



Rapport de mission en Allemagne et aux USA

- Mission à Brême du 22 au 23 avril 2005
- Mission à Memphis du 5 au 13 juin 2005

Participation au groupe de travail Commercial Standardized Instrument for Testing of Cotton (CSITC) de l'International Cotton Advisory Committee (ICAC)

Participation à la conférence des standards internationaux

Participation à la conférence Engineered Fiber Selection de Cotton Incorporated

Préparation de projets Common Fund for Commodities

Jean-Paul Gourlot
Unité propre de recherche
« Qualité et production cotonnière »
Laboratoire de technologie cotonnière
Cirad-ca
Juin 2005

CIRAD-DIST
Unité bibliothèque
Lavalette

CIRAD



000072055

1 - Objectif

- Participation active au groupe de travail Commercial Standardized Instrument for Testing of Cotton (CSITC) de l'International Cotton Advisory Committee (ICAC).
- Participation à la conférence des standards internationaux.
- Participation à la conférence Engineered Fiber Selection de Cotton Incorporated.
- Préparation de projets Common Fund for Commodities.

2 - Personne rencontrées

- les membres du groupes de travail CSITC
- Hossein Ghorashi, Uster Technologies
- Urania Kechagia, Réseau Coton Méditerranéen
- Mrs Diaby, Ky, Mansour et ??, classeurs du Mali, du Burkina Faso, du Tchad et du Bénin
- Darryl Earnest, Jimmy Knowlon, Nikky Fowler de l'USDA AMS.

- 4 JUL. 2005

3 - Faits marquants pour le sujet CSITC

Le groupe CSITC a été constitué par l'ICAC pour répondre à la demande de l'*International Cotton Association* (ex-Liverpool Cotton Association) pour la mise en place d'une classification des fibres de coton sur la base d'une mesure objective et instrumentale des caractéristiques technologiques (voir début de l'annexe 1 qui résume ce point).

3.1 - Réunion de Brême

L'ordre du jour comportait les points suivants :

- *Proposal for CFC funding to support the establishment of a reference laboratory and regional laboratories. Review the draft proposal prepared by Bremen.*
- *Actions Recommended in the CSITC Report to the Plenary In Mumbai:*
- *Definition of specifications for cotton trading (complete, Peter Wakefield and Bruno Widmer are working on a sampling protocol)*
- *Definition of international test rules (Bremen agreed to propose simplified test rules, drawing on publications by USDA and ITMF, that will be practical to implement in the first stage. Where are we with this?)*
- *Implementation of the test rules (discussion on principles - requires trade involvement)*
- *Rules for certification of the testing laboratories (Current status in Bremen/USDA? Should the ICAC Secretariat have a role in the certification?)*
- *Development of Calibration Cottons (Report from Jimmy Knowlton regarding current status)*
- *Specifying commercial control limits for trading (Reports from Bremen and USDA on results of round tests and checklots as a basis for empirical determination of tolerances)*
- *Arbitration procedures (discussion on principles - requires trade involvement)*

La réunion de Brême qui devait se faire en petit comité pour préparer la réunion de Memphis a en fait regroupé tous les acteurs du groupe de travail à l'exception des représentants de la commercialisation.

En résumé, l'objectif de cette réunion de Brême était de définir les éléments essentiels à la reconnaissance qualitative des laboratoires participants à cet effort de standardisation internationale. Pour y parvenir, le groupe restreint a suggéré de mettre en place un test inter-laboratoire spécifique à la détermination de la précision et de la justesse de mesure des appareils installés dans les différents laboratoires participants.

Il est également paru nécessaire d'envisager le statut juridique du groupe de travail ou de son successeur à terme. En effet, comme cela existe actuellement pour le classement manuel et visuel, s'il y a désaccord entre deux ou plusieurs parties dans le cadre d'un contrat, une procédure d'arbitrage est engagée. Le compte-rendu d'arbitrage fait foi devant un tribunal afin qu'il statue sur les suites à donner au litige. La même « procédure » serait utilisée dans le cas d'un litige faisant suite à une caractérisation instrumentale. Il est donc nécessaire d'envisager une structure indépendante et faisant foi devant les tribunaux, qui organise ou supervise les opérations de classement des fibres de coton au niveau mondial.

Un résumé des minutes de ce meeting est donné en annexe 1.

3.2 - Réunion de Memphis

L'ordre du jour comportait les points suivants. Tout ce qui a été confirmé est indiqué en clair dans cet ordre du jour sinon discuté plus loin.

RECAP Definition of CSITC.

1. *Objective: Implement instrument testing reliability through out the world cotton industry, similar to the existing model within USDA.*
2. *How: Initially working of the 7 point action plan which includes, laboratory certification of competence, simulation manual classing by acceptance of natural variance between cotton samples, and commercial evaluation of disputes based on arbitration*
3. *Recommendation of name change for Expert Panel to Task Force, to reflect these objectives.*

II) DEFINITION OF SPECIFICATIONS FOR COTTON TRADING

1. *Confirm recommendation of six characteristics* → Confirmé
2. *Confirm recommendation for 100% bale sampling* → Confirmé
3. *Confirm decision to exclude trash measurement for commercial application.* → Confirmé
4. *Review Proposed Sampling Protocol prepared by Peter and Bruno* → A revoir
 - a. *Consider 60 samples maximum/package (Steve Burris)*
 - b. *Sampling at destination (Andrew)*
 - c. *Arbitration Samples (Andrew)*

III) DEFINITION OF TEST RULES

1. *Confirm recommendation that Universal Calibration Standards to be used in all circumstances* → Confirmé
2. *Confirm agreement on procedures for USDA & Bremen to jointly design and conduct a special series of Round Tests to develop recommendations for certification rules and tolerances.*
→ Confirmé

IV) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TEST RULES

1. *Pending on III) above*

V) RULES FOR CERTIFICATION OF TESTING LABORATORIES

1. Confirm that ICAC Expert Panel or "Task Force" will serve oversight role to establish certification standards and compliance requirements for laboratories → Confirmé
2. Discuss diagrams of a certification system to be presented by Ralph and Thomas → A revoir, voir document en annexe 2
3. Discuss recommendation from Ralph for grading system as opposed to pass/fail scenario. → A revoir, voir document en annexe 3, ma réponse en Annexe 4
4. Discuss Thomas and Jean-Paul investigations to integrate ISO-like principles into the certification system → Retiré de l'agenda
5. Consider the value of national or regional programs → Retiré de l'agenda

VI) DEVELOPMENT OF CALIBRATION COTTONS

1. Confirm USDA position to the full committee → Confirmé

VII) SPECIFYING COMMERCIAL TOLERANCES FOR TRADING

1. Confirm tolerances recommended in Bremen

2. Confront results of international textile survey

VIII) ARBITRATION PROCEDURES

- A revoir

1. Concept of arbitral bodies

2. Acceptance of certified/grade laboratories and legal implications for trade protection.

3.3 - Discussion des points précédents si nécessaire

3.3.1 - A propos du check-test pilote

J'ai inscrit le Laboratoire de Technologie Cotonnière du Cirad au « check-test » pilote pour être partie intégrante des efforts réalisés en matière de normalisation. A ce titre, nous recevrons des échantillons à tester mi-août pour remise des résultats dans les 10 jours.

Les résultats de tous les laboratoires seront regroupés par USDA et Brême et nous seront envoyés pour les analyses et émettre des propositions (pour mi septembre 2005) de règles de fonctionnement de la validation et de la reconnaissance des laboratoires au niveau commercial.

3.3.2 - Forme juridique et diagramme de certification

La structuration finale de l'« organisme » en charge de la validation des recommandations du groupe de travail ayant un gros impact sur le mode de fonctionnement, il est important d'attendre la réalisation du test pilote inter-laboratoire en cours de montage pour conclure (Annexe 2). Une réponse Cirad est donnée en Annexe 4. Le sujet sera encore débattu.

3.3.3 - Procédures d'échantillonnage

Un texte de procédure a été discuté et demande des modifications. Il sera ré-édité et revu en Septembre à Liverpool.

3.3.4 - Notations probables de la performance des laboratoires au vu des résultats des tests inter-laboratoires

Ralph Schulze propose de ramener les résultats des laboratoires pour chacun des 4 cotonns analysés soit à la moyenne standardisée à 100 de tous les laboratoires, soit à la valeur connue pour ces cotonns. Par exemple, le coton 1 ayant une valeur reconnue de 4, aurait une « note »

de 100. Un laboratoire qui trouverait 3.8 aurait une « note » de 95 (Annexe 3).

Au vu de ces notes, tout demandeur d'analyse se rapprocherait alors des laboratoires qui auraient une note approchant le plus de 100 pour tous les critères mesurés. Cette méthode aurait l'avantage de ne pas obliger l'ICAC ou le CSITC à émettre un avis sur la qualité de la prestation des laboratoires.

Le sujet ayant été proposé trop tard pour être étudié lors de la réunion, la discussion est repoussée à la conclusion des observations qui pourront être faites suite au test inter-laboratoires pilote.

3.3.5 - Tolérances commerciales

Ce sujet, basé sur une proposition de la réunion restreinte de Brême, a occasionné des discussions passionnées de la part des membres du groupe. Il faut en effet se rappeler que les représentants de la commercialisation n'avaient pas pu se rendre à Brême.

L'idée de proposer des tolérances commerciales est rejetée car des pratiques sont déjà en cours que ce soit pour des classements manuels et visuels ou par instruments de mesure.

Pour conclure, le groupe a décidé de se concentrer sur la « validation », la manière de reconnaître les compétences des laboratoires participants et la manière de l'afficher largement.

3.3.6 - Procédures d'arbitrage

Les associations cotonnières, qui sont partenaires de cet effort de normalisation, ont émis une note de commentaire à discuter lors du prochain comité (fin septembre à Liverpool lors du comité plénier de l'ICAC). La note est donnée en annexe 5.

Tout commentaire ou apport par les lecteurs de ce rapport sont les bienvenus et à me remettre avant mi septembre. Merci.

4 - Autres faits marquants (mission de Memphis)

4.1 - Conférence des standards universels

Tous les représentants de signataires de l'accord des standards universels étaient représentés. Il s'agit des acteurs de la filière cotonnière américaines et des associations cotonnières mondiales qui furent ou sont encore consommateurs de fibres des USA.

Pascal Desmet était le représentant de l'AFCOT.

Deux propositions ont été faites par l'USDA :

- créer 14 types de standards physiques de couleur (pavés de fibres), référencés par leurs coordonnées Rd% et +b ; cette mesure a été approuvée. Les cotonns produits seraient copiés à l'identique grâce à l'utilisation de colorimètres performants. Les cotonns vendus auront une période de validité de 1 an. Note : les colorimètres actuels sont étalonnés à partir de carrelage de teintes variées couvrant la gamme des couleurs rencontrées pour les fibres de coton. Or il existe autant de carrelage de référence que de types et de modèles d'instrument. Pour établir une référence stable dans le temps, il a été choisi de fabriquer ces standards physiques de couleur et de créer des guides photographiques et physiques de grades de *Bark and grass* valides pour le classement des cotonns des USA. L'utilisation de ce guide de classement à l'essai depuis 2 ans à l'USDA n'a pas été approuvée par le comité.

Les documents expliquant les procédures d'établissement des standards universels sont en circulation et seront centralisés à mon niveau.

Depuis 1998, le Laboratoire de Technologie Cotonnière du Cirad s'est battu pour faire partie des laboratoires qui établissent les valeurs de référence des matières d'étalonnage des appareils HVI® de mesure du monde entier. C'est maintenant chose faite suite à l'annonce officielle en comité plénier de notre participation effective dans ce travail. **Félicitations et merci à tous ceux qui se sont battus pour faire avancer ce dossier, et à tous ceux qui participent au travail d'établissement de ces valeurs de référence. Champagne !!**

4.2 - Conférence Engineered Fiber Selection (EFS)

Cette conférence complètement financée par Cotton Incorporated a lieu deux fois par an aux Etats-Unis. Elle est regroupée avec la conférence des standards universels tous les trois ans à Memphis.

Cette conférence permet de relater aux participants tous les efforts de promotion du coton réalisés par Cotton Incorporated. Elle fait par ailleurs appel à des orateurs indépendants pour rappeler les contextes techniques et organisationnels qui peuvent avoir une influence pour la prise de décision sur des actions futures à titre individuel.

Cotton Incorporated crée des logiciels pour tous les segments du secteur cotonnier, depuis les planteurs jusqu'aux utilisateurs. Ces logiciels permettent la gestion des stocks de balles de coton assorties respectivement de toutes les caractérisations physiques de fibre mesurées par l'USDA, depuis le planteur jusqu'à l'utilisateur final.

Le calendrier de cette conférence, ainsi que tous les documents collectés sont en circulation et seront regroupés à mon niveau. Note : deux CD relatent les actes de toutes les conférences depuis 1998 (excepté 2005 qui sera disponible en juillet 2006).

La session 8 relative aux efforts du CSITC a permis de constater l'aval de tous les intervenants, dont le National Cotton Council, Cotton Incorporated, un représentant des *shippers et traders* à la condition que le système actuellement en place aux USA ne soit pas contesté sur le fond.

Rappelons deux points :

- le CSITC a pour vocation de promouvoir mondialement l'instrumentalisation des mesures technologiques, et, dans la mesure des moyens mis en place, de la rendre aussi efficace et reconnue que celle de l'USDA ; il n'y a pas de problème.
- la Chine a établi un plan de développement pour caractériser toute sa production de balle par chaîne de mesure instrumentale à l'horizon de 2010 grâce à l'utilisation de près de 300 chaînes de mesure réparties dans environ 108 laboratoires. Cette démarche se fait en concertation avec l'USDA.

4.3 - Réseau Coton méditerranéen : Urania Kechagia

Urania Kechagia m'a contacté pour rester un des responsables du groupe Technologie du Réseau Coton Méditerranéen en concertation avec le nouveau chef de groupe. Il s'agirait d'unir nos compétences pour couvrir l'ensemble de la filière textile, du coton-graine jusqu'aux produits finis. A suivre en fonction de l'intérêt du Cirad pour s'investir dans ce travail.

4.4 - Faserinstitut de Brême et projets CFC : Axel Drieling

Nous travaillons avec le Faserinstitut de Brême dans trois domaines convergents ;

- le CSITC déjà mentionné plus haut ;
- un partage de compétences dans le cadre du Programme Qualité de l'UEMOA mis en œuvre par l'ONUDI au travers d'un contrat en cours sur l'étude de faisabilité d'un centre technique régional sur le coton dans cette zone ;

- le dépôt, sous l'égide de Brême, de deux projets *Common Fund for Commodities*, un de juillet à décembre 2005, et un de 2006 à 2010 environ, le premier projet devant permettre d'établir précisément le plan de travail du deuxième projet.

Les discussions ont donc porté sur le contenu technique des différents projets en cours ou en montage.

4.5 - Partenaires africains du Programme Qualité de l'UEMOA mis en œuvre par l'ONUDI

En décembre 2004, l'USAID a organisé une mission d'expertise sur le système de classement à la qualité de fibres en Afrique de l'Ouest.

Cette mission a été suivie de l'invitation des classeurs représentants de quatre pays africains (Mali, Burkina Faso, Bénin et Tchad) pendant toutes ces journées de conférence. Nous avions rencontrée la plupart d'entre eux lors de notre mission de formation ONUDI / UEMOA au Bénin du 11 au 21 mai 2005.

Cette mission était co-organisée par l'USDA et le National Cotton Council, ce dernier étant très jaloux de ses prérogatives vis-à-vis de nos amis africains ...

Afin de les aider, je me suis permis de leur faire rencontrer Hossein Ghorashi (Uster Technologies), Stanley Anthony (USDA AMS, égrenage) et Kyle Shofner (Shaffner Technologies) pour qu'ils puissent aborder avec eux les problèmes ou questions techniques les concernant directement.

4.6 - Uster Technologies : Hossein Ghorashi

Un point sur l'étude en cours a été fait : les caractérisations technologiques des échantillons doivent s'achever fin juin 2005, pour une remise du rapport définitif en fin d'année.

Nous avons par ailleurs discuté de l'achat de deux machines de leurs concurrents (Premier, Inde) pour les laboratoires africains (Togo, Mali) sur financement Union Européenne dans le cadre du Programme Qualité de l'UEMOA mis en œuvre par l'ONUDI.

Annexe 1

Small group meeting in Bremen

April 23, 2005

Summary of the CSITC small-group meeting on April 23, 2005, in Bremen

A small-group meeting of the Expert Panel on Commercial Standardization of Instrument Testing of Cotton (CSITC) was held in Bremen, Germany, on April 23, 2005. The meeting was open to all members of the CSITC. Andrew Macdonald, Chair, and Zbigniew Rostwitalski, Rapporteur, were present. Also in attendance were James Knowlton and Steve Grantham of USDA, Jean-Paul Gourlot of CIRAD, Axel Drieling, Thomas Schneider and Professor Axel Herrmann of the Bremen Fiber Institute, Ralph Schulzé from Australia, Bruno Widmer of SGS, Peter Wakefield of Wakefield Inspection Services, and Terry Townsend as executive director of the ICAC. Fritz Grobien and Jan Wellman of the Bremen Cotton Exchange also attended.

The Expert Panel on CSITC was formed in December 2003 on the instruction of the 62nd ICAC Plenary Meeting. There is a consensus that instrument testing of cotton is superior to traditional hand classing. Instrument test results provide information to spinners that allow more efficient use of cotton, thereby enhancing demand. Instrument test results provide information to seed breeders, cotton producers and ginners, enabling the production of cotton with characteristics desired by the spinning industry. Instrument testing can also render the trading of cotton more efficient.

The purpose of the CSITC is to facilitate increased use of instrument testing of cotton around the world by developing recommendations for standardized testing systems so that results from laboratories around the world are comparable. The CSITC met in Bremen in March 2004 and in Mumbai in November 2004; a third meeting of the full CSITC is scheduled for Memphis on June 6, 2005, and a fourth meeting is scheduled for September 25, 2005 in Liverpool. The purpose of the small-group meeting was

- a) To assist the Bremen Fiber Institute in preparing a project proposal for submission to the Common Fund for Commodities (CFC) and
- b) To further discussions on CSITC recommendations so as to make the Third meeting in Memphis in June as productive as possible.

CFC Project Proposal

The Bremen Fiber Institute is developing a project proposal for submission to the Common Fund for Commodities (CFC). The proposal will be submitted to the CFC in time for consideration at the July 2005 meeting of the CFC Consultative Committee. The proposal seeks funds to

- (1) Assist the coordinated development and implementation of commercially viable international standards and procedures, for the instrument testing of cotton
- (2) Assist developing countries, particularly in Africa, to develop the capability to participate in the international instrument testing system.

Additional potential donors are being kept informed of developments with the project and will be asked to provide support for those components outside the mandate of the CFC.

During the small-group meeting, the outlines of the proposal were reviewed and elements needing additional clarification were identified. Members of the CSITC pledged to provide information to the Bremen Fiber Institute as needed.

CSITC Recommendations

The participants in the small-group meeting reviewed the seven recommended action items of the CSITC from the meeting in Mumbai in December.

1. Definition of Specifications for cotton trading

The small group confirmed that the characteristics recommended for inclusion in an instrument testing system at this time include

- Strength (grams/tex)
- Length (Upper Half Mean Length - expressed in inches and decimals, or in mms)
- Length uniformity (Index)
- Micronaire
- Color (Rd and +b)

Definitions of each measurement were discussed and will be presented for approval by the full CSITC in June.

There was a consensus to recommend that in a standardized testing system 100% of bales should be sampled, with the understanding that commercial agreements between buyer and seller may stipulate different sampling percentages.

The issue of trash measurement was discussed. There was a consensus that current technology for measuring trash is not fast enough or repeatable enough to include in an international system at this time. It was recognized that a trash measurement should be added to the international instrument testing system as soon as an acceptable, reliable measurement system can be authenticated. USDA is currently addressing this issue.

Other specific instrument measurements, including those for neps, short fiber, fineness/maturity, and stickiness, are currently under research development for SITC instrumentation. The inclusion of any of these, following approval, will be considered only after the standardized system has been adopted and the necessary confidence developed.

Peter Wakefield and Bruno Widmer presented a working paper on a sampling protocol (attached). The protocol will be discussed in June.

2. Definition of international test rules

The small group recommends that the criteria for certification of acceptable testing instruments be compliance with the Universal Calibration Standards (e.g. HVI-CCS and USDA Color Calibration Tiles) and appropriate parameters (e.g. UHML and UI).

For the certification of the CSITC laboratories based on the accuracy and precision of their results the following steps should be followed:

- (1) Define rules for an adequate Round Trial system
- (2) Define laboratory limits of acceptance for the validation of the laboratory individual results
- (3) Define rules and procedures for the certification of the laboratories based on the total performance of the laboratories during the certification period.

Therefore USDA and Bremen have developed a procedure for an adequate International Round Trial. The procedure comprises

- *Round trials to be conducted 4 times a year*
- *4 cotton samples per round*
 - *Day 1: 12 test on all the four cottons (24 combs) for the determination of the level / accuracy*
 - *Days 2 to 5: 6 tests on two cottons (12 combs) for the determination of precision*
 - *Total of 96 tests*
 - *1 test consists of 2 combs for length and strength measurement, 2 for color measurement, and 1 for micronaire*
- *All individual results have to be submitted for evaluation, so that precision can be calculated*
- *Round cotton samples will have restricted variability*
- *Origin of cottons: at least two representative cottons plus other possibilities including processed cotton (blended or carded) and other growths.*
- *Retest possibility*

For fixing the laboratory limits of acceptance and the rules for the certification of the laboratories the accuracy of data given by the USDA HVI Checktest or the Bremen Round Trial are not comprehensive enough. In response to this, USDA and Bremen agreed to jointly design and conduct a special series of Round Tests among willing laboratories, and from this information to develop recommendations for certification rules and tolerances. It is hoped that the results will be available to the Expert Panel for discussion during the 4th meeting in Liverpool in September.

It was agreed that certification standards for laboratories would be as inclusive as possible to facilitate participation, without compromising the integrity of an international cotton testing system.

3. Implementation of the test rules

4. Rules for certification of the testing laboratories

It was agreed that, at least initially, ICAC with its CSITC Expert Panel would serve an oversight role to establish certification standards and compliance requirements for laboratories, and that the functions of coordination among laboratories would be delegated to existing institutions.

The structure of similar activities in the international wool industry was discussed, and it was noted that to adapt this model, would necessitate the creation of new international bodies. However the consensus view was that this was not desirable, and that the international cotton industry should use existing structures (possibly with some minor modification) to oversee, coordinate and implement internationally standardized instrument testing.

In preparation for the continuation of this discussion, Ralph Schulzé and Thomas Schneider will prepare diagrams to represent the above. They will also investigate the practicality of integrating ISO, or ISO-like principles, into the overall certification system. The potential value of national and regional best practice programs (for example that used internally by USDA), which are capable of being coordinated and audited, will also need to be considered.

Another important discussion will need to focus on the different levels of CSITC work, particularly regarding laboratory certification:

- Level 1: Test result check of the laboratory results based on an adequate round trial
- Level 2: Provide guidance to laboratories to meet quality requirements
- Level 3: Check of the laboratories for their laboratory practice
- Level 4: ISO quality management (ISO 17025)

5. Development of calibration cottons

James Knowlton reported that USDA recently expanded warehouse capacity and has the ability to provide calibration cottons to the world industry for at least the next several years. He noted that Chinese authorities have indicated that they will eventually develop their own calibration cottons, but they agree in principle to the importance of maintaining a single world reference standard for calibration cottons based on the Universal Standards prepared by USDA.

In discussing calibration cottons it was noted that these should have an expiration date (e.g. 2 years), and in the longer term should comply with ISO Standard 17025 requirements, (e.g. statement of measurement uncertainty).

The small group discussed the possibility of additional countries being able to produce calibration cottons true to a single reference standard produced by USDA. James Knowlton agreed to consider such a system and how it might be developed.

6. Specifying commercial tolerances for trading

The small group recognized that commercial tolerances for trading are a different concept to the laboratory limits of acceptance mentioned in action item 3. In general, commercial tolerances for trading cotton will be broader and less rigorous than the tolerances agreed for certification of laboratories.

Including input from traders and others present at the meeting, there was a consensus that the following tolerances should apply within international trade in cotton:

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| • Strength | -3 grams/tex |
| • Length (UHML) | -0.03 inches (approximately 1/32nds of an inch) |
| • Length uniformity | -2 on index |
| • Micronaire | +/- 0.3 on reading |
| • Color Rd | -3 for Rd 70 and higher
-4 for Rd under 70 |
| • Color +b | +1.5 |

The international cotton trade should further consider these recommendations, so that they can be reviewed in June.

7. Arbitration procedures

Discussion at either the Memphis or Liverpool CSITC Expert Panel meeting to be led by ICA (formerly LCA).

Fichier "Summary April 23 V1.doc" message du 02/05/2005

Annexe 2

CSITC restructure proposal

CSITC RESTRUCTURE

1. INTRODUCTION - Why?

ICAC established the CSITC Expert Panel to develop a commercially acceptable, standardised, instrument based cotton testing system; and to develop strategies for its implementation. This is quite a complex task and is one which will be addressed in stages. It could take say 2 years to achieve. However right now we should recognise that any new system will need to operate under a structured body to achieve accountability. Having at least some idea of the structure of the ongoing responsible body should help us consider how everything will tie together, and how the system as a whole might operate.

Change is inevitable, and right now we need to determine if major or minor structural change best suits the needs of the international cotton industry.

2. TYPE OF CHANGE - Major or Minor?

An example of major change would be the establishment of a new autonomous organization – possibly along the lines of the wool industry's INTERWOOLLABS. However there is a major difference between wool and cotton in that wool does not have a 'government to government' body similar to the cotton industry's ICAC. (*However in the past the old International Wool Secretariat partially filled that role.*) Internationally cotton has simply evolved along different lines.

An autonomous body, accountable only to itself, can create problems as it attempts to assert itself and confirm its independent authority.

In my view there is no need to establish a separate autonomous organization to manage all things relating to the instrument testing of cotton fibre.

The issue can be better addressed by adapting what we now have to cater for those additional needs, i.e., appropriate, but minor change.

3. ADAPTING STATUS QUO

CSITC is well structured as a special ICAC panel or task force, but it has no mandate to enshrine itself in perpetuity. The continuing role for the body which will eventually manage the 'new' system is quite different, and for that reason its structure and composition need to be different – but maybe not all that different.

The following suggestions, and diagram, are simply aimed at achieving a starting point for further debate and consideration.

