Standards and Certification Training

Module A – Administrative
A5. Publication of Standards
Module A contains six modules. This is Module A5 Publication of Standards
## REVISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/9/23</td>
<td>Changed to reference Updated Writing and Style Guide. Changed to align with Rev. 19 of ANSI accredited procedures. Updated to use consistent wording.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/21/16</td>
<td>Revised entirely. Reformatted, added notes throughout, deleted Pop Quizzes and updated to current acceptable publication submittal and proof review practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the end of this module you will know…

- Proper document preparation to avoid untimely delays in publishing documents.
- How to review the proofs of the standards, noting and/or alleviating and reducing the number of discrepancies.
- How you can help to produce consistent and uniform standards.
These are the areas this module will cover.

AGENDA

I. Preparation of Proposals for Committee Ballot
II. Sample Revisions
III. Preparation of Submittal of Revisions to C&S Publications
IV. Distribution and Review of Rough Proofs and Manuscripts
V. Distribution and Review of Proofs
This section offers guidelines for preparing proposed revisions of standards for committee review and submittal to C&S Publications.
The best resources available to both staff and volunteers to aid in the preparation of new or revised standard manuscripts are located online through the link shown here.

- When presenting proposed revisions for committee action, members should follow the “Guidelines for Presenting Proposed Revisions for Ballot and Submittal of Approved Revisions to C&S Publishing” and “C&S Writing & Style Guide 2023” both of which are posted on the ASME Website.

- It should be noted that certain committees prefer to see the proposed revisions in a consistent format. Guidance may be available in committee guides.
For new standards and revised sections of the standard, follow the “ASME Codes and Standards Writing Guide 2023,” which is posted on the ASME Web site. The writing guide provides an overview to a common writing platform for ASME Codes and Standards publications. The guide is mainly intended for new documents, or new parts being created for existing documents, but it contains a lot of useful information for all committee members and staff.

• **Style** - Adhering to established ASME style ensures that similar information is presented in a similar manner in all books, which contributes to better understanding of the material. Style includes, for example, how things are stated, the order in which information is presented, punctuation, and abbreviations.

• **Format** - The section on format explains the various elements (e.g. title page, foreword, contents, main text, art, etc.) of a code or standard.

• **Special Policies** - The guide also addresses the special policies affecting the writing of ASME standards that are derived from the Procedures for ASME Codes and Standards Development Committees, and the ASME Codes and Standards Policies document (CSP). This includes copyright and copyright clearances. Volunteers shouldn’t appropriate text, tables or images for proposals without securing permission. Refer to the C&S Writing and Style Guide and Editorial Guide, section SG2-2.10 Use of Copyrighted Material.

Providing manuscripts that follow the parameters provided in the guide will provide a more
uniform publishing style for all our codes and standards and will expedite the publishing process.

This presentation will not go through the writing guide in detail, it will focus on the requirements for submittal of the approved revisions to C&S Publications department.
Proposals for committee ballot should be prepared as follows:

- For a new standard, create the text in MS Word.
- For revisions to an existing standard, start with the most recent version of the standard.
- Present revisions using one of the following preferred methods:
  - Mark up a MS Word document using the “Track Changes” tool in MS Word.
  - Mark up a PDF of the standard using the “Comment” features in Adobe Acrobat.
  - Print the affected page, manually mark the changes, and scan the page.
  - Adhere to committee-specific methods, if any.

For additional guidance, see “Guidelines for Presenting Proposed Revisions for Ballot and Submittal of Approved Revisions to C&S Publishing” See the references page at the end of this presentation for the link to that Guide.
For minor revisions to existing Tables, Graphics and Equations, PDF markups or hand markups of the existing standard are preferred.

When preparing significant revisions or new items, follow these requirements to ensure that the revisions are in a format that will be acceptable to C&S Publishing:

• Use the MS Word table function to create tables and include them in the text near their first mention. Tables should not be created by using spaces or tabs. For more complex tables, Excel may be more appropriate (although such Excel files must be supplied separate from the MS Word manuscript). If you have very complex tables, multilevel column headings, or merged-cell structures, it is best to discuss it with your Staff Secretary, provide a sample, and work with your Staff Secretary and C & S Publishing staff to create something usable and that best represents your intent.

