



WEIGHLOG

SCALE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
6724 Lone Oak Blvd. • Naples, Florida 34109
<http://www.scalemanufacturers.org>

WINTER 2006

SMA Member Companies

REGULAR MEMBERS

Avery Weigh-Tronix, Inc.

Cardinal Scale Manufacturing Co.

Fancor, Inc.

Hobart Corporation

Hottinger Baldwin Measurements

McKesson Automation Systems

Mettler-Toledo, Inc.

Sartorius Corporation

Systems Associates, Inc.

Vishay Transducers

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

A&D Engineering, Inc.

Flintec, Inc.

NCR

Rice Lake Weighing Systems



SCALE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, INC.

SMA FALL MEETING

The SMA Fall Meeting convened on Thursday morning, November 16, 2007 at the Eldorado Hotel in downtown Santa Fe, New Mexico. Seventy-eight percent of SMA Member Companies were represented. Special Guests included Michael (Mike) Cleary, Director, Division of Measurement Standards, State of California, and Chairman, National Conference on Weights and Measures; Joe Gomez, Division Director, Standards and Consumer Services Division, New Mexico Department of Agriculture; Carol Hockert, Chief, Weights and Measures Division, National Institute of Standards and Technology.



Approaching sunset at Santa Fe, NM.

Each of the guests provided input on the status of Weights and Measures in their area of concern and jurisdiction. Summaries of our guests' remarks are on the following pages.



(Center) SMA President, Todd Manifold (*Mettler-Toledo, Inc.*) welcomes (L) Jay Visco (*Vishay Transducers*) back to the SMA after his recent absence and (R) Rick Cartwright (*Hobart Corporation*) to his first meeting as the successor to Bob Schuller, SMA Past President. Bob Schuller has gone on to other duties at Hobart. SMA wishes to thank him for his support of SMA and we wish him well in his new position.

The assembled SMA members developed and adopted SMA Official Positions on the relevant agenda items of the NCWM Standards and Technology Committee at the upcoming Interim Meeting of the National Conference on Weights and Measures in January, 2007.

The members compared their perceptions of business conditions and challenges going forward. The consensus appeared to be that business has been picking up and the companies are cautiously optimistic that this trend will continue into the next year. Major issues continue to be raw material prices, especially for steel, as well as rising health care costs. Moves to India, China, and other Asian Pacific countries continue.

The 62nd SMA Annual Meeting is scheduled for April 17-19, 2007, at the Crowne Plaza Resort, Hilton Head Island, South Carolina.

The SMA Board of Directors agreed to change the meeting schedule back to a Wednesday-Friday format beginning with the SMA Fall Meeting in 2007.

Chicago's O'Hare Airport Hilton Hotel was selected as the site of the meeting and the dates will be November 14-16, 2007, meeting. It is anticipated that the sleeping room rate will be higher than past meetings, but when taking into account usual travel time from airports along with rental car costs, actual costs will be lower for attendees.



The Eldorado Hotel was centrally located to allow walking tours of the historic district of Santa Fe. The city has been the capital of New Mexico since 1610.

The SMA Board of Directors also agreed to hold the 2008 Annual Meeting in the Naples/Marco Island area of Florida.



Comments of Guest Speakers at the SMA Fall Meeting

OFFICERS

President

Todd Manifold
Mettler-Toledo, Inc.

Vice President

Stephen Langford
*Cardinal Scale
Manufacturing Co.*

Immediate Past President

Richard G. Norden
FANCOR, Inc.

Executive Director

Robert A. Reinfried
SMA

DIRECTORS

Term Expires 2007

Todd Manifold
Mettler-Toledo, Inc.

Term Expires 2008

Doug Biette
Sartorius Corporation

Term Expires 2009

Steve Beitzel
Systems Associates

Stephen Langford
*Cardinal Scale
Manufacturing Co.*

STAFF

Secretary

Philip G. Hannigan

Meeting Coordinator

Kimberly MacLaren

Joe Gomez, *Division Director, Standards and Consumer Services Division, New Mexico Department of Agriculture*, welcomed the group to New Mexico and gave a quick overview of the New Mexico Weights and Measures program. Some key items of interest from his presentation are summarized below:



