SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

ON

RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL PROGRAMS

FOR

ACCREDITATION OF TESTING LABORATORIES

ILAC/78

WASHINGTON, D.C.

OCTOBER 23-27, 1978

Prepared by:

Office of Product Standards

United States Department of Commerce

PREFACE

This International Conference on Recognition of National Programs for Accrediting Test Laboratories (ILAC) is an informal assemblage of nations and international organizations interested in promoting international recognition of national laboratory accreditation programs. The objective of ILAC is to facilitate international trade in products or services for which reliable reports of test data are needed prior to their importation and/or exportation.

The first meeting of ILAC was held in Copenhagen, October 24-28, 1977. Representatives of seventeen nations and three international organizations attended the Copenhagen meeting.

Presentations describing existing or planned national programs of laboratory accreditation were made at the Copenhagen meeting. Following these presentations, discussions concerning the feasibility of establishing an international mechanism for the reciprocal recognition of nationally accredited laboratories were held. Out of these Copenhagen discussions came the formation of three Task Forces having the following assignments:

Task Force 1 — Dr. R. W. Middleton (ISO), Chairman

To meet with the appropriate comittee of ISO/CERTICO to study fully the impact of international laboratory accreditation on ISO guided certification programs and to develop areas of future cooperation towards common goals.

Task Force 2 — Mr. Allen J. Farrar (USA), Chairman

To identify, study and report to the Conference (ILAC) at its next meeting the various legal problems which may affect participation by nations in any international arrangement for reciprocal recognition of national accreditation programs or schemes.

Task Force 3 — Mr. J. Stanley Linton (UK), Chairman

To consider in collaboration with ISO the preparation of an international register of accrediting organizations, and in this connection to identify those items in laboratory accreditation documents presented at this Conference which are predominant in all countries (list the countries) which have operating systems having actually accredited laboratories.

This second meeting of ILAC, held in Washington, October 23-27, 1978, was attended by representatives of 24 nations and 9 international organizations (listed in Appendix 1). Reports prepared by the three Task Forces served as the basis for discussions in pursuit of the objectives of ILAC. The reports formed the basis for the establishment of three new Task Forces, A, B, and C, basically to carry on and extend the work of the three original Task Forces and to prepare reports which will be presented at the third conference to be held in Sydney, Australia, October 22-26, 1979.

Howard I. Forman
Chairman, ILAC/78

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTIONS

Dr. Jordan J. Baruch, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology welcomed the delegates to the United States. He suggested that the task of ILAC is to lay the groundwork for a new international treaty which will define the characteristics of test laboratories whose results will be accepted worldwide, and which will facilitate the entry of products from every country into the world of international trade.

Dr. Howard I. Forman, Chairman of ILAC/78, reviewed the events at the Copenhagen meeting of ILAC/77, and the essence of subsequent discussions during the past year. He pointed out that the original goals of ILAC were to exchange experiences gained by countries which have or are planning accreditation schemes and to discuss possibilities of reciprocal recognition. A third goal of ILAC, perhaps unstated but none-the-less obviously present in the minds of the conferees, was to upgrade the quality of the world's testing laboratories.

Dr. Forman pointed out the difference between laboratory accreditation schemes and product certification systems, noting that laboratory accreditation may serve as an optional element of a certification system for a particular product but that accreditation cannot serve as a substitute for certification. He also pointed out that the words "registration" and "authorization" are used in identifying programs for establishing the competence of test laboratories in some countries, and in other countries the term used is "accreditation."

In looking at the long range objectives of ILAC, Dr. Forman suggested that full reciprocal recognition of laboratory accreditation systems may one day be achieved, but that the focus of ILAC/78 must, of necessity, be on addressing the legal obstacles and difficult technical problems involved short of formal reciprocal recognition. Unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral recognition of each others systems could possibly evolve between some of the government agencies and private sector organizations represented at ILAC/78 in the near future, whereas such recognition made through international treaty inevitably will require extensive deliberations that may take years to consummate.

Several examples of international interest in ILAC/78 proceedings or similar programs were noted. The OECD has a project under consideration to develop harmonized testing methods and a code of good laboratory practices for laboratories testing toxic and other biological and chemical substances. The UN/ECE Committee on Housing, Building and Planning has determined that there is a need to establish an international system of test-house accreditation. The International Union of Testing and Research Laboratories of Materials and Structures (RILEM) has been contemplating the need for a system of accreditation of testing laboratories

on an international basis. There is also a likelihood that accomplishment of the major goals for ILAC will also benefit all who will be affected by the GATT Code of Standards. All of these organizations were represented at ILAC/78.

