December 8, 2017

Dear Mr. Proulx,

UL appreciates the opportunity to provide comments to Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED) on the proposed changes to the conformity assessment process related to wireless equipment subject to certification for Category I equipment (Gazette Notice SMSE-011-17). We have reviewed prior comments and would like to provide our questions and comments for consideration as well.

UL is a premier global independent safety science company that has championed progress for more than 120 years. Its nearly 14,000 professionals are guided by the UL mission to promote safe working and living environments for all people. UL uses research and standards to continually advance and meet ever-evolving safety needs. We partner with businesses, manufacturers, trade associations and international regulatory authorities to bring solutions to a more complex global supply chain. In our mission to deliver safer living and working environments, UL has been active as a Foreign Certification Body (FCB) FCB since the inception of the program with three international locations participating in the FCC Telecommunication Certification Body program and two international locations (Japan and the United Kingdom) participating in the ISED's FCB program with Canada.

UL applauds ISED's recognition of the important role independent third parties can play in the process of ensuring that covered telecommunications equipment fully comply with ISED's applicable ISED technical standards and labelling requirements. UL believes that through partnership with independent test labs, ISED is better able to benefit Canadian consumers, business and public institutions wireless devices deployed in the Canadian marketplace have been certified or comply with Canadian technical standards, and that the equipment sold in the Canadian marketplace continues to meet those standards during the entire product life-cycle. UL understands the most recent proposed changes to the conformity assessment process for wireless equipment seeks to enhance this program and supports the effort. However, as an experienced FCB and TCB, we would like to put forward a few items for clarification as well as note some potential challenges we see in the proposal that could limit its success.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide our feedback and welcome any additional questions stemming for our submission. Please do not hesitate to contact Mark Briggs at +1-360-817-5531or via email at Mark.Briggs@ul.com should you have any questions.

Regards,

Mark Briggs
Director, Wireless Certification Services
UL Verification Services

UL LLC
1850 M St. N.W., Suite 1000, Washington, DC 20036-5833 USA
T: 202.296.1435 / F: 202.872.1576 / W: UL.com

All Paragraph references are to the document titled “Consultation on New Requirements for Wireless Device Testing Laboratories SMES-011-17” dated August, 2017.

Section 7

We appreciate ISED’s effort to continue having world-class telecommunications infrastructure by maintaining a robust compliance process. We noted the changes being put forward by ISED and note a few items for clarification specific to Section 7:

a. Will the site registration still be linked to individual test sites (chambers and OATS) within a lab (current procedure) or will that disappear and lab recognition will only be based on the test laboratory and its location?
b. How will the physical location be identified in the scope of registration? For example, a laboratory may have an accreditation certificate that covers multiple locations within a small geographic area, how will the lab registration indicate which of those locations are covered?
c. Will ISED make changes to the SpectraWeb system to ensure multiple labs can be selected for a specific application (example when some measurements are made at one location and others at another). The current process separates SAR lab and EMC lab but does not allow for multiple different EMC labs to be selected.

Section 8 and Annex B section 7:

Related to ISED’s effort to ensure testing laboratories are specialized in certain areas of testing, we would like clarification regarding a few points of the proposal for a minimum scope of accreditation based on specific Radio Standards Specifications (RSS) and Broadcasting Equipment Technical Standards (BETS):

a. Related to Paragraph 24/25: Is it necessary to split out accreditation based on individual RSS EMC standards? Would it be possible to base accreditation on the test procedural standards and thus allow flexibility when RSS standards are updated or released to allow a lab to have continuous recognition provided that the measurement standards are covered under their scope. For example:
    1. ANSI C63.10 to cover most of the RSS 2xx standards
        i. With EN 301 893 or FCC KDB 905462 D02 to cover RSS 247 DFS devices
        ii. With ANSI C63.17 for UPCS devices under RSS 213
    2. ICES 001 (to cover RSS 216)
    3. ANSI C63.26 to cover RSS 1xx standards
b. Related to Section 8 Paragraph 26: For RF exposure it seems reasonable to split the scope into three sections – one to cover SAR measurement, one to cover MPE measurement and one to cover NS. Reference measurement standards to be on the scope of accreditation for SAR: RSS 102, IEEE 1528, IEC 62209-2, IEC 62209-1. Reference standards for MPE type measurements, IEEE C95.3 and for NS measurements IEEE C95.3 and SPR-002.
c. Section 8 Paragraph 26: For devices that are exempt from testing under RSS 102 will it be necessary for the lab submitting the Annex C form to be accredited for RSS 102?

Section 9 – transition period:

UL supports ISED’s change to request that all labs in non-MRA countries seek out and achieve accreditation of testing laboratories to ISO 17025 by accepted accreditation bodies (ABs). However, notes that it is important that ISED set out clear time lines and provide ample transition time for labs to become accredited by those accepted ABs. Based on our experience with similar transitions with

the US Federal Communications Commission, we would suggest extending the implementation period in order to limit market destabilization and ensure that the flow of goods is not interrupted. At the moment the ISED rules (RSS GEN) recognize organizations that have been accredited by an AB that is a member of the International Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation (ILAC) and rather than recognition of MRAs. Absent ISED continuing to recognize ILAC member ABs, UL would recommend that the transition period should be extended and comprised of two stages – one period (6-12 months) to allow for AB recognition followed by a second period (12 months) to allow labs the opportunity to become re-accredited by a recognized AB. Doing so will help ensure that labs currently recognized by ISED via ILAC accreditation where that ILAC AB does not become recognized under ISED's new scheme, have the opportunity to maintain their status as accredited for ISED testing through a recognized AB. In addition, UL supports ISED's proposal for accreditation renewal every two years in order to ensure that accrediting bodies are able to meet the increased demand.

Annex B, Section 9:

UL would like to request further clarification concerning subcontract of testing. Specifically, Clause 9 indicates that a device must be tested at an ISED-recognized test laboratory and that it is not acceptable for an ISED-recognized test lab to incorporate test data or a report from a non-recognized test lab. Can an ISED-recognized test lab contract out part of the testing to another ISED-recognized test lab?