



# **AACE** INTERNATIONAL RECOMMENDED PRACTICE

## **DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES AND PROCESS**

**This file MUST be opened in  
Adobe Acrobat (not in a web  
browser).**

**It contains several embedded  
attachments that are only  
accessible through the  
Acrobat interface.**



## Recommended Practice (RP) Development Process

(Rev. 2025-01-12)

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	2
2.	Summary of the Typical Process	2
3.	Summary of Overall Responsibilities	3
	Director of RPs (AAACE Tech Board) Responsibilities (DRP)	3
	Primary Contributor (Author) Responsibilities (PC)	3
	Subcommittee Chair Responsibilities (SCC)	3
	Technical Board Liaison Responsibilities (TBL)	4
	Reviewer/Commenter Responsibilities (R/C)	4
	AAACE Technical Board Responsibilities (TB)	4
	AAACE Headquarters Responsibilities (HQ)	4
4.	Criteria for Primary vs. Regular Contributors for Recommended Practices	5
	Primary Contributor(s) (Author)	5
	Contributor(s)	5
5.	Rules of Engagement and Participation	5
6.	Recommended Practice Development Process	6
	I. RP Scoping Process	6
	II. RP Development Process	7
	III. Subcommittee Review Process	8
	IV. Public Review Process	9
	V. Publication Process	10
7.	Appeal Process	12
8.	ANSI Requirements	13
	Process Project Initiation Notification System (PINS)	13
	ANSI Publication Process	15
9.	Reference Documents	15
10.	Detailed Process Map	16

## 1. INTRODUCTION

AACE International recommended practices (RPs) represent the cost engineering industry's methodologies regarding related technical topics. They establish the technical foundation for our educational and certification products and services. RPs are aligned with the *Total Cost Management Framework* and provide technical reference information vetted by a rigorous review process regarding specific competency areas. RPs may be industry-generic, providing a broad overview of specific practices that apply to most industries, or industry-specific, describing a particular application of a practice in a specific industry.

The intent of the RPs is to provide AACE membership and cost engineering and project controls practitioners with industry-vetted solutions, guidelines, and recommendations to advance total cost management. All RPs are required to relate to 1) TCM/cost engineering/project controls domains and their respective specialties and sub-domains and 2) define purposeful, objective, repeatable practice/deliverables.

- Purpose: The RP is designed to fit within AACE's TCM Framework and other AACE RPs to optimize inter-enterprise performance.
- Knowledge: The RP is designed to provide users with industry knowledge and practices that assist them in increasing their skills for use within their respective organizations.
- Usability: The RP is designed to provide the reader with deliverables/practices that will enhance their work efforts and create standardization and interoperability of the functions under the cost engineering domain.

Based on this understanding, this document is to be used for the development of new AACE International RPs. It is intended to explain the RP development process, provide guidance to contributors, and define the roles and responsibilities for the publication of new recommended practices. A separate guideline is provided for the review of legacy RPs. The RP development process also explains how to submit an RP under development to be an ANSI standard.

## 2. SUMMARY OF THE TYPICAL PROCESS

The recommended practice/ANSI standard development process entails multiple steps that are followed in sequence. These steps are summarized as follows:



Once a step has been completed, the draft RP will be reviewed and approved so it can advance to the next step. If necessary, the RP may require content changes, additions, and deletions to ensure compatibility with other AACE RPs and industry standards. Once the reconciliation and changes are approved, the RP can advance. In terms of the review timelines (open for review), the subcommittee review period is 45 days, and the public review period is also 45 days.

### 3. SUMMARY OF OVERALL RESPONSIBILITIES

#### **Director of RPs (AACE Tech Board) Responsibilities (DRP)**

1. Monitors and facilitates the RP process and assists in shepherding the RP through the entire process, including the ANSI approval process.
2. Provides updates to the master RP log on the status of all RPs. Tracks the current status of RP development associated with their subcommittees.
3. Ensures that legacy RPs are updated as per AACE protocols.
4. Works with other Tech Board Members and Subcommittees to identify future RP needs.
5. Review and validate the RP scoping document in conjunction with the assigned subcommittee chair.
6. Review and validate the ANSI PINS document before submittal to ANSI.
7. Walks the primary contributor through the development and disposition processes and assists with RP development as necessary.

#### **Primary Contributor (Author) Responsibilities (PC)**

1. Develop new or update the existing scoping document(s) to provide a general and/or specific understanding of key concepts, ideas, and focus of the proposed RP based on expertise on the subject matter.
2. Develop the RP in alignment with AACE, Total Cost management, and its sub-domains. If the RP has been selected as an ANSI Standard, ensure there is no duplication or conflict to ANSI documents.
3. Develop the RP to promote the practical usability of industry knowledge (it is developed to allow the user to apply/replicate the recommended practice). Other responsibilities include:
  - a. The RP is technically correct, addresses the subject matter clearly and thoroughly, and effectively communicates all technical aspects of the RP.
  - b. The RP is clearly organized and is reinforced with developed reasoning, examples, figures, and other supporting information.
  - c. The RP has a fluent style and demonstrates syntactic variety and clear command of language and vocabulary.
4. Develop the RP while following the RP development process through subcommittee and public reviews.
5. Consolidate all disposition logs and address comments in a fair, equitable, reasonable, and timely manner while updating/maintaining the comments in the disposition log. The comment disposition log is an established form that includes the following information: Name of person providing the comment, date of the comment, RP section, line number, the comment itself, and disposition of comment (form attached to this PDF).
6. Maintains communication with the subcommittee chair or designee as appropriate.
7. If necessary, contact reviewers/commenters to seek understanding and clarity on their respective comments. Promote a collaborative discussion to assist in the disposition of the comment(s).

#### **Subcommittee Chair Responsibilities (SCC)**

The following items are the responsibility of the technical subcommittee chair or his/her designee. The responsibilities below should not be performed by the author or primary contributor(s).

1. Monitor and facilitate the progress of all recommended practice development for which the subcommittee is responsible.
2. Review and approve RP scoping documents affiliated with the subcommittee. Once approved, forward the final scoping document to the Technical Board for approval.
3. Maintain scoping documents related to their subcommittee for recommended practice development.
4. Assist primary contributor with RP development as necessary.
5. Review and distribute the draft RP in accordance with the RP development process.
6. Review the completed comment disposition log after subcommittee review to ensure that all comments are included in the log and have been addressed.

### **Technical Board Liaison Responsibilities (TBL)**

1. Review RP scoping documents affiliated with the subcommittee.
2. Assist subcommittee chair and primary contributor with RP development as necessary.

### **Reviewer/Commenter Responsibilities (R/C)**

Reviewers of draft RPs are expected to critically review the draft RP, primarily regarding its content. Although proposed grammar improvements are welcome, it is more important that the technical content of the RP is in alignment with industry practices.

The names of reviewers may be added to the RP as a contributor if the review comments are, in the view of the author and/or the Technical Board, substantial enough to add technical value to the RP. Contributor credit will not be given for grammar or stylistic comments. Reviewers/commenters who participate in the RP review process acknowledge that their comments become the intellectual property of AACE.

1. Ensures that the RP is technically correct, that the author addresses the subject matter clearly and thoroughly, and effectively communicates all technical aspects of the RP.
  - a. If not, Identify any issues with the RP narrative and provide alternative language that improves clarity and language and is technically more in line with industry practices.
  - b. Provide explanations and context behind their comments regarding any recommended technical revisions.
2. Ensures that the RP is clearly organized and is reinforced with developed reasoning, examples, figures, and other supporting information.
3. Input all comments in the disposition log provided.
4. In some circumstances, the author may reach out to the reviewers/commenters to seek understanding and clarity on their respective comments. Please be prepared to have a collaborative discussion to assist in the disposition of the comment(s).

### **AACE Technical Board Responsibilities (TB)**

1. Review the RP for technical content and alignment with the *TCM Framework*.
2. Review the completed comment disposition log after subcommittee review and public review to ensure that all comments have been addressed and adjudicated.
3. With a quorum present (in person or virtually), a majority vote (greater than 50%) is needed to approve a new or updated recommended practice. Members of the Tech Board who are not present may designate a proxy member who is attending to provide their vote. Approves/disapproves the recommended practice under consideration for public review and publication.

The ANSI standards development process should have a balance of interests<sup>1</sup>. If the Technical Board voting membership lacks balance, outreach to achieve balance will be undertaken. **(Balance)**

If an appeal has been submitted, AACE will assign the appropriate personnel to manage the appeal process and ensure resolution. The appeals process is addressed later in this document.

### **AACE Headquarters Responsibilities (HQ)**

1. Assists in monitoring and facilitating the RP process.
2. In coordination with the RP Coordinator, maintain the RP log that tracks the primary contributor and the current status of RP development.

---

<sup>1</sup> As determined in accordance with ANSI's criteria for balance.

3. Format and distribute the RP. This includes quality and plagiarism checks, review of punctuation, spelling, copyright issues, and editorial integrity.
  - a. If the RP includes new or revised terms and definitions, these need to be clearly pointed out when distributing the RP.
4. Maintain version histories of recommended practice and comment disposition log source files.
5. Review and distribute the draft RP in accordance with the development process.
6. Notifies the primary contributor and subcommittee chair upon publication.
7. Maintains communication with the RP Coordinator and Technical Board as appropriate.
8. Once the Technical Board has approved the RP for publication, AACE Headquarters (or the primary contributor) distributes the final comment disposition log to each commenter, including all comments, the primary contributor's responses, and the Technical Board's responses. This is done in the interest of creating a transparent process.

#### **4. CRITERIA FOR PRIMARY VS. REGULAR CONTRIBUTORS FOR RECOMMENDED PRACTICES**

##### **Primary Contributor(s) (Author)**

1. Being a Primary Contributor is open to anyone interested in submitting a Recommended Practice. No undue financial requirements shall be placed primary contributor to submit a Recommended Practice. It is expected that the primary contributor has a general and/or specific (both theoretical and practical) understanding and knowledge of key concepts, ideas, and focus of the proposed RP based on expertise on the subject matter.
2. If there is more than one primary contributor, all must individually have provided significant portions of the written content critical to the development of the RP.
3. If called upon, should have enough knowledge of the RP content to be able to provide a presentation, or discuss its content in detail with authority.
4. Provide all draft revisions and updates to the RP, including review comment dispositions.
5. An RP typically has one or two primary contributors. Listing more than two primary contributors will require Technical Board approval.

##### **Contributor(s)**

1. Have provided materially applicable technical content that has been incorporated into the RP.
2. Have provided significant editorial comments that add clarity or materially improve the RP.
3. Grammatical and minor editorial suggestions/edits are not considered to be contributions that warrant Contributor status.

#### **5. RULES OF ENGAGEMENT AND PARTICIPATION**

When developing a recommended practice, establishing clear rules of engagement and participation is essential to ensure a structured and collaborative process. These rules set expectations for all participants, defining how input will be gathered, decisions made, and responsibilities assigned. This fosters open communication, maintains focus on objectives, and efficiently produces a comprehensive and effective procedure. For these purposes, AACE will ensure that there is no single interest category, individual, or organization that will be allowed to dominate<sup>2</sup> the RP development process. The following points are to be considered when participating in the development of an RP.

- Ensure that everyone's perspective is considered to create a comprehensive and effective recommended practice.
- Maintain transparent and open channels of communication. Encourage members to voice their ideas, concerns, and suggestions during development.
- Strive for consensus in decision-making. Aim for solutions that balance different viewpoints and meet the overall objectives.

---

<sup>2</sup> Dominance means a position or exercise of dominant authority, leadership, or influence because of superior leverage, strength, or representation to exclude fair and equitable consideration of other viewpoints. (Lack of Dominance)

- Ensure that all perspectives are evaluated and encourage open dialogue.
- Leverage the expertise of specialists in relevant areas to guide specific sections of the recommended practice. Ensure that their input is valued and incorporated where applicable.
- Actively seek feedback from members during reviews and ensure it is integrated into the recommended practice. Address feedback constructively and promptly.
- Prioritize quality over speed. Ensure that the final product meets the required standards and effectively serves its intended purpose.

## 6. RECOMMENDED PRACTICE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

### Roles/Legend:

- DRP – Tech Board Director of Recommended Practices
- HQ – AACE International Headquarters Liaison to the Technical Board
- PC – Primary Contributor (ANSI defines this individual as the developer)
- R/C – Reviewer/Commenter
- SCC – Subcommittee chair or designee
- TB – Technical Board
- TBL – Tech Board Liaison

### I. RP Scoping Process

The scoping document is intended to concisely describe the RP content and ensure alignment with the *Total Cost Management (TCM) Framework* and other published recommended practices.

