APPENDIX F

NATIONAL TYPE EVALUATION PROGRAM (NTEP) WEIGHING SECTOR MEETING SUMMARY

August 25 - 26, 2015
Denver, Colorado

INTRODUCTION

The charge of the NTEP Weighing Sector (WS) is important in providing appropriate type evaluation criteria based on specifications, tolerances, and technical requirements of NIST Handbook 44, "Specifications, Tolerances, and Other Technical Requirements for Weighing and Measuring Devices," Sections 1.10. General Code, 2.20. Scales, 2.22. Automatic Bulk Weighing Systems, and 2.24. Automatic Weighing Systems. The Sector's recommendations will be presented to the National Type Evaluation Program (NTEP) Committee each January for approval and inclusion in NCWM Publication 14, "Technical Policy, Checklists, and Test Procedures" for national type evaluation.

The Sector is also called upon occasionally for technical expertise in addressing difficult NIST Handbook 44, *Specifications, Tolerances, and Other Technical Issues* on the agenda of National Conference on Weights and Measures (NCWM) Specifications and Tolerances (S&T) Committee. Sector membership includes industry, NTEP laboratory representatives, technical advisors, and the NTEP Administrator. Meetings are held annually, or as needed and are open to all NCWM members and other registered parties.

Proposed revisions to the handbook(s) are shown as follows: 1) deleted language is indicated with a **bold face font using ~~strikeouts~~** (e.g., **~~this report~~**), 2) proposed new language is indicated with an **underscored bold faced font** (e.g., **new items**), and 3) nonretroactive items are identified in ***italics***. There are instances where the Sector will use **red** text and/or highlighted text to bring emphasis to text that requires additional attention. When used in this report, the term "weight" means "mass."

Note: It is the policy of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) to use metric units of measurement in all of its publications; however, recommendations received by NCWM technical committees and regional weights and measures associations have been printed in this publication as submitted. Therefore, the report may contain references in U.S. customary units.

Table A
Table of Contents

Table B
Glossary of Acronyms and Terms

Acronym	Term	Acronym	Term
ABWS	Automatic Bulk Weighing Systems	NCWM	National Conference on Weights and Measures
AREMA	American Railway Engineering Maintenance-of-Way Association	NTEP	National Type Evaluation Program
AWS	Automatic Weighing Systems	OIML	International Organization of Legal Metrology
CC	Certificate of Conformance	OWM	Office of Weights and Measures
DES	Digital Electronic Scales	R	Recommendation
IZSM	Initial Zero-Setting Mechanism	SS	National Type Evaluation Program Software Sector
LMD	Liquid Measuring Device	S&T	Specifications and Tolerances Committee
MC	Measurement Canada	SMA	Scale Manufacturers Association
MRA	Mutual Recognition Agreement	WS	National Type Evaluation Program Weighing Sector

Details of All Items
(In order by Reference Key)

CARRY-OVER ITEMS

1. Recommended Changes to NCWM Publication 14 Based on Actions at the 2015 NCWM Annual Meeting

Source:
Mr. Richard Harshman, National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Technical Advisor, provided the Sector with specific recommendations for incorporating test procedures and checklist language based upon actions of the 2015 NCWM Annual Meeting. The Sector is asked to briefly discuss each item and, if appropriate, provide general input on the technical aspects of the issues.

1.a. Item 310-2 G-UR.4.1. Maintenance of Equipment.

Source:
2015 S&T Committee Final Report

Background/Discussion:
At the 2015 NCWM Annual Meeting, NCWM voted to amend NIST Handbook 44 paragraph G-UR.4.1. Maintenance of Equipment as follows:

> **G-UR.4.1. Maintenance of Equipment.** – All equipment in service and all mechanisms and devices attached thereto or used in connection therewith shall be continuously maintained in proper operating condition throughout the period of such service. Equipment in service at a single place of business ~~**found to be in error predominantly in a direction favorable to the device user (Also see the Introduction, Section Q**~~) shall not be considered "maintained in a proper operating condition~~.~~" **if:**
>
> **a. predominantly, equipment of all types or applications are found to be in error in a direction favorable to the device user, or**
>
> **b. predominantly, equipment of the same type or application is found to be in error favorable to the device user.**
>
> (Amended 1973**,** ~~**and**~~ 1991**, and 2015**)

Recommendation:
Mr. Harshman, NIST Technical Advisor, believes that no changes are required for NCWM Publication 14 and that no further actions by the WS are necessary. This item was included on the Sector's agenda to make members aware of the changes to the paragraph. The S&T Committee's interpretation of the second sentence of paragraph G-UR.4.1., in consideration of the changes that were adopted, is that predominance could be applied to equipment of the same type (e.g., all the retail motor fuel dispensers at a fueling station) and the same application (e.g., all devices, regardless of type, used in a commercial application) at a single place of business.

Conclusion*:*
No action was recommended nor taken by the WS on this item.

1.b. Item 320-1 T.N.3.5. Separate Main Elements.

Source:
2015 S&T Committee Final Report

Background/Discussion:
At the 2015 NCWM Annual Meeting, NCWM voted to amend NIST Handbook 44 Scales Code paragraph T.N.3.5. Separate Main Elements: Load Transmitting Element, Indicating Element, Etc. as follows:

> **T.N.3.5. Separate Main Elements: Load Transmitting Element, Indicating Element, Etc**. – If a main element separate from a **complete** weighing device is submitted for **laboratory** type evaluation, the tolerance for the **main** element is 0.7 that for the complete weighing device. This fraction includes the tolerance attributable to the testing devices used.

Recommendation:
Scales Code Paragraph T.N.3.5. is referenced in NCWM Publication 14 DES Section 57 Device Tolerances and has been copied below. Footnote 6, which appears beneath the tolerances table in Section 57 explains how tolerances are to be applied to separate main elements.

57. Device Tolerances

Code References: G-T.1. (e), T.N.3.2., T.N.3.5. and Table 6.

The acceptance tolerances for complete scales are shown below and apply to complete devices and separable main elements during type evaluation.

Acceptance Tolerances (All values in this table are in scale divisions)				
Tolerance in Scale Divisions				
Complete Devices	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.5
Separable Main Elements[6]	0.35	0.7	1.05	1.75
Separable Indications w/o Expanded Resolution	0	0	1	1
Class	**Test Load**			
I	0 - 50 000	50 001 - 200 000	200 0001 +	
II	0 - 5 000	5 001 - 20 000	20 0001 +	
III	0 - 500	501 - 2 000	2 001 - 4 000	4 001 +
IIII	0 - 50	51 - 200	201 - 400	401 +
III L	0 - 500	501 - 1 000	(Add 1/2d for each additional 500d or fraction thereof)	

It is strongly recommended that indicating elements submitted separately for evaluation have a test mode providing reading indications to 0.1e to provide adequate resolution to apply the tolerance (expanded resolution). If the indicator provides indications to only the maximum number of divisions requested for the Certificate of Conformance, the tolerance will be truncated to the number of divisions that can be indicated.

[6]When main elements (indicating elements and weighing/load-receiving elements) are tested separately, the tolerance applied to all laboratory tests (influence factors and permanence tests) are 0.7 times the acceptance tolerance for complete scales.

Mr. Harshman believes that footnote 6 adequately explains how tolerances are to be determined for main elements evaluated separately and that no changes are needed. However, the Sector might consider amending footnote 6 as follows to be consistent with the changes to T.N.3.5. that were adopted:

> [6] When main elements (indicating elements and weighing/load-receiving elements) are tested separately **from a complete weighing device**, the tolerance applied to all laboratory tests (influence factors and permanence tests) **of those main elements shall be** ~~are~~ 0.7 times the acceptance tolerance **applicable to** ~~for~~ complete scales.

Conclusion:
In considering this item, members of the Sector agreed that footnote 6, which is an added comment associated with the term "Separable Main Elements" in the Tolerance Table included in Section 57 of NCWM Publication 14 DES, is clear and adequately explains how tolerances are to be determined for main elements evaluated separately. Consequently, the Sector agreed that no amendments to the footnote are needed.

1.c. Item 320-5 Part 2.20. Weigh-In-Motion Vehicle Scales for Law Enforcement – Work Group

Source:
2015 S&T Committee Final Report

Background/Discussion:
At the 2015 NCWM Annual Meeting, NCWM voted to adopt a new NIST Handbook 44 device code applicable to weigh-in-motion (WIM) systems used for vehicle enforcement screening and include it in Section 2 of NIST Handbook 44, assigning it a new code reference number "2.25." The new code was adopted as "tentative," meaning it will be in a trial or experimental status and not intended to be enforced until such time that the tentative status is removed. Removal of the tentative status requires NCWM adoption of a proposal to remove it, which would then make the code fully enforceable. Definitions of terms used in the code were also adopted in support of the new code and will appear at the end of the code. The new code, titled "Weigh-In-Motion Systems used for Vehicle Enforcement Screening," along with the definitions of terms appearing in the code are included in this agenda as an attachment to Agenda Item 1.c.

Recommendation:
Mr. Harshman, NIST Technical Advisor, believes that no changes are required for NCWM Publication 14 and that no further actions by the Sector are necessary at this time. However, should NCWM decide to develop type evaluation criteria for the different components of WIM systems as a result of the new code being added to NIST Handbook 44, the WS may be called upon to help develop these criteria, including a new type evaluation checklist for the NTEP evaluators to use when evaluating such equipment.

Discussion/Conclusion:
Mr. Darrell Flocken (NCWM) reported that following adoption of the new NIST Handbook 44 device code applicable to WIM systems used for vehicle enforcement screening at the 2015 NCWM Annual Meeting, some manufacturers of WIM equipment contacted NTEP and expressed interest in having NTEP evaluate their equipment. He suggested the next task for the WIM Work Group (WG) might be to develop type evaluation criteria for NCWM Publication 14 intended to apply to this equipment.

In discussing this item, it was stated that the application of the new NIST Handbook 44 Weigh-In-Motion Systems Used for Vehicle Enforcement Screening Code is for equipment that will be used for screening purposes only. An industry member questioned why weights and measures would be interested in regulating such equipment.

Mr. Flocken, who served as Chairman of the WIM WG and Mr. Rick Harshman (OWM), who served as NIST Technical Advisor to the same WG responded to this question by providing an explanation of the application of NIST Handbook 44; that is, to equipment being used in either a commercial or law enforcement application. They noted that the weighing results obtained from these systems are used in a law enforcement application to determine whether vehicles are to be immediately directed back onto the roadway or onto a certified static scale for final weight determination. If directed onto a certified static scale, the results of weighing the vehicle statically are used to determine whether or not a fine gets imposed and, if so, the amount of the fine. During early development of the new Code, the U.S Federal Highway Administration reported that the weighing results from WIM systems are sometimes being contested in court proceedings based on the argument there are no documented performance standards for which these devices must comply; yet, the weighing results obtained from these systems are used as the determining factor on whether or not vehicles get released back onto the roadway or detained to be reweighed on a static scale for possible citation.

No action was recommended nor taken by the Sector on this item.

1.d. Item 360-3 Appendix D – Definitions. point-of-sale-system.

Source:
2015 S&T Committee Final Report

Background/Discussion:
At the 2015 NCWM Annual Meeting, NCWM voted to amend the definition of point-of-sale system in NIST Handbook 44 Appendix D as follows:

> **point-of-sale system. –** An assembly of elements including a weighing or measuring element, an indicating element, and a recording element (and may also be equipped with a "scanner") used to complete a direct sales transaction. **The system components, when operated together must be capable of the following:**
>
> **1. determining the weight or measure of a product or service offered;**
>
> **2. calculating a charge for the product or service based on the weight or measure and an established price/rate structure;**
>
> **3. determining a total cost that includes all associated charges involved with the transaction; and**
>
> **4 providing a sales receipt.**
>
> [2.20, 3.30, 3.32, 3.37]
>
> (Added 1986) (Amended 1997 **and 2015**)

Although amended based on a recommendation by the USNWG on Taximeters (the submitter of the S&T Agenda Item), the definition, as amended, applies not only to the Taximeters Code, but also to other device codes in NIST Handbook 44; one of which is likely to be of interest to some members of the WS; Section 2.20., the Scales Code.

Recommendation:

Mr. Harshman, NIST Technical Advisor, believes that no changes are required for NCWM Publication 14 and that no further actions by the WS are necessary. This item was added to the Sector's agenda to make members aware of the changes to the definition.

Discussion/Conclusion*:*
No action was recommended nor taken by the Sector on this item.

2. Acceptable Symbols/Abbreviations to Display the CC Number Via a Device's User Interface

Sources:

- 2010-2014 Final Reports of the S&T Committee: **https://www.ncwm.net/meetings/annual/meeting-reports**
- 2015 Final Report of the S&T Committee: **https://www.nist.gov/pml/wmd/ncwm-2015-annual-report-sp-1210**
- 2008-2013 Software Sector summaries: **http://www.ncwm.net/committees/ntep/sectors/software/archive**
- 2013-2014 Weighing Sector summaries: **http://www.ncwm.net/committees/ntep/sectors/weighing/archive**

Background:
Local weights and measures inspectors need a means to determine whether equipment discovered in the field has been evaluated by NTEP. If so, the inspector needs to know at a minimum the CC number. From this starting point, other required information can be ascertained (e.g., the software version or revision identifier of the software installed in an electronic device at the time it was evaluated). NIST Handbook 44 currently includes three options for marking of the CC:

1. Permanent marking
2. Continuous display
3. Recall using a special operation

Among other tasks, the SS was charged by the NCWM Board of Directors to recommend NIST Handbook 44 specifications and requirements for software incorporated into weighing and measuring devices, which may include tools used for software identification. During its October 2007 meeting, the SS discussed the value and merits of required markings for software, including possible differences in some types of software-based devices and methods of marking requirements.

In 2008, the Software Sector (SS) developed and submitted a proposal to the NCWM S&T Committee to modify G-S.1. and associated paragraphs to reflect these technical requirements. Between 2008 and 2011, this item appeared on the S&T Committee's main agenda and the Committee and the SS received numerous comments and suggestions relative to the proposal. The SS developed and presented several alternatives based on feedback from weights and measures officials and manufacturers. Among the key points and concerns raised during discussions over this period were how to address the following:

(a) **Limited Character Sets and Space.** – How to address devices that have limited character sets or restricted space for marking.

(b) **Built-for-Purpose vs. Not-Built-for-Purpose.** - Whether or not these should be treated differently.

(c) **Ease of Access.** – Ease of accessing marking information in the field:

(1) complexity of locating the marking information;

(2) use of menus for accessing the marking information electronically;

(3) limits on the number of levels required to access information electronically; and

(4) possibility of single, uniform method of access.

(d) **Hard Marking vs. Electronic.** – Whether or not some information should be required to be hard marked on the device.

(e) **Continuous Display.** – Whether or not required markings must be continuously displayed.

(f) **Abbreviations and Icons.** – Establishment of unique abbreviations, identifiers, and icons and how to codify those.

(g) **Certificate of Conformance Information.** – How to facilitate correlation of software version information to a CC, including the use of possible icons.

Further details on the alternatives considered can be found in the S&T Committee's Final Reports from 2008 to 2014, and the SS summaries from 2009-2013.

During its 2013 meeting, the WS reviewed and provided feedback to the SS on a proposal to amend NIST Handbook 44 General Code Paragraphs G-S.1.Identification and G-S.1.1. Location of Marking Information for Not-Built-For-Purpose, Software-Based Devices. See the 2013 Weighing Sector Meeting Summary to review the feedback provided by the WS on the proposal and for additional background information on this item.

Prior to the 2014 WS meeting, members of OWM's Legal Metrology Devices Program (LMDP) amended the proposal considered by the WS at its 2013 meeting; this after being asked by the SS to provide additional input and modify G-S.1. and G.S.1.1. in consideration of the goals of the SS and the comments provided during the 2014 Open Hearings of the S&T Committee relating to this item.

The following is a list of the goals provided by the SS in modifying G-S.1. and G.S.1.1. as communicated to the members of OWM's LMDP:

1. Remove the existing distinction between software identification requirements for built-for-purpose and not-built-for-purpose devices.
2. To require that <u>all</u> software-based devices have a software version or revision identifier for metrologically significant software.
3. Require that <u>certified</u> software versions or revision identifiers for metrologically significant software is recorded on the CC for access by inspectors.
4. Software itself does not require serial numbers.
5. Require that software-based devices version or revision identifier shall be accessible via the display and user interface and only if device's display is incapable of displaying the identifier or has no display and/or interface; then permanently marking the version or revision identifier shall be acceptable (e.g., digital load cell).
6. Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2016, if passed by the NCWM in July 2015.

OWM's LMDP developed the following proposed draft alternative changes to G-S.1. based on the SS's request for additional input on how best to meet its goals and forwarded them to the Chairman of the SS for consideration at the 2014 WS/SS joint meeting:

Amend NIST Handbook 44*:* G-S.1. Identification and G-S.1.1. Location of Marking Information for Not-Built-For-Purpose, Software-Based Devices as follows:

G-S.1. Identification. – All equipment, except weights and separate parts necessary to the measurement process but not having any metrological effect**,** shall be clearly and permanently marked for the purposes of identification with the following information:

(a) the name, initials, or trademark of the manufacturer or distributor;

(b) a model identifier that positively identifies the pattern or design of the device;

(1) The model identifier shall be prefaced by the word "Model," "Type," or "Pattern." These terms may be followed by the word "Number" or an abbreviation of that word. The abbreviation for the word "Number" shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter "N" (e.g., No or No.). The

abbreviation for the word "Model" shall be "Mod" or "Mod." Prefix lettering may be initial capitals, all capitals, or all lowercase.
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2003]
(Added 2000) (Amended 2001)

(*c*) *a nonrepetitive serial number, except for equipment with no moving or electronic component parts and* ~~***not built-for-purpose software-based devices***~~ ***software****;*
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 1968]
(Amended 2003)

(1) The serial number shall be prefaced by words, an abbreviation, or a symbol, that clearly identifies the number as the required serial number.
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 1986]

(2) Abbreviations for the word "Serial" shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter "S," and abbreviations for the word "Number" shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter "N" (e.g., S/N, SN, Ser. No., and S. No.).
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2001]

(*d*) the current software version or revision identifier for not-built-for-purpose software-based devices~~;~~ **manufactured as of January 1, 2004 through December 31, 2015, and all software based devices or equipment manufactured as of January 1, 2016;**
~~***[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2004]***~~
(Added 2003) (Amended **20XX)**

(1) The version or revision identifier shall be:
i. prefaced by words, an abbreviation, or a symbol, that clearly identifies the number as the required version or revision;
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2007]
(Added 2006)

ii. directly linked to the software itself; and
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2016]
(Added 20XX)

iii. continuously displayed* or be accessible via the display menus. Instructions for displaying the version or revision identifier shall be described in the CC. As an exception, permanently marking the version or revision identifier shall be acceptable providing the device does not have an integral interface to communicate the version or revision identifier.
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2016]
(Added 20XX)

****The version or revision identifier shall be displayed continuously on software-based equipment with a digital display manufactured as of January 1, 20XX and all software-based equipment with a digital display as of January 1, 20YY.***

(2) Abbreviations for the word "Version" shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter "V" and may be followed by the word "Number." Abbreviations for the word "Revision" shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter "R" and may be followed by the word "Number." The abbreviation for the word "Number" shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter "N" (e.g., No or No.).
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2007]
(Added 2006)

(e) an National Type Evaluation Program (NTEP) Certificate of Conformance (CC) *number or a corresponding CC Addendum Number for devices that have a CC.*

(1) *The CC Number or a corresponding CC Addendum Number shall be prefaced by the terms "NTEP CC," "CC," or "Approval." These terms may be followed by the word "Number" or an abbreviation of that word. The abbreviation for the word "Number" shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter "N" (e.g., No or No.)*
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2003]

The required information shall be so located that it is readily observable without the necessity of the disassembly of a part requiring the use of any means separate from the device. (Amended 1985, 1991, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2003, ~~**and,**~~ 2006 **and 201X**)

G-S.1.1. Location of Marking Information for ~~Not Built For Purpose~~ All Software-Based Devices. *– For ~~not built for purpose,~~ software-based devices, either:*

(a) The required information in G-S.1. Identification. (a), (b), ~~(d),~~ and (e) shall be permanently marked or continuously displayed on the device; or

(b) The CC Number shall be:

(1) permanently marked on the device;

(2) continuously displayed; or

(3) accessible through an easily recognized menu and, if necessary, a submenu. Examples of menu and submenu identification include, but are not limited to, "Help," "System Identification," "G-S.1. Identification," or "Weights and Measures Identification."

Note: *For (b), clear instructions for accessing the information required in G-S.1. (a), (b), and (d) shall be listed on the CC, including information necessary to identify that the software in the device is the same type that was evaluated.*
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2004]

(Added 2003) (Amended 2006 **and 20XX**)

No changes to subparagraph G-S.1.1. were proposed by OWM's LMDP since the SS had indicated earlier that it may be possible to eventually eliminate G-S.1.1. Thus, the proposed changes to subparagraph G-S.1.1. shown above in OWM's draft alternative changes are those originating from the SS's 2013 proposal.

