



Template for comments on Workspace Document			OIML TC 9/SC 2/ p 8/ R 61
Comments on: OIML TC 9/SC 2/ p8/R 61-1	Workspace Document: OIML R 61	Title: <i>Automatic gravimetric filling instruments Part 1: Metrological and technical requirements</i>	Project: p 8 : Revision of R 61: Automatic gravimetric filling instruments
2 WD date: 3 September 2015	Circulation date: 3 September 2015	Closing date for comments: 22 January 2016	
Secretariat: UK Mr Morayo Awosola		Morayo.awosola@nmo.gov.uk , National Measurement Office, United Kingdom	

Member /Liasion	Clause/ paragraph/ table	gen./ edit./ techn.	COMMENTS	PROPOSED CHANGE	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
Austria	4.5.1	g	The term multi-load AFGI is not defined in chapter 3. We understand such instruments as cumulative weigher as the definition stated in 3.2.2.2. Whether our interpretation is correct or not, we support clarification in this issue.	If necessary, please define the term multi-load AFGI in chapter 3 or amend a Note to 3.2.2.2, that such instruments are kind of this type.	Note attached to 3.2.2.2 to define multi-load AFGI. “AFGI” replaced with “AFGI” throughout the document.
Austria	4.8.4	t	In case of AGFI used in vehicles the additional requirement of R61-2 10.2.9.2 (tilting by up to 10%) shall be mentioned here. In addition the information about the assumption for AGFI with a levelling device and a level indicator with a tilt less than 1 % no testing of tilt seems necessary.	Please amend: „For AGFI used in vehicles the tilting might be up to 10 % or if higher – referring to the manufacturer’s specification.” “For instruments, which fulfil the requirement of 4.8.4. a) and are limited to 1% or less, no tilt testing may be necessary.”	Text added to 4.8.4
Austria	5.8.5.1	t	The chapter also includes the control of tare devices, which is covered by 5.8.3. We think the	Please retain the initial wording.	Corrected as proposed.

Member /Liasion	Clause/ paragraph/ table	gen./ edit./ techn.	COMMENTS	PROPOSED CHANGE	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
Austria	5.9	t	If the instrument has a data storage we do not understand the option of storing. The usage of a data device is to store. Therefore we don't support the change. We are well aware, that a data storage may be disactivated in an instrument, where in this case no storing is possible.	Please change "may" to "shall"	Members commented that the storage of measurement data is optional, hence the use of "may". I have Corrected as you proposed subject to approval by the working group.
Austria	7.2	t	With the changed wording, it seems to be enough to test modules within the performance tests. We are strongly in favour of testing a whole instrument, to ensure the requirements are met. For the influence and disturbance tests it might be useful to test the respective electronic parts. Anyway at the performance tests also the mechanical influences should be taken into account.	Please retain the original wording.	Sentence Corrected.
Austria		g	To NL-54: This aspect is clear to and we share the understanding of the secretary. No change necessary.	Please retain the initial wording.	Thank you. This clause is moved to 8.4 in R 61-2.
POLAND	page 48, Bibliography		missing number [8] in bibliography		Number inserted. Thank you.

Member /Liasion	Clause/ paragraph/ table	gen./ edit./ techn.	COMMENTS	PROPOSED CHANGE	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
PTB, Germany	3.3.11	techn.	There are no requirements with regard to testing load cells and indicators / analogue data processing devices in R61. These should be added to 8.2.2, a reference should be put in the note of 3.3.11. See also our comment on 8.2.3.3	"Note: During type evaluation a modular testing may be done (see 8.2.2)."	Note added.
PTB, Germany	3.3.11 Table 1	edit.	The first column of the third line should read "digital load cell" instead of "load cell" (to be in line with the definition in 3.3.11.1, see also R76-1 No. T.2.2)	Replace "load cell" by "digital load cell" in the first column of the third line in table 1.	Corrected.
PTB, Germany	3.5.2.7	edit.	Last two words under the last hyphen: "the applicable" are a remainder from the former versions.	Delete "the applicable" in last hyphen	Deleted.
PTB, Germany	4.3.3	edit.	For AGFIs set with a preset, value the maximum difference	Delete the comma, perhaps shift it.	Corrected
PTB, Germany	8.2.3.3	techn.	<p>In accordance with the wording in R76 No. 3.10.2 we propose to adapt the structure dealing with modular testing. i.e. "8.2.3.3 Modules", "8.2.3.3.1 apportioning of errors", "8.2.3.3.2 tests" and "8.2.3.3.3 compatibility"</p> <p>We also propose to adopt the wording of OIML R76 No. 3.10.2.3 (in chapter "compatibility") because this contains a reference to OIML R76 Annex F which gives guidance how to prove compatibility.</p>	<p>New chapter: "8.2.3.3 Modules Subject to agreement with the approving authority, the manufacturer may define and submit modules to be examined separately. This is particularly relevant in the following cases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - where testing the instrument as a whole is difficult or impossible; - where modules are manufactured and/or placed on the market as separate units to 	Corrected as proposed. New text inserted.

