

Ally Kupferberg

From: Anne Caldas
Sent: Monday, March 22, 2021 8:25 AM
To: Dina Kallay
Cc: Anne Caldas; Jim Thompson
Subject: Response to public comments - Proposed revisions to the ANSI Essential Requirements - Ericsson
Attachments: ExSC_025_2021_ER TG Report from 2019.pdf; ExSC_017_2019_030921.pdf; ExSC_012_2021_balance_outreach.pdf; ExSC_017J_2019_Ericsson.pdf

Greetings –

We hope that you are well.

Thank you for submitting the attached public comments in response to proposed revisions to the *ANSI Essential Requirements* (www.ansi.org/essentialrequirements) announced in *ANSI Standards Action* in December 2019. Background on the original proposed revision is included in the attached report (ExSC_025_2021). The ExSC has considered all public comments and as a result, edited the original proposed revision, now attached here in its final edited form (ExSC_017). This edited version was approved by the ANSI ExSC in February 2021 and will be submitted to the Executive Committee of the ANSI Board of Directors for final approval in March 2021 for incorporation into the 2022 edition of the *ANSI Essential Requirements*.

Note that the final revision (ExSC_017) includes updates to the following provisions:

- Openness – moved existing “Affiliation” footnote to main text to promote transparency
- Balance:
 - The interest category of a voting member to reflect the business interests of their primary source of support for participation on the consensus body
 - Definition of “sponsor” and “Consultant”
 - Clarification that sub-categories of interest categories should not be used to circumvent balance requirements and a clarification of the use of General Interest
 - Deletion of “Professional society” and “Trade association” from list of optional, sample, interest categories as these are more akin to membership categories than to interest categories, and the source of funding should be reflected in the interest category
- Project Initiation Notification System (PINS):
 - New requirement to list anticipated interest categories expected to comprise the consensus body to promote transparency
 - New requirement for a response from an ASD to a request for further information on a project or to discuss it
- Emphasis on timely and adequate notice of standards development activity
- Appeals: Clarification of ANSI appeals process and reference to applicable procedures based on the type of appeal, e.g., American National Standard (ANS) approval versus accreditation of a standards developer

Please also note that consistent with recommendations in the attached ExSC Task Group Report, ANSI has updated our website to provide easy access to information about the American National Standards (ANS) process and how to participate in it. Please visit the new ANS pages, including these: <https://www.ansi.org/american-national-standards/ans-introduction/overview#introduction> , <https://www.ansi.org/american-national-standards/info-for-the-general-public/general-public> and <https://www.ansi.org/american-national-standards/info-for-standards-developers/standards-developers> .

In addition to the discussion in the attached ExSC_025_2021 report which addresses some of your comments and the edits reflected in the final version of ExSC_017, please see the following responses presented by section of the proposed revision:

Original Lines 1-5: Section 1.3 Balance – This section was not open for comment, but included for reference

- Please note that section 1.3 was provided for background and was not open for public comment. See the attached ExSC report for background. See also sections 1.3 Balance & 2.3 Balance and 1.1 Openness and 2.1 Openness for current requirements. In addition, the definition of "standards activity" is out of scope of the proposed revisions.

Original Lines 7-18: Section 2.1 – Openness

- Line 10 "materially affected interests", Line 76. Some of the comments were accepted in part and others are out of scope. The ExSC agreed on the use of updated terminology as part of a separate project and those updates appear in the 2021 issue of the *ANSI Essential Requirements*. For example, the routine text now reads "directly and materially interested parties" or "directly and materially interested parties who are adversely affected". In addition, ANSI already requires broad public notice, including through *Standards Action*. Finally, it is unclear how one would identify "unknown" directly and materially affected interests or "all" such interests; the current requirement achieves the goals of public notice in "suitable media".
- Suggest adding OMB A-119 as an Annex to the *Essential Requirements*. This suggestion is out of scope with respect to the proposed revisions, but in any event, OMB A-119 is not an ANSI document and is publicly available through the Federal Government.

