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Interpretations Task Group (ITG)

• ITG is called (by 1104 Chair) as Needed
• 2 Meetings in (Sort of) 2018 (March and early January)
• 10 (March) and 22 (January) Interpretations Developed and Submitted to API
• Reviewed/Approved by API Legal
• Maintaining the 20th Edition and 21st Edition Versions

In the last round of interpretations included the following

NOTE This topic is currently under review by the committee. New, proposed language may result in requirements that could change this reply based on the next edition of API 1104.
Section/Table/Figure: Section 6 6.2.2 1104-I-0406-15

Question 1: In item 6.2.2 for single qualification welders, specifies the following condition for the essential variable of the filler metal “A change of filler metal classification from Group 1 or 2 to any other group or from any Group 3 through 9 to Group 1 or 2 (see Table 1)”. As interpretation of this section can we say that if I have a welder with a classified in group 1 electrode, is qualified to complete welding with electrodes which are in Group 2 and vice versa?
Response 1: Yes.

Question 2: If the welder does the qualification under a procedure having electrodes of Group 1 and Group 2. This welder can complete welds in Group 1 and Group 2?
Response 2: Yes.
Voting Membership

7 Voting Segments:

- American Petroleum Institute – Pipeline Segment
- American Gas Association
- Pipeline Contractors Association
- Pipe Manufacturers
- American Society for Nondestructive Testing
- American Welding Society
- General Interest
American Petroleum Institute – Pipeline Segment

Charlie Ribardo  BP
Doug Fairchild  ExxonMobil
Tim Burns  Shell International
Jon Lee  Chevron
American Gas Association

Richard Clyne  CenterPoint Energy
Mike Childers  Southwest Gas Corporation
Perry Sheth  National Grid
Brian Moidel  Dominion East Ohio
Pipeline Contractors Association

Brian Laing  CRC Evans Welding Services
Kelly Osborn  U.S. Pipeline, Inc.
Jon Connaway  Michels Corporation
Ronnie Wise  Price Gregory Construction
Pipe Manufacturers

Aaron Litschewski  Stupp Corporation
Gustavo Turconi  Tenaris
Scott Robertson  USS Tubular Products
Bob Wise  Intertek
American Society for Nondestructive Testing

David Culbertson NDT Technical Services
Scott Metzger Intertek
Tom Reeder PA Systems, Inc.
Chuck Woodruff Consultant
American Welding Society

Olivier Jouffron  Serimax
William Bruce  DNV Columbus, Inc.
Robert Gatlin  Welding & Robotic Solutions
Robert Lazor  TransCanada Pipeline
General Interest

Bob Huntley  RHM Welding Consulting
Robert Bates  AUT Consulting
Matt Boring  Kiefner and Associates
Yong-yi Wang  Center for Reliable Energy
Officers

Mike Childers – Chair
Bill Bruce – Vice Chair
Melissa Gould – Secretary
Approved in 2017 by Ballot 4182
Term: January 2018 – December 2020
1104 Publication, 22nd Edition

Ballot 4676 Opened 11/19/18 closed 1/3/19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balloting Totals:</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
<th>Did Not Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Responses: | 28          |
| Total Ballots:   | 28          |

Response Rate ((Affirmative + Negative + Abstain) / Total Ballots): 100%  
Must be > 50%

Approval Rate (Affirmative / [Affirmative + Negative]): 92%  
Must be >= 66.66%

Consensus: YES
1104 Publication, 22nd Edition

- 819 Comments Submitted Through Ballot System
  - 336 Editorial
  - 257 General
  - 226 Technical

- Comment Sources
  - 467 from Voters
  - 352 from Non-voters
1104 Publication, 22nd Edition

819 Comments Submitted Through Ballot System

– Section 1 (Scope) 7 Comments
– Section 2 (References) 2 Comments
– Section 3 (Definitions) 47 Comments
– Section 4 (Specifications) 5 Comments
– Section 5 (Qualification of Welding Procedures...) 117 Comments
– Section 6 (Qualification of Welders) 71 Comments
– Section 7 (Design/Prep of a Joint for Production Welding) 12 Comments
– Section 8 (Inspection and Testing of Production Welds) 4 Comments
– Section 9 (Acceptance Standards for NDT) 42 Comments
– Section 10 (Repair and Removal of Weld Defects) 108 Comments
– Section 11 (Procedures for Nondestructive Testing (NDT)) 157 Comments
– Section 12 (Mechanized Welding...) 72 Comments
819 Comments Submitted Through Ballot System

- Annex A (Alternative Acceptance Standards for Girth Welds) 58 Comments
- Annex B (In-service Welding) 64 Comments
- Tables and Figures 83 Comments
- Other (Foreword, TOC, N/A) 5 comments
- Overlap Comments (-35 total)
1104 Publication, 22nd Edition

819 Comments Submitted Through Ballot System

- Section 11 (Procedures for Nondestructive Testing (NDT)) 19%
- Section 5 (Qualification of Welding Procedures...) 14%
- Section 10 (Repair and Removal of Weld Defects) 13%
- Section 6 (Qualification of Welders) 8%
- Section 12 (Mechanized Welding...) 8%
- Annex B (In-service Welding) 8%
- Annex A (Alternative Acceptance Standards for Girth Welds) 7%

