



Amy Beasley Cronin
Secretary, Standards Council

11 August 2009

To: Interested Parties

Subject:

Standards Council Decision (Final):	D#09-9
Standards Council Agenda Item:	SC#09-8-5-a-1
Date of Decision*:	6 August 2009
NFPA 72 [®] , <i>National Fire Alarm and Signaling Code</i> , 2010 edition	

Dear Interested Parties:

At its meeting of 4-6 August 2009, the Standards Council considered an appeal on the above referenced matter.

Attached is the final decision of the Standards Council on this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Amy Beasley Cronin".

Amy Beasley Cronin
Secretary, NFPA Standards Council

- c: D. Berry, M. Brodoff, L. Fuller, L. Richardson, J. O'Connor
Members, TC on Fundamentals of Fire Alarm Systems (SIG-FUN)
Members, TCC on Signaling Systems for the Protection of Life and Property (SIG-AAC)
Members, NFPA Standards Council (AAD-AAA)
Individuals Providing Appeal Commentary

*NOTE: Participants in NFPA's codes and standards making 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 NFPA Regulations Governing Committee Projects 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.



Standards Council Decision (Final):	D#09-9
Standards Council Agenda Item:	SC#09-8-5-a-1
Date of Decision*:	6 August 2009
NFPA 72 [®] , <i>National Fire Alarm and Signaling Code</i> , 2010 edition	

At its meeting of 4-6 August 2009, the Standards Council considered an appeal from Thomas Hammerberg of the Automatic Fire Alarm Association, Inc., requesting that Comment 72-164 be accepted. Specifically the appeal requests adding a new paragraph 4.4.7.1.18 (2007 edition numbering) to the 2010 edition of NFPA 72[®], *National Fire Alarm and Signaling Code*. That provision would require that a wire-to-wire short circuit fault, occurring on any voice alarm notification appliance circuit, either before or after the circuit is activated, initiate a trouble signal and isolate the circuit from the rest of the system. The intent of the new paragraph was to specifically address the performance of voice alarm notification appliance circuits, especially after activation of the circuit, so that failure of one circuit would not compromise the voice evacuation system. The reason for rejection indicated by the technical committee was that the specified performance is already addressed in 4.4.7.1.16 and is not limited to a specific mode of operation. The requirements of 4.4.7.1.16 specifically prohibit a short-circuit fault on one notification appliance circuit from affecting the operation of any other alarm notification circuit.

As background, Proposal 72-150 which recommended adding new paragraph 4.4.7.1.18 was rejected by the Technical Committee on Fundamentals of Fire Alarm Systems (TC). Subsequently, Comment 72-164 recommended acceptance of the Proposal, and it was also rejected by the TC. A Certified Amending Motion (CAM 72-8) seeking acceptance of Comment 72-164 was made at the 2009 Association Technical Meeting (Tech Session). The amending motion was passed by the NFPA membership. Subsequently, however, it failed the required balloting within the responsible committees because, while it passed the ballot of the Technical Correlating Committee on Signaling Systems for the Protection of Life and Property (TCC), it failed the ballot of the TC. When a recommended amendment is not approved by the committees, under NFPA rules, the default recommendation of the codes and standards development process is that no change from the existing edition should occur and the portion of the Report modified by the Association amendment is returned to previous edition text. In this case, therefore, the default recommendation that comes to the Council is that new paragraph 4.4.7.1.18 should not be included in the new edition of NFPA 72.

The appeal requests that the Standards Council overturn the action that was recommended by the full NFPA codes and standards development process. On appeal, the Standards Council accords great respect and deference to the NFPA codes and standards development process. In conducting its review, the Council will overturn the result recommended through 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 on which to overturn the results recommended by the NFPA codes and standards development process. Accordingly, the Council has voted to deny the appeal. The effect of this action is that paragraph 4.4.7.1.18 will not be added.

Without attempting to review each argument that the Council has considered as part of this appeal, the Council notes that TC members, in their balloting rejecting the amendment, expressed concern that the proposed amendment language is more restrictive than it needs to be in order to achieve any desired clarification. More significantly the Committee Statement rejecting Comment 72-164, as well as TC members' comments on balloting of the recommended amendment suggest that NFPA 72 already includes requirements that address the circuit performance intended by the amendment. While arguments in support of the appeal suggested that clarification is needed in the requirements of NFPA 72 to assure that product standards properly reflect the intended requirements, the record of the consensus process on this matter suggests that the intended performance is clear. If there is a need for clarification in related product standards, these changes should be addressed to UL or other appropriate product standards developers.

Council Member Clary recused himself during deliberations and vote on this issue.