



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)	Michael D. Kinard
Telephone/Telefax:	770.798.2109
Email:	mkinard@ofsoptics.com
Date:	7 October 2015

Meeting of IEC SC86A, Optical Fibre and Cables (Designation/Title)
Date(s) 7 October 2015
Location Gwangju, South Korea

1. MEETING ATTENDANCE
<p>Please indicate, if available, both the number of delegates and the countries represented at the Meeting:</p> <p>29 delegates from 10 countries</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>None</p>

MEETING OBSERVATIONS
2. Overall, how well did the U.S. meet its objectives on policy or technical matters?
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very Successful -- U.S. positions were accepted in whole</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Successful -- Compromises were reached which are acceptable to the U.S.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not Successful -- U.S. positions were not accepted</p>
3. Please comment on any issues of significance which might have an impact upon materially affected or interested U.S. parties.
None of especial significance. See the minutes of the SC and of the two WGs for details of issues under study.
4. Was there any discussion for which the United States was unprepared? (e.g., late document distribution, addition of new items, etc.)
None.
5. Did the U.S. extend an offer to assume any new TC/SC Secretariat or management positions?
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>(If yes, please indicate which position and provide Officer contact information.)</p>
6. Did the U.S. extend an offer to host any future TC/SC meetings?
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If yes, please identify:</p> <p>Note that the US is hosting the interim WG meetings in April 2016 in Washington, DC.</p>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, please identify: This will involve the normal attention of the US TAG for SC86A.</p>
<p>8. Did the U.S. put forth/agree to put forth any New Work Items?</p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, please identify: WG1: Corrigendum to correct labeling error in 60793-1-20, core diameter. WG3: 2 new documents to define fibre ribbon as a cable element. This is to address the use of ribbon in indoor cable in addition to the traditional outdoor cable. Also a new cord specification to support work in SC86B and JWG8 on Category I.</p>
<p>9. Was there any evidence of irregular voting by participating countries?</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, please identify any significant issues or concerns:</p>
<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>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No related regional activity If yes, please explain: Nothing new, here. The European delegates are constantly trying to insert CENELEC issues into the SC86A work. This time, the significant issues were moves to accommodate EU CPR regulations. The language seems to also allow other regional codes and regulations to use the IEC documents. There was also a discussion of what halogens should be tested for LSZH cables. Two are listed. The question was how about the others. I note that the US standards simply say, "...all halogens..."</p>
<p>11. Were any new issues raised which require, or might involve, coordination with emerging market countries?</p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, please explain: This is really an ITU-T issue, but it was being talked up extensively in the TC86 meetings. ITU-T L.dsa is a new set of initiatives for cables to be "installed" by just throwing them out on the ground. There was a "business case" sort of presentation to support the idea that this is cost effective for extremely rural settings with very little infrastructure. The cost of maintenance is far offset by the low cost of installation. There were also cables proposed. Several Experts, including those from the US, pointed out that the extremely robust, welded core tube, cables were overkill. Our experience with many classes of normal OSP cable would suggest that they would be very effective in this service at a much lower cost.</p>
<p>12. 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 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?)
Current involvement seems quite effective.	
16.	Has this report been provided to your TAG Administrator for US TAG distribution?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
17.	Other Comments

September 2012