The RP Scoping Process includes use of the following documents:

- the *RP Scoping Document Template* (Attachment A)
- the *RP Scoping Document Review Form* (Attachment BB)
- the *ANSI PINS Form* (Attachment C)

The scoping document template must be utilized for this step of the RP development process. It is maintained by AACE Headquarters and is attached to this development process as Attachment A. Without approval of the Technical Board, no more than two primary contributors can be listed on the scoping document template.

STEP	DESCRIPTION	RESPONSIBILITY
1.	Identify the need for a new RP and communicate with SCC to discuss further. Once agreed upon, an email will be sent to the DRP to determine if an existing scoping document exists.	Anyone/SCC
2.	Solicit a PC(s) with the expertise/knowledge to develop the RP. Only two PCs can be assigned to the development of the RP (unless approved by the TB). One PC must be an AACE member.	SCC
3.	Develop (or update the existing) scoping document for approval, ensuring current version utilizes the <i>RP Scoping Document Template</i> (see Attachment A). PC(s) to ensure that the RP meets the conditions outlined in the RP Development Process Guideline.	PC
4.	Review the scoping document and complete the <i>RP Scoping Document Review Form</i> (see Attachment B). This may be an iterative/collaborative step between the PC and SCC. Once an agreement has been determined, the SCC will send the scoping document and associated review form to the DRP for consideration and approval.	SCC

STEP	DESCRIPTION	RESPONSIBILITY
5.	Review scoping document and associated review form for approval. This review includes confirmation that no other subcommittees are affected by the proposed document and that the proposed RP will not duplicate or contradict the <i>TCM</i> or existing recommended practices. a. If yes – make motion to the TB for approval of the scoping document. b. If no – return to SCC and PC (Repeat Step 3).	DRP
6.	Technical Board considers motion for approval of the scoping document. a. If yes – send a notification to the DRP indicating disposition. b. If no – return to SCC and PC (Repeat Step 3)	TB
7.	TB is required to review the scoping document and determine/approve RP to be developed as an ANSI standard. a. If yes to an ANSI standard, PC must complete the PINS form, submit to the DRP who will submit to ANSI. The PINS review process: i. Assess ANSI documents (current) for duplication/conflict issues. ii. For ANSI standards, the <i>ANSI PINS Form</i> (see Attachment C) is completed and submitted to ANSI for review (30 days). iii. ANSI to review the PINS form, assess for duplication/conflicts, and request additional information (as necessary, within the 30-day PINS review period). iv. AACE to respond (30 days) to any written correspondence from ANSI regarding the PINS submittal. b. If no, proceed to develop the RP as an AACE product (only). A detailed understanding of the PINS process is provided in Section 8 of this document.	TB
8.	Assign RP a reference number for document control purposes.	HQ
9.	DRP to update the master RP log, send the PC the requirements templates, style guides, etc., and walk the PC through the development process (as necessary).	DRP

## II. RP Development Process

The initial RP Development must utilize the following documents:

- the RP Template (Attachment D)
- the Technical Document Style Guide (Attachment E)
- the Style Guide Adherence Review Form (Attachment F)
- the Recommended Practice Review Form (Attachment G)
- the Comment-Disposition Log Template (Attachment H)

STEP	DESCRIPTION	RESPONSIBILITY
10.	Develop the initial draft of the RP in accordance with these RP development guidelines, utilizing the <i>RP Template</i> (see Attachment D). Ensure that the RP is in alignment with the TCM Framework. The PC will also comply with the style requirements provided in the <i>Technical Document Style Guide</i> (see Attachment E) and completes the <i>Style Guide Adherence Review Form</i> (see Attachment F). The completed draft along with the completed form should be submitted to the SCC.	PC
	For RPs that have been designated to be an ANSI standard candidate, ensure ANSI compliance (no reported duplicates or conflicts). The PC will work with the TB (and others) to review current ANSI products to ensure that there are no duplicates or conflicts).	
11.	Review draft RP by the applicable technical subcommittee chair. The subcommittee chair checks to ensure the RP draft is of acceptable standards, clearly written, and is in alignment with the scoping document by completing the <i>Recommended Practice Review Form</i> (see Attachment G). a. If yes – the subcommittee chair submits to DRP.	SCC



STEP	DESCRIPTION	RESPONSIBILITY
	b. If no – the subcommittee chair provides comments back to the PC for edits to draft RP. (Repeat Step 10)	
12.	Log document status and submit package to HQ.	DRP
13.	Post the Draft RP to the appropriate AACE Community for subcommittee review along with the <i>Comment-Disposition Log Template</i> Excel file (see Attachment H). (Section III.) Cross-post to multiple subcommittees as appropriate.	HQ
	a. HQ maintains version history for document control purposes.	
	b. HQ will notify the PC (and others as necessary) when the review period starts and send the source files to the PC for future editing resulting from the subcommittee review.	

### III. Subcommittee Review Process

The subcommittee review process includes utilization of the following documents:

- the RP Template (Attachment D)
- the Technical Document Style Guide (Attachment E)
- the Style Guide Adherence Review Form (Attachment F)
- the Recommended Practice Review Form (Attachment G)
- the Comment-Disposition Log Template (Attachment H)

STEP	DESCRIPTION	RESPONSIBILITY
14.	Subcommittee review. Subcommittee members shall provide subject matter expert review and comments using the <i>Comment-Disposition Log Template</i> (Excel) (see Attachment H).	SC
	a. Subcommittee review duration – minimum 45 calendar days.	
	b. Comments are to be submitted using AACE Communities and must include a reference to the affected line number where applicable.	
	i. Substantial (technical and non-stylistic) comments must be received from at least three commenters to proceed to Technical Board review. It is in the best interest of the primary contributor(s) and subcommittee to proactively solicit comments from subject-matter experts	
	ii. If comments are not received from three commenters, the subcommittee chair shall work with the primary contributor to develop a plan and timeline to acquire the necessary subcommittee review comments.	
15.	HQ to close the review period and notify the PC and SCC.	HQ
16.	Incorporate subcommittee review comments. Upon the closing of the subcommittee review period, the PC is responsible for compiling and maintaining all submitted disposition logs (from the communities page and incorporating all comments and dispositions into one file) and updating the draft RP as required. Before submitting revised draft, PC must complete the <i>Style Guide Adherence Review Form</i> (see Attachment F). The revised draft, consolidated disposition log, and the completed form should be submitted to the SCC.	PC
17.	The subcommittee chair or designee validates that all comments in the disposition log have been addressed. The SCC will also ensure that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical content is in alignment with the TCM Framework and published RPs (no duplications or conflicts).</li> <li>• The RP development process has been followed by completing the <i>Recommended Practice Review Form</i> (see Attachment G).</li> </ul>	SCC
	a. If yes, submit to the HQ for processing (Step 18)	
	b. If no, the PC addresses issues raised by the subcommittee chair (Step 16)	
18.	Log document status and submit package to TB.	DRP

- |     |   |    |
|-----|---|----|
| 19. | Approval by the Technical Board to publish for Public Review. The Technical Board review is limited to the final disposition of rejected or disputed comments to confirm appropriate resolution has been incorporated.  | TB |
|     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If yes – the Technical Board approves RP to be released for public review and submits to headquarters for formatting and posting (Section IV).</li> <li>b. If no – the Technical Board comments are submitted to the PC and SCC for review and incorporation into the RP. Once addressed, the RP shall be resubmitted to the Technical Board for review.</li> </ul> |    |
| 20. | HQ to post the Draft RP to the appropriate AACE community site(s) for public review along with the template comment/disposition log Excel file. (Section IV.).  | HQ |
|     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. HQ maintains version history for document control purposes.</li> <li>b. HQ will notify the PC (and others as necessary) when the review period starts and send the source files to the PC for future editing resulting from the public review.</li> <li>c. HQ to submit RP to ANSI membership for public review.</li> </ul>   |    |

Please note: If the RP requires significant changes/modifications, the RP may be sent back for PC and subcommittee for an additional review cycle.

#### IV. Public Review Process

The public review process must utilize the following documents:

- the Style Guide Adherence Review Form (Attachment F)
- the Recommended Practice Review Form (Attachment G)
- the Comment-Disposition Log Template (Attachment H)

STEP	DESCRIPTION	RESPONSIBILITY
21.	The RP is published in the public review section of the AACE Communities. The public shall provide review comments by subject matter experts using the <i>Comment-Disposition Log Template</i> (Excel) (see Attachment H).	PUBLIC
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Public review duration – minimum 45 calendar days</li> <li>b. Comments to be submitted using the AACE Public Review Community or other means and must include a reference to the affected line number where applicable.</li> <li>c. ANSI to post RP for membership to review and provide comments.</li> <li>d. A minimum of three public comments must be received to proceed to Technical Board review. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. It is in the best interest of the primary contributor(s) and subcommittee to proactively solicit comments from subject-matter experts.</li> <li>ii. If three public comments are not received, the subcommittee chair shall work with the primary contributor to develop a plan and timeline to acquire the necessary public review comments.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	ANSI
22.	HQ to close the review period and notify PC.	HQ
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. ANSI to collect comments and send them to AACE HQ.</li> </ul>	ANSI
23.	Incorporate public review comments. Upon the closing of the public review period, the PC is responsible for compiling and maintaining all submitted disposition logs (from the communities page and putting all logs into one file), addressing all proposed comments, and updating the RP as required. Before submitting revised draft, PC must complete the <i>Style Guide Adherence Review Form</i> (see Attachment F). The revised draft, consolidated disposition log, and the completed form should be submitted to the SCC.	PC
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Address all proposed ANSI comments and update as required. Be prepared for discussions with the TB (once their review is complete) to assist in completing a deliberations report (when necessary).</li> </ul>	



Please note: If the RP requires significant changes or modifications, the RP may be sent back for public review. Also, any person(s) can submit an appeal based on the action or inaction during the RP process (within 30 days of publication).

## 7. APPEAL PROCESS

The appeal process for RP development is a structured approach that ensures all stakeholders have the opportunity to voice concerns or objections regarding the content or implementation of a proposed RP. This process fosters transparency, accountability, and collaboration, allowing for the resolution of issues through a fair and systematic review. The process includes the following:

1. **Complaint** – Persons who have been or may be affected by any AACE action or inaction shall have the right to appeal such action or inaction. The appellant shall file a written complaint with AACE within 30 days after the date of notification of any action, or at any time with respect to inaction. The complaint shall state the nature of the objection, the procedures or the sections of the Standards that are at issue, the action or inaction at issue, and the specific remedial action(s) that would satisfy the appellant's concerns. Previous efforts to resolve the objections and the outcome of each shall be noted.
2. **Response** – Within 30 days after the receipt of the complaint, the Technical Board chair shall respond in writing to the appellant, specifically addressing each allegation in the complaint to the extent possible. AACE shall attempt to resolve, informally, the complaint of the appellant.
3. **Appeals Panel and Hearing** – If AACE is unable to informally resolve the complaint, it shall appoint an appeals panel to hold a hearing on a date agreeable to all participants, with at least 15 working days' notice. The appeals panel shall consist of three individuals who have not been directly involved in the dispute and will not be materially affected by any decision made. At least two members of the panel shall be acceptable to the appellant and at least two shall be acceptable to AACE.
4. **Conduct of the Hearing** – The appellant has the responsibility of demonstrating improper action or inaction, the adverse effects therefrom, and the efficacy of the requested remedial action. AACE is responsible for demonstrating that it took all actions in question in compliance with these procedures.
5. **Decision** – The appeals panel shall render its decision in writing within 30 days of the hearing, based upon a preponderance of the evidence, stating its findings of fact and conclusions, with reasons therefore, and citing the evidence. The Technical Board Chair shall notify the appellant in writing of the appeals panel's decision, which shall be binding and final for all concerned.
  - a. ANSI: Further appeal may be made directly to ANSI in accordance with its procedures.
6. In connection with an appeal articulated during a public comment period, an effort to resolve all expressed objections accompanied by comments related to the proposal under consideration shall be made, and each such appellant shall be advised in writing (including electronic communications) of the disposition of the objection and the reasons therefor. If resolution is not achieved, each such appellant shall be informed in writing that an appeals process exists within procedures used by the standards developer.
  - a. ANSI: In addition, except in the case of Audited Designators, each objection resulting from public review or submitted by a consensus body member that is not resolved must be reported to the ANSI Board of Standards Review (BSR).

The Technical Board takes all appeals seriously and will therefore initiate the process of addressing the appeal. All appeals will be dealt with fairly and impartially. If the appeal is based on the actions of anyone other than the Technical Board, then the Technical Board will investigate and lead the appeal response. The individual(s) involved in the appeal response cannot have contributed to the RP or provided review comments. Within 15 calendar days after the Technical Board Chair receives the appeal, the Chair will issue a response to the appellant.

