

AWS: Comments on proposed changes to the ANSI PROCEDURES FOR U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS ACTIVITIES OF ISO

Proposed change No	Lines	Comments
5	317-320	<p>The first part of the second sentence is not needed since the remaining text says all that is needed. Shorter sentences make this easier to read. In the least consider the proposed the changes below.</p> <p>The ISO Directives grant authority to the committee secretariats (TC or SC) to nominate the chair. ANSI delegates this authority to the ANSI-delegated secretariat organization noting Pursuant to ANSI International Procedures, it is a U.S. TAG function to recommend U.S. candidates to ANSI as chairs of ISO committees.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Thank you but disagree. The statement is accurate as written and informative in that it explains to the reader the chain of authority.</p>
11	822	<p>ANSI explanation for proposed change: “Revision to the role of the ANSI-Accredited U.S. TAG Administrator to include the appointment of members to the U.S. TAG. <u>This eliminates concerns that a TAG member should not be asked to approve a TAG membership application of a competitor.</u>”</p> <p>If this is a real issue, the underlined above would seem to be a bigger issue for the ANSI Essential Requirements. However, we see nothing in the Essential Requirements that address this for ANS’s let alone US TAG Activities.</p> <p>We prefer that the proposed changes are NOT made but that applicants know their rights to appeal if membership is not accepted. That would be no different than for members of US committees developing ANS’s. Otherwise, this has to be addressed in the ANSI Essential requirements as well.</p> <p>RESPONSE: The text at issue is part of the TAG Model Procedures and so it applies to TAGs that are accredited under the Model Procedures. The scope of this project is limited to the <i>ANSI International Procedures</i>, not the <i>ANSI Essential Requirements</i>, which does not in any event, include model procedures.</p>
13	859-861	<p>A4.1, item 3 seems to indicate that the TAG Chair cannot vote if they are to serve as a neutral convenor. Is that the intent? We don’t seem to have the same restriction for Chairs of American National Standards committees.</p>

		RESPONSE: Thank you, but no that is not the intent and the second sentence of 3 reads “If a Chair wishes to advocate for a position, other than a consensus position of the TAG, then they must give over the role of Chair to an impartial TAG member for the duration of such discussions.”
15	952-954	<p>Why are we focusing so much on The Code of Conduct when there are many other policies that should be mentioned? Is it because it is relatively new? I ask this in ISO meetings as well because many ISO committees mention the new ISO code of Conduct on agendas but they do not mention others see https://www.iso.org/resources.html</p> <p>Surely all apply and we need to either mention them all or refer to them collectively?</p> <p>RESPONSE: A Code of Conduct is a public way to set expectations and clearly state consequences for non-compliance. Clear expectations promote a productive working environment and minimize arbitrariness. The need for a Code of Conduct (or similar) has been discussed for a number of years and this revision is the appropriate opportunity to address issues related to participation as well as consequences for failure to comply with published expectations.</p>
17	1036	<p>I believe the proposed change (17) is on A7.7 (line 1036) and not A7.6 as stated</p> <p>Since neither “material change” nor “substantive change” are defined, we prefer that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the change is not made, OR • a definition for “material change” is included <p>We assume material is preferred as we have materially interested parties?</p> <p>RESPONSE: A definition of “material” will be included as follows:</p> <p><u>A material change is one that alters or modifies the U.S. position or the intent of the U.S. comments at issue.</u></p>
20	1407-1479	<p>See comments on proposed change 15 above. There is a lot of focus on Code of Conduct but what about other polices that can be as important if not of greater importance in a standards setting environment?</p> <p>RESPONSE: See response above. Other policies that relate to an ANSI-Accredited U.S. TAG’s work in connection with the formulation of U.S. positions are addressed already, e.g., record retention, appeals policy. Other policies are properly addressed in the ISO/IEC Directives, e.g., patent policy.</p>

Additional comments

Line number	Comments
14/15	<p>Edit as follows to make text more readable:</p> <p>A mechanism for development and coordination must exist to assure that the positions developed by ANSI-Accredited U.S. TAGs to ISO presented to ISO are representative of U.S. interests before presentation , a mechanism must exist for the development and coordination of such positions which are developed by ANSI-Accredited U.S. TAGs to ISO.</p> <p><u>CLEAN:</u> A mechanism for development and coordination must exist to assure the positions developed by ANSI-Accredited U.S. TAGs to ISO are representative of U.S. interests before presentation to ISO.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Accept.</p>
384	<p>Since the antecedent has become plural, "its" is incorrect. Change to "their"</p> <p>RESPONSE: Replace “its” with “the TAG’s”.</p>
626/627	<p>An express certification A declaration by the U.S. TAG Administrator that the U.S. TAG has been and continues to be operated in a manner that complies with all applicable ANSI and ISO procedures</p> <p>We are not certifying anything</p> <p>RESPONSE: Certify in this context means to attest to in a formal statement. The TAG Annual Report/Compliance Form includes the following statement:</p> <p><i>I, the undersigned, on behalf of the ANSI-Accredited U.S. TAG to _____ certify that the TAG has been operating in a manner that complies with all applicable ANSI and ISO Procedures.</i></p>