



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

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:

Head of Delegation: (Please print)	Werner Schaefer
Telephone/Telefax:	(415) 515-4768
Email:	wernerschaefer@comcast.net
Date:	Ocother 27, 2016

Meeting of CISPR/A (Designation/Title)
Date(s) October 24, 2016
Location Hangzhou, China

1. MEETING ATTENDANCE

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

67 Attendees from 17 countries plus 2 Officers.

___ 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.).

Meeting roster was not available for distribution

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.

- 1) Radiated emission measurements below 30 MHz: This project consists of multiple parts: Specification of test sites and antennas (CISPR/A/WG1), Site validation methods (CISPR/A/WG1), Radiated measurement methods (CISPR/A/WG2) and Measurement uncertainties (CISPR/A/WG2). The US is participating in all adhoc groups. Progress was made in regard to the development of the test method as well as the derivation of NSA values for the frequency range 9 kHz to 30 MHz. Requirements for antennas have been proposed and some requirements for the antenna calibration site have been established as well.**
- 2) Radiated emission measurements above 1 GHz: This project consists of four projects: Specification of test sites and antennas (CISPR/A/WG1), Site calibration (CISPR/A/WG1), Antenna calibration (CISPR/A/WG1) and Radiated emission measurement methods (CISPR/A/WG2). Progress was made regarding the definition of an antenna pattern test method and the associated test site requirements. In addition, requirements for the antenna patterns of the receiving antenna to be used during the site validation and measurement in the frequency range above 1 GHz were proposed.**
- 3) Additions of standardized uncertainty calculations to calibration and validation activities: Individual projects for NSA measurements, LISN calibration, absorbing clamp calibration, CMAD calibration have been initiated. These projects will result in a standardized approach for all calibration laboratories (or test laboratories performing their own calibrations or validations) to determine an uncertainty value that is comparable to the one derived by other laboratories.**

4.	Was there any discussion for which the United States was unprepared? (e.g., late document distribution, addition of new items, etc.)
	No. The US submitted no papers for consideration in the CISPR/A meeting this year. However, on the working group level the US contributed several papers on specific technical subjects. US is taking the lead on several projects and does participate in all initiated projects.
5.	Did the U.S. extend an offer to assume any new TC/SC Secretariat or management positions?
	___ Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (If yes, please indicate which positio (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?
	___ Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, please identify:

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.)
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, please identify:</p> <p>Some items related to antenna calibration are of interest to ANSI C63 SC1. The feedback is provided by dual membership of US experts in CISPR/A and ANSI C63 SC1. No further coordination is required.</p>
8.	Did the U.S. put forth/agree to put forth any New Work Items?
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, please identify:</p>
9.	Was there any evidence of irregular voting by participating countries?
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, please identify any significant issues or concerns:</p>
10.	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><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No related regional activity If yes, please explain:</p> <p>Multiple projects and resultant documents are being put forward for parallel voting. For details the document archive of CISPR/A can be consulted which identifies the documents put forward for parallel voting.</p>
11.	Were any new issues raised which require, or might involve, coordination with emerging market countries?
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, please explain:</p>
12.	Were any issues raised which relate to or impact existing U.S. regulatory matters?
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, please explain:</p>
13.	Please identify any IMMEDIATE U.S. TAG actions which will be required as a result of this international meeting.

None	
14.	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?
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
15.	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?)
From a CISPR/A standpoint we need more ACTIVE participants in the TAG and active representatives in CISPR work. The activity level of is very low. So, in order for ANSI to promote global standards the key issue is to take influence in standardization work. This can only be accomplished through active participation. ANSI should try to address this matter.	
16.	Has this report been provided to your TAG Administrator for US TAG distribution?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
17.	Do you have any questions, comments, or suggestions regarding the ISO/IEC Directives, including the IEC Supplement?
No further comments at this point.	
18.	Other Comments
None	

May 2016