



*Via email only*

March 8, 2022

Susan Carioti, ASIS  
[sue.carioti@asisonline.org](mailto:sue.carioti@asisonline.org)

Jason Johnson, BEPP  
[jjohnson@jljalaw.com](mailto:jjohnson@jljalaw.com)

Jerry Heying, IPG Company  
[jerry@ipgcompany.com](mailto:jerry@ipgcompany.com)

James Cameron, BEPP  
[info@ep-board.org](mailto:info@ep-board.org)

James S. Wilson, Jr., Webster, Chamberlain &  
Bean, LLP  
[jwilson@wc-b.com](mailto:jwilson@wc-b.com)

Chuck Andrews, BEPP  
[charles.andrews.cso@gmail.com](mailto:charles.andrews.cso@gmail.com)

#### **Dated Notice**

Re: Decision of the ANSI Executive Standards Council (ExSC) Appeals Panel in connection with the appeal filed by ASIS International (ASIS) of the ExSC Decision to Accredit the Board of Executive Protection Professionals (BEPP) as a Developer of American National Standards (ANS)

Dear Appeals Participants:

On February 17, 2022, the ANSI Executive Standards Council (ExSC) heard the above appeal. The decision of the ANSI ExSC follows.

Please be advised that **this transmission via e-mail constitutes your official notification of the decision of the ExSC.**

Parties to the appeal who believe that they have been or will be adversely affected by this decision are hereby notified of their right of further appeal to the ANSI Appeals Board.

Should a party to this appeal choose to appeal this decision to the ANSI Appeals Board, written notice of appeal and all appeals statements and supporting documentation must be filed with the Secretary of the ANSI Appeals Board (the office of the undersigned) by **March 29, 2022**. The appeal shall be accompanied by a filing fee in the amount of \$1,200.00. If you require an extension for the filing of appeals materials, you must contact the Secretary of the ANSI Appeals Board on or before **March 29, 2022**, or you will forfeit your right to further appeal. A copy of the *ANSI Appeals Board Operating Procedures* is attached to the e-mail that transmitted this decision.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, or if I may be of assistance to you, please contact me at (212) 642-4914 or send an e-mail to [acaldas@ansi.org](mailto:acaldas@ansi.org).

Sincerely,  
Anne

Anne Caldas  
Secretary, ANSI Executive Standards Council

cc: P. Griffin, ANSI Sr. VP & General Counsel  
F. Schrotter, ANSI Sr. VP & Chief Operating Officer  
ANSI ExSC Members  
Appeals Hearing Observers

**ANSI EXECUTIVE STANDARDS COUNCIL (ExSC)  
SUMMARY DECISION**

In response to the appeal filed by ASIS International (ASIS), with the ANSI Executive Standards Council (ExSC) of the decision to accredit the Board of Executive Protection Professionals (BEPP) as a developer of American National Standards (ANS), the ANSI ExSC denies the appeal and affirms its decision to accredit BEPP.

---

**Appellant: ASIS International (ASIS)**

**Represented by:**

Susan Carioti, ASIS International - Vice President, Certification, Standards and Guidelines  
Jerry Heying, President/CEO, IPG Company  
James S. Wilson, Jr., Webster, Chamberlain & Bean, LLP

**Respondent: Board of Executive Protection Professionals (BEPP)**

**Represented by:**

Jason Johnson, BEPP Board Member  
James Cameron, CPP, BEPP, Board Chair  
Chuck Andrews, CPP, BEPP Board Member

---

**Hearing Date: February 17, 2022**

**Hearing Location: Virtual Hearing**

**ANSI Executive Standards Council Panel (ExSC Panel)**

Gaby Davis, IAPMO  
Kerri Haresign, CTA  
Megan Hayes, NEMA  
Ajit Jillavenkatesa, Apple  
Tim Koczanski, Department of Defense  
Joe Lewelling, AAMI  
Shuliang Li, FDA  
Alan Manche, Schneider Electric  
Earl Nied, Intel  
Paul Olson, AWWA  
Stephanie Reiniche, ASHRAE  
Cassy Robinson, NIST  
Jen Rodgers, ASTM  
Alton Sanders, Boeing  
Paula Watkins, API, Chair

## **Observers**

Joe Aurtera, BEPP Board Secretary  
Gerry Boniello, CPP, BEPP Board Vice Chair  
Steve Hernandez, BEPP Board Member  
Susan Mosedale, ASIS International - Chief Global Member Engagement Officer  
Aivelis Opicka, ASIS International - Director, Standards and Guidelines  
Christine Peck, ASIS International, Chief Global Learning Officer

## **ANSI EXECUTIVE STANDARDS COUNCIL (ExSC) DECISION**

An ANSI ExSC Appeals Panel (the Panel) has considered the appeal filed by ASIS (Appellant) challenging the ExSC's September 20, 2021 decision to accredit BEPP (Respondent) as an ANSI-Accredited Standards Developer (ASD). The Panel denies the appeal. As detailed below, the arguments raised by Appellant fail to demonstrate that the ExSC's decision was in error.