Member /Liasion	Clause/ paragraph/ table	gen./ edit./ techn.	COMMENTS	PROPOSED CHANGE	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
				<p>be incorporated in a complete instrument; or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - where the applicant wants to have a variety of modules included in the approved type. <p>Where modules are examined separately, the following requirements apply.”</p> <p>New numbering: “8.2.3.3.1 apportioning of errors</p> <p>New chapter: “8.2.3.3.2 Tests As far as applicable the same tests shall be performed as for complete instruments. The applicable tests for indicators and analog data processing devices are given in OIML R76 Annex C, the applicable tests for digital data processing devices, terminals and digital displays are given in OIML R76 Annex D, and the applicable tests for weighing modules are given in OIML R76 Annex E. Test procedures for load cells are provided in OIML R60”</p> <p>New chapter (instead of 8.2.3.4): “8.2.3.3.3 compatibility The compatibility of modules shall</p>	

Member /Liasion	Clause/ paragraph/ table	gen./ edit./ techn.	COMMENTS	PROPOSED CHANGE	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
				be established and declared by the manufacturer. For indicators and load cells this shall be done according to OIML R76 Annex F. For modules with digital output, compatibility includes the correct communication and data transfer via the digital interface(s), see OIML R76 Annex F.5. As far as applicable, e.g. replace “e” with “d” for the AGFI”	
PTB, Germany	B.2.1.2.b	edit.	The wording of the last paragraph seems to be a little bit confusing. Partly quoted the paragraph reads as follows: “Technical means (such as sealing) of preventing a program from circumventing the interface ... shall not be possible.” In other words, there must not be any technical means to prevent a program from circumventing the interface! Or something the like.	Proposed rewording: “There shall be technical means (such as sealing) of preventing a program from circumventing the interface and programming hidden commands is not allowed.”	Sentence originated from 5.2.1.2b in D 31. However, we have corrected it in accordance with your proposal.
PTB, Germany	B.3	edit.	The first paragraph should not bear the No. 1).	Modify as follows: Updating: The legally relevant of an instrument in service shall be considered as: 1) A modification of the instrument, when exchanging the software with another approved	The term “legally relevant software” is defined in 3.3.6.1.

Member /Liasion	Clause/ paragraph/ table	gen./ edit./ techn.	COMMENTS	PROPOSED CHANGE	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
				version, 2) A repair of the instrument, when re-installing the same version.	
JP 1	3.1.3 fill (<i>F</i>) (clean: p. 5)	Edit.	In “4.2 Accuracy classes” (p.19), this term is expressed as “value of mass of the fills (3.1.3)”. Therefore, use the same expression for this term for consistency.	Replace “fill (<i>F</i>)” with “mass of the fills”.	Corrected as proposed.
JP 2	3.2.2.1 Associative weigher 8.2.2 General	Edit.	The term “selective combination weigher” is used more commonly than “associative weigher” in this document. The latter should be defined as a supplementary term.	Change the clause title as shown below. Present: <i>associative (selective combination) weigher</i> Suggested: <i>selective combination weigher (associative weigher)</i> In 8.2.2, replace “associative weigher” with “selective combination weigher”.	Corrected.
JP 3	3.3.11 module: Figure 1 (p.11)	Tech.	Output data from AD converter is usually in mass or force. Therefore, the expression “Digital data (<u>e.g., speed, position</u>)” is inappropriate.	Delete (<i>e.g. speed, position</i>) as shown below. Present: <i>Digital data (e.g. speed, position)</i> Suggested: <i>Digital data</i>	Figure 1 corrected as proposed.
JP 4	3.3.11 module: Figure 1 (p.	Edit.	The term in the box 1 is expressed differently in 3.3.11.7. Therefore, use the same name for consistency.	Change the name in the box 1 of Figure 1 from “Mechanical electrical connecting elements” to	Corrected as proposed.