If the appeal is based on the actions of or by the Technical Board, then the appeal will be referred to the Executive Director who will investigate and lead the appeal response. The individual(s) involved in the appeal response cannot have contributed to the RP or provided review comments.

Each unresolved objection and attempt at resolution, and any substantive change made in a proposed American National Standard shall be reported to the Technical Board Chair to allow all voting members of the Technical Board to respond, reaffirm, or change their vote. **(Appeals)**

## **8. ANSI REQUIREMENTS**

AACE International agrees to comply with the provisions of ANSI's Patent (3.1 of the ANSI ER) and Commercial Terms and Conditions (3.2 of the ANSI ER) policies for proposed or existing American National Standards.

General Notes:

1. Any substantive changes subsequently made in a proposed ANS after the original public review must be relisted for public review.
2. American National Standards shall be developed in accordance with applicable antitrust and competition laws, and meetings amongst competitors to develop American National Standards are to be conducted in accordance with these laws.
3. Each ANSI-Accredited Standards Developer shall have on file at ANSI a metric policy. International System of Units (SI) are the preferred units of measurement in American National Standards.

### Interpretation Policy

Official interpretations of American National Standards shall be made only by AACE, who is responsible for the maintenance of that standard. ANSI shall not issue, nor shall any party have the authority to issue, an interpretation of an American National Standard in the name of the American National Standards Institute. Requests for interpretations addressed to ANSI shall be referred to AACE International.

### Withdrawal of an American National Standard

If AACE chooses to withdraw its approval of one or more of its American National Standards, it may do so with a vote of the relevant consensus body. If AACE does withdraw one or more of its American National Standards, then it shall notify ANSI immediately, and the standard shall be withdrawn as an ANS and announced in Standards Action.

### Discontinuance of a Standards Project

AACE may decide to abandon the processing of a proposed new or revised American National Standard or portion thereof at its own discretion and with a vote of the relevant consensus body.

### Records Retention

AACE International shall retain records to demonstrate compliance with all aspects of its accredited procedures. Records shall be retained for one complete standards cycle, or until the standard is revised. Records concerning withdrawals of all American National Standards shall be retained for at least five years from the date of withdrawal or for a duration consistent with the audit schedule.

## **Process Project Initiation Notification System (PINS)**

### PINS Process

1. At the initiation of a project to develop or revise an American National Standard, notification shall be transmitted to ANSI using the Project Initiation Notification System (PINS) form, or its equivalent, for

announcement in Standards Action. Comments received in connection with a PINS announcement shall be handled in accordance with ANSI procedures.

2. A statement shall be submitted and published as part of the PINS announcement that shall include:
  - a. An explanation of the need for the recommended practice, including, if it is the case, a statement of intent to submit the standard for consideration as an ISO, IEC or ISO/IEC JTC-1 standard; and
  - b. Identification of the stakeholders (e.g., telecom, consumer, medical, environmental, etc.) likely to be directly impacted by the standard; and
  - c. The interest categories that will or are expected to comprise the consensus body.
3. If the response to changes substantively as the standard is developed, a revised PINS shall be submitted and published.
4. If the RP author receives a written request for additional information or for the opportunity to discuss the proposal from a directly and materially interested outside party or current consensus body member during the 30-day PINS comment period, AACE shall respond in writing within 30 days of the comment deadline.
5. A PINS is not required for revisions of an American National Standard that is maintained under continuous maintenance and (1) is registered as such on the ANSI website, (2) has a notice in the standard that the standard is always open for comment and how to submit comments, and (3) has information on the AACE's website that the standard is under continuous maintenance and how to submit comments. A PINS is also not required in connection with the decision to maintain an ANS under the stabilized maintenance option. A PINS form may be submitted but is not required, at the initiation of a project to reaffirm or withdraw an American National Standard.

#### Proposals for New or Revised Standards – Public Review

6. Proposals for new American National Standards and proposals to revise, reaffirm, or withdraw approval of existing American National Standards shall be transmitted to ANSI using the BSR-8 form, or its equivalent, for listing in Standards Action in order to provide an opportunity for public comment. If this is the case, then a statement of intent to submit the standard for consideration as an ISO, IEC, or ISO/IEC JTC-1 standard shall be included as part of the description of the scope summary that is published in Standards Action. The comment period shall be one of the following:
  - a. A minimum of thirty days if the full text of the revision(s) can be published in Standards Action;
  - b. A minimum of forty-five days if the document is available in an electronic format, deliverable within one day of a request, and the source (e.g., URL or an E-mail address) from which the public can obtain it is provided to ANSI for announcement in Standards Action; or
  - c. A minimum of sixty days, if neither of the abovementioned options applies.

#### Conflicts or Duplication Assertions

7. If a developer receives written comments within 30 days from the publication date of a PINS announcement in *Standards Action*, and said comments assert that a proposed standard duplicates or conflicts with an existing American National Standards (ANS) or a candidate ANS that has been announced previously (or concurrently) in *Standards Action*, a mandatory deliberation of representatives from the relevant stakeholder groups shall be held within 90 days from the comment deadline. Such a deliberation shall be organized by the developer and the commenter and shall be concluded before the developer may submit a proposed standard for public review. If the deliberation does not take place within the 90-day period and the developer can demonstrate that it has made a good faith effort to schedule and otherwise organize it, then the developer will be excused from compliance with this requirement. The purpose of the deliberation is to provide the relevant stakeholders with an opportunity to discuss whether there is a compelling need for the proposed standards project.

8. The outcome of a PINS deliberation shall be conveyed in writing (the "Deliberation Report") within 30 days after the conclusion of the deliberation by the developer to the commenter and to ANSI. Upon submission of the Deliberation Report, the developer may continue with the submission of the proposed standard for public review. If additional deliberations take place, they should not delay the submission of the proposed standard for public review, and an updated Deliberation Report shall be conveyed within 30 days after each deliberation. Any actions agreed upon from the deliberations shall be carried out reasonably promptly but typically should not exceed 90 days following the deliberation. Subsequently, the developer shall include all of the Deliberation Report(s) with the BSR-9 submittal to the ANSI Board of Standards Review (BSR) for consideration should the developer ultimately submit the subject standard to ANSI for approval. Stakeholders who were involved in the PINS deliberation process may also file separate Deliberation Report(s) with ANSI and the developer within 30 days after conclusion of any deliberation for consideration by the BSR, if the standard is submitted to ANSI for approval.
9. In the case of ANSI Audited Designators, the Audited Designator shall provide a Deliberation Report to the commenter and to ANSI within 30 days after each deliberation. The Audited Designator shall review the results of the deliberation prior to designating a standard as an ANS.
10. While the outcome is not binding unless the developer agrees to binding provisions, participants are encouraged to develop a consensus on whether and how the standards development project should proceed.

#### **ANSI Publication Process**

1. Ballot/review by the ASD's consensus body (the group whose final vote to approve an American National Standard (ANS) is compiled on a BSR-9 form and forwarded to ANSI for review/approval).
2. ASDs are not required to consider negative votes accompanied by comments not related to the proposal under consideration, or negative votes without comments. The ASD shall indicate conspicuously on the letter ballot that negative votes must be accompanied by comments related to the proposal and that votes unaccompanied by such comments will be recorded as "negative without comments" without further notice to the voter. If comments not related to the proposal are submitted with a negative vote, the comments shall be documented and considered in the same manner as submittal of a new proposal. If clear instruction is provided on the ballot, and a negative vote unaccompanied by comments related to the proposal is received notwithstanding, the vote may be counted as a "negative without comment" for the purposes of establishing a quorum and reporting to ANSI. However, such votes (i.e., negative vote without comment or negative vote accompanied by comments not related to the proposal) shall not be factored into the numerical requirements for consensus, unless the ASD's procedures state otherwise. The ASD is not required to solicit any comments from the negative voter. The ASD is not required to conduct a recirculation ballot of the negative vote. The ASD is required to report the "no" vote as a "negative without comment" when making their final submittal to the Board of Standard Review (BSR) unless the ASD has been granted the authority to designate its standards as American National Standards without approval by the BSR.

#### **9. REFERENCE DOCUMENTS**

- RP Scoping Document Template (Attachment A)
- RP Scoping Document Review Form (Attachment B)
- ANSI PINS Form (Attachment C)
- RP Template (Attachment D)
- Technical Document Style Guide (Attachment E)
- Style Guide Adherence Review Form (Attachment F)
- Recommended Practice Review Form (Attachment G)
- Comment-Disposition Log Template (Attachment H)



## 10. DETAILED PROCESS MAP