Mr. Per Lund Thoft, Honorary Chairman of ILAC/78 and Chairman of ILAC/77, suggested that, although the reports of Task Forces 2 and 3 make clear that formal international arrangements for reciprocal recognition of national accreditation programs are a long way off, such arrangements would be most valuable in order to facilitate international trade and to utilize our respective accreditation schemes in the best way. He urged all at ILAC/78 to "work persistently and seriously to achieve this goal of reciprocal recognition." Mr. Thoft suggested that the establishment of general guidelines on which the accreditation systems in various countries should be based would, with appropriate broadly defined fields of testing, be an effective way of beginning the development of an international accreditation system.

Dr. John C. Williams, a technical advisor to the United States delegation, presented a paper examining the relationship between the proposed GATT Standards Code and possible international testing laboratory accreditation schemes. He concluded that the objectives of the draft Code and those of ILAC not only are compatible but also are mutually reenforcing. ILAC could serve to help implement important provisions of the Code. Participants at ILAC/78 were urged to consider the possible interrelationships between ILAC and the Code, to the mutual benefit of both.

2. NATIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL ACCREDITATION PROGRAM SUMMARIES

The exchange of experiences gained by countries which have or are planning accreditation schemes is a goal of ILAC. All countries and international organizations were encouraged to describe their programs. At ILAC/77, presentations were made by the United States (NVLAP), Denmark, Australia, New Zealand, Sweden, United Kingdom, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, South Africa, Netherlands, Canada, Japan, France, Norway, RILEM and ISO. Additional presentations were made at ILAC/78 by Canada, Chile, Finland, Norway, United States (AALA), CEE, CENELEC, and NORDTEST. Summaries of these presentations and copies of reports presented at ILAC/78 are listed in Appendix 2 and are available from the heads of the official delegations from each of those countries or organizations, whose names and addresses are also found in Appendix 2.

3. TASK FORCE 1 REPORT -- RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTERNATIONAL LABORATORY ACCREDITATION AND ISO GUIDED CERTIFICATION PROGRAMS

Dr. Robert W. Middleton, ISO delegate to ILAC who served as the Chairman of Task Force 1, presented the findings of that group. For purposes of clarity, the term accreditation was defined. Accreditation is more than mere registration and should be understood as implying some form of evaluation of laboratories based on a system or systems of rules (criteria), including the provision that the accreditation should specify the test(s) for which accreditation is granted. A number of areas of interface between ILAC and ISO were described:

1. The Task Force noted that there were some dangers of confusion between the objectives of laboratory accreditation and those of conformity certification. Any action to set up national systems should not create the impression that the one was a substitute for the other. While certification systems made use of laboratory accreditation, such systems also included many other components required for making authoritative statements concerning conformity of products with standards; laboratory accreditation was normally limited to information relating to testing of samples only. Laboratory accreditation was applicable to a very wide range of subjects, whereas conformity certification of products related to a much smaller area.

2. On the other hand, criteria for judging the technical competence of laboratories could be a common element to both systems; it was desirable that any cross-frontier recognition of laboratories should be based on a common document.

3. Pending further discussions of aims and objectives of international accreditation, the Task Force considered that a valuable first step could be the preparation of a document on criteria for judging the technical competence of testing laboratories. Such a document should cover the needs of both accreditation systems and certification systems.

4. The Task Force prepared a first draft of such a document which was circulated to ISO member bodies for broad consultation with interested parties at national levels. This consultation was concluded before ILAC/78 and is published as "ISO Guide 25, Guidelines for Assessing the Technical Competence of Testing Laboratories," ISO Guide 25-1978(E).

5. If further discussions on international laboratory accreditation were to lead to proposals for cross-frontier recognition of systems, such proposals might also require the establishment of basic principles for laboratory accreditation to ensure compatibility and facilitate recognition, covering inter alia the evaluation process and assessment of the personal qualifications of assessors. In this case, there would be a close relationship between this and the work going on in ISO for the development of basic rules for an ISO certification system; future work should therefore be undertaken together with ISO.

The Task Force recommended:

1. In view of their relevance for the development of international laboratory accreditation, ISO/CERTICO should be encouraged to continue its work on rules, guides, and other documents relating to the establishment of international certification systems and arrangements.

2. With a view to avoiding confusion between laboratory accreditation and conformity certification, ISO should be invited to set up a working group to prepare a statement on the ISO aims and objectives of laboratory accreditation as used in certification.

