

**INTERNATIONAL ELECTROTECHNICAL COMMISSION****CONFORMITY ASSESSMENT BOARD****SUBJECT**

CAB result on the CAB WG 18, BizL, recommendations, including Convenor's comments

BACKGROUND

CAB Members were invited to vote on the five recommendations submitted under Part A (A.1 to A.5) of the report, CAB/1814/R.

RESULT OF VOTING

Note: Y=Yes; N=No; A=Abstention; *=Comment received

Member	Item A.1	Item A.2	Item A.3	Item A.4	Item A.5
Didier BOURGES (FR)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Marty COLE (CA)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tim DUFFY (US)	Y	Y	Y	Y*	Y*
Nickolay FAYZRAKHMANOV (RU)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ian FORTE (AU)	Y	Y	Y*	Y	Y
Jörg HARTGE (DE)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Masayuki HIRATA (JP)	N	N	N	N	N
Byungkuk LEE (KR)	Y*	Y	Y	Y	Y
LIU Weijun (CN)					
Faudzi MOHD YASIR (MY)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bert NAGTEGAAL (NL)					
Rafael NAVA (MX)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Trond SOLLIE (NO)	Y*	Y	Y	Y	A*
Rajeev VAGDIA (GB)	Y	Y	Y*	Y	Y
Fredrik WENNERSTEN (SE)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
TOTAL	12Y/1N	12Y/1N	12Y/1N	12Y/1N	11Y/1N/1A

*Results: Recommendations A.1, A.2, A.3, A.4 12 Yes, 1 No, 0 Abstention
Recommendation A.5 11 Yes, 1 No, 1 Abstention*

CONCLUSION

Decisions of the Conformity Assessment Board taken by correspondence require a two-thirds (2/3) majority of those voting (abstention is not considered as voting), clause 12.4 of the Rules of Procedure.

In this case 12 CAB Members voted in favour of recommendations A.1, A.2, A.3, A.4, and 11 in favour of recommendation A.5, therefore all five recommendations submitted by CAB/WG 18 have been approved.

COMMENTS

Member	Item	Comments	Comments from the Convenor
BK Lee	A.1	I agree with the title basically, but what about modifying it with a "New CA Service Radar"?	To be discussed at the CAB meeting in June see also Ian Forte's comment
Trond Sollie	A.1	General comment to the voting system: Please check the placing of the tick-boxes. At least on my iPhone 5, the tick-boxes are shown next to the opposite answer.	Noted
Ian Forte	A.3	The references in the titles should be changed from "BizL" to "New Services Radar List"	To be discussed at the CAB meeting in June
Raj Vagdia	A.3	Suggest editorial changes to the 'INSTRUCTIONS' tab: Cell D3 from 'The person(s) or CA System identified here is responsible to update columns marked with green at the top.' to 'The person(s) or CA System identified here is responsible for updating columns marked with green at the top.' Cell D3 from 'They are responsible to do this at least once a year and send the results to the WG 18 Convener.' to 'They are responsible for updating this list at least once a year and sending the results to the WG 18 Convener.'	Essentially agreed, but not being native English speaker, further agreement may be needed.
Tim Duffy	A.4	Perhaps you want to clarify where it indicates "responsible persons" that this is actually responsible persons/CA System	Replace in Annex "Feedback Procedure" the term "responsible persons" with "responsible persons/Executive Secretary of the responsible CA System"
Tim Duffy	A.5	I would suggest flexibility be provided the CA Systems to allow this to be done in a WG or other sub-group (e.g., IECEE may wish to place this item under their PSC)	The current wording allows that an individual group of a CA System prepares the standing agenda item for the CMC meeting.
Trond Sollie	A.5	Don't quite understand the implications of this	To assure that the broad expertise of the CA Systems is involved