

National Type Evaluation Program (NTEP) 2026 Software Sector Meeting Summary

September 16th – 17th, 2026 / Pensacola, FL
Day 1 in conjunction with the NTEP Measuring Sector

INTRODUCTION

The charge of the National Type Evaluation Program (NTEP) Software Sector is important in providing appropriate type evaluation criteria for software-based weighing or measuring device based on specifications, tolerances and technical requirements of *NIST Handbook 44* Section 1.10 General Code, Section 2 for weighing devices, Section 3 for liquid and vapor measuring devices, and Section 5 for taximeters, grain analyzers, and multiple-dimension measuring devices. The sector's recommendations are presented to the 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* issues on the agenda of the National Council 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.

Suggested revisions are shown in **bold face print** by ~~striking out~~ information to be deleted and underlining information to be added. Requirements that are proposed to be non-retroactive are printed in ***bold faced italics***.

Table A
Table of Contents

Title of Content	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
WELCOME	2
STATUS REPORTS – RELATED NCWM AND INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITY	2
JOINT SESSION PROGRESS REPORT, ACTIVE ITEMS OF MUTUAL INTEREST	2
CARRY-OVER ITEMS	3
1. Software Identification / Markings	3
2. Software Protection / Security	5
3. NTEP Application for Software and Software-based Devices	6
4. Training	8
5. Publication 14 - Software Technical Policy	10
NEW ITEMS	11
6. Development of a national EVSE Compliance Lifecycle Data Standard	11
7. Next Meeting	13
APPENDIX A – NIST OWM REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITY RELATED TO SOFTWARE STANDARDS	14
APPENDIX B – ATTACHMENTS TO ITEM 6 – EVSE	16

Table B
Glossary of Acronyms and Terms

Acronym	Term	Acronym	Term
BIML	International Bureau of Legal Metrology	OIML	International Organization of Legal Metrology
CC	Certificate of Conformance	OWM	Office of Weights and Measures
EPO	Examination Procedure Outline	PDC	Professional Development Committee
NCWM	National Council on Weights and Measures	S&T	Specifications and Tolerances Committee
NIST	National Institute of Standards and Technology	SMA	Scale Manufacturers Association
NTEP	National Type Evaluation Program	WELMEC	European Cooperation in Legal Metrology

Details of All Items
(In order by Reference Key)

WELCOME

Since the Software Sector meeting is a joint meeting with the Measuring Sector, some time will be allocated to meet and greet both new and familiar faces.

STATUS REPORTS – RELATED NCWM AND INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITY

Attendees of the 2026 NCWM Interim and Annual Meeting are asked to share any relevant comments or discussion that took place during the open hearings, or the NCWM standing committee working sessions or voting sessions. Results related to items on our Agenda will be of particular focus.

NIST OWM personnel will provide a synopsis of international activity that relates to the work of the sector.

JOINT SESSION PROGRESS REPORT, ACTIVE ITEMS OF MUTUAL INTEREST

The NTEP Software Sector and NTEP staff have elected to continue holding the Software Sector meetings in a joint Sector format for now. To make sure we make the most of the time a quick review of the agenda items from both Sectors will be held to identify those that require collaboration, so all participants have a solid foundation for discussion. As part of this review, items of importance or interest should be allocated more time during the joint session day.

CARRY-OVER ITEMS

1. Software Identification / Markings

Source:

NTEP Software Sector

Background:

See the 2025 Software Sector Meeting Summary for more background on this item.

The bulk of the work on this item resulted in the final, amended proposal for a modification to G-S.1. being accepted as a ‘Voting’ item at the 2016 Interim meeting, which was adopted at the 2016 Annual Meeting. Currently G-S.1 reflects the Sector-recommended language. The non-retroactive date was 2021, so the current language is applicable to all devices now being placed into service.

There is currently no intent to modify G.-S.1 further. This agenda item will remain a standing item, allowing a placeholder to get feedback and address any issues with software identification, either in the type evaluation process, or in the field.

There was quite a bit of discussion about problems related to tracking POS version changes.

