

USNWG ON TAXIMETERS

MARCH 13, 2013

MEETING SUMMARY

A meeting of the U.S. National Working Group on Taximeters (USNWG) was held on Wednesday, March 13, 2013 via web-conference. This meeting was a continuation of the group’s work to update the Taximeters Code in the NIST Handbook 44 (*Specifications, Tolerances, and Other Technical Requirements for Weighing and Measuring Devices*).

Following the initial meeting of the group in 2012, it was recognized that a significant portion of the group’s discussions included some terms frequently used in a weights and measures regulatory context that need to be clearly defined. Some of these terms may not be fully understood by those who are not closely associated with the weights and measures community when those terms are used in that context. The major portion of the agenda for this meeting was based on this premise. Some of the terms included in this meeting’s agenda were part of the USNWG discussions during the group’s previous meeting in September 2012 when the work group developed draft definitions for those terms.

Where changes are proposed within this summary, the following formatting will be used to indicate those changes being recommended.

- Language proposed to be deleted will be shown using the ~~strikethrough~~ formatting.
- New language proposed to be added will be shown using **bold, underlined** formatting.

Contents

I. Definition of “Taximeter”	2
taximeter.	2
taximeter. – A device that, based on time and/or distance travelled automatically calculates, at a predetermined rate or rates and indicates the charge for hire of a vehicle.[5.54]	2
II. Definition of “Taximeter Point of Sale System (POS)”	3
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.	4
III. Definition of “Metrological effect”	8
IV. Definition of “Primary Indications”	8
V. Definition of “Extras Charges”	9
VI. Proposed addition of new requirement to HB44 Taximeters Code, paragraph A.2.	11
VII. Final Notes	13
VIII. Attendance	14

I. Definition of “Taximeter”

Background:

The existing definition contained in NIST Handbook 44 (HB44) Appendix D for “taximeter” reads as follows:

taximeter. – A device that automatically calculates, at a predetermined rate or rates, and indicates the charge for hire of a vehicle.[5.54]

The work group was asked to comment on several points that were raised in the meeting’s agenda and which included:

- The existing definition describes a taximeter as a “device” which may not be an adequate description for the more complex *systems* that are currently being used in some taxis;
- “*Taximeter*” may not be appropriate in defining systems designed using GPS or other alternative sources of measurements because the suffix “meter” could be interpreted as a strictly mechanical type of device;
- The current definition for taximeter does not include any reference to the nature of the measurement (time and/or distance) which taximeters use to calculate a charge for hire.

An amendment to the existing definition was proposed to the work group and is shown below:

taximeter. – A device that, based on time and/or distance travelled automatically calculates, at a predetermined rate or rates and indicates the charge for hire of a vehicle.[5.54]

In addition to consideration of the definition for taximeter, the group was asked whether a taximeter should be considered a commercial weighing or measuring device subject to legal metrology regulation, when the basis for the calculation of a fare does not involve a measurement of time and/or distance. This can occur in jurisdictions where it is permitted to base a passenger’s fare on flat rates that have been pre-established for transportation on specific, frequently traveled routes.

Discussion:

The work group generally acknowledged that, initially the term “taximeter” was used to describe relatively simple mechanical-type, stand-alone devices. The group also recognized however, that “taximeter” has become a well-established term used to describe a device used in a *vehicle-for-hire*. The group generally agreed that the term adequately identifies the device as a means to assess a charge for the *hire of a vehicle*. A number of terms have become part of the “dialect” that is well established in this industry (e.g., fare, extras, flat rate, negotiated flat rate) and some of the USNWG members felt that

amendments to the term taximeter and its definition could potentially create a need for changes in many layers of regulation within this industry.

Another reason that members of the work group cited to retain the current terminology was that any necessary distinction between stand-alone taximeters and taximeter systems could be made within specific requirements in the HB44 Taximeters Code rather than in HB44 Appendix D. This could be accomplished by drafting new requirements or amending existing requirements in such a way that the requirement would specifically apply to stand-alone taximeters, taximeter systems, or both.

While the work group considered that appropriate changes to the definition could result in a more accurate description of the *function* (time/distance measurement) of these devices, the majority of comments offered during the meeting supported maintaining the existing language and indicated that if the definition were to be amended to reflect the function (i.e., “a device that calculates based on time/distance”), then the use of flat rates (where permitted) could be considered as being non-compliant with the HB44 Taximeters Code

This issue was discussed further when the USNWG members were asked if, when the specific function of calculating a charge based on time and/or distance is not used, and the fare is based instead on a flat rate, is the taximeter at that time considered to be a commercial weighing and measuring device and subject to weights and measures laws?

It should be stated that while the value for established flat rates for transportation between frequently traveled points may be based on an average time or distance, flat rates should not to be confused with fares incurred during trips where the charges are based on actual measurements performed through the taximeter as the trip occurs.

USNWG member Mr Bill Fishman stated that a flat rate is simply an option for a rate selection where the rate at which fare is calculated is set at a zero factor for time/distance. Other members commented that if any amendment to the definition of taximeter is proposed, then the definition should not prohibit producing a fare through the use of flat rates.

Conclusion:

The majority of comments from the USNWG during the 3/13/13 web-conference indicated that the term “taximeter” and its definition do not need to be changed. Based on those comments, it is recommended that the term and definition for “taximeter” be retained in their current form and no further action is considered necessary for this item.

II. Definition of “Taximeter Point of Sale System (POS)”

Background:

The USNWG recognized during the September 2012 meeting that an existing definition in HB44 - Appendix D for the phrase “point-of-sale” may not adequately describe the type of systems used in conjunction with taximeters. This existing definition reads 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.

At that meeting, the work group agreed that a definition should be developed that better describes the type of system incorporating a taximeter. The definition shown below is the USNWG’s draft for a definition of a POS system specifically interfaced with a taximeter.

taximeter point-of-sale system. – **An assembly of devices including, but not limited to a taximeter and any other interactive components connected (wired or wirelessly) that provide a means to accept electronic payment for charges, used to complete a sales transaction.**

In developing the definition for “taximeter point-of-sale”, the USNWG did not include a recording element as a required component of that system. While the group recognized the importance of providing the passenger a record of the service rendered and the associated charges, they also noted that today’s technology provides alternate methods for supplying a customer receipt (i.e., electronic receipt).

It was pointed out to the work group that it has not been necessary in any of the HB44 specific codes to create a separate definition for a POS system used in conjunction with those specific types of devices. To propose a separate definition for POS system as used with taximeters could possibly detract from the consistency that is sought in language and principle between the various sections of HB44. The omission of a required recording element in the draft for a “taximeter POS” provides an noticeable distinction of taximeters from other commercial weighing and measuring devices which are required to supply the customer a form of receipt. This distinction is a controversial issue for many regulatory officials that support requiring that a recording element be used with taximeters.

Discussion:

The work group was asked to provide further explanation for the justification to develop a separate definition for “taximeter POS” rather than accepting the existing, generic definition. The group was also asked if amending the existing definition in HB44 for point-of-sale system could provide an acceptable alternative.

USNWG member Mr David Paul explained that the development of a draft for a new definition for “taximeter POS” by the work group during its initial meeting was based on the group recognizing that other proposed requirements for inclusion in HB44 were dependent on whether the equipment that is being referred to is considered either a taximeter or a taximeter POS.

Additional comments offered by USNWG members indicated that the reason to draft a new, separate definition was to clearly distinguish between stand-alone (traditional) taximeters and those that have been connected to associated equipment. In addition the new definition would help to recognize the nature of the interaction between the taximeter and other components within the system. USNWG member, Ms Aileen Fox pointed out the proposed draft of a new definition for taximeters POS specifies that it is comprised of “interactive components” which is not specified in the existing POS definition.

A point considered as critical to some work group members was that the proposed new definition for taximeter POS would require a means to provide an electronic form of payment. This is considered to be relevant when it is recognized that existing equipment being installed and used (e.g., credit card readers) in conjunction with taximeters will offer this method for finalizing transactions.

