

Template for comments and convener's observations

Date:2019-11-27

Document:

Project:

Country Code ¹	Part	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/Table	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Convener's responses
0001 FR				GEN	<p>As France mentioned it for the CD1 and CD2, this type of instrument is patented and there is a fear that these patents would prevent any other manufacturer from positioning itself on this material. For the previous comment, it was indicated an answer of BIML was expected. It is noticed US wrote on this subject to explain, according their point of view, that other companies can develop other patentable designs or obtain licenses from any of the current patent holders.</p> <p>According to the rules about patents, it is possible to patent only if the invention is « new » (that is to say that it should not relate to an innovation that has already been made accessible to the public) and “inventive” (it means that it shall involve an inventive step and not derives obviously from the current technique).</p> <p>France maintain that is seems that there is still a risk that this situation prevents any other new manufacturer from positioning itself on this material</p>		Ian, please can you provide a BIML response to the comments regarding the patent issues.
0002 FR				GEN	<p>Parameters such as density, granulometry and environmental conditions as humidity have an important influence on the instrument. The “flow presentation” of the product to weight, the infeed flow and the position of the test load on the weighing platform (for simulation test) are also critical.</p> <p>France has noticed new requirements have been added about the designation of the acceptable moisture and temperature range for each product to be weighed, the instructions on adjusting infeed flow or the description of positioning requirements for product flow presentation in the markings and in the documentation for type evaluation. However, France question on how the authority issuing the certificate will be able to « validate » that the simulation tests can be</p>		<p>Part 1, 6.1.1 requires the manufacturer to provide descriptions of requirements for product flow presentation, installation and loading requirements for a force simulation platform that can be loaded with weights for use in simulation testing, and instructions on adjusting infeed mass flowrate and suitable cautions about limits and securing adjustments during the test the infeed mechanism.</p> <p>This information will guide and allow the Issuing Authority to test the efficiency of these cautions and limits provided in the manufacturer’s documentation against the Recommendation.</p> <p>Clause 9.1.1 Conditions and product provides additional testing information with various products.</p>

¹ Country code (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China)

² Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial

Template for comments and convener's observations

Date:2019-11-27

Document:

Project:

Country Code ¹	Part	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/Table	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Convener's responses
					representative of the use of the instrument with a product. In the same time, how this will be able to check that the cautions about the effect of improper product infeed and about limits and securing adjustments during the test of the infeed mechanism, described by the manufacturer in the documentation, are suitable. How this authority can test the efficiency of these cautions and limits ?		
0003 SP					Spain don't have any experience in this kind of instruments	Abstention	Thank you.
0004 AU	1			GE	In the text of the Recommendation 'Rxx-2' and 'Part 2' are used to refer to Part 2 of the Recommendation. For consistency, suggest to stick to one of these.	Change 'Rxx-2' to 'Part 2', or vice versa.	Agreed. To amend. "Part" is used in B6 2019 (E)
0005 UK	1				The percentages for the test are missing;	Insert the percentages for the classes: a) class 0.2: 0.07 % x load; b) class 0.5: 0.18 % x load; c) class 1: 0.35 % x load; d) class 2: 0.7 % x load.	Disagree. No additional amendments necessary. The MPEs for Part 1,3.7.4.2 Discrimination of the totalization indicating device are already given in Part 2, 8.2.
0006 AU	1			GE	Australia shares the concerns of France about the patent issue. This issue also appears to be unresolved with BIML.	Needs to be discussed and resolved.	I have asked Ian Dunmill to provide a BIML response to the patent issue comments. See response to 0001 FR
0007 AU	1			TE	There appears to be a fundamental issue with mass and force. By definition, the force is proportional to the mass. But the relationship is not mass times gravity, because it is centripetal force, and will vary with the flow rate and radius of curvature. It is suggested this document needs to be clearer on this point. See other AU comments.	Needs to be discussed and resolved.	The informative Annex A in Part 1, (contribution from Switzerland) clarifies the basic measurement principle for arched chute weighers. Simulation tests are fitted and conducted as described in Part 2, 4.2, 4.3, and 7.1.1. The indicated value of the weights on the platform (part of the force receptor) are recorded and compared to the recorded values from the control instrument as described in Part 2, 4.4. The error of indication should be within the MPEs. Other methods which enable the weighing function to be verified may be used as appropriate. The MPEs, in terms of mass, will be the same regardless of the method used. Part 2, 4.3.

¹ Country code (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China)

² Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial

Template for comments and convener's observations

Date:2019-11-27

Document:

Project:

Country Code ¹	Part	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/Table	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Convener's responses
0008 US	1	General	02.1.1	ed	For clarification, user convenience and readability: when a separate Document, Standard, or Recommendation are Incorporated by Reference (IBR) include the complete title the first time the IBR occurs in the Recommendation and (and to avoid the confusion sometimes caused by dynamic incorporation), should include the specific year (e.g., 2004 Edition) of the edition to be incorporated. This is done in 2. Terminology but not in 2.1.1. and in other sections of the Recommendation such as in 6. Metrological Controls for D19 and D20 and in Note 2 under Table 4.	Note: In this Recommendation “mass” (or “weight value”) is preferably used in the sense of “conventional mass” or “conventional value of the result of weighing in air” according to OIML R 111 (2004 Edition) “ <u>Weights of Classes E₁, E₂, F₁, F₂, M₁, M₁₋₂, M₂, M₂₋₃ and M₃</u> ” [5] and OIML D 28 (2004 Edition) “ <u>Conventional Value of the Result of Weighing in Air</u> ” [6], whereas “weight” is preferably used for an embodiment (or material measure) of mass that is regulated in regard to its physical and metrological characteristics. NOTE: In Annex B the 2004 Edition Year for D28 is not included in [6].	Agreed. To amend as proposed.
0009 AU	1	2.1.1		TE	Australia still has concerns about whether this is a weighing instrument. Evidence of this concern is the confusion between mass and force. Put simply, you cannot simply apply standard weights to test this instrument, because it does not “weigh” the mass. The mass is determined by centripetal force – not by weighing (using the effect of gravity.)	Needs to be discussed and resolved.	See convener response to 0007 AU. There are instruments of this type on the market. In addition, CECIP (European weighing federation) has published an article in the OIML Bulletin article about this type of weighing instrument (OIML Bulletin Volume LVII, Number 3, July 2016, Page 9). CECIP has actively promoted the development of technical regulations for this type of instrument.
0010 UK	1	2.1.12		te	Terminology for “audit trail” is given twice, in 2.1.12 and also in 2.1.9.	Delete 2.1.12.	Agreed. To delete.
0011 AU	1	2.1.9 and 2.1.12		ED	There are two clauses that define ‘audit trail’	Amend to have a single clause that defines ‘audit trail’	Agreed. To delete. See response to 0010 UK
0012 AU	1	2.2.1.2		TE	It is unclear how a <i>force simulation platform</i> would work. Based on clause 4.4 in Part 2, it seems the expectation is that the platform actually converts a standard weight, into the force that the weight would exert on the force receptor if it were dynamically moving across the chute. If true, Australia has concerns about the impacts on traceability between the arched chute weigher and the standard	Needs to be discussed and resolved.	Once the Recommendation is published and put into use, we can look at setting up a working group to address these issues. At the moment, it is recommended to limit further technical changes which could hold up the work. It is important to note that Recommendations are mainly performance-based requirements not technology specific, so it can be difficult to address all technical issues in one revision.

¹ Country code (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China)

² Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial

Template for comments and convener's observations

Date:2019-11-27

Document:

Project:

Country Code ¹	Part	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/Table	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Convener's responses
					weights. If not true, it is unclear how the standards weights are being used to test the arched chute weigher.		Information about the force simulation platform was added to the 3CD at the request of Australia, and in accordance with Australia's comment to the 2CD (0067 AU in the 2 CD collated comments). Test weights are loaded on the platform (part of the force receptor), Part 2, 4.3. The force simulation platform is defined in Part 1, 2.2.1.2.
0013 AU	1	2.4.5.6		ED	Align the definition with VIML by denoting the singular 'maximum permissible error' and amend the definition accordingly.	Change "maximum permissible errors" to 'maximum permissible error'. Change "extreme values" to "extreme value"	Agreed. To align with VIML as proposed.
0014 AU	1	2.5.2 and 2.5.3		GE	Suggest to provide sections in the Recommendation that define the rated operating conditions and reference conditions.		Already described in Part 1, 5.1.1.
0015 AU	1	2.7		TE	What is the significance of B, length of conveyor? It does not appear to be used anywhere.	Remove.	Agreed to delete "B" from 2.7.
0016 AU	1	2.7			The symbols e , p_i , sf, e.m.f, I/O, RF, DC and AC have been referred to in the text of the Recommendation. However, they do not appear in the list of abbreviations and symbols.	Add.	Agreed. To add symbols as proposed. DC Direct current AC Alternating current pi Fraction of the MPE applicable to a module of the instrument which is examined separately emf electromotive force RF radio frequency I/O input/output
0017 AU	1	2.7		GE	The symbol E should be defined as 'relative error' rather than just 'error'	For the symbol E , change 'error' to 'relative error'	Agreed. To amend as proposed.
0018 AU	1	2.8.5		TE	The relationship is wrong. You cannot multiply a force by mass flow to get mass flow. The relationship between (maximum) flow rate and the (maximum) force is dependent on the design of the instrument.	Needs to be discussed and resolved.	Agreed to remove the relationship. Q_{mmax} is already defined in 2.3.5.1. The derivative formula is not useful.
0019 AU	1	2.8.6		TE	Σ_{min} is specified, so T_{min} is dependent on Q_m (which can vary between Q_{mmin} and Q_{mmax}). But, now the document suggests that T_{min} must be specified (it is also listed	Remove this relationship and remove references to T_{min} .	Agreed to remove the relationship

¹ Country code (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China)

² Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial

Template for comments and convener's observations

Date:2019-11-27

Document:

Project:

Country Code ¹	Part	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/Table	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Convener's responses
					in 4.6.2). So, if Σ_{min} is specified and T_{min} is specified then Q_m must be a fixed value, equal to Σ_{min}/T_{min} . This does not make sense. Other than this relationship, there are no requirements for T_{min} .		See Switzerland 2CD comments (<i>Performing product tests</i>), in Part 2, Annex D which gives an example of the practical application of $\Sigma_{min} = Q_m \times T_{min}$. T_{min} is the minimum totalized time obtained from the internal clock, and listed in Part 3, 1.8.
0020 AU	1	2.8.7		TE	Something has gone missing here. In 2CD, this text was preceded by “2% of the load at Q_{mmax} for 1 hour”. Without that, this text has no context and no meaning.	Review	For clarity, relationship removed.
0021 UK	1	2.8.7		ed	Line space needed before 2.8.7	Move 2.8.7 into its own line by inserting line spacing before 2.8.7	Relationship removed.
0022 AU	1	2.8.8		TE	There is clearly a mistake here. The relationship says that $T = L$ (because the totalizing times cancel). So, the totalised quantity of simulation tests is equal to the static load! Even if the relationship was “corrected” (by expressing L as mass flow and multiplying by the totalizing time), this is still not right, because of the mass and force issue mentioned above.	Needs to be discussed and resolved.	For clarity, relationship removed.
0023 UK	1	2.8.8, 3.4, 3.5, etc.	Table 3,	ge	Σ_{min} at Q_{mmax} , Q_{mmin} & Q_{mint} , etc., should all be in a standard font format.	Standardised the fonts in abbreviations and formulas, e.g., all italics.	Agree. The BIML will contribute to the final formatting before publication.
0024 AU	1	3.2.2		ED	There is no explanation of 3.2.2, which seems inconsistent with 3.2.1	Add explanation of 3.2.2	Not critical. However, a short sentence as follows might be useful: “Maximum permissible errors for influence factor tests shall not exceed the values in Table 2 rounded to nearest totalization scale interval, d
0025 US	1	3.4.	example	ed	Revise the Example for clarity and to follow language of the requirement which specifies that the minimum totalized quantity shall be not less than the <u>largest</u> of the two values (e.g., largest value of a or b).	Σ_{min} shall not be less than the <u>largest value of either:</u> <u>$0.02 \times Q_{mmax}$ or $2000 \times d$</u> <u>$0.02 \times Q_{mmax}$ or $800 \times d$</u> <u>$0.02 \times Q_{mmax}$ or $400 \times d$</u> <u>$0.02 \times Q_{mmax}$ or $200 \times d$</u>	Agreed. To amend as proposed.

¹ Country code (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China)

² Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial

Template for comments and convener's observations

Date:2019-11-27

Document:

Project:

Country Code ¹	Part	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/Table	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Convener's responses
0026 UK	1	3.5		ed	Redundant line space between the sentence and the full stop.	Delete the line spacing.	Agreed
0027 UK	1	3.7.1		ed	Reference to the test would be useful.	Add test clause to the heading, “ R-xx-2, 5.4 ”	Agreed
0028 UK	1	3.7.2		ed	Reference to the test would be useful.	Add test clause to the heading, “ R-xx-2, 5.5 ”	Agreed
0029 US	1	3.7.3.2.	list	ed	The order of presentation in this requirement is that the percentages are presented first followed by the class of device. For consistency with 3.7.4.3 through 3.7.4.4.2 and readability (e.g., a user would likely look up the accuracy class of a device to determine which performance requirement to apply).	a) class 0.2: 0.007 % b) class 0.5: 0.0175 % c) class 1: 0.035 % d) class 2: 0.07 %	Agreed. To amend as proposed.
0030 AU	1	3.7.3.3	c)		The upper limit is U_{nom} or U_{max} is incorrect.	Change ‘ U_{min} ’ to ‘ U_{max} ’	Agreed to amend.
0031 AU	1	3.7.4.4		TE	As drafted, the stability of zero tests do not make sense. How can a zero load test be performed at maximum mass flowrate? On a belt weigher, you can have max belt speed and no load – but there is no obvious equivalent for an arched chute weigher.	Review requirements for the stability of zero test.	A simulation test (Part 2, 4.2) in which the indicated value of the weights on the receptor is compared to the indication of control instrument (Part 2, 4.4). Note that the tests for stability of zero was re-inserted into the 3CD as a result of Australia’s comment to the 2CD (0036 AU in the 2 CD collated comments).
0032 AU	1	3.8		GE	Under Clause 3.8 there aren’t any subclauses that relate to zero load tests. Suggest to include clauses on: MPEs on checking of zero, Discrimination of the totalisation indicating device used for zero-setting, maximum variation during zero-load		Disagreed. The discrimination of the totalisation indicating device used for zero-setting was deleted as it is more relevant to beltweighers.
0033 UK	1	3.9		ed	Include a reference to the “absolute value of the maximum permissible error for automatic weighing.”	Add to the end of the sentence, “(3.2.1, Table 1)”	Agreed. To amend as proposed.
0034 UK	1	4.2.6, 6		ed	“.” is missing from the end of the first sentence.	Add “.” after the first sentence.	Agreed. To amend as proposed.

¹ Country code (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China)

² Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial

Template for comments and convener's observations

Date:2019-11-27

Document:

Project:

Country Code ¹	Part	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/Table	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Convener's responses
0035 UK	1	4.2.7		ed	Reference to the test would be useful.	Add test clause to the heading, “R-xx-2, 6.3”	Agreed. To amend as proposed.
0036 UK	1	4.3		ed	Reference to the test would be useful.	Add test clause to the heading, “R-xx-2, 6.4”	Agreed. To amend as proposed.
0037 AU	1	4.3.2.2	Paragraph 3	ED	Improve grammar	Change “for values with decimal sign” to “for values with a decimal sign”	Agreed. To amend as proposed.
0038 AU	1	4.3.5	d)		Sentence is unclear.	Improve grammar.	Agreed. Amended as follows: <i>In the case of a multi-function display, an automatic indication of the total shall be generated if the automatic operation is interrupted or during automatic operation no more than 20 seconds after the previous indication.</i>
0039 UK	1	4.4		ed	Reference to the test would be useful.	Add test clause to the heading, “R-xx-2, 5.6”	Agreed. To amend as proposed.
0040 AU	1	4.5.3		TE	In 3CD Internal Clock requirements were added. However, there are no metrological requirements, even though it appears that time is critical to the measurement result.	Replace 4.5.3 a) with time-keeping accuracy requirements: $\pm x$ seconds over 1 day. Alternatively, if the internal clock is considered as a module, the required accuracy could be governed by apportioning of errors (see 6.1.6.7).	Agreed. Suggested new text in bulletin d): The accuracy of the clock shall be determined in accordance with 6.1.6.7.
0041 AU	1	4.6.2		TE	See AU comment on 2.8.6.	Suggest to remove Tmin.	See response above to 0019 AU.
0042 AU	1	4.6.4		ED	Improve grammar	Change “in case of a plate or sticker” to “in the case of a plate or sticker”	Agreed. To amend as proposed.
0043 UK	1	6.1.1	List I)	ed	“4.8” does not exist.	Delete “4.8” from list I)	Agreed. To delete.
0044 UK	1	6.1.1	List s)	ed	“9.3.3. in Part 2” is not worded correctly.	Amend “9.3.3. in Part 2” to “ R-xx-2, 9.3.3”	Agreed. To amend in line with response to 0004 AU, i.e., replace “R-xx” with “Part”, in accordance with B6.

¹ Country code (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China)

² Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial

Template for comments and convener's observations

Date:2019-11-27

Document:

Project:

Country Code ¹	Part	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/Table	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Convener's responses
0045 AU	1	6.1.5		ED	Text refers to simulation tests, however the accompanying clause refers to clause 5.4 which is on 'variation in the mass inflow rate'	Change clause '5.4' to 'Rxx-2, 4.3'	Agreed. To amend as proposed.
0046 AU	1	6.1.6.7			The second paragraph up from Table 4 appears to be belt weigher specific.	Suggest to remove.	This is a generic text, is similar to wording in other OIML AWIs and in R76, Part 1, 3.10.2.1.
0047 AU	1	6.1.6.7	Note 3	ED	The note explains the '-' symbol, but the table uses the '- ' symbol	Either change '-' to '- ', or vice versa.	Agreed. To amend as proposed.
0048 US	1	6.1.6.7.	Table 4	ed	This requirement relates to testing modules but one column title in Table 4 reads "Connecting Elements, etc." Recommend this title be revised to limit the scope to other modules and strike out "etc" because it is too vague.	Revise to read "Connecting Elements and Other Modules " Strike out etc.	Agreed. To amend as proposed.
0049 UK	1	7	Summary of tests, Note 1	ed	"Value" is repeated twice in Note 1.	Delete the last instance of "value" from Note 1 Value of the fault limit value	Agreed. To amend as proposed.
0050 UK	1	7	Summary of tests, Note 2	ed	The severity levels should apply to all the tests in 7.3.	Reword "7.3.1 to 7.3.5" to "in 7.3"	Agreed. To amend as proposed.
0051 AU	1	Annex A		TE	Most terms are not defined, but the equations appear to state that the force is equal to the mass flow-rate times the angular velocity divided by the radius of curvature. This implies that angular velocity must be measured. The final paragraph is difficult to understand. It appears to suggest that v (and r) can be taken as constants, resulting in a linear relationship between F and mass flowrate. But the meaning and justification for this is not clear.	Suggest editing to define terms and clarify the final paragraph.	Annex A is informative. And the formula is for illustrative purposes.
0052 US	1	Annex B	Table	ed	The dates for most of the IEC standards are out of date. To recognize the latest technology and test procedures incorporate the current editions. Add latest edition date for D31 [24] following CIML adoption.	Update all publication editions and dates.	Agreed. The BIML editor will help with this.
0053 AU	2	3.8.1		ED	The text refers to test methods in part 1 (Rxx-1, clause 7), but these have been moved to Part 2, clause 4.	Change the sentence to read "...using the test methods specified in 4".	Agreed. To align all clauses in all parts of the Recommendation.
0054 AU	2	4.3		TE	It is unclear how standard weights can be used to simulate the mass flow. The actual force that would be felt by the force receptor	Needs to be discussed and resolved.	Disagree to further technical changes. The current wording in the Recommendation should be enough.

¹ Country code (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China)

² Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial

Template for comments and convener's observations

Date:2019-11-27

Document:

Project:

Country Code ¹	Part	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/Table	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Convener's responses
					is dependent on the mass of the load and the design of the instrument. See AU comments on Part 1, 2.2.1.2.		<p>1)The verification process in this Recommendation includes simulation tests with static load, described in Part 2, 4.3. (i.e., Part 2, 4.5 b, "... weighing operation shall be conducted using standard weights placed on the force simulation platform. The indicated mass shall be observed and recorded..."). The recorded values are compared to the control instrument indication.</p> <p>2)The design and measurement principle of the instrument is left to the manufacturer but will be based on a mass flow signal representing the actual mass. Weights are placed on the platform; the force transducer converts the weight value to a measurement force which is indicative of the actual mass. The transducer is part of the force receptor which is designed to sense the force induced by the mass.</p> <p>3)The manufacturer's design documentation required in Part 1, 6.1.1, and additional requirements in Part 1, 6.1.2 and 6.1.3, should provide sufficient information for a competent Issuing Authority to understand and be able to perform the test.</p> <p>Future usage of this Recommendation will identify improvement opportunities for the next revision.</p>
0055 AU	2	4.4b)		TE	It is unclear if this can apply to an arched chute weigher. See AU comments on 4.3.	Needs to be discussed and resolved.	See response to 0054 AU
0056 AU	2	4.5b)		TE	It is unclear if this can apply to an arched chute weigher. See AU comments on 4.3.	Needs to be discussed and resolved.	See response to 0054 AU
0057 AU	2	4.6		TE	It is unclear if the simulation test can apply to an arched chute weigher. See AU comments on 4.3.	Needs to be discussed and resolved.	See response to 0054 AU
0058 AU	2	5.1		TE	It is unclear if the simulation test can apply to an arched chute weigher. See AU comments on 4.3.	Needs to be discussed and resolved.	See response to 0054 AU
0059 AU	2	5.2		TE	It is unclear if the simulation test can apply to an arched chute weigher. See AU comments on 4.3.	Needs to be discussed and resolved.	See response to 0054 AU
0060 AU	2	5.2		TE	New text seems to have been added starting with "Other test methods..." This does not	Suggest to remove.	Agreed to delete. Consistency with R50 is important.

¹ Country code (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China)

² Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial

Template for comments and convener's observations

Date:2019-11-27

Document:

Project:

Country Code ¹	Part	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/Table	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Convener's responses
					seem to correspond to test procedures in R 50. Further, Step 5 references 3.7.1 which relates to the control instrument.		
0061 AU	2	5.2	Paragraph 2	ED	The text refers to 'every automatic weighing cycle'. There are no weighing cycles associated with arched chute weighers.	Replace the paragraph with "Zero-tracking and automatic zero-setting (if available) shall be disabled."	Disagree. The instrument may be capable of performing consecutive weighing cycles without any intervention of an operator, in which case it is always regarded to be an AWI.
0062 AU	2	5.6.1		TE	The procedure for determining the zero-setting range is based on the loads (test weights) on the force simulation platform. But the limit for the zero-setting range is 4% of Max, which is a force. How does the static weight test relate to the zero-setting range that relates to force? I don't see an easy way to fix this. The force felt by the force receptor for a static weight, is different to the force felt by the force receptor when in operation.	Needs to be discussed and resolved.	This is a recognised static test in which standard weights and analysis of loading indications are used to ensure that zero-setting range is within the mpe. A conversion to force is not expected during this test. A comparison with the type is made at initial verification when the instrument is in operation.
0063 AU	2	5.6.2		TE	If I understand correctly, the loads for this test are required to be 50% and 100% of the zero-setting ranges. At most, this is 2% and 4% of Max. Firstly, is this likely to be below Qmmin? Secondly, how do you determine the loads due to the mass vs force issue?		Standard weights may be used to simulate the effect of a mass flow, as stated in Part 2, 5.3.
0064 AU	2	7.3.2		ED	Refers to Tables 12.1 and 12.2, however there is no Table 12.1 or 12.2	Suggest changing to '12.1' to 'Table 8' and '12.2' to 'Table 9'	Agreed. To amend as proposed.
0065 AU	2	7.3.5.2		ED	In the last cell of the table, the text repeats "either shall not" twice	Delete repeated "either shall not"	Agreed. To amend as proposed.
0066 UK	2	9.1.1	3 rd para	ed	The reference to R-xxx-2, 4.6, is incorrect. Reference to Rxx-1, 3.8.1, should be added.	Delete "R-xxx-2", and change the reference to "...4.6, and Rxx-1, 3.8.1".	Agreed. To amend as proposed.
0067 AU	2	9.1.1	Paragraph 2	ED	The third line down in the second paragraph uses a comma to end a sentence	Change ',' to '.'	Agreed. To amend as proposed.
0068 UK	2	9.3.3	1 st para	ed	"Product" is repeated twice and superfluous in the paragraph.	Delete the first instance of "product" from the first paragraph.	Agreed. To amend as proposed.
0069 UK	2	Annex D	2 nd para	ed	"&", instead of "and" creates confusion	Replace the symbol "&", with text " and " in the first paragraph.	Agreed. To amend as proposed.

¹ Country code (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China)

² Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial

Template for comments and convener's observations

Date:2019-11-27

Document:

Project:

Country Code ¹	Part	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/Table	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Convener's responses
						Standardised the fonts in abbreviations and formulas, e.g., all italics.	
0070 AU	2	Contents		ED	In the contents, clause 2.8 comes after 3.7. However, in the text of the document there is no clause 2.8. However, there is a clause 3.8 (which could possibly be its own separate clause, i.e. clause 4)	Fix up contents to reflect actual clause numbering.	Agreed. To amend as proposed.
0071 UK	2	Contents		ed	New “8.3 and 8.4” are missing.	Add the following page contents: 8.3 Discrimination of the totalization indicating device used for zero totalization 8.4 Stability of zero	These tests are already in the 3CD
0072 UK	2	Contents	02.8	ed	“2.8” is incorrect.	Replace “2.8” with “ 3.8 ”.	Agreed
0073 AU	3			TE	Part 3 has not been reviewed because it is unclear if/how any simulations test could actually be performed.		Part 3 has been aligned with Parts 1 and 2, as closely as possible. With the newly revised B6: 2019 requiring a fourth part, Part 4 Type evaluation report format , maybe Ian Dunmill can suggest if we need to go down this part before publication.
0074 UK	3	1	First reference	ed	“7.11” is incorrect.	Replace “7.11” with “ 7.1 ”	Agreed
0075 UK	3	1	Header	ed	The reference “(R xx-1, 7.3,” is incorrect	Change to (R xx-1, 7.3 6.1.2 , R xx-2, , 4.3 5.4)	Agreed
0076 UK	3	1.5.1, 1.5.2, 1.5.3, 1.5.4, 1.5.5	Result sheet B	ed	The first part of the sentence, “...where integrations of a constant load is applied, ...” is superfluous.	Delete the first part of the sentence and change to “...where integrations of a constant load is applied, and the totalization indicator is used to determine the error”	Agreed
0077 UK	3	1.7.2	Load percentages	te	The percentage value for class 0.5 is incorrect	Replace “0.175%” with “0.18%”	Disagreed. “0.175%” is the specified error value in 3.7.4.4.2.
0078 UK	3	2		ed	Page break is needed before clause 2.	Insert page break.	Agreed

C:\Users\MUSSIO\Documents\comments\371-AUSTRALIA-TC9_SC2_P9_Rxxx_3CD_Comments_AU -draft- - Copy.docx: Collation successful

C:\Users\MUSSIO\Documents\comments\371-FRANCE-TC9_SC2_P9_Rxxx_3CD_Comments_France.docx: Collation successful

C:\Users\MUSSIO\Documents\comments\371-SPAIN-TC9_SC2_P9_Rxxx_3CD_Comments_template SP.docx: Collation successful

C:\Users\MUSSIO\Documents\comments\371-UK-TC9_SC2_P9_Rxxx_3CD_Comments_template SP.docx: Collation successful

C:\Users\MUSSIO\Documents\comments\371-UNITED STATES-10-7-19 US Comments TC9_SC2_P9_Rxxx_3CD.docx: Collation successful

Collation of files was successful. Number of collated files: 5

1 Country code (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China)

2 Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial

Template for comments and convener's observations

Date:2019-11-27	Document:	Project:
-----------------	-----------	----------

Country Code ¹	Part	Clause/ Subclause	Paragraph/ Figure/Table	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Convener's responses
---------------------------	------	----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------	----------	-----------------	----------------------

SELECTED (number of files): 5
PASSED TEST (number of files): 5
FAILED TEST (number of files): 0
CCT - Version 4.0/2015

¹ Country code (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China)

² Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial