



Ensuring Retail Food Scale
Accuracy and Consumer
Confidence in a Changing
Market

Written by: Patrick Vanasse

For: Industry Canada, Office of Consumer Affairs

October 2002

Acknowledgments

This research project was coordinated by Louise Rozon, Director of Option consommateurs, and conducted by Patrick Vanasse, who wrote the report. The documentary research on French regulations was conducted by Guylène de Mascureau.

Option consommateurs wishes to thank Industry Canada for its financial support for this research project.

The reproduction of this report is permitted provided that the source is credited. However, the reproduction of this report or any reference to its contents for purposes of publicity or profit is strictly prohibited.

Legal Deposit

Bibliothèque nationale du Québec
National Library of Canada

ISBN 2-921588-48-X

Option consommateurs
2120, rue Sherbrooke est, bur. 604
Montreal (Quebec) H2K 1C3

Telephone: (514) 598-7288
Fax: (514) 598-8511
E-mail: courriel@option-consommateurs.org

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this policy paper is to express the position of Option consommateurs on the strategy of Measurement Canada in conjunction with the Retail Food Sector Review. In this sector review, Option consommateurs's concern is to insure that the accuracy of retail food scales and consumer confidence are preserved through suitable regulation of the industry by Measurement Canada.

In 1999, Measurement Canada embarked on a process of reviewing the scope of its intervention in trade measurement. In all, 39 trade sectors will be reviewed by 2013 to establish a level of intervention that allows for optimal use of the agency's resources, adaptation to technological and market changes, and consumer protection. The sector reviews will consult industry and consumer stakeholders as well as other interest groups in determining the changes to be made to the agency's intervention. Some of these reviews directly affect consumers, since they concern sectors in which a measured quantity of a product is sold directly to them. Option consommateurs has an interest in these reviews; it participated in the Electricity Trade Sector Review in 2001. This year, Option consommateurs is taking part in the Natural Gas Trade Sector Review and the Retail Food Sector Review.

Measurement Canada's intervention in the retail food sector is multifaceted, and changes are in the offing with a view to making its intervention more effective and filling certain gaps. Measurement Canada is considering certain possibilities and wants to consult stakeholders to obtain their point of view. First, Measurement Canada plans to expand the delegation of certain of its activities to third parties through its accreditation program. In particular, Measurement Canada intends to use this program for maintenance and calibration of standards, approval of new scale types, initial scale inspection, and scale reinspection. Second, this sector review is designed to fill gaps in the agency's intervention; specifically, the unregulated status of scale service companies and the significant decline in its scale reinspection activities.

Option consommateurs conducted a literature review on the regulatory system for scales in France. This system is characterized by a sharing of powers between France and the European Union. For example, type or pattern approval, as well as initial inspection of scales intended for use in direct sales to the public and prepacking of retail food products, are now regulated by a European Council Directive. Thus far, periodic inspection of scales is not governed by European regulations. However, the accreditation and certification mechanisms adopted by the European governments are sufficiently comparable so that the organizations performing these inspections can, through an agent, apply for accreditation and certification in any member state. French regulation of scales is much more thorough than Canada's, and better able to protect consumer interests. First of all, the type approval procedure is more restrictive; manufacturers must apply for renewal every ten years. Second, scale service companies are regulated and must be accredited in the same way as companies performing initial inspection and reinspection. Third, scales are subject to mandatory periodic reinspection. Another feature of the French system is the extensive use of the accreditation process: calibration, type approval, initial inspection and reinspection can all be performed by accredited organizations.

Option consommateurs commissioned the firm Environics to conduct a Canada-wide survey. The purpose of the survey was to ascertain Canadians' level of confidence in scale accuracy, their general knowledge of the scale regulatory system, and the experience of those who have reported a problem with scale accuracy to a food store. The results show that retail food scale accuracy is not a major concern for the respondents. They are relatively confident in scales, and this confidence may be ascribed to the fact that most of them believe that the system works well, they have never experienced problems, or they are naturally inclined to trust in scale accuracy. However, it should be noted that this confidence is not total, and consumers did indicate some reasons for not expressing total confidence. Interestingly, these reasons have little to do with the devices themselves, and more to do with the stores that use them. In fact, the number one expressed reason for non-confidence in scale accuracy was the lack of confidence in the store.

We observed that the proportion of consumers who believe that scales are regulated is rather low. In addition, such consumers had only a vague idea of the authority responsible, even though most of them thought that this was probably a government agency. Very few respondents reported a problem with a scale reading to a food store. Consumers who did report such a problem were relatively satisfied with the way the store handled their case. A minuscule percentage of them considered appealing to Measurement Canada or received the suggestion to do so.

We held six focus groups to gather the impressions of the participants on consumer confidence in scales, their reactions to the Canadian regulatory framework for scales, and their opinion about the best ways to improve this framework. The participants stressed that on the whole they are highly confident in scale accuracy; however, they suspected some stores of cheating on the quantity sold — of putting a finger on the scale, as it were. The participants stated that they are less confident in smaller stores, which might be more attempted to cheat due to their lower profit margins. They also felt that large supermarket chains were more likely to have reliable and accurate scales than small stores, whose devices might be more poorly maintained. They expressed greater confidence in the scales than the optical scanners used in food stores.

The participants stressed the importance of regulations to oversee measurement in this sector. They were reassured to know that Measurement Canada is in charge of enforcing scale regulations. They stated that they prefer random inspection to periodic inspection, believing that the former option will keep stores more vigilant. The different focus groups reacted differently to the 90% scale conformity rate. The Toronto and Calgary groups felt reassured by the fact that inaccuracies are divided evenly in terms of favoring the store or the consumer, whereas most of the Montreal participants were troubled to learn that such a large percentage of scales were inaccurate in one way or another. They were also concerned that if Measurement Canada's role were to be diminished in any way, inaccuracies would become more common.

Concerning the future of the regulatory system, the focus group participants think that Measurement Canada should continue to approve all scale types, inspect all new scales

before they are put into service, and continue to perform unannounced inspections. They agreed with the idea that Measurement Canada could accredit organizations to perform tasks hitherto carried out by the agency, provided that they are supervised by Measurement Canada. The participants feel that food stores should not be accredited to inspect their own scales so as to avoid conflicts of interest. Finally, they felt that scale service companies should be held to operating standards, and that Measurement Canada should require them to obtain a license.

The literature review, the survey, the focus groups, and the standard positions of Option consommateurs on regulatory affairs lead us to put forward the following recommendations:

1- Measurement Canada should take the necessary steps to expand its accreditation program so as to resolve the problem of insufficient scale reinspection.

2- Measurement Canada should supervise accredited organizations by using standard SA-0-1 and performing surveillance audits, product audits, and accreditation renewal audits.

3- Measurement Canada should guarantee that accredited organizations are sheltered from potential conflicts of interest by making them independent of the stores where they carry out mandates for the agency.

4- Measurement Canada should regulate scale service companies by issuing licenses, with a system for controlling conformity to the agency's requirements.

5- The licensing system for scale service companies should include the requirement that companies use measurement standards verified and approved by Measurement Canada.

6- The licensing system for scale service companies should require them to use the Measurement Canada Standard Test Procedures so as to ensure that these practices are consistent with those of the agency.

7- Measurement Canada should further publicize its role to consumers who report scale accuracy problems, and should take steps to involve retail food stores in this effort.

8- Measurement Canada should retain its power to develop metrological standards.

9- All new scale types should be approved by Measurement Canada at the expense of the manufacturer making the application.

10- For accreditation of external laboratories contracted to approve new scale types, Measurement Canada should use a more metrologically oriented standard (e.g., ISO 17025).

11- Laboratories accredited by Measurement Canada to perform approval testing on new scale types should be at arm's length from scale manufacturers.

12- Measurement Canada should retain its powers to issue final approval of new scale types where approval testing is performed by external laboratories.

13- Measurement Canada should contract out scale reinspection to external organizations through its accreditation program, mandating these organizations to perform surprise inspections in food stores.

14- Measurement Canada should, through contractual arrangements and through auditing of inspection logs, guarantee that accredited organizations in charge of scale reinspection inspect all scales with reasonable frequency.

15- Measurement Canada should play a more active role in net quantity verification by performing more inspections, even in stores that are not the subject of consumer complaints.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ERREUR ! SIGNET NON DEFINI.
INTRODUCTION.....	13
1- MISSION OF OPTION CONSOMMATEURS.....	16
1.1- PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF INTERVENTION	16
1.2- PRINCIPAL REGULAR ACTIVITIES.....	17
1.3- RESEARCH AND REPRESENTATION DEPARTMENT	17
2- CURRENT MEASUREMENT CANADA INTERVENTION IN THE RETAIL FOOD SECTOR/OPTIONS FOR CHANGE	18
2.1- TWO SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF INTERVENTION IN THE RETAIL FOOD SECTOR.....	18
2.1.1- Measurement Canada Accreditation Program	18
2.1.2- Regulatory Framework for the Scale Service Industry	21
2.2- SCOPE OF INTERVENTION OF MEASUREMENT CANADA	23
2.2.1- Development of Metrology Standards.....	23
2.2.2- Maintenance and Calibration of Measurement Standards.....	23
2.2.3- Pattern Approval of New Measuring Devices	24
2.2.4- Initial Inspection of New Devices (Verification)	25
2.2.5- Periodic In-Service Inspection (Reinspection).....	26
2.2.6- Net Quantity Verification	27
2.2.7- Complaint Investigation and Dispute Resolution.....	27
2.2.10- Accreditation of Organizations to Inspect Approved Devices	28
3- THE REGULATORY CONTEXT OF FRANCE	30
3.1- EUROPEAN CONTEXT	30
3.2- COUNCIL DIRECTIVE 90/384/EEC	31

4- ANALYSIS OF CANADA-WIDE SURVEY	43
4.1- CONFIDENCE IN SCALE ACCURACY	43
4.2- FACTORS EXPLAINING CONFIDENCE LEVELS.....	44
4.2.1- More-Confident Group: Breakdown of Responses	46
4.2.2- Less-Confident Group: Breakdown of Responses.....	47
4.3- KNOWLEDGE OF SCALE REGULATIONS	49
4.4- HANDLING OF MEASUREMENT-RELATED PROBLEMS IN RETAIL FOOD STORES.....	51
4.4.1- Reporting of the Problem and Actions Taken	51
4.4.2- Consumer Satisfaction with Complaint Handling.....	52
4.4.3- Measurement Canada’s Role	53
4.5- CONCLUSIONS.....	53
5- DETAILED FOCUS GROUP FINDINGS.....	55
5.1- REGULATION OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES IN CANADA.....	55
5.1.1- How Weights and Measures Are Currently Regulated	55
5.1.2- Reactions to the Role of Measurement Canada.....	56
5.1.3- Understanding of the Trade Sector Review.....	57
5.2- RETAIL FOOD SECTOR REVIEW.....	58
5.2.1- Personal Use of Retail Food Scales.....	58
5.2.2- Initial Attitude Toward the Accuracy of Scales	58
5.2.3- Personal Experience with Retail Food Scale Inaccuracy	59
5.2.4- Awareness of Current Regulatory Framework for Retail Food Scales	60
5.2.5- Reaction to Regulatory Framework for Retail Food Scales.....	60
5.2.6- Accreditation of Other Organizations.....	62
6- POSITION OF OPTION CONSOMMATEURS	65
6.1- THE ROLE OF MEASUREMENT CANADA.....	66
6.1.1- Accreditation Program.....	66
6.1.2- Scale Service Companies.....	67
6.1.3- Visibility of Measurement Canada	68
6.2- SCOPE OF INTERVENTION OF MEASUREMENT CANADA	69

6.2.1- Development of Metrological Standards	69
6.2.2- Maintenance and Calibration of Measurement Standards	69
6.2.3- Approval of New Device Types	70
6.2.4- Initial Inspection	71
6.2.5- Reinspection	72
6.2.6- Net Quantity Verification	73
6.2.7- Dispute Resolution	74
GENERAL CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	75
BIBLIOGRAPHY	79
APPENDIX 1 – QUESTIONS USED FOR THE SURVEY.....	81
APPENDIX 2 – SURVEY RESULTS	85
APPENDIX 3 –DISCUSSION GUIDE	116
ANNEXE 4 – BACKGROUNDER DOCUMENT DISTRIBUTED TO FOCUS GROUPS PARTICIPANTS.....	121

INTRODUCTION

Measurement Canada is an agency of the Ministry of Industry of Canada whose mission is to guarantee the accuracy of trade measurement through various means of intervention. Specifically, Measurement Canada is responsible for approving device types intended to be used in trade, performing initial inspection of devices before they are placed in service, reverifying and monitoring devices in service, verifying the net quantity content of products sold based on their measurement, and resolving disputes and complaints related to measurement.¹ The foundation for these activities is provided by two laws, the *Electricity and Gas Inspection Act* for the electricity and natural gas sectors and the *Weights and Measures Act* for all other sectors regulated by the agency. Measurement Canada intervenes in various trade sectors, some of which affect consumers directly, such as electricity, natural gas, retail food and gasoline. For these sectors, Measurement Canada aims to preserve consumer confidence by guaranteeing consumers that the products they purchase are measured accurately and that the quantity sold is exactly the same as the quantity measured.

In 1999, Measurement Canada embarked on a process of reviewing thirty-nine (39) trade sectors over a period extending up to 2013. The purpose of each trade sector review is to reassess Measurement Canada's level of intervention in each sector and to determine whether the current level of intervention should be adjusted to keep current with market conditions and the need for consumer protection.

In carrying out the reviews, Measurement Canada will strive to “focus [the agency's] limited resources on those areas where return to the Canadian taxpayer is greatest.”² To achieve this objective, it has established a method to:

¹ MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Natural Gas Trade Sector Review*. Ottawa, 2002, 3.

² MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Assessment and Intervention Strategy for Canada's Marketplace*. Ottawa, September 1999, 1.

periodically assess measurement in all trade sectors, intervening only where necessary to ensure accuracy and equity in the marketplace, and developing criteria for determining its level of intervention in trade measurement. Stakeholders' informed views will be a key element in these decisions.³

Each sector review is conducted separately and consists of a consultation of the relevant stakeholders. Generally, the teams responsible for the sector reviews bring together consumer and industry representatives as well as other public interest groups. The form of these consultations may vary from one review to another: in some cases, the team holds one or more meetings where the stakeholders attempt to reach consensus on the desirable changes to Measurement Canada's level of intervention; in other cases, the team meets with the interested groups individually and produces a synopsis of the opinions expressed. Following these consultations, the team submits recommendations to the Measurement Canada senior management team, which makes the final decision on their acceptance. Finally, Measurement Canada implements the changes approved by the senior management team.

As a consumer protection organization, Option consommateurs is involved in the sector reviews involving the sale of products to individuals. In commercial transactions involving consumers, the latter are the vulnerable party. When purchasing a product whose price is established by measurement (e.g. gasoline sold by the litre, natural gas by the cubic metre, or cheese by the kilogram), consumers do not have the financial, legal and technical resources to verify that the quantity paid for is the quantity actually delivered. Likewise, they cannot defend their rights without assistance when they have reason to believe that a measurement is inaccurate. Therefore, consumers need a neutral and impartial body with no interest in the transaction to make and enforce trade measurement regulations. Measurement Canada plays this role in Canada, and Option consommateurs thinks that it should be preserved.

³ MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Assessment and Intervention Strategy for Canada's Marketplace*. Ottawa,

Last year Option consommateurs participated in the Electricity Trade Sector Review, which enabled us to express our point of view as to the industry's demands for self-regulation. Option consommateurs opposed this idea because it threatens the protection afforded to consumers, who are the vulnerable party in this sector. Option consommateurs stressed that the changes to Measurement Canada's mode of intervention must not impair its function as the measurement accuracy watchdog, and that it should remain the body in charge of providing protection to vulnerable parties, which include residential electricity consumers.

This year Measurement Canada will conduct two sector reviews having a direct impact on consumers: retail food and natural gas. Option consommateurs is taking part in the consultations for both reviews. This policy paper constitutes the position of Option consommateurs on the Retail Food Sector Review. Our position is a composite of our established stance on regulatory affairs in general; our assessment of the documents provided by the Retail Food Sector Review team and other documents issued by the agency; the results of a study on French regulatory practices for retail food scales; the results of a Canada-wide survey conducted by Environics, a specialized polling firm; and the recommendations emerging from six focus groups held in Toronto, Calgary and Montreal on July 16, 18 and 25, 2002 by Environics. The last section of the document contains Option Consommateurs's recommendations. Before we discuss our findings on French regulatory practices, we shall briefly explain the mission of Option consommateurs and touch on the scope of intervention of Measurement Canada.

1- MISSION OF OPTION CONSOMMATEURS

1.1- Purpose, Objectives and Scope of Intervention

The mission of Option consommateurs is to advocate on behalf of consumers and promote their rights and interests. The purpose of these activities is to minimize or eliminate the injustices of which consumers are victims. To carry out this mission, the organization has a staff of twenty-three (23) employees assigned to five departments:

1. Budget Department;
2. Legal Department;
3. Media Relations Department;
4. Research and Representation Department;
5. Call and Support Centre.

The association was founded in 1983. In 1999, it merged with the Association des Consommateurs du Québec, a fifty-year-old organization with a mission similar to that of Option consommateurs. The goal of the merger was to increase work efficiency while cutting operating costs.

Option consommateurs is a cooperative formed under the Quebec provincial *Cooperatives Act*. It is directed by an annual assembly which votes on general strategy and orientation. This assembly is sovereign for certain decisions concerning the organization. The general assembly elects a board of directors whose principal mandate is to implement and develop these strategies. It is not responsible for routine management, a task that falls to the management team composed of seven (7) employees.

1.2- Principal Regular Activities

Over the years, Option consommateurs has developed expertise in numerous fields, and is now acknowledged as an authoritative stakeholder in the area of consumer affairs. Each year, we reach between 7,000 and 10,000 consumers directly; we conduct more than 400 interviews with the media; we sit on various working committees and boards of directors; we carry out large-scale intervention projects with major partners; we produce research reports, policy papers, consumer guides and a consumer information and action magazine called *Consommation*.

1.3- Research and Representation Department

The Research and Representation Department (RRD) is responsible for Option consommateurs' relations with the agencies and crown corporations of the Quebec and federal governments. The RRD is responsible for representing Option consommateurs before the Régie de l'énergie du Québec, the regulatory authority on matters of electricity, natural gas and retail gasoline sales in our province.

The RRD is also responsible for representing Option consommateurs on committees relating to industries such as agri-food, financial services, energy, and property and personal insurance.

The RRD is responsible for the organization's research studies that are funded by government agencies, including Industry Canada's Office of Consumer Affairs. This research aims to develop Option consommateurs's expertise in various fields as well as to channel consumers' arguments to the governmental authorities so as to ensure that these are taken into account when public policy decisions are made. This paper is part of the research funded by this agency; its purpose is to advocate on behalf of consumers' interests in the context of the Measurement Canada Retail Food Sector Review.

2- CURRENT MEASUREMENT CANADA INTERVENTION IN THE RETAIL FOOD SECTOR/OPTIONS FOR CHANGE

The Minister of Industry's obligations and powers with respect to trade measurement in the retail food industry are governed by the *Weights and Measures Act*. In enforcing this act and its regulations, Measurement Canada performs a number of tasks to guarantee the measurement accuracy of scales used to weigh food in retail businesses, which include checkout or point-of-sale scales, prepack scales (e.g. meat counter) and counter scales (e.g. cold cuts). It is important to note that the measurement and quantity of food products pre-packed outside of food stores (e.g. cereal boxes, canned foods) are under the jurisdiction not of Measurement Canada but rather the Canadian Food Inspection Agency. As for non-food products, such as laundry soap, their measurement and net quantity are under the responsibility of the Fair Business Practices Branch of the Competition Bureau.⁴ Before detailing the intervention of Measurement Canada in this sector for each sphere of activity, we shall address two specific aspects of it.

2.1- Two Specific Aspects of Intervention in the Retail Food Sector

2.1.1- Measurement Canada Accreditation Program

Currently, Measurement Canada intervenes directly in the market, but not for all of its activities. Through the use of the accreditation program, the agency has contracted certain

⁴ MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Foods [RFSR] Trade Sector Review: a presentation to Retail Food Stakeholders (Industry & Consumer)*. Ottawa, 2002.

jobs to the private sector. The accreditation program was instituted in 1986 with the publication of document LMB-EG-05, *Criteria and Procedures for the Accreditation of Electricity and Gas Meter Verifiers*. This program authorizes qualified organizations to conduct mandatory inspection (initial verification) and periodic inspection (reverification) of weighing and measuring devices on behalf of Measurement Canada. In 1988 the Legal Metrology Branch (Measurement Canada's predecessor) accredited the first organization for the verification of single phase electricity meters.⁵

Organizations seeking accreditation must implement a complete quality assurance program in compliance with standard S-A-01 (based on ISO standard 9002-1994). The organization must specify the operation type (initial verification or reverification) and device type for which it seeks accreditation.⁶ In the application process, the organization must develop a quality manual describing the procedures it intends to use to perform the tasks for which it seeks accreditation. The application is studied by Measurement Canada, which audits the applicant. After reviewing the quality manual, Measurement Canada's auditors make an accreditation decision which is valid for a three-year period. If accreditation is granted, the accredited organization must inspect the weighing and measuring devices for which it is accredited, in accordance with Measurement Canada's requirements. Thereafter, Measurement Canada no longer plays an inspection role for these devices but, rather, a surveillance role, which it fulfils through surveillance and product audits. Surveillance audits take place annually. They consist of an audit of the quality manual and field operations of the accredited organization. Product audits consist of verification of measuring devices approved by the accredited organization. Their frequency varies according to the type of device and the problems detected previously. Where there are problems relating to the work performed by the accredited organization, Measurement Canada's auditors may take action ranging up to suspension or revocation

⁵ MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Measurement Canada's Accreditation Program*, <http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/inmc-mc.nsf/vwGeneratedInterf/lm01807f.html>; MEASUREMENT CANADA, *S-A-01, Criteria for the Accreditation of Organizations to Perform Inspections Pursuant to the Electricity and Gas Inspection Act and the Weights and Measures Act*, <http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/inmc-mc.nsf/vwGeneratedInterf/lm01469f.html>.

of accreditation. When accreditation expires, the organization must file a renewal application, and Measurement Canada then conducts audits to determine whether renewal should be granted.⁷

According to Measurement Canada, organizations derive a number of advantages from being accredited:

- Accredited organizations are able to undertake inspection work at their own pace and are therefore less dependent on Measurement Canada for these activities. **Benefit:** Organizations can inspect at their own convenience, save time and lower costs.
- Accredited organizations have an opportunity to expand as service providers offering inspection services to other organizations. **Benefit:** Financial gains and competitiveness.
- Accredited organizations have an opportunity to further their knowledge of the rules and regulations that apply to measurement. **Benefit:** Organizations enhance their ability to comply with requirements and gain from the application of a sound quality program, with better products and services, less waste and more confidence in a consistent quality production.⁸

Measurement Canada also considers accreditation to be advantageous to itself:

- Measurement Canada oversees organizations that comply with its requirements. **Benefit:** The function of overseeing is less costly and time-consuming than inspecting. Measurement Canada can better achieve its mission and mandate with the help of its new partners.

⁶ MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Measurement Canada's Accreditation Program*, <http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/inmc-mc.nsf/vwGeneratedInterf/lm01807f.html>.

⁷ Benoît MONTPETIT, Measurement Canada auditor, interview, Montreal, 29 July 2002.

⁸ MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Measurement Canada's Accreditation Program*, <http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/inmc-mc.nsf/vwGeneratedInterf/lm01807f.html>.

- Measurement Canada spends less resources in the enforcement of its requirements. **Benefit:** Measurement Canada can redirect its freed-up resources to areas requiring more monitoring.⁹

The accreditation program is applied to a number of trade sectors, including those governed by the *Electricity and Gas Inspection Act* (electricity and natural gas), in which nearly all the initial inspection and reinspection of measuring devices is performed by accredited organizations. The accreditation program is also used in certain trade sectors governed by the *Weights and Measures Act*. Here, companies are accredited by device type rather than by trade sector. Thus, for example, a company's accreditation under the *Weights and Measures Act* may apply to scales. Currently, the accreditation program is used almost exclusively for initial inspection, and companies have very little incentive to extend their accreditation to other fields. In addition, very few companies have been accredited so far, although some are in the process of obtaining accreditation.¹⁰

In its initial consultations with consumer and industry representatives, Measurement Canada is considering the possibility of using the accreditation program under standard S-A-01 for approval of new device types, calibration of measurement standards used to inspect scales, initial and periodic inspection of measuring devices, and verification of net product quantities sold.¹¹

2.1.2- Regulatory Framework for the Scale Service Industry

Scales require regular maintenance which may be performed by scale service companies. In addition to selling most scales, these companies perform much of the calibration and service work. They include independent companies specializing in scales, office equipment suppliers working with a wide range of trade devices, and organizations

⁹ MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Measurement Canada's Accreditation Program*, <http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/inmc-mc.nsf/vwGeneratedInterf/Im01807f.html>.

¹⁰ Jean-Gilles POIRIER, member, Measurement Canada Retail Food Sector Review team, e-mail received 5 September 2002.

providing services exclusively to large retailers. Moreover, Measurement Canada has noted a proliferation of small service companies working out of small shops and private homes. Most of these companies have little experience with scales.¹²

At present, scale service companies are not regulated or registered with Measurement Canada, which does not supervise them in any way. These companies are not subject to the accreditation process since they do not perform inspections for Measurement Canada. Furthermore, when performing maintenance, these companies often recalibrate devices using measurement standards that are not traceable to the standards used by Measurement Canada. They are free to choose their own standards, which need not conform to Measurement Canada's rules of accuracy. In fact, they are not required to possess any test weights and measures, and some do not. What is more, they are not required to use the test procedures recognized by Measurement Canada. The agency's own inspectors use its *Standard Test Procedures*, documents that describe all tests to be performed on a given device type and how each should be performed. These procedures are not currently distributed to scale service companies. Finally, Measurement Canada does not conduct a periodic review of the scale service industry.¹³

In Measurement Canada's opinion, the situation is becoming problematic, what with the proliferation of small companies whose skill and experience is insufficient for them to guarantee scale accuracy. The agency wants to subject the companies to a recognition program (licensing or accreditation), and require them to use measurement standards certified by Measurement Canada and test procedures approved by the agency.¹⁴

¹¹ MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Food Sector Review: a Questionnaire for the Retail Food Industry of Canada*. Ottawa, 2002, 17.

¹² MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Food Sector Review: a Questionnaire for the Retail Food Industry of Canada*. Ottawa, 2002, 14.

¹³ Luciano BURTINI, Team Manager, Measurement Canada Retail Food Sector Review, e-mail received 7 June 2002; MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Food Sector Review: a Discussion Paper on Measurement Issues in the Retail Food Industry of Canada*. Ottawa, September 2002, 28-30.

¹⁴ MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Food Sector Review: a Discussion Paper on Measurement Issues in the Retail Food Industry of Canada*. Ottawa, September 2002, 14.

2.2- Scope of Intervention of Measurement

Canada

Currently, in order to fulfil its trade measurement surveillance mission, Measurement Canada intervenes in a number of areas. The following description of the scope of the agency's intervention applies to all trade sectors it covers, whether under the *Electricity and Gas Inspection Act* or the *Weights and Measures Act*. The information is derived from correspondence with Mr. Luciano Burtini and Mr. Jean-Gilles Poirier, members of the Retail Food Sector Review team, as well as the consultation document written by them and a questionnaire distributed to the relevant stakeholders.

2.2.1- Development of Metrology Standards

Measurement Canada's Program Development Division is responsible for the development of standards, regulatory changes, policies and procedures governing weighing and measuring devices. When a new metrological technology appears on the market, it is approved and inspected with reference to applicable regulatory standards and test procedures. The standards are developed in consultation with industry representatives.¹⁵

Measurement Canada did not call for input on the development of metrology standards as part of this sector review.

2.2.2- Maintenance and Calibration of Measurement Standards

Measurement Canada, through its Calibration Services Laboratory, owns and maintains measurement (reference) standards that are traceable to the National Research Council primary base units of measurement. Standards of mass, length, volume, temperature,

¹⁵ MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Food Sector Review: a Discussion Paper on Measurement Issues in the Retail Food Industry of Canada*. Ottawa, September 2002, 49.

pressure, and electricity are calibrated and certified. These measurement standards are used by government inspectors and recalibrated annually.¹⁶ As mentioned previously, scale service companies are not required to possess standards approved by Measurement Canada.

Measurement Canada is willing to assess the possibility of using Alternate Service Delivery (ASD) mechanisms for verification of industry standards used to inspect and certify measuring devices.¹⁷ This means that Measurement Canada is set to withdraw from direct intervention in this area and to contract the relevant tasks out to external organizations. This could be done through the accreditation program used for initial scale inspection.

2.2.3- Pattern Approval of New Measuring Devices

Measurement Canada, through its Approval Services Laboratory, must approve all measuring devices intended for trade use in Canada. All new and modified devices are examined and tested with respect to legislative requirements for design, composition, construction, and performance. This service is intended to ensure a population of measuring devices which are reasonably accurate throughout their lifetime, and to minimize the possibility of fraudulent use. When a device type is approved, it receives an approval number, and the documentation regarding the approval is available to inspectors. Measurement Canada is a partner in a Mutual Recognition Program with our United States counterparts in order to harmonize requirements for the approval of weighing devices in both countries. Thus, Measurement Canada recognizes the results of tests performed by four government laboratories under the National Type Evaluation Program (NTEP) for a certain class of devices. Based on the evaluation and results of the

¹⁶ Luciano BURTINI, Team Manager, Measurement Canada Retail Food Sector Review, e-mail received 7 June 2002; MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Food Sector Review: a Discussion Paper on Measurement Issues in the Retail Food Industry of Canada*. Ottawa, September 2002, 49.

¹⁷ MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Food Sector Review: a Questionnaire for the Retail Food Industry of Canada*. Ottawa, 2002, 17.

NTEP tests, Measurement Canada may approve a device if it complies with Canadian regulations, which differ from those of the United States.¹⁸

In its initial consultations with stakeholders, the Retail Food Sector Review team asks if they would like pattern approvals to continue and, if so, who would be responsible for approving devices (Measurement Canada, industry, or a partnership between the two).¹⁹

In its consultation document, Measurement Canada considers the possibility of using external laboratories to perform tests for approval of new scale types.²⁰

2.2.4- Initial Inspection of New Devices (Verification)

Measurement Canada, through its regional inspection staff and its accredited inspectors, must inspect weighing and measuring devices before they are used in trade (initial inspection), except where an exemption exists under the act and the regulation. This measure is designed to ensure that devices meet the approval criteria, that they are correctly installed, and that they operate within the prescribed tolerances before they are put into service. Thus, all scales must be inspected before being put into service. This inspection may be performed on the manufacturer's premises, or on the site where the device is used if installation has an effect on how it operates. Checkout scales connected to the final payment system are inspected on site with the installation as a whole. Scales located at a service counter (e.g., meat or fish counter) are inspected on the manufacturer's premises, as are scale systems used to weigh store-packed meat. The tolerances for scales are very low — between 0.1 and 0.2%.²¹

¹⁸ MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Food Sector Review: a Discussion Paper on Measurement Issues in the Retail Food Industry of Canada*. Ottawa, September 2002; Jean-Gilles POIRIER, team member, Measurement Canada Retail Food Sector Review, e-mail received 5 September 2002; Luciano BURTINI, Team Manager, Measurement Canada Retail Food Sector Review, e-mail received 7 June 2002.

¹⁹ MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Food Sector Review: a Questionnaire for the Retail Food Industry of Canada*. Ottawa, 2002, 6, 8.

²⁰ MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Food Sector Review: a Discussion Paper on Measurement Issues in the Retail Food Industry of Canada*. Ottawa, September 2002, 19.

²¹ Luciano, BURTINI, Team Manager, Measurement Canada Retail Food Sector Review, e-mail received 7 June 2002; MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Food Sector Review: a Questionnaire for the Retail Food Industry of Canada*. Ottawa, 2002, 49-50; Jean-Gilles POIRIER, team member, Measurement Canada Retail Food Sector Review, e-mail received 5 September 2002.

The Measurement Canada consultation document stresses the need to contract out initial inspection to external organizations so as to expedite the inspection process. The current inspection process involving Measurement Canada inspectors causes delays when new stores open, and the use of external providers could solve the problem.²²

2.2.5- Periodic In-Service Inspection (Reinspection)

Measuring devices used to measure quantities of mass or volume pursuant to the requirements of the *Weights and Measures Act* are verified, on an ad-hoc basis, throughout their lifetime to ensure that they are properly maintained, continue to measure accurately, and are not used in a fraudulent manner.²³

In the retail food sector, Measurement Canada formerly conducted surprise inspections in stores, and this enabled the inspectors based in some twenty offices to inspect all scales every two years (more often in urban areas and less often in remote regions). In recent years, with the significant reduction in the number of inspectors, full coverage is no longer assured and, in some regions, scales are no longer reverified after being put into service. Reverifications are performed by Measurement Canada alone, and there are currently no organizations accredited to do this work. However, companies accredited to perform initial inspection must do their own marketing to convince stores to ask them to be accredited to offer this service. The persons in charge of the Retail Food Sector Review consider this situation to be problematic and, during the initial stakeholder consultations, Measurement Canada is asking them whether they would agree to other modes of service provision.²⁴

²² MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Food Sector Review: a Questionnaire for the Retail Food Industry of Canada*. Ottawa, 2002, 8.

²³ MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Food Sector Review: a Discussion Paper on Measurement Issues in the Retail Food Industry of Canada*. Ottawa, September 2002, 49.

²⁴ Luciano, BURTINI, Team Manager, Measurement Canada Retail Food Sector Review, e-mail received 7 June 2002; MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Food Sector Review: a Questionnaire for the Retail Food Industry of Canada*. Ottawa, 2002, 8; Jean-Gilles POIRIER, team member, Measurement Canada Retail Food Sector Review, e-mail received 5 September 2002.

2.2.6- Net Quantity Verification

In the trade sectors under the jurisdiction of the *Weights and Measures Act*, which include the retail food sector, Measurement Canada verifies the net quantity of products sold, in addition to its inspection of measuring devices. Measurement Canada's inspectors visit stores and weigh clerk-served food in order to determine whether the quantity indicated on the package is the same as the quantity weighed. However, not all clerk-served food is inspected, since the net quantity of products weighed and pre-packed in the store (meat, cheese, etc.) is inspected by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency or the Quebec Ministère de l'Agriculture, des Pêcheries et de l'Alimentation. Such inspections are generally only conducted where Measurement Canada suspects a net quantity-related problem in a given store. This situation explains the 65% compliance rate for net quantity verification.²⁵

In its initial stakeholder consultations, Measurement Canada asks who should be responsible for net quantity verification (Measurement Canada, industry, industry/government partnership). Measurement Canada also asks stakeholders to express an opinion on the desired frequency of these inspections.²⁶

2.2.7- Complaint Investigation and Dispute Resolution

Measurement Canada, through its field inspection staff, investigates complaints and advises affected parties of the result of the investigation, including any corrective action instituted where warranted.²⁷ Measurement Canada is and will remain the ultimate authority in resolving disputes and investigating complaints, and the agency considers this role to be non-negotiable in all the trade sector reviews.

²⁵ Luciano, BURTINI, Team Manager, Measurement Canada Retail Food Sector Review, e-mail received 7 June 2002; MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Food Sector Review: a Questionnaire for the Retail Food Industry of Canada*. Ottawa, 2002, 23.

²⁶ MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Food Sector Review: a Questionnaire for the Retail Food Industry of Canada*. Ottawa, 2002, 10.

When a complaint is filed against a food store, Measurement Canada encourages settlement of complaints and disputes rather than automatic resort to legal proceedings. If noncompliance is found, inspectors may choose different levels of enforcement action, including warning letters, non-compliance notices, seizure of devices, or prosecution where the problems are not corrected or evidence of fraud or tampering is found.²⁸

Measurement Canada encourages businesses to institute measurement-related complaint and dispute resolution procedures. Some businesses have implemented a compensation policy as a means of resolution. A number of existing mechanisms compensate customers if a problem occurs, and various solutions have been put forward. For example, the Canadian Council of Grocery Distributors has stated that a code of practice similar to the one governing optical scanners could be implemented.²⁹

2.2.10- Accreditation of Organizations to Inspect Approved Devices

An organization may be invested with the power to perform initial inspection, reinspection and certification of trade weighing and measuring devices on behalf of Measurement Canada if it meets the program's requirements.³⁰ A description of the accreditation program is given in section 2.1.1. Measurement Canada has not put any proposals on the table to modify the accreditation program.

This summarizes the scope of Measurement Canada's surveillance of trade measurement. Of course, this description is merely a summary; it does not describe the agency's strategic objectives, nor does it present a complete listing of the regulations for which it is

²⁷ MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Food Sector Review: a Discussion Paper on Measurement Issues in the Retail Food Industry of Canada*. Ottawa, September 2002, 50.

²⁸ MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Food Sector Review: a Questionnaire for the Retail Food Industry of Canada*. Ottawa, 2002, 16.

²⁹ MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Food Sector Review: a Discussion Paper on Measurement Issues in the Retail Food Industry of Canada*. Ottawa, September 2002, 30-31.

³⁰ MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Food Sector Review: a Discussion Paper on Measurement Issues in the Retail Food Industry of Canada*. Ottawa, September 2002, 50.

responsible. In the next section, we shall describe the trade measurement regulations of France using the same descriptive framework.

3- THE REGULATORY CONTEXT OF FRANCE

A review of French regulations will put the Canadian regulatory system in perspective, so that we can better discern its strengths and weaknesses in terms of consumer protection.

3.1- European Context

Its status as a member state of the European Union gives France a special position in regard to the regulation of weights and measures in general, and trade scales in particular: the government of France shares responsibility with the EU authorities (particularly the European Commission). This is different from the Canadian situation, where the federal government does not share its jurisdiction.

As we shall see, type approval and initial inspection of scales used for direct sales to the public and pre-packing of retail food products are now regulated by a European Council Directive. This means that describing the legal provisions adopted by France on the basis of this directive and the control and accreditation mechanisms arising from them is tantamount to describing the compliance assessment procedures applied in all the European countries. Only the government agencies and competent bodies differ from one country to the next. The requirements and procedures for type approval and initial inspection are identical.

At this writing, periodic scale inspection is not governed by the European regulations. However, the accreditation and certification arrangements adopted by the European governments are sufficiently comparable to allow organizations performing these inspections to apply, through an agent, for accreditation and certification in any country.

Under European weights and measures regulations, all weighing instruments requiring the intervention of an operator during weighing are grouped into a single category called non-automatic weighing instruments (NAWI). Computing/counter scales, point of sale

scales, and prepack scales, as defined in the Measurement Canada Retail Food Sector Review glossary, all belong to this category in Europe.

3.2- Council Directive 90/384/EEC

Type approval during the design phase and conformity assessment during the production phase of all NAWIs, which are used, *inter alia*, in the determination of mass for commercial transactions and the determination of price on the basis of mass for the purposes of direct sales to the public and the making-up of prepackages, are regulated by Council Directive 90/384/EEC of 20 June 1990 on the Harmonization of the Laws of the Member States Relating to Non-Automatic Weighing Instruments of 20 June 1990.

This directive took effect on 1 January 1993 and was amended by Council Directive 93/68/EC of 22 July 1993. It sets forth the essential metrology and performance requirements necessary to guarantee the effective protection of users and consumers on the one hand, and to set conformity rules and procedures on the other.

3.3- Scope of Intervention

3.3.1- Traceability of Scale Standards

Council Directive 90/384/EEC³¹ provides that each member state must notify to the others the body or bodies responsible for supervising the various stages leading to the marketing of weighing instruments.³² The traceability of scale calibration is provided by codes identifying the notified or certified bodies involved in the validation of standards all along the calibration chain.

³¹ Council Directive 90/384/EEC - <http://www.europa.eu.int.pdf/>, d.c. 12/07/02.

³² Welmec, *Guide for the Assessing and Operation of Notified Bodies Performing Conformity Assessment According to the Directive 90/384/EEC* - <http://www.welmec.org.pdf/>, d.c. 12/07/02. List of notified bodies, OJEC C129 p.30-42, -<http://www.europa.eu.int.pdf/>, 12/07/02.

Mandatory marking of these codes on the weighing instrument enables the bodies in charge of control and supervision to trace the calibration chain. The EC Type Approval Certificate, the EC Declaration of Conformity or the EC Verification held by the manufacturer and registered with the notified bodies, as well as the maintenance logbook (*carnet métrologique*) kept by the user, constitute the detailed regulatory documentation required for each scale.

3.3.1.1- Calibration Chain

For each field of measurement, the role of metrology is to develop techniques for comparing measuring devices to primary standards (which may be national or international) without discontinuity and with minimal loss of accuracy. This is accomplished by means of a calibration chain. Calibration is the set of operations establishing, under the specified conditions, the relationship between the values given by a measuring device or system or the values represented by a material measure or reference material on the one hand, and the corresponding values produced by the standards.

The existence of calibration chains gives credibility to the calibrations performed by laboratories as well as the measurements and tests performed by businesses. Organizations participating in the calibration chain are laboratories located at different levels of accuracy with respect to the primary laboratory, which sits at the top of the measurement hierarchy.

3.3.1.1.1- Primary Laboratories

These are the national reference laboratories for given dimensions. Their activity is essentially a kind of research; their main purpose is to preserve primary standards and conduct research to improve measurement precision and accuracy.

3.3.1.1.2- Secondary Standards Laboratories

These are situated next in the chain after primary laboratories. They are defined as bodies in charge of performing calibration at the request of laboratories and industry. They

interact directly with the user or builder of measuring instruments. Their mission is to ensure the traceability of any measuring instrument to their reference standards, the secondary standards. They issue official calibration documents (calibration certificates) after each calibration operation, under the responsibility of the body in charge of supervising the national calibration system. To accomplish this, they must periodically calibrate their reference standards to the standards of the primary laboratories.

3.3.1.1.3- Company Metrology Laboratories (Tertiary)

Any company in which metrology plays an important role and which possesses the necessary human and physical resources may set up its own laboratory for calibration of its instrument population, as well as offer this service to third parties. The reference standards of these laboratories must be traceable to a secondary standard, making them tertiary standards in terms of precision.³³

3.3.1.2- Traceability to Reference Standards

France, like Canada, adheres to the International System of Units. The reference standard for the creation and maintenance of primary national standards is that of the International Bureau of Weights and Measures in Sèvres, France. The calibration of secondary and tertiary standards to primary standards is done in conformity with ISO/CEI 17025 (EN 45001).

3.3.1.3- Competent Bodies

In order to operate in France, secondary and tertiary metrology laboratories must obtain certification from the ministry responsible for industry. These laboratories may also apply for accreditation for their quality system from the legal authority in charge of accreditation. These two separate and complementary procedures jointly guarantee adherence to the regulatory provisions (either of the European Union or France) as well as the reliability of calibration. For metrology laboratories, accreditation of the

³³ MCI - Métrologie - <http://www.mcinet.gov.ma.html>, d.c. 25/07/02.

conformity of their quality system to regulatory standards saves time and money and offers a competitive advantage.

3.3.1.3.1- Traceability of Secondary and Tertiary Standards to National Standards

The Laboratoire National D'essais (LNE), a public body with industrial and commercial functions and a member of the Bureau National de Métrologie (BNM), is designated by the minister for industry to calibrate national (primary) reference standards, working (secondary) standards used by standards laboratories, and company metrology (tertiary) laboratories. This makes it possible to guarantee the traceability of measurements to national standards.

3.3.1.3.2- Accreditation of Secondary and Tertiary Metrology Laboratories

The Comité français d'accréditation (COFRAC) is the body legally delegated by the Ministry of Industry for the purposes of accreditation. The Calibration Section of COFRAC, in collaboration with the BNM, accredits secondary and tertiary metrology laboratories on demand, by reviewing their quality system (EN 45001/ISO/CEI 17025). Accreditation is not permanent; if subsequent audits are conclusive, accreditation is valid for approximately five years. The laboratories are responsible for applying for renewal with the Calibration Section.³⁴

3.3.2- Accreditation and Surveillance of Company Metrology Laboratories, Inspection Organizations and Scale Service Companies

As part of the decentralization process underway in France, the regional divisions of industry, research and environment (DRIRE)³⁵ responsible to the Ministry of the Economy, Finance and Industry (MINÉFI), are notified for the EC Declaration of

³⁴ COFRAC, Calibration Section - www.cofrac.fr, html, d.c. 12/07/02.

³⁵ See DRIRE sites.

Conformity and the EC Verification. The DRIRE are also responsible for surveillance of organizations accredited for periodic inspection.

Twenty-three regional DRIRE have the mission to accredit and supervise the company metrology laboratories of manufacturers and inspection and repair organizations in their respective regions.

Decree 88–682 of 6 May 1988 on inspection of measuring instruments stipulates the conditions for accreditation of inspection and repair organizations.³⁶ Decisions to grant and withdraw accreditation are issued with the recommendation of an advisory committee.³⁷ This committee is composed of two representatives of the Metrology Section, including its director; a representative of the DRIREs; a representative of the NAWI repairers who are members of the National Association of Weighing Professionals (*Union National des Professionels du Pesage*); a representative of the independent NAWI repairers; a representative of NAWI manufacturers belonging to the weighing and metering association; a representative of the minister responsible for crafts, who represents commercial craftspeople. Decisions are made by majority vote of the members present. In the event of a tie, the director of the Metrology Section, who chairs the committee, casts the deciding vote.

The quality system for periodic inspection must comply with EN 45001, *General Criteria for the Operation of Testing Laboratories*.³⁸

This surveillance includes *a posteriori* inspection of verified instruments which may involve statistical control with a tolerance limit equal to 5%.³⁹ This means that when the DRIRE inspects a statistical batch of instruments verified by the accredited organization and 5% or more of the instruments are non-compliant, the DRIRE may revoke the organization's accreditation.

³⁶ Decree 88-682 of 6 May 1988.

³⁷ Executive order of 22 March 1993 respecting control of an NAWI, in service, section. 5.

³⁸ *Ibid.* art.6.

³⁹ *Ibid.* art.10.

Moreover, one case in which accreditation is subject to non-renewal is where an organization did not verify at least 500 instruments during a calendar year in a given administrative region.⁴⁰

The DRIRE also monitor the population of regulated instruments in service in each respective region; this consists in an assessment of regulatory compliance by scale owners⁴¹ and, as mentioned in the previous paragraph, in surveillance of certified inspection and repair organizations.

Where there is no organization in a region that is accredited to inspect and repair instruments, the local DRIRE conducts these operations itself.

3.3.3- Approval of New Device Types

When a scale manufacturer designs a new model or modifies the design of a previously approved model, it must apply to the notified body for a type examination in order to obtain a type approval certificate.

3.3.3.1- EC Type Examination

The EC type examination is the procedure whereby a notified body inspects and certifies that a prototype instrument satisfies the directive's requirements. The manufacturer or its authorized representative in the European Community must file a type examination application with a single notified body. This application contains the following:

- the name and address of the manufacturer as well as the representative, if any;
- a written declaration that the application was not filed with another notified body;
- the technical documentation described in Annex III of the directive.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.* art.11.

⁴¹ See paragraph 1.7.3 regarding periodic inspection.

3.3.3.2- Notified Body

It is specified in Annex V of Council Directive 90/384/EEC that the notified bodies for certification of type conformity shall work independently of all circles, groups or persons having direct or indirect interest in non-automatic weighing instruments regarding the carrying-out of the tests, the preparation of the reports, and the issuing of the certificates.

In France, as mentioned above, the Laboratoire National d'Essais (LNE) is the notified body for type examinations and issuance of the EC type approval certificate. The LNE publishes the certificates it issues, with a copy to the legal metrology service.

3.3.3.3- EC Type Approval Certificate

Where the type is approved, the document issued to the manufacturer is an EC type approval certificate valid for ten years and renewable for additional ten-year periods at the manufacturer's request. Approved instruments may bear the EC conformity marking as described in Annex VI of the directive. In 2001, the LNE issued 25 type approval certificates for NAWI.

3.3.4- Initial Inspection

Initial inspection is the quality control procedure for the production of instruments. Conformity to the essential requirements defined in Annex I of the directive (transcribed into French law by means of Decree 91-330 of 27 March 1991 concerning NAWI⁴²) is attested, at the applicant's option, by one of the following procedures:

- EC type examination followed either by EC declaration of type conformity, which provides quality assurance, or EC verification;
- EC unit verification.

⁴² Decree 91-330 of 27 March 1991 - www.mt.com, pdf, d.c. 12/07/02 (p.j.4)

3.3.4.1- Notified Bodies

As discussed above, the DRIRE are notified for carrying out the EC declaration of conformity, verification and surveillance procedures. The LNE is the notified body for the EC declaration of conformity and unit verification procedures.

3.3.4.2- EC Declaration of Conformity

In order to make an EC declaration of conformity, which assures the quality of the product, the manufacturer must hold an EC type approval certificate, implement an approved quality system (ISO 17025), and be subjected to EC surveillance by the competent body. Where these conditions are met, the manufacturer declares its instruments to conform to the type described in the certificate, and to comply with the provisions of Decree 91–330. In this case there is no EC verification.

3.3.4.3- EC Verification

EC verification is the procedure whereby the manufacturer or its agent in the European Community verifies and attests that the instruments submitted individually to the appropriate examinations and tests by a notified body conform to the type described in the EC type approval certificate and comply with the provisions of Decree 91–330. EC verification applies where the manufacturer does not have an approved quality system for the production of the instruments in question.

3.3.4.4- EC Unit Verification

EC unit verification is the procedure whereby the manufacturer or its agent in the European Community verifies and attests that the instrument (in general designed for a specific application) which, following the appropriate examinations and tests by a notified body, was the subject of an attestation of conformity, complies with the applicable provisions of Decree 91–330. EC unit verification applies where the manufacturer does not have an approved quality system for the production of the instruments in question.

3.3.4.5- Validity

The EC declaration of conformity and verification are valid until the instrument is retired from service. However, where an instrument is declared non-compliant during a periodic inspection, the accredited repair organization must determine its conformity to the metrological provisions of Decree 91–330 (Appendix I, article 4.1) as amended, before authorizing the instrument to be returned to service. At the request of the competent DRIRE within the fifteen days following the intervention, this organization must deliver a report of the intervention and affix its identification number to all sealing devices, including those not affected by the intervention.

3.3.5- Periodic Reinspection

In application of the Executive Order of 22 March 1993 concerning control of NAWI in service, the owners of the instruments or their representatives are responsible for periodic verification of the instrument and its logbook, either by an organization certified by the DRIRE or by the DRIRE itself.⁴³

3.3.5.1- Metrological Logbook

A metrological logbook must be kept for each instrument at the place where it is used. The logbook, made available to representatives of the government at all times, contains information on inspection, repair and modification of the instrument.⁴⁴

3.3.5.2- Competent Bodies

The organizations accredited and supervised by the DRIRE are competent for periodic inspection of NAWI in service.⁴⁵ Note that as mentioned, surveillance of the population of instruments in service is the responsibility of the DRIRE.⁴⁶

⁴³ *cf.* section 3.2.3.2.

⁴⁴ Executive Order of 22 March 1993, section 3.

3.3.5.3- Administrative Review and Metrological Testing

Periodic inspection must be interrupted where an examination or test gives rise to a result or observation that indicates non-conformity to the regulations. If the metrological logbook is missing or in poor condition, the corresponding instrument is rejected.

Where periodic inspection and repair or adjustment are performed in a single visit by the same organization or by the operator acting on behalf of an accredited repair organization and an accredited verification organization, the verification tests must follow any repair or adjustment. In this case, the applicable tolerances are those set by article 4.1 of Annex I of Decree 91–330 as amended, for declaration of type conformity. The instrument is then subject to new periodic inspection.⁴⁷

3.3.5.4- Validity

The inspection frequency is biannual for NAWI measuring maximum weights less than or equal to 30 kg and designed for use in direct sales to the public.

For NAWI used in determining mass in excess of 30 kg for trade transactions, the inspection frequency is annual.⁴⁸

3.3.6- Net Quantity Verification

Control of net quantity accuracy is under the responsibility of the Competition, Consumer Affairs and Fraud Prevention Division (DGCCRF)⁴⁹ of the MINÉFI. The DGCCRF is represented in all departments of France by a departmental division of competition, consumer affairs and fraud prevention (DDCCFR), whose inspectors and controllers are

⁴⁵ *cf.* section 3.2.3.2.

⁴⁶ *cf.* section 3.2.3.2.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.* art. 7

⁴⁸ *Ibid.* art. 5.

⁴⁹ [Missions de la DGCCRF -www.finances.gouv.fr, html, d.c. 12/07/02.](http://www.finances.gouv.fr/html_d.c.12/07/02)

responsible for consumer protection, control of product and service safety and quality, and enforcement of fair trade practices.⁵⁰

3.3.7- Handling of Complaints

Consumers who observe a violation or anomaly may report it to the instrument owner or its representative. If necessary, they may also file a complaint with a law enforcement authority (gendarmerie or police station) as well as the following agencies, depending on the problem:

- problems concerning the NAWI itself: for example, for missing sticker or expiry of periodic inspection, consumers may contact the subdivision of the DRIRE in the department.
- problems concerning improper use of the NAWI: for example, for inaccurate weighing of quantities sold resulting from improper zeroing, consumers may complain to the frauds section of the local DDCCFR.

3.4- Conclusion

French regulations concerning scales are much more extensive and thorough, hence better able to protect consumer interests, than Canadian regulations. First, the type approval procedure is more restrictive, and the manufacturer is obligated to apply for renewal after 10 years. This obligation means that outdated scales whose accuracy no longer complies with new requirements must be withdrawn from the market. Greater consumer protection is the result.

Second, scale service companies are regulated; they are subject to the same accreditation requirements as companies performing initial inspection and reinspection. These

⁵⁰ This information obtained by telephone from the director of the DDCCRF for Loire-Atlantique (44) on 17 July 2002. Telephone number: 011 33 2 40 08 80 40.

companies must comply with the same regulations, and their accreditation is renewable. This situation affords consumers much better protection than in Canada, where scale service companies are unregulated.

Third, scales are subject to mandatory periodic reinspection, which is not the case in Canada. Here, the budget cuts have made random reinspections increasingly infrequent. In this area too, French consumers benefit from much greater protection than Canadians do.

Another feature of the French system is the extensive use of accreditation (*agrément*) in areas which, in Canada, are under the direct control of Measurement Canada. Calibration, type approval, initial inspection and reinspection may all be performed by accredited organizations. These organizations must adhere to metrological standards (including ISO 17025), rather than mere quality standards as Measurement Canada requires.

4- ANALYSIS OF CANADA-WIDE SURVEY

Option consommateurs commissioned a Canada-wide survey and six focus groups from Environics, a polling firm. The main purpose of this survey was to ascertain Canadians' level of confidence in the accuracy of scales, their general knowledge of the regulatory system for scales, and the experience of persons who have reported a problem with scale accuracy to a food store.

The survey contacted 2,000 Canadians age 18 and over by telephone between June 18 and July 9, 2002. Among these people, the 1,776 who purchase food requiring in-store weighing by scales regulated by Measurement Canada constituted the statistical sample. The survey sought to determine the level of Canadian consumer confidence in retail food scales, the reasons for that level of confidence, Canadians' knowledge of scale regulation, the stores' handling of scale-related problems they have experienced, and their knowledge of Measurement Canada. The survey questionnaire is included in Appendix 1 and the results in Appendix 2.

The results are broken down by respondent category (gender, occupation, income, political opinion, etc.). These categories are found in all omnibus surveys conducted by Environics. To simplify the analysis, we used only the following categories to analyze consumer confidence: age, employment status, family income and education. We used these categories only for the question about confidence levels, since the sample was too small to provide reliable results for the other questions.

4.1- Confidence in Scale Accuracy

On the whole, consumer confidence in food scale accuracy is high: 37% are completely confident and 51% relatively confident. It is interesting to note that only 3% of consumers have no confidence in scale accuracy.

Table 1 –Confidence in Scale Accuracy

Level of Confidence	Proportion (%)
Complete confidence	37
Relative confidence	51
Little confidence	8
No confidence	3

Age has no influence on confidence, which remains the same for all groups. The analysis for the other categories yields only slight variation. Employment status is significant only for the unemployed, whose confidence level is lower (22% completely confident, 55% relatively confident and 23% with little confidence). Income is significant only for the highest income bracket (\$80,000 and over), where confidence is higher (44% completely confident and 49% relatively confident), and the lowest (\$20,000 and under), where confidence is lower (28% are completely confident and 53% relatively confident). The same pattern holds true for education, where only the highest and lowest educated groups show significant differences; consumers without high-school diplomas are less confident (30% completely confident and 51% relatively confident), while those holding university degrees are more confident (42% completely confident and 50% relatively confident).

4.2- Factors Explaining Confidence Levels

Option consommateurs sought to ascertain the reasons for confidence or non-confidence in scale accuracy. Respondents were asked to choose from a list of options, and these choices were correlated with the respondents belonging to the more-confident (complete or relative confidence) and less-confident (little or no confidence) groups.

The list of responses offered to explain confidence was as follows:

- trusts the store or the scale, has never experienced problems;
- considers the price paid to be regular and reasonable;
- has never thought about scale accuracy or believes the scales work well;
- knows how to read a scale or watches the clerk while it is being used;
- the scale seems new.

The following responses were offered to explain non-confidence:

- distrusts the store or the scale;
- insufficient maintenance or too infrequent inspection of the scale;
- extreme price variations and fluctuations;
- does not know how to read the scale;
- human error;
- the price is too high.

Before continuing, it is important to mention that there is some intentional overlap in the reasons offered to consumers expressing relative or little confidence in scale accuracy. These groups were offered a choice from among reasons for both “confidence” and “non-confidence.” The overlap is necessary, since one may assume that those with relative confidence in the accuracy of their scales have reasons for not being completely confident, while those with little confidence have reasons for not responding “no confidence.” The inclusion of extra responses did not yield significant results for less-confident respondents, since none of the reasons for confidence accounted for more than 3% of the responses in this category. On the other hand, it did yield significant results for the more-confident group, as we shall see later in the analysis of that group.

4.2.1- More-Confident Group: Breakdown of Responses

Among consumers who are completely or relatively confident in scale accuracy, the most commonly offered reasons for confidence were that they had never experienced problems and that the scale seems new (22% each). This was followed by the response of having never thought about scale accuracy (17%) and that the price is regular and reasonable (8%). Finally, 7% of consumers mentioned that they know how to read a scale or that they watch the clerk during use of the scale.

It is interesting to note that 14% of the more-confident respondents mentioned that they distrusted the store or the scales. The other reasons for non-confidence were mentioned by less than 5% of more-confident respondents.

Table 2 – Reasons invoked by more-confident respondents

Reason	Proportion (%)
Is confident, has never experienced problems	22
The scale seems new	22
Has never thought about scale accuracy or believes the scale works well	17
Considers the price paid to regular and reasonable	8
Knows how to read the scale or watches the clerk during use	7
Distrusts the store or the scale	14
Insufficient maintenance or too infrequent inspection of the scale	5
Human error	2
Does not know how to read the scale	1
Extreme price variations and fluctuations	1
The price is too high	1

4.2.2- Less-Confident Group: Breakdown of Responses

Among consumers who have little or no confidence in scale accuracy, a clear majority (57%) gave as the reason that they distrust the store or the scale. This data is even more interesting in that this was also the most common reason for non-confidence provided by the more-confident group. The other answers provided by the less-confident group were

as follows: extreme price variations (15%), insufficient maintenance or infrequent inspection (10%), human error (4%), prices too high (1%), and not knowing how to read the scale (1%). Reasons for confidence among the less-confident group were not mentioned often, none of them by more than 3% of respondents.

Table 3 – Reasons invoked by less-confident respondents

Raison	Proportion (%)
Distrusts the store or the scale	57
Extreme price variations and fluctuations	15
Insufficient maintenance or too infrequent inspection of the scale	10
Human error	4
The price is too high	3
Has never thought about scale accuracy or believes the scale works well	3
Knows how to read the scale or watches the clerk during use	2
The scale seems new	2
Is confident, has never experienced problems	1
Does not know how to read the scale	1
Considers the price paid to regular and reasonable	0

4.3- Knowledge of Scale Regulations

We asked consumers whether they knew if food scale accuracy is regulated, and if so, by what body. Forty-five percent believed that scales are regulated, but 28% believed that they are not. It is interesting to note that 27% of consumers did not know whether scales are regulated or not.

Table 4 – Knowledge of scale regulation

Response	Proportion (%)
Yes	45
No	28
Don't know	27

We asked consumers who stated that scales are regulated to name the body responsible for setting and enforcing these regulations. Most of these consumers think that this is done by the government (67%), while 16% believe that there is some form of self-regulation (by stores or scale industry companies).

Although a non-negligible proportion (13%) of respondents correctly named Measurement Canada as responsible for scale regulation, this is due in part to the fact that the preceding questions in the omnibus survey to which they were responding had mentioned the existence of this agency.⁵¹ Therefore, it is difficult to ascertain the precise degree to which consumers are aware of Measurement Canada's role.

⁵¹ Environics conducts a quarterly Canada-wide omnibus survey of 2,000 respondents. Use of the omnibus survey format helps to reduce costs. Option consommateurs is participating in the Natural Gas and Retail Food Sector Reviews, and therefore drafted questions for both sectors. In this survey, the natural gas questions were asked just before the retail food questions. This may cause some bias, although it is limited

Table 5 – Entity believed to be responsible for scale regulation (among consumers who believe that regulation exists)

Entity	Proportion
Federal government	25
Provincial government	16
Measurement Canada	13
Store owners and/or staff	11
Government (unspecified)	11
Scale manufacturers/retailers/technicians	5
Inspectors in general (unspecified)	3
Better business bureau	1
No response	17

by the fact that only 125 respondents (6.25% of persons surveyed) had to answer questions about the existence of Measurement Canada for the natural gas part.

4.4- Handling of Measurement-Related Problems in Retail Food Stores

4.4.1- Reporting of the Problem and Actions Taken

Very few consumers have reported a problem with scale reading to a retail food store.⁵² Among the persons surveyed, only 6% had ever done so. We asked these people if the store had offered to weigh their merchandise on another scale, which was done in 56% of cases. We also asked them if the store had suggested they contact Measurement Canada, which was done for only 2% of these respondents.

Finally, we asked these consumers if the store had taken another action, which was the case for 43% of them. Of this group, 57% was offered a price correction or reduction, 26% stated that the store had replaced the scale, 5% did not receive a price reduction, and 2% received information about the weight. This data is summarized in the table below. Note that the figures about other actions taken are given as proportions of the total group of respondents who reported a problem.

⁵² The term “reading” is used by the surveyors to simplify understanding of the question. It is understood that this term may have a broader meaning than “accuracy.”

Table 6 – Actions taken by store in response to reported scale problem

Action taken	Proportion (%)
Offer to weigh product on another scale	56
Suggestion to contact Measurement Canada	2
Price correction or reduction	24
Replacement of scale	11
No price reduction	2
Information about weight	1
Other action	6

4.4.2- Consumer Satisfaction with Complaint Handling

We went on to ask those respondents who had reported a scale reading error about their level of satisfaction with the store’s handling of their complaint. Overall, consumer satisfaction was relatively high. On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being the highest satisfaction rating, the average score is 6.8. Examining this figure in more detail, we note that 10% of respondents were completely dissatisfied, 14% were relatively dissatisfied (score of 2–4), 13% were moderately satisfied (score of 5–6), 31% were very satisfied (score of 7–9) and 28% were totally satisfied.

Table 5 – Consumer satisfaction with action taken by food store

Satisfaction score (/10)	% of Respondents
Total (10)	28
High (7 to 9)	31
Moderate (5 to 6)	13
Low (2 to 4)	14
Dissatisfied (1)	10
Satisfaction score (/10)	6.8

4.4.3- Measurement Canada's Role

Among respondents who reported a scale reading problem, a small proportion were familiar with Measurement Canada's role: only 32% knew that this agency is competent to handle their complaint if they are dissatisfied with the actions taken by their food store. Among respondents familiar with Measurement Canada's role, only 15% considered filing a complaint with the agency; or, as a proportion of total respondents who reported problems, only 4.7% considered this action.

4.5- Conclusions

Food scale accuracy is not a major concern for the consumers surveyed. They put a considerable amount of trust in these scales, and this is largely due to the fact that most of them believe that the system works well, they have never experienced problems, or they are naturally inclined to trust in scale accuracy. However, this confidence is not total, and

some consumers give reasons for why they feel that way. It is interesting to note that these reasons have little to do with the scales themselves, and much more to do with the stores operating them — this being the main reason for distrusting scale accuracy. This problem, as we shall see later, was also mentioned by the focus group participants.

We noted that the proportion of consumers stating their belief that scales are regulated is rather small. In addition, this group of consumers had only a vague idea of which authority is responsible for regulation. The great majority of consumers who believed that scales are regulated thought that this function was fulfilled a public body, but often they could not state which one.

Very few respondents reported a problem with scale reading to the food store itself. Those who did were relatively satisfied with the way the store handled the complaint. Very few of them considered appealing to Measurement Canada, nor was it often suggested that they do so.

5- DETAILED FOCUS GROUP FINDINGS

In July 2002, six focus groups were held by Environics in three Canadian cities: Toronto (July 16), Calgary (July 18), and Montreal (July 25). The participants were people who purchase clerk-served food products and who take a keen interest in public policy issues in general. This technique was designed to gather more enlightened opinions than those that might be revealed by a survey, which is directed at Canadians as an undifferentiated group. Focus groups are also a means of covering a greater range of subjects relating to scale regulation. The discussion guide for these groups is included in Appendix 3, and the document distributed to the participants to explain the context of the discussion is included in Appendix 4.⁵³

5.1- Regulation of Weights and Measures in Canada

5.1.1- How Weights and Measures Are Currently Regulated

Virtually all participants assumed that the accuracy of weights and measures in Canada was regulated in some way. In Toronto, it was assumed that this was done by some federal government agency. A number of people mentioned “Weights and Measures Canada” or “Trade and Commerce” or “Consumer and Corporate Affairs.” In Montreal and Calgary, most people also assumed that this must be regulated by some federal agency but some people also wondered whether measuring devices might be regulated at the local or provincial level. Some participants mentioned that they’d seen certification stickers on scales at grocery stores or on gas pumps. Most added that this was not

⁵³ Focus groups dealt with two sector reviews: the Natural Gas Sector Review and the Retail Food Sector Review. The documents appended refer only to the retail food section of the sessions.

something that they had ever thought about. They took for granted the fact that weights and measures are accurate.

Only a couple of participants – both in Montreal – spontaneously identified Measurement Canada as being the name of the agency that is charged with this responsibility. Those people who did know about Measurement Canada knew about it because they had worked in places where they had dealt with measuring devices and had been exposed first hand to Measurement Canada inspection activities.

Participants universally felt that this regulatory role should be performed by some national government agency that was able to impose national standards of reliability and quality on meters and scales. It was mentioned that the gas utilities and retail food outlets and meter manufacturers themselves should not be given the ultimate power to regulate the meters since they were seen as having a conflict of interest. It was notable that in all the groups, there were some off-hand comments by participants that, in the wake of the accounting scandals at Enron and WorldCom, they had even less trust in the ability of industry to regulate itself. This sentiment was strongest in Toronto. In Calgary, there was a bit more openness to the idea of giving more responsibility for regulation to industries.

5.1.2- Reactions to the Role of Measurement Canada

When participants were told that Measurement Canada was responsible for regulating weights and measures in Canada, a couple of people mentioned that they had heard of Measurement Canada before. A couple of participants had some awareness of MC as a result of having worked in places where they had seen scales and meters get inspected and had had direct dealings with Measurement Canada inspectors. A couple of people also recalled having seen a sticker or logo marked Measurement Canada at some point in the past. It was clear that there was virtually little top-of-mind identification of Measurement Canada with the regulation of weights and measures in Canada.

Participants read some background material explaining the role of Measurement Canada with regard to meters and scales. For most people, the extent of Measurement Canada's role in this area came as a surprise. Some had assumed that "someone" was performing

these functions but the consensus was that it was good to know that some arm of government was keeping “an eye on things.” Most participants said that knowing all of this made them feel more comfortable about the accuracy of weights and measures that they deal with in their everyday lives and that it was good to have some kind of watchdog over industry. Participants were most concerned about the idea of stores and utilities trying to cheat consumers and they were happy to know that there was some kind of mechanism whereby they could be “spot checked.”

The only discordant reaction was from a couple of participants in each city who were sceptical as to whether Measurement Canada actually performed all these functions. Since these people had never heard of Measurement Canada and had never seen any Measurement Canada inspectors with their own eyes, they wondered whether all this regulation was actually happening. Some wanted to know whether they as consumers could phone Measurement Canada if they had questions or complaints about measuring devices. Also, some participants mentioned that since they had always taken it for granted in the first place that scales and meters were accurate, there was no way that they could feel any more confident than they had felt in the first place.

5.1.3- Understanding of the Trade Sector Review

Understanding of the Trade Sector Review (TSR) was quite varied. Some participants, particularly in Montreal, clearly did not know what the Trade Sector Review was all about. They saw it as an internal bureaucratic process of the sort that probably happens frequently without the public having to be informed. Participants in Toronto and Calgary had a better grasp of the idea that Measurement Canada had to review its role in view of new technology and to see how they could most efficiently use their resources. It was understood that Measurement Canada was a relatively small government agency and must find the most efficient way to use its resources in a changing world. Some comments were made about how “Measurement Canada has to find ways to do more with less” and that “Measurement Canada is up to its eyeballs in work and has to efficiently allocate its resources.”

5.2- Retail Food Sector Review

5.2.1- Personal Use of Retail Food Scales

All participants reported having extensive personal experience with getting food weighed at points of sale in retail settings. It was notable that in every group, when the topic of food scales was first raised, many participants would make the initial assumption that we were referring to non-commercial rudimentary scales in the fruit and vegetable departments of grocery stores that are not actually allowed to be used for commercial purposes. When participants understood that we were actually referring to scales used to calculate prices at points of sale, they all reported routinely using these kinds of scales. Usage of retail food scales was most often reported in the context of checkout counters at supermarkets, delicatessens, cheese shops, and chocolate and confectionery shops, as well as in open farmers markets where fruits and vegetables are sold.

5.2.2- Initial Attitude Toward the Accuracy of Scales

Most participants reported having, at least fleetingly, wondered if the scales used in retail food outlets are accurate and whether they were regulated in any way. When it came to big supermarket chains, some participants wondered if the scales could be accurate since the weighing seemed to happen so quickly at the checkout counter. Others felt that big supermarket chains would not want the bad publicity that would come from having inaccurate scales and, as a result, were more likely to be regularly checking their scales and making sure that they were accurate. Also, it was often assumed that a major chain like Loblaws or Provigo would be more likely to be using the most “state of the art” scale technology in the first place.

Participants in all three cities expressed the most concern about the accuracy and trustworthiness of scales in smaller independent retail food shops. The perception was that these kinds of enterprises operate on very narrow profit margins and that proprietors would be more motivated to try to “cheat.” Many people had old memories of “butchers

who put their finger on the scale” and there was a feeling that in smaller shops this might still happen. Also, small food shops were suspected of using very old poorly maintained scales that might be easier to manipulate and that may very rarely get verified.

Ultimately, most participants did not worry too much about scale inaccuracy when buying food as long as the price seemed fair. Several participants mentioned that they were much more concerned about getting overcharged in ways that have nothing to do with the accuracy of the scales themselves. These included incorrect price tags, wrong bar codes and human error at the checkout counter. Still, there was a strong visceral suspicion that small retail food outlets would try to cheat “a little bit here and a little bit there.” It was also acknowledged that any retailer has an interest in having accurate scales, both to prevent losing money do to scales that are inaccurate in favour of the customer, but also because of the potential damage to a store’s reputation if they were known to have inaccurate scales.

5.2.3- Personal Experience with Retail Food Scale Inaccuracy

Most participants reported that they had not personally bought food and suspected that the scale was inaccurate and that if they had, it had been many, many years ago when scales were much more “manual” than they are today. A couple of participants recounted some anecdotes about re-weighing a fruit or vegetable in a farmers’ market and having the weight always come out slightly different or of some experience of the proverbial “finger on the scale.” To the extent that these incidences had occurred, they were usually over very small differences that might have a made a difference of a couple of cents at most. Once again, the consensus was that much more money is lost as a result of human error or wrong bar codes than from the scales themselves being inaccurate.

When participants are asked to really focus on the issue of whether or not food scales are accurate, they zero in on the possibility of proprietors trying to cheat them. For the most part, participants take it for granted that retail food scales are very accurate.

5.2.4- Awareness of Current Regulatory Framework for Retail Food Scales

Participants were unsure of whether retail food scales are currently regulated or inspected. They assumed that most supermarkets and proprietors of food shops must verify scales on some kind of a regular basis, but they were unsure of whether these inspections were mandated by Measurement Canada. Once again, they were confident that the big supermarkets probably do this routinely, but they were concerned that small operators might try to avoid the expense of getting their scales inspected and therefore don't bother.

Participants were asked about how they thought retail food scales should be regulated. They said that they would feel better about the accuracy of scales if they knew that random, unannounced spot checks of retail food scales were regularly carried out and that scales had a sticker on them indicating when they had last been inspected. They wanted to know that proprietors who might want to “fix” their scales would always have to worry about the possibility of spot checks. They also want to know that there are penalties for retailers who have scales that are inaccurate and particularly those that may have been tampered with. Ideally, stores would be mandated by Measurement Canada to verify their scales and that spot checks would be done to make sure that this actually took place. In other words, Measurement Canada should impose some minimum standards for getting scales verified. Most people did not think that it was essential for Measurement Canada to actually do the inspections, as long as Measurement Canada did take responsibility for spot checks and publicized the fines that could be imposed for non-compliance..

5.2.5- Reaction to Regulatory Framework for Retail Food Scales

Participants were given some material to read that described what MC currently does with regard to regulating retail food scales. It was explained that, at one time, MC regularly re-inspected scales in retail food outlets but that this had been phased out due to

both efforts at cost-cutting and the difficulty of keeping up with the new technology in scales. It was noted in this material that:

“When scales are inspected at food retail outlets, about 10% are found with measurement errors. Of these errors, about half are in favour of the consumer while the other half are in favour of the store. Most of these errors are quite small (i.e. less than 0.5%), but if a large error is found the scale is removed from service until the error is corrected. An additional 7% of all scales inspected have other non-measurement problems identified during these inspections (i.e. installation issues).”

In general, participants in Toronto and Calgary were quite reassured both by these statistics and by the information about what Measurement Canada currently does in this sector. While there were some concerns about the fact that ten percent of scales were found to have some inaccuracies, it was also noted that the vast majority of inaccuracies are very slight. What most reassured participants was the fact that any scale inaccuracies were evenly split between those that favour the consumer and those that favour the merchant. This reassured people that, in the end, any inaccuracies probably even out, with the consumer rarely paying due to inaccurate scales. They noted that, given this information, Measurement Canada seems to be regulating effectively and that there may not be a need for more aggressive regulation. In Montreal, the reaction was somewhat different, with most participants being concerned that so many scales have inaccuracies of any kind. They worried that if the role of Measurement Canada were scaled back at all, the level of inaccuracy could go up. All participants felt that these statistics showed that there was enough potential inaccuracy in retail food scales that there was clearly a role for MC as a regulator and inspector. Despite the statistics about the inaccuracies going in both directions, there was an underlying concern that merchants are trying to cheat consumers through fixed scales and that there must be enough spot-check inspections to act as a deterrent against this.

With regard to what Measurement Canada’s role should be, participants formed a strong consensus on the following points:

- It must continue to be mandatory that Measurement Canada approves all scale TYPES used in the retail food sector. Participants want to be reassured that any prototypes of scales used for commercial purposes be approved by MC, either directly or indirectly. Some added that this approval of type should be at the expense of the scale manufacturer as part of the cost of doing business
- Participants also universally felt that it must be mandatory that all new individual scales be approved by Measurement Canada and sealed before they are put into service. This is seen as an essential step in quality control of weighing devices.
- There was also a very strong consensus that even if Measurement Canada were to do less systematic inspections of scales, they must at the very least continue to do some spot checks of food retailers' scales. This was seen as being far preferable to doing inspections at set intervals. Once again, participants are worried about cheating retailers and want to know that the possibility of being spot-checked will “keep people on their toes.”

5.2.6- Accreditation of Other Organizations

Most participants were very open to the idea of Measurement Canada accrediting other organizations to do some of the “hands-on” tasks associated with the inspection and verification of scales. Most people felt that if this could render the process more efficient, then so much the better. There were some concerns raised about the idea that this would represent yet another rollback of the role of government. Some participants in Montreal and Toronto were concerned about all the deregulation they see around them and the subsequent consequences. They felt that, perhaps, government was getting too small and were suspicious of sub-contracting and privatizing. Nonetheless, most agreed that this was not an area where a direct role for a government agency was essential. It was suggested that as long as Measurement Canada was still going to be auditing the work of any accredited organizations, this could be acceptable.

If other organizations were to be accredited to do this work, it was agreed that these accredited organizations should not in any way be affiliated with the food retailers

themselves as this was seen to be a conflict of interest. Participants thought that the types of organizations to be accredited would include scale manufacturers and companies that service and repair scales. Food retailers themselves should never be accredited to inspect their own scales. As mentioned previously, participants felt it was essential that Measurement Canada still play a role in auditing the work of any accredited organizations to make sure that standards were being followed.

The idea of making it mandatory for food retailers to get their scales inspected at set intervals was very well received. Some participants were surprised that this was not already compulsory. It was often noted that the big supermarket chains such as Loblaws or Provigo probably already get their scales checked regularly for their own protection from the possibility of losing money from scales being inaccurate in the customers' favour. There was much more concern that small food retailers might have older, more faulty equipment and might never bother having it serviced. If this were done, Measurement Canada could still drop in on stores unannounced to see if they were complying with these rules and had proof that their scales had been checked. This was seen as a good way of toughening the regulation of scales without causing too much extra work for Measurement Canada. Many participants wanted to know that food retailers who are caught not having followed these regulations would be fined.

There was also a virtually unanimous sentiment that the companies and scale technicians that are used by stores for potentially compulsory subsequent re-inspections should have to be accredited by Measurement Canada, just as the companies that do approval of types and initial inspections of scales must be accredited. It was envisioned that Measurement Canada would create a "roster" of approved and accredited organizations that food retailers could use for the compulsory re-inspections and that scales would have to have a seal showing when they had last been re-inspected.

There was less of a consensus on whether all people doing work on scales in Canada – whether mandated by Measurement Canada or not – should need to be accredited to do their work. Most participants liked the idea that there be some standards and quality control of people servicing scales. They saw a scale technician as being tradesperson, like a plumber, who should have to work to certain standards. However, participants

expressed some concern that the accreditation process might be too expensive and onerous for some very small operators. Some suggested that some of these people currently working on scales be “grand fathered” into the system and be allowed to continue to do non-Measurement Canada related work on scales, but that from now on it should be compulsory that all scale technicians be accredited. A few participants wondered if this was really necessary and whether it might just create a new level of bureaucracy.

6- POSITION OF OPTION CONSOMMATEURS

The position of Option consommateurs in the Retail Food Sector Review draws upon the research discussed in the previous sections of this paper. First, the consultation documents published by Measurement Canada helped to elucidate the agency's scope of intervention and enabled us to identify those areas where changes are planned or desirable. Second, a comparison between Canadian and French practices helped to find solutions to the problems raised by the consultation documents. Third, the Canada-wide survey was useful in assessing consumer confidence in the existing system and the handling of problematic cases. It should be noted that Option consommateurs' arguments deal with some rather technical issues relating to the current Canadian regulatory environment and the changes that could make for better consumer protection; these points were beyond the scope of a short telephone survey, but they were covered by the focus groups.

Finally, we shall draw upon Option consommateurs's traditional positions on regulatory affairs and standardization. These positions may be summarized by the following points:

- Trade practices must be supervised and monitored by a government agency where commercial transactions involve individual consumers.
- Where certain conditions are met, Option consommateurs may agree to industry self-regulation in areas where consumer interests are at stake.
- Option consommateurs does not oppose industry participation in designing and implementing regulations if consumers are also allowed to participate, and if the process is supervised by a neutral and impartial body with final decision-making authority.
- Option consommateurs is aware that public regulatory bodies must find ways to fulfil their mandates effectively.

6.1- The Role of Measurement Canada

6.1.1- Accreditation Program

As discussed in Chapter 2, the accreditation program is infrequently used in the retail food sector but, despite this, Measurement Canada's intervention has significantly decreased for scale reinspections, and these have become increasingly rare.

Faced with this problem, increased use of the accreditation program could represent a practical solution. The consumers in our focus groups approve of the use of accreditation to perform tasks that Measurement Canada can no longer carry out directly. In this way, organizations accredited by Measurement Canada could perform initial inspection and reinspection work on behalf of the agency.

Our research on the French regulatory system (chapter 3) reveals an accreditation process that includes controls exercised by the governmental authorities. Our focus group participants stressed that accredited organizations must be supervised and monitored by Measurement Canada. The position of Option consommateurs regarding supervision of industry participation in regulatory affairs is substantially the same. In view of this, the solution would be to make use of quality standard S-A-01. This standard includes elements of standard ISO 9002-1994 as well as specifications particular to Measurement Canada, and was discussed in Chapter 2.

The consumers we consulted stressed that food stores should not be accredited to perform inspection and reinspection of their own scales. That situation would be likely to lead to a conflict of interest. This work should be performed by organizations independent of the stores. The independence requirement should also apply to other areas of intervention in which Measurement Canada mandates accredited organizations to perform tasks on its behalf. For example, if Measurement Canada were to entrust accredited organizations with the job of approving new device types, it should exclude scale manufacturers from performing that work. In short, whatever work is contracted out to an accredited

organization, Option consommateurs insists that that organization be out of reach of any potential conflict of interest in the performance of its duties.

6.1.2- Scale Service Companies

The unregulated status of scale service companies is a major concern for Option consommateurs. This concern is shared by the focus group participants, who feel that these companies should be regulated by Measurement Canada. In addition, our research on France shows that scale service companies are regulated there. Finally, Measurement Canada states that the lack of regulation is a particular concern in that these companies have proliferated, and many of them do not possess adequate equipment and expertise.

Option consommateurs insists that these companies be supervised by Measurement Canada. The confidence expressed by consumers in our survey could be preserved through a system of control; conversely, the proliferation of unregulated companies could jeopardize scale accuracy and impair consumer confidence in the existing system. What is more, the rate of accuracy-related non-compliance is high (10%) and we believe that regulation would help to diminish it. There is no reason why companies working on regulated equipment should be unregulated themselves. For Option consommateurs, this regulation should address three issues.

First, companies should be given Measurement Canada authorization to perform scale maintenance, calibration, adjustment, installation and repair work. This authorization should be subject to inspection by Measurement Canada of the work performed. The Measurement Canada accreditation program could serve as the basis of an authorization system, but since scale service companies are not mandated to perform tasks on behalf of Measurement Canada, we feel that the use of such an exacting program is not necessary. It would be excessive to require these companies to be accredited under standard SA-0-1, since the work they perform is not as important as that of the organizations responsible for enforcing the Measurement Canada regulations. Therefore, Measurement Canada should create a licensing system for scale service companies. This system should include

control measures to assure that companies perform their tasks according to Measurement Canada's requirements.

Second, scale service companies should be obligated to use measurement standards traceable to Measurement Canada's, which are audited and approved by the agency. In our opinion, it is nonsensical to allow these companies to use nontraceable standards for calibration work on regulated devices. Scales calibrated with such standards are likely to be non-compliant with Measurement Canada's accuracy requirements; this is unfair to consumers, but also stores, which could be penalized in the event of an inspection. Measurement standards used by scale service companies should meet the same requirements as those used by Measurement Canada and the organizations accredited for design and construction of devices. This requirement should be incorporated into Measurement Canada's new licensing system.

Third, scale service companies must use the Measurement Canada *Standard Test Procedures* in order to ensure that their practices are compliant with those of the agency. The use of these procedures would improve scale conformity to Measurement Canada's accuracy requirements. This requirement should be incorporated into the proposed licensing system.

6.1.3- Visibility of Measurement Canada

Both the survey respondents and the focus group participants were very unfamiliar with Measurement Canada's role as a weights and measures regulatory agency. Furthermore, when the respondents reported a scale reading problem, a minuscule proportion of them were told to contact Measurement Canada.

The survey results and focus group comments indicate that consumers know very little about Measurement Canada's role. Very few consumers know that they can appeal to a neutral, independent body in the event of a conflict with their food store concerning scale accuracy. Consumers need to know how Measurement Canada can help them in such cases, and in fact this knowledge is one factor in their confidence in the system.

Currently, most consumers believe they have no recourse in the case of a dispute concerning scale accuracy. They believe that the food store has the final say in such cases. In addition, the focus group participants stated that they had little confidence in small stores, which use scales that are easier to tamper with; due to their slim profit margins, these stores might be more tempted to deliver less food than they actually sell.

Therefore, consumers need to be acquainted with the existence of Measurement Canada and its role as an arbiter in conflicts pitting consumers against food stores. In this way, consumers will feel more protected and reassured that a fair and impartial arbiter can help them. We are aware that Measurement Canada has limited resources, and that it would be unable to respond to an increased volume of calls following a national information campaign about its role. Therefore, we recommend that Measurement Canada better publicize its role to consumers who report problems relating to measurements in food stores. Measurement Canada should take steps to involve the stores in disseminating this information.

6.2- Scope of Intervention of Measurement Canada

6.2.1- Development of Metrological Standards

Option consommateurs's usual stance is to accept a degree of self-regulation. However, it believes that final regulatory power should remain in the hands of the government, which is not subjugated to business interests. For this reason, we recommend that Measurement Canada retain its power to develop metrological standards.

6.2.2- Maintenance and Calibration of Measurement Standards

We reiterate our recommendation on the obligation of scale service companies to use standards verified and approved by Measurement Canada. All standards used to verify or

calibrate scales must be approved, verified and reverified periodically by Measurement Canada.

6.2.3- Approval of New Device Types

Our literature review shows that, as in Canada, scales used in France must be approved, and that this approval is issued by the European Union. The focus group participants stressed the importance of scales being approved, in this case by Measurement Canada. They also suggested that the approval fees be borne by the manufacturers. The participants also stated that this approval could be given directly or indirectly.

Option consommateurs recommends that all scale types be approved by Measurement Canada, which should have the last word in this process. The Retail Food Sector Review document mentions the need to make further use of external laboratories for such testing, so as to render the process more efficient. Option consommateurs does not oppose this action, but suggests that it be subject to certain conditions. First, we think that these tests should be regulated by a special Measurement Canada accreditation program based on a more appropriate standard than SA-0-1, which is essentially a quality standard. Approval of new scale types requires greater metrological competency and closer supervision than initial inspection and reinspection. A specific metrology-oriented standard must be used to accredit scale-testing organizations. For example, a standard based on ISO 17025 might be adequate. Such an action would serve to maintain both the quality of scales and consumer confidence in their accuracy.

Second, Option consommateurs thinks that any form of self-approval of new device types could well lead to a conflict of interest. The focus group participants indeed stressed their opposition to any form of device approval by manufacturers and its potential to cause conflicts of interest.⁵⁴ Therefore, if Measurement Canada considers expanding the

⁵⁴ The focus groups discussed two different sector reviews, natural gas and retail food. In the natural gas section, the participants stressed their opposition to industry self-approval of natural gas meters. They did not mention this issue for scales, but we feel justified in assuming that their opinion is the same, since

recognition of laboratories that perform pattern approval testing, the agency should not select laboratories owned by scale manufacturers.

Finally, the final approval of scales should be under the responsibility of Measurement Canada, which should always use its regulatory power. Regardless of the laboratory that actually performs the tests, Measurement Canada must give final approval for any new device type.

6.2.4- Initial Inspection

In the view of Option consommateurs, initial scale inspection must continue in order that the current level of conformity be maintained, and that the high level of consumer confidence be preserved. This was indeed the view expressed by the focus group participants.

The Measurement Canada consultation document suggests contracting out some of this work to external organizations so as to increase the efficiency of initial inspection and shorten the waiting period for inspection when new stores open. This practice has begun to take hold in the retail food sector and it is widespread in the electricity and natural gas industries, where nearly 90% of inspections are performed by external organizations through the accreditation program. In France's regulatory system there is a similar program. The focus group participants did not see any objection to initial inspection being performed by external organizations, provided that they are regulated and supervised by Measurement Canada.

In the Option consommateurs's view, if Measurement Canada intends to contract out initial scale inspection, this should be done by means of the accreditation program and standard SA-0-1. It is important that external organizations performing this job be supervised and regulated by Measurement Canada so that the agency can continue to play its regulatory enforcement role.

scales are essentially a type of metering device. Option Consommateurs, *Ensuring Natural Gas Meter Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market*, Montreal, Option consommateurs, 2002, 68.

6.2.5- Reinspection

Option consommateurs is concerned about the sharp drop in Measurement Canada's scale reinspection activities. This concern is additional to the low rate of conformity for scales as compared with other trade sectors (for example, gas and electricity meters show 99% rates of conformity). The fact that scales are almost never reinspected is likely to further decrease the rate of conformity. As the focus group participants emphasized — and we agree — it is important for scales to be inspected periodically after being put into service. This would serve to correct instances of non-conformity when they are detected, but it would also instill an awareness in store managers that random inspection is a likely event, which would in turn cause them to be more vigilant about scale accuracy.

The decline in reinspection is due to the smaller number of inspectors at Measurement Canada. In the current context, the problem is unlikely to be solved in the short run by working to increase the agency's budget so as to provide for a larger number of inspectors. The solution, instead, is to use organizations accredited under the Measurement Canada accreditation program (based on standard SA-0-1). These organizations would be contracted to perform both initial inspections and reinspections. We must reiterate our position that food stores should not be accredited to inspect their own scales — this should be done by independent organization. The scale service companies already in business would be the natural candidates for such accreditation. In fact, they could perform an inspection for Measurement Canada at the same time that they perform scale maintenance work.

Scale reinspection could take place in three ways. The first would be to require food stores to have their scales inspected regularly by accredited companies (under service contracts or otherwise). This solution was proposed by the focus groups and is similar to the metrological logbooks required under French regulations. It would be difficult to apply, since Measurement Canada would then have to perform audits to ensure that each store is inspecting its scales as required. This would demand considerable resources on the agency's part, and it is not at all clear that Measurement Canada is in a position to carry out such a mandate.

The second solution would be for scales to be reinspected at regular intervals, as is the case for measuring devices under the *Electricity and Gas Inspection Act* and the regulations of France. Currently, the *Weights and Measures Act* does not require periodic reinspection of scales. This solution would provide for regular scale inspection in all stores, but would require legislative amendments that may take time. In addition, the focus group participants preferred the third solution — random inspection — to periodic inspection.

Random inspection by accredited organizations would represent a viable and more workable solution. Measurement Canada could accredit organizations under the accreditation program to perform unannounced inspections in food stores. It would be necessary for these organizations to have a contractual obligation to Measurement Canada to perform a certain number of reinspections during a given period on a given territory. These commitments to be designed to ensure that taken together, the organizations provide coverage of all stores throughout the country at a reasonable frequency. Measurement Canada could maintain control over the organizations by requiring that they keep inspection logs. All in all, this solution would make it possible for a sufficient number of inspections to be performed while making rational use of Measurement Canada's resources, for — contrary to the first solution — the agency would only control the accredited organizations instead of all the stores and — contrary to the second solution — no legislative amendments would be necessary.