- New Mexico Department of Agriculture (NMDA) is an agriculture producer-consumer service and regulatory department placed under the New Mexico State University (NMSU) Board of Regents with a director/secretary who serves on the Governor's Cabinet.
- The department has five divisions consisting of agricultural and environmental services, agricultural programs and resources, marketing and development, standards and consumer services, and veterinary diagnostics services.
- His division has 28 employees and is responsible for providing egg and dairy product inspection, weights and measures surveillance, petroleum product inspection and octane testing, weighmaster licensing, and houses the metrology laboratory which maintains custody of New Mexico standards of weights and measures (mass, volume, and length).
- They are required by law to inspect commercial devices once a year. This imposes a very heavy inspection schedule. For example, in the month of August, alone, they did 1,300 livestock scale inspections.
- Their funding is tenuous since it is considered a part of the University's funding and competes with other parts of the department, and the rest of the university, for its funds. *They would appreciate it if some regulated industries promoted a state legislative initiative to fund them directly.*

Carol Hockert, *Chief, Weights and Measures Division, National Institute of Standards and Technology*, provided an update on NIST and OIML activities, as well as the priorities that she and the division will focus on in the coming years in pursuit of their mission to further competitiveness, equity, and fair trade, both in the U.S. and Internationally. She has been in office for about one year and, in that time, has developed seven strategic objectives that the division will seek to achieve in the next five years. They are summarized below.



- Improve the credibility of the U.S. weights and measures system. Most state w&m divisions do not have clear benchmarks whereby they can show those responsible for their budgets the financial utility of their investments in the state weights and measures program and, consequently, the health of the state's commercial economy. Even if they do have those measurements, there is no comparable system in other states to allow comparisons between the state and other states. Her office will study what the states are doing and not doing and will endeavor to develop and provide any state a standard model to evaluate itself. They can then use that data to evaluate their programs, justify their programs, and seek additional support with standard, verifiable, and comparative data.
- Promote harmonization on U.S. and International Standards to promote equitable trade across borders.
- Develop Education and Training standards.
- Foster metric acceptability. They would like to have the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act to allow optional metric and/or inch-pound labeling and allow the marketplace to determine which system will ultimately prevail with the consumer. They would also like to have the European Directive modified. Currently, it requires metric only labeling in European markets by 2010. They would like the law to allow optional dual labeling, again, to allow the marketplace to meet customer needs and cut down this barrier to free trade.
- They would like to improve the credibility of State Metrology Laboratories. There are 54 state laboratories and 16 accredited state labs that do traceable measurements. Most are under-funded, under-staffed, and under-trained. This situation needs improvement and the W&M Division will seek ways to improve the current status.
- Improve Communications. They want to be more clear about what they are communicating and being those messages to more people. To this end, they are improving their web site, adding more relevant content to their newsletter and other publications.

Mike Cleary, Director, Division of Measurement Standards, State of California, and Chairman, National Conference on Weights and Measures provided an overview of the status of major items of interest regarding the NCWM and NTEP. Some of his points are grouped and summarized below.



- The California Weights and Measures program is fully funded by the State. They have 58 jurisdictions and have developed performance measures to evaluate the effectiveness and utility of their program as a cheap insurance program to insure that the sixth largest economy in the world can conduct commerce in a fair and equitable marketplace with a minimum of fraud.
- They need a similar comparative standard to measure themselves against other states.
- He and his State fully support the National Conference on Weights and Measures.
- During his term his theme for this year is "United by common purpose we can and shall prevail in all that we do."
- His goals include the following:
 - Recruit new members. The current membership is aging. They need new expertise and talent for future leadership roles.
 - Continue to repair the NCWM/NIST relationship.
 - Get information out on how important Weights and Measures are as a foundation of commerce and insurance against fraud.
 - Focus on Standards Development, i.e., Uniform and Standard Training Curriculum for Weights and Measures Inspectors. California has developed 14 self-directed training programs that can be adapted by the conference for the entire country.
 - Improve NTEP. NTEP keeps bad people and equipment out of the marketplace. Ways to improve it include, decreasing the NTEP certificate backlog, implementing the VCAP program, and the launch of the standardized data capture components of the Initial Verification Program.
 - Seek consensus and funding for OIML R60 and R76 Lab Capability.
 - Move our orientation from a Eurocentric to an Asia-Pacific centered orientation. "We are trying to get Europe to notice us. In the meantime, the Asia-Pacific powerhouses are open to U.S. regulatory ideas such as NTEP."

