

**From:** Admussen, Jennifer <[JAdmussen@asq.org](mailto:JAdmussen@asq.org)>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 24, 2022 5:28 PM  
**To:** PSA Department <[PSA@ansi.org](mailto:PSA@ansi.org)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] FW: Proposed Revisions to ANSI International Procedures

One more suggestion for improvement that I forgot to mention is the removal of “letter” when describing ballots. There are 5 instances of “letter ballot” in the procedures.

**RESPONSE: Accept. Change all “letter ballots” to “ballots”.**

**From:** Admussen, Jennifer <[JAdmussen@asq.org](mailto:JAdmussen@asq.org)>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 14, 2022 4:43 PM  
**To:** PSA Department <[PSA@ansi.org](mailto:PSA@ansi.org)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Proposed Revisions to ANSI International Procedures

Hello –

Below are suggestions for revisions:

Line 858  
“Ensure” is too strong. Change to “Monitor”

Ensure decisions made by the TAG are implemented or advanced.

**RESPONSE: Alternative approved: Work with the TAG Administrator to ensure that decisions made by the TAG are implemented or advanced.**

Line 872  
“Ensure” is too strong. Change to “Monitor”

**RESPONSE: Alternative approved: Work with the TAG Administrator to monitor compliance with and enforcement of the TAG's Code of Conduct.**

Line 1007  
Keep “or nominated by member of the U.S. TAG.” We use nominating committees and accept nominations from TAG members, but “Approval of officers appointed by the TAG Administrator” alone makes it sound like the TAG Administrator determines who the nominees are and the TAG confirms it by ballot.

**RESPONSE: Alternative approved: Approval of officers appointed by the TAG Administrator, which may or may not have been nominated by members of the U.S.TAG.**

Line 1076  
In the past we have received complaints that are not related to the development of a standard (for example, a leadership election that followed the TAG procedures, but a member thought was unfair) but still had to have a formal appeal. A10 seems to be focused on the development of standards. I’m not sure if this is true of other complaints, but maybe giving more definition around “procedural action” could help.

**RESPONSE:** Procedural actions are a broad category and include voting, membership, as well as any process issues addressed in a TAG's accredited procedures or related supporting documents. While there is no definition of "procedural actions", appeals of procedural actions include whether a technical issue was afforded due process.

Line 1079

With 15 days or "a reasonable time" is difficult to measure, and it's unclear who determines that it is a reasonable amount of time. We would prefer that "within a reasonable time after becoming aware of the inaction and within the current standard development cycle" be removed or changed.

**RESPONSE:** Thank you, but disagree. Imposing specific timeframes, when possible, will help TAG Administrators implement a fair appeals process. 15 working days is a common filing timeframe used in other ANSI procedures. For "inactions", adding a connection to the current standards development cycle sets the expectation that appeals of inactions would be filed timely and not, for example, after a standard has been approved and implemented in the marketplace. "Reasonable" does allow for a fact-specific assessment, but also sets the expectation that there are limits to the timeframe within which inactions may be appealed.

Line 1252

"TAG Members, including consultants, typically are classified in accordance with the business or other interests of their employers or the sponsors they represent in connection with the standards development activity." One of our TAGs currently has "consultants" as an interest category. Does this statement allow me to notify TAG leadership that it may not be used as an interest category? The inclusion of "typically" makes it unclear.

**RESPONSE:** Unless the nature of the standards under development relates to "consultants", "consultants" should not be an interest category. Rather, a consultant may certainly participate, but should be classified based on the interest category of the sponsor that is funding the consultant to participate as a voting member of the TAG.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,  
Jennifer

**Jennifer Admussen, CQA, CQIA**  
**Standards Development Manager**  
**ISO Committee Manager - TC176 SC1, TC207 SC4, TC69**

414-274-2100 | [jadmussen@asq.org](mailto:jadmussen@asq.org)



[asq.org](http://asq.org) | [my.asq.org](http://my.asq.org)

600 N. Plankinton Ave.

Milwaukee, WI 53203-2914, USA

