

**Notes from the Software Meeting,
Held at Federation House, 17th June 2013**

The first software meeting was held at the UKWF offices and was attended by a range of representatives from a number of companies and Paul Dixon, the head of the certification services from the NMO.

A brief explanation of the legal framework for software was given. This involved looking at the requirements of both the Non-Automatic Weighing Instruments (NAWI) Directive and the Measuring Instrument Directive (MID). The points of note were:

- The requirements of the NAWI Directive are less specific than the MID, but the principles are very similar. We should look at the requirements of the MID as a good indication of the principles we should apply with all weighing equipment.
- The important distinction between the two directives is the "Preliminary Observation" at the beginning of Annex 1 of the NAWI Directive. This means that any devices that repeat the result of the weighing operation do not need to meet the essential requirements of annex 1, if a record of the weighing result is maintained. This was felt to be a vitally important element in the design of non-automatic weighing instruments and of great use in the short to medium term.

There was some concern shown for the longer term, when more and more elements of the weighing functions would reside outside of the weighing instrument.

- The importance of the software requirements in the new version of EN45501 was emphasised. These requirements shared many of the principles of the MID and the WELMEC Guide 7.2 and are the requirements we must meet in the future. It was noted that the new standard was likely to be published in the next few months.
- There was a discussion on the WELMEC Guides 2.3 and 7.2. It was noted that the guide 2.3 was an old document but explained many of the principles of software for weighing and measuring instruments. This was to be amalgamated with the Guide 7.2 and this is the guide that we should use. There was then a brief explanation of how the Guide 7.2 operated and some of the parallels it would have with EN45501.
- There was a discussion as to some of the problems that may be faced in the future:
 - There was concern as to the requirements that may be placed on instruments that had network connectivity or made use of long term storage of measurement data. It was felt that a high percentage of instruments would have these options in the future and we must ensure that the security requirements for these situations mirrored a real and demonstrable risk rather than a theoretical risk. There was concern that relatively low priced instruments used to weigh relatively low value goods may need over-stringent requirements, if there was the opportunity that they could be connected to networks or made use of long term storage. This problem would be increased as the connectivity could easily be added after the instrument had been supplied without either being aware of, or complying with, any of the requirements of legal metrology legislation. This would put the companies supplying the instruments at an obvious economic disadvantage.
 - There is a suggestion that "end devices" may need to meet the requirements of risk class D (i.e. equivalent to banking security). It was felt that this was not appropriate and the risk class of the end device should be concomitant to the base device. This was again basing requirements on theoretical rather than practical and demonstrable risk.

It was felt that the meeting was of benefit and it was agreed to meet again in approximately six months. It was hoped that a small group of people would be prepared to help in the consultations of these various documents.

Ian Turner
Technical Officer, UK Weighing Federation