This third solution would ensure that all food scales are inspected after being put into service. Since some stores (probably the smaller ones) do not have in-house scale reinspection programs and the focus groups suspect smaller businesses of maintaining their scales less diligently, effective reinspection would ensure that consumers benefit from the same level of protection regardless of where they shop.

6.2.6- Net Quantity Verification

For those survey respondents expressing their lack of confidence in food stores, one major reason was their distrust of the scales. The focus group participants, for their part,

suggested that stores might be tempted to steal from customers by cheating on the quantity sold — putting a finger on the scale, as it were. Measurement Canada is not presently proactive in this area, since the agency only investigates if it receives a consumer complaint.

Option consommateurs considers net quantity verification to be an important area of intervention, since consumers believe this to be the most likely source of error and fraud. Measurement Canada should be more proactive, conducting inspections systematically rather than waiting for complaints to be filed. The fact that the majority of stores have not instituted net quantity verification measures is additional justification for Measurement Canada to be more active in this area.⁵⁵

6.2.7- Dispute Resolution

As mentioned in Chapter 2, Measurement Canada retains final authority over disputes relating to measurement in retail food stores. The agency promotes settlement of disputes between the parties in such cases. Industry stakeholders have mentioned that some stores have implemented a system of compensation for unresolved disputes, and that others are considering adopting a code of practice similar to the one governing optical scanners.⁵⁶

Option consommateurs welcome these initiatives, but thinks that Measurement Canada should retain final authority over food measurement disputes — as is indeed the agency's stated intention.

⁵⁵ MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Food Sector Review: a Discussion Paper on Measurement Issues in the Retail Food Industry of Canada*. Ottawa, September 2002, 26.

⁵⁶ MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Food Sector Review: a Discussion Paper on Measurement Issues in the Retail Food Industry of Canada*. Ottawa, September 2002, 31.

GENERAL CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Measurement Canada's Retail Food Sector Review is designed to ascertain stakeholders' opinion on desirable changes in trade measurement regulation in this sector. As a stakeholder, Option consommateurs insists that consumer confidence be maintained and justified through effective and sustained market surveillance.

The purpose of this policy paper has been to express the position of Option consommateurs for the purposes of this sector review. In the process of developing a complete and reasoned set of arguments on the current and future regulatory framework for this sector, Option consommateurs used a range of research methods: a literature review on French regulatory practices, a Canada-wide survey, and six focus groups. This paper is also based on Option consommateurs's past experience with the Electricity Trade Sector Review in 2001 as well as its standard positions on regulatory affairs.

The resulting position addresses Measurement Canada's overall activities and its specific scope of intervention in trade measurement. In broad terms, our position is based on the fact that consumers are a vulnerable clientele who do not possess the financial, technical and legal means to verify the accuracy of the measurement provided by food scales, nor to resolve disputes amicably, even if stores implement conflict resolution mechanisms. Consumers need a neutral and independent entity to guarantee them that stores are actually selling the quantity of food products they claim to have weighed. To achieve this, scales must be designed, maintained, inspected and reinspected in such a manner as to ensure that they are reliable, durable and accurate.

On the whole, consumers are confident in scale accuracy, and this confidence can be largely ascribed to the fact that Measurement Canada effectively supervises the retail food measurement market. However, there are gaps in the agency's intervention: scale service companies are unregulated, reinspections have sharply declined, and

Measurement Canada is not proactive in net quantity verification. The intent of this paper is to propose changes that will improve consumer protection in this sector, and to prevent these gaps from impairing both scale accuracy and consumer confidence.

Another purpose of this sector review is to find alternate solutions to direct intervention by Measurement Canada. The agency's resources have diminished over the years, and various solutions have been proposed to provide for more effective service provision while maintaining the agency's surveillance role. For example, Measurement Canada has proposed to expand the use of third party organizations to perform tasks hitherto reserved to the agency. Option consommateurs has reflected on these solutions as well as the gaps in Measurement Canada's intervention.

The position of Option consommateurs on the Measurement Canada Retail Food Sector Review may be summarized in the following set of recommendations:

1- Measurement Canada should take the necessary steps to expand its accreditation program so as to resolve the problem of insufficient scale reinspection.

2- Measurement Canada should supervise accredited organizations by using standard SA-0-1 and performing surveillance audits, product audits, and accreditation renewal audits.

3- Measurement Canada should guarantee that accredited organizations are sheltered from potential conflicts of interest by making them independent of the stores where they carry out mandates for the agency.

4- Measurement Canada should regulate scale service companies by issuing licenses, with a system for controlling conformity to the agency's requirements.

5- The licensing system for scale service companies should include the requirement that companies use measurement standards verified and approved by Measurement Canada.

6- The licensing system for scale service companies should require them to use the Measurement Canada Standard Test Procedures so as to ensure that these practices are consistent with those of the agency.

7- Measurement Canada should further publicize its role to consumers who report scale accuracy problems, and should take steps to involve retail food stores in this effort.

8- Measurement Canada should retain its power to develop metrological standards.

9- All new scale types should be approved by Measurement Canada at the expense of the manufacturer making the application.

10- For accreditation of external laboratories contracted to approve new scale types, Measurement Canada should use a more metrologically oriented standard (e.g., ISO 17025).

11- Laboratories accredited by Measurement Canada to perform approval testing on new scale types should be at arm's length from scale manufacturers.

12- Measurement Canada should retain its powers to issue final approval of new scale types where approval testing is performed by external laboratories.

13- Measurement Canada should contract out scale reinspection to external organizations through its accreditation program, mandating these organizations to perform surprise inspections in food stores.

14- Measurement Canada should, through contractual arrangements and through auditing of inspection logs, guarantee that accredited organizations in charge of scale reinspection inspect all scales with reasonable frequency.

15- Measurement Canada should play a more active role in net quantity verification by performing more inspections, even in stores that are not the subject of consumer complaints.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BURTINI, Luciano, Team Manager, Measurement Canada Retail Food Sector Review, e-mail received 7 June 2002.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION, Council Directive 90/34/EEC - <http://www.europa.eu.int.pdf/>, d.c. 12/07/02.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION, List of Notified Bodies, OJEC C129 p.30-42,- <http://www.europa.eu.int.pdf/>, 12/07/02.

COFRAC, Calibration Section - www.cofrac.fr, html, d.c. 12/07/02

DRIRE, *Marquage des IPFNA*: <http://www.ile-de-france.drire.gouv.fr.html/>, d.c. 12/07/02.

EUROPEAN COOPERATION IN LEGAL METROLOGY, Welmec, *Guide for the Assessing and Operation of Notified Bodies Performing Conformity Assessment According to the Directive 90/384/EEC* - <http://www.welmec.org.pdf/>, d.c. 12/07/02.

MCI - Métrologie - <http://www.mcinet.gov.ma.html/>, d.c. 25/07/02.

MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Assessment and Intervention Strategy for Canada's Marketplace*. Ottawa, September 1999.

MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Food Sector Review: a Discussion Paper on Measurement Issues in the Retail Food Industry of Canada*. Ottawa, September 2002.

MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Food Sector Review: a Questionnaire for the Retail Food Industry of Canada*. Ottawa, 2002.

MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Retail Foods [RFSR] Trade Sector Review: a presentation to Retail Food Stakeholders (Industry & Consumer)*. Ottawa, 2002.

MEASUREMENT CANADA, *Measurement Canada's Accreditation Program*,
<http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/inmc-mc.nsf/vwGeneratedInterf/lm01807f.html>.

MEASUREMENT CANADA, *S-A-01, Criteria for the Accreditation of Organizations to Perform Inspections Pursuant to the Electricity and Gas Inspection Act and the Weights and Measures Act*, <http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/inmc-mc.nsf/vwGeneratedInterf/lm01469f.html>.

MONTPETIT, Benoît, Measurement Canada auditor, interview in Montreal, 29 July 2002.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, *Join NCWM Today*,
<http://www.ncwm.net/join.html>.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, *NCWM: The Decision-Making Process*, <http://www.ncwm.net/process.html>.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, *NCWM: The Organization*, <http://www.ncwm.net/organization.html>.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, *General Information*:
http://www.nist.gov/public_affairs/general2.htm.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, *NIST Laboratories*,
http://www.nist.gov/public_affairs/labs2.htm.

OPTION CONSOMMATEURS, *Ensuring Natural Gas Meter Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market*, Montreal, Option consommateurs, 2002.

SUITER, Richard, National Institute of Science and Technology, e-mail received 5 August 2002.

POIRIER, Jean-Gilles, team member, Measurement Canada Retail Food Sector Review, e-mail received 5 September 2002.

APPENDIX 1 – QUESTIONS USED FOR THE SURVEY

June 10, 2002

Options Consommateurs

FC22

Final Omnibus on Natural gas meters and supermarket weights

ASK ALL

30 F- Do you often, sometimes, rarely or never buy food products at supermarkets and grocery stores that need to **weighed** before you pay for them? These could include meats, cheeses, vegetables etc...

01 - Often

02 - Sometimes

03 – Rarely

04 – Never **SKIP TO Q.**

VOLUNTEERED

99 – DK/NA **SKIP TO Q.**

ASK ALL WHO AT LEAST RARELY BUY FOODS IN Q. 11F

31 F- In general, how confident are you in the accuracy of the scales at supermarkets and grocery stores that are used to weigh your food purchases when you pay? Are you...**READ LIST**

- 01 - Totally confident
- 02 - Relatively confident
- 03 - Not too confident
- 04 - Not at all confident

VOLUNTEERED

99 – DK/NA

32 F- What is the main reason why you are [ANSWER TO Q. 12F] in the accuracy of these scales? **ACCEPT ONE RESPONSE ONLY**

33 F- As far as you know, are the scales used to weigh food in supermarkets and grocery stores regulated by anyone to make sure that they are accurate?

- 01 – Yes
- 02 – No
- 99 – DK/NA

34 F- Who do you think regulates these scales to make sure that they are accurate? **DO NOT READ...ACCEPT ONE RESPONSE**

- 01 – Measurement Canada
- 02 – Federal government
- 03 – Provincial government
- 04–Better Business Bureau
- 05 – Other (SPECIFY)_____
- 99 – DK/NA

35 F- Have you ever notified a supermarket or grocery store about a problem with the readings given by their scales?

01 - Yes

02 – No **SKIP TO Q.**

99 – DK/NA **SKIP TO Q.**

IF THE ANSWER TO QUESTION 16F IS “YES”, ASK:

36 F- Please tell me whether or not each of the following happened after you notified the store about the problem? **READ AND ROTATE**

a. The store offered to weigh your purchase on another scale

01 - Yes

02 – No

99 – DK/NA

b. The store suggested that you contact “Measurement Canada”.

01 - Yes

02 – No

99 – DK/NA

37 F- a. Did anything else happen when you notified the store?

01 - Yes

02 – No

99 – DK/NA

b. What was it?

38 F- How would you rate the way the store resolved your situation on a scale from 1 to 10, where 10 means you are totally satisfied with the resolution and 1 means you are not at all satisfied with the resolution.

Rating_____

VOLUNTEERED

02 – Situation not yet fully resolved

99 – DK/NA

39 F- Were you aware of a government organization called “Measurement Canada” that can review and deal with your complaint if you are not satisfied with your treatment by a supermarket or grocery store?

01 - Yes

02 – No **SKIP TO Q.**

99 – DK/NA **SKIP TO Q.**

IF THE ANSWER TO QUESTION 20F IS “YES”, ASK:

40 F- Did you consider filing a complaint with Measurement Canada?

01 - Yes

02 – No

99 – DK/NA

APPENDIX 2 – SURVEY RESULTS

THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT – 2002-2

Options Consommateurs

30. F Do you often, sometimes, rarely or never buy food products at supermarkets and grocery stores that need to weighed before you pay for them? For example, meats, cheeses, vegetables etc ...?

MEMBER	GENDER		A G E			MARITAL STATUS		KIDS <18 AT HOME		LANGUAGE AT HOME		RELIGION			NON-BRIT IMMIGRANT			TENURE		UNION	
	Male	Female	18 to 29	30 to 44	45 to 59	60 or more	Single	Married	Yes	No	English	French	Catholic	Protestant	Ath/Ag	Eur/Ope	Oth/er	Own	Rent	Yes	
Pri vate Sect	29	44	59	375	793	1193	722	1269	1442	482	796	613	456	84	105	1356	626	379			
UNWEIGHED SAMPLE	2000	970	1030	372	664	539	375	793	1193	722	1269	1442	482	796	613	456	84	105	1356	626	379
WEIGHED SAMPLE	2000	960	1040	430	645	449	430	839	1148	700	1293	1435	473	782	601	470	103	134	1297	686	358
Often	54	54	55	55	61	56	43	50	57	59	52	57	47	51	54	61	54	51	56	52	59
Sometimes	25	25	24	25	21	26	28	26	24	23	26	24	28	23	27	23	29	32	24	26	21
Rarely	10	10	10	12	11	7	9	11	9	9	10	9	12	12	9	9	3	7	8	13	10
Never	11	11	11	8	8	10	20	12	10	9	12	10	12	14	11	7	15	9	12	9	9
DK/NA	*	*	*	-	*	*	1	*	*	-	*	*	-	*	*	*	-	1	*	*	*
1	-																				
Some Univ Deg.	EMPLOYMENT STATUS		OCCUPATION							HOUSEHOLD INCOME					EDUCATION						
	Full Time	Part Time	Home mak	Un empl	Work Ret	Prof Adm.	Tech S.P.	Off. Sale	Sk/ Semi	Un- Work	Less than \$20K	\$20K to \$30K	\$30K to \$40K	\$40K to \$60K	\$60K to \$80K	Less than \$80K	Or more	H.S.	H.S.	Voca Coll	
UNWEIGHED SAMPLE	2000	987	191	119	65	351	626	386	228	299	301	121	213	258	252	394	297	308	219	406	602
WEIGHED SAMPLE	2000	966	189	112	66	381	622	383	230	294	293	106	202	267	254	379	303	321	203	403	602
Often	54	58	58	54	37	41	61	61	59	62	53	53	42	46	51	58	60	69	29	49	57
Sometimes	25	24	27	22	20	30	23	22	24	24	28	23	27	29	25	22	23	19	31	26	24
Rarely	10	10	7	10	19	9	10	10	10	7	9	16	9	13	12	12	8	6	14	12	10
Never	11	8	8	14	24	19	7	7	6	7	10	8	21	12	13	8	9	6	26	12	9
DK/NA	*	*	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-	*	*	-	1	-	*
-	*																				

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

PREFERENCE	REGION					SUB-REGIONS					COMMUNITY SIZE					FED. POLITICAL					
	Atl. Que	Ont	West em	Tor	Van	Alb	Man.	Sask	erta	B.C.	Que	Can. 1 excl Mill	100K to 1	5K to 100K	Less than	Lib.	P.C.	NDP	CA		
Bloc	TOTAL	Prov	hec	ario	Can.	onto	real	ver													
Que. Und.	2000	225	500	557	718	183	200	110	129	131	220	238	1500	493	517	508	482	630	254	239	299
UNWEIGHED SAMPLE	143	330																			
WEIGHED SAMPLE	141	317																			
Often	54	43	47	58	59	62	52	67	56	51	62	60	57	59	54	52	50	56	57	51	58
Sometimes	25	27	27	25	23	24	26	24	29	26	18	24	24	25	25	24	25	25	23	23	25
Rarely	10	12	13	8	8	7	11	3	5	12	10	7	9	8	9	12	11	8	9	14	7
Never	11	18	13	9	9	7	11	3	10	12	9	8	10	8	11	11	15	10	10	12	10
DK/NA	*	-	-	*	1	-	-	3	-	-	-	1	*	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	*

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT - 2002-2
Options Consommateurs

31. F In general, how confident are you in the accuracy of the scales at grocery stores that are used to weigh your food purchases when you pay?

Subsample: Respondents who often, sometimes or rarely buy food products that need to be weighed before paying for them

MEMBER	GENDER	A G E				MARITAL STATUS	KIDS <18 AT HOME	LANGUAGE		RELIGION	NON-BRIT			TENURE	UNION						
		Male	female	18 to 29	30 to 44			45 to 59	60 or more		Single	Married	Yes			No	English	French	Other	Ag	Open
Pri. Pub				18	30	45	60														
ivate lic				Fe	to	to	or	Sin	Mar	Eng	Fre	Ath/ Eur	Oth								
Sect Sect	TOTAL	Male	male	29	44	59	more	gle	ried	Yes	No	lish	nch	Cath	Prot	Ag	ope	er	Own	Rent	Yes
UNWEIGHED SAMPLE	1776	859	917	345	608	480	295	691	1071	659	1108	1290	421	684	543	427	73	94	1194	566	343
WEIGHED SAMPLE	1782	853	928	396	594	404	343	734	1034	639	1136	1288	415	674	535	438	88	121	1145	623	323
Totally confident	43	37	37	36	35	36	42	35	39	33	39	36	39	37	36	37	40	31	39	32	34
Somewhat confident	48	52	51	52	53	53	46	53	50	54	50	53	48	51	53	52	46	45	51	52	56
Not too confident	4	8	8	9	7	8	8	9	7	8	7	7	8	9	7	8	7	15	6	10	5
Not at all confident	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	4	3	3	2	8	6	2	4	3
DK/NA	2	1	1	-	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	*	1	1	2	-	3	1	1	1

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

	EMPLOYMENT STATUS					OCCUPATION						HOUSEHOLD INCOME					EDUCATION									
	Home Full	Un Part	emk	empl	Ret	Work ing	Prof Adm.	Tech S.P.	Off. Sale	Sk/ Semi	Un- skil	Less than	\$20K to	\$30K to	\$40K to	\$60K to	\$80K or	Less than	Comm Coll							
Some Univ	TOTAL	Time	Time	er	oyed	ired	Wm.	OLB	OSB	Serv	Skil	Work	\$20K	\$30K	\$40K	\$60K	\$80K	More	H.S.	H.S.	Voca					
Univ Deg.	UNWEIGHED SAMPLE	191	508	WEIGHED SAMPLE	192	534																				
Totally confident	37	36	38	34	22	42	36	33	42	39	35	25	28	37	35	37	34	44	30	37	34					
Somewhat confident	51	53	48	54	55	47	51	57	49	51	50	55	53	50	49	52	56	49	51	53	53					
Not too confident	8	7	8	8	23	7	7	6	7	7	11	13	11	9	12	8	7	4	11	8	10					
Not at all confident	3	3	3	4	-	3	3	3	2	2	4	6	7	4	2	3	2	1	7	2	3					
DK/NA	1	1	2	-	-	2	2	2	*	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	*	1					
2	2																									

PREFERENCE	REGION				SUB-REGIONS				COMMUNITY SIZE				FED. POLITICAL								
	Atl.	Que	Ont	West em	Tor	Van	Mont	cou	Alb	Can.	1 excl	100K Mill	5K to	Less than	Lib.	P.C.	NDP	CA			
Bloc	TOTAL	Prov	hec	ario	Can.	onto	real	ver	Man.	Sask	erta	B.C.	Que	+	Mill	100K	5K	Lib.	P.C.	NDP	CA
Que. Und.	UNWEIGHED SAMPLE	131	287	WEIGHED SAMPLE	130	274															
Totally confident	37	25	40	37	37	40	39	40	34	40	35	39	36	40	33	32	41	36	39	39	40
Somewhat confident	51	64	47	49	55	45	49	50	57	52	58	52	53	47	55	56	51	51	50	53	53
Not too confident	8	8	8	10	5	10	8	6	6	4	3	6	8	8	9	7	5	10	7	5	6
Not at all confident	3	3	4	3	2	3	4	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	4	2	3	3	2	1
DK/NA	1	1	*	2	2	2	-	3	-	3	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
-	3																				

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
 THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT - 2002-2
 Options Consommateurs

32. F What is the main reason why you are [totally/somewhat] confident in the accuracy of these scales?
 Subsample: Respondents who have buy food products that need to be weighed before paying for them and are totally or somewhat confident in the accuracy of the scales used

MEMBER	GENDER		A G E				MARITAL STATUS		KIDS <18	LANGUAGE		RELIGION		NON-BRIT			TENURE	UNION			
	Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Single	Married	English	French	Catholic	Protestant	Other	Ag	Other	Own	Rent	Yes	
UNWEIGHTED SAMPLE	1578	769	809	304	544	429	259	608	959	586	986	1161	368	605	489	382	64	73	1085	480	312
WEIGHTED SAMPLE	1573	758	815	346	527	357	301	643	919	560	1008	1149	363	592	479	389	75	92	1035	526	290
Trust them/never had any problems	22	19	25	24	19	21	26	25	21	22	23	23	18	18	28	19	29	30	20	26	19
New scales/recent scale maintenance/regulations	22	27	16	11	24	24	26	18	24	20	23	21	25	21	20	25	25	6	25	15	22
Never thought to question/assume it works	17	14	20	23	15	14	16	18	16	16	17	16	18	18	16	18	17	18	17	17	17
Do not trust the stores/prices/bills/scales	14	14	13	16	13	13	14	15	13	13	14	16	8	12	16	15	17	9	14	15	17
Price/bill is consistent/accurate/not expensive	8	8	8	5	9	9	10	8	9	9	8	9	4	8	8	9	6	11	9	7	7
Know how to read scales/monitor their use	7	8	7	8	8	9	5	7	7	8	7	8	4	8	7	8	6	9	8	7	8
Poor maintenance/seldom inspected	5	6	4	3	7	5	4	5	5	7	5	7	1	4	7	6	5	4	6	5	6
Human error	2	2	2	1	1	3	1	1	2	2	1	2	-	1	1	2	2	3	2	2	1
I do not know how to read scales	1	1	2	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	-	1	1	1
Variation/extreme fluctuation in price/bills	1	1	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	5	2	1	1	1
Price/bill is too high	1	*	1	1	*	*	-	*	1	1	*	*	-	*	*	*	3	5	*	1	-
Other	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	2	1	2	1
None/nothing	1	1	1	1	1	2	*	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	*	-	4	1	2	1
EK/NA	8	7	8	9	8	8	6	9	7	7	8	4	20	14	4	4	6	10	7	10	9

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
 THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT - 2002-2
 Options Consommateurs

32. F What is the main reason why you are [totally/somewhat] confident in the accuracy of these scales?

Subsample: Respondents who have buy food products that need to be weighed before paying for them and are totally or somewhat confident in the accuracy of the scales used

	EMPLOYMENT STATUS					OCCUPATION					HOUSEHOLD INCOME					EDUCATION						
	Home Full	Un Part	empl mak	er Ret	oyed	ired	Wm. OLB	Work Prof Adm.	Tech S.P.	Off. Sale	Sk/ Semi	Un- skill	Less than	\$20K to	\$30K to	\$40K to	\$60K to	\$80K or	Less than	Coll		
Some Univ																						
Univ Deg.	TOTAL	Time	Time	er	oyed	ired	Wm.	OLB	OSB	Serv	Skil	Work	\$20K	\$30K	\$40K	\$60K	\$80K	More	H.S.	H.S.	Voca	
UNWEIGHED SAMPLE	1578	819	153	93	38	242	514	324	194	248	235	89	134	193	190	327	245	270	129	323	483	
169 467																						
WEIGHED SAMPLE	1573	796	150	85	39	270	508	318	195	244	221	77	129	202	186	308	247	281	120	315	474	
169 489																						
Trust them/never had	22	19	26	27	23	28	23	17	19	23	23	20	20	26	18	23	22	18	24	21	21	
21 24																						
any problems																						
New scales/recent	22	21	13	16	17	26	15	26	23	18	17	26	17	14	21	26	22	26	18	18	21	
21 26																						
scale maintenance/ regulations																						
Never thought to	17	17	18	13	14	16	21	16	18	19	15	16	18	17	21	16	13	19	16	19	15	
20 16																						
question/assume it works																						
Do not trust the	14	15	12	13	14	13	15	13	13	11	21	17	13	16	10	15	14	12	13	15	16	
11 12																						
stores/prices/bills /scales																						
Price/bill is	8	8	7	5	14	9	8	8	6	9	9	5	5	7	12	7	9	10	5	9	8	
11 8																						
consistent/accurate /not expensive																						
Know how to read	7	9	11	3	-	6	9	10	8	9	9	4	8	6	6	8	8	8	5	6	10	
6 7																						
scales/monitor their use																						
Poor maintenance/ 7 5																						
seldom inspected																						
Human error	2	1	3	4	4	-	2	1	2	4	1	1	3	*	1	1	2	2	3	1	1	
1 3																						
I do not know how to	1	2	1	1	-	2	2	3	1	1	-	-	1	1	2	1	2	2	-	1	1	
3 2																						
read scales																						
Variation/extreme	1	1	3	2	-	*	2	*	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	-	1	1	
2 1																						
fluctuation in price/bills																						
Price/bill is too	1	*	2	2	-	-	1	*	-	1	1	-	1	*	*	1	1	-	-	-	1	
* *																						
high																						
Other	1	1	2	-	3	1	2	1	1	2	*	2	1	1	1	*	1	1	1	2	1	
* 1																						
None/nothing	1	1	1	2	3	*	1	2	1	*	1	2	2	*	2	1	-	*	2	1	1	
1 1																						
DK/NA	8	7	10	12	12	6	8	8	9	7	6	6	12	11	13	6	5	6	14	7	7	
10 7																						

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
 THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT - 2002-2
 Options Consommateurs

32. F What is the main reason why you are [totally/somewhat] confident in the accuracy of these scales?

Subsample: Respondents who have buy food products that need to be weighed before paying for them and are totally or somewhat confident in the accuracy of the scales used

PREFERENCE	REGION				SUB-REGIONS				COMMUNITY SIZE				FED. POLITICAL								
	Atl. Que	Que	Ont	West em	Tor	Van Mont	cou	Alb	Can. excl	1 Mill	100K to 1	5K to 1	Less than	Lib.	P.C.	NDP	CA				
Bloc Que. Und.	TOTAL	Prov	bec	ario	Can.	onto	real	ver	Man.	Sask	erta	B.C.	Que	+	Mill	100K	5K	Lib.	P.C.	NDP	CA
UNWEIGHTED SAMPLE	1578	164	378	440	596	145	157	92	109	107	185	195	1200	394	407	395	382	491	203	192	251
113 249																					
WEIGHTED SAMPLE	1573	119	383	587	484	253	219	101	62	53	152	215	1190	573	337	350	313	513	204	184	234
112 235																					
Trust them/never had any problems	22	25	17	25	21	31	15	34	16	28	15	26	24	25	16	20	25	25	20	22	21
19 18																					
New scales/recent scale maintenance/regulations	22	21	25	20	21	22	27	18	26	26	24	17	21	23	19	20	23	20	28	20	25
28 19																					
Never thought to question/assume it works	17	13	19	17	15	18	19	17	20	13	13	17	16	18	19	16	13	18	16	20	16
19 16																					
Do not trust the stores/prices/bills/scales	14	15	6	16	17	10	6	17	16	13	19	17	16	9	18	16	14	13	13	18	17
4 14																					
Price/bill is consistent/accurate/not expensive	8	6	4	10	10	13	3	10	9	6	10	12	10	9	10	8	6	8	9	8	9
5 8																					
Know how to read scales/monitor their use	7	7	4	8	9	8	5	10	8	7	7	11	8	7	8	6	9	9	7	8	5
1 9																					
Poor maintenance/seldom inspected	5	8	1	6	7	7	1	8	6	7	6	8	7	5	3	5	8	4	8	4	8
- 7																					
Human error	2	2	-	2	3	2	-	3	-	3	5	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	2
- 1																					
I do not know how to read scales	1	3	1	1	2	1	1	4	-	1	1	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
- 1																					
Variation/extreme fluctuation in price/bills	1	3	-	2	1	1	-	-	2	1	2	-	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	-	1
- 1																					
Price/bill is too high	1	1	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	2	-	1	1	1	1	*	1	*	-	*
- -																					
Other	1	-	2	1	1	-	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	*	1	2	*	1
5 1																					
None/nothing	1	-	2	1	1	-	4	-	-	-	2	*	1	1	2	*	-	2	*	-	*
1 2																					
DK/NA	8	5	22	3	4	3	20	2	5	3	4	3	3	9	6	6	8	8	3	6	4
22 8																					

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
 THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT - 2002-2
 Options Consommateurs

32. F What is the main reason why you are [totally/somewhat] confident in the accuracy of these scales?

Subsample: Respondents who have buy food products that need to be weighed before paying for them and are totally or somewhat confident in the accuracy of the scales used

	Q31F. CONFIDENT IN ACCUR. OF GRO. STO.				
	TOTAL	Totally		Somewhat	
		Con.	Con.	Con.	Con.
UNWEIGHTED SAMPLE	1578	642	936	-	-
WEIGHTED SAMPLE	1573	656	917	-	-
Trust them/never had any problems	22	31	16	-	-
New scales/recent scale maintenance/regulations	22	26	18	-	-
Never thought to question/assume it works	17	24	12	-	-
Do not trust the stores/prices/bills /scales	14	*	24	-	-
Price/bill is consistent/accurate /not expensive	8	10	7	-	-
Know how to read scales/monitor their use	7	10	5	-	-
Poor maintenance/seldom inspected	5	-	9	-	-
Human error	2	-	3	-	-
I do not know how to read scales	1	1	2	-	-
Variation/extreme fluctuation in price/bills	1	-	2	-	-
Price/bill is too high	1	-	1	-	-
Other	1	1	2	-	-
None/nothing	1	1	1	-	-
DK/NA	8	8	7	-	-

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
 THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT - 2002-2
 Options Consommateurs

32. F What is the main reason why you are [not too/not at all] confident in the accuracy of these scales?

Subsample: Respondents who buy food products that need to be weighed before paying for them and are not too or not at all confident in the accuracy of the scales used

MEMBER	GENDER		A G E				MARITAL STATUS		KIDS <18 AT HOME		LANGUAGE AT HOME		RELIGION			NON-BRIT IMMIGRANT			TENURE		UNION	
	Fe	to	to	to	or	Sin	Mar	Yes	No	Eng	Fre	Cath	Prot	Ag	Eur	Oth	Own	Rent	Yes	No		
Pri Pub			18	30	45	60																
vate lic																						
Sect Sect																						
UNWEIGHTED SAMPLE	179	84	95	41	54	48	32	76	102	69	109	116	52	75	49	37	9	18	98	79	27	
5 19																						
WEIGHTED SAMPLE	189	89	100	50	56	43	37	84	104	75	113	124	51	78	49	41	13	25	98	89	28	
4 20																						
Do not trust the	57	58	56	68	53	42	65	54	59	48	63	55	64	66	35	65	54	45	52	62	42	
51 43																						
stores/prices/bills																						
/scales																						
Variation/extreme	15	14	16	9	14	14	25	17	13	17	14	16	11	5	33	13	21	21	17	13	9	
24 7																						
fluctuation in																						
price/bills																						
Poor maintenance/	10	11	9	9	10	18	2	10	10	10	10	12	6	4	13	13	-	6	12	7	13	
- 13																						
seldom inspected																						
Human error	4	2	7	5	5	4	4	4	4	3	5	7	-	3	5	3	10	11	5	4	9	
- 13																						
Price/bill is too	3	3	3	2	5	3	2	3	3	4	2	2	5	1	6	4	-	-	2	4	6	
- 9																						
high																						
Never thought to	3	4	2	-	5	8	-	5	2	4	3	3	5	4	2	-	-	7	1	4	8	
- 11																						
question/assume it																						
works																						
Know how to read	2	3	1	3	2	-	4	3	1	3	1	2	-	3	3	-	-	4	2	2	4	
24 -																						
scales/monitor																						
their use																						
New scales/recent	2	4	-	-	-	6	2	1	2	3	1	-	7	4	-	-	-	-	3	-	8	
- 11																						
scale maintenance/																						
regulations																						
Trust them/never had	1	3	-	4	-	-	2	1	2	-	2	1	-	2	-	-	-	7	3	-	7	
- -																						
any problems																						
I do not know how to	1	-	2	-	3	2	-	-	2	2	1	2	-	2	1	-	13	-	2	-	2	
- 4																						
read scales																						
Price/bill is	*	-	*	-	1	-	-	-	*	1	-	*	-	-	1	-	-	-	*	-	-	
- -																						
consistent/accurate																						
/not expensive																						
Other	2	1	3	-	2	3	3	3	1	2	2	3	-	1	5	-	-	-	2	1	-	
- -																						
DK/NA	5	4	6	7	1	7	5	7	3	5	4	3	10	7	3	4	12	5	3	7	-	
- -																						

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
 THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT - 2002-2
 Options Consommateurs

32. F What is the main reason why you are [not too/not at all] confident in the accuracy of these scales?

Subsample: Respondents who buy food products that need to be weighed before paying for them and are not too or not at all confident in the accuracy of the scales used

	EMPLOYMENT STATUS					OCCUPATION					HOUSEHOLD INCOME					EDUCATION						
	Home Full	Unempl	Part mak	erpl	Ret	Work ing	Prof Adm.	Tech S.P.	Off. Sale	Sk/ Semi	Un- skill	Less than	\$20K to	\$30K to	\$40K to	\$60K to	\$80K or	Less than	Coll			
Some Univ																						
Univ Deg.	TOTAL	Time	Time	er	oyed	ired	Wm.	OLB	OSB	Serv	Skil	Work	\$20K	\$30K	\$40K	\$60K	\$80K	More	H.S.	H.S.	Voca	
UNWEIGHED SAMPLE	179	80	20	10	12	30	58	29	19	25	33	19	30	27	27	34	21	15	28	33	63	
20 33																						
WEIGHED SAMPLE	189	86	20	11	12	30	61	30	20	25	39	19	29	29	31	37	25	15	27	37	68	
20 36																						
Do not trust the	57	51	55	59	74	78	49	64	67	28	54	42	50	61	54	58	71	49	58	59	59	
49 56																						
stores/prices/bills																						
/scales																						
Variation/extreme	15	10	33	10	6	12	18	14	5	29	16	18	13	12	29	2	16	25	13	17	15	
7 17																						
fluctuation in																						
price/bills																						
Poor maintenance/	10	12	13	8	11	3	10	9	5	28	9	15	9	-	12	14	17	-	3	15	11	
15 5																						
seldom inspected																						
Human error	4	4	4	-	-	4	9	2	15	3	7	-	3	5	-	4	8	7	-	-	7	
11 4																						
Price/bill is too	3	4	-	-	-	3	4	2	9	-	5	5	2	11	-	5	3	-	2	-	2	
12 5																						
high																						
Never thought to	3	6	-	-	-	-	2	4	-	-	7	6	7	-	3	8	-	-	4	6	4	
- -																						
question/assume it																						
works																						
Know how to read	2	-	-	-	9	4	-	-	5	-	-	-	5	-	-	7	-	-	5	-	-	
- 7																						
scales/monitor																						
their use																						
New scales/recent	2	3	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	15	-	3	-		
- 6																						
scale maintenance/																						
regulations																						
Trust them/never had	1	2	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	8	-	-	3	-	-	5	-	-	3	-	-	
9 -																						
any problems																						
I do not know how to	1	3	-	-	-	-	4	6	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	
- 7																						
read scales																						
Price/bill is	*	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	
- -																						
consistent/accurate																						
/not expensive																						
Other	2	1	-	6	-	3	2	-	-	4	-	-	-	9	-	2	-	-	4	2	2	
- -																						
DK/NA	5	6	-	16	-	3	5	5	-	-	3	12	11	7	8	-	-	6	10	-	6	
- 4																						

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
 THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT - 2002-2
 Options Consommateurs

32. F What is the main reason why you are [not too/not at all] confident in the accuracy of these scales?

Subsample: Respondents who buy food products that need to be weighed before paying for them and are not too or not at all confident in the accuracy of the scales used

PREFERENCE	REGION				SUB-REGIONS							COMMUNITY SIZE				FED. POLITICAL					
	Atl. Que	Que	Ont	West em	Tor	Van Mont	cou	Alb	Man.	Sask	erta	B.C.	Que	Can. 100K excl Mill	5K to 100K	Less than 5K	Lib.	P.C.	NDP	CA	
UNWEIGHTED SAMPLE	179	21	55	60	43	22	21	8	8	7	11	17	124	51	49	50	29	63	22	14	19
WEIGHTED SAMPLE	189	14	56	83	36	38	30	8	6	3	9	18	133	77	44	44	24	73	21	14	17
Do not trust the stores/prices/bills/scales	57	49	70	57	40	50	72	13	49	59	48	30	52	55	59	60	56	54	46	64	60
Variation/extreme fluctuation in price/bills	15	24	9	17	16	28	10	51	14	-	7	24	17	24	9	9	10	20	25	13	4
Poor maintenance/seldom inspected	10	-	4	11	20	4	-	12	-	31	10	29	12	3	21	9	12	8	16	-	10
Human error	4	5	-	4	12	5	-	25	13	-	16	12	6	5	-	5	9	1	17	-	11
Price/bill is too high	3	7	2	3	3	4	-	-	14	11	-	-	4	2	4	6	1	6	2	-	-
Never thought to question/assume it works	3	-	2	5	3	4	4	-	-	-	-	6	4	4	2	-	9	2	-	7	6
Know how to read scales/monitor their use	2	-	3	3	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	2	3	-	4	-	8	-
New scales/recent scale maintenance/regulations	2	-	6	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Trust them/never had any problems	1	-	-	2	2	5	-	-	13	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	3	3	-	6	-
I do not know how to read scales	1	-	-	2	2	4	-	-	-	-	7	-	2	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	4
Price/bill is consistent/accurate/not expensive	*	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-
Other	2	9	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	11	-	3	-	-	4	7	2	-	8	6
DK/NA	5	4	12	2	2	4	9	-	10	-	-	-	2	6	5	4	2	3	10	-	-

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
 THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT - 2002-2
 Options Consommateurs

32. F What is the main reason why you are [not too/not at all] confident in the accuracy of these scales?

Subsample: Respondents who buy food products that need to be weighed before paying for them and are not too or not at all confident in the accuracy of the scales used

	Q31F. CONFIDENT IN ACCUR. OF GRO. STO.				
	TOTAL	Totally what		Not	
		Con.	Con.	Con.	Con.
UNWEIGHTED SAMPLE	179	-	-	130	49
WEIGHTED SAMPLE	189	-	-	137	51
Do not trust the stores/prices/bills /scales	57	-	-	57	56
Variation/extreme fluctuation in price/bills	15	-	-	14	18
Poor maintenance/seldom inspected	10	-	-	10	9
Human error	4	-	-	2	10
Price/bill is too high	3	-	-	3	3
Never thought to question/assume it works	3	-	-	4	-
Know how to read scales/monitor their use	2	-	-	3	-
New scales/recent scale maintenance/regulations	2	-	-	2	-
Trust them/never had any problems	1	-	-	2	-
I do not know how to read scales	1	-	-	1	3
Price/bill is consistent/accurate /not expensive	*	-	-	*	-
Other	2	-	-	2	2
DK/NA	5	-	-	5	4

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
 THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT - 2002-2
 Options Consommateurs

33. F As far as you know, are the scales used to weigh food at grocery stores regulated by anyone to make sure that they are accurate?

Subsample: Respondents who buy food products that need to be weighed before paying for them

MEMBER	GENDER		A G E			MARITAL STATUS		KIDS <18 AT HOME		LANGUAGE AT HOME		RELIGION		NON-BRIT IMMIGRANT			TENURE		UNION		
	Male	Female	18 to 29	30 to 44	45 to 59	60 or more	Single	Married	Yes	No	English	French	Catholic	Protestant	Other	Ag	Open	Owned	Rent	Yes	No
UNWEIGHTED SAMPLE	1776	859	917	345	608	480	295	691	1071	659	1108	1290	421	684	543	427	73	94	1194	566	343
WEIGHTED SAMPLE	1782	853	928	396	594	404	343	734	1034	639	1136	1288	415	674	535	438	88	121	1145	623	323
Yes	45	52	39	30	39	58	59	42	47	41	48	43	56	48	46	41	42	34	49	38	49
No	28	28	28	41	33	20	13	31	25	31	26	28	25	27	24	34	20	36	24	34	25
DK/NA	27	20	34	29	28	22	28	27	27	28	27	30	19	25	30	25	39	30	26	28	25
	16	26																			
	EMPLOYMENT STATUS		OCCUPATION					HOUSEHOLD INCOME					EDUCATION								
	Some Univ		Home Full	Univ Part	Unempl	Retired	Work Man	Prof Adm.	Tech S.P.	Off. Sale	Sk/ Semi	Un- skill	Less than	\$20K to	\$30K to	\$40K to	\$60K to	\$80K or	Less than	Comm Coll	
Univ Deg.	TOTAL	Time	Time	er	oyed	ired	Man.	OLB	OSB	Serv	Skil	Work	\$20K	\$30K	\$40K	\$60K	\$80K	More	H.S.	H.S.	Voca
UNWEIGHTED SAMPLE	1776	908	176	103	50	276	582	358	214	276	270	109	165	222	221	364	268	289	160	358	549
WEIGHTED SAMPLE	1782	891	174	97	51	305	579	355	215	273	262	97	158	233	222	347	273	302	149	353	545
Yes	45	45	41	34	27	57	37	45	48	40	44	42	36	40	43	48	52	45	45	43	44
No	28	30	30	38	32	14	29	30	24	26	36	32	34	32	30	27	24	28	25	26	31
DK/NA	27	25	30	28	41	28	34	25	29	34	20	26	30	28	27	24	24	27	29	31	25
	29	26																			

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

PREFERENCE	REGION					SUB-REGIONS					COMMUNITY SIZE					FED. POLITICAL					
	Atl.	Que	Ont	West em	Tor	Van Mont	cou	Alb	Man.	Sask	erta	B.C.	Que	Can. 1 excl Mill	100K to 1	5K to	Less than	Lib.	P.C.	NDP	CA
Bloc	TOTAL	Prov	hec	ario	Can.	onto	real	ver	Man.	Sask	erta	B.C.	Que	+	Mill	100K	5K	Lib.	P.C.	NDP	CA
Que. Und.																					
UNWEIGHED SAMPLE	1776	186	434	507	649	171	178	103	117	117	199	216	1342	452	461	450	413	558	227	209	272
131 287																					
WEIGHED SAMPLE	1782	134	439	681	528	298	249	113	68	58	164	237	1343	660	384	398	339	589	228	200	253
130 274																					
Yes	45	41	55	41	43	40	53	41	42	56	39	43	42	45	41	45	51	45	43	40	51
55 43																					
No	28	28	26	28	28	28	28	26	26	16	36	26	28	28	33	28	21	27	27	31	25
24 29																					
DK/NA	27	31	19	31	29	33	18	33	32	28	25	31	30	27	26	27	28	29	30	28	24
21 28																					

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
 THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT - 2002-2
 Options Consommateurs

34. F Who do you think regulates these scales to make sure that they are accurate?

Subsample: Respondents who buy food products that need to be weighed before paying for them and who believe someone regulates the scales to ensure accuracy

MEMBER	GENDER			A G E				MARITAL		KIDS <18		LANGUAGE		RELIGION			NON-BRIT			TENURE		UNION
	TOTAL	Male	female	18 to 29	30 to 44	45 to 59	60 or more	Single	Married	Yes	No	English	French	Catholic	Protestant	Ag	Eur	Oth	Own	Rent	Yes	
UNWEIGHED SAMPLE	824	459	365	100	244	280	180	292	527	279	543	562	239	337	260	179	31	34	601	218	171	
45 119																						
WEIGHTED SAMPLE	804	446	359	118	233	233	201	308	490	263	540	548	231	325	246	181	37	42	563	237	160	
43 109																						
Federal government	25	30	18	6	29	26	30	22	27	21	27	23	31	27	22	26	25	11	27	20	30	
37 28																						
Provincial	16	17	15	8	8	17	28	15	17	11	19	17	15	15	20	13	25	19	17	14	10	
7 11																						
government																						
Measurement Canada	13	16	9	3	16	17	10	8	15	14	12	14	11	11	13	14	16	1	15	7	14	
18 13																						
Store owners/	11	6	17	31	10	6	3	15	8	13	10	13	6	9	14	10	9	16	8	16	6	
3 7																						
managers/other																						
staff																						
Other government	11	11	10	12	10	13	9	9	12	12	10	12	6	9	12	13	12	20	11	11	12	
6 12																						
mentions																						
(unspecified																						
jurisdiction)																						
Scale manufacturer/	5	3	6	9	6	2	4	5	4	6	4	5	5	6	4	4	-	-	4	7	6	
5 7																						
scale retailer/																						
scale technician																						
Inspectors/	3	2	4	5	3	2	3	4	2	3	3	3	4	2	3	4	-	11	2	5	3	
2 3																						
regulators in																						
general																						
Better Business	1	1	2	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	4	3	1	1	-	-	2	1	2	
2 2																						
Bureau																						
Other	2	2	1	1	1	3	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	-	-	2	1	3	
6 2																						
DK/NA	17	15	19	24	18	16	12	20	15	20	15	15	17	20	13	17	16	22	16	19	19	
25 18																						

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
 THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT - 2002-2
 Options Consommateurs

34. F Who do you think regulates these scales to make sure that they are accurate?

Subsample: Respondents who buy food products that need to be weighed before paying for them and who believe someone regulates the scales to ensure accuracy