### **1.0 Background**

An understanding of ANSI's procedural framework is important to a proper assessment of this appeal. The *ANSI Essential Requirements: Due process requirements for American National Standards (ANSI Essential Requirements)*<sup>1</sup> is the document that governs the American National Standards (ANS) process. Section 4.1 of the *ANSI Essential Requirements* addresses the accreditation of standards developers while Sections 1.4 and 2.4 *Coordination and harmonization* as well as 4.2 address requirements for the approval of individual standards as ANS.<sup>2</sup> Accreditation means that an ASD's procedures, as written, have been deemed by the ANSI Executive Standards Council (ExSC) to comply with the *ANSI Essential Requirements* and that the accreditation application meets ANSI's minimum requirements. Approval of a standard as an ANS is a wholly separate process. Approval means that the evidence of procedural compliance submitted by an ANSI-Accredited Standards Developer (ASD) in support of an individual document<sup>3</sup> satisfies the provisions of Section 4.2. Accreditation by ANSI (through the ANSI ExSC) is a precondition for proposing and maintaining documents for approval as ANS. Accreditation does not guarantee that any or all proposed ANS will ultimately be approved as such.

### **Procedural History**

BEPP applied for ANSI accreditation on June 1, 2021. As per ANSI's procedures, notice of BEPP's application was published in *ANSI Standards Action*<sup>4</sup> on June 4, 2021, along with instructions on how to obtain a copy of BEPP's application and proposed procedures. This published notice announced the opportunity for commenters to provide input on BEPP's application and procedures for 30 days. No public comments were received in response to this announcement.

BEPP's scope statement, included on its accreditation application and published in *ANSI Standards Action*, states that:

BEPP is pursuing a national standard that focuses on Executive Protection. This standard will establish the compulsory platform for competently, professionally, and

---

<sup>1</sup> See [www.ansi.org/essentialrequirements](http://www.ansi.org/essentialrequirements)

<sup>2</sup> Sections 1 and 2 of the *ANSI Essential Requirements* discuss in more detail how an ANS must be developed, for ultimate approval as an ANS under Section 4.2.1.1. (See excerpted text in Annex A.)

<sup>3</sup> ANSI's procedures do not limit the type of documents that may be processed and submitted as proposed ANS. ANS include documents with titles such as Recommended Practice, Best Practice, Standard, Guide, etc.

<sup>4</sup> See [www.ansi.org/standardsaction](http://www.ansi.org/standardsaction)

ethically providing this specialized service for high-net-worth individuals, government officials, business executives, foreign diplomats, and other at-risk individuals. Currently, there is no established standard in this complex domain, allowing unqualified individuals to provide support, placing those in their charge at increased physical risk and liability.

On September 20, 2021, based on its review of BEPP's application and procedures, the ExSC approved BEPP's request and ANSI published a notice of the decision to accredit BEPP in the September 24, 2021 issue of *ANSI Standards Action*. ASIS notes that it was not aware of BEPP's accreditation application or the ExSC's decision to approve until after the public comment period concluded and the decision to approve was made and published. Upon later requesting and reviewing BEPP's accreditation application, ASIS stated that it wished to "provide new and corrected information" in connection with it for the ExSC's information. In accordance with section 19 *ExSC hearing of appeals* of the *ANSI ExSC's Operating Procedures*, this appeal followed. (See ASIS International Appeal to ANSI ExSC, November 8, 2021 at page 2.) A virtual appeals hearing was held on February 17, 2022.<sup>5</sup>

### **Relevant Provision of the Essential Requirements**

Section 4.1 *Accreditation of American National Standards Developers* of ANSI's *Essential Requirements* provides that in order to be accredited by ANSI, a "developer's procedures and practices for standards development shall meet the criteria for accreditation as set forth below." Section 4.1.1 sets forth those criteria, which include an agreement to comply with the *Essential Requirements* when developing ANSs. Section 4.1.2 addresses specifically the *Application for Accreditation as a Developer of American National Standards* requiring:

a statement from the applicant that details their coordination efforts to date and confirms their agreement to attempt to coordinate their standards activities with other ANSI-Accredited Standards Developers and with ANSI.

BEPP's accreditation application, shown in Attachment B, provided information that purported to show its coordination efforts and included responses to other relevant questions that are part of the application. Most relevant to this appeal, BEPP stated:

In 2018 and 2019, robust dialogue occurred at several meetings with the ASIS Executive Protection Council, encouraging the Council to establish the standard we are currently proposing. The Council had no interest in putting forth the required effort or resources to develop an American National Standard.

During a recent May 2021 web conference hosted by the Executive Protection Council, the topic was again raised. The Council Chair reiterated that ASIS was not considering establishing a standard for this domain.

Over the past decade, as expressed in numerous industry conferences, there is an increasing consensus and desire among industry leaders to establish a standard for Executive Protection. Several factors driving this effort include the need for employers to have a benchmark to gauge an applicant's competence, the growing number of unqualified individuals asserting their expertise in this domain, the

---

<sup>5</sup> During the hearing on this matter, BEPP claimed that ASIS does not have standing to appeal. The Panel rejects BEPP's standing argument, finding that ASIS is directly and materially affected by BEPP's accreditation and could be adversely affected by it therefore, ASIS has standing to bring this appeal.

increased exposure to risk and liability, the declining quality of services, and the overall deterioration of the profession.

See Attachment B.

