The Repair Welding Subcommittee was called to order at 1:05 PM on January 28, 2015 and adjourned at 4:45 PM. There were seven members and 19 non-member participants that attended the meeting. This was the second meeting for the Repair Welding Subcommittee since its formation after completion of Section 10 revisions in the 21st Edition by the disbanded Repair Welding Task Group.

The following is a description of the significant items that were discussed:

**Disposition of All Remaining Ballot Items** – Ballot 2475 and Ballot 2914 were addressed as follows:

- Ballot 2475, Item 162: Add a sentence to 10.1 stating that rework is not a repair.
- Ballot 2914, Items 12 and 13: Further review of the total number and spacing of hardness indent locations is required.

**Interpretation Requests** – No formal request for an interpretation from the ITG was received.

**21st Edition Errata** – API staff was requested to review the January 22, 2014 Repair Welding Subcommittee Report to assure all proposed errata have been addressed. The subcommittee requests notification of the proposed errata that are not accepted for further review and disposition.

**Additional Errata** – The committee proposes the following errata for consideration:

Table 5 – Cover pass face bend test specimen does not reference footnote “a”.

10.4.2 – Add word “appropriate” to first sentence of second paragraph after the word “are”. Read as [...]6.5 are appropriate for qualification of a repair welder...

10.3.4 h) Delete 2nd sentence: [The time delay specified in 10.3.3 is not required for repair welding.]

Figures 21 through 26 require English units.
Throughout Section 10 delete NDT and use the term nondestructive testing to be consistent with the remainder of the document.

Other Discussion Items – Open discussion resulted in the following items to address in the future:

1. A welder should not fail a qualification test due to a rejectable indication in the original weld that was not created as a part of the qualification or repair welder. It is unclear if the rejectable indication was created during repair welder qualification, then the welder shall fail the test.

2. Nick-break test specimens for automatic or semi-automatic welds should have a requirement that the depth of the optional cover pass notch not go below the external pipe surface. The subcommittee will recommend the issue to the Welding Procedure Qualification subcommittee for review.

3. Is company approval required for all repair types? (Ref. to 10.2.3) Yes as written, however, blanket authorization may be provided by the company for repair of specific defect types. This response requires further review to confirm that this is the intent of the original revision. The word with may have originally been without.

4. Centerline full thickness repair does not qualify partial thickness repairs along the fusion line. Full thickness repair at centerline does not qualify a full thickness repair along the fusion line. Confirmed the essential variable is the location of repair at the fusion or centerline.

5. Is the original production welding procedure an essential variable for a repair procedure? By using the words …the production welding procedure specification… in Clause 10.3.6 in “Repair procedures shall be qualified on a test weld completed following the details of the production welding procedure specification.” Further review and draft revision with options and justification is required. Bill Amend, DNV GL will draft a proposal for committee consideration.

6. Modify 10.1 to clarify identification during visual or nondestructive testing “of production welds.”

7. Modify 10.1 to clarify Section 10 does not apply of in-service welds.

8. A section 10.2.8 Additional guidance criterion is to be supplied to the committee for future revision by Madana Mohan Kunjapur with Shell Pipeline Company.

**********************************************************************************************

Alan S. Beckett, Chairman, Repair Welding Subcommittee