



Standards Resource & Research Request (SR³) Form Pipeline Standards

Document Information

Standard Designation:	RP 1161							
Title:	Pipeline Operator Qualification (OQ)							
Edition:	6							
Budget Year:	2023 - 2025							
Committee/Subcommittee/Group: (check all that apply if a joint project)	SMS VG	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Awareness & Engagement VG	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cybernetics VG	<input type="checkbox"/>	Operator Qualifications VG	X
	Pipeline Integrity VG	<input type="checkbox"/>	Emergency Response VG	<input type="checkbox"/>	Construction & Operations VG	<input type="checkbox"/>	Underground Storage VG	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Gathering Lines VG	<input type="checkbox"/>	Environment, Health & Safety VG	<input type="checkbox"/>	COPS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Priority Matrix Ranking: (to be completed by API Staff)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Priority 1 (Rank 10-15)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Priority 2 (Rank 7-9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Priority 3 (Rank ≤6)		
UN Sustainable Development Goal (to be completed by API Staff)	<input type="checkbox"/>	#7 Access to Energy	<input type="checkbox"/>	#8 Economic Growth	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	#9 Resilient Infrastructure	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other
API Energy Excellence Program (to be completed by API Staff)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No				
Proposed Action:	<input type="checkbox"/>	New Standard			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Revise Current Standard		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Withdraw Current Standard			<input type="checkbox"/>	Research Only		
Proposed Funding Type:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Budget Request			<input type="checkbox"/>	Special Solicitation		
Total Funding Request (Parts A & B):	\$	0						
Name of Submitter(s):	Jacque Pruitt, Scott Sanders							
Date:	3 November 2022							

Part A – Resource Plan

I. Background and Information:

1. Explain the business need for the proposed action. Indicate potential cost savings to industry where possible.

API RP 1161 is a document assigned to the status of continuous revision. The Operator Qualification Work Group (OQWG) has been meeting regularly, in different incarnations, since the Operator Qualification (OQ) rule was initially proposed in 1998.

Since then, the RP has evolved into a liquids-only document, focusing on the needs of the liquids pipeline industry. A complementary document, maintained by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME), B.31Q, is widely used by the gas industry, and includes tasks which are only used on gas pipelines.

This sixth edition of RP 1161 narrows the scope to solely liquid pipelines, reflecting this long-standing reality in the industry.

Additionally, following discussion with federal regulators, it is clear that they consider repair tasks (covered under 49 CFR 195.422) as meeting the third-part of the four-part test in the OQ regulation. As these tasks are often not covered by operators, they are increasingly audited and having findings brought against them due to not having OQ-tasks for repair activities. As such, the work group is



Standards Resource & Research Request (SR³) Form Pipeline Standards

preparing to review additional OQ tasks which might need to be developed under the new regulatory interpretations.
Additionally, the work group is reviewing the entire document, per its scope, to clarify programmatic needs and its included tasks.

2. What is the scope of the standard?

API Recommended Practice (RP) 1161 establishes a framework for developing and maintaining an operator qualification program for hazardous liquid pipeline personnel. This RP is applicable for all hazardous liquid pipelines, both onshore and offshore, subject to 49 *Code of Federal Regulations (CFR)* Part 195, Subpart G. Operators may choose to use all or part of this document as applicable to their operations.

For the purposes of this document, the word “pipeline” is used interchangeably with pipeline facility or pipeline system, as defined in 49 *CFR* Part 195. This document pertains to all employees, contractors, subcontractors, or other entities who perform covered tasks on behalf of the Operator.

3. Is this standard on the work program of another standards development organization (SDO)?

Yes No

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.

Scott Sanders, Chair (beginning in 2023); Enbridge
Crystah Carter, Vice-chair (beginning in 2023); Plains All American
Jacque Pruitt, Advisor (beginning in 2023); Marathon
Robert Coker, Advisor (beginning in 2023); LOOP
The standing OQWG has ~40 regular members who attend quarterly in-person meetings

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?

No. The OQWG has relied on volunteer expertise for the last several editions.

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

If Yes, please provide details:

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

The 6th Edition of 1161 has already had some ballots circulated and reviewed. These ballots do not



Standards Resource & Research Request (SR³) Form Pipeline Standards

pertain to sections covered under the above scope changes, but are updates to the language in existing task standards. Further ballots are anticipated in the near future, following the in-person meeting in early October.

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

API is continuing to work on building relationships with DoT / PHMSA regarding OQ. Not updating the document to both reflect the current reality that B.31Q is the gas industry's standard for OQ tasks will continue to drain energy from the OQWG's efforts to update the document for the liquids industry. Further, the needs of operators to write updated tasks in agreement with how the regulator is interpreting the regulation (namely, that .422 repair tasks ARE covered tasks), leaves operators and vendors behind the curve regarding audits and inspections. Finally, some legacy language in 1161 is out-of-date with how the OQWG believes OQ programs should be managed.

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

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If yes, complete Part B of this form.			

II. Project Timing

Proposed start date:	Feb 2023	Proposed date draft will be ready for letter ballot:	n/a (RP 1161 is under continuous maintenance and is balloted in sections)
TG/WG: (estimated number of volunteers needed)	40	Content Management: (\$ amount "if needed" or volunteer)	volunteer

PART B – Research Plan

I. Background and Information

1. **Proposed Research Title:**

2. **Proposed Project Scope:**

3. **Research Amount:**

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



File Name:

Standards Resource & Research Request (SR³) Form Pipeline Standards

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

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

If multiple standards, please cite the standards effected:

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?

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

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

If Yes, with whom?

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

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

What organizations?

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

II. Dates and Funding:

Estimated Completion Date	Prior Research Funding Requested	Anticipated Future Research Funding Needs					
		Year 2: \$		Year 3: \$		Year 4: \$	
	\$						

PART C – Proposal Feedback/Approval Information

For API Use ONLY

COPS comments to Proposer/WG:	<input type="text"/>
Date approved by COPS:	<input type="text"/>
Date entered into API Publications DB:	<input type="text"/>