



State Directors' Breakfast
Questions and Responses
Regarding
NTEP Issues
2000

For the past several years, the Scale Manufacturers Association and the National Conference on Weights and Measures have hosted breakfast meetings at the regional Weights and Measures association venues throughout the year. We have published the 1997, 1998, and 1999 questions. They are available for review or download as a PDF File on the SMA Web Site at <http://www.scalemanufacturers.org>. This document covers the three questions asked at the four regional W&M Conferences in 2000.

In order to ascertain the degree of uniformity and interpretation of selected W&M practices, the same questions are asked at each regional meeting.

The responses are non-attributable to preserve an atmosphere for candid answers.

This document is a composite of the responses and is provided as a service by the Scale Manufacturers Association in support of the continuing education effort required to insure the success of the National Type Evaluation Program.

*For a downloadable copy visit the SMA Web Site at
<http://www.scalemanufacturers.org>.*

2000 STATE DIRECTORS' BREAKFAST NTEP QUESTIONS

QUESTION ONE: Have you encountered situations in your jurisdiction in which you felt that production did not meet type? If so, how did you deal with the situation? Was it resolved satisfactorily?

Page 1

QUESTION TWO: What are your thoughts about resolving the 3-Rs (Remanufacture, Recondition and Repair)?

Page 4

QUESTION THREE: *Do you find the NTEP CC listing on the internet to be useful? In what other format(s) would you like to see the CC's offered?*

Page 7

State Directors' Breakfast Questions and Responses Regarding NTEP Issues

QUESTION ONE - 2000:

Have you encountered situations in your jurisdiction in which you felt that production did not meet type? If so, how did you deal with the situation? Was it resolved satisfactorily?

Southern Weights and Measures Association **Responses:**

S1 We feel that there are production meets type problems within our state but are not sure how to identify them. An questions regarding whether a device meets type are directed back to the device manufacturer.

S2 Although we have not found any design problems with devices, we have found configuration problems where the device has not been setup properly or has incorrect components. For example, incorrect load cells or indicators may be used. In these instances we contact the manufacturer and call on them to resolve the discrepancy.

S3 We also contact the device manufacturer anytime we feel there may be a production meets type issue.

S4 Production meets type is not a major problem within our jurisdiction. We've found that a greater problem is the incorrect configuration of individual components (like load cells and indicators) to form a larger system. When we encounter this type of problem, we always work with the manufacturer to resolve it.

S5 We are not aware of any production meets type problems within our state.

S6 Yes, we have experienced some production meets type problems within our state and have always worked with the device manufacturer on an individual basis to resolve the matter.

S7 Yes, we feel we have experienced some production meets type problems. When we encounter such problems, we contact the device manufacturer in an attempt to resolve the issue.

S8 Should we find what we consider to be a production meets type problem, we contact the device manufacturer.

S9 We're not aware of any production meets type problems within our state but we believe that they exist.

S10 We don't feel that we have a major problem with production meets type within our state. We always work with the device manufacturer's local representative or with the device manufacturer directly to resolve any problems or concerns we may have.

S11 We contact the device manufacturer anytime we feel there may be a production meets type issue.

S12 Yes, we too have experienced production meets type problems. When a production meets type problem is discovered, we contact the local service organization who normally is able to address the matter. We, however, feel that the device manufacturer needs to do a better job at ensuring that production meets type.

S13 When we identify or suspect a production meets type problem, we contact the Office of Weights and Measures at NIST for additional information and confirmation of our suspicions. Once this information is received, we contact the device manufacturer in an effort to resolve the problem.

Northeast Weights and Measures Association **Responses:**

N1 We are not aware on any production meets type problems in our jurisdiction. All inspectors have copies of Publication 5 and are checking the web site for applicable NTEP CCs.

N2 We haven encountered many production meets type problems in our state. We have our own type approval procedure which we are continuing to develop. We recently completed a new state laboratory.

N3 We thought that we had a production meets type problem but then discovered that the device was not in

State Directors' Breakfast Questions and Responses Regarding NTEP Issues

commercial service. In short, we have not discovered production meets type problems. Our problem is with devices whose performance is not correct but we are not sure whether the problems are the result of production not meeting type or not.

N4 In our state, licensed service personnel perform the device installations. Because of our manpower limitations, we are not always able to immediately follow up on the installation. When our state inspectors do review the installations, they find that 98% of them do have NTEP Certificate(s) of Conformance. We are currently attempting to get the jewelry industry to upgrade the devices they use to weigh gemstones. We try to work with the trade associations in the implementation of new and existing requirements.

N5 We haven't had any scale related production meets type problems but we have had repair/re-manufacture problems with gas pumps. If we have a problem with production meeting type, we contact our state lab.

N6 We have had three instances of production not meeting type in the year 2000. In the first, the platform size of a vehicle scale was not called out on the applicable NTEP Certificate of Conformance. It requires a thorough inspection and knowledgeable inspector to identify this type of production meets type problem. The second instance was with a price computing scale where the tare was cleared before the end of the transaction. The device manufacturer and NIST were contacted and it was discovered that the scale had been incorrectly configured. The third instance was with a gas pump where a temperature compensation feature was enabled but not listed on the pump's NTEP CC. It was corrected by disabling the temperature compensation during setup. Regarding the first instance with the vehicle scale, we will probably consider that model as a one-of-a-kind device and therefore subject it to a full NTEP test. We have been able to resolve these types of problems through cooperation between the lab, NIST and the device manufacturer. We would like to see a national database developed to identify one-of-a-kind devices to prevent more than one from being installed. It is important to train inspectors to look at the device to verify that it is the same as the device listed on the NTEP CC.

N7 We have only encountered minor problems with production meeting type. With the exception of load cells, most of the problems are dealt with easily. Most of these problems were corrected in the field.

Central Weights and Measures Association Responses:

C1 Our inspectors track the devices and if one is found where production does not meet type the owner is advised and, after the deficiency has been corrected, the device is re-inspected. For example, we had a vehicle scale that appeared to have a production meets type problem. We contacted the scale manufacturer who advised us that it was a problem with a purchased load cell. The problem was resolved satisfactorily. We are currently investigating a product and collecting data and, at the conclusion of the investigation, will contact the device manufacturer. We have experienced some problems with load cells under low temperatures (tested in January after a summer calibration showed changes in calibration consistently in the same direction) and will contact NIST about the problem.

C2 We are not aware of any production meets type problems. Problems are typically the result of an improper installation. We too have found load cells that do not appear to be properly temperature compensated.

C3 We have found a couple of production meets type problems. Additional testing resulted in two of the devices being removed from service. One of the devices was a hopper scale which had been installed prior to the completion of NTEP evaluation.

C4 We are currently attempting to complete the work to become an NTEP state. We have hired a new NTEP program manager for the state and are adding 2400 square feet to our lab. Wisconsin discovered a Michigan manufacturer whose device was creating a problem. The situation was addressed with a retrofit kit and was eventually removed from the market.

C5 Yes, we have found some production meets type problems in our laboratory. We find that manufacturer A submits a scale with manufacturer B's indicator

State Directors' Breakfast Questions and Responses Regarding NTEP Issues

which was previously approved. During the evaluation of the scale, we find that the indicator has changed operationally. Field problems are found when the device was modified by the installer. We have more problems with vehicle scales (three have been removed from service during the first 6 months following installation). We've encountered problems with a point of sale system that was based only on the evaluation of the scanner scale.

C6 We too have found some production meets type problems. These problems vary from improper markings to poor performance. We contacted the Board of Governors who had NIST get involved. NIST sent the information to other jurisdictions. There is no central clearinghouse nor is there a documented procedure for the handing of this kind of information. (NIST/OWM receives a number of calls regarding production meets type problems and attempts to contact the device manufacturer first in an effort to resolve the matter.)

C7 We're not aware of any production meets type problems in our state. We do, however, encounter devices that are not properly marked.

C8 We do encounter production meets type problems and always attempt to work with the device manufacturer or dealer to resolve the matter. A national database would be invaluable in the identification of trends among various device types or models. There is no uniformity in MIS among the states, however, that would encourage such a central database.

C9 Yes, we have encountered production meets type problems and have notified the manufacturers of the devices along with NIST. The problems have been resolved to our satisfaction but we are concerned that perhaps these same problems were not corrected in all jurisdictions.

C10 We have encountered problems with monorail scales where the device owner has made their own modifications to them. There are major problems with performance, speed and customer modifications. We are becoming more aggressive with scale production meets type problems.

Western Weights and Measures Association Responses:

W1 Yes, we've had a few problems primarily with hopper scales since each installation is unique. We require the use of NTEP components and follow through with a thorough examination. We depend on an extensive test to verify that the performance of the device is acceptable.

W2 We've had two or three instances in which devices were found to be one-of-a-kind and not covered under an existing NTEP CC. All in all, it hasn't been much of a problem.

W3 We've not had much of a problem with production meets type. We have had a problem with a tank meter where the nozzle transponder sends a signal direct without an on site display. This feature had been added to a NTEP approved device. The PC was confiscated and returned to the manufacturer.

W4 We've had very few problems with production meets type. Our emphasis is on looking at the NTEP Certificate of Conformance in field enforcement. We did have one instance in which the device was not covered under a CC but the problem was caught and resolved before the device was installed.

W5 We always check for the NTEP Certificate of Conformance number on every device we check. We've not had any problems with production not meeting type within our state.

W6 When complaints are received from various local jurisdictions regarding device performance and there appears to be a state wide trend, a survey is conducted to verify the complaint. If the complaint is verified, a report is sent to NTEP with the complaint and supporting documentation. If the NTEP CC is withdrawn our own state's approval is also withdrawn. If the device in question is only approved in our state, we follow an administrative process which includes contacting the manufacturer before withdrawing the state certificate. Modifications or features not listed on the NTEP CC are also a problem. If it is found that the modification

State Directors' Breakfast Questions and Responses Regarding NTEP Issues

or feature was not evaluated, the manufacturer or the party who made the modification is given the opportunity of submitting the device for state approval with the new modification or feature.

W7 We've not found any production meets type problems within our state but that doesn't mean that they don't exist. We feel that it is a matter of training requiring field inspectors to be able to identify characteristics of the device that indicate production does not meet type. We take one-of-a-kind devices seriously and require that a memorandum of understanding be signed with the device manufacturer confirming that the device is one-of-a-kind and agreeing to obtain an NTEP Certificate of Conformance should a second device be installed within the state.

W8 We've only had a very few problems. We did find a fuel pump not properly blending the fuel resulting in an incorrect octane rating. The manufacturer was contacted who found that it was a software problem. The problem was resolved satisfactorily.

W9 We've not had much of a problem with production meeting type in our state. In one instance, a scale was removed from service (it had been grandfathered and was on a prototype approval) for not meeting the required performance. We have a one-of-a-kind program used primarily with hopper and livestock scales but require that these devices use NTEP components.

W10 No, we really haven't experienced any production meets type problems. We have had some situations with hopper scales used in the fishing industry as to whether they're covered under an NTEP Certificate of Conformance or not. In general, we treat these scales as one-of-a-kind devices which means that they must use NTEP listed components and meet the appropriate tolerance. We always look for NTEP compliance on all devices.

W11 We have an administrative procedure in place to handle production meets type problems. Although we don't have a major problem with production meeting type, we do find a number of small scales that are improperly marked. We have accepted these devices if the scale owner applies a permanent mark identifying the scale.

W12 We've not had any recent production meets type problems. We've had two to three problems with scales not having NTEP Certificates of Conformance and have taken these devices out of service. This has primarily been a communication problem with device owners not realizing that the device must have an NTEP Certificate of Conformance.

W13 Once in a while we find a device (usually a scale) that is not listed on an NTEP Certificate of Conformance but we usually manage to get the matter resolved satisfactorily.

W14 We're not aware of any production meets type problems within our state. We agree that field inspectors need more training to allow them to identify characteristics of a device that would indicate that it is not the same as the device evaluated. We had one manufacturer install a device that did not have a NTEP CC but allowed them time to obtain a CC resolving the problem. We require that all one-of-a-kind devices employ NTEP components.

State Directors' Breakfast Questions and Responses Regarding NTEP Issues

QUESTION TWO - 2000

What are your thoughts about resolving the 3-Rs (Remanufacture, Recondition and Repair)?

Southern Weights and Measures Association **Responses:**

S1 We have experienced this problem on pre-NTEP scales but believe that if the device works and passes the appropriate tests, it's alright to use it.

S2 We don't feel that the 3-Rs is a significant problem.

S3 We've never experienced any problems that could be identified as being related to the 3-Rs.

S4 Repair needs to be well defined. It must be directed to the device and not to the internal component that has been repaired. We agree that a remanufactured device should be identified and that compliance with the original manufacturer's certificate of conformance should be handled at state level.

S5 Test it. If it's OK then move on.

S6 We have no comment.

S7 We don't feel that the 3-Rs is a real problem. We feel that, with additional training, this matter can be successfully addressed.

S8 Why is repair an issue? It's the solution to recycling.

S9 We also don't feel that the 3-Rs is a real problem. If the device works and passes inspection, it should be accepted.

S10 This is a difficult issue. The definitions for the 3-Rs are being developed but we believe there must be more to follow.

S11 We don't see the 3-Rs issue as a serious problem. If the device works and passes the tests, then it should be OK to use. If it works, don't fix it.

S12 We feel that the current proposal offered by the work group is acceptable and, further, that this matter should be kept at a state level.

S13 We haven't been able to identify a 3-Rs problem in the field. If the device is tested and works correctly, accept it for use and go on to the next device.

Northeast Weights and Measures Association **Responses:**

N1 We don't have much of an opinion on this matter. We've seen many struggle with the definitions for these terms.

N2 We don't have much of a problem. Annual inspections of every device take place and should identify any re-manufactured device.

N3 We find meters that don't pass but we don't know if the problem is the result of a re-manufactured device or not. We advise our service technicians to make sure that they use "NTEP parts". We don't have the ability to identify re-manufactured devices by looking at them.

N4 We have found two or three devices that have been re-manufactured but didn't have the proper markings (didn't identify the re-manufacturer). These devices are generally gas pumps. Initial inspections are required to identify those devices as soon as they're placed in service.

N5 We see re-manufactured devices with fuel oil and gas pump dispensers. Many service stations have re-conditioned pumps. Most of the problem has been with independents. We would like to see service technicians licensed. We often discover a gas pump that has been constructed from a mix of components and is not

State Directors' Breakfast Questions and Responses Regarding NTEP Issues

covered under a single NTEP CC.

N6 The issue of re-manufactured devices is addressed through inspector training. We make sure that people are aware of the rules then make certain that the rules are followed. We often don't see re-manufactured devices because we don't know that they have been re-manufactured. They're typically discovered by finding a performance problem.

N7 We are uncertain as to who will police the industry and determine when a device has been re-manufactured. The state inspector cannot make the determination of whether a device has been re-manufactured. When does the NTEP CC no longer cover a device? Should the marking requirement become a user requirement? Why haven't the registered service agencies assumed responsibility for the appropriate marking of re-manufactured devices?

Central Weights and Measures Association **Responses:**

C1 This issue needs to be resolved one way or the other. The task force assigned to the development of definitions for these terms plan to have them ready for a vote at the 2001 meeting.