In providing feedback to the SS, OWM's LMDP noted that the shaded portion of G-S.1.(d)(1)iii. of their draft alternative changes was developed solely by OWM (i.e., does not reflect any of the goals communicated by the SS) and was being offered for consideration with the understanding that:

1. this change will make it easier in the future for inspectors to be able to identify software installed in equipment;
2. a reasonable amount of time for the changes to take effect can be specified;
3. it is probable that improvements in technology over time will make it easier for equipment manufacturers to comply.

In addition to the alternative changes proposed by OWM's LMDP, a member of the SS submitted the following definition of "software-based devices" for discussion during the joint meeting of the Weighing and Software Sectors and possible future inclusion into Appendix D of NIST Handbook 44:

software-based devices: devices used to compute and control processes using software, where software is a general term for the programs and data used to operate the computers and/or related electronic devices. Software-based device may also consist of just software (e.g., weigh in/weigh out software).

At its 2014 meeting, the WS met jointly with the SS to consider the proposal as amended by OWM's LMDP. After further amending the proposal, the two sectors agreed to submit the following proposal to the regional associations for consideration and requested its status be change from Developing to Informational.

Amend NIST Handbook 44*:* G-S.1. Identification as follows:

G-S.1. Identification. – All equipment, except weights and separate parts necessary to the measurement process but not having any metrological effect**,** shall be clearly and permanently marked for the purposes of identification with the following information:

(a) the name, initials, or trademark of the manufacturer or distributor;

(b) a model identifier that positively identifies the pattern or design of the device;

(1) The model identifier shall be prefaced by the word "Model," "Type," or "Pattern." These terms may be followed by the word "Number" or an abbreviation of that word. The abbreviation for the word "Number" shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter "N" (e.g., No or No.). The abbreviation for the word "Model" shall be "Mod" or "Mod." Prefix lettering may be initial capitals, all capitals, or all lowercase.
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2003]
(Added 2000) (Amended 2001)

(*c*) *a nonrepetitive serial number, except for equipment with no moving or electronic component parts and* ~~***not built-for-purpose software-based software devices***~~ ***software****;*
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 1968]
(Amended 2003)

(1) The serial number shall be prefaced by words, an abbreviation, or a symbol, that clearly identifies the number as the required serial number.
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 1986]

(2) Abbreviations for the word "Serial" shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter "S," and abbreviations for the word "Number" shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter "N" (e.g., S/N, SN, Ser. No., and S. No.).
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2001]

(*d*) the current software version or revision identifier for not-built-for-purpose software-based devices~~;~~ **manufactured as of January 1, 2004 and all software-based devices or equipment manufactured as of January 1, 2020;**
~~***[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2004]***~~
(Added 2003) **(Amended 20XX)**

(1) The version or revision identifier shall be:

i. *prefaced by words, an abbreviation, or a symbol, that clearly identifies the number as the required version or revision;*
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2007]
(Added 2006)

Note: If the equipment is capable of displaying the version or revision identifier but is unable to meet the formatting requirement, through the NTEP type evaluation process, other options may be deemed acceptable and described in the CC.
(Added 20XX)

ii. directly linked to the software itself; and
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2020]
(Added 20XX)

iii. continuously displayed or be accessible via the display. Instructions for displaying the version or revision identifier shall be described in the CC. As an exception, permanently marking the version or revision identifier shall be acceptable providing the device does not have an integral interface to communicate the version or revision identifier.
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2020]
(Added 20XX)

(2) Abbreviations for the word "Version" shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter "V" and may be followed by the word "Number." Abbreviations for the word "Revision" shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter "R" and may be followed by the word "Number." The abbreviation for the word "Number" shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter "N" (e.g., No or No.). ***Prefix lettering may be initial capitals, all capitals, or all lowercase.***
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2007]
(Added 2006)

(e) a National Type Evaluation Program (NTEP) Certificate of Conformance (CC) *number or a corresponding CC Addendum Number for devices that have a CC.*

(1) The CC Number or a corresponding CC Addendum Number shall be prefaced by the terms "NTEP CC," "CC," or "Approval." These terms may be followed by the word "Number" or an abbreviation of that word. The abbreviation for the word "Number" shall, as a minimum, begin with the letter "N" (e.g., No or No.)
[Nonretroactive as of January 1, 2003]

The required information shall be so located that it is readily observable without the necessity of the disassembly of a part requiring the use of any means separate from the device.

(Amended 1985, 1991, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2003, ~~and,~~ 2006 **and 201X**)

Technical Advisor's note: *Although the SS had earlier proposed changes to G-S.1.1., it was decided during the joint meeting that no changes to G-S.1.1. were necessary since the sectors had agreed to retain the term "not-built-for-purpose software-based devices" in G-S.1.(d). Thus, no changes are proposed to paragraph G-S.1.1. Members of the two sectors also reviewed the draft definition of "software-based devices." The draft definition had been developed by a member of the SS in consideration of a comment that had been received by the S&T Committee during one of the 2014 NCWM Conferences. The sectors agreed that no action was currently necessary other than that the definition be retained for future consideration should the need develop.*

See the 2013 and 2014 Weighing Sector Meeting Summaries for additional details.

Recommendation:
No recommendation is being made at this time. A joint meeting of the MS and SS is planned for September 2015 to further consider the proposal as amended by the SS and WS during their joint meeting. This item also appears on the 2015 S&T Committee's agenda as a Developing item (agenda Item 310-1). The NIST Technical Advisor will provide an update on the progress of this item to the Sector.

Conclusion:
Mr. Rick Harshman (OWM) provided an update to the Sector on this item and noted that the proposal developed at last year's joint meeting between the WS and SS had not been changed and would be considered by the Measuring Sector at a September 2015 joint meeting between the Measuring Sector and SS. No action was recommended nor taken by the WS as it agreed to await the outcome of this upcoming joint meeting before taking any additional action.

3. NCWM Publication 14 DES Section D. Substitution of Load Cells, Load Cells Section 5.

Source:
NCWM/NTEP (2014)

Background:
Current Load Cell Substitution Policy is outdated and needs to be revised to include the use of new load cell output technology and to make the requirements less open to interpretation.

At its 2014 meeting, the WS considered the following proposal to replace the current load cell substitution policy in Section D. *Substitution of Load Cell in Scales* on Page DES-11 and Section *5. Substitution of Metrologically Equivalent Load Cells in Scales* on Page LC-2 of the 2014 edition of NCWM Publication 14, Weighing Devices:

In a Weighing/Load Receiving Element with a single or multiple load cells installed, the replacement of one or more load cells, from the same or a different manufacturer, is considered a metrologically equivalent replacement provided requirements (1) through (7) below are met.

1. **The original and the replacement load cells have a Certificate of Conformance from having been evaluated individually and not as a component in a complete weighing instrument.**
2. **Have as many or more verification scale intervals (n_{max}) as required for the scale's capacity and division size.**
3. **Have a minimum load cell verification interval (v_{min}) that is suitable for the application.**
4. **Are of the same load cell design as the cell being replaced. Note: load cell design defines the physical design of the load cell. e.g. canister compression, dual ended shear beam, etc.**
5. **Have a capacity equal to or greater than 85 % of the capacity of the load cells installed during type evaluation testing.**
6. **Can be placed in the scale without any modification, as defined in Publication 14, Digital Scales Code, Technical Policy, to the basic design of the Load Receiving Element or the load cell mounting assembly. Note: The use of spacers to compensate for differences in load cell height is permitted.**
7. **Utilize the same output technology (e.g., analog, digital, hydraulic, etc.) as all other load cells in the system or weighing element. Note: For replacement load cells with analog output technology; the same wiring configuration must be maintained as the cells being replaced without adding jumper wires, connecting sense wires to excitation wires, or by removing the sense leads.**

In a system with multiple load cells, the replacement of ALL load cells in the system with National Type Evaluation Program certified and compatible load cells that have an output technology different than the original load cell is considered a metrologically equivalent replacement provided all requirements in (1) through (6) above are met.

During the discussion of this item at the 2014 WS Meeting, it was noted that Item 4 of the current load cell substitution policy specifies that load cells to be substituted must be of the same basic type as the cells being replaced. Thus, in order to correctly apply Item 4. of the current load cell substitution policy, one must have knowledge of the different

variables that establish load cell type. No explanation of the criteria or factors that were intended to be used to establish same basic type is provided in the policy, nor are any examples of different types of load cells given. Thus, the policy leaves open for interpretation the different factors that establish load cell type.

Much of the 2014 discussion by the Sector on this item involved attempts in identifying the criteria or factors that define the "type" (or "design") of a load cell. There was no consensus reached by the Sector regarding what those factors are or should be. Members of the Sector offered many suggestions of the different factors that they believed might or should define type to include: the method of force introduction, output characteristic, output capacity, impedance, supply voltage, material used in its construction, method of construction, shape, etc. The Sector concluded that the word "design" encompasses many characteristics of a load cell.

The Sector considered whether the load cell substitution policy is intended to apply to the replacement of all the load cells in a scale or just some of the load cells and concluded that the proposed alphabetic list of requirements is intended to apply only to the replacement of one or more load cells in a scale but not full replacement of all the cells.

The Sector agreed at its 2014 meeting to recommend the following changes to the proposal based on comments heard from its members during the discussion of this item:

- Item 4. in the proposed list, should read as follows:

  Are of the same basic physical characteristic load cell design as the cell being replaced. Note: load cell design defines the physical design of the load cell. E.g. canister compression, dual ended shear beam, etc.

- The following sentence is to replace the sentence in Item 5. of the proposed list:

  Have a capacity that is greater than or not less than 85 % of the capacity of the original cell.

- It was suggested that the following two sentences be added to the end of the proposed list:

  1) The replacement of a load cell(s) resulting in a combination of analog, digital, or hydraulic load cells in one system is not considered a metrologically equivalent replacement.

  2) All load cells in a multiple load cell system must have the same type of output (e.g. all analog, all digital, or all hydraulic.)

The Sector also agreed that additional work on this item was still needed and that it was to remain on next year's (2015) WS agenda. Mr. Darrell Flocken (NTEP) agreed to rewrite the proposal and take into account the changes agreed to by the Sector and to make clear the intended application of the numbered list of requirements that establish the load cell substitution policy.

Recommendation:
The Sector is asked to consider the following revised proposal for the load cell substitution policy, which was recently updated by Mr. Flocken for consideration at the 2015 WS Meeting:

Revised Proposal for the Load Cell Substitution Policy:

In a Weighing/Load Receiving Element with a single or multiple load cells installed, the replacement of one or more load cells, from the same or a different manufacturer, is considered a metrologically equivalent replacement provided requirements (1) through (7) below are met.

1. The original and the replacement load cell or load cells have a Certificate of Conformance from having been evaluated individually and not as a component in a complete weighing instrument.

