Weights and Measures Association (WWMA).

Purpose: To add a definition for the term “utility type water meter,” which is used with increased frequency in the Water Meters code.

Item Under Consideration:

utility type water meter. A device used for the measurement of water generally applicable to meters installed in residences or business establishments, excluding batching meters. [3.36] (Added 201X)

Background/Discussion: With the recent changes to the Water Meter Code for utility type meters, it was made apparent that a definition for a utility type meter was not listed in Appendix D – Definitions of HB 44. Several water meter manufacturers believe that a clear definition for these types of metering instruments is needed. The manufacturers that developed and support this item are:

- Mr. Andre Noel Neptune Technology Group Inc.
- Mr. George De Jarlais Badger Meter
- Mr. Scott Swanson Sensus Metering
- Mr. Alex Watson Elster AMCO
- Mr. Scott Bruneau Master Meter

During the 2010 WWMA Annual Technical Conference, the WWMA S&T Committee agreed with the justification for the definition provided by the submitters. The Committee revised the proposed definition for a “utility type water meter” to eliminate the term “utility type” from the body of the definition. The WWMA recommended that this item (as revised by the WWMA S&T Committee) move forward as a Voting item on the NCWM S&T Committee Agenda.

At the 2010 SWMA Annual Meeting, the SWMA S&T Committee heard no opposition to establishing a definition for “utility type water meter.” Like the WWMA, the SWMA S&T Committee noted that the definition as originally proposed included the word that was being defined in the definition itself and was, therefore, still not clear. The Committee reviewed alternative language developed by the WWMA and agreed that the alternative language was
preferable. Consequently, the SWMA voted to recommend that the language as modified by the WWMA move forward as a Voting item on the NCWM S&T Committee Agenda.

442 FARM MILK TANKS

442-1 N.5.1. Verification of Master Metering Systems

Source: Central Weights and Measures Association (CWMA) (This item was originally part of the 2010 Agenda Item 360-2- Developing Items Part 4.42, Farm Milk Tanks - Item 1: N.5.1. Verification of Master Metering Systems.)

Purpose: Eliminate unnecessary verification testing for master meters capable of operating within a prescribed percent of the applicable tolerance.

Item Under Consideration: Amend paragraph N.5.1. as follows:

N.5.1. Verification of Master Metering Systems. – A master metering system used to gauge a milk tank shall be verified before and after the gauging process. A master metering system used to calibrate a milk tank shall be verified before starting the calibration and re-verified every quarter of the tank capacity or every 2000 L (500 gal), whichever is greater. A master metering system capable of operating within 25% of the applicable tolerance in T.3. Basic Tolerance Values needs only be verified before and after the gauging process.

(Added 201X)

Background/Discussion: The CWMA received a proposal at its fall 2008 Interim Meeting to modify paragraph N.5.1. Verification of Master Metering Systems in NIST HB 44 Section 4.42. Farm Milk Tanks. USDA provided data suggesting that mass flow meters currently used to test milk tanks would not have to be verified every quarter of the tank capacity, or every 2000 L (500 gal), whichever is greater. Because no supporting data was provided to show that all mass flow meters will perform to the same standard, the CWMA originally recommended this proposal be Informational.

At its fall 2008 meeting, NEWMA recommended this proposal be Informational. NEWMA forwarded the following additional justification for the proposed change from Mr. Richard Koeberle, Federal Milk Market Administrator:

The use of a mass flow meter has eliminated the variations seen in other types of meters used to calibrate or check farm bulk milk tanks. The reverification of the meter at every quarter of tank capacity adds time and potentially introduces errors by requiring the hose or valves to be moved before the tank is totally filled. This proposal originated by Mr. Tom MacNish, Market Administrator, and was presented to the CWMA in September [2008]. Mass flow meters have been used extensively in their market with excellent results.

At the 2010 NCWM Annual Meeting, the Committee heard comments from Mr. Andersen, New York, reiterating NEWMA’s request to place this item on the Committee’s 2011 Interim Agenda.

The Committee agreed to NEWMA’s request and included this item on its 2011 Interim Agenda and submitted it to the 2010 fall regional weights and measures association meetings.

At its 2010 fall Interim Meeting, the CWMA heard comments during the open hearing about testing from the USDA; which performs the most testing of this type of device for farm milk tanks in the region. Additional comments noted the increased uncertainty resulting from the connecting and disconnecting of valves and hoses in order to verify the master meter at every 2000 L (500 gal) when calibrating a farm milk tank opposed to testing the master meter only at the beginning and end of a farm milk tank calibration. Based on comments heard from the floor and data provided by Mr. Koeberle and Mr. MacNish the, CWMA S&T Committee believes that this proposal is ready to move forward as a Voting item on the NCWM S&T Committee agenda.
During its 2010 WWMA Annual Technical Conference, the WWMA S&T Committee reviewed the submitted data in a file titled “cali_massflowsheet.xlsx.” The S&T Committee noted that the results in the column titled “Diff in cc” appears to be the difference between the “meter reading in gallons” and the “prover reading in gallons” without any conversion to cubic centimeters (cc) in the “Diff in cc” column (see example below). Additionally, the title for the “Diff in cc” column could be amended to show that the differences between the prover and meter indications are in terms of under or over registration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meter Gal</th>
<th>Prover Gal</th>
<th>Diff in cc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>49.99</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was difficult to analyze the data because of a lack of information describing test parameters, legends, and column headings. The WWMA S&T Committee recommends the NCWM S&T Committee seek additional information on the data describing the test conditions and type of mass flow meter used. Additionally, a general summary of the data would help in assessing the proposal as would a clarification of whether or not the reduced re-verification applies to other meter technologies (e.g., PD meter, turbine meter, etc.). The WWMA recommends that this item move forward as an Information item on the NCWM Interim agenda to allow time to seek the additional information on the submitted data.

At its 2010 Annual Meeting, the SWMA S&T Committee recognized the efficiencies realized by using a master meter to test farm milk tanks. Allowing fewer verification points to be used when a master meter can be shown to perform within a tighter tolerance would provide for further efficiency in the test process while maintaining confidence in the test. Consequently, the SWMA supports the proposal as written.

At its fall 2010 Interim Meeting, a representative of New York volunteered to work with the Market Administrators to address WWMA’s concerns and obtain a summary of the analysis.

360 OTHER ITEMS

360-1 International Organization of Legal Metrology (OIML) Report

Many issues before the OIML, the Asian-Pacific Legal Metrology Forum (APLMF), and other international groups are within the purview of the Committee. Additional information on OIML activities will appear in the Board of Directors agenda and Interim and Final Reports and on the OIML website at http://www.oiml.org. NIST WMD staff will provide the latest updates on OIML activities during the open hearing sessions at NCWM meetings. For more information on specific OIML-related device activities, contact the WMD staff listed in the table below. The OIML projects listed below represent only currently active projects. For additional information on other OIML device activities that involve WMD staff, please contact WMD using the information listed below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Information</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Postal Mail and Fax for All Contacts:** | NIST WMD  
100 Bureau Drive MS 2600  
Gaithersburg, MD 20899-2600  
Tel: (301) 975-4004    Fax: (301) 975-8091 |
| Mr. John Barton (LMDG)  
(301) 975-4002  
john.barton@nist.gov | •R 21 “Taximeters”  
•R 50 “Continuous Totalizing Automatic Weighing Instruments (Belt Weighers)”  
•R 60 “Metrological Regulations for Load Cells” (jointly with Ken Butcher)  
•R 106 “Automatic Rail-weighbridges” |
| Mr. Kenneth Butcher (LMG)  
(301) 975-4859  
kenneth.butcher@nist.gov | •D 1 “Elements for a Law on Metrology”  
•TC 3 “Metrological Control”  
•TC 3/SC 1 “Pattern Approval and Verification”  
•TC 3/SC 2 “Metrological Supervision”  
•TC 6 “Prepackaged Products”  
•R 60 “Metrological Regulations for Load Cells” (jointly with John Barton) |
| Mr. Steven Cook (LMDG)  
(301) 975-4003  
steven.cook@nist.gov | •R 76 “Non-automatic Weighing Instruments” |
| Dr. Charles Ehrlich (ILMG)  
(301) 975-4834  
charles.ehrlich@nist.gov | •CI MIL Member for the United States  
•V1 “International vocabulary of terms in legal metrology (VIML)”  
•V2 “International vocabulary of basic and general terms in metrology (VIM)”  
•B3 “OIML Certificate System for Measuring Instruments”  
•B6 “OIML Directives for the Technical Work”  
•B 10 “Framework for a Mutual Acceptance Arrangement (MAA) on OIML Type Evaluations”  
•TC 3/SC 5 “Expression of Uncertainty in Measurement in Legal Metrology Applications,” “Guidelines for the Application of ISO/IEC 17025 to the Assessment of Laboratories Performing Type Evaluation Tests”  
•TC 3 “Metrological Control”  
•ISO/IEC Guide to the Expression of Uncertainty in Measurement” |
| Mr. Richard Harshman (LMDG)  
(301) 975-8107  
richard.harshman@nist.gov | •R 51 “Automatic Cacheweighting Instruments”  
•R 61 “Automatic Gravimetric Filling Instruments”  
•R 107 “Discontinuous Totalizing Automatic Weighing Instruments” (totalizing hopper weighers)  
•R 134 “Automatic Instruments for Weighing Road Vehicles In-Motion and Measuring Axle Loads” |
| Ms. Diane Lee (LMDG)  
(301) 975-4405  
diane.lee@nist.gov | •R 59 “Moisture Meters for Cereal Grains and Oilseeds”  
•R 92 “Wood Moisture Meters – Verification Methods and Equipment”  
•R 121 “The Scale of Relative Humidity of Air Certified Against Saturated Salt Solution”  
•TC 17/SC 8 “Measuring Instruments for Protein Determination in Grains” |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Information</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ralph Richter (ILMG)</td>
<td>• D 11 “General Requirements for Electronic Measuring Instruments”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(301) 975-3997</td>
<td>• R 35 “Material Measures of Length for General Use”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:ralph.richter@nist.gov">ralph.richter@nist.gov</a></td>
<td>• R 49 “Water Meters” (Cold Potable Water &amp; Hot Water Meters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• R 71 “Fixed Storage Tanks”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• R 80 “Road and Rail Tankers” (static measurement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• R 85 “Automatic Level Gauges for Measuring the Level of Liquid in Fixed Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanks”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• R 95 “Ship’s Tanks”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• R 117 “Measuring Systems for Liquids Other Than Water” (all measuring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>technologies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• R 118 “Testing Procedures and Test Report Format for Pattern Examination of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fuel Dispensers for Motor Vehicles”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• TC 3/SC 4 “Verification Period of Utility Meters Using Sampling Inspections”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• R 137 “Gas Meters” (all measuring technologies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• R 140 “Measuring Systems for Gaseous Fuel” (i.e., large pipelines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ISO TC 30/SC 7 “Water Meters”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ambler Thompson (ILMG)</td>
<td>• D 11 “General Requirements for Electronic Measuring Instruments”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(301) 975-2333</td>
<td>• D 16 “Principles of Assurance of Metrological Control”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:ambler@nist.gov">ambler@nist.gov</a></td>
<td>• D 19 “Pattern Evaluation and Pattern Approval”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• D 20 “Initial and Subsequent Verification of Measuring Instruments and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Processes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• D 27 “Initial Verification of Measuring Instruments Using the Manufacturer’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality Management System”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• D 31 “General requirements for software controlled measuring instruments”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• R 34 “Accuracy Classes of Measuring Instruments”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• R 46 “Active Electrical Energy Meters for Direct Connection of Class 2”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Juana Williams (LMDG)</td>
<td>• R 81 “Dynamic Measuring Devices and Systems for Cryogenic Liquids”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(301) 975-3989</td>
<td>• R 139 “Compressed Gaseous Fuels Measuring Systems for Vehicles”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:juana.williams@nist.gov">juana.williams@nist.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIST OF ACRONYMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Basic Publication</th>
<th>LMDG</th>
<th>Legal Metrology Devices Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIML</td>
<td>International Committee of Legal Metrology</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Document</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILMG</td>
<td>International Legal Metrology Group</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMG</td>
<td>Laws and Metrics Group</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Technical Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The WWMA and the SWMA support these issues and the related device activities as an Informational item.

### 360-2 Developing Items

The NCWM established a category of items called Developing items as a mechanism to share information about emerging issues which have merit and are of national interest, but have not received sufficient review by all parties affected by the proposal or that may be insufficiently developed to warrant review by the Committee. The items in this section have been designated as Developing items by the submitter and/or the Committee based on an assessment of their relative stage of development. The Developing items are currently under review by at least one regional association, technical committee, or organization.
Developing items are listed in Appendix C according to the specific HB 44 code section under which they fall (e.g., a scale-related item appears in part 2.20 which corresponds to NIST HB 44 Section 2.20 Scales Code). Periodically, a proposal will be removed from the Developing item agenda without further action because the submitter recommends it be withdrawn. Any remaining proposals will be renumbered accordingly.

The Committee encourages interested parties to examine the proposals included in Appendix C and send their comments to the contact listed in each item. The Committee asks that the regional associations and NTETC sectors continue their work to develop each proposal fully. Should an association or sector decide to discontinue work on an item, the Committee asks that it be notified.

In future Committee reports, the Committee plans to include only a brief summary and point of contact for each Developing item in this section and will post any additional details on the item on the Committee’s web page on the NCWM web site.

Mr. Steve Giguere, Maine, Chairman
Mr. Kenneth Ramsburg, Maryland
Mr. Paul Moyer, Nebraska
Mr. Doug Deiman, Alaska
Mr. Brett Gurney, Utah

Mr. Ted Kingsbury, Measurement Canada, Technical Advisor
Mr. Steven Cook, NIST, Technical Advisor
Ms. Tina Butcher, NIST, Technical Advisor

Specifications and Tolerances Committee
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Item 360-2: Developing Items

In future Committee reports, the Committee plans to include only a brief summary and point of contact for each Developing item in this section and will post any additional details on the item on the Committee’s web page on the NCWM web site.

Part 2.20. Weigh-In-Motion Vehicle Scales for Law Enforcement – Work Group

Source: Mr. Richard Harshman, NIST, on behalf of the U.S. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)

Purpose: Introduce a new Developing Item on the Specification and Tolerances Committee 2011 Agenda to keep the weights and measures community apprised of work to develop standards for weigh-in-motion (WIM) scale systems and to encourage their participation in this work.

Item Under Consideration: The FHWA is forming a U.S. National Work Group (USNWG) to develop proposed standards that would apply to WIM scale systems used to screen or sort commercial vehicles for possible violations of legal roadway weight limits with the ultimate goal of bringing the proposed standards before the weights and measures community for possible inclusion in HB 44. FHWA has been collaborating with NIST WMD and the commercial vehicle enforcement community to identify industry experts, device users, regulatory officials, and others interested in participating in the WG. The WG plans to develop proposed specifications, tolerance, and other technical requirements applicable to WIM scale systems used in official use for the enforcement of law or for the collection of statistical information by government agencies.

Background/Discussion: The nation’s highways, freight transportation system, and enforcement resources are being strained by the volume of freight being moved and the corresponding number of commercial vehicles operating on its roads. Traditional, manual-based vehicle inspection activities simply cannot keep pace with anticipated truck volume increases. Current U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) forecasts project freight volumes to double by 2035 and commercial vehicles to travel an additional 100 billion miles per year by 2020. WIM technology has been targeted by FHWA and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) to a technology capable of supporting more effective and efficient truck weight enforcement programs.

Several DOT efforts are underway and planned for the future to maintain adequate levels of enforcement that ensure equity in the trucking industry market and protection of highway infrastructure. Judicial support for enforcement decisions to apply more intense enforcement actions on specific trucks depends on support from the U.S. legal metrology community. Standards are needed in HB 44 to address the design, installation, accuracy, and use of WIM systems used in a screening/sorting application. The implementation of a uniform set of standards will greatly improve the overall efficiency of the nation’s commercial vehicle enforcement process.

Once adopted by the truck weight enforcement community, these requirements will enhance the accuracy of the nation’s WIM scale systems, serve as a sound basis for judicial support of next-generation truck weight enforcement programs and result in fewer legally loaded vehicles being delayed at static weigh station locations, thus reducing traffic congestion and non-productive fuel consumption and improving the movement of freight on our nation’s roadways.

During the fall 2010 CWMA Interim Meeting, a comment was heard from the floor during its open hearings that WIM scales could be used for enforcement issues and evaluating or assessing fines to overweight trucks. Currently most of these scales are used for audit purposes only. The CWMA S&T Committee believes that the efforts to establish requirements for WIM scales has merit, and when fully developed, will assist in expediting commerce by not having to reweigh clearly legal highway vehicles while protecting roadways from vehicles that exceed legal highway load limits.
At the 2020 WWMA Annual Technical Conference, Mr. Stephen Langford, Cardinal Scales, stated during the open hearings that he is a member of the WG and supports adding language defining performance parameters of WIM devices for use in law enforcement. Mr. Langford added that the WG will be considering other existing standards to help develop the language in HB 44 (e.g., OIML R 134 “Automatic instruments for weighing road vehicles in motion and measuring axle loads”). Mr. Kurt Floren, Los Angeles County, added that even though these devices are non-commercial they are covered under the scope of HB 44 General Code Application paragraph G-A.1.(c) Commercial and Law Enforcement Equipment.

At its 2010 SWMA Annual Meeting, the SWMA S&T Committee heard during the open hearing comments from Mr. Langford, Cardinal Manufacturing, supporting the direction of this work group. Mr. Langford noted that these WIM scales are not currently used to levy fines, but rather to screen for overweight trucks. He noted that the WG just getting started and that Cardinal is looking forward to participating in this work. Mr. Max Gray, Florida questioned whether putting requirements for highway WIM devices in HB 44 would obligate jurisdictions to conduct tests of these devices. While he doesn’t oppose the inclusion of requirements in general, he questioned the availability of resources to accommodate the additional workload given the extreme budget restrictions many jurisdictions are facing. Ms. Tina Butcher, NIST WMD, noted that DOT reported that highway weight enforcement officials are concerned that the use of the scales in screening will be challenged without reference to a recognized standard. Since many of these agencies currently reference HB 44, they felt that recognition of these devices in NIST HB 44 as law enforcement equipment would lend credibility and consistency to the design, use, accuracy, and application of this equipment.

At its 2010 Annual Meeting, the SWMA S&T Committee stated its support for the efforts of the WG. However, given some of the concerns and questions raised at the open hearings about resources for testing, that committee did not want to take a position on this issue until it has more information about the direction of the work group.

During the 2010 fall NEWMA Interim Meeting, comments were heard during it open hearing that supported the formation of the WG but questioned what role existed for the NCWM S&T Committee at this time.


**Source:** 2009 Carryover Item 330-3. This item originated from WMD and the regional associations and first appeared on the Committee’s 2007 agenda.

**Purpose:** To review and update criteria in the LMD Code related to price posting and computing capability on RMFDs to reflect current market practices.

**Item Under Consideration:** The Committee was asked to consider a proposal to make modifications to Section 3.30. LMD Code to address price posting and computing capability for RMFD. Full details of the recommendation are found in the Committee’s 2009 Interim and Final Reports. The Committee believes that changes are needed to the LMD Code; however, based on comments received it does not believe these proposed changes adequately address people’s concerns.

**Key Points:**

- Current LMD Code requirements relative to unit price posting and selection and total price computation were developed to address marketing practices in place in the early 1990s; primarily cash/credit/debit forms of payment.

- Marketing practices have changed since the 1990s, and the LMD Code does not adequately address these changes with regard to the display, posting, and selection of unit price information or total price information at various points in a transaction.

- There appears to be general agreement in the weights and measures community that changes are needed to the LMD Code in HB 44 to better reflect current market practices.
• Comments indicate the current proposal being considered by the Committee does not adequately address concerns, particularly on the parts of Weights and Measures officials.

• Weights and Measures officials are concerned that customers be given adequate information at all points of the transaction, not just at the end.

• Regional Weights and Measures associations and industry comments indicate support for a work group to further develop this issue.

• The S&T agreed to establish a work group to further develop this issue and present an alternative recommendation for the S&T to consider.

**Background/Discussion:** In the early 1990s, various sections of the LMD Code in HB 44 (including paragraphs S.1.6.4. Display of Unit Price and Product Identity, S.1.6.5.4. Selection of Unit Price, UR.3.2. Unit Price and Product Identity, and UR.3.3. Computing Device) were modified to address multi-tier pricing applications, such as cash or credit in instances where the same product is offered at different unit prices based on the method of payment or other conditions of the sale. Since that time, marketing practices have evolved to include the addition of new practices, such as frequent shopper discounts and club member discounts. Numerous questions have been posed to WMD and Weights and Measures officials regarding the requirements for posting unit prices, calculation of total price, customer-operated controls, and other related topics, such as the definitions for associated terminology.

It is clear from these questions that changes are needed to HB 44 to ensure the requirements adequately address current marketplace conditions and practices. WMD has raised this issue with the Committee, and has also discussed a variety of pricing practices with individual state and local Weights and Measures jurisdictions.

The WMD reviewed the existing requirements and their application to current market practices and collected information on a number of scenarios, including the following:

1. Frequent shopper discounts
2. Club member discounts
3. Discount for prepaying cash (to prevent “drive-offs”)
4. Prepay at the cashier for credit sales
5. Discounts for purchasing store products
6. Discounts for purchasing a service (e.g., carwash)
7. Targeted group discounts (e.g., Tuesday – ladies 5 cents off per gallon)
8. Full service
9. Self service
10. Progressive discounts based on volume of motor-fuel purchased
11. Coupons for discounts on immediate or future purchases
12. Rebates (e.g., use of oil company credit card)
13. Day of the week discounts

**Note:** The conditions under some of these scenarios may not typically fall under the authority of Weights and Measures jurisdictions.

The WMD expressed an interest in receiving input from the weights and measures community about the various practices and pricing structures in use, and indicated it welcomed opportunities to discuss this item at regional Weights and Measures associations to ensure the item is adequately addressed.

The regional Weights and Measures associations agreed that changes are needed and encouraged WMD to continue development of the issue. At the 2008 NCWM Interim Meeting, Ohio Weights and Measures submitted a proposal to modify various sections of the LMD Code to the Committee. With a specific proposal to consider, the Committee elevated the item to Information status for further review and input.

In 2008 and 2009, the Committee heard comments from all of the regional Weights and Measures associations (including the CWMA), industry, and individual NCWM members that, while changes are needed to the LMD Code, the changes proposed through the CWMA do not meet the needs of the marketplace (see the Committee’s 2008 and 2009 Final Reports for details of specific concerns). A key concern raised by Weights and Measures officials was the importance for consumers to have full information about the purchase price of the product before they dispense the fuel and to be able to follow all aspects of the transaction.
The CWMA recommended establishment of a small WG to further develop the issue and encouraged consideration of points such as the following:

1. discounts calculated at the pump and others at the counter;
2. level of consumer responsibility;
3. can the dispensers do tier pricing;
4. competitors complaining about non-uniformity of enforcement;
5. discounts should be done electronically; and
6. all is okay as long as the receipt explains the transaction.

NIST WMD agreed to form a small WG to further study this issue and held an initial meeting of interested parties in July 2008. A reduction of staff at NIST prevented subsequent work on this issue. The S&T Committee continued to hear requests from the regional associations and industry regarding the importance that this work be continued and urging that NIST allocate resources to the project. Mr. John Eichberger, National Association of Convenience Stores, offered to coordinate assistance from some of the association’s interested members at the point where work would resume. See the Committee’s 2008 and 2009 Final Reports for additional details on this effort.

At its fall 2009 meeting, the CWMA recommended that this item remain Informational and urged resources be committed to its further development. CWMA members commented that price posting continues to be a problem, noting that the current language in NIST HB 44 does not reflect current market practices and the language needs to be either fixed or removed from the Handbook. The CWMA also requested that the NCWM sponsor a WG to address this issue.

At its fall 2009 meeting, NEWMA agreed that this is a priority item and wants to encourage the formation of a WG as soon as possible. NEWMA further noted comments heard during its meeting:

- As long as terms and conditions are made clear prior to sale, the transaction should be allowed.
- Businesses should purchase the correct equipment (according to HB 44) for their marketing strategy.
- This item needs to move forward as a priority.
- We need to find some remedy for businesses that have older equipment.
- It is very difficult to take a hard line (follow HB 44 exactly) on this item.
- We must enforce equally and provide a level playing field.
- HB 44 is antiquated and should be revised.

At its fall 2009 meeting, the SWMA recommended that NIST WMD resume working on this proposal as soon as resources are available. NIST should include Mr. Eichberger and other sectors that are interested in the work and any stakeholders impacted by proposals to modify the LMD code relative to price posting and computing for RMFDs.

Prior to the 2010 Interim Meeting, NIST reallocated additional resources to work on this issue and announced that Ms. Juana Williams, NIST WMD, would lead the effort to renew the WG. Working in collaboration with the S&T Committee, Ms. Williams held an informal meeting during the 2010 Interim Meeting to allow interested parties to further discuss the issue, share thoughts about next steps, and indicate interest in participating in the WG. That meeting was well attended with 29 NCWM members participating and a number of useful comments were made. Prior to the open hearings, Ms. Williams gave the Committee an overview of the informal meeting and an update on the plan to renew the WG.
At its open hearings, the S&T Committee received positive comments regarding NIST’s reallocation of resources to this project and agreed that reviewing and revising current requirements is important. The Committee continues to strongly support the intent of the proposal and recognizes that significant additional development is needed. The Committee believes that this can best be done through an S&T WG, and decided to give this item Developing status until the WG develops a proposal for consideration by the Conference. After collaborating with NCWM Chairman, Randy Jennings, the Committee Chair indicated that the work group should be chaired by an NCWM voting member under the technical direction of NIST. The Committee asks that Juana Williams collaborate with the Chair regarding possible candidates for the chair based on those who have indicated an interest in serving on the WG. The Committee asks that the WG provide frequent updates on its progress to the Committee and to the regional Weights and Measures associations. The Committee also asks that the WG communicate a work plan and time line after its first official meeting.

During the July 2010 NCWM Annual Meeting, the RMFD Price Posting and Computing Capability U.S. National Work Group wishes to expressed its thanks to its sponsor the NCWM S&T Committee and also to NCWM members for their contributions to during the meeting discussions at the 2010 NCWM Annual Meeting.

The WG offered this abbreviated summary on the direction it will take, based on the task it was given by the S&T Committee and input received at the meeting. The WG is tasked with reviewing the current NIST Handbook 44 Section 3.30 LMD Code to determine if the code requirements address rapidly changing practices for marketing retail motor-fuels to the general public. The WG is also tasked with developing proposals for modifying those codes that need changing and preparing them for a review by the S&T Committee.

The WG has laid out several next steps to establish a work plan to achieve this goal:

1. The WG will work using a teleconference and web conference meeting format to maximize its resources. The WG has a 1 ½ hour meeting tentatively scheduled for mid August 2010 to begin its to development of the work plan;

2. The WG will establish a tentative timeline for completing this task and will submit that timeline by e-mail to the S&T Committee for its consideration to determine if that time frame meets with the approval of the Committee;

3. To better manage this task and ensure input from all groups of stakeholder affected by these marketing practices the WG will consist of approximately 12-15 individuals who represent at least each of the following organizations/agencies/associations:

   - CWMA
   - API
   - NEWMA
   - Convenience Store Associations
   - SWMA
   - Petroleum Marketers Associations
   - WWMA
   - RMFD Manufacturers
   - Consumer Groups

   The WG is seeking input from any stakeholders that might have been overlooked and should be part of this effort. The WG will contact representatives from each group who expressed interest in the work to fill the positions on the Work Group.

   The WG is also seeking additional information to ensure that it does not reinvent code sections that already work to address marketing practices. Therefore, the WG requested copies of any recent legislation or policies enacted to address these marketing scenarios be forwarded to its Chair by August 31, 2010. The WG wishes to examine various examples of marketing practices to establish some general categories for classifying these marketing practices and analyzing if a practice is adequately addressed by any codes it might develop. The WG will develop a form for stakeholders to provide information on marketing practices they regularly encounter which are either (1) not addressed in the code, (2) result in nonuniform interpretation of the application of code sections, or (3) are difficult to enforce because of conflicting codes that apply to the equipment’s design and use.
Anyone interested in participating in this WG or with questions about this issue is asked to contact NIST WMD Technical Advisor Ms. Juana Williams by e-mail at juana.williams@nist.gov, by telephone at (301) 975-3989, or in writing at NIST 100 Bureau Drive – Stop 2600, Gaithersburg, MD 20899-2600.
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#### Section I

**Examples of Repaired Devices/Repaired Elements**  
(no metrological change)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measuring Activity</th>
<th>Remanufactured Device</th>
<th>Remanufactured Element</th>
<th>Still Traceable to NTEP CC</th>
<th>Marking Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-1-W</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A scale that is disassembled for the purpose of cleaning and repairing pivots and bearings this activity covers cleaning and packing bearings.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-2-W</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A device in which the electronic components have been changed on site using original manufacturer’s factory components parts or NTEP traceable replacement parts.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-3-W</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A weighing element that is replaced on site with original manufacturer’s factory parts or NTEP traceable replacement parts. This does not prohibit repairs by other than the original manufacturer.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-4-W</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A class III L scales in which a section adjustment (mechanical or electronic) is made and some disassembly is required.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-5-W</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mechanical scales in which a nose iron is adjusted and some disassembly is required.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-6-W</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of Liquid Crystal Display (LCD) or non-metrological computer boards or chips.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-7-W</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of pivots and bearings on mechanical scales. <strong>NOTE:</strong> Pivots and bearings would have to meet the original manufacturer's specifications for the scale to operate correctly.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-8-W</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of some or all load cells with load cells identical (same manufacturer, make and model) to those removed.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-9-W</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of some or all load cells with metrologically equivalent (n_max, v_min, etc.) load cells from a different manufacturer, provided the load cells are of the same basic type that have an NTEP CC and can be replaced without modification to the basic design of the load cell mounting assembly.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-10-W</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of all load cells of a particular technology (analog, digital, and hydraulic) in a scale system with approved and compatible digital load cells that have an NTEP CC provided the cells can be replaced without any modification to the basic design of the load cell mounting assembly.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Measuring Activity

**I-1-M** Disassembly of a motor fuel dispenser for the purpose of replacing a meter gasket.  
No | No | Yes | No
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I-2-M</th>
<th>A device in which the electronic components have been replaced on site using original manufacturer’s factory components, parts, or NTEP traceable replacement parts.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-3-M</td>
<td>Any measuring element that is replaced on site with original manufacturer’s factory parts or NTEP traceable replacement. This does not prohibit repairs by other than the original manufacturer.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-4-M</td>
<td>Replacement of nozzles on gasoline dispensers.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-M</td>
<td>Replacement of LCD or non-metrological computer boards or chips.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-6-M</td>
<td>Adjustment of ranger gears on meters (some disassembly required). This activity applies to meters calibrated with a range of gears rather than an adjustor.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-7-M</td>
<td>A service agency replaces a meter that cannot be brought into the proper calibration with a used meter (at the service station) of the same model and the meter is recalibrated.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-8-M</td>
<td>A used equipment dealer replaces a meter that cannot be brought into the proper calibration with a used meter (in their shop) of the same model taken from a used dispenser and the meter is recalibrated when installed and placed back in service.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-9-M</td>
<td>A remanufacturer disassembles a dispenser to replace a meter that cannot be brought into the proper calibration with a used meter (in their plant) of the same model taken from a used dispenser and the meter is recalibrated when installed and placed back in service.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-10-M</td>
<td>A service agency partially disassembles a motor fuel dispenser, cleans the dispenser and replaces the meter with a meter identical (same manufacturer, make and model) to that removed.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section II - Examples of Remanufactured Devices/Remanufactured Elements (no metrological change)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remanufactured Device</th>
<th>Remanufactured Element</th>
<th>Still Traceable to NTEP CC</th>
<th>Marking Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighing Activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-1-W</td>
<td>A scale that is disassembled for the purpose of checking for worn parts, cleaning the scale, and replacing some or all of the scale’s load cells with remanufactured load cells provided the load cells are remanufactured by the original manufacturer or are remanufactured metrologically equivalent ($n_{\text{max}}$, $V_{\text{min}}$, etc.) load cells with an NTEP CC and are identical to those removed.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – Load Cells No – Weighing Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-2-W</td>
<td>A service agency replaces a digital indicating element of a floor scale with the same</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – Indicating Element</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Indicator remanufactured by a firm other than the original manufacturer of the scale. <strong>NOTE:</strong> The remanufacturer made no design change to the indicator.</th>
<th>No – Weighing Element</th>
<th>Element only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>II-3-W</strong> A service agency completely disassembles a counter computing scale in their shop, checks for worn parts and replaces all worn parts (without replacing the load cell(s)) with remanufactured parts (not original manufacturer but no design change), replaces other parts as needed, cleans and reassembles the scale for sale.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| A device or element is sent back to the original equipment manufacturer. The device is disassembled, checked for wear, parts are replaced or fixed as necessary, and the device is reassembled and made to operate like a new scale of the same type. | Yes | No | Yes | No (Original markings meet requirement) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **II-4-W** A device or element is sent to a company (not the original manufacturer). The device is disassembled, checked for wear, parts are replaced with Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) parts or fixed as necessary, and the device or element is reassembled and made to operate like a new device or element of the same type. | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |

**Measuring Activity**

| A dispenser remanufacturer completely disassembles a motor fuel dispenser in their shop, checks for worn parts and replaces all worn elements with remanufactured elements (not original manufacturer but no design change), cleans and reinstalls the dispenser. | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|---|---|---|---|
| **II-6-M** A dispenser remanufacturer completely | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section III</th>
<th>Examples of Remanufacturing/Repairs/Modifications that Constitute a Metrological Design Change or a Violation of NTEP Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighing Activity</strong></td>
<td>Remanufactured Device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-1-W</td>
<td>A company disassembles a scale, cleans the scale and checks for worn parts, then replaces hydraulic load cells with shear beam load cells. <strong>NOTE:</strong> Requires different mounting due to different type of cells.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-2-W</td>
<td>A metrological change to Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) design of a weighing device or element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-3-W</td>
<td>Structural modifications to weighbridges. Scale changes that do not comply with UR. 4.3. Scale Modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-4-W</td>
<td>Replacing a lever system with load cells.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-5-W</td>
<td>Substitution of a load cell or cells in a scale when the replacement cells were not repaired or remanufactured by the original manufacturer or authorized agent of the original manufacturer. The remanufactured load cell(s) does not have an NTEP CC. (NTEP Policy, see NCWM Pub. 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-6-W</td>
<td>A company completely disassembles a counter computing scale in their shop, checks for worn parts and replaces all worn parts with remanufactured parts (not the original manufacturer but no design change) and load cell without an NTEP CC, replaces other parts as needed, cleans and reassembles the scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measuring Activity</strong></td>
<td>Remanufactured Device</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**NOTE:** The remanufacturer made no design change.

---

**NOTE:** Requires Not Applicable Not Applicable No Yes*
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### III-1-M
A metrological change to the Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) design of a measuring device or element.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### III-2-M
A dispenser remanufacturer adds temperature compensation to a dispenser, which was never approved for temperature compensation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*The Committee agreed that devices in Section III should be marked. The Task Force indicated that remanufactured marking requirements do not apply to Section III activities. The Committee noted that devices in Section III require the following:

- must be reevaluated
  - must be marked with new manufacturer’s identity
  - must be marked with new NTEP CC number
  - must meet paragraph G-S.1. Identification

The Committee agreed that it was historically important to include in the report the following NTEP Policies that are the basis for placing examples in Section III (activities that represent a metrological change or violation of current NTEP Policy).

#### III-1-W
The 2000 edition of NCWM Pub 14 Weighing Devices Checklist for Load Cells Section A Program Description 5. Substitution of Metrologically Equivalent Load Cells in Scales states that metrologically equivalent load cells from the same or a different manufacturer may be substituted into a scale provided that the substituted load cells can be placed in the scale without any modification to the design of the load cell mounting assembly.

#### III-2-W
The 2001 edition of NCWM Pub 14 Administrative Policy Section M. Policy on Remanufactured and Repaired Devices specifies that a device is no longer covered by an NTEP Certificate of Conformance if a company or individual makes changes to a device to the extent that the metrological characteristics are changed.

#### III-3-W
Devices that fall under this activity are not covered by a CC unless the device complies NIST Handbook 44 paragraph UR.4.3. Scale Modification. Devices that meet UR.4.3. require approval by the weights and measures authority having jurisdiction over the device.

#### III-4-W
The 2000 edition of NCWM Pub 14 Checklist for Digital Electronic Scales Section E. Modification of Type 1. Replacing the Lever System with Load Cells specifies that changing a scale from a lever system scale to a full electronic scale is considered a modification of type. The total replacement of any levers in a mechanical scale is a modification of type that is not covered by the original CC without additional testing.

#### III-5-W
The 2000 edition of NCWM Pub 14 Weighing Devices Checklist for Load Cells Section A. Program Description 4. Repaired or Remanufactured Load Cells specifies that the original Certificate of Conformance (CC) no longer applies to a repaired load cell if that load cell is repaired by other than the original manufacturer or its authorized agent.

#### III-6-W
The 2000 edition of NCWM Pub 14 Weighing Devices Checklist for Load Cells Section A. Program Description 5. Substitution of Metrologically Equivalent Load Cells in a Scale states that load cells from the same or a different manufacturer may be substituted into a scale provided that the load cells to be substituted have been evaluated separately and have a CC.

#### III-1-M
NIST Handbook 130, Uniform National Type Evaluation Regulation Section 4. Prohibited Acts and Exemptions (9) Repaired Device and (10) Remanufactured Device and the 2001 edition of NCWM Pub 14 Administrative Policy Section M and the Checklist for Liquid-Measuring Devices Section K. Policy on Remanufactured and Repaired Devices specify that if a company or individual repairs or remanufactures a device, they are obligated to repair or remanufacture the device consistent with the manufacturer’s original design. Otherwise, that specific device is no longer traceable to the NTEP CC.
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**III-2-M** Handbook 130, Uniform National Type Evaluation Regulation Section 4. Prohibited Acts and Exemptions (9) Repaired Device and (10) Remanufactured Device and the 2001 edition of Pub 14 Administrative Policy Section J.2 Re-evaluation to Expand an Existing Certificate of Conformance. A type with a valid CC may be re-

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Section</th>
<th>Nonretroactive paragraph</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>G-S.1.(b)(1)</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Identification - Model Identifier</td>
<td>Abbreviations for Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>G-S.1.(c)</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Serial number</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>G-S.1.(c)(1)</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Serial number</td>
<td>Identified with words, symbols, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>G-S.1.(c)(2)</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Serial number</td>
<td>Acceptable abbreviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>G-S.1.(d)</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Software version</td>
<td>Must be identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>G-S.1.(d)(1)</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Software version</td>
<td>Identified with words, symbols, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>G-S.1.(d)(2)</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Software version</td>
<td>Acceptable abbreviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>G-S.1.(e)</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>CC number</td>
<td>Identified with words, symbols, acceptable abbreviations, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>G-S.1.1.</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Locations of markings</td>
<td>Applicable to not-built-for-purpose devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>G-S.1.2.</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Remanufactured devices and elements</td>
<td>Markings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>G-S.5.2.2.(d)</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Digital zero indications</td>
<td>Minimum zero indications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>G-S.6.</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Operational control indications, etc.</td>
<td>Markings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>G-S.8.</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Sealing electronic adjustable components</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>G-S.8.1.</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Sealing multiple elements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.1.1.1.(b)</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Center of zero requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.1.2.</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Value of d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.1.2.1.</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Digital indicating scales single unit of measure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.1.4.3.</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Width of index for graduations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.1.7.(b)</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Capacity indication</td>
<td>Max 9d above capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.1.8.3.1.</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Weight classifiers-sealing and indications</td>
<td>Applicable to weight classifiers and normal rounding scales capable of weight classifying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.1.8.4. (a)(b) footnote</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td># symbol</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.1.11.(a)</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Sealing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.1.11.(b)</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Sealing</td>
<td>Recognizes audit trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.1.11.(c)</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Sealing</td>
<td>Table S.1.11. format for audit trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.1.11.11. (table)</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Audit trail format</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Nonretroactive paragraph</td>
<td>Effective Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.1.12.</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Manual weights</td>
<td>Requirements and abbreviations for manual weights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.1.12.</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Manual weights</td>
<td>Net weights permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.2.1.3.</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>Automatic zero-tracking</td>
<td>Mfg. before and after dates in lieu of nonretroactive dates (applicable to remanufactured devices?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.2.1.3.3.</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Means to disable AZT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.2.1.5.(c)</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>IZSM</td>
<td>Requirements and limits for IZSM on separable indicating elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.2.2.2.</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Equal arm scales</td>
<td>Balance indicator requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.2.3.</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Tare</td>
<td>Nonretroactive requirements for clearing of tare and for MI &amp; MR scales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.2.4.</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Level-indicating means</td>
<td>Retroactive exemption for jewelers, prescription, and dairy test scales including Class I and II scales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.5.1.</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Accuracy Class Markings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.5.2.</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Parameters for Accuracy Classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.5.4.</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Relationship of v and e</td>
<td>Suitability of load cell vmin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>Table 3</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Parameters for Accuracy Classes</td>
<td>Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.6.1.</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>CLC marking requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.6.4.</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>RR track scale section capacity</td>
<td>Limitations of capacity of 2-section and more that 2-section scales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.6.5.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Livestock scales</td>
<td>Limitations of capacity of 2-section and more that 2-section scales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.6.3.(b)1</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Model designation</td>
<td>Allowable prefixes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.6.3.(b)2</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Serial number</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.6.3.(b)2</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Serial number</td>
<td>Allowable prefixes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.6.3.(b)3</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Nominal Capacity</td>
<td>Nonretroactive requirement for value of the scale division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.6.3.(b)4</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>d and e</td>
<td>Markings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.6.3.(b)5</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Temperature ranges</td>
<td>Marking if required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.6.3.(b)6</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>nmax for load cells</td>
<td>Includes acceptable abbreviation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.6.3.(b)7</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Single and Multiple load cell</td>
<td>Markings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.6.3.(b)8</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Separable indicating element</td>
<td>Marking Included III/III L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.6.3.(b)9</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>CLC marking requirements</td>
<td>Includes modified scales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.6.3.(b)11</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Load cell markings</td>
<td>Permits accompanying document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.6.3.(b)12</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>CLC marking requirements</td>
<td>Acceptable abbreviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.6.3.(b)13</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Marking for special application</td>
<td>In additions to existing retroactive counting feature requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.6.3.(b)14</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>CLC marking requirements</td>
<td>Added for livestock scales that also weigh vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.6.3.(b)15</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Loading direction for load cells</td>
<td>Markings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>S.6.3.(b)16</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Serial number markings</td>
<td>Includes prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Section</td>
<td>Nonretroactive paragraph</td>
<td>Effective Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20 S.6.3.(b)17</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Accuracy class marking requirements</td>
<td>Included load-receiving elements</td>
<td>Nominal capacity marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20 S.6.3.(b)18 (e)</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>nmax, vmin, accuracy class markings</td>
<td>Applicable to separable weighing-load-receiving elements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20 S.6.3.(b)19</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>CLC requirements for combination RRtrack/Vehicle scales</td>
<td>Markings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20 S.6.3.(b)20</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>vmin in terms of mass</td>
<td>Applicable to combination RR track and vehicle scales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20 S.6.3.(b)21</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>CC marking requirement</td>
<td>refers to G-S.1.(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20 S.6.3.(b)22</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Acceptable abbreviations for &quot;Section Capacity.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20 S.6.3.(b)23</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>&quot;In-service before&quot; in lieu of nonretroactive dates (applicable of remanufactured devices?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20 N.1.5.</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Discrimination test</td>
<td>&quot;In-service after&quot; in lieu of nonretroactive dates (applicable of remanufactured devices?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20 N.1.4.2.</td>
<td>1991?</td>
<td>CIM railroad weighing systems &lt; ten cars</td>
<td>Applicable to remanufactures scales (e.g., T.N.4.5., T.N.4.6., T.N.4.7., T.N.7., T.N.8.,)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20 N.1.4.3.</td>
<td>1991?</td>
<td>CIM railroad weighing systems &lt; ten cars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20 T.N.1.</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Tolerance for marked scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20 UR.1.3.</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Value of scale division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20 UR.1.5.</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>RR track scale printer requirement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20 UR.2.6.1.</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30 S.1.5.3.(a)</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Width of index for graduations</td>
<td>Quantity and total price inhibited until fueling conditions reached.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30 S.1.6.1.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Indications of delivery for electronic devices</td>
<td>Transaction and user information retention requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30 S.1.6.2.</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Power loss provisions</td>
<td>Selected UP displayed prior to delivery with exceptions (e.g., fleet, contract, and truck refueling sales).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30 S.1.6.4.1.(b)</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Display of Unit Prices</td>
<td>Device shall compute (and display?) all possible sales within range of measurement or computing elements (i.e., with exceptions to fleet, contract, truck-stop dispensers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30 S.1.6.5.(a)</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Money-Value computations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30 S.1.6.5.3.</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Auxiliary element money indications</td>
<td>Agreement requirements with primary indications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30 S.1.6.5.4.</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Selection on unit price</td>
<td>Requires selection of UP prior to delivery using device or other customer activated controls with exceptions (e.g., fleet, contract, and truck refueling sales).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30 S.1.6.5.5.</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Retention of quantity and total price</td>
<td>Indications on the face of the dispenser retained for a minimum of 5-minutes or until new transaction initiated. Exception for aviation refueling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Section</td>
<td>Nonretroactive paragraph</td>
<td>Effective Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>S.1.6.5.6.(a)</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Quantity and total price - Aviation refueling</td>
<td>Quantity displayed through the transaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>S.1.6.5.6.(b)</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Total price display</td>
<td>Conditions for displaying total price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>S.1.6.5.6.(c)</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Retention of quantity and total price</td>
<td>Indications retained for a minimum of 5-minutes or until new transaction initiated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>S.1.6.5.6.(d)</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Printed receipt</td>
<td>Shall be available &amp; include TP, UP, and quantity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>S.1.6.6. (b)</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Agreement between indications</td>
<td>Primary and auxiliary indicated or recording elements meet formula (quantity x UP = TP to nearest 1 cent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>S.1.6.7.</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Recorded representations (receipt)</td>
<td>Receipt requirements for POS and card (debit/credit) or cash activated devices with exceptions to fleet and contract sales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>S.2.2.</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Provisions for sealing</td>
<td>Table S.2.2. format for audit trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>S.2.2. Table</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Methods for sealing Cat. 2 devices</td>
<td>Hardware on-site, scales with adequate event counters or physical seal and requirements for the location of event counters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>S.2.2. Table</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Cat. 3 devices</td>
<td>Indication, operation, and recorded representations during remote configuration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>S.2.6.</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Temp. determinations (wholesale)</td>
<td>Requirements for thermometer well and its location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>S.4.4.1.</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Retail devices (discharge rate)</td>
<td>Discharge rate marking requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>S.4.4.2.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Retail devices (location - G-S.1. Info)</td>
<td>Height range, internal/external access, and permanent part of device.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>S.5.</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Retail devices (totalizers)</td>
<td>Requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>T.4.</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>ATC - differences in meter error</td>
<td>Based on results of determined with and without ATC activated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PMP CORPORATION
Petroleum Meter & Pump

May 4, 2010

Steve Giguere
Maine Department of Agriculture State House Station 28 Augusta, ME 04333

Dear Steve,

The National conference on Weights and Measures has on its agenda for 2010 a voting item which could have a dramatic effect on the Remanufacturing Industry and on low volume retail fuel outlets. Item 310-4 (See Supplement I) was proposed at the 2009 WNMA and SWMA Regional Meetings but was originally submitted by the NIST office of Weights and Measures. It was based on an inquirer NIST received from a State Director, asking if the Nonretroactive Requirements apply to Remanufactured Devices. It is stated that the change is needed to clarify the application of intent for the Nonretroactive Clause in Handbook 44, G-A.6.

To say that this change is just a clarification is an understatement. It changes the overall interpretation and scope of the Nonretroactive requirement. The change will add requirements to remanufactured devices that were added to the Handbook after the device was originally manufactured. It ultimately could eliminate or severely impact the practice and business of Remanufacturing and of low volume retail fuel outlets.

If you review G-A.6 as it currently reads in the 2010 version of Handbook 44, Nonretroactive Requirements apply to New Devices based on the "Original Manufacturing Date" compared to effective date of a requirement. Adding "Remanufactured" to the requirement will establish a new point in time (Remanufactured Date) to apply requirements. So in short a device originally manufactured in January of 2002 and remanufactured January of 2007 would need to meet all nonretroactive requirements added to the handbook up to and including January of 2007.

A good example of this would be if a Tokheim 1200 series dispenser was removed from the island and remanufactured. Let say the dispenser was disassembled checked for wear and a new mechanical computer and new outer skins were installed. The dispenser was checked for accuracy and everything checked out per handbook 44. Because this dispenser was out of production prior to the adding of the nonretroactive marking requirement specifying that the CC number be clearly marked on the dispenser, it could be rejected by a state and not allowed to be installed. These dispensers are very accurate, and proven to be very reliable and especially suitable for low volume retail outlets in rural areas. There is a vast difference in the cost per gallon for equipment that is passed on to the consumer from a retail location that sells 250,000 gallons per month verses the location that sells 30,000 gallons per month. The same issues apply to scales such as a deli scale that is removed from one grocery store location to the stores shop where it is rebuild and move to another grocery store.
As stated in the discussion of the item NIST wants to make a direct comparison between a new device and a remanufactured device indicating they directly compete with each other. This is true as far as competing in the same market as a whole but not if you factor in technology, features, warranty, etc. Some time back the Remanufactured Task Force recognized that Remanufacturing has been going on for a long time and is just part of the business. The remanufactured devices do not directly compete with new devices but they do fill a void. A smaller low volume operation can buy remanufactured devices at a reduced price which keeps them competitive with the large volume operations. It provides a means to extend the life of equipment that maybe has gone out of production but is still very accurate and reliable.

NIST has also stated they do not want to reopen the whole remanufactured discussion. However to fully understand the ramification of the change and to determine if the change is even needed, one has to go back and review the current handbook requirements, and definitions for remanufactured devices and repaired devices. Simply said there are very subtle differences between the definitions or repaired and remanufactured. More importantly, the handbook under the nonretroactive requirements already defines application for "used" devices which includes remanufactured devices.

This item should be moved back to an informational item or removed for the agenda. If made informational it would give all of those companies that could be impacted by the change to review and comment on this issue. This is not just a clarification. It is clearly a change in the philosophy of applying Nonretroactive Requirements.

Please feel free to contact me at 1 (800) 243-6628 if you have any questions or need further information.

Sincerely,

Thomas McGee
President
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Tina G. Butcher (NIST Tech Advisor)
NIST, Weights & Measures Division
100 Bureau Drive, MS 2600
Gaithersburg, MD 20899-2600

Ms. Butcher:

We write to you as stakeholders in the community that works to recondition-or, as coined in Handbook 44, "remanufacture" - used gas pumps for sale in the United States. It has come to our attention that a provision currently viewed as a "technical correction" is proposed as a voting item at the National Conference of Weights and Measures in July; the item is 310-4 of the 2010 Publication 15, entitled "Nonretroactive Requirements (Remanufactured Equipment)." This "correction," however, could have a major and lasting impact on the market for reconditioned or remanufactured gas pumps and has not been adequately discussed by the Weights and Measures community or by the remanufacturing community.

This letter is to urge you to support moving the 310-4 G-A6 amendment from "voting" to an "informational item," so that a task force, like the Remanufacturing Task Force formed in the early 2000s, can adequately discuss the ramifications of the change and the resulting impact on the process of reconditioning gas pumps.

We realize that there has been continued debate on how exactly to treat reconditioned or remanufactured gas pumps, and the need for conformity throughout the Weights and Measures community. This item, 310-4, however, is likely to exacerbate the problem and lead to further confusion in the remanufacturing community on the appropriate procedure for compliance with Handbook 44. For this reason, both the Northeast Weights and Measures Association and the Central Weights and Measures Association have recommended that the item be moved to "informational" status at the National conference.

For the last decade, "gas pump remanufacturers," equipment distributors, oil companies, and convenience store operators have been reconditioning gas pumps to meet the specifications of the original Certificate of Compliance (CC). The proposal for revised language in 310-4, however, could be interpreted as requiring these reconditioned gas pumps (and possibly even gas pumps repaired on site, but taken off the island) to be treated as if they were newly manufactured gas pumps. This change would drastically increase the costs associated with reconditioning used gas pumps, and potentially ending the practice in the industry, leaving only new gas pumps available in an already depressed market and used pumps sitting as potential hazards in local landfills.

This change would not only harm those that recondition gas pumps, but also the industries that rely on selling used gas pumps, or retailers that seek access to reconditioned pumps as a way to reduce costs in an economically strained market. This letter has been signed by stakeholders with the hope that this issue can be better discussed if there is no change in July. Item 310-4 needs to remain an informational item.

We appreciate all the work that you do on behalf of the Weights and Measures community and look forward to continued discussion on this topic. Please feel free to contact any of us with questions regarding our position on Item 310-4.

Sincerely,

GRAFFCO, INC.
Dan Graff President
13957 Lake Drive Forest Lake,
MN 55025
651-464-1079
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADA INC DBA PINE SQUARE</td>
<td>Matthew Seymour, President</td>
<td>驯兔er, MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN FUEL SERVICES</td>
<td>Allen Williams</td>
<td><a href="mailto:allen@allenfuelservices.com">allen@allenfuelservices.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL-TECH FUEL SYSTEMS, LLC</td>
<td>Jerry Montgomery, Owner/President</td>
<td>PO Box 941765 Houston, TX 77094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL L. DOVER COMPANY, INC.</td>
<td>Wade Dover, President</td>
<td>Jaspar, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARTERENERGY CORPORATION</td>
<td>Michael Kittrell, Texas Area Manager Overland, KS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mikelkittrell@carterenergy.com">mikelkittrell@carterenergy.com</a> 214-762-0504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOWDEN OIL COMPANY, INC.</td>
<td>David Hamilton, General Manager</td>
<td>P.O. Box 145 Sylacauga, AL 35150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAUMAN OIL DISTRIBUTORS, INC.</td>
<td>Paul F. Bauman, President</td>
<td>1503 Commercial Blvd. Hercuaneum, MO 63048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLODGETT OIL COMPANY, INC.</td>
<td>Ross W. Blodgett, President</td>
<td>P.O. Box 39 Mt. Pleasant, MI 48804-0039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPBELL OIL CO. INC.</td>
<td>Les Campbell, Pres/CEO</td>
<td>2028 Edison Ames, IA 50010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLBEA ENTERPRISES, LLC</td>
<td>Thomas W. Breckel, Vice President of Operations/HS&amp;E</td>
<td>2050 Plainfield Pike Cranston, RI 02921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CISSY'S C-STORES</td>
<td>Norma L. Campbell, Owner</td>
<td>2028 Edison Ames, IA 50010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUGAR OIL, INC.</td>
<td>John Larry Jones, Vice President</td>
<td>Des Moines, IA <a href="mailto:diamondoil@diamoindoil-corp.com">diamondoil@diamoindoil-corp.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIAMOND OIL LLC</td>
<td>Neil Patel, Vice President</td>
<td>1296 Magnolia Ave Corona, CA 92879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOWNS ENERGY</td>
<td>Michael Downs, President</td>
<td>1296 Magnolia Ave Corona, CA 92879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERBASE (Formerly Farmers Union Oil Of Minot, DBA Enerbase)</td>
<td>Tony Bernhardt, CEO</td>
<td>215 E. Central Ave. Minot, ND 58702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST COAST ENERGY</td>
<td>Eddie West, Service Manager</td>
<td>1 Putney Road Brattleboro, VT 05301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEMING OIL COMPANY INC.</td>
<td>Richard Fleming, Jr. President</td>
<td>1 Putney Road Brattleboro, VT 05301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G&amp;M OIL CO</td>
<td>Rickie Allen, Controller</td>
<td>Barbourville, KY <a href="mailto:rlallen@barbourville.com">rlallen@barbourville.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTES EQUIPMENT CO., INC.</td>
<td>Dale Simmons, Managing Partner</td>
<td>1258 Old Hwy 11 Birmingham, AL 35235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLODGETT OIL COMPANY, INC.</td>
<td>Ross W. Blodgett, President</td>
<td>P.O. Box 39 Mt. Pleasant, MI 48804-0039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPBELL OIL CO. INC.</td>
<td>Les Campbell, Pres/CEO</td>
<td>2028 Edison Ames, IA 50010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLBEA ENTERPRISES, LLC</td>
<td>Thomas W. Breckel, Vice President of Operations/HS&amp;E</td>
<td>2050 Plainfield Pike Cranston, RI 02921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENMAR CORPORATION</td>
<td>Dennis Austin, President</td>
<td>PO Box 13117 Scottsdale, AZ 85267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOUGLASS DISTRIBUTING, INC.</td>
<td>Brad Douglass, President</td>
<td>325 E Forest Ave Sherman, TX 75090-8832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUNLAVY PRO LLC BEAR CROSSING LLC</td>
<td>Leo Dunlavy, Vice President</td>
<td>107 E. Broadway Glidden, WI 54527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPRESS MART</td>
<td>Patrick Hyde, Facilities Manager</td>
<td>6567 Kinne Rd. DeWitt, NY 13214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEST QUALITY EQUIPMENT INC.</td>
<td>Tony Lizarra, Sales Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tony@bestqualityequipment.com">tony@bestqualityequipment.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Title/Role</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HANDEE MARTS INC. dba 7-Eleven</td>
<td>Ed Szalankiewicz</td>
<td>Director of Gas &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>714 Warrendale Rd. Gibsonia, PA 15044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JM OIL CO INC</td>
<td>Brian Laudenbach</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>St. Cloud, MN 800-233-8044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWCOMB OIL CO.</td>
<td>L. Newcomb Jr.</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Bardstown, KY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'CONNELL OIL ASSOC., INC.</td>
<td>James Sobon</td>
<td>VP Maintenance</td>
<td>545 Merrill Road Pittsfield, MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'CONNELL OIL ASSOC., INC.</td>
<td>Mark Sobon</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>545 Merrill Road Pittsfield, MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'CONNELL OIL ASSOC., INC.</td>
<td>William C. Pepper</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Georgetown, DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'CONNELL OIL ASSOC., INC.</td>
<td>Russell B. Clegg</td>
<td>Managing Member</td>
<td>Duluth, GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'CONNELL OIL ASSOC., INC.</td>
<td>Joe A. Hollingsworth</td>
<td>Jr. Chairman</td>
<td>Two Centre Plaza Clinton, Tennessee 37716</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'CONNELL OIL ASSOC., INC.</td>
<td>Tim Shirley</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>5744 Hwy. 84 East Cowarts, AL 36321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTG MANAGEMENT, INC.</td>
<td>Guy Oliver</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'CONNELL OIL ASSOC., INC.</td>
<td>George Dickhout</td>
<td>CFO</td>
<td>545 Merrill Road Pittsfield, MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'CONNELL OIL ASSOC., INC.</td>
<td>John Gaudraut</td>
<td>Senior VP</td>
<td>545 Merrill Road Pittsfield, MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'CONNELL OIL ASSOC., INC.</td>
<td>Steven Yates</td>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>545 Merrill Road Pittsfield, MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETES OF ERIE, INC.</td>
<td>Gratz Peters</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Bloomington, IL <a href="mailto:gjcobb@aol.com">gjcobb@aol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREEDOM OIL LLC</td>
<td>Gregory Cobb</td>
<td>Managing Member</td>
<td>Bloomington, IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GULF COASTEQUWMENT CO INC.</td>
<td>Bob Moore</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Houston, TX 77060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS BROKERS, INC.</td>
<td>Robert T. Novak</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>3480 Kossuth St., #7 Lafayette, IN 47905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASHVILLE EQUIPMENT SERVICE, INC.</td>
<td>Gary Beasley</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>610 1 California Avenue Nashville, TN 37209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'CONNELL OIL ASSOC., INC.</td>
<td>Michael Sobon</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>545 Merrill Road Pittsfield, MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'CONNELL OIL ASSOC., INC.</td>
<td>James Zoltek</td>
<td>VP Operations</td>
<td>545 Merrill Road Pittsfield, MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEI MAINTENANCE &amp; CONTRACTING</td>
<td>Rod Armes</td>
<td>Fuel System Specialist</td>
<td>Bloomington, IN 7630 N. Fox Hollow Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETROLEUM SERVICES GROUP</td>
<td>Thomas Podczaski</td>
<td>Eastern Sales and Engineering</td>
<td>Waycross, GA <a href="mailto:podczaski@eseng.org">podczaski@eseng.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTSG, INC.</td>
<td>Larry Gariepy Sr.</td>
<td>National Sales and Marketing Mgr.</td>
<td>1340 Kings Cove Dr. Canyon Lake, TX 78133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKY TOP MARKETS, LLC</td>
<td>Steve Poe</td>
<td>Vice President of Operations</td>
<td>Kingston, TN <a href="mailto:rockytopmarkets@aol.com">rockytopmarkets@aol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAPLES ENTERPRISES, INC.</td>
<td>Corey Maricle</td>
<td>Business Director</td>
<td>Windom, MN 56101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE WILLS GROUP INC.</td>
<td>Steve Stookey</td>
<td>Manager, Engineering &amp; Environmental Services</td>
<td>La Plata, MD 20646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTHUSING'S INC.</td>
<td>Bruce H. Deutscher</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Stockton, KS 67669</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Contact Person</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;B SYSTEMS, INC.</td>
<td>Robert Beal</td>
<td>1520 N. Argonne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spokane, WA 99212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAPLES ENTERPRISES, INC.</td>
<td>Brent Staples, President</td>
<td>P.O. Box 243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Windom, MN 56101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAPLES OIL CO., INC.</td>
<td>Alan Staples, President</td>
<td>Box 243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Windom, MN 56101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIUMPH ENERGY</td>
<td>Mike Martinelli, Construction Maintenance Director</td>
<td>9171 Dry Fork Rd. Harrison, OH 45030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINNSBORO PETROLEUM CO</td>
<td>Charles Renwick, Plant Manager</td>
<td>Winnsboro, SC <a href="mailto:crenwick@pops-mart.com">crenwick@pops-mart.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R &amp; S TANK SERVICE, LLC</td>
<td>Rick Standifer, President</td>
<td>1006 N6th Conroe, TX 77301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEINHAGEN OIL CO., INC.</td>
<td>Gary M. Holcombe, Operations Director</td>
<td>Beaumont, TX <a href="mailto:gholcombe@soc-fastlane.com">gholcombe@soc-fastlane.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARE OIL &amp; SUPPLY CO., INC.</td>
<td>Donald Everett, President</td>
<td>2715 S. Bryon Butler Pkwy Perry, FL 32348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYKSTRA OIL COMPANY</td>
<td>Harold Wykstra, Vice President</td>
<td>917 E Allegan St. Martin, MI 49070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DRESSER Wayne

July 7, 2010
Executive Secretary
National Conference on Weights and Measures
National Institute of Standards and Technology
100 Bureau Drive, Stop 2600
Gaithersburg, MD 20899-2600

ATTN: Specifications and Tolerances Committee


Dear Mr. Saum and the Specifications and Tolerances Committee:

As one of the leading manufacturers of fuel dispensers in the United States, Dresser Wayne takes great care in providing products in which fuel retailers can place their confidence and can rest assured that their equipment will be safe for and fair to the general public. To that end, we put considerable effort into maintaining Certificates of Conformance for each of our dispensers to ensure that they meet all current NTEP requirements. Dresser Wayne understands that changes to the NTEP standards are not arbitrary: they are put into place to meet the changing needs of the marketplace and to help protect consumers and retailers alike.

Under ordinary circumstances, retailers replace their fuel dispensers with new equipment at the end of the normal lifecycle, a practice that helps ensure that their dispensers always meet the most current standards. However, there is a growing trend to extend that lifecycle by refurbishing or "remanufacturing" the equipment after its removal from the original site, and then placing it back into the stream of commerce without first bringing it into compliance with current NTEP standards. This failure to meet applicable NTEP certification standards increases the chances of errors, misuse, and fraud, and puts consumers as well as station owners at risk.

The purpose of the NTEP standards is to promulgate consistency and fairness in the dispensing of fuel to the public. Dresser Wayne believes that those standards should apply equally to every company selling fuel dispensers, whether the equipment is new, used or remanufactured. The current practice of extending the usable life of fuel dispensers without a system of checks and balances to help ensure that, at the time of sale, such used and remanufactured equipment meets current NTEP standards results in inconsistency in the marketplace, and an unacceptable risk of error. All dispenser suppliers should have an obligation to help keep the public protected, and to see to it that customers at the pump are getting exactly what they pay for.

The consistency and accuracy of fuel-dispensing equipment is an issue of critical and growing importance. For decades the industry has been able to safely and reliably operate within a fueling and payment infrastructure that remained relatively stable. However, the last few years have brought significant changes to the marketplace including:

- **Payment security.** Higher fuel prices and sophisticated identity-theft schemes both have exposed dispensing equipment to increasing threats of fraud - manifested by the theft of fuel as well as customers' personal and financial data. As such, the credit card industry has mandated increasingly rigorous payment-security standards, and dispenser manufacturers have enhanced fuel-meter technology and associated electronics to deter tampering with measurement and calibration.

- **Fuel evolution.** The last few years have brought unprecedented changes in the country's fuel supply based on national energy policy and environmental initiatives. The introduction of ultra-low-sulfur diesel
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(ULSD) and diesel exhaust fluid (DEF) have taxed the capabilities of dispensers' hydraulic systems. In addition, higher levels of ethanol in today's fuels require specially fabricated seals and components. Manufacturers must adapt quickly and skillfully to these changes, not only to meet environmental standards, but also to maintain the integrity of the metrological function.

- **Communications interface.** Although current dispenser communications are via serial interface, the recent introduction of Ethernet communication to the forecourt portends both the download of dispenser software from remote sources as well as the potential for automatic meter-calibration based on real-time statistical reconciliation. These emerging technological advances may well require updated sealing methods and robust audit requirements achievable only with adherence to the latest industry standards.

It is critical that such developments in a rapidly evolving industry be built upon an infrastructure that does not compromise when it comes to fairness. As such, Dresser Wayne supports maintaining item 301-4 G-A.6 as a voting item at the National Conference of Weights and Measures on July 11-15, 2010. It is in the best interest of the general public, station owners and the fuel-dispensing industry in general.

Sincerely,

R. Michael Carlson
President, Dresser Wayne North America
Dresser, Inc.
Dresser Wayne Dresser. Inc.
3&14 Jarrett Way, Austin, 1X 7872&
Office: +15123&88371 Fax: +1512388&302
www.dresserwayne.com
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501 90th Avenue N.W.
Minneapolis, MN 55433

PH: 800-445-3503
Fax: 763.783.2525
www.thermofisher.com

Memo to: 20 June 2010
National Conference on Weights and Measures
Specifications and Tolerances Committee

A sub-committee of the Belt Conveyor Scale Working Group has held conference calls on over the past several months to discuss NCWM informational item 321-1 regarding the consistency of the conveyor belt.

The existing wording in HB-44 is:

**N.3.1.3. Check for Consistency of the Conveyor Belt Along Its Entire Length.** – After a zero load test with flow rate filtering disabled, the totalizer shall not change more than plus or minus (+/- 3d) 3.0 scale divisions from its initial indication during one complete revolution.

The current proposal (321-1) reads:

**N.3.1.3. Check for Consistency of the Conveyor Belt Along Its Entire Length.** – During a zero-load test, the total change indicated in the totalizer during one revolution of the belt shall not exceed 0.18% of the load that would be totalized at scale capacity for the duration of the test. The end value of the zero-load test must meet the +/-0.06% requirement of paragraphs N.3.1.2. Initial Stable Zero and N.3.1.3 Test for Zero Stability.

The sub-committee has agreed that the final proposal must include reference to disabling the flow rate filtering (low flow cutoff, dead band, flow rate damping, etc.). The committee also has agreed that the allowable error should be based on the maximum load that can be delivered in one revolution of the belt operated at maximum capacity. The effects of significant variations in the belt carcass could affect the delivered load if the delivered load requires less than complete revolutions of the belt (it is uncommon for a load to be equal to an exact belt revolution or multiples thereof). The committee has also agreed that the allowable error should be expressed in percentage, not in scale divisions. We have also noted that it is not necessary to refer to a different paragraph in the handbook, as each section should be capable of being enforced individually.

In order to determine the current % of belt consistency variance, the team has distributed a brief survey to several manufacturers and scale service companies to obtain data on current installations, both commercial and non-commercial use. Use of current conditions in the majority of installations will be used to establish the final proposed allowable consistency variance.

While not yet fully defined, the committee’s version of the revised proposal will be similar to:

**N.3.1.4.3. Check for Consistency of the Conveyor Belt Along Its Entire Length.** – Prior to performing a materials test, the consistency of the conveyor belt shall verified as follows:

a. Flow rate filtering and no flow cut-off shall be disabled.

b. The belt shall be marked in order to verify one complete revolution.

c. Run the empty belt.

d. The total variance in weight accumulation during one complete revolution of the belt shall not exceed x% (tbd) of the load delivered when operated at maximum capacity for one revolution of the belt. (example: If the capacity is 2500 TPH and 1 belt revolution takes = 260 seconds, the load delivered in one
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revolution at maximum capacity = 180.55 Tons. The total variance of < 0.12% (total +/- accumulation) cannot exceed 0.216 tons.)

Based on the progress of the sub-committee, and the pending receipt of actual field information as it relates to belt consistency, the sub-committee of the National Belt Conveyor Scale Working Group requests the National S&T committee to consider moving the Belt Consistency proposal from informational to developing. The sub-committee expects to have data ready for the fall 2010 regional conferences, or if data is slow in being provided, by the NCWM interim meeting in January, 2011.

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Ripka – sub-committee lead

Sub-Committee Members:
Peter Sirrico – Thayer Scale
Phil Carpentier – PTC Consulting
Al Page – independent
James Hale – Southern Company Services
John Barton – NIST
Rick Harshman – NIST
Jim Dietrich – Kaskaskia Valley Scale
Professional Development Committee (PDC)
Interim Agenda

Stacy Carlsen, Chairman
Marin County Weights and Measures
Novato, California

Reference
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400  INTRODUCTION

The Professional Development Committee (Committee) will address the following items at the National Conference on Weights and Measures (NCWM) January 2011 Interim Meeting.

Table A identifies the agenda items in the Report by Reference Key Number, Item Title, and Page Number. An item marked with an “I” after the reference key number is an Informational item. An item marked with a “D” after the reference key number is a Developing item. The developing designation indicates an item has merit; however, the item was returned to the submitter for further development before any action can be taken at the national level.

In some cases, background information will be provided for an item. The fact that an item appears on the agenda does not mean that the item will be presented to the Conference for a vote. The Committee will review its Agenda at the Interim Meeting and may withdraw some items, present some items for information meant for additional study, issue interpretations, or make specific recommendations that will be presented for a vote at the Annual Meeting.

The recommendations are statements of proposals and are not necessarily those of the Committee.

<table>
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401  EDUCATION

401-1  National Certification Program (NCP)

Source: Carryover Item 401-1. (This item originated from the Committee and first appeared on its Agenda in 2003.) The committee has combined items previously numbered as 401-1 National Certification Program (NCP), 401-2 Create a Curriculum Plan, and 401-4 Certification into one item covering all aspects of the Certification Program.

Background/Discussion: For complete background information, see the Professional Development Committee (PDC) page or the PDC meeting archives on the NCWM website (www.ncwm.net), or the previous committee reports available from the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) website (ts.nist.gov/WeightsAndMeasures/pubs.cfm).

The Committee set a goal at the 2009 Annual Meeting to conduct an on-line beta test on the retail motor fuel curriculum. The beta test is completed and the results reviewed and analyzed.

Results:

- 63 took exam/43 completed exam/20 timed out and did not receive a score.
- 6 passed with passing set at 85%.
- 20 would have passed if passing was set at 75%.
- 27 would have passed if passing was set at 70%.

What did the results show about the exam process itself?

- The settings of the service caused a large number of people to time out. Each section of the test was timed. Any remaining time from one section could not be added to the next sections, but the instructions did not make that clear to the candidates. In addition, if candidates timed out in the first section, they were not allowed to continue to the other sections. The NCWM staff has corrected this. In the future, if a candidate times out on a section, the candidate will just progress to the next section or the test will end. The candidate will receive the score for all questions answered correctly.

- Some candidates had web navigation issues. It was difficult or impossible to use an electronic version of Handbook 44 (HB 44) as a reference while taking the test. Reviewing past answers was cumbersome because the candidates were required to page back question by question. There is no solution for this as this is the way the testing service operates. Candidates should consider using a hardcopy of HB 44 when taking the test.

- The illustration graphic quality needs improvement. We are going to make every effort to provide quality graphics in the first case, and to improve graphics where test results show that improvements are necessary.

- The grading of short answer questions was very intolerant of variations like capitalization and punctuation. The Committee believes that short answer questions are necessary to test for the ability to apply code requirements. To help in this regard, the Committee is working on improved instruction on how to take the test. A sample test, which will not be timed or graded, may be built into the test itself. The Committee is also looking at using a pull-down help feature on some questions to aid the candidate in properly formatting the answers.
• Some candidates could not see the entire question without scrolling down. Others experienced difficulty seeing the graphics. These problems are related to the candidates’ computer settings and can be corrected by changing the screen resolution, or by using the zoom function on the bottom of the Internet browser. The graphics can be seen by adjusting the candidates’ browser security settings. The Committee thinks that the sample test can be designed so that the candidate discovers these problems before getting to the real test. The candidate will then have the opportunity to leave the exam and make the needed setting changes or consult with information technology (IT) specialists as needed. In addition, a guide to taking the NCWM certification tests could be written addressing frequently asked questions (FAQs) that arise out of taking the tests.

What did the results show about the exam content?

• The Committee analyzed the scoring versus the elapsed time on each section and found that 16 of the 20 people, who timed out on the test, did so on the first section relating to general HB 44 questions. Three people timed out in the general liquid measuring section, and only one person timed out on the retail motor fuel device (RMFD) section. The Committee will be adjusting the timing by taking five minutes off the RMFD section, and adding it to the HB 44 section. The Committee also expects that timeout problems will decrease as candidates become accustomed to taking tests with timed sections.

• Questions with high error rates and low average times were identified as problem questions. People thought they knew the answers as evidenced by the quickness of their responses, but the error rate indicates that something is potentially wrong with those questions. Questions with high error rates and long response times will also be subject to review to determine whether they exceed the learning objectives.

• Ms. Georgia Harris, NIST Weights and Measures Division, assisted the Committee with information on ISO 17204, which is the ISO guide for certification bodies. One component of this guide is analysis of the cut score that defines the passing grade. A wealth of information exists on setting the cut score to define the minimally competent person. The competent group includes individuals at the basic, proficient, and advanced levels. The Committee wants to ensure that the candidate at the bottom of the basically competent group has a reasonable chance of passing the test. Based upon the results of the beta test, the Committee thinks that the cut score for the RMFD test should be set at either 70 % or 75 %.

• Future tests will require similar question evaluation and cut score analyses that will require staff resources to coordinate the review of questions and tests.

What did the result show about the Committee’s plan for certification?

The low passing rate may indicate that the parts of the system were not working together. It is important that users of the NCWM Certification Program understand how the pieces fit together and form a coherent system. To illustrate the relationships we can describe the system as a triangle of interdependent parts (see diagram below). The standards come in the form of goals with measurable learning objectives. The education part involves training provided to help the candidate reach the desired level of proficiency for each of the learning objectives. The certification involves an assessment of proficiency that measures whether or not the objectives have been met.
The Committee has until now focused attention on the standards and the certification pieces in the triangle as illustrated in the flowcharts below.
The Committee has described this work in a number of documents available on the PDC pages of the NCWM website:

- the Curriculum Outline, which breaks the profession of Weights and Measures into component parts called curriculum segments;
- the Core Competency Model, which explains how to create the curriculum segments as learning goals with measurable learning objectives or milestones;
- the Curriculum Segments that have been developed; and
- the Certification Disciplines, which identify the areas of certification offered and the curriculum segments on which the exam will be based.

Results of the beta test indicate it will be very important as the program moves forward that trainers integrate the learning objectives into their materials and design courses in such a way that students will achieve the desired levels of learning. See Item 401-2 Instructor Improvement.

**What will happen next?**

The PDC will adjust the timing allocation on the test, will review and fix the problem questions, develop the practice test, and set the cut score. The NCWM board will be continuing to develop the infrastructure to manage the Certification Program.

**Discussion**: Comments were heard from the regulatory sector noting that the average score was 72%, but the test takers were the most likely the cream of the crop of the regulatory agencies. Therefore, the test may not be a “basic” test, even if the bar is lowered to 72%. Concern was expressed that the cut score not be set so high that the test would not be useful for service agent certification. The necessity of short answer questions on a basic test was questioned. The speaker thought that making sure that the test is really a basic test was more important than rushing the test into production by an August 1, 2010, deadline.

A beta test-taker found that the timing element was intimidating, and questioned whether the test itself might be more useful as a learning tool than as a certification tool. He suggested candidates be allowed to take the test together and discuss the questions. The Committee agrees that collaborative work would be an excellent training technique but certification must be done individually.
An associate member indicated that there is a lot of interest in using the test at the associate level. The speaker echoed the regulatory member’s concerns that the quality of the people taking the test was in the upper 20% and that if service people had taken this test the passing level would have been much lower.

The Committee plans to ask the people who took the beta test to be among the first people to take the official version so that improvements in the test can be measured.

Central Weights and Measures Association (CWMA) Comments: There was an appreciation for the Committee’s response to the concerns put forth at the annual meeting in May 2010. Although the timeline is important, it was stated that it is more important to get the test right. We want to ensure this test does not produce negative results for an employee because of rushed implementation. It is critical that, when the test is implemented, it be as fair and equitable as possible. The Committee recommends this item remain Informational.

Western Weights and Measures Association (WWMA) Comments: WWMA PDC Committee requested each WWMA jurisdiction develop 10 or more questions for each of the following categories: small capacity scales, vehicle-tank meters (VTMs), checking the net content of packaged goods, and retail motor fuel dispensers (RMFD). Completed questions were to be submitted to Mr. Ed Williams, at ewilliams@cdfa.ca.gov by October 20, 2010; however, additional test questions will be accepted after this date. It was announced that the National PDC Committee will be meeting on October 21, 2010. There was a request for guidelines for developing test questions (see Appendix C). WWMA received comments about the Certification Triangle. It will be very important as the program moves forward that trainers integrate the learning objectives into their materials and design courses in such a way that students will achieve the desired levels of learning. The WWMA PDC Committee recommends that NCWM manage the Certification Program to ensure test questions are kept up to date with NIST Handbook changes. WWMA PDC recommends that the NCWM and the Board of Directors (BOD) consider assigning one individual to manage the Certification Program.

Northeastern Weights and Measures Association (NEWMA) Comments: When asked who had attempted the beta examination process no one indicated that they had attempted it. Massachusetts indicated that it has its own certification process. All participants agreed that this exam module is an excellent step as it covers the basic areas of competency. All participants understood that there were still some bugs with the on-line version of the exam.

401-2 Instructor Improvement

Source: Carryover Item 401-3 (This item originated from the Committee and first appeared on its agenda in 2003.)

Background/Discussion: The Committee is charged with the coordination of activities to improve the competence of instructors and the uniformity of delivery of the curriculum. For complete background information, see the PDC pages of the NCWM website (www.ncwm.net). After logging in under the members’ area, look under the PDC Legacy Documents for the PDC Formal Scope.

Industry has continued to support and sponsor training on their new technology for weighing and measuring devices. NIST has assured the Committee that work will continue towards providing technical training for the trainers. The Committee supports the recommendation from the WWMA to encourage jurisdictions to participate in the NIST, Weights and Measures Division (WMD) Instructor Training program as those classes become available.

At the NCWM 2009 Interim Meeting, a work group from the NCWM BOD provided information to the Committee on initiatives it was considering to use the NCWM website to provide training materials and other trainer aids, such as presentations, videos, etc. The Committee applauds and supports the BOD’s efforts. However, the Committee will continue to maintain this item as low priority until other parts of the Certification Program are completed.

At the 2009 Annual Meeting and 2010 Interim Meeting, the Committee reported that no action is being taken on this item while the Committee concentrates on curriculum development and the establishment of the Certification Program.

Prior to the 2010 open hearing, Ms. Harris, NIST WMD, provided the Committee with reference material on teaching methods and assessment of training success. Distilling the essence of these materials, the Committee feels
that instructors need training in more than just the technical material; they need training in setting the learning objectives, developing the training materials with those objectives in mind, selecting training methods that incorporate adult learning styles, and evaluating the effectiveness of their training.

The chart below covers three levels of learning objectives and relates them to the training activities most likely to be successful and best methods for assessing the success of the training. The curriculum segments state the learning objectives using verbs similar to those in the bottom row of the table. These drive both the training activities required to promote adult learning and the assessment tools appropriate to measure success at that level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments</th>
<th>Multiple Choice</th>
<th>Multiple Choice</th>
<th>Practical Examples Short Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training Activities</td>
<td>Lecture Videos Examples</td>
<td>Discussion Review Learner Presentation</td>
<td>Exercises Simulations Demonstrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Levels</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define Relate List</td>
<td>Restate Discuss Describe Identify</td>
<td>Employ Apply Use Illustrate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NIST WMD has expressed strong interest in collaborating with the NCWM in efforts to educate instructors in adult learning techniques and relating them to the learning objectives in the NCWM curriculum. The Committee is considering developing another document describing how to translate a curriculum segment into a lesson plan.

The Committee would like to remind everybody designing training materials that the Core Competency Model document is available on the PDC section of the NCWM website. (www.NCWM.net)

**Discussion:** Prior to or during the 2010 Annual Meeting, no comments were received from the floor.

WWMA Discussion: Adequate training for instructors is needed. Instructors must have available resources that are consistent. Subject matter expertise does not necessarily equate to proficient training. Training is needed for the instructor on how to identify and use learning objectives, and design teaching materials that integrate interactive and adult learning styles.

The WWMA PDC appreciates the offer from the Associate Membership Committee (AMC) to provide funding for training.

WWMA PDC recommends the following:

- NIST develop and provide professional trainers.
- NIST develop and provide training to state instructors that will incorporate the certification triangle.
- Encourage NIST to provide the resources necessary to have state trainers attend these regional training sessions.
  - NIST coordinate with the Associate Membership Committee (AMC).

NEWMA Discussion: Instructor improvement is an on-going effort not only at the national level but also within state and local programs.

### 401-3 Recommended Topics for Conference Training

**Source:** Carryover Item 401-5 (This item originated from the Committee and first appeared on its agenda in 2003.)

**Background/Discussion:** The Board has charged the Committee with responsibility for selecting appropriate topics for the technical sessions at future Annual Meetings. The Board asked that the Committee review and prioritize possible presentations and submit those to the Chairman. The Chairman would then work with NCWM staff to make the arrangements and schedule the sessions.

The Committee continues to carry the following list and recommends these topics for possible training seminars, roundtables, or symposia for presentation at the NCWM meetings:

- Marketplace Surveys;
- Auditing the Performance of Field Staff (Mr. Will Wotthlie, Maryland, volunteered to lead the session);
- Alternative Fuels (Fuel Volatility Issues and Ethanol Blending, and biodiesel blend issues);
- Device Inspections Using a Sampling Model;
- Emerging Issues;
- Ergonomics (including Proper Lifting Techniques, Back and Stress Techniques and Office Ergonomics);
(g) Public Relations, specifically dealing with aggressive/angry people (recommended by the SWMA);

(h) General Safety Issues (recommended by the WWMA);

(i) Defensive Driving (recommended by the WWMA);

(j) Administrative Civil Penalty Process (recommended by the WWMA);

(k) Price Verification (recommended by the WWMA);

(l) Customer Service (recommended by the WWMA);

(m) Ethics (recommended by the CWMA);

(n) Automatic Temperature Compensation (ATC) testing for field inspectors;

(o) Hydrogen Measuring Systems;

(p) Handbook 44 Scale Code Tare Changes;

(q) Wet Tare/U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Issues; and

(r) Moisture Loss.

The Committee asked for suggestions for future training or recommendation on how to prioritize suggestions already on the list. Based on the needs identified in the first two items (401-1 and 401-2), the Committee would like to recommend that the regional associations and the NCWM consider offering training or trainers on how to identify learning objectives, and design training materials that integrate interactive activities and adult learning styles. NIST has a 1.5 hour course on taking technical material and turning it into a course for adult learners, which may be appropriate to fill this need.

**Discussion:** At the 2010 Annual Meeting, no comments were received from the floor.

The Committee received written comments from Mr. Paul Hoar of AgriFuels LLC suggesting that the Committee challenge the Associate Membership to provide training materials (videos, operations manuals, etc.) to the Conference for use in developing the skills of the NCWM members and state weights and measures officials.

**WWMA Discussion:** The PDC solicited topics from the WWMA for future conference training. The Committee recognized a need for promoting the value of our programs to stakeholders. Stakeholders include but are not limited to, executive administrators, elected officials, and the public. During challenging economic times, it is critical that Weights and Measures maintain a strong presence in the marketplace. The NIST, WMD Chief suggested a session to teach trainers how to teach. The WWMA PDC sees a benefit in this type of training for developing presentation skills. The WWMA Board of Directors has recommended that the PDC develop a shared calendar of scheduled training events available to other jurisdictions. The WWMA Board of Directors has suggested that training be conducted concurrent with, but independent of, the national and regional meetings. This training would utilize the same facilities and could allow for additional savings when negotiating conference locations. This would allow exposure to weights and measures officials that would not normally be able to attend conferences.

The WWMA PDC suggested topics are train the trainer and those topics that would promote Weights and Measures Programs to the stakeholders. One recommended format would be to facilitate a round table to identify success stories and best practices from weights and measures jurisdictions. The WWMA PDC recommends that the NCWM develop a shared calendar of scheduled training and consider scheduling training in conjunction with conferences.
402 PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

402-1 Safety Awareness

Source: Carryover Item 402-1 (This item originated from the Committee and first appeared on its agenda in 2003.)

Background/Discussion: In the past, the Committee’s responsibility extended to the identification of safety issues in the weights and measures field and included efforts to increase safety awareness. Jurisdictions are encouraged to send their safety reports and issues to their regional safety liaison, who in turn will forward them to the PDC. Below is a list of the Regional Safety Liaisons.

- SWMA Mr. Steve Hadder, Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services
- WWMA Mr. Douglas Deiman, Alaska Division of Measurement Standards/CVE
- CWMA Ms. Julie Quinn, Minnesota Department of Commerce
- NEWMA Mr. Michael Sikula, New York Bureau of Weights and Measures

The Committee will continue to ask the regions to prepare articles for the NCWM newsletter and revised the schedule as follows for future issues. The Committee plans to notify the Regional Safety Coordinators as their assignment date approaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
<th>Article Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEWMA</td>
<td>2010, Issue 3</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>July 15, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWMA</td>
<td>2011, Issue 1</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>January 15, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWMA</td>
<td>2011, Issue 2</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>April 15, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWMA</td>
<td>2011, Issue 3</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>July 15, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All articles should be e-mailed to the NCWM headquarters at info@ncwm.net.

The Committee has not received any reports of safety incidents in the last six months.

Mr. Craig Harris, Ohio, has prepared safety material on handling diesel emission fluid (DEF). Anyone interested in seeing or utilizing this material should contact the Director of Ohio Weights and Measures.

The Committee asks for suggestions on safety articles people would like to see in future newsletters and/or safety issues which must be addressed immediately. They would like to remind regional associations to check the submission deadlines for their upcoming article assignments. Completed articles should be sent to NCWM headquarters by the submission deadline.

Discussion: The Committee was informed that Mr. Douglas Deiman, Alaska, is now the safety liaison for the WWMA.

WWMA Discussion: It was noted that the WWMA PDC is responsible for submitting a safety article for April 15, 2011, which will be published in the June NCWM newsletter. WWMA PDC recommends that “Controlling the Risk of the Solitary Worker” be the subject of the safety article.

402-2 PDC Publication

Background/Discussion: This item originally served to record the development of various documents prepared in pursuit of our training and Certification Programs. These are available on the Member’s section of the NCWM website at www.ncwm.net. At the 2008 Annual Meeting, the Committee indicated its desire to eliminate this item from the agenda. However, in the report from the CWMA PDC Committee, the Committee received a proposal to create a standard like HB 130, Uniform Laws and Regulations in the Areas of Legal Metrology and Engine Fuel Quality, or HB 44, Specifications, Tolerances, and Other Technical Requirements for Weighing and Measuring Devices, to serve as the work product of the Committee. This standard could be reviewed, amended, and adopted by
the NCWM to make it a living document. The Committee considered this proposal during discussions held at the 2009 Interim Meetings.

Based on feedback at the 2009 NCWM Interim Meeting, the PDC decided to move forward on the new publication to be titled NCWM Publication XX National Certification Program Guide. This publication will serve to document the details of the Certification Program.

The guide will remain under control of the PDC Committee but will not require formal NCWM vote to add new sections or revise existing sections. The Committee will add and modify sections continuously to meet its priority objectives with a concerted effort to respond to feedback from program users and the NCWM membership. The three main sections of the Guide would include:

1. Program Administration – combines historical documentation (curriculum outline and work plan, etc.) with administrative procedures on administering exams and records of certifications;

2. Competency Standards – includes the curriculum segments that describe the objectives and measurable competencies that will be used in certification; and

3. Certification Disciplines – includes one document per certification area delineating the standards from the curricula that will be covered in the exam and the weighting of the competencies.

All segments of the PDC publication will be posted online as they are developed. New pages within the NCWM website will be created for the curriculum disciplines and segments so that interested parties can easily find and utilize this material.

Guidelines for operation of the Certification Program still need developing and will be posted online when they are completed.

As of July 2010, the PDC Publication will remain on the website at this point and not be printed as a separate handbook. The Committee anticipates organizing the material into three sub-pages (Curriculum Development, Training, and Certification) following the triangle model pictured in Item 401-1. We will work with the NCWM staff to establish those pages and keep them updated.

Discussion: At the 2010 Annual Meeting, no comments were received from the floor.

WWMA Discussion: WWMA PDC informed the WWMA Conference that the NCWM PDC is developing a National Certification Program Guide. States have different regulatory requirements and have training materials designed for their own programs. However, the basic information should be useful for any jurisdiction with minor adjustments. WWMA PDC supports the NCWM effort to gather and post training materials from various jurisdictions online and make them available for use.

WWMA PDC recommends that NCWM support the continued development of a new publication to be titled “NCWM publication XX National Certification Program Guide.” It is critical that NIST be involved in the development of this publication. WWMA PDC recommends that all weights and measures jurisdictions submit training materials to the NCWM.
Mr. Stacy Carlsen, Chair, Marin County, California
Ms. Julie Quinn, Minnesota
Mr. Dale Saunders, Virginia
Ms. Cheryl Ayer, New Hampshire
Mr. Steven Grabski, Walmart

Professional Development Committee
Appendix A

National Conference on Weight and Measures
National Certification Program

NCWM CURRICULUM WORK PLAN
Revised January 2010

Segment/Subject

Level 1/Level 2/Level 3

1. Fundamentals of Weights and Measures
   1.1. Introduction to Weights and Measures Programs
   1.2. W&M Laws and Regulations
   1.3. Field Standards and Test Equipment
   1.4. State Program Scope and Overview
   1.5. Enforcement Powers

2. W&M Administration
   2.1. Fundamentals of W&M Administration (Commercial System, Powers and Duties, etc.)
   2.2. Administration Functions (Personnel, Management, Budget, Safety, etc.)
   2.3. Legislation and Regulations (Legal Considerations, Interaction with Legislature, Stakeholders, Industry, etc.)
   2.4. Regulatory Control (Device Inspection, Commodities, Complaints)
   2.5. Laboratory Metrology Administration (Purpose of Laboratory, Responsibilities of Metrologist, NIST Expectations for Recognition of Laboratory, Quality System, Training Requirements, etc.)
   2.6. Public Relations and Communications (Publicity, Public Relations, Communications)

3. Laboratory Metrology
   3.1. NIST Basic Metrology
   3.2. NIST Intermediate Metrology
   3.3. NIST Advanced Metrology

4. Device Control Program
   4.1. Safety Considerations
   4.2. NIST Handbook 44 – Introduction to Device Control
   4.3. Weighing Systems, General
      4.3.1. Static Electronic Weighing Systems, General
      4.3.2. Static Mechanical and Hybrid Weighing Systems, General
      4.3.3. Dynamic Weighing Systems, General
      4.3.4. Precision Weighing Systems Class I and II
      4.3.5. Small Capacity Weighing Systems Class III
      4.3.6. Medium Capacity Weighing Systems Class III
      4.3.7. Large Capacity Class III and IIL Weighting Systems (Vehicle and Livestock)
      4.3.8. Large Capacity Class III and IIL Weighing Systems - Advanced
      4.3.9. Railroad Track Weighing Systems
      4.3.10. In-Motion Railroad Track Weighing Systems
      4.3.11. Hopper Weighing Systems
4.3.12. Automatic Bulk Weighing Systems
4.3.13. Automatic Weighing Systems
4.3.14. Belt Conveyor Weighing Systems
4.3.15. In-Motion Monorail Weighing Systems
4.3.16. Point-of-Sale Weighing Systems
4.3.17. Other Specialty Weighing Systems

4.4. Dynamic Measuring Systems – General
4.4.1. Retail Motor Fuel Dispensers
4.4.2. Loading Rack and Other Stationary Metering Systems
4.4.3. Loading Rack and Other Stationary Metering Systems – Advanced
4.4.4. Vehicle-Tank Meter Systems
4.4.5. Vehicle-Tank Meter Systems – Advanced
4.4.6. Milk Metering Systems
4.4.7. Water Meters
4.4.8. LPG/Anhydrous Ammonia Liquid Metering Systems
4.4.9. LPG/Anhydrous Ammonia Liquid Metering Systems – Advanced
4.4.10. LPG Vapor Meter Systems
4.4.11. Mass Flow Metering Systems
4.4.12. Other Metering Systems (Cryogenics, Carbon Dioxide, etc.)

4.5. Static Volume Measuring Systems – General
4.5.1. Liquid Measures
4.5.2. Farm Milk Tanks
4.5.3. Dry Measures

4.6. Other Measuring Systems
4.6.1. Taximeters and Odometers
4.6.2. Wire and Cordage Measuring Systems
4.6.3. Linear Measures
4.6.4. Timing Devices
4.6.5. Weights
4.6.6. Multiple Dimension Measuring Systems

4.7. Quality Measuring Systems
4.7.1. Grain Moisture Meters
4.7.2. NIR Grain Analyzers
4.7.3. Carcass Evaluation Systems

5. Market Practices, Laws and Regulations (NIST HB 130) and Commodities (NIST HB 133)
5.2. NIST Handbook 130 – Laws and Regulations
5.2.1. NIST Handbook 130 – General Provisions
5.2.2. Packaging and Labeling Regulations
5.2.3. Method of Sale Regulations
5.2.4. Quality of Automotive Fuels and Lubricants
5.2.5. Price Verification
5.3. NIST Handbook 133 – Package Net Contents Control
5.3.1. Commodities – General
5.3.2. Packages Labeled by Weight, Standard and Random
5.3.3. Packages Labeled by Weight, Special Commodities
5.3.4. Packages Labeled by Volume (Volumetric and Gravimetric Testing)
5.3.5. Packages Labeled by Volume, Special
5.3.6. Packages Labeled by Length/Area/Thickness
5.3.7. Packages Labeled by Count
5.3.8. Other Package Types

5.4. Test Purchases
5.5. E-Commerce

Note: Initial Verification has been intentionally been left off this listing and will be addressed later.
Appendix B

National Conference on Weights and Measures
National Training Program
CERTIFICATION DISCIPLINE
for
Retail Motor Fuel Devices
Beta Exam – February 2010

Prepared by the NCWM Professional Development Committee

The NCWM is offering a (beta) certification examination on the subject above. The examination will be taken online via the NCWM website. You must register with the NCWM and be granted a user authorization to access the test site. For registration information call NCWM at 402-434-4880 or email info@ncwm.net. Be sure to include the exam title in the subject line.

Format and Duration:

The examination will be in three sections with a total of 50 questions and a 2 hour time limit to complete all three parts. The test will be given in one session and you may not log off and then attempt to return to that exam. You must complete each section before moving to the next section.

The exam is OPEN BOOK, and you may make use of any reference materials, training documents, and procedural guides at your disposal. You are expected to take the examination alone and may not receive assistance from any other person. You will be asked to affirm that at the conclusion of the examination.

Test instructions will be provided on-line. Since the test is electronically graded, the answer must be marked or answer typed correctly. The test questions will be either multiple choice, fill in the blank, or compliance/citation. For multiple-choice questions, you will be asked to pick the best answer from four options. For fill in the blank questions, you must enter the specific answer, typed correctly. For compliance/citation questions, you will be given information describing a situation and asked to assess compliance. Answer “yes” if the situation complies based on the information provided, otherwise provide the specific citation if the device does not comply. The form of the citation will typically be something like S.X.X. for a specification, T.X.X. for a tolerance, N.X.X. for a note, or UR.X.X. for a user requirement. Typically, you will be directed to the specific Handbook Code so reference to the code designations such as 1.10. for the General Code will usually not be necessary.

Subject of Examination:

1. Segment 4.2. Introduction to Device Control – 15 questions
These questions test for knowledge, understanding, and ability to apply the basic requirements applicable to all weighing and measuring devices. This may include questions on the selection, care and use of standards, the legal basis of NIST Handbook 44, the organization of that handbook, understanding of
Fundamental Considerations, knowledge of systems of measurement units, understanding and application of General Code requirements, and understanding of the NTEP program and Certificates of Conformance.

   These questions test for knowledge and understanding of the basic technologies used in liquid measuring devices (LMD), understanding of classification of various LMD, ability to operate LMD and interpret indications, understanding and ability to apply code requirements from NIST Handbook 44 LMD Code, and understanding and ability to conduct basic tests of LMD and properly apply tolerances.

3. Segment 4.4.1. Retail Motor Fuel Dispensers (RMFD) – 20 questions
   These questions test for knowledge and understanding of the basic technologies used in RMFD, understanding and ability to apply code requirements from NIST Handbook 44 LMD Code for RMFDs, and understanding and ability to conduct basic tests of RMFDs and properly apply tolerances.

Additional Information:

For more details on the subject matter for this exam, refer to the individual curriculum segments as published on the Certification pages on the NCWM website at www.ncwm.net/certification.

Passing Score and Grading: (not applicable for Beta Exam)

Weights and Measures regulatory officials 85 % (43 or more correct answers)
Service agents 75 % (38 or more correct answers)

You will be given a score for each section and total score immediately after completing the exam (or upon reaching the two-hour time limit). To protect the integrity of the test questions, you will not be advised of the specific questions you answered incorrectly. The PDC Committee will be reviewing incorrect answers in periodic reviews and will adjust scores in select cases if a question is judged invalid. If your score is affected, you will be notified.

If you wish to challenge any of the questions, there will be a section at the end of the examination where you can offer comments. You may also contact the NCWM PDC Committee through the NCWM staff via the website.
Appendix C

National Conference on Weights and Measures
National Training Program
Instructions for On-Line Certification Examinations
(Beta Exam)

Prepared by the NCWM Professional Development Committee

Exam Title: 4.4.1 Retail Motor Fuel Devices

Scope of Exam: The exam will consist of three sections comprising 50 test questions as follows:

1. **Segment 4.2. Introduction to Device Control** – 15 questions
   These questions test for knowledge, understanding, and ability to apply the basic requirements applicable to all weighing and measuring devices. This may include questions on the selection, care and use of standards, the legal basis of NIST Handbook 44, the organization of that Handbook, understanding of Fundamental Considerations, knowledge of systems of measurement units, understanding and application of General Code requirements and understanding of the National Type Evaluation Program (NTEP) and Certificates of Conformance (CC).

   These questions test for knowledge and understanding of the basic technologies used in liquid measuring devices (LMDs), understanding of classification of various LMDs, ability to operate LMDs and interpret indications, understanding and ability to apply code requirements from NIST Handbook 44 Liquid Measuring Device Code, and understanding and ability to conduct basic tests of liquid measuring devices and properly apply tolerances.

3. **Segment 4.4.1. Retail Motor Fuel Dispensers** – 20 questions
   These questions test for knowledge and understanding of the basic technologies used in retail motor fuel devices, understanding and ability to apply code requirements from NIST Handbook 44 Liquid Measuring Device Code for RMFDs, and understanding and ability to conduct basic tests of RMFDs and properly apply tolerances.

Time Limit: You must complete the test in one session limited to two (2) hours from the time the first question screen appears. Each Section also has a time limit and once you complete the last test question in a section, you will not be allowed to go back to any question in that section. Please be sure you have completed and checked each question in the section before answering the last questions. You should plan a dedicated two hour slot and may not log out and back in.

Test Conditions: The exam is OPEN BOOK, and you may make use of any reference materials, training documents, and procedural guides at your disposal. You are expected to take the examination alone and may
not receive assistance from any other person. You will be asked to affirm that at the conclusion of the examination.

**Navigation:** You may move ahead and back within a test section using the F8 (ahead) and F7 (back). This allows you to skip questions within a section and return to it later. Once you complete a section you will not be able to go back to any question in that section so be sure to answer all questions before leaving a section.

**Types of Questions:** Since the test is electronically graded, the answer must be marked or typed correctly. The test questions will be either *multiple choice, fill in the blank, or compliance/citation.*

- **Multiple Choice** - You will be asked to pick the best answer from four options. If there is more than one correct answer, you must select the best option.

- **Fill in the Blank** - You must enter the specific answer, typed correctly. When providing numerical answers, you will be informed of the number of decimal places to include in your answer.

- **Compliance/Citation** - You will be given information describing a situation and asked to assess compliance. Answer “yes” if the situation complies based on the information provided, otherwise provide the specific citation if the device does not comply. DO NOT answer “NO” as it will be scored incorrect. The form of the citation will typically be something like S.X.X. for a specification, T.X.X. for a tolerance, N.X.X. for a note, or UR.X.X. for a user requirement. You will typically be directed to the specific Handbook Code so reference to the code designations such as 1.10 for the General Code will usually not be necessary.

**Scoring:** You will receive a score for each section and for the total exam. The score for the section will show the number of questions and the number answered correctly. The final score will include the number of questions, the total answered correctly, and the percent correct.

- Passing score for Weights and Measures Professionals is 85 % (43 or more correct answers).
- Passing score for Service and Repair Technicians is 75 % (38 or more correct answers).

**Comments and Challenges:** The NCWM Professional Development Committee encourages you to comment on the test to help us improve our product. If you wish to challenge any of the questions, contact the Committee via the NCWM e-mail at info@ncwm.net, and please include the exam title in the subject line.
National Type Evaluation Program (NTEP) Committee
Interim Agenda

Randy Jennings, Chairman
Executive Assistant
Tennessee Department of Agriculture

Reference
Key Number

500 INTRODUCTION

The National Type Evaluation Program (NTEP) Committee will address the following items at its 2011 Interim Meeting. Except when posted, all meetings are open to the membership. The members will be invited to dialogue with the NTEP Committee on issues on its agenda. The NTEP Committee is currently working on the following issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Key Number</th>
<th>Title of Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mutual Recognition Arrangement (MRA)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mutual Acceptance Arrangement (MAA)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>NTEP Participating Laboratories and Evaluations Reports</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>National Type Evaluation Technical Committee (NTETC) Sector Reports</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conformity Assessment Program</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>NTEP Contingency</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Publication 14 – NTEP Administrative Policy</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix D. NTETC Software Sector Meeting Summary ........................................... D1
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1 Note: The policy of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) is to use metric units of measurement in all of its publications; however, recommendations received by the National Conference on Weights and Measures (NCWM) technical committees have been printed in this publication as they were submitted and may, therefore, contain references to inch-pound units.
Table B
Glossary of Acronyms*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIML</td>
<td>Bureau of International Legal Metrology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Committee Draft&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIML</td>
<td>International Committee of Legal Metrology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR</td>
<td>Committee on Participation Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>Draft Document&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Draft Recommendation&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td>Draft Vocabulary&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoMC</td>
<td>Declarations of Mutual Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Issuing Participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>International Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAA</td>
<td>Mutual Acceptance Arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIML</td>
<td>International Organization of Legal Metrology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Measurement Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Technical Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>Utilizing Participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD</td>
<td>Working Document&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> CD: a draft at the stage of development within a technical committee or subcommittee; in this document, successive drafts are numbered 1 CD, 2 CD, etc.

<sup>2</sup> DD, DR, DV: draft documents approved at the level of the technical committee or subcommittee concerned and sent to BIML for approval by CIML.

<sup>3</sup> WD: precedes the development of a CD; in this document, successive drafts are number 1 WD, 2 WD, etc.

* Explanation of acronyms provided by OIML.

Details of All Items
(In Order by Reference Key Number)

500-1 Mutual Recognition Arrangement (MRA)

Background/Discussion: The MRA between Measurement Canada (MC) and the National Type Evaluation Program (NTEP) labs originated April 1, 1994. Since that time, the original MRA has expanded, and a second MRA covering measuring devices has been developed. The MRA pursuant to weighing devices will expire in January 2011, and the MRA for measuring devices will expire in July 2011. The NTEP Committee and members of the Board of Directors have been actively engaged with MC over the past year to develop a new agreement that will continue our relationship with MC by formalizing an updated MRA that meets the needs of both the NCWM and MC, and includes both weighing and measuring devices in one document. A very productive meeting between MC and NCWM Board representatives was held during the July 2010 Annual Meeting in St. Paul, Minnesota. As a result, positive communications between MC and NTEP have continued.

The scope of the current MRA’s includes:

- gasoline and diesel dispensers;
- high-speed dispensers;
- gasoline and diesel meters intended to be used in fuel dispensers and truck refuelers;
- electronic computing and non-computing bench and floor scales with a capacity up to 1000 kg (2000 lb);
- weighing/load receiving elements with a capacity of up to 1000 kg (2000 lb);
- electronic weight indicating elements (except those that are software based, i.e., programmed by downloading parameters); and
- mechanical scales up to 10 000 kg (20 000 lb).
As part of this evaluation process, the NTEP Committee was asked to consider expanding the MRA to higher capacity scales. The NTEP weighing labs agreed that expanding the MRA should be considered and MC expressed willingness to consider a proposal from the NCWM. The NTEP Administrator opened communication with MC with a recommendation to expand the MRA to include electronic platform scales up to 14 000 kg (30 000 lb). The current limit is 1000 kg. If the limit was expanded to just platform scales (i.e., not including hoppers, OBWS, IIIIL), it appeared the only addition to what is required during an evaluation would be the field permanence test criteria (Pub 14, DES Sections 62.22., 63.7., 64.3., and 64.4.). Upon discussion with MC type evaluation personnel, other issues surfaced: a) MC tests some weighing elements up to 10 000 kg in the lab, applying influence factor requirements (power, temperature, EMI, etc). There is a size limit of 1.6 m x 1.6 m. NTEP has a lab test limit of 1000 kg and some of the chambers will not accommodate the larger weighing elements; and b) MC does not apply the minimum 20 day use limit for field permanence tests for “cost factor” reasons (i.e., they want to avoid a second visit to the site). MC initially had a 20 day use requirement, then did away with the time requirement, now only requiring 300 weighments, and may not want to reinstitute the time requirement for NTEP. Based upon this information, taking the current workload of the weighing labs and current economic conditions into consideration, NTEP does not plan to move forward with the expansion of the MRA to include larger capacity weighing devices at this time. Additionally, U.S. manufacturers requested that the Committee consider expanding the MRA to include Automatic Weighing Systems (AWS) and Multiple Dimension Measuring Devices (MDMD). The requests were discussed by the MC and the NCWM Board members. Expansion to include AWS was deemed inappropriate at this time because of significant differences in requirements. The inclusion of MDMD is under consideration. NTEP is working to identify differences between the United States and Canada technical requirements and test procedures.

The MRA is due to be renewed, and both countries have expressed a desire to renew the MRA because of the benefits. The NTEP Committee has met with representatives of MC regarding renewal and possible expansion of the MRA. Several issues were brought to the table, and the plans are to renew and sign the MRA in January 2011.

**500-2 Mutual Acceptance Arrangement (MAA)**

**Background/Discussion:** Information regarding the International Organization of Legal Metrology (OIML) Mutual Acceptance Agreement (MAA) can be found at www.oiml.org/maa. The NCWM has signed the OIML MAA DoMC for R 60 Load Cells as a utilizing participant. A Utilizing Participant is a participant which does not issue any OIML Certificates of Conformity (CC) nor OIML Test Reports and/or Test Reports under a DoMC but which utilizes the reports issued by Issuing Participants.

The OIML Technical Subcommittee for TC 3/SC 5 “Conformity assessment” is revising the following OIML B documents that are classified as Basic Publications:

- OIML B 3, “OIML Certificate System for Measuring Instruments;” and
- A combined revision of OIML B 10-1, “Framework for a Mutual Acceptance Arrangement on OIML Type Evaluations,” and OIML B 10-2, “Checklists for Issuing Authorities and Testing Laboratories carrying out OIML Type Evaluations.”

A 2 CD of B 3 and a 1 CD of the combined B 10 revision were distributed to TC 3/SC 5 “Conformity assessment” in December 2009. Comments were requested by April 30, 2010, in advance of a TC 3/SC 5 meeting planned for October 2010.

Plans to revise the OIML B 3 and B 10 documents are proceeding (the present revision will not incorporate the inclusion of test data from MTLs into B 10, but will keep it in B 3). It has recently been clarified by a TC 3/SC 5 member who wants to include test data from Manufacturers Testing Laboratories (MTLs) into B 10 that the data is not obtained under “unsupervised” conditions, but rather under conditions of “controlled supervision,” meaning that, at a minimum, 1) a thorough review of the manufacturer’s quality system has been performed; 2) the manufacturer has an independent testing laboratory that reports to the highest management level of the organization; 3) the Issuing Authority must be notified before any type approval tests are begun; 4) the Issuing Authority must be allowed to observe any and all testing on a short-notice basis; 5) the Issuing Authority is entitled to repeat any tests that it deems necessary, either at the manufacturing facility or at its own laboratory, at the manufacturer’s expense; plus 6)
possibly other requirements. In addition, the Issuing Authority (Issuing Participant) would take all responsibility for any test data it obtained from the manufacturer. It would not be required, however, that the Issuing Authority be present at the MTL for all of the testing. The NCWM has already determined that NTEP will not accept test data from manufacturers unless there was an Issuing Authority representative on-site at the manufacturer’s site to supervise 100% of the testing.

Dr. Charles Ehrlich attended the TC 3/SC 5 meeting held October 2010 in France. The meeting had two intended objectives: 1) to further the process of incorporating necessary revisions to the two main documents pertaining to the OIML Certificate System for Type Evaluation (OIML B 3 on the OIML Basic Certificate System, and OIML B 10 on the OIML MAA; and 2) to further the possibility of permitting under the MAA the use of test data that is obtained directly from instrument manufacturers.

The revisions of B 3 and B 10 are necessary in order to update these documents to incorporate lessons learned over the last several years during the startup phase of the MAA. Revising the documents also permits their “harmonization,” in the sense that the MAA is now seen as an extension of the Basic Certificate System and so it is necessary to better clarify how the two systems work together, yet separately. The meeting focused on addressing some specific comments that had been submitted on draft revisions of B 3 and B 10 that had been circulated prior to the meeting. Topics discussed included legal obligations of authorities that issue OIML certificates, whether to combine all of the individual signed arrangements under the MAA into one master document, confidentiality of reports submitted to the Committees on Participation Review (CPRs) that decide which testing laboratories can participate in the MAA system, equity of the processes used for accreditation or peer review of the testing laboratories, the number of participants required to begin an arrangement for a particular category of instrument, and several issues related to ownership of OIML Certificates (e.g., withdrawal and transfer of certificates). Revised drafts of the B 3 and B 10 documents were developed by the conclusion of the meeting, and will be circulated (along with responses to the comments) by the Secretariat to TC 3/SC 5 members for vote, with the objective of having final documents submitted to the International Committee on Legal Metrology (CIML) for their vote at the next CIML Meeting (October 2011).

The issue of whether to allow test data from manufacturers’ test laboratories (MTLs) into the MAA has been contentious. The practice of utilizing test data from MTLs to issue national or regional type approval certificates has been used fairly successfully for many years in parts of Europe but seems to be opposed in many other parts of the world, including by the NCWM. The NCWM continues to state its current position that NTEP will not accept test data from manufacturers unless there is an Issuing Authority representative on-site at the manufacturer’s site to supervise 100% of the testing.

500-3 NTEP Participating Laboratories and Evaluations Reports

Background: During the 2010 NCWM Annual Meeting, Mr. Jim Truex, NTEP Administrator, updated the Committee on NTEP laboratory and administrative activities.

The NTEP weighing and measuring laboratories held a joint meeting March 22 - 26, 2010, in Sacramento, California. The NTEP weighing laboratories met again in August 2010 prior to the meeting of the Weighing Sector in Columbus, Ohio, and the NTEP measuring laboratories met once more in October 2010, prior to the Measuring Sector meeting in Columbia, South Carolina.

Mr. Truex, reported to the Committee that incoming applications remain strong. He reported there is no backlog concern for measuring devices and the brick and mortar weighing labs report a minimal backlog.

2011 NTEP Meetings:
- NTETC Belt-Conveyor Sector February 23 - 24, 2011 St. Louis, Missouri
- NTETC Software Sector Meeting March 15 - 16, 2011 Annapolis, Maryland
- NTEP Laboratory Meeting March 28 - April 1, 2011 Annapolis, Maryland
- NTETC Grain Analyzer Sector August 24 - 25, 2011 Kansas City, Missouri
- NTETC Weighing Sector August 30 - September 1, 2011 Sacramento, California
The Committee has announced plans to conduct a survey of NTEP customers and NTEP laboratories regarding customer service. The Board plans to use the results of the survey to form a continuous improvement plan for NTEP.

500-4 National Type Evaluation Technical Committee (NTETC) Sector Reports

Background/Discussion:

The Committee is happy to report that all National Type Evaluation Technical Committee (NTETC) Sector reports were available to members at the time Pub 15 was published and is committed to insuring that electronic versions of Sector reports are available with Pub 15 in the future. Please note that the Sector reports will only be available in the electronic version of Pub 15; it will not be available in the printed versions of Pub 15. (NIST/WMD – www.nist.gov/pml/wmd/index.cfm and NCWM – www.ncwm.net)

Grain Moisture Meter and NIR Protein Analyzer Sectors: The NTETC Grain Moisture Meter and NIR Protein Analyzer Sectors held a joint meeting in Kansas City, Missouri, August 25 - 26, 2010. A draft of the final summary was provided to the Committee prior to the 2011 NCWM Interim Meeting for review and approval.

The next meeting of the Grain Moisture Meter and NIR Protein Analyzer Sectors is scheduled for August 24 - 25, 2011, in Kansas City, Missouri. For questions on the current status of Sector work or to propose items for a future meeting, please contact the Sector Technical Advisors:

Ms. Diane Lee
NIST WMD
100 Bureau Drive, Stop 2600
Gaithersburg, MD 20899-2600
Phone: (301) 975-4405
Fax: (301) 975-8091
e-mail: diane.lee@nist.gov

Mr. Jack Barber
J.B. Associates
10349 Old Indian Trail
Glenarm, IL 62536
Phone: (217) 483-4232
e-mail: barber.jw@comcast.net

Measuring Sector: The NTETC Measuring Sector met October 1 - 2, 2010, in Charleston, South Carolina. A draft of the final summary was provided to the NTEP Committee prior to the 2011 NCWM Interim Meeting for review and approval.

The next meeting of the Measuring Sector is scheduled for October 2011, in conjunction with the Southern Weights and Measures Association’s 2011 Annual Meeting. For questions on the current status of Sector work or to propose items for a future meeting, please contact the Sector Technical Advisor:

Ms. Tina Butcher
NIST WMD
100 Bureau Drive, Stop 2600
Gaithersburg, MD 20899-2600
Phone: (301) 975-2196
Fax: (301) 975-8091
e-mail: tbutcher@nist.gov

Software Sector: The NTETC Software Sector met March 2 - 3, 2010, in Sacramento, California. A final draft of the meeting summary was provided to the Committee prior to the 2011 NCWM Interim Meeting for review and approval.
NTEP 2011 Interim Agenda

The next meeting of the Software Sector is scheduled for March 15 - 16, 2011, in Annapolis, Maryland. For questions on the current status of Sector work or to propose items for a future meeting, please contact the Sector Chairs and NTEP Administrator:

Mr. Jim Pettinato  
Sector Chair  
FMC Technologies  
1602 Wagner Avenue  
Erie, PA 16510  
Phone: (814) 898-5250  
Fax: (814) 899-3414  
e-mail: jim.pettinato@fmcti.com

Mr. Norm Ingram  
Sector Chair  
CA Div. of Measurement Standards  
6790 Florin Perkins Road, Suite 100  
Sacramento, CA 95828  
Phone: (916) 229-3016  
Fax: (916) 229-3026  
e-mail: ningram@cdfa.ca.gov

Mr. Jim Truex  
NTEP Administrator  
NCWM  
1135 M Street, Suite 110  
Lincoln, NE 68508  
Phone: (740) 919-4348  
e-mail: jim.truex@ncwm.net

**Weighing Sector:** The NTETC Weighing Sector met August 31 – September 2, 2010, in Columbus, Ohio. A final draft of the meeting summary was provided to the Committee prior to the 2011 NCWM Interim Meeting for review and approval.

The next Weighing Sector meeting is scheduled for August 30 - September 1, 2011, in Sacramento, California. For questions on the current status of Sector work or to propose items for a future meeting, please contact the Sector Technical Advisor:

Mr. Steven Cook  
NIST WMD  
100 Bureau Drive, Stop 2600  
Gaithersburg, MD 20899-2600  
Phone: (301) 975-4003  
Fax: (301) 975-8091  
e-mail: steven.cook@nist.gov

**Belt-Conveyor Scale Sector:** The NTETC Belt-Conveyor Scale Sector met February 24 - 25, 2009, in St. Louis, Missouri. A final draft of the meeting summary was provided to the Committee prior to the 2010 NCWM Interim Meeting for review and approval.

The next meeting of the Belt Conveyor Scale sector is scheduled for February 2011, in St. Louis, Missouri. For questions on the current status of Sector work or to propose items for a future meeting, please contact the Sector Technical Advisor:

Mr. John Barton  
NIST WMD  
100 Bureau Drive, Stop 2600  
Gaithersburg, MD 20899-2600  
Phone: (301) 975-4002  
Fax: (301) 975-8091  
e-mail: john.barton@nist.gov

### 500-5 Conformity Assessment Program

**Background/Discussion:** The Conformity Assessment Program was established to ensure devices produced after the device has been type evaluated and certified by NTEP continue to meet the same requirements. This program has three major elements: 1) Certificate Review (administrative); 2) Initial Verification (inspection and performance testing); and 3) Verified Conformity Assessment (influence factors). This item is included on the Committee’s agenda to provide an update on these elements.

**Certificate Review:** Certificates are constantly under review by NTEP staff and laboratories. Many active certificates are amended annually because of manufacturer submission for evaluation or issues reported by the states.
pertaining to information on the certificate. When the devices are re-evaluated and certificates are amended, the information is reviewed and necessary steps are taken to assure compliance and accurate, thorough information is reported on the certificate.

In an effort to keep certificate information up to date, the NTEP Committee offered, during the CC annual maintenance fee invoice period, an opportunity for active certificate holders to update contact information that is contained in the “Submitted By” on certificates during the payment period with the payment of their annual maintenance fee. Many CC holders have taken advantage of the opportunity.

**Initial Verification (IV):** The IV initiative is ongoing. Field enforcement officials perform an initial inspection and test on new installations on a routine basis. The Committee recognized that the states do not want IV reporting to be cumbersome.

An IV report form has been developed. The Committee wanted to have a simple form, perhaps web based for use by the state and local regulators. The form has been approved by the Committee and distributed to the states. A completed form can be submitted via mail, e-mail, fax, or online. The form is available to regulatory officials who are members of the NCWM online at www.ncwm.net/content/initial_verification_report.

**Verified Conformity Assessment Program (VCAP):** The NCWM and NTEP have been concerned about production meeting type, protecting the integrity of the NTEP CC since the inception of NTEP. Load cells traceable to NTEP certificates have been selected for the initial effort. All holders of NTEP CCs for load cells have been notified.

The NTEP Committee has been asked to announce which device(s) will be next after load cells. The NTEP Committee wants some additional time to see what issues and concerns come to light with the load cell effort before making a decision.

The NCWM Board of Directors reconfirmed its belief that conformity assessment is vital to NTEP’s continued success and will be implemented. VCAP Audit Reports for manufacturers with load cell certificates were due no later than June 30, 2010. VCAP Audit Reports for private label certificate holders were due no later than November 30, 2010. VCAP for load cells will occur according to the final timelines below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NTEP VCAP Timeline – Load Cell Manufacturer Certificate Holders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refine VCAP procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer incoming questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine/develop appeals process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notify all CC holders of updated plan, Q&amp;A, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The NCWM decided to require a systems audit checklist that is to be completed by an outside auditor and submitted to the NCWM per Section 2.5 of the VCAP requirements. A “VCAP Systems Audit Checklist for Manufacturers” and a “VCAP Systems Audit Checklist for Private Label Certificate Holders” have been developed and are available on the NCWM website at www.ncwm.net.

In 2010 the NCWM revised requirements for private label CC holder audits and auditors. A new checklist for private label certificate holders was developed and distributed. The requirements for the Certification Body and VCAP auditor were changed to require an “ISO auditor.” Clarification was requested to avoid confusion by private label auditors. The Committee added clarification language to the introduction section of the private label checklist.

Additionally, the Committee developed a new NCWM Publication 14 (Pub 14), Administrative Policy to distinguish between the requirements for parent NTEP certificate holders (S.1.c.) and private label certificate holders. The requirements in S.1.d. track the private label checklist requirements; traceability to parent NTEP CC, traceability of the private label cell to a VCAP audit, purchase and sales records, plan to report non-conforming product and non-conforming product in stock, plan to conduct internal audits to verify non-compliance action, and internal audit records.

Proposed S.1.d.  NTEP Verified Conformity Assessment Program (VCAP) Procedures for Private Label Certificate Holders

Introduction

Many NTEP Certified devices must meet NIST Handbook 44 (HB 44), Specifications, Tolerances, and Other Technical Requirements for Weighing and Measuring Devices, requirements for influence factors. It is not possible to verify these requirements during the Initial Verification in the field. Therefore, manufacturers of metrological devices (instruments) and/or components (modules), which are subject to influence factors, as defined in HB 44, must have a Verified Conformity Assessment Program (VCAP) in place to ensure that these metrological devices and/or components are produced to perform at a level consistent with that of the device and/or component previously certified.

For weighing devices that are subject to influence factors, traceable to a private label NTEP Certificate of Conformance, NTEP will require the private label certificate holder to verify that the parent certificate holder has complied with VCAP requirements, has a current VCAP audit certificate, the VCAP certification is traceable back to the parent NTEP certificate, and the parent certificate is active.

Devices that Must Meet this Requirement are Limited to the List Below:

- Load Cell (T.N.8.)
- Indicating Elements (T.N.8.)
- Weighing/Load Receiving Elements with non-NTEP Load Cells (T.N.8.)
• Complete Scales (T.N.8.)
• Automatic Weighing Systems (T.7.)
• Belt-Conveyor Scales (T.3)
• Automatic Bulk Weighing Systems (T.7.)

Requirements:

1. The Private label NTEP CC Holder's Responsibilities:

   1.1 Documentation is available to show that all private label certificates are traceable back to a parent certificate holder(s).
   1.2 All parent certificates are active.
   1.3 Records are records available to show the private label certificate holder has confirmed that the supplier has a current VCAP audit meeting applicable requirements.
   1.4 The private label certificate holder’s purchase and sales records verify that no other supplier is providing the product listed on the NTEP certificate.
   1.5 The supplier’s sales records agree with the private label certificate holder’s purchasing records.
   1.6 The private label certificate holder has a plan in place to report non-conformance to the supplier.
   1.7 The private label certificate holder has a plan in place to address non-conforming devices already sold or in stock.
   1.8 The private label certificate holder has a plan in place to conduct internal audits to verify non-conformance action. Internal audits shall be conducted at established intervals, not to exceed one year.
   1.9 Surveillance audits for VCAP conducted by an outside auditor representing a certification body must be completed. The surveillance audits will be conducted every three years until objective evidence is obtained to move to a maximum of every five years.
   1.10 The NTEP private label CC holder shall take corrective action within 90 days of non-conformances sited by the auditor.
   1.11 All records and plans shall be made available to the VCAP auditor.

2. Certification Body's Responsibilities:

   2.1 The selected Certification Body (auditor) shall be accredited to the ISO 9001:2000 standard for providing audits and certifications of management systems.
   2.2 The Certification Body is required to notify NCWM when a major breakdown of the NTEP private label CC holder's VCAP program is found.
   2.3 The Certification Body shall submit a completed “VCAP Systems Audit Checklist for Private Label Certificate Holders” to NCWM. Submitted documentation must contain a clear statement of compliance as a result of the VCAP audit.
3. **NCWM Responsibilities:**

3.1. For new certificate holders, ensure that VCAP certification has been completed within a one year cycle of the first maintenance fee, but not to exceed 18 months (example: if NTEP certified in July 2011, VCAP certification would be required by November 2012).

3.2. As part of annual maintenance, NCWM shall ensure that VCAP audit reports are on file, current, and that all non-conformances have been addressed.

3.3. Ensure that an appeals process is in place and made available to Certificate holders. [Note: The appeal and review process contained in section T. of this document shall be used.]

**500-6 NTEP Contingency**

**Source:** NTEP Committee

**Purpose:** NTEP Contingency, to keep NTEP operating and ensure NTEP services are available at an adequate level. The NTEP Committee wants to ensure there is an appropriate number of laboratories and personnel (evaluators) to maintain viable support for NTEP services, including MRAs, MAAs, and potentially to be an R 76 Issuing Participant.

**Item Under Consideration:** The NTEP Committee discussed contingency planning for continuity of NTEP operations. With the state of today’s economy, what if NTEP lost a lab? How will NTEP maintain workflow? Are there additional states interested in applying to become an NTEP field lab or an NTEP brick-and-mortar lab? The NTEP Committee will continue to discuss these issues during a long-range planning session and welcomes comments from the membership.

Issues under consideration include should the NCWM:

1. Employ NTEP evaluators to conduct testing at manufacturer’s facilities?
2. Have evaluators under contract to conduct testing at manufacturer’s facilities?
3. Employ NTEP evaluators or have evaluators under contract to assist the state NTEP laboratories?
4. Have a brick and mortar NTEP laboratory and NTEP evaluators?
5. Use a private third party laboratory to conduct NTEP evaluations?

The Committee heard testimony expressing support and concerns pertaining to the options. Several stated that the Committee should consider adding OIML MAA participation as a Utilizing Participant to the list. Another urged the Committee to continue working on the idea of NCWM NTEP evaluators, an NCWM NTEP lab, and keeping all options open. One member asked the Committee to consider accepting manufacturer compliance data in lieu of hiring NTEP contractors. Another suggestion from the floor was to consider beefing up and utilizing “Initial Verification” as part of the NTEP process. A representative of a state brick and mortar NTEP laboratory asked the Committee to move cautiously forward and not destroy the state NTEP labs. He expressed concern that the establishment of an NCWM/NTEP brick and mortar lab could lead to significant legal complications for the states.

**Current Comment:** The NTEP Committee wants the membership to know that, at this time, the preferred course of action would be the evaluators under contract option. The Committee recognizes the commitment states with NTEP laboratories have made over the years and would only resort to contingency measures in the event of a severe loss of state lab resources. Labs are handling current demand without a need for contingency measures. The Committee continues to keep NTEP contingency a top priority and watch over the status of the laboratories.
500-7  Publication 14 – NTEP Administrative Policy

Source: NTEP Committee

Purpose: The NTEP Committee feels that it in the best interest of the program to amend the NTEP Administrative Policy to make it clear that the manufacturers/CC holders are obligated to meet current HB 44 requirements, regardless of when the devices covered by the NTEP certificate(s) were evaluated and the certificate was issued.

Item Under Consideration: Amend sections D.2., J.1.a, R. and S. as follows.

Amend Section D.2. to read:

D.2. Responsibility for Reporting Occurrence of Modification

When a manufacturer or other certificate holder makes changes to a certified type, evaluation of the modification may be necessary. Manufacturers and other certificate holders are responsible for insuring compliance of the production devices to NIST Handbook 44. When changes to NIST Handbook 44 are adopted by the NCWM that affect the device traceable to an NTEP certificate, devices produced after the effective date must meet the current applicable Handbook 44 requirements. The manufacturer must report changes that might require the attention of NTEP. The decision to report changes is dictated by the metrological significance of the modification.

a. Notification of Change

The manufacturer or other certificate holder notifies NTEP that a change to a certified device has been made or is contemplated. The manufacturer may make judgments concerning the modifications and request issuance of an approval of a modification, by citing the existing Certificate of Conformance, detailing the changes, giving any data, analysis, and conclusions concerning the technical or metrological consequences of the changes.

b. NTEP Options

On the basis of the manufacturer's or other certificate holder's notification, NTEP will decide whether or not to require an evaluation for approving the modification or issuance of a new Certificate of Conformance. NTEP will inform the manufacturer certificate holder accordingly.

Amend Section J.1.a to read:

J.1. Re-evaluation to Verify Compliance

NTEP may decide to re-evaluate a previously evaluated type, whether or not a Certificate of Conformance has been issued. Re-evaluation must be justified based on considerations such as the following:

a. Manufacturers and other certificate holders are responsible for insuring compliance of the production devices to NIST Handbook 44. When changes to NIST Handbook 44 are adopted by the NCWM that affect the device traceable to an NTEP certificate, devices produced after the effective date must meet the current applicable Handbook 44 requirements. That is, devices manufactured after the effective date of any new non-retroactive regulations must meet the new requirements; devices manufactured prior to the effective date of such regulations must meet retroactive requirements only.

Amend Section R to read:

R. Post Evaluation Responsibility of Manufacturer Certificate Holder

As a result of requesting an evaluation and accepting an NTEP Certificate of Conformance, the manufacturer implicitly claims that all devices manufactured as the type referenced in the Certificate of Conformance are the same type. Manufacturers and other certificate holders are responsible for
insuring compliance of the production devices to NIST Handbook 44. When changes to NIST Handbook 44 are adopted by the NCWM that affect the device traceable to an NTEP certificate, devices produced after the effective date must meet the current applicable Handbook 44 requirements. The certificate holder may be responsible for reporting modifications to NTEP, per section D.2.a. NTEP does not normally require re-evaluation for technical requirement changes to NIST Handbook 44 per section J.1.a. as compliance can be determined through field enforcement. If a production device is found with a model number corresponding to that referenced in the Certificate of Conformance, but which does not conform to the type, the Certificate of Conformance may be withdrawn.

Amend Section S to read:

S. Conformity Assessment Process

Type approval (certification) is one of the main elements in the metrological control system for weighing and measuring devices used in commercial measurements. The NTEP Certificate of Conformance, issued by NCWM, is a tool used by weights and measures officials in the inspection and approval of those devices. NTEP looks at one or more devices in a family, during the evaluation process. This typically occurs in the early stages of product development or production, yet it is expected that a commercial device will have a useful production life of several years. It is inevitable that changes will occur in production methods or components, that new features will be added to improve the product to respond to user needs and that the technical and performance standards will change as NIST Handbook 44 evolves in its annual cycle. Some of these changes will result in the manufacturer certificate holder requesting a re-evaluation. The content and format of a Certificate of Conformance will also evolve over time.

Conformity Assessment is a responsibility of the certificate holder. It is vital that the Certificate of Conformance accurately reflects the device design and its features. It is also vital that the device be manufactured in conformance with the applicable requirements, while the Certificate of Conformance is in active status. In addition to the type evaluation, described in Section E through G of this document, the steps below outline the measures NTEP will use to keep the Certificate of Conformance accurate and to ensure conformance.

Mr. Randy Jennings, Tennessee, NTEP Committee Chair
Mr. Tim Tyson, Kansas, NCWM Chair
Mr. Mike Sikula, New York
Mr. Kirk Robinson, Washington
Mr. Kurt Floren, LA County, California
NTEP Technical Advisor: Mr. Jim Truex, NTEP Administrator
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1. Report on the 2010 NCWM Interim and Annual Meetings

The 95th Annual Meeting of the National Conference on Weights and Measures (NCWM) was held July 11 - 15, 2010, in St. Paul, Minnesota. No Grain Moisture Meter (GMM) or Near Infrared (NIR) Grain Analyzer items appeared in the Specifications and Tolerances (S&T) Committee Interim Report for consideration by the NCWM at the 2010 Annual Meeting.

Mr. Jim Truex, National Type Evaluation Program (NTEP) Administrator, reported that Annual Meeting attendance this year was down to approximately 250 registrants with only 35 - 36 states participating. There was some speculation that the attendance drop was partly due to the economy. Conference membership for 2010 is down approximately 200 from 2009. A similar drop in membership occurred the previous year. NCWM is running smoothly; in spite of the drop in membership, the Conference is in sound financial shape.

Other General Code items of interest to the Sector were non-voting items related to software and provisions for sealing electronic adjustable components. [See Grain Analyzer Sector Agenda Items 5, 6, and 7.]
2. Report on NTEP Type Evaluations and On-going Calibration Program (OCP) (Phase II) Testing

Ms. Cathy Brenner of the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA), the NTEP Participating Laboratory for Grain Analyzers, briefed the Sector on NTEP Type Evaluation activity. A Phase I evaluation is currently underway for one new grain moisture meter. Annual GMM calibration reviews were completed on schedule and updated Certificates of Conformance (CCs) were issued for six device types. Six device types are enrolled in the OCP (Phase II) for the 2010 harvest:

- Bruins Instruments
  - DICKEY-john Corporation
  - Foss North America
  - Perten Instruments
  - The Steinlite Corporation
- OmegAnalyzerG
  - DICKEY-john Corporation
  - Foss North America
  - Perten Instruments
  - The Steinlite Corporation
  - GAC2000 NTEP, GAC2100, GAC2100a, GAC2100b
  - Infratec 1241
  - AM5100
  - SL95

[Note: Models listed on a single line are considered to be of the same “type.”] 

Ms. Brenner pointed out that plans to resume work on an addition to and the remodeling of the Federal Grain Inspection Service (FGIS) Technical Services Division Building can have an impact on NTEP testing. Of major concern is the loss the walk-in environmental chamber. The chamber will be completely disassembled and removed to make way for utility hook-ups. It is likely to be the last item to be restored to operating condition. If started in September, the new addition is tentatively scheduled to be completed in March. Some of the labs will then be moved to the new building. The labs remaining in the old building will be rearranged to allow renovations to be made to the empty portion of the old building. Those labs will then be moved into the renovated portion so the renovation can be completed. The air-oven lab, NTEP lab, the moisture meter lab, among others, would each have to be relocated twice in the remodeling process. At least two years of renovations and disruptions are anticipated.

Other facilities are being looked into as possible interim sites where Phase I environmental testing might be performed. One possibility for manufacturers with suitable walk-in environmental chambers would be for GIPSA to perform the tests on site. There is also the possibility that facilities might be available for GIPSA to use on a short term rental basis. Alternatively, testing could be subcontracted to other NTEP laboratories. There are questions of how the added cost of on-site, rental, or subcontracting can be handled and what additional training other NTEP laboratories might require for conducting tests unique to grain moisture meters (GMMs). If these details cannot be resolved satisfactorily, testing might have to be deferred until the new facility is fully operational.

Some of the facilities suggested include: Kansas State University, Ohio Department of Agriculture, and Iowa Department of Agriculture. Additional sites are being investigated.

3. Review of Ongoing Calibration Program (Phase II) Performance Data

At the Sector’s August 2005 meeting, it was agreed that comparative Ongoing Calibration Program (OCP) data identifying the Official Meter and listing the average bias for each NTEP meter type should be available for annual review by the Sector. Accordingly, Ms. Brenner, representing GIPSA, the NTEP Participating Laboratory for Grain Analyzers, presented data showing the performance of NTEP meters compared to the air oven. These data are based on the last three crop years (2007 - 2009) using calibrations updated for use during the 2010 harvest season.

Four meter types were included in the comparison graphs: DICKEY-john’s GAC2100, Foss’s Infratec 1241, Perten’s AM5100, and Steinlite’s SL95. Only the GAC2100 has been identified on the comparisons. It is identified as “Official Meter”. The remaining three instruments were randomly assigned numbers 1, 2 and 3, or, in the case of sunflowers, A and B.

[Note: The 2007 - 2009 GMM Phase II comparison graphs were distributed with the August 2010 Grain Analyzer Sector Agenda. Until completion of the NCWM Interim Meeting, held in January 2011, they can be downloaded from the NCWM web site using the following link: ]
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Ms. Brenner pointed out that sunflower results were included this year. They had been eliminated last year to preserve confidentiality, because only two meters were approved for sunflowers and one of them was the Official Meter. This year there are now two meters in addition to the Official Meter with sunflower results.

The 2009 crop year was atypical especially for Corn and Rough Rice. Many of the samples received were of low test weight per bushel (TW) or of low quality. Two of the meters showed abnormal results especially in the 14 % to 16 % moisture range. When performance was reviewed before calibrations were adjusted (using the calibrations from the 2009 harvest), out of five meters in the program two meters passed, and three just barely failed if 2009 data was included. When 2009 data was ignored, all meter passed.

Dr. Richard Pierce, GIPSA, expanded on Ms. Brenner’s comments, explaining that they had received many more low TW samples than in previous years. Under usual circumstances GIPSA might have decided that this is not the kind of data that they wanted to use for the calibration program, and they could have deleted those samples. This wasn’t done because the effects of low TW differ radically from one meter type to the next. Some read low if TW is low, others may read high, and some are not affected. As a result, GIPSA didn’t believe there was a valid reason for deleting those samples. As one of the lower frequency meters, the Official Meter seems to be more sensitive to unusual grain conditions. This has shown up on the rice samples, and there have been issues in the 14 % to 16 % moisture range with corn.

At the last Grain Inspection Advisory Committee meeting, GIPSA was asked if there was anything they could do to improve the moisture calibrations for rice and corn. Dr. David Funk, GIPSA, told the Committee that the meter is doing as well as it can for the technology that is used. He suggested that if this is a serious problem for the Committee, then GIPSA may need to look at selecting a new meter technology that performs better on these atypical crops. The Advisory Committee responded by suggesting that GIPSA move forward and explore that. Although there is presently no agency decision and no firm timeline regarding selecting a replacement for the current Official Meter, Dr. Pierce was of the belief that we are now at the point where manufacturers and agencies within GIPSA need to be made aware that this could be coming and it could be coming fairly quickly.

Dr. Funk indicated his willingness to make the same Power Point presentation to the Sector that he had given to the Grain Inspection Advisory Committee if the Sector was interested in hearing more on this subject. The Sector agreed to amend the Agenda to include Dr. Funk’s presentation. [Note: See Agenda Item 14. Future Direction of Moisture Measurement Technology.]


The five-year Interagency Agreement that provides funding and defines the fee schedule for the NTEP Phase II GMM OCP expired September 30, 2009 (the end of the Federal Government’s Fiscal Year 2009). At the time of the Sector’s August 2009 meeting, a new Interagency Agreement was being reviewed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology’s (NIST’s) legal office. The new agreement was finally approved in the spring of 2010.

Dr. Pierce, GIPSA, explained the fee table showing how fees are calculated based on the number of meter types in the program. With six device types presently enrolled in Phase II for the 2010 harvest the cost to manufacturers will be $8750 per device type. If a seventh meter enters the program, the cost per device type per year increases to $10,715. Dr. Pierce noted that over the last 15 years the number of meters in the program each year has varied from 5 to 7.
The fee schedule for the new agreement is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Total Meters (including official meter)</th>
<th>(2) Meters In NTEP Pool</th>
<th>(3) Cost Per Pool Meter</th>
<th>(4) Total Program Cost</th>
<th>Funding Contribution From Participants</th>
<th>(5) NIST</th>
<th>(6) GIPSA</th>
<th>(7) Mfg's (total funding from mfg's)</th>
<th>(8) Cost Per Meter Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>3,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>67,500</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>5,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>112,500</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>52,500</td>
<td>8,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>10,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>157,500</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>97,500</td>
<td>12,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>13,335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column Explanation (or formula for calculating)

1. Total Meters: The number of meter types (including the Official GIPSA meter) that will share in the NTEP calibration costs.
2. Meters In NTEP Pool: The number of meter types other than the Official meter that will share in the NTEP calibration costs.
3. Cost per Pool Meter: The cost associated with each pool meter in the program.
4. Total Program Cost: A per meter type cost of $22,500 times the number of NTEP "pool" meters.
5. NIST Contribution: One-third the total program cost up to a maximum of $30,000.
6. GIPSA Contribution: One-third the total program cost up to a maximum of $30,000.
7. Manufacturers Contributions (total funding from manufacturers): Total Program Cost minus NIST Contribution minus GIPSA Contribution.
8. Cost per Meter Type: Manufacturers' Contributions divided by Total Meters (including the Official meter).


**Background:** This item originated from the Southern Weights and Measures Association (SWMA) and first appeared on the S&T Committee’s 2008 agenda. The proposal added requirements to G-S.8. to assure that a device could not be sealed in the configuration mode and continue to operate normally. Such a condition could facilitate fraud. The proposal as submitted required that a device continuously indicate when access to the set-up mode was not disabled.
At the 2008 Interim Meeting, the S&T Committee reviewed comments received during the open hearing and discussed alternate proposals provided by NIST Weights and Measures Division (WMD) and the Scale Manufacturers Association (SMA). At the 2008 Annual Meeting, the WMD suggested that the S&T Committee amend the recommendation to address some of the concerns noted by the CWMA, NTEP participating laboratories, and WMD since the 2008 Interim Meeting. The item remained Informational for the 2008 Annual Meeting

During the open hearings at the 2009 Interim Meeting, WMD stated that it had received comments questioning how the application of a physical seal (as recommended by the manufacturer and listed on the Certificate of Conformance [CC]) ensures that the calibration and configuration modes are disabled. What does that presence of the physical seal (pressure sensitive or lock and wire) do to the device that disables the calibration and configuration modes? The S&T Committee agreed with the comments that the proposal was not ready to become a Voting item and recommended that the item remain Informational for 2009.

At the 2010 NCWM Interim Meeting, WMD stated that it remained concerned about devices which could be sealed while allowing access to calibration or configuration changes without breaking that seal. WMD agreed with the position of the NCWM S&T Committee that the current language in paragraph G-S.8. requires that a security seal be broken before a metrological change can be made to a device (or other approved means of security such as an audit trail provided). Thus, once a security seal is applied, it should not be possible to make a metrological change to the device without breaking that seal. Since this philosophy addresses provisions for protecting access to any metrological adjustment, the philosophy should be applied consistently to all device types. WMD encouraged the S&T Committee to reiterate in its Interim and Final Reports the correct interpretation of G-S.8. as the Committee and the Measuring Sector have done in the past, and as demonstrated in more recent actions by the Weighing Sector.

The S&T Committee agreed that a device must be equipped with an approved audit trail or that a physical seal is required to be broken before any metrological adjustments to comply with paragraph G-S.8. The Committee also believed that an indication that the adjustment mode is in operation is only necessary for devices with approved electronic methods of sealing. Additionally, the adjustment mode indicator should not be operable during normal weighing or measuring operations. The Committee agreed that if a device designed for commercial applications is capable of being sealed and still allows external or remote access to the calibration or configuration mode, then that device is clearly in violation of the current provisions in G-S.8. Provision for Sealing Electronic Adjustable Components and G-S.2. Facilitation of Fraud and, therefore, no change to the existing language in paragraph G-S.8. would be needed. The S&T Committee believed that type evaluation procedures have been amended in applicable sections of NCWM Pub 14 to address the issues of incorrectly applying the requirements in G-S.8. The Committee also noted that there was some confusion regarding the meaning of the terms “adjustment” and “adjustment mode” in the CWMA Annual Meeting reports.

The S&T Committee received no comments addressing potential inconsistent interpretations of the requirements by field officials, requirements for adjustment mode indications, and limitations on metrological indications while in the adjustment mode in any proposals. Consequently, the Committee developed a revised proposal that:

- does not change the existing text in G-S.8.;
- adds language that restates the intent of G-S.8.;
- adds language to address metrological (legal for trade) measurements while in an adjustment mode;
- adds a new paragraph G-S.8.1. that requires an indication and, recorded representations while in the adjustment mode (if equipped with a printer); and
- adds new definitions for “adjustment” and “adjustment mode” from the white paper on the “Metrological Requirements for Audit Trails” adopted by NCWM in July 1993 to facilitate a common understanding of the terms.

The S&T Committee also recommended that the amended proposal be given Informational status to allow interested parties sufficient time to analyze and comment on the most recent language that appears in the “Item Under Consideration” below:
[See the 2008 NCWM Annual and 2009 Interim and Annual Reports for additional background information.]

**Item Under Consideration:**

Amend General Code paragraph G-S.8. and subsequent subparagraphs.

**G-S.8. Provision for Sealing Electronic Adjustable Components.** - A device shall be designed with provision(s) for applying a security seal that must be broken, or for using other approved means of providing security (e.g., data change audit trail available at the time of inspection), before any change that detrimentally affects the metrological integrity of the device can be made to any electronic mechanism. That is:

(a) It shall not be possible to apply a physical security seal to the device while it is in the calibration and/or configuration mode nor to access the calibration and/or configuration (adjustment) mode when sealed; or

(b) The calibration and/or configuration adjustments are protected by an approved method for providing security (e.g., data change audit trail).

A device may be fitted with an automatic or a semi-automatic calibration mechanism. This mechanism shall be incorporated inside the device. After sealing, neither the mechanism nor the calibration process shall facilitate fraud.

During any mode of operation in which adjustments can be made, devices shall not provide indications that can be interpreted, transmitted into memory, or printed as a usable (legal) measurement value.*

[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 1990]

* [Nonretroactive as of January 1, 201X]

(Added 1985) (Amended 1989, and 1993, and 201X)

**G-S.8.1. Adjustment Mode Indication.** For electronic devices protected by an approved means for providing security (e.g., data change audit trail), the device shall clearly and continuously indicate and print, if equipped with a printer, that the calibration and configuration adjustment modes are enabled.

[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 201X]

**G-S.8.12. Multiple Weighing or Measuring Elements that Share a Common Provision for Sealing.** – A change to any metrological parameter (calibration or configuration) of any weighing or measuring element shall be individually identified.

[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2010]

**Note:** For devices that utilize an electronic form of sealing, in addition to the requirements in G-S.8.12., any appropriate audit trail requirements in an applicable specific device code also apply. Examples of identification of a change to the metrological parameters of a weighing or measuring element include, but are not limited to:

1. a broken, missing, or replaced physical seal on an individual weighing, measuring, or indicating element or active junction box;

2. a change in a calibration factor or configuration setting for each weighing or measuring element;

3. a display of the date of calibration or configuration event for each weighing or measuring element; or

4. counters indicating the number of calibration and/or configuration events for each weighing or measuring element.

(Added 2007)

Add applicable definitions to Appendix D from a white paper on the “Metrological Requirements for Audit Trails” adopted by NCWM in July 1993.
Adjustment mode. An operational mode of a device which enables the user to make adjustments to sealable parameters, including changes to configuration parameters.

Adjustment. A change in the value of any of a device's sealable calibration parameters or sealable configuration parameters.

Discussion: This item is a carryover from the Grain Analyzer Sector’s August 2009 meeting (Agenda Item 9). At that time, the changes did not appear to affect the provisions for sealing GMMs and NIR Grain Analyzers. However, if the most recent language proposed for G-S.8. and its sub-paragraphs, see “Item Under Consideration” above, is the version that will ultimately be accepted, changes will have to be made in both the GMM Code in HB 44 and the GMM checklist in Pub 14.

The necessary changes could be addressed as follows:

1) Incorporate the essence of the proposed changes to G-S.8. and applicable subparagraphs; retain the simple device categories of the existing GMM Code; broaden the scope of Category 3 by removing “remotely”; and add a note to Table S.2.5. to explain the meaning and scope of “Remote configuration capability.” This is accomplished by amending paragraph S.2.5. Provision for Sealing and Table S.2.5. Categories of Device and Methods for Sealing of HB 44 Section 5.56.(a) Grain Moisture Meters, and amending all the GMM Pub 14 checklist items under the heading Code Reference: S.2.5. Provision for Sealing to include the proposed additions/amendments to G-S.8.

The suggested GMM HB 44 changes are as follows:

S.2.5. Provision for Sealing. – Provision shall be made for applying a security seal in a manner that requires the security seal to be broken, or for using other approved means of providing security (e.g., audit trail available at the time of inspection as defined in Table S.2.5. Categories of Device and Methods of Sealing) before any change that affects the metrological integrity of the device can be made to any electronic mechanism. That is:

(a) It shall not be possible to apply a physical security seal to the device while it is in the calibration and/or configuration mode nor to access the calibration and/or configuration (adjustment) mode when sealed; or

(b) The calibration and/or configuration adjustments are protected by an approved method for providing security (e.g., data change audit trail).

During any mode of operation in which adjustments can be made, devices shall not provide indications that can be interpreted, transmitted into memory, or printed as a usable (legal) measurement value.

[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 201X]
(Amended 201X)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Device</th>
<th>Methods of Sealing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1:</strong> No remote configuration capability.</td>
<td>Seal by physical seal or two event counters: one for calibration parameters (000 to 999) and one for configuration parameters (000 to 999). If equipped with event counters, the device must be capable of displaying, or printing through the device or through another on-site device, the contents of the counters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 2:</strong> Remote configuration capability, but access is controlled by physical hardware.</td>
<td>The hardware enabling access for remote communication must be at the device and sealed using a physical seal or two event counters: one for calibration parameters (000 to 999) and one for configuration parameters (000 to 999). If equipped with event counters, the device must be capable of displaying, or printing through the device or through another on-site device, the contents of the counters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 3:</strong> Remote configuration capability access may be unlimited or controlled through a software switch (e.g., password).</td>
<td>An event logger (e.g., a data change audit trail) is required in the device; it must include an event counter (000 to 999), the parameter ID, the date and time of the change, and the new value of the parameter (for calibration changes consisting of multiple constants, the calibration version number may be used rather than the calibration constants). A printed copy of the information must be available through the device or through another on-site device. The event logger shall have a capacity to retain records equal to twenty-five (25) times the number of sealable parameters in the device, but not more than 1000 records are required. (Note: Does not require 1000 changes to be stored for each parameter.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 3a:</strong> No remote capability, but operator is able to make changes that affect the metrological integrity of the device (e.g., slope, bias, etc.) in normal operation.</td>
<td>Same as Category 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 3b:</strong> No remote capability, but access to metrological parameters is controlled through a software switch (e.g., password).</td>
<td>Same as Category 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Remote configuration capability is defined in HB 44 as the ability to adjust a weighing or measuring device or change its sealable parameters from or through some other device that is not itself necessary to the operation of the weighing or measuring device or is not a permanent part of that device.

As used in this table, “remote configuration capability” also includes the ability of the measuring device to accept new or revised sealable parameters from a memory chip, external computer, network, or other device plugged into a mating port (e.g., USB port) on the measuring device or connected wirelessly to the measuring device.

(Amended 201X)

[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 1999 and January 1, 201X]

(Amended 1998)

**Note:** Zero-setting and test point adjustments are considered to affect metrological characteristics and must be sealed.


Any additions/changes to the GMM section of HB 44 will also need to be made to the corresponding Sections to Pub 14.

**Comments/Conclusions:** Several Sector members questioned the need for adding “and continuously” to the second paragraph of Category 3 in Table S.2.5. reasoning that menu-driven devices typically allow access to a configuration.
mode only by password. Once in a configuration mode, it is not possible to make measurements without first leaving the configuration mode. The Sector agreed that “and continuously” should be deleted.

Please note that this proposal is in response to an informational item on the NCWM S&T agenda. Consideration of the suggested changes and additions depends on further discussion of this item and on the final action taken by the S&T Committee on Item 310-1. This will remain a carryover item for the next Grain Analyzer Sector meeting.

6. Item 310-3 G-S.1. Identification. – (Software)

Purpose: This proposal is intended to amend the identification marking requirements for all electronic devices manufactured after a specified date by requiring that metrological software version or revision information be identified. Additionally, the proposal will list methods, other than “permanently marked,” for providing the required information.

