

REDRAF~1

Dear APLAC RMP Workshop members,

Firstly I would like to share my thanks to WW and Rob for their significant effort in drafting the report.

As per the discussions on scopes of accreditation for CRM producers on page 14, I have prepared the attached set of instructions for your review and feedback.

As the consensus from the workshop was for the uncertainties in the RMP scopes to be representative of the produced CRM (including possible contributions from stability & homogeneity determinations) and not simply based on the characterisation/determination of a material sample, I have avoided using the term CMC. A Calibration and Measurement Capability would imply solely the characterisation activity and not the consolidated reference value capability for the producer.

Since the workshop NATA has processed 3 assessments using the principals in my procedure with considerable success. It is true the RMP would offer a great number of possible CRMs, whether they be gas mixes, CRMs used in environmental testing, or drugs in sports and we are finding that while the material types are diverse, the producer only makes use of a few measurement models in reporting the property value and its measurement uncertainty. It is the best capability from these measurement models that will make up the ranges and uncertainties in the scope.

Aspects I have not included are level of detail for material types to be listed in a scope of accreditation (for example the PCB discussion) and listing of the characterisation methods in the scope. My thoughts being that these criteria will be covered under a general set of requirements for all RMP scopes as per clause 4.1.1 of Guide 34.

I have attempted to keep these instruction as short as possible and noted that further expansion and examples may be required in order for the concepts contained to be more user friendly for the ABs and Producers.

I hope this is of some assistance

Kind regards

Paul

Sector Manager – Calibration

National Association of Testing Authorities (NATA)

www.nata.com.au

Level 1

675 Victoria Street

Abbotsford 3067

Australia

Ph: + 6139274 8200

Fax: + 613 9421 0887

email:paul.mcmullen@nata.com.au

-----Original Message-----

From: WW WONG [<mailto:wwwong@itc.gov.hk>]

Sent: Tuesday, 14 January 2014 6:29 PM

To: rglass@ianz.govt.nz; paochukao@taftw.org.tw; Morio.Hosaka@jab.or.jp; Paul McMullen; chanyas@tisi.go.th; okumura-kumiko@nite.go.jp; sudanan@dss.go.th; rbigyeura@inmetro.gov.br; pr@aac-analitica.ru; dberg@pjlabs.com;

REDRAF~1

bhirt@anab-aclass.org; rquery@A2LA.org; venkat@nabl-india.org;
seta-katuo@nite.go.jp; aran.t@dmisc.mail.go.th; www@itc.gov.hk;
heping@cnas.org.cn; takeshi.saito@aist.go.jp; mtm19115@ideacon.co.jp;
Hayakawa.masako@wako-chem.co.jp; schang@taftw.org.tw; jsc@firdi.org.tw;
ohtaka-hiroaki@nite.go.jp; tsuruga-masafumi@nite.go.jp; director@nabl-india.org;
puntawit.n@dmisc.mail.go.th; hansa.c@dmisc.mail.go.th;
chomchailai.s@dmisc.mail.go.th; dede_erawan@bsn.go.id; nguyen.huu@boa.gov.vn;
imai.hidetaka3@gmail.com; stecnico2; saebomi@ktr.or.kr; duck@ktr.or.kr;
hyojae33@korea.kr; k-nozawa@pjla.jp; oyuntungalag@cenceolab.com;
tuya_1010@yahoo.com; hamasaki-nao@niu.ac.jp; m.mosca@accredia.it;
g.suriani@accredia.it; rob.bettinson@ukas.com; k-morita@pjla.jp;
wolfram.bremser@bam.de
Cc: yamamoto-tadako@nite.go.jp
Subject: Draft report on the APLAC Workshop on RMP Accreditation

Dear All,

I hope this email finds you well.

I have drafted the report on the APLAC Workshop on RMP Accreditation based on the notes provided to me by Rob Glass. One of the annexes of the report is the outcomes of the discussion papers. I need the inputs from the respective ABs contributing the papers to complete that part of the report. Rob Glass has also prepared some notes of some of the discussions which should assist you in providing the inputs.

Both the draft report as well as the notes that Rob Glass has prepared are attached below. I noticed that Rob has not included the following discussion papers to his notes, viz, 1, 7, 9 10, 13, 14, 18, 19 and 20. I am attaching the full set of discussion papers to assist you in providing the your inputs.

Could the respective contributors complete the part on "Consensus of the workshop" of the discussion papers that you contributed, and return them to me on or before 8 February 2014. For all participants, please let me have your comments, if any, on the draft report on or before the same date.

Thanks.

Wishing you a healthy and prosperous Year of the Horse!!

WW

(See attached file: APLAC Report r2.doc)

(See attached file: Collated discussion papers #2.doc)

(See attached file: Discussion paper_all.zip)

REDRAF~1

This e-mail message (together with any attachments) is for the designated recipient only.

It may contain information that is privileged for the designated recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, retention, disclosure, copying, printing, forwarding or dissemination of the message is strictly prohibited.

If you have received the message in error, please erase all copies of the message (including attachments) from your system and notify the sender immediately.

NATA IT Dept e-mail system: Scanned for virus and spam (using MessageLabs Security System).

This e-mail (and any files transmitted with it) is confidential and intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed. If you have received this email and you are not the intended recipient, you must not use, disclose, distribute, copy, print or otherwise disseminate this information. Please inform the sender immediately by email and then delete this message from your system. Any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of NATA.