

Summary of Comments and Dispositions for Draft Charter and Bylaws of Panel

This document summarizes, at a high-level, the comments received during the review period on the Draft Charter and Bylaws for the Panel. These comments are not restated below verbatim. A brief explanation is provided of whether or not the comments were incorporated, and reasoning for those decisions. Most of the comments presented in this document have not been incorporated. Comments that have been incorporated are reflected in the updated Charter and Bylaws. Each individual comment and its disposition are not provided for brevity.

General Comment: Additional standing committees should be created to help address the overall resilience planning process and interdependencies. The stove-piped standing committees make it difficult to address interdependencies.

Response: The initial standing committees will remain as stated in the draft Charter and Bylaws. However, these are only initial standing committees. As stated in the Charter and Bylaws, new standing committees can be created as deemed appropriate by the Coordinating Committee (CRPCC). There were several good ideas for potential standing committees that could be created. We encourage you to discuss your ideas with the Panel's leadership for future standing committees.

Though the initial standing committees are stove-piped, the Coordinating Committee is intended to facilitate cross-sector coordination and address interdependencies. Note that the chair from each standing committee (or an alternate from the standing committee selected by the standing committee chair) is a member of the Coordinating Committee. The Coordinating Committee also has the ability to form new standing committees, and standing committees can propose to form working groups with other standing committees.

General Comment: Panel leadership is supposed to be elected, but Chairs and Vice Chairs have already been selected without input from the Panel.

Response: Per the Charter and Bylaws, the initial leadership positions for the first term of 2 years are appointed by the Administrator. After the initial terms, successive leadership positions will be elected by the Panel.

General Comment: There seems to be some confusion between a committee's work and that of the Center of Excellence.

Response: The Panel is independent of the Center of Excellence, though they are both initiatives from NIST's Community Resilience Group. Members from the Center of Excellence may participate in the Panel and, thus, the Panel's or Center of Excellence's work may benefit each effort.

The mission of the panel is to "identify methods that can improve the resilience of communities by considering the adequacy of codes and standards, and participating in development, coordination, and harmonization of guidelines, best practices, and other

tools that enhance the performance of the buildings and infrastructure systems that support the social and economic functions of communities.”

The mission of the Center of Excellence is to “develop system-level models and associated databases to support tools that will help local governments decide how to best invest resources” with a “scientific basis for developing resilience metrics and decision tools to support the resilience of the built environment and for evaluating cascading effects arising among interconnected infrastructure.”

General Comment: “Harmonization” seems like it does not belong in this document.

Response: Harmonization has been kept as a Panel Principle to reflect the goal of developing guidance, best practices, metrics, tools, and informing codes and standards such that the different sectors strive for a similar level of resilience rather than varying levels.

General Comment: Why are only four stakeholder categories used? These could be significantly expanded.

Response: Originally, a list of sixteen stakeholder groups was developed over the course of three NIST workshops by participants. However, to assure balance in voting, it was determined that 16 stakeholder groups was too many. The number of stakeholder groups was reduced to 4 with examples included for the reader’s reference.

General Comment: The threshold of 50% seems too low to support consensus, especially since a stakeholder group can have up to 49% of a Panel vote.

Response: Agreed. In general, the threshold for passing a vote has been increased two-thirds (67%). This threshold is consistent with that used by other consensus bodies.

General Comment: The role of the Data, Metrics, & Tools Standing Committee is unclear.

Response: The Data, Metrics, and Tools Committee will be responsible for evaluating and/or creating data, metrics and tools, needed to support community resilience. The language in the Charter and Bylaws has been updated accordingly.

General Comment: In addition to the built environment, and social and economic functions, the Panel should consider the environment.

Response: The environment is an important consideration. However, the focus of this Panel and the recently release NIST Guide, are the built environment (i.e., buildings and infrastructure systems) and the social systems which they support. Impacts on the environment may be indirectly addressed through resilience, in the context of reducing the risk from hazards and in that reduced damage and recovery will reduce the impact on the environment. However, general environmental issues are outside the scope of this Panel.

General Comment: There is concern over each individual having one vote. It seems that one vote per organization would be more appropriate.

Response: The “Assurance of Balance” for stakeholder categories is intended to prevent an organization from dominating votes instead of using the “one organization, one vote” approach.

General Comment: There is concern in having the Administrator (a NIST contractor) add their own expertise to Panel documents without review of the changes by the Panel.

Response: The Panel's standing committees will develop the products. The Administrator’s role is to review and editorially correct documents if needed. Any substantive changes must be made through the Panel processes.

General Comment: The purpose of a Priority Action Plan is unclear.

Response: Agree. The name “Priority Action Plan” has been changed to “Project Plan” throughout the Charter and Bylaws. Project Plans will be developed by each of the Panel’s committees to identify their goals, tasks, target audience(s), and schedules. Section 1.2.2 of the Charter has been updated accordingly.

General Comment: Forty-five and seven days’ notice for face-to-face and virtual meetings, respectively, may need to be increased.

Response: These are minimums. Efforts will be made to announce meetings earlier than this when possible.

General Comment: Language to address Intellectual Property and Antitrust is needed.

Response: Agree. Additional language has been incorporated to address Intellectual Property and Antitrust.