A major consideration regarding this issue is that the existing definition for point-of-sale system includes a recording element as a standard component within a POS system. This creates a situation where, if a taximeter is attached to accessory equipment, creating a system, it would not be classified under the existing definition as a point-of-sale system unless a recording element is included. Even in cases where the capabilities of the stand-alone taximeter are enhanced through an interface with a computer-type device (e.g., MDT), unless a recording element is also attached, this would not qualify as a POS system under the existing definition.

A number of regulatory officials have supported the notion that, because some jurisdictions have complex rate structures a printed receipt should be required to provide the passenger/customer assistance in fully understanding the charges incurred during a transaction. A printed receipt is largely viewed as a means to supplement the minimal amount of information and space for that information that a typical taximeter is capable of providing/indicating.

In order to supply a passenger with sufficient detail of the charges incurred during a transaction, it has been suggested that when a taxi is equipped with a *system* of components (either as a completely new installation or an upgrade for a stand-alone taximeter) the system should then be required to be capable of providing some form of receipt to the passenger.

Further comments from the USNWG members do indicate that the work group agrees in principle that, when the total charge for taxi service consists of many different fees, some form of receipt should be made available to the passenger with enough information to clearly identify all charges incurred.

The matter is complicated when a stand-alone taximeter is enhanced through the addition of accessory equipment such as Mobile Data Terminals (MDTs), Passenger Information/input Monitors (PIMs), or Driver Information/Input Monitors (DIMs). These components can greatly increase the functionality of a taximeter through the creation of a taximeter system and this form of upgrade is considered by some USNWG members to be justification in requiring a recording element. Until a recording element is also added however, under the existing definition of POS system this system would not constitute a POS system.

An additional point was raised by USNWG member Mr Jesse Davis who pointed out that the term “recording element” may need to be clarified. Existing definitions found in HB44, Appendix D for “recording element” and “recorded representation” describe devices and representations that do not necessarily encompass the possibility of electronic versions of either of those terms.

This particular agenda item involves multiple issues facing the USNWG and raises a number of questions. Some of the questions the work group is asked to consider are:

- Can a point-of-sale system be defined by the functions of that system rather than the hardware components?

- What configuration of components (or what functions of a system) will signify that the system created by the interface of those components has evolved into a POS system?
- At what point (determined either by a change in equipment installed in a for-hire vehicle or an increase of a taximeter's features/functions) is there justification to require that a recording element be required in association with a taximeter?
- Should the requirement of a recording element depend upon the complexity of a jurisdiction's rate schedule?

Conclusion:

Some members of the USNWG support the proposed definition for "taximeter POS" that was developed during the September 2012 meeting which does not require a recording element. Other members believe that this definition does not sufficiently define a POS because this new definition does not include what are considered critical components which have been traditionally considered as part of POS systems.

Certain functions performed through a particular system may be performed by one or more components within that system. For example, a system of components connected to a retail gasoline dispenser may not consist of identical equipment as a system connected to food market checkout scale, even though the systems perform the same basic functions. Because the design, construction, installation, and capabilities of a system's equipment may not be the identical when used in connection with various weighing and measuring devices, the NIST Technical Advisor to the USNWG suggested that a POS could be defined as a categorization of the functions it is capable of rather than the components (hardware) that comprise the system. These basic functions that are common to POS systems are as follows:

1. Determination of a weight or measure for a product or service offered Calculation of a charge for the product or service based on a price per unit
2. Determination of a total cost by accumulating charges for distinct products or services or related fees associated with a transaction;
3. Producing a sales receipt for the transaction (could be a printed receipt or an electronic receipt if customer chooses) when required.

Because there was no consensus regarding this item during the meeting, the USNWG members were asked to consider the three questions listed below that were distributed to USNWG members on April 4, 2013. These questions are considered to be critical to the resolution of this item were included in the March 13, 2013 meeting's draft summary. USNWG members were requested to provide their responses to the NIST Technical Advisor. The following conclusion(s) are based upon the additional input received in response to those questions.