During the ensuing discussion at ILAC/78 there appeared to be general agreement that:

1. Laboratory accreditation and certification were two different subjects and while laboratory accreditation was not intended as a substitution for certification it was or could be apart from the latter.

2. ISO/CERTICO should be encouraged to expand its scope and work program relative to laboratories engaged in certification activities.

3. ILAC should continue as an informal organization until an appropriate existing organization appears willing and able to undertake the ILAC objectives.

4. TASK FORCE 2 REPORT -- LEGAL PROBLEMS WHICH MAY AFFECT PARTICIPATION IN ANY INTERNATIONAL LABORATORY ACCREDITATION ARRANGEMENT

Mr. Allen J. Farrar, a member of the U.S. delegation to ILAC who served as Chairman of Task Force 2, presented the findings of that group. In view of the wide range of legal implications covered by the charge to the Task Force, it was decided that resources and time would not be available to study all the legal problems that might affect international arrangements. Priority was given to a method for the compilation of relevant legal information concerning accreditation programs. A questionnaire was developed covering the following subjects:

1. What are the legal aspects pertaining to laboratory testing in relation to product conformance? Specifically, this would require representatives from each country to identify any laws or administrative regulations which require that products must conform to certain standards or technical regulations before they can be marketed, installed or used and which stipulate that tests must be carried out in accredited or specified testing laboratories.

2. What are the legal aspects pertaining to laboratory accreditation programs? This question calls for the identification of all programs in each country which evaluate or qualify testing laboratories. Among the detailed data to be provided for each program would be any legal constraints, restrictions or prohibitions governing the operation of the accreditation program and whether the program would permit accreditation of a foreign testing laboratory.

3. What are the legal aspects pertaining to testing laboratories? This question deals with any laws or administrative regulations which impose specific requirements or obligations on foreign testing laboratories that do business in each country, whether or not located within national borders. Also to be included are laws and administrative regulations which control the use of laboratory test reports, such as in advertising.

4. What are the legal aspects pertaining to liability of accrediting bodies and of testing laboratories? This question includes any laws which might immunize an accrediting body from liability of acts of negligence as well as laws which specifically subject testing laboratories to liability for acts of negligence.

5. What are the laws and procedures pertaining to recognition of foreign laboratory accreditation programs? This inquiry deals with programs operating in both the mandatory and voluntary sectors.

Included would be specific laws which either preclude or permit recognition of accreditation programs which function outside the country, and any treaties or agreements which recognize or accept foreign accreditation programs. A statement as to what requirements each country might want to have included in a foreign country's accreditation program is also requested.

The Task Force made the following recommendations:

1. To facilitate an examination of the legal problems and issues discussed earlier, all delegations should agree to complete the questionnaire.

2. Further consideration should be given by Task Force 2 to legal problems and issues affecting international recognition of laboratory accreditation programs on the basis of the answers received to the proposed questionnaire and with regard to any other specific action assigned to Task Force 2 by this Conference.

During the discussion of these recommendations and proposed questionnaire there seemed to be general agreement on the following points:

1. Recognizing that it was important to collect the information, it was felt that the questionnaire would be extremely difficult to fill out.

2. It was felt that a small working group composed of national officials familiar with ongoing national laboratory accreditation programs should be able to answer the questions in a general way. These general responses should provide at least the outline of the legal problems that would have to be addressed in developing a reciprocal recognition of nationally accredited laboratories.

5. TASK FORCE 3 REPORT -- INTERNATIONAL REGISTER OF ACCREDITING ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. J. Stanley Linton, head of the Great Britain delegation and Chairman of Task Force 3, presented the findings of that group. The Task Force identified three options for creating a register of accrediting organizations:

1. Option 1 would be to set up, maintain, and distribute a directory of accrediting organizations that claim to meet specified minimal conditions, listing their fields of operation, and identifying their relationships with other listed organizations. The directory of accrediting organizations would provide a referral system that would enable a potential user of a foreign testing laboratory to contact the accrediting organization in the country concerned. The directory would not provide detailed information on accredited laboratories but would comprise a summary of the overall scope and field of testing of listed accrediting organizations and their relationship with other listed organizations. Organizations which wish to be listed in the directory would need to supply evidence that they conform to minimum criteria covering the operation of their programs. This option could be implemented quickly and would help users identify at minimal cost accrediting laboratories in foreign countries. A disadvantage of this option is that it would not include a mechanism for verifying the accuracy of information supplied by the accrediting organization.

