



## Standards Resource & Research Request (SR<sup>3</sup>) Form Pipeline Standards

### Document Information

Standard Designation:	RP 1186											
Title:	Pipeline Process Safety											
Edition:	1											
Budget Year:	2021 - 2022											
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	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	COPS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Priority Matrix Ranking: (to be completed by API Staff)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Priority 1 (Rank 10-15)		<input type="checkbox"/>	Priority 2 (Rank 7-9)		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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes		<input type="checkbox"/>	No							
Proposed Action:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	New Standard				<input 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):	<input type="checkbox"/>	\$ 0										
Name of Submitter(s):	Paul Hartmands											
Date:	19 March 2021											

### 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.

The American Petroleum Institute is currently engaged in the revision of RP 754, Process Safety Performance Indicators for the Refining and Petrochemical Industries. This recommended practice (RP) identifies leading and lagging process safety indicators useful for driving performance improvement. As a framework for measuring activity, status or performance, this document classifies process safety indicators into four tiers of leading and lagging indicators. Guidance on methods for development and use of performance indicators is also provided.

While RP 754 contains Annex A on Application to Petroleum Pipeline and Terminal Operations, the Midstream Environmental, Health, and Safety Group [EHSG] has suggested that a separate RP specific to pipeline operators be developed. They have noted that pipeline operators need reporting and performance metrics built specifically for their operations and that refining performance indicators do not fit that purpose. Creating a unified schema for the pipeline segment would assist in data collection and



## Standards Resource & Research Request (SR<sup>3</sup>) Form Pipeline Standards

incident response.

This document will be the responsibility of the EHSG at API, which consists of API member pipeline operators, and has been engaged with the RP 754 task group. This new RP will be built on RP 754's outline, aim to stay consistent with that document's organization and terminology to the extent possible. Scoping for this project is ongoing and input from your company is being sought. A Task Group will be established to work on this document and if interested in participating, please contact [insert name and e-mail]. Additionally, participation by manufacturers and service suppliers is also being sought – if you know any persons who might be able to assist, please send [insert name and e-mail] their contact information.

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

This recommended practice (RP) identifies leading and lagging process safety indicators useful for driving performance improvement. As a framework for measuring activity, status or performance, this document classifies process safety indicators into four tiers of leading and lagging indicators. Tiers 1 and 2 are suitable for nationwide public reporting and Tiers 3 and 4 are intended for internal use at individual facilities. Guidance on methods for development and use of performance indicators is also provided. This RP was developed for hazardous liquid and natural gas transmission pipelines, but may also be applicable to other industries with operating systems and processes where loss of containment has the potential to cause harm. This RP is intended for both interstate and intrastate transmission lines.

This recommended practice applies to the responsible party. At co-located facilities (e.g. other lines in the ROW), this recommended practice applies individually to the responsible parties and not to the facility as a whole.

### 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.

Ellen Walenski; Marathon – chair

### 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?

We anticipate that volunteers will be sufficient to draft the document.



## Standards Resource & Research Request (SR<sup>3</sup>) Form Pipeline Standards

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

If Yes, please provide details:

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

API currently runs the 754 Process Safety Events program which collects metrics on downstream incidents. We also collect data on pipeline process safety. A separate RP for pipelines would assist operators in reporting accurate and consistent data to support this program. The data collected is public, is used for advocacy, with the objective of improving industry safety. Building out a parallel program for pipeline will allow API to use uniformly corrected data for advocacy, strategy, and member purposes.

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

Without an independent process safety metric RP, API will continue to collect data which is not uniform and may not accurately reflect pipeline safety and incidents. API will not be able to report out the industry's progress on pipeline safety and environmental impacts, and operators will not have accurate benchmarking for their operations.

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:	15 April 2021	Proposed date draft will be ready for letter ballot:	15 April 2022
TG/WG: (estimated number of volunteers needed)	20	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:

\$	<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 17px;"></div>
----	--



## Standards Resource & Research Request (SR<sup>3</sup>) Form Pipeline Standards

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

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:	23 March 2021 – please clarify scope. Is it only intended for regulated transmission pipelines? – Yes, for both. Change made to scope.
Date approved by COPS:	
Date entered into API Publications DB:	