

FINAL DRAFT
BASIC
PUBLICATION

Draft 6

47th CIML Meeting

Bucharest 2012

INFORMATION

Revision of B 6-1

Directives for OIML technical work.

Part 1: Structures and procedures for the development
of OIML publications



ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE
DE MÉTROLOGIE LÉGALE

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION
OF LEGAL METROLOGY

BIML Explanatory note on the revision of B 6-1

At its 46th Meeting held in Prague in October 2011, the CIML approved a revision of B 6-1, subject to certain conditions, according to Resolution 23 below:

The Committee,

Approves, subject to re-titling the proposed “working groups” as “Project Groups” and other necessary editorial changes, the revision of:

- OIML B 6-1 *Directives for OIML technical work. Part 1: Structures and procedures for the development of OIML publications*; and
- OIML B 6-2 *Directives for OIML technical work. Part 2: Guide to the drafting and presentation of OIML publications*,

Instructs the Bureau to produce a guidance document no later than 1 December 2011 setting out the arrangements for implementation and to introduce the new arrangements from 1 January 2012 in an orderly way,

Establishes an ad-hoc working group, chaired by the Second Vice-President, to consider improvements to OIML B 6-1 and OIML B 6-2, suggested by CIML Members in the light of the experience of operating the new procedures, and

Instructs the ad-hoc working group to present proposals for the amendment of OIML B 6-1 and OIML B 6-2 for consideration at its 47th Meeting.

The Final Draft revision now presented to the 47th CIML Meeting for approval is the result of the work conducted by the ad hoc committee mentioned in the Resolution, and chaired by Roman Schwartz.

This information document contains the collated comments received from CIML Members, as well as Roman Schwartz’s responses to these comments, as chairman of the ad hoc working group.

The Final Draft revision is presented in three versions:

- 1 A marked-up version, showing how the comments received from CIML Members have been incorporated into the text.
- 2 A clean version, enabling the result of these changes to be more clearly seen.
- 3 A renumbered version, which includes some additional editorial changes which were necessary during the renumbering. This is the result of a longstanding comment that OIML publications are difficult to make reference to due to the amount of un-numbered paragraphs and the use of bulleted lists. There are no technical differences between this and the “clean” version it’s based on. It is simply intended to make reference to B 6 easier.

This is the version which, if approved, the BIML intends to publish.

CIML comments on revision of B 6-1:2011 *Directives for OIML technical work*

Structures and Procedures for the Development of OIML Publications

2012-06-26

*Member States which stated that they agreed with the circulated draft revision and had no comments:
Australia, Austria, Canada, Czech Republic, Germany, Monaco, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia*

B 6-1 Section	Country	Comments on and proposals for improvement	Responses
General	Japan	(Comment) We deeply appreciate the dedicated efforts by the ad-hoc WG and BIML to revise the Directives (B6).	
General	USA	<p>The USA supports this “Revision of OIML B 6-1:2011” because it corrects several of the problems with the original “B 6-1:2011.”</p> <p>The US is highly supportive that this revision gives primary responsibility to the BIML for tracking/maintaining all of the P- and O- membership lists.</p> <p>The USA remains concerned about the complexity and likely confusion of having P- and O- membership at both the TC/SC level and, simultaneously, at the Project Group level. An easy solution would be to maintain P- and O- membership at the TC/SC level, while designating Project Group members as either “voting member” or “nonvoting member”.</p>	<p>The P- and O-membership at the TC/SC and PG level is considered as a key element of the new procedures decided by the CIML and laid down in B6-1:2011. A change as proposed would turn back the wheel and could itself give rise to confusion.</p>
General	USA	We believe that having voting for <u>every</u> secretariat and convenor position <u>every</u> three years will be a tremendous burden on both the BIML and everyone that would be involved in the voting. That would be almost 200 votes every three years. We propose instead that voting for a secretariat or convenor position only be initiated if some issue arises (such as through a formal complaint from a CIML member to the BIML, or if work is not being accomplished, etc.). See, e.g., 5.2.6, 5.5.5, 5.9.	Again, this is considered as a key element of the new procedures, which should not be weakened without having gained experience with the new procedures.
Foreword (4th paragraph led by “The OIML...”)	Japan	(Comment) We support addition of the sentence “ <i>there is no hierarchy between international standards</i> ” because it clarifies the position of OIML among the international organizations such as ISO and IEC.	Noted.