## 2.0 Analysis<sup>6</sup>

The main thrust of ASIS's appeal is that BEPP's application in general, and the foregoing passage in particular, does not meet BEPP's obligations under the *Essential Requirements* to "coordinate" with ASIS on the development of Executive Protection (EP)-related standards. In addition, ASIS maintains that the application contains false information in that BEPP in fact made no prior good faith attempt to advise ASIS of its decision to apply for accreditation or acknowledge that ASIS itself has been considering the development of documents in the area of Executive Protection (EP) for years. ASIS offers the appeal "to correct the record" concerning ASIS's own "EP related work," citing meetings attended by Mr. Cameron and others (of BEPP) as evidence of BEPP's awareness of ASIS's prior activities in the EP space. While making this argument, ASIS also acknowledges that it has not sought approval for any ANS or even yet determined whether any ASIS EP documents will be submitted to ANSI for approval as ANS in the future. The ExSC addresses each argument, in turn, below.

### **a. BEPP Provided Sufficient Evidence of Coordination in its Application under Section 4.1.2 *Application for Accreditation as a Developer of American National Standards***

Appellant's primary claim is that BEPP failed to coordinate with ASIS about its plan to submit an ANSI application to develop EP-related standards and falsely stated in its accreditation application that ASIS was not interested in itself developing such standards. ASIS asserts that "[p]er the ANSI *Essential Requirements* Section 1.4 and 2.4 on Coordination and Harmonization, dialogue should have occurred prior to submitting an ANSI application as an ASD and prior to any PINS submittal." (See ASIS International Appeal to ANSI ExSC, November 8, 2021 at pages 1 and 3-5.)

For its part, BEPP argues that "there is no ASIS standard for BEPP to conflict with, per the definition." (See BEPP Response to ASIS International Appeal to the ANSI ExSC, November 22, 2021 at page 19). BEPP maintains that it checked ANSI's website regularly and has found no ASIS PINS in the EP space. As ASIS has not announced any proposed EP standards through the ANS process, BEPP was not under an obligation to coordinate in accordance with sections 1.4 and 2.4 *Coordination and harmonization of the ANSI Essential Requirements*, which apply to proposed ANS, not accreditation applications.

We find that, while some level of coordination is required at the pre-application phase, the heightened coordination efforts described in Sections 1.4 and 2.4 are not applicable where, as here, there is no "existing" ANS or "candidate" ANS to which harmonization efforts could apply. Sections 1.4 and 2.4 require that "good faith" efforts be made to resolve potential conflicts between such "existing" and "candidate" ANS. By contrast, Section 4.1.2, the section addressing the *Application for Accreditation as a Developer of American National Standards*, requires only a statement from the applicant that

---

<sup>6</sup> This decision summarizes the oral and written arguments presented to the ANSI ExSC. While this decision may not reference every argument or point made in connection with the appeal, the ExSC had full access to the complete written record. The ExSC did not evaluate any technical data or make any assessment of the merits of the technical content of any particular standards or other documents, or other issues outside of the ExSC's jurisdiction identified within the context of this appeal. The ExSC relied on the written record and oral statements made by all parties regarding procedural matters only.

“details their coordination efforts to date and confirms their agreement to attempt to coordinate their standards activities with other ANSI-Accredited Standards Developers and with ANSI.” See Attachment B.

We find that BEPP’s application statements addressing discussions in 2018-2019 to encourage ASIS to develop EP standards, while limited, were sufficient to meet the requirements of Section 4.1.2. While ASIS takes issue with BEPP’s conclusion that it was “not interested” in developing standards in this space, we think it was not unreasonable for BEPP to draw that conclusion based on the fact that, despite Mr. Cameron’s advocacy of several years, ASIS did not take steps to develop or announce the development of an ANS relating to EP. Accordingly, Appellant’s arguments that BEPP failed to coordinate with ASIS are rejected.

**b. BEPP Provided Sufficient Notice of its Application under Section 4.1.2 *Application for Accreditation as a Developer of American National Standards***

ASIS also maintains that BEPP did not give ASIS sufficient notice of its intent to become accredited by ANSI and independently seek to develop EP-related ANS. BEPP counters that it in fact gave sufficient public notice by submitting its application for publication in *Standards Action* in accordance with ANSI's procedures and it was not required to do more. BEPP also recounts its pre-application attempts to encourage ASIS to develop an EP standard. (See BEPP Response to ASIS International Appeal to the ANSI ExSC, November 22, 2021 at pages 19, 25-26.)

The Panel notes that Section 4.1.2 requires only that “[a] notice announcing the application for accreditation be published in *Standards Action* with a call for comment.” The ANSI Executive Standards Council (ExSC) requires that the comment period be 30 days if procedures are available electronically or 45 days, if not. BEPP complied with this requirement as the application was submitted and timely published in ANSI's *Standards Action* providing Appellant and others with an opportunity for public comment through ANSI during the 30-day period of June 4, 2021 – July 5, 2021. No public comments were received from any party, including from ASIS. Accordingly, Appellant’s arguments regarding allegedly insufficient notice of BEPP’s application are rejected.

