AACE INTERNATIONAL RECOMMENDED PRACTICE

DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES AND PROCESS

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

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

AACE INTERNATIONAL

Rev. December 6, 2023

Recommended Practice (RP) Development Guidelines
(Rev. 2023-12-06)

Introduction

This document describes key points of guidance in the development of (or revision to) an AACE International recommended practice.

Expectations and Requirements

RPs must be submitted and reviewed by AACE International subject matter experts and approved by the AACE Technical Board. The following are some expectations of RP content;

- <u>Professional</u> — Peer reviewed publication quality with appropriate references.
- <u>Fit for Use</u> — The RP will address practical needs of the professional community.
- <u>Source Content</u> — An RP shall contain original content, and may include or reference existing material from a reputable source (in compliance with copyright laws). Content shall be in alignment with the *Total Cost Management Framework* and published recommended practices.
- <u>References</u> — List applicable AACE reference materials. Cite external references in compliance with copyright laws.
- <u>Scoping Document</u> — The RP shall be aligned with a corresponding preapproved scoping document.
- <u>Concise</u> — Attempt to limit each RP to ten pages or less.
- <u>Benchmark Practices</u> — Where there are a variety of acceptable practices, describe and compare them in the RP. Specific examples from industry or other organizations are valuable where appropriate.
- <u>Appropriate Level</u> – The RP must convey the technical content written at an appropriate level of understanding.
- <u>Define Terms</u> — All terminology must be consistent with *10S-90, Cost Engineering Terminology.* Any key terms not contained in 10S-90 must be submitted for inclusion. This includes not only new terms, but revisions as well.

RP Types

There are two types of RPs, *Generic* and *As Applied In*:

- <u>Generic</u> — A broad overview of the practice at a summary level that applies to most industries. Defines basic processes, practices, guidelines, etc., and avoids specific *how-to* details. Serves as a foundation to *As Applied In* RPs. For example: 17R-97, *Cost Estimate Classification System.*
- <u>As Applied In</u> — An RP focused on a specific application or industry. Includes references, benchmarks, and practices specific to that application or industry. Shall be in alignment with a corresponding generic RP, if one exists. May provide *how-to* specifics. For example: 18R-97, *Cost Estimate Classification System - As Applied in Engineering, Procurement, and Construction for the Process Industries*.

Recommended Practice (RP) Development Process
(Rev. 2023-12-06)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This document describes the process used for the development of new AACE International recommended practices. 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.

The Technical Board shall decide which specific recommended practices will become ANSI standards. The process outlined in this document meets the criteria of AACE International's expected RP level of quality and follows ANSI's approval process.

The required forms referenced in this document are attached. This document should be opened in Adobe Acrobat to access the referenced attachments.

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:

Scoping Document → RP Draft Development → Subcommittee Review → Public Review → Publication

1. Submit the proposed recommended practice scoping document to the appropriate technical subcommittee (SC) chair for approval to submit to the Technical Board.
2. Review and approval of the scoping document by the Technical Board.
3. Submittal of the first draft of recommended practice by the primary contributor (author) to the appropriate SC chair for approval to be released to subcommittee review.
4. AACE Headquarters staff posts the draft RP in the appropriate technical subcommittee community for a 45-calendar day (minimum) review by subcommittee members.
5. The RP primary contributor (author) reviews SC comments and recommended edits and revises the draft RP accordingly, tracking changes in the source Word document and updating the comment disposition log, including the disposition column. The revised draft and updated comment disposition log are submitted to the SC chair for approval and forwarded to the Technical Board for review to issue for public comment.
6. The Technical Board reviews the draft RP at a scheduled RP review meeting and returns the draft to the primary contributor with any recommended edits and approval to post the draft RP for public review.
7. The updated draft RP is posted by AACE Headquarters staff for review to the AACE Communities in a forum (or forums) applicable to the RP for a minimum of 45 calendar days. AACE Communities is the central repository for comments and discussions related to the RP during the public review period. The author is encouraged to solicit additional input from other credible subject-matter experts (SMEs), including from other applicable professional associations.
8. Timely and adequate notice of standards development activity will be announced in media suitable to ensure that a meaningful opportunity for participation, debate, and deliberation by materially interested parties is provided fairly and equitably. **(Notification of Standards Development)**
9. Reviewing and commenting on AACE's draft RPs is open to parties directly and materially interested in the activity. There are no undue financial barriers to participation, which shall not be conditional upon membership in any organization nor unreasonably restricted based on technical qualifications or other such requirements. **(Openness)**
10. For ANSI standards, a reasonable effort will be made to resolve potential conflicts between and among existing American National Standards and candidate American National Standards. **(Coordination and Harmonization)**

