

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
001				<b>No Comments</b>		
BE 003				No reply from experts		
CH 005				SNV Switzerland		
FR 006	Introduction	Whole document	ge	<p>French version and english versions:</p> <p>dès l'introduction des pages 5 à 10, il est dommage de ne pas avoir introduit la notion de norme environnement ISO 14000.</p> <p>En effet, dans le tableau processus support dérivés dans les processus principaux listés tels que : production et vente de gros et de détail avec processus de nettoyage industriel et entretien des terrains il y a matière à traiter de l'environnement - même si dans les pages suivantes par exemple 88 le développement durable est abordé.</p> <p>It is regrettable not to introduce ISO 14000 in the beginning of the document.</p> <p>The environmental part can be listed with the other primary processes in point 2 : "the derived support processes are" despite the fact that sustainable development is mentioned in ANNEX B3</p>	Introduce ISO 14000 in the standard	
FR 007		Last §	ge	"(commodified) " is it an English word ? If one means "commodities" it the too strong. One cannot consider Standard products as commodities which can be bought from the shelves		
IT				We ABSTAIN due to lack of a national position on this subject		

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
008						
PT 010				No comments		
SE 016			ge	The FM products defined in Appendix A (15521-4) are not in compliance with those examples specified in 15521-1.	15521-1 may be reviewed after approving the standard proposals.	
SK 017			ge	No available expertise		
SE 019	Appendix B		te	This text is not satisfactory based on recent master thesis from the Norwegian university NTNU and further articles published afterwards by Håkon Gissinger sponsored by STATENS BYGNINGSTEKNISKE ETAT www. be.no .	We recommend deleting the point B.7	
DK 020	Appendix B to E		GE	The quality of the appendixes B to E is not as expected for an European standard in terms of structure, graphics and content.	We recommend deleting these appendixes and publishing them in a later and improved version of this standard.	
SE 021	Appendix B to E		ge	The quality of the appendixes B to E is not as expected for an European standard in terms of structure, graphics and content.	We recommend deleting these appendixes and publishing them in a later and improved version of this standard.	
CH 022	Definitions			Difference between product and process to clarify		

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
DE 023	Diagrams	The whole document	ed	Please name the diagrams as figures or tables.		
DE 024	Diagrams	The whole document	Ed	The numbering and the references are mostly wrong. Please check all references and numbers.		
AT 025	Facility Management related cost and income definitions	Page 29	ge	Internal cost allocation What are Facility Costs and what is part of the Facility Costs? E.g. internal service charge for ICT, the FMers PC must not be counted twice (as Facility Product and part of the service operational management) E.g. rooms/space for cleaners and similar	Clear list how to allocate costs	
DE 026	General		ed	Part 4 and Part 5 of the Standard series should be harmonized (figures, process definition, principles)		
CH 027	General comment			Voluminous, not easy to understand Quality cycle PDCA very positive	No change required	
CH 028	Introduction			The standard needs some more explanations and a statement about the requirements for the product structure and its benefits	Proposal: The taxonomy is not just an additional new structure, it describes the linkage between existing and new structures (system); Requirements: comprehensive, easy to use, well defined, compatible , hierarchical, scalable, clear separation of different structures, client and organisation oriented, internationally usable, identical for processes/products/costs/SLA etc., Advantages: harmonising of various building cost structures around Europe on organisational level, client view	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
DE 029	Introduction	Bullet point 3, after the table	ed	The sentence is incomplete.	The high number of invoices and the  intransparency of the cost and the performance of the procured services...???	
DE 030	Introduction	Fundamenta ls of FM	ed	The sentence "Facility Management cannot be outsourced, only facility services" is confusing and should be discussed again and maybe deleted.		
FR 031	<b>Normative references</b>		te		Add ISO 14000 to the normative references	
AT 032	Title		ge	We find the term "Taxonomy" not adequate with the intended content of the standard: Some reasons: - "Taxonomy is defined as " the practice and science of classification" <sup>[1]</sup> - - In an even wider sense, the term taxonomy could also be applied to relationship schemes <sup>1</sup> - This standard is a „Classification of Facility Products“, it is not a structure model for realizing/delivering of Facility Products” - there is neither a correspondence to organizational structures nor to processual structures - there is no correspondence with other classification items like classification of Non-Products (space, service levels, quality, performance, prerequisites or needs of organisations, Key figures, etc.) 1. <a href="http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Taxonomy#cite_note-0">http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Taxonomy#cite_note-0</a>	Facility Management – Part 4: Classification of Facility Products	
DE 033	Title		ed	Please correct the title, that it fits with the other parts of the series EN 15221 with main title "Facility Management".	prEN 15221-4 "Facility Management – Part 4 –	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
					Taxonomie – Classification and Structures	
LT 034	Title page	Title	ed	Taxonomy of Facility Management - Classification and Structures	Taxonomy of Facility Management – <b>Part 4:</b> Classification and Structures	
FR 035	<b>Whole document</b>	Whole document	ge	<p>Since the Munchen TC meeting in October 2006, four WGs with many experts have been working hard on four F.M. projects of standards and started a new one N° 7 “Benchmarking”. Now that the approval process for four projects is just ahead, it seems important, starting from the objectives set in München, to review the activities performed and the results obtained as well as to define a realistic approach for the next steps.</p> <p>Only a few of the comments below directly apply to the project of standard 6. The approach for this project is simpler and is discussed separately.</p> <p>Recognition is given to the experts who have worked hard and did their best. The below comments should only be considered as a tentative to explain and dramatically improve the present situation in order to be able to publish 3, 4, 5 and 7 high quality standards useful for FM actors: the clients and providers of FM services.</p> <p>The final global objective of the standards 3,4, 5 and 6 was to prepare the foundations of the standard “Benchmarking”. For a large part this objective has been lost during the 3, 4 and 5 standards elaboration process. This led the WG to work hard, but partly outside the defined scope.</p> <p>Considerations to be strictly coherent with on ISO 9001 have led to forget the above objective and partly blurred the whole picture.</p> <p>Preparing four standards at the same time was too ambitious, countries like France could not find enough experts to be active in four groups at the same time. The</p>		

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				<p>consequences have been late discoveries of main gaps between the French Mirror Committee expectations and the content of proposed documents, even after the French commission has alerted the TC and obtained the insurance that changes will be introduced.</p> <p>One knew that preparing the four projects at the same time would require a strong month to month co-ordination between the WGs to get coherence and avoid duplicating work. The WG4 was supposed to play an important role in this respect, especially at the beginning of the studies. Late TC tentative to find remedies through a Task Force between the 4WGs was too late and cannot be considered as successful.</p> <p>Today, there is a true danger to formally approve the projects of standards 3, 4 and 6, even enhanced ones, because:.</p> <p>1- The present content of the three projects has to be seriously improved, this should not be done in urgency and, until one sees the final documents, approval should not be requested and given, since we saw the problems which came by approving the launching of the public enquiry on non-finalised documents.</p> <p>2- There is a high probability that the work which will be now performed to elaborate the "benchmarking standard N° 7 will lead to discover good reasons to introduce additions or changes within the approved standards 3, 4, and 5, e.g. incoherence between the 3, 4, and 5 standards between themselves or between N°7, additions needed, moves from one of theses standards into N° 7, unnecessary paragraphs,...</p> <p>3- Introduction of changes coming from the N°7 elaboration of already approved standards 3, 4 and 5 will be impossible during the <u>five years</u> following their approval.</p>		

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				<b>MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS</b>  Postpone any quick formal and final approval of the standards 3, 4 and 5 until the project N° 7 is at least ready for public enquiry.  Improve the 3, 4 and 5 projects of standards to take into consideration the remarks coming from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the public enquiries which will be adopted by the WG and TC</li> <li>- the work on N° 7 elaboration.</li> </ul> Concentrate FM experts resources and capabilities to insure that the results of WG 7 work will come as soon as possible and be of high quality.		
FR 036	<b>Whole document</b>		ed	The “z” (american), instead of the “s” (English) should not be used: e.g.  standardize to standardised (page 32 annex A)	Substitution of the letter “z” (american), by “s” (English).	
FR 037	<b>Whole document</b> as well as when used within other projects of standards	Whole document	ed	As decided by the TC, the term “FM product” found within the project of standard 3 should have been replaced by “FM services” unless the service concerned is defined within the project of the standard 4 as a “FM classified service” today defined as a “FM product” (e.g. page 25, 5.4.2, Organising requirements ..) only	The term “FM product” found within the project of standard 3 should be replaced by “FM services” unless the service concerned is defined within the project of the norm 4 as a “FM classified service” today defined as a “FM product” . In final to be replaced by “FM standard or standardised service”	
FR 038	<b>Whole document</b> as well as within the others projects of standards using the term “product”	Whole document	te	The term “product” used within project of standard 4 and consequently within the other projects to designate a “classified FM service” is not used in France FM business activities and leads to unnecessary complexity and misunderstanding for no deep reasons (ISO 9001 accept the term “service” to designate a product within specialised areas)	The term “product” used within all the projects of standard to designate a “classified FM service” should be replaced by “classified FM service”, in fact by “standard or standardised FM services”, assuming next remark and change is accepted	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
FR 039	<b>Whole document</b> as well as within the others projects of standards using the term "classified"	Whole document	te	<p>The term "classified" used within project of standard 4 and consequently within 3, 4, and 5 when needed to designate FM services" considered as "standard" or "standardised" FM services, is not the adequate term.</p> <p>Why ?</p> <p>First reason: services, even specific ones will anyway be classified according to the categories defined in standard 4. The strict minimum classification being is a service a standard one ("classified" in the project of standard 4) or is it specific. Consequently the term "classified" will apply to all services. Consequently, the term "classified" does is not defined correctly a standard or standardised service ("classified" in the project of standard 4).</p> <p>Second reason: classified has a second English meaning. Info from Webster dictionary "Classified" :</p> <p>1- a: consisting of classes</p> <p>1- b: divided into classes or or placed in class</p> <p>2- : forbidden to be disclosed outside a specified ring of secrecy for reason for national security; <i>specif</i>: having a particular specific classification"</p> <p>The average FM business persons reading the word "classified" will think of the second meaning and not of the first one. This lead to unnecessary confusion.</p> <p>Consequently the term "standard" or "standardised" facility</p>	Within all the projects of standards, the terms "FM classified services" should be replaced by "standard or standardised FM services".	



1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				service should be used		
FR 040	<b>Whole document</b> of standards	Whole document	ge	The whole document is very rich and show the work of the WG4, but it's richness deserves it. One dimension as been expanded: the "costs structure. These axis of structure may be quickly mentioned in the introduction but then be skipped.		
AT 041	1	Page 14	ge	A classification of facility products is not able to set up c) principles for cost allocation;  d) a framework for benchmarking.	Omit c) and d) it could be replaced the facility product classification gives an orientation for cost allocation classifications for building owners, providers, clients and customers respectively,	
CH 042	A1 and A2			Portfolio optimisation – property management includes administration, CAFM and optimisation	Discuss terminology, give graphical representation (PM, IM, CREM, etc. <-> property ownership)	
CH 043	A1 and A2			FM service desk part of central functions?		
CH 044	A1 and A2			Moves should be part of logistics		
CH 045	A1 and A2			Tenant fitout vs. Enhancement of initial performance, in which product is the tenant fitout when it is included in the rent or when it is rented separately?	Discuss a characteristic to separate those two	
CH 046	A1 and A2			Repro and archives do not fit together	Separate Archives	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
CH 047	A1 and A2			Product Knowledge management is missing	Introduce e.g. under Identity	
CH 048	A1 and A2			Product Risk policy should be better placed under Risk management	Move as stated	
CH 049	A1 and A2			Term Provider Management is missing (Process in Paper 5)	Add new horizontal function Provider Management	
CH 050	A1 and A2			Term Asset Management is missing	Add new horizontal function Asset Management	
CH 051	A1 and A2			Terms Communication and PR are missing	Discuss structure of Marketing	
CH 052	A1 and A2			Product Business Software	Use Application Providing for Business Software and give additional examples	
CH 053	A1 and A2			Organisation specific	Give additional examples for better understanding	
CH 054	A1 and A2			Numbering	Give Product FM the Number 1	
NO 055	Chapter 3	Terms and definitions		Maintenance and Operation concepts should be defined.	Include definition of “Maintenance” and of “Operation”	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
SE 056	Chapter 3  Terms and definitions	From Page 16		Maintenance and Operation concepts should be defined. We strongly recommend using as a reference the concepts included in LCC Bjørberg (2004). Check definitions paragraph in the attached document Nordic LCC project. NOTE: if the term “maintenance project” is used as synonym to “maintenance”, it will be easier to understand the overall idea.		
DE 057	Clause 3		ed	This clause specifies concepts and abbreviations. Abbreviations are not concepts. The paragraph heading must be changed according to the contents of the paragraph, 3 Terms and definitions and abbreviated terms.  Please check and amend.	<b>3 Terms and definitions and abbreviated terms</b> 3.1 Terms and definitions For the purposes of this <b>document</b> , the following terms and definitions apply. 3.1.1 General taxonomy of Facility management related terms and definitions ... 3.2 Abbreviations	
CH 058	3.3			Differentiate between costs (operational accounting) and expenses (financial accounting IAS)		
DE 059	3.3		ed	This clause may contain only concepts and their definitions. Introductory comments shall be avoided or declared as comments, if I's comments are considered necessarily. Please check and amend.	3.3 Financial and administrative terms and definitions NOTE When registering, recording or...	
CH	3.3.1			IAS: cost of capital instead of capital cost	Compare definition also with ISO 15686-5 and DIN	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
060					18960 (2008)	
CH 061	3.3.3			depreciation	Add remark that this is not meant in the fiscal sense and that it could be used to save for future investments and compare with British standards of BCIS or BMI	
CH 062	3.3.4			end of life cost, why is this term defined and all the other parts of an LCA are not defined?	Use definition in ISO 15686-5 : net cost or fee for disposing of an asset at the end of its service life or interest period, including costs resulting from decommissioning, deconstruction and demolition of a building; recycling, making environmentally safe and recovery and disposal of components and materials and transport and regulatory costs	
CH 063	3.3.8			live cycle cost	Use definition in ISO 15686-5	
CH 064	3.3.9			cost of materials (materials expenses), Sachaufwand	Check terminology with IAS	
AT 065	3.4	Page 19	ed	Chapter numbering 3.4.2.1, 3.4.1.2 is not consistent	Change to 3.4.1 to 3.4.11	
DE 066	3.4		ed	See comments to 3.3	<b>3.4 Main facility products</b> NOTE The facility products are hierarchially structured.	
DE 067	3.4		ed	The numbering in the chapter 3.4 is wrong.	3.4.2.1 has to be changed into 3.4.1 3.4.1.2 has to be changed into 3.4.2 ...	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
CH 068	3.4.1.8			Translation Aussenanlagen is misleading	Better use e.g. Aussenflächen or Aussenbereich	
AT 069	3.4.1.10	Page 19	ge	Space The Term space in EN 15221-4 is very different to the term space in EN 15221-6 Chapt. 3.8 page 13	clarify	
CH 070	4	Fig. 4.1		Give the different part of the graphic model characteristic names	E.g. FM-model, FM process matrix, FM product map, FM income structure	
CH 071	4	Fig. 4.1		The cost codes give the impression of an exhaustive list; depreciation is missing and taxes is not common	Add comments that these cost codes are only exemplary for the basic structure of expenses in an income statement in a financial accounting system in accordance with e.g. IAS, ad depreciation if necessary	
CH 072	4	Fig. 4.1		Who is paying for the products?	Add the payee (additional structure?)	
CH 073	4	Fig. 4.3		Asset Management	Add AM as part of the central functions	
CH 074	4	Fig. 4.3		Cost structure	Make an explicit remark in the text that the product structure is also a cost structure	
CH 075	4	Fig. 4.5		Intangibles + taxes – is this correct compared to the definition of facilities?		
CH 076	4	Fig. 4.5		Cost codes	Give IFRS as an example	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
FR 077	<b>Introduction</b> Page 4	First sentence	te	This introduction does not fit with it's true intent	This introduction goal is to position the standards 3, 4, 5 and 6 in continuity with the standards 1 and 2.	
FR 078	<b>Introduction</b> Page 4	Fundamentals of FM	te	The first 3 sentences and the last one are coming from standard 1 the sentences 4 and 5 appears as a marketing text for FM. No reason to have theses sentences	All these sentences and the title should be suppressed.	
FR 079	<b>Introduction</b> Page 4	Basic principles which are used in the drafts	te	The first 2 bullets are not « principles » but « knowledge»  Number 3 and first part of 4 are an obvious when one elaborate standards and the last part of 4 "example" is not true at least for standard N°3 N° 3 and 4 should be suppressed	Knowledge used within the draft: - ISO 9000-90004 and the guidance papers - the cycle of PDCA which stands for Plan, Do, Check and Act	
FR 080	<b>Introduction</b> for all the 4 projects of standards	Whole document	te	This introduction is part of the 4 projects of standards, could be useful for the future "benchmarking" standard and is said to be suppressed within the final standards. This leads to two questions: 1- What will be the final introduction to be approved ? 2- The pedagogical example contains within the present introduction may be useful for actors not aware of FM, to introduce these FM standards and future ones to them. Should not this example be mentioned within the final introduction and enclosed within an annex in the 4 standards Assuming this introduction will remain one way or an other, comments are proposed below	Within the norms 3, 4, 5 6 and future ones (Benchmarking) keep this introduction within an annex. In the new introduction set up a sentence leading the reader to read this annex	
AT 081	4.1	page 21	ge	The proposed cost allocations (capital, personnel, material, taxes) - are internal cost representations for the supplier of the whole product (without having sub-suppliers). As a	e) <del>Uniform</del> <b>classified</b> specification for the	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				consequence the proposed cost allocations are different and often not applicable for the “purchaser and the seller” of the facility product (and its components).	provisions of services;  <del>f) Cost allocation and cost comparisons;</del>  <del>g) Measuring quality and performance in a consistent way;</del>  <del>h) Benchmarking across organisations and national borders.</del>	
DK 082	Clause 4.1		ED, GE	The product name "space" should be renamed, so it is not similar to a word in the top level space and infrastructure	The product name "space" should be renamed	
DK 083	Clause 4.1,	Page 23	TE	The broad way of using "Space" as a FM product creates problem. It is not in line with the thinking among practitioners to include space acquisition as well as development, administration, with the operation, maintenance and utilities in the same item. The idea to include space acquisition in the taxonomy is fine and can be a good way forward in developing the scope of FM and supporting the use of life cycle thinking, but to include it in the same main product as operation and maintenance is problematic.	It is strongly recommended to separate the product of space in one or more products for space acquisition or provision and one or more products for property administration, portfolio optimisation, maintenance and operation, and utilities.  The “Space” box in page 25 (Diagram 4.3) needs to be divided in two, as a consequence of the previous comment.	
DK	Diagram 4.1	Page 22	GE	We recommend to precise the use of concepts. A “facility	The term “Facility service process” should be used	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
084				process” is not defined previously.	instead.	
SE 085	Diagram 4.1	Page 22	ge	We recommend to precise the use of concepts. A “facility process” is not defined previously.	The term “Facility service process” should be used instead.	
DE 086	4.1 and 4.2	Figures 4.1. 4.2 and 4.3	ed	<p>Figures shall be designated „Figure“ and numbered with Arabic numerals, beginning with 1. This numbering shall be independent of the numbering of the clauses and of any tables.</p> <p>Every figure included in the document shall be referred to in the text.</p> <p>When a figure is continued over several pages, it may be useful to repeat the figure designation, followed by the title and by “(continued)”.</p> <p>Please check and amend.</p> <p>The text crossed out shall not be part of the figure title; it shall be taken in the usual text in an accompanying site.</p>	<p><b>Figure 1</b> — Graphic model of relationship of Facility products to the different structures used in this standard</p> <p><b>Figure 2</b> — Facility product map (facilities/activities matrix with facility product structure) with activities list opened for the operational level <del>(for the other levels see A.4)</del></p> <p><b>FIGURE 3</b> — Product, cost and cost allocation structure in FM</p>	
SE 087	Clause 4.1, Page 23		TE	The broad way of using "Space" as a FM product creates problem. It is not in line with the thinking among practitioners to include space acquisition as well as development, administration, with the operation, maintenance and utilities in the same item. The idea to include space acquisition in the taxonomy is fine and can be a good way forward in developing the scope of FM and supporting the use of life cycle thinking, but to include it in the same main product as operation and maintenance is problematic.	<p>It is strongly recommended to separate the product of space in one or more products for space acquisition or provision and one or more products for property administration, portfolio optimisation, maintenance and operation, and utilities.</p> <p>The “Space” box in page 25 (Diagram 4.3) needs to be divided in two, as a consequence of the previous comment.</p>	
CH	4.2			Capital cost including depreciation?	Check with definition	



1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
088						
CH 089	4.2			Are the terms Real estate and property synonymous?	Check and add definition if necessary	
CH 090	4.2			Meaning of terms replacement and refurbishment	Add definitions	
DK 091	Clause 4.2	Page 25		Diagram 4.3 should be fully in accordance with diagram A1.3 in Annex A	Revised diagram 4.3	
AT 092	Diagram 4.2 Diagram A.1.2	page 23 page 34	ge	<p>- in the 1st and 2nd level (FM Total costs (strategical level) and Space &amp; Infrastructure and People &amp; Organisation costs (tactical level)) a general cost classification is acceptable.</p> <p>From the 3rd level on (products xx00 eg. 1100,1200, 1300) the proposed classification are not in line with many cost structures in practice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The definitions from 3rd level down are partly incomplete and give much space for interpretation (see also other comments).</li> </ul>	<p>No standardization of cost allocations in the levels xx00, xxx0 and xxxx,</p> <p>Omit the bottom rectangle (capital/personnel/material/taxes) in Diagram 4.2</p>	
DE 093	4.3	Diagram 4.4	ed	See comments to 4.1	<p><b>Figure 4 —</b></p> <p><b>Figure 5 —</b></p> <p><b>Figure 6 —</b></p>	
DE 094	Clause 4 and 4.1		ed	<p>“Hanging paragraph” shall be avoided since reference to them is ambiguous. The first paragraph shall be numbered as a subclause.</p> <p>Please check and amend.</p>	<p><b>4 Facility products</b></p> <p>4.1 General</p> <p>4.2 Structure of the facility products</p>	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
<b>MB<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)</b>	<b>Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</b>	<b>Type of comm ent<sup>2</sup></b>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	<b>Secretariat observations</b> on each comment submitted
DE 095	Clause 5	Diagrams 5.1, 5.2	ed	See comments to 4.1	<b>Figure 7 —</b> <b>Figure 8 —</b>	
FR 096	<b>Introduction</b> Page 5	Second §	ge	These drafts have also strong linkages with the FM model of EN 15221-1. Add EN 15221-2	These drafts have also strong linkages with the FM model of EN 15221-1 and EN 15221-2.	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
FR 097	<b>Introduction</b> Page 5	Third §	ed	which can be used in “REAL ESTATE” or for standard Benchmark purposes. Why capital letters for REAL ESTATE and Benchmarking What is a “standard” benchmark, qualification not needed	which can be used in “real estate” or for benchmark purposes.	
FR 098	<b>Introduction</b> Page 5	Message prEN 15221-3	ge	The demand, requirement of the needs of an organisation are transformed into the steps and measures to act on deviation.	Through the described steps, the needs and demand of an organisation are transformed into requirements and objectives to be reached, as well as, after implementation, measurements of the results and actions to limit deviations activated.	
CH 099	6	Fig. 6.2		Direct path to cost units should be omitted	Redraw figure	
AT 100	6. Facility Management related cost and income definitions	Page 29	ge	Cost specifications are missing for Total Costs, Value Added Tax - VAT – a statement, how to treat VAT should be in.	Total cost of FM or S & I or P & O are costs should be used only from the perspective of an owner-occupier (organisation) VAT is included VAT is excluded VAT is included – no deduction possible	
AT 101	6. Facility Management related cost and income definitions	Page 29	ge	How to handle incomes of FM, counted or not? Income for the FM product “catering” or “sold waste” the information should be the total cost of a product and not which part pays the company/organisation	All costs will not be reduced by possible incomes of the FM organisation. That means that e.g. catering costs are counted in total not reduced by parts paid by the members of the staff.	
AT 102	6. Facility Management related cost and income definitions	Page 29	ge	grants some costs are not only costs of a Facility Product but include social costs, examples are long time staff members not able to fulfill their real duty in that case the costs should be separated into facility costs and social costs	In case of social indicated grants costs should be separated into facility costs and social costs.	
FR	<b>Introduction</b>	Drawing	ge	KPIs and SLAs appearing within the draft do not fit any	NO PROPOSAL	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
103	Page 6			more with the standard 3		
DE 104	6.1	Diagram 6.1	ed	See comments to 4.1	<b>Figure 9 —</b>	
DE 105	6.2	Diagram 6.2	ed	See comments to 4.1	<b>Figure 10 —</b>	
CH 106	6.3			National accounting standards could be used as well	Write: national and international ...	
FR 107	<b>Introduction</b> Page 10	Guidance how to achieve, .....	ge	"Guidance how to achieve, improve and measure quality in FM." One should starts by measuring	"Guidance how to measure, improve and achieve quality in FM."	
FR 108	<b>Introduction</b> Page 11	Terms product and service... Third §	ge	'Service' as part of the definition 'product' is used in the general quality management context as a time-perishable, intangible experience performed for a customer acting as co-producer.  « intangible experience » cannot be understood	'Service' as part of the definition 'product' is used in the general quality management context as a time-perishable, activity performed for a customer acting as co-producer	
FR 109	<b>Introduction</b> Page 11	Terms product... Last §	ge	"According to the existing FM model in standard EN 15221-1 is decided that facility services are only used on operational level. The terms «facility services» and «classified facility products» are not used on tactical and strategic level."  Why ? e.g. a co-ordination service at a tactical level IS a	Suppress this abstract , difficult to understand and not always true §	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				facility service		
FR 110	<b>Introduction</b> Page 12	Term product... Last §		<p>"The classification of 'facility services' to 'classified facility products' is described in chapter 5.4.2. After these chapters the terms 'facility services' and 'classified facility products' are used in this standard."</p> <p>The above explanations are not clear, the introduction of two terms for the same object is very confusing. Within standard 3 the only term to be used is « Facility services », mentioning that within the ISO context it means « facility product »</p> <p>NB THIS RULE AS NOT BE APPLIED (See above)</p>	<p>"The classification of a 'facility services' into 'classified facility products' is described in chapter 5.4.2. Within standard 3 the terms 'facility services' and 'classified facility products' are accordingly"</p> <p>Classified has also to be changed to "standard" or "standardised" see above.</p>	
FR 111	<b>Page 12</b>	1 Scope 3d § Bullets c and d	te	The principles for costs allocation and a framework for benchmarking are outside the "Taxonomy" Standard and apart for a few introductory sentences should not be developed.	Suppress bullets c)and d)	
FR 112	<b>Page 16</b>	3.1. ....definitions	ge	Within the project of standards 3, 4, 6 one finds definitions. Some of them are coming from the standards 1 and 2, but others e.g "facility product" are found in two projects, the TC should say which project should be the "master" for common definitions and then within the standard repeating "salve" definitions again one should find reference to the "master" standard.	GW A should be the co-ordinator on this subject	
FR 113	<b>Page 16</b>	3.1.3 facility product	ge	TO BE REWRITTEN SEE ABOVE		
FR 114	<b>Page 23</b>	4.2	te	French version : Page 23 chap 4.2 "coutumes nationales" ..... "coutumes européennes" termes impropres pas vraiment industriels, par rapport au nom coutumes, il conviendrait plutôt de parler de pratiques nationale ou et européennes...	il conviendrait plutôt de parler de pratiques nationale ou et européennes...	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
FR 115	<b>Page 25</b>	Diagram 4.3	ge	Since cost should not be studied in details within this standards the bottom part of the figure should be suppress. This will bring simplicity		
FR 116	<b>Page 27</b>	Diagram 4.5 And the whole document	ge	IMPORTANT One very important factor for the clients point of view whatever the costs structure may be, is the final price of the service which will be invoiced. Within the standard this price seems to be mostly determined by the cost approach and not the price coming from the market result of fair competition.	Introduce the concept of the price of a service coming from the market (client view) and not only from the costs (provider view)	
FR 117	<b>Page 27</b>	Page 28 5 The FM model and quality cycle	ge	This whole chapter on quality should be reduced to a sentence leading to read the standard N° 3. WG3 should check that all the ideas from this chapter 5 have been considered in Standard 3.	See remark on the left	
FR 118	<b>Page 29 to 31</b>	Whole chapter 6	ge	Most of the content of the chapter 6 can be found in cost accounting text books. One does not mention F.M.	Suppress the whole chapter	
FR 119	<b>Page 32</b>	Annex A	ge	The annex A describing the “products” = “standard FM services” is the core of the N°3 standard, why should it be only informative ?		
FR 120	<b>Page 38</b>	A2 Product number	ge	In the table propose each Product as a N° 1 000, 2 000 etc. in the presentation this number is also the identifier of the product. In fact this number is first of all a logical code to classify the product. One should be aware that there is a danger to use this logical code as an identifier because it force to reserved holes in the series of numbers to be attributed and multiply the number of values of the possible value of the logical code. An other approach much more in line with data processing approach would be to identify the	RECOMMENDATION: Before finalising, make sure that this approach {identifier = logical code} is the best one on the long term, considering the data technology existing knowledge.	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				product with a non significant number and to associate to each product a logical code enabling taxonomy. Two products could have their own different identifier and the same logical code if the logic of taxonomy leads to it		
FR 121	<b>Page 53 to 82</b>		te	<p>French version and english versions: pages 51 à 82 il subsiste un gros travail de définition pour ce qui est des descriptions produits.....</p> <p>A consequent work needs to be established in order to define the descriptions of products</p>	<p>Ne garder comme produits standards que ceux pour lesquels l'ensemble des rubriques sont remplies ou mettre la remarque « Non Applicable » à la place de « A définir »</p> <p>It is preferable to only keep the standardised products fully described.</p> <p>In the other cases the comment “Non Applicable” should be used instead of “TBD”</p>	
FR 122	<b>Page 76</b>	<b>B3</b>	ge	Sustainability is obviously an important topic and F.M. actor should have to considered it, the concepts presented within this § are interesting but do not lead to a FM service as such, it may lead to consulting services	Leave out this § and reserve it to future standard on sustainability. Sustainability may be classified among a list of concepts to be considered (one similar one “no corruption”	
FR 123	<b>Page 77</b>	B.4	ge	ISO 9000 support tools and may effectively be considered as a service but it is not only when it is planned but when it is operated	To be rephrased by WG4	
FR 124	<b>Page and following82</b>	<b>Annex C</b>	ge	<p>This whole annex duplicating a large part of N° 3 standard should be suppressed.</p> <p>WG3 should check that all the ideas from this chapter 5 have been considered in Standard 3.</p>	See remark	
FR 125	<b>Page 88</b>	D.1	ge	D1 is a very specific explanation on IT structure, is it really useful there ? Especially because this D1 is not homogeneous with the other D § of this annex which concerning costs.	Leave it out.	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
FR 126	<b>Page 88 and following</b>	D.2 and following	ge	These § concern detailed cost accounting explanations which fall outside the taxonomy field. See above remark.	Remove these D § keep them in mind if proven to be needed for the bechnmarking snadard.	
FR 127	<b>Page 89</b>		te	French version :  Page 89 le terme adéquat du tableau en bas de page "faire des bâtiments un lieu de travail adéquat", ce terme me paraît impropre. il est possible de dire adapté aux caractéristiques humaines ou bien adapté aux exigences professionnelles et en accord avec la réglementation en vigueur (je pense au code du travail).	"faire des bâtiments un lieu de travail adéquat", ce terme me paraît impropre. il est possible de dire adapté aux caractéristiques humaines ou bien adapté aux exigences professionnelles et en accord avec la réglementation en vigueur (je pense au code du travail).	
SE 128	Nr 1162	Page 43	te	Building operations definition may cause some challenges when comparing cost.	Building operation should not include services to the organisation, like rearranging furniture, etc, since this may complicate cost comparisons.	
SE 129	Diagram A.1.3.		ge	The group does not agree on the understanding of the box "Enhancement".	This discussion must be addressed during the preparation of standard 15221-7.	
AT 130	Table A.2 Detailed description of each Classified Facility Product	page 38 to 72 page 34	ge	Because of the fact that costs shall/can not be allocated to the facility product levels xx00, xxx0, xxxx, the rows	Costs included and cost excluded should be changed to services / performances included and services / performances excluded	
DE 131	B.1	Diagram B.1.1	ed	See comments to 4.1	<b>Figure B.3</b>	
DE 132	B.2	Diagrams B.2.1 and B.2.2	ed	See comments to 4.1	<b>Figure B.4</b> <b>Figure B.5</b>	



1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
<b>MB<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)</b>	<b>Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</b>	<b>Type of comm ent<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</b>	<b>Proposed change by the MB</b>	<b>Secretariat observations on each comment submitted</b>
DE 133	B.3	Diagram B.3	ed	See comments to 4.1	<b>Figure B.6</b>	
DE 134	B.6	Diagrams B.6.1 and B.6.2	ed	See comments to 4.1	<b>Figure B.7</b> <b>Figure B.8</b>	
DE 135	B.7	Diagram B.7	ed	See comments to 4.1	<b>Figure B.9</b>	
DE 136	B.8	Diagram B.8	ed	See comments to 4.1	<b>Figure B.10</b>	
DE 137	C.1	Diagrams C.0.1, C.0.2, C.0.3, C.0.4	ed	See comments to 4.1	<b>Figure C.1</b> <b>Figure C.2</b> <b>Figure C.3</b> <b>Figure C.4</b>	
DE 138	C.1 and C.1.1		ed	<p>“Hanging paragraph” shall be avoided since reference to them is ambiguous. The first paragraph shall be numbered as a subclause.</p> <p>We ask to take a suitable heading or not to number the following paragraphs.</p> <p>The heading „Introduction“ should be used only for the clause between foreword and Clause 1. At different position in the text, e. g. in annexes, we recommend to use the term “General” as heading.</p> <p>Please check and amend.</p>		

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
DE 139	C.1.2.1		ed	A subclause shall not be created unless there is at least one further subclause at the same level. Please delete headline C.1.2.1.		
DE 140	C.1.2.1	Diagrams C.1.1, C.1.2	ed	See comments to 4.1	<b>Figure C.5</b> <b>Figure C.6</b>	
DE 141	C.1.2.1	b), Tabelle C.1 or diagram C.1.3	ed	A table is not a figure and a figure is not a table. If the represented table as a figure is declared, the name "table" shall be used. In the case that the table as a table is declared, the term "figure" shall not be used.  Please clear.		
DE 142	C.1.4	Diagram C.1.4	ed	See comments to 4.1	<b>Figure C.7 ((oder C.8))</b>	
DE 143	E.1	Diagrams E.1.1, E.1.2	ed	See comments to 4.1	<b>Figure E.1</b> <b>Figure E.2</b>	
DE 144	E.2	Diagrams E.2.1 and E.2.2	ed	See comments to 4.1	<b>Figure E: 3</b> <b>Figure E.4</b>	
DE 145	E.3	Diagrams E.3.1 to E.3.3	ed	See comments to 4.1	<b>Figure E.5</b> <b>Figure E.6</b> <b>Figure E.7</b>	
DE 146	E.4	Diagram E.4	ed	See comments to 4.1	<b>Figure E.8</b>	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
147 DK	Annex A	Page 25 Diagram 4.3	ED	It seems that the boxes “cleaning” and “outdoors” have been switched.	We recommend to switch the positions of the boxes “cleaning” and “outdoors” in order to correspond with table diagram A.1.3 in annex A.	
148 DK	Annex A	Figure 1.3 Page 35	TE	<p>The division in sub products should follow the Operation/Maintenance dimension prior to the Building/Technical system dimension, to bring it in accordance with the Nordic LCC proposal from 2004 and the Nordic FM Benchmarking group from 2009 (The division of Maintenance tenants and owners responsibility will hardly be accepted from CEN)</p> <p>We do not recommend a sub categorization of Maintenance.</p>	<p>One box for Operation and one box for Maintenance on first level under Space to replace the common O &amp; M box in the draft.</p> <p>Under Operations we recommend the following sub-categories:</p> <p>Building Operations</p> <p>Technical Operation</p> <p>The two boxes called “building maintenance” and “technical maintenance” should be deleted as a consequence of our recommendation.</p>	
DE 149	Annex A	Tables	ed	Every table has to numbered.		

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
DE 150	Annex A	Diagrams A.1.1 to A.1.5	ed	See comments to 4.1	<b>Figure A.1</b> <b>Figure A.2</b> <b>Figure A.3</b> <b>Figure A.4</b> <b>Figure A.5 —</b>	
SE 151	Annex A	Figure 1.3 Page 35	te	The division in sub products should follow the Operation/Maintenance dimension prior to the Building/Technical system dimension, to bring it in accordance with the Nordic LCC proposal from Svein Bjørberg from 2004 and the Nordic FM Benchmarking group from 2009 (The division of Maintenance tenants and owners responsibility will hardly be accepted from CEN) We do not recommend a sub categorization of Maintenance.	One box for Operation and one box for Maintenance on first level under Space to replace the common O & M box in the draft. 1 box including Operations 1 box including Maintenance 1 box including Enhancement Under Operations we recommend the following sub-categories: Building Operations Technical Operation The two boxes called “building maintenance” and “technical maintenance” should be deleted as a consequence of our recommendation.	
SE 152	Annex A	Table page 43 and 44	te	The tables should be regrouped with Operation as heading for table on page 43 and Maintenance as heading for table on page 44 to be in accordance with the suggested comment on figure A 1.3	Table on page 43 includes Product 1161, 1162 and 1164 Table on page 44 includes Product 1163 and 1165 Products should be re-numbered (ex Product 1160 Operation and Product 1170 Maintenance.) re numbering may impact on table on page 45 which needs to be re numbered on the 118-serie. Tables (page 43, 44 and 45) should be updated as a consequence of our recommendation.	
SE 153	Annex A	Table A.1.3		We recommend moving the box “Enhancement of initial performance” closer to “running costs” since this is,	Move the box “enhancement of initial performance” to the right of the end of Acquisition dashed-box.	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
		Page 35		according to us, not a part of Acquisitions. It is understood as a synonym to the “development” component/product as described in LCC proposal Bjørberg (2004).		
SE 154	Annex A	Page 25 Diagram 4.3		It seems that the boxes “cleaning” and “outdoors” have been switched.	We recommend to switch the positions of the boxes “cleaning” and “outdoors” in order to correspond with table diagram A.1.3 in the annex A.	
DE 155	Annex B	Diagrams B.0.1 and B.02	ed	See comments to 4.1	<b>Figure B.1 —</b> <b>Figure B.2 —</b>	
DE 156	Annex D	Tables D.1 to D.5	ed	Please provide all tables consistently with title.Even table included in the standard shall normally be referred to in the text. Please check and and complete if required,		
CH 157	Annexe B	B.2.1. + 2.		Role model – Facility Management is organisation oriented and not building oriented like building or real estate management	Redraw graphic role model	
CH 158	Annexe C	C.1.4		Process map ideal for defining the tasks of the responsible persons	Define strategic processes as tasks of the Facility manager, define name of task manager on tactical level (e.g. facility services manager) and give examples for task/product managers on operational level (object manager, cleaning manager, etc.)	
CH 159	Annexe C	C.1.4		Process map contains important additional information to Diagram 4.1	Move to main part chapter 4 and name it ‘FM process matrix’	
CH 160	Annexes	general		Check for relevance of information		

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
AT 161	6. Facility Management related cost and income definitions Annex D	Page 29 page 88	ed	Cost - general  There should be some basic statements to costs for a given facility product – for a given activity building for the same period are different for owner, provider, client and customer  There will be costs for cleaning, HVAC, energy, etc. coming from two sources.  - it is dangerous to compare the same costs but for different spaces. (compare EN 15221-6)	An introduction should contain:  1) costs can only be considered in relation to a cost centre (as a part ) of the building owner, the provider, the client and the customer  2) the costs of a given facility product in a given process can not only be considered as the price of a purchased product – from the perspective of an owner-occupier organisation in a building	
DK 162	Annex A.2	Table in general	TE	The table does not include all the products from table A.1.3-4, for instance “Outdoors” and “Cleaning”, and there are products in the table that are not included in diagram A.1.3-3, for instance 1220: “Additional space on site”	The table should include all and only the products from diagram A.1.3 and A.1.4	
DK 163	Annex A.2	Table page 43 and 44	TE	The tables should be regrouped with Operation as heading for table on page 43 and Maintenance as heading for table on page 44 to be in accordance with the suggested comment on figure A 1.3	Table on page 43 includes Product 1161, 1162 and 1164  Table on page 44 includes Product 1163 and 1165 Products should be re-numbered (ex Product 1160 Operation and Product 1170 Maintenance.) re numbering may impact on table on page 45 which needs to be re numbered on the 118-serie.  Tables (page 43, 44 and 45) should be updated as a consequence of our recommendation.	
DE 164	Annex B, B.1		ed	“Hanging paragraph” shall be avoided since reference to them is ambiguous. The first paragraph shall be numbered as a subclause.  Please check and amend.	<b>Annex B</b> (informative)  Zusätzliche Bemerkungen zu bestimmten Facility Produkten  B.1 General	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted

					B.2 Produkt FM: Facility Management — Strategische Integration B.3 Produkt 1000: Taktische Integration (Fläche und Infrastruktur...usw.)	
NO	Annex A	Figure 1.3 Page 35	TE	<p>The division in sub products should follow the Operation/Maintenance dimension prior to the Building/Technical system dimension, to bring it in accordance with the Nordic LCC proposal from Svein Bjørberg from 2004 and the Nordic FM Benchmarking group from 2009 (The division of Maintenance tenants and owners responsibility will hardly be accepted from CEN)</p> <p>We do not recommend a sub categorization of Maintenance.</p>	<p>One box for Operation and one box for Maintenance on first level under Space to replace the common O &amp; M box in the draft.</p> <p>1 box including Operations</p> <p>1 box including Maintenance</p> <p>1 box including Enhancement</p> <p>Under Operations we recommend the following sub-categories:</p> <p>Building Operations</p> <p>Technical Operation</p> <p>The two boxes called “building maintenance” and</p>	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted

					"technical maintenance" should be deleted as a consequence of our recommendation.	
NO	Annex A	Table page 43 and 44	TE	The tables should be regrouped with Operation as heading for table on page 43 and Maintenance as heading for table on page 44 to be in accordance with the suggested comment on figure A 1.3	Table on page 43 includes Product 1161, 1162 and 1164 Table on page 44 includes Product 1163 and 1165 Products should be re-numbered (ex Product 1160 Operation and Product 1170 Maintenance.) re numbering may impact on table on page 45 which needs to be re numbered on the 118-serie. Tables (page 43, 44 and 45) should be updated as a consequence of our recommendation.	
NO	Annex A	Table A.1.3 Page 35		We recommend moving the box "Enhancement of initial performance" closer to "running costs" since this is, according to us, not a part of Acquisitions.  It is understood as a synonym to the "development" component/product as described in LCC proposal Bjørberg	Move the box "enhancement of initial performance" to the right of the end of Acquisition dashed-box.	



1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted

				(2004).		
NO	Annex A	Page 25 Diagram 4.3		It seems that the boxes “cleaning” and “outdoors” have been switched.	We recommend to switch the positions of the boxes “cleaning” and “outdoors” in order to correspond with table diagram A.1.3 in the annex A.	
NO	Chapter 3 Terms and definitions	From Page 16		<p>Maintenance and Operation concepts should be defined. We strongly recommend using as a reference the concepts included in LCC Bjørberg (2004).</p> <p>Check definitions paragraph in the attached document Nordic LCC project.</p> <p>NOTE: if the term “maintenance project” is used as synonym to “maintenance”, it will be easier to understand the overall</p>		

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted

				idea.		
NO			GE	The FM products defined in Appendix A (15521-4) are not in compliance with those examples specified in 15521-1.	15521-1 may be reviewed after approving the standard proposals.	
NO			Ed	At an overall level we think that the taxonomy standard is good, but that the challenge will be to make all stakeholders base themselves on it (including making necessary changes of established notions, structures and terms).		These comments are from the Norwegian supplier company Coor.
NO	Introduction	s. 5.13	Ed	Is it really necessary to have such a long introduction with the same text in all (?) the documents? For a comprehensive understanding of FM one has in anyway to relate to all documents.		These comments are from the Norwegian supplier company Coor.
NO	Introduction	s. 7-13	Ed	Given that so much space is allocated to a hypothetical case, should an introduction be given to describe for what purpose		These comments are from the Norwegian supplier company

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted

				the example is given for what follows?		Coor.
NO	Introduction	s. 5	Te	It is too "strong" to establish that "Facility Mgmt. cannot be outsourced....."; our understanding is that it is only the strategic level which should not/cannot be outsourced.		These comments are from the Norwegian supplier company Coor.
NO	Introduction	s. 13	Ed	First INTRODUCTION (viz. the above) and then the Introduction – there are a lot of introductions here!		These comments are from the Norwegian supplier company Coor.
NO	Introduction	s. 13	Ge	Very good presentation of the purpose of the standard concerned; the supply- and demand page (both separately and together) need a common vocabulary and a common understanding of structure and terms.		These comments are from the Norwegian supplier company Coor.
NO			Ge	The standardisation work and the results represent a great leap forward what concerns "academising" of a relative fresh professional area, and based on the thought that "good practice is base don good theory" the standard is legitimate.		These comments are from the Norwegian supplier company Coor.
NO			Ge	The proposed taxonomy (presumed read, commonly understood, accepted and utilised by all stakeholders) should have an effect of increased efficiency in all FM related processes (common basis of reference will yield efficient		These comments are from the Norwegian supplier company Coor.