Question #1

Is it acceptable to amend the current definition of point-of-sale system as shown below, rather than creating a separate new definition only for taximeter POS?

point-of-sale system. – An assembly of interactive elements connected either wired or wirelessly 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 shall be capable of performing the following functions:**

1. **determination of a weight or measure of a product or service offered;**
2. **calculation of a charge for a product or service that is based on an established price/rate structure;**
3. **determination of a total cost based on all associated fees involved with the transaction;**
4. **provision for a means to make and accept payment; and**
5. **provision for a sales receipt when required by either buyer or seller in a form that is acceptable to all parties involved in the transaction.**

While one response indicated that either resolution was acceptable, other responses rejected the proposal to create a new definition for “taximeter point-of-sale systems.” There were no responses however, in opposition to amending the existing definition of “Point-of-Sale System.”

Another comment received stated that it would be more appropriate to consider whether the components in a system impart any metrological effect on the transaction when the application of various requirements will be determined.

In addition, some suggestions for changes to the amendments as shown above were provided. One comment indicated that “connected either wired or wirelessly” was not needed and that the word “interactive” was the only term needed to indicate that the components were interfaced. Other comments stated that listing the functions of a POS as shown were not needed and stated further that the functions could be listed in a separate specifications requirement within the Taximeters Code.

The amendments proposed for the existing definition of “point-of-sale systems” will be carried over to the next meeting of the USNWG.

Question #2

*Is it acceptable to require a recording element which would provide a printed receipt (or an electronic form of receipt with customer approval) when a taximeter (or taximeter system) is capable of performing functions listed as numbers 1-4 in the previous question? **If so, this of course would not be required on existing taximeters – the requirement would be non-retroactive.***

One post-meeting comment recommended that any printed receipt should only be required if specified by local regulation. Responses from the majority of the work group however, indicated support for a proposal that would require a recording element.

The development of such a proposal will be discussed at the next meeting of the USNWG. It should be noted that any proposal to require a recording element would be drafted as a non-retroactive requirement.

Question #3

Should a requirement for a recording element include an exemption for taximeters/systems used only in a jurisdiction with basic and very simple rate structures? Such as jurisdictions which only permit extras charges for additional passengers and transportation/handling of luggage.

The responses to this question were a unanimous rejection of any exemption such as mentioned.

III. Definition of “Metrological effect”

Background:

The discussion during the September 2012 meeting indicated that the term “metrological effect” or “metrological integrity” is not clearly understood and should be clarified prior to further discussion. This item was included on the agenda not to amend or revise the definition for the term but simply to ensure that the USNWG has a complete understanding of “metrological effect/integrity”.

The following is an existing definition provided in NIST HB44, Appendix D:

metrological integrity (of a device). – The design, features, operation, installation, or use of a device that facilitates (1) the accuracy and validity of a measurement or transaction, (2) compliance of the device with weights and measures requirements, or (3) the suitability of the device for a given application.

Discussion:

The work group did not offer any additional comments that indicate there is a need to further amend the current definition for this term. Mr. Jesse Davis did propose however, that any responsibility for ensuring that the metrological integrity of a device/system remains intact, should be placed upon the taximeter which offers the interface protocol for the connection of accessory devices. The additional devices which can be attached as accessories in a system should not bear this responsibility.

Not all members indicated their satisfaction with the existing definition however; no comments were made that indicated the term is misunderstood. No further work by the USNWG is recommended at this time.

IV. Definition of “Primary Indications”

Background:

Part of the discussions during the September 2012 meeting resulted in questions about what constitutes a “primary” display. An existing definition for “primary indicating or recording elements” is as follows:

primary indicating or recording elements. – The term “primary” is applied to those principal indicating (visual) elements and recording elements that are designed to, or may, be used by the operator in the normal commercial use of a device. The term

“primary” is applied to any element or elements that may be the determining factor in arriving at the sale representation when the device is used commercially. (Examples of primary elements are the visual indicators for meters or scales not equipped with ticket printers or other recording elements and both the visual indicators and the ticket printers or other recording elements for meters or scales so equipped.) The term “primary” is not applied to such auxiliary elements as, for example, the totalizing register or predetermined-stop mechanism on a meter or the means for producing a running record of successive weighing operations, these elements being supplementary to those that are the determining factors in sales representations of individual deliveries or weights. (See “indicating element” and “recording element.”)