2. Option 2 would be to create an international group of accrediting organizations that meet specified minimal conditions, which in addition to supervising a directory similar to that described in (1) above would exchange information on the practical operation of LAP's and would develop harmonization and liaison between accrediting organizations. In this option, the group would verify claims made by accrediting organizations wishing to be listed in the directory. The group would be expected to encourage harmonization of LAP's, would arrange for information exchange on the practical operation of LAP's by means of seminars and conferences, and would encourage liaison between accrediting organizations. The main advantage of this option is that it would provide a simple institutional framework through which international laboratory accreditation could be developed. It would provide a means by which the proposed laboratory directory could be supervised and it would provide a mechanism by which an international laboratory accreditation criteria could be developed. Disadvantages of this option are that there would be a greater financial commitment involved and there may be legal problems to resolve.

3. Option 3 would be to establish an international body and system that would define conditions for recognition of the competence of laboratories accredited by participating organizations. Such an arrangement would include rules for participation of accrediting organizations, common criteria and procedures for the assessment of laboratories, arrangement for surveillance and monitoring of the accredited laboratories and agreement as to mutual recognition of the competence of such laboratories. This option has the advantage that it would provide a fully harmonized international laboratory accreditation system. Provided this system included a substantial number of accrediting organizations, it would provide a very effective way of promoting mutual recognition of the competence of testing laboratories. The agreement to set up such a system would, however, take an extended period to negotiate. Furthermore, this option would be significantly more costly to implement and would create more legal problems than either of the two options above.

The Task Force recommended that:

1. An international directory of accrediting organizations should be established.

2. Option 2 outlined above should be adopted on the grounds that it would provide an international directory of greater validity and utility than would Option 1, while at the same time providing a means of building on the momentum established at the Copenhagen Conference.

3. Task Force 3 should prepare a proposal for establishing an international group as outlined in Option 2, including its terms of reference, membership requirements, financial provisions and secretariat support, taking into consideration comments received including those made at the Washington Conference.

This report proved to be a popular subject and stimulated extensive discussion. Many delegates felt that a simple listing of accrediting organizations, without any regard for an evaluation of their accrediting criteria, would not produce a useful document. Most delegates felt that a careful screening of the criteria used and an investigation as to how well the criteria were aplied, suggested a role beyond that envisaged for ILAC. Fears were also expressed that nations which did not accredit laboratories, preferring to operate a national laboratory for testing and certification, might not be included in the register since ILAC was concerned primarily with accreditation programs.

The Australian delegate offered to prepare a draft directory of organizations or bodies which operate accreditation schemes, based on inputs received from each country wishing to submit such information.

6. ACTIONS OF THE ILAC/78 CONFERENCE

- Considering that the 2nd ILAC Conference has confirmed the need to organize and develop international cooperation and circulation of information on systems of accreditation of test laboratories with a view of promoting the recognition of tests performed under such systems, thereby facilitating international trade.

- Taking into account the great diversity of national situations.

- Considering that a more thorough examination of different aspects of laboratory accreditation is necessary before final decisions are made as to the form adopted to conduct international activity in that field but that at this point it is not yet recognized that it is desirable to envisage the creation of a new supranational organization for that particular purpose but rather to seek among existing bodies those which could take this activity in charge.

The Conference adopted the following resolutions:

Resolution 1

Acknowledging the work of the three Task Forces set up at the Copenhagen meeting and in order to continue and extend their work, the Conference decides to create three new Task Forces as follows:

1. Task Force A:

   The mandate of Task Force A would be to make an analysis of the legal problems raised by the recognition of national laboratory accreditation systems considering, inter alia, the answers given by the participants to the questionnaire drafted by Task Force 2 bearing in mind that the answers will be provided to the best of the ability of the participants.

2. Task Force B:

   To accept the offer of the Australian delegate to prepare a draft directory of organizations or bodies which operate accreditation systems or other schemes for the assessment of testing laboratories. The draft of the directory shall be based on information provided by such organizations or bodies. In providing such information, the organizations or bodies shall identify the criteria against which they claim to operate and in particular the extent to which they comply with the criteria listed in Annex 1 of the report of Task Force 3 and in the criteria listed in ISO Guide 25. The Task Force is to

advise the Australian delegate on the information to be sought. This draft directory will only be circulated to those involved in the ILAC Conferences. The Task Force should report to the next ILAC Conference on the problems encountered in collecting and presenting the information including costs and size and make proposals for its further maintenance and dissemination.

