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• 1104 Publication, 22nd Edition
  – Ballot 4676 4989 Results
  – Comment Resolution
Interpretations Task Group (ITG)

- ITG is called (by 1104 Chair) as Needed
- 1 Meeting in 2019 (November)
- Interpretations Developed and Submitted to API
- Reviewed/Approved by API Legal
- Issued 17 Interpretations
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

Giovanne Lopez  CRC Evans Welding Services
Kelly Osborn  U.S. Pipeline, Inc.
Jon Connaway  Michels Corporation
Matt Steel  RMS Welding Systems
Pipe Manufacturers

Open
Argelia Alfonso  Tenaris
Scott Robertson  USS Tubular Products
Bob Wise  Hawk Technical
American Society for Nondestructive Testing

David Culbertson  NDT Technical Services
Scott Metzger       Intertek
Tom Reeder          Central NDT Inc.
Kyle Lee            Southern California Gas Co
American Welding Society

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

Bob Huntley        RHM Welding Consulting
Robert Bates      AUT Consulting
Matt Boring        DNV GL
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

Re-Ballot 4989 Opened 12/02/19 closed 1/16/20

<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>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Responses: | 26         |
| Total Ballots:   | 28         |
| Response Rate ((Affirmative + Negative + Abstain) / Total Ballots): | 93% Must be > 50% |
| Approval Rate (Affirmative / [Affirmative + Negative]) | 100% 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

- 819 284 Comments Submitted Through Ballot System
  - 336 157 Editorial
  - 257 50 General
  - 226 77 Technical

- Comment Sources
  - 467 169 from Voters
  - 352 115 from Non-voters
After the Lazor Factor Correction
146 (all duplicated) 73 from voter and 73 nonvoter

• 819 284 211 Comments Submitted Through Ballot System

• Comment Sources
  — 467 169 from Voters
  — 352 115 42 from Non-voters
819 284 211 Comments Submitted Through Ballot System

– Section 1 (Scope) 7 0 Comments
– Section 2 (References) 2 2 Comments
– Section 3 (Definitions) 47 44 Comments
– Section 4 (Specifications) 5 4 Comments
– Section 5 (Qualification of Welding Procedures...) 117 27 Comments
– Section 6 (Qualification of Welders) 71 24 Comments
– Section 7 (Design/Prep of a Joint for Production Welding) 12 3 Comments
– Section 8 (Inspection and Testing of Production Welds) 4 0 Comments
– Section 9 (Acceptance Standards for NDT) 42 12 Comments
– Section 10 (Repair and Removal of Weld Defects) 108 24 Comments
– Section 11 (Procedures for Nondestructive Testing (NDT)) 157 65 Comments
– Section 12 (Mechanized Welding...) 72 10 Comments
1104 Publication, 22nd Edition

819 284 211 Comments Submitted Through Ballot System

- Annex A (Alternative Acceptance Standards for Girth Welds) 58 5 Comments
- Annex B (In-service Welding) 64 29 Comments
- Tables and Figures 83 29 Comments
- Other (Foreword, TOC, N/A) 5 2 comments
- Overlap Comments (-35 -4 total)
819 Comments Submitted Through Ballot System

- Section 11 (Procedures for Nondestructive Testing (NDT)) 19% 23%
- Annex B (In-service Welding) 8% 10%
- Section 5 (Qualification of Welding Procedures...) 14% 9%
- Section 10 (Repair and Removal of Weld Defects) 13% 8%
- Section 6 (Qualification of Welders) 8% 8%
- Section 12 (Mechanized Welding...) 8% 3.5%
- Annex A (Alternative Acceptance Standards for Girth Welds) 7% 2%
- Section 3 (Definitions) 6% 15%
- Tables and Figures 10% 10%
- All others 7% 11.5%
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
- Every Response Must Start with one of these 4 options
- Every Response Must Start with one of these 4 options
- 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>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>Welding 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 Numbe</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 an 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>12.2.5</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 all 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)
1104 Publication, 22\textsuperscript{nd} Edition

Timeline

\begin{itemize}
\item Develop Proposed Changes by Each SC/TG January 2018 Meeting
\item Proposed Changes Integrated into the Draft of 22\textsuperscript{nd}-Edition (Drafting Task Group)
\item 1\textsuperscript{st} Ballot
\item 1\textsuperscript{st} Ballot/Comment Resolution (January–May, 2019)
\item Integration of Changes from Ballot by Drafting TG) – June 2019
\item 2\textsuperscript{nd} (Re-)ballot [Limited Scope] in Q3, 2019 (July) – 6 Weeks
\item 2\textsuperscript{nd} (Final) Comment Resolution Q2, 2020 (June/July 2020)
\item Final Recirculation for Approval of Comment Changes – 2 Weeks (August 2020)
\item Submitted to Publication as 22\textsuperscript{nd} Edition in September 2020
\end{itemize}
1104 Publication, 22\textsuperscript{nd} Edition

Timeline

– 2\textsuperscript{nd} (Final) Comment Resolution Q23, 2020 (June/July, 2020)

– Then Two Options
  
  • Final Recirculation for Approval of Comment Changes – 2 Weeks (July, 2020)
  
  • Submitted to Publication as 22\textsuperscript{nd} Edition in September 2020

Or

• 3\textsuperscript{rd} Ballot, July 2020 (6 weeks)

• Comment Resolution, September/October 2020

• Final Recirculation for Approval of Changes, November 2020

• Publish in December 2020/January 2021
Questions?
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