Instead of altering G.S.1 in HB44 further, it may make more sense to strengthen the requirements in the handbooks for specific device types, e.g. Scales code. For example, POS systems interfacing with weighing systems could be addressed specifically. This would address the largest number of systems that cause problems for type evaluation and field inspectors.

Apparently, EV devices are also an issue and not many manufacturers are aware of requirements.

At the 2025 meeting, it was agreed that the NTEP Administrator will convene a sub-group of Weighing and Software Sector members to propose language for the Scales code specific to not-built-for-purpose interfaces. Loren Minnich (NIST OWM) should be included in this sub-group.

Discussion:

Jeff Gibson is planning to submit a Form 15 on behalf of NTEP to alter G-S.1.1.b to remove the option for not-built-for-purpose software to display the CC number through a menu. Instead, the CC would have to be continuously displayed while the software is active, though there’s an option to grandfather putting it behind a menu option or icon. The exact proposed text is:

(b) The Certificate of Conformance (CC) Number shall be:

- (1) permanently marked on the device;*
- (2) continuously displayed*~~;- or~~ when the not-built-for-purpose, software-based device is active and the CC provides information to access to the information required in G-S.1. Identification, (a), (b), and (d) when not provided in accordance with G-S-1.1.(a).; or*
- (3) for not-built-for-purpose, software-based devices manufactured before January 1, 20XX**, 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. Identification, (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]

[**Nonretroactive as of January 1, 20XX]

(Added 2003) (Amended 2006 and 20XX)

We may have reached the point where it makes sense to work toward eliminating the differentiation between built-for-purpose and not-built-for-purpose. Jim Pettinato suggested that that might be the next step after adoption of this change to G-S.1.1.b. On the other hand, further discussion about having information accessible by selecting the CC number showed that it could be difficult for built-for-purpose software to accommodate this because they might not have a touch screen or a mouse.

There was some discussion during the Software Sector meeting about modifications to the specific language; it was suggested that the inclusion of 'not-built-for-purpose' in (2) and (3) is redundant and could be removed, since the entire section is already exclusive to not-built-for-purpose devices. It was also suggested that the explicit conditions in the phrase 'and the CC provides information to access to the information required in G-S.1. Identification, (a), (b), and (d) when not provided in accordance with G-S-1.1.(a).' is not necessary because the clarifying note at the end of the section already stipulates this. That would leave (2) to read simply

(1) continuously displayed;~~or~~ when the device is active; or*

It was also noted during the meeting that WELMEC 7.2 has a limit of three levels or less for locating the additional required information called out by the note, and that would potentially be a reasonable stipulation.

Conclusion:

The Measuring and Software Sectors will be sent an email with the updated language and a request to endorse this proposal, since an email will reach the entirety of Sector members and there will be a record of the responses.

2. Software Protection / Security

Source:

NTEP Software Sector

Background:

See the 2025 Software Sector Summary for additional background on this item.

The Sector continued to work on the content and the checklist for *NCWM Publication 14 – Software Technical Policy*.

The checklist is based roughly on the OIML R76–2 checklist together with discussions beginning as early as the October 2007 NTEP Software Sector Meeting.

In relation to updating software versions in the field, the Sector considered recommending best practice implementation of a digital signature. There's authentication as a first measure, then digital signature(s) can be applied to ensure the package hasn't been modified. Additionally, if it's sent remotely, encryption would be recommended. The Sector discussed the differentiation of best practices and requirements. Per Darrell Flocken, Pub. 14 is the appropriate place for best practice recommendations.

No action items were identified for this agenda item in 2025. The Publication 14 Software Technical Policy was reviewed in detail on Day 2 and no specific changes related to protection/security were identified at this time.

Discussion:

The Software Sector plans to review the current edition of Publication 14 on Day 2 to determine if any tweaks need to be made this year. We also reviewed the recent updates to the WELMEC 7.2 document for consideration of applicability. The Sector noted that changes due to Europe's upcoming Cybersecurity Resiliency Act may need to be considered.

