

API/EI Phoenix Agreement

Working together

Introduction

Initial attempts at working together via the Phoenix Agreement broke down possibly due to the lack of alignment of each organization's expectations, direction in what standards should be followed for joining, and clear instructions at working group level. This document is a supplemental guide intended to help the American Petroleum Institute (API) and Energy Institute (EI) understand each other's expectations, lay down a framework for choosing the documents to join and help delegates work together to produce joined API/EI standards and guidelines.

Expectations of the Organizations

The industry expects that there will be a reduction in duplication of standards for any particular subject covered by Hydrocarbon Measurement. Currently there are API, EI and International Organization for Standardization (ISO) standards, which can confuse industry bodies if, on the same subject, may have differing requirements. The EI can work with both the API and ISO. For U.S. legal reasons, API does not provide national standard adoption intellectual property (IP) licenses to all of ISO members.

The expectation of both the Energy Institute and API is to develop common standards covering global requirements as dictated by industry or to fill identified gaps in current international industry or national practice. By utilising the expertise from all organizations, there will be access to additional resources for all parties accepting that API is unable to license its IP or contribute on technical matters with ISO.

Choice of standards to joint

It is not the intention of either organization to join every document. The organizations will only join documents having similar objectives. Subject to the execution of separate copyright license and joint publication agreements, the organizations will use the following procedure to consider joint publication of documents:

- API and EI shall form an API/EI Steering Group to identify common standards as potential candidates for joining. It will consist of the Chair COPM, Chair HMC, HM Advisor to the EI (delegated as EI staff representative) and an API Staff representative.
- The API/EI Steering Group will develop and maintain a Relationship Matrix consisting of a list of committees and the documents each separate organization maintains. It will also list the committee chairmen and their contact details. The API/EI Steering Group will review the matrix at least twice a year. Possibilities for face-to-face meetings of the Steering Group will be during the API COPM Spring and Fall meetings, and EI HMC 4 May and November meetings.
- The API/EI Steering Group will identify:
 - new ideas/areas of development within the industry to propose as new joint standards to be developed;
 - existing standards from both organizations as candidates for joining.

- Each organization will consult with their respective committees/working groups to assess the feasibility of developing a joint standard.
- If support is forthcoming for a joint project, with the agreement of the respective working groups/committees in both organizations, the API/EI Steering Group will decide on the document lead for each standard to be joined. The lead organization will ultimately coordinate and facilitate the completion of the final editorial layout and publication of the joint standard.
- Each organization will undertake approval of the proposed new joint project using its own procedures (e.g. the SR3 process used in COPM). If funding is required for a joint API-EI project, in principle this would be split equally between the two organizations, but a separate agreement shall be established that address the goals of the research and handling financial details.
- Steering and Drafting Group members will be provided with access to each other's organization standards website with respect to documents for standards development such as working/task group agendas, minutes and drafts.
- The applicable sections of the Phoenix Implementation Guide will remain relevant for these rules.

Working Group Rules

1. Once a potential API-EI joint standard has been identified by the API/EI Steering Group and support obtained for joint development by both organizations, each organization will form a distinct drafting group (one for each organization). Each organization will appoint its own Drafting Group, consisting of a Chair and two members, six people in total who are active participants in API COPM or EI HMC measurement standards activities. In the event either organization is not able to supply the required three volunteers, the joint project shall not proceed.
2. Joint collaboration meetings will take place to determine the document scope, outline, resources required and group assignments. Initial meeting will be with both groups and may take place in person or via video/web conferencing. Each organization may work with a larger work group, separately, in order to involve a wider audience. Each organization may coordinate this effort separately.
3. Each organization will undertake approval of the proposed new joint project using its own procedures. If approval is obtained by one organization and not the other, and the approving organization was the original publisher of a prior edition of the standard, the approving organization may continue with independent development of a stand-alone document. If approval is obtained by only one organization that is not the original publisher of a prior edition of the standard, then it may continue with development of a stand-alone document only with the written permission of the original publisher.
4. Each drafting group will work independently on their assignments. They may call on their respective standards committee members to provide additional resources, but for drafting discussions between the organizations only the six people identified will take part in video/web, teleconferencing or in person meetings. If unreconcilable differences appear at this stage either party may exit the process.
5. Drafts shall be exchanged via the two drafting group chairs, ensuring that the appropriate API and EI staff are included in the distribution. It is the responsibility of the respective Drafting Group chairs to solicit consensus from

their respective drafting groups. Chairs may ask respective members of their steering group to help with reaching agreement. Again, if consensus cannot be reached, either party may exit the process.

6. When consensus has been reached, the drafting groups will prepare a final draft which, with the approval of the Chairs, will be distributed to the respective subcommittees or work groups etc. for stakeholder review prior to formal balloting within each organization's consensus body.
7. Review comments will be addressed by the drafting group of the lead organization and a final ballot draft prepared.
8. Drafting group Chairs shall approve any final draft prior to formal balloting within each organization's consensus body.
9. Formal balloting within each organization's consensus body shall be undertaken in accordance with the relevant procedures of that organization. Comments will be reviewed and addressed by the work or task group of the lead organization. Whether or not API is the lead organization, if comments with negative ballots (submitted to either organization) are determined to be non-persuasive, they shall be recirculated to the appropriate API consensus body. Furthermore, if any ballot comments are determined to be persuasive and substantive, the proposed changes shall also be recirculated to the appropriate API consensus body. However, if substantive changes are made to the draft while incorporating accepted ballot comments, a rebalot within the consensus body can be undertaken in lieu of recirculation.

Note: Administration, publishing process or any other non-technical matter on the standard worked will be covered under our current Joint Standards Development Agreement and Phoenix Agreement