2. Have as many or more verification scale intervals (n_{max}) as required for the scale's capacity and division size.

3. Have a minimum load cell verification interval (v_{min}) that is suitable for the application.

4. Are of the same basic physical characteristic load cell design as the cell being replaced. Note: load cell design defines the physical design of the load cell, e.g., canister compression, dual ended shear beam, etc.

5. Have a capacity that is greater than or not less than 85% of the capacity of the original load cell.

6. Can be placed in the scale without any modification, as defined in Publication 14, Digital Scales Code, Technical Policy, to the basic design of the Load Receiving Element or the load cell mounting assembly. Note: The use of spacers to compensate for differences in load cell height is permitted.

7. Utilize the same output technology (e.g., analog, digital, hydraulic, etc.) as all other load cells in the system or weighing element. Note: For replacement load cells with analog output technology; the same wiring configuration must be maintained as the cells being replaced without adding jumper wires, connecting sense wires to excitation wires, or by removing the sense leads.

In a system with multiple load cells, the replacement of ALL load cells in the system with National Type Evaluation Program certified and compatible load cells that have an output technology different than the original load cell is considered a metrologically equivalent replacement provided all requirements in (1) through (6) above are met.

a) The replacement of a load cell(s) resulting in a combination of output technology as stated in item (7) in one Weighing/Load Receiving Element is not considered a metrologically equivalent replacement.

b) All load cells in a multiple load cell system must have the same type of output (e.g. all analog, all digital, or all hydraulic.)

Discussion/Conclusion:
With respect to Requirement 5. of the revised proposal for the load cell substitution policy, an industry member asked, "If the original load cell is replaced with one that has a capacity equal to 85 % of the original load cell and then that load cell needs to be replaced at some later date, how would one know that the original load cell had been replaced previously? That is, unless replacement of a load cell is documented and made known to a technician performing work on a scale, then couldn't the 85 % allowable reduction in load cell capacity be applied multiple times?" In response to this concern, Mr. Darrell Flocken (NCWM) acknowledged that this further reduction in load cell capacity quite possibly could occur. He reminded members of the Sector that it had been agreed at last year's meeting, the additional reduction in load cell capacity isn't of critical concern providing the V_{min} formula in Scales Code paragraph S.5.4. Relationship of Load Cell Verification Interval Value to the Scale Division is met and the device meets accuracy requirements when tested with the replacement load cell(s) installed. Several members of the Sector acknowledged agreement.

It was noted by another industry member that the policy, as revised, would *not* allow a six-wire load cell to be replaced with one that has only four-wires; yet, in some cases, such replacement could be deemed acceptable and the scale receiving the replacement six-wire cell(s) would still be capable of performing within accuracy requirements. Today's technology also makes possible the use of different types of cells in a system (e.g., hydraulic, digital, and analog). Several members of the Sector voiced agreement with these points. In response to these additional comments, Mr. Flocken stated that the intent of Requirement 4. is to prevent the mixing of technology (e.g., canister compression with dual ended shear beam, etc.) The intent of Requirement 6. is to prevent substituting a particular type of load cell with another of the same type, for example, substituting a canister load cell with another canister load

cell that is, perhaps, of different dimension (e.g., taller) than the one currently used. The Sector concluded that no additional changes were needed to the proposal as revised by Mr. Flocken for consideration at the 2015 WS Meeting, and agreed to recommend the proposal (as shown in the text box above and beneath the title, "Revised Proposal for the Load Cell Substitution Policy") be inserted into Publication 14 to replace the current policy.

NEW ITEMS

4. NIST Handbook 44 Scales Code Paragraph S.5.4 Relationship of Load Cell Verification Interval Value to the Scale Division

Source:
NCWM/NTEP

Background:
NTEP has identified two different interpretations of how to apply the formula specified in NIST Handbook 44, Scales Code, paragraph S.5.4. Relationship of Load Cell Verification Interval Value to the Scale Division; specifically, to bulleted item (a). The formula determines the suitability of the v_{min} value of a load cell in relationship to the value of the scale division (d) for scales without lever systems. The different interpretations occur only when applying the formula to a scale having multiple platforms (Weighing/Load Receiving Elements (W/LRE)) where the output of each W/LRE has its own weight display and is capable of operating as an independent scale in a commercial application.

Consider the number of load cells in each W/LRE of the following example scale and how the formula is to be applied:

Platform	Number of Load Cells
1	4
2	4
3	6

The first interpretation applies the formula to the three W/LREs as a single platform using the total of all load cells (14) for the value of "N" in the formula.

The second interpretation applies the formula to each of the three W/LRE's individually using only the number of load cells (4, 4, and 6) in the W/LRE for the value of "N" in the formula.

Recommendation:
This item appeared on the Sector's 2014 agenda, but there was no action taken on it during the 2014 WS meeting. The reason no action was taken is because not all stakeholders were in attendance when this item was first introduced during the 2014 WS meeting due to conflicting NCWM announcements of the meeting start time. Consequently, the NCWM agreed to reintroduce this item at the 2015 WS Meeting in the interest of fairness to all.

Most recently, there have been two NCWM Form 15 proposals submitted to NCWM proposing changes to Scales Code paragraph S.5.4. Relationship of Load Cell Verification Interval Value to the Scale Division. The regional weights and measures associations will consider those proposals at their fall 2015 meetings (for the 2016 NCWM cycle). It is recommended that this item be held open on the Sector's agenda pending the outcome of the two proposals by the S&T Committees.

Discussion/Conclusion:
The Sector agreed *not* to take a position on this item given that there are two NCWM Form 15 proposals that have been submitted to the NCWM proposing amendments to Scales Code paragraph S.5.4. and will be considered by the different regional weights and measures associations during their upcoming fall 2015 meetings.

5. NCWM Publication 14 ABWS Technical Policy Section E. Automatic Bulk Weighing Systems - NTEP On-Site Evaluation, and ABWS Checklists Paragraph 32

Source:
NCWM/NTEP

Background:
Current Technical Policy, Section E, of the Automatic Bulk Weighing Systems (ABWS) Code states:

> During laboratory evaluation, the bulk weighing controller is tested under simulated field conditions; therefore, the results of such an evaluation should not be used to determine compliance with all pertinent requirements. Compliance with all requirements shall be determined only when the bulk weighing controller, having successfully passed National Type Evaluation Program laboratory evaluation, is installed and tested under actual field conditions as part of an automatic bulk weighing system.

In addition, Paragraph 32. Performance and Permanence Tests for Automatic Bulk Weighing Systems of the ABWS Code states:

> The tests described here, apply to the entire automatic bulk weighing system, (e.g., the bulk weighing scale controller interfaced with the weigh hopper, load cell(s), material handling system, etc.). It is assumed that all components of the automatic bulk weighing scale controller have already been examined and found to comply with applicable National Type Evaluation Program requirements. If the design and performance of the bulk weighing controller is to be determined during the same test, the applicable requirements for automatic bulk weighing systems must be referenced.

The wording implies that a complete evaluation of the weighing controller is not possible without connecting the weighing controller to an actual hopper. After discussing this with the NTEP Labs and a few manufacturers it was concluded that the weighing control can receive a complete evaluation in the lab with proper simulation.

Recommendation:
The following changes to Section E. of the ABWS Technical Policy and to Paragraph 32. of the ABWS Checklist are suggested to eliminate the requirement of having to test the weighing controller under field conditions providing a complete simulated test can be conducted during lab evaluation:

E. Automatic Bulk Weighing Systems - NTEP On-Site Evaluation

During laboratory evaluation, the bulk weighing controller is tested under simulated field conditions.~~; therefore, the results of such an evaluation should not be used to determine compliance with all pertinent requirements. Compliance with all requirements shall be determined only when the bulk weighing controller, having successfully passed National Type Evaluation Program laboratory evaluation, is installed and tested under actual field conditions as part of an automatic bulk weighing system~~. **If the simulation is not capable of simulating all functions and operations of a complete system; the weighing controller is to be installed and all functions or operations not simulated during the laboratory evaluation are to be tested under actual field conditions as part of an automatic bulk weighing system.**

32. Performance and Permanence Tests for Automatic Bulk Weighing Systems

Performance tests are conducted to ensure compliance with the tolerance requirements of NIST Handbook 44 and for systems used to weigh grain with additional requirements of the GIPSA.

The tests described here, apply to the entire automatic bulk weighing system, (e.g., the bulk weighing scale controller interfaced with the weigh hopper, load cell(s), material handling system, etc.) ~~It is assumed that~~

~~all components of the automatic bulk weighing scale controller have already been examined and found to comply with applicable National Type Evaluation Program requirements.~~ If the design and performance of the bulk weighing controller is to be determined during the same test, the applicable requirements for automatic bulk weighing systems must be referenced.

…

Discussion/Conclusion:
Mr. Darrell Flocken (NCWM) introduced this item to the Sector and stated that it is the view of NTEP that a field evaluation of a bulk system controller in actual use and connected to other components of an ABWS is not needed in order to sufficiently evaluate it. He also stated that not everyone agreed with this assessment and that NTEP had received a written list of comments from Mr. Henry Oppermann (Weights and Measures Consulting, LLC), who opposed the item and had asked that his list of comments be reviewed during the Sector meeting. Mr. Oppermann's comments were projected onto a screen for all to see and reviewed individually in the order appearing on his list by the Sector. Mr. Darrell Flocken (NCWM) led the Sector's review and discussion of each item on Mr. Oppermann's list as follows:

Automatic Bulk Weighing Systems *(submitted by Mr. Henry Oppermann to NTEP for Review and Discussion at the 2015 Sector Meeting)*

NTEP is to provide a minimum level of evaluation to ensure that a weighing or measuring system complies or is capable of complying with the specifications and tolerances of H44.

1. The question is, "What level of evaluation is needed to provide the minimum level of evaluation to ensure that a measuring instrument is capable of complying with H44?"

2. An ABWS is a measuring system for a dynamic weighing process. As a minimum, NTEP should test and evaluate the system when operating under normal conditions in an actual application.

    a. The installation characteristics for the different inputs to the ABWS are not fully simulated in a laboratory test.

    b. There are venting concerns around the hopper, the speed of operation, and the timing of the gates that can affect the weight signals generated by the W/LRE. The type evaluation should verify that the ABWS controller is capable of dealing with the varying weighing signals.

    c. The shutoff of the flow of product into the hopper is a variable that the ABWS must address. The rate of flow of product varies with the capacity of the hopper. This cannot be assessed adequately in the laboratory.

    d. The stabilizing of the weight values depend upon the field installation. At a minimum, the type evaluation should look at this characteristic in a field application.