Background: Starting at the October 2007 meeting, the Software Sector has discussed the value and merits of required markings for software. After several iterations, the Software Sector developed a table to reflect their positions. This table was submitted to NCWM S&T Committee and was assigned Developing status in 2008. However, the Software Sector did not include a recommendation on how to incorporate the proposal into existing G-S.1. and G-S.1.1. language. In particular, WMD was concerned about properly addressing the various existing requirements and multiple non-retroactive dates.

Prior to the NCWM 2009 Interim Meeting, NIST WMD commented on S&T Item 310-3, and presented an alternate proposal with significant modifications, which were included in the Interim Meeting Agenda background for the item. There was much additional comment and various proposed versions of the table from NIST WMD, et al.

[Note: For the complete background on Item 310-3 refer to the Specifications and Tolerances Committee Interim Agenda for the 2010 NCWM Interim Meeting as it appeared in Pub 15, 2010. This is available online at: http://ts.nist.gov/WeightsAndMeasures/Publications/upload/08-ST-10-Pub15-FINAL.pdf.]

At the 2009 Software Sector Meeting, it was agreed that the proposed table had not accomplished the intended purpose of clarifying the requirements. To remove some of the confusion the Software Sector revisited this item from the beginning modifying the text of G-S.1. to match the Software Sector’s original intent.

At its March 2010 meeting, the Software Sector, in response to comments heard during the 2010 Interim meeting, revised the proposed language changes described in the S&T Committee Interim Agenda Item 310-3. These revisions removed existing mention of “not-built-for purpose” and the differentiation between Type P and Type U software types. The first sentence of G-S.1. was restored to the current HB 44 wording.

The Software Sector also initiated discussion on two new concepts, which may eventually result in additional recommendations to amend G-S.1. First, the Software Sector sees merit to requiring some “connection” between the software identifier (i.e., version/revision) and the software itself. The proposal was as follows (with the expectation that examples of acceptable means of implementing such a link would be included in Pub 14).

Add a new sub-subparagraph G-S.1.(d)(3):

“The version or revision identifier shall be directly and inseparably linked to the software itself. The version or revision identifier may consist of more than one part, but at least one part shall be dedicated to the metrologically significant software.”

Second, it seems that at each meeting of the Software Sector, the states reiterate the problems they have in the field locating the basic information required when the CC number is marked via the rather general current HB 44 requirement of ‘accessible through an easily recognizable menu, and if necessary a sub-menu’ [G-S.1.1.(b)(3)]. The states have indicated that this is too vague and field inspectors often cannot find the certificate number on unfamiliar devices.
The Software Sector would like feedback on the proposal to specify a limited number of menu items/icons for accessing the CC number (if is not hard-marked or continuously displayed) in subparagraph (c) as follows:

(b) The CC Number shall be:

(3) accessible through **one or, at most, two levels of access.**

(i) For menu-based systems, “Metrology”, “System Identification”, or “Help”.

(ii) For systems using icons, a metrology symbol (“M” or “SI”), or a help symbol (“?,” “I,” or an “i” within a magnifying glass).

To facilitate a review of the suggested amendments, additions, and changes to G-S.1. and its sub-paragraphs, the current HB 44 language has been marked up below to show all of the suggested modifications.

G-S.1. Identification. – All equipment, except weights and separate parts necessary to the measurement process but not having any metrological effect, shall be clearly and permanently marked for the purposes of identification with the following information:

(a) the name, initials, or trademark of the manufacturer or distributor;

(b) a model identifier that positively identifies the pattern or design of the device;

(1) The model identifier shall be prefaced by the word “Model,” “Type,” or “Pattern.” These terms may be followed by the word “Number” or an abbreviation of that word. The abbreviation for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., No or No.). The abbreviation for the word “Model” shall be “Mod” or “Mod.” Prefix lettering may be initial capitals, all capitals, or all lowercase. [Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2003]

(Added 2000) (Amended 2001)

(2) Abbreviations for the word “Serial” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “S,” and abbreviations for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., S/N, SN, Ser. No., and S. No.). [Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2001]

(d) the current software version or revision identifier for **not-built-for-purpose software-based electronic** devices; [Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2004]

(Added 2003) (Amended 201X)
(1) The version or revision identifier shall be prefaced by words, an abbreviation, or a symbol, that clearly identifies the number as the required version or revision.
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2007]
(Added 2006)

(2) Abbreviations for the word “Version” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “V” and may be followed by the word “Number.” Abbreviations for the word “Revision” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “R” and may be followed by the word “Number.” The abbreviation for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., No or No.).
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2007]
(Added 2006)

(3) The version or revision identifier shall be directly and inseparably linked to the software itself. The version or revision identifier may consist of more than one part, but at least one part shall be dedicated to the metrologically significant software.
(Added 201X)

(e) an NTEP CC number or a corresponding CC Addendum Number for devices that have a CC. The CC Number or a corresponding CC Addendum Number shall be prefaced by the terms “NTEP CC,” “CC,” or “Approval.” These terms may be followed by the word “Number” or an abbreviation of that word. The abbreviation for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., No or No.)
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2003]

The required information shall be so located that it is readily observable without the necessity of the disassembly of a part requiring the use of any means separate from the device.

G-S.1.1. Location of Marking Information for Not-Built-For-Purpose Software-Based Electronic Devices. – For not-built-for-purpose, software-based devices either:

(a) The required information in G-S.1. Identification. (a), (b), (d), and (e) shall be permanently marked or continuously displayed on the device; or

(b) The Certificate of Conformance (CC) Number shall be:

(1) permanently marked on the device;

(2) continuously displayed; or

(3) accessible through an easily recognized menu and, if necessary, a submenu. Examples of menu and submenu identification include, but are not limited to, “Metrology,” “System Identification,” “G-S.1. Identification,” or “Weights and Measures Identification” one or, at most, two levels of access.

(i) For menu-based systems, “Metrology,” “System Identification,” or “Help”.

(ii) For systems using icons, a metrology symbol (“M” or “SI”), or a help symbol (“?,” “I,” or an “i” within a magnifying glass).
**Note:** For (b), clear instructions for accessing the information required in G-S.1.(a), (b), (c), and (d) shall be listed on the CC, including information necessary to identify that the software in the device is the same type that was evaluated.

[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2004 and 201X]

(Added 2003) (Amended 2006 and 201X)

**Discussion:** It should be noted that these new ideas are in the developmental stage, and are included here at the request of the Software Sector, which is seeking comments from interested parties. The Grain Analyzer (GA) Sector is asked to comment on the proposed changes to G-S.1. and G-S.1.1. shown above, specifically those that will most affect Grain Analyzers.

1. G-S.1.(d) and its sub paragraphs will require a software version or revision identifier that is directly and inseparably linked to the software itself; and

2. G-S.1.1. and its sub paragraphs will allow the identifiers required in G-S.1. to be either permanently marked or continuously displayed for software-based electronic devices. This includes the software version or revision identifier. It also allows display of the CC number to be accessible by menu or icon (as opposed to continuously displayed.)

3. If not either permanently marked or continuously displayed, the CC Number will have to be accessible through one or two levels of access identified by the labels, “Metrology”, “System Identification”, or “Help” in menu based systems, or for systems using icons, a metrology symbol (“M” or “SI”), or a help symbol (“?” “I,” or an “i” within a magnifying glass). Note that this is not suggested to be the final list of valid options; the Software Sector would like to have feedback specifically on additional menu text/icon images that should be considered acceptable. The Software Sector feels that the number of acceptable options is less of an issue (within reason) than the fact that the list is finite.

**Comments/Recommendations:** The GA Sector found the wording of G-S.1.1. confusing. It seemed to say that the markings spelled out in G-S.1. were to be **EITHER** permanently marked or continuously displayed on the device **OR** the Certificate of Conformance (CC) Number shall be either: permanently marked or continuously displayed, or accessible through menu or icon. To some, this implied that the software version identifier did NOT have to be displayed. Others believed that the “**OR**” phrase meant that only the CC had three options for marking (permanent, continuously displayed, or accessible via menu or icon), and that the software/firmware version/revision number must be either permanently marked or continuously displayed.

Regardless of how the wording is interpreted, the GA Sector agreed that it was not practical to permanently mark or continuously display the software/firmware version/revision identifier for GMMs. The GA Sector recommends that G-S.1.1.(b) be amended to include accessing the software version or revision identifier by menu or icon. At present all NTEP GMMs are built-for-purpose. They all have permanently marked CC numbers. Software version/revision identifiers, however, are accessible by menu or icon. GMM displays are of limited size. Some existing devices don’t have room to display the software version/revision identifier on every “screen”. Hard marking of that identifier is not practical, because it precludes updating software without also replacing the hard-marked label.

**7. Other Software Requirements That May Impact Grain Analyzers**

The items under this heading are mostly excerpts from the Software Sector’s March 2010 meeting summary intended to keep Grain Analyzer Sector Members informed of developmental software requirements that may impact grain analyzers. For more detailed information, see the complete Software Sector meeting summary at:

http://www.ncwm.net/sites/default/files/meetings/software/2010/10_Software_Summary.pdf

a. Identification of Certified Software

[Note: This item is now partially covered by the provisional proposal to make G-S.1.(d) applicable to software-based electronic devices and by adding the following new sub-subparagraph G-S.1.(d)(3):]
“The version or revision identifier shall be directly and inseparably linked to the software itself. The version or revision identifier may consist of more than one part, but at least one part shall be dedicated to the metrologically significant software.”

Also the Software Sector recommends the following information be added to Pub 14 as explanation/examples:

- Unique identifier must be displayable/printable on command or during operation, etc.
- At a minimum, a version/revision indication (1.02.09, rev 3.0 a, etc.). Could also consist of/contain checksum, etc. (crc32, for example).

Software Sector Conclusions: The item needs additional discussion and development by the Software Sector. Outstanding questions: If we allow hard-marking of the software identifier (the Sector has wavered on this in the past), does the above wording then imply that some mechanical means is required (i.e., physical seal) to ‘inseparably link’ the identifier to the software? Do we still have to be able to display/print the identifier if it is hard-marked?

b. Software Protection / Security

Background: The Software Sector derived a trial Pub 14 checklist based on the International Organization of Legal Metrology (OIML) checklist to verify that the software adequately protected against fraudulent modification as well as accidental or unintentional changes. The checklist has been distributed to current NTEP labs for use on a trial basis for new type approval applications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Devices with embedded software TYPE P (aka built-for-purpose)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of the manufacturer that the software is used in a fixed hardware and software environment, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cannot be modified or uploaded by any means after securing/verification</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The software documentation contains:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>description of all the metrologically significant functions, designating those that are considered metrologically significant OIML states that there shall be no undocumented functions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>description of the securing means (evidence of an intervention)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>software identification</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>description how to check the actual software identification</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The software identification is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clearly assigned to the metrologically significant software and functions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provided by the device as documented</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal computers, instruments with PC components, and other instruments, devices, modules, and elements with programmable or loadable metrologically significant software TYPE U (aka not built-for-purpose)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The metrologically significant software is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>documented with all relevant (see below for list of documents) information</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protected against accidental or intentional changes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of intervention (such as, changes, uploads, circumvention) is available until the next verification / inspection (e.g. physical seal, Checksum, CRC, audit trail, etc. means of security)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Software with closed shell (no access to the operating system and/or programs possible for the user):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check whether there is a complete set of commands (e.g. function keys or commands via external interfaces) supplied and accompanied by short descriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check whether the manufacturer has submitted a written declaration of the completeness of the set of commands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operating system and/or program(s) accessible for the user:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check whether a checksum or equivalent signature is generated over the machine code of the metrologically significant software (program module(s) subject to legal control W&amp;M jurisdiction and type-specific parameters)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check whether the metrologically significant software will detect and act upon any unauthorized alteration of the metrologically significant software using simple software tools e.g. text editor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Software interface(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verify the manufacturer has documented:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the program modules of the metrologically significant software are defined and separated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the protective software interface itself is part of the metrologically significant software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the functions of the metrologically significant software that can be accessed via the protective software interface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the parameters that may be exchanged via the protective software interface are defined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the description of the functions and parameters are conclusive and complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there are software interface instructions for the third party (external) application programmer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Software Sector Discussion: The labs again indicated they had not had a chance to utilize the checklist. The list was reviewed and some minor modifications to the checklist text were incorporated as shown above.

Software Sector Conclusion: Work is ongoing on this item with the intent that it eventually be incorporated as a checklist in Pub 14; again the labs are requested to try utilizing this checklist for any evaluations on software-based electronic devices.

c. Software Maintenance and Reconfiguration

Background: The Software Sector agreed that the two definitions below for update and Traced update were acceptable.

Verified Update: A verified update is the process of installing new software where the security is broken and the device must be re-verified. Checking for authenticity and integrity is the responsibility of the owner/user.

Traced Update: A traced update is the process of installing new software where the software is automatically checked for authenticity and integrity, and the update is recorded in a software update log or audit trail.

The Software Sector also worked towards language proposed for defining the requirements for a Traced Update (currently considered as relevant for Pub 14):
For a Traced Update, an event logger is required. The logger shall be capable of storing a minimum of the 10 most recent updates. An entry shall be generated for each software update.

Use of a Category 3 audit trail is required for the Traced Update. If software update is the only loggable event, then the Category 3 audit trail can be limited to only 10 entries. A log entry representing a software update shall include the software identification of the newly installed version.

Software Sector Conclusions: The general consensus of the group after considering feedback from external interested parties is that a new G-S.9 with explicit requirements [for Metrologically Significant Software] is not necessary (nor likely to be adopted by the Conference) and that this requirement belongs in the Pub 14 lists of sealable parameters rather than in Handbook 44:

The updating of metrologically significant software shall be considered a sealable event.

Additional work is to be done to further develop the proposed text toward inclusion in Pub 14.

Grain Analyzer Sector Discussion: At its August 2009 meeting the GA Sector questioned the need for a definition of “Traced Update”. The traced update was initially intended to cover cases in Europe where the National Body controls a network of devices and wants to update all the devices simultaneously from a central location. Denmark and France do this with NIR Grain Analyzers. Even though individual states may still require that a device updated via a “Traced Update” must be “returned to service” by a registered serviceperson before it can be used, the Sector may want to consider adopting “Traced Update” requirements for all Category 3 Grain Analyzers. The device is still subject to later inspection by state Weights and Measures personnel. By designing to the requirements for “traced update”, states might be encouraged to allow devices updated to those requirements to be returned to service without requiring a visit by a registered serviceperson.

Logic flow charts illustrating “traced update” and “verified” update are shown on the following page.
Traced Update (5.2.6.3)

1. Normal operating mode
2. Request for update?
   - NO
   - YES Loading of updated files (Note 1)
3. Is integrity valid?
   - NO Discard loaded files, keep old version active or become inoperable
   - YES Is authenticity valid?
4. YES Installation and activation of updated files (Note 1)
5. Record information about update to audit trail
6. Restart

Verified Update (5.2.6.2)

1. Normal operating mode
2. Request for update?
   - NO
   - YES Loading of updated files (Note 2)
3. Installation and activation of updated files (Note 2)
4. (Subsequent) verification by a person at place (See 5.2.6)
5. Is verification successful?
   - NO
   - YES Apply verification mark
6. Restart

Software Update Procedure – from OIML D 31:2008 (E)
Notes:

(1) In the case of a Traced Update updating is separated into two steps: “loading” and installing/activating”. This implies that the software is temporarily stored after loading without being activated because it must be possible to discard the loaded software and revert to the old version, if the checks fail.

(2) In the case of a Verified Update, the software may also be loaded and temporarily stored before installation but depending on the technical solution loading and installation may also be accomplished in one step.

(3) Here, only failure of the verification due to the software update is considered. Failure due to other reasons does not require re-loading and re-installing of the software, symbolized by the NO-branch.

Note: GA Agenda Item 7 was for information only. No action was taken. No comments or recommendations were made


Background: This item was included on the Sector’s agenda to provide a summary of the activities of OIML TC 17/SC 1. In October 2008, the Secretariat of TC 17/SC 1 was jointly allocated to China and the United States. The Co-Secretariats (China and the United States) are working closely with an international work group (IWG) to revise OIML R 59 “Moisture meters for cereal grains and oilseeds.” The 5 CD of OIML R 59, revised to comply with OIML’s Guide Format for OIML Recommendations and to incorporate tests for the recommended disturbances of OIML D 11 General Requirements for Electronic Measuring Instruments, was distributed to the Subcommittee in February 2009.

Comments: Ms. Diane Lee, NIST/WMD, reported that comments on the 5 CD of OIML R 59 have been received by 10 countries, including the United States. Ms. Lee is working on a draft 6 CD based on those comments. It will reflect the U.S. recommendation to remove the Sand & Dust test (one of the disturbance tests of OIML D 11) on the basis that the sand and dust concentration specified for that test far exceeds the concentrations encountered by GMMs in normal use. The equipment diagrams of 5 CD will be replaced by generic block diagrams and, at the request of Japan, a block diagram will be added for a resistance type GMM.

A meeting of TC 17/SC 1 to review the draft 6 CD will be held in Orlando, Florida following the CIML meeting. Ms. Lee noted that, in addition to herself, TC 17/SC 1 meetings are usually attended by Dr. Pierce, Ms. Brenner, and Ms. Cassie Eigenmann. She will arrange a conference call to go over the draft 6 CD before the changes are made permanent for discussion at the meeting.

Mr. Richard Cantrill, AOCS, recommended that TC 17/SC 1 become aware of the work that ISO Food Group Technical Committees, TC 34/SC 2 – Oil Seeds, and TC 34/SC 4 – Cereals and Pulses, have done that relates to the use of moisture meters.

Editor’s Note: The related Standards are:

ISO 7700-1:2008 -- Checking the performance of moisture meters in use
   -- Part 1: Moisture meters for cereals
ISO/DIS 7700-2 -- Checking the performance of moisture meters in use
   -- Part 2: Moisture meters for oilseeds
(ISO/DIS 7700-2 is a Draft International Standard. When approved, it will replace ISO 7700-2:1987.)

Editor’s Note: At the September 28 - 29, 2010, TC 17/SC 1 meeting in Orlando, Florida, the participants reviewed a preliminary copy of OIML R 59 CD and comments to R 59 CD. Changes to R 59 6 CD will include the changes that were agreed to at the September 2010 meeting.
9. **Report on OIML TC 17/SC 8 “Protein Measuring Instruments for Cereal Grain and Oil Seeds”**

**Background:** This item was included on the Sector’s agenda to provide a summary of the activities of OIML TC 17/SC 8. A new subcommittee was formed to study the issues and write a working draft document “Protein Measuring Instruments for Cereal Grain and Oil Seeds.” Australia is the Secretariat for this new subcommittee. A TC 17/SC 8 meeting was hosted by NIST in September 2007 to discuss the 2 CD. Discussions on 2 CD dealt mostly with maximum permissible errors (MPEs) and harmonization of the TC 17/SC 8 Recommendation for protein with the TC 17/SC 1 Recommendation for moisture. The secretariat distributed a 2 CD N6 of the document in February 2010. Comments were due in May 2010.

**Discussion/Comments:** Ms. Lee, NIST/WMD, reported that 2 CD N6 reflects major changes to harmonize with R 59-5 CD. A meeting of TC 17/SC 8 will be held September 27-28, 2010, in Orlando, Florida to address the comments to 2 CD N6.

Dr. Pierce noted that there is still resistance to accepting the U.S. recommendation that two instruments be submitted for type evaluation. He asked those who had been with the Sector from the early days, to explain what had led the Sector to decide that type evaluation would require two instruments as opposed to one or three. At least two Sector members remembered the reasoning: It is easy to make one instrument. The problem is to make two that read alike. The Sector originally considered three instruments but that was too expensive. Three would have been ideal, because if one fails during testing, you usually have two that agree with each other, so you know immediately which one is wrong.

GIPSA has seen numerous instances in NTEP testing where one test instrument passes a test and the second instrument does not (for the NTEP Power Supply test, since 1994, in 24% of the tests one instrument failed while the other passed; in 3% of the tests both instruments failed). The failures appear not to be random events. They appear to identify legitimate deficiencies.

*Editor’s Note:* At the September 27-28, 2010, TC 17/SC 8 meeting comments to the Recommendation on Protein Measuring Instruments for Cereal Grain and Oil Seeds 2 CD were reviewed. It was agreed at this meeting that two instruments will be submitted for OIML type approval. This agreed change and other changes from the September 2010 meeting will be included in 3 CD.

10. **Standardization of Grain Moisture Meters – Traceability of GMMs used in Meter to Like-Meter testing.**

**Background:** This item is a carry-over from the Sector’s August 2009 meeting (Item 9.5). For NTEP meters HB 44 permits meter to like-meter testing using “Properly Standardized Reference Meters”. Mr. Karl Cunningham, Illinois Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, asked for a definition of a “Properly Standardized Reference Meter”. He also wanted to know what criteria these “Reference Meters” must meet.

He was referred to Section VI. **Standardization of Instruments** in the GMM chapter of Pub 14 that shows the relationship and maximum permissible errors between the NTEP Lab meters, Manufacturer’s Laboratory Standard Meters, Manufacturer’s Production Master Meter, and “As Shipped” meters. It was explained that a properly standardized reference meter for a Service Company should have the same traceability to the NTEP Lab Meters as the Manufacturer’s Production Master Meter has.

**Section VI. Standardization of Instruments** in the GMM chapter of Pub 14 requires manufacturers to demonstrate that their methods for standardizing units in production result in as “shipped” units which agree with the corresponding NTEP Laboratory units (path D in the accompanying Figure 1) within ±0.3 x the HB 44 acceptance tolerance. They are also required to show that the mean moisture difference between Manufacturer's Laboratory Standard Meters and the corresponding NTEP Laboratory Meters (path A in the accompanying Figure 1) does not exceed ±0.2 x the HB 44 acceptance tolerance.
During a discussion of potential agenda items for the Sector’s 2010 meeting, Dr. Pierce, FGIS/GIPSA, representing the NTEP Participating Laboratory for Grain Analyzers, suggested that the Sector may want to explore how the NTEP program (or lab) can assist manufacturers who are asked to demonstrate traceability of field instruments back to the air oven reference method. The NTEP Lab has manufacturers’ instruments in the NTEP Phase II program that are directly traceable to the GIPSA air oven reference lab. There is, however, no documentation demonstrating alignment of NTEP instruments with manufacturers’ master instruments or field instruments. The NTEP lab is not involved in this process. There are no criteria for the grain types, the number of analyses, or the number of samples that should be used in side-by-side testing.

The Sector co-Technical Advisor suggested that a first step in acquiring documentation demonstrating alignment of NTEP instruments with manufacturers’ master instruments or field instruments would be adding language to the NTEP Application to require submission of the documentation required by §VI., and adding a check list of the Required Documentation to the existing GMM Checklist of Pub 14.

A related issue mentioned by Dr. Pierce was authorized repair facilities providing states with documentation that their “standard” instrument is traceable to the air oven reference. He was of the opinion that this was not directly an NTEP lab issue, but believed that manufacturers should be able to trace these standards back to NTEP Phase II instruments.

Proposed: Amend the Application Instructions Section of the Grain Analyzer NTEP Application as shown below:

- **Submit details of procedures and tests for maintaining reference meters and standardizing units in production to meet the requirements of §IV of the GMM Chapter of Pub 14.**

And insert the following Check List of Required Documentation just in front of the **General** section [but still under the “Checklist” Heading in the Table of Contents] of the GMM chapter of Pub 14:

![Figure 1](image-url)
Discussion: Dr. Pierce suggested that there are two issues being presented here:

1. For Phase I, a clarification of what information is being obtained at the time of initial type evaluation. At present, manufacturers are asked for a general description of the process (not all the details) they intend to use to standardize instruments.

2. For Phase II, whether there should be some kind of semi-official document signed by the NTEP laboratory attesting to the fact that a side-by-side test (or by grain sample exchange) demonstrated that manufacturer “A’s” working masters line up with the two calibration instruments at the NTEP laboratory within 0.x % moisture. This might be issued each year (or every two years) as part of the Phase II program. If the laboratory provided this service, Dr. Pierce noted that they would have to specify the test procedure that had been used including the grain type(s), number and sequence of drops, etc.

When manufacturers were asked if this addition to Phase II was needed, Mr. Tim Kaeding, Perten Instruments, responded that, with the exception of an NTEP lab issued certificate, what Dr. Pierce described was very much like what they were already doing. Perten takes their working standard instruments to the NTEP lab, performs a side-by-side comparison with the NTEP instruments using corn, soybeans, and wheat, analyzes the data, determines that they match statistically, and prepares a report showing the traceability of their working standards to the corresponding NTEP instruments lab. This has apparently satisfied the Illinois Department of Agriculture’s request for traceability.

Ms. Eigenmann outlined the procedures used by DICKEY-john. Twice a year the base parameters of three laboratory standard meters, which never leave DICKEY-john’s temperature and humidity controlled laboratory, are measured to ensure that they are aligned. Records are kept of every test, adjustment, etc. performed on the lab standards. Three working standards, used on the production line, are taken to the laboratory once a month for a check against the three lab standards. In side-by-side comparisons of six drops of grain per unit, the average moistures must agree within 0.08. Similarly, three Product Service working standards are brought to the laboratory twice a year to be checked against the lab standards using the same criteria as the production line standards. Additionally, two transfer standards are checked against the lab standards. These are held to a tighter tolerance than 0.08. The transfer standards are hand carried to Kansas City, Missouri, and checked against all the like instruments at FGIS (including the two NTEP lab units). Anyone requiring a document showing comparative data between a GAC 2100 and the lab standards can bring their GAC 2100 to DICKEY-john’s moisture lab for checking.
With no one from Steinlite to report, Dr. Pierce recalled that Steinlite typically picked up their two NTEP lab meters and took them back to Atchison, Kansas, for testing.

With manufacturers already running comparative tests and providing the requested documentation, it didn’t appear that the NTEP laboratory needed to be involved. Manufacturers were not in agreement that the testing be standardized. Some questioned whether the testing could be standardized because it would be technology dependent. Others saw some merit in standardizing comparative tests using specified grains and procedures (number and sequence of drops, etc.) and of standardized reports. No action was taken on this issue.

Some Sector members objected to the proposed amendments to the Grain Analyzer NTEP Application and the GMM checklist. Manufacturers were of the opinion that they were already providing the information required in the Section VI of the GMM Chapter of NCWM Pub 14. Further, Section IV relates more to Phase II than to Phase I. No Phase I testing is required by Section IV, so the addition of check-list items was not required.

**Decided:** The Sector decided that the proposal to amend the Application Instructions Section of the Grain Analyzer NTEP Application and to insert a Checklist of Required Documentation in the Checklist of the GMM chapter of Pub 14 was a Phase II issue not a Phase I issue. The Proposal will be withdrawn.

### 11. Air-Oven Collaborative Study – Analysis of results

**Background:** At its August 2008 meeting, the Sector agreed that a collaborative study was long overdue. It was also noted that such a study addresses the measurement traceability requirements of *ISO 17025 General requirements for the competence of testing and calibration laboratories*. Mr. Cunningham subsequently agreed that the State of Illinois Moisture Meter Laboratory would serve as the “pivot” laboratory. At the August 2009 meeting, he reported that 14 laboratories participated in this study. Participants included: USDA/GIPSA (as reference laboratory), Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, South Carolina, Wisconsin (corn only), Wyoming, and DICKEY-john. Perten was sent samples but didn’t return results. With the exception of one or two outliers, results were fairly good. Histograms showing the distribution of Lab error (Participant Lab result minus Reference Lab result) for each of the grain samples were presented (see August 2009 Sector Meeting Summary).

**Discussion:** Dr. Charles Hurburgh, Iowa State University, was unable to attend the Sector meeting. He forwarded a statistical analysis of the results, and supplied the following comments:

The results were quite good. Two outliers were removed. Outliers are detected by calculating the SD with the questionable point removed. If the questionable point is 3 SDs out after being removed it is considered an outlier. When you don’t have many data points this prevents a bad data point from making the SD very large and protecting itself, so to speak. Standard deviations across labs of less than 0.20 percentage points are good. The sample handling and prep were clearly done well.

Overall, the individual Labs did well; there were only two cases where the lab average was significantly different from the average of the labs but none of the information values (temperatures, humidity, etc. seemed to correlate with errors. No attempt was made to analyze the information data; it would be helpful in the future to require all the temperatures in one type of units (C or F) and all the times in minutes and so on.

The chart below shows the deviation from the average. Most are within 0.2 % of the Average.
**Discussion:** Several Sector members asked why the lab difference from average was averaged across two samples of each grain type. They wondered what the chart would look like if results were shown for individual samples. The concern was that in some cases the averaging over two samples might lead to significantly understating errors.

Several weeks after the Sector’s meeting, the Co-Technical Advisor prepared a chart showing the lab difference from average for each individual sample (see chart following). One of the most dramatic differences showed up in Lab 3’s results for soybeans. Averaged over two samples, the difference was only $-0.04$, while individual differences from individual averages were $0.19$ for SB08 and $-0.27$ for SB03. A similar phenomenon was observed in Lab 6’s results for corn. Averaged over two samples, the difference was only $-0.02$ while the individual differences were $-0.23$ for Corn12 and $0.19$ for Corn29.
12. Proficiency Testing

[Submitted by Ms. Amy L. Johnson, SQT Program Manager, American Oil Chemists Society (AOCS)]

**Background:** At the Sector’s August 2009 Meeting Dr. Hurburgh, Iowa State University, urged the representatives from the American Oil Chemists Society (AOCS) to prepare a proposal so that the collaborative (air-oven) study could be conducted on an on-going basis rather than on an ad hoc basis. He cautioned that the proposal would have to include corn and wheat as well as soybeans.

Several years ago the AOCS in conjunction with the United Soybean Board (USB) established the AOCS-USB Soybean Quality Traits Analytical Standards Program (SQT), a system of verification of analytical measurements. This program provided the infrastructure for the generation of reliable analytical results at all levels of the soybean industry by establishing industry-wide acceptance of analytical methods and protocols and their implementation under internationally accepted quality management standards. The AOCS has proposed the addition of an air-oven/grain moisture meter proficiency testing (PT) series to their Analytical Standards Program (ASP). Proficiency testing is a continuous program, samples are sent out in regular intervals (e.g., 2 to 4 times/year). Participants are able to join on a continuous basis.

**Discussion:** Ms. Johnson, AOCS, proposed an air-oven/GMM proficiency testing series designed specifically to address the needs of GMM manufacturers and states maintaining a grain moisture laboratory. AOCS would administer the program, oversee distribution of samples, compile results, perform statistical analysis of results, and distribute a report to participants. AOCS does not collect the samples. This is subcontracted to suitable providers. AOCS does not have laboratories. Since GIPSA/FGIS is a certified laboratory already participating in the SQT program, GIPSA air-oven results could be reported for comparison if desired.

The Sector decided that a program that included distribution of two samples each of corn, wheat (preferably of one type), and soybeans per year would be adequate. A final report by mid July is desirable, so sample distribution would have to take place in early spring (March – April). The annual cost of such a program was estimated to be in the range of $80 to $100 per participant.
Sector chair, Ms. Eigenmann, asked Ms. Johnson to put together a formal proposal based on the above criteria. Ms. Johnson will contact all those on the GA Sector mailing list as well as those on the NIST/WMD list of state W&M officials interested in grain moisture with details of the proposed program.

13. Time and Place for Next Meeting

The next meeting is tentatively planned for Wednesday, August 24 and Thursday, August 25, 2011, at the Chase Suites by Woodfin at Kansas City International Airport in Kansas City, Missouri. Sector members are asked to hold these days open pending determination of agenda items, exact meeting times, and meeting duration. Final meeting details will be announced by early June 2010.

If you would like to submit an agenda item for the 2011 meeting, please contact any of the following persons by June 1, 2011:

- Mr. Jim Truex, NTEP Administrator at jim.truex@ncwm.net
- Ms. G. Diane Lee, NIST Technical Advisor, at diane.lee@nist.gov
- Mr. Jack Barber, Co-Technical Advisor, at barber.jw@comcast.net

14. Future Direction of Moisture Measurement Technology

The Grain Inspection Advisory Committee (GIAC) meets twice annually to advise GIPSA on the programs and services it delivers under the U.S. Grain Standards Act. Recommendations by the committee help GIPSA to better meet the needs of its customers who operate in a dynamic and changing marketplace.

The committee is comprised of 15 members and 15 alternate members appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture. Committee members and alternates represent all segments of the grain industry. They include grain producers, processors, merchandisers, handlers, exporters, consumers, grain inspection agencies, and scientists. Committee members serve without compensation, but are reimbursed for travel expenses.

Meetings typically follow a format of a day of presentations followed by a morning during which committee members digest the material they have heard to produce resolutions addressing the significant issues. The resolutions are subjected to a vote by the committee. Those that are adopted are taken seriously by GIPSA’s administer in considering how to respond to these resolutions.

On June 16, 2010, Dr. Funk, GIPSA/FGIS Associate Director for Methods Development, made a presentation to the GIAC entitled, “Future Direction of Moisture Measurement Technology.” He repeated this presentation on August 26, 2010, at the NTETC Grain Analyzer Sector meeting in Kansas City, Missouri. Following is a digest of Dr. Funk’s presentation.

In November of 2009 the GIAC approved the following resolution:

The Advisory Committee recommends that GIPSA evaluate the current moisture calibration for high moisture rough rice for accuracy when compared to the air oven reference.

The FGIS Annual Calibration Study was already doing this. Each year approximately 1100 samples are collected to evaluate and enhance official moisture meter accuracy. For 15 major grains, all NTEP-certified models are tested with the same set of grain samples. Grain calibrations are optimized to the most recent three years of data with consideration of abnormal conditions. To minimize “hunting”, calibrations are changed only if certain error thresholds are exceeded, but there are problems. The long gain rough rice accuracy for 2007 - 2009 crops shows a large scatter above 20 % moisture and for 2009 a very strange pocket of data between 14 % and 17 % moisture with significant negative bias. Similar problems appeared in corn. The crop year 2009 was a year of extremely low quality and low test weights. Many samples were well under 50 pounds per bushel.

The conclusions reached from the 2009 crop calibration study revealed:
• Year-to-year differences contribute significant instability to GMM calibrations.
• Rice is one of the more difficult grains for accurate moisture measurements.
• Growing conditions in 2009 resulted in some grain samples not being measured accurately by current official moisture meters.
• It is impossible to significantly improve the official meter’s accuracy for the “problem” samples without degrading overall accuracy.

So GIPSA’s response to the GIAC Resolution was that FGIS is continually evaluating and trying to improve moisture calibrations. FGIS has expert knowledge of moisture measurement technologies and the current official technology is doing the best that it can. If the market needs better performance, FGIS needs to select and implement different technology. If FGIS is going to implement different moisture technology, it needs to happen soon.

New technology offers improved accuracy, better stability over time and crop conditions, easier calibration development, reduced support cost, and provides competition (it can be duplicated by any manufacturer).

It needs to happen soon to avoid being caught in a technology “rut” for decades as with the older dielectric instruments which required look-up tables. It needs to happen soon to be able to utilize current FGIS expertise before it is depleted by retirements. It needs to happen soon to create and implement a sustainable official moisture measurement system based on up-to-date technology.

New technology will be selected using the following steps:
• Develop and prioritize criteria for the selection.
• Develop a procurement document.
• Solicit proposals.
• Evaluate proposals and submitted performance data.
• Conduct further testing of the proposed technologies.
• Announce selection and establish contract(s).
• Develop and validate official standardization processes.
• Procure new moisture measurement instruments.
• Conduct a pilot test to validate system readiness for the transition.
• Implement the switch to the new instrumentation.

The criteria used to select a new official meter will most likely include the following criteria used in 1997:
• Best value to the government
  o Procurement costs
  o Support costs
• NTEP certification
• Accuracy over moisture and temperature ranges
• Repeatability
• Suitability for all grain type officially tested
• Suitability for automation
• Consistency among units
  o Transferability of calibrations
  o Precision of standardization
  o Ease of standardization
  o Stability over time

Other possible criteria might include:
• Speed of test
• Multiple-factor capability
• Accuracy of tests on abnormal samples such as “green soybeans”
• Availability of multiple sources for equivalent technology
• Prior commercial acceptance of technology

Dr. Funk offered the following time line for fully implementing a new technology:
• October 2010 – Agency decision on whether to pursue new moisture technology
• June 2011 – Develop criteria and procurement documents and issue solicitation for proposals
• February 2012 – Announce decision
• May 2013 – Implement new technology for initial grains
• September 2013 and later – Implement new technology for other grains.

Following his presentation to the GIAC, the following resolution was adopted:

The Advisory Committee recommends that GIPSA/FGIS move forward with expediency to determine the feasibility and selection of a new federal standard moisture measurement technology and/or instrument(s) for use in the official system.

Following Dr. Funk’s presentation to the GA Sector, he conducted a question and answer session. Some of the questions and Dr. Funk’s responses are shown below:

**Question:** Will the new technology require any changes to existing HB 44 or Pub 14 requirements or procedures?

**Answer:** Basically, no … and yes. We have choices of technology, but the technologies out there are already represented in the NTEP program. We’re not going to select a technology that hasn’t proven itself. If
it’s not out there as a commercial technology that’s proven itself in the marketplace, we’re not going to consider it. In the NTEP program we have two technologies represented: dielectric RF methods and NIR methods. Right now we have two instruments that represent the technology I’m talking about that have been NTEP certified. That was the trigger point at which we could consider adopting a new technology. That is not to say that is the technology we are going to select, but until we had proven that we could have two instruments using that technology we were not ready to even consider adopting a new technology.

**Question:** You’ve answered the “Yes” half of the previous question. Could you please address the “No”?

**Answer:** The answer is, to the extent that industry migrates to this technology hopefully we will get to the point where we don’t need a Phase II evaluation. When all USDA instruments are using the same calibrations, and they are not being yanked around year by year, we may be looking to a more technical evaluation of instruments where we just evaluate the ability of an instrument to accurately measure density corrected dielectric constants. If the new technology is widely accepted we may get to a point in 5 to 10 years where the NTEP looks significantly different from what it is now. The current five-year interagency agreement may be the last one.

[Note: Dr. Pierce commented that he believed they were committed to finishing the current five-year agreement.]

**Question:** Do you think this new technology will eliminate a lot of complaints we get about such things as the “rebound” effect in soybeans?

**Answer:** It will help. It’s not going to eliminate green soybeans effect nor will it eliminate test weight sensitivity in corn, but it will reduce the effects. It has about half the effect as the current official meter. I’m not saying this is the best technology possible. The goal is not to come up with the best possible technology. The goal here is to come up with a simple, well documented, public technology that anybody can use successfully and get equivalent results. We do want it to be accurate, and it is accurate. We want it to be stable, and it is much more stable. Is it perfect? Absolutely not! There is a microwave technology out there that is probably very good, but it also requires an exclusive license. It is not open for anyone to use royalty free. The goal here is to have something that is royalty free by anybody that wants to make it.
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Meeting Summary

Carry-over Items:

1. Table of Key Characteristics of Products in Product Families for Meters Table

Source: Carryover Item from 2006-2009 Measuring Sector Agendas

Purpose: For the past several years, the Measuring Sector (Sector) has been working to revise the “Product Family” tables in National Conference on Weights and Measures (NCWM) Publication 14 (Pub 14) with the goal of clarifying the tests to be conducted and products to be referenced on a National Type Evaluation Program (NTEP) Certificate of Conformance (CC) based on NTEP testing. This item is included on the agenda to allow for review of a recent revision to the tables and to determine what additional work is needed.

Background: Since 2006, the Sector has been working to develop and agree upon revisions to the NTEP Technical Policy on Product Families for Meters. The Sector has considered multiple iterations of the table and various formats with the goal of providing NTEP laboratories and manufacturers with guidelines that will help to improve the clarity and consistency of application of product family criteria. Please see the 2006-2009 Measuring Sector Meeting Summaries for details.

At the end of its 2009 meeting, the Sector reached the following conclusion:

Of three alternative versions of the table presented to the Sector during its 2009 meeting, the approach in which technologies are addressed in separate tables was viewed as a more appropriate approach. [Note: An example of this format is illustrated in Appendix C to the Sector’s 2009 Meeting Summary in a draft table prepared by Mr. Henry Opperman, W&M Consulting, and further revised and reformatted by Mr. Michael Keilty, Endress and Hauser.]

Mr. Keilty agreed to continue to shepherd this work, coordinating with those who have expressed interest in this issue and welcoming additional input from other Sector members. Work was to be done to integrate the separated technology proposal with that presented at the 2009 Sector meeting. This newly edited version will be circulated among Sector members and discussed with those members who are able to attend the January 2010 NCWM Interim Meeting. Based on any comments received, additional revisions may be made prior to presenting a revised draft to the Sector at the 2010 Sector meeting. The goal is to develop a version for inclusion in Pub 14 in which it is easy to understand which tests and procedures must be followed for type evaluation testing.

Since the 2009 Sector meeting, Mr. Keilty has continued working with members of the Sector to refine the table. Mr. Keilty reported receiving suggestions at the January 2010 NCWM Interim Meeting to:

(1) align the products in each horizontal row; and
(2) insert a column for conductivity to the magnetic flow meter column.

Based on suggestions received and discussions at the last Sector meeting, Mr. Keilty made revisions to the proposed table as outlined in Appendix A to the agenda. The revisions also include the addition of product conductivity characteristics based on data received from Mr. Dmitri Karimov, Liquid Controls. Mr. Keilty noted that the first
request to align product rows could not be easily accomplished and would significantly increase the page length of the table to make it unwieldy.

**Discussion:** The Sector was asked to review and comment on proposed changes to NTEP Technical Policy Section C, as shown in Appendix A to the Sector’s 2010 Agenda. Sector Chairman, Mr. Keilty, indicated that there has been a lot of work done since the Sector’s 2009 meeting. He proposed that the Sector consider adoption of the table included in the appendix and asked the Sector members present for comment on the latest draft.

Mr. Marc Buttler, Emerson Process Management - Micro Motion Inc., commented that the terminology used in the text of Policy C and the associated table may need to be examined more closely to ensure consistent use and understanding. In particular, it would be helpful to have a clear definition for family and category and to have a clear understanding of the difference between subgroups, families, and other terms. Such clarifications would help to ensure uniform understanding and application of the technical policy in the future. As an example of how the criteria could be misinterpreted, Mr. Buttler noted that the Test B definition refers to the CC covering “all products and categories” listed in the table within the specific gravity range listed. Interpreted literally, this would mean that even product categories included under Test D would be included on the CC and he believes this interpretation is incorrect. Further, under the mass flow meter column, Test B refers to families and there is a similar reference under Test D. These tests are intended to provide coverage within families of products, which are still not completely defined. Likewise, if you consider Test F under magnetic flow meters, there is a reference to families. However, there is no definition or reference to that term elsewhere. Modifying the table by adding definitions for the terminology would help clarify the use of the table. Mr. Buttler noted that, if we can agree on the meaning of the terms, the text in the table and associated policy could be modified rather easily.

Some questions regarding specific values referenced for given products were raised and some modifications were made to the table during the course of the discussions. Additionally, Mr. Dennis Beattie, Measurement Canada (MC), noted that there are some products for which no values are listed. Mr. Keilty acknowledged that, for some products, we don’t have the data available, just like we don’t have information for conductivity in some instances. The Sector acknowledged that values for specific product characteristics can be added as that information becomes available and noted that additional products can also be added over time. However, this is a start in providing the NTEP laboratories and manufacturers with additional data and guidance in assessing where particular products would fall in the families table.

Mr. Buttler questioned whether it is necessary to specify the type of viscosity being referenced under positive displacement meters. He also noted that it is necessary to consider the product characteristic relative to the metrology of the specific meter type. Mr. Beattie commented that one of Measurement Canada’s engineers preferred the use of the term kinematic throughout the table. He also noted that they normally rate meters in centistokes as a more common term.

Sector Technical Advisor, Ms. Tina Butcher, National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Weights and Measures Division (WMD), suggested that consideration be given to using the same format for all meter technologies to make it easier to see the demarcation between product categories. For example, mass flow meters and magnetic flow meters include columns with “typical products,” “specific gravity,” and “product category” whereas positive displacement meters and turbine meters list “product category” in rows at various points in the table. Recognizing that page space might be an issue, consideration might be given to using the same format for all technologies.

At the conclusion of discussions on this item during the first day of the meeting, the Sector agreed that additional work might be done to the table, including assessing the use of the term kinematic (viscosity) throughout the document, considering deleting the term kinematic at the heading of the turbine meter column, and/or modifying footnote 5 to clarify its application. Mr. Buttler and Mr. Keilty volunteered to work on the additional changes to the table and present them for review by the Sector the following day.

One the second day of the 2010 Sector meeting, there was additional discussion of the table as modified overnight by Mr. Keilty and Mr. Buttler. The Sector further modified the table during the meeting and more discussion ensued. The Sector also agreed to modify the denominator of the equation defining kinematic viscosity as shown in the Appendix A to this meeting summary. Mr. Keilty summarized how the table was developed over the past couple
of years, noting that the content extracted from the original tables has not changed much in the sense that ranges of products can be covered with a specific test(s); however, we have identified groupings with regard to specific products. He proposed that the Sector at least come to agreement on the reformatted structure as shown in the table with revisions during the meeting and asked the Sector for a vote.

Decision: After making revisions to the version of the table distributed with the Sector’s agenda and lengthy discussion, the Sector agreed by a formal vote to recommend inclusion of the revised table (shown in Appendix A to this meeting summary) in the next edition of Pub 14. The results of the vote are as follows:

Yes: 13
No: 1
Abstain: 0

The Sector also agreed to move the heated products to a single section in the final version of the table.

NTEP Director, Mr. Jim Truex noted that the table does not address brine used as a de-icing solution for roads. The NTEP Measuring Labs discussed this during their meeting on October 1, 2010 and agreed that this product is to be considered in the category of clear liquid fertilizers. However, Mr. Truex noted that the product won’t be added to the table at this time, pending NTEP obtaining additional information about the specific characteristics of the product.

2. Testing Meters Made of Different Materials

Source: California NTEP Laboratory – Carryover from 2007-2009 Measuring Sector Agendas

Purpose: For the past several years, the Sector has been discussing the issue of how to assess variations in meter materials in conjunction with type evaluation testing. A key point of contention in these discussions revolves around changes to meter materials from that used in the meter evaluated during type evaluation. The NTEP laboratories would like more definitive criteria to help them assess when changes to meter materials are metrologically significant to the extent that additional testing should be required in order for the new material to be covered on the NTEP CC. Meter manufacturers generally believe that changes in materials should be left to the judgment of the manufacturer since they must ensure continued meter performance for their customers and, as the designers of the meter, they well understand and take into consideration product and environmental applications and adjust materials accordingly to meet the needs of the end application. The issue is further complicated by the lack of definitive criteria that would guide the NTEP laboratories in making a decision about which meter materials should be selected for testing to be representative of a range of materials.

Background: In 2006, the Sector considered the following proposal for adding a new section to the Technical Policy Section of Publication 14 to address meters made of different materials within the same family.

U. Meters Made of Different Materials within the Same Family

When multiple meters made of different materials within a meter family are submitted for evaluation all meters will be tested with at least one product from each product family to be included on the CC and at least one meter will be tested with the range of products required in the Product Family Table for the meter type (e.g., positive displacement, turbine, mass meter, etc.) submitted for evaluation.

The Sector was unable to reach an agreement at its 2006 meeting and again reviewed this issue at its 2007, 2008, and 2009 meetings, but was again unable to reach a consensus on the item.

After discussing this issue at great length at its 2009 meeting, the Sector concluded that it would not reach a resolution on this issue by continuing to discuss it at the Sector meetings alone. Consequently, the Sector agreed to form a work group (WG), the “Metrologically Significant Characteristics of Technologies WG,” to arrive at a uniform, appropriate, and clear approach for initial, subsequent, and additional tests for the performance of a device technology. The following people agreed to serve on the WG:
The WG was tasked to:

1. Create a short list of features/options affecting the metrological characteristics of each device technology by December 15, 2009;
2. Prepare a 1-page analysis that briefly documents and provides the rationale for including each metrological characteristic in the list (referenced in task 1) by December 15, 2009;
3. Review the first draft list of “significant constituents” and condense that list to only relevant characteristics; and
4. Prepare a final list for a WG meeting during the NCWM Interim Meeting by January 15, 2010.

Discussion: At the 2010 Sector Meeting, Sector Chairman, Mr. Keilty, Endress and Hauser, asked for an update from any members of the WG on the progress of this work. Mr. Rodney Cooper, Tuthill Transfer Systems, noted that when he was asked to serve as chairman of this WG, he worked for Actaris; he has since switched jobs and, with the need to focus on making this transition, he has been unable to devote time to this activity. While he would be willing to try to continue in the capacity of chair and possibly prepare something by the next Sector meeting, he does not believe his current assignments would allow him adequate time to work on the project. He also noted that his co-chair, Mr. Rich Miller, FMC, has indicated that he, too, is very busy.

Mr. Keilty noted that he had previously proposed that the Sector drop this item; however, the Sector indicated that the item is important. He asked for input on the idea of dropping the item from the Sector’s agenda. Mr. Cooper indicated that, while he believes the issue is still an important one, he believes that the revised product families table may address many of the concerns.

Mr. Jerry Butler, NC NTEP Laboratory, indicated that the key issue was that manufacturers were responsible enough to monitor the materials on the meters. He also noted that a 20-day permanence test really isn’t adequate to assess the effect of a given material on meter performance in a given application. He suggested that, perhaps, a large part of the burden needs to be placed on the device purchaser to ensure that the meter purchased is suitable for the application. Mr. Dan Reiswig, CA NTEP Laboratory indicated that he had raised this issue noting inconsistencies with alloys and materials and the way in which they were listed on CCs. He suggested that the laboratories could continue to work with individual manufacturers and, if an alloy is to be referenced on a CC, then testing needs to be conducted with that alloy.

Sector Technical Advisor, Ms. Butcher, NIST WMD, commented that a key part of this issue was the question of what was and was not covered by a given CC; one manufacturer might test a particular material and list it on the CC, but if another manufacturer doesn’t list the material, there was a question of whether or not that material was covered. Without additional guidance in the NTEP policy, laboratories have to rely on individual manufacturers to provide guidance on the “worst case” scenarios to select for testing. Manufacturers who aren’t candid may be permitted to get by with doing less stringent testing, putting those manufacturers who are more forthright at a competitive disadvantage. NTEP Director, Mr. Truex, added that NTEP does not want to have to test with lots of
different materials; however, if an inspector calls and asks about a material that isn’t listed on the CC, then he would have to indicate that the meter made with that material is not covered. Mr. Truex indicated that he has serious reservations on hearing that there are still unresolved concerns on this issue (including that the material of the meter sold for a given application makes a metrologically significant difference), but that manufacturers will take care of this themselves. While most manufacturers such as those present at the table will probably do this reliably, NTEP deals with many, many companies and some companies are not so responsible. He further commented that in discussing this issue, the Sector is asking manufacturers to identify the “worst case” scenarios, otherwise NTEP will have to do it for them.