3. Task Force C:

To prepare, in cooperation with ISO and other concerned international organizations, a paper on the needs, objectives, and the effects and consequences of laboratory accreditation and prepare a list of basic terms and their definitions relevant to laboratory accreditation or assessment. ISO should be invited to provide the secretary of this Task Force.

Resolution 2

That as a first step towards international harmonization, ISO Guide 25 be widely circulated among other international organizations to serve as a basic element of any test laboratory accreditation program.

Resolution 3

That Task Forces A, B, and C present progress reports at an interim meeting of the conference to be held in Sydney, Australia between October 22-26, 1979. A plenary meeting of ILAC should be held in mid-1980 to which the Task Forces will present their final reports. At the plenary meeting, delegates should, where possible, come prepared to make decisions on behalf of their governments or organizations as to the continuation of activity in the field of international acceptance and recognition of national accreditation systems.

Resolution 4

To endorse and support the ISO/CERTICO work in developing rules, guides, and other documents relating to the establishment of international conformity certification systems.

Resolution 5

To welcome the work of the GATT Code for Preventing Technical Barriers to Trade, and in order to ensure the mutual compatibility of the Code and the work emanating from ILAC, the Gatt Secretariat should be invited to keep ILAC informed of any development relating to the GATT Code which could have an impact on the work of ILAC.

Resolution 6

That the Conference commend the regulatory harmonization program of the UN/ECE Working Party on the Building Industry. The Conference recognizes that the Working Party has accorded the highest priority to the harmonization of approval and control rules for buildings and building products (UN/ECE project 08.5.6). The Conference supports the aims of this project which are:

1. The adoption of internationally agreed standard methods of test (even in the absence of internationally agreed building product standards).

2. The establishment of an international system of test-house accreditation.

3. The international mutual recognition of national certificates of acceptance for building products and components.

In recognizing the usefulness of ILAC activities to the realization of the aims of the UN/ECE Working Party, the Conference recommends the establishment of close cooperation between these two developing activities.

That the ILAC/78 Conference strongly recommends that its Chairman name a person to represent him at the January 22-26, 1979, meeting of the ad hoc group of experts on quality approval and control upon receiving such invitation of the UN/ECE Working Party on the Building Industry.

In response to these resolutions, Dr. Forman, Chairman of ILAC/78, in consultation with Mr. Thoft of Denmark, Mr. Monaghan of Australia, and Mr. Bryden of France, appointed the following as Chairmen of the Task Forces:

Task Force A: Mr. Allen J. Farrar (U.S.A.)
Task Force B: Mr. J. Stanley Linton (U.K.)
Task Force C: Dr. Robert Middleton (ISO)

The Chairman also named the following to the Planning and Agenda Committee for the next meeting scheduled for October 22-26, 1979, in Sydney, Australia:

Mr. Frank Monaghan (Australia), Chairman
Mr. Per Lund Thoft (Denmark)
Mr. Alan Bryden (France)
Dr. Howard I. Forman (U.S.A.)

Mr. Bryden volunteered to host an ILAC meeting in Paris, France during the summer or fall of 1980.

APPENDIX 1

NATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED AT ILAC/78

Australia
Brazil
Canada
Chile
Denmark
Finland
France
Germany, Federal Republic of
Great Britain
Hong Kong
Ireland
Israel
Italy
Jamaica
Japan
Mexico
Netherlands
New Zealand
Norway
Republic of China
South Africa
Sweden
Trinidad
United States

International Organization for Standardization (ISO)
Economic Commission for Europe (UN/ECE)
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)
International Commission on Rules for Approval of Electrical Equipment (CEE)
European Committee for Electrotechnical Standardization (CENELEC)
General Agreement on Tariff and Trade (GATT)
European Economic Communities (EEC)
Joint Nordic Body for Promoting Developments in Technical Testing (NORDTEST)
International Union of Testing and Research Laboratories for Materials and Standards (RILEM)

APPENDIX 2

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS DISTRIBUTED
AT THE ILAC/78 CONFERENCE

The following list of publications is classified according to the submitting country and identifies a national contact person in each country. It is suggested that anyone desiring copies of these publications, request them from the national contact person.