• Graphic files for production and publishing must be provided directly from the application in which they were created, not solely embedded in a MS Word file. MS Word-embedded graphics are not acceptable for production, though they are useful for document review and balloting.
  • Each illustration must also be supplied as a separate file.
  • The following are acceptable figure types and file formats.
    • Vector (e.g., Illustrator files/line art): EPS (or native AI with all fonts embedded)
    • Raster/Bitmap (e.g., Photoshop/photographs/halftone): TIF/TIFF
    • Visio/Excel
  • Equations must be provided in a clear, unambiguous fashion. It is best to work in an environment in which you are comfortable, e.g., MathType.
For further guidance, review the Guidelines for the Creation of Tables, Graphics and Equations. See the references page at the end of this presentation for the link to that Guide.
While color coding can enhance the readability of revisions, it can cause confusion for those who do not have access to color printers and for those with color blindness. Do not rely solely on the use of color text or highlights to indicate proposed revisions. Use another noncolor formatting method as well, such as underlining/strike-through, boxing, clouding, or notations such as “add” or “delete.”

In addition:
- Avoid the use of colors close in the color spectrum
- Do not use different fonts or font sizes alone to indicate proposed revisions.
- Do not use italics and boldface to indicate revisions.

The following should also be taken into consideration:
- When using multiple colors, avoid colors close in the color spectrum, such as blue/light blue, blue/purple, and light grey/medium grey. Instead, opt for colors far apart in the color spectrum (e.g., yellow and dark blue). However, do not use red and green — red/green color blindness is the most common form of the condition.
- Do not use different fonts or font sizes alone to indicate proposed revisions.
- Do not use italics and boldface unless the affected material is intended to be italicized or boldfaced in the published version, such as for glossary terms and table subheadings.
We will look at some samples of correct and incorrect revisions.
• The most basic requirement for revisions is that they only show the existing material vs. proposed revision.

• You should clearly indicate the location of the change (e.g., para. designator); the existing text, table, or figure; and the proposed revision.

• The following slides will show examples of appropriate and inappropriate proposed revisions as described in the “Guidelines for Presenting Proposed Revisions for Ballot and Submittal of Approved Revisions to C&S Publishing”.
In this example, the author has revised Table 4 by pasting the revised values (circled in red on slide) over the already existing values, leaving it unclear as to what, if any, changes need to be made. In addition, the author has dropped in an unmarked paragraph (circled in green in slide) under the table.
This example shows an acceptable version of the proposed revision from Example 1. Here the author has clearly indicated changes to the table.
This example illustrates a proposal with poorly marked revisions. Although the current and proposed texts are clearly labeled and the affected paragraph identified, the markup does not clearly show how the proposed text differs from the current text.
This example shows an improved markup of the proposed revision that was shown in Example 3. Here Track Changes clearly indicate the revisions.
This example shows a revision created from a page extracted from the most recent edition of the Code Section. The author has used the Adobe Comment tools to indicate that a table row should be revised per the proposed changes on the following page. The following page, created in MS Word, uses Track Changes to show the revisions to the row. Note that in this case, the author has saved the MS Word portion of the record as a PDF, which is acceptable.
This example shows a page from a proposal that was rejected because of illegible type. The same applies for illegible handwritten markups.

Also note that the copy runs off the top of the page.
MS Word revision tracking is acceptable. This example demonstrates the use of the revision tracking feature of MS Word to highlight additions to, and deletions of current text.
In this example, a combination of lines, arrows, and text boxes clearly show revisions to an existing figure.
Once the committee has approved the revisions and they are ready to go to C&S Publishing, the revised manuscript and electronic files must be prepared.
When submitting a new standard manuscript for submittal to C&S Publishing, it is preferred that a MS Word manuscript be submitted.

When submitting a revised standard manuscript for submittal to C&S Publishing, a marked-up PDF of the previous edition with MS Word attachments (for extensive revisions) is the preferred method to submit revisions. Hand marked-up pages of the standard are also acceptable.

- Make sure the markups are clear and legible in all scanned or photocopied documents.
- Mark revisions directly on the pages.
- Do not write too close to margin.
In addition to preparing the body of the document for submittal to C&S publication, the Staff Secretary responsibilities also include:

Review of cover material, for example:
- Complete designator
- Complete title
- Other publication information, if applicable

Review of front matter, for example:
- Foreword
- Preface
- Introduction
- Committee roster
- Summary of changes

Review of back matter such as appendix designations for both mandatory or nonmandatory sections.

Staff is responsible for identifying portions of the standard that have not gone through the full consensus process as not being a part of the American National Standard. Refer to ANSI Essential Requirements, para. 4.4.

Portions of a published document that were not approved through the ANS consensus
process shall not contain requirements necessary for conformance with the approved American National Standard (ANS) and shall be (1) clearly identified at the beginning and end of each such portion of the document, or (2) such information shall be overprinted on the cover page. These portions of the document shall be marked with the following, or similar, explanatory language:

“The information contained in this (portion of a document) is not part of this American National Standard (ANS) and has not been processed in accordance with ANSI’s requirements for an ANS. As such, this (portion of a document) may contain material that has not been subjected to public review or a consensus process. In addition, it does not contain requirements necessary for conformance to the standard.”
PREPARATION OF ELECTRONIC FILES

- Acceptable Software for Initial Manuscript Submittal
  - MS Word and PDF format are preferred software for text and table
  - Excel for extended tables
  - The image files for new graphics must be provided

- MS Word and PDF are the preferred software for manuscript submittal due to their popularity.
- Excel is preferred for extended tables.
- The image files for new graphics must be provided. Artwork should be submitted in original electronic format as noted in the requirements outlined in Section I of this module.
Let us now take a look at the process for distributing and reviewing manuscripts, rough proofs and final proofs. The edited manuscript is a copy of the manuscript submitted to ASME Publishing on which the editor has marked editorial and stylistic changes. The rough proofs are the preliminary page proofs of the standard/code that incorporate the editor’s revisions. The purpose of this review is to ensure committee-voted actions are accurately incorporated into published ASME documents.
The edited manuscript is a copy of the manuscript submitted to ASME Publishing on which the editor has marked editorial and stylistic changes. The rough proofs are the preliminary page proofs of the standard/code that incorporate the editor’s revisions.

- Staff Secretary and appropriate committee members
  - Review the editorial corrections/queries proposed in the edited manuscript.
  - Review rough proofs to ensure that committee approved technical and editorial changes and errata were incorporated.

- The purpose of this review is to ensure that ASME has properly reproduced the items approved by the committee and to ensure that the technical details have been accurately included in the proofs.

Note: The rough proof review stage is the last point in the production process where additional technical changes that have been approved through the committee’s consensus process, if any, can be introduced in the standard.

The “Guideline for Review of Rough Proofs and Manuscripts” contains further information. See the references page at the end of this presentation for the link to that Guide.
TIMETABLE FOR RETURN OF PROOFS

• Timing issues:
  – Timetable is established by ASME Staff Secretary and Editors
  – Important to keep to timetable for return of proofs
  – One or two weeks (max. three)
  – If committee member(s) cannot meet deadline, another committee member(s) will be assigned

• A definite deadline for the return of manuscript and proofs shall be established by the Staff Secretary and editorial staff when the proofs are sent to the committee members for review.
• It is important to keep to timetable for return of proofs
• Typical review time is one or two weeks (max. three)
• If committee member(s) cannot meet deadline, another committee member(s) will be assigned
• The Staff Secretary shall review final proof to ensure that changes requested have been incorporated accurately into the proofs.
• No additional editorial or technical changes should be made to the proofs at this stage.
In summary,

- Use of the ASME Guidance documents will help to produce consistent and uniform standards. This will help to avoid untimely delays in publishing documents.

- A limited number of committee members may review the proofs, the purpose of this review is to ensure that the proposed revisions have been incorporated accurately.
The various guides and tools that have been discussed during this presentation are located online through the committee page, on the left hand side by clicking on ASME C&S Policies Procedures and Guidelines or through this link noted here. These guides have been developed by ASME Staff and are intended to improve the entire publishing process.