Mr. Keilty observed that the Sector’s discussion on this issue seems to have evolved from the original discussion of meter materials into one of metrologically significant characteristics that are of importance to specific meter technologies. Mr. Wade Mattar, Invensys/Foxboro, commented that there is a fundamental difference between the metrologically significant features for a particular technology. Others noted that for some technologies, certain materials and products are metrologically significant and for other technologies those same variables make no difference.

Ms. Butcher reiterated that the NTEP Laboratories want to do the fewest tests possible and give manufacturers the most coverage based on those tests. Without guidelines, each laboratory will interpret this differently. The laboratories are asking for guidance on what is and is not metrologically significant with respect to meter materials to help ensure that they are making consistent decisions regarding what can or cannot be covered on a CC and so that it is clear to the inspector in the field whether or not a given meter is covered by a CC.

Mr. Cooper questioned whether we will come back to the Sector meeting next year and once again argue about the issue without resolution if we head in the direction of defining metrologically significant criteria for materials. He indicated he does not see any benefit to doing this. Mr. Buttler, Emerson Process Management - Micro Motion Inc., questioned why we are singling out materials. He noted that there are many other aspects of design that could be considered metrologically significant. If it is likely that material will make a significant difference then, it may be worthwhile to pursue development of this issue; if not, then it’s not worthwhile to continue with this issue. Mr. Truex commented that, if there is data that the manufacturer can provide that would prove to NTEP that a particular attribute is not metrologically significant, then he believes this would be acceptable.

After further discussion on this issue without any apparent resolution, Mr. Keilty proposed dropping the item from the Sector’s agenda.

**Decision:** After extended discussion of this issue once again, the Sector appeared no closer to resolving the concerns regarding meter materials than it had in the past. Since no one could suggest or support any course of action that would enable the Sector to reach a resolution, the Sector agreed to drop this item from its agenda.

### 3. Add Testing Criteria to NTEP Policy U “Evaluating electronic indicators submitted separate from a measuring element”

**Source:** California NTEP Lab

**Background:** At its 2007 meeting, the Sector heard that Section U. of the NTEP Policy in Pub 14 allows for testing an indicator separate from a measuring element. However, specific test criteria had not been developed for this section. The Sector heard a recommendation to develop and add specific criteria for testing an indicator separate from a measuring element for this section. From 2007 to 2009, the CA NTEP laboratory worked to develop a checklist, but had received limited input on the drafts. At the 2009 Sector meeting, Mr. Reiswig, CA Division of Measurement Standards (DMS), provided an update to the Sector on progress to develop criteria for separate electronic indicators. He reported that the draft checklist provided to the Sector follows the general format of Pub 14 and the main test procedures are at the end of the document. Questions were raised about the readiness of the checklist for inclusion in NCWM Pub 14. The Sector agreed that some additional work is needed and suggested that a small WG be formed to further develop the checklist. One additional question to consider is whether or not the checklist would apply to indicators across all technologies and applications.
At the conclusion of its 2009 meeting, the Sector agreed to the following.

- A small WG comprised of the following individuals is to further review and discuss the checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actaris</td>
<td>Mr. Rodney Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuthill Transfer Systems</td>
<td>Mr. Maurice Forkert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid Controls</td>
<td>Mr. Dmitri Karimov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMC Technologies</td>
<td>Mr. Rich Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veeder-Root</td>
<td>Mr. Dave Rajala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIST WMD</td>
<td>Mr. Ralph Richter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA DMS</td>
<td>Mr. Dan Reiswig</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The WG will provide input to Mr. Reiswig at least one month prior to the March 2010 NTEP Laboratory Meeting. Mr. Reiswig will provide this input to the Measuring Laboratories. One additional question the WG will consider is whether or not the checklist would apply to indicators across all technologies and in all applications.

- Following the March 2010 NTEP Laboratory meeting, Mr. Reiswig will modify the draft checklist based on feedback from the NTEP Measuring Labs.

- Mr. Reiswig will provide a copy of the draft checklist to the NIST Technical Advisor by the end of August 2010 to allow for distribution to the Sector one month prior to the fall 2010 Sector Meeting.

- Following the fall 2010 Sector meeting, Mr. Reiswig will work with Sector Technical Advisor Ms. Butcher, NIST WMD, to update the draft checklist to reflect comments from the Sector.

- Assuming the checklist requires no further modification or review by the Sector, Ms. Butcher will submit the checklist to the NTEP Committee to consider for inclusion in the 2011 version of NCWM Pub 14.

**Discussion:** The Sector heard an update from Mr. Reiswig who indicated that he distributed the checklist with a request for comments; however, none were received other than from the other NTEP Laboratories. There were some members of the WG who indicated that they might discuss it at the January 2010 NCWM Interim Meeting, but he did not hear back from anyone regarding whether or not such a meeting took place. He has consulted with Measurement Canada and attempted to incorporate ideas from their procedures into the draft checklist. Mr. Reiswig believes the checklist still needs a lot of work before it is finalized. He noted that the key motivation for developing such a checklist is to help ensure that all of the NTEP Laboratories are conducting evaluations of indicators consistently. Thus, he felt that it is still important to pursue development of the checklist, but noted that he particularly needs help from industry.

NTEP Director, Mr. Truex, recognized the amount of work that Mr. Reiswig has put into the development of the draft and pointed out the importance of having industry review the checklist to determine if it is ready to be finalized.

Mr. Cooper, Tuthill Transfer Systems, who was the only other individual (besides Mr. Reiswig) from the original WG present, pointed out that when he initially agreed to participate on the WG he worked for Actaris, a company that made digital indicators, where he could have consulted with engineers responsible for designing indicators. Though Mr. Cooper would like to be able to help, he has changed companies and he doesn’t feel he has the individual expertise needed to assist.

During discussions of this item on the first day of the Sector meeting, the Sector concluded that it would be helpful for Mr. Reiswig and the other NTEP Laboratory representatives to identify a list of specific areas where work is
needed in order to finalize the checklist. This list would also assist the Sector in identifying people in the industry who would best be able to assist as subject matter experts in those areas.

On the second day of the Sector’s meeting, Mr. Reiswig presented a list of five areas of the checklist that need specific attention and review. The Sector reviewed these items and added some additional comments.

Decision: The Sector agreed that Mr. Reiswig, CA Division of Measurement Standards (DMS), should continue developing the Checklist for Electronic Indicators Submitted Separate from a Measuring Element.

The Sector identified the following points that require further development and input from industry in order to finalize the checklist.

1. It is recommended to run a minimum of 10,000 pulses when verifying pulses captured. Should we consider specifying a minimum number of pulses/division? For example, 100 pulses = 1 indication division or 10 pulses = 1 indication division.

2. Would a limit of “plus or minus 1 pulse in 10,000” be an appropriate tolerance?

3. Test with low, medium, and high temperature inputs to the indicator to verify a temperature compensation function, if available. Test with a minimum of two API Gravity values through the temperature test ranges tested. Identify and specify reference tables.

4. Develop a test to verify multi point calibration using pulses. Include frequencies for switchover of linearizations. For example, specify a certain number of pulses per liters.

5. The tests listed above are based on an indicator receiving pulses from a measuring element. Therefore, it would seem logical to also develop tests for an indicator to verify other process signal output from other elements in the system that is sent to indicators such as frequencies at 4-20 milliamps, or other process signals.

The Sector also identified the following people who might be able to provide additional input and asked that Mr. Reiswig also contact them to request their assistance.

| Possible Industry Contacts to Assist in Review of Draft Electronic Indicators Checklist |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Organization                  | Name                             |
| Contrec                       | Mr. Jef Gaskil                   |
| Dresser Wayne                 | Mr. Phil Katselnik               |
| Emerson (Daniel)              | Mr. Andrew MacAllister           |
| Emerson Process Management - Micro Motion Inc., | Mr. Marc Buttler              |
| Endress and Hauser            | Mr. Michael Keilty               |
| FMC                            | Mr. Rich Miller                  |
| Gilbarco                      | Mr. Gordon Johnson               |
| Invensys                      | Mr. Wade Mattar                 |
| Itron                         | Mr. Mike McGhee                  |
| Kraus Global                  | Mr. Gord Wedel                   |
| Liquid Controls               | Mr. Dmitri Karimov               |
| Measurement Canada            | Mr. Dennis Beattie               |
| Midwest Meter                 | Mr. Rick Salvesen                |
| Toptech                       | Mr. Jim Xander                   |
| VeederRoot                    | Mr. Kevin Jensen                 |
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The Sector agreed that Mr. Reiswig should forward the latest draft of the checklist along with the five areas requiring specific attention to the people listed in the original WG and to the list of possible contacts above. Mr. Reiswig should ask for their assistance in reviewing and commenting on the checklist, noting that input on the five areas would be of particular help.

4. Policy C - Product Family Table – Change in Upper Limit for Oxygenated Blends – Note 4

Source: Mr. Gordon Johnson, Gilbarco, Inc.

Background: At its 2009 meeting, the Sector was asked to review Pub 14, Technical Policy C. Product families for meters, Note 4 in the product families table, which currently states:

"Gasoline includes oxygenated fuel blends with up to 15% oxygenate"

The Sector was asked to consider changing the oxygenated fuel blends from 15% to 25%. The new note 4 would read:

"Gasoline includes oxygenated fuel blends with up to 25% oxygenate"

At that time, Mr. Johnson, Gilbarco, Inc., advised the Sector that UL recently issued UL87A Edition 5, which details the tests and specifications needed to list dispensers for Ethanol and Ethanol blends. Mr. Johnson also outlined the history of this issue, noting that UL has made several significant changes to UL 87 (to include an alternative fuel standard) as a result of a push by EPA to coincide with a federal mandate to increase the levels of ethanol in vehicle fuel. He proposed changing the current reference in Pub 14 from 15% standard to 25%, noting that he has no data to illustrate the impact of the change. He indicated that both Gilbarco and Wayne are completing tests for E85, but no tests have been conducted for 25%. He also noted that there was not enough ethanol in production and he anticipated a gradual increase in the amount of 25% fuels. He expressed concerns that weights and measures officials will tag devices out of service if equipment is used to deliver product above 15% without a corresponding increase on the application section of NTEP CCs.

At the 2009 Sector meeting, the NTEP Measuring Laboratories agreed additional data is needed to support increasing the limit. After discussing this issue at that meeting, the Sector was unable to reach agreement on the proposed change to policy C. The Sector expressed its appreciation to Mr. Johnson for information on changes to the fuel standard and agreed that this should remain an information item on the Sector’s agenda. See the 2009 Measuring Sector summary for details.

Discussion: As agreed to at the last Sector meeting, this item was included on the agenda to allow Sector members to provide any updates they might have on this issue.

At its 2010 meeting, the Sector discussed the history of this item and the meaning of the clause in Note 4 of the Product Family table. Summarizing from last year’s discussion, Technical Advisor, Ms. Butcher, NIST WMD, noted that the footnote does not preclude someone from submitting and testing for product with up to 25% oxygenates; the footnote would simply not permit the higher (than 15%) percentages to be covered without additional testing. When the Sector discussed this item last year, there was no available data on 25% oxygenate blends and that, because there was no UL approval on the units used to dispense the higher blends, it was not possible to conduct testing to demonstrate compliance. Several NTEP Lab representatives expressed the desire for additional data before extending the range to cover a larger percentage of oxygenate. Consequently, there was not support for making the proposed modification to Note 4 of the table.

Decision: The Sector did not support increasing the upper limit referenced in Note 4 of Policy C - Product Family Table from 15% to 25% and decided to drop the item from its agenda. The Sector notes that the submitter can resubmit the item; however, the NTEP Laboratories have advised that they would want to see data supporting the proposed change before they would consider expanding the upper limit. In the meantime, this decision does not preclude a company from submitting a meter for use with a higher
percentage of oxygenate; it simply means that additional testing would be required in order to cover the higher percentage.

5. Electronic Linearization for Positive Displacement Meters

Source: Mr. Maurice Forkert, Tuthill Transfer Systems

Background: At its 2009 meeting, the Sector was asked to add criteria into Pub 14 for electronic linearization for positive displacement meters. Mr. Forkert suggested considering, if permissible, Measurement Canada’s “Approval Procedure for Linearization Functions Incorporated in Measuring Systems” (Document Number VO-AP-037) as the basis for the criteria. Mr. Forkert noted that there apparently is no regulation for electronic linearization internal to a positive displacement meter. He also suggested some additional revisions to the Measurement Canada document (see 2009 Sector Summary for details).

In discussing this issue, reference was made to Pub 14 Policy G. Range of Data Points, which addresses the use of “multi-point calibration.” This policy specifies that “multi-point calibration” must be “blind and integral” which, according to the policy, is intended to mean it is programmed during the manufacture of the device and is not accessible in the field. The policy also prohibits multi-point calibration from being used as a means to establish the minimum turn down ratios of 5:1 or 10:1; however, it does allow the feature to be used to extend the measuring range beyond the minimum ratios. In discussing how this policy is to be applied in conjunction with Mr. Forkert’s example, there were questions regarding the use of the term “blind and integral.” Several members noted that a better definition of the term is needed in order to ensure consistent understanding of the term and its use in the application of requirements.

Mr. Forkert explained that his company had introduced a meter into the market with a linearization board and was advised by the weights and measures authority that there were no regulations to address that component. He recommended including the feature as allowable in the register and to not require a separate evaluation of this component. He explained that the part could not be removed or modified without breaking a seal. He also requested that the electronic linearization feature be considered as part of the meter just as the pulse output component is looked at as part of the meter.

Mr. Oppermann, Weights and Measures Consulting, commented that industry wants to be able to use electronic linearization as a means to improve the performance of a meter and noted that this has been done for years with scales and load cells. Provided the performance is within acceptable levels, it should not matter how this is accomplished.

Mr. Forkert noted a distinction in his scenario is that they want the electronic linearization feature to be considered a part of the meter, much as one would consider other components of the device. Understanding that the electronic linearization feature is used to individually program each meter at the factory, some NTEP laboratory representatives expressed concerns about the possibility of interchanging parts in the field and the impact on meter performance and questioned what means would be provided to deter field replacements. Some manufacturers noted that this should be viewed no differently than replacing other metrologically significant parts in the field; for example, meters are not shipped back to the factory for replacement of a rotor and replacement of the electronic linearization board should be viewed in the same light. It is up to the user/installer to ensure continued compliance with accuracy and other requirements.

There were also questions during the discussion regarding whether or not the electronic linearization feature should be listed as a feature on the CC. Some pointed out that other device types use metrologically significant components that can be replaced in the field when problems are encountered. Repairs, adjustments, or changes to these features are generally obvious or detectable. Mr. Steve Patoray, Consultants on Certification, gave several examples of weighing device applications such as load cells (which are not repairable in the field), junction boxes (which can be protected by a security seal), and electronic boards (which are completely replaced when they fail).

The Sector discussed developing language to clarify the application of Policy G., but was unable to reach a conclusion at the meeting. While they did not identify a specific alternative, there was general agreement that the electronic linearization that is programmed during the manufacture of a device should not be readily accessible in
the field without breaking an approved seal. The NTEP Labs expressed concern regarding the unique nature of the programming and how interchange of the e-linearization board would be controlled in the field to prevent the facilitation of fraud. The Sector agreed that this issue requires additional work that would best be accomplished by a small WG.

At its 2009 meeting, the Sector agreed that a small WG comprised of the following individuals be established to further develop this issue for the Sector’s review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultants on Certification</td>
<td>Mr. Steve Patoray</td>
<td>Work Group Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuthill Transfer Systems</td>
<td>Mr. Maurice Forkert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland NTEP Laboratory</td>
<td>Mr. Mike Frailer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuthill Transfer Systems</td>
<td>Mr. Mike Guidry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid Controls Corporation</td>
<td>Mr. Dmitri Karimov</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMC</td>
<td>Mr. Rich Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meggitt/Whittaker Controls</td>
<td>Mr. Ken Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The WG was tasked with the following:

1) Clarify Policy G. Range of Data Points by bouncing ideas off of Mr. Mike Frailer for:
   a. Defining what is meant by multi-point calibration shall be “blind and integral” to the measuring element.
   b. Clarifying what is meant by multi-point calibration shall be not "accessible" in the field.
2) Develop language in Policy G. Range of Data Points to allow for uniform interpretation and application of the criteria by the United States and Canadian stakeholders by February 2010, including
   a. Where necessary to clarify the intent of the criteria:
      i. Modify language
      ii. Define terminology
3) Review and Discuss Modifications to Policy G. at the March 2010 NTEP Measuring Lab Meeting

Discussion: The Sector asked for an update of the WG’s progress.

Mr. Frailer, MD NTEP Laboratory, indicated that he has had no contact from any members of the WG on this issue.

Mr. Cooper, Tuthill Transfer Systems, reported that he visited with Mr. Maurice Forkert, Tuthill Transfer Systems, on this issue. He noted that they are attempting to clarify that it is necessary to break a seal to access meter adjustments, and he proposed the following alternative language for the Sector to consider:

“Multi-point calibrations shall be blind and integral (programmed during manufacture and not accessible in the field without breaking a physical seal).”

Mr. Butler, NC NTEP Laboratory, questioned whether the term “blind and integral” is referring to something that is part of the meter that cannot be replaced or if it is referring to something else. Other Sector members asked for clarification on various aspects of how Tuthill’s meter works.

Mr. Cooper clarified that, in Tuthill’s instance, the meter does all calculations within the meter; it does not rely on a separate device such as a controller for those adjustments. He noted that their meter has a programmable chip that is inside of the mother board of the device. The programmable chip is accessible by removing a cover and several screws. By using the program in the chip, it is possible to get a very flat curve, thus, taking a really good meter and making it even more accurate. Their product uses the same mother board for all meters across the product lines. The small, programmable chip has different pulses per gallon for different meters. If the mother board on a given
meter were damaged, they would send a new mother board with a new chip with the exact same profile as the original one for that individual meter. The mother board has all of the electronics in the meter; no matter which indicator is used with the meter, it will always provide the same output.

Technical Advisor, Ms. Butcher, NIST WMD, asked for clarification that the meter cannot be adjusted at multiple points along its calibration curve in the field. You can break a seal and change the chip; you can replace the chip with a chip with another profile, but you can’t selectively calibrate the meter at different points. This is unlike a meter that is interfaced with an indicator in which you can adjust the meter factor at different flow rates along its curve. Mr. Cooper indicated that this is correct.

Mr. Reiswig, California NTEP Laboratory, expressed concern over the possibility of being able to interchange a reprogrammed mother board in the field. The Sector discussed at length how the term “blind and integral” is being used in Tuthill’s scenario as well as in other instances and also discussed whether or not these various approaches would facilitate fraud. The Sector also discussed the importance of a meter being able to meet the basic 5:1 (or 10:1 in the case of a mass flow meter) turndown ratio without being calibrated at multiple points. The Sector also discussed whether or not there is justification for prohibiting multiple point calibration from being used to meet the minimum turn down ratio; however, there was not a clear consensus on this point. Some members also cited concerns about various types of adjustments being used to compensate for worn or poorly designed meters.

Mr. Beattie, Measurement Canada, commented that it appears we are giving two different features the same name. He associates the term “multipoint calibration” with something that is accessible in a register and that can be programmed in the field. He suggested that the Sector consider using the following International Organization of Legal Metrology (OIML) definition for “correction device:”

**OIML Definition for Correction Device:**

“Device connected to or incorporated in the meter for automatically correcting the measured quantity at the time of measurement, by taking into account the flowrate and/or the characteristics of the liquid to be measured (viscosity, temperature, pressure, etc.) and the pre-established calibration curves.

The characteristics of the liquid shall either be measured using associated measuring devices, or stored in the memory of the instrument.”

Mr. Cooper commented that OIML refers to the meter as a complete system. He suggested that the OIML terminology might make this issue overly complex and that we should strive to keep this issue simple. Mr. Cooper also noted that the multi-point calibration is not a correction device in this instance. If you can program this inside the meter and, after it leaves the factory you can’t change it, then it is “blind and integral to the meter.” We want to simply say that you can’t change it after it leaves the factory.

Following discussions on this issue the first day of the meeting, Mr. Cooper drafted alternative language for the Sector to consider. After further discussions on the issue, the Sector finally agreed on recommended changes to Policy G.

**Decision:** The Sector agreed to recommend that the second paragraph of Technical Policy G be replaced with the following:

A measuring element may use factory-established linearization curves to establish the minimum flow range (5:1, 10:1, or as required) providing the linearization programming is installed during manufacturing and the programming cannot be altered after leaving the manufacturer.

Auxiliary equipment (e.g., indicator or register) with programmable multi-point calibration that alters the output signal from the measuring element to extend the flow range of the system beyond the measuring element’s required minimum flow range may be used and the auxiliary device’s multi-point calibration will be noted on the CC and must be marked on the meter.
New Items:

6. **Code Reference S.1.6.1. Indication of Delivery – Reference to Indicator Reset**

**Source:** Mr. Dmitri Karimov, Liquid Controls

**Background:** The Sector was asked to consider modifying Pub 14 LMD Checklist Code Reference S.1.6.1. Indication of Delivery (see page LMD-29) by adding a “Note” to Step 5, as follows:

**Code Reference: S.1.6.1. Indication of Delivery**

7.25. Retail devices shall automatically show their initial zero condition and amount delivered up to the nominal capacity of the device. For electronic devices manufactured on or after January 1, 2006…to ensure delivery starts at zero.

7.26 For electronic devices manufactured prior to January 1, 2006….need not be indicated.

**Test Method Steps:**
Step 1: Set unit price on dispenser.
Step 5: Activate the dispenser and let the system reset to 8s, blanks then 0s.

**Note:** Display segment check instead of “8s and blanks” is allowed.

Putting aside the fact that there is no code reference that specifies an indicator must initially display “8’s and blanks,” this requirement might be applicable only to the old-style cathode tube-based displays. This requirement is not applicable to LED displays, which perform a segment check of the display.

In addition to the above reference to the NTEP LMD checklist, the submitter provided the following reference to OIML R 117-1, Page 55:

From R 117-1 (page 55)

a) For fuel dispensers:
   • displaying all the elements (“eights” test if appropriate); and
   • blanking all the elements (“blank” test), and displaying “zeros” for quantity and, if applicable, displaying the valid unit price and “zeros” for price, just before a new delivery starts. Each step of the sequence shall last at least 0.5 second.

b) For all other interruptible and non-interruptible measuring systems, the test sequence shall be as described under (a) (above) or any other automatic test cycle which indicates all possible states for each element of the display.

**Discussion:** Mr. Beattie, Measurement Canada, asked whether or not there is a specific reference to the reset display in NIST Handbook 44 (HB 44). Sector Technical Advisor, Ms. Butcher, NIST WMD, noted that there is not a specific reference in the Liquid-Measuring Devices code; however, there are General Code requirements specifying that a device must be in proper operating condition. Additionally, she noted that this checklist item is addressing a return to zero, not the segments. It might be appropriate to have something specific to address unlit segments. Sector Chairman, Mr. Keilty, Endress and Hauser, and NTEP Director, Mr. Truex, also cited references in the General Code, paragraphs G-S.5.1. Indicating and Recording Elements, General and G-S.6. Marking Operational Controls and Features that could be used to address malfunctioning displays.

The NTEP Measuring Labs reported meeting prior to the Sector meeting and suggested a proposed alternative (outlined in the Decision below) to address the issue. The Sector reviewed the proposed alternative and agreed that it appears to address the concern raised by the submitter.

**Decision:** The Sector agreed to recommend modifying Step 5 as follows to recognize other methods for resetting the indications:
7. Development of Water Meters Checklist

**Source:** Mr. Andre Noel, Neptune Technology Group, Inc.

**Background:** Utility type water meter manufacturers are receiving state requests for a NTEP Certificate of Approval. Utility type water meters under HB 44, Section 3.36. are evaluated under the California Type Evaluation Program (CTEP). Currently there is no NTEP for utility type water meters. The Sector was asked to consider adding a checklist for utility type water meters to Pub 14. Mr. Andre Noel, Neptune Technology Group, distributed (via e-mail) a draft checklist to the Sector Chairman, NTEP Director, and Technical Advisor the night before the Sector meeting; he also offered copies to those interested at the Sector meeting.

**Discussion:** At the Sector meeting, Mr. Noel provided an overview of this item. He noted that he and representatives from other water meter manufacturers have been working quite a bit with CADMS, which does most of the testing of water meters in the United States for those water meters regulated by weights and measures jurisdictions. Presently Certificates are issued under the California Type Evaluation Program and, if a checklist and test procedures were developed for inclusion in Pub 14, then the scope of water meter testing could be expanded to include NTEP testing. Mr. Noel proposed establishing a small WG to work on the development of a checklist and present it to the Sector for consideration.

The Sector was amenable to establishing a WG to work on the development of a checklist. Mr. Beattie, Measurement Canada, asked that Mr. Jim Welsh, Measurement Canada, be included in any mailings and correspondence since MC is currently working on its water meter criteria (Mr. Beattie confirmed this with Mr. Truex via e-mail during the Sector meeting). Sector Technical Advisor, Ms. Butcher, NIST WMD, asked that Mr. Ralph Richter, NIST WMD, be copied on any WG correspondence since he is the U.S. technical point of contact for OIML R49 (Water Meters). NTEP Director, Mr. Truex Truex, noted that this draft should be circulated to as many people in the community as possible.

Mr. Reiswig, CA DMS, advised the Sector that he put together a draft checklist a few years ago and circulated the document. He noted that, in the draft presented to the Sector, Mr. Noel has made some changes to the original document and, for some of the changes CA DMS is not in agreement with the proposed changes. For example, with regard to the number of meters to be tested, CA tests three meters of the same model. This is a bit different from what NTEP does in testing other meter types; however, the testing process is different for water meters in that three meters can be tested at one time on a water meter test bench. Additionally, conducting only nine tests on a water meter still provides an extremely limited data set for a meter that is used so widely in apartment buildings. An additional area of discussion is the flow rates at which the meters are to be tested. Mr. Reiswig noted that CA DMS is in closer agreement to the proposed procedures now than previously and anticipates continued work will allow these differences to be resolved. Mr. Reiswig noted that his comments are reflected using track changes in the document that Mr. Noel has submitted.

Mr. Keilty, Endress and Hauser, questioned the inclusion of criteria for remote communication in the draft checklist and asked whether event counters would be required. Mr. Reiswig explained that the criteria were included because CA anticipates seeing this type of feature on meters in the future. Ms. Juana Williams, NIST WMD, also suggested that the HB 44 Water Meters Code be examined with regard to any proposed audit trail criteria to be sure that the proposed criteria is supported by the code; if not supported, a proposed change to the code might need to be considered. Likewise, the WG might be alert to other proposed changes to the code which would update the code to reflect current technology. Ms. Butcher, suggested that as the group reviews the code and develops the checklist that it examine American Water Works Association standards and consider proposed changes to the code and/or checklist. Manufacturers have criticized the HB 44 Code for divergence from AWWA standards and this might be an opportune time to propose changes to either HB 44 or to AWWA to harmonize standards where appropriate. In some instances differences may make sense since the focus of HB 44 and AWWA are somewhat different; however,
if there are areas where the standards can be better aligned, we should consider taking steps to do so. Additionally, it would be helpful to make the NCWM Specifications and Tolerances (S&T) Committee aware of needed changes to HB 44.

Mr. Keilty asked whether or not the draft checklist might be ready for circulation to the Sector by the 2011 NCWM Interim Meeting, with the ultimate goal of readying the checklist over the next year for publishing in the 2012 edition of NCWM Pub 14. Mr. Noel and Mr. Reiswig indicated that this could be accomplished.

Decision: The Sector agreed to establish a WG to further develop the draft checklist presented to the Sector at its October 2010 meeting. The WG consists of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Meters Checklist Development Work Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Andre Noel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dan Reiswig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jim Welsh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Noel will forward the draft checklist to other companies such as those who hold CA type approval certificates to ensure that it gets wide distribution. Mr. Beattie, MC, will contact Mr. Welsh, MC, and confirm that it is acceptable for Mr. Noel to forward the document to Mr. Welsh for input from MC.

In developing the checklist, the group is asked to:

1. Identify areas in HB 44 Section 3.36 Water Meters Code where changes might be appropriate to update the criteria to reflect current technology and practices. For example, more specific audit trail criteria may need to be added to the Water Meters Code.
2. Forward any proposed changes to HB 44 to the NCWM S&T Committee via the established NCWM process by preparing and submitting NCWM Form 15 to the regional weights and measures associations and NTETC Measuring Sector.
3. Consider any differences between AWWA standards and NIST HB 44 and consider recommendations for aligning the two documents where that makes sense.
4. Copy the Measuring Sector Chairman, Mr. Keilty and Technical Advisor, Ms. Butcher on communications to the group.
5. Copy Mr. Richter, NIST WMD, who is the U.S. point of contact for OIML R49 with any proposed drafts.
6. Distribute a subsequent draft for review by the Sector by the January 2011 NCWM Interim Meeting.
7. Distribute a final draft for review by the Sector at least a month prior to the fall 2011 Sector meeting.

This item will be maintained as a Carryover Item on the Sector’s agenda.


Source: NIST Weights & Measures Division

Background: At the July 2010 NCWM Annual Meeting, NCWM members voted to add a tentative code for commercial hydrogen gas-measuring devices to HB 44. Since the majority of states require NTEP CCs for commercial weighing and measuring devices, offering NTEP CCs for these devices would facilitate the acceptance of these devices in the commercial marketplace and assist states in their assessment of these devices.
The Sector was asked to discuss and consider the following:

(1) Propose that the NTEP Committee consider expanding the scope of NTEP evaluations to include hydrogen gas-measuring devices.

(2) In anticipation that the NTEP Committee will support this proposal, establish a small working group tasked with the development of a checklist for hydrogen gas-measuring devices.

**Discussion:** NTEP Director Mr. Truex noted the importance of developing a checklist for hydrogen gas-measuring devices in a timely manner. Now that a tentative code has been adopted, manufacturers of this equipment will begin seeking type evaluation on these devices. Particularly since this equipment is already in use, Mr. Truex commented that we are already behind in the development of a checklist. He cited a similar situation with Multiple Dimension Measuring Devices and noted the importance of involving all parties affected by the code, including manufacturers, users, regulatory officials, and NTEP laboratories. Mr. Truex also noted that, since alternative fuels are highly visible, some jurisdictions may get political pressure to accept devices in advance of finalizing the HB 44 code and NTEP checklists. Mr. Truex also cited the paragraph included in the application section of the tentative code which states that NTEP will only accept for type evaluation those devices which comply with the provisions of the code.

Sector Chairman, Mr. Keilty, Endress and Hauser, suggested establishing a small WG of Sector members to develop a draft for consideration by the Sector. Technical Advisor, Ms. Butcher, NIST WMD, recommended including Sector members who have served on the U.S. National working group (USNWG) for hydrogen since they would be familiar with the criteria included in the draft code and represent many of the interest groups noted by Mr. Truex. Sector members present were amenable to the idea of establishing a WG to work on a draft checklist.

Several members noted that CA DMS had developed a draft checklist in 2008 and NIST WMD provided comments on the checklist; however, the work had been set aside pending further development of the HB 44 code. Now that the code has been adopted as a tentative code, this checklist could be resurrected and updated to reflect the provisions of the tentative code. Ms. Butcher noted that the USNWG is continuing to work on developing recommended test procedures for hydrogen gas-measuring devices; she suggested that work could move ahead in developing the portions of the checklist other than the test procedures section, including updating the draft developed by CA DMS to the current tentative code requirements; once the USNWG has completed its work on recommended test procedures, the WG would have information that could be used as the basis for developing more detailed type evaluation test procedures. Ms. Williams, NIST WMD and Technical Advisor to the USNWG on Hydrogen Measuring Devices, advised the Sector that last year Ms. Diane Lee, NIST WMD, developed and circulated a draft EPO and associated Excel spreadsheet for use in testing hydrogen-gas measuring devices; while the draft is not final, this information might also be of use to the WG. She also noted that the USNWG members provide links to the broader hydrogen measurement community and many, including herself, are involved in international standards development such as OIML R139 (which addresses compressed gas motor fuels) and OIML R81 (which addresses liquid hydrogen). Ms. Butcher commented the test procedure developed by NIST WMD is based on other NIST examination procedure outlines (EPOs) for gravimetric testing, and NIST has questions about the uncertainties associated with gravimetric testing for these devices given the relatively small net quantities involved and the availability of appropriate equipment in field environments. Consequently, the USNWG is actively exploring other alternatives to find the best solution for field testing. Mr. Reiswig, CA DMS, noted that CA DMS has contracted with the CA Energy Commission for the development of field test equipment and procedures and, while there have been delays as a result of the contracting process, he anticipates this work will provide input for the WG to use.

**Decision:** The Sector established a small WG to develop a draft Pub 14 Hydrogen Measuring Devices Checklist for the Sector to consider at its next meeting. The WG consists of the following:
The WG will begin by reviewing a draft checklist prepared in 2008 by Mr. Norman Ingram, CA Division of Measurement Standards. Ms. Williams will contact Mr. Ingram to ask that he send a copy of the checklist to the members of this WG to ensure that everyone is working on the same version of the checklist. The WG will:

1. Update the checklist to correspond to the 2010 version of the Hydrogen Gas-Measuring Devices Code (adopted by the NCWM in July 2010);
2. Review the checklist and provide comments to Sub Group Chairman, Mr. Keilty;
3. Schedule web conference call(s) to discuss needed changes; and
4. Finalize the draft and present it to the Sector for consideration at its next meeting.

The Sector also acknowledged that the USNWG on hydrogen is presently exploring multiple options for performance tests of hydrogen measuring instruments. Once the USNWG makes its final recommendations for field test procedures for these devices, the WG will proceed to work on the development of test procedures for type evaluation. Ms. Williams will also update the USNWG on the Sector’s efforts so that they are aware of the work.

9. Next Meeting

The Sector was asked to develop a proposed date and location for the next meeting. The Sector discussed whether to recommend that the meeting continue to be held in conjunction with the Southern Weights and Measures Association (SWMA) meeting or to recommend that it be held with another regional association or as a separate meeting. The Sector discussed some alternate ideas; however, there were no strong feelings to either maintain the current arrangements or to consider an alternative.

Recommendation: The Sector agreed to recommend that its next meeting be held in conjunction with the SWMA once again. However, because the Sector must be mindful of meeting publication deadlines for the NCWM Interim Meeting Agenda, the Sector noted that this decision may need to be revisited once a date and location has been selected for the next SWMA meeting.

Additional Items as Time Allows:

The Measuring Sector was asked to provide input to the NCWM S&T Committee on the following measuring-related issues on its agenda if time permitted during the Sector Meeting. In the interest of brevity, the narrative for each item is abbreviated to the extent practical. Full descriptions of the items can be found in the S&T Committee’s list of carryover items and its 2009 Interim and Final Reports.

10. General Code, Section 1.10, Paragraph G-S.1. Marking (Software) (S&T Carryover Agenda Item)

Sources: 2009 and 2010 NTETC Software Sector Agenda Items and 2010 S&T Item 310-3 G-S.1. Identification. (Software)
NTEP 2011 Interim Agenda
Appendix B – NTETC Measuring Sector

See also:
   2010 Software Sector summary:
      (http://ncwm.net/sites/default/files/meetings/software/2010/10_Software_Summary.pdf)

   2010 Interim Report of the S&T Committee:
      (http://ts.nist.gov/WeightsAndMeasures/Publications/10-Pub16.cfm)

**Background:** Weights and Measures inspectors need a means to determine whether equipment discovered in the field has been evaluated by NTEP. If so, the inspector needs to know at a minimum the CC number. From this starting point, other required information can be ascertained. Currently HB 44 Paragraph G-S.1. includes three options for marking of the CC:

1. Permanent marking
2. Continuous display
3. Recall using a special operation

Manufacturers of Purpose-built (known internationally as “Type P”) equipment often choose permanent marking. For Type Approved software executing on a Universal computer (internationally known as “Type U”), permanent marking is not very practical. The second option of continuous display is also undesirable as the permanent display because it occupies valuable operator/customer screen area. As a result most makers of software for Type U equipment opt for the special recall option. Unfortunately, Paragraph G-S.1. is somewhat vague about the specific means of recall. According to the Software Sector, software makers can be quite creative, leaving the field inspector guesswork, frustration, and wasted time. If the inspector complains about how difficult it is to locate required information, the maker notes that the recall procedure is documented in the CC. But this is precisely the information that cannot be retrieved in the field, leading to a circular argument.

Compounding the problem, makers of sophisticated built-for-purpose equipment would also like the same flexibility currently afforded to makers of software for Type U equipment. The recall method is not available to the Type P maker today.

In response to comments heard during the 2010 NCWM Interim meeting, the Software Sector (at its March 2010 meeting) proposed changes to the language shown in the NCWM S&T Committee’s 2010 Interim Report Item 310-3. These revisions removed the differentiation between types of software (Type P and Type U) while still managing to achieve the Sector’s objective of simplifying the process of locating required marking information. That revised proposal can be seen in the 2010 Software Sector Summary and is not included here for the sake of brevity.

In summary, for S&T Item 310-3 the Software Sector now suggests amending the current item under the S&T Committee’s consideration. The Software Sector also initiated discussion on two new concepts, which may eventually result in additional recommendations to amend G-S.1. It should be noted that these new ideas are in the developmental stage, and are included here by request of the Software Sector, since its members would appreciate comments from the regions and other interested parties.

First, the Software Sector sees merit to requiring some connection between the software identifier (i.e., version/revision) and the software itself. The proposal was as follows (with the expectation that examples of acceptable means of implementing such a link would be included in Pub 14).

Add a new sub-subparagraph (3) to G-S.1. (d) to read as follows:

“The version or revision identifier shall be directly and inseparably linked to the software itself. The version or revision identifier may consist of more than one part, but at least one part shall be dedicated to the metrologically significant software.”

Second, it seems that at each meeting of the Software Sector, the state officials reiterate the problems they have in the field when attempting to locate the basic information required when the CC number is marked via the rather general current HB 44 requirement of ‘accessible through an easily recognizable menu, and if necessary a sub-
menu’ [G-S.1.1. (b)(3)]. The states have indicated that this is too vague and field inspectors often cannot find the certificate number on unfamiliar devices.

The Software Sector would like feedback on the proposal to specify a limited number of menu items/icons for accessing the CC number (it is not hard-marked or continuously displayed) in proposed G-S.1.1. subparagraph (b) as follows:

(b) The CC Number shall be:

(3) accessible through one or, at most, two levels of access.

(i) For menu-based systems, “Metrology”, “System Identification”, or “Help”.

(ii) For systems using icons, a metrology symbol (“M” or “SI”), or a help symbol (“?,” “I,” or an “i” within a magnifying glass).

Note that this is not suggested to be the final list of valid options for locating the point of access for the CC number; the Software Sector would like to have feedback specifically on other acceptable menu text/icon images that identify how to access the CC number on software-based systems. The Software Sector agreed that a reasonable list of acceptable options is not as much of an issue as the fact that the list is finite. The sector realizes this may affect manufacturers so feedback from associate members and representative groups is also appreciated.

A Possible Compromise Solution:

The Software Sector is asking if the restrictions for marking Type P equipment (which allow the same options as for Type U) be relaxed in exchange for limiting the number of optional means for recalling the CC number when a recall sequence is required.

The proposed limitations on CC recall sequence are:

1. Recall shall not require more than two levels of operations. The CC recall method (trigger, command, etc.) may be present either on the main screen or one sub-menu/sub-screen down.

2. A limited number of menu text strings or icon shape choices are permitted for both the CC recall methods and the optional top level. (There is actually some validity to the argument that this requirement is currently already implied by the term ‘readily identifiable menu’ currently used in HB 44 paragraph G-S.1. to describe the allowable means of recalling the CC.)

Of course, to affect this compromise a finite list of acceptable menu text/button icon options will have to be agreed upon and documented. Note that the states didn’t express much concern about the actual number of allowable selections included (although they agreed it should be reasonable); they are more concerned that there is simply a finite list of options which the NTEP labs can reference to validate the device’s implementation and that using that same list inspectors can locate the required information in the field.

Thus, the Software Sector developed the following brief initial list of ideas of allowable/acceptable menu text and icons as a starting point for developing the complete list of acceptable options for the readily identifiable menu. Comments and additional suggestions for entries in the list are welcome.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permitted examples</th>
<th>Menu Text</th>
<th>Permitted Icon shape examples</th>
<th>Essential characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Information        | ![i-icon](image) | ![i-icon](image) | Top level menu text or icon  
• Icon text is a lower case “i” with block serifs  
• Text color may be light or dark but must contrast with the background color  
• Icon may have a circular border  
• Activation of this menu text/icon may invoke a second level menu text/icon that recalls metrology information. |
| Help               | ![?](image)  | ![?](image) | Top level menu text or icon  
• Icon text is a question mark  
• Text color may be light or dark but must contrast with the background color  
• Icon may have a circular border  
• Activation of this menu text/icon may invoke a second level menu text/icon that recalls metrology information. |
| Metrology          | ![M](image) | ![M](image) | Top or second level menu text or icon  
• Icon text is an upper case “M”  
• Text color may be light or dark but must contrast with the background color  
• Icon may have a rectangle or rounded rectangle border  
• If present, the activation of this menu text/icon must recall at a minimum the NTEP CC number. Other metrology information may optionally be displayed. |
| SI                 | ![SI](image) | ![SI](image) | Top or second level menu text or icon  
• Icon text is upper case “SI”  
• Text color may be light or dark but must contrast with the background color  
• Icon may have a rectangle or rounded rectangle border  
• If present, the activation of this menu item/icon must recall at a minimum the NTEP CC number. Other metrology information may optionally be displayed. |
| NTEP Data          | ![NTEP-Logo](image) | ![NTEP-Logo](image) | This one is debatable – what if the certificate is revoked? Does NTEP grant holders of CCs the right to display the logo on the device, or just in documentation? |

Acceptable examples of where the text or icon may be displayed:

1. The “M” icon is available on the home screen. Activation of the icon displays a new screen containing the CC number and some additional metrology information including the software version/revision number(s).
2. The “SI” icon is available on the home screen. Touch screen activation of the icon displays a pop-up containing the CC number. Releasing the icon erases the pop-up.
3. The main screen contains the “i” icon (information). Activating this icon displays a screen of other icons including the “M” icon. Activating the “M” icon displays the NTEP CC.
4. The main menu includes a “Help” selection which in turn contains a “Metrology” selection. Activation of the Metrology selection displays a pop-up screen containing all global metrological approvals, including the NTEP CC number. The user manually dismisses the pop-up screen by pressing the [X] button.
5. The main menu includes an “Info” selection which in turn contains a “SI” selection. Activation of the SI selection displays a pop-up screen containing all global metrological approvals, including the NTEP CC number. The user manually dismisses the pop-up screen by pressing the [OK] button.
Recommendation to the Measuring Sector: This item was included on the Measuring Sector’s agenda as an information item to keep Sector members informed of the progress of this NCWM S&T Issue and to ask for input from Sector members on this issue.

The S&T Committee has been considering changes to G-S.1. to better address identification requirements for metrologically significant software in software-based systems. The Committee has considered multiple proposals under this item from the NTETC Software Sector and the weights and measures community. At the July 2010 NCWM Annual Meeting, the S&T Committee agreed to maintain this as an Information item on its agenda to allow for additional review and input. As noted above, the Software Sector is looking for specific feedback on proposed modifications to paragraph G-S.1. so that it can develop a revised proposal for consideration by the S&T Committee. Should time permit the Measuring Sector to discuss this item, the NCWM S&T Committee and the Software Sector would appreciate the Sector’s input.

Discussion: NTEP Director and past Software Sector Chairman, Mr. Truex, provided a history of how this issue evolved. He noted that there were multiple attempts to address software in not-built-for purpose devices. The Software Sector has attempted to further simplify the identification requirements that apply to software-based systems and has made multiple suggestions that were not accepted. The Sector has taken a step back and is trying to get the point across that the marking requirements are not for the manufacturer, but to assist the inspector in the inspection process and in assessing whether or not a specific device, including software, is covered under an NTEP CC. The Sector realizes that this information is not going to be physically marked on the device and is looking for alternatives in which this information can be provided electronically to inspectors in an easily accessible manner. It will likely be provided on the device’s display screen and there is limited space for this information to be displayed. The SW Sector is looking for input on the general direction it should take in developing/updating HB 44 requirements. If the direction seems reasonable, the SW Sector will further develop the idea; if not, the Sector will consider an alternative direction.

The Sector discussed some of the symbols in the proposed list of icons and discussed differences between built-for-purpose and not-built-for-purpose devices. Some Sector members also acknowledged that sometimes changes to software will affect the metrological functions of the device, even though the change was not intended to have that effect and was supposed to be a “non-metrologically significant” change. Some members, particularly the regulators, supported the idea of a “Weights and Measures” key that would be standardized and, thus, readily recognized by the field official. Mr. Truex acknowledged that the regulatory community has, in his opinion, indicated that the options need to be limited. Mr. Rich Tucker, RL Tucker Consulting LLC, and Mr. Keilty, Endress Hauser Flowtec AG USA, expressed support for labeling the key that would enable display of the required information as “help.”

Decision: The Sector had no additional technical guidance to offer to the S&T Committee on this issue. However, based on comments from Sector members present, the Sector expressed general support for trying to refine the marking requirements and limit the number of options for marking keys that enable the inspector to view the required marking information.


Purpose: The purpose of the proposed changes is to clarify what is considered an effective method of sealing metrological features and what information is required to be indicated and recorded when a device is in a metrological adjustment mode.

Background: For several years, the NCWM S&T Committee has been considering proposed modifications to General Code paragraph G-S.8. that would help to ensure that the paragraph is being consistently interpreted during type evaluation and by the weights and measures community in field applications.
The Committee has heard opposition to making changes to G-S.8. from SMA and the NTETC Weighing Sector. NIST WMD suggested that the Committee consider withdrawing the item and proposing changes to align the NTETC weighing devices checklist with the measuring devices checklists.

The S&T Committee agreed that the current language in paragraph G-S.8. requires that a security seal be broken before a metrological change can be made to a device (or other approved means of security is provided, such as an audit trail). Thus, once a security seal is applied, it should not be possible to make a metrological change to the device without breaking that seal. Since this is the primary philosophy for protecting access to metrological adjustment, the philosophy should be applied consistently to all device types.

The Committee is concerned about a device which could be sealed in a mode that would allow access to calibration or configuration changes without breaking a seal. Since the NTEP tests and procedures are based on interpretations of HB 44, the Committee supports the efforts of the Weighing Sector and is recommending that this item remain informational until Publication 14 type evaluation procedures to verify compliance with G-S.8. provisions for sealing are consistent with the Committee’s interpretation of G-S.8. stated in the previous paragraph.

The NCWM S&T Committee is looking to the Weighing Sector to develop type evaluation criteria consistent with the philosophy stated in the Publication 14 LMD checklist. Thus, no action was asked of the Measuring Sector. This item was included on the Measuring Sector’s agenda as an informational item to keep Sector members informed of the progress of this NCWM S&T issue and to acknowledge that the criteria in the LMD checklist is consistent with the intent of G-S.8.

See the 2008 and 2009 NCWM Annual Reports and the 2010 Interim and Annual Reports for additional background information.

**Discussion:** Sector Chairman, Mr. Keilty, and Sector Technical Advisor and NCWM S&T Committee Technical Advisor, Ms. Butcher, gave an overview of this item and noted that no action was required on the part of the Sector unless the Sector had comments it wishes to share with the S&T Committee.

**Decision:** The Sector had no additional technical guidance to offer to the S&T Committee on this issue.


**Source:** WWMA and SWMA, 2010 Carryover Item 310-4.

**Purpose:** Clarify the intent of the 2001 NCWM position on the application of nonretroactive requirements to devices which have been determined to have been “remanufactured.”

**Item Under Consideration:** Amend HB 44 General Code paragraph G-A.6. Nonretroactive Requirements by amending subparagraphs (a) and (b) as follows:

**G-A.6. Nonretroactive Requirements.** – “Nonretroactive” requirements are enforceable after the effective date for:

(a) devices manufactured and remanufactured within a state after the effective date;

(b) both new and used, and remanufactured devices brought into a state after the effective date; and

(c) devices used in noncommercial applications which are placed into commercial use after the effective date.
Nonretroactive requirements are not enforceable with respect to devices that are in commercial service in the state as of the effective date or to new equipment in the stock of a manufacturer or a dealer in the state as of the effective date.

*Nonretroactive requirements are printed in italic type.*

(Amended 1989 and 201X)

**Background:** NIST WMD received an inquiry from a state Weights and Measures Director regarding whether a nonretroactive paragraph in the LMD Code of HB 44 would apply to a remanufactured device. In researching this inquiry, WMD discovered an unintended gap in the General Code requirements relative to remanufactured equipment.

- Paragraph G-S.1.2. Remanufactured Devices and Remanufactured Main Elements is a nonretroactive requirement for marking a device with the remanufacturer’s information and became enforceable as of January 1, 2002. WMD believes that this paragraph was intended to apply to remanufactured devices and remanufactured main elements that have been placed into commercial service as of the effective date of the requirement, which was January 1, 2002.

- Paragraph G-A.6. Nonretroactive Requirements (which provides the various conditions in which nonretroactive requirements apply) does not include references to “remanufactured devices” or “remanufactured main elements.” Subparagraph (a) (of G-A.6.) references and applies to “manufactured” devices within a state. Appendix D of HB 44 defines a “manufactured” device as any commercial weighing or measuring device shipped as new from the original equipment manufacturer (OEM). Subparagraph (b) could be applied to remanufactured devices that are brought into a state, but could not be applied to those devices installed by a remanufacturer or distributor operating within the state. Subparagraph (c) applies to devices placed into commercial service that had previously been used in noncommercial applications.

If paragraph G-A.6. does not apply to remanufactured devices, then paragraph G-S.1.2. cannot be applied to remanufactured devices as it is currently written. Additional details on this item were included in the Sector’s 2010 Agenda and in the NCWM S&T Committee’s 2010 Interim and Annual Reports.

The S&T Committee is considering a change to paragraph G-A.6. to clarify its application to “remanufactured” equipment. However, the Committee heard suggestions from two regional Weights and Measures associations, industry representatives, and remanufacturers requesting the item be made informational to give the device remanufacturers additional time to evaluate the impact of the proposed amendment to G-A.6.

This item was included on the Sector’s agenda to keep Sector members informed of the issue and allow opportunity for input should time permit.

**Discussion:** Sector Chairman, Mr. Keilty, and Sector and NCWM S&T Committee Technical Advisor, Ms. Butcher, summarized the background information on this item. During discussions of this issue, some Sector members asked about definitions for the difference between “remanufactured” and “repaired.” Ms. Butcher noted that, in proposing this item, NIST WMD is not attempting to redefine these terms or to suggest that the community change how it addresses these devices; the proposal is only attempting to correct a gap in the current HB 44 language. NTEP Director, Mr. Truex, who also served as the Chairman of the NCWM Task Force on Remanufactured Equipment, also noted that the terms were already defined (see HB 44, Appendix D) by that Task Force and guidelines were already adopted by the NCWM to define how the terms apply.

Mr. Doug Long, RDM Electronics, noted that in remanufacturing, companies are not supposed to be changing designs, only bringing equipment back up to its original condition. These changes are more like repairs and eighty percent of these changes are of a cosmetic nature. Mr. Truex pointed out the additional caveat of G-A.6., which notes that if you bring such a device into another state, you would have to make that device like new and it would have to meet current requirements. While that might sound unfair, the requirement is already in HB 44.
**Decision:** The Sector did not have any specific technical guidance to offer on this issue. However, the Sector recognized the need for those affected by the proposed change to study it carefully.

13. **Product Depletion Test Paragraph T.4.** (HB 44 Section 3.31. Vehicle-Tank Meters) *(S&T Item – New Item)*

**Source:** Northeast Weights and Measures Association (NEWMA)

*(NOTE: Measuring Sector member Mr. Karimov, Liquid Controls, requested that this item be included on the Sector’s agenda for discussion.)*

**Purpose:** Modify the VTM code to base the product depletion test tolerances on the meter’s maximum flow rate (a required marking on all meters), rather than the meter size. This will enable more consistent application of the tolerances for older meters, which are not required to be marked with the meter size, and address an unintentional gap which allows an unreasonably large tolerance for smaller meters.

**Background:** The NCWM S&T Committee is considering the following changes to paragraph T.4. The proposed changes would base the tolerances for the product depletion test on the maximum flow rate of the meter rather than the meter size. This item previously appeared on the S&T Committee’s Developing Items agenda and was elevated to a carryover item as a result of discussions at the July 2010 NCWM Annual Meeting. Additional background information can be found in the 2010 Final Report of the S&T Committee.

**Item Under Consideration:** Amend paragraph T.4. as follows:

T.4. Product Depletion Test. – The difference between the test result for any normal test and the product depletion test shall not exceed one-half (0.5 %) percent of the volume delivered in one minute at the maximum flow rate marked on the meter. Tolerances for typical meters are shown in Table T.4. Test drafts shall be of the same size and run at approximately the same flow rate.

[Note: The result of the product depletion test may fall outside of the applicable test tolerance as specified in Table 1. Accuracy Classes and Tolerances for Vehicle-Tank Meters.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meter Size</th>
<th>Maximum Flow Rate</th>
<th>Maintenance and Acceptance Tolerances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to, but not including, 50 mm (2 in)</td>
<td>114 Lpm (30 gpm)</td>
<td>1.70 L (104 in³)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.57 L (0.15 gal) (34.6 in³)¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 50 mm (2 in) up to, but not including, 75 mm (3 in)</td>
<td>225 Lpm (60 gpm)</td>
<td>2.25 L (137 in³)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 L (0.30 gal) (69.3 in³)¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 mm (3 in) or larger</td>
<td>378 Lpm (100 gpm)</td>
<td>3.75 L (220 in³)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9 L (0.5 gal) (115 in³)¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>758 Lpm (200 gpm)</td>
<td>3.8 L (1.0 gal) (231 in³)¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Based on a test volume of at least the amount specified in N.3. Test Drafts.

*(Table Added 2005) (Amended 201X)*
Alternatively, NEWMA proposed the following modifications to paragraph T.4., with larger tolerances for smaller meters.

**T.4. Product Depletion Test.** – The difference between the test result for any normal test and the product depletion test shall not exceed *one-half (0.5 %) percent of the volume delivered in one minute at the maximum flow rate marked on the meter for meters rated higher than 378 Lpm (100 gpm), or six-tenths (0.6 %) percent of the volume delivered in one minute at the maximum flow rate marked on the meter for meters rated 378 Lpm (100 gpm) or lower. Tolerances for typical meters are tolerance shown in Table T.4. Test drafts shall be of the same size and run at approximately the same flow rate.

[Note: The result of the product depletion test may fall outside of the applicable test tolerance as specified in Table 1. Accuracy Classes and Tolerances for Vehicle-Tank Meters.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table T.4.</th>
<th>Tolerances for Typical Vehicle-Tank Meters on Product Depletion Tests, Except Milk Meters Refer to T.4 for meters with flow rates not listed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meter-Size Maximum Flow Rate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Maintenance and Acceptance Tolerances</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to, but not including, 50 mm (2 in) 114 Lpm (30 gpm)</td>
<td>1.70 L (104 in³)¹ 0.57 L (0.18 gal) (41.6 in³)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 50 mm (2 in) up to, but not including, 75 mm (3 in) 225 Lpm (60 gpm)</td>
<td>2.25 L (137 in³)¹ 1.1 L (0.36 gal) (83.2 in³)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 mm (3 in) or larger 378 Lpm (100 gpm)</td>
<td>3.75 L (229 in³)¹ 1.9 L (0.6 gal) (139 in³)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>758 Lpm (200 gpm)</td>
<td>3.8 L (1.0 gal) (231 in³)¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Based on a test volume of at least the amount specified in N.3. Test Drafts.

(Table Added 2005) (Amended 201X)

[Editor’s Note: The metric and customary values in the proposed changes to the table are not equivalent. This point needs to be addressed in any final proposal.]

This item was included on the Measuring Sector’s agenda to keep Sector members informed of the item and to allow for Sector comment, discussion, and input to the S&T Committee. See the S&T Committee’s 2010 Final Report and 2011 Interim Agenda for details.

**Discussion:** Mr. Cooper, Tuthill Transfer Systems, commented that concerns may arise regarding whether or not meters with smaller maximum flow rates will be able to meet the proposed change in tolerances since the revised tolerances are much tighter for the smaller meter sizes. Sector Chairman, Mr. Keilty, Endress and Hauser, noted that data should be supplied to illustrate whether or not the smaller meters can meet the revised tolerances. Sector Technical Advisor, Ms. Butcher, NIST WMD, noted that the uncertainties in the test process should also be considered in the tests of smaller meters to ensure that the revised tolerances are appropriate, but also noted that the tolerance based on maximum flow rate seems logical. She also suggested that the Sector consider proposing that, if the revised tolerances are adopted, the marking requirement for meter size in paragraph S.5.7. Meter Size be eliminated from the code. This marking requirement was added to assist inspectors in applying the current product depletion tolerance, which is based on meter size.

**Decision:** The Sector did not have any specific technical guidance to offer on this issue. However, some members cited concerns regarding whether smaller meters can meet the tighter tolerances. Others suggested that the S&T Committee consider asking for data to support the proposed change and also consider the uncertainties in the test process relative to the tolerance to ensure that the proposed tolerances are appropriate.
14. N.5.1. Verification of Master Meter Systems for Testing of Farm Milk Tanks (HB 44 Section 4.42 Farm Milk Tanks) (S&T Item – New Item)

Source: Central Weights and Measures Association (CWMA)

Purpose: Eliminate unnecessary verification testing for master meters capable of operating within a prescribed percent of the applicable tolerance.

Item Under Consideration: Amend paragraph N.5.1. as follows:

N.5.1. Verification of Master Metering Systems. – A master metering system used to gauge a milk tank shall be verified before and after the gauging process. A master metering system used to calibrate a milk tank shall be verified before starting the calibration and re-verified every quarter of the tank capacity or every 2000 L (500 gal), whichever is greater. A master metering system capable of operating within 25% of the applicable tolerance in T.3. Basic Tolerance Values needs only be verified before and after the gauging process.

(Added 201X)

Background/Discussion: (2010 Developing Item Part 4.42, Farm Milk Tanks - Item 1: N.5.1. Verification of Master Metering Systems) The CWMA received a proposal at its fall 2008 Interim Meeting to modify paragraph N.5.1. Verification of Master Metering Systems in NIST HB 44 Section 4.42. Farm Milk Tanks. USDA provided data suggesting that mass flow meters currently used to test milk tanks would not have to be verified every quarter of the tank capacity, or every 2000 L (500 gal), whichever is greater. The CWMA does not have data that supports that all mass flow meters will perform to the same standard. Based on this information the CWMA recommends this proposal be Informational and is considering the proposal outlined in the recommendation above.

At its fall 2008 meeting, NEWMA recommended this proposal be Informational. NEWMA forwarded the following additional justification for the proposed change from Mr. Richard Koeberle, Federal Milk Market Administrator:

The use of a mass flow meter has eliminated the variations seen in other types of meters used to calibrate or check farm bulk milk tanks. The reverification of the meter at every quarter of tank capacity adds time and potentially introduces errors by requiring the hose or valves to be moved before the tank is totally filled. This proposal originated by Mr. Tom MacNish, from the Cleveland Market Administrator, and was presented to the CWMA in September [2008]. Mass flow meters have been used extensively in their market with excellent results.

Data submitted with this item is posted on the S&T Committee’s web page on the Members Only section of the NCWM website at:

http://www.ncwm.net/members/index.cfm?fuseaction=st

At the 2010 NCWM Annual Meeting, the Committee heard comments from Mr. Ross Andersen, New York, reiterating NEWMA’s request to place this item on the NCWM S&T Committee’s 2011 Interim Agenda.

The Committee agreed to NEWMA’s request and included this item in the list of carryover items submitted to the fall 2010 regional weights and measures association meetings.

This item was included on the Measuring Sector’s agenda to keep Sector members informed of the item and to allow for Sector comment, discussion, and input to the S&T Committee.

Discussion: Sector Chairman, Mr. Keilty, Endress and Hauser, provided background on this issue. Several Sector members commented that the proposal makes sense, particularly for large tanks where the testing process can be quite lengthy. Sector Technical Advisor, Ms. Butcher, NIST WMD, noted that NIST WMD’s Laboratory Metrology Group has had multiple inquiries about developing a standard on master meters, but to date no one has
agreed to take on this task. However, it is necessary to look at the uncertainties in the test process to be sure that the proposed tolerance is achievable.

**Decision:** The Sector did not have any specific technical guidance to offer on this issue. However, Sector members generally noted support of the proposal since it would eliminate unnecessary testing and, hopefully, eliminate some uncertainties in the test process.


**Source:** Fall 2010 NCWM S&T Committee Proposal to 2010 Regional Weights and Measures Associations

(NOTE: Measuring Sector member Mr. Karimov, Liquid Controls, also requested that this item be included on the Sector’s agenda for discussion.)

**Purpose:** To provide a means for inspectors and service personnel to determine the temperature of the product at the meter and, thus, enable them to apply paragraph N.5. Temperature Correction for Refined Petroleum Products.

**Background:** The NCWM S&T Committee announced at the July 2010 Annual Meeting that it intended to submit a proposal for consideration by the weights and measures community to nonretroactively require means (e.g., thermometer wells) for determining the temperature of the product at the meter during meter testing.

During discussions of proposed changes to the tolerances for VTMs (which were ultimately adopted in July 2010) equipped with automatic temperature compensating systems (paragraph T.2.1.), meter manufacturers expressed concerns about how to ensure that consistent and appropriate test procedures and equipment be used by weights and measures officials during inspections of VTMs. NIST WMD revised the Examination Procedure Outlines for VTMs and presented this information during a training seminar in April 2010. In the process of revising and presenting the procedures, WMD received comments indicating that many VTMs are not equipped with means for determining the temperature of the product at the meter. Thus, the inspector is unable to properly apply paragraph N.5. Temperature Correction for Refined Petroleum Products; paragraph N.5. requires the inspector to make corrections for any changes in volume resulting from differences in liquid temperatures between the time of passage through the meter and the time of volumetric determination in the prover.

In order for inspectors and service personnel to determine the difference between the temperature of the product at the meter and at the prover, some means is needed for determining the temperature of the product as it passes through the meter. Inspectors have reported that few VTMs are equipped with provisions such as a thermometer well at the meter that would enable them to determine the temperature of the product at the meter using a traceable thermometer. Consequently, the inspector is not able to make adjustments to the indications for changes due to temperature between the meter and the prover. Failing to account for differences in product temperature can, in some instances, introduce errors into the testing process, possibly resulting in the acceptance of a meter that is actually out of tolerance or the incorrect rejection of a meter that may actually be performing within applicable tolerance.

The S&T Committee submitted a proposal to several 2010 regional weights and measures associations to non-retroactively require a thermometer well for all VTMs.

This item was included on the Measuring Sector’s agenda to keep Sector members informed of the item and to allow for Sector comment, discussion, and input to the S&T Committee. See the NCWM S&T Committee’s 2011 Agenda for details.

**Discussion:** The Sector discussed possible locations where the thermometer well might be placed into the system, recognizing that similar paragraphs in other codes recognize more than one possible location for the well such as piping adjacent to the meter. Mr. Buttler, Emerson Process Management - Micro Motion Inc., noted that some aspects of the proposed paragraph appear to be more of a user requirement than a device specification. Mr. Tucker, RL Tucker Consulting LLC, pointed out that during discussions at the WWMA, questions were raised regarding why the threshold was 20 gpm rather than 30 gpm, which coincides with the requirement for marking minimum and
maximum flow rate on the meter. Sector Technical Advisor and Technical Advisor to the NCWM S&T Committee, Ms. Butcher, commented that the Committee considered whether to use 20 gpm or 30 gpm as the threshold, noting both thresholds appear in various requirements within the code. The 20 gpm threshold was selected because inspectors frequently use provers with capacities of 25 gallons and larger to test VTM's and the impact of the temperature difference on these sizes of test drafts can be significant relative to the applicable tolerance. Ms. Butcher pointed out the example cited in the S&T’s proposal in which a 1-degree difference in temperature between the liquid at the meter and in the prover can result in a difference of about 16 cubic inches on gasoline and 11 cubic inches on diesel on a 100-gallon test draft. On a 100-gallon test draft, the applicable acceptance tolerance is only 35 cubic inches. The impact on of a temperature difference on a 25-gallon test draft would be a quarter of this, but the applicable tolerance is also less.

Mr. Beattie, Measurement Canada, noted that they have been making corrections to account for temperature for some time, but also noted that they may run additional runs to stabilize the temperature between the two systems. He also noted that they set a limit on the amount of variation in temperature between the two systems before starting an official test run. Mr. Mike Gallo, CLEANFUEL USA, expressed support for doing a “wet down” run for each meter as is done with liquefied petroleum gas systems. His experience indicates that the temperatures equalize after doing a “wet down” run.

Decision: The Sector did not have any specific technical guidance to offer on this issue. However, some members suggested that the S&T Committee consider requiring wet down runs on each meter test as an alternative to requiring a thermometer well. Another member suggested the Committee consider whether or not the threshold for requiring a thermometer well in a system should be meters marked with maximum flow rates of 20 gpm or 30 gpm.
C. Product Categories and Families for Meters

When submitting a meter for evaluation, the manufacturer must specify the product category(ies) and/or family(ies) and critical parameters for which the meter is being submitted.

**Product Category:** A group of products that share similar characteristics.

Note: Under certain Test Requirements, product coverage is indicated by reference to the “Product Category,” while under other Test Requirements, product coverage is indicated by “Product Family.”

**Product Family:** A group of products, sometimes including multiple Product Categories, which share a common Test Requirement.

Note: Coverage of different products by a certificate may be indicated using references to either “Product Categories” or “Product Families,” as indicated in the Test Requirement for that Product Family.

The product family and the specific product subgroup covered by the Certificate are to be identified on Page 1 of the Certificate of Conformance. More detailed information, including the typical product types found in the subgroup, is to be included in the application section of the Certificate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</th>
<th>Magnetic Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</th>
<th>Positive Displacement Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</th>
<th>Turbine Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test B</strong> - To cover a range of the following products, test with one product having a low specific gravity and test with a second product having a high specific gravity. The Certificate of Conformance will cover all products in all product categories listed in the table under Test B within the specific gravity range tested. (Test B does not apply to product categories of liquefied gases, compressed liquids, cryogenic liquids or heated products.) Note: Product categories under Test B were formerly referred to collectively as “Normal Liquids.”</td>
<td><strong>Test F</strong> - To cover a range of the following products, test with one product having a specified conductivity. The Certificate of Conformance will cover all products with conductivity equal to or above the conductivity of the tested liquid. (Test F does not apply to product categories of potable water, non-potable water and tap water; water mixes of alcohols and glycols; fertilizers; suspension fertilizers; liquid feeds; clear liquid fertilizers; chemicals or crop chemicals A, B, C, or D.) (Test F does not apply to product categories of liquefied gases, or compressed liquids.)</td>
<td><strong>Test C</strong> - To cover a range of products within each product category, test with one product having a low viscosity and test with a second product having a high viscosity within each category. The Certificate of Conformance will cover all products in the product category within the viscosity range tested.</td>
<td><strong>Test E</strong> - To cover a range of products within each product category, test with one product having a low kinematic viscosity and test with a second product having a high kinematic viscosity within each category. The Certificate of Conformance will cover all products in the product category within the kinematic viscosity range tested. Note: see note 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Products</td>
<td>Specific Gravity (60 F)</td>
<td>Product Category</td>
<td>Typical Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
<td>Gasoline</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Category: Fuels, Lubricants, Industrial and Food Grade Liquid Oils (FL&amp;O)</td>
<td>Typical Products</td>
<td>Reference Viscosity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Products</td>
<td>Reference Viscosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Product Category:** Fuels, Lubricants, Industrial and Food Grade Liquid Oils (FL&O)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</th>
<th>Magnetic Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</th>
<th>Positive Displacement Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</th>
<th>Turbine Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avgas</td>
<td>JP4</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
<td>Gasoline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet A</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
<td>Jet A-1</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet B</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
<td>JP7 &amp; JP8</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spindle Oil</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
<td>Kerosene</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjuvants</td>
<td>0.7 - 1.2 CC</td>
<td>JP5</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banvel</td>
<td>0.7 - 1.2 CC</td>
<td>Corn Oil</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fumigants</td>
<td>0.7 - 1.2 CC</td>
<td>Cooking Oils</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fungicides</td>
<td>0.7 - 1.2 CC</td>
<td>Diesel Fuel</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbicides</td>
<td>0.7 - 1.2 CC</td>
<td>Biodiesel above B20</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecticides</td>
<td>0.7 - 1.2 CC</td>
<td>Light Oil</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraquat</td>
<td>0.7 - 1.2 CC</td>
<td>Sunflower Oil</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prowl</td>
<td>0.7 - 1.2 CC</td>
<td>Soy Oil</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round-up</td>
<td>0.7 - 1.2 CC</td>
<td>Olive Oil</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touchdown</td>
<td>0.7 - 1.2 CC</td>
<td>Vegetable Oil</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treflan</td>
<td>0.7 - 1.2 CC</td>
<td>Bunker Oil</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia Nitrate</td>
<td>1.16-1.37 Fert</td>
<td>Avgas</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude Oil</td>
<td>0.79-0.97 FL&amp;O</td>
<td>Jet A</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubricating Oils</td>
<td>0.80-0.90 FL&amp;O</td>
<td>Jet B</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peanut Oil</td>
<td>0.9-1.0 FL&amp;O</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hexane</td>
<td>0.66 Sol Gen</td>
<td>Peanut Oil</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Fuel</td>
<td>0.84 FL&amp;O</td>
<td>SAE Grades</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline</td>
<td>0.72 FL&amp;O</td>
<td>Lubricating Oils</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerosene</td>
<td>0.75 FL&amp;O</td>
<td>Crude Oil</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet A-1</td>
<td>0.76 FL&amp;O</td>
<td>6 Oil (#5, #6)</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP4</td>
<td>0.76 FL&amp;O</td>
<td>Fuel Oil (#1, #2, #3, #4)</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP5</td>
<td>0.76 FL&amp;O</td>
<td>Spindle Oil</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP7</td>
<td>0.76 FL&amp;O</td>
<td>Acetone</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP8</td>
<td>0.76 FL&amp;O</td>
<td>Sol Gen</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60 F)  Centipoise (cP)</td>
<td>(60 F)  Centipoise (cP)</td>
<td>(60 F)  Centipoise (cP)</td>
<td>(60 F)  Centipoise (cP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avgas</td>
<td>Gasoline</td>
<td>JL A-1</td>
<td>Jet A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet A</td>
<td>JP4</td>
<td>JP7 &amp; JP8</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spindle Oil</td>
<td>Jet A-1</td>
<td>Kerosene</td>
<td>Jet A-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banvel</td>
<td>Kerosene</td>
<td>Jet A-1</td>
<td>Kerosene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fumigants</td>
<td>JP5</td>
<td>JP5</td>
<td>JP5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fungicides</td>
<td>Corn Oil</td>
<td>Corn Oil</td>
<td>Corn Oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbicides</td>
<td>Cooking Oils</td>
<td>Cooking Oils</td>
<td>Cooking Oils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecticides</td>
<td>Diesel Fuel</td>
<td>Diesel Fuel</td>
<td>Diesel Fuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraquat</td>
<td>Biodiesel above B20</td>
<td>Biodiesel above B20</td>
<td>Biodiesel above B20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prowl</td>
<td>Light Oil</td>
<td>Light Oil</td>
<td>Light Oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round-up</td>
<td>Sunflower Oil</td>
<td>Sunflower Oils</td>
<td>Sunflower Oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touchdown</td>
<td>Soy Oil</td>
<td>Soy Oil</td>
<td>Soy Oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treflan</td>
<td>Olive Oil</td>
<td>Olive Oil</td>
<td>Olive Oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonia Nitrate</td>
<td>Vegetable Oil</td>
<td>Vegetable Oil</td>
<td>Vegetable Oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude Oil</td>
<td>Jet A</td>
<td>Bunker Oil</td>
<td>Bunker Oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubricating Oils</td>
<td>Avgas</td>
<td>1.5 to 6</td>
<td>Avgas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peanut Oil</td>
<td>Jet A</td>
<td>1.5 to 6</td>
<td>Jet A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hexane</td>
<td>Jet B</td>
<td>1.5 to 6</td>
<td>Jet B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Fuel</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>100 – 5000</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline</td>
<td>Peanut Oil</td>
<td>11 to 110</td>
<td>Peanut Oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerosene</td>
<td>Crude Oil</td>
<td>SAE Grades</td>
<td>SAE Grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet A-1</td>
<td>6 Oil (#5, #6)</td>
<td>Lubricating Oils</td>
<td>Lubricating Oils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP4</td>
<td>Fuel Oil (#1, #2, #3, #4)</td>
<td>11 to 110</td>
<td>Peanut Oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP5</td>
<td>6 Oil (#5, #6)</td>
<td>6 Oil (#5, #6)</td>
<td>6 Oil (#5, #6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP7</td>
<td>Fuel Oil (#1, #2, #3, #4)</td>
<td>8 to 88</td>
<td>Fuel Oil (#1, #2, #3, #4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP8</td>
<td>Acetone</td>
<td>8 to 88</td>
<td>Acetone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NTEP - B30
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</th>
<th>Magnetic Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</th>
<th>Positive Displacement Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</th>
<th>Turbine Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethanol</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>Alc Gly</td>
<td>Hexane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isopropyl</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>Alc Gly</td>
<td>Acetates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetone</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Sol Gen</td>
<td>MEK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methanol</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>Alc Gly</td>
<td>Toluene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butanol</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>Alc Gly</td>
<td>Xylene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isobutyl</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>Alc Gly</td>
<td>Ethylacetate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEK</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>Sol Gen</td>
<td>Methylene-Chloride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiesel above B20</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
<td>Trichloro-Ethylene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Oil</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
<td>Carbon Tetra-Chloride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toluene</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>Sol Gen</td>
<td>Perchloro-Ethylene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Aqua-Ammonia</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>Fert</td>
<td>Methanol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xylene</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>Sol Gen</td>
<td>Ethanol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Oil (#5, #6)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
<td>Isopropyl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Oil (#1, #2, #3, #4)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
<td>Butanol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAE Grades</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
<td>Isobutyl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn Oil</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
<td>Ethylene glycol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking Oils</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
<td>Propylene glycol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive Oil</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
<td>Demineralized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Test C - Product Category:** Solvents General (Sol Gen)

**Test E - Product Category:** Solvents General (Sol Gen)

**Reference Viscosity* (60 F):**

- Acetone: 0.34
- Hexane: 0.34
- MEK: 0.44
- Toluene: 0.62
- Xylene: 0.86
- Ethylacetate: 1.36
- Methanol: 0.64
- Ethanol: 1.29
- Isopropyl: 2.78
- Butanol: 3.34
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</th>
<th>Magnetic Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</th>
<th>Positive Displacement Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</th>
<th>Turbine Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable Oil 0.92 FL&amp;O Deionized Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>Test C - Product Category: Alcohols, Glycols &amp; Water Mixes Thereof (Alc Gly)</td>
<td>Isobutyl 4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetates 0.93 Sol Gen Asphalt Heated</td>
<td></td>
<td>Typical Products Reference Viscosity* (60 F)</td>
<td>Ethylene glycol 25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soy Oil 0.93 FL&amp;O Bunker C Heated</td>
<td></td>
<td>Centipoise (cP)</td>
<td>Propylene glycol 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunflower Oil 0.93 FL&amp;O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethylacetate 0.96 Sol Gen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunker Oil 0.99 FL&amp;O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverages 1.0 Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deionized 1.0 Water Tap water 72** Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demineralized 1.0 Water Potable 72** Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juices 1.0 Water Nonpotable 72** Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk 1.0 Water Juices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonpotable 1.0 Water Beverages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potable 1.0 Water Water mixes of alcohols &amp; glycols Alc Gly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap Water 1.0 Water Urea 5000 Fert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'Vegetable Oil' 0.92 FL&O

'Acetates' 0.93 Sol Gen

'Soy Oil' 0.93 FL&O

'Sunflower Oil' 0.93 FL&O

'Ethylacetate' 0.96 Sol Gen

'Bunker Oil' 0.99 FL&O

'Beverages' 1.0 Water

'Deionized' 1.0 Water Tap water 72** Water

'Demineralized' 1.0 Water Potable 72** Water

'Juices' 1.0 Water Nonpotable 72** Water

'Milk' 1.0 Water

'Nonpotable' 1.0 Water

'Potable' 1.0 Water

'Tap Water' 1.0 Water

NTEP - B32
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</th>
<th>Magnetic Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</th>
<th>Positive Displacement Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</th>
<th>Turbine Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Propylene glycol</td>
<td>Ammonia Nitrate</td>
<td>Fert</td>
<td>Ammonia Nitrate 11.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrochloric Acid</td>
<td>Liquid Feed</td>
<td>Fert</td>
<td>Cobalt-270 Chloride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethylene glycol</td>
<td>20% Aqua-Ammonia</td>
<td>Fert</td>
<td>Perchloro-Ethylene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid Molasses</td>
<td>Clear Liquid Fert</td>
<td>Fert</td>
<td>Perchloro-Ethylene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-18-9</td>
<td>Fert</td>
<td>Fert</td>
<td>Perchloro-Ethylene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methylene-Chloride</td>
<td>28%, 30% or 32%</td>
<td>Fert</td>
<td>Perchloro-Ethylene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-34-0</td>
<td>N-P-K solutions</td>
<td>Fert</td>
<td>Perchloro-Ethylene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trichloro-Ethylene</td>
<td>9-18-0</td>
<td>Fert</td>
<td>Perchloro-Ethylene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Tetra-Chloride</td>
<td>4-4-27</td>
<td>Sus Fert</td>
<td>Nitrogen Solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perchloro-Ethylene</td>
<td>3-10-30</td>
<td>Sus Fert</td>
<td>Nitrogen Solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfuric Acid</td>
<td>Molasses plus Phos Acid and/or Urea (TreaChle)</td>
<td>Liq Feed</td>
<td>Centipoise (cP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphoric Acid</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>4-4-27</td>
<td>28%, 30% or 32% Liq Fert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urea</td>
<td>209000</td>
<td>3-10-30</td>
<td>9-18-0 Liq Fert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fungicides</td>
<td>1 – 1.2</td>
<td>395000</td>
<td>3-10-30 Sus Fert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronutrients</td>
<td>1 – 1.2</td>
<td>56600</td>
<td>3-10-30 Sus Fert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Test C - Product Category:** Suspension Fertilizers (Sus Fert)

**Typical Products**

**Reference Viscosity** (60 F)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reference Viscosity* (60 F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N-P-K solutions</td>
<td>28%, 30% or 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sus Fert</td>
<td>9-18-0, 28%, 30%, 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liq Fert</td>
<td>4-4-27, 3-10-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Test C - Product Category:** Liquid Feeds (Liq Feed)

**Typical Products**

**Reference Viscosity** (60 F)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reference Viscosity* (60 F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Molasses plus Phos Acid and/or Urea (TreaChle)</td>
<td>28%, 30%, 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sus Fert</td>
<td>3-10-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liq Feed</td>
<td>4-4-27, 3-10-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</td>
<td>Magnetic Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molasses plus Phos Acid and/or Urea (TreaChle)</td>
<td>Herbicides CC-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 to 1.3</td>
<td>Liq Feed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-10-30</td>
<td>0.9 – 1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9 – 1.65</td>
<td>Liq Fert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-4-27</td>
<td>0.9 – 1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronutrients</td>
<td>0.9 – 1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-P-K</td>
<td>1.28 – 1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%, 30% or 32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-P-K solutions</td>
<td>1.2 – 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Liquid Fert</td>
<td>1.17 – 1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Solution</td>
<td>1.17 – 1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronutrients</td>
<td>0.9 – 1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test C - Product Category:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronutrients</td>
<td>0.9 – 1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecticides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test C - Product Category:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fungicides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test D – To obtain coverage for each of the following product categories, test with one product in each product category. The Certificate of Conformance will cover the products in the product category in which a product was tested.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjuvants</td>
<td>CC-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fumigants</td>
<td>CC-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fungicides</td>
<td>CC-C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Typical Products**

- **Micronutrients** CC-D Hydrochloric Acid 0.80 – 1.0 Herbicides CC-A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Category</th>
<th>Typical Products</th>
<th>Specific Gravity&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; (60 F)</th>
<th>Test C - Product Category: Crop Chemicals (Type A) (CC-A)</th>
<th>Test C - Product Category: Crop Chemicals (Type B) (CC-B)</th>
<th>Test D - To obtain coverage for each of the following product categories, test with one product in each product category. The Certificate of Conformance will cover the products in the product category in which a product was tested.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comp gas</td>
<td>Compressed Natural Gas (CNG)</td>
<td>0.6 to 0.8 (1=Air)</td>
<td>Fungicides</td>
<td>Doubleplay</td>
<td>Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp liq</td>
<td>Anhydrous Ammonia</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>Insecticides</td>
<td>Topnotch</td>
<td>Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp liq</td>
<td>Butane</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>Adjuvants</td>
<td>Guardsman</td>
<td>Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp liq</td>
<td>Ethane</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fungicides</td>
<td>Harness</td>
<td>Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp liq</td>
<td>Freon 11</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>Micronutrients</td>
<td>Marksmans</td>
<td>Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp liq</td>
<td>Freon 12</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>Dual</td>
<td>Bicep</td>
<td>Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp liq</td>
<td>Freon 22</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>Flow</td>
<td>Paraquat</td>
<td>Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp liq</td>
<td>Propane</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td>Broadstrike</td>
<td>Prowl</td>
<td>Flow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test C - Product Category: Crop Chemicals (Type A) (CC-A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test C - Product Category: Crop Chemicals (Type B) (CC-B)</th>
<th>Test C - Product Category: Crop Chemicals (Type B) (CC-B)</th>
<th>Test D - To obtain coverage for each of the following product categories, test with one product in each product category. The Certificate of Conformance will cover the products in the product category in which a product was tested.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</td>
<td>Magnetic Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</td>
<td>Positive Displacement Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbine Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</td>
<td>Turbine Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</td>
<td>Turbine Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Category</th>
<th>Typical Products</th>
<th>Specific Gravity&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; (60 F)</th>
<th>Typical Products</th>
<th>Reference Viscosity* (60 F)</th>
<th>Centipoise (cP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cryo LNG</td>
<td>Liquefied Natural Gas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fungicides</td>
<td>0.7 – 100</td>
<td>Harness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryo LNG</td>
<td>Liquefied Oxygen</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>Insecticides</td>
<td>0.7 – 100</td>
<td>NH&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryo LNG</td>
<td>Nitrogen</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>Adjuvants</td>
<td>0.7 – 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fumigants</td>
<td>0.7 – 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</td>
<td>Magnetic Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</td>
<td>Positive Displacement Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</td>
<td>Turbine Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test D</strong> – To obtain coverage for each of the following product categories, test with one product in each product category. The Certificate of Conformance will cover the products in the product category in which a product was tested.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product Category</strong></td>
<td><strong>Typical Products</strong></td>
<td><strong>Specific Gravity(^2) (60 F)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reference Viscosity(^*) (60 F)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Centipoise (cP)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reference Viscosity(^*) (60 F)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heated Products</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heated Products</td>
<td>Bunker C</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test C</strong> - <strong>Product Category</strong>: Crop Chemicals (Type C) (CC-C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Products</td>
<td>Fungicides</td>
<td>20 – 900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deionized</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potable</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonpotable</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juices</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beverages</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test C</strong> - <strong>Product Category</strong>: Crop Chemicals (Type D) (CC-D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Products</td>
<td>Micronutrients</td>
<td>20 – 1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beverages</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test C</strong> - <strong>Product Category</strong>: Flowables (Flow)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Products</td>
<td>Dual</td>
<td>20 – 900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liquefied Natural Gas</td>
<td>Cryo LNG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bicep</td>
<td>20 – 900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marksman</td>
<td>20 – 900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broadstrike</td>
<td>20 – 900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doubleplay</td>
<td>20 – 900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topnotch</td>
<td>20 – 900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guardsman</td>
<td>20 – 900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</td>
<td>Magnetic Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</td>
<td>Positive Displacement Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</td>
<td>Turbine Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harness</td>
<td>20 – 900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test C</strong> -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Category: Compressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquids: Fuels and Refrigerants (Comp liq)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typical Products</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reference Viscosity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Viscosity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(60 F)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Centipoise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(cP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propane</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhydrous Ammonia</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butane</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freon 11</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freon 12</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freon 22</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test D</strong> – To obtain coverage for a product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>category: Test with one product in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>product category. The Certificate of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformance will cover all products in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>category.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product Category: All Water</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Water)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typical Products</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reference Viscosity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Viscosity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(60 F)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Centipoise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(cP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap Water</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deionized</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demineralized</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potable</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonpotable</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</td>
<td>Magnetic Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</td>
<td>Positive Displacement Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</td>
<td>Turbine Flow Meter Product Category &amp; Test Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Juices 1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beverages 1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Milk 1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test A – The following products must be individually tested and noted on the Certificate of Conformance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product Category:</strong> Cryogenic Liquids and Liquefied Natural Gas (Cryo LNG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Products</td>
<td>Reference Viscosity* (60 F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centipoise (cP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquefied Oxygen</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquefied Natural Gas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Product Category Table – Category Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Product Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FL&amp;O</td>
<td>Fuels, Lubricants, Industrial and Food Grade Liquid Oils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solv Gen</td>
<td>Solvents General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solv Cl</td>
<td>Solvents Chlorinated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alc Gly</td>
<td>Alcohols, Glycols &amp; Water Mixes thereof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fert</td>
<td>Fertilizers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC-A</td>
<td>Crop Chemicals (Type A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC-B</td>
<td>Crop Chemicals (Type B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC-C</td>
<td>Crop Chemicals (Type C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC-D</td>
<td>Crop Chemicals (Type D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow</td>
<td>Flowables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sus Fert</td>
<td>Suspension Fertilizers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liq Feed</td>
<td>Liquid Feeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem</td>
<td>Chemicals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heated</td>
<td>Heated Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp liq</td>
<td>Compressed Liquids: Fuels and Refrigerants NH₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp gas</td>
<td>Compressed Gases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryo LNG</td>
<td>Cryogenic Liquids and Liquefied Natural Gas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Note: The Typical Products listed in this table are not limiting or all-inclusive; there may be other products and product trade names, which fall into a product family. Water and a product such as stoddard solvent or mineral spirits may be used as test products in the fuels, lubricants, industrial, and food-grade liquid oils product family.

2 The specific gravity of a liquid is the ratio of its density to that of water at standard conditions, usually 4 °C (or 40 °F) and 1 atm. The density of water at standard conditions is approximately 1000 kg/m³ (or 998 kg/m³).

3 Diesel fuel blends (biodiesel) with up to 20 % vegetable or animal fat/oil.

4 Gasoline includes oxygenated fuel blends with up to 15 % oxygenate.

5 Kinematic viscosity is measured in centistokes.

Source for some of the viscosity value information is in the Industry Canada - Measurement Canada "Liquid Products Group, Bulletin V-16-E (rev. 1), August 3, 1999."

** Editor Note: This data point is suspected to be lower than that of normal tap water supplied for residential consumption.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible Person(s)</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Table of Key Characteristics of Products in Product Families for Meters Table</td>
<td>Make final editorial changes, (including removing editorial marks, moving heated products, and making general editorial formatting changes) to the table and forward to Chair and NTEP Director for submission to the NCWM NTEP Committee.</td>
<td>Technical Advisor, Ms. Tina Butcher</td>
<td>12/1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Add Testing Criteria to NTEP Policy U “Evaluating electronic indicators submitted separate from a measuring element”</td>
<td>Continue development of checklist, including:</td>
<td>Mr. Dan Reiswig, CA DMS</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contact list of possible work group members (as identified by Sector).</td>
<td>Mr. Dan Reiswig, CA DMS</td>
<td>1/1/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forward latest draft of checklist AND five areas requiring special attention (identified by Sector) to original work group members and list of possible contacts identified by Sector.</td>
<td>Mr. Dan Reiswig, CA DMS</td>
<td>1/1/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apprise Chairman, NTEP Director, and Technical Advisor of progress via e-mails or periodic reports.</td>
<td>Mr. Dan Reiswig, CA DMS</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Present updated checklist to Sector for review and acceptance.</td>
<td>Work Group</td>
<td>2011 Sector Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Policy C - Product Family Table – Change in Upper Limit for Oxygenated Blends – Note 4</td>
<td>Advise original submitter of Sector’s decision.</td>
<td>Technical Advisor, Ms. Tina Butcher</td>
<td>12/1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Electronic Linearization for Positive Displacement Meters</td>
<td>Submit recommendation to modify NCWM Publication 14 to NTEP Committee</td>
<td>Technical Advisor, Ms. Tina Butcher</td>
<td>12/1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Code Reference S.1.6.1. Indication of Delivery – Reference to Indicator Reset</td>
<td>Submit recommendation to modify NCWM Publication 14 to NTEP Committee</td>
<td>Technical Advisor, Ms. Tina Butcher</td>
<td>12/1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Water Meters Checklist</td>
<td>(8) Forward current draft checklist to other companies who hold CA Type Evaluation Program Certificates for Water Meters.</td>
<td>Mr. Andre Noel</td>
<td>12/1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(9) Identify areas in NIST HB 44 Water Meters Code where updates are needed to reflect current technology and practices.</td>
<td>Water Meters Checklist Sub-Group: Mr. Andre Noel Mr. Dan Reiswig Mr. Jim Welsh (Others Identified)</td>
<td>7/1/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10) Forward any proposed changes to NIST HB 44 to the NCWM S&amp;T Sub-Group</td>
<td>Water Meters Checklist Sub-Group</td>
<td>7/1/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B
### Action Items Table

**October 1-2, 2010 NTETC Measuring Sector Meeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible Person(s)</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Committee by developing and submitting an NCWM Form 15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(11) Identify differences between AWWA standards and NIST HB 44 and consider recommendations for aligning the two documents.</td>
<td>Water Meters Checklist Sub-Group</td>
<td>7/1/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(12) Copy the Chairman, Mr. Mike Keilty and Technical Advisor, Ms. Tina Butcher on communications to the group.</td>
<td>Water Meters Checklist Sub-Group</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(13) Copy Mr. Ralph Richter, NIST WMD, U.S. point of contact for OIML R49 with any proposed drafts.</td>
<td>Water Meters Checklist Sub-Group</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(14) Distribute an updated draft for review by the Sector by the 2011 NCWM Interim Meeting.</td>
<td>Water Meters Checklist Sub-Group</td>
<td>01/10/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(15) Distribute a final draft for review by the Sector at least one month prior to the 2011 Sector meeting.</td>
<td>Water Meters Checklist Sub-Group</td>
<td>8/15/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hydrogen Gas-Measuring Devices Checklist</td>
<td>(1) Contact Norm Ingram to request distribution of draft checklist.</td>
<td>Ms. Juana Williams, NIST WMD</td>
<td>11/15/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Update USNWG on Sector’s plans to develop checklist.</td>
<td>Ms. Juana Williams, NIST WMD</td>
<td>11/15/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Update the checklist to correspond to the 2010 Hydrogen Measuring Devices Code.</td>
<td>Hydrogen Meters Checklist Sub-Group: Mr. Mike Keilty, Chairman Mr. Dennis Beattie, MC Mr. Marc Buttler, Micro Motion Mr. Dan Reiswig, CA DMS Ms. Juana Williams, NIST</td>
<td>As assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Review the checklist and provide comments to Sub Group Chairman.</td>
<td>Hydrogen Meters Checklist Sub-Group</td>
<td>As assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Schedule web conference call(s) to discuss needed changes.</td>
<td>Sub-Group Chairman</td>
<td>Jan-July 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Finalize and present draft to the Sector for consideration.</td>
<td>Hydrogen Meters Checklist Sub-Group</td>
<td>8/15/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7) Monitor USNWG progress on developing test procedures. Begin development of type evaluation test procedures when USNWG completes test procedures work.</td>
<td>Hydrogen Meters Checklist Sub-Group</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Next Meeting</td>
<td>Identify location and time of next SWMA Meeting and propose location to NTEP Committee</td>
<td>Chair, NTEP Director, Technical Advisor</td>
<td>2011 Interim Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>G-S1. Marking (Software) (S&amp;T)</td>
<td>Forward Sector comments to NCWM S&amp;T Committee</td>
<td>Technical Advisor, Ms. Tina Butcher</td>
<td>2011 Interim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Item</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Responsible Person(s)</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>G-S.8.1. Provision for Sealing (S&amp;T)</td>
<td>Forward Sector comments to NCWM S&amp;T Committee</td>
<td>Technical Advisor, Ms. Tina Butcher</td>
<td>2011 Interim Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>G-A.6. Nonretroactive Requirements (S&amp;T)</td>
<td>Forward Sector comments to NCWM S&amp;T Committee</td>
<td>Technical Advisor, Ms. Tina Butcher</td>
<td>2011 Interim Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Product Depletion Test (S&amp;T)</td>
<td>Forward Sector comments to NCWM S&amp;T Committee</td>
<td>Technical Advisor, Ms. Tina Butcher</td>
<td>2011 Interim Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>N.5.1. Master Meter Systems- Farm Milk Tanks (S&amp;T)</td>
<td>Forward Sector comments to NCWM S&amp;T Committee</td>
<td>Technical Advisor, Ms. Tina Butcher</td>
<td>2011 Interim Mtg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>S.2.6. Thermometer Well -VTMs (S&amp;T)</td>
<td>Forward Sector comments to NCWM S&amp;T Committee</td>
<td>Technical Advisor, Ms. Tina Butcher</td>
<td>2011 Interim Mtg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Measuring Sector Attendee List
October 1-2, 2010 / Columbia, SC

- Dennis Beattie
  Measurement Canada
  400 St Mary Ave
  Winnipeg, Manitoba R3C 4K5
  P: (204) 983-8910
  E: dennis.beattie@ic.gc.ca

- Mike Gallo
  CLEANFUEL USA
  116 Halmar Cove
  Georgetown, TX 78628
  P: (512) 789-8543
  E: mikegallo@cleanfuelusa.com

- Tina Butcher
  NIST Weights & Measures Division
  100 Bureau Drive
  Gaithersburg, MD 20899-2600
  P: (301) 975-2196
  E: tbutcher@nist.gov

- Jerry Butler
  North Carolina Department of Agriculture
  105 Mail Service Center
  Raleigh, NC 27699
  P: (919) 733-3313
  E: jerry.butler@ncagr.gov

- Marc Butler
  Emerson Process Management - Micro Motion Inc.
  7070 Winchester Circle
  Boulder, CO 80301
  P: (303) 530-8562
  E: marc.buttler@emerson.com

- William Cooper
  Tuthill Transfer Systems
  8825 Aviation Drive
  Fort Wayne, IN 46809
  P: (260) 747-7529 x1352
  E: rcooper@tuthill.com

- Michael Frailer
  Maryland Department of Agriculture
  50 Harry S. Truman Parkway
  Annapolis, MD 21401
  P: (410) 841-5790
  E: fraileml@mda.state.md.us

- Allen Katalinic
  North Carolina Department of Agriculture
  105 Mail Service Center
  Raleigh, NC 27699
  P: (919) 733-3313
  E: merleallen1234@aol.com

- Michael Keilty
  Endress + Hauser Flowtec AG USA
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Glossary of Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABWS</td>
<td>Automatic Bulk Weighing Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>Automatic Weighing Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>NTEP Certificate of Conformance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIM</td>
<td>Coupled-in-Motion (Railway Track Scales)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWMA</td>
<td>Central Weights and Measures Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECRS</td>
<td>Electronic Cash Registers Interfaces with Scales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIPSA</td>
<td>Grain Inspection Packers and Stockyards Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCWM</td>
<td>National Conference on Weights and Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWMA</td>
<td>Northeastern Weights and Measures Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIST</td>
<td>National Institute of Standards and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTETC</td>
<td>National Type Evaluation Technical Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIML</td>
<td>International Organization of Legal Metrology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;T</td>
<td>NCWM Specifications and Tolerances Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWMA</td>
<td>Southern Weights and Measures Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;T</td>
<td>Specifications and Tolerances Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMD</td>
<td>NIST Weights and Measures Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS</td>
<td>NTETC Weighing Sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unless Otherwise Stated:

Note: NIST does not imply that these acronyms are used solely to identify these organizations or technical topics.

Carry-over Items:

1. Recommended Changes to Publication 14 Based on Actions at the 2010 NCWM Annual Meeting

Source: The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Technical Advisor, Mr. Steve Cook, provided the Sector with specific recommendations for incorporating test procedures and checklist language based upon actions of the 2010 Annual Meeting of the 95th National Conference on Weights and Measures (NCWM). The Sector was asked to briefly discuss each item and, if appropriate, provide general input on the technical aspects of the issues.


Background: See the 2009 Summary of the Weighing Sector (WS) Agenda Item 8 and the Interim and Annual Reports of the 2010 NCWM Specifications and Tolerances (S&T) Committee agenda items 320-2, 322-1, and 324-1 for the adopted language and additional background information on items to amend Handbook 44 (HB 44) Scales Code paragraph S.2.1.1. General (Zero-Load Adjustment), ABWS Code paragraph S.2.1. Automatic Zero-Tracking (AZT) Mechanism and AWS Code paragraph S.2.1.1. Automatic Zero-Tracking Mechanism. This item was originally proposed by a sub group of the 2008 WS. However, at its 2009 Annual Meeting, the sector reached a consensus among the attendees that an Automatic Zero-Setting Mechanism does not have any value and at times will facilitate inaccurate weight determinations either against the buyer or seller. The NCWM considered the recommendations of the WS and additional comments at the NCWM Interim and Annual meetings and agreed to amend Scales and Automatic Weighing System (AWS) codes to clarify that automatic zero adjustments beyond the AZT limits are not permitted. The WS also agreed with the amendment to the Automatic Bulk Weighing Systems (ABWS) code to clarify that an automatic zero-setting mechanism is prohibited. The NCWM adopted the WS recommendations to amend Scales Code paragraph...
S.2.1.1., ABWS paragraph S.2.1., and AWS paragraphs S.2.1.1. in the 2011 Edition of HB 44. The NCWM also adopted a new definition of automatic zero-setting mechanism (AZSM) in HB 44 Appendix D since the term is used in the ABWS code.

The background information may be obtained online at:

Discussion/Conclusion: The NIST Technical Advisor provided the Sector with specific recommendations for incorporating test procedures and checklist language into Publication 14 based upon actions of the 2010 Annual meeting of the 95th NCWM. The WS discussed each item and provided the following input regarding the technical aspect of the issues:

- Pub 14 DES 43. Zero-Tracking Mechanism: A question was raised by a member of the WS whether the Publication 14 would automatically change as the result of R76 being amended since the language recommended excluded the reference to a specific edition of R76. The WS recommended that the year “2006” be added to specifically indicate that it is the language from that particular edition, and no other, that was being agreed upon by members of the WS. The WS also agreed to replace the words “a period of time” with “30 minutes” when it was pointed out that Canada had adopted 30 minutes as a standard and “a period of time” is too subjective.

- Pub 14 ABWS Section 8. The WS agreed to recommend that the new sentence proposed by the NIST Technical Advisor prohibiting AZSM be added.

- Pub 14 AWS Section 16. The WS agreed to recommend that the new sentence proposed by the NIST Technical Advisor prohibiting an automatic zero adjustment beyond the limits of AZT be added. However, rather than adding the new sentence to Section 16 as proposed, the WS recommends that the sentence be added to Section 25.

- Pub 14 AWS Section 25. The WS discussed the need to include a specific period of time as a condition in which AZT may operate rather than “after a period of time” as proposed in language developed and recommended by the NIST Technical Advisor. The WS agreed to recommend “30 minutes” as the time period.

Additionally, the WS agreed to amend procedures proposed by the NIST Technical Advisor for verifying that a device does not automatically rezero an amount greater than the limit of AZT. The procedures developed by the NIST Technical Advisor recommended the test be conducted by placing a load just above the limit of AZT. A WS member questioned the meaning of “just above the AZT limits” and the WS concluded that the procedures should indicate a specific amount of weight. The WS agreed to recommend that the procedure specify the test be conducted with a load 1 to 3 d above the limit of AZT. These recommendations can be found in Appendix A, Agenda Item 1.a.


Background: See the Final Report of the 2010 NCWM S&T Committee Agenda Item 320-3 for the adopted language and additional background information on the item to amend HB 44 Scales Code paragraphs T.N.4.5.1. Time Dependence, T.N.4.5.2. Time Dependence (III L), and add new paragraph T.N.4.5.3. Zero-Load Return (http://www.ncwm.net/sites/default/files/meetings/annual/2010/10_Pub_16_ST.pdf). The NCWM agreed to amend the existing paragraphs (T.N.4.5.1. and T.N.4.5.2.) by moving creep recovery tolerances and adding them in a new paragraph (T.N.4.5.3.) to align creep recovery tolerances on scales with the equivalent tolerances for load cells, which were adopted in 2009.

Discussion/Conclusion: The NIST Technical Advisor provided the Sector with specific recommendations for incorporating test procedures and checklist language into Publication 14 based upon actions of the 2010 Annual
Meeting of the 95th NCWM. The WS reviewed the item and suggested the technical advisor review the applicable references for weighing segment and weighing range. The WS agreed to recommend the proposed changes to the time dependence test form with the editorial corrections noted above be added to Publication 14. The proposed changes can be found in Appendix A, Item 1b.

1.c. UR.2.6. Approaches

**Background:** See the Final Report of the 2010 NCWM S&T Committee Agenda Item 320-4 for additional background information on the item to amend HB 44 Scales Code paragraphs UR.2.6. Approaches.

**Conclusion:** The WS agreed with the NIST Technical Advisor recommendation that no changes to Publication 14 are needed.


**Source:** NCWM S&T Committee – 2009 WS Agenda Item 13.

**Background:** At its 2009 meeting, the WS reviewed the comments from the S&T Committee, the background information in the NCWM 2008 Annual and 2009 Interim Reports, and the summary of proposals provided by the NIST Technical Advisor. The WS believes that existing language in HB 44 is sufficient and that the sectors review existing type evaluation criteria to verify that devices shall be designed with:

1. provision(s) for applying a physical security seal that must be broken before any change that detrimentally affects the metrological integrity of the device can be made to any electronic mechanism; or

2. other approved means of providing security to document any change that detrimentally affects the metrological integrity of the device can be made to any electronic mechanism (e.g., data change audit trail available at the time of inspection.

During the fall 2009 WWMA Technical Conference, Mr. Darrell Flocken, Mettler-Toledo, speaking as chairman of the WS, reported the Sector's position as stated above, and noted that the Sector can develop additional guidance in NCWM Publication 14 to ensure uniform interpretation of the requirement during type evaluation.

At its October 2009 meeting, the National Type Evaluation Technical Committee (NTETC) Measuring Sector provided the Committee with the following comments:

The Sector stated that measuring devices with National Type Evaluation Program (NTEP) Certificate of Conformances (CCs) have been evaluated to either:

1. not function in the calibration or configuration mode;

2. not be sealed in the calibration or configuration mode; or

3. clearly indicate the device is in the calibration or configuration mode.

The Measuring Sector agreed that these options reflect the intent of General Code paragraph G-S.8. and, because the intent of the paragraph is understood and appropriately applied by the measuring community, the Measuring Sector recommends that no changes be proposed to General Code paragraph G-S.8.

Additional information on the past S&T Committee discussion on the item can be found at:


NTEP - C4
Discussion: The WS reviewed the sealing procedures in Publication 14 Scales and compared them with Publication 14 for Liquid Measuring Devices and also compared applicable HB 44 sealing requirements in the General, Scales, and Liquid Measuring Device (LMD) codes. A small WG was formed to develop more detailed procedures for determining compliance of the methods for sealing and requested the WS to consider its recommendations for Publication 14, DES Section 10. The WS reviewed the recommendations and was asked to determine whether the guidance in the WG recommendation ensures uniform interpretation of sealing requirements during type evaluation.

During the discussions, Mr. Flocken, Chairman, reported that the goal is to add additional guidance in Publication 14. Mr. Jim Truex, NTEP Administrator, stated that NTEP has received numerous reports of scales found left in the calibration/configuration mode with physical seals intact. Mr. Nigel Mills, Hobart Corp., added that the use of the phrase “clearly indicate” in the first paragraph of the WG recommendation is ambiguous without additional clarification and subject to multiple interpretations. The WS discussed various examples of indications intended to clearly indicate that a device is in a calibration/configuration mode. Some of the examples were considered by the WS to be acceptable while other examples were deemed unacceptable (e.g., flashing weight indications or blanking units of measure). Mr. Truex suggested that as a starting point a small list of acceptable and unacceptable means of providing clear indication be developed by the WS. Mr. Cook volunteered to develop a short list as a starting point before the conclusion of the meeting. The WS reviewed the list and discussed additional acceptable and unacceptable indications that were then added. The list should not be limiting or all inclusive and that other indications may be acceptable. Mr. Flocken suggested that the WG recommendation, with suggestions from the WS, be forwarded to the S&T Committee and Scale Manufacturers Association (SMA) for consideration prior to the 2011 NCWM Interim Meeting.

Conclusion: The WS agreed with the revised proposal to amend Publication 14 Section 10. This recommendation can be found in Appendix A, Agenda Item 2. The WS also agreed to forward the amended language for Publication 14 to the S&T Committee with a recommendation that the S&T item be withdrawn from the Committee’s Agenda.

3. DES Section 66 (c) – Remove.

Source: Mr. Ed Luthy, formerly of Brechbuhler Scales – 2009 WS agenda item 15

Background: Mr. Luthy requested the WS to consider deleting DES Section 66 (c). Performance and Permanence Tests for “Side-by-Side” Modular and Non-Modular Vehicle Scales, stating that the time and expense is too large for the value added to having the option listed on an NTEP CC.

At its 2009 meeting, the WS stated that it is not in favor of removing the section. The purpose of the original proposal to delete DES Section 66(c) is intended to reduce the expense of type evaluation on these devices. The scale manufacturers in attendance volunteered to form a small work group (WG) to review the existing procedures and develop proposals to amend existing language for a possible abbreviated test procedure.

Discussion/Conclusion: The WS recommended this item be removed from the its Agenda upon learning from the NIST Technical Advisor that no activity had been reported by the small WG since the item was first introduced at the 2009 Annual WS meeting. Additionally, Mr. Luthy requested the item be removed since he no longer represents Brechbuhler.

New Items:


Source: Mr. Kevin Fruechte, Avery Weigh-Tronix
Background: Avery Weigh-Tronix reported that HB 44 Creep Recovery tolerances for Class III load cells with \( n > 4000 \) divisions in Scales Code paragraph T.N.4.7., is now greater than creep recovery tolerances applicable to Class III L load cells. In terms of mV/V equivalency, a Class III/III L load cell can now pass Class III and fail Class III L creep recovery tolerances.

Prior to 2009, the tolerance for Class III load cells was 0.5v. This was increased by a factor of 5/3 to arrive at the 0.83v tolerance in the current requirement. This recommendation proposes to increase the existing 1.5v tolerance for Class III L load cells by the same 5/3 factor. Thus the new tolerance would be 1.5v x 5/3 or 2.5v.

The following is an example of a 50 000 lb load cell marked with both III and III L accuracy classes that illustrates the problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class III</th>
<th>Class III L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( n_{\text{max}} = 5000 )</td>
<td>( n_{\text{max}} = 10 000 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_{\text{min}} = 10 \text{ lb} )</td>
<td>( v_{\text{min}} = 5 \text{ lb} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Class III creep recovery tolerance is 0.83v (0.83v x 10 lb/v = 8.3 lb)
The Class III L creep recovery tolerance is 1.5v (1.5v x 5 lb/v = 7.5 lb)
The proposed Class III L creep recovery tolerance is 1.5v x 5/3 = 2.5v (2.5v x 5 lb/v = 12.5 lb)

Avery Weigh-Tronix also notes the increased cost involved with meeting Class III L VCAP (voluntary Conformity Assessment Program) requirements with a tolerance that is less than Class III. Multiplying the Class III L tolerance by 5/3, as was done with Class III, would be more cost effective for a load cell manufacturer.

Discussion/Conclusion: The NIST Technical Advisor to the WS provided the sector with a summary of creep recovery test results from October 1, 2007, through August 12, 2010, for Class III L load cells from the NIST Force Group that shows that Class III L load cell creep recovery type evaluation compliance rate is 76% using existing tolerances (See Attachment for Agenda Item 4.). The compliance rate for Class III load cells over the same time period is 69% using the expanded tolerance adopted in 2009. Mr. Fruchte, Avery Weigh-Tronix, explained to the WS the need to amend the creep recovery tolerances for Class III L load cells based on the example provided by the NIST Technical Advisor. A WS member stated that using the 5/3 factor would reconcile the differences between U.S. Class III L creep recovery tolerances with comparable International Organization of Legal Metrology (OIML) R 60 Class C load cell tolerances. The WS agreed to submit the language to amend paragraph T.N.4.7. to the S&T Committee and regional weights and measures associations as follows:

T.N.4.7. Creep Recovery for Load Cells During Type Evaluation. – The difference between the initial reading of the minimum load of the measuring range \( (D_{\text{min}}) \) and the reading after returning to minimum load subsequent to the maximum load \( (D_{\text{max}}) \) having been applied for 30 minutes shall not exceed:

(a) 0.5 times the value of the load cell verification interval \((0.5v)\) for Class II and III load cells;

(b) 0.5 times the value of the load cell verification interval \((0.5v)\) for Class III load cells with 4000 or fewer divisions;

(c) 0.83 times the value of the load cell verification interval \((0.83v)\) for Class III load cells with more than 4000 divisions; or

(d) \( \frac{5}{3} \times \frac{1.5}{3} \) times the value of the load cell verification interval \((\frac{5}{3} \times \frac{1.5}{3} v)\) for Class III L load cells.

(Added 2006) (Amended 2009 and 201X)

5. DES Section 11 - Indicating and Recording Elements – Use of the Comma as a Decimal Marker.

Source: Mr. Steven Cook, NIST Weights and Measures Division (WMD)
Background: WMD has received a request for clarification about the use of commas as a decimal marker. There is no specific prohibition of the use of commas in HB 44 and Handbook 130 (HB 130). Additionally, Publication 14 DES section only uses periods or dots when decimals markers are used. However, Pub 14 Liquid-Measuring Devices section 1.20. states that “Symbols for decimal points shall clearly identify the decimal position. (Generally acceptable symbols are dots, small commas, or x.)”

The use of the dot as the decimal marker is customary in the United States and WMD believes that the use of a comma is not appropriate for commercial applications. HB 44 references the words “decimal point” in the General Code. The “decimal point” is generally defined as a dot, point, or period and is based on the terminology having a general meaning found in several U.S. dictionaries. Additionally, the comma is not used universally in international marketplaces where it conflicts the customary usage of the country. WMD believes that there is general resistance to the use of the comma by U.S. consumers and regulatory officials based on concerns over potential misinterpretations of indications and printed representations of weight or volume on weighing and measuring devices. The “Forward” of Handbook includes language that recognizes potential issues with the use of the “comma” where it states that:

“... a space has been inserted instead of commas in all numerical values greater than 9999 in this document, following a growing practice, originating in tabular work, to use spaces to separate large numbers into groups of three digits. This avoids conflict with the practice in many countries to use the comma as a decimal marker.”

Additionally, our recollections are that other NTEP applicants were denied the use of the comma as a decimal marker before the administration of NTEP was transferred from NIST to the NCWM.

The following references to the use or prohibition of the commas as a decimal marker were used to develop the WMD response.


12.27. Fractions (¼, ½, ¾, ⅘, ⅝, ⅞, 1/2954) or full-sized figures with the shilling mark (1/4, 1/2954) may be used only when either is specifically requested. A comma should not be used in any part of a built-up fraction of four or more digits or in decimals. (See rule 12.9e.)

12.9. e. Use spaces to separate groups of three digits in a decimal fraction.
(See rule 12.27.) 0.123 456 789; but 0.1234

Extract from NIST Tech Beat by Ms. Carol Hockert Nov. 2006

“The specification of the use of only the decimal comma in English language international standards has been a source of antagonism for native English speaking people developing and using international standards for decades. Building upon a recent General Conference on Weights and Measures (CGPM 2003) resolution endorsing the use of the point on the line as the decimal sign, NIST, through ANSI, the official U.S. representative body in ISO and IEC, has recently been successful in gaining the acceptance of using the decimal point instead of the decimal comma in new English language international standards. This change in policy by ISO and IEC reflects customary usage of native English speakers and eliminates the disparity in practice between ISO and IEC standards and English language documents of other international organizations.”

Extract from the NIST Monthly Highlights February 2004

22nd CGPM Unanimously Adopts Decimal Marker Resolution

The 22nd General Conference on Weights and Measures (CGPM), at its meeting in Paris on Oct. 13 17, 2003, unanimously adopted a resolution initiated by NIST declaring that "the symbol for the decimal marker shall be either the point on the line or the comma on the line," thereby giving full equality
to the two symbols. In the same resolution the 22nd CGPM reaffirmed that "Numbers may be divided in groups of three in order to facilitate reading; neither dots nor commas are ever inserted in the spaces between groups."

In the International System of Units (SI), which is the modern metric system, values of quantities are normally expressed as a number times an SI unit. Often the number contains multiple digits with an integral part and a decimal part. The symbol that separates the integral part from the decimal part is called the decimal marker. The established custom in English, as well as in many other languages, is to use the point on the line as the decimal marker, while in other languages, including French, the comma is used.

Despite these long-standing customs, some international bodies employ the comma as the decimal marker in their English language publications, and two of the world's most influential international standardizing bodies specify that the comma shall be the symbol for the decimal marker in all languages. Clearly, the specification of the comma as the decimal marker is in many languages in conflict with customary usage and could lead to much confusion if followed.

To address this issue, the 22nd CGPM unanimously adopted the NIST-initiated resolution. NIST will now work with international standardizing bodies, such as ISO and IEC, to bring the documentary standards of such bodies into agreement with the resolution.

**Discussion/Conclusion:** The WS agreed that the use of the comma as a decimal marker instead of the point or dot would be confusing in the U.S. marketplace. It was noted by Mr. Luciano Burtini, Measurement Canada (MC), that it would not be confusing in the Canadian marketplace since the use of the decimal point or comma depended upon whether a person spoke English or French. The WS agreed to recommend that Publication 14 DES Section 11 Indicating and Recording Elements- General be amended as proposed by the NIST Technical Advisor and that the decimal point would be used in U.S./Canada mutual recognition type evaluations. This recommendation can be found in Appendix A, Agenda Item 5.

6. **DES Section 42 - Zero-Load and Tare Adjustment - Rounding of Intermediate Values in an Equation.**

**Source:** Mr. Steven Cook, NIST WMD

**Background:** Publication 14 DES Sections 42 - Zero-Load Adjustment – Monorail Scales currently reflects language in HB 44 regarding the setting of zero and tare value less than 5% of the scale capacity to within 0.02% of scale capacity according to HB 44 Scales Code paragraphs S.2.1.4 (Monorail Scales) and S.2.3.1.(Monorail Scales Equipped with Digital Indications). In other words, a 1000 lb x 1 lb monorail scale shall have the capability to set tare values up to 50 lb to within a resolution of 0.2 lb (1000 x 0.02%).

However, there are no procedures in Section 42 to verify that a correct zero-load balance or semiautomatic, keyboard entered, or stored tares are not rounded to the nearest value of d (1 lb) before the net weight is calculated. In the above example, a tare that is rounded before the net weight calculation introduces an extra 0.5 lb uncertainty in the net weight. This can be a problem if an average tare value of 7.6 lb for a series of trolleys is entered as tare. Objects (animal carcasses) will be consistently short weighed if the tare is rounded from 7.6 lb to 8 lb before the net weight is calculated. This may present economic harm to sellers or producers of livestock that are paid based on the weights from the monorail scale. Conversely, average tare weights that are rounded down to the nearest displayed scale division may present economic harm to the buyers, typically processors, that pay the producers based on the weights from the monorail scale.

Another question is whether the net weights are determined using the digital indicator's internal or displayed resolution of the gross weight in the calculation of the net weight.

The following is additional background information supporting the correct rounding (and significant digits) of values in an equation
B.7.2 Rounding converted numerical values of quantities
The use of the factors given in Secs. B.8 and B.9 to convert values of quantities was demonstrated in Sec. B.3. In most cases the product of the unconverted numerical value and the factor will be a numerical value with a number of digits that exceeds the number of significant digits (see Sec. 7.9) of the unconverted numerical value. Proper conversion procedure requires rounding this converted numerical value to the number of significant digits that is consistent with the maximum possible rounding error of the unconverted numerical value.

Example: To express the value \( l = 36 \text{ ft} \) in meters, use the factor 3.048 \( \times 10^{-1} \) from Sec. B.8 or Sec. B.9 and write
\[
l = 36 \text{ ft} \times 0.3048 \text{ m/ft} = 10.9728 \text{ m} = 11.0 \text{ m}.
\]

Rounding guidelines found on the Internet:
- In any math problem you should wait until the end to round; Only the final answer should be rounded. Carry as many significant digits as you can throughout the problem.
- Round Off Rule: Round only the final answer not the intermediate values that occur during the calculation. Carry at least twice as many decimal places as will be used in the final answer.
- Do the math, then round the answer so that the number of significant figures is equal to the least number of significant figures found in any one measurement in the equation.

Discussion: WMD asked the sector to consider the following suggestions to address the specific issues of correctly rounding values in the calculation of net weight determinations on monorail scales, develops test procedures, and support a general guideline in the rules for rounding in HB 44.

Part 1 Technical Advisor Recommendation: WMD requested that the WS consider adding language to DES 42 that clarifies that rounding is not performed until the last mathematical operation is completed to read as follows (Note that the language is consistent with the rounding requirements in DES Section 12.3.2.3. for converting units of measure):

42. Zero-Load and Tare Adjustment - Monorail Scales
Code References: S.2.1.4. and S.2.3.1.

Under the regulations of the Packers and Stockyards Administration, the rollers and hooks used on monorail scales within a facility are required to be nearly the same weight. Since monorail scales typically have scale divisions of 1 lb, a monorail scale must be capable of setting tare weights that are less than 5 % of the scale capacity to a weight value less than the displayed scale division. This reduces the rounding error in the tare weight that would otherwise be present if the tare weight were rounded to the nearest displayed scale division.

42.1. Means must be provided for setting the zero-load balance and any tare value less than 5 % of the scale capacity to within 0.02 % of scale capacity.

42.2. For an in-motion system, the conditions above must be automatically maintained.

42.3. Rounding is not performed until the last mathematical operation to reduce the uncertainty of the net weight calculation.

Part 1 Conclusion: The WS agreed to recommend that Publication 14 Section 42 be amended to clarify rounding procedures for monorail scales. This recommendation can also be found in Appendix A, Agenda Item 6.

Part 2 Technical Advisor Recommendation: WMD believes that that compliance with HB 44 paragraphs S.2.1.4. (Monorail Scales) and S.2.3.1. (Monorail Scales Equipped with Digital Indications) should be verified with
documented and agreed upon test procedures. The NIST Technical advisor suggests that a small WG be formed that includes a member representing manufacturers of monorail scale digital indicating elements and a representative from Grain Inspection Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA). The group may also want to address the appropriate method of calculating net weight using the digital indicator's internal or displayed resolution of the gross weight.

**Part 2 Conclusion:** The WS agreed to form a small WG to develop test procedures for verifying correct rounding of net weight determinations on monorail scales. Mr. Cook and Mr. Truex will contact holders of monorail NTEP CCs and request their involvement. GIPSA will be consulted on any recommendations from the WG.

**Part 3 Technical Advisor Recommendation:** Submit or support a recommendation to the S&T Committee to amend Appendix A - Fundamental Considerations, Section 10. Rounding Off Numerical Values to state that intermediate values that occur during a calculation shall not be rounded. If intermediate values are to be rounded they should only be rounded so that the number of significant figures is equal to the least number of significant figures found in any one measurement or value in the equation.

**Part 3 Conclusion:** Mr. Cook, NIST Technical Advisor, stated that the proposal to develop language for HB 44 is not sufficiently developed. Therefore, the WS agreed to take no action at this time.

**7. HB 44 -2.10. T.N.4.5.1. Creep and Creep Recovery Requirements for Class III Scales with n > 4000 divisions.**

**Source:** Mr. Nigel Mills, Hobart

**Background:** During the 2010 Annual Conference, the NCWM voted to amend the language in T.N.4.5. as shown in agenda item 2(b). Hobart reports that the recent change to scale tolerances for time dependence in HB 44 are still not consistent with the intent to harmonize load cell and scale performance. In 2009, the WS addressed creep recovery on return to zero but there is still an extremely tight 0.5e (Scales Code paragraph T.N.4.5.1. (a)) requirement, which makes the recent changes to the scale zero return specification of minimal value since the amount of creep at capacity is related to a load cells ability to return to zero.

According to paragraph T.N.4.5.1. Time Dependence: Class II, III, and IIII Non-automatic Weighing Instruments: the change in the near capacity indication after 30 minutes for a complete device may not exceed 0.5e while the load cell of the same rated increments is permitted a maximum permissible error (mpe) of 1.5e or even 2.5e.

Hobart proposed that the WS submit a proposal to the S&T Committee amending the language in bullet (a) of the 2011 HB 44 Scales Code Paragraph T.N.4.5.1. to provide specific tolerances for time dependence for the different accuracy classes of scales and maximum number of divisions.

**Discussion/Conclusions:** The WS agreed with the intent of the proposal and asked that Mr. Cook and Mr. Mills verify the time references in the proposal and agreed to submit the following language to the NCWM S&T Committee and regional weights and measures associations as a proposal to amend HB 44 Scales Code paragraph T.N.4.5.1.(a) for by the NCWM during the 2011 NCWM Interim Meeting.

(a) When any load is kept on an instrument, the difference between the indication obtained immediately after placing the load and the indication observed during the following 30 minutes shall not exceed $0.5e$.

(i) $0.5e$ for Class II and IIII devices,

(ii) $0.5e$ for Class III devices with 4000 or fewer divisions,

(iii) $0.83e$ for Class III devices with more than 4000 divisions.

However, the difference between the indication obtained at 15 minutes and the indication obtained at 30 minutes shall not exceed 0.2e.
For multi-interval or multiple range instruments, when any load is kept on an instrument, the difference between the indication obtained immediately after placing the load and the indication observed during the following 30 minutes shall not exceed 0.83 $e_i$ (where $e_i$ is the interval of the weighing segment or range).

If the conditions in (a) are not met, the difference between the indication obtained immediately after the load is applied to the instrument and the indication observed during the following 4 hours shall not exceed the absolute value of the maximum permissible error at the load applied.

**NIST Technical Advisor’s note.** Mr. Mills, Mr. Darrell Flocken, and Mr. Cook submitted the NCWM Form 15 Proposal to Amend Handbooks to Central Weights and Measures Association (CWMA), Western Weights and Measures Association (WWMA), Southern Weights and Measures Association (SWMA), and Northeastern Weights and Measures Association (NEWMA) in time for their fall meetings, and to the NCWM.

8. NTEP Policy Clarification on Adding a CIM Controller to a Static RR Track Scale.

**Source:** Mr. Lou Straub, Fairbanks Scales, Inc.

**Background:** Fairbanks Scales was asked by a customer to add a Coupled-in-Motion (CIM) controller to a Static Railroad Track Scale. Both the scale and the CIM controller have current NTEP CCs. The State where the device was located would not approve this application because the static Railroad Track scale was not evaluated with the CIM controller. The State took the position that any static Railroad Track scale used with a CIM controller must be evaluated for in-motion weighing and this application must be included on an NTEP CC.

Fairbanks Scales believes that the State’s perspective concerning a static weighbridge receiving NTEP approval for in-motion weighing is legitimate. However; after searching the NTEP database they could not find any railway weighbridges approved for in-motion weighing. The only two CCs addressing this issue are for the controller - and both (96-141 and 06-061) used a NTEP approved static weighbridge.

This item has been addressed in previous Weighing Sector Meetings; however, the published comments in the NTEP Weighing Sector Summaries, the changes made to NCWM Pub 14, or information supplied by the NTEP Administrator and NIST would not change the decision of the State.

The submitter reports that after discussing this issue with the NTEP Administrator and NIST Technical Advisor to the Weighing Sector, he believes the following bullets reflect the actions of the 2007 WS:

- The 2010 Edition of Pub 14 Section 70 only applies to the controllers, indicators and recording elements.
- Pub 14 Section 70 states that the in-motion controller performance tests are to be conducted with a railway track scale load-receiving element and without the use of simulation devices.
- Pub 14 Section 70 also states “It is assumed that the weighing/load-receiving element used during the test has already been examined and found to comply with applicable requirements in Section 71.” (Performance and Permanence Tests for Railway Track Scales Used to Weigh Statically)
- The permanence test requirement was removed (starting with in the 2008 Edition of Publication 14).
- There is no section in Pub 14 for “Permanence and Performance Tests for Railway Track Scales Used to Weigh Dynamically (in-motion)”.
- Fairbanks Scales was unable to find any “stand-alone” CCs for in-motion railway track scale weighing/load-receiving elements.

The submitter asked the WS to review this issue and provide clarification that will be considered acceptable to all the states participating in NTEP. The submitter provided the following possible solutions:

1) Require NTEP CCs for CIM controllers be clarified to reflect the decisions of the 2007 Weighing Sector which specifically allow any NTEP approved static Railroad Track scale to be used with an NTEP approved CIM controller, or
2) Add permissive language to NIST HB 44

Discussion: Mr. Lou Straub, Fairbanks Scales, indicated that in spite of NTEP Technical Policy to the contrary, the particular state referenced above would only permit one manufacturer to sell a CIM in that state since NTEP CCs do not state that a CIM system can be used with other compatible and NTEP certified static railway track scales.

Mr. Truex commented that it is a state’s right to fix the policy for the state and added that there are no CCs for railway track CIM weighing element. Darrell Flocken suggested amending existing railway track scale CCs by removing the words “static.”

Conclusion: The WS recommends that the NTEP Committee consider editorially amending existing active CCs for railway track scale weighing/load-receiving elements by removing the word “static” since static railway track scales are allowed to be used for in-motion weighing applications (e.g., “Application: For general purpose railway track scale weighing applications.”).

9. ECRS Section 8 - Power Failure

Source: NTEP Weighing Labs

Background: During the March 2010 NTEP Lab Meeting, held in Sacramento, California, the Weighing Labs were asked by Mr. Steve Patoray, (Weighing Labs Agenda Item 2) to explain how Section 8, paragraph 8.7.3. of Pub 14, ECRS could be met. The labs agreed that this item be forwarded to the WS for review and possible development of appropriate test criteria. The following is a copy of the 2010 Weighing Labs Agenda Item 2:

**Weighing Labs Item 2 – ECRS Power Failure**

Source: Steve Patoray
Section 8 in ECRS has info on power loss for the ECRS.

Mr. Patoray asks how 8.7.3. can be met from what is stated in the Note below this section? Parts 1 and 2 of 8.7. are fairly clear, but in part 3, how does the ECR “continue to function and perform correctly” if it prevents indication or continuation of any transaction.

If part 3 is acceptable, what must occur after the card has been read in a card-activated system when the power has been restored? Some questions are:

- Does step 3 apply to such a system?
- Could the transaction be “canceled” in case of a power loss?
- No charges?
- Then the POS returns to normal operation, (with no transaction) once power is restored?

8.7. Power Interruptions. If a power interruption occurs via the switch, plug, or line fluctuation, the register must do one of the following:

8.7.1. Continue to function and perform correctly (e.g., the ECR is equipped with an uninterruptible power supply) Yes No N/A

8.7.2. Cease operation when power is interrupted and resume the transaction in process, at the time of the power failure when power is returned. Yes No N/A

8.7.3. Prevent any indication or the continuation of any transaction initiated before a power interruption. Yes No N/A
NOTE: Either alternative is acceptable provided that the ECR continues to function and perform correctly. There are no requirements to indicate when a power failure or interruption has occurred. Test first with a power failure to the ECR alone, then power failure to the scale alone and finally by power failure to both components simultaneously.

Also, the sentence underlined below, does not seem to fit with 8.7.3. either.

8. Indicating and Recording Elements – General


A point-of-sale system (POS) shall be designed to provide clear, definite, and adequate indications.
- Its features and operations shall be designed so that they minimize the potential of both intentional and unintentional errors.
- The price-look-up (PLU) capability shall prevent the interaction of weight and nonweight PLUs, (e.g., weight-related PLUs must require a weight input and nonweight PLUs shall not respond to weight input).
- Manual gross or net weight entries are permitted only under specific conditions and shall be identified on the printed ticket or receipt. Manual, stored, or other predetermined tare entries do not have to be identified.
- Transaction information shall not be lost or unrecorded in the event of a power failure.

It would seem that with this criteria that every ECR/POS would need to have some type of battery back-up or UPS (for the 15 minute requirement) to continue with the transaction. Is this correct?

Recommendation/Conclusion: The WS reviewed existing test criteria in Section 8.7. and recommended changing Publication 14 to clarify how an ECR is to perform when power is restored after a power interruption. This recommendation can be found in Appendix A, Agenda Item 9.

10. Acceptable Symbols/Abbreviations to Display the CC Number via a Device’s User Interface.

Sources: 2009 NTETC Software Sector Agenda Item 3 and 2010 S&T Item 310-3 G-S.1. Identification. (Software)

2010 Interim Report of the S&T Committee:
(http://ts.nist.gov/WeightsAndMeasures/Publications/10-Pub16.cfm)
2010 Software Sector summary:
(http://ncwm.net/sites/default/files/meetings/software/2010/10_Software_Summary.pdf)

Background: Local Weights and Measures inspectors need a means to determine whether equipment discovered in the field has been evaluated by NTEP. If so, the inspector needs to know at a minimum the CC number. From this starting point, other required information can be ascertained. HB 44 currently includes three options for marking of the CC:

1. Permanent marking
2. Continuous display
3. Recall using a special operation

Makers of Purpose-built (known internationally as “Type P”) equipment often choose permanent marking. For Type Approved software executing on a Universal computer (internationally known as “Type U”), permanent marking is not very practical. The second option of continuous display is also undesirable as the permanent display occupies valuable operator/customer screen area. As a result most makers of software for Type U equipment opt for the special recall option. Unfortunately, HB 44 is somewhat vague about the specific means of recall. Software makers can be quite creative leaving the field inspector guesswork, frustration and wasted time. If the inspector complains,
the maker notes that the recall procedure is documented in the CC. But this is precisely the information that cannot be retrieved in the field, leading to a circular argument.

Compounding the problem, makers of sophisticated built-for-purpose equipment would also like the same flexibility currently afforded to makers of software for Type U equipment. The recall method is not available to the Type P maker today.

At its March 2010 meeting, the Software Sector, in response to comments heard during the 2010 Interim meeting, revised the proposed language changes described in the NCWM S&T Committee’s Interim Report Item 310-3. These revisions removed the differentiation between types of software (Type P and Type U) while still managing to achieve the Sector’s objective. The revised 310-3 proposal can be seen in the 2010 Software Sector Summary and is not included here for the sake of brevity.

In summary, for S&T Item 310-3 the Sector now suggests amending the current item under consideration. The Software Sector also initiated discussion on two new concepts, which may eventually result in additional recommendations to amend G-S.1. It should be noted that these new ideas are in the developmental stage, and are included here by request of the Sector, since comments from the regions and other interested parties would be appreciated by the Software Sector members.

First, the sector sees merit to requiring some “connection” between the software identifier (i.e., version/revision) and the software itself. The proposal was as follows (with the expectation that examples of acceptable means of implementing such a link would be included in Pub 14).

Add a new sub-subparagraph (3) to G-S.1.(d) to read as follows:

“The version or revision identifier shall be directly and inseparably linked to the software itself. The version or revision identifier may consist of more than one part, but at least one part shall be dedicated to the metrologically significant software.”

Second, it seems that at each meeting of the Sector, the states reiterate the problems they have in the field locating the basic information required when the CC number is marked via the rather general current HB 44 requirement of ‘accessible through an easily recognizable menu, and if necessary a sub-menu’ [G-S.1.1. (b)(3)]. The states have indicated that this is too vague and field inspectors often cannot find the certificate number on unfamiliar devices.

Discussion: The WS was requested to provide feedback on a brief initial list of menu text and icons intended to form a starting point for developing a complete list of acceptable options for accessing the required CC Number (if it is not hard-marked or continuously displayed) relating to the proposed G-S.1.1. subparagraph (b) and possible compromise solution as follows:

Proposed G-S.1.1.subparagraph (b):

(b) The CC Number shall be:

(3) accessible through one or, at most, two levels of access.

   (i) For menu-based systems, “Metrology”, “System Identification”, or “Help”.

   (ii) For systems using icons, a metrology symbol (“M” or “SI”), or a help symbol (“?,” “I,” or an “i” within a magnifying glass).

The software sector noted they are not suggesting the items in (i) and (ii) of the subparagraph be the final valid options and desired to have feedback specifically on additional menu text/icon images that should be considered acceptable. The software sector also noted that the number of acceptable options is less of an issue (within reason) than the fact that the list is finite.
A Possible Compromise Solution:

The Software Sector is asking if the restrictions for marking Type P equipment (allow the same options as for Type U) be relaxed in exchange for limiting the number of optional means for recalling the CC number when a recall sequence is required.

The proposed limitations on CC recall sequence are:

1. Recall shall not require more than two levels of operations. The CC recall method (trigger, command, etc.) may be present either on the main screen or one sub-menu/sub-screen down.

2. A limited number of menu text strings or icon shape choices are permitted for both the CC recall methods and the optional top level. (There is actually some validity to the argument this requirement is currently already implied by the term ‘readily identifiable menu’ used in HB 44 to describe the allowable means of recalling the CC.)

Of course, to affect this compromise a finite list of acceptable menu text/button icon options will have to be agreed upon and documented. Note that the states didn’t express much concern about the actual number of allowable selections included (though it should be reasonable); they are more concerned that there is simply a finite list of options which the NTEP labs can reference to validate the device’s implementation and that using that same list inspectors can locate the required information in the field.

Thus, the Software Sector developed the following brief initial list of ideas of menu text and icons which would form the starting point to developing the complete list of acceptable options for the readily identifiable menu.

Comments and additional suggestions for entries in the list are welcome.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permitted Menu Text examples</th>
<th>Permitted Icon shape examples</th>
<th>Essential characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Information                 | ![i_icon](image)             | Top level menu text or icon
  • Icon text is a lower case “i” with block serifs
  • Text color may be light or dark but must contrast with the background color
  • Icon may have a circular border
  • Activation of this menu text/icon may invoke a second level menu text/icon that recalls metrology information. |
| Help                        | ![?_icon](image)             | Top level menu text or icon
  • Icon text is a question mark
  • Text color may be light or dark but must contrast with the background color
  • Icon may have a circular border
  • Activation of this menu text/icon may invoke a second level menu text/icon that recalls metrology information. |
| Metrology                   | ![M_icon](image)             | Top or second level menu text or icon
  • Icon text is an upper case “M”
  • Text color may be light or dark but must contrast with the background color
  • Icon may have a rectangle or rounded rectangle border
  • If present, the activation of this menu text/icon must recall at a minimum the NTEP CC number. Other metrology information may optionally be displayed. |
| SI                          | ![SI_icon](image)            | Top or second level menu text or icon
  • Icon text is upper case “SI”
  • Text color may be light or dark but must contrast with the background color
  • Icon may have a rectangle or rounded rectangle border
  • If present, the activation of this menu item/icon must recall at a minimum the NTEP CC number. Other metrology information may optionally be displayed. |

Acceptable examples:

1. The “M” icon is available on the home screen. Activation displays a new screen containing the CC number and some additional metrology information including the software version/revision number(s).

2. The “SI” icon is available on the home screen. Touch screen activation displays a pop-up containing the CC number. Releasing the icon erases the pop-up.

3. The main screen contains the “i” icon (information). Activating this icon displays a screen of other icons including the “M” icon. Activating the “M” icon displays the NTEP CC.
4. The main menu includes a “Help” selection which in turn contains a “Metrology” selection. Activation of the Metrology selection displays a pop-up screen containing all global metrological approvals, including the NTEP CC number. The user manually dismisses the pop-up screen by pressing the [X] button.

5. The main menu includes an “Info” selection which in turn contains a “SI” selection. Activation of the SI selection displays a pop-up screen containing all global metrological approvals, including the NTEP CC number. The user manually dismisses the pop-up screen by pressing the [OK] button.

**Conclusion:** The WS reviewed the initial list of menu text and icons and provided the following comments:

- Mr. Flocken indicated that the green M is an EU metrology mark and for that reason should not be considered an acceptable icon.
- There was general consensus amongst WS members that the SI should not be considered acceptable since it is also used to identify the International System of Units.

**Next Sector Meeting:**

**Conclusion:** The WS agreed to recommend that its annual meeting be held during the last week of August 2011 in Sacramento, California. The WS suggested Denver, Colorado, as an alternate location.
Appendix A - Recommendations for Amendments to Publication 14

Agenda Item 1.a.

DES Section 40. Zero-Load Adjustment - General
Code References: S.2.1.1. and S.2.1.2.

Indicate the zero load adjustment method provided.

- Tool operated zero-load adjustment. (Manual zero-setting mechanism)
- Semi-automatic zero-load adjustment.  (Semi-automatic zero-setting mechanism)
- Power switch zero-load adjustment.
- Initial zero setting mechanism.(editorial)

DES 43. Zero-Tracking Mechanism
Code Reference: S.2.1.3., S.2.1.3.1., S.2.1.3.2., and S.2.1.3.3.

A scale may be equipped with an automatic zero-tracking mechanism (AZT) capability to automatically correct for weight variations near zero within specified limits. To reduce the potential for weighing errors, the AZT may operate only under limited conditions as indicated in the specific type evaluation criteria. **Automatic zero-setting (setting the scale to zero without the intervention of the operator after 30 minutes) beyond the limits of AZT as defined in OIML R76 (Edition 2006) as an zero-setting mechanism is not permitted in HB 44 since there is no limit on the amount of zero adjustment in HB 44. Note that automatic zero setting is not the same as the initial zero-setting mechanism.**

43.1. This amount must comply with S.2.1.3. for the intended application.  
Yes □ No □ N/A □

43.2. AZT shall not be operable on any hopper scale.  
Yes □ No □ N/A □

43.3. For vehicle, axle-load, and railway track scales, and scales other than bench, counter, and livestock scales AZT may be operable only at a gross load zero.  
Yes □ No □ N/A □

43.4. AZT shall not be operational when the scale is displaying a positive weight value greater than the maximum AZT quantity allowed.  
Yes □ No □ N/A □

43.5. Hopper scales used in automatic bulk-weighing systems and all Class III L scales shall be equipped with a sealable means to enable/disable or set the AZT window to zero (0) for testing and inspection.  
Yes □ No □ N/A □

43.6 Review documentation to verify whether the device has an automatic zero-setting mechanism. If yes, the feature shall be configured in the disabled position. This feature shall also be protected by the approved security mean in Pub 14 Section 10.  
Yes □ No □ N/A □

If there is no reference to automatic zero-setting in the documentation, verify that the device does not automatically rezero an amount greater than the limits of AZT.

1) Place a load of 1 to 3 d above the limits of AZT. After 30 minutes, observe the device to see if the indication automatically returned to a zero indication.
2) Place a load of 1 to 3 d above the limits of AZT. Zero the scale using the semiautomatic zero-setting mechanism. Remove the test load. The device should maintain a negative weight indication or an error message or code that it is below zero. After 30-minutes, observe the device to see if the indication automatically returned to a zero indication.

The device does not comply if the indication automatically returns to zero.

ABWS Section 8

The weighing system shall be equipped with manual or semiautomatic means by which the zero-balance or no-load reference value may be adjusted. An automatic zero setting mechanism (AZSM) and an automatic zero tracking (AZT) mechanism as defined in Appendix D of HB 44 are prohibited.

AWS Section 25. Automatic Zero-Setting Tracking Mechanism (Zero Tracking) (AZT)

A scale may be equipped with an AZT capability to automatically correct for weight variations near zero within specified limits. To reduce the potential for weighing errors, the AZT may operate only under limited conditions. Automatic zero-setting (setting the scale to zero without the intervention of the operator after 30 minutes) the limits of AZT as defined in HB 44 for the intended application is prohibited. Note that automatic zero setting is not the same as an initial zero-setting mechanism. An automatic zero adjustment beyond the limits of automatic zero-tracking (AZT), as defined in HB 44, is prohibited.

If the device has an AZT capability, record the maximum amount (in scale divisions) that can be zeroed at one time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Maximum Amount (in scale divisions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVOIRDUPOIS</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRIC</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER UNITS</td>
<td>Specify unit ; d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25.1. This amount must comply with S.2.1.3. (Scales Code) for the intended application.
For devices falling under S.2.1.3. (a), that is, bench or counter, AZT may be operable with the device at a gross load zero at a net load zero or at a negative net weight indication resulting from a tare weight entry having been made with the scale at zero gross load.
Indicate where AZT is operational.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Zero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Zero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative with Tare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25.2. AZT shall not be operational when the scale is displaying a positive weight value greater than the maximum AZT quantity allowed.

Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐
25.3 Review documentation to determine if the device has an automatic zero-setting mechanism. If yes, the feature shall be configured in the disabled position. This feature shall also be protected by the approved security mean in Pub 14 Section 8.

If there is no reference to automatic zero-setting in the documentation, verify that the device does not automatically rezero an amount greater than the limits of AZT.

1) Place a load of 1 to 3 d above the limits of AZT. After 30-minutes, observe the device to see if the indication automatically returned to a zero indication.

2) Place a load of 1 to 3 d above the limits of AZT. Zero the scale using the semiautomatic zero-setting mechanism. Remove the test load. The device should maintain a negative weight indication or an error message or code that it is below zero. After 30-minutes, observe the device to see if the indication automatically returned to a zero indication.

The device does not comply if the indication automatically returns to zero.
Agenda Item 1.b.

## TIME DEPENDENCE TEST FORM

**Code Reference:** T.N.4.5.1., and T.N.4.5.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control No.:</th>
<th>Pattern designation:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Observer:</th>
<th>Verification scale interval e:</th>
<th>Resolution during test (smaller than e):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Zero-tracking device is:
- [ ] Non-existent
- [ ] Not in operation
- [ ] Out of working range

\[
E = I + 0.5 \, e - \Delta L - L
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Load L</th>
<th>Time of Reading</th>
<th>Indication I</th>
<th>Add. Load ( \Delta L )</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>mpe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial + 20 sec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the difference between the indication obtained at 15 minutes and that at 30 minutes exceeds 0.2 \( e \), the difference between the indication obtained immediately after placing the load on the instrument and the indication observed during the following four hours shall not exceed the absolute value of the maximum permissible error at the load applied.

|        | 1 hr   |              |                          |       |
|        | 2 hr   |              |                          |       |
|        | 3 hr   |              |                          |       |
|        | 4 hr   |              |                          |       |

- 15 - 30 min Passed
- 0 - 30 min Passed
- 0 – 4 hr Passed

### Time Dependence Zero Return

Zero-tracking device is:
- [ ] Non-existent
- [ ] Not in operation
- [ ] Out of working range

\[
P = I + 0.5 \, e - \Delta L
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Reading</th>
<th>Load ( L_0 )</th>
<th>Indication of zero ( I_0 )</th>
<th>Add. load ( \Delta L )</th>
<th>( P )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After loading for 30 minutes</td>
<td>Load = ___________\</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change of indication \( \Delta P = \___________\ \)

Meaning of symbols:
- \( I = \) Indication
- \( P = \) Indication
- \( \Delta = \) Change of indication
- \( \Delta P = \) Change of indication
- \( \Delta L = \) Change of load
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### For single range scales:

- Check that $|\Delta P| \leq |\text{MPE}|$ for Class III L devices
- Check that $|\Delta P| \leq 0.5 \ e$ for Class II, III, and IIII devices
- **Check that $|\Delta P| \leq 0.5 \ e$ for Class III devices ($n \leq 4000$ d)**
- **Check that $|\Delta P| \leq 0.83 \ e$ for Class III devices ($n > 4000$ d)**

### For multi-interval scales:

- **Check that $|\Delta P| \leq 0.83 \ e$ of the first weighing segment of the scale**

### For multiple range scales:

- **Check that $|\Delta P| \leq 0.83 \ e$ (interval of the weighing range under test)**

- Check that after returning to zero from any load greater than $\text{Max}_1$ and immediately after switching to the lowest weighing range, the indication near zero shall not vary by more than $e$, during the next 5 minutes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passed</th>
<th>Failed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:**

**Agenda Item 2.**

### 10. Provision For Metrological Sealing of Adjustable Components or Audit Trail

**Code References: G-S.8.1. and S.1.11.**

Due to the ease of adjusting the accuracy of electronic scales, all scales (except for Class I scales) must provide for a security seal that must be broken or provide an audit trail, before any adjustment that detrimentally affects the performance of the electronic device can be made. Only metrological parameters that can affect the measurement features that have a significant potential for fraud and features or parameters whose range extends beyond that appropriate for device compliance with NIST HB 44 or the suitability of equipment, shall be sealed.

For additional information on the proper design and operation of the different forms of audit trail, see see **Appendix B for the Requirements for Metrological Audit Trails**.

The judgment of whether or not the method of access to an adjustment represents a “significant potential for fraud” and will normally require sealing for security will be made based upon the application of the **Philosophy for Sealing in Appendix A**.

**Sealing - General**

In addition to satisfying the physical security sealing requirement; the presents of a physical seal shall clearly indicate that the setup or configuration mode (any mode permitting access to any or all sealable parameters...
based upon the application of the *Philosophy for Sealing in Publication 14* of the device can not be accessed without additional actions (e.g., removal of a jumper, pressing a key or switch, etc.) only possible after the removal of the seal.

If the use of a physical seal is the only approved method of sealing; it shall not be possible to apply the physical seal with the device in the setup or configuration mode (any mode permitting access to any or all sealable parameters based upon the application of the *Philosophy for Sealing in Publication 14*) unless the device has a clear indication that the device is in this mode. See the list of acceptable and unacceptable indications below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technologist:</th>
<th>Remarks:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Applicable for Devices Using a Physical Seal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Temp °C</th>
<th>RH (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism used to enter calibration / configuration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jumper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mechanism effective upon exit of calibration / configuration in Approved Mode, when mechanism is properly set according to manufacturers specifications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jumper</th>
<th>Pushbutton (momentary switch)</th>
<th>Toggle / Slide Switch</th>
<th>Other (Describe in Remarks)</th>
<th>Meets requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: entering and exiting the calibration/configuration access mode shall be listed on the NTEP CC.)

### Indications representing that the device is configured with the setup or configuration mode enabled (i.e., any mode permitting access to any or all sealable parameters)

This list is not limiting or all-inclusive; other indications may be acceptable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptable Clear Indications</th>
<th>Indications NOT Acceptably Clear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unusable weight indications</td>
<td><strong>C 100.05 lb</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example: <strong>C100.05E</strong></td>
<td>Any digit in the weight differentiated buy size, shape, or color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“not HB 44” annunciator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Audit Trails – General
10.1. Verify that… (The remainder of Section 10 is unchanged.)

Agenda Item 5.

11. Indicating and Recording Elements - General

There are several general requirements to facilitate the reading and interpretation of displayed weight values. Other requirements address the proper operation of indicating and recording elements. The use of the dot as the decimal marker is customary in the U.S. and that the use of other types of decimal markers (e.g., comma or “∙”) is not acceptable.

Agenda Item 6.

42. Zero-Load and Tare Adjustment - Monorail Scales
Code References: S.2.1.4. and S.2.3.1.

Under the regulations of the Packers and Stockyards Administration, the rollers and hooks used on monorail scales within a facility are required to be nearly the same weight. Since monorail scales typically have scale divisions of 1 lb, a monorail scale must be capable of setting tare weights that are less than 5 percent of the scale capacity to a weight value less than the displayed scale division. This reduces the rounding error in the tare weight that would otherwise be present if the tare weight were rounded to the nearest displayed scale division.

42.1. Means must be provided for setting the zero-load balance and any tare value less than 5 percent of the scale capacity to within 0.02 percent of scale capacity. Yes □ No □ N/A □

42.2. For an in-motion system, the conditions above must be automatically maintained. Yes □ No □ N/A □

42.3. Rounding is not performed until the last mathematical operation to reduce the uncertainty of the net weight calculation. Yes □ No □ N/A □

Agenda Item 9

8.7. Power Interruptions: If a power interruption occurs via the switch, plug, or line fluctuation, the register must do one of the following:

8.7.1. Continue to function and perform correctly (e.g., the ECR is equipped with an uninterruptible power supply.) ½ Yes □ No □ N/A □

8.7.2. Cease operation when power is interrupted and resume the transaction in Yes □ No □ N/A □
8.7.3. Prevent any indication or the continuation of any transaction initiated before a power interruption when power is returned.

**Note:** Either alternative is acceptable provided that the ECR continues to function and perform correctly. There are no requirements to indicate when a power failure or interruption has occurred. Test first with a power failure to the ECR alone, then power failure to the scale alone, and finally by power failure to both components simultaneously.
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### Creep Recovery history and tolerance scenario

**NIST tests 10/1/2007 - 8/12/2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>capacity</th>
<th>classification</th>
<th>delay time (seconds)</th>
<th>measured recovery (v)</th>
<th>outcome for tolerance of 1.50v</th>
<th>also listed for Class III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 t</td>
<td>III L Mult 10000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>pass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 t</td>
<td>III L Mult 10000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>pass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 klb</td>
<td>III L Mult 10000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>pass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 klb</td>
<td>III L Mult 10000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>pass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 klb</td>
<td>III L Mult 10000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 klb</td>
<td>III L Mult 10000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 klb</td>
<td>III L Mult 10000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 klb</td>
<td>III L Mult 10000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>pass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 klb</td>
<td>III L Mult 10000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 kg</td>
<td>III L Mult 10000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>pass</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 klb</td>
<td>III L Mult 10000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>pass</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 klb</td>
<td>III L Mult 10000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>pass</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 klb</td>
<td>III L Mult 10000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>pass</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 klb</td>
<td>III L Mult 10000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>pass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 klb</td>
<td>III L Mult 10000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>pass</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 t</td>
<td>III L Mult 10000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>pass</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**percent passing ==> 76%**

---

**Note 1:** Actual time for NIST unloading is on the order of 1 second, regardless of capacity.

**Note 2:** "delay time" means the time between initiation of unloading and taking the first (reference) reading.

**Note 3:** Prior to 2009, recovery values for "delay times" of 30 or 50 seconds were interpolated from measured readings at nearby points.

**Note 4:** Since 1/1/2009, NIST sampling begins with a reading at the "delay time" required by the new Pub. 14 Table 5.
Creep Recovery history and tolerance scenario
NIST tests 10/1/2007 - 8/12/2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>capacity</th>
<th>classification</th>
<th>delay time (seconds)</th>
<th>measured recovery (v)</th>
<th>outcome for tolerance of 0.83v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 klb</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 klb</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 kg</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 kg</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 klb</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 klb</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 kg</td>
<td>III Sing 5000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 kg</td>
<td>III Sing 5000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 klb</td>
<td>III Sing 5000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 kg</td>
<td>III Sing 5000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 lb</td>
<td>III Sing 5000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 kg</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 klb</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 klb</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 klb</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 klb</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 klb</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 klb</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 klb</td>
<td>III Sing 5000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 klb</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 klb</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 klb</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 klb</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 klb</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 lb</td>
<td>III Sing 5000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 lb</td>
<td>III Sing 5000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 kg</td>
<td>III Sing 5000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 kg</td>
<td>III Sing 5000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000 lb</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000 lb</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 klb</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 klb</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 klb</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 klb</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 t</td>
<td>III Mult 5000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

percent passing ==> 69%
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Carry-over Items

1. NCWM/NTEP Policies – Issuing CCs for Software

**Source:** NCWM Reports

**Background:** For additional background on this item, see the 2009 Software Sector Meeting summary.

**Recommendation:** The Sector recommended the following language to be submitted to the National Type Evaluation Program (NTEP) Committee as a policy change.

Software Requiring a Separate CC: Software, which is implemented as an add-on to other NTEP Certified main elements to create a weighing or measuring system and its metrological functions, are significant in determining the first indication of the final quantity. Such software is considered a main element of the system requiring traceability to an NTEP CC.

NOTE: OEM software may be added to an existing CC or have a stand-alone CC with applicable applications (e.g., a manufacturer adding a software upgrade to their ECR or point-of-sale system, vehicle scale weigh-in/weigh-out software added as a feature to an indicating element, automatic bulk weighing, liquid-measuring device loading racks, etc.) and minimum system requirements for “type P” devices (see proposed software definition below). It may be possible for a manufacturer to submit a single application for both hardware and software contained in the same device. A single CC would be issued.