Discussion/Conclusion:

The listing of this item in the March 13, 2013 meeting’s agenda included a listing of situations and configurations with an explanation of how the primary indication would be determined in each case. The USNWG was requested in the agenda to review this listing and comment on it during the meeting. No comments were voiced during the meeting, no further action needed regarding this item. No additional comments were made, no further work by the USNWG is recommended at this time.

V. Definition of “Extras Charges”

Background:

During the September 2012 meeting the USNWG developed proposed amendments for the existing definition for “extras charges”. The existing definition for extras charges is as follows:

extras. – Charges to be paid by a passenger in addition to the fare, including any charge at a flat rate for the transportation of passengers in excess of a stated number and any charge for the transportation of baggage.[5.54]

The proposed amendments to this definition that were drafted at that meeting indicated that this term applies to charges that relate directly to the transportation service provided. Examples for these charges were included in an amended version developed by the WG as follows:

extras. - Any charge or charges to be paid by a passenger in addition to the fare, **that are directly related to the transportation service provided. Examples include but are not limited to charges for the transportation of baggage, fuel surcharges, bridge/tunnel/toll fees, telephone or dispatch surcharges/fees, and additional passenger fees.** ~~including any charge at a flat rate for the transportation of passengers in excess of a stated number and any charge for the transportation of baggage.~~[5.54]

The work group also elected to propose the addition of a new definition for the term “additional charges.” This addition would provide further clarification of some charges that may be applied but do not fall under the category of extras charges.

additional charges. - Any charge or charges to be paid by the passenger in addition to the fare and any extra(s) that are not directly related to the transportation services provided. Examples include but are not limited to purchase of items other than transportation services, tip, and taxes.

Discussion:

At the March 13, 2013 meeting, the USNWG was asked to review and comment on these proposals.

The NIST Technical Advisor recommended that the work group consider simply proposing an amendment of the term “extras charges” and that the proposal for a new definition of “additional charges” would not be necessary. Those charges and fees that are not covered under extras charges would by default be considered as additional charges. The USNWG was asked to consider additional changes to the work group’s draft definition of extras charges as follows:

extras. - Any charge or ~~C~~charges to be paid by a passenger in addition to the fare, including any charge at a flat rate for the transportation of passengers in excess of a stated number and any charge for the transportation of baggage that are directly related to the transportation service provided. Examples include but are not limited to charges for the transportation of baggage, fuel surcharges, bridge/tunnel/toll fees, telephone or dispatch surcharges/fees, and additional passenger fees. Charges that are not considered as “extras” include (but are not limited to) tips, taxes, and purchases not related to the transportation service provided.[5.54]

The work group discussed whether charges for “taxes” and “tips” are associated with the transportation service that is provided and should these fees be considered as extras. Mr. Jesse Davis commented that extras charges should be considered as optional, but non-discretionary fees added to the fare. He added that any charge categorized as an extra should be a pre-set value and established prior to any transaction. Based on this premise, a tip should not be considered as an extras charge. There was general agreement from the group on this point.

Several members offered examples of different locales having variations in the way taxes are applied to goods and services. USNWG member, Mr. Robert McGrath stated that taxes applied to the cost of transportation services should not be listed as either extras or additional charges and suggested that the work group avoid categorizing all possible types of charges as this could better be handled within the development of language for specific requirements in HB44 that address the itemization of charges as well as through local regulation.

Following the March 13, 2013 meeting, the NIST Technical Advisor drafted amendments for the existing definition of “extras charges” based on discussion from the work group during that meeting and offered the amended draft to the USNWG in the draft summary of the meeting which was circulated to the work group on April 4, 2013.

extras. – Any pre-existing ~~C~~charges established prior to a transaction to be paid by a passenger in addition to the fare. Extras charges are those fees directly related to the transportation service provided including any charge at a flat rate for the transportation of passengers in excess of a stated number and any charge for the transportation of baggage.[5.54]

The work group was asked to forward their comments on this latest draft proposal to the NIST Technical Advisor via email (john.barton@nist.gov).

Conclusion:

There was general agreement among the USNWG that the definition for “extras” should be amended to indicate that these are charges directly associated with the transportation service provided, and that these charges are pre-set fees, established prior to the start of any transaction in which they will be included as part of the fare. While there were general comments from the group made regarding specific charges being considered as “additional charges”, there were no specific comments offered during this meeting that supported the proposal to add a new definition for the term “additional charges.”