Member /Liasion	Clause/ paragraph/ table	gen./ edit./ techn.	COMMENTS	PROPOSED CHANGE	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
	11)			"weighing module" which is used in 3.3.11.7.	
JP 5	3.3.11 module: Table1 (p. 11)	Edit.	"Load cell" in the 2 nd line is an ambiguous expression. Does it indicate analog or digital type?	Change the module item from "load cell" to "digital load cell" in order to make a contrast with "analog load cell" in the 1 st line.	Corrected.
JP 6	3.3.11 3.3.11.2 3.3.11.3 3.3.11.6 3.4.1 3.5.1.3 <i>Annex B.1.1</i>	Edit.	Both of two expressions "analog" and "analogue" are used in the documents.	Use only one of the two expressions in the same document. "Analogue" is used in the following places. 3.3.11 <i>module</i> 5 th line & Table1 <u>2 places</u> (p. 11) 3.3.11.2 <i>indicator</i> (p. 12) 3.3.11.3 <i>analogue data processing device</i> <u>2 places</u> (p. 12) 3.3.11.6 <i>terminal</i> (p. 12) 3.4.1 <i>scale interval (d) a</i> (p. 13) 3.5.1.3 <i>analogue indication</i> (p.14) <i>Annex B.1.1 Software identification</i> 2 nd a) (p. 43)	Corrected. "Analogue" is used.
JP 7	4.3.3 Maximum permissible preset value error (p. 20)	Edit.	The text refers clause numbers 9.2.6 and 9.2.7 in R61-2. These two clauses do not exist in R61-2, however.	Correct the clause numbers to refer. The correct clause numbers might be "8.6 Present value" and "8.7 Mass and average mass value of the test fills".	Corrected as proposed.

Member /Liasion	Clause/ paragraph/ table	gen./ edit./ techn.	COMMENTS	PROPOSED CHANGE	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
JP 8	4.5.1.2 Multi-load AGFIs... (p. 21)	Edit.	“And” is unnecessary.	Delete “and” as shown below. <i>The examples in OIML R 61-2, Annex A.2 and show how to determine...</i>	“And” deleted. Thank you.
JP 9	4.8.1 Humidity (p. 22)	Tech.	In 10.3.1 of R61-2, <i>damp heat test (condensing)</i> is categorized as one of the disturbance tests.	It may be better to move 4.8.1, which specifies the condition of 93% (condensing), to 6.2 <i>Disturbances</i> in R61-1.	Damp heat, steady state and cyclic tests are now classified as influence factor test in 10.2.4 of R61-2. In accordance with comments from Germany, the Netherlands, etc.
JP 10	5.8.3.2 Automatic zero-setting device (p.27-8)	Tech./E dit.	<p>The 1st and 3rd paragraphs are unclear. The original text reads as follows.</p> <p>1st paragraph (original): <i>An automatic zero-setting device may operate at the start of automatic operation, as part of every automatic weighing cycle, or after a programmable time interval.</i></p> <p>3rd paragraph (original): <i>Where the automatic zero-setting device operates as part of every automatic weighing cycle, it shall not be possible to disable this device or to set this device to operate at time intervals.</i></p> <p>We consider that there are two ambiguous points assuming that (A) means an “operation at every automatic</p>	<p>We propose to revise the 1st and 3rd paragraphs as shown below.</p> <p>1st paragraph (recommended): <i>An automatic zero-setting device may operate at the start of automatic operation as a part of either (A) every automatic weighing cycle, or after (B) an arbitrary cycle with a programmable time interval.</i></p> <p>3rd paragraph (recommended): <i>Where the automatic zero-setting device operates as a part of (A) every automatic weighing cycle, it shall not be possible to disable this device or to set this device to operate at time intervals.</i></p>	Amended as proposed.

