



**Minutes of the QUALANOD Technical Committee meeting  
held on 19 November 2003 in Zurich (Hotel Sofitel)**

---

TC members:

**ESTAL**

E. Arnoux  
J. Bettencourt (Chairman)  
R. Boi  
W. Buchholz  
P. Lloret  
S. Meirsschaut  
J. van den Heuvel  
R. Wunderlin

**EAA**

Å. Andersson  
R. Furneaux  
W. Mader

Guests (EC members):

C. Baroni  
T. Ulucak

Secretariat:

J. Schoppig  
P. Bellot (Minutes)

## A G E N D A

1. Minutes of the meeting held on 19 June 2003
2. Statistical report
3. "QUALANOD Specifications" working group
4. Results of the inquiry about section 6.8 of the Specifications
5. Mr. Furneaux's remarks regarding Appendix VII
6. QUALISURFAL: meeting of the Anodising Section held in Nice on 16.09.03
7. ESTAL Belgium's request (COIL)
8. Report on CEN TC 132/WG 15
9. Elections
10. Any other business
11. Next meeting



The Chairman of the Technical Committee, Mr. Bettencourt, welcomed those present and opened the meeting.

### 1. Minutes of the meeting held on 19 June 2003

*The minutes of the previous meeting were unanimously approved.*

### 2. Statistical report

Mr. Schoppig commented on the list of unsatisfactory inspections based on the reports received between 1 June and 31 October 2003. Seven inspections out of 112 (6.2%) had been negative, three due to the weight loss test. In the previous period, which had been longer (01.11.02.–31.05.03), five reports out of 200 (2.5%) had been negative, with two negative results due to the weight loss test.

Qualanod's Secretariat had compiled a list of all the weight loss values reported by the testing laboratories between 1 June and 31 October 2002 (white statistics). This list had been distributed to those present at the beginning of the session together with the yellow statistics (average); an illustrative chart was shown to those present.

Out of 112 measurements, three values exceeded the limit of 30 mg/dm<sup>2</sup> (versus two out of 200 in the previous period). During this period, there had not been any extremely poor result (over 45 mg/dm<sup>2</sup>).

Mr. Arnoux once again questioned the relevance of the average rule stated in § 8.3.2 of the Specifications. He argued that, in practice, there was no case of an average value over 26.0 mg/dm<sup>2</sup> because every negative weight loss test result was replaced by the measurement taken during the repeat inspection. The Chairman, Mr. Bettencourt, agreed that this question could be discussed at a next meeting.

Mr. Lloret pointed out that the weight loss test results had improved considerably over the last few years.

### 3. Meetings of the “Specifications” working group

Since the last QUALANOD meetings in June 2003, the "Specifications" working group had proceeded to restructure the Specifications in order to make them clearer (chapters, titles and subtitles, verifying references, eliminating repetitions, etc.). While doing so, some new proposals had arisen. These proposals had been submitted to the national associations and committee members together with the first draft of the English Specifications.

Mr. Arnoux commented on the new proposals by the working group:

- title of the Specifications
- section 3.2.12 Medium temperature sealing
- new chart A "Procedure for Granting the Quality Label"
- new chart B "Procedure for Renewing the Quality Label"

After a short discussion, the Technical Committee decided to change the title of the Specifications again. The definitive text of the title would be “**Specifications for the QUALANOD Quality Label for Sulphuric Acid-Based Anodising of Aluminium**”. Furthermore, it was noted that one line was in chart B.

*With these corrections, the Technical Committee approved the first draft of the new Specifications as a whole.*

*The national associations – which had not been able to send in their comments before the meeting for lack of time - would be requested to submit them **by the end of February 2004**. The “Specifications” working group would then meet again to study the remarks and prepare a second draft which, hopefully, would be definitively approved at the June 2004 meeting.*

On the Technical Committee’s request, Mr. R. Furneaux, who had already sent many interesting comments concerning the first English draft, agreed to join the next meeting of the “Specifications” working group.

#### 4. Results of the inquiry about section 6.8 of the Specifications

On 19 June 2003, the Technical Committee had agreed to Mr. Boi's proposal to refer only to Appendix VII and to drop the second paragraph of section 6.8: *"If there are any deviations from the typical anodising conditions (composition, concentration, temperature, current density, etc.), records stating these deviations must be available in the plant and be submitted to the inspector to verify."*

Following the QUALANOD meeting, the national associations had been requested to express their opinions on this matter. Only three national associations had sent a written answer: two had said they were in favour of Qualital's proposal and one (the Dutch association) had asked for this matter to be reconsidered and for the original text of section 6.8 to be maintained. Mr. Meirsschaut said that the Belgian anodisers also disagreed with the proposed change.