Conclusion:

During the second day of the Software Sector meeting the members reviewed the Software Technical Policy document and made a handful of changes, including adding an additional example of an acceptable approach for software identification, and other editorial changes to align with standard NTEP terminology, etc.

3. NTEP Application for Software and Software-based Devices

Source:

NTEP Software Sector

Background:

See the 2025 NTEP Software Sector Meeting Summary for additional history on this agenda item.

At the 2022 meeting, it was communicated that since the NTEP staff has the best understanding of the needs of the software-specific NTEP application, they have taken on the task of developing the draft application for software-specific submissions for type approval

At the 2023 meeting, NTEP staff reported that the application had been crafted and that they are using this new application for software at this time. During the NIST update discussion, it was communicated that the NTEP Committee policy for software will be adding a requirement for an application for software upgrades, i.e., an application must be submitted to update the certificate for new metrologically significant software revisions. This is intended to eliminate certificates with language indicating that ‘software version X and higher’ is acceptable. This requirement will be non-retroactive for existing certificates. It is expected that this type of application will be significantly less expensive than the standard \$950 submission fee; the expectation is it would be around \$150. The details haven’t been fully worked out, but it might be implemented via an approved software version table on the certificate.

Both Measurement Canada (i.e. MAL) and OIML have a similar policy, and it may be possible that any evaluation from those jurisdictions may be acceptable to submit to NTEP, so manufacturers don’t have to duplicate effort (mention was made of MRA potentially applying for Canada). This suggestion should be brought up in the January meeting. In general, bug fixes aren’t going to require evaluation.

One concern that was expressed is how long this process may take. The goal of NTEP is to achieve a fast turnaround of these types of applications; a 2- to 3-week turnaround could be typical. Measurement Canada can vary between a week (if nothing appears to be metrologically significant) to up to a month, as a yardstick for comparison.

The proposed new ADM-24.2 software change policy was discussed at length. The plan is that there will be a separate, new application for software updates. All the information should be coming from the applicant, and the revision in the certificate should be small – merely updating a table. Darrell Flocken and Jeff Gibson’s recommendation for a lower price (\$150) is in the NTEP report. Currently the manufacturer sends an email describing the change(s). Darrell Flocken’s intention is that this description would come in with the application, which would potentially be a simple draft of the edit to the table. Another possibility (though not preferred) would be something like what Measurement Canada does, using a letter of addendum. This might impact the certificate search mechanism though.

At the 2026 Board of Directors Spring meeting, ADM-24.2 was adopted. The Software Sector has offered their support to NTEP in implementing a software/firmware update-specific application and review process.

Discussion:

There is some concern that using this new application for metrological software will result in subsequently needing to bring in the system for reevaluation, which would result in needing the full application fee.

POS systems regularly fail field inspections, and they have frequent software updates. They virtually all initially fail type evaluations, too. Most type evaluations performed each year are actually for POS systems, yet, despite this, there are only a handful of mentions of this type of device in Handbook 44.

It is beneficial that CCs are no longer allowing wording of “or higher” for the software version number.

Jeff Gibson located a current CC, so we could view the wording. The major revision is typically what is used for metrological software. Previously, in the For box, “or higher” was included after the Software Version.

Darrell Flocken had worked on a form for software revision applications, but Jeff Gibson still needs to locate it on his computer. If/when he finds it, he'll send it to the Software Sector. If it's not found, now is an ideal time to create one since all NTEP's applications are being updated.

Measurement Canada has a form that indicates that the software is going from version X to Y. Descriptions of the change(s) should include an explanation of the impact with respect to metrology.

From a VCAP perspective, NTEP verifies that a method of documenting these changes exists.

Measurement Canada is currently trying to deal with situations where systems (e.g. POS) are changing software versions extremely frequently. They may ultimately have multiple such applications, to differentiate between true metrological changes versus patch updates. Software separation can help.

NTEP will also need to decide whether they want to be notified for every software change (particularly when software separation is not employed) to evaluate whether the change impacts the metrological software, but recognizes that this could potentially delay a software release for some simple cosmetic change. The NTEP workload is a concern. The purpose of the lower cost application needs to be well explained, and it seems like there is confusion at this point.

Conclusion:

At the 2026 meeting the Software Sector offered any assistance to NTEP as needed in developing the application and the procedure as NTEP transitions away from assuming that 'and higher' revisions still meet type.

4. Training

Source:

NTEP Software Sector

Background:

See the 2025 NTEP Software Sector meeting summary for more background on this item.

The Software Sector maintains a presentation that provides some general information about software in metrological devices and applications and what field inspectors might need to know to accomplish their tasks. This agenda item is related to the maintenance and management of that presentation as well as any other activity of the Sector aligned with the goal of educating stakeholders.

It was suggested in the past that we consider a new slide for best practice for security. It was pointed out that the presentation is primarily targeted at field inspectors, so maybe defining some terminology related to security would be helpful.

On the topic of promoting the availability of this material, regional meetings were suggested as a potential venue for training since more inspectors are included, as opposed to the Annual or Interim meetings where the audience is primarily state directors and program managers. It was also pointed out that the state directors have a shared mailing list. Don Onwiler has access and could be asked to distribute the training presentation to the various state organizations via this mailing list.

A service provider in attendance asked if the presentation could be made more accessible to service providers. It's currently in a rather obscure location on the NCWM website, so perhaps it could be moved or links provided elsewhere on the site. It was suggested that additional effort be made to communicate the availability of this training information in general. We could request that NIST OWM incorporate the presentation into their online training materials.

It would be helpful to add information or examples about cloud-based systems to the training presentation. It seems premature to add anything related to AI. NTEP has indicated that no one has yet reported during type evaluation that their system is using AI.

Discussion:

It was noted that there are upcoming administrative changes including changes to VCAP to allow only NCWM Technical employees to perform VCAP audits. One goal of the National Council is to start providing training on POS systems. VCAP revenue can be allocated to delivering such training. This will likely be a multi-year process. It would be helpful to provide training on POS systems that demonstrates to developers how they should be implementing metrological software.

NIST OWM suggested that we consider adding a typical software architecture diagram, though we do have to keep in mind that the target audience is field inspectors. We may want to consider a separate training module for type evaluators and regulators.

Vere Miller noted that the proposed NTEP change to G-S.1.1 may aid in eventually eliminating the differentiation between built-for-purpose and not-built-for-purpose, especially if there's a focus on data transfer.

Conclusion:

On the 2nd day of the Software Sector meeting the training presentation was reviewed and some minor changes were made to update the presentation and add additional examples.

5. Publication 14 - Software Technical Policy

Background:

See the 2025 NTEP Software Sector meeting summary for additional background.

Significant revisions to the Publication 14 Software Technical Policy document were made in 2024, so at the 2025 meeting the current document was still relatively up to date. Recent changes to OIML D31 were not technical (mostly reorganization of information within the document) so there is not really any new material to consider for adoption.

The Sector considered reviewing the security suggestions since new security problems are always arising. We might choose to review this every year. It was also suggested that we might want to add an explanation for software developers on how to populate the Model field on the NTEP application. It was suggested that the application name could be a suitable entry for the Model or software products.

At the 2025 meeting the Sector reviewed the current Policy document in the work session on Day 2. Among other minor tweaks, an explanation was added (new section 5.5) that the application name might be appropriate to use for the Model for software products.

Discussion:

Alison thinks that the checklist could benefit from a better definition of metrological subjects such as parameters. There's a challenge that not all of the states approach this the same way. For example, if a POS system doesn't perform tare, then NTEP doesn't view it as metrologically significant; however, some states do, assuming that the POS software is interacting with a scale to calculate the price. She requested that we form a subgroup from the Software Sector to write a draft for a Form 15 focused on POS requirements to be addressed in the Handbook.

Handbook 44 currently has only three total references to the equivalent of a POS system. Everything else in the Handbook is for a particular device type. Perhaps there should be a separate section for POS devices. This sounds like a lengthy task.