Some of the comments contained in responses to the request for additional post-meeting input rejected the notion to further define extras charges in greater detail than in the existing HB44 definition. Most however, were in favor of maintaining the amended language added which indicates that extras are those charges specifically related to the transportation service provided.

The majority of post-meeting USNWG comments received also rejected the specific change that designates extras charges as those which would be established prior to a transaction. While “pre-existing” charges may be added to the total charge by activating control keys or buttons during any portion of the trip, USNWG members pointed out that the phrase “established prior to a transaction” may eliminate additional charges that may be legitimately added during a trip. For example: tolls incurred if the passenger elects to change routes during the trip and takes a route where an additional tolls are assessed.

This item will carry-over to the next meeting of the USNWG where additional consideration will be given to the definition of “extras charges.”

VI. Proposed addition of new requirement to HB44 Taximeters Code, paragraph A.2.

A.2 Associated Equipment. – This code also applies to associated equipment that can be interfaced with taximeters and which has any metrological effect on a taximeter such as: POS systems; driver/passenger input devices and displays; and computing types of devices (i.e., Mobile Data Terminals).
(Added 201X)

Background:

This proposed new requirement shown above was drafted to provide an understanding that equipment interfaced with taximeters as part of a system and, which has any metrological effect on the transaction involving that system will be regulated using the requirements found in the HB44 Taximeters Code. This proposal was considered during the September 2012 meeting however, the USNWG did not reach any agreement on this item and elected to table further discussion until definitions for certain terms such as:

metrological effect/integrity; primary indication; point-of-sale; and other terms that are included in the agenda for the March 13, 2013 meeting, could be clearly defined and understood by the USNWG.

In some instances, the operation of associated devices within a taximeter system will impart metrological effects on transactions conducted using that system. The associated equipment in some systems may: alter total charges; affect the means by which required information is displayed or represented to an operator and/or passenger; and introduce the potential for fraudulent use of the taximeter system. In some cases this associated equipment would serve as a proxy for the taximeter and under those circumstances it would seem appropriate that requirements contained in HB44 applicable to a taximeter would be applicable to this equipment as well.

The work group acknowledged that certain associated equipment should be regulated under the HB44 Taximeters Code but did not come to any agreement on what, if any requirements could apply and what criteria to use to determine what components within a system should fall under regulation.

One notion that the USNWG did agree upon was the idea that the means of providing an interface between components (i.e., wired or wireless) would not factor into a determination whether those components were regulated or not.

Discussion:

During the March 13, 2013 USNWG meeting, the participants were asked revisit this item and to provide input on whether the proposed new requirement, paragraph A.2. is necessary. The USNWG was also asked to consider an existing requirement found in HB44 General Code under paragraph *G-A.1. Commercial and Law-Enforcement Equipment*. This requirement, being located in the General Code is applicable to all commercial and weighing devices and addresses the type of equipment that the requirements within HB44 would apply to. The subparagraph G-A.1.(b) reads as follows:

G-A.1. Commercial and Law-Enforcement Equipment. – These specifications, tolerances, and other technical requirements apply as follows:

- (a) To commercial weighing...
- (b) To any accessory attached to or used in connection with a commercial weighing or measuring device when such accessory is so designed that its operation affects the accuracy of the device.
- (c) To weighing and...

It was pointed out the there are no current HB44 specific codes that include requirements similar to the proposed new requirement, A.2. *Associated Equipment*, and to include it in the Taximeters Code would not be consistent with the other HB44 codes.

It should also be recognized that other requirements within the General Code will have direct effects on specific devices covered under separate HB44 codes. General Code requirement G-S.2. *Facilitation of Fraud* shown below refers to the design, construction, and installation of commercial devices.

G-S.2. Facilitation of Fraud. – All equipment and all mechanisms, software, and devices attached to or used in conjunction therewith shall be so designed, constructed, assembled, and installed for use such that they do not facilitate the perpetration of fraud.
(Amended 2007)

Most of the work group member's comments indicated that this newly proposed requirement is unnecessary and is redundant to the General Code requirement G-A.1. It was also stated that the intent behind the requirement is the motivation for the work group developing a new definition for "taximeter point-of-sale." If all associated equipment in a system is subject to regulation, then a taximeter point-of-sale system must be defined so that it is clear what equipment is considered as part of the system and therefore subject to the various requirements.

