



# HEAD OF DELEGATION (HoD) REPORT

U.S. Member Body of the  
International Organization for  
Standardization (ISO)



U.S. National Committee of the  
International Electrotechnical  
Commission (IEC)

Please return this report within one month of the completion of the international meeting and submit it to the appropriate ANSI Department as follows:

ISO

USNC

[ISOT@ansi.org](mailto:ISOT@ansi.org)

[USNC@ansi.org](mailto:USNC@ansi.org)

HoD reports can be used for a variety of purposes. For example:

- ❖ To report results of a TC/SC meeting to the related TAG
- ❖ To publicize the work of the TC/SC to the related US constituency via ANSI On-line, USNC News and Notes, or other media
- ❖ To suggest areas for possible development of featured articles
- ❖ To address specific challenges and concerns that the HoD may bring to the attention of related ANSI and/or USNC/IEC management

**PLEASE REMEMBER:** Your HoD report is NOT filed as a confidential, password protected document and, therefore, may have broad, unintended distribution. Keep this in mind when preparing the report and, if appropriate, use a more secure form of correspondence to call attention to any sensitive issues.

Completed by:

<b>Head of Delegation:</b> (Please print)	Steven E. Swanson
<b>Telephone/Telefax:</b>	828-901-5328
<b>Email:</b>	swansonse@corning.com
<b>Date:</b>	December 16, 2014

<b>(Designation/Title) Meeting of IEC SC86B, Fibre optic interconnecting devices and passive components</b>
<b>Date(s) November 10, 2014</b>
<b>Location Tokyo, Japan</b>

<b>1. MEETING ATTENDANCE</b>
<p>Please indicate, if available, both the number of delegates and the countries represented at the Meeting:</p> <p><b>21 Delegates from 12 Countries</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Meeting attendance roster and meeting resolutions attached, if available</p> <p>Please comment on significant or unusual attendance issues (e.g., new member bodies, regular members not in attendance, new Chairman or Secretariat, non-accredited U.S. persons, etc.).</p> <p><b>T Bolhaar (NL) was reconfirmed as SC86B/WG4 Convenor and S Kannan (USA) was reconfirmed as SC86B/WG7 Convenor; G Sandels and M Kinard were appointed as SC86B JWG8 Co-convenors</b></p> <p><b>The SC86B Secretary, Dr. E Sugita, will retire in March 2015. Dr. Shigeru Tomita has been appointed secretary of SC86B to succeed Dr. Etsuji Sugita.</b></p> <p><b>The assistant secretary, M Murakami will also retire his position.</b></p> <p><b>The Secretary noted that Slovakia was changed to P-member.</b></p>

<b>MEETING OBSERVATIONS</b>
<b>2. Overall, how well did the U.S. meet its objectives on policy or technical matters?</b>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Very Successful -- U.S. positions were accepted in whole</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Successful -- Compromises were reached which are acceptable to the U.S.</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Not Successful -- U.S. positions were not accepted</b></p>
<b>3. Please comment on any issues of significance which might have an impact upon materially affected or interested U.S. parties.</b>
<p><b>IEC SC86B has proposed to form a joint working group with IEC SC48B to formulate the performance standard for copper/fibre hybrid connectors. Mike Gurreri (USA) has been proposed as Convenor.</b></p>
<b>4. Was there any discussion for which the United States was unprepared? (e.g., late document distribution, addition of new items, etc.)</b>
<b>No</b>

<p><b>5. Did the U.S. extend an offer to assume any new TC/SC Secretariat or management positions?</b></p>												
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes                      <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No          (If yes, please indicate which position and provide Officer contact information.)</p>												
<p><b>6. Did the U.S. extend an offer to host any future TC/SC meetings?</b></p>												
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes                      <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No          If yes, please identify:</p>												
<p><b>7. Were any new issues raised which require, or might involve, coordination with other U.S. bodies? (Include coordination items with other U.S. TAGs, ANSI policy-level committees (AIF, AIC, the USNC TMC and/or Council, etc.)</b></p>												
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes                      <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No          If yes, please identify:</p>												
<p><b>8. Did the U.S. put forth/agree to put forth any New Work Items?</b></p>												
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes                      <input type="checkbox"/> No          If yes, please identify:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="263 1081 1356 1654"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="263 1081 488 1146">Project</th> <th data-bbox="488 1081 1356 1146">Title</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="263 1146 488 1255">IEC 62664-1-3</td> <td data-bbox="488 1146 1356 1255">Fibre optic connector product specifications -Part 1-1: LC-PC duplex singlemode connectors terminated on IEC 60793-2-50 category B1.1 and B1.3 fibre</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="263 1255 488 1329">IEC 61754-7-3</td> <td data-bbox="488 1255 1356 1329">Fibre optic connector interfaces - Part 7-X: Type MPO connector family – Two fibre rows 16 fibre wide</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="263 1329 488 1438">IEC 62664-1-2</td> <td data-bbox="488 1329 1356 1438">Fibre optic connector product specifications -Part 1-1: LC-APC duplex singlemode connectors terminated on IEC 60793-2-50 category B1.1 and B1.3 fibre</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="263 1438 488 1547">IEC 61755-3-X</td> <td data-bbox="488 1438 1356 1547">Fibre optic connector optical interfaces - Part 3-x: Connector parameters of non-dispersion shifted single mode physically contacting fibres- non-angled, ferrule-less, bore alignment connector</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="263 1547 488 1654">IEC 61755-6-2</td> <td data-bbox="488 1547 1356 1654">Fibre optic connector optical interfaces - Part 6-2: Connection of 50,0 µm multimode physically contacting fibres - Non- angled for reference connector application, 850nm</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Project	Title	IEC 62664-1-3	Fibre optic connector product specifications -Part 1-1: LC-PC duplex singlemode connectors terminated on IEC 60793-2-50 category B1.1 and B1.3 fibre	IEC 61754-7-3	Fibre optic connector interfaces - Part 7-X: Type MPO connector family – Two fibre rows 16 fibre wide	IEC 62664-1-2	Fibre optic connector product specifications -Part 1-1: LC-APC duplex singlemode connectors terminated on IEC 60793-2-50 category B1.1 and B1.3 fibre	IEC 61755-3-X	Fibre optic connector optical interfaces - Part 3-x: Connector parameters of non-dispersion shifted single mode physically contacting fibres- non-angled, ferrule-less, bore alignment connector	IEC 61755-6-2	Fibre optic connector optical interfaces - Part 6-2: Connection of 50,0 µm multimode physically contacting fibres - Non- angled for reference connector application, 850nm
Project	Title											
IEC 62664-1-3	Fibre optic connector product specifications -Part 1-1: LC-PC duplex singlemode connectors terminated on IEC 60793-2-50 category B1.1 and B1.3 fibre											
IEC 61754-7-3	Fibre optic connector interfaces - Part 7-X: Type MPO connector family – Two fibre rows 16 fibre wide											
IEC 62664-1-2	Fibre optic connector product specifications -Part 1-1: LC-APC duplex singlemode connectors terminated on IEC 60793-2-50 category B1.1 and B1.3 fibre											
IEC 61755-3-X	Fibre optic connector optical interfaces - Part 3-x: Connector parameters of non-dispersion shifted single mode physically contacting fibres- non-angled, ferrule-less, bore alignment connector											
IEC 61755-6-2	Fibre optic connector optical interfaces - Part 6-2: Connection of 50,0 µm multimode physically contacting fibres - Non- angled for reference connector application, 850nm											
<p><b>9. Was there any evidence of irregular voting by participating countries?</b></p>												
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes                      <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No          If yes, please identify any significant issues or concerns:</p>												

<b>10.</b>	<b>Are work items in the TC or SC being affected by related work in regional standards bodies (e.g., CEN, CENELEC, ETSI, PASC, NAFTA, COPANT, etc.)?</b>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes    <input type="checkbox"/> No  <input type="checkbox"/> No related regional activity  <b>If yes, please explain:</b></p> <p><b>ITU-T is working on performance tests, test severities and acceptance criteria in ITU-T L.36 and L.fmc. After agreement of the COG members a Liaison Report will be sent through the official channels (and Plenary approval) to ITU (via M. Murakami, liaison officer to/from SC86B) noting that SC86B decided to prepare a text with an IEC proposal to support ITU-T's work on performance tests, test severities and acceptance criteria.</b></p> <p><b>The IEC-Cenelec cooperation will become a permanent agenda item in IEC SC86B; Cenelec TC86BXA will be informed and progress will be reviewed with the aim to improve harmonization between CENELEC and IEC.</b></p>	
<b>11.</b>	<b>Were any new issues raised which require, or might involve, coordination with emerging market countries?</b>
<p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No  <b>If yes, please explain:</b></p>	
<b>12.</b>	<b>Were any issues raised which relate to or impact existing U.S. regulatory matters?</b>
<p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No  <b>If yes, please explain:</b></p>	
<b>13.</b>	<b>Please identify any IMMEDIATE U.S. TAG actions which will be required as a result of this international meeting.</b>
<b>14.</b>	<b>Please identify specific decisions which the U.S. delegation believes to be noteworthy for publication, publicity and/or development of a future article. If there are any, would you be willing to help develop an article for publication?</b>
<p style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes    <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	
<b>15.</b>	<b>What might be done to further promote the ANSI Federation's goal of "global standards that reflect U.S. interests?" (Consider such issues as how might the U.S. further promote acceptance of related American National Standards in international and, where applicable, regional fora?)</b>

<b>16. Has this report been provided to your TAG Administrator for US TAG distribution?</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>17. Other Comments</b>

**September 2012**