**c. BEPP’s Legal Entity Status is Sufficient**

Appellant also questions whether BEPP’s status as a stock company, rather than a 501(c)(3) makes BEPP ineligible to apply for accreditation. During the hearing, BEPP confirmed that it is indeed a stock company, but with an application pending for 501(c)(3) status. The ExSC notes that ANSI’s requirement is that an applicant for accreditation must be “incorporated, registered or otherwise recognized as a legal entity”, which includes both statuses. Accordingly, this is not a basis upon which accreditation would be withdrawn. (See ANSI Essential Requirements, January 2022, section 4.1.1 Criteria for accreditation.)

**d. ANSI’s Role**

To the extent the arguments raised by this appeal suggest that ANSI can pre-determine whether a single developer can “occupy” a particular area of standards development, the Panel notes that: (1) ANSI has no jurisdiction over standards development work that is outside of the ANS process; and (2) ANSI does not brand an ASD as “the” or an “exclusive” developer of standards in a given scope. Rather, accreditation by ANSI of a standards developer’s procedures gives that developer the right to try to develop ANS.

Only when a standards developer, like BEPP or ASIS proposes its standards for approval as ANS are they required to engage in good faith efforts to resolve potential conflicts between and among ANS. And, even then, there is no prohibition against two ANS on the same topic, as long as good faith efforts were made to resolve conflicts and no directly and materially interested parties were excluded from participating in the ANS process.<sup>7</sup>

### **3.0 Conclusion**

For the reasons set forth above, the ExSC denies this appeal and affirms its prior decision to accredit BEPP as an ASD.

---

<sup>7</sup> BEPP noted that it did not seek a certain category of contributor, i.e., those who own executive protection training schools, for its governing Board because of conflict of interest concerns; however, while this may be acceptable on a governing body of an organization, the ExSC notes that membership on an ANS consensus body must be open to all directly and materially interested parties, including eligible competitors and those with differing opinions. (*See* BEPP Response to ASIS International Appeal to the ANSI ExSC, November 22, 2021 at page 28.)

## Attachment A

### Select excerpts from the *ANSI Essential Requirements: due process requirements for American National Standards (2022)*

#### **1.4 Coordination and harmonization**

Good faith efforts shall be made to resolve potential conflicts between and among existing American National Standards and candidate American National Standards.

#### **2.4 Coordination and harmonization**

Good faith efforts shall be made to resolve potential conflicts between and among existing American National Standards and candidate American National Standards.

##### **2.4.1 Definition of Conflict**

Conflict within the ANS process refers to a situation where, viewed from the perspective of a future implementer, the terms of one standard are inconsistent or incompatible with the terms of the other standard such that implementation of one standard under terms allowable under that standard would preclude proper implementation of the other standard in accordance with its terms.

##### **2.4.2 Coordination/Harmonization**

ANSI-Accredited Standards Developers shall make a good-faith effort to resolve potential conflicts and to coordinate standardization activities intended to result in harmonized American National Standards<sup>8</sup>. A “good faith” effort shall require substantial, thorough and comprehensive efforts to harmonize a candidate ANS and existing ANSs. Such efforts shall include, at minimum, compliance with all relevant sections of these procedures<sup>9</sup>. Developers shall retain evidence of such efforts in order to demonstrate compliance with this requirement to the satisfaction of the appropriate ANSI body.

#### **4.1 Accreditation of American National Standards Developers**

A standards developer whose procedures meet the requirements of due process and criteria for approval and withdrawal of American National Standards contained herein and is incorporated, registered or otherwise recognized as a legal entity, may apply to ANSI for accreditation. To be accredited by ANSI, the developer’s procedures and practices for standards development shall meet the criteria for accreditation as set forth below. The ANSI Executive Standards Council (ExSC) is the accrediting body for developers of American National Standards. Accreditation is a pre-condition for submitting a standard for consideration for approval as an American National Standard.

##### **4.1.1 Criteria for accreditation**

Accreditation shall be based on compliance, as determined by the ANSI ExSC, with the following criteria:

- a) the applicant is incorporated, registered or otherwise recognized as a legal entity;
- b) the operating procedures used for the development of evidence of consensus for approval,

---

<sup>8</sup> Note that clause 4.2.1.3.4 *Withdrawal for Cause* provides a mechanism by which a directly and materially interested party who has been or will be adversely affected by the ANS may at any time request the withdrawal of an existing ANS.

<sup>9</sup> See, for example, clauses 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 and 4.3.

revision, reaffirmation, or withdrawal of standards as American National Standards shall satisfy the essential requirements contained herein;

- c) with respect to American National Standards or candidate American National Standards, including the national adoption of ISO or IEC standards as American National Standards, the applicant shall agree to:
  - 1) provide continuity of administrative oversight and support of its standards activities;
  - 2) provide for designation, publication, and maintenance of the standard(s) produced;
  - 3) provide for an appeals mechanism;
  - 4) cooperate with ANSI in standards planning and coordination activities of mutual interest;
  - 5) advise ANSI of the initiation and scope of new standards activities and revisions of existing standards expected to result in candidate American National Standards;
  - 6) submit to ANSI for public comment the requisite information concerning activities related to new candidate American National Standards and the national adoption of ISO or IEC standards as American National Standards as well as the revision, reaffirmation, or withdrawal of American National Standards;
  - 7) consider applicable international standards;
  - 8) comply with the procedures contained herein with respect to the national adoption of ISO and IEC standards as American National Standards; and
  - 9) pay to ANSI all relevant fees.
- d) as appropriate to the extent to which the applicant is involved with standardization, the applicant shall consider participation in international standards activities through ANSI; and
- e) with respect to submitting proposed American National Standards to ANSI for Board of Standards Review (BSR) approval, the applicant shall agree to comply with the normative policies and administrative procedures contained herein.

