



Snapshots of IO Practices

OIML Memoranda of Understanding

Organisation(s): International Organization of Legal Metrology

The Snapshots of IO Practices present examples of specific efforts undertaken by an international organisation to work towards more effective international instruments. They aim to highlight examples of practices within the five focus areas of the Partnership of International Organisations for Effective International Rulemaking (IO Partnership), namely the variety and development of international instruments, their implementation, evaluation, ensuring stakeholder engagement, and co-ordination among IOs. The snapshots are submitted by the secretariats of the relevant international organisations implementing the relevant practice. The practices were compiled by the OECD Secretariat and focal points of the IO Partnership (UNCITRAL, OIE, WHO, ISO, WCO, BIPM, and SIECA), with a brief review to ensure consistency and comparability of the information provided within the snapshots. The inclusion of a practice in these snapshots implies no endorsement or assessment of that practice on the part of the OECD Secretariat or the focal points of the IO Partnership.

1	Overview of the Practice	Answers	Comments and intersections
1.1	Organisation	<p>International Organization of Legal Metrology (OIML)</p> <p>The OIML is an intergovernmental treaty organisation which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • develops model regulations, standards and related documents for use by legal metrology authorities and industry, • provides mutual recognition systems which reduce trade barriers and costs in a global market, • represents the interests of the legal metrology community within international organisations and forums concerned with metrology, standardisation, testing, certification and accreditation, • promotes and facilitates the exchange of knowledge and competencies within the legal metrology community worldwide, • co-operates with other metrology bodies to raise awareness of the contribution that a sound legal metrology infrastructure can make to a modern economy. 	

Compendium of International Organisations' Practices

Working Towards More Effective International Instruments



1.2	Area of relevance among the IO partnership focus themes (variety of instruments, implementation, stakeholder engagement, evaluation, co-ordination)	Co-ordination (in the development of instruments)	
1.3	Name of the Practice	The OIML has a number of Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) in place with International Organisations (IOs) to co-ordinate activity, reduce the possibility of duplication and to enhance communication and collaboration.	
1.4	Name of person(s) completing the template	Chris Pulham, BIML	
2	Description of the Practice	Answers	Comments and intersections
2.1	Please describe the practice shortly, providing information on its core features.	Since its establishment in 1955, the OIML has always endeavoured to conclude agreements with other IOs whenever necessary, with a view to strengthening collaboration and international harmonisation. This involves co-ordinating a joint approach in areas of common understanding and, when relevant, developing joint technical documents.	
2.2	What are the objectives of the practice?	The objective is to avoid contradictory or duplicate requirements and to establish common interpretations and understanding in the field of legal metrology; consequently, manufacturers and users of measuring instruments, certification bodies, test laboratories, etc. may simultaneously apply OIML Publications and those of other institutions.	

Compendium of International Organisations' Practices

Working Towards More Effective International Instruments



2.3	What have been the key results of the practice?	<p>A number of joint publications have been established:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OIML R 49 for water meters is a joint publication between OIML-ISO-CEN • Joint assessment procedure with ILAC addressing accreditation of test laboratories • Joint assessment procedure with IAF addressing accreditation of certification bodies • Joint statement on metrological traceability with BIPM and ILAC. <p>In addition, joint work programs have been established with a number of IOs to support the collaboration. Closer, better defined procedures and scopes of activity have also been established which set the framework for joint work with certain other IOs.</p>	<p>The establishment of joint publications between the OIML and its international partners encompasses a variety of intersections. These include those between co-ordination (WG5) and the development of international instruments (WG1, which applies to the joint publication on water meters between OIML-ISO-CEN as well as the joint statement on metrological traceability with BIPM and ILAC), as well as with implementation (WG2, visible in the joint assessment procedures of accreditation of test laboratories with ILAC, and addressing the accreditation of certification bodies with IAF respectively).</p>
2.4	In what year was the practice introduced?	<p>MoUs have been established with the following IOs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OIML-ISO in 1966 • OIML-ILAC-IAF in 2006 • OIML-UNIDO-BIPM in 2008 • OIML-IEC in 2011 	
2.5	Has the practice been updated/reformed since then? If yes, when and how has it evolved over time?	<p>There have been subsequent revisions of the MoUs listed in section 2.4 since they were originally signed.</p>	

Compendium of International Organisations' Practices

Working Towards More Effective International Instruments



2.6	What do you consider to be the primary strengths of the practice?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased co-operation in joint areas of work • Close relationships have been built and maintained • A formal structure to joint work has been established, including joint work programs • Provision of guidelines for future projects 	
2.7	What do you consider to be the main challenges faced during the implementation of the practice?	To identify and then harmonise work areas and ensure there are no conflicting objectives.	
2.8	<p>Does the practice have a formal/normative basis within the organisation or is it conducted informally? Does this basis make the practice mandatory or voluntary?</p> <p>If there is formal basis, please provide the relevant link or documentation.</p>	<p>The policy towards IOs, and liaison organisations in general, is detailed in OIML B 12 Policy paper on liaisons between the OIML and other bodies.</p> <p>The practice is conducted formally via signed MoUs with some IOs, generally at a meeting of the International Committee of Legal Metrology (CIML) with a ceremony to mark the occasion.</p>	<p>The Policy Paper on Liaisons between the OIML and other Bodies provides a tailored framework governing the organisation's co-operation with intergovernmental organisations, international standard-setters and accreditation organisations, as well as regional legal metrology organisations (RLMOs) and industrial federations. In this respect, the Policy Paper represents an intersection between co-ordination among IOs (WG5), stakeholder engagement (WG3, applying to co-operation with industrial federations for example), implementation of international instruments (WG2, co-operation with regional bodies), and the development of international instruments itself (WG1, co-ordination with international standard-setters and accreditation bodies).</p>

Compendium of International Organisations' Practices

Working Towards More Effective International Instruments



2.9	At what frequency is the practice applied? i.e. is it conducted once or on an iterative basis?	MoUs between the OIML and other partner organisations are regularly reviewed and updated when the need arises (e.g. when there is overlap in the Recommendations/standards other organisations develop, etc.).	
2.10	Is this practice applied systematically, (e.g. with respect to every normative instrument, according to specific criteria or on an ad hoc basis)?	The OIML does not have formal MoUs with all the other organisations it works with, but still enjoys collaborative working relations with a large number of bodies with whom there are less formal ties – see OIML B 12.	
2.11	Please provide specific details or examples to illustrate the practice (including supporting links and documents).	MoUs already signed, their backgrounds, and photographs are available here	
3	Design of the Practice	Answers	Comments and intersections
3.1	Who designed the practice (e.g. Was it developed internally, in collaboration with other organisations, etc.?)	When the need arises for either a new MoU or to revise an existing one, the OIML and the partner organisation liaise to develop the MoU together. The text is modified in line with the common objectives and matures into the final version at Board level (the CIML President for the OIML).	
3.2	Which stakeholders were engaged with in the design of the practice?	A range of intergovernmental organisations, international standard-setters, accreditation organisations, regional legal metrology organisations (RLMOs), and industrial federations have participated in the design of OIML MoUs.	

Compendium of International Organisations' Practices

Working Towards More Effective International Instruments



3.3	How long did it take to design the practice?	<p>Data regarding the decision to establish MoUs, and the development of the practice, is not available as it dates back to the early 1960s.</p> <p>The development of OIML B 12 took four months, and was published in 2004 following approval by the CIML in late 2003.</p> <p>The time taken to develop individual MoUs varies depending upon the IO and the complexity of the MoU.</p>	
3.4	What resources were needed to design the practice initially (i.e., staff, budget etc.)?	Senior staff from the OIML secretariat, the International Bureau of Legal Metrology (BIML), and the CIML President.	
3.5	What challenges were encountered during the design of the practice and how were they overcome?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Penetrating the hierarchy of the partner organisation in order to identify the correct representative who has the authority to negotiate on behalf of their organisation. • Initially, the need to establish bilateral or multilateral MoUs may not be obvious, but may become clearer over time. • Another challenge is that some IOs may not wish for the text of an MoU to be made publicly available as it may contain confidential information. 	
3.6	Has the practice been tested before implementation (i.e. pilot phase)? If yes, please describe.	N/A	

Compendium of International Organisations' Practices

Working Towards More Effective International Instruments



4	Implementation of the Practice		Comments and open questions
4.1	Which units are responsible for implementing the practice within your IO?	BIML Director, Assistant Directors, CIML President and Vice-Presidents.	Intersection with area of IO Partnership on 'Strengthening the Implementation of International Instruments'
4.2	Are IO members involved in implementing the practice? If so, how?	N/A	
4.3	Are external actors beyond the organisation or its membership involved in implementing the practice? If so, how?	Other international organisations with whom the MoUs are concluded.	
4.4	Which resources are needed to implement the practice (e.g., staff and budget)?	BIML Director, Assistant Directors, CIML President and Vice-Presidents.	
5	Outputs and Evaluation of the Practice	Answers	Comments and intersections
5.1	Has the practice been evaluated or reviewed?	The MoUs are reviewed periodically as the need arises.	Intersection with area of IO Partnership on "Developing a greater culture of evaluation of IO rules and standards"
5.2	If yes, who carried out the evaluation (please specify whether it was done internally or externally)	The evaluation was carried out internally by the BIML Director and BIML Assistant Directors, in consultation with the President and the Presidential Council.	Intersection with area of IO Partnership on "Developing a greater culture of evaluation of IO rules and standards"

Compendium of International Organisations' Practices

Working Towards More Effective International Instruments



5.3	If yes, please describe the evaluation methodology? (e.g. were any quantitative or qualitative indicators/criteria used to measure/assess the outcomes of the practice?).	Identification of new or changed items in the MoU which require updating or adding/deleting.	Intersection with area of IO Partnership on “Developing a greater culture of evaluation of IO rules and standards”
5.4	If yes, what were the conclusions of the evaluation, and has the practice evolved subsequently? If possible, please attach related documents or provide a link.	A decision to revise the MoU or not to revise the MoU.	Intersection with area of IO Partnership on “Developing a greater culture of evaluation of IO rules and standards”
6	Additional comments and information	Answers	Comments and intersections
6.1	Is there any more information or documentation that would be valuable to share in relation to the practice (e.g. links, reports, meeting minutes, supporting documents)?	More information is available here	
	Sources		