Member /Liasion	Clause/ paragraph/ table	gen./ edit./ techn.	COMMENTS	PROPOSED CHANGE	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
			<p>weighing cycle” and (B) means an “operation at an arbitrary cycle with a programmable time interval”.</p> <p>1. We believe that the two operations (A) and (B) should be exclusive. The 1st paragraph however, does not mention this relationship clearly.</p> <p>2. If the relationship is defined as exclusive in the 1st paragraph, there is no need to mention about operation (B) in the 3rd paragraph because this paragraph only mentions operation (A).</p>		
JP 11	5.8.5.3 Automatic tare device (p. 28)	Tech./E dit.	The structure of this clause is similar to that of 5.8.3.2. The 1st and 3rd paragraphs are unclear as we already pointed out in 5.8.3.2.	We propose the same revisions with those in 5.8.3.2.	Corrected as proposed.
JP 12	5.8.5.3 Automatic tare device (p. 28)	Edit.	Please correct a typo. Also, AGFI is expressed in singular and plural forms.	Correct “AFGI” to “AGFI” and use either “AGFI” or “AGFIs” for consistency in the following places. 6 Requirements for <u>AFGIs</u> with respect to their environment (p. 33) 6.1 Performance under rated operating conditions (p. 33) 6.2 Disturbance tests 6.4 Application (p. 33), 6.8 Warm-up time (p. 34)	Corrected.

Member /Liasion	Clause/ paragraph/ table	gen./ edit./ techn.	COMMENTS	PROPOSED CHANGE	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
JP 13	8.1 General (p. 36)	Edit.	Please make a correction	Like other places (i.e., 5.9), please correct using <i>a)</i> , <i>b)</i> , <i>c)</i> and <i>d)</i> as shown below. Present: 1) type evaluation, 2) initial verification, 3) subsequent verification 4) in-service inspection Correct: <i>a)</i> type evaluation, <i>b)</i> initial verification, <i>c)</i> subsequent verification <i>d)</i> in-service inspection	Corrected.
NL-1	3.2.2.4 b)	techn.	A display is necessary in this case (see 3.3.11). Is this clause necessary when 5.13.3 reads the same?	Change to: “b) the integral weighing module with primary display of the AGFI under test”	Text inserted as proposed. A description of what the control instrument is for is given in 3.2.2.4. Propose to delete 5.13.3 as it is superfluous information.
NL-2	3.3.3	edit.	There may be some confusion regarding the use of “a reference value”	Since it is meant here to not refer to any specific value maybe this clause could be improved editorially by changing “ a reference value” to “some reference value”	Corrected as proposed. See also comments from CECIP.
NL-2	3.3.2.1 ... 3.7.3	edit.	In “Refer to OIML D11” etc. “Refer to” is superfluous and not consistent	Remove “Refer to”	“Refer to” deleted as proposed.

Member /Liasion	Clause/ paragraph/ table	gen./ edit./ techn.	COMMENTS	PROPOSED CHANGE	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
NL-3	3.3.5.2	edit.	<i>“device for subtracting a preset tare value from a gross or net weight value and indicating the result of the calculation. The weighing range for net loads is reduced accordingly.”</i> Propose to better clarify the definition	Propose to amend to : <i>“device for subtracting a preset tare value from a gross or net weight value and indicating the calculated net weight. The weighing range for net loads is reduced accordingly.”</i>	Corrected as proposed.
NL-4	4.2	edit.	Not necessary to refer to Terms and definitions	Delete “(3.1.3)” and “(3.6.2)”	Deleted as proposed.
NL-5	4.3.1	edit.	The presentation of the percentages in table 2 may lead to misinterpretation when referred to.	Suggest to add “of F” after each % sign in the table and to delete “as percentage of F or” in the combined header of column 2 and 3.	Corrected as proposed.
NL-6	4.3.4 Note	edit.	R 61-1 annex A.1 does not exist, R61-2 Annex A.2 is also necessary to refer to	Change to “R 61-2 Annex A.1 and Annex A.2”	Corrected as proposed.
NL-7	4.4	techn.	This clause is not clear and especially while it is incorrect at the end where it is mentioned that the increased mpd shall not exceed 9 % of the original mpd .This is one of the places where there may be introduced confusion on where the percentage refers to.	It is suggested to set up a special SG for improving clauses related to calculation of the Minfill and mpd.	Clause amended in accordance with CECIP’s proposal.
NL-8	4.7		The added last sentence “However.. certificate” on request of Germany refers to the (former) last sentence which however was deleted. Moreover: concerning this last statement in particular there is a risk for mixing up requirements and test results. Tests and their results are meant to	Delete “However .. certificate” and do not reinsert the previous last sentence.	Last paragraph of last sentence deleted as proposed.