B 6-1 Section	Country	Comments on and proposals for improvement	Responses
Foreword (5 th paragraph led by "Additionally...") , and 6.7.5 Approval of a Guide	Japan	<p>In regard to the sentence “<i>Expert Reports ... are written solely from the viewpoint of their author Thus, they do not necessarily represent the views of the OIML</i>”, we do not agree this view point. We consider all OIML documents carrying the OIML logo are generally accepted by the member states to represent an official view of OIML. Therefore, some important Experts Reports (E) and Guides (G) shall be also covered within the scope of B6. For example, G16 defines procedures for publication of all OIML documents that is closely related to the Directives (B6). As another example, G18 is a summary of terms used in the OIML documents that is closely related to VIML and VIM.</p> <p>If these important OIML documents could be published with the OIML logo and without acknowledgement by the member states, there would be a critical failure in the approval procedure. We request that a decision on approval procedure for E and G documents shall be made by CIML or Presidential Council and not solely by the President.</p>	<p>Partially agreed.</p> <p>Although the wording is in line with OIML G 16:2007, it is suggested to replace the 5th paragraph by:</p> <p>“Additionally, the OIML publishes or participates in the publication of Vocabularies (OIML V), Expert Reports (OIML E), Seminar Reports and others, as defined in OIML G 16, edition 2007 (E).”</p> <p>This would avoid repeating information that is already contained and well explained in G 16.</p>
List of terms and abbreviations used in this publication	Japan	<p>We support the idea adding such an explanation of abbreviations. In this explanation, we hope brief explanations will be added to “<i>CIML approval</i>” and “<i>CIML preliminary ballot</i>”.</p> <p>In addition, we expect there is a clarification about a difference between the “<i>TC/SC Secretariat</i>” and “<i>Project Group Convenor</i>” in an appropriate clause in this document.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>This seems to be made sufficiently clear already in clauses 5.4.2 and 5.4.3.</p>
List of terms and abbreviations used in this document	USA	Need to add “PG” for “Project Group”	Agreed.

B 6-1 Section	Country	Comments on and proposals for improvement	Responses
1 Scope	USA	<p>In order to minimize confusion about the rules applying to Basic Publications, we propose to replace, at the end of the second paragraph, “if the CIML so decides” with “unless the CIML decides otherwise”, so that a clear CIML decision would be required to exclude a Basic Publication from being governed by these Directives.</p> <p>Further, if the CIML makes such a decision to exclude any Basic Publication, it should also establish a mechanism for governing the development and maintenance of each such Basic Publication.</p>	<p>This was discussed and so decided at the Presidential Council meeting in March 2012.</p> <p>It is, however, supported that this be discussed and finally decided by the CIML.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>
4 OIML structures ...			
4.5	Japan	<p>We would like to know the background why the requirement “(<i>without committing their government or administration</i>)” has been added to the present draft. Because many CIML members belong to governmental organizations, it might be difficult to avoid their commitment to the government. We afraid if this requirement may significantly spoil the position of OIML as an international organization composed of representatives of the member states based of the Treaty.</p>	<p>This goes back to a request from a CIML Member, who argued that “representative” could be misinterpreted as a person who has “Full Powers” in the sense of the OIML Convention, Article VII, i.e. a person which is fully mandated to commit the Member State government (e.g. as regards a country’s annual contribution). A CIML member does normally not have such “Full Powers”.</p>
4.8	USA	<p>While we appreciate that there are some benefits to having Project Groups, we continue to question whether having them is really worth the complexity and cost to the BIML (and others), especially with the administrative burden they create.</p> <p>As mentioned earlier, the USA remains concerned about the complexity and likely confusion of having P- and O-membership at both the TC/SC level and, simultaneously, at the Project Group level. An easy solution would be to maintain P- and O-membership at the TC/SC level, while designating Project Group members as either “voting member” or “nonvoting member”.</p>	<p>See response under “General” above.</p>