Jeff Gibson suggested that the Software Sector solicits the states to determine which ones consider POS systems to require type evaluation, and which factors are metrologically significant.

It sounds like there are very few differences between how NTEP and Measurement Canada evaluate POS systems; however, there is no reciprocity.

Conclusion:

On day 2 of the meeting, the Sector reviewed the current Software Technical Policy document. In addition to some editorial changes to align terminology, we added an additional example for an acceptable software identification.

Jim Pettinato will take action to create an ad-hoc sub-group for the purpose of crafting a Form 15 to make changes to Handbook 44 that can be used to enforce an ECR checklist. The subgroup currently consists of Alison, Jan, Jack, Barry, Jeff Gibson, and Greg Gholston. (NOTE: Jim Pettinato will email the Weighing Sector to see if anyone else is interested in participating.) The meetings will be scheduled monthly and be held virtually.

NEW ITEMS

6. Development of a national EVSE Compliance Lifecycle Data Standard

Source:

Ryan Rowell, Pearce Renewables

Background:

Electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) is the first new commercial measuring device category in a generation to come under NIST Handbook 44 (Section 3.40) at national scale. As jurisdictions activate enforcement one by one, each has independently created its own device registration, placed-in-service reporting, service agency filing, and violation resolution formats: paper forms, email submissions, web portals, and spreadsheets, no two alike. Operators and registered service agencies working across state lines must maintain dozens of parallel administrative processes to report the same facts about the same devices.

More fundamentally, no continuous record follows an individual EVSE through its compliance life: installation, placed-in-service report, in-service examination, violation, correction and amendment, metrologically significant software update, and removal from service. Compliance status is scattered across state files, operator databases, and service agency records. A jurisdiction today cannot readily answer basic questions about its own territory: which devices are in service, under which Certificate of Conformance, at which software version, and with what examination history. An examiner arriving on site today begins from zero - no view of the device's placed-in-service filing, accuracy history, prior violations and their resolution, or current software version before the first port is touched.

This is squarely a software problem. EVSE are software-defined measuring instruments, remotely updated, cloud-managed, and configured at fleet scale, yet there is no standardized, machine-readable way for a device, operator, or service agency to report device identity, software version, or compliance lifecycle events to a jurisdiction. The Sector was informed at its 2025 meeting that the Publication 14 EVSE work group has not met in several years and has no plans to reconvene, while field deployment and state enforcement have only accelerated. This item is addressed to the Software Sector, jointly with the Measuring Sector, because its substance - export capability, software version identification, and lifecycle event records — is cross-cutting software and data policy within this Sector's charge, and because the device-specific work group that would otherwise receive it is dormant.

The outcome this item seeks is to enable some standard mechanism by which any authorized party (e.g., a jurisdiction official, a registered service agency, or an operator) can retrieve a device's complete compliance lifecycle history in seconds, and every party sees the same answer. More specifically, that:

- the Software Sector, jointly with the Measuring Sector, recommends reactivation of the Publication 14 EVSE work group, or formally assumes its software and data scope, to carry out the items below:
- the Sector initiate development of a national EVSE Compliance Lifecycle Data Standard: a uniform, machine-readable schema defining minimum data elements for (a) device identity, including manufacturer, model, serial number, NTEP CoC number, and software version; (b) installation and placed-in-service reporting; (c) registered service agency examination and test events, including as-found and as-left results; (d) jurisdictional examination results; (e) violation issuance, correction, and amendment; (f) metrologically significant software updates and audit trail status; and (g) removal from service.
- Publication 14 is amended with an EVSE checklist: "The system's back office or device management platform shall be capable of exporting, in the standardized machine-readable format, the identification information required by G-S.1, the current version or revision identifier of all metrologically significant software, and the device's compliance lifecycle event records, for retrieval and exchange by authorized jurisdiction, registered service agency, and operator systems." Display requirements at the device remain as prescribed by Handbook 44; the export obligation attaches to the back office, where cloud-managed EVSE holds this information.

- NCWM evaluates establishment of a national EVSE compliance registry: a federated single source of truth, keyed to device serial number and Certificate of Conformance, in which each jurisdiction remains the authority of record for its territory while jurisdiction, service agency, and operator systems contribute to and read from the same record. One record, three role-scoped views — a jurisdiction console, a service agency workbench, an operator dashboard — so the communication that today moves by email, portal, and re-keyed form becomes a shared record, and a device’s entire lifecycle history is a single query rather than a file search. An examiner arriving on site opens one record — placed-in-service filing, accuracy history, prior violations and their resolution, software version, open items — and begins the examination informed rather than from zero. With that record in hand, jurisdictions also gain the option of responses proportionate to metrological significance: a marking or labeling deficiency can be recorded, time-limited, and verified to correction without interrupting service, while accuracy, security, and audit-trail failures continue to carry full consequence. Controlled by no single party, the registry conceptually extends the NTEP CoC database from type approval into field compliance.

Alternatives considered:

- Status quo: each newly enforcing jurisdiction continues to invent its own formats, compounding the burden state by state and reproducing the fragmented registration landscape of retail petroleum, for a device class far more software-dynamic than any dispenser.
- Handbook 130 route alone: a uniform model regulation through the Laws and Regulations Committee is valuable and complementary, but a model regulation without a technical data standard still produces incompatible implementations. The schema itself is a software and data matter within this Sector’s competence.
- Market solution: leaving the gap to proprietary systems yields vendor lock-in and unequal jurisdictional access. The compliance record of a regulated commodity should not exist only as a private asset.

Attachments (see Appendix B):

- Attachment A. Multi-jurisdiction EVSE filing fragmentation matrix: comparison of device registration, placed-in-service, and service agency filing requirements across currently enforcing states.
- Attachment B. EVSE Compliance Lifecycle Data Standard: concept overview and draft minimum data element set.
- Attachment C. Illustrative lifecycle record for a single EVSE, installation through violation resolution.

Discussion:

Jeff Gibson believes that this is a topic for the broader regulatory community and not NTEP specifically and believes it will be a big challenge to get the states to agree to standardize, though it could offer a large benefit, particularly to RSAs. States don’t typically have any centralized databases of this sort for any other device types. Also, it was mentioned that manufacturers would likely be concerned about protecting proprietary information and this data once supplied to government entities essentially would become public. Alison agreed that individual states have statutes codifying these subjects, and NCWM doesn’t oversee these statutes, though they can make recommendations to the states.

It was noted that if the current proposal from Vermont is fleshed out in time for the Interim meeting, it is likely that the EVSE workgroup will be revived. There is a Pub 14 for EVSE.

Conclusion:

The Software Sector feels this is out of scope of their responsibility. Jeff Gibson suggested that the submitter consider a display at the Annual Meeting, explaining what they’re trying to accomplish and its benefits.

7. Next Meeting

Background:

The sector is on a yearly schedule for NTEP Software Sector Meetings. Now that we've adopted a joint meeting system, the next Sector joint meeting will likely coincide with one of the remaining Sector meetings.

At the 2024 meeting we decided to 'skip' the MDMD Sector and instead meet in conjunction with the Weighing Sector in 2025, due to conflicts and noting that the MDMD and Weighing Sector membership overlaps significantly.

Previous meetings:

2021 – Multiple Dimensioning Measuring Device (MDMD) Sector

2022 – Weighing Sector

2023 – Measuring Sector

2024 – Grain Analyzer Sector

2025 – Weighing Sector

2026 – Measuring Sector

2027 - ?

If we continue with our joint meetings the 2027 Software Sector meeting would be in conjunction with the Grain Analyzer Sector. Note that there are other active NTEP work groups aside from the Sectors that may warrant consideration for joint meetings due to the prevalence of software in those applications, particularly the EVSE and the Transportation-For-Hire work groups.

Discussion:

There may be little benefit to meeting with the Grain Analyzer sector, as their section of Publication 14 is relatively unique and well developed. It was suggested that the Weighing and Measuring Sectors are the most active and likely the most well-equipped to meet jointly with the Software Sector on a regular basis. Our rotation could be limited to just those sectors, or we could choose to meet independently. It is still possible that the EVSE group will be re-established and we could meet jointly with that group since there is a significant software component to that device type and they are pushing boundaries when it comes to both software architecture and software security.

Conclusion:

The Software Sector is willing to participate in a joint meeting in 2027 either with both Measuring and Weighing Sectors, or, if that is not feasible with just the Weighing Sector. Multiple locations were considered, with Ottawa and Pensacola Beach being included as preferable options.

Appendix A – NIST OWM report on international activity related to software standards

OIML D 31 update

Voting on the 2CD of D 31 closed on September 3rd. Once approved by the project group, a final draft will be submitted for a vote at the CIML meeting. The upcoming CIML meeting takes place next month. It is unlikely that the final draft will be ready for a vote at this edition. If not, then it will probably be on the agenda for next year's CIML meeting. In that case, the new OIML D 31 will be published at the end of 2027.

The main objective for this revision of D 31 is to reorganize the clauses without technical changes, so that the document is easier to understand and easier for project groups to implement the clauses of D 31 into the Recommendations.

Digitalization

Digitalization is taking place on multiple fronts. Examples are:

- **Digital Calibration Certificates (DCC)**
This effort is mainly driven by the PTB in Germany, but it has a global reach. Digital in this context should be interpreted as machine-interpretable. The NCSLI is providing a taxonomy for specific measurements. NIST Calibration Services is currently developing a digital version of the NIST calibration reports.
- **Digital Product Passport (DPP)**
This is a European development to make essential product information available to all stakeholders. It consolidates information on a product's identity, compliance, safety, and sustainability. It is not entirely clear whether information on legal metrological compliance will be included.
- **SI Reference Point**
The BIML has introduced the digital SI (SI Reference Point). It contains the essential information from the SI brochure (units, prefixes, defining constants, and decisions) in a machine-readable format. This enables machines to implement or link to the digital SI, eliminating human interpretation and errors. The SI Reference Point is accessible at <https://si-digital-framework.org/>
- **SMART Standards**
IEC and ISO have launched an effort to transform documentary standards into machine-interpretable standards, known as SMART standards. It involves converting PDF standards into digital content, based on a semantic structure that can be interpreted and processed by machines. This will, for example, make it easier to collect all applicable requirements for a given product or feature and enable automated compliance verification. OIML is currently creating a SMART version of OIML R 60 for load cells as a test case.
- **AI**
OIML has established a subgroup, "Guidance on AI," within the OIML Digitalization Task Group. The main objectives of this subgroup are to:

- provide fundamental terminology on AI and machine learning,
- address topics such as regulation, standardization, risks and challenges, and
- foster interaction, collaboration, and training on AI.

The subgroup has made some AI-related information available on the OIML website.

Europe

- WELMEC Software Guides

WELMEC has published several revisions of software-related guides from Workgroup 7, including their main guide, WELMEC 7.2. Where the previous versions listed a set of requirements on the basic configuration aspects of an instrument (like data storage and software download), is the new edition based on a risk analysis approach, which is commonly used in security assessments.

- WELMEC Webinar

There will be a WELMEC Webinar on September 14 on Software Examination with the WELMEC Software Guides 2026. This webinar will probably be recorded and made available on the WELMEC website.

- MID

There will be a targeted technical amendment of the MID which is scheduled to come into effect in Q3 of next year with a 2-year transition period. One of the amendments will allow utility meters and EVSE to use a personal device as an indicating device.

Appendix B – Attachments to Item 6 – EVSE

Attachment A. Multi-jurisdiction EVSE filing fragmentation matrix: comparison of device registration, placed-in-service, and service agency filing requirements across currently enforcing states



Attachment_A_Filing_Fragmentation_M

Attachment B. EVSE Compliance Lifecycle Data Standard: concept overview and draft minimum data element set



Attachment_B_Lifecycle_Data_Standard_

Attachment C. Illustrative lifecycle record for a single EVSE, installation through violation resolution



Attachment_C_Illustrative_Lifecycle_Record