

# ANS Standards Development Process

The mission of the American Nuclear Society (ANS) Standards Committee is to develop voluntary consensus standards to be certified by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) as American National Standards. The ANSI has served as administrator and coordinator of the United States private sector voluntary standardization system for close to 100 years. Founded in 1918 by five engineering societies and three government agencies, the Institute remains a private, nonprofit membership organization supported by a diverse constituency of private and public sector organizations. Its prescribed process is set forth in the ANS Standards Committee Rules and Procedures, and it is also illustrated in the following flow chart presented as [Figure 1](#) (# 6 in the toolkit).

The [National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 \(NTTAA\)](#) requires all federal agencies and departments to use technical standards that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies, unless such use is impractical or inconsistent with law. To implement the Act, the Office of Management and Budget issued [Circular A-119, Federal Participation in the Development and Use of Voluntary Consensus Standards and in Conformity Assessment Activities](#), which provides guidance to promote consistent application of the Act across federal agencies and departments.

The process to produce an American National Standard requires time, patience, most of all dedication of many professionals. The birth of a standard begins with recognizing a need for a particular standard. Any individual or committee within the ANS Standards Committee may identify this need by completing a Project Initiation Notification System (PINS) form, which declares the purpose and need of the proposed standard. The document is reviewed, discussed, and most often approved by a select subcommittee (SubC) and a consensus committee (CC) that will oversee the standard. Last, the Standards Board (SB) will review the PINS form before it is submitted to ANSI.

Once the PINS form is approved and submitted to ANSI, a working group (WG) is assembled to commence the standards development process. Working group members comprise a small number of individuals recognized for their expertise in the subject. Although there is no requirement for a balance of representation on a WG, as required for the CC, WG membership should include those organizations having a significant interest in the project.

Subcommittees (SubC) consist of members who have been appointed due to their expertise in one or more areas. They manage the development of several standards in closely related disciplines. Each SC member is expected to lend his/her special expertise in the development of standards. Subsequent to drafting the standard, a formal ballot process within the SubC is not required, but SubC approval is often achieved via internal committee discussion.

The SB has established eight consensus committees -- Environmental and Siting Consensus Committee (ESCC); Fuel, Waste, and Decommissioning Consensus Committee (FWDCC); Nonreactor Nuclear Facilities Consensus Committee (NRNFCC); Nuclear Criticality Safety Consensus Committee (NCSCC); Large Light Water Reactors Consensus Committee (LLWRCC); Research and Advanced Reactors Consensus Committee (RARCC); Safety and Radiological Analyses Consensus Committee (SRACC); and Joint Committee on Nuclear Risk Management (JCNRM) a joint consensus committee with the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME). Consensus committees comprise a diverse balance of interest. Each CC supervises the development of proposed standards within their assigned scopes, and they achieve consensus approval of these projects. A formal ballot must be employed to ascertain each member's position on the standards brought before the committee.

The WG chair must respond to all "approved with comments" and "negative" comments received from the formal ballot period; the SubC may assist in resolving comments. Balloters who ballot negative, must review the attempted resolution of his/her negative ballot vote. If the negative balloter finds the response unacceptable, then the balloter may maintain that decision by formally stating his/her reasons for doing so. Any outstanding negative positions must be circulated to all members of the CC for review. A member holding an affirmative position may change his/her vote if he/she wishes to support negative balloters.

Simultaneous to the CC ballot, public review (PR) is conducted through the auspices of ANSI. ANSI announces a 45- or 60-day public review period for the proposed standard in its publication, *Standards Action*. As with CC comments, all comments from PR must be considered and resolved promptly. Upon completion of the consensus process, a Letter Ballot is created for the SB to review and certify that all ANS procedures have been implemented to finalize the standard. The SB Letter Ballot summarizes the CC ballot tallies and other details during the ballot period.

The final step in the development of a proposed standard is to gain approval by the ANSI Board of Standards Review (BSR). Once certification by the SB has been granted, documentation is sent to the ANSI BSR with details of the ballot results to carefully scrutinize the case. After ANSI notifies ANS of its approval, the proposed standard emerges as an American National Standard—a remarkable achievement and a credit to all the volunteers who made it possible.

Once approved, an American National Standard must be maintained to keep its certification. ANSI dictates that current standards be reviewed at least every five years to determine if the standard should be reaffirmed (reapproved), revised, or withdrawn. Standards that are found to be current and are not in need of any changes can be reaffirmed. A reaffirmation requires a consensus ballot, public review, and recertification by ANSI. Absolutely no changes can be made to the formal portion of a standard through the reaffirmation process. If any changes are deemed necessary, a revision should be initiated. If the evaluation of technical content reveals that strict application of one or more criteria could result in equipment inoperability or a violation of a safety or technical specification, withdrawal shall be recommended.