	National Contact Person
CANADA	
Criteria and Procedures for Accreditation of Testing Organizations CAN-P-4 June 1978	Mr. J. E. Roue Standards Council of Canada 350 Sparks Street Canada K1R7S8 (613) 238-3222
CHILE	
Present Position of the Chilean Programme on Accreditation of Certification Agencies Quality Requirements Regulations for the Exportation of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables	Mr. Pedro Vilaseca Instituto Nacional de Normalizacion Matias Cousino 64 piso 6 Santiago, Chile 68144-86318
DENMARK	
Remarks by Mr. Per Lund Thoft, Honorary Chairman of ILAC/78 Minutes of the ILAC/77 Conference, Copenhagen, Denmark, Oct. 24-27, 1978	Mr. Per Lund Thoft Council of Technology Danish National Testing Board Bredgade 31 DK 1260 Copenhagen K Denmark (01)146655

FINLAND

Laboratory Accreditation in Finland Decree on Measurement Service Nr. 489/78 Technical Inspectorate 1978 Finland	Dr. Pekka Kivalo Technical Inspectorate (State) Nervanderinkatu 5D SF-00100 Helsinki 10 Finland 90-409 266

GERMANY

The Accreditation of Laboratories Within the CECC Harmonized System of Quality Assessment for Electronic Components The Accreditation of Laboratories Within the Conformity Certification System of the CEE el (CB System)	Dr. A. Strecker Bundesministerium fur Wirtschaft Villemombler Str. 76 Bonn Germany (02 22 21) 76-2343

NETHERLANDS

Short Description of the Situation in the Netherlands Concerning the Development of Recognition of Certification Systems by a Central Organization	Mr. Hendrik G. van Nielen Ministry of Economic Affairs Bezuidenhoutseweg 111 The Hague The Netherlands

NORWAY

Norway - Accreditation of Testing Laboratories	Mr. Knut Birkeland Norwegian Service of Legal Metrology Post Box 6832 St. Olavs pl. Oslo 1, Norway

TRINIDAD

Government Notice No. 35 The Standards Act, 1972 Extracts of the Regulations	Dr. Michael G. Lines Trinidad and Tobago Bureau of Standards Room 318, 3rd Floor Salvatori Building Frederick St. PORT OF SPAIN, Trinidad 38836

UNITED STATES

Commerce Announces International Conference on Laboratory Accreditation

Opening of ILAC/78 by Dr. Howard I. Forman

Address by Dr. Jordan J. Baruch, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology

Review of Events of Copenhagen Conference (ILAC/77) and Introduction to Washington Conference (ILAC/78) by Dr. Howard I. Forman

National Voluntary Laboratory Accreditation Program and its Possible Implications in Product Liability Matters by Dr. Howard I. Forman

Laboratory Accreditation and its Relation to Product Liability by Dr. Howard I. Forman

ILAC and the Proposed International (GATT) Standards Code: Friend or Foe? by Dr. John C. Williams

American Association for Laboratory Accreditation (AALA) by Roger J. Amorosi

Dr. Howard I. Forman
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Product Standards
U.S. Department of Commerce
Washington, DC 20230
(202) 377-3221

In addition to the above publications, copies of the reports of the Copenhagen (ILAC/77) Task Forces can be obtained as follows:

Report of Copenhagen Task Force 1
ISO/CERTICO

Dr. R. W. Middleton
Assistant Secretary-General
International Organization for Standardization
1 rue de Varembe
1211 Geneve 20 Switzerland

Report of Copenhagen Task Force 2 Legal Problems Affecting International Acceptance of Laboratory Accreditation Programs Report and Questionnaire of Task Force 2 - ILAC by Allen J. Farrar	Mr. Allen J. Farrar Legal Adviser National Bureau of Standards Washington, DC 20234 (301) 921-2425
Report of Copenhagen Task Force 3 Directory of Laboratory Accrediting Organizations	Mr. J. Stanley Linton Department of Prices and Consumer Protection Millbank Tower, 28th Floor Millbank, London SW1P 4QU Great Britain 01-211-3460

The following international organizations also submitted publications. Copies may be obtained by writing to the contact person identified below:

NORDTEST

The Presentation of Nordtest at ILAC 1978 Nordtest Annual Report 1977 Annual Report 1977 Project List Nordtest Scheme for Certification of Non-destructive Testing Personnel Nordtest Method, Testing Machines: Calibration	Mr. Bertil Lindkvist Swedish National Authority for Testing, Inspection and Metrology Box 857 S-501 15 Boras Sweden 46-33-102000

UN/ECE

Report of Tenth Session UN/ECE Working Party on The Building Industry HBP/WP.2/12 July 1978	Mr. Erik Stackelberg United Nations, ECE Palais des Nations CH-1211 Geneve 10 Switzerland