NTEP Directors Questions for 2006 Published

The **NTEP Directors Questions for 2006** have been compiled and published on the SMA web site's Home Page (scalemanufacturers.org)

Since 1997, the Scale Manufacturers Association and the National Conference on Weights and Measures have invited state directors attending their regional Weights and Measures association meetings to comment on a series of three to four questions regarding the NTEP program implementation in their jurisdictions. The candidate questions for each year have been solicited from SMA, NIST/OWM, NCWM, and State Directors. Those candidate questions are balloted and scored by degree of interest. The top three or four questions are then chosen as the questions for that year. In order to ascertain the degree of uniformity and interpretation of selected W&M practices, the same questions are asked at each regional meeting.

The following questions were discussed in the 2006 round.

QUESTION ONE: Wireless communication between load-receiving elements and primary indicators is becoming more and more common.

- Do you feel your inspectors should be concerned with testing the integrity of the wireless communications in initial verification or in subsequent evaluations or both?
- Should NTEP include testing of the wireless communications in the evaluation process?
- Do you have any specific recommendations for such evaluations?

QUESTION TWO: A device as originally supplied by the manufacturer has an NTEP Certificate of Conformance. Installation of a replacement part supplied by the same manufacturer renders the device out of conformance with Handbook 44. Should a disclaimer be included in all advertising and literature for the replacement part? If so, how should it be stated and how prominent should it be?

QUESTION THREE: Shortly after arriving at a site to conduct an inspection on a livestock scale you observe racks have been added to the deck of a vehicle scale for livestock weighing. What administrative, inspection and test procedures do you follow to determine the scale is suitable for this application(s)?

SURVEY QUESTION: Does your state or jurisdiction require registration of scale sales personnel?

With regard to the survey question, the results, so far, are shown on the next page. We welcome any updates and/or corrections. E-mail or call Phil Hannigan at SMA Headquarters (phil@scalemanufacturers.org, Ph. 239-514-3441 x 12).

SURVEY QUESTION

Does your state or jurisdiction require registration of scale sales personnel?

Alabama		Nevada	No
Alaska		New Hampshire	No
Arizona	Arizona does not require the registration of scale sales personnel unless they were to multi-task and do installation and or repair in addition to their sales responsibilities.	New Jersey	No
		New Mexico	No
		New York	No
Arkansas		North Carolina	No
California	No, we do not require registration of sales personnel, but the state requires all persons selling, renting, leasing, or loaning any weighing instrument to notify, within 24 hours, the local sealer of the county where the scale will be located.	North Dakota	
		Ohio	No
		Oklahoma	
Colorado	We understood that we did have this requirement but in checking with our attorney general we find that our law had been misinterpreted.	Oregon	No
		Pennsylvania	
Connecticut	No	Rhode Island	
Delaware	No	South Carolina	No
Florida	Our State does not register scale sales personnel, or any individual scale personnel for that matter. We register companies that service and install commercial scales, and have the name of one person in the company that is held responsible for their work.	South Dakota	No
		Tennessee	
		Texas	No
Georgia	No	Utah	No
		Vermont	
Hawaii		Virginia	Yes
Idaho	No	Washington	No
Illinois		West Virginia	
Indiana		Wisconsin	No
Iowa	No	Wyoming	
Kansas	No, but a licensed agency must do the installation.		
Kentucky	No	District of Columbia	
Louisiana	No	American Samoa	
Maine		Federated States of Micronesia	
		Midway Islands	
Maryland	No	Puerto Rico	
		Guam	
Massachusetts	No	Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands	
		US Virgin Islands	
Michigan			
Minnesota	No		
Mississippi	No		
Missouri	No		
Montana			
Nebraska	Our state statutes allow it but we have not implemented it		

UPCOMING MEETINGS OF INTEREST TO SMA MEMBERS

NCWM 92nd Interim Meeting

Omni Jacksonville,
Jacksonville, FL
January 21-24, 2007

SMA Annual Meeting

Crowne Plaza Hilton Head Isl. &
Beach Resort,
Hilton Head Island, SC
April 17-19, 2007

CWMA Annual Meeting

Crowne Plaza North,
Minneapolis, MN
April 29-May 2, 2007

NEWMA Annual Meeting

Springfield Marriott,
Springfield, MA
May 14-17, 2007

NCWM 91st Annual Meeting

Snowbird Resort,
Salt Lake City, UT
July 8-12, 2007
<http://www.ncwm.net>

WWMA Annual Meeting

Lake Tahoe, California
September 9-12, 2007

CWMA Annual Meeting

Bettendorf, Iowa
September 2007

NTEP Weighing Sector

September 5-7, 2007

NTEP Measuring Sector

October 2007

SWMA Interim Meeting

Little Rock, Arkansas
October 2007

NEWMA Interim Meeting

October 2007

SMA Fall Meeting

O'Hare Airport Hilton Hotel
Chicago, Illinois
November 14-16, 2007

SMA's Conformity Assessment Program Celebrates Five Year Anniversary



SMA's Conformity Assessment Program will celebrate its five year anniversary on January 1, 2007. Back in 2001, three SMA member companies successfully completed audits. Effective January 1, 2002, those companies were awarded certificates authorizing them to use the SMA Production Meets Type logo on the products that had been registered under SMA's program.

SMA is currently updating its Conformity Assessment Policy & Procedures and has contacted a qualified auditor to begin scheduling the next round of audits.

Since 2002, additional members of SMA have also successfully completed their audits by an auditor qualified to audit in SIC codes 3596 and 3821.

Under the terms of the SMA program, companies must be re-audited after every five years.

OTHER NEWS YOU CAN USE

Extract of Decisions of the 41st Meeting of the International Committee of Legal Metrology, Cape Town, 18-20 October

The Committee approved the following Recommendations:

- R76-1 Non-automatic weighing instruments. Part 1: Metrological and technical requirements – Tests;
- R51-1 Automatic catchweighing instruments. Part 1: Metrological and technical requirements – Tests;
- R134-1 Automatic instruments for weighing road vehicles in motion and axle-load measuring. Part 1: Metrological and technical requirements – Tests. The CIML noted that account would be taken of US comments concerning terminology and the overall scope of the Recommendation.

The Committee approved the following Amendments:

- Amendment to B 3 OIML Certificate System for Measuring Instruments;
- Amendment to B 10-1 Framework for a Mutual Acceptance Arrangement on OIML Type Evaluations (MAA).

The Committee approved the withdrawal of R 74 Electronic weighing instruments.

The Committee allocated the Co-Secretariat of TC 5/SC 2 Software - hitherto held by France - to the BIML.

Continued on next page

The Committee approved the following work projects:

- Revision of B 3 OIML Certificate System for Measuring Instruments;-
- Revision of B 10-1 Framework for a Mutual Acceptance Arrangement on OIML Type Evaluations (MAA);
- Revision of B 10-2 Checklists for Issuing Authorities and Testing Laboratories carrying out OIML Type Evaluations;
- Guide for the application of ISO/IEC Guide 62 to the assessment of quality system certification bodies in the field of legal metrology;
- Guide for the application of ISO 9001 to legal metrology controls.

The Committee withdrew the following work projects:

- Project P6 of TC 3/SC 5: OIML procedure for the review of laboratories to enable mutual acceptance of test results and OIML Certificates of Conformity

The Committee instructed the Bureau and the TC 3 Secretariat (Metrological control) to review the organization of the Working Group on Conformity to Type.

The Committee approved the proposal made by the Bureau, that:

- When a revision of a publication is published, the previous version remains available on the OIML web site, but with an indication that this version has been superseded;
- As long as the three parts of a revised Recommendation included in the Certificate System have not been published, the version referenced in the Certificate System remains applicable;
- When the Certificate System references a revised Recommendation, Certificates may still be issued by reference to the previous version providing that the application for a Certificate has been lodged before the publication of the revised version.
- 8.3 MAA. The Committee took note of a presentation given by Mrs. Gaucher on the implementation of the MAA, and expressed its appreciation for the work carried out and on the signature of the two first Declarations of Mutual Confidence (DoMCs).

The Committee approved the following MAA Resolutions:

- The BIML shall initially bear the costs of peer assessments and subsequently invoice the peer assessed bodies with a lump sum equal to 1500 • per assessor-day.
- The end of the transitory period during which an OIML Issuing Authority which participates in the R 60 DoMC and/or the R76 DoMC as a Utilizing Participant or which did not sign the R 60 DoMC and/or the R 76 DoMC will still be authorized to issue OIML Certificates of Conformity according to OIML B 3 outside the scope of the MAA, is provisionally fixed at 31 December 2008.

This deadline will be reviewed by the CIML at its 43rd Meeting based on a BIML report on operation, experience and feedback from industry.

In addition to these Resolutions, the Committee took note that Issuing Participants in the R 60 and R76 DoMCs are able to issue basic OIML Certificates related to applications for OIML type evaluations received before the publication of the DoMC.

The CIML instructed TC 3/SC 5 to consider the rules for appointing new Issuing Authorities after the transition period mentioned in the MAA Resolution 2006-2 above, and to propose an appropriate solution for approval by the Committee

The Committee accepted Australia's invitation to hold the 13th Conference and 43rd CIML Meeting in Sydney, Australia, in 2008.



**SMA Positions on the Draft Interim Agenda
of the
NCWM Specifications and Tolerances Committee
92nd NCWM Interim Meeting
January, 2007**

310 GENERAL CODE

310-1 G-S.2. Facilitation of Fraud

SMA supports the proposal and offers the following alternative wording:

G-S.2. Facilitation of Fraud - All equipment, mechanisms, software, and devices, without limitation, shall be so designed, constructed, and installed such that they do not facilitate the perpetration of fraud.

310-2 G-S.5.6.1. Indications and Recorded Representation of Metric Units on Equipment with Limited Character Sets; - Appropriate Abbreviations

SMA supports the proposal with the following changes:

1. "Indications" should be replaced with "Indicated" in the title.
2. Metric should not be removed from the title.
3. In G-S.5.6.1. (a), we question the location and use of the quotation marks.
4. We recommend that a web site not be referenced in Handbook 44.

310-3 G-S.8.1. Multiple Weighing or Measuring Elements with a Single Provision for Sealing

The SMA opposes this item.

Rationale:

The original item was intended for codes dealing only with measuring devices (codes 3.31 thru 3.38). SMA does not feel there is justification to expand this to weighing devices. The SMA is not aware of any specific problems for scales and recommends that this proposal be limited to measuring devices.

320 SCALE CODE

320-1 S.1.1. (c) Zero Indication; Requirements for Markings or Indications for Other than Digital Zero Indications

The SMA opposes this item.

Rationale:

The current process, as allowed by S.1.1.(c)., is sufficient to prevent facilitation of fraud. The SMA supports the Weighing Sector analysis.

320-2 S.1.1. 1. (b) Digital Indicating Elements

SMA Supports Weighing Sector wording.

320-3 S.1.2. 1. Weight Units and T.N.2.1. General

The SMA supports the Weighing Sector version of the proposal and suggests:

1. The note become a sub-paragraph of S.1.2.1.
2. Modify T.N.2.1 to replace “every” with “any”.

320-4 S.1.4.6. Height and Definition of Minimum Reading Distance, UR.2.10. Primary Indicating Elements Provided by the User, UR.2.11. Minimum Reading Distance, and Definitions of Minimum Reading Distance and Primary Indications

The SMA supports the WWMA proposal.

Specifically,

- The SMA supports the S.1.4.6 technical specification.
- The SMA supports UR.2.10 and the definition of primary indication.
- The SMA opposes UR.2.11 Minimum Reading Distance because we feel that it is difficult to enforce equitably.

320-5 S.2.1.7. Tare Rounding on a Multiple Range Scale

The SMA supports the proposal provided that the last sentence is changed to reflect the rounding requirements as stated in HB 44, Appendix A, Fundamental Considerations, Section 10, Rounding Off Numerical Values.

320-6 N.1.3.1. Bench or Counter Scales, N.1.3.8. All Other Scales Except Crane Scales, Hanging Scales, Hopper Scales, Wheel–Load Weighers, and Portable Axle Load Weighers, and Appendix D; Definitions of Bench Scale and Counter Scale

The SMA supports this item.

320-7 N.1.3.6.1. Dynamic Monorail Weighing Systems

The SMA has no position.

320-8 Table 4. Minimum Test Weights and Test Loads

The SMA supports the proposal with the following changes:

1. Remove “12.5 % or” from row 5 of the table.
2. Remove superscript 3 from row 5 of the table.

320-9 Appendix D; Definitions for Tare Mechanism, Gross Weight Value, Net Weight, Net Weight Value, Tare, and Tare Weight Value

The SMA supports the intent of the item and feels that it needs to be referred back to the Weighing Sector for further development.

324 AUTOMATIC WEIGHING SYSTEMS

324-1 S.1.2. Value of Division Units and T.2.1. General

The SMA supports the Weighing Sector version of the proposal and suggests:

1. The note become a sub-paragraph of S.1.2.
2. Modify T.2.1 to replace “every” with “any”.

324-2 Note 5 Table S.7.b. Notes for Table S.7.a.

The SMA supports the proposal.