

ISO/TC 197 Hydrogen technologies

Email of secretary: <u>jim.ferrero@bnq.qc.ca</u> Secretariat: SCC (Canada)

Vote Results Evaluation 2016 Strat Plan and Plenary with comments

Document type: Summary of voting

Date of document: 2017-02-06

Expected action: **INFO**

Background: Here are the results from the 2016 evaluations of the meetings in the Netherlands, which include the

comments from several member bodies.

These results are the sames as those sent out automatically by the ISO ballot system, except they have an N-number and include the US vote along with the comment sheet submitted by Japan.

Committee URL: http://isotc.iso.org/livelink/livelink/open/tc197

Result of voting

Ballot Information	
Ballot reference	Evaluation 2016 ISO-JRC Strategic Plan Meeting & Plenary
Ballot type	CIB
Ballot title Evaluation of 2016 ISO-JRC Strateg Planning Meeting and the Plenary, h Netherlands	
Opening date	2017-02-01
Closing date	2017-02-02
Note	This evaluation is for countries that had representatives attending the abovementioned activities and it will complement the evaluation of the Chair, TAB and Secretary that was sent out earlier.

Member responses:	
Votes cast (19)	Argentina (IRAM) Canada (SCC) China (SAC) Czech Republic (UNMZ) Denmark (DS) Egypt (EOS) France (AFNOR) India (BIS) Italy (UNI) Japan (JISC) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Netherlands (NEN) New Zealand (NZSO) Norway (SN) Russian Federation (GOST R) Spain (UNE) Sweden (SIS) United Kingdom (BSI) United States (ANSI)
Comments submitted (2)	Australia (SA) Sri Lanka (SLSI)
Votes not cast (1)	Germany (DIN)

Questions:				
Q.1	"Please rate satisfaction with the ISO-JRC Strategic Planning Meeting that was held in the Netherlands on Dec.7th, 2016, on a scale of 1 to 5 (5 being the most satisfied and 1 being the least satisfied) or Abstain, if there were no participants from the			

	country member. Please feel free to submit comments for improving any similar future activities."
Q.2	"Please rate satisfaction with the ISO/TC 197 Plenary Meeting that was held in the Netherlands on Dec.8-9, 2016, on a scale of 1 to 5 (5 being the most satisfied and 1 being the least satisfied) or Abstain, if there were no participants from the country member. Please feel free to submit comments for improving future plenary meetings."

Votes by members	Q.1	Q.2
Argentina (IRAM)	Abstain	Abstain
Canada (SCC)	4	4
China (SAC)	5	5
Czech Republic (UNMZ)	Abstain	Abstain
Denmark (DS)	Abstain	Abstain
Egypt (EOS)	Abstain	Abstain
France (AFNOR)	4	4
India (BIS)	Abstain	Abstain
Italy (UNI)	Abstain	Abstain
Japan (JISC)	3	4
Korea, Republic of (KATS)	5	4
Netherlands (NEN)	3	4
New Zealand (NZSO)	Abstain	Abstain
Norway (SN)	Abstain	Abstain
Russian Federation (GOST R)	Abstain	Abstain
Spain (UNE)	Abstain	Abstain
Sweden (SIS)	5	5
United Kingdom (BSI)	4	4
United States (ANSI)	4	4

Answers to Q.1: "Please rate satisfaction with the ISO-JRC Strategic Planning Meeting that was held in the Netherlands on Dec.7th, 2016, on a scale of 1 to 5 (5 being the most satisfied and 1 being the least satisfied) or Abstain, if there were no participants from the country member. Please feel free to submit comments for improving any similar future activities."

3 x	5	China (SAC) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Sweden (SIS)
4 x	4	Canada (SCC) France (AFNOR) United Kingdom (BSI)

		United States (ANSI)
2 x	3	Japan (JISC) Netherlands (NEN)
0 x	2	
0 x	1	
10 x	Abstain	Argentina (IRAM) Czech Republic (UNMZ) Denmark (DS) Egypt (EOS) India (BIS) Italy (UNI) New Zealand (NZSO) Norway (SN) Russian Federation (GOST R) Spain (UNE)

Answers to Q.2: "Please rate satisfaction with the ISO/TC 197 Plenary Meeting that was held in the Netherlands on Dec.8-9, 2016, on a scale of 1 to 5 (5 being the most satisfied and 1 being the least satisfied) or Abstain, if there were no participants from the country member. Please feel free to submit comments for improving future plenary meetings." China (SAC) 2 x Sweden (SIS) 7 x Canada (SCC) France (AFNOR) Japan (JISC) Korea, Republic of (KATS) **Netherlands (NEN) United Kingdom (BSI)** United States (ANSI) 0 x 3 0 x 2 0 x 1 10 x Argentina (IRAM) **Abstain** Czech Republic (UNMZ) Denmark (DS) Egypt (EOS) India (BIS) Italy (UNI) New Zealand (NZSO) Norway (SN)

Comments from Voters				
Member:	Comment:		Date:	
Japan (JISC)		Comment	2017-01-24 06:40:37	

Russian Federation (GOST R)

Spain (UNE)

It defines the evaluation standard (average) as "3".##The ISO-JRC Strategic Planning Meeting was a very good event but Japan considers this time is an standard for evaluation because there is no existing standard due to the first event with#TC197 Plenary Meeting.

It defines the evaluation standard (average) as "3".# Japan highly evaluates that WG conveners showed their consciousness that are going to cooperate among#related WGs through some joint presentation of progress by WG conveners.# On the other hand, it is slightly negatively evaluated that many materials for TC197 Plenary Meeting were distributed just before the meeting.# Therefore, Japan would estimate as "4" not "5" this time.

Japan (JISC)	Comment File	2017-01-24 06:40:37			
CommentFiles/Evaluation	on 2016 ISO-JRC Strategic Plan Meeting & Plenary_JISC.docx				
United Kingdom (BSI)	Comment	2017-01-24 09:21:11			
I would like to see a stra	I would like to see a strategic planning meeting included in the future, at least at the next plenary meeting.				
The plenary could be improved by the minutes being made available before the meeting.					
United States (ANSI)	Comment	2017-02-02 20:04:26			

The strategic planning meeting was a good exchange and update on activities around the globe.

The plenary meeting was fine with regard to reporting the development status of the working groups and conducting the necessary ISO/TC 197 business meeting. The lack of financial support for the secretary is still quite troubling as it will not be resolved until 2018. As a result the secretary is still performing below expectations. With the exception of minutes from the last plenary, the lack of unanimous consent for the resolution to thank Koseki-san was awkward and unfortunate.

	Comments from Co	mmenters			
Member:	Comment:		Date:		
Australia (SA)	Com	ment	2017-01-25 00:59:48		
Abstain					
Sri Lanka (SLSI)	Com	ment	2016-12-29 10:41:51		
Abstain for both questions					

Template for comments and secretariat observations

Date: 2017.1.24 Document: **ISO/TC197 Ballot** Project: Comment from JP

MB/ NC ¹	Line number (e.g. 17)	Clause/ Subclause (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment ²	Comments	Proposed change	Observations of the secretariat
					Dear TC197 Secretary,		
					Thank you very much for your organizing very fruitful meeting of TC197 for the TC197 members.		
					We would like to make a comment slightly with the evaluation for the plenary meeting as follows;		
JP01				ge	It seems that the chairman's speech is too long.		
					A concise speech is better for us because we can understand a point of the speech better and it must bring the valuable time for us to speak and discuss something.		
JP02				te	Although we fully understand that the meeting time was too tight, it is regrettable that Mr. Koseki's presentation for IEC/TC105 liaison report was skipped.		
					He wanted to caution about that ISO/TC197 should consider to develop the standard of performance test methods of water electrolyzers as soon as possible because TC105 has started to develop the performance test methods of water electrolysis as a reverse reaction of fuel cells.		
					A secretary Mr. Jim has his presentation made with PowerPoint.		

¹ MB = Member body / NC = National Committee (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by **)

² **Type of comment: ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial