

#	Comment submitted by	Reference (Clause/ Annex/ Para/ Fig/ Table/ Note)	Comment (Rational or justification for change)	Proposed change (Indicate source, if applicable)	Decision (Persuasive/ Non-Persuasive/ Non-Germane/ Editorial)
1.	CSA America Standards Inc.	General	It would be helpful to have some rationale statement provided to support the proposed changes. As an active standards developer, we are always concerned when more requirements are added to the process without appropriate justification		
2.	CSA America Standards Inc.	2.1 line 18	It is unclear under what circumstances this information is to be made available and using what mechanism	Add "upon request" after "made available"	
3.	CSA America Standards Inc.	2.3 line 35	This information should be presented as an expected way of operating and the phrase "shall normally" is an unusual one	Insert "Typically" at the beginning and replace "shall normally" with "are"	
4.	CSA America Standards Inc.	2.3 line 37	Disclosure of funding is not relevant to the determination of voting interest classification	Delete sentence: In cases where a consensus body member receives funding from the sponsoring ASD or other entity, that information shall be disclosed, to determine if it will impact the participant's interest classification.	
5.	CSA America Standards Inc.	2.3 line 38	If our proposal for deletion of line 37 is denied, we suggest clarification on the disclosure	Add "upon request" after "be disclosed"	

#	Comment submitted by	Reference (Clause/ Annex/ Para/ Fig/ Table/ Note)	Comment (Rational or justification for change)	Proposed change (Indicate source, if applicable)	Decision (Persuasive/ Non-Persuasive/ Non-Germane/ Editorial)
6.	CSA America Standards Inc.	1.5 line 75	<p>Unnecessary adjectives - the terms “reasonable” and “meaningful” are vague and do not add value to the intent of the clause. Addition of “debate” is problematic.</p> <p>The use of the phrase “fair and equitable manner” inside one clause would infer that it is not needed in any clause where it is not specifically stated. Since “equity and fair play” appears in clause 1.0, this principle is therefore inherent in the ER as a whole and need not be repeated throughout.</p>	Revert to original text, however retain “and deliberation”	
7.	CSA America Standards Inc.	2.5 line 81	See CSA comments on 1.5 line 75	Revert to original text	
8.	CSA America Standards Inc.	2.3 line 52 note 3	What is the value of deleting h) Professional society and k) Trade association, if these are only examples? Does this intend to mean that an ASD can no longer use these as interest categories?	Revert to original text	
9.	CSA America Standards Inc.	2.5.1 c) line 99	Inclusion of interest categories is an additional administrative burden and is not relevant at the PINS stage; the standards developer may not have a final structure for the consensus body. This would also increase the size of the PINS form – more work for ASDs!	Delete this new requirement	
10.	CSA America Standards Inc.	2.5.1. line 102	While it is important to respond to feedback from interested parties, this new requirement could be very onerous; this requirement should only to apply to serious issues, not just general information	Replace “for additional information or for the opportunity to discuss the proposal” with “significant concerns”	

#	Comment submitted by	Reference (Clause/ Annex/ Para/ Fig/ Table/ Note)	Comment (Rational or justification for change)	Proposed change (Indicate source, if applicable)	Decision (Persuasive/ Non-Persuasive/ Non-Germane/ Editorial)
11.	CSA America Standards Inc.	2.8.2 line 137	This additional phrase is repetitive since the concept already appears in 2.8.1 (line115-116)	Delete "which must be implemented promptly and with decisions made expeditiously"	
12.					
13.					
14.					