Member /Liasion	Clause/ paragraph/ table	gen./ edit./ techn.	COMMENTS	PROPOSED CHANGE	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
			<p>verify whether the manufacturer specifications may fulfil the requirements stated in the applicable Recommendation. It therefore is not possible to base any requirement on results of tests, which would be just the other way around. Referring to the results presented in an OIML certificate in a part of the Recommendation that concerns the requirements for the instruments and producing these OIML certificates is not correct</p> <p>So making any provision on basis of what is specified in an OIML certificate for the AGFI would be incorrect It would be different if the provision is based on the outcome of the examination of a component of influence being part of the instrument. Such information from a certified part could be considered an input variable. In the AGFI case this means that the outcome of the examination could be based on the certified specifications from e.g. loadcells, as being part of AGFI's.</p> <p>The German comment refers to operational Minfills and thus do not concern the type evaluation stage in the metrological control but concerns the initial verification stage.</p>		
NL-9	4.7	techn.	The instrument shall prevent setting the	Add an line stating: "It shall not be	Text added as proposed.

Member /Liasion	Clause/ paragraph/ table	gen./ edit./ techn.	COMMENTS	PROPOSED CHANGE	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
			fill value below Minfill	possible (pre)set the fill value to a value below Minfill"	
NL-10	4.8.2.3	edit.	<p><i>"...for a load disabling any zero-tracking..."</i></p> <p>It appears that the phrase which NL suggested may be interpreted in different ways</p>	<p><i>"...for a load sufficient to disable any zero-tracking..."</i></p>	Corrected.
NL-11	5.4	edit.	<p>Suggest to editorial improve the underneath text:</p> <p><i>"If fill setting is by means of a scale, it shall be graduated in units of mass.</i></p> <p><i>If fill setting is by means of weights, they shall be either weights in accordance with the requirements of OIML R 111 [4] or purpose-designed of any nominal value, distinguishable by shape and identified with the AGFI."</i></p>	<p>Suggest to amend to</p> <p><i>"Where a weighing instrument is used for setting the desired fill value its indication shall be in units of mass.</i></p> <p><i>Where weights are used to set the desired fill value these shall be in accordance to OIML R111 or shall be specifically designed for this purpose and shall as such be distinguishable by shape and identification. The mass of such special weight should fit for purpose and may be of any value."</i></p>	Corrected as proposed.
NL-12	5.5 First phrase	edit.	<p>The underneath text is not clear:</p> <p><i>"The final feed cut-off device shall be clearly different from any other device on the AFGI."</i></p>	<p>Suggest to amend to</p> <p><i>"The final feed cut-off device shall be a clearly distinguishable device."</i></p>	Corrected as proposed.
NL-13	5.5 Second phrase	techn.	<p><i>"For automatic mechanical scales the final feed cut-off device may include a correction device for the material feed into the weighing module."</i></p> <p>Correction devices are also applied and</p>	<p>Should be amended; Suggested amended clause:</p> <p><i>"The final feed cut-off device may include a device which corrects for</i></p>	Corrected as proposed.