Mr. Jesse Davis stated his belief that the responsibility of compliance with relevant HB44 requirements should be placed upon the taximeter which supplies an interface and protocol and provides the capability for additional pieces of equipment to perform those various functions which may have a metrological effect on the transaction.

Conclusion:

Those comments offered during the March 13, 2013 meeting supported the notion that the newly proposed requirement is not necessary. There were no comments offered during the meeting in support of the proposal to add the new requirement to the Taximeters Code.

USNWG member, Ms. Joanne Rausen suggested that the work group should be further advised on the application of the General Code requirements prior to establishing any conclusions on this issue.

With the understanding that the General Code requirements apply to all specific commercial devices, it is recommended that the proposal to add a new (A.2. Associated Equipment) requirement to the Taximeters Code be withdrawn until it is demonstrated that by reason of design, function, or installation, certain equipment attached to a taximeter would not be subject to requirements under the General Code.

VII. Final Notes

The meeting was concluded at the scheduled time of 4:00 pm eastern time. The results of the two polls included in the web-conference showed that approximately one-third of the participants are unable to travel under any circumstances and that only a few participants (11%) had the ability to travel as necessary. The remaining participants were subject to restrictions which limit their ability to travel. The poll which asked members to make a selection of their preference for the date of the next USNWG meeting indicated that the largest percentage (67%) of participants would prefer the meeting to be held on May 22, 2013. Based on this information, the next meeting will be scheduled on that date and will also be a web-conference style meeting.

VIII. Attendance

Name	Affiliation	Email
John Barton	NIST Office of Weights and Measures	john.barton@nist.gov
Tina Butcher	NIST Office of Weights and Measures	tina.butcher@nist.gov
James Cassidy	City of Cambridge Weights and Measures	jcassidy@cambridgema.gov
Byron Corcoran	Centrodyne, Inc.	byron@centrodyne.com
Jesse H. Davis	President Creative Mobile Technologies LLC	jdavis@cmtnyc.com
Bill Fishman		bfishman@nycap.rr.com
Aileen Fox	NYC Taxi and Limousine Commission	foxa@tlc.nyc.gov
Angela Godwin	Sealer of Weights & Measures Ventura County	angela.godwin@ventura.org
Viktor Gruber	Inspector Weights and Measures City and County of San Francisco	viktor.gruber@sfdph.org
Maria del Carmen Kern	Deputy Sealer of Weights and Measures City and County of San Francisco	Carmen.Kern@sfdph.org
Anthony Bong Lee (Gary Smith, Juan Lopez)	Weights and Measures Inspector Agricultural Commissioner's Office/ Sealer of Weights and Measures County of Orange	Bong.Lee@ocpw.ocgov.com
Craig Leisy	City of Seattle Consumer Affairs Unit	craig.leisy@seattle.gov
Jasmine LeVeaux	Windels Marx Lane & Mittendorf, LLP	mailto:jleveaux@windelsmarx.com
Bob McGrath	City of Boston Weights and Measures	Robert.McGrath@CityofBoston.Gov
Kevin McDonald	City of Chicago	Kevin.McDonald@cityofchicago.org
Javier Ortiz	City of Chicago	
David Paul	Director, Business Operations Taxi Magic	dmp@taximagic.com
Joanne Rausen	NYC Taxi and Limousine Commission Legal Department	Rausenj@tlc.nyc.gov
John Roach	Division of Measurement Standards, California Department of Food and Agriculture	jroach@cdfa.ca.gov
Philip Steiner	President Centrodyne, Inc.	psteiner@centrodyne.com
Keith Walsh	NYC Taxi and Limousine Commission	walshke@tlc.nyc.gov

Juana Williams	NIST Office of Weights and Measures	juana.williams@nist.gov
James Wisniewski	Frias Transportation Infrastructure	james.wisniewski@transportationinfrastructure.com