

## AFAA’s Voting Guide for the 2024 NFPA Technical Meeting:

### Introduction:

NFPA’s 2024 Technical Meeting will be held in person in Orlando, next week on June 20<sup>th</sup>. This guide is provided to provide AFAA members with details about the voting process.

More than 60 AFAA members dedicate a great deal of time and expertise on dozens of technical committees. AFAA appreciates the commitment of these members and their employers for participating in this important process. AFAA urges all members that will be attending the NFPA Conference in Orlando to also participate in the NFPA Technical Meeting.

To find out more information on how to attend and register for this meeting, click [here](#).

The following CAMs (Certified Amending Motions) were reviewed by **AFAA Codes and Standards Committee**. Reasons for these positions are listed on Page 2.

The committee’s position to oppose or support is indicated as follows.

<i>Code</i>	<i>CAM ID#</i>	<i>AFAA Position</i>
<i>72</i>	<i>72-2</i>	<i>Support</i>
<i>72</i>	<i>72-6</i>	<i>Oppose</i>
<i>13</i>	<i>13-19</i>	<i>Support</i>
<i>150</i>	<i>150-7 thru 150-14 Heard as one</i>	<i>Oppose</i>

For CAMs not listed here, the AFAA Codes & Standards Committee supports the position of the respective partner sprinkler associations. Here are links to these reports:

[AFSA Voting Guide 2024](#)

[NFSA Voting Guide 2024](#)

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Tim Knisely – AFAA Training Manager at (814) 933-8552 or by email at [training@afaa.org](mailto:training@afaa.org).

Reasons for the AFAA C&S Position to support or oppose:

**CAM 72-2** Reject Second Revision No. 5127 (section 26.6.5.1)  
**AFAA C&S SUPPORTS this CAM.**

**Reason:**

It was learned after the NFPA 72 second draft meetings that at least one product is listed for two-way radio and therefore this section should not be deleted.

**CAM 72-6** Reject Second Revision No. 5025 ((section 17.7.4.2.3.1\*)  
**AFAA OPPOSES this CAM**

**Reason:**

1. The NFPA 72 SIG-IDS technical committee carefully considered the information and conclusions in the Fire Protection Research Foundation report, *Smoke Detector Spacing in High Ceiling Spaces Phase 2*. While the report offered an option to adjust smoke detector spacing based on a ceiling height formula, the technical committee deemed this approach too complex for inclusion in the standard. The report did offer other alternate approaches based on other assumptions.
2. The proposed language in 17.7.4.2.3.1 is not inconsistent with the recommendations in the FPRF report. The recommendations are explained in Section 16 of the research.
3. The proposed language in 17.7.4.2.3.1 is not contrary to Annex B. The guidelines in NFPA 72 Annex B are for “informational purposes only.” They are based on certain assumptions of how fires develop and research that was conducted in the mid-1990s. Whether or not Annex B is in conflict with SR-5025 depends entirely on the specifics of the application, assumptions of the development of the fire and tenability criteria.
4. The new text of SR-5025 that allows standard spacing on ceilings up to 40 feet is consistent with many international guidelines for spacing smoke detectors on high ceilings, including Germany and France.
5. Since there was no first draft revision for this section, if the CAM were to pass, there would exist no smoke detector spacing guidance in the standard for ceilings over 10 feet.

There are numerous other CAM’s with no direct fire alarm implications, however AFAA C&S did discuss and vote to support the following positions:

**CAM 13-19** Reject second revision no. 1122 **SUPPORT CAM**

**CAM 150-7 through 150-14** all deal with the same section and will be heard as one motion.

Support the committee and **OPPOSE CAM**

Release date: June 7, 2024

This document may be updated as needed.