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**Part A – Resource Plan**

1. **Background and Information:**
   1. Explain the business need for the proposed action. Indicate potential cost savings to industry where possible.

   There are over 30 pipeline operations and safety-related RPs and standards, each of which require revision or reaffirmation every five years. These RPs and standards often reference each other for common elements or similarities. The proposed action is to develop a “roadmap” for updating API’s pipeline standards and to make them more understandable by defining their interconnectivity. The proposed action will make API’s pipeline standards easier to update – i.e. the “roadmap” would identify changes to a standard, and highlight overlapping standards that may also need to be updated to reflect those changes. This roadmap will ultimately fall under the umbrella of RP 1173, tying common elements such as Leadership Commitment, Stakeholder Engagement and Management Review back to Pipeline SMS.

2. **What is the scope of the standard?**

   The research will result in a tangible “roadmap,” which map API pipeline standards to one another such that they can be updated in a coherent manner.

3. **Is this standard on the work program of another standards development organization (SDO)?**
   
   Yes [ ] No [x] 
   
   If yes, specify SDO and standard designation/project title/contact


If yes, is the work being coordinated with the appropriate group? Are there special circumstances that would justify independent API initiation of the proposed action?

4. Are a volunteer chair and group of experts available to perform the proposed action? Please include names and company affiliation and indicate chair, if available.

   N/A

5. Is there a need to commit resources to supplement the development of the draft? Would a paid content specialist accelerate progress on the development/revision? Is there a readily available content specialist?

   Yes – SPAN

6. Are there special format requirements for final document, i.e. knowledge of ISO template required, significant graphics, photos or equations) required that would need extraordinary resources?

   Yes   No   X

   If Yes, please provide details:

   N/A

7. Please provide any other information that is pertinent to the proposed action.

   PRCI has recently completed a similar project, but with their many research projects.

8. What are the implications of not initiating the proposed action? Include potential safety, reliability, environmental and financial impacts that may arise.

   The impact is not a future consequence. Rather, the proposed roadmap would alleviate a current issue concerning the large number of intertwined API standards and would reduce confusion, frustration, and duplication of effort on behalf of API member companies and other standards users.

9. Is there research proposed to accomplish the proposed action?

   Yes   X   No

   If yes, complete Part B of this form.

II. Project Timing

   Proposed start date: July 2020

   Proposed date draft will be ready for letter ballot: TBD

   TG/WG: (estimated number of volunteers needed) TBD

   Content Management: ($ amount "if needed" or volunteer) $ 50,000

PART B – Research Plan

I. Background and Information

1. Proposed Research Title:

   API Pipeline Standards Roadmap

2. Proposed Project Scope:

   A contractor will be hired to conduct research into existing API pipeline standards, including those that are undergoing revision, to determine their interconnectivity and common elements that would need to be harmonized under the umbrella of RP 1173 such as Leadership Commitment, Stakeholder Engagement and Management Review, and therefore ultimately linking back to Pipeline SMS. The research will result in a tangible “roadmap,” which map API...
pipeline standards to one another.

3. Research Amount:

$50,000

4. What is the business need for the proposed research?

Develop a mapping system to better manage the updating of API's many pipeline standards and their connections to RP 1173. The consultant will analyze the standards through the perspective of 1173 with the goal of correlating each standard's requirements with the requirements of 1173. Currently, API task groups working on revision efforts do not have clear guidance on how to connect their revision text with the safety management system, which API is trying to use as the underpinnings of many of its pipeline standards efforts.

5. Is the proposed research edition-specific for a single standard or will it result in technology enhancement for multiple standards?

If multiple standards, please cite the standards affected:

All API Pipeline Standards

6. Research Timing:

Research is necessary prior to scheduled revision.

Research can be done concurrent with revision.

7. How does the research support the proposed action identified in Part A?

Part A and B are essentially the same. This project will not result in an RP, rather it will result in a standards roadmap for updating multiple standards.

8. Is a joint industry project (JIP) a possibility?

If Yes, with whom? N/A

9. Are there opportunities for leveraged research with other organizations?

What organizations? N/A

10. What are the implications of not performing the proposed research?

Duplication of effort by those updating the standards, lack of harmonization of common elements in API's pipeline standards, and ultimately increased confusion by standards users.

II. Dates and Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Completion Date</th>
<th>Prior Research Funding Requested</th>
<th>Anticipated Future Research Funding Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EOY 2020</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Year 2: $5,000 Year 3: $5,000 Year 4: $5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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