3. Would NTEP test any of the following devices without examining its operational and performance capability in an actual application?

    a. Coupled-in-motion or uncoupled-in-motion railway track scale

    b. An in-motion monorail scale

    c. An automatic checkweigher

4. Although the characteristics of each ABWS installation may be unique to the installation, what is expected and what should NTEP evaluate in the type evaluation of an ABWS?

NTEP should make sure that the type evaluation includes an actual field installation to verify that the inputs actually exist in a real installation

During the review, several members of the Sector commented that they agreed with many of the points made by Mr. Oppermann. An industry member commented that he understood the purpose of the field evaluation was to prove a bulk weighing controller capable of being able to comply with all existing requirements when connected to other parts of an ABWS and operated under normal use. Mr. Doug Musick (Kansas) questioned whether or not simulated tests, alone, were adequate. A second industry member noted that the results of a field test are no guarantee that a bulk weighing controller will operate correctly in every application and installation. Several of the NTEP evaluators participating in the meeting voiced agreement with the comment made by the second industry member. There was a general consensus amongst the Sector that *initial verification*, as opposed to *type evaluation*, confirms correct operation; that is, that a controller is working properly for a particular application.

Prior to Voting on this item, Mr. Flocken stated that a vote of agreement to the changes proposed to Section E. of the ABWS Technical Policy would also constitute a vote of agreement to the changes proposed to Paragraph 32. of the ABWS Checklist.

A single vote was then taken to amend both the policy and checklist. Results were as follows: 16 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstained. There were 5 NTEP evaluators, 11 manufacturers, and a NIST T/A, who voted. The Sector agreed to recommend the following changes to Section E. of the ABWS Technical Policy and to Paragraph 32 of the ABWS Checklist:

E. Automatic Bulk Weighing Systems - NTEP On-Site Evaluation

During laboratory evaluation, the bulk weighing controller is tested under simulated field conditions.~~; therefore, the results of such an evaluation should not be used to determine compliance with all pertinent requirements. Compliance with all requirements shall be determined only when the bulk weighing controller, having successfully passed National Type Evaluation Program laboratory evaluation, is installed and tested under actual field conditions as part of an automatic bulk weighing system.~~ **If the simulation is not capable of simulating all functions and operations of a complete system; the weighing controller is to be installed and all functions or operations not simulated during the laboratory evaluation are to be tested under actual field conditions as part of an automatic bulk weighing system.**

32. Performance and Permanence Tests for Automatic Bulk Weighing Systems

Performance tests are conducted to ensure compliance with the tolerance requirements of NIST Handbook 44 and for systems used to weigh grain with additional requirements of the GIPSA.

The tests described here, apply to the entire automatic bulk weighing system, (e.g., the bulk weighing scale controller interfaced with the weigh hopper, load cell(s), material handling system, etc.) ~~**It is assumed that all components of the automatic bulk weighing scale controller have already been examined and found to comply with applicable National Type Evaluation Program requirements.**~~ If the design and performance of the bulk weighing controller is to be determined during the same test, the applicable requirements for automatic bulk weighing systems must be referenced.

…

6. NCWM Publication 14 DES Section 62 Permanence Tests for Scales

Source:
Mr. Darrell Flocken (NCWM/NTEP)

Background:
The wording related to the test load used for the permanence test in Sections 62.1. and 63.6.5. is misleading as to what test load is to be used when conducting this test.

- Section *62.1. Laboratory Permanence Test* states a test load of "one-quarter to one-half scale capacity,…" This can be interpreted as an allowable range and an acceptable test load could be any load between the two values.

- Section *63.6.5. Test Load:* defines absolute test loads determined by the maximum capacity of the device being tested.

  - Section 63.6.5.1. states "For laboratory tests of scales with a capacity of 1000 lb or less, the test load required for the permanence test is 50 % of maximum capacity…"

  - Section 63.6.5.2. states "For laboratory tests of scales with a capacity greater than 1000 lb, the test load required for the permanence test is 250 kg (550 lb),…"

Recommendation:
Modify the statement in Section 62.1. as follows:

> "A laboratory permanence test consists of repeatedly applying to the scale, a test load ~~of one-quarter to one-half scale capacity~~ as defined in Section 63.6.5., simulating normal load application, and periodically conducting normal tests for accuracy."

Conclusion:
The Sector agreed that the wording used to define the test loads used for the permanence test in Sections 62.1. and 63.6.5. is misleading and agreed to amend Section 62.1 as follows:

> **62.1.** Laboratory Permanence Test
> A laboratory permanence test consists of repeatedly applying to the scale, a **test** load **~~of one-quarter to one half scale capacity~~ as defined in Section 63.6.5.,** simulating normal load application, and periodically conducting normal tests for accuracy. Normally, a scale, which…

7. NCWM Publication 14 DES Technical Policy

Source:
Mr. Darrell Flocken (NCWM/NTEP)

Background:
Footnote 2, referenced in paragraph 8.d of the DES Technical Policy and found at the bottom of page DES-6 of the 2015 edition of Publication 14 is misleading. The footnote (repeated below) leads the reader to believe that it is possible to increase the CLC rating of a device that had its Certificate of Conformance issued before October 1998 provided the manufacturer submits evidence of appropriate changes to support the request.

> *[2]For a CC issued prior to October of 1998, the CLC for additional models is allowed to be 5 tons higher than the CLC of the device evaluated, provided evidence is submitted to NTEP that appropriate changes have been made to the weighing/load receiving element to adequately support the increased CLC. If a CC with the additional 5 ton allowance is amended, the 5 ton increased CLC will be retained*

for models already covered by the CC; however, higher CLCs for additional models may not be included without additional testing.

When in fact, this policy allowance was removed from the policy for non-modular vehicle platforms per a decision of the WS during their 1998 Meeting. Attached is an excerpt from the 1998 meeting detailing the decision of the WS members. (Bold and highlights were added to make the appropriate information easy to locate.)

The following was excerpted from the 1998 Weighing Sector Meeting Summary:

Appendix J – Weighing Sector
1998 Meeting Summary
NTEP-63
Meeting Summary
Carry-Over Items

1) Criteria for Modular Scales

Source: NTEP Labs

Background:
At its last meeting, the Weighing Sector agreed to ask the Scale Manufacturers Association's (SMA) Technical Committee to review this item and submit a proposal for changes to Publication 14 relative to modular scales. The Sector specifically asked if SMA could review the current policy for parameters to be covered on a modular scale Certificate of Conformance (CC) based on the model tested. The Sector is asked to consider the resulting proposal developed by the SMA Technical Committee as outlined in Appendix A. The Sector was also asked to review the issue of whether or not a permanence test should be required to expand existing modular scale CCs to include additional capacities and sizes.

Discussion:
Mr. Darrell Flocken (Mettler-Toledo) reviewed the background for the issue and introduced the proposal found in Appendix A. Darrell stated that, although the document has been reviewed by some of the members, the document should not be considered an SMA position because it had not been reviewed by the entire SMA membership. The proposal was presented for consideration on its own merit. The Sector reviewed the basic types of modular scale designs, which were approved at the last meeting. There was general agreement that the intent of the modular criteria was to allow longer scales to be produced by a manufacturer without requiring re-evaluation provided the appropriate load cell parameters were met. There also was discussion of possibly eliminating the lower length limit of 50 % of the shortest module tested. The majority of the Sector favored keeping the lower limit in place.

Conclusion:
The Sector agreed to modify the NTEP Technical Policy for Scales Section B, Part 6, NCWM Publication 14 page 1-11 modular vehicle scale criteria as follows:

6 (a): No change.
6 (b): No change
6 (c): Modify the section as follows:

c. A scale with at least two modules must be tested. The module with the largest CLC is to be tested. Strive to test the module with the longest distance between two sections. If the longest span between sections is not tested, the Certificate of Conformance will include up to 120 percent of the span between sections that was tested. Arrangements regarding the specific scale in the family to be tested will be established in consultation with NTEP representatives.

6 second Part (b): Modify the section as follows:
b. Platform area not less than 50 percent of the smallest two-section (four-cell) module incorporated in the device evaluated to 150 percent of the scale longest module evaluated. Increased platform areas and lengths for scales with

two or more modules are not restricted as long as the width complies with 6(e) and the load cells meet the v_{min} formula; (i.e., v_{min} = d / n). Additional modules to increase length must be of the same type as those used in the device submitted for evaluation (i.e., 4 - cell, 2- cell, 0 - cell.)

6 second Part (c): Modify the section as follows:
c. CLC's complying with the minimum CLC rating (i.e., not less than 80 percent of the capacity of one cell) to 5 tons above device evaluated, but not exceeding twice the capacity of one load cell.

6 second (d) through (h): No change

The Sector also agreed to modify the non-modular vehicle scale criteria as follows:

Part 5(f): Eliminate the 5-ton allowance above the CLC tested as follows:

f. concentrated load capacities (CLC) of 50 percent of the CLC of the device tested to a the maximum of 5 ton higher (for optional higher capacities of devices); however, the manufacturer must provide evidence that the scale with the higher CLC has been structurally strengthened to accommodate the higher loading concentration; in addition the scale that is tested is limited to the CLC rating that applies at the time of the test CLC evaluated; the minimum CLC rating shall not be less than 80 percent of the capacity of one cell but not exceeding twice the capacity of one load cell (the dead load of the weighbridge must be considered);

The Sector discussed eliminating the lower (50 %) restriction on length for non-modular vehicle scales; however, it could not reach a consensus on this proposed change. The Sector also considered making modifications to other non-modular vehicle scale criteria; however, it agreed that it would be better to bring this back as a separate issue for discussion at a future meeting. The Sector agreed that manufacturers can request to have their CCs expanded under the new criteria. The elimination of the five-ton allowance for CLC (under part 5[f] and part 6 second [c]) will not be applied retroactively, but will be applied to new CCs and to requests to modify the CLC beyond that originally listed on the CC.

The Sector discussed a proposal to waive permanence testing on evaluations performed to expand CCs beyond the lengths listed on the original CC. However, in view of changes made by the Sector to expand the criteria, the Sector did not feel that this proposal was still appropriate. Consequently, any testing performed to expand the CC beyond its original platform size or capacity will require a full permanence test.

The outcome of the 1998 discussion was to remove this allowance but to document that the removal will not be applied retroactively meaning the increased CLC value on certificates already modified under this allowance will remain at the modified value. However, the higher CLC allowance will not be applied to new models added to this certificate or to new certificates issued after 1998.

Recommendation:
Remove from the DES, Technical Policy:

1. The reference to footnote 2 in paragraph 8.d.
2. The actual footnote (2) located at the bottom of page DES-6.

Alternatively, revise the wording of footnote 2 to read as follows:

[2] For a CC issued prior to October of 1998, NTEP allowed the CLC value, for additional models, to be increased by 5 tons greater than the CLC of the device evaluated, provided evidence was submitted to NTEP that appropriate changes were made to the weighing/load receiving element to adequately support the increased CLC. This allowance was no longer offered by NTEP for CCs issued after 1998 however, the elimination of this allowance was non-retroactive. CC which were modified per this allowance will remain with the higher CLC value.

This alternate proposal would change the wording of the footnote to eliminate the possible misunderstanding that this allowance is still offered while maintaining the history of the allowance.

Discussion/Conclusion:
Ms. Fran-Elson Houston (Ohio) commented that she had a concern regarding removal of the footnote in its entirety because, by removing it, the history of NTEP allowing the additional five-ton increase in the CLC rating would be lost. She supported replacing the existing footnote with the revised alternative version proposed. Several other Sector members voiced agreement with her concern and supported replacing the existing footnote with the revised alternative footnote. Consequently, the Sector agreed to recommend the existing footnote referenced in paragraph 8.d. of the DES Technical Policy of NCWM Publication 14 be replaced with the following:

[2] **For a CC issued prior to October of 1998, NTEP allowed the CLC value, for additional models, to be increased by 5 tons greater than the CLC of the device evaluated, provided evidence was submitted to NTEP that appropriate changes were made to the weighing/load receiving element to adequately support the increased CLC. This allowance was no longer offered by NTEP for CCs issued after 1998 however, the elimination of this allowance was non-retroactive. CC which were modified per this allowance will remain with the higher CLC value.**

8. NCWM Publication 14 DES Section 46. Tare Operation – Facilitation of Fraud

Source:
Rick Harshman (NIST OWM) on behalf of the 2015 NTEP Weighing Lab Evaluators

Background:
Representatives from Measurement Canada have identified a possible contradiction in NCWM Publication 14 DES Section 46. Tare Operation - Facilitation of Fraud. This concern was brought to the attention of the NTEP Weighing Labs and discussed at the 2015 NTEP Lab meeting (RE: Weighing Labs Item 4 on the 2015 NTEP Lab Meeting Agenda). The NTEP evaluators were not able to resolve the matter and asked that the WS take up this issue at its 2015 meeting in hopes that it could provide a correct interpretation of the type evaluation criteria.

A description of the concern is as follows:

The following statements appear in subsection 46.2:

46.2. Devices equipped with a tare capability, except for electronic cash registers, are required to provide a clear indication that a tare value has been entered. This indication may be GROSS and NET indications (display modes), or a lighted legend or annunciator such as TARE ENTERED" .... At least one of the following methods must be used to indicate that a tare value has been entered. Indicate which method is used.

46.2.1. A separate continuous display of tare.	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A
46.2.2. The device has selectable GROSS, TARE, and NET weight display modes with proper descriptors for this information.	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A
46.2.3. The device has selectable GROSS and NET weight display modes with proper descriptors for this information.	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A
46.2.4. The display indicates only the net weight and a NET legend or annunciator appears when a tare weight is entered. Gross weight is displayed when the tare weight entry is zero and the NET legend or annunciator is off.	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A

"TARE ENTERED," although mentioned in the preamble as being an acceptable means of providing a clear indication that tare has been entered, is not one of the options specified in checklist sections 46.2.1. through 46.2.4.

Thus, the preamble uses "TARE ENTERED" as an example of an acceptable means of providing an indication that tare has been taken, whereas, the checklist seems to suggest otherwise.

It was noted during discussion at the 2015 NTEP Lab meeting that the term "net weight" is well defined in NIST handbooks and means the weight of the product alone, whereas, "tare entered" could be interpreted to mean something different (not necessarily that a value being displayed on a scale is the net weight). Canadian representatives reported that Measurement Canada allows a "tare entered" annunciator to be used when the net weight is displayed.

The following meaning of the term "net weight" was copied from the 2015 version of NIST Handbook 130 "Uniform Laws and Regulations in the areas of legal metrology and engine fuel quantity."

Meaning of the term "net weight" copied from 2015 NIST Handbook 130, Uniform Weights and Measures Law

1.8. Net "Mass" or Net "Weight." – The term "net mass" or "net weight" means the weight [***NOTE 1***, page 21] of a commodity excluding any materials, substances, or items not considered to be part of the commodity. Materials, substances, or items not considered to be part of the commodity include, but are not limited to, containers, conveyances, bags, wrappers, packaging materials, labels, individual piece coverings, decorative accompaniments, and coupons, except that, depending on the type of service rendered, packaging materials may be considered to be part of the service. For example, the service of shipping includes the weight of packing materials.

(Added 1988) (Amended 1989, 1991, and 1993)

Recommendation:
Review DES Section 46.2., including the checklist portions 46.2.1. through 46.2.4. and recommend changes, where appropriate, to better clarify the acceptable means of providing a clear indication that a tare value has been entered, including conditions in which the words "tare entered" might be considered appropriate in defining a net weight indication on a scale.

Technical Advisor's note: Members of OWM's Legal Metrology Devices Program reviewed this WS agenda item and offers the following comments and recommendations:

> The words "tare entered," when defining a value displayed on a scale designed with a single weight display, can be interpreted to mean that the displayed value is the value of a tare that's been entered or that a tare has been entered and the value displayed is a net weight. If a lighted legend or annunciator indicating "tare entered" were used to identify a net weight indication, OWM believes such marking would conflict with NIST HANDBOOK 44 paragraph G-S.6. Marking Operational Controls, Indications, and Features. For this reason, OWM recommends that "tare entered" not be permitted as a means of identifying a net weight indication on a scale. It is OWM's view that the entire second sentence in Section 46.2. can be deleted since 46.2.1. through 46.2.4. provide indication of all the different acceptable ways a scale is able to comply with Section 46.2.
>
> Additionally, OWM finds the language in 46.2.1. ambiguous and suggests it be amended to clarify the meaning of the word "tare." It is not clear from the language if the word "tare" is intended to mean "tare value" or some type of descriptor, such as a tare annunciator? If it is intended that the tare value be continuously displayed and that the value be identified as such, OWM recommends adding additional text to make this clear.

Discussion/Conclusion:
The Sector agreed with OWM's assessment that the words, "tare entered," when used to identify a net weight value being displayed on a scale, *does not* comply with NIST Handbook 44 paragraph G-S.6. Marking Operational Controls, Indications, and Features. During the discussion of this issue, it was noted that a lighted legend or annunciator indicating "tare entered" could be provided to show that a tare had been taken on a scale, but the net weight value displayed would still need to be identified as such in order to comply with paragraph G-S.6.

With respect to OWM's recommendation of amending subsection 46.2.1., the NTEP evaluators participating in the meeting were asked their interpretation of the requirement. The evaluators agreed that the correct interpretation is that there be provided a separate continuous display of the tare *value*.

As the result of these discussions, the Sector agreed to recommend that the second sentence in Section 46.2. be deleted and the word "value" be added to the end of the sentence in subsection 46.2.1. The following represents all the changes agreed to and recommended by the Sector with respect to this item:

46.2. Devices equipped with a tare capability, except for electronic cash registers, are required to provide a clear indication that a tare value has been entered. ~~**This indication may be GROSS and NET indications (display modes), or a lighted legend or annunciator such as TARE ENTERED.**~~ A computing scale shall… At least one of the following methods must be used to indicate that a tare value has been entered. Indicate which method is used.

46.2.1. A separate continuous display of **the** tare **value**. ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

…

Following the Sector's decision to delete the second sentence in Section 46.2., Mr. Darrell Flocken (NCWM) noted there may be scales in existence that have been issued a CC that use a "tare entered" legend to identify a net weight indication. He suggested, and the Sector agreed, that a revision date be added at the bottom of Section 46.2. to provide indication of the date of this change.

9. NCWM Publication 14 DES Section73 Performance and Permanence Test Procedures for Dynamic Monorail Scales

Source:
Maryland NTEP Lab

Background:
In Publication 14 Digital Electronic Scales, there is no distinction between testing procedures for Dynamic Monorail Scales and Static Monorail Scales.

Recommendation:
To clarify the NTEP evaluation test procedures for Static Monorail Scales, it is recommended that the following procedures be added to Section 73 of DES Publication:

Procedures to be added to Section 73:

Tests for Static Monorail Scales:

1. Discrimination test at zero-load or near zero-outside the range of the AZT, and at scale capacity or the maximum test load, whichever is less.
2. Increasing and decreasing load test from zero to scales capacity at tolerance break points of 500e, 2000e, 4000e, and 4001+e, load centered on the live rail.
3. A shift test at scale capacity, at maximum used capacity but not less than 1/2 scale capacity. Test loads located at the left, center, and right ends of the scale.
4. Temperature tests, and creep test. Temperature effect on zero.
5. Permanence test cycle of 100 000 weight applications conducted for each model submitted.

Discussion/Conclusion:
The Sector agreed that there exists a gap in NCWM Publication 14 because nowhere within the DES Section are performance and permanence test procedures for static monorail scales explicitly stated. Rather than the Sector taking time during its meeting to develop the performance and permanence test procedures for static monorail scales, Mr. Darrell Flocken (NCWM) offered, and the Sector accepted the offer, to develop a draft of the procedures and distribute them to members of the Sector for an e-mail vote. It was hoped that the procedures could be developed and approved by the Sector's membership in time that they be considered by the NTEP Committee for inclusion into the 2016 version of NCWM Publication 14.

In considering where the procedures for static monorail scales would best fit within the DES Section, it was suggested, and the Sector agreed, that the title of Section 73. be amended and there be two subsections created within; one for dynamic monorail scales, and the other for static monorail scales. The Sector considered two options for changing the Title of Section 73. to make known the inclusion of the additional procedures for static monorail scales as follows:

1. Add the words "Static and" before the word "Dynamic" in the title; or
2. Delete the word "Dynamic" in the title.

Members of the Sector agreed that either option would be acceptable.

10. NCWM Publication 14 DES Section 31 Multi-Interval Scales

Source:
Measurement Canada/Canada

Background:
As part of a routine general maintenance of its documents, Measurement Canada is currently reviewing requirements for multi-interval tare. Because of our mutual recognition agreement, we have to be careful to not change something that could contradict or conflict with NIST Handbook 44 or NCWM Publication 14. In order to avoid this scenario, we need an interpretation of these following sections of that, in our sense, are conflicting.

The preamble to Section 31. contains examples and clauses that conflict with the requirements set out in 31.1. and 31.2. For example, the tare calculation example shows a net weight value that is not consistent with the scale interval of the weighing segment in which it falls, but both 31.1. and 31.2. require that it be consistent. The preamble also states that "Except for semi-automatic tare, all tare values shall not exceed the maximum capacity of the first weighing segment" whereas as 31.1.5. states "Tare may be taken to the maximum capacity of the smallest weighing range (segment) of the scale," leading to another contradiction.

Another issue with Section 31. is the applicability of 31.1. vs 31.2. It seems to be implied that either one or the other applies, depending on how the device operates, but it is not clear. It seems that 31.1. applies to devices that display all three values, while 31.2. is for devices that only display in one mode. However, review of the sub-clauses in each section show this isn't correct (e.g. 31.1.9. refers to scales that only show net weight). We feel that Section 31 needs to be reviewed to consolidate redundant clauses and clearly state the applicability of 31.1. and 31.2.

Recommendation:
The Sector is asked to review NCWM Publication 14, Section 31. for consistency and recommend changes as needed to resolve any conflicts or ambiguous parts.

Discussion/Conclusion:
Mr. Pascal Turgeon (Measurement Canada) identified conflicts in various parts of NCWM Publication 14, DES Section 31. Multi-Interval Scales and suggested some changes based on the type evaluation criteria developed and used by MC in their evaluation of a tare feature on a multi-interval scale. Members of the Sector concluded there are conflicts within Section 31, and it was generally accepted that at least some of the conflicts identified

are the result of grouping together the different requirements that apply to the various types of tare (e.g., semi-automatic, keyboard, etc.) used with multi-interval scales and scales designed with a single versus dual weight display.

Mr. Rick Harshman (NIST Technical Advisor) noted that the tare requirements contained in the Scales Code of NIST Handbook 44 do not provide the same level of detail as those in the NCWM Publication 14 checklist. He noted that members of OWM's Legal Metrology Devices Program believe more work is needed to further develop requirements that apply to tare taken on multi-interval scales. Mr. Darrell Flocken (NCWM) suggested a small work group be formed to further develop the checklist and eliminate the conflicts in Section 31. of NCWM Publication 14 DES. Mr. Harshman suggested a review of the requirements in Section 31. to determine their intended application (e.g., those intended to apply to a scale equipped with semi-automatic tare versus keyboard tare, etc.). He further noted that he believed that much of this work had already been completed by the Sector in previous meetings.

The Sector agreed with Mr. Flocken's suggestion to form a small work group to further develop the checklist and eliminate the inconsistencies that had been identified. The following members of the Sector volunteered to participate on the work group:

Tom Buck (Ohio)
Scott Davidson (Mettler-Toledo)
Paul Lewis (Rice Lake Weighing)
Pascal Turgeon (MC) or (Justin Rae)
Rick Harshman (OWM)

Mr. Harshman agreed to host the first work group tele-conference and it was agreed that the work group would attempt to develop a proposal for the Sector to consider at next year's meeting.

A final recommendation made by Mr. Pascal is to move 31.1.9. and all of its subparts to 31.2. since all of 31.1.9. applies to scales that display or record only net weight values and 31.2. applies to scales that indicate in only one mode (gross or net). This recommendation to be considered by the work group as part of their review and further development of Section 31.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX A
WEIGHING SECTOR FINAL ATTENDEE LIST

Tom Buck
Ohio Department of Agriculture
8995 East Main Street
Reynoldsburg, OH 43068
P. (614) 728-6290
F. (614) 728-6424
E. tom.buck@agri.ohio.gov

Steven Beiztel
Systems Associates, Inc.
1932 Industrial Drive
Libertyville, IL 60048
P. (847) 367-6650
F. (847) 367-6960
E. sjbeitzel@systemsassoc.com

Kevin Chesnutwood
NIST Mass and Force
100 Bureau Drive, Stop 8222
Gaithersburg, MD 20899
P. (301) 975-6653
E. kevin.chesnutwood@nist.gov

Scott Davidson
Mettler-Toledo, LLC
1150 Dearborn Drive
Worthington, OH 43085
P. (614) 438-4387
E. scott.davidson@mt.com

Fran-Elson Houston
Ohio Department of Agriculture
8995 East Main Street, Building 5
Reynoldsburg, OH 43068
P. (614) 728-6290
F. (614) 728-6424
E. Fran.Elson-Houston@agri.ohio.gov

Darrell Flocken
National Conference on Weights and Measures
1135 M Street, Suite 110
Lincoln, NE 68508
P. (614) 620-6134
E. darrell.flocken@ncwm.net

Nathan Gardner
Oregon Weights and Measures
635 Capitol Street N.E.
Salem, OR 97301
P. (503) 881-4586
E. ngardner@oda.state.or.us

Eric Golden
Cardinal Scale Manufacturing Co.
203 East Daugherty Street
Webb City, MO 64870
P. (417) 673-4631 Ext. 211
E. egolden@cardet.com

Richard Harshman
NIST, Office of Weights and Measures
100 Bureau Drive, MS 2600
Gaithersburg, MD 20899
P. (301) 975-8107
E. richard.harshman@nist.gov

Jon Heinlein
Transcell Technology, Inc.
975 East Deerfield Parkway
Buffalo Grove, IL 60089
P. (847) 419-9180
E. jheinlein@transcell.com

Scott Henry
Zebra Technologies
721 Richmond Court
Loganville, GA 30052
P. (770) 466-3658
E. scott.henry@zebra.com

Stephen Langford
Cardinal Scale Manufacturing Co.
203 East Daugherty Street,
P.O. Box 151
Webb City, MO 64870
P. (417) 673-4631 Ext. 132
E. slangford@cardet.com

Paul A. Lewis, Sr.
Rice Lake Weighing Systems, Inc.
230 W. Coleman Street
Rice Lake, WI 54868
P. (715) 234-6967
E. plewis@ricelake.com

L. Edward Luthy
Schenck Process, LLC
108 Wade Drive
Dover, OH 44622
P. (440) 241-0194
E. e.luthy@gmail.com

Robert Meadows
Kansas Department of Agriculture
1320 Research Park Drive
Manhattan, KS 66502
P. (785) 564-6681
E. robert.meadows@kda.ks.gov

Eric Morabito
New York State Weights and Measures
10B Airline Drive
Albany, NY 12235
P. (518) 457-3452
E. eric.morabito@agriculture.ny.gov

Doug Musick
Kansas Department of Agriculture
1320 Research Park Drive
Manhattan, KS 66502
P. (785) 564-6681
E. doug.music@kda.ks.gov

Edward Payne
Maryland Department of Agriculture
50 Harry S. Truman Pkwy
Annapolis, MD 21401
P. (410) 841-5790
E. edward.payne@maryland.gov

Samuel Sagarsee
Emery Winslow Scale, Co.
4530 North 25th Street
Terre Haute, IN 47805
P. (812) 466-5265 x 112
E. srsagarsee@winslowth.com

Louis Straub
Fairbanks Scales, Inc.
3056 Irwin Drive S.E.
Southport, NC 28461
P. (910) 253-3250
E. lstraub@fairbanks.com

Pascal Turgeon
Measurement Canada
151 Tunney's Pasture
Ottawa, ON, Canada
P. (613) 301-4488
E. pascal.turgeon@ic.gc.ca

Robert Upright
Vishay Transducers
42 Countryside Road
North Grafton, MA 01536
P. (508) 615-1185
E. rob.upright@vpgsensors.com

Russ Vires
Mettler-Toledo, LLC
1150 Dearborn Drive
Worthington, OH 43085
P. (614) 438-4306
F. (614) 438-4355
E. russ.vires@mt.com

Jerry Wang
A&D Engineering, Inc.
1756 Automation Parkway
San Jose, CA 95131
P. (408) 518-5113
E. jwang@andonline.com

ATTACHMENTS
TO
AGENDA ITEM 1.C. WEIGH-IN-MOTION SYSTEMS USED FOR VEHICLE ENFORCEMENT SCREENING

TENTATIVE CODE APPLICABLE TO WEIGH-IN-MOTION SYSTEMS USED FOR VEHICLE ENFORCEMENT SCREENING

A. Application

A.1. General. – This code applies to systems used to weigh vehicles, while in motion, for the purpose of screening and sorting the vehicles based on the vehicle weight to determine if a static weighment is necessary.

A.2. The code does not apply to weighing systems intended for the collection of statistical traffic data.

A.3. Additional Code Requirements. – In addition to the requirements of this code, Weigh-In-Motion Screening Systems shall meet the requirements of Section 1.10. General Code.

S. Specifications

S.1. Design of Indicating and Recording Elements and of Recorded Representations.

S.1.1. Ready Indication. – The system shall provide a means of verifying that the system is operational and ready for use.

S.1.2. Value of System Division Units. – The value of a system division "d" expressed in a unit of weight shall be equal to:

(a) 1, 2, or 5; or a decimal multiple or submultiple of 1, 2, or 5.

Examples: divisions may be 10, 20, 50, 100; or 0.01, 0.02, 0.05; or 0.1, 0.2, 0.5, etc.

S.1.2.1. Units of Measure. – The system shall indicate weight values using only a single unit of measure.

S.1.3. Maximum Value of Division Size. – The value of the system division "d" for a Class A, Weight-In-Motion System shall not be greater than 50 kg (100 lb).

S.1.4. Value of Other Units of Measure.

S.1.4.1. Speed. – Vehicle speeds shall be measured in miles per hour or kilometers per hour.

S.1.4.2. Axle-Spacing (Length). – The center-to-center distance between any two successive axles shall be measured in:

(a) feet and inches;

(b) feet and decimal submultiples of a foot; or

(c) meters and decimal submultiples of a meter.

S.1.4.3. Vehicle Length. – If the system is capable of measuring the overall length of the vehicle, the length of the vehicle shall be measured in feet and/or inches, or meters.

S.1.5. Capacity Indication. – An indicating or recording element shall not display nor record any values greater than 105 % of the specified capacity of the load receiving element.

S.1.6. Identification of a Fault. – Fault conditions shall be presented to the operator in a clear and unambiguous means. The following fault conditions shall be identified:

(a) Vehicle speed is below the minimum or above the maximum speed as specified.

(b) The maximum number of vehicle axles as specified has been exceeded.

(b) A change in vehicle speed greater than that specified has been detected.

S.1.7. Recorded Representations.

S.1.7.1. Values to be Recorded. – At a minimum, the following values shall be printed and/or stored electronically for each vehicle weighment:

(a) transaction identification number;

(b) lane identification (required if more than one lane at the site has the ability to weigh a vehicle in-motion);

(c) vehicle speed;

(d) number of axles;

(e) weight of each axle;

(f) identification and weight of axles groups;

(g) axle spacing;

(h) total vehicle weight;

(i) all fault conditions that occurred during the weighing of the vehicle;

(j) violations, as identified in paragraph S.2.1., that occurred during the weighing of the vehicle; and

(k) time and date.

S.1.8. Value of the Indicated and Recorded System Division. – The value of the system's division " (d)", as recorded, shall be the same as the division value indicated.

S.2. System Design Requirements.