B 6-1 Section	Country	Comments on and proposals for improvement	Responses
4.8 (9-10 th dots), and others	Japan	This is a re-confirmation of our comment to B6-1 submitted in January 2012. In a case where a TC/SC secretariat is different from the convenor of the Project Group, we still consider that the role and responsibility of TC/SC has been weakened. The final CD shall be reviewed by TC or SC, and then submitted to BIML from the TC/SC secretariat and not from the convenor. Although a new statement has been added in 6.4 requiring the final checking of the CD by TC/SC, more explicit statement about the roles of TC/SC is needed.	Agreed. See response and proposal under 4.8, 9 th bullet, of the USA below.
4.8, 2 nd bullet	USA	Insert “5.4.2 and 5.4.3”, and delete “5.5.5 and 5.9” in the parentheses, since 5.4.2 and 5.4.3 refer to the initial allocation of PG Convenership, whereas 5.5.5 is just informational, and 5.9 is duplicative (see USA comments on 5.9).	Agreed. It is, however, suggested to refer simply to “5.4”, or to add also a reference to 5.4.5, i.e. “(see 5.4.2, 5.4.3 and 5.4.5)”
4.8, 9 th bullet (and 10 th bullet)	USA	We believe this is not consistent with the decision of the Ad-Hoc Working Group on the Directives, which was to have the PG Convener send the final CD to the TC/SC Secretariat (if different than the PG Convener), who will make a final check of all documents and check whether everything has been done in accordance with the Directives, before then sending the CD to the BIML for processing it to the CIML Preliminary Ballot stage. We believe that this should also be reflected as an added bullet in 4.7 of TC and SC responsibilities.	Agreed. Both in 4.7 and 4.8 it should be properly reflected what is said in 6.4: “If the TC or SC secretariat is not the convenor of that Project Group, the convenor shall also send all CDs to the TC or SC secretariat in order that it can check the general conformity of the CD with other publications under its responsibility.”
4.8, last bullet	USA	Change spelling to “maintenance”.	Agreed.
5 Operation of Technical ...			
5.2.3	USA	For consistency with the 1993 Directives, insert “by majority CIML vote,” after “approved by the CIML”. The Table of Voting Rules also needs to be changed accordingly (>50% of CIML Members).	Agreed. This seems indeed to be an important clarification. Both 5.2.3 and the flowchart in Annex A.1 should be amended as proposed.

B 6-1 Section	Country	Comments on and proposals for improvement	Responses
5.2.8	USA	Change “administration” to “technical content”.	It is rather proposed to change “the administration of” to “keeping ... updated with the assistance of the BIML.”, because a TC/SC secretariat is not only responsible for the technical content.
5.2.9 and 5.2.10	USA	We believe that keeping these clauses here is not consistent with the decision of the Ad-Hoc Working Group on the Directions. These items are not part of the “Procedure for establishing a TC or SC”, as 5.2 is titled. As before, we propose deleting 5.2.9 and 5.2.10, since they more logically belong (and are already included) in 4.7 (responsibility of TCs and SCs), as the first bullet.	This is not agreed. If a new TC or SC is established, this must be accompanied by one or more project proposals and a work programme for one or more PGs. A new TC or SC without any work programme nor PG does not make sense. 4.7, 1 st bullet, correctly summarizes and refers to 5.2.9.
5.3, 1st bullet	USA	Add that P-members of TCs/SCs shall be OIML Member States.	Agreed.
5.3, 2 nd bullet	USA	In the 1993 Directives, OIML Corresponding Members were not allowed to serve as O-members on TC/SCs. As evidence, there are currently no Corresponding Members on any OIML TC/SCs. We feel that the decision to have Corresponding Members be allowed to be O-members of TC/SCs should be a separate decision made by the CIML.	This was discussed at the Presidential Council meeting in March 2012. There seem to be one or more CIML Resolutions (1998 / 1999?) which support Corresponding Members having the status of O-members in TCs/SCs/PGs. Nevertheless, it is supported that the CIML should decide or confirm a previous decision at the next CIML meeting.
5.4.3	USA	We agree that the BIML shall send details of the proposal and the ToR within one month. However, as before, we recommend <u>further specifying</u> that CIML members have 3 months in which to respond to what the BIML sends them.	Agreed.