Member /Liasion	Clause/ paragraph/ table	gen./ edit./ techn.	COMMENTS	PROPOSED CHANGE	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
			should also be allowed for non-mechanical weighing instruments and the text is not sufficiently clear	<i>the residual material feed into the weighing module after cut-off.</i>	
NL-14	5.8	edit.	Tare balancing is not only applicable to non-automatic tare which is already explained in clause 3.	Delete “(tare balancing)”	Deleted
NL-15	5.8.2	techn.	Only Min is to be mentioned . Minfill may be larger for multi load instruments but when taking this Minfill value as reference a larger error for multi load would be acceptable for each of the individual weighing modules which is an unnecessary and rather undefined situation for selective combination instruments	Delete “....or Minfill” (twice)	Deleted
NL-16	5.8.3.2	techn.	The option to allow that an automatic zero-setting would only be operational at the start of the automatic operation is not acceptable. It would mean that over the undefined period of time that the AGFI is in automatic operation there would not be any need for automatic zero setting. Such would only be correct in case there would not be any temperature effect during this whole unlimited period of time, which would only be true if there was no temperature effect at all! .	Delete “at the start of automatic operation, “	Deleted
NL-17	5.8.3.2	edit.	It would be useful to include some text mentioning that clause 4.8.2.3 is not applicable in case of automatic zero-	Include in the part 2 of the Recommendation (61-2) that performing a test for verification of	Note inserted in 10.2.3 in R61-2.

Member /Liasion	Clause/ paragraph/ table	gen./ edit./ techn.	COMMENTS	PROPOSED CHANGE	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
			setting as part of every weighing cycle	the clause 4.8.2.3 is not required in case of automatic zero-setting as part of every weighing cycle.	
NL-18	5.9 e)	edit.	Unclear sentence, some wording missing	Suggest to amend to: “when storage capacity is exhausted, new data may replace the oldest data provided that overwriting the old data is authorized and/or after this data has been archived	Corrected as proposed.
NL-19	5.10.1 Note	edit.	The Note should be underneath 5.10 instead of 5.10.1	Move the note to 5.10	Note moved as proposed.
NL-20	5.12	edit.	Both “where applicable” and “if applicable” to be are applied	For consistency reasons replace “where applicable” by “if applicable”	Corrected as proposed.
NL-21	5.12	techn.	In most cases it is not possible to define something like a Maxfill for an AGFI and there is no use for such marking, moreover it is our experience that this would be very confusing to request for setting something like a Maxfill	Delete the row : Maxfill:	Maxfill row deleted.
NL-22	5.12	edit.	Please be aware that many member states do not require a type approval symbol . Often it is required to mention the approval number.	Change to “ <i>Type approval marking</i> ”	Corrected.
NL-23	5.12.1, 3 rd par	techn.	The minimum load to be discharged should be equal to Minfill	Delete 3 rd paragraph	3 rd paragraph deleted.
NL-24	5.13.1	edit.	It seems unlikely that the AGFI will be removed to see its markings, may be “move” is meant?	1. Suggest to replace “place” by “location” 2. Change to: “c) be visible without	Amended as proposed.

Member /Liasion	Clause/ paragraph/ table	gen./ edit./ techn.	COMMENTS	PROPOSED CHANGE	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
				moving the AGFI or removing its protective covers”	
NL-25	5.13.3	techn.	A display is necessary in this case (see 3.3.11)	Change to: “b) the integral weighing module together with the primary display of the AGFI under test”	5.13.3 deleted in line with NL-1.
NL-26	8.1, 5 th par	edit.	Items (a) to (d) do not exist	Change to: “... under items 1) to 4) above.” Measures to ensure durability shall be taken which are subject to national regulations, include assessments under items (1) to (4) above.	(1) to (4) replaced with (a) to (d) in accordance with comments from Japan (JP 13). Sentence corrected as proposed.
NL-27	8.2.1, 2 nd bullet	edit.	Class is not necessary because X(x) and Ref(x) are already mentioned	Delete “Class,”	Deleted.
NL-28	8.3.3	edit.	Title Conduct of the test	Correct to: Conduction of the test	Corrected.
NL-29	8.3.4 a)	edit.	Reference to 8.2.5 is incorrect	Change to: “... with 8.2.4 by ...”	Corrected.
NL-30	B	edit.	Annex B needs specific editorial attention	Reminder for later stage work	Annex B amended in line with proposals from several members, e.g., see comments from Japan.
NL-31	B.1.1, 4 th par	techn.	The exception is not acceptable. If the instrument cannot do identify itself, it should not be approved.	Delete 4 th paragraph “As an exception ...”	Deleted.
NL-32	B.2.1.2.b, 3 rd par	edit.	The sentence “Technical means ...”does not make sense.	See D31 for the original text and copy from there	Sentence is in accordance with 5.2.1.2.b in D31. However, we have amended it in line with comments from Germany.
NL-33	B.2.3.5	edit.	Second sentence repeats first sentence.	See D31 for the original text and	Corrected as proposed.

Member /Liasion	Clause/ paragraph/ table	gen./ edit./ techn.	COMMENTS	PROPOSED CHANGE	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
			D31 describes the requirement in a different way.	copy from there	
CECIP-01	3.3.3	edit	- the difference between mass of a load and a reference value (...). Since the definition of Reference mass (3.1.1.1) is deleted it is not clear which 'reference class' is meant	Undelete 3.1.1.1 reference class or redefine reference value in 3.3.3.	3.3.3 amended. "a reference value" changed to "some reference value" in accordance with comments from the Netherlands (NL-2)
CECIP-02	5.12	edit	There is no definition for Maxfill	Add definition for Maxfill	Maxfill deleted. See comments from Netherlands (NL-21)
CECIP-03		gen	As a definition F is in Italic F.	Replace F into F like in 3.1.3	Corrected as proposed.
CECIP-04	4.4	techn	For material tests, when the product reference quantity exceeds 10 % of the mpd in-service, an increased mpd shall may be applied.	For material tests, when the product reference quantity exceeds 10 % of the mpd in-service of the applicable F-range , an increased mpd may be applied.	Corrected as proposed.
CECIP-05		edit	However, the Minfills may never be smaller than those linked to the reference value for accuracy class and those that are stated in the OIML certificate.	However, the Minfills may never be smaller than those linked to the reference value for accuracy class and those that are stated in the OIML certificate or type approval certificate.	Last sentence of 4.7 deleted in accordance with Netherlands comments (NL-8)
CECIP-06	B.1.1	edit	<i>The legally relevant parts of the software of a AGFI and/or its modules shall be clearly identified with the software</i>	Make clear (in the type approval) which part is defined as dedicated software.	Amended.

Member /Liasion	Clause/ paragraph/ table	gen./ edit./ techn.	COMMENTS	PROPOSED CHANGE	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
			<p><i>version or any other token. The identification may apply to more than one part but at least one part shall be dedicated to the legal purpose.</i></p> <p><i>The identification shall be inextricably linked to the software and shall be:</i></p> <p>“Clearly identified”, “may apply to more than one” “at least one part shall be dedicated”.</p> <p>But at the end it is not clear which part is identified for legal purpose.</p>		
CECIP-07	B.2.1.2.d	edit	If the legal metrology relevant software	Delete metrology If the legal relevant software	Corrected as proposed.
CECIP-08		techn	<p>4.4 Product reference mass correction (...) the product reference quantity (253 g) is larger then 10% of the mpd(in-service), then a higher value for mpe is allowed.</p> <p>In other words: if 253 g is larger then 10% van 9 g, then the value of 9 gram may be increased.</p> <p>De new value is 9 g + 1,5 * 253 g!!</p> <p>The value shall not be greater then 9% of the original <i>mpe</i>, but the formula state $9\% * F$</p>		Sentence amended accordingly.

Member /Liasion	Clause/ paragraph/ table	gen./ edit./ techn.	COMMENTS	PROPOSED CHANGE	OBSERVATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT on each comment submitted
			<p>My idea is that the equation must start from the absolute value between F (testfill) and the product reference quantity.</p> <p>Thus, if $(253 - 250) > 10\% * mpe(\text{in-service})$, then the $mpe(\text{in-service})$ value for $F = 250 \text{ g}$ shall be increased by $1,5 * 9 \text{ g} = 13,5 \text{ g}$</p> <p>In my opinion this is what must be written, but that is not how I think it is stated.</p>		