

EFNDT WG 5 suspended, how to continue?

Dear Colleagues,

My retirement at BAM inevitably entails certain changes. Most visibly, the BAM E-mail account is expiring, but I have acquired a new E-mail address as shown below at the bottom. The other change is that I do not have any more the funds necessary for attending conferences or meetings nor the capacity to organize events such as workshops etc. So I tried to find a successor as convener of the Working Group 5 who has all the necessary resources. Unfortunately, no one could be found to take over this post yet. So the Board of Directors has decided to suspend the activities of the WG 5 and will bring this to attention at the next General Assembly. Nevertheless, I intend to remain active with whatever I can do from home without incurring expenses. The WG 5 with all its ideas should not die.

What bothers me is why it is so difficult to find someone for the post of the convener of such a working group. I do not hope that the subjects of this one seem to be of secondary priority and therefore not sufficiently attractive. Or is it a consequence of the current streamlining processes observed in many enterprises? Or are other commitments in the focus occupying someone completely? Or are we blindly relying on "the others"? Difficult enough to find answers, but what can we do? Just demonstrating empathy with victims alone ("je suis Charlie")? Waiting until something might have happened? In such a case, it could be too late to act oneself. To wait until some completely new countermeasures may be invented by someone? But how should this happen? After all, the WG's approach to reconsider the multiple use of the tools readily available still appears as most reasonable, practicable and therefore appropriate.

As a consequence, the tasks of this WG encompassed several meetings and workshops. They were dedicated to elaborate ideas and concepts of applying the tools of non-destructive testing in security applications, to identify whether these tools can be transferred directly to the other fields or if they might need adaptations, to identify the signatures of the threats in either context, to assess the various risks and to analyse the effectiveness of the countermeasures etc. Certainly, some of all this might be already common practice in either field separately, technical safety and public security. So it is one of the biggest concerns tackled in the WG to bring together these two different fields for a mutual exchange of knowledge and experience where both sides could profit from. These activities should also have lead into common projects. However, some colleagues are experiencing right now that this becomes increasingly difficult.

In conclusion, there are sufficient arguments to keep the WG 5 alive. So please consider ways to contribute and to find a convener with the necessary resources.

Kind regards

Kurt Osterloh

