



RESULT OF VOTING ON NEW WORK ITEM PROPOSAL		
Date 2007-25-05	ISO/TC 67 / WG 8	N 980R
Title of TC/SC concerned <b>Materials, corrosion control, welding and joining and non-destructive examination</b>		

To be completed by the secretariat and sent to the ISO Central Secretariat and to all P- and O-members of the TC or SC concerned, with a copy to the TC secretariat in the case of a subcommittee.

<b>Proposal</b>	ISO/TC 67/WG 8 N 977c	Circulation 2007-02-23	Deadline 2007-05-23
<b>Title</b> (new title if appropriate; French title to be indicated in all cases, even when no French version is envisaged)			
English title	<b>Petroleum, petrochemical and natural gas industries - Materials selection for upstream operations</b>		
French title			

<b>Results</b> (the compilation of results is given as an annex)
<b>The following criteria for acceptance have been met:</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approval by a simple majority of the voting P-members
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 or more P-members voting approval have agreed to participate in the development of the project and have nominated an expert

<b>Average points (y/x) awarded by P-members for market relevance</b> (score as calculated in annex) NA
<i>Note: This SVAT score is not intended to be the principle criterion upon which a decision is based, but rather is additional support for determining the best action. Nevertheless, if the average points scored is less than 15 consideration should be given to disapproval.</i>

<b>In the light of results, the proposal is therefore:</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Approved</b> (all approval criteria met)
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Not approved</b> (one or more approval criteria not met)

<b>Associated draft</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> no draft was associated with this ballot. A first draft is expected by (give date)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the associated draft is adopted as a working draft (WD)
<input type="checkbox"/> the associated draft is approved as a Committee draft (CD)
<input type="checkbox"/> the associated draft is approved as the proposed Draft International Standard (DIS)

<b>Further procedures</b> (attribution to TC/SC/WG, Project Leader, development procedure, meetings, etc.)
<input type="checkbox"/> The project is to be first registered as a Preliminary Work Item (stage 00.60)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The project is to be immediately registered as an active work item
<b>Other:</b>

<b>Experts</b> (give details below, or as a separate annex)
See Annex A

<b>Documents to be considered</b> (give details below, or as a separate annex)
--

<b>Proposed development track</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 1 (24 months) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 (36 months - default) <input type="checkbox"/> 3 (48 months)
<i>Note: Selection of a development track will automatically associate default target dates with critical stages. If you envisage that you can advance a project quicker than the default target dates you may indicate your preferred earlier target dates in the field "Target date for submission". <b>Important!</b> Quoting earlier target dates implies a commitment to meeting these dates <b>If you do not want to change the defaults to earlier dates do not put anything in the "Target date for submission" fields.</b></i>

<b>Target date for submission:</b>	as a CD: 05-2008	as a FDIS: 03-2010
	as a DIS: 05-2009	for publication: 05-2010

<b>Secretariat</b>	<b>Secretary</b>
API for ANSI	David Miller

<b>Registration by the Central Secretariat</b>	
Date	Allocated project number
2007-05-25	19910

**Annex A:**

Brazil:

Luciana Farias Hörlle  
Avenida Almirante Barroso, 81-12º andar  
Rio de Janeiro - RJ  
Brazil  
e: [lfarias@petrobras.com.br](mailto:lfarias@petrobras.com.br)  
t: (55) 21 3229-3068

France:

Thierry Cassagne  
Total, CSTJF  
CB 469, Avenue Larribau  
64018 Pau  
France  
e: [thierry.cassagne@total.com](mailto:thierry.cassagne@total.com)  
t: 33 (0) 5 59 83 43 44  
f: 33 (0) 5 59 83 69 56

Italy:

Tiziana Cheldi  
Eni E&P  
e: [tiziana.cheldi@eni.it](mailto:tiziana.cheldi@eni.it)

Japan:

Tsuneaki Kobayashi  
JISF Standardization Center  
Japan  
kobayashi@jisf.or.jp

Netherlands:

Mr. Ken Welsh  
Shell Intern Exploration & Production  
Kessler Park 1  
2288 GS Rijswijk  
The Netherlands  
e: [ken.welsh@shell.com](mailto:ken.welsh@shell.com)  
t: 31 (0) 704 474 617

Norway:

Ragnar Mollan  
e: [ragnar.mollan@hydro.com](mailto:ragnar.mollan@hydro.com)  
Stein Olsen  
e: [stein.olsen@statoil.com](mailto:stein.olsen@statoil.com)

Qatar:

Saif S. Al-Naimi  
e: [SSS\\_alnaimi@qp.com.qa](mailto:SSS_alnaimi@qp.com.qa)

United Kingdom:

Mr. Raman Patel  
e: [raman.patel@hse.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:raman.patel@hse.gsi.gov.uk)  
Mr. Andrew Leonard  
e: [Andrew.leonard@uk.bp.com](mailto:Andrew.leonard@uk.bp.com)

United States:

Peter Sandy, Marathon Oil  
e: [pasandy@marathonoil.com](mailto:pasandy@marathonoil.com)

Maarten Simon-Thomas, Shell  
e: [marten.simon-thomas@shell.com](mailto:marten.simon-thomas@shell.com)

Richard Thompson, Chevron  
e: [rmth@chevron.com](mailto:rmth@chevron.com)





**Annex B- Comments**

Date: 3 April, 2007 Document: **NWI – Materials selection for Upstream Operations**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
<b>MB<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)</b>	<b>Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)</b>	<b>Type of comment<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Comment (justification for change) by the MB</b>	<b>Proposed change by the MB</b>	<b>Secretariat observations</b>
JP	Entire document			The draft standard, NORSK M-001, does not define the responsibility of the user manufacturer. For example, if operational problem has happened even if users follow the confisiton given in Table 6, who would have the responsibility of the problem, either user or manufacturer? Since Manufacturer does not guarantee material performance, I think that user who select the material should have the responsibility for his selection. Manufacturer's responsibility is to produce material according to material standard such as ISO 11960.	Proposal: 1. To add a stipulation to define the user's responsibility in appropriate clause. 2. To start with CD stage to discuss and confirm the above statements.	
UK	Entire Document		ge	The value of the proposed standard is unclear given the present development of materials selection documents for specific areas, where and when appropriate (e.g. API 17/ISO 13628 for subsea equipment). However, the UK would recommend that if this NWI does go ahead that it is as a 'guide' (i.e. a Technical Specification) that describes the philosophy of undertaking materials selection but does NOT contain any mandatory requirements, such as limitations on applicability of individual materials (unfortunately the NORSOK document that is proposed as a basis contains many such mandatory requirements). This would avoid any conflicts with other ISO documents (e.g. API 17/ISO 13628 for subsea equipment; ISO 15156 on materials for sour service) or 'application/company/country/region specific' guidelines that already exist.		
UK	General		ge	Also the UK would recommend that the first meeting of the WG is NOT called until the vote has been completed and experts from various countries taking part have been identified so their availability can be assessed. The first meeting of a WG is one of the most important as it sets the scene for how the WG will undertake its charge so it is critical that as many of the WG members as possible are present. The proposal for a June 2007 meeting would not enable this to be achieved.		
US	Entire Document	See Comments	ge	The scope of application for this standard is unclear. Is it to be used in the procurement process by operators when they	Clarify the scope of application for this document. Consider changing it to a Publicly Available Specification instead of an	

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

**Annex B- Comments**

Date: 3 April, 2007 Document: **NWI – Materials selection for Upstream Operations**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations
				purchase equipment from a supplier or is it to be used beforehand by operators as guidance when selecting/specifying equipment?	International Standard. Alternatively, if the industry as a whole agrees that the content of this document is so much better than anything existing, the relevant parts of the document should be added to the product specifications in the course of their normal review process.	
US				The document does not state the manner in which its contents are to be applied in conjunction with the existing product specifications.	Include in the document scope the pecking order for the application of this standard versus the product standards.	
US				The document has numerous examples where "teaching" is performed versus setting forth requirements. An example is clause 4.5 where