

Subject 1698

February 06, 2017

SUMMARY OF TOPICS

The following topics were discussed at the meeting of the Standards Technical Panel for Personal Emergency Response Equipment, STP 1698:

1. Updates from Established Task Groups

2. Discuss Additional Items of Concern

A meeting of the Standards Technical Panel of UL for Personal Emergency Response Equipment, STP 1698 was held on February 01, 2017 via teleconference. The purpose of the meeting was for the STP to review the Preliminary Review comments and discuss the next steps.

The purpose of the STP meeting report is to briefly summarize discussions held during the meeting, and to document any resulting outcomes, including planned future action.

CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS, INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS, GUESTS, AND OBSERVERS

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 AM EST. The meeting was held online, using GoTo Meeting technology. The STP Chair welcomed attendees and verified who was on the call. A list of meeting attendees is at the end of this report. The STP Project Manager then verified the meeting attendees again.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS FROM THE STP PROJECT MANAGER

The STP Chair summarized the protocol for the meeting, and the rules and regulations governing Standards Technical Panels, including UL's patent policy and Anti-trust rules.

The current balance of the STP was discussed at the meeting and is shown in the following table:

Interest Category	Number of Members	Interest Category	Number of Members
Producers	5 (42%)	Government	0
Testing & Standards Organizations	1 (8%)	Consumer	0
Supply Chain	1 (8%)	General Interest	3 (25%)
AHJs	0	Commercial/Industrial User	2 (17%)

UL's goal is to have no interest category comprise more than one-third of the STP membership.

FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE

Future meetings will be held on an as-needed basis.

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSALS AND AGENDA TOPICS

**UL COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL –
NOT AUTHORIZED FOR FURTHER REPRODUCTION OR
DISTRIBUTION WITHOUT PERMISSION FROM UL**



Documents

Document Sharing Hub

1. Discuss Preliminary Review Comments

DISCUSSION

Discussion item submitted by: Diane Haithcock, Underwriters Laboratories Inc.

All the preliminary review comments were discussed and addressed by the STP.

For comment #1 from J. Smith regarding non-corrosive metal requirements for hinges, it was agreed that hinges are covered by Clause 15.5 and hinge corrosion is covered by Clause 9.4.

For comment #9 from M. Hertel regarding revision of the section on receiving equipment, it was agreed that a Task Group be formed to look at this section and address requirements relating to cloud-based services, API, and their security measures.

Task Group 1: Paul Baril (or an SME from Phillips), Bob Benetti, Ron Carr, Joshua Greko, Morgan Hertel, Albert Janjigian, Todd Lindstrom, Eric Murrell, Larry Shudak, and Pete Tallman (Larry to contact Pete).

For comment #7 of J. Greko regarding the number of attempts the mPERS signal initiating unit needs to make, it was agreed that a Task Group be formed to develop requirements to address the minimum and maximum number of attempts to be made, the time between each attempt, and if the unit refreshes following depletion of battery.

Task Group 2: Paul Baril, Bob Benetti, Joshua Greko, Morgan Hertel, and Larry Shudak.

For comment #5 from R. Carr regarding checking the signal initiating unit/receiving equipment communication every 24 hours, it was agreed to change the 24 hour period to 7 days. Larry agreed to develop the wording to clarify that this is an end-to-end test and specify requirements for a factory-default minimum time period.

For comments #3 and #6 from R. Carr, it was agreed that these were typos that will be fixed in the draft standard.

For comment #4 from R. Carr regarding the submersion test of the signaling unit, it was noted that comment #2 from D. Williams was a suggested response to comment #4. The STP agreed with the proposed revision from comment #2, which is to submerge the unit at 1 meter for 30 minutes in accordance with the IPX7 rating.

2. Discuss Additional Items of Concern

DISCUSSION

Discussion item submitted by: Larry Shudak, UL LLC

Larry pointed out two items that still need to be addressed in the standard.

The first item concerns the X-Y location accuracy for GPS, which is currently "TBD" in Clause 3.1.7. It was remarked that location accuracy/resolution data need to be part of the signal payload in order to provide emergency services with adequate information to make an informed decision on how to react. It was agreed that a Task Group be formed to address requirements for GPS X-Y location accuracy, which may affect clauses 30.1.5 – 30.1.8. There was general agreement that the minimum requirement should align with the FCC minimum requirement.