Mr. Van den Heuvel said that the Dutch Association did not see any reason to change a specification which had been in force for so many years. As far as he could tell, nothing wrong had ever happened because of section 6.8. The only thing that counted for QUALANOD was the quality and testability of the final product.

A long discussion followed, and Mr. Boi justified Qualital's request once more. Most of the Technical Committee members agreed that the procedure described in Appendix VII should be followed for any deviation from the typical anodising conditions, although some of them felt that the national associations should be allowed to draw conclusions for each deviation.

*Finally, the Technical Committee decided to abide by the decision taken at the previous meeting, which had been ratified by the majority of the national associations anyway.*

#### 5. Remarks regarding Appendix VII

The Technical Committee members discussed Mr. Furneaux's remarks regarding Appendix VII.

##### **Assessment of the results of outdoor exposure**

*The Technical Committee fully endorsed Mr. Furneaux's proposal to mention that the Technical Committee had the responsibility for interpreting the outdoor exposure results.*

##### **Duration of the acetic salt spray test**

Mr. Furneaux was convinced that the acetic salt spray test provided an opportunity to compare samples to the point of failure, which might be longer than 1000 hours. Mr. Boi thought that, although a longer exposure time could provide information, this should not be stated in the Specifications because QUALANOD had to specify minimum requirements.

*The text would remain unchanged.*

##### **Requirements for the alloy to be employed for the new product**

Mr. Furneaux explained why he considered it wrong to be prescriptive over the alloy, anodising process and film thickness to be employed for the new product.

The Technical Committee decided to add a sentence saying that exceptions had to be proposed by the supplier and be accepted by QUALANOD.

*The Specifications working group would have to find the appropriate wording.*

## **6. QUALISURFAL: meeting of the Anodising Section held in Nice on 16.09.03**

Mr. Boi summarised the last meeting of the Anodising Section.

The final draft of the new combined checklist (inspection report) – which had already been approved at the last QUALANOD meeting – had been revised and finally approved by Qualisurfal.

The members of the Anodising Section felt that it was up to each national association to prepare working instructions for its own members in their own language. However, anodisers in countries without national associations must have all the relevant standards if no working instructions were available.

Another important issue had been the Belgian laboratory's request to organise round robin tests every year within the framework of Qualisurfal. A concrete testing programme for the next few years would be submitted by CORI.

## **7. ESTAL Belgium's request (COIL)**

Mr. Meiersschaut gave some information about COIL, a company asking to apply for a QUALANOD licence for the second time. ESTAL Belgium was convinced that this company produced a good anodising quality for architectural purposes. In spite of the difference in process, the Belgian association fully supported this request.

Mr. Lloret reminded the other delegates that, many years ago, a group of QUALANOD delegates had visited coil-anodised buildings and made a very interesting and quite positive report.

While Mr. Arnoux wondered whether QUALANOD was ready to revise the Specifications to adapt them for coil anodising, Mr. Buchholz thought that the few coil anodising companies working in Europe today should get together and write special specifications for coil anodising. He estimated that such specifications would differ by 40-50% from the QUALANOD Specifications.

The Chairman of the Technical Committee thought that QUALANOD should consider opening up to coil anodisers too.

*COIL and other coil anodising companies would be contacted to form a working group. Mr. Boi, who also knew some experts in Italy, was ready to be the convenor of this working group.*

**8. Report on CEN TC 132/WG 15**

Mr. Bettencourt said that a new convenor should be nominated since the former convenor had retired.

Mr. Boi informed the other delegates that the Italian Standards Organization had asked CEN to study a standard for architectural purposes.

**9. Elections**

In November 2002, Mr. Bettencourt had agreed to chair the Technical Committee for the remaining one year of Mr. Sheasby's term of office. Happily, Mr. Bettencourt was prepared to remain Chairman of the Technical Committee for the next two years.

Mr. Arnoux explained that, in order to re-equilibrate the composition of the QUALANOD Committees, he had resigned as a representative of ESTAL and had been nominated by EAA.

Mr. Bettencourt reminded those present that, under the Articles of Association, the Technical Committee should be appointed by the members of the association (EAA and ESTAL) and not – as had been done in recent years – by the national associations.

*A list with the new composition of the Technical Committee would be added to the minutes.*

**10. Any other business**

None

**11. Next meetings**

Technical and Executive Committees:

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Thursday, 17 June 2004</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">and</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Wednesday, 24 November 2004</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">in Zurich (Hotel SOFITEL)</p>
--