B 6-1 Section	Country	Comments on and proposals for improvement	Responses
5.5	USA	While 5.4.6 discusses the numbering of projects, there is nothing in 5.4 that addresses the naming of projects. Further, there is nothing in 5.5 that discusses the naming of Project Groups (just as TCs and SCs have numbers and names). This should be explicitly addressed in the Directives, such as by discussing both the numbering and the naming of Project Groups in 5.5.4.	Agreed. Also applied to 5.2.5 for the naming of TCs and SCs, since this was also not covered in the 1993 edition of the Directives either.
5.5.1	USA	The process for obtaining information about membership status on Project Groups should be the responsibility of the BIML, not of the TC or SC secretariats. The database being developed by the BIML will help them with this data-collecting activity.	This would indeed be a great advantage for TC/SC secretariats. This would also be in line with the general intention of B6-1 to strengthen the role of the BIML.
5.5.1	USA	<p>We feel that the change that is proposed does not properly reflect our (and others') original request for clarification here. We had recommended that the original text be made more clear that <u>only</u> if the TC/SC secretariat does not want to become the Project Group convener will volunteers be sought for that position (as it says in 5.4.2 and 5.4.3). We therefore propose the following text for the first paragraph of 5.5.1: "Once the CIML has approved a project according to the procedure in 5.4, the BIML shall send details of the project, including the convener of the Project Group, and its ToR to all P-members of the appropriate TC or SC, asking them"</p> <p>We propose deleting the third bullet since the selection of the Project Group convener was already decided in 5.4.2 – 5.4.5.</p> <p>Note that the third dash in the top box in Annex A.3 ("– whether they accept convener") needs to be removed accordingly. (Note also that the first decision block (diamond) in Annex A.2 already addresses this.)</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>In principal agreed. However, "P-members" should read "members" (see response to the second US comment on 5.5.1 below).</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

B 6-1 Section	Country	Comments on and proposals for improvement	Responses
5.5.1	USA	For purposes of clarification, we propose to slightly edit (in bold) the Note as follows (see opening paragraph of 5.5.1 about P-members): “Note: A Member State can only be a member of a Project Group if it is a P -member of the respective TC or SC. Once the CIML has approved a new project, it is the responsibility of each CIML Member to ensure that their country is, or becomes, a P -member of the respective TC or SC, if it wants to participate in the new Project Group.”	This is not agreed. From clause 5.6, 2 nd bullet, it follows, that it is the intention of B6-1 to include <u>all</u> O-members (and also liaisons) on a TC/SC in the PG(s) of that TC/SC. 5.5.1 indeed requires clarification, but it is proposed to change the wording as presented in the draft publication. Accordingly, the note should remain unchanged.
5.5.2	USA	We propose that the BIML conduct the inquiry (see our first comment above on 5.5.1. Therefore we propose to delete this clause, since the BIML will already have this information.	Agreed.
5.5.3	USA	We propose modifying 5.5.3 as follows: If a majority of the TC’s or SC’s P members indicate that they do not accept the proposed convener, or (Since selection of the Project Group convener was already decided in 5.4.2 – 5.4.5.) “If there are not at least six CIML Members from two different regions who want their countries to be registered as P-members on this Project Group, the BIML shall try to reach an agreement by consultation with the TC or SC P-members. If not enough CIML Members agreement can be reached to be registered, the BIML shall refer the matter to the CIML which shall make the decision by majority vote.”	Agreed.
5.5.4	USA	Besides being numbered (see 5.4.6), projects (and Project Groups) need to be named, reflecting the nature of the project. We propose adding a statement: “The project (and Project Group) shall be named by consensus of Project Group members to reflect the nature of the project.”	Agreed. On changing to the new system, they have been named after the publication they are developing (i.e. using the name of those projects already in existence before 2012).
5.5.7	USA	Change “administration” to “technical content”.	See other proposal above (5.2.8)

