



CAB/608/R

For IEC use only

2006-05-03

## INTERNATIONAL ELECTROTECHNICAL COMMISSION

**CONFORMITY ASSESSMENT BOARD (CAB)**

**Meeting 19, Geneva, 2006-05-12**

### **SUBJECT**

**Agenda item 5.1**

CAB WG 9 Convenor's report on the outcome of questionnaire AC/2006/03

### **BACKGROUND**

Document AC/2006/03, *Questionnaire to National Committees on hazardous substances*, was circulated on 2006-01-20. National Committees were invited to complete and return the Questionnaire by 2006-03-31 to the CAB secretariat and Mr. J.-P. Isnard, CAB WG 9 convenor.

The attached report is based on the answers received from Australia, Czech Republic, Germany, Finland, France, Israel, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Russian Federation, Sweden, Thailand and the United States of America.

A complete synthesis comprising the comments received after the deadline (from New Zealand, IECEE and IECQ) will be sent to CAB WG 9 members.

### **ACTION**

The CAB is invited to note the report.

## **1 Responses received**

We have received responses from the following countries:

Australia, Czech Republic, Germany, Finland, France, Israel, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand Russian Federation, Sweden, Thailand and the United States of America; i.e.:

- 13 countries out of the 52 Members and 14 Associate Members,
- 19.6 % of IEC Countries,
- 7 countries out of the 12 represented by CAB Members.

We have received comment from the three schemes.

Due to the low rate of answers, it is impossible to give a clear conclusion and it does not seem fair to publish to the whole IEC community the completed responses from the countries which have answered.

## **2 Outcome**

The remaining countries have not answered for a range of possible reasons:

- No willingness to answer?
- No interest in this matter?
- Negligence?

The majority of the countries which have answered believes there is no need for specific process management, at least for the time being, even if there is some legislation on hazardous substances in their countries.

The originating country of the document which has been transformed into QC 080000 says: "There is neither legal requirement nor market desire for such a management system in this country".

If the preferred solution—SdoC—is not accepted as such, existing tools (ISO 9001 and ISO 14001) are considered sufficient.

It is held to be uncertain whether regulatory bodies will recognise such process management.

In cases where the market demands specific process management, consistency between schemes is requested.

The result of the questionnaire, together with the statement made by some schemes at WG level, confirms the big discrepancy between National Committees, where manufacturers have a strong influence, and Certification Bodies, which expect new fields of development, with the support of some big companies, which have to deal with the regulatory issue for their equipment made from a lot of parts coming from several manufacturers.

## **3 Proposal**

CAB should decide if:

- we should stop the study there as it seems there is no real interest, or
- we should proceed in one way or another.

Jean-Pierre ISNARD, CAB WG 9 Convenor  
2006-05-02