	EMPLOYMENT STATUS					OCCUPATION							HOUSEHOLD INCOME					EDUCATION			
	Home Full	Unempl	Part mak	erpl	Ret	Work ing	Prof Adm.	Tech S.P.	Off. Sale	Sk/ Semi	Un- skill	Less than	\$20K to	\$30K to	\$40K to	\$60K to	\$80K or	Less than	Coll	Univ	
Some Univ	TOTAL	Time	Time	er	oyed	ired	Wm.	OLB	OSB	Serv	Skil	Work	\$20K	\$30K	\$40K	\$60K	\$80K	More	H.S.	H.S.	Voca
Univ Deg.																					
UNWEIGHED SAMPLE	824	417	74	37	13	164	223	160	107	111	123	51	63	95	95	178	146	135	74	155	254
86 252																					
WEIGHED SAMPLE	804	398	71	33	14	175	216	159	102	109	114	41	57	93	95	168	143	137	68	151	240
80 264																					
Federal government	25	24	21	10	29	33	18	25	32	15	20	18	15	24	20	21	29	36	28	19	19
31 30																					
Provincial	16	12	18	12	25	25	13	16	14	8	13	23	20	17	16	16	13	14	12	19	13
17 17																					
government																					
Measurement Canada	13	15	12	-	-	11	11	12	20	18	12	16	6	9	13	14	15	17	4	14	15
8 14																					
Store owners/	11	10	26	26	7	4	20	6	3	22	15	14	18	18	19	7	7	4	21	8	20
7 3																					
managers/other																					
staff																					
Other government	11	11	9	7	-	8	10	13	12	13	10	6	9	8	6	15	10	11	7	8	12
21 9																					
mentions																					
(unspecified																					
jurisdiction)																					
Scale manufacturer/	5	6	1	7	-	5	5	4	5	4	7	1	7	3	3	5	2	7	5	5	5
2 5																					
scale retailer/																					
scale technician																					
Inspectors/	3	2	1	7	-	3	3	3	-	3	2	2	7	2	3	4	3	1	7	2	3
- 4																					
regulators in																					
general																					
Better Business	1	2	1	-	-	1	2	1	1	1	1	-	3	1	1	2	1	2	-	1	*
2 3																					
Bureau																					
Other	2	2	2	2	-	1	1	2	3	1	1	-	1	1	-	4	1	1	-	3	1
3 1																					
DK/NA	17	19	11	29	39	11	20	19	19	15	19	20	15	17	20	17	21	9	17	21	16
11 17																					

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
 THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT - 2002-2
 Options Consommateurs

34. F Who do you think regulates these scales to make sure that they are accurate?

Subsample: Respondents who buy food products that need to be weighed before paying for them and who believe someone regulates the scales to ensure accuracy

PREFERENCE	REGION				SUB-REGIONS				COMMUNITY SIZE				FED. POLITICAL								
	Atl. Que	Ont	West em	Tor	Van Mont	cou	Alb	Can. excl	1 Mill	100K to 1	5K to 1	Less than	Lib.	P.C.	NDP	CA					
Bloc Que. Und.	TOTAL	Prov	bec	ario	Can.	onto	real	ver	Man.	Sask	erta	B.C.	Que	+	Mill	100K	5K	Lib.	P.C.	NDP	CA
UNWEIGHTED SAMPLE 73 127	824	78	245	211	290	68	96	42	49	66	82	93	579	206	195	208	215	252	102	88	142
WEIGHTED SAMPLE 71 119	804	55	243	279	228	118	133	46	29	33	64	102	562	296	156	179	173	264	98	81	128
Federal government 21 18	25	10	32	21	25	20	33	19	35	23	20	25	21	26	28	26	19	26	28	27	23
Provincial government 13 20	16	20	13	23	10	25	8	7	16	12	8	9	18	15	14	19	18	15	22	12	18
Measurement Canada 15 10	13	12	10	12	16	12	11	9	6	22	22	14	14	11	13	11	18	9	13	10	23
Store owners/ 4 10 managers/other staff	11	22	6	13	11	18	7	13	9	13	13	10	13	12	6	13	11	11	17	14	9
Other government 8 11 mentions (unspecified jurisdiction)	11	16	5	11	15	9	7	13	17	10	16	16	13	9	12	9	15	12	6	9	11
Scale manufacturer/ 1 8 scale retailer/ scale technician	5	3	5	4	5	5	7	5	2	5	5	4	4	6	3	3	6	6	4	4	3
Inspectors/ 6 3 regulators in general	3	2	5	2	3	3	6	2	3	2	2	4	2	4	3	3	1	4	4	1	2
Better Business 4 1 Bureau	1	-	3	1	1	2	2	-	-	-	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	-	-	1
Other 1 3	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	-	3	-	2	1	1	1	3	*	1	1	3	-	1
DK/NA 27 17	17	15	19	16	16	12	17	34	11	16	11	20	16	17	18	17	14	16	10	26	13

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
 THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT - 2002-2
 Options Consommateurs

35. F Have you ever notified a supermarket or grocery store about a problem with the readings given by their scales?

Subsample: Respondents who buy food products that need to be weighed before paying for them

MEMBER	GENDER		A G E			MARITAL STATUS		KIDS <18 AT HOME		LANGUAGE AT HOME		RELIGION			NON-BRIT IMMIGRANT			TENURE		UNION	
	Male	Female	18-29	30-44	45-60	Single	Married	Yes	No	English	French	Catholic	Protestant	Ath/Ag	Eur	Oth	Own	Rent	Yes	No	
UNWEIGHTED SAMPLE	1776	859	917	345	608	480	295	691	1071	659	1108	1290	421	684	543	427	73	94	1194	566	343
WEIGHTED SAMPLE	1782	853	928	396	594	404	343	734	1034	639	1136	1288	415	674	535	438	88	121	1145	623	323
Yes	6	5	7	4	7	5	9	5	7	7	6	6	6	6	6	7	6	6	6	6	4
No	94	94	93	96	93	95	91	95	93	93	94	94	94	94	94	93	94	94	94	94	96
DK/NA	*	*	*	-	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	*	-	-

MEMBER	EMPLOYMENT STATUS					OCCUPATION					HOUSEHOLD INCOME					EDUCATION					
	Time	Part	Full	Unempl	Retired	Wm.	OLB	OSB	Serv	Skil	Unskil	Less than \$20K	\$20K to \$30K	\$30K to \$40K	\$40K to \$60K	\$60K to \$80K	More than \$80K	H.S.	H.S.	Voca	
UNWEIGHTED SAMPLE	1776	908	176	103	50	276	582	358	214	276	270	109	165	222	221	364	268	289	160	358	549
WEIGHTED SAMPLE	1782	891	174	97	51	305	579	355	215	273	262	97	158	233	222	347	273	302	149	353	545
Yes	6	6	4	11	2	7	6	6	5	6	7	5	6	8	6	6	7	6	4	8	5
No	94	94	96	89	98	93	93	94	94	94	93	95	94	92	94	94	93	94	96	92	95
DK/NA	*	-	-	-	-	*	*	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*	1	-	-

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

PREFERENCE	REGION					SUB-REGIONS					COMMUNITY SIZE					FED. POLITICAL						
	Atl.	Que	Ont	West em	Tor	Van	Mont	cou	Alb	Man.	Sask	erta	B.C.	Que	Can. 1 excl Mill	100K to 1	5K to 1	Less than	Lib.	P.C.	NDP	CA
Bloc	TOTAL	Prov	hec	ario	Can.	onto	real	ver														
Que. Und.																						
UNWEIGHED SAMPLE	1776	186	434	507	649	171	178	103	117	117	199	216	1342	452	461	450	413	558	227	209	272	
131 287																						
WEIGHED SAMPLE	1782	134	439	681	528	298	249	113	68	58	164	237	1343	660	384	398	339	589	228	200	253	
130 274																						
Yes	6	7	6	6	5	5	7	5	7	9	4	4	6	6	7	6	6	7	8	8	4	
6 6																						
No	94	92	94	94	95	95	93	95	93	91	96	95	94	94	93	94	94	93	92	92	96	
94 94																						
DK/NA	*	*	-	*	*	-	-	1	-	-	-	*	*	*	-	*	-	*	1	-	-	
- *																						

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
 THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT - 2002-2
 Options Consommateurs

36. F Please tell me whether or not each of the following happened after you notified the store about the problem.

a) The store offered to weigh your purchase on another scale.

Subsample: Respondents who have notified a supermarket or grocery store about a problem with the readings of their scales

MEMBER	GENDER	A G E					MARITAL		KIDS <18	LANGUAGE		RELIGION	NON-BRIT	TENURE	UNION						
		Male	female	18	30	45	60	STATUS	AT HOME	AT HOME	Eng	Fre	Ath/ Eur	Oth	Own	Rent	Yes				
Pri Pub																					
vate lic																					
Sect Sect	TOTAL	Male	male	29	44	59	more	gle	ried	Yes	No	lish	nch	Cath	Prot	Ag	ope	er	Own	Rent	Yes
UNWEIGHED SAMPLE	108	47	61	17	39	26	25	34	73	43	64	81	25	36	35	32	4	5	73	35	15
2 12																					
WEIGHED SAMPLE	108	46	62	17	40	21	30	35	72	42	66	80	26	38	35	30	5	7	71	37	13
1 11																					
Yes	56	51	59	51	53	53	66	61	53	58	55	57	56	59	57	52	45	39	55	57	40
52 34																					
No	44	49	41	49	47	47	34	39	47	42	45	43	44	41	43	48	55	61	45	43	60
48 66																					
DK/NA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- -																					

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

	EMPLOYMENT STATUS					OCCUPATION					HOUSEHOLD INCOME					EDUCATION					
	Full	Part	mak	empl	Ret	Home	Prof	Tech	Off.	Sk/	Un-	Less	\$20K	\$30K	\$40K	\$60K	\$80K	Less	Comm		
Some Univ						ing	Adm.	S.P.	Sale	Semi	skil	than	to	to	to	to	or	than	Coll		
Univ Deg.						Wom.	OLB	OSB	Serv	Skil	Work	\$20K	\$30K	\$40K	\$60K	\$80K	More	H.S.	H.S.	Voca	
UNWEIGHED SAMPLE	108	58	8	9	1	20	39	22	11	17	18	6	10	16	14	25	18	14	6	28	28
18 28																					
WEIGHED SAMPLE	108	58	7	11	1	20	38	21	12	16	19	5	10	18	14	21	19	17	5	30	26
16 31																					
Yes	56	48	75	59	-	72	55	34	37	80	60	15	67	66	70	59	49	43	76	53	62
63 47																					
No	44	52	25	41	100	28	45	66	63	20	40	85	33	34	30	41	51	57	24	47	38
37 53																					
DK/NA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- -																					

PREFERENCE	REGION				SUB-REGIONS				COMMUNITY SIZE				FED. POLITICAL									
	Atl.	Que	Ont	West	Van	Alb	Can.	1	100K	5K	Less	Lib.	P.C.	NDP	CA							
Bloc				em	Tor	Mont	cou	excl	Mill	to	1	to	than									
Que. Und.				ario	Can.	onto	real	ver	Man.	Sask	erta	B.C.	Que	+	Mill	100K	5K	Lib.	P.C.	NDP	CA	
UNWEIGHED SAMPLE	108	13	27	32	36	9	12	5	7	10	9	10	81	26	30	26	26	35	19	16	11	
7 16																						
WEIGHED SAMPLE	108	10	28	43	28	16	17	5	5	5	7	11	80	38	25	23	22	40	17	16	9	
7 15																						
Yes	56	50	56	62	48	34	67	40	63	61	41	39	56	50	62	54	62	60	48	56	56	
82 47																						
No	44	50	44	38	52	66	33	60	37	39	59	61	44	50	38	46	38	40	52	44	44	
18 53																						
DK/NA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- -																						

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
 THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT - 2002-2
 Options Consommateurs

36. F Please tell me whether or not each of the following happened after you notified the store about the problem.

b) The store suggested that you contact "Measurement Canada."

Subsample: Respondents who have notified a supermarket or grocery store about a problem with the readings of their scales

MEMBER	GENDER		A G E				MARITAL STATUS		KIDS <18 AT HOME		LANGUAGE AT HOME		RELIGION			NON-BRIT IMMIGRANT			TENURE		UNION	
	Male	Female	18	30	45	60	Single	Married	Yes	No	Eng	Fre	Cath	Prot	Ath/Ag	Eur	Oth	Own	Rent	Yes	No	
UNWEIGHED SAMPLE	108	47	61	17	39	26	25	34	73	43	64	81	25	36	35	32	4	5	73	35	15	
WEIGHED SAMPLE	108	46	62	17	40	21	30	35	72	42	66	80	26	38	35	30	5	7	71	37	13	
Yes	2	2	2	-	4	2	-	4	1	4	-	1	3	2	3	-	-	-	1	4	6	
No	98	98	98	100	96	98	100	96	99	96	100	99	97	98	97	100	100	100	99	96	94	
DK/NA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

MEMBER	EMPLOYMENT STATUS					OCCUPATION					HOUSEHOLD INCOME					EDUCATION					
	Some	Univ	Univ	Deg.	Other	Home Full	Unem	Work	Prof	Tech	Off.	Sk/Un-	Less	\$20K	\$30K	\$40K	\$60K	\$80K	Less	Comm	
UNWEIGHED SAMPLE	108	58	8	9	1	20	39	22	11	17	18	6	10	16	14	25	18	14	6	28	28
WEIGHED SAMPLE	108	58	7	11	1	20	38	21	12	16	19	5	10	18	14	21	19	17	5	30	26
Yes	2	2	-	-	-	3	4	6	2	-	-	7	-	-	2	-	5	-	2	1	
No	98	98	100	100	100	97	96	94	98	100	100	93	100	100	98	100	95	100	98	99	
DK/NA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

REFERENCE	REGION				SUB-REGIONS						COMMUNITY SIZE				FED. POLITICAL						
	Atl. Que	Ont	West ern	Tor	Van Mont	cou	Alb	Man.	Sask	erta	B.C.	Que	Can. 1 excl	100K Mill	5K to 1	Less than	Lib.	P.C.	NDP	CA	
Bloc Que. Und.	TOTAL	Prov	bec	ario	Can.	onto	real	ver	Man.	Sask	erta	B.C.	Que	+	Mill	100K	5K	Lib.	P.C.	NDP	CA
UNWEIGHTED SAMPLE 7 16	108	13	27	32	36	9	12	5	7	10	9	10	81	26	30	26	26	35	19	16	11
WEIGHTED SAMPLE 7 15	108	10	28	43	28	16	17	5	5	5	7	11	80	38	25	23	22	40	17	16	9
Yes 9 -	2	-	2	-	4	-	-	-	-	7	11	-	1	-	4	-	3	2	2	-	-
No 91 100	98	100	98	100	96	100	100	100	100	93	89	100	99	100	96	100	97	98	98	100	100
DK/NA - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
 THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT - 2002-2
 Options Consommateurs

37. F a) Did anything else happen when you notified the store?

Subsample: Respondents who notified a supermarket or grocery store about a problem with the readings of their scales

MEMBER	GENDER	A G E				MARITAL STATUS	KIDS <18 AT HOME	LANGUAGE AT HOME		RELIGION	NON-BRIT IMMIGRANT	TENURE	UNION								
		18	30	45	60			Eng	Fre					Ath/ Eur	Oth						
Private Sect	TOTAL	Male	male	29	44	59	more	gle	ried	Yes	No	lish	nch	Cath	Prot	Ag	ope	er	Own	Rent	Yes
UNWEIGHTED SAMPLE 2 12	108	47	61	17	39	26	25	34	73	43	64	81	25	36	35	32	4	5	73	35	15
WEIGHTED SAMPLE 1 11	108	46	62	17	40	21	30	35	72	42	66	80	26	38	35	30	5	7	71	37	13
Yes 52 55	43	62	30	47	47	44	38	36	48	48	41	40	55	48	43	39	19	54	44	42	57
No 48 40	54	36	67	53	53	53	55	60	50	51	55	59	40	45	57	61	81	46	52	58	39
DK/NA - 6	3	2	3	-	-	3	7	4	2	1	3	2	6	7	-	-	-	-	4	-	5

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

	EMPLOYMENT STATUS					OCCUPATION					HOUSEHOLD INCOME					EDUCATION					
	Full	Part	mak	empl	Ret	Home Un	Work Prof	Tech Off.	Sk/ Un-	Un-	Less	\$20K	\$30K	\$40K	\$60K	\$80K	Less	Comm	Coll		
Some Univ	Time	Time	er	oyed	ired	Wan.	OLB	OSB	Serv	Skil	Work	\$20K	\$30K	\$40K	\$60K	\$80K	More	H.S.	H.S.	Voca	
Univ Deg.																					
UNWEIGHED SAMPLE	108	58	8	9	1	20	39	22	11	17	18	6	10	16	14	25	18	14	6	28	28
18 28																					
WEIGHED SAMPLE	108	58	7	11	1	20	38	21	12	16	19	5	10	18	14	21	19	17	5	30	26
16 31																					
Yes	43	48	33	25	-	39	31	32	61	51	50	60	49	36	25	56	55	51	24	51	44
17 52																					
No	54	51	67	75	100	50	67	68	39	46	50	40	51	59	75	44	45	49	76	44	54
77 48																					
DK/NA	3	1	-	-	-	11	2	-	-	4	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	4	2
6 -																					

PREFERENCE	REGION				SUB-REGIONS				COMMUNITY SIZE				FED. POLITICAL									
	Atl.	Que	Ont	West	Que	Ont	West	Van	Man.	Sask	Alb	Que	100K	5K	Less	Can.	100K	5K	Less	Lib.	P.C.	NDP
Bloc	Prov	bec	ario	Can.	Onto	real	ver	Man.	Sask	Alb	Que	100K	5K	Less	Can.	100K	5K	Less	Lib.	P.C.	NDP	CA
Que. Und.																						
UNWEIGHED SAMPLE	108	13	27	32	36	9	12	5	7	10	9	10	81	26	30	26	26	35	19	16	11	
7 16																						
WEIGHED SAMPLE	108	10	28	43	28	16	17	5	5	5	7	11	80	38	25	23	22	40	17	16	9	
7 15																						
Yes	43	52	48	36	47	34	50	40	37	47	31	62	42	42	32	40	64	25	57	56	50	
79 33																						
No	54	48	46	61	53	66	50	60	63	53	69	38	57	58	62	60	30	72	43	44	50	
9 63																						
DK/NA	3	-	5	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	6	-	6	3	-	-	-	
12 4																						

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
 THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT - 2002-2
 Options Consommateurs

37. F b) What was it?

Subsample: Respondents who said something else happened when they notified a supermarket or grocery store about a problem with the readings of their scales

MEMBER	GENDER		A G E				MARITAL STATUS		KIDS <18 AT HOME		LANGUAGE AT HOME		RELIGION			NON-BRIT IMMIGRANT			TENURE		UNION	
	Male	Female	18 to 29	30 to 44	45 to 59	60 or more	Single	Married	Yes	No	English	French	Catholic	Protestant	Other	Ag	Other	Own	Rent	Yes	No	
UNWEIGHTED SAMPLE	48	28	20	8	19	12	9	14	34	21	27	33	14	18	15	13	1	3	32	16	8	
WEIGHTED SAMPLE	47	29	18	8	19	9	11	13	34	20	27	32	14	18	15	12	1	4	31	16	7	
Reduced bill/	57	68	40	64	54	58	55	66	53	72	46	61	44	39	76	62	100	-	61	49	42	
100 corrected mistake																						
Changed/replaced	26	22	32	24	21	38	25	43	20	26	26	21	38	34	9	29	-	32	22	33	9	
- scales																						
They did not reduce	5	-	12	-	12	-	-	-	6	-	8	7	-	-	-	18	-	-	4	7	-	
- my bill/increased																						
my bill																						
Offered information	2	-	5	-	-	11	-	-	3	-	4	3	-	-	7	-	-	25	-	6	14	
- 17																						
on weight/																						
measurement/price																						
Other	14	11	20	11	19	-	20	5	18	8	19	11	22	27	9	5	-	43	19	6	36	
- 44																						
DK/NA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

	EMPLOYMENT STATUS					OCCUPATION					HOUSEHOLD INCOME					EDUCATION					
	Full	Part	mak	empl	Ret	Home	Prof	Tech	Off.	Sk/	Un-	Less	\$20K	\$30K	\$40K	\$60K	\$80K	Less	Comm	Coll	
Some Univ						Wor	Adm.	S.P.	Sale	Semi	skil	than	to	to	to	to	or	than			
Univ Deg.	TOTAL	Time	Time	er	oyed	ired	Man.	OLB	OSB	Serv	Skil	Work	\$20K	\$30K	\$40K	\$60K	\$80K	More	H.S.	H.S.	Voca
UNWEIGHED SAMPLE	48	29	3	3	-	7	14	8	7	8	9	4	6	6	4	13	10	7	2	15	13
3 15																					
WEIGHED SAMPLE	47	28	2	3	-	8	12	7	7	8	9	3	5	6	3	12	10	9	1	15	11
3 16																					
Reduced bill/ 56 55	57	62	71	25	-	47	48	23	66	55	86	89	34	60	80	66	62	43	100	59	52
corrected mistake																					
Changed/replaced 66 21	26	19	29	-	-	36	28	16	25	24	14	32	66	40	33	14	12	26	-	32	17
scales																					
They did not reduce - 7	5	-	-	41	-	-	9	16	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	10	-	-	-	10
my bill/increased my bill																					
Offered information - 6	2	4	-	-	-	8	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	-	-	-
on weight/ measurement/price																					
Other - 18	14	16	-	34	-	17	12	31	9	21	-	-	-	-	20	16	15	19	-	9	22
DK/NA - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
 THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT - 2002-2
 Options Consommateurs

37. F b) What was it?

Subsample: Respondents who said something else happened when they notified a supermarket or grocery store about a problem with the readings of their scales

PREFERENCE	REGION			SUB-REGIONS							COMMUNITY SIZE				FED. POLITICAL						
	Atl. Que	Ont	West ern	Van Tor	Man. Mont	Sask ver	Alb erta	B.C.	Que	Can. 100K excl	100K to 5K	5K to 10K	Less than	Lib.	P.C.	NDP	CA				
Bloc																					
Que. Und.																					
UNWEIGHTED SAMPLE	48	6	13	12	17	3	6	2	3	5	3	6	35	11	10	10	17	10	10	5	
WEIGHTED SAMPLE	5	5																			
Reduced bill/	57	100	42	57	56	68	52	-	68	60	100	36	63	51	52	62	63	44	70	51	77
corrected mistake																					
Changed/replaced	26	13	35	24	24	-	48	51	-	40	-	32	22	32	16	19	29	47	13	18	23
scales																					
They did not reduce	5	-	-	7	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	17	6	-	-	12	8	11	-	12	-
my bill/increased																					
my bill																					
Offered information	2	-	-	-	8	-	-	49	-	-	-	15	3	6	-	-	-	10	-	-	-
on weight/																					
measurement/price																					
Other	14	-	23	19	4	32	-	-	32	-	-	-	11	11	32	19	5	6	17	18	-
DK/NA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
 THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT - 2002-2
 Options Consommateurs

38. F How would you rate the way the store resolved your situation on a scale from 1 to 10, where 10 means you are totally satisfied with the resolution and 1 means you are not at all satisfied with the resolution.

Subsample: Respondents who notified a supermarket or grocery store about a problem with the readings of their scales

MEMBER	GENDER		A G E				MARITAL STATUS		KIDS <18 AT HOME		LANGUAGE AT HOME		RELIGION		NON-BRIT IMMIGRANT			TENURE	UNION		
	Male	Female	18 to 29	30 to 44	45 to 59	60 or more	Single	Married	Yes	No	English	French	Catholic	Protestant	Ag	Eur	Oth	Own	Rent	Yes	
UNWEIGHED SAMPLE 2 12	108	47	61	17	39	26	25	34	73	43	64	81	25	36	35	32	4	5	73	35	15
WEIGHED SAMPLE 1 11	108	46	62	17	40	21	30	35	72	42	66	80	26	38	35	30	5	7	71	37	13
Totally satisfied 52 18	28	31	25	32	28	34	21	19	33	33	25	28	29	29	31	24	-	17	28	28	21
- 18 ...[9]	14	11	16	9	10	16	19	23	10	13	14	12	21	10	13	21	19	-	14	13	15
- 8 ...[8]	13	12	14	13	18	7	12	9	16	19	10	13	13	9	19	10	-	46	15	10	7
- 16 ...[7]	4	7	2	-	7	3	3	2	5	-	7	5	2	6	3	4	-	23	4	4	13
- - ...[6]	3	5	1	10	4	-	-	5	2	2	4	3	3	5	2	2	-	-	3	3	-
- 9 ...[5]	10	5	13	23	2	3	14	6	12	8	9	9	9	13	10	7	-	-	10	10	13
- - ...[4]	3	5	2	-	3	2	6	1	4	5	2	4	-	1	6	4	-	-	4	1	-
- 9 ...[3]	5	8	3	-	9	11	-	3	7	7	4	6	5	8	3	3	-	-	7	3	8
- 9 ...[2]	6	4	8	-	11	11	-	11	4	-	10	8	-	4	9	7	-	14	5	8	8
Not at all satisfied - 13	10	6	12	13	4	6	19	20	5	7	11	8	11	10	4	14	81	-	5	19	11
Situation not yet 48 - fully resolved DK/NA	2	-	3	-	2	6	-	-	1	5	-	2	-	-	-	4	-	-	3	-	5
- -	2	3	1	-	2	-	5	2	2	2	2	1	6	4	-	2	-	-	2	2	-
Average rating 10.0 6.2	6.8	7.1	6.6	6.9	6.9	7.0	6.5	6.0	7.2	7.4	6.4	6.7	7.4	6.7	7.2	6.7	2.5	7.3	7.1	6.3	6.4

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
 THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT - 2002-2
 Options Consommateurs

38. F How would you rate the way the store resolved your situation on a scale from 1 to 10, where 10 means you are totally satisfied with the resolution and 1 means you are not at all satisfied with the resolution.

Subsample: Respondents who notified a supermarket or grocery store about a problem with the readings of their scales

	EMPLOYMENT STATUS					OCCUPATION					HOUSEHOLD INCOME					EDUCATION								
	Home Full	Unempl	Ret	oyed	ired	Wm.	OLB	OSB	Serv	Skil	Un- skil	Less than	\$20K to	\$30K to	\$40K to	\$60K to	\$80K or more	H.S.	H.S. Voca					
UNWEIGHED SAMPLE	108	58	8	9	1	20	39	22	11	17	18	6	10	16	14	25	18	14	6	28	28			
WEIGHED SAMPLE	108	58	7	11	1	20	38	21	12	16	19	5	10	18	14	21	19	17	5	30	26			
Totally satisfied	28	29	22	19	-	31	26	17	20	38	38	28	12	21	32	42	21	32	34	29	35			
26	7	...	[9]	14	10	15	34	-	13	12	6	34	9	5	21	33	20	12	6	20	8	17	17	10
2	19	...	[8]	13	14	-	16	-	12	11	11	-	12	20	-	13	9	24	3	24	16	-	14	15
6	9	...	[7]	4	3	9	-	-	5	3	8	-	11	-	-	-	3	-	5	6	10	-	2	-
6	2	...	[6]	3	6	-	-	-	2	-	15	4	6	-	-	-	8	7	5	-	-	-	-	7
14	3	...	[5]	10	5	44	20	-	12	14	5	-	22	7	-	19	18	11	6	5	-	37	13	6
-	-	...	[4]	3	1	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	10	7	3	-	-	5	10	-	-	8	4	4
-	11	...	[3]	5	10	-	-	-	5	9	9	-	9	-	-	-	4	9	13	-	6	3	3	3
-	12	...	[2]	6	10	-	-	100	-	10	18	23	-	2	-	-	12	-	10	-	16	-	6	5
Not at all satisfied	10	10	-	-	-	20	9	14	-	4	3	44	19	13	9	6	-	5	11	4	8	8	8	8
Situation not yet fully resolved	2	2	10	-	-	-	5	9	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
DK/NA	2	1	-	-	-	8	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	7	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
Average rating	6.8	6.5	7.1	7.7	2.0	6.9	6.5	5.4	6.6	7.7	7.3	5.4	6.5	6.4	7.6	7.1	7.5	6.7	6.9	7.1	7.3	7.0	6.0	6.0

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
 THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT - 2002-2
 Options Consommateurs

38. F How would you rate the way the store resolved your situation on a scale from 1 to 10, where 10 means you are totally satisfied with the resolution and 1 means you are not at all satisfied with the resolution.

Subsample: Respondents who notified a supermarket or grocery store about a problem with the readings of their scales

PREFERENCE	REGION				SUB-REGIONS				COMMUNITY SIZE				FED. POLITICAL								
	Atl.	Que	Ont	West em	Tor	Van	Mont	Que	Alb	Man.	Sask	Prta	B.C.	Que	Can. 100K excl Mill	5K to 100K	Less than 5K	Lib.	P.C.	NDP	CA
UNWEIGHTED SAMPLE	108	13	27	32	36	9	12	5	7	10	9	10	81	26	30	26	26	35	19	16	11
WEIGHTED SAMPLE	108	10	28	43	28	16	17	5	5	5	7	11	80	38	25	23	22	40	17	16	9
Totally satisfied	28	49	25	16	43	11	23	40	73	17	30	51	29	20	32	26	39	25	30	26	46
...[9]	14	-	19	21	1	23	18	-	-	7	-	-	12	18	13	9	12	10	13	27	-
...[8]	13	12	12	18	7	11	17	-	27	-	11	-	13	12	10	24	7	21	7	-	17
...[7]	4	-	2	4	7	11	-	-	-	-	14	10	5	4	-	-	12	3	10	4	-
...[6]	3	15	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	4	6	4	5	8	-	-
...[5]	10	7	9	5	18	-	9	-	-	63	25	-	10	4	18	12	8	9	-	10	27
...[4]	3	-	-	7	1	12	-	-	-	7	-	-	4	5	-	5	2	5	-	9	-
...[3]	5	-	4	4	10	11	7	21	-	-	11	20	6	11	3	4	-	-	10	6	-
...[2]	6	-	-	11	8	22	-	39	-	7	-	19	9	14	4	-	2	7	2	18	11
Not at all satisfied	10	17	10	12	3	-	9	-	-	-	11	-	9	4	15	8	15	13	15	-	-
Situation not yet fully resolved	2	-	7	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	3	-	3	-	-	-
DK/NA	2	-	8	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	3	-	-	4	-	-
Average rating	6.8	7.3	7.3	6.3	7.0	6.0	7.2	5.4	9.5	5.9	6.5	6.8	6.7	6.4	6.7	7.1	7.3	6.7	6.8	6.7	7.5
	7.6	6.8																			

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
 THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT - 2002-2
 Options Consommateurs

39. F Before this survey was begun, were you aware of a government organization called "Measurement Canada" that can review and deal with your complaint if you are not satisfied with your treatment by a supermarket or grocery store?

Subsample: Respondents who notified a supermarket or grocery store about a problem with the readings of their scales

MEMBER	GENDER		A G E			MARITAL STATUS		KIDS <18 AT HOME		LANGUAGE AT HOME		RELIGION			NON-BRIT IMMIGRANT			TENURE		UNION	
	Male	Female	18 to 29	30 to 44	45 to 59	60 or more	Single	Married	Yes	No	English	French	Catholic	Protestant	Ath/Ag	Eur/ope	Oth/er	Own	Rent	Yes	No
Pri vate Sect	108	47	61	17	39	26	25	34	73	43	64	81	25	36	35	32	4	5	73	35	15
UNWEIGHTED SAMPLE 2 12	108	46	62	17	40	21	30	35	72	42	66	80	26	38	35	30	5	7	71	37	13
WEIGHTED SAMPLE 1 11	32	42	24	15	27	41	41	41	28	31	32	31	36	30	38	27	26	17	36	22	31
Yes 52 30	68	58	76	85	73	59	59	59	72	69	68	69	64	70	62	73	74	83	64	78	69
No 48 70	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DK/NA - -																					
MEMBER	EMPLOYMENT STATUS					OCCUPATION					HOUSEHOLD INCOME					EDUCATION					
	TOTAL	Time	Part	Home	Unempl	Ret	Man.	Prof.	Tech.	Off.	Sk/Un-	Less than \$20K	\$20K to \$30K	\$30K to \$40K	\$40K to \$60K	\$60K to \$80K	More than \$80K	H.S.	H.S. Voc		
Some Univ	108	58	8	9	1	20	39	22	11	17	18	6	10	16	14	25	18	14	6	28	28
UNWEIGHTED SAMPLE 18 28	108	58	7	11	1	20	38	21	12	16	19	5	10	18	14	21	19	17	5	30	26
WEIGHTED SAMPLE 16 31	32	31	24	18	-	44	20	25	35	28	31	19	26	34	32	46	15	48	17	33	18
Yes 45 37	68	69	76	82	100	56	80	75	65	72	69	81	74	66	68	54	85	52	83	67	82
No 55 63	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DK/NA - -																					

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

PREFERENCE	REGION				SUB-REGIONS						COMMUNITY SIZE				FED. POLITICAL						
	Atl. Que	Ont	West em	Tor	Van Mont	cou	Alb	Man.	Sask	erta	B.C.	Que	Can. 1 excl Mill	100K to 1	5K to 100K	Less than	Lib.	P.C.	NDP	CA	
Bloc Que. Und.	TOTAL	Prov	hec	ario	Can.	onto	real	ver	Man.	Sask	erta	B.C.	Que	+	Mill	100K	5K	Lib.	P.C.	NDP	CA
UNWEIGHED SAMPLE 7 16	108	13	27	32	36	9	12	5	7	10	9	10	81	26	30	26	26	35	19	16	11
WEIGHED SAMPLE 7 15	108	10	28	43	28	16	17	5	5	5	7	11	80	38	25	23	22	40	17	16	9
Yes 64 31	32	40	34	24	37	23	33	40	52	34	9	51	31	30	34	11	54	27	35	15	48
No 36 69	68	60	66	76	63	77	67	60	48	66	91	49	69	70	66	89	46	73	65	85	52
DK/NA - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP LIMITED
THE FOCUS CANADA REPORT - 2002-2
Options Consommateurs

40. F Did you consider filing a complaint with Measurement Canada?

Subsample: Respondents who notified a supermarket or grocery store about a problem with the readings of their scales and who were aware of Measurement Canada before the survey

MEMBER	GENDER	A G E				MARITAL		KIDS <18	LANGUAGE		RELIGION	NON-BRIT	TENURE	UNION							
		Fe	to	to	to	or	Sin	Mar	Yes	No	lish	nch	Cath	Prot	Ath/ Eur	Oth	Own	Rent	Yes		
Pri Pub		18	30	45	60																
vate lic		29	44	59	more	gile	ried	Yes	No	lish	nch	Cath	Prot	Ag	ope	er	Own	Rent	Yes		
Sect Sect	TOTAL	Male	male																		
UNWEIGHED SAMPLE 1 4	36	22	14	3	12	11	10	14	22	15	21	27	9	12	13	10	1	1	27	9	5
WEIGHED SAMPLE 1 3	34	19	15	2	11	9	12	14	20	13	21	25	9	12	13	8	1	1	26	8	4
Yes - -	15	6	27	-	6	22	22	19	13	15	15	11	28	17	10	24	100	-	12	24	-
No 100 100	85	94	73	100	94	78	78	81	87	85	85	89	72	83	90	76	-	100	88	76	100
DK/NA - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Ensuring Retail Food Scale Accuracy and Consumer Confidence in a Changing Market

	EMPLOYMENT STATUS					OCCUPATION					HOUSEHOLD INCOME					EDUCATION					
	Home Full	Unempl	Part mak	emp	Ret	Work ing	Prof Adn.	Tech S.P.	Off. Sale	Sk/ Semi	Un- skil	Less than	\$20K to	\$30K to	\$40K to	\$60K to	\$80K or	Less than	Coll	Voca	
Some Univ	TOTAL	Time	Time	er	oyed	ired	Wan.	OLB	OSB	Serv	Skil	Work	\$20K	\$30K	\$40K	\$60K	\$80K	More	H.S.	H.S.	Voca
Univ Deg.																					
UNWEIGHED SAMPLE	36	20	2	1	-	8	9	6	4	5	7	2	3	5	5	11	4	7	1	12	6
7 10																					
WEIGHED SAMPLE	34	18	2	2	-	9	8	5	4	4	6	1	3	6	4	10	3	8	1	10	5
7 11																					
Yes	15	7	-	-	-	30	18	-	17	-	-	65	26	22	-	20	-	15	-	21	-
9 22																					
No	85	93	100	100	-	70	82	100	83	100	100	35	74	78	100	80	100	85	100	79	100
91 78																					
DK/NA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- -																					

PREFERENCE	REGION			SUB-REGIONS				COMMUNITY SIZE				FED. POLITICAL									
	Atl.	Que	Ont	West em	Tor	Van Mont	cou	Alb	Can. excl	1 Mill	100K to	5K to	Less than	Lib.	P.C.	NDP	CA				
Bloc	TOTAL	Prov	bec	ario	Can.	onto	real	ver	Man.	Sask	erta	B.C.	Que	+	Mill	100K	5K	Lib.	P.C.	NDP	CA
Que. Und.																					
UNWEIGHED SAMPLE	36	5	9	8	14	2	4	2	4	4	1	5	27	8	11	3	14	11	6	4	5
4 5																					
WEIGHED SAMPLE	34	4	9	10	10	4	6	2	2	2	1	5	25	11	9	3	12	11	6	2	4
5 5																					
Yes	15	16	21	25	-	-	22	-	-	-	-	-	13	11	16	-	23	6	22	-	-
15 27																					
No	85	84	79	75	100	100	78	100	100	100	100	100	87	89	84	100	77	94	78	100	100
85 73																					
DK/NA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
- -																					

APPENDIX 3 –DISCUSSION GUIDE

JULY 15, 2002

DISCUSSION GUIDE

ENVIRONICS PN 5177

MEASUREMENT CANADA – NATURAL GAS AND RETAIL FOOD SECTOR REVIEWS

1.0 INTRODUCTION TO PROCEDURES (5 MINUTES)

Welcome to the group. We want to hear your opinions. Not what you think other people think – but what you think!

Feel free to agree or disagree. Even if you are just one person among ten that takes a certain point of view, you could represent hundreds of thousands of people in the country who feel the same way as you do.

You don't have to direct all your comments to me; you can exchange ideas and arguments with each other too.

You are being taped and observed to help me write my report.

I may take some notes during the group to remind myself of things also.

The hostess (I) will pay you your incentives at the end of the session.

Let's go around the table so that each of you can tell us your name and a little bit about yourself, such as what you do for a living, who lives in your house and what you like to do for fun.

2.0 INTRO. TO MEASUREMENT CANADA AND THE CURRENT REGULATORY FRAMEWORK FOR OF METERS (15 MINUTES)

Today we are going to be talking about issues relating to weights and measures. As far as you know, are weights and measures such as electricity and gas meters or food scales in stores etc...regulated in any way? Is there any level of government or industry that polices whether the meters and scales are sound and reliable and keep to any standards?

Who does this?

Who should be doing this? Should it be the gas utilities or stores? Should it be the government? Some other agency?

In fact, the reliability of weights and measures is the responsibility of a federal government agency called Measurement Canada. Did anyone know this?

I am going to circulate a couple of pages that describe in greater detail how Measurement Canada works and what we are here to discuss.

Distribute “Backgrounder”

I want you all to read **Point 1.0** that describes what Measurement Canada does. Were any of you aware of any of this before?

How does it make you feel to know that MC does all these things? Does this make you feel more confident in your meter and in metering in general? Or does it have no impact?

Measurement Canada is conducting what is called a Trade Sector Review. If you read on to **Point 2.0** that starts on page 1 and goes on to the top of page 2 it will explain this in more detail.

Does everyone understand what this Trade Sector Review is all about?

3.0 FOOD SECTOR REVIEW – INITIAL EXPERIENCE WITH RETAIL FOOD SCALES (10 MINUTES)

Now, I want to turn to the issue of the weighing of food. When do you get food weighed?

NOTE: We are referring to the scales that are used to tell you how much you owe, often at the check out counter. This does NOT include rudimentary scales in the fresh produce department of a grocery store where you can weigh your own vegetables.

What about the scales used to weigh your food in grocery stores and other kinds of food stores? Have you ever wondered how these are regulated for accuracy?

Have any of you ever bought food and suspected that the scale was inaccurate or used incorrectly (i.e. zeroed before use, paid for packaging, etc.)?

What happened?

Do you trust the scales at food retail outlets?

As far as you know, are these scales inspected for accuracy and usage?

How should they be regulated?

4.0 FOOD SECTOR REVIEW – REACTION TO PROPOSED NEW REGULATORY FRAMEWORK (30 MINUTES)

In fact, Measurement Canada has responsibility in this area also. When a new supermarket opens, all the scales (i.e. check out counters, deli's, meat & seafood, etc.) are checked initially for accuracy and installation. Similarly, Measurement Canada must approve any new type of scale.

Please read **Point 3.0** about the Retail Food Sector Review.

At one time Measurement Canada regularly re-inspected and spot-checked scales in stores to make sure they were still compliant. This is seldom done now, due to the costs and huge resources involved.

“When scales are inspected at food retail outlets, about 10% are found with measurement errors. Of these errors, about half are in favour of the consumer while the other half are in favour of the store. Most of these errors are quite small (i.e. less than 0.5%), but if a large error is found the scale is removed from service until the error is

corrected. An additional 7% of all scales inspected have other non-measurement problems identified during these inspections (i.e. installation issues). “

Does this information about accuracy reassure you? Or is this an area that needs to be regulated more aggressively?

Should it be mandatory that Measurement Canada approve all scale **types** used in the retail food industry? *The ramifications of not requiring approved devices would be that a trader could choose to use a bathroom scale or other low quality scale for buying/selling, thereby increasing the likelihood of errors in measurement.*

Should it still be mandatory that all new scales be tested before they are put to use?

Should Measurement Canada still do random inspections of scales? Would it be better if they did periodic inspections of all food scales? How often should these be done?

PROBE: every few years? After x amount of usage? Based on past compliance?

Could Measurement Canada accredit other organizations to do this verification work since it is a very large and expensive task to be regularly inspecting every single weighing device in Canada?

What other organizations could be accredited to do the work?

What would you think if Measurement Canada made it mandatory for food retailers to get their scales verified on a regular basis? Scale technicians hired by the stores and spot-checked by Measurement Canada could do this work.

Currently, there is a process by which companies that do the initial inspections of scales in the food retail sector get certified or accredited by Measurement Canada. This only applies to the initial inspection of scales. There is no regulation right now forcing stores to get their scales re-checked after the initial installation. Therefore, scale technicians require no accreditation to do this re-inspection work.

Right now, anyone can claim to be a scale technician and anyone can work on a scale regardless of the procedures or equipment (including weights) they use. Should

companies that manufacture or repair food scales have to be accredited or somehow recognised by Measurement Canada?

There is now an industry built around servicing and selling scales, but the people who do this are often not the people who manufacture the scales. Should we have a requirement to force companies/technicians to be accredited before being allowed to perform any work on a scale [calibration] or should this accreditation only be required if the company/technician wishes to perform work on MC's behalf)?

ANNEXE 4 – BACKGROUNDER DOCUMENT DISTRIBUTED TO FOCUS GROUPS PARTICIPANTS

BackgRound Information

1. What is Measurement Canada?

Have you ever stopped to think about why and how goods are weighed or measured before they are sold each day in Canada? Have you ever wondered about how these weights and measures are standardised and regulated?

In Canada, weights and measures are a responsibility of the federal government. Measurement Canada (MC) is a government agency that is part of Industry Canada. Its role is to ensure that a fair and accurate weights and measures system exists to protect both buyers and sellers.

- MC's mission is: *“to ensure equity and accuracy where goods and services are bought and sold on the basis of measurement, in order to contribute to a fair and competitive marketplace for Canadians.”*
- MC administers and enforces the Electricity and Gas Inspection Act and the *Weights and Measures Act*

- There are 39 different business sectors where trade measurement is significant (examples of these are electricity, natural gas, retail food, gasoline, water, taxis etc...)
- MC periodically reviews the need for a role in each sector beyond active surveillance and solicits stakeholders' views as a key element in these decisions, particularly those of vulnerable parties.

2. What is a Trade Sector Review?

Measurement Canada is initiating what is called a Trade Sector Review (TSR). This is a comprehensive review process to determine the most appropriate role for Measurement Canada in a particular trade sector or marketplace. MC is consulting its clients to ensure fair and efficient measurement in all trade sectors. By clients we mean stakeholders who buy and sell a given commodity. This can include: consumers, retailers, utilities etc...

Measurement Canada is responsible for measurement issues in all sectors of the Canadian marketplace. With the increase in the number of devices and the increasingly sophisticated technology used it is becoming more difficult for Measurement Canada to have an effective presence in all areas of the marketplace. For these reasons, the department would like to ensure it focuses its resources in the most important areas and identifies other suitable methods of ensuring that the goal of Measurement Equity is maintained.

There are 39 different trade sectors that have weights or measures that Measurement Canada regulates. A phased approach is being used to review Measurement Canada's role in each of these sectors. The first trade sector reviews include the **electricity sector** the **natural gas sector** and the **retail food sector**, etc. Later on many other sectors such as mining, forestry, fishing, taxi meters etc...) will be reviewed, with targeted completion by 2013.

3. Review of the Retail Food Sector.

Stakeholders are being called upon to give input into how Measurement Canada's future involvement in the retail food industry can be changed. It is government policy to consult stakeholders. You as consumers are a part of this consultation process.

At present, Measurement Canada (MC) directly provides the following services with regard to retail food measurement:

- Establishes measurement rules and requirements for measuring equipment.
- Calibrates and certifies measurement standards (test weights) and test equipment.
- Evaluates and approves new measuring apparatus (scales).
- Does the initial inspection of new scales and scale installations.
- Routinely inspects scales and scale installations which are in service.
- Conducts random net quantity inspections (test purchases) of clerk served items.
- Investigates measurement complaints.

- Accredits 3rd parties (service companies) to conduct initial inspections of scales and meters on Measurement Canada's behalf.
- Monitors and enforces compliance e.g., inspections, audits, prosecutions.

When scales are inspected at food retail outlets, about 10% are found with measurement errors. Of these errors, about half are in favour of the consumer while the other half are in favour of the store. Most of these errors are quite small (i.e. less than 0.5%), but if a large error is found the scale is removed from service until the error is corrected. An additional 7% of all scales inspected have other non-measurement problems identified during these inspections (i.e. installation issues).