C2 Our inspectors primarily look at the device and its associated certificate and address problems as they find them regardless of whether the problem is the result of a remanufacture or whether it came from the original manufacturer.

C3 The device owner is ultimately responsible for the device and not the manufacturer or service personnel. The field inspector has the most knowledge of the device and its application and should make the decision. We see this primarily as a user problem.

C4 Regardless of what is done, it must be done with the field inspector in mind. If it can't be used easily in the field, it isn't worth having. We try to work with industry and the device manufacturer to resolve these types of problems on a state level.

C5 When an individual repairs or reconditions a de-

vice, they must make it consistent with the original device. The user must share in the responsibility of keeping a device compliant. Most changes are not readily apparent and require some expertise to detect. Because of this, many inspectors feel it is a problem for the device manufacturer.

C6 It is a difficult task to define these terms but clearly something must be done. We don't understand why re-manufacturers aren't getting their own NTEP Certificates of Conformance. We have written a letter to a load cell manufacturer asking if a re-manufacturer of load cells is authorized to work on their load cells. Their response was no. We will write a letter to the load cell re-manufacturer telling them that they must have their own NTEP Certificate of Conformance in order to re-manufacture these load cells. Device manufacturers should be concerned about the sale of parts to those who are re-manufacturers.

C7 We feel that it's a gray area. We don't know how we will handle it. We don't know how to determine the nature of modifications. At present, if the device passes the required tests, it is accepted for use in commerce.

C8 Our approach is similar. That is, if the device works and passes the required tests it is allowed to be used commercially. Our inspectors don't know how to identify a re-manufactured device.

C9 Current NTEP rules and requirements provide the tools to deal with re-manufactured devices. Simply put, if the device is repaired or overhauled consistent with the original device manufacturer's design (i.e. no metrological changes) the device is accepted for commercial use. If the device's metrological design is altered, then it is no longer traceable to an NTEP Certificate of Conformance and cannot be used in commercial service.

State Directors' Breakfast Questions and Responses Regarding NTEP Issues

C10 We just test for accuracy and performance. We don't involve ourselves with device re-manufacturers.

Western Weights and Measures Association Responses:

W1 Additional education is needed for all including the consumer on this matter. Having repaired devices properly marked will help.

W2 It is a difficult problem. Reputable re-manufacturers will comply but others will not. In spite of this, we don't anticipate too great a problem with it.

W3 We're beginning to find incorrect components in truck scales. Inspectors all too often look very close at new installations but less so at existing installations thus possibly missing indications that the device has been improperly repaired.

W4 We feel that this is a serious matter and that it must move forward for further development.

W5 This problem is difficult to resolve. It is very difficult to track these repaired devices and who and when the repair was performed. Consumers should be educated that repaired devices may not be appropriate.

W6 We agree that the proposals from the working group will not catch all persons that try to circumvent the regulation and its intent. That issue exists in nearly all weights and measures programs. That is why no single approach to weights and measures is the answer. A good program will include thorough type evaluation, effective field testing, and transaction verification or test purchases and sales. Further, we also support the SMA position that a manufacturer can determine if a specific repaired or remanufactured device is still traceable to their Certificate of Conformance. If it has been determined that it does not, the responsible party should submit the device for either partial or full evaluation and seek a NTEP CC for a rebuild or remanufactured device.

W7 We support the task force's work and feel that the problem can be solved. Once the new requirements

are in the handbook and training has been accomplished, it will be a valuable system.

W8 We feel that this problem may not be resolvable. A field inspector has no knowledge of a device's internal components making it difficult to determine the level of modification. We base our acceptance on performance only.

W9 Our primary concern is the accuracy and performance of the device. Our limited budget prevents us from securing the additional manpower needed to enforce this proposed regulation.

W10 We hope that the definitions will be clear and concise. We're not sure how a field inspector will know the extent of the repair or modification. We will simply perform our tests on the device and if it performs within the appropriate tolerance, it will be accepted.

W11 We think that the re-manufacturing issue is fairly clear but not so with repair. Inspectors will require a clearer set of guidelines and directions.

W12 This issue is very difficult to address with existing resources. Additional education is required before enforcement can take place. We need clear and concise definitions but feel that the matter is solvable but with a major effort.

State Directors' Breakfast Questions and Responses Regarding NTEP Issues

QUESTION THREE - 2000

Do you find the NTEP CC listing on the internet to be useful? In what other format(s) would you like to see the CC's offered?

Southern Weights and Measures Association

Responses:

S1 Yes, we use it and also print hard copies for use by our field inspectors. We would like to see a better job on "family" certificates. It is often difficult to find a single model number of a certificate when the family name is different than the individual models.

S2 The internet site offering the certificates is certainly useful but we would like to see an updated version of Publication 5 made available.

S3 It's very useful. We use it daily and print out hard copies and send them to our field inspectors. We would like to have access to the report of test for older scales.

S4 We use the internet site but we also use Publication 5 and would like to see it made available again. We have had some problems using the internet site but we believe these may be operator problems. The addition of pictures of the devices to the certificates would be quite useful

S5 Although we're not an NTEP state, it is still a good reference that we use on a regular basis.

S6 We have not used the internet site but plan on looking at it to determine its usefulness to our program.

S7 Very useful.

S8 We like it very much but a hard copy of the certificate is still quite useful.

S9 We find it to be very useful but would like to see hard copies made available.

S10 We would like to see a return of Publication 5. We do use the internet site to secure hard copies for field inspectors.

S11 We don't use the internet site a lot at this time but anticipate using it more as greater numbers of PCs become available for field use. We would like to see Publication 5 continued.

S12 We find it to be very useful but having a hard copy in hand is also important.

S13 We find it to be very useful and use it daily. We would, however, like to see Publication 5 continued for field inspector's use to access certificates.

Northeast Weights and Measures Association

Responses:

N1 We find the web site to be very useful.

N2 We don't maintain a cross reference between New Jersey certificates and NTEP certificates. Our inspectors do not have laptops.

N3 The web site is a valuable tool for answering questions from consumers.

N4 We don't use the internet but would like to do so to allow our field inspectors to look at individual NTEP CCs.

N5 We want our inspectors to funnel their NTEP questions through the office to ensure uniformity in judgment and decisions. We do find access to the NTEP CCs via the internet to be very useful.

N6 We depend on the internet to gather NTEP CC data. We use it to determine model coverage of a single CC and to gather information on the procedure for use of the audit trail. We depend heavily on the web site. Our field inspectors do not have laptops. We want the field inspector's NTEP CC questions directed to our lab personnel and use these questions as feedback to

State Directors' Breakfast Questions and Responses Regarding NTEP Issues

identify problems and issues. We are currently working on a cross reference between our state certificates of conformance and NTEP CCs.

N7 We find the service very useful.

Central Weights and Measures Association Responses:

C1 We feel that it is a good tool. We require a printed CC for each component in a new installation therefore scale service companies in our state access the web site to secure these certificates.

C2 Access to the NTEP CC's via the internet is very useful for our field inspectors who each have a laptop computer.

C3 It works well for us.

C4 The web site has proven to be very useful. We think a CD containing the NTEP CCs would be beneficial for field inspectors.

C5 Access to NTEP CCs via the web has been very helpful to us. This information should be disseminated without any restrictions.

C6 Our field staff do not have laptops but they do have access to an index to the NTEP CCs that is printed at our office. If problems arise, the field inspector can call the office. Field inspectors can often use the device owner's internet access to reach the site. A CD would be obsolete as soon as you get it.

C7 The NTEP CCs on the web page are very helpful. We use forms for new devices which include a section for the applicable CC numbers and access to the certificates on the web make completing this section easy. CDs worked well for our field staff.

C8 Although our field inspectors do not have laptops, access to the NTEP CCs via the internet has proven to be very helpful.

C9 Yes, the internet site meets all our needs.

Western Weights and Measures Association Responses:

W1 Excellent, we use it a lot. Inspectors have access to it and find it cleaner than Publication 5. We also use Handbook 44 on the NIST site.

W2 We are trying to get portable computers for our field inspectors. Secretaries and supervisors have no problems getting Certificates of Conformance from the website.

W3 It would be good if new entries of Certificates of Conformance could be highlighted or otherwise identified.

W4 We find it extremely useful. We have no computers for our field inspectors at this time. It would be helpful if manufacturers or service representatives would have a copy of the NTEP Certificate of Conformance available at installation.

W5 It's very helpful and we use it most every day. Our inspectors have laptop computers.

W6 I find them to be very useful. It greatly assists in being able to answer questions from the field and the public to verify a device's approval status. Although I have no suggestions on offering the certificates in different formats, I do have some suggestions that might make them easier to use:

- Offer a jpg or bmp or similar graphic version for those who want a signed copy.
- Include a link to the "Contact Person" and maybe the evaluator listed in the CC.
- Investigate listing state or local directors limited database access to verify the evaluation status for
- Effective CCs not yet published including a draft version of the CC.
- Place the lists of devices (formerly Pub 5) on the same page as the CC search page.
- Offer a subscription service of new CCs to weights and measures jurisdictions.

W7 We find it to be very useful. Hard copies, however, are required for field inspectors.

W8 It's very useful. We use it daily.

State Directors' Breakfast Questions and Responses Regarding NTEP Issues

W9 It's very useful. The addition of Handbook 44 to the web is also good. We're planning on getting portable computers for the field. It would be good if you could download the entire database to free you up from a connection to the Internet.

W10 Very useful. It's sometimes difficult to get into the site. Our inspectors do not have laptop computers at this time.

State Directors' Breakfast Questions and Responses Regarding NTEP Issues
Tabulated Results of Questions

Question 1: Have you encountered situations in your jurisdiction in which you felt that production did not meet type?

Production Meets Type Problem?		
No Problem	19	48%
Have Problem	13	33%
Suspect Problem	8	20%
# of Relevant Comments	40	
Type of Problem		
Markings and Minor Compliance Problems	9	24%
Improper Modifications After Installation	8	21%
One Of A Kind	7	18%
Improper Configuration	4	11%
Poor Performance	4	11%
Improper Installation	3	8%
Wrong or Non-Compliant Load Cells	3	8%
# of Type Problems Mentioned	38	

If so, how did you deal with the situation?

How Did You Fix The Problem?		
Manufacturer / Dealer Fixed It	18	72%
Service	3	12%
Field	2	8%
Owner	1	4%
NIST	1	4%
# of Fixes	38	

Was it resolved satisfactorily?

Resolved Satisfactorily?		
Yes	18	100%
No	0	0%
Total Comments	18	

Question 2: What are your thoughts about resolving the 3-Rs (Remanufacturing, Reconditioning and Repair)?

How to Resolve the 3Rs Issue		
Not a Big Problem	13	38%
Use Performance Criteria	11	31%
User Problem	2	6%
Don't Know How to Handle	2	6%
Serious Matter	1	3%
Difficult to Resolve	1	3%
Not Resolvable	1	3%
Support TG's Work	1	3%
WG's Proposal is OK	1	3%
More Guidelines	1	3%
More Work on Repair	1	3%
Pre-NTEP	1	3%
Total Comments	36	

Question 3: Do you find the NTEP CC listing on the internet to be useful? In what other format(s) would you like to see the CC's offered?

Are NTEP CC's on Internet Useful?		
Yes	34	97%
Not	0	0%
Somewhat	1	3%
Total Comments	35	

Resolved Satisfactorily?		
Don't Use The Web		3

END OF DOCUMENT

