28 August 2018

To: Interested Parties

Subject: Standards Council Decision (Final): D#18-9
Standards Council Agenda Item: SC#18-8-3-e-1
Date of Decision*: 14 August 2018

Dear Interested Parties:

At its meeting of August 13-15, 2018, the Standards Council considered an appeal on the above referenced matter. The Council’s Final decision is now available and is attached herewith.

Sincerely,

Dawn Michele Bellis
Secretary, NFPA Standards Council

cc: S. Everett, L. Fuller, S. Gallagher, R. Roux, S. Frost
Members, CC Signaling Systems for the Protection of Life and Property (SIG-AAC)
Members, TC Supervising Station Fire Alarm and Signaling Systems (SIG-SSS)
Members, NFPA Standards Council (AAD-AAA)
Individuals Providing Appeal Commentary

*NOTE: Participants in NFPA’s standards development process should know that limited review of this decision may be sought from the NFPA Board of Directors. For the rules describing the available review and the method for petitioning the Board for review, please consult section 1-7 of the Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards and the NFPA Regulations Governing Petitions to the Board of Directors from Decisions of the Standards Council. Notice of the intent to file such a petition must be submitted to the Clerk of the Board of Directors within 15 calendar days of the Date of Decision noted in the subject line of this letter.
SUMMARY OF ACTION (for convenience only; not part of official decision): The Standards Council voted to deny the appeal to overturn the Technical Committee amendment ballot results on CAM 72-6, which accepts Public Comment No. 6, as passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting.

DECISION:
At its meeting of August 13-15, 2018, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Richard Simpson, Vector Security. The appeal requests that the Standards Council overturn the Technical Committee amendment ballot results on Certified Amending Motion 72-6 and accept Public Comment No. 6 for the 2019 Edition of NFPA 72®, National Fire Alarm and Signaling Code®. Specifically, the appeal requests deleting approval of the requirement for the authority having jurisdiction (AHJ) to permit alarm, supervisory, and trouble signals at a listed central supervising station.

As background, the Technical Committee rejected Public Comment No. 6. Mr. Simpson thereafter filed a Notice of Intent to Make a Motion (NITMAM) in accordance with the Regulations Governing the Development of NFPA Standards (“Regs”) which was certified by the Motions Committee as Certified Amending Motion 72-6. CAM 72-6 passed on the floor of the NFPA Technical Meeting by a vote of 304-128. However, the amendment ballot failed to achieve the necessary ⅔ affirmative vote of the Technical Committee to recommend approval of the Association action. The Correlating Committee amendment ballot results, in contrast, achieved the necessary ⅔ affirmative vote to recommend approval of the Association action.

The Council considered all testimony provided at the hearing and comments received. There are differing arguments as to whether a safety reason exists to require AHJ approval for using a listed central supervising station. Several members of the Technical Committee commented that the AHJ is responsible for the safety and protection of the jurisdiction and therefore should have the ultimate right to determine how to receive alarm signals for AHJ response. Mr. Simpson and several other Technical Committee members commented that AHJ approval, while historically required as a quality and safety control measure, is no longer necessary as it relates to listed central supervising stations because the listing requirement for equipment and services is a quality and safety control measure in itself.

On appeal, the Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the results of that process only where a clear and substantial basis for doing so is demonstrated.

The Council has reviewed the entire record concerning this matter and has considered all the arguments put forth in this appeal. In the view of the Council, this appeal does not present any clear and substantial basis upon which to overturn the results yielded by the NFPA standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that the NFPA 72®, National Fire Alarm and Signaling Code® will not include the text of Public Comment No. 6.

In acknowledging claims related to a lack of expertise related to alarm signaling and communications
technologies, particularly with respect to commercial, listed supervising station expertise, the Council notes that in 2016, the Technical Committee on Supervising Station Fire Alarms and Signaling Systems was reconstituted to include broader regional diversity and representation of all affected technologies. In the context of the 2016 reorganization, the Council directs NFPA staff to review the Technical Committee expertise related to alarm signaling and communications technologies. As with all matters, the Council encourages all individuals with pertinent expertise to participate in the NFPA standards development process, including submitting an application for Technical Committee membership.

Council Members Kerry Bell and Rodger Reiswig recused from the deliberations and vote on the appeal.