Original Lines 25-71: 2.3 Balance

- Lines 26-29 need to define "Balance" (Page 4). The ExSC notes that balance is defined in sections 1.3 and 2.3 of the *ANSI Essential Requirements* and informed by other sections, such as 1.1 Openness. ANSI's requirements meet or exceed those in OMB A-119.
- Lines 41-47 General interest category. Comments appear to indicate a misunderstanding of current requirements. ANSI's requirements for balance are that balance shall be sought and outreach to achieve balance is a requirement. The ExSC has already decided that ANSI-Accredited Standards Developers (ASDs) are not required to use only User-Producer-General Interest as flexibility exists and will continue to exist. Please see the additional clarification that has been included in the final updated revision.

Original Lines 73-88: 1.5 & 2.5 Notification of Standards Development

- Lines 8, 75, 81: Inconsistent use of timely and adequate. Please see the edited version of the proposal that uses "timely and adequate".
- Suggest that the *Essential Requirements* define "standards activity"/"standards development activity"/"standards development" which are used interchangeably, in the way the commenter understands the SDOAA.
 - Related comments and proposals were not accepted and are considered out of scope. The *ANSI Essential Requirements* defines the framework over which ANSI's jurisdiction applies with respect to the ANS process. It does not apply to every aspect of an ASD's organization, nor does it apply to conformity assessment activities or to the use of ANS or the development of an ASD's procedures and policies. For reference, *1.0 Essential requirements for due process* within the *ANSI Essential Requirements* states that "[t]hese requirements apply to activities related to the development of consensus for approval, revision, reaffirmation, and withdrawal of American National Standards (ANS)." The context in which the phrases at issue are used - "standards activity"/"standards development activity"/"standards development process" – is limited to the ANS process as defined and governed by the *ANSI Essential Requirements* which do not address how an ASD develops or maintains its accredited procedures. ASDs have flexibility with respect to how policies and procedures are developed.

Indeed, a Panel of the ANSI Executive Standards Council (ExSC) expressly rejected an argument that the process employed by an ASD to develop revisions to its Patent Policy did not reflect a consensus of all interested stakeholders in accordance with the *Essential Requirements*, stating that:

We do not find this argument persuasive as it rests on the false premise that the *Essential Requirements* apply to the development of an ASD's procedures. They do not. Instead, the *Essential Requirements* apply to the approval of standards (i.e., ANSs). As stated clearly in Section 1 of the *Essential Requirements*, the *Essential Requirements* apply to "activities related to the development of consensus for approval, revision, reaffirmation, and withdrawal of American National Standards (ANS)" (Section 1,

emphasis added). Section 1.9 provides that “written procedures shall govern the methods used for standards development...” (Section 1.9, emphasis added). Section 1 thus makes clear that the *Essential Requirements* relate to standards development and not, as Appellants would have it, to the process by which an ASD’s written procedures themselves are developed.

See ANSI Executive Standards Council (ExSC) Appeals Panel decision in response to the joint appeal filed by Alcatel-Lucent, Ericsson, and Qualcomm of the ExSC’s prior decision to re-accredit IEEE. February 25, 2016 at page 5. (emphasis in original). To the extent the commenter uses the SDOAA to urge a broader definition of the term “standards development activity,” such a definition does not align with the *Essential Requirements*.

Original Lines 81-105: Section 2.5.1 PINS

- Lines 103-105, suggest adding a mechanism to challenge balance. This proposal was not accepted. Balance is not required to be established at the PINS phase.

Original Lines 107-156: Appeals

- Line 116 Appeals. Please see the edits in ExSC_017 to the text concerning appeals and also the Operating Procedures of the ANSI BSR, ANSI ExSC and ANSI Appeals Board for appeals decision requirements.

Again, thank you for your interest and your comments.

Sincerely,
Anne

Anne Caldas
Secretary, ANSI Executive Standards Council
ANSI
212-642-4914
acaldas@ansi.org
www.ansi.org



www.ansi.org/usss