#### **4.1.2 Application for Accreditation as a Developer of American National Standards**

Application to ANSI for accreditation shall be in writing and shall include copies of the pertinent standards developing procedures and other documentation demonstrating compliance with the criteria specified in these procedures. If more than one set of standards developing procedures is used by an applicant, each procedure requires separate review for accreditation. The applicant shall submit its scope for informational purposes only, a description of its present program of standards activities and a list of candidate American National Standards. Also included shall be a statement from the applicant that details their coordination efforts to date and confirms their agreement to attempt to coordinate their standards activities with other ANSI-Accredited Standards Developers and with ANSI.

A notice announcing the application for accreditation shall be published in *Standards Action* with a call for comment. Copies of the pertinent standards developing procedures shall be available from the applicant, upon request.

Following the comment period, the ExSC shall consider the information supplied by the applicant and any comments and responses received, including reports on coordination from the appropriate ExSC designee if any, standards advisors, and the BSR. If comments are submitted that challenge support for an applicant's accreditation, the applicant shall supply documented evidence of sufficient support for consideration by the commenter and the ExSC. The ExSC shall determine whether accreditation should be approved. The applicant must satisfy the requirements established in the *ANSI Essential Requirements* before accreditation can be granted. If, during the course of the accreditation process, the developer makes a change to their originally submitted scope or to their originally submitted

operating procedures, an additional announcement shall be published in *Standards Action*. If, however, the developer makes changes to the originally submitted operating procedures at the specific direction of the ExSC or their designee in order to bring their procedures into compliance with the *ANSI Essential Requirements*, an informational announcement shall be placed in *Standards Action* without additional public review. Accreditation will not be granted to an applicant whose procedures do not satisfy the requirements set forth herein. In the event that accreditation is not granted, the ExSC shall advise the applicant of the reasons, and the applicant shall have the opportunity to reapply. Upon accreditation, the applicant shall be notified and a notice shall appear in *Standards Action*.

#### **4.2.1.1 Criteria for approval of an American National Standard**

With respect to any proposal to approve, revise or reaffirm an American National Standard (including the national adoption of an ISO or IEC standard as an American National Standard) for which one or more unresolved objections have been reported, the BSR shall evaluate whether:

- a) the standard was developed in accordance with the procedures upon which the developer was granted accreditation, with particular attention given to whether due process was followed, consensus was achieved, and an effort was made to resolve any objections to the standard;
- b) any appeal to the standards developer with respect to the standard was completed;
- c) notice of the development process for the standard was provided to ANSI in accordance with PINS or its equivalent;
- d) any identified conflict with another American National Standard was addressed in accordance with these procedures;
- e) other known national standards were examined with regard to harmonization and duplication of content and if duplication exists, there is a compelling need for the standard;
- f) ANSI's patent policy is met, if applicable;
- g) ANSI's policy on commercial terms and conditions is met, if applicable;
- h) the standards developer provided the following or evidence thereof:
  1. title and designation of the proposed American National Standard;
  2. indication of the type of action requested (that is, approval of a new American National Standard or reaffirmation, revision, or withdrawal of an existing American National Standard);
  3. a declaration that applicable procedures were followed;
  4. a declaration that the proposed standard is within the scope of the previously registered standards activity;
  5. a declaration that conflicts with another American National Standard have been addressed in accordance with these procedures;
  6. a roster of the consensus body that indicates: the vote of each member including abstentions and unreturned ballots, if applicable; the interest category of each member; and a summary thereof;
  7. a declaration that all appeal actions related to the approval of the proposed standard have been completed;

8. a declaration that the criteria contained in the ANSI patent policy have been met, if applicable; and
9. identification of all unresolved negative views and objections, with names of the objector(s), and a report of attempts toward resolution.

If the BSR determines, based on the weight of the evidence presented, that the above-stated criteria have been satisfied, the standard shall be approved as an American National Standard. The BSR shall deny approval, if, based on the weight of the evidence presented, the BSR determines that the American National Standard:

- a) is contrary to the public interest;
- b) contains unfair provisions;
- c) is unsuitable for national use;

or that the ASD has failed to make a good faith effort to resolve conflicts.



**Application for Accreditation as a Standards Developer  
By the American National Standards Institute**

**SECTION I - Organization Seeking Accreditation**

Organization: Board of Executive Protection Professionals

**Official Contact:** James Cameron

**Address:** 8131 Dolce Flore Ave

**City:** Las Vegas

**State:** Nevada    **Zip:** 89178

**Telephone:** 714 510 067

**Facsimile:** N/A

**Email:** info@ep-board.org

**SECTION II - Scope and Rationale**

**A. Scope\*** : (Please include only the scope of the standards development activities for which you are seeking accreditation by ANSI.)