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				communication with more efficient request/offers, more efficient negotiations and agreement documentation, more efficient implementation and following-up, and more efficient cost/allocation, control and benchmarking).		
NO			Ge	The challenge in our daily work is to "phase in" message as well as practice internally and externally, including also to implement possible necessary changes in own established "standard" and practise.		These comments are from the Norwegian supplier company Coord.
NO			Ge	The greatest challenge will probably be to make the demandPage (which per definition is concerned with other thing than FM) to become familiar with the standard and base itself on it.		These comments are from the Norwegian supplier company Coord.
				<b>Key for Commentators</b> UK United Kingdom		
UK	Whole document		Ed	There seems to be a number of typo's throughout the document		
UK	Introduction		Te	This standard includes an introduction of 8-9 pages which appears virtually identical to the introduction to prEN 15221-3. Users of standards are required to purchase standards based on page count and are not going to be very pleased to pay for the same	Confirm Introductions will be removed or Proposal. Carry out a fundamental restructuring of the draft standards; shorten the introduction to no more than one page and remove the remainder to an informative annex in one of the draft standards, and cross-refer to it in the	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				content in two or more occasions.	other standards	
UK	Introductio n		Ge	Page 13 is a second introduction, and contains text that would appear to be more relevant to the scope	See previous comment and comment on Scope – Shorten the text by avoiding duplication, and reword accordingly	
UK	Scope		Ge	This is poorly worded as a scope (see Internal Regulations) and is too long. The scope clause of standards are used in library databases and other tools to facilitate use of standards and for this reason it is essential that the scope is precisely worded. Paragraphs 1 and 2 are informative, and should be moved elsewhere. Paragraph 3 appears to be the essential text of the scope. The remainder is either informative, or includes recommendations, i.e. use of 'should' and should be deleted, or moved to informative notes.	Reword as appropriate in accordance with Internal Regulations	
UK	General		Te	The concept of classified products vs. non classified products (now: individual services or products) was discussed. The paper needs to be overworked on this as the definitions have changed during the process of writing the	New version after enquiry Suggest final review within TC to confirm acceptance of the 'Facility Products' terminology within all standards	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				standard and this is not reflected throughout.		
UK	General			The usage of the term 'space' in another sense than WG6 was discussed. Space has several other meanings as well so this was found to be no problem.	no change needed	
UK	Title		Te	The title has to contain Facility Management (for search engines) and reflect the emphasis on products	The title is to be clarified to "Taxonomy of Facility Management – Classification of Facility Products" (based on comments from Austria)	
UK	Intro		Te	The core purposes of the standard have been discussed and listed. These are to be merged with the existing purposes in the introduction of the standard.	New proposal to be provided by Marc	
UK	General		Te	The product map is the "heart" of the standard and thus the Appendix A (Table with descriptions) is to be moved into the main part	The main part is to be rearranged so that the product map is becoming more prominent New version after enquiry	
UK	Descriptio n of Context	Page 8	Ed	Generally poor English. Last paragraph cites "three" alternative path – which is followed by a list of four options	Redraft	
UK	4.1 Structure..	Page 21	Ed	List starts at "e)"	Review content	
UK	Diagram 4.2	Page 23	Ed	"Strategic" spelt wrong in title	Edit	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
UK	4.4		Te	Diagram 4.4 will need to be redrawn to be more specific on what it tries to say.	New proposal to be provided by Marc	
UK	6.2		Te	An enhanced version of Diagram 6.2 was presented. It shows also the relation between the facility products and the various building oriented cost codes.	New proposal to be provided by Marc. New version after enquiry	
UK	6.4		Te	Chapter 6.4 and associated Appendix E about cost allocation and benchmarking is to be moved to paper of WG7 for their purposes.	New version after enquiry	
UK	6.4 Principles..	Page 31	Te	Second paragraph: the list is broken in mid sentence.	Review content	
UK	Annexes		Te	A description of the connection between product map and process map might be helpful.	New version after enquiry	
UK	Annex A	Page 33 & 34	Te	Need to reference diagrams	Review content	
UK	Annexe A	table	Te	The fields "Benchmark" and "Description of ration" will be taken out of the table and the subject handed over to WG7	New version after enquiry	
UK	Annexe B		Te	The Annex on the product Sustainability is to be adapted to the latest developments eg. by DGNB or aspects of adaptability	(proposal by Kunibert and Pedro) This may influence the product map and will be discussed in a later meeting.	
UK	Annexe B		Te	Diagram B2.1 and 2.2 about the role model needs some clarification. Marc will draw and propose a changed version.	Marc will draw and propose a changed version.	

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
<b>MB<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)</b>	<b>Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</b>	<b>Type of comm ent<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</b>	<b>Proposed change by the MB</b>	<b>Secretariat observations on each comment submitted</b>
UK	Product map		Te	Is Risk Management part of Sustainability or vice versa?	No decision to change existing structure taken.	
UK	Product map			ISO14000 is to be removed from product name 'Sustainability' and ISO9000 form 'Quality Management'	New version after enquiry	
UK	Product map		Te	The term "Asset Management" (and to a lesser extend CREM) was discussed but no decision taken if and how to incorporate it into the product map so far.	Rinus has provided an interesting Diagram showing the primary activities, FM and the provider which may be further developed in this context.	
UK	B.6 Product..	Page 78	Te	Last paragraph: consider changing the word "competition" – perhaps to "There could be a disconnect between .."	Review content	
UK	Diagram B.7	Page 80	Ed	ERP needs to be cited in the abbreviations section or expanded	Revise wording	
UK	C.1 Introduction...	Page 82	Te	Second paragraph is unclear	Review content	
UK	C.1.3 Act...	Page 86	Te	Title refers to "Diagram 7.1" – where is this?	Review content	
UK	E.1 Representation	Page 92	Ed	Is the right "principle" used – should it be "principal"?	Revise wording	



1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				<b>FROM HERE ON: OLD COMMENTS:</b> Minor UK comments have been worked through by a small group (Marc, Jeff, Helmut and Jozsef) on Saturday morning. This resulted in a condensed comments list.	Green: answers from Madrid	
UK	throughout		Ge	Confusion on UK spelling (with S's) or US spelling with Z's)	UK -> S	done (needs to be checked during final editing)
UK	Introduction	Para 1	Ge	The streamlining of the service provision and interaction of parties is noted. It may be worth noting the value of interaction with (for instance) HR regarding alternative workplace strategies that are likely to impact on the terms and conditions of employees.  There is no explicit recognition of the concept of value, which may include intangible elements. (This may be implied in the word 'optimise', but an explicit recognition may be better.)	Will be done (redraft intro after enquiry)	to be discussed in group
UK	3.1			Add abbreviations list	Better: full names	ok., discuss in TC for all papers?
UK	3.1.2			Is this verbatim from the std -	Jeff will propose a better one	please explain comment
UK	3.2.9	Para 1	Te	This definition is fundamentally wrong: The unit of personnel. The total number of hours worked	Proposal by Jeff	Different definition in UK and German and

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				<p>in a given period by the members of a functional group, divided by the number of hours that a person would work in a full-time position during that period.</p> <p>Numerator in this definition can be 70 hours (by two people in one week)</p> <p>Denominator in this definition can be 40 hours (hours that a person would work in a full-time position during that same week)</p> <p>As an answer you get 1.75 FTE, whereas the answer should be 0.875 FTE</p> <p>Either replace 'the members of a functional group' with 'a person' - or - replace 'a person' with 'those members'.</p>		Dutch speaking countries -> to be discussed in group
UK	3.3.10		TE	Plot / site - use WG6 wording	Jeff is taking this one (site could be within a plot)	to be done later
UK			Ed	Number / tables differently from figures	Final editing	check during final editing
UK				Remove all references to chapter from all sections	Use chapter instead section if applicable	please explain comment
UK	4.3	Para 1	Ed	Facilities and activities should be in bold text	Against standards regulation	discuss in group
UK		A2	Te	Needs introduction and specific reference to the tables A4. 1 to A4 .3. Detailed descriptions – Complete the exercise and add text for all	This is vital to the document and a significant step forward for the industry. The current text is insufficiently complete and therefore not ready for mirror group	ok, will be done

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comm ent <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations on each comment submitted
				boxes.	review and comment. Completed document will need additional review by the mirror groups when completed. <b>Tasks attributed to WG members</b>	
UK			Te	There needs to be an index of standards with figure A2	Difficult to find specific content <b>Numbering added to product map</b>	please explain comment
UK	Fig a 4.1		Te	Outdoors – land site lot	Use definitions from the space std <b>Proposal provided by Jeff</b>	ok, will be done
UK	Page 34	A1	Te	Fig descriptions need to put with the figures not as separate paragraphs.		<b>part of final editing</b>
UK			Ge	Figure numbering needs to be rationalised	Current system is inconsistent and confusing	<b>part of final editing</b>
UK	C.4..			Reference to Site - ? context with space std	The definition of site needs to be resolved in the space std. the two standards need to be harmonised in this context. <b>Site not in WG6, Jeff is taking care of</b>	ok, to be discussed in group and with WG 6