11. Once the public review period is complete, the primary contributor will consider all public comments and update the RP and comment disposition log accordingly, then submit the updated draft to the Technical Board for review prior to publication.
12. The Technical Board will review the final draft RP at a scheduled RP review meeting and vote on whether to approve the document for publication.
   For ANSI standards, evidence of consensus in accordance with ANSI's requirements and the accredited procedures of the standards developer will be documented. **(Consensus Vote)**
13. The Technical Board publishes the recommended practice on the AACE website.

SUMMARY OF OVERALL RESPONSIBILITIES

Primary Contributor (Author) Responsibilities

1. Develops a new or updates an existing scoping document to provide a general understanding of key concepts, ideas, and focus of the RP.
2. Develops the RP while following the RP development process through subcommittee and public reviews.
3. Addresses comments in a fair, equitable, and reasonable manner; and maintains the comment 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).
4. Maintains communication with the subcommittee chair or designee as appropriate.

Subcommittee Chair Responsibilities

The following items are the responsibility of the technical subcommittee chair or his/her designee. In some cases, the subcommittee has an RP coordinator officer role. 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. In coordination with the Technical Board, maintain an RP log that tracks the primary contributor and current status of RP development associated with their subcommittee.
7. Reviews the completed comment disposition log after subcommittee review to ensure that all comments are included in the log and have been addressed.

Reviewer/Commenter Responsibilities

1. 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.
2. Reviewer comments should not only identify any issues with the RP narrative but should also provide alternative language that improves grammar or is technically more in line with industry practices. It is also helpful to the RP authors if reviewers provide explanation and context behind their comments regarding any recommended technical revisions.

3. 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 minor grammar or stylistic comments.

AACE Technical Board Responsibilities

No single interest category, individual, or organization will be allowed to dominate the RP/ANSI standards development process. 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)**

The RP/ANSI standards development process will have a balance of interests[1]. If the Technical Board voting membership lacks balance, outreach to achieve balance will be undertaken. **(Balance)**
1. Review the RP for technical content and alignment with the *TCM Framework*.
2. Ensure compliance with the RP development process.
3. Maintain communication with the primary contributor, subcommittee chair, and/or AACE headquarters as appropriate.
4. Reviews the completed comment disposition log after subcommittee review and public review to ensure that all comments have been addressed and adjudicated.
5. Approves/disapproves the recommended practice under consideration for public review and publication.

AACE Headquarters Responsibilities

1. In coordination with the Technical Board, maintain an RP log that tracks the primary contributor and the current status of RP development.
2. Format and distribute the RP. This includes a check for plagiarism, review of punctuation, spelling, copyright issues, and editorial integrity.
3. Maintain version histories of recommended practice and comment disposition log source files.
4. Review and distribute the draft RP in accordance with the development process.
5. Notifies the primary contributor and subcommittee chair upon publication.
6. Maintains communication with Technical Board as appropriate.
7. 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.

DETAILED RECOMMENDED PRACTICE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Roles/Legend:
PC – Primary Contributor
SC – Technical SubcommitteeSCC – Subcommittee chair or designee
TB – Technical Board
TBL – Technical Board Liaison to Subcommittee
HQ – AACE International Headquarters Liaison to the Technical Board

I. RP Scoping Process

---

[1] As determined in accordance with ANSI's criteria for balance.

The technical subcommittee should maintain scoping documents for recommended practice development. The scoping document is intended to provide a concise description of the RP content and ensure alignment with the *Total Cost Management (TCM) Framework* and other published recommended practices.

Note: The scoping document form must be utilized for this step of the RP development process. It is maintained by AACE Headquarters and is attached to this development process. The scoping document form is attached to this PDF. Without prior approval of the Technical Board, there should be no more than two primary contributors listed on the scoping document form.

PROCESS STEP	RESPONSIBILITY
1. Identify the need for a new RP.	PC or SCC
2. Check if scoping document exists.	SCC
a. If yes – review or modify the scoping document.	PC
b. If no – write the scoping document and proceed to Step 3.	PC
3. Review scoping document for approval by the subcommittee chair.	SCC
a. If yes – send to TB for approval.	
b. If no – edit the scoping document accordingly (Repeat Step 2)	
4. Review scoping document for approval by Technical Board.	TB
a. If yes – begin RP development. (Section II)	
b. If no – return to SCC and PC (Repeat Steps 2 & 3)	

II. Development Process

Note: The RP template must be utilized. It is maintained by HQ and is attached to this development process.

PROCESS STEP	RESPONSIBILITY
5. **Identify the primary contributor** (and supporting team if required). At least one primary contributor must be a current AACE member. Without prior approval of the Technical Board, there can be no more than two primary contributors to an RP.	SCC
6. **Develop an initial draft.** See the attachments in this PDF for all associated guides and templates required for RP development. RP shall be written in alignment with the *Total Cost Management (TCM) Framework (*https://web.aacei.org/resources/tcm), adhere to the "AACE International Technical Paper Style Guide" and use the current RP template. This initial draft can be circulated for informal feedback on AACE Communities. It is recommended that the author use grammar-checking software before submission. Primary contributor(s) shall submit the draft RP for review to the subcommittee chair. Once the draft is finalized, move to Step 3.	PC
7. **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. The subcommittee chair does not need to provide comments for disposition but does need to make a recommendation to the Technical Board that it is ready for Subcommittee Review.	SCC

a. If yes – the subcommittee chair submits to HQ for formatting and posting to the appropriate AACE Community for subcommittee review along with the template comment disposition log Excel file. (Section III.)

b. If no – the subcommittee chair provides comments back to the author for edits to draft RP. (Repeat Step 2)

III. Subcommittee Review Process

PROCESS STEP	RESPONSIBILITY
8. **Subcommittee Review posting.** HQ performs plagiarism checks, verifies RP formatting, maintains version history for document control purposes, and posts RP to appropriate subcommittee(s) for review on the AACE Communities website. The PC should be notified when the review period starts and is finished.	HQ
9. HQ notifies PC that the RP has been posted for subcommittee review as well as when the review period starts and is finished. HQ will send the source files for the posted RP draft to the PC for future editing resulting from the subcommittee review.	HQ
10. **Subcommittee review.** Subcommittee members shall provide subject matter expert review and comments preferably on AACE Communities using the RP comment disposition log template (Excel). a. Subcommittee review duration – minimum 45 calendar days b. Comments to be submitted using AACE Communities and must include reference to the affected line number where applicable. c. Substantial (technical and non-stylistic) comments must be received from at least three commenters to proceed to Technical Board review. d. It is in the best interest of the primary contributor(s) and subcommittee to proactively solicit comments from subject-matter experts. e. 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. f. The plan and timeline is submitted to the Technical Board for review, which will be discussed at the next TB meeting. If approved, the plan will be executed with any TB revisions. g. If the plan or timeline is not approved by the TB, the Technical Board chair will return respond to the subcommittee chair and primary contributor with the TB's decision and alternative.	SC
11. **Incorporate subcommittee review comments.** Upon closing the subcommittee review period, the primary contributor is responsible for compiling and addressing the proposed comments and updating the draft RP as required. a. Primary contributor generates and maintains a disposition log of all comments received using the established comment disposition log template (Excel).	PC
12. **Validation by subcommittee chair.** The primary contributor submits the revised RP draft to the subcommittee chair. The subcommittee chair or designee validates that all comments in the disposition log have been addressed. a. If yes, submit to the Technical Board for approval (Step 6) b. If no, primary contributor addresses issues raised by the subcommittee chair (Step 4)	SCC

13. **Approval by the Technical Board for Public Review.** The Technical Board reviews the subcommittee RP revision to ensure that:

      TB

- technical content is in alignment with the TCM Framework and published RPs,
- all comments in the disposition log have been appropriately addressed, and
- the RP development process has been followed.

a. If yes – the Technical Board submits to headquarters for formatting before posting for public review (Section IV)

b. If no – the Technical Board comments are submitted to the primary contributor and subcommittee chair for review and incorporation into the RP. Once addressed, the RP shall be resubmitted to the Technical Board. If the RP requires significant changes or modifications the RP may be sent back for subcommittee review.

IV. Public Review Process

PROCESS STEP	RESPONSIBILITY
14. **Public Review posting.** HQ performs plagiarism checks, verifies RP formatting, maintains version history for document control purposes, and posts RP to an AACE Public Review Community with the template comment disposition log. The primary contributor(s) are encouraged to solicit specific feedback from known subject matter experts.	HQ PC
15. **Public review.** RP is published in the public review section of the AACE Communities. a. Public review duration – minimum 45 calendar days b. Comments to be submitted using the AACE Public Review Community preferably using the established comment disposition log template (Excel). c. A minimum of three public comments must be received to proceed to Technical Board review. d. It is in the best interest of the primary contributor(s) and subcommittee to proactively solicit comments from subject-matter experts. e. 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. f. The plan and timeline are submitted to the Technical Board for review, which will be discussed at the next TB meeting. If approved, the plan will be executed with any TB revisions. g. If the plan or timeline is not approved by the TB, the Technical Board chair will respond to the subcommittee chair and primary contributor with the TB's decision and alternative.	AACE Community Members
16. **Incorporate public review comments.** Upon closing the public review period, the primary contributor is responsible for addressing the comments, updating the RP as required, and maintaining the disposition log of all comments.	PC
17. **Distribute final draft.** Primary contributor submits the final RP draft to the subcommittee chair and Technical Board.	PC

V. Publication Process

PROCESS STEP	RESPONSIBILITY
18. **Technical Board review for publication.** The Technical Board reviews the final RP draft to ensure that: • all comments in the disposition log have been appropriately addressed, • wording and grammar are clear, concise, and professionally written, and • the RP development process has been followed. • Note: It is preferred that Technical Board members review the RP during the public review period and provide comments per Process VI, rather than holding comments until Process V. However, if significant changes during the Technical Board review have the potential to affect the technical content, the RP should be routed back to the primary contributor for review. a. If yes – the Technical Board submits it to headquarters for publication. Notification of publication is sent to the primary contributor and subcommittee chair. b. If no – the Technical Board comments are submitted back to the primary contributor and subcommittee chair to be addressed. Once addressed the RP shall be resubmitted to the Technical Board. If the RP requires significant changes or modifications, the RP may be sent back for additional subcommittee or public review.	TB
19. HQ publishes the RP and updates the master RP Tracking sheet with a revision date	HQ
20. 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 maintaining a transparent process.	HQ or PC

VI. Appeals Process

After the RP is published, contributors and commenters will be allowed to make an appeal regarding the final published RP content. Within 30 calendar days after an RP is published, the appellants must submit a written notice of appeal to the Technical Board chair by identifying the RP, the excerpt(s) in question, and an explanation of the appeal.

The Technical Board takes all appeals seriously and will therefore initiate the process of addressing the appeal.
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.

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.

Within 60 calendar days after the appeal notice is received by the Technical Board, a response will be provided to the appellant with an update or decision on the appeal. **(Appeals)**

CRITERIA FOR PRIMARY VS. "REGULAR" CONTRIBUTORS FOR RECOMMENDED PRACTICES

Primary Contributor(s) (Author)
- At least one primary contributor needs to be a current AACE member.
- Have provided the majority of the written content, and/or information or advice critical to the development of the RP.
- 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.
- Provide all draft revisions and updates to the RP, including review comment dispositions.
- An RP typically has one or two primary contributors. Listing more than two primary contributors will require Technical Board approval.

Contributor(s)
- Have provided significant technical content that has been implemented in the RP.
- Have provided significant editorial comments that add clarity or materially improves the RP.
- Grammatical and minor editorial suggestions/edits are not considered to be significant contributions.