- Section 3 (Definitions) 6%
- Tables and Figures 10%
- All others 7%
## Comment Resolution Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ballot:</th>
<th>4676</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>1104 22nd Edition</th>
<th>Report Date:</th>
<th>1/4/2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closing Date:</td>
<td>1/3/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sort Key</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Clause Subclause Number</th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Type of Comment</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Comment Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lazor, Robert</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>delete 'units'</td>
<td>... customary units (USC) or metric units (SI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regdos, Nathan</td>
<td>Non/Voter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The beginning of this paragraph (Scope) states that this Standard Covers...</td>
<td>Remove the reference to automatic welding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rogers, Geoff</td>
<td>Non/Voter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>first</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Branch weld type should be added to the list of weld types.</td>
<td>After the word butt in the first sentence, add the word “branch”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rogers, Geoff</td>
<td>Non/Voter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>first</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>A socket weld is a fillet weld. This is the only place in the document where the word socket is used.</td>
<td>Remove the word “socket”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gould, Melissa</td>
<td>Non/Voter</td>
<td>1. Scope</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>Redundant use of the word “units” when discussing USC</td>
<td>Replace sentence with: “The values stated in either U.S. customary (USC”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Resolution Process

- Comments will be assigned to the specific subcommittees
- Some comments may need to be worked by multiple subcommittees (Definitions, Tables, Figures, other?)
- Every Comment Submitted Must have a Response
- Every Comment Submitted Must have a Response
- Every Comment Submitted Must have a Response
Comment Resolution Process

• Response Options:
  – Agree
  – Agree in Principle
  – Disagree
  – Noted

• Every Response Must Start with one of these 4 options
Comment Resolution Process

Response Option “Agree”:

• It means that the subcommittee accepts the proposed response as submitted

• No additional changes are made to the change from what is submitted

• The subcommittee need only put the word “Agree” in the resolution box

• The subcommittee makes the applicable change in the document
Comment Resolution Process

Example of “Agree” Resolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Subclause Number</th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Type of Comment</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Comment Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>wleding is misspelled</td>
<td>correct spelling to &quot;welding&quot;</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Resolution Process

Response Option “Agree in Principle”:

- It means that the subcommittee accepts that a change in the applicable clause is needed
- The subcommittee did not fully accept the proposed change as submitted and made its own modification to the change wording
- The subcommittee must put the words “Agree in Principle” in the resolution box and provide a reason for why it did not accept the change as proposed
- The subcommittee makes the applicable change in the document
## Comment Resolution Process

**Example of “Agree in Principle” Resolution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Subclause Number</th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Type of Comment</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Comment Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>The stated tolerance +/- 0.01 inches is too tight and generally not achievable. The tolerance needs to be in alignment with industry norms</td>
<td>Change the tolerance in this section to +/- 0.05 inches.</td>
<td>Agree in Principle. The subcommittee discussed this issue and consensus was that 0.05 was too great a value and a compromise value of 0.03 was acceptable and achievable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Resolution Process

Response Option “Disagree”:

• It means that the subcommittee does *not* accept that a change in the applicable clause is needed.

• The subcommittee must put the words “Disagree” in the resolution box *and provide a reason for why it did not accept the change as proposed*

• No change in the document is required.
## Comment Resolution Process

### Example of “Disagree” Resolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Subclause Number</th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Type of Comment</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
<th>Comment Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.2.2.5</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>The 15 minute hold time for the pressure test is excessive. Most similar protocols in industry require no more than a 3 minute hold time.</td>
<td>Align the language of the document to that of standard industry practice of using a 3-minute hold period</td>
<td>Disagree. The subcommittee recognizes that 3 minutes is insufficient to allow a full determination of the integrity of the seals and that a longer period is needed to determine if leakage occurs. The subcommittee chose 15-minutes as a compromise to all suggested times for this test.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Resolution Process

Response Option “Noted”:

- If properly used, it will be rare (< 1-2% of replies)
- If a change occurs to the document from a comment, the use of NOTED cannot be the resolution
- 3 Examples of proper use of NOTED
  - No proposed specific resolution was offered to a comment (e.g., “I think the whole section needs rewritten”)
  - The comment is a question and not a not comment (e.g., “I want to know what is the justification for this?”)
  - Attempt to expand the scope of the document. (e.g., “The document does not include XYZ and it needs to be added)
Comment Resolution Process

• The ballot (comments) are not a starting point for discussion or dialog
• Avoid scope “creep”
• When a resolution is “agree” or “agree in principle” make the changes to the document immediately; do not wait until the end of the comment review
• Table problematic comments or assign to a smaller group for review and report back to larger group
• Editorial changes should require little argument (is it toh-MAY-toh or is it toh-MAH-toh)
Comment Resolution Process

What Happens When We Missed the Boat?

- If there is a topic that really needed to be included (by overwhelming consensus of the subcommittee) but was not....
- Then the “subcommittee” can enter a comment on the comment matrix and answer it
- We use the comment matrix as a record of change and this will record the source of the comment
- This is almost never done
1104 Publication, 22nd Edition

Timeline

- Develop Proposed Changes by Each SC/TG January 2018 Meeting
- Proposed Changes Integrated into the Draft of 22nd Edition (Drafting Task Group)
- 1st Ballot
  - 1st Ballot/Comment Resolution (January - May, 2019)
  - Integration of Changes from Ballot by Drafting TG) – June 2019
- 2nd (Re-)ballot [Limited Scope] in Q3, 2019 (July) – 6 Weeks
- 2nd (Final) Comment Resolution Q3/4, 2019 (September, October, 2019)
- Final Recirculation for Approval of Comment Changes – 2 Weeks (November, 2019)
- Submitted to Publication as 22nd Edition in December, 2019
Questions?

Ed Baniak
American Petroleum Institute
1220 L Street, NW
Washington, DC  20005
baniake@api.org
202-682-8135
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