In this instance, OEM refers to a 3rd party. The request to add software could be made by the original CC holder on behalf of the 3rd party. Alternatively, a new CC could be created that refers to the original CC and simply lists the new portions that were examined.

The NTEP committee included this item in their agenda (NTEP Committee 2009 Interim Agenda Item 8); there was no discussion during the open hearing, and this became a Voting item for the 2009 Annual Meeting. At the 2009 National Conference on Weights and Measures (NCWM) Annual Meeting, this proposal was passed unanimously by the Conference.

**Discussion:** The NTEP Administrator was asked if there is to be any actual change in any document or is this strictly a procedural change? How do the labs know they can/should handle software items differently now? The answers to these questions were: there have not been any changes to Pub 14 this year. The Certificates of Conformance (CC) can now say “software.” The labs know this; NTEP policy is communicated to the labs. It was suggested that software could be a secondary classification on the certificates.

**Conclusions:** Our work is complete on this item; it will be removed from the agenda.

2. Definitions for Software Based Devices

**Source:** 2009 Carryover Item 310-2. This item originated from the National Type Evaluation Technical Committee (NTETC) Software Sector and first appeared on the Committee’s 2007 Agenda as Developing Item Part 1, Item 2.
Item under Consideration:

Delete the current definition of built-for-purpose device as follows:

_Built-for-purpose device._ Any main device or element, which was manufactured with the intent that it be used as, or part of, a weighing or measuring device or system. [1.10] (Added 2003)

and, add a new definition and a cross-reference to Appendix D in the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Handbook 44 (HB 44) for “Electronic devices, software-based” as follows to replace the current definition of “built-for-purpose device”:

_Electronic devices, software-based._ — Weighing and measuring devices or systems that use metrological software to facilitate compliance with Handbook 44. This includes:

(a) _Embedded software devices (Type P), aka built-for-purpose._ — A device or element with software used in a fixed hardware and software environment that cannot be modified or uploaded via any interface without breaking a security seal or other approved means for providing security and will be called a “P,” or

(b) _Programmable or loadable metrological software devices (Type U), aka not-built-for-purpose._ — A personal computer or other device and/or element with PC components with programmable or loadable metrological software and will be called “U.” A “U” is assumed if the conditions for embedded software devices are not met.

_Software-based devices — See Electronic devices, software-based._

Background: For additional background information on this item, please reference the 2009 Software Sector Meeting Summary and the 2010 NCWM Interim Meeting Agenda (Pub 15)

At its 2009 Interim Meeting, the Central Weights and Measures Association (CWMA) received comments that the proposal is sufficiently developed and recommends moving this item forward as a Voting item on the Committee’s Agenda. At its 2009 Annual Technical Conference, the Western Weights and Measures Association (WWMA) received comments from Mr. Lou Straub, speaking on behalf of the Scales Manufacturers Association (SMA), indicating the SMA continues to oppose this item, noting that requirements should apply equally to the two different device types described. The WWMA received no other input on this item and recommends this item should remain Informational until the Software Sector has had an opportunity to review comments from the 2009 NCWM Annual Meeting and any comments made at subsequent regional weights and measures association meetings. At its 2009 Annual Meeting, the Southern Weights and Measures Association (SWMA) recommended keeping the status of this proposal to delete the current definition of built-for-purpose device and add a new definition and a cross-reference to Appendix D in HB 44 for “Electronic devices, software-based” to replace the current definition of “built-for-purpose device” as an Informational item. The SWMA agreed that the Software Sector should continue to work on the proposal until it arrives at some final language. During its 2009 Interim Meeting, the Northeastern Weights and Measures Association (NEWMA) stated that it supports the Committee’s decision to keep this item Informational to allow updated comments from the regional Weights and Measures associations and other interested parties based on information in the summary of the March 2009 meeting of the Software Sector. The item remains as an Informational item on 2010 Annual Meeting Agenda; the Specifications and Tolerances (S&T) Committee indicated that they look forward to additional work being done on this item by the Sector.

Discussion: Initially it was decided to table discussion on this item; as we worked on items further down the list, we would see if it was really necessary to include the ‘Type P’ and ‘Type U’ differentiation at this time; if so, we...
would come back and work on the definitions. In particular, Agenda Item 3 (which contained references to the proposed definitions) would be examined in more detail to see if we couldn’t satisfy the concerns of the SMA by avoiding differentiation of device types for identification purposes.

**Conclusion:** When all other Agenda items had been discussed, it was determined that there was no real need to introduce this differentiation in device types at the current time. It was decided that we would recommend to S&T that this item be withdrawn for now (with the realization that work on future items may require we reintroduce the concept). The previously proposed language is recorded herein if future requirements would revive the need for the definitions to differentiate between device types.

### 3. G-S.1. Identification (Software)

**Source:** NTETC Software Sector

**Background:** During their October 2007 meeting, the Sector discussed the value and merits of required markings for software. This included the possible differences in some types of devices and marking requirements. After hearing several proposals, the Sector agreed to the following technical requirements applicable to the marking of software.

1. The NTEP CC Number must be continuously displayed or hard marked;
2. The version must be software-generated and shall not be hard marked;
3. The version is required for embedded (Type P) software;
4. Printing the required identification information can be an option;
5. Command or operator action can be considered as an option in lieu of a continuous display of the required information; and
6. Devices with Type P (embedded) software must display or hard mark make, model, S.N. to comply with G-S.1. Identification.

The Sector developed marking information requirements and submitted a proposal to the S&T Committee for considered inclusion in HB 44. There was much additional comment and various proposed versions of the table from NIST Weights and Measures Division (WMD), et al. (The complete background on this item can be seen in the 2010 Interim Meeting Agenda, NCWM Pub 15, 2010.)

The Sector noted that though currently it is allowable to display the CC number via a menu, there has been some challenges locating this information in the field due to the vagueness of the term “easily recognized.” Hence, since it is left to the interpretation of the NTEP laboratory to ascertain whether a device’s method for displaying the CC number meets the requirements, this vagueness has not been addressed in this new recommendation.

At the 2009 Software Sector Meeting, it was agreed that the proposed table had not accomplished the intended purpose of clarifying the requirements, indeed it seemed to have generated more confusion. Hence, this item was revisited from the beginning, and it was suggested that a simpler approach be taken, namely to modify the text of G-S.1. to match our intent. The proposal from our Sector was as follows:

**G-S.1. Identification.** – All equipment, except weights and separate parts necessary to the measurement process but not having any metrological effect and manufactured prior to after January 1, 201X, shall be clearly and permanently marked for the purposes of identification with the following information:

(a) the name, initials, or trademark of the manufacturer or distributor;

(b) a model identifier that positively identifies the pattern or design of the device;

(1) The model identifier shall be prefaced by the word “Model,” “Type,” or “Pattern.” These terms may be followed by the word “Number” or an abbreviation of that word.
The abbreviation for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., No or No.). The abbreviation for the word “Model” shall be “Mod” or “Mod.” Prefix lettering may be initial capitals, all capitals, or all lowercase.

[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2003]
(Added 2000) (Amended 2001)

(c) a nonrepetitive serial number, except for equipment with no moving or electronic component parts and not built-for-purpose software-based software that is not part of a Type P (built-for-purpose) device.

[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 1968]
(Amended 2003 and 201X)

(1) The serial number shall be prefaced by words, an abbreviation, or a symbol, that clearly identifies the number as the required serial number.

[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 1986]

(2) Abbreviations for the word “Serial” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “S,” and abbreviations for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., S/N, SN, Ser. No., and S. No.).

[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2001]

(d) the current software version or revision identifier for not built-for-purpose software-based electronic devices;

[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2004]
(Added 2003) (Amended 201X)

(1) The version or revision identifier shall be prefaced by words, an abbreviation, or a symbol, that clearly identifies the number as the required version or revision.

[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2007]
(Added 2006)

(2) Abbreviations for the word “Version” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “V” and may be followed by the word “Number.” Abbreviations for the word “Revision” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “R” and may be followed by the word “Number.” The abbreviation for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., No or No.).

[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2007]
(Added 2006)

(e) an NTEP Certificate of Conformance (CC) number or a corresponding CC Addendum Number for devices that have a CC. The CC Number or a corresponding CC Addendum Number shall be prefaced by the terms “NTEP CC,” “CC,” or “Approval.” These terms may be followed by the word “Number” or an abbreviation of that word. The abbreviation for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., No or No.)

[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2003]

The required information shall be so located that it is readily observable without the necessity of the disassembly of a part requiring the use of any means separate from the device.

G-S.1. Location. Method of Marking Information for Not Built For Purpose all Software-Based Devices. — For not built-for-purpose software-based devices manufactured prior to January 1, 201X, either:

(a) The required information in G-S.1. Identification. (a), (b), (d), and (e) shall be permanently marked or continuously displayed on the device; or

(b) The Certificate of Conformance (CC) Number shall be:

(1) permanently marked on the device;

(2) continuously displayed; or

(3) accessible through an easily recognized menu and, if necessary, a submenu. Examples of menu and submenu identification include, but are not limited to, “Help,” “System Identification,” “G-S.1. Identification,” or “Weights and Measures Identification.”

Note: For (b), clear instructions for accessing the information required in G-S.1. (a), (b), and (d) shall be listed on the CC, including information necessary to identify that the software in the device is the same type that was evaluated.

[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2004]
(Added 2003) (Amended 2006 and 201X)

Discussion: As was noted in the review of what transpired at the Interim Meeting, there appears to be continued resistance, especially from the SMA, to differentiating between Type P and Type U software types. From their perspective it is ‘all software’ and they are concerned that marking requirements will be more complex if we delineate between two different types of software-based devices. Also, the inspectors want to standardize the method of locating the marking information when it is being displayed via menu, and insist that it should be very simple for field personnel to locate. Some additional work by the group resulted in this modified proposal that does not include the new definitions and does not specifically delineate any device types (in fact, it removes the existing mention of ‘built-for-purpose’):

G-S.1. Identification. — All equipment, except weights and separate parts necessary to the measurement process but not having any metrological effect and manufactured after January 1, 201X, shall be clearly and permanently marked for the purposes of identification with the following information:

(a) the name, initials, or trademark of the manufacturer or distributor;

(b) a model identifier that positively identifies the pattern or design of the device;

(1) The model identifier shall be prefaced by the word “Model,” “Type,” or “Pattern.” These terms may be followed by the word “Number” or an abbreviation of that word. The abbreviation for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., No or No.). The abbreviation for the word “Model” shall be “Mod” or “Mod.” Prefix lettering may be initial capitals, all capitals, or all lowercase.

[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2003]
(Added 2000) (Amended 2001)

(c) a nonrepetitive serial number, except for equipment with no moving or electronic component parts and not built-for-purpose software-based software that is not part of a Type P (built-for-purpose) device.

[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 1968]
(Amended 2003 and 201X)

(1) The serial number shall be prefaced by words, an abbreviation, or a symbol, that clearly identifies the number as the required serial number.
(2) Abbreviations for the word “Serial” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “S,” and abbreviations for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., S/N, SN, Ser. No., and S. No.). [Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2001]

(d) the current software version or revision identifier for not-built-for-purpose software-based electronic devices; [Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2004]
(Added 2003) *(Amended 201X)*

(1) The version or revision identifier shall be prefaced by words, an abbreviation, or a symbol, that clearly identifies the number as the required version or revision. [Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2007] (Added 2006)

(2) Abbreviations for the word “Version” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “V” and may be followed by the word “Number.” Abbreviations for the word “Revision” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “R” and may be followed by the word “Number.” The abbreviation for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., No or No.). [Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2007] (Added 2006)

(e) an NTEP CC number or a corresponding CC Addendum Number for devices that have a CC. The CC Number or a corresponding CC Addendum Number shall be prefaced by the terms “NTEP CC,” “CC,” or “Approval.” These terms may be followed by the word “Number” or an abbreviation of that word. The abbreviation for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., No or No.) [Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2003]

The required information shall be so located that it is readily observable without the necessity of the disassembly of a part requiring the use of any means separate from the device. (Amended 1985, 1991, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2003, and, 2006 and 201X)

**Comments:** The thinking was that standalone software has no moving or electronic component parts and hence is not required to have a serial number. This was considered acceptable by the Sector; the Sector sees no value in requiring vendors submittals for NTEP approval that are software-only to print serial numbers on their distribution media (CD, DVD, etc). It was observed by California that if we continue with the concept of only examining ‘devices’ that typically off-the-shelf PC’s have their own serial number, generated by the manufacturer. This can and has been used by the inspectors as a means to meet G-S.1.(c) though the prefix/abbreviation is sometimes an issue since the PC manufacturer knows nothing about G-S.1.

It was also suggested that G-S.1.1.(b)(3) be modified to omit the term “easily recognized”; instead, a limited list of options would be available. A first pass at reworking G-S.1.1(b)(3) resulted in:

**G-S.1.1. Location Method of Marking Information for Not-Built-For-Purpose all Software-Based Electronic Devices.** – For not-built-for-purpose software-based devices manufactured after January 1, 201X, either:

(a) The required information in G-S.1. Identification, (a), (b), (d), and (e) shall be permanently marked or continuously displayed on the device; or
(b) The CC Number shall be:

(1) permanently marked on the device;

(2) continuously displayed; or

(3) accessible through one or, at most, two levels of access, an easily recognized menu and, if necessary, a submenu. Examples of menu and submenu identification include, but are not limited to, “Help,” “System Identification,” “G-S.1. Identification,” or “Weights and Measures Identification.”

(a) For menu-based systems, “Metrology”, “System Identification”, or “Help”.

(b) For systems using icons, a metrology symbol (“M”), “SI”, or a help symbol (“?”, “i”, or an “i” within a magnifying glass).

Note: For (b), clear instructions for accessing the information required in G-S.1. (a), (b), (c), and (d) shall be listed on the CC, including information necessary to identify that the software in the device is the same type that was evaluated.

[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2004]
(Added 2003) (Amended 2006 and 201X)

This new language for G-S.1.1.(3)(b) is in the early stages, and the Software Sector would like feedback regarding G-S.1.1(b)(3), particularly suggestions for specific allowed menu items/icons that should be included on the list.

Conclusion: The revised G-S.1. (and G-S.1.1.) above will be sent to NCWM S&T Committee as our updated recommendation.

[Note: It was observed by WMD (after our meeting adjourned) that there have been several revisions, and revisions to revisions, to our G-S.1. proposals. The proofing (font, bold/italic, etc.) may no longer reflect the correct form with which changes are to be submitted, and they may not actually reflect the changes from what is currently in the 2010 Handbook. This needs to be addressed prior to submission to the S&T Committee; the Chair will compare the proposed language to the current HB 44 language and make sure the desired changes are marked properly in the forwarded proposal.]

4. Identification of Certified Software

Source: NTETC Software Sector

Background/Discussion: This item originated as an attempt to answer the question “How does the field inspector know that the software running in the device is the same software evaluated and approved by the lab?” In previous meetings it was shown that the international community has addressed this issue (both the European Cooperation in Legal Metrology (WELMEC) and the International Organization of Legal Metrology (OIML)). From WELMEC 7.2:

Required Documentation:
The documentation shall list the software identifications and describe how the software identification is created, how it is inextricably linked to the software itself, how it may be accessed for viewing and how it is structured in order to differentiate between version changes with and without requiring a type approval.
From OIML D 31:

The executable file “tt100_12.exe” is protected against modification by a checksum. The value of checksum as determined by algorithm XYZ is 1A2B3C.

Previous discussions have included a listing of some additional examples of possible valid methods (not limiting):
- CRC (cyclical redundancy check)
- Checksum
- Inextricably Linked version no.
- Encryption
- Digital Signature

Is there some method to give the Weights and Measures (WM) inspector information that something has changed? (Yes, the Category III audit trail or other means of sealing). How can the WM inspector identify an NTEP Certified version? (They can’t, without adding additional requirements like what is described here, in conjunction with including the identifier on the CC).

The Sector believes that we should work towards language that would include a requirement similar to the OIML requirement in HB 44. It is also the opinion of the Sector that a specific method should not be defined; rather the manufacturer should utilize a method and demonstrate the selected identification mechanism is suitable for the purpose. It is not clear from the discussion where such proposed language might belong.

NTEP strongly recommends that metrological software be separated from non-metrological software for ease of identification and evaluation. From OIML:

Separation of software parts – All software modules (programmes, subroutines, objects etc.) that perform metrologically significant functions or that contain metrologically significant data domains form the metrologically significant software part of a measuring instrument (device or sub-assembly). The conformity requirement applies to all parts and parts shall be marked according to Section G-S-X.X.

If the separation of the software is not possible or needed, then the software is metrologically significant as a whole.

(Segregation of parameters is currently allowed - see table of sealable parameters)

Initial draft proposed language: (G-S.1.1.?)

Identification of Certified Software:

Software-based electronic devices shall be designed such that the metrologically significant software is clearly identified by the version or revision number. The identification, and this identification of the software shall be inextricably directly and inseparably linked to the software itself. The version or revision number may consist of more than one part, but at least one part shall be dedicated to the metrologically significant software.

Pub. 14:

Identification of Certified Software:

Note: Manufacturers may choose to separate metrologically significant software from non-metrologically significant software. Separation would allow the revision of the non-metrological portion without the need for further evaluation. In addition, non-metrologically significant
software may be updated on devices without breaking a seal, if so designed. Separation of software requires that all software modules (programs, subroutines, objects etc.) that perform metrologically significant functions or that contain metrologically significant data domains form the metrologically significant software part of a measuring instrument (device or sub-assembly). If the separation of the software is not possible or needed, then the software is metrologically significant as a whole. The conformity requirement applies to all parts and parts shall be marked according to Section G-S.X.X.

The manufacturer must describe and possibly demonstrate how the version or revision identifier is directly and inseparably linked to the metrologically significant software. Where the version revision identifier is comprised of more than one part, the manufacturer shall describe which portion represents the metrological significant software and which does not.

From OIML D-31:

Legally relevant software of a measuring instrument / electronic device / sub-assembly shall be clearly identified with the software version or another token. The identification may consist of more than one part but at least one part shall be dedicated to the legal purpose.

The identification shall be inextricably linked to the software itself and shall be presented or printed on command or displayed during operation or at start up for a measuring instrument that can be turned off and on again. If a sub-assembly/an electronic device has neither display nor printer, the identification shall be sent via a communication interface in order to be displayed/printed on another sub-assembly/electronic device.

The first sentence of the first paragraph above is already addressed in HB 44’s marking requirements.

**Recommendation:** Recommend the following change to HB 44, General Code: G-S.1.(d) to add a new subsection (3):

(d) The current software version or revision identifier for not-built-for-purpose software-based electronic devices;
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2004]
(Added 2003) (Amended 201X)

(1) The version or revision identifier shall be prefaced by words, an abbreviation, or a symbol, that clearly identifies the number as the required version or revision.
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2007]
(Added 2006)

(2) Abbreviations for the word “Version” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “V” and may be followed by the word “Number.” Abbreviations for the word “Revision” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “R” and may be followed by the word “Number.” The abbreviation for the word “Number” shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter “N” (e.g., No or No.).
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2007]
(Added 2006)

(3) The version or revision identifier shall be directly and inseparably linked to the software itself. The version or revision identifier may consist of more than one part, but at least one part shall be dedicated to the metrologically significant software.
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 201X]
(Added 201X)
Also the Sector recommends the following information be added to Pub. 14 as explanation/examples:

- **Unique identifier must be displayable/printable on command or during operation, etc.**
- **At a minimum, a version/revision indication (1.02.09, rev 3.0 a, etc). Could also consist of / contain checksum, etc (crc32, for example)**

**Conclusions:** The item needs additional discussion and development by the sector. Outstanding questions: If we allow hard-marking of the software identifier (the Sector has wavered on this in the past), does the above wording then imply that some mechanical means is required (i.e., physical seal) to ‘inseparably link’ the identifier to the software? Do we still have to be able to display/print the identifier if it is hard-marked?

### 5. Software Protection / Security

**Source:** NTETC Software Sector

**Background:** The sector agreed that HB 44 already has audit trail and physical seal, but the question on the table is does the Handbook need to be enhanced to sufficiently discourage the facilitation of fraud, intentional or accidental, where software is concerned?

WELMEC and OIML again have addressed this issue specifically when dealing with software. From WELMEC:

**Protection against accidental or unintentional changes**

Metrologically significant software and measurement data shall be protected against accidental or unintentional changes.

**Specifying Notes:**

Possible reasons for accidental changes and faults are: unpredictable physical influences, effects caused by user functions and residual defects of the software even though state of the art of development techniques have been applied. This requirement includes:

- **a)** Physical influences: Stored measurement data shall be protected against corruption or deletion when a fault occurs or, alternatively, the fault shall be detectable.
- **b)** User functions: Confirmation shall be demanded before deleting or changing data.
- **c)** Software defects: Appropriate measures shall be taken to protect data from unintentional changes that could occur through incorrect program design or programming errors, e.g. plausibility checks.

**Required Documentation:**

The documentation should show the measures that have been taken to protect the software and data against unintentional changes.

**Example of an Acceptable Solution:**

- The accidental modification of software and measurement data may be checked by calculating a checksum over the relevant parts, comparing it with the nominal value and stopping if anything has been modified.
- Measurement data are not deleted without prior authorization, e.g. a dialogue statement or window asking for confirmation of deletion.
- For fault detection see also Extension I.

The Sector derived a suitable checklist for Pub 14 from the OIML checklist, and asked the current NTEP labs to begin using this checklist on a trial basis for new type approval applications.
### Declaration of the manufacturer that the software is used in a fixed hardware and software environment, and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

cannot be modified or uploaded by any means after securing/verification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Note: It is acceptable to break the “seal” and load new software, audit trail is also a sufficient seal.

### The software documentation contains:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **description of all the metrologically significant functions, designating those that are considered metrologically significant**

OIML states that there shall be no undocumented functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **description of the securing means (evidence of an intervention)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **software identification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **description how to check the actual software identification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The software identification is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **clearly assigned to the metrologically significant software and functions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **provided by the device as documented**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Personal computers, instruments with PC components, and other instruments, devices, modules, and elements with programmable or loadable metrologically significant software TYPE U (aka not built-for-purpose)

The metrologically significant software is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **documented with all relevant (see below for list of documents) information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **protected against accidental or intentional changes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Evidence of intervention (such as, changes, uploads, circumvention) is available until the next verification / inspection (e.g., physical seal, Checksum, CRC, audit trail, etc. means of security)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Software with closed shell (no access to the operating system and/or programs possible for the user)

Check whether there is a complete set of commands (e.g. function keys or commands via external interfaces) supplied and accompanied by short descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Check whether the manufacturer has submitted a written declaration of the completeness of the set of commands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Operating system and / or program(s) accessible for the user:

Check whether a checksum or equivalent signature is generated over the machine code of the metrologically significant software (program module(s) subject to legal control WM jurisdiction and type-specific parameters)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Check whether the metrologically significant software will detect and act upon any unauthorized alteration of the metrologically significant software using simple software tools (e.g., text editor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Software interface(s)

Verify the manufacturer has documented:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **the program modules of the metrologically significant software are defined and separated**
### Software Documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the protective software interface itself is part of the metrologically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significant software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the functions of the metrologically significant software that can be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accessed via the protective software interface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the parameters that may be exchanged via the protective software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interface are defined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the description of the functions and parameters are conclusive and complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there are software interface instructions for the third party (external)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>application programmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Sector hopes to obtain feedback at this meeting from the NTEP labs regarding this checklist.

**Discussion:** The labs again indicated they had not had a chance to utilize the checklist. The list was reviewed and some minor modifications to the checklist text were incorporated as shown in this excerpt:

The software documentation contains:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>description of all the metrologically significant functions,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designating those that are considered metrologically significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIML states that there shall be no undocumented functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>description of the securing means (evidence of an intervention)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>software identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion:** Work is ongoing on this item with the intent that it eventually be incorporated as a checklist in Pub 14; again the labs are requested to try utilizing this checklist for any evaluations on software-based electronic devices.

### 6. Software Maintenance and Reconfiguration

**Source:** NTETC Software Sector

**Background:** After the software is completed, what do the manufacturers use to secure their software?

**Discussion:** The following items were reviewed by the Sector. Note that agenda item 3 also contains information on Verified and Traced updates and Software Log.

a. Verify that the update process is documented (OK).

b. For traced updates, Installed Software is authenticated and checked for integrity.

Technical means shall be employed to guarantee the authenticity of the loaded software (i.e., that it originates from the owner of the type approval certificate). This can be accomplished, for example, by cryptographic means like signing. The signature is checked during loading. If the loaded software fails this test, the instrument shall discard it and either use the previous version of the software or become inoperative.

Technical means shall be employed to guarantee the integrity of the loaded software i.e., that it has not been inadmissibly changed before loading. This can be accomplished for example, by adding a checksum or hash code of the loaded software and verifying it during the loading procedure. If the loaded software
fails this test, the instrument shall discard it and either use the previous version of the software or become inoperative.

Examples are not limiting or exclusive.

c. Verify that the sealing requirements are met.

The Sector asked, what sealing requirements are we talking about?

This item is only addressing the software update, it can be either verified or traced. It is possible that there are two different security means, one for protecting software updates (software log) and one for protecting the other metrological parameters (Category I, II, or III method of sealing).

Some examples provided by the Sector members include, but are not limited to:

- Physical Seal, software log
- Category III method of sealing can contain both means of security

d. Verify that if the upgrade process fails, the device is inoperable or the original software is restored.

The question before the group is can this be made mandatory?

The manufacturer shall ensure by appropriate technical means (e.g., an audit trail) that traced updates of metrologically significant software are adequately traceable within the instrument for subsequent verification and surveillance or inspection. This requirement enables inspection authorities, which are responsible for the metrological surveillance of legally controlled instruments, to back-trace traced updates of metrologically significant software over an adequate period of time (that depends on national legislation). The statement in italics will need to be reworded to comply with U.S. WM requirements.

The Sector agreed that the two definitions below for verified update and traced update were acceptable.

**Verified Update**

A verified update is the process of installing new software where the security is broken and the device must be re-verified. Checking for authenticity and integrity is the responsibility of the owner/user.

**Traced Update**

A traced update is the process of installing new software where the software is automatically checked for authenticity and integrity, and the update is recorded in a software update log or audit trail.

The Sector also worked towards language proposed for defining the requirements for a Traced Update (currently considered as relevant for Pub 14):

For a Traced Update, an event logger is required. The logger shall be capable of storing a minimum of the 10 most recent updates. An entry shall be generated for each software update.

Use of a Category 3 audit trail is acceptable required for the software update logger Traced Update. In this case the existing requirement of 1,000 entries supersedes the 10 entry requirement. If software update is the only loggable event, then the Category 3 audit trail can be limited to only 10 entries. A software update log entry representing a software update shall include the following: the software identification of the newly installed version.

- An event counter:
• the date and time of the change; and
• the event type/parameter ID, which indicates a software update event (if not using a dedicated update log);
• the new value of the parameter, which is the software identification of the newly installed version.

A Category III device may include the software update events in the Category III audit log in lieu of a separate software update log; the existing requirement for 1,000 entries supersedes the requirement for 10 entries.

The traceability means and records are part of the metrologically significant software and should be protected as such. If software separation is employed, the software used for displaying the audit trail belongs to the fixed metrologically significant software. (Note: This needs to be discussed further due to some manufacturer’s concerns about where the software that displays the audit trail information is located and who has access if this feature is provided. Manufacturers did indicate that there are methods available to encrypt the audit trail information; however, it cannot be protected from being deleted.) (include flowchart from OIML D 31)

The Sector discussed how to best move this item forward, and there was also some discussion as to whether new language for the General Code was required. The following new text was proposed:

G-S.9. Metrologically Significant Software Updates

The updating of metrologically significant software shall be considered a sealable event. Metrologically significant software that does not conform to the approved type is not allowed for use.

The NTEP Administrator indicated that the current requirements in G-S.8. already make the statement that any changes that affect metrological function are sealable, hence software updates may be covered and the proposed G-S.9. unnecessary. Mr. Todd Lucas suggested we go ahead and submit the proposed G-S.9. to the Committee and request a clarification/interpretation of G-S.8.

At the 2009 meeting, the Sector opined that the explicit language proposed for G-S.9. is clearer than any implied requirement in G-S.8. The Sector would like a clarification/interpretation of G-S.8. as it relates to software updates from the S&T Committee (with their response preferably to be included in Pub 16). The Sector will also continue to develop the proposed text (and flow chart) targeted for inclusion in Pub 14.

Discussion: The Sector reviewed the proposal and reconsidered allowing a separate ‘update log’. It was decided that this would probably generate confusion and is not likely to be adopted by manufacturers anyway. Hence, the previously proposed text was modified to require a Category III audit trail for ‘traced updates’:

For a Traced Update, an event logger is required. The logger shall be capable of storing a minimum of the 10 most recent updates. An entry shall be generated for each software update. Use of a Category 3 audit trail is acceptable required for the software update logger Traced-Update. In this case the existing requirement of 1,000 entries supersedes the 10 entry requirement. If software update is the only loggable event, then the Category 3 audit trail can be limited to only 10 entries. A software update log entry representing a software update shall include the following—the software identification of the newly installed version:

• An event counter;
• the date and time of the change; and
• the event type/parameter ID, which indicates a software update event (if not using a dedicated update log);
• the new value of the parameter, which is the software identification of the newly installed version.

A Category III device may include the software update events in the Category III audit log in lieu of a separate software update log; the existing requirement for 1,000 entries supersedes the requirement for 10 entries.

Conclusions: The general consensus of the group after considering feedback from external interested parties is that a new G-S.9. with explicit requirements is not necessary (nor likely to be adopted by the Conference) and that this requirement belongs in the Pub 14 lists of sealable parameters rather than in HB 44; i.e.

The updating of metrologically significant software shall be considered a sealable event.

Additional work is to be done to further develop the proposed text toward inclusion in Pub 14.

7. Verification in the Field, By the W&M Inspector

Source: NTETC Software Sector

Background Question: What tools does the field inspector need?

Possible Answers:

• Have NTEP CC No. continuously displayed. (needs some type of protection) during the normal weighing or measuring operation
• Clear and simple instructions on NTEP CC to get to the other inspection information
• The CRC, checksum, version number, etc., needs to be easily accessible from operator console.
• Inspector needs to know how to access audit trail.
• System information is easily accessible (ram, OS, etc.)
• System parameters are easily accessible (AZT, motion, time outs, etc.).

Some discussion about system information requirements for the inspector took place… does the inspector really need to have access to OS, RAM information, etc.? (General opinion seems to be if there is a dependency, then the NTEP lab would specifically include that requirement in the CC.)

Audit trail info – the question was asked, does there need to be a specific requirement for providing access to this information?

Regarding the concept of First Final – There was some concern expressed as to how the inspectors are able to discern where the indication of first final be found for the system (as opposed to the devices in the system). What devices in the system are of concern to the inspector? The NTEP Administrator indicated that field inspectors need to follow the system all the way to receipt/bill generation.

Data transmission is an issue when considering systems as opposed to devices… how far does the inspector’s jurisdiction extend? (Should we model future requirements on the WELMEC section concerning DTD/DSD?)

Decision: data transmission/storage is not currently being addressed by the Sector at this time. Since part of the Sector’s mission is education, do we want to assist in developing training aids for labs/inspectors related to evaluating/inspecting software-based devices? This will be a topic to be added to the Sector’s Agenda for the next meeting.

At the 2009 meeting, the Sector decided to continue to develop this item, and initiate a new Agenda item specific to inspector training in relation to evaluating/validating software-based devices.

Discussion: A question from the floor requested opinion as to whether this Agenda item continued to serve a purpose. During discussion, it was stated that the goals of this item have all been addressed as part of all the other
agenda items save one (training), and inspector training will now be covered in a new item (Training of Field Inspectors), leaving this item without merit.

**Conclusion:** No argument was made for retaining this item as a separate item on the Agenda. This item will be removed from future Agendas.

8. **NTEP Application for Software requiring a separate Certificate of Conformance-based Electronic Devices**

**Source:** NTETC Software Sector

**Background/Discussion:** The purpose of initiating this item was to identify issues, requirements and processes for type approving Type U device applications. It was suggested that it may be useful to the labs to devise a separate submission form for software for Type U devices. Question: What gets submitted? What requirements and mechanisms for submission should be available?

Validation in the lab - all required subsystems shall be included to be able to simulate the system as installed.

It was noted this Agenda item is irrelevant if the NTEP Committee does not approve the pending item up for vote.

Mr. John Roach, CA NTEP Lab, stated that if the software package being evaluated supports platforms/subsystems from multiple manufacturers, testing should be done using at least two platforms/subsystems. Scale labs and scale manufacturers indicated that this is not usually done for scale evaluations.

Conclusion of 2009 Sector Meeting: The Sector will continue to develop this item, contingent on the status of the related NTEP Committee Agenda item after the 2009 Annual Meeting.

**Discussion:** Since the NTEP committee passed the related item at the Annual we will continue to work on this. The NTEP director indicated that we can move in this direction, but felt that it was somewhat premature to develop this thoroughly now. At the point where the sector has developed checklist requirements, then we could move to perhaps add a subsection to current NTEP applications for applicable software. Refer to D-31.6.1. It was also agreed that there seems to be no reason for limiting the scope of this item to software-only applications, and hence all software/software-based devices could benefit from an enhanced application process. Hence the description of this agenda item was modified as shown in the marked up heading.

**Conclusion:** The item will be revisited at the 2011 Meeting and it will be decided whether to begin further development of this item at this time.

9. **Training of Field Inspectors**

**Source:** NTETC Software Sector

**Background:** During discussions at the 2009 meeting, the Sector concluded that a new Agenda item should be initiated specific to the training of field inspectors in relation to evaluating/validating software-based devices.

**Discussion:** CA has an Examination Procedure Outline (EPO) that begins to address this. Use Handbook 112 as a pattern template for how it could read.

Items to be addressed:
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- Certificate of Conformance
- Terminology (as related to software) beyond what is in HB 44.
- Reference materials / information sources
- Safety

System Verification Tests
NOTE: Item numbers 1 through 5 apply to both weighing and measuring devices. Numbers 6 and 7 are specific to weighing devices; while numbers 9 and 10 apply to measuring devices.

1. Identification. The identification (ID) tag may be on the back room computer server and could be viewed on an identification screen on the computer monitor. The ID information may be displayed on a menu or identification screen. Though currently discouraged, some systems may be designed so the system must be shut down and reset to view the ID information. G-S.1. (1.10.)
   1.1. Manufacturer.
   1.2. Model designation.
   2.1. Verify sealing category of device (refer to Certificate of Approval for that system).
   2.2. Verify compliance with certificate.
3. Units of measure.
   3.1. A computer and printer interfaced to a digital indicator shall print all metrological values, intended to be the same, identically. G-S.5.2.2.(a); G-S.5.1. [1.10.]
   3.2. The unit of measure, such as lb, kg, oz, gal, qts, liters, or whatever is used, must agree.
4. Operational controls, indications and features (buttons and switches). Verify that application criteria and performance criteria are met (refer to Certificate of Approval).
   4.1. Any indication, operation, function or condition must not be represented in a manner that interferes with the interpretation of the indicated or printed values.
5. Indications and displays.
   5.1. Attempt to print a ticket. The recorded information must be accurate or the software must not process and print a ticket with erroneous data interpreted as a measured amount.

Weighing Devices
6. Motion detection.
   6.1. For railway track, livestock, and vehicle scales apply or remove a test load of at least 15 d while simultaneously operating a print button, push-button tare or push-button zero. A good way to do this is to try to print a ticket while pulling the weight truck or another vehicle onto the scale. Recorded values shall not differ from the static display by more than 3d. Perform the test at 10 %, 50 % and 100 % of the maximum applied test load. S.2.5.1.(a) [2.20.]; EPO NO. 2-3, 2.4.
   6.2. For all other scales, apply or remove at least 5d. Printed weight values must agree with the static weight within 1d and must exactly agree with other indications. S.2.5.4.(b) [2.20.]; EPO NO. 2-3, 2.4.
   7.1 Apply a load in excess of the automatic zero setting mechanism (AZSM) and zero the scale. S.2.1.3. [2.20.]; EPO NO. 2-3, 2.4., 2.5.2.
   **Example:** On a vehicle scale have someone stand on the scale, then zero them off (AZSM is 3d). Remove the weight (person) and note the behind zero display (usually a minus weight value) or error condition.
   7.2. Attempt to print a ticket. With a behind zero condition, (manually or mechanically operated) a negative number must not be printed as a positive value.
8. Over capacity.
   8.1. Manually enter a gross weight if permissible or apply a test load in excess of 105 % of the scale’s capacity. S.1.7. [2.20.]; S.1.12., UR.3.9. [2.20.]
   8.2. Attempt to print a weight ticket. A system must not print a ticket if the manually entered weight or load exceeds 105 % of the scale capacity.

NTEP – D18
Measuring Devices

10. Motion detection.
   10.1. Initiate flow through the measuring element. Attempt to print a ticket while the product is flowing through the measuring chamber. The device must not print while the indication is not stable. S.2.4.1. (3.30.)

11. Over capacity.
   11.1. Attempt to print a ticket in excess of the indicated capacity. A system must not print a ticket if the device is manually or mechanically operated in excess of the indicated value.

NOTE: Be aware of error codes on the indicator which may be interrupted as measured values.

Conclusion: This item is in the early stages; work will continue on the item working toward materials to aid in the training of field inspectors. It was indicated that working in conjunction with the Professional Development Committee (PDC) to develop training materials, etc. would be a logical path of progress once we have developed the information content to include.

10. Next meeting

Background: The Sector is on a yearly schedule for Sector meetings. The NTEP Administrator determines when the next meeting is possible.

Discussion: The NTEP Administrator indicated that the NTETC meetings are to be scheduled where the Conference gets the most ‘bang for the buck’, so that implies (considering our spring schedule) one of the states with an NTEP lab. Hence we’ve been rotating among Annapolis, Maryland, Columbus, Ohio, and Sacramento, California. It was also mentioned by the Technical Advisor that this rotating of the location has been quite beneficial to the group, considering the variety of input from individuals not typically able to make the trip to attend distant meetings.

Conclusion: Given the above, it was suggested that it would be Maryland’s turn in 2011. In keeping with the March timeframe and trying to avoid the last blast of winter, the group decided to return to Annapolis, Maryland, preferably March 15-16, 2011. Second choice would be the following week (March 22-23rd). The Maryland lab personnel will assist the NCWM staff in suggesting one or more suitable host facilities for the meeting.
Appendix A: Report on 2009 Interim Meeting

There were two items on the NCWM S&T Committee agenda related to our mission – Item 310-2 (definitions of software based devices) and Item 310-3 (marking requirements). The consensus was that they still need work, and they remain informational.

It seemed from the comments made during the open hearings that the membership didn’t see a clear benefit to the field inspectors, and the scale manufacturers were also resistant to the change, fearing distinction between different types of devices would complicate marking, and additionally the SMA didn’t see a difference between built-for-purpose and non-built-for-purpose.

In general, the feedback at the Interim gave the impression to Sector members that attended that we need to back up a little.
Appendix B: Report on International WM Activity

There’s a new project regarding field verification, but there likely won’t be activity this year.

There weren’t too many changes to WELMEC 7.2. They are mainly clarifications. The current methodologies are now considered a bit too restrictive, so they’re being reconsidered.

There has been an update to one of our referenced WELMEC documents since our last Software Sector meeting:


You can download an updated copy of this document at [http://www.welmec.org/publications/7-2.asp](http://www.welmec.org/publications/7-2.asp)

The changes are minor, including:
- Removal of the requirement that the NB maintain a file of the documentation and (if necessary) the software supplied for Type P & Type U submissions.
- Software Download extension has two additions, listed below in [blue](#) (underscored and bolded) below.

9 Extension D: Download of Legally Relevant Software

This extension shall be used for the download of legally relevant software as long as the metrological characteristics remain unchanged and the declaration of conformity is still valid, (e.g., bug-fixes). These requirements are to be considered in addition to the basic requirements for Types P and Type U described in Chapters 4 and 5 in the guide.

D2: Authentication of downloaded software

Means shall be employed to guarantee that the downloaded software is authentic, and to indicate that the downloaded software has been approved by an NB.

Specifying Notes:

1. Before the downloaded software is used for the first time, the measuring instrument shall automatically check that:
   a. The software is authentic (not a fraudulent simulation).
   b. The software is approved for that type of measuring instrument.
2. The means by which the software identifies its NB approval status shall be made secure to prevent counterfeiting of the NB status.
3. If downloaded software fails any of the above tests, see D1.
4. If a manufacturer intends to change or update the legally relevant software he shall announce the intended changes to the responsible notified body. The notified body decides whether an addition to the existing TEC is necessary or not. For software download it is indispensable that there is a software identification which is unambiguously assigned to the approved software version.
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A. NCWM Publication 14 Updates

1. **Handbook 44, UR.3.2. (S&T Committee agenda Item 321-1)**

   **Background:** At the 2009 National Conference on Weights and Measures (NCWM) Annual Meeting, the Conference adopted an amendment to paragraph UR.3.2. to clarify that zero-load and material or simulated-load tests are required to be performed between official testing at intervals determined by the statutory authority or by the manufacturer. Full details of the amendments to the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Handbook 44 (HB 44) may be found in the Specifications and Tolerances (S&T) Committee 2009 Interim Report.

   **Discussion/Conclusion:** The Sector members agreed that this is a HB 44 User Requirement and not intended for use during type evaluation. No changes are recommended in Publication 14 (Pub 14).

2. **Handbook 44, S.1.3.1. (S&T Committee agenda Item 321-3)**

   **Background:** At the 2009 NCWM Annual Meeting, the Conference adopted an amendment to paragraph S.1.3.1. to reconcile the value of the minimum scale division (0.1% of the minimum totalized load) with the value of the minimum test load (800 divisions) listed in paragraph N.2.3.(a).

   **Recommendation:** National Type Evaluation Technical Committee (NTETC) Belt-Conveyor Scales (BCS) Sector Technical Advisor recommended the amendment to NCWM Pub 14 Section 1.8. as shown below to reflect changes in HB 44 BCS Code, design specification S.1.3.1.
1.8. (S.1.2. and S.1.3.1.) The scale division shall be in increments of 1, 2, or 5 times 10\(^k\) where \(k\) is an integer and shall not be greater than 0.125 % (1/800) of the minimum totalized load.

1.8.1. What is the scale division?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pounds</td>
<td>lb or LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. short ton</td>
<td>ton or T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. long ton</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metric ton</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kilograms</td>
<td>kg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.8.2. Verify that the value of the scale division is protected by an acceptable security means (e.g., physical seal or audit trail).

Discussion/Conclusion: Sector members agreed to recommend the proposed change to Pub 14 BCS Section 1.8., and add a new Section 1.8.2. to verify that the value of the scale division should be a sealable parameter which is protected by a security means as shown above.

3. Handbook 44, N.2. and N.2.1. (S&T Committee agenda Item 321-5) (Number of Tests during Initial Verification)

Background: At the 2009 NCWM Annual Meeting, the Conference adopted an amendment to paragraph N.2.1. to provide clarification of how many test runs are required during an official test. Portions of the wording changes in N.2.1. relate to testing a belt-conveyor scale at a single flowrate (using a minimum of four test runs) if it can be verified that the system is operated using a single flowrate and that rate does not vary in either direction by an amount more than 10 % of the normal flow rate that can be developed at the installation for at least 80 % of the time.

These changes are applicable to specific installations that operate exclusively (within parameters) at one flowrate and would therefore not impact procedures used during type evaluation testing.

Other changes to N.2.1. will impact testing procedures regardless of the specifics of an installation and should therefore result in changes to Pub 14.

Recommendation: To reflect changes in the 2010 edition of HB 44, the technical advisor recommends that Pub 14 page BCS-15 be amended as follows:

13. Field Test Procedure

Field Performance Test of the Belt-Conveyor Scale

N.2.1. Initial Verification – A belt-conveyor scale system shall be tested at the normal use flow rate, 35 % of the maximum rated capacity, and an intermediate flow rate between these two points. The system may also be tested at any other rate of flow that may be used at the installation.
N.2.1. Initial Verification. – A belt-conveyor scale system shall be verified with a minimum of two test runs at each of the following flow rates:

(a) normal use flow rate,
(b) 35% of the maximum rated capacity, and
(c) an intermediate flow rate between these two points.

Discussion/Conclusion: The sector agreed to recommend the proposed amendments to Pub 14 BCS Section 13. In addition the members also recommend that a note (as shown below) for Section 13 be added to clarify that the site identified for conducting the field permanence test portion of the type evaluation shall be capable of providing tests at various flowrates.

Note: The test site selected for permanence testing shall be capable of testing over a range of flow rates. Any site where the belt-conveyor scale system is limited to a single flow rate will not be considered acceptable.

4. Handbook 44, T.1.1. (S&T Committee agenda Item 321-6)

Background: At the 2009 NCWM Annual Meeting, the Conference adopted and amendment to paragraph T.1.1. Tolerance Values. to clarify the allowable change in zero during an official test. Background information on the amendments to HB 44 may be found in the S&T Committee 2009 Interim Report.

Recommendation: The Technical Advisor recommended that no action is necessary because the amendments to HB 444 requirements shown above are applicable to subsequent field examinations, are not referenced explicitly in Pub 14, and do not apply to type approval test procedures.

Discussion/Conclusion: Sector members agreed with the Technical Advisor's recommendation that no further actions are required.


Background: At the 2009 NCWM Annual Meeting, the Conference adopted amendments to paragraphs N.3.1.2., N.3.1.3., N.3.1.4., and to add new paragraph S.3.1.1. in order to:

- Consolidate the requirements in N.3.1.2. and N.3.1.3.;
- Clarify the testing guidelines in N.3.1.3.;
- Rerumber the impacted paragraphs; and
- Add a new paragraph to state that the zero balance condition shall not be obscured by the automatic zero-setting mechanism.

Recommendation: The technical advisor recommended that references in Pub 14, pages BCS-16 be amended to reflect the consolidation and renumbering of the paragraphs as shown below:

13. Field Test Procedure

N.3.1.2. Initial Stable Zero. – The conveyor system shall be run to warm up the belt and the belt scale shall be zero adjusted as required. A series of zero-load tests shall be carried out until three consecutive zero-load tests each indicate an error which does not exceed ±0.06% of the totalized load at full scale capacity for the duration of the test. No adjustments can be made during the three consecutive zero-load test readings.

(Added 2002) (Amended 2004)
N.3.1.3. Test of Zero Stability. – The conveyor system shall be operated to warm up the belt and the belt scale shall be zero adjusted as required. A series of zero-load tests shall be carried out before weighing material immediately before the simulated or materials test until the three consecutive zero-load tests each indicate an error which does not exceed ± 0.06 % of the totalized load at full scale capacity for the duration of test. No adjustments can be made during the three consecutive zero-load test readings.

(Added 2002) (Amended 2004 and 2009)

N.3.1.4. Check For Consistency of the Conveyor Belt Along Its Entire Length. – After a zero-load test with flow rate filtering disabled, the totalizer shall not change more than plus or minus (± 3 d) 3.0 scale divisions from its initial indication during one complete belt revolution.

(Added 2002) (Amended 2004)

The technical advisor also recommended adding the following language to Publication 14 page BCS-7:

6. Zero-Setting Mechanism


6.3. The completion of the automatic zero-setting operation must be indicated.

6.3.1. Verify that any changes in the zero reference are indicated and/or recorded

Yes □ No □ N/A □

Discussion/Conclusion: The Sector members agreed with the proposed changes and recommended that NCWM Publication 14 be amended as shown above.

B. Proposed Update to NCWM Publication 14 Belt-Scale Checklist

Background: During the February 2009 BCS Sector meeting, a draft Pub 14 checklist was developed and offered for use on a trial basis by the National Type Evaluation Program (NTEP) labs that would evaluate manufacturer's replacement instruments. During the meeting, Sector Chairman, Mr. Bill Ripka, Thermo-Fisher, stated that Thermo-Fisher would possibly have an instrument that would be submitted in the near future to undergo the NTEP process. This checklist could then be used on this instrument as a trial basis. The results/comments would then be returned to NTEP Administrator and Sector work group (WG) for review and further development. The entire draft checklist may be found in the 2009 NTETC Belt-Conveyor Scale Sector meeting summary.

Discussion: Based on information provided by NTEP Administrator Mr. Jim Truex, the Sector members were informed that NTEP had not received an instrument from any manufacturer to use as a trial for the checklist that has been drafted. Mr. Lars Marmasater indicated that Merrick Industries will be submitting an indicator to update its NTEP Certificate of Conformance (CC).

Conclusion: NTEP Administrator Mr. Truex indicated that the California NTEP Lab would perform the evaluation when the device is submitted and that the sector will be provided with a report from the NTEP lab for any recommendations to approve or amend the proposed checklist. Sector members agreed that no further work is needed to the checklist at this time, pending a report from NTEP after applying the draft to the evaluation of an instrument. This item will be carried over and placed on the next meeting agenda of the NTETC BCS Sector.

C. Develop a List of Sealable Parameters for BCS Systems

Background: The list shown below was developed during the 2009 NTETC BCS Sector meeting and was to be forwarded to NTEP laboratories for use on a trial basis after which comments and recommended
amendments would be forwarded to the Sector WG for further development. The technical advisor reported to the members that no manufacturers' devices have been submitted for NTEP approval and therefore the list has not been used during any evaluations.

**Discussion/Conclusion:** Sector members agreed that no further amendments to the table are needed at this time, and that the table should be incorporated in the 2011 edition of Pub 14.

### Belt-Conveyor Scale Features and Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typical Features to be Sealed</th>
<th>Typical Features and Parameters Not Required to be Sealed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Official verification zero reference</td>
<td>Display update rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official verification span/calibration reference</td>
<td>Baud rate for electronic data transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linearity correction values</td>
<td>Communications (Configuration of input, output signal to peripheral devices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable range of zero (if adjustable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of measurement units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division value, d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of over capacity indications (if it can be set to extend beyond regulatory limits)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarm limits for flow rate (high/low)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automatic zero-setting mechanism (on/off)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automatic zero-setting mechanism (range of a single step)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Configuration (speed, capacity, calibrated test weight value if applicable, pulses per belt revolution, load cell configuration)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The above examples of adjustments, parameters, and features to be sealed are to be considered "typical" or "normal." This list may not be all inclusive, and there may be parameters other than those listed which affect the metrological performance of the device and must, therefore, be sealed. If listed parameters or other parameters which may affect the metrological function of the device are not sealed, the manufacturer must demonstrate that the parameter will not affect the metrological performance of the device (i.e., all settings comply with the most stringent requirements of HB 44 for the applications for which the device is to be used).

### D. New Business

1. **Revisit parameters used to categorize "Family" groups**

   Mr. Steve Cook, NIST, recommended that the Sector review and revise if necessary the criteria used to base the grouping of instruments submitted for type evaluation as a Family or Type of devices. This topic is recommended to be included on the next NTETC Belt-Conveyor Scale Sector Meeting Agenda.
### E. Attendance
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