S.2.1. Violation Parameters. – The instrument shall be capable of accepting user entered violation parameters for the following items:

(a) single axle weight limit;

(b) axle group weight limit;

(c) gross vehicle weight limit; and

(d) bridge formula maximum.

The instrument shall display and or record violation conditions when these parameters have been exceeded.

S.3. Design of Weighing Elements.

S.3.1. Multiple Load-Receiving Elements. –An instrument with a single indicating or recording element, or a combination indicating-recording element, that is coupled to two or more load-receiving elements with independent weighing systems, shall be provided with means to prohibit the activation of any load-receiving element (or elements) not in use, and shall be provided with automatic means to indicate clearly and definitely which load receiving element (or elements) is in use.

S.4. Design of Weighing Devices, Accuracy Class.

S.4.1. Designation of Accuracy. – WIM Systems meeting the requirements of this code shall be designated as accuracy Class A.

Note: This does not preclude higher accuracy classes from being proposed and added to this Code in the future when it can be demonstrated that WIM systems grouped within those accuracy classes can achieve the higher level of accuracy specified for those devices.

S.5. Marking Requirements. – In addition to the marking requirements in G-S.1. Identification (except G.S.1.(e)), he system shall be marked with the following information:

(a) Accuracy Class;

(b) Value of the System Division "d";

(c) Operational Temperature Limits;

(d) Number of Instrumented Lanes (not required if only one lane is instrumented.);

(e) Minimum and Maximum Vehicle Speed;

(f) Maximum Number of Axles per Vehicle;

(g) Maximum Change in Vehicle Speed during Weighment; and

(h) Minimum and Maximum Load.

S.5.1. Location of Marking Information. – The marking information required in G-S.1. of the General Code and S.5. shall be visible after installation. The information shall be marked on the system or recalled from an information screen.

N. Notes

N.1. Test Procedures.

N.1.1. Selection of Test Vehicles. – All dynamic testing associated with the procedures described in each of the subparagraphs of N.1.5 shall be performed with a minimum of two test vehicles.

(a) The first test vehicle may be a two axle, six tire, single unit truck; that is, a vehicle with two axles with the rear axle having dual wheels. The vehicle shall have a maximum Gross Vehicle Weight of 10,000 lbs.

(b) The second test vehicle shall be a five axle, single trailer truck with a maximum Gross Vehicle Weight of 80,000 lbs.

Note: Consideration should be made for testing the systems using vehicles which are typical to the systems daily operation.

N.1.1.1. Weighing of Test Vehicles. – All test vehicles shall be weighed on a reference scale before being used to conduct the dynamic tests.

N.1.1.2. Determining Reference Weights for Axle, Axle Groups and Gross Vehicle Weight. – The reference weights shall be the average weight value of a minimum of three static weighments of all single axle, axle groups and gross vehicle weight.

Note: The axles within an axle group are not considered single axles.

N.1.2. Test Loads.

N.1.2.1. Static Test Loads. – All static test loads shall use certified test weights.

N.1.2.2. Dynamic Test Loads. – Test vehicles used for dynamic testing shall be loaded to 85 to 95% of their legal maximum Gross Vehicle Weight. The "load" shall be non-shifting and shall be positioned to present as close as possible, an equal side-to-side load.

N.1.3. Reference Scale. – Each reference vehicle shall be weighed statically on a multiple platform vehicle scale comprised of three individual weighing/load-receiving elements, each an independent scale. The three individual weighing/load receiving elements shall be of such dimension and spacing to facilitate 1) the single-draft weighing of all reference test vehicles, and 2) the simultaneous weighing of each single axle and axle group of the reference test vehicles on different individual elements of the scale; gross vehicle weight determined by summing the values of the different reference axle and reference axle groups of a test vehicle. The scale shall be tested immediately prior to using it to establish reference test loads and in no case more than 24 hours prior. To qualify for use as a suitable reference scale, it must meet NIST Handbook 44, Class III L maintenance tolerances.

N.1.3.1. Location of a Reference Scale. – The location of the reference scale must be considered as vehicle weights will change due to fuel consumption.

N.1.4. Test Speeds. – All dynamic tests shall be conducted within 20% below or at the posted speed limit.

N.1.5. Test Procedures.

N.1.5.1. Dynamic Load Test. – The dynamic test shall be conducted using the test vehicles defined in N.1.1. The test shall consist of a minimum of 20 runs for each test vehicle at the speed as stated in N.1.4.

At the conclusion of the dynamic test, there will be a minimum of 20 weight readings for each single axle, axle group and gross vehicle weight of the test vehicle. The tolerance for each weight reading shall be based on the percentage values specified in Table T.2.2.

N.1.5.2. Vehicle Position Test. – During the conduct of the dynamic testing ensure that the vehicle stays within the defined roadway along the width of the sensor. The test shall be conducted with 10 runs with the vehicle centered along the width of the sensor, 5 runs with the vehicle on the right side along the width of the sensor, and 5 runs with the vehicle on the left side along the width of the sensor. Only gross vehicle

weight is used for this test and the tolerance for each weighment shall be based on the tolerance value specified in T.2.3.

N.1.5.3. Axle Spacing Test. – The axle spacing test is a review of the displayed and/or recorded axle spacing distance of the test vehicles. The tolerance value for each distance shall be based on the tolerance value specified in T.2.4.

T. Tolerances

T.1. Principles.

T.1.1. Design. – The tolerance for a weigh-in-motion system is a performance requirement independent of the design principle used.

T.2. Tolerance Values for Accuracy Class A.

T.2.1. To Tests Involving Digital Indications or Representations – To the tolerances that would otherwise be applied in paragraphs T.2.2 and T.2.3, there shall be added an amount equal to one-half the value of the scale division to account for the uncertainty of digital rounding.

T.2.2. Tolerance Values for Dynamic Load Test. – The tolerance values applicable during dynamic load testing are as specified in Table T.2.2.

Table T.2.2.
Tolerances for Accuracy Class A

Load Description*	Tolerance as a Percentage of Applied Test Load
Axle Load	± 20 %
Axle Group Load	± 15 %
Gross Vehicle Weight	± 10 %

* No more than 5 % of the weighments in each of the load description subgroups shown in this table shall exceed the applicable tolerance.

T.2.3. Tolerance Value for Vehicle Position Test. – The tolerance value applied to each gross vehicle weighment is ±10% of the applied test load.

T.2.4. Tolerance Value for Axle Spacing. – The tolerance value applied to each axle spacing measurement shall be ± 0.15 meter (0.5 feet).

T.3. Influence Factors. – The following factor is applicable to tests conducted under controlled conditions only.

T.3.1. Temperature. – Systems shall satisfy the tolerance requirements under all operating temperature unless a limited operating temperature range is specified by the manufacturer.

T.4. Radio Frequency Interference (RFI) and Other Electromagnetic Interference Susceptibility. – The difference between the weight indication due to the disturbance and the weight indication without the disturbance shall not exceed the tolerance value as stated in Table T.2.2.

UR. USER REQUIREMENTS

UR.1. Selection Requirements. – Equipment shall be suitable for the service in which it is used with respect to elements of its design, including but not limited to, its capacity, number of scale divisions, value of the scale division or verification scale division and minimum capacity.

UR.1.1. General

The typical class or type of device for particular weighing applications is shown in Table 1. Typical Class or Type of Device for Weighing Applications.

Table 1.
Typical Class or Type of Device for Weighing Applications

Class	Weighing Application
A	Screening and sorting of vehicles based on axle, axle group and gross vehicle weight.
Note: A WIM system with a higher accuracy class than that specified as "typical" may be used.	

UR.2. User Location Conditions and Maintenance. – The system shall be installed and maintained as defined in the manufacturer's recommendation.

UR.2.1. System Modification. – The dimensions (e.g., length, width, thickness, etc.) of the load receiving element of a system shall not be changed beyond the manufacturer's specifications, nor shall the capacity of a scale be increased beyond its design capacity by replacing or modifying the original primary indicating or recording element with one of a higher capacity, except when the modification has been approved by a competent engineering authority, preferably that of the engineering department of the manufacturer of the system, and by the weights and measures authority having jurisdiction over the system.

UR.2.2. Foundation, Supports, and Clearance. – The foundation and supports shall be such as to provide strength, rigidity, and permanence of all components.

On load-receiving elements which use moving parts for determining the load value, clearance shall be provided around all live parts to the extent that no contacts may result when the load-receiving element is empty, nor throughout the weighing range of the system.

UR.2.3. Access to Weighing Elements. – If necessary, adequate provision shall be made for inspection and maintenance of the weighing elements.

UR.3. Maximum Load. – A system shall not be used to weigh a load of more than the marked maximum load of the system.

The following are the definitions of terms used in the Weigh-In-Motion Systems used for Vehicle Enforcement Screening – Tentative Code and will appear in NIST HANDBOOK 44 at the end of the code. Once the tentative status is removed from the code, these definitions will then be moved to Appendix D of NIST HANDBOOK 44.

weigh-in-motion (WIM). A process of estimating a moving vehicle's gross weight and the portion of that weight that is carried by each wheel, axle, or axle group, or combination thereof, by measurement and analysis of dynamic vehicle tire forces.

axle. – The axis oriented transversely to the nominal direction of vehicle motion, and extending the full width of the vehicle, about which the wheel(s) at both ends rotate.

axle-group load. – The sum of all tire loads of the wheels on a group of adjacent axles; a portion of the gross-vehicle weight.

axle load. – The sum of all tire loads of the wheels on an axle; a portion of the gross-vehicle weight.

axle spacing. – The distance between the centers of any two axles. When specifying axle spacing, you also need to identify the axles used.

single-axle load. – The load transmitted to the road surface by the tires lying on the same longitudinal axis (that axis transverse to the movement of the vehicle and about which the wheels rotate).

tandem-axle load. – The load transmitted to the road surface by the tires of two single-axles lying on the same longitudinal axis (that axis transverse to the movement of the vehicle and about which the wheels rotate).

triple-axle load. – The load transmitted to the road surface by the tires of three single-axles lying on the same longitudinal axis (that axis transverse to the movement of the vehicle and about which the wheels rotate).

Weigh-in-Motion Screening Scale. – A WIM system used to identify potentially overweight vehicles.

Wheel weight. – The weight value of any single or set of wheels on one side of a vehicle on a single axle.

WIM System. – A set of sensors and supporting instruments that measure the presence of a moving vehicle and the related dynamic tire forces at specified locations with respect to time; estimate tire loads; calculate speed, axle spacing, vehicle class according to axle arrangement, and other parameters concerning the vehicle; and process, display, store, and transmit this information. This standard applies only to highway vehicles.

NEXT MEETING

There was a recommendation, but no decision made, to hold the 2016 Weighing Sector meeting in Columbus, Ohio. The week of August 21 - 27, 2016, was suggested.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK