

**Minutes of the QUALANOD Technical Committee meeting
held on 28 June 2006 (9h30 – 11h30)
in Zurich (Hotel Sofitel)**

TC members:

ESTAL

J. Bettencourt
R. Boi
R. Furneaux
M. Koot

Meirsschaut

T. Poulet
T. Ulucak
R. Wunderlin

EAA

E. Arnoux
T. Bardh
F. Dijkstra
W. Mader (Chairman) S.

Guests:

Th. Becker (ESTAL)
P. Lloret (Executive Committee)
J. Luthiger (EAA)

Secretariat:

J. Schoppig
P. Bellot (minutes)



A G E N D A

1. Minutes of the meeting held on 18 November 2005
2. Statistical report
3. Abrasion test
4. Cold impregnation – ADAL’s remarks
5. Etching – Modifications proposed by Mr. Furneaux
6. Preanodizing – STANOD’s request
7. Composition of the Technical Committee in 2006/2007
8. CEN TC 132/WG 15
9. Any other business
10. Next meeting



As the new Chairman of the Technical Committee¹, Mr. Mader welcomed the delegates and guests.

1. Minutes of the meeting held on 18 November 2005

Mr. Boi suggested deleting the last sentence of the first paragraph of Item 4 “Chloride content”, which read “This recommendation was in line with the QUALANOD Specifications...100 mg/l”.

Mr. Arnoux thought that the last part of the final sentence of paragraph 6.1 “and would have to be repeated” was not necessary and should be deleted.

The other attendees agreed with both proposals.

With these corrections, the minutes of the previous meeting were unanimously approved. The amended minutes would be attached to these ones.

Answering Mr. Mader, who requested some information about items 3.2 and 6.1 discussed at the previous meeting, Mr. Schoppig confirmed that both the applicant and the Belgian national association had been informed of the request to carry out the referee test according to section 2.4.2 of the Specifications. However, since QUALANOD had not received any feedback from Belgium, Mr. Bettencourt had contacted the applicant company. On hearing that the Belgian laboratory was not able to perform the referee test due to a lack of equipment, he had suggested letting another laboratory carry out the test and had given Coil the address of the Portuguese laboratory LNEC.

¹ See Item 5 of the General Meeting held on 28.06.06

2. Statistical report

Mr. Schoppig commented on the list of unsatisfactory inspections based on the reports received between 1 November 2005 and 31 May 2006. Five inspections out of 183 (2.7%) had been negative. The reasons for negative results were high weight loss (2) and insufficient thickness (3). In the previous period (01.06 – 31.11.05), five inspections out of 142 (3.5%) had been negative.

Mr. Bardh said he was surprised by the long period between the two negative inspections which had led to the withdrawal of one licence. Those present confirmed that, under section 5.2.3 of the QUALANOD Specifications, repeat inspections had to be carried out within one month. Mr. Boi specified that the time between a negative inspection and the repeat visit was 30 “days worked”. However, this period could sometimes be longer when changes had to be carried out in the plant as a consequence of a negative result.

Those present affirmed that the rule concerning the time between a negative visit and its repetition should be observed and that the Secretariat should be informed promptly of any negative result.

The national associations would be reminded of the rules set out in the Specifications. It was their responsibility to instruct their inspectors to carry out the repeat visits on time.

3. Abrasion test

3.1 Update Sheet No. 5 “Negative results of abrasion test”

Those present reviewed the draft submitted by the Secretariat and made some slight corrections to the wording.

The amended Update Sheet No. 5 effective from 1 July 2006 would be sent to the national associations and be published on the website.

3.2 Abrasive paper

Mr. Schoppig reported that only three countries had replied to the survey conducted among the national associations. A total of 610 sheets had been ordered. However, as the British supplier did not seem to be interested in such a global order, the Secretariat had been looking for an alternative. Other papers had been investigated by the Italian laboratory, but the results were never comparable to those obtained with the paper recommended by the standard. Mr. Boi had asked the British Standards Organisation to solve the problem by delivering the prescribed paper but had not received any answer to this request.

Mr. Ulucak confirmed that, while he had been able to purchase 200 sheets of paper four years ago, he had now found it impossible to obtain the paper.

Mr. Lloret was worried about the situation. He did not see why QUALANOD should maintain the abrasion test if the material used to carry out the test was not available. Should this problem remain unresolved until the next meeting, he would recommend dropping the abrasion test from the Specifications.

Mr. Furneaux proposed to contact the supplier and ask the company to make the paper available. However, as it seemed to be very difficult to get in touch with English Abrasives, he would also contact Michael Clark, the initiator of the test, in order to get his support.

The Technical Committee thanked Mr. Furneaux for his proposal.

4. Cold impregnation – ADAL’s remarks

Mr. Arnoux had discovered that the QUALANOD Specifications did not clearly state that the impregnation sealing processes described in section 3.2.11 did not need an approval. The first sentence of section 3.2.10 could even be construed to mean the opposite. He thought that this should be clarified.

This proposal was welcomed by the other attendees and the “Specifications” working group was requested to prepare an update sheet.

5. Etching – modifications proposed by Mr. Furneaux

Following the November meeting, Mr. Furneaux had prepared a concrete proposal which had been sent to the committee members and national associations together with the agenda for the meeting.

As there were many new delegates at this meeting and the topic needed to be studied very thoroughly, the TC Chairman proposed that the discussion of this paper be postponed to the next meeting and asked the attendees to carefully review the proposed modifications by then.

This item would be put on the agenda again for the next Technical Committee meeting.

6. Preanodizing – STANOD’s request

Mr. Koot explained that the Dutch associations STANOD and VISEM had recently become aware of many problems linked with preanodizing. They therefore proposed that QUALANOD and QUALICOAT should together set up a joint working group with a view to defining the necessary conditions for good anodic pretreatment.

Mr. Boi thought that QUALANOD’s participation could only be considered if the problems were better defined by the Dutch association.

Mr. Lloret could not figure out why the Dutch association considered preanodizing to be QUALANOD’s problem. He maintained that, although the process was called “preanodizing”, this treatment had nothing to do with the anodizing process described by QUALANOD. The conditions were quite different and could not be followed by every anodizing plant. QUALANOD licensees knew how to do good anodizing on aluminium but not as a pretreatment before coating of aluminium.

Mr. Meiersschaut supported the idea of QUALANOD being involved in this discussion. He knew of some studies which showed that, under certain conditions, normal anodizing plus coating produced much better results than the anodic pretreatment defined by QUALICOAT. If QUALICOAT decided to investigate this matter, the participation of some QUALANOD experts could surely be helpful.

As ESTAL’s president, Mr. Becker said that this issue could be discussed by the joint technical committee because it was a working group open to any subject of common

interest. However, the decision had to be taken by QUALANOD and QUALICOAT, the quality label organizations.

After a lengthy discussion, also covering economic aspects, the Technical Committee finally decided to wait for QUALICOAT's decision. QUALANOD's participation in a joint working group was not rejected a priori.

7. Composition of the Technical Committee in 2006/2007

At the General Meeting, which had been attended by all the delegates present, EAA and ESTAL had confirmed the following nominations:

EAA

Messrs.	José ARENAS	SAPA	France
	Torbjörn BARDH	SAPA	Sweden
	Fokko DIJKSTRA	ALCOA	Netherlands
	Werner MADER (Chairman)	GDA e.V.	Germany
	Thierry POULET	ALCAN	France

ESTAL

Messrs.	Riccardo BOI	QUALITAL	Italy
	José BETTENCOURT	APAL	Portugal
	Robin FURNEAUX	TSC Surface Critical Prod. Ltd	United Kingdom
	Michiel KOOT	STANOD	Netherlands
	Simon MEIRSSCHAUT	ESTAL BELGIUM	Belgium
	Timur ULUCAK	AYID	Turkey
	Ruedi WUNDERLIN	VSA	Switzerland

8. CEN TC 132 / WG 15

As the convenor of the working group, Mr. Boi reported that WG 15 had met the day before to complete a draft for architectural applications.

Mr. Boi explained that the working group was confronted with a major problem that could jeopardize the whole project. Although the methods used in Europe were the same, the limits actually differed from one country to another. While end users in the UK defined class 25 as the best class for architectural applications, classes 15 and 20 were good enough in other countries. The working group had concluded that the only way to overcome the problem was to introduce exceptions in the standard. If such a demand could not be satisfied by CEN, the working group would have to be closed.

9. Any other business

Mr. Ulucak explained that Turkey had introduced a new law on waste water. He asked whether the delegates could give some information about their own experience in their respective countries.

Mr. Becker confirmed that this topic could be discussed by an ESTAL working group. He also advised Mr. Ulucak to take a closer look at the IPPC final draft and BREF, which gave a lot of information.

10. Next meeting

The next meeting would be held on:

**Thursday, 23 November 2006
in Zurich (Hotel SOFITEL)**

H:\ac2\Q-NOD\PROTOKqnd\TK\2006 2007\TC-28.06.06-e.doc