



Comment consolidation

Committee:	CAB	Status:	<input type="radio"/> In Preparation <input checked="" type="radio"/> Circulated
Type:	Meeting document	Document number:	CAB/469/DC
Meeting reference:	CAB/2004-06-08/Geneva	Voting Document:	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Created:	2004-05-28 17:27		
Circulated:	2004-05-30 11:35		

Title: Comment Consolidation on CAB/469/DC: Report and recommendations of the CAB /SMB ad hoc group on Interpretation of standards after its 2004-04 meeting

Author: J.-P. Isnard - **Date:** 2004-05-17 11:39:19

Title: Comment: Report and recommendations of the CAB/SMB ad hoc group on Interpretation of standards after its 2004-04 meeting

I fully support Gerhard Imgrund's statements, it is why this ad hoc group was set-up.

(Note by the CAB Secretary: The above remark refers to a discussion on the wording of the report, which has since been cleared up.)

On the last version of the document I wonder if the sub-clause 3.3.2 is in fact what CLC calls "clarification"

So I suggest the following amendments in 3.3.2 and in the new 3.9

3.3.2 Evaluate the Decision, whether superficially or thoroughly, for consistency with the standard; communicate the result of the evaluation as a recommendation to the scheme, which may choose to publish a reference to this result in the Decision itself (e.g. "Approved/endorsed by the TC"). This implies that the Decision touches the matter of the standard itself, but is not an interpretation, need not be known to other (non-laboratory) users of the standard, and need not influence future revision of the standard. This process may be called "clarification".

3.9 Clarifications, after having been recognized as such by the TC, will keep their own specific numbering system as developed by the bodies by which they were generated. They are best collected in a specific folder of a database set up by these bodies for the purpose of keeping them up-to-date and making them publicly available. Moreover, for transparency reasons and to indicate that these clarifications have been recognized by the TC, information on existing clarifications and the relevant database(s) are given in the IEC and IEC Scheme databases..

Taking into account this "clarification", I think the proposal is good now.

Author: D Mader - **Date:** 2004-05-24 18:43:18

Title: Comment: Report and recommendations of the CAB/SMB ad hoc group on Interpretation of standards after its 2004-04 meeting

The US National Committee supports the concept in principle from a high level. However, noting this is on the SMB agenda that meets later in June, the US suggests that SMB working-level bodies and CAB working-level bodies should coordinate at the operational level. Therefore, before the CAB takes any formal action, some representative major TC Chairs or Secretaries (e.g. TCs active in the IEC Schemes such as TC 108 which represents approximately 50% of the IECEE CB Scheme activity) and representative Scheme Chairs or Secretaries need to get together to address the details of the interpretation sheet process revisions. In addition, the US proposes that the recommendations presented in Sub-clauses 3.1 to 3.7 of the Report should be formally recorded as an official procedure like that for Interpretation Sheets" for "Scheme Decisions" since the ISO/IEC Directives apply to the Schemes as well.

Sub-clause 7.3 of the proposed text, 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence - We suggest that the word "further" be added between "it may" and "be discussed." The text would then read "... it may further be discussed ..."

Sub-clause 7.4 of the proposed text, 1st paragraph, 1st sentence - The requirement states distribution for "approval within two months" but it does not specify within 2 months of what - submittal of proposal, distribution of draft interpretation, communication to the secretariat of the appropriate scheme, other? This should be clarified.

Author: T Yagisawa - **Date:** 2004-05-26 03:26:21

Title: Comment: Report and recommendations of the CAB/SMB ad hoc group on Interpretation of standards after its 2004-04 meeting

The Japanese National Committee agrees with the report and supports the recommendations without comment.

Author: Didier George - **Date:** 2004-05-27 19:51:01

Title: Comment: Report and recommendations of the CAB/SMB ad hoc group on Interpretation of standards after its 2004-04 meeting

The comment of JP Isnard is the comment of the French National Committee.

Author: Warren Miller - **Date:** 2004-05-28 04:22:53

Title: Comment: Report and recommendations of the CAB/SMB ad hoc group on Interpretation of standards after its 2004-04 meeting

Australia has the following comments to make on this document.

1. The CAB should request the Schemes to ensure that their operating procedures include consultation with the relevant Technical Committees before issuing Interpretation Sheets.
 2. Technical committee consideration of Interpretation Sheets should be carried out promptly.
-