The main points follow:-

- ICAC TO REMAIN THE PARENT BODY. The new continuing committee should be directly accountable to ICAC.
- ICAC would appoint the Chair; establish appropriate reporting and authorisation procedures; approve work plans, and budgets; and issue directives as determined by Plenary etc.
- It is suggested that there be four Core Members of the new body, i.e., ITMF; ICA; USDA; and the Bremen Fibre Institute- each nominating a member but ICAC retaining rejection rights.
- USDA and Bremen working collaboratively would form a notional International Testing Coordinating Centre to coordinate all relevant instrument testing.
- Much of the day to day testing management, data recording etc., could be delegated to the above.
- Similarly coordination of trade and arbitration related issues could be delegated to ICA (working with kindred bodies, like ACSA, Gdansk etc.). End user and textile related matters could be coordinated by ITMF. Hence the logic of 'core members'.
- A further six to eight members could be appointed by ICAC, subject to annual review and confirmation. These members would be selected to achieve the right 'balance' of technical, commercial, managerial and sectoral expertise. All links in the 'farm to fabric' market chain, including those in developing countries, need to be part of that 'balance'.

- Members would NOT represent their own sector or country, and would be solely accountable through the 'committee' to ICAC. There should be no exclusion of a person whose country is not a member of ICAC. However to avoid perceived conflict of interest, the major manufacturers of testing equipment should not be members. Possibly observer status could be considered by the Committee later for selected individuals.

As there is a nexus between the work of the Committee, and the integrity of international trade/ sanctity of contracts, each member must be committed to these fundamentals.

The naming of the new body will also need to be thought through. There may be value in avoiding convoluted or 'weak' names. A strong short title &/or catchy acronym.

4. RELATED MATTERS

On the more general topic of worldwide input into the CSITC 'model' we need to create opportunities for this to happen, and to crystallize – and we need to do this soon. In September, the ICAC meetings, followed by ICA activities in Liverpool, will provide such an opportunity. Providing there is adequate preparation and notice (and time allocation) "Government" and "Trade" input, guidance, and hopefully support, should eventuate. This could be absorbed into preparation for the CSITC March 06 meeting in Bremen.

Traditionally many technical and textile people participate in the ITMF and other related meetings at that time – Bremen have a different participant mix to Liverpool.

There may be an opportunity for ICAC's CSITC, with ITMF and Bremen support, to organise a full day *Fibre Quality Testing Workshop*. We would need to mesh it into the overall program, but I am sure that it could be done to the benefit of all. In my view we should seek to target 'hands on' cotton classers, by giving them a meaty agenda and open workshop format (plus inclusion in other related Bremen activities), to entice them and to justify international travel costs. Input and support from this group is essential, as they represent the real engine room, and will be the ones responsible for implementing any new CSITC system. Indeed when we look at ongoing structure and activities we need to be mindful of this.

If there was support for this suggestion then, through ICAC, we would need to quickly discuss it with the Bremen/ITMF people.

5. DIAGRAM OF STRUCTURE

Actually the proposed structure does not present well as a diagram. The 'accountability' line is simple – directly to ICAC, and the structure is straightforward, but the subsidiary role of members is less so.

Ralph Schulze, 31st May 2005

International Cotton Advisory Committee – ICAC

CSITC Expert Panel – mark 2

USDA	BREMEN FIBRE INSTITUTE	INTERNATIONAL COTTON ASSOC - ICA	INT TEXTILE MANUFACT FEDERATION – ITMF	BALANCE MEMBERS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jointly act as the International Testing Coordination Centre. Manage calibration Round Tests to assess accuracy and consistency – equipment, facilities, and laboratories. Seek feedback, assist in improving co-operator performance. Manage the Registration/Accreditation/Certification system (when completed and approved). Continue to improve testing methodology to increase, repeatability, confidence, acceptability and adoption. Utilise USDA efforts to continuously improve 'Universal Standards', e.g., re colour and trash. Utilise ITMF/Bremen Working Groups to assess and authenticate new testing equipment and methods – including that for neps, short fibre, fineness/maturity, stickiness, etc. Involve and liaise with other members with technical expertise, e.g., CIRAD, re all the above. Maintain and manage an appropriate data base (including data accessibility procedures). Provide adequate technical support to full group. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote adoption of the standardised system by members, affiliates and the Trade generally. Seek and coordinate input from Trade, especially addressing commercial, operational and confidence issues. Ensure that the standardised systems, and further developments of it, complement 'integrity of trade' and 'sanctity of contract'. Develop, introduce and manage appropriate arbitration procedures – in collaboration with affiliate and kindred bodies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote adoption by members and the Spinning and Textile industries generally. Seek and coordinate input from its sectors, especially regarding fibre specification, useability, and improvements. Encourage its sectors to use the enhanced information to improve operations, and to develop new opportunities for cotton. Continue support for its Bremen coordinated Fibre Quality Technical Working Groups. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure objective 'balance' in input, deliberation and outcomes. Pay attention to the need for balance between technical, commercial and pragmatic considerations. Ensure that no sector of the international cotton community, or the full market chain from farm to fabric, is disadvantaged; and that their needs and expectations are addressed. Introduce innovations to improve the effectiveness of the overall standardised system, especially regarding anomaly correction, operations, confidence and adoption. Along with other members, to promote the standardised system and to act as 'champions'. 	

Annexe 3

Laboratory certification proposed procedure

DRAFT CSITC DISCUSSION PAPER

Memphis Agenda Item (V) 3

LABORATORY CERTIFICATION Vs RATING/RANKING

1. CERTIFICATION

Feedback from the special USDA/BREMEN/CSITC tests, about to get underway, should assist us in developing a Certification, Accreditation or Registration process. The feedback data should also help us develop scenarios where we can test the likely outcomes of a range of 'pass and fail' and other options. Some additional questions relating to 'PASS/FAIL' and Certification include;

- *At what point do instruments or labs (or facilities) 'fail'?
- *How many results outside the tolerance levels are acceptable for each parameter? *If an instrument fails in one parameter does the lab/instrument as a whole fail?
- *And if it does, how does it become reinstated?
- *How long would certification last ?
- *How would you implement de-certification where performance deteriorates?
- *Who would have the authority to grant, modify, withdraw or reinstate certification? Etc.etc.
- *What about legal liability implications?

We will also need to choose our terminology carefully, e.g., 'certification' , 'accreditation' , 'approved', etc.

No matter how emphatic we are that the term relates only to the individual lab, there will be those who will infer or assume that the term extends to particular commercial results.

Another feature of a formalised 'certification' system is an ability to effectively audit or verify its implementation. This could involve regular on site inspections – particularly regarding any 'ISO-like' requirements deemed necessary. So the system could become more cumbersome and more costly; overly process driven, rather than performance focussed- and people may simply turn away.

Personally I feel that going down the pass/fail certification pathway will create more problems than it will solve.

2. RANKING/RATING

A simple example of a RANKING system would be that each instrument or lab would get 100% for each test in each parameter

that fell within the acceptable range. Then if a test fell outside the range it might get a score equal to the % of the actual test result compared to the 'standard', e.g. a length of 1.05" against a standard of 1.15" might give a score of 91.3, or a mic of 4.2 compared to 5.0 gets a score of 84.0.

Then all the scores could be averaged(and reported) for each parameter, and for the lab as a whole. Alternatively more sophisticated summaries of result distribution could be given.

NOTE: There may be some logic in rationalising parameter or characteristic reporting back to 4, viz., combining the 2 colour components and the 2 length related components.

So a lab may be rated as: OVERALL 97.3 comprising;
LENGTH 98.5, STRENGTH 97.5, MIC 100.0, COLOUR 93.2,

I feel that such a system would be quickly assessed by the Trade, and confidence established. At the same time the data would also help to identify lab problem areas, which may or may not be 'fixable'. Regarding this last point, I feel we need to support the adequate resourcing of USDA and Bremen to assist in 'fixing' problems.

NOTE: As part of the CFC/ICAC project Bremen could consider 'troublefix' activities in Developing Countries.

In most countries this need not be overdone, as the owner/operator of the lab has a strong commercial incentive to improve lab rating and test data acceptability. The commercial consequences of poor or suspect performance will become increasingly damaging as the Trade gains confidence in the 'new' system.

3. CO-ORDINATION AND REGISTRATION.

Most of the following comments apply to the RATING system more than to CERTIFICATION, but some apply to both.

- Ranking would be determined from the results for each instrument (or lab/facility) in a Bremen or USDA Round Test. It could be expressed as the results from the most recent test, or say the average of the three best of the last four tests – feedback will guide us on this. Some may prefer labs to be ranked in 'bands', rather than rated with performance figures.
- Each participating Laboratory, or Classing Facility, would need to 'register' and to nominate all equipment to be assessed. Registration would be conditional on agreeing to fully comply with the USDA/HVI or ITMF instrument and facility operating guidelines and procedures.
'Registration' is a good term in that it does not infer any endorsement of a lab, or of its results.
- Registration may also involve agreement to accept special protocols determined by CSITC (or its successor). These could relate to somewhat contradictory things such as; 'privacy', confidentiality, 'freedom of information', 'transparency', password access, and integrity and intellectual property protection; as well as to additional operational requirements, re-test rules, use of non compliant or 'unregistered' equipment in a 'registered' facility etc.
- Ideally, in the future, there needs to be a single secure data base (maintained or delegated by ICAC / CSITC). Initially we may need to use two (USDA and the Bremen Institute), but I personally doubt that we could continue to use USDA in the longer term without impinging on that bodies sovereignty.
- Personally I see an unnecessary complication arising from the 'regional coordinating lab' concept. Initially why don't we confine ourselves to assessments based on Round / Calibration Tests conducted directly by either USDA or the Bremen Fibre Institute? Here we would need to be sure that we were not overtaxing their capacity. Then once the system has reached 'critical mass', and confidence established, to then gradually integrate 'regionally coordinated' sub-systems into the whole. *NOTE: The CFC Project could seek to design and test such systems for Developing Countries. Other countries, like Australia, already have systems in place, which may require only minimal change.*
- The ongoing coordination and management of any new system would be a task for the body which will eventually replace CSITC –see other Discussion Paper.

Ralph Schulze 25th May 2005.

Annexe 4

Ma réponse en parallèle

-----Message d'origine-----

De : gourlot [mailto:gourlot@cirad.fr]

Envoyé : mercredi 1 juin 2005 17:31

À : 'Thomas Schneider'; 'schulze@nsw.chariot.net.au'

Cc : Bruno BACHELIER (bruno.bachelier@cirad.fr); Axel DRIELING (drieling@uni-bremen.de) **Objet :**

RE : Diagrams of certification system, Integration of ISO-like principles

Dear All,

I had a careful look at both messages, and I now have some time to answer.

First I have a question from Thomas's message : when and to whom I need to talk about Africa ? Is that during the CSITC plenary meeting ? Or is that among us 3 ? I need to know that fast in order to prepare something somewhat formal ... Please advise.

Coming back to Ralph's ideas :

According to structure :

As Ralph, I am thinking that the final structure can be addressed "during walking the path". I guess that we have to wait for comments from the other Task Force members who were not in Bremen in April. It will probably bring other new ideas about the possibilities we have to build that structure. I would think through the objectives we want for that structure. At first, I would see

- proposing goals to be achieved by the labs everywhere in the world
- proposing conditions for these labs to be "recognised" in the CSITC objectives
- proposing ways of control (periodic?, randomised ?, all labs ? ...) so as to clearly define on which points they will be audited and controlled (from the inside as well from the outside)

Remain some questions to better define the objectives of such a structure:

- do we wish that the actual Task Force will have full control on everything or do we wish to delegate someone else (outside the task force and or the structure) to do something in particular to cover the full range of activities we have in scope ?
- has the Task Force or the future structure the means (knowledge, expertise, time, resources) to cover all the activities we would like? As an example, if there are say 2 labs per country in average to control/audit in every of the 80 cotton producing countries, that will make 160 labs to audit per year + 4* 160 test sample results to check per year if the proposed check test is installed on a routine basis. Will the structure be able to afford that work load ? And what about flight tickets and accommodations costs ? Who would pay for a central organization as proposed in Bremen (everything managed from a center lab) ?

From these answers, it will be possible to complement the objectives of the structure by adding or not

- running the international check-test (dispatching samples, analysing data, editing reports and advises ...)
- auditing the labs at least one time per year
- editing / removing certificates
- running training sessions on an international level thanks to external experts
- getting the financial contributions of every labs for the next year
- prepare annual reports, publications, lists of certified members, list of uncertified members, run an internet site to inform cotton textile participants in the cotton chain
- ...

Having these objectives clearly defined, there will be solutions of organisations for the structure. At least, I see ICAC involved at some given steps.

It will also be necessary to think the other way : with a given structure, will it be possible to achieve all / a part of the objectives and how it can be done ... This is the reason why I proposed to take ground on existing systems

such as ISO or compatible structures. Do you remind the attached paper I prepared in this direction? I agree that we can limit the system to chapter 5 of ISO 17025 which is directly (concerning the technical management of a lab) in comparison with what is written in the attached file. Anyway, I would prefer an ISO like 17025 better than ISO 9000, because we can see many things and their contrary under 9000, as far as I know that system. The advantage of having a de-localised auditing process is the reduction in cost of travel and accommodation for auditors, and in consequence for the labs, and transfer the responsibility to another existing system which is used to perform this way.

It is to be noted that the spirit of ISO 9000 is moving toward the spirit of ISO 17025 along the years, so if we could go straight to the point, we would avoid to loose time (and probably troubles and money)

Coming to ISO like principles

The main idea of ISO standards, I would prefer to say Quality Management System, is to always improve the situation, by putting together a maintenance scheme, a monitoring system, procedures, and clear operating methods for instruments, and a periodical auditing process. As CSITC task Force member, I cannot dream of a better solution to achieve the overall objective of having good results any where in the world.

What ever the type of instrument used, what is important is the scale of reading under a precise referential (UHVICC for instance). Taking into consideration that some countries will slowly come to automatic classing from individual apparatus classing, we only can provide them with a quality management framework that is already clear in ISO standards, but that CSITC should make it clearer and / or adapted for cotton classing purposes.

And then Lab accreditation

In the former paragraph I tried to approach the idea.

It's true that the pass/fail is a solution that can be improved. I like the idea of rating the scores. However, this will require another tolerance setting from us, don't you think (one for tolerances to be applied, one for the score to be accredited)? However this has the advantage to get a clearer idea of the multi-parameter accreditation, especially when one criteria is "fail" while all others are "pass".

Since 1994, I have been organising a quarterly check-test, where labs have to perform test in a particular way that allow me to track problems, and most of the time to help these labs to correct their problem through advises from us. We do it criteria per criteria, and it works fine as results merged toward a common and stable average reading after some tests only. Thus, we can add an objective to the check test : provide setting solutions or advices for instruments that may be "fail" in some labs. Perhaps, the check test should start soon, and the certification procedure a little bit latter ...

By the way, what do you think about the objectives and scopes of the regional centers ?

Best regards and great patience to read all that !!

Jean-Paul Gourlot

Annexe 5

**Proposition d'amendement des règles
d'arbitrages par l'association de Gdynia,
Pologne.**

Proposed HVI Arbitration Procedures

1. HVI arbitration cotton testing will be done in a certified laboratory being recognised to be an arbitration laboratory when agreed by the parties, with no participation of any third persons.

It means that in case of quality arbitration effected on the HVI, the interested parties will not appoint arbitrators, as it has been the case at traditional arbitration, so far. hence, the role of an arbitrator will be played by the laboratory.

2. The number of cotton samples undergoing the HVI arbitration should follow from the kind of sampling defined in the buying/selling contract.

If the contract provides for 100% sampling, the 100% of samples should undergo the testing; in case of 10% sampling the test should be done on 10% etc..

**The weight of the arbitration sample should be not less than 150 grammes.
200 grammes is recommended.**

3. According to our proposition, the number of measurements for particular parameters of cotton, tested on the HVI for arbitration purposes, should be:

- Micronaire :	2 measurements(specimens) / 1 sample
- Length :	4
- Length Uniformity Index	4
- Strength (G/tex)	4
- Elongation	4
- Colour Reflectance (Rd)	4
- Colour Yellowness (+b)	4

up to an average

The above proposition follows from the laboratory practice which takes into consideration the applied number of measurements for classification purpose (2 specimen), as well as from the number of measurements effected during the calibration of the HVI and during the HVI CHECK LEVEL TEST (Micronaire – 3 specimens, remaining – 12 specimens).

4. The results of arbitration testing conducted on the HVI will take into consideration the permitted deviation limits for particular cotton parameters settled and accepted by the CSITC.

R