



# 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)	<b>Craig Rodine</b>
<b>Telephone/Telefax:</b>	<b>+1-408-872-7515 (office); +1-408-319-7307 (mobile)</b>
<b>Email:</b>	<b>craig.rodine@chargepoint.com</b>
<b>Date:</b>	<b>December 16, 2014</b>

<b>(Designation/Title) Meeting of TC69</b>
<b>Date(s) December 6, 2014</b>
<b>Location Asahi-seimei Otemachi Building, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor, Otemachi 2-6-1, Choyda-ku, Tokyo</b>

## 1. MEETING ATTENDANCE

Please indicate, if available, both the number of delegates and the countries represented at the Meeting:

**Ten national delegations, as follows: BE, CA, CH, FR, GE, IT, JP, KR, SE, US**

Meeting attendance roster and meeting resolutions attached, if available

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.).

**There was no IEC participation, this was noted as undesirable. TC69 might not have given adequate notice this time; however, IEC has generally not been as supportive of TC69 as desired. This concern will be communicated to the IEC Central Office by the TC Secretary.**

### **MEETING OBSERVATIONS**

**2. Overall, how well did the U.S. meet its objectives on policy or technical matters?**

- Very Successful -- U.S. positions were accepted in whole  
 Successful -- Compromises were reached which are acceptable to the U.S.  
 Not Successful -- U.S. positions were not accepted

**3. Please comment on any issues of significance which might have an impact upon materially affected or interested U.S. parties.**

**Inadequate or non-existing coordination between ISO and IEC strongly affects this TC. Delays and mistakes in information sharing (notices, drafts, etc.) are confounding our efforts and becoming increasingly problematic. For example, joint documents that are disseminated by ISO but not shared quickly by IEC with other interested IEC TCs and SCs leave parties unaware of key information, and often render their concerns and contributions irrelevant.**

**The US Delegation asked the TC69 Officers for their support in ensuring transparency and collaboration between other TCs and SCs within and outwith TC69 (specifically, access to SC23E documents and meetings), which have been inadequate in 2014.**

**4. Was there any discussion for which the United States was unprepared? (e.g., late document distribution, addition of new items, etc.)**

No

**5. Did the U.S. extend an offer to assume any new TC/SC Secretariat or management positions?**

Yes  No  
(If yes, please indicate which position and provide Officer contact information.)

**6. Did the U.S. extend an offer to host any future TC/SC meetings?**

	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes                          <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If yes, please identify: The US Delegation offered to host the next TC69 WG4 meeting in San José, CA during the last week of January, 2015. This offer was accepted.</p>
7.	<p>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.)</p>
	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes                          <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If yes, please identify: Coordination with USTAG regarding IEC SC23E.</p>
8.	<p>Did the U.S. put forth/agree to put forth any New Work Items?</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes                          <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If yes, please identify:</p>
9.	<p>Was there any evidence of irregular voting by participating countries?</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes                          <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If yes, please identify any significant issues or concerns:</p>
10.	<p>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.)?</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes                          <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No related regional activity</p> <p>If yes, please explain:</p>
11.	<p>Were any new issues raised which require, or might involve, coordination with emerging market countries?</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes                          <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If yes, please explain:</p>
12.	<p>Were any issues raised which relate to or impact existing U.S. regulatory matters?</p>
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes                          <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If yes, please explain:</p>
13.	<p>Please identify any IMMEDIATE U.S. TAG actions which will be required as a result of this international meeting.</p>

14.	<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>		
—	Yes	—	No
15.	<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>		
16.	<b>Has this report been provided to your TAG Administrator for US TAG distribution?</b>		
<u>  x  </u>	Yes	—	No
17.	<b>Other Comments</b>		

September 2012