Our organization is pursuing a national standard that focuses on Executive Protection. This standard will establish the compulsory platform for competently, professionally, and ethically providing this specialized service for high-net-worth individuals, government officials, business executives, foreign diplomats, and other at-risk individuals.

Currently, there is no established standard in this complex domain, allowing unqualified individuals to provide support, placing those in their charge at increased physical risk and liability.

**B. Rationale\*** : (Include justification/assessment of the economic and social advantages which would result from the approval of your proposed standards as American National Standards. This should include demonstrated support by the affected industry area for the standards activity.)

When charged with the protection and security of individuals, including children, it is imperative to have certain minimum standards to refer to, which currently do not exist. The motivation is to create a consistent and measurable platform in this niche yet expanding security industry market.

---

\* Attach separate sheet if necessary

The standards established and follow-up Board Certification will create qualifiers for employers when assessing an individual's competence to perform this complex and often sensitive service. Advantages for those who meet the American National Standard on Executive Protection would include the following:

- Commonality in terms thus creating continuity in the industry
- Creates continuity in the industry
- Standardized knowledge base to refer to
- Increased client confidence in the expertise of the individual hired to protect them
- Reduce negative public contacts due to a more thorough understanding of the position
- Expanded Career Opportunities
- Increase potential for positions with higher responsibilities
- Enhanced Income
- Reduced General Liability Insurance Premiums
- Personal satisfaction of achievement
- Validated to mentor new individuals joining the Executive Protection industry

### **SECTION III - Information Regarding Standards Activities**

#### **A. Operating Procedures**

The organization agrees to comply with and operate under its own procedures for documenting consensus on proposed American National Standards. These procedures meet the requirements found in the *ANSI Essential Requirements* (attach copy of procedures to application).

#### **B. Requested Enclosures - Administrative Documentation**

Please enclose the following items:

- The scopes of committees, subcommittees or technical committees that have standards development or approval responsibilities (i.e. which group is the consensus body?).  
 See attached.  
\_\_\_\_\_ See section 2 of the enclosed operating procedures.
- Policy regarding evidence of compliance (record retention).  
 See attached.  
\_\_\_\_\_ See section 2.3 of enclosed operating procedures.
- Policy regarding interpretation of the developer's American National Standards.  
 See attached.  
\_\_\_\_\_ See section 8 of enclosed operating procedures.
- Metric Policy.  
 See attached.  
\_\_\_\_\_ See section 12 of enclosed operating procedures.

- Commercial Terms and Conditions.  
 See attached.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ See section \_\_\_\_\_ 10 \_\_\_\_\_ of enclosed operating procedures.
- Patent Policy.  
 See attached.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ See section \_\_\_\_\_ 9 \_\_\_\_\_ of enclosed operating procedures.
- Antitrust Policy.  
 See attached.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ See section \_\_\_\_\_ 11 \_\_\_\_\_ of enclosed operating procedures.
- Appeals Procedures.  
 See attached.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ See section \_\_\_\_\_ 14 \_\_\_\_\_ of enclosed operating procedures
- Attach initial list of your consensus body (i.e. canvass list, committee members, consensus body within the organization). Please identify and discretely define the interest categories applicable to the consensus body(ies).

Commission Members (Consensus body)

| Name                | ANSI Category                  |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| Bill Cage           | General Interest               |
| Don Robinson        | General Interest               |
| Jason Johnson       | General Interest               |
| Roman Garcia        | General Interest               |
| Chris Grow          | Producer                       |
| Deni Grow           | Producer                       |
| Lance Guillory, CPP | Producer                       |
| Tom Lebrun          | Producer                       |
| Travis Lishok, CPP  | Producer                       |
| Anthony DeMolina    | Specific Subject Matter Expert |
| Joe Aurtera         | Specific Subject Matter Expert |
| Micheal Debusk MD   | Specific Subject Matter Expert |
| Raffaele Di Giorgio | Specific Subject Matter Expert |
| Timothy Bigler, CPP | Specific Subject Matter Expert |
| Aurelia Fedenish    | User                           |
| Gerry Boniello, CPP | User                           |
| James Cameron, CPP  | User                           |
| Michael Pukish      | User                           |
| Steve Hernandez     | User                           |

| ANSI Categories for Balance    | Interpritation                                     | Total Number | Percentage  |
|--------------------------------|--|--------------|-------------|
| Producer                       | Executive Protection Agent                         | 5            | 26%         |
| User                           | Business Owner/Sr. Leadership Team Member          | 5            | 26%         |
| Specific Subject Matter Expert | Individuals with Specific Skills and Certificaiton | 5            | 26%         |
| General Interest               | All others   | 4            | 21%         |
|                                | <b>Total</b>                                       | <b>19</b>    | <b>100%</b> |

### C. Coordination Efforts

- **Briefly describe your present program of standards activities. Please include, as applicable, a listing of candidate American National Standards (you may provide this information as a separate attachment, if necessary):**

This is our first American National Standards application. However, members of our commission have been involved with ANSI process during the creation of ASIS Standards such as revision of ASIS WBPI AA-202 (Workplace Violence and Active Assailant-Prevention, Intervention, and Response and creation and revision of ANSI/ASIS PSC.1-2012 (Management Systems for Quality of Private Security Company Operations-Requirements with Guidance)

- **Please describe your efforts to coordinate your standardization efforts with other organizations/groups to date:**

In 2018 and 2019, robust dialogue occurred at several meetings with the ASIS Executive Protection Council, encouraging the Council to establish the standard we are currently proposing. The Council had no interest in putting forth the required effort or resources to develop an American National Standard.

During a recent May 2021 web conference hosted by the Executive Protection Council, the topic was again raised. The Council Chair reiterated that ASIS was not considering establishing a standard for this domain.

Over the past decade, as expressed in numerous industry conferences, there is an increasing consensus and desire among industry leaders to establish a standard for Executive Protection. Several factors driving this effort include the need for employers to have a benchmark to gauge an applicant's competence, the growing number of unqualified individuals asserting their expertise in this domain, the increased exposure to risk and liability, the declining quality of services, and the overall deterioration of the profession.

By signing this application, your organization formally states its agreement to attempt to coordinate its standards activities with other ANSI-accredited standards developers and with ANSI.

### D. Resources: Staffing

**Please provide an explanation of how your organization will provide continuity of administrative oversight and support of its standards activities:**

Our organization was opened with the specific task of creating and managing this standard for the Executive Protection sector. Our Executive Management teams' sole purpose is to maintain continuity, administration and oversight of this standard.

## SECTION IV - Certification of Procedural Requirements

### A. Certification from Standards Developer Using Its Own Operating Procedures:

We certify that the procedures we are using meet or exceed the due process requirements specified in the *ANSI Essential Requirements*, including:

- Openness (1.1 and 2.1)
- Lack of dominance (1.2 and 2.2)
- Balance (1.3 and 2.3)
- Coordination and harmonization (1.4 and 2.4)
- Written Procedures (1.9)
- Interest Categories (2.3)
- Notification of Standards Development (1.5 and 2.5)
- Consideration of Views and Objections (1.6 and 2.6)
- Evidence of Consensus and Consensus Body Vote (1.7 and 2.7)
- Appeals (1.8 and 2.8)
- ANSI Patent Policy (3.1)
- Commercial Terms and Conditions (3.2)
- ANSI Antitrust Policy (3.3)
- Evidence of compliance (3.44)
- Metrics (3.5)
- Interpretations (3.6)
- Procedures for the National Adoption of ISO or IEC Standards (4.6)
- Maintenance of American National Standards (4.7)

## **B. General Certification from Standards Developer**

1. We agree that the standards we submit for approval as American National Standards or revisions thereof must comply with both the Criteria for Approval of American National Standards specified in 4.2.1.1 of the *ANSI Essential Requirements* and with all administrative requirements relating to the American National Standard submittal process.
  - The standard was developed in accordance with the procedures upon which the developer was granted accreditation with particular attention given to whether due process was followed, consensus was achieved, and an effort was made to resolve any objections to the standard.
  - Any appeal to the standards developer with respect to the standard was completed.
  - Notice of development process for the standard was provided to ANSI in accordance with PINS or its equivalent.
  - Any identified conflict with another American National Standard was addressed in accordance with the developer's procedures.
  - Other known national standards were examined with regard to harmonization and duplication of content and if duplication exists, there is a compelling need for the standard.
  - ANSI's patent policy is met.
  - ANSI's policy on commercial terms and conditions is met.
  - ANSI's antitrust policy is met.
2. We agree that the standards we submit for approval as reaffirmations of American National Standards must comply with the Criteria for Reaffirmation of American National Standards specified in 4.2.1.2 of the *ANSI Essential Requirements*.
  - The due process and consensus requirements were met.
  - The reaffirmation does not include any substantive change(s) to the main text of the standard.
  - All non-substantive changes in the main text of the standard were explained or noted in a foreword.

- The designation of the American National Standard clearly indicates that the approval is a reaffirmation.
3. We agree that the standards submitted for withdrawal as American National Standards shall comply with the Criteria for Withdrawal of American National Standards specified in 4.2.1.3 of the *ANSI Essential Requirements*.
  4. With respect to American National Standards or candidates therefore, we agree to (see clause 4.1.1 of the *ANSI Essential Requirements*):
    - Provide continuity of administrative oversight and support of our standards activities.
    - Provide for designation, publication and maintenance of the standard(s) produced.
    - Provide for an appeals mechanism
    - Cooperate with ANSI in standards planning and coordination activities of mutual interest.
    - Advise ANSI of the initiation and scope of new standards activities and revisions of existing standards expected to result in candidate American National Standards.
    - Submit to ANSI for public comment the requisite information concerning activities related to new candidate American National Standards and the national adoption of ISO or IEC standards as American National Standards as well as the revision, reaffirmation or withdrawal of American National Standards.
    - Consider using applicable international standards.
    - Comply with the applicable ANSI procedures with respect to the national adoption of ISO and IEC standards as American National Standards.
    - Pay to ANSI all relevant fees, including all costs associated with the procedural audit of our ANSI-related standards activities (including payment of annual ANSI Membership/equivalent Maintenance of Accreditation Dues and a National Activity Assessment based upon the number of American National Standards maintained).
  5. With respect to submitting proposed American National Standards to ANSI, we agree to provide the following (clause 4.2.1.1):
    - Title and designation of the proposed American National Standard.
    - Indication of the type of action requested (that is, approval of a new American National Standard or reaffirmation, revision, or withdrawal of an existing American National Standard).
    - A declaration that applicable procedures were followed.
    - A declaration that the proposed standard is within the scope of the previously registered standards activity.
    - A declaration that any identified conflicts with another American National Standard have been identified and addressed in accordance with 2.5 of the *ANSI Essential Requirements*.
    - A roster of the consensus body that indicates: the vote of each member including abstentions and unreturned ballots, if applicable; the interest category of each member; and a summary thereof.
    - A declaration that all appeal actions related to the approval of the proposed standard have been completed.
    - A declaration that the criteria contained in the ANSI Patent Policy have been met.
    - Identification of all unresolved negative views and objections, with names of the objector(s) and a report of attempts toward resolution.
    - Applicable ANSI fees for maintenance of accreditation.
  6. When the ANSI Executive Standards Council issues an interpretation to the *ANSI Essential Requirements* or a policy statement, we agree to make any necessary revisions to our accredited

