

<b>Type of Revision</b>	<b>Action</b>
Result of Annual Compliance Form and Issuance of Updated ANSI Essential Requirements (ER)	Administrative reaccreditation by staff if changes are limited to the incorporation of new text corresponding to approved changes to the ANSI ER. If new revisions vary from current ER text, but appear to be clearly in compliance, review and approval via letter ballot to the Subcommittee on Accreditation (SC-A) is required. Anything beyond such changes (or if staff believes compliance is questionable) requires full reaccreditation process.
Result of an Audit or Appeal	Administrative reaccreditation by staff if changes are limited to the incorporation of new text explicitly requested by the ExSC as part of audit recommendations. Any additional revisions that appear to be clearly compliant require review and approval via letter ballot to the Subcommittee on Accreditation (SC-A). Anything beyond such changes (or if staff believes compliance is questionable) requires full reaccreditation process.
Result of an Appeal	Typically, Appeals Panel reviews and approves reaccreditation.
Result of revisions related to procedural matrix	Administrative reaccreditation by staff if changes are limited to the incorporation of ANSI ER procedural excerpts (or other such language the ExSC has previously approved); or if they reflect a change in consensus ballot or appeals filing periods (unless it is less than 10 days). If new revisions vary from these changes, but appear to be clearly in compliance, review and approval via letter ballot to the Subcommittee on Accreditation (SC-A) is required. Anything beyond such changes (or if staff believes compliance is questionable) requires full reaccreditation process.
Change from unique procedures to TAG Model Procedures	Administrative reaccreditation.
Submission of any other revisions excluded from those above.	Full reaccreditation process (public review and ballot to the SC-A) is required.

Participants discussed the above matrix. Staff stated their understanding, and the ExSC confirmed, that non-substantive revisions (for these purposes, those revisions that do not affect the implementation of the ANS submittal processes) and any text an ASD decides to excerpt from the *ANSI Essential Requirements* into its procedures (whether initiated by the ASD or suggested by Staff) would also fall under the category of “administrative reaccreditation”.

The ExSC also clarified that, if a comment is received on text that is not out for public comment, the developer should consider and respond to such a comment but does not have to address it immediately. If the comment identifies an issue of non-compliance, then the developer must address.