

## Ally Kupferberg

---

**From:** Anne Caldas  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 17, 2021 3:12 PM  
**To:** 'susan.mclaughlin@alumni.stanford.edu'  
**Cc:** Jim Thompson; Anne Caldas  
**Subject:** Response to public comments - Proposed revisions to the ANSI Essential Requirements - Susan Gitlin  
**Attachments:** ExSC\_025\_2021\_ER TG Report from 2019.pdf; ExSC\_017\_2019\_030921.pdf; ExSC\_017P\_2019\_SGitlin.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](http://www.ansi.org/essentialrequirements)) announced in 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*.

Please also note that consistent with recommendations in the attached ExSC TG 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> .

Responses to your comments and suggestions are presented here by section:

### **Original Lines 7-18: Section 2.1 – Openness**

- Please see the attached edits in ExSC\_017. Section 2.1 para 1, last sentence, requires that all consensus body members disclose their affiliation and now includes a new footnote defining “sponsor”.

### **Original Lines 25-71: 2.3 Balance**

- Lines 48-49: Suggest consultants with multiple interests do not belong in GI, that the developer/participant should decide on a more specific interest category. Delete "or those who represent multiple interest categories". Accepted - please see edits to this section.
- Line 65 Suggest "product or representative of a trade association for that industry". Not accepted - not all trade associations represent Users; context and nature of the standard matters. See also other edits to 2.1 including text related to interest classifications and the “General Interest” category.

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](mailto:acaldas@ansi.org)

[www.ansi.org](http://www.ansi.org)



[www.ansi.org/usss](http://www.ansi.org/usss)