procedures to be in conformance with ANSI requirements. These revisions shall be made in accordance with the implementation schedule supplied by the Executive Standards Council.

7. In those instances when the *ANSI Essential Requirements* are revised, we agree to make any necessary revisions to our accredited procedures to be in conformance with ANSI requirements. These revisions will be made in accordance with the implementation schedule supplied by the Executive Standards Council.
8. We agree to notify and provide to ANSI in a timely manner a detailed description of any revision to the organization structure of the developer that affects its accredited procedures and all revisions of the accredited procedures, which includes both substantive and editorial.
9. We hereby represent and certify that any electronic submittal provided to ANSI in lieu of a hard-copy form (i.e. PINS, BSR-8, or BSR-9 Forms) that requires a signature indicating that certain representations are being made to ANSI, may be treated and relied on by ANSI as if the Accredited Standards Developer (ASD) actually signed and delivered the form in hard-copy to ANSI. The ASD confirms that ANSI can rely on this in receiving and processing the electronic submittal. This certification will remain in effect for all electronic submittals made to ANSI unless and until ANSI receives a written notice from the ASD stating otherwise.

#### **SECTION V – Conflict of Interest**

The Conflict of Interest provisions contained in clause 12 of the current version of the *Operating Procedures of the ANSI Executive Standards Council* (excerpted next page) apply to the review of every application for ANSI Accredited Standards Developer accreditation and every set of revised procedures submitted for reaccreditation. Please review the current listing of ANSI Executive Standards Council Members posted at:

[http://www.ansi.org/about\\_ansi/structure\\_management/committees/exsc/exsc.aspx?menuid=1#Officers](http://www.ansi.org/about_ansi/structure_management/committees/exsc/exsc.aspx?menuid=1#Officers)

If you wish to identify any ExSC member as posing a potential conflict of interest concern, please advise staff upon submittal of your application (or revised procedures), and the relevant provisions shall apply.

#### **SECTION VI - Legal Entity**

An applicant for accreditation as an ANSI-Accredited Standards Developer (ASD) must be a legal entity, accept all legal and financial responsibility for the administration of its accredited standards program and maintain adequate resources, including insurance, to cover any expenses or liabilities that may arise from this role.

#### **SECTION VII - Application Fee**

A nonrefundable payment in the amount of **\$5,000.00** is included with this application. Payments shall be made to the ***American National Standards Institute***.

## SECTION VIII - Signature

We understand that if the conditions upon which accreditation is granted are not maintained, withdrawal of accreditation may result.

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ 

**Print or Type Name:** James Cameron

**Title:** President/CEO

**Organization:** Board of Executive Protection  
Professionals

**Mailing Address:** 8131 Dolce Flore Ave  
Las Vegas NV 89178

**Telephone:** 714-510-0671

**Facsimile:** N/A

**Email:** info@ep-board.com

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_ 2 Aug 2021

### *Excerpted from the Operating Procedures of the ANSI Executive Standards Council*

#### **12 Conflict of Interest**

A member of the ExSC shall act at all times in a manner that promotes confidence in the integrity and impartiality of ANSI's processes and procedures and should avoid a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest in connection with all ExSC activities. A conflict of interest can arise from involvement by an ExSC member with the subject matter of a dispute under consideration by the ExSC or from any relationship between the ExSC member and a party to an action before the ExSC, whether past or present, that reasonably raises a question of an ExSC member's impartiality.

Typically a potential conflict of interest arises when a member of the ExSC participated in activities integral to the particular issue under review or that person is employed by, or a member of the governing body of, the relevant standards developer or other entity as applicable. Similarly, a conflict of interest usually does not exist by virtue of the fact that a member of the ANSI committee participated in the development of standards by a particular standards developer or is a member of that standards developer.

If a materially affected party (such as a standards developer or a possible appellant) asserts that it believes that a member of the ExSC has a conflict of interest, that materially affected party is required to state the reason(s) for its belief. That information shall then be forwarded to the member of the ExSC identified as having a possible conflict for that person's response. If that committee member disagrees with the assertion, then the Chairman of the ExSC shall make a final determination as to whether a conflict of interest exists.

Members of the ExSC who are disqualified from a particular discussion shall not participate in the deliberations or decisions.

*January 1, 2018*