B 6-1 Section	Country	Comments on and proposals for improvement	Responses
5.6	USA	Again, we believe that the primary function of the Project Groups can be accomplished by having P-members of TC/SCs designate whether they wish to have “voting” or “non-voting” status on each project within the TC/SC. This would eliminate the need for an entirely new level of bureaucracy (Project Groups) within the functioning of the technical work, while still accomplishing the objective of speeding up the process of voting and of creating/revising OIML publications.	See response under “General” above.
5.6, 2 nd bullet	USA	We believe that OIML Corresponding Members have not in the past been eligible to serve as O-members on TC/SCs. (As mentioned earlier, we feel that the decision to have Corresponding Members be allowed to be O-members of TC/SCs should be a separate decision made by the CIML.) Note that the second bullet of 5.6 conflicts with 5.5.1 with regard to membership on a Project Group. We understand this section concerns Project Groups, but we believe the policy should be the same as it is for TC/SCs.	See response under 5.3, 2 nd bullet. See response under 5.5.1 (second US comment) above.
5.7	Japan	Recommend adding a reference to “ clause 5.2.1 ” as shown below. <i>The work of a TC, SC or Project Group shall follow strictly its approved Terms of Reference and work programme established under 5.2.1 and 5.2.9.</i>	Agreed. See response under “USA” below.
5.7	Poland	This point refers to the p.5.2.9 which contains only Terms of Reference of Project Group. Having regard the text of the p. 5.7 mentioned also about TC/SC it should be reference also to the p. 5.2.2 which include a TC/SC Terms of Reference.	In principle agreed. However, 5.2.1 seems to be the more appropriate reference (see response under “USA” below).
5.7	USA	Add “4.7 and ” before “5.2.9”.	Agreed. It is suggested to also refer to 5.2.1 (see comments above), i.e. to add “4.7, 5.2.1 and “ before “5.2.9”.
5.8	USA	Since B6:2011 already significantly diminishes the role of TC and SC secretariats, we feel that it is appropriate to replace 2 nd paragraph with: The BIML shall monitor the voting and participation in TC/SCs and project groups by electronic means. If a p-member does not: ... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ... • ... Then, the BIML shall notify the TC/SC secretariat or project group convenor, who shall try to resolve	This is not agreed, because it is still considered an important task of a TC / SC secretariat, or PG convenor, to oversee the work which includes the voting behaviour of the P-members.

B 6-1 Section	Country	Comments on and proposals for improvement	Responses
5.9	Poland	<p>This point constitutes that the secretariat of TC/SC may be re-elected for further periods of three years by a two-thirds majority of votes cast by the TC's, SC's or Project Group's P-members.</p> <p>In our opinion secretariat should be elected by the votes of the members of the TC/SC not by the members of the Project Group. Alternately, a word the “convener” should be added in this phrase</p> <p>“The secretariat (<u>or the convener</u>) may be re-elected for further periods of three years by a two-thirds majority of votes cast by the TC's, SC's or Project Group's P-members (abstentions and failures to reply do not count as votes cast) in a vote organized by the BIML”.</p> <p>Additionally. I would like to indicate that we still believe that a convener of the Project Group should be elected for the period of the project work, without re-electing periodically after three years.</p>	<p>Agreed. The 2nd sentence of the 2nd paragraph in clause 5.9 should be amended as follows: “The secretariat or convener may be re-elected...”</p> <p>Not agreed. This should be decided later in the light of the experiences gained with the new procedures.</p>
5.9	USA	<p>2nd paragraph: We recommend that this paragraph be deleted, since it is already covered multiple times (see, e.g., 5.2.6, 5.4.2, 5.4.3 and 5.5.5).</p>	<p>This is not agreed, because this paragraph mainly addresses the possible re-election of secretariats and conveners which is not addressed in the other clauses mentioned.</p>
5.12.1	USA	<p>We are in general opposed to proxies at TC, SC and Project Group meetings. If not enough members are able to attend, we feel that decisions should be supported by an online ballot.</p>	<p>There are clear and strict conditions defined for that (exceptional) case. This could be reconsidered and decided later in the light of the experience gained with the new procedures.</p>
5.12.1 4th paragraph	Japan	<p>(Editorial) Recommend revising the sentence as shown below.</p> <p><i>In exceptional cases, a P-member who is unable to be present at a TC, SC or Project Group meeting, may give a proxy to either another expert from their own <u>the same</u> country, or to another P member's representative ...</i></p>	<p>This has been checked by native English speakers, who decided that the wording is sufficiently clear as it is.</p>

B 6-1 Section	Country	Comments on and proposals for improvement	Responses
5.12.2	USA	<p>We agree with the new rule that “abstentions and failures to reply are not considered as votes cast,” since this new voting rule accelerates the voting process.</p> <p>We note that the rule “abstentions and failures to reply are not considered as votes cast” brings into question the need for P- and O-members in Project Groups, because having this rule could <u>automatically</u> allow even P-members of Project Groups to choose not to vote without causing any problems or delaying the voting process. (See also our comment on 5.6.)</p>	<p>Clause 5.8 clearly addresses the obligations of P-members, which include “to vote whenever asked to do so”.</p> <p>In addition, 5.8 clearly describes the consequences, if a P-member does not vote in successive votes.</p>
5.12.2 4th paragraph	Japan	<p>(Editorial) The use of a subjective expression “happy” in the sentence below might not be appropriate in an OIML basic document.</p> <p><i>Although comments may be submitted with a favourable vote, note that if a P-member votes “Yes” they are stating that they are <u>happy</u> for a CD....</i></p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>It is proposed to exchange “are happy for” by “accept”.</p>
5.12.2 5th paragraph	Japan	<p>A confirmation procedure of reception of vote/comments from the P-members shall be added by the proposed sentence below. It is because some troubles in communication in e-mail happened so far between our country and BIML (and TC/SC).</p> <p><i>In addition, the TC/SC secretariat or the convenor of the Project Group is strongly recommended to confirm the reception of votes and /or comments from the P-members.</i></p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>The following wording is suggested:</p> <p>“In addition, votes and/ or comments from P-members should be confirmed by the secretariat of a TC or SC, or the convener of a PG.”</p> <p>“Secretariat” has also been added to the first sentence.</p>
5.15.4	UK	<p>5.15.2 and 5.15.3 do not seem specifically relevant to this case. It could be that there are 5 members who are active on a specialised topic. We would recommend the first action should be for the BIML to seek additional ‘P’ members or members from a different region. Only if this fails should disbanding be considered.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>
5.16	Japan	<p>When the three-year time limit elapses, specified in the last dot point of “5.13 Timelines”, disbanding of the Project Group shall be considered by BIML and CIML even if the document has not been published. We propose adding a sentence to 5.16 in accordance with the time limitation of three years specified in 5.13.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>The following wording is suggested:</p> <p>“... progress (see 6.4.4), or if the timelines in 5.13 are significantly exceeded. In this case ...”</p>

B 6-1 Section	Country	Comments on and proposals for improvement	Responses
6 Development of a publication			
6.4 3rd paragraph	Japan	We request a marked-up version of CD will be also distributed to the member states.	Agreed. The following wording is suggested: “... Second and subsequent CDs (clean and marked-up version), together with...”
6.4.4	Japan	<p>We would like to know why “Presidential Council (PC)” has been changed to “President”. If it is understood that President always makes the final decision after consulting with PC, we will accept this change. If President solely makes the decision however, we request to involve PC or CIML into the decision process. As we aware, new ToR (B16) has been approved at the 46th CIML meeting in order to clarify the roles of PC.</p> <p>In addition, we wonder why the first dot point “<i>abandon the project...</i>” has been deleted. It is a very natural decision to abandon the project when further progress of the document is not possible. The decision of abandonment may be included implicitly in the last dot point “<i>follow another course....</i>” However, we request to retrieve the first dot point as one of the choices.</p>	<p>Agreed. This should be brought in line with the new OIML publication B 16. The following wording is suggested: “The BIML shall consider ... by consulting the President, supported by the Presidential Council according to B 16, and the CIML.”</p> <p>In principle agreed. However, to abandon a project should be finally decided by the CIML. It is therefore suggested to amend the 2nd bullet as follows: “... follow another course of action with the approval of the CIML, which includes the possibility to abandon a project according to 5.16.”</p>
6.5	USA	<p>In paragraph beginning: “The Draft publication ...”, at the end of the first bullet, add in parentheses “abstentions and failures to reply do not count as votes cast”, as is shown in the revised “Voting Rules” table at the end of Annex A.</p> <p>(See complete proposal for revised text below)</p>	Agreed.

B 6-1 Section	Country	Comments on and proposals for improvement	Responses
6.5	USA	<p>We propose the following changes (in bold):</p> <p>“The Draft publication is considered to have passed the CIML preliminary ballot stage if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a majority of CIML Members has voted in favour (abstentions and failures to reply do not count as votes cast), and • there are no proposals or objections requiring substantial amendments of the text. <p>If the Draft publication has passed the CIML preliminary ballot, the BIML shall consult the convener of the Project Group to incorporate any comments received which do not require substantial amendments of the text. The BIML shall then send the results of the ballot and the comments received to all CIML Members and register the publication as a Final Draft publication as described in 6.6.</p> <p>When appropriate, the BIML shall remind CIML Members of their obligation to vote on publications presented for CIML preliminary ballot.</p> <p>If the Draft publication has not passed the CIML preliminary ballot, it shall be returned to the convener of the Project Group which developed it for reconsideration by the Project Group and the possible development of a successor Draft publication. From this, it follows that there is the possibility for there to be a “second” (“third”, etc.) Draft publication.</p> <p>The comments received may indicate a significant difference in CIML members’ points of view, and the convener must make the determination that all possible steps have been taken to reconcile these differences, and make the determination that the document has achieved maximum possible consensus. If further consensus cannot be achieved, the convener shall, after consulting the TC or SC secretariat (if appropriate), explain the situation and the reasons for it to the BIML. The BIML shall consult with the President who will try to resolve the situation, and if necessary, make a proposal to the CIML.”</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed. “further” used instead of “successor”</p> <p>Not agreed. This would not improve the comprehensibility of the paragraph.</p>
6.5 last paragraph	Japan	<p>We appreciate the acceptance of our previous proposal regarding an additional procedure for solving a dispute in the CIML preliminary ballot. However, we hope Presidential Council also should be involved in this procedure.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>A similar amendment is suggested as under 6.4.4: “...The BIML shall consult with the President, supported by the Presidential Council according to B 16, who will ...”</p>

B 6-1 Section	Country	Comments on and proposals for improvement	Responses
6.5 & 6.6	UK	Both ‘marked up’ and ‘clean’ versions should be included. (As USA’s agreed comment)□	Agreed. Already included in “information document” in both cases, but separated to make it clearer. Also added to 6.7.2 where the Final Draft is distributed.
6.7.3	UK	Towards the end, an additional first bullet point should be added: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offer the publication at the next CIML meeting <p>This is because the online voting required 100% in favour and it is quite likely that the document will gain approval at a meeting which has a lesser voting criteria</p>	Agreed. Suggested wording: “Put the Final Draft publication forward for approval at the next CIML Meeting”
6.7.5	Japan	See our comment to Foreword (5th paragraph).	See response there.
6.10.2	UK	This does not seem to address a procedure for a technical amendment (not editorial or a simple correction) which requires consideration by the TC/SC/PG before being offered to the CIML. If this is not included the only option for such changes is a full revision which takes several years and is a costly process, or someone offering an amendment which has not been seen by the TC/SC/PG.	Agreed. It is suggested to add a new clause “6.10.3 Other situations” which addresses the possibility and conditions for a technical amendment under special circumstances. If a new clause 6.10.3 is added, the existing clause 6.10.3 will have to be renumbered to 6.10.4.
7 Reporting on progress	USA	If the concept is that all secretariats and convenors are required to have dedicated web pages, then more training needs to be provided. The BIML needs to provide significant support to the secretariats and convenors both for training and for keeping the web pages up-to-date. This should be a core BIML function.	Agreed. Mentioned in 4.6
8 Appeals			
Annex A			

B 6-1 Section	Country	Comments on and proposals for improvement	Responses
	USA	<p>We feel that the Annex A's should be labelled as Informative, so that if there are any conflicts with the main document, the main document is the authoritative text.</p> <p>Annex A.2 and A.3 still have ambiguities/inconsistencies concerning Project Group convenors and when the Project Group number is allocated.</p> <p>In Annex A.6 and A.7, we propose to include after "between CIML Meetings (6.7.3)" in the boxes, "(Direct CIML online approval)", in order to make the flow charts consistent with the language in the main text.</p> <p>We recommend that it be made clearer in these Annexes that only if the TC/SC secretariat does not want to become the Project Group convenor will volunteers be sought for that position. (See 5.4.2 and 5.4.3, as well as USA comments above).</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>These have been eliminated as far as possible.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>This does not seem to be necessary, because Annex A.2, being the only relevant Annex in this context, does already contain the box "Does TC or SC secretariat want to be convener for Project Group (5.4.2)?" which is considered to be clear enough.</p>
Annex B	USA	<p>We propose moving "Annex B – Model forms" to be Annex C (See next comment).</p> <p>Both forms in Annex B for new TC/SCs and new Project Groups refer to "Scope", but the Directives (see 4.7 and 5.4.1) refer to "Terms of reference". We propose that the term "scope" in B.1 and B.2 be changed to "terms of reference," for consistency with the text of B6-1.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>
Summary Table of Voting Rules	USA	<p>This Table should be made an Informative Annex (Annex B).</p> <p>In the voting "Rule" for CIML approval of the establishment of a TC or SC (at a CIML meeting), add " ≥ 50% of CIML members have voted in favour of the proposal." (See also US comment on 5.2.3)</p> <p>In the voting "Rule" for CIML approval of a Final Draft Publication (At CIML Meeting), add "present or represented (abstentions, blank and null votes do not count as votes cast)" after "Vote cast by ≥ 80% of CIML members."</p> <p>In the voting "Rule" for Conference (OIML Conference), add "present or represented (abstentions, blank and null votes do not count as votes cast)" after "Vote cast by ≥ 80% of CIML members."</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Second part agreed, but "present or represented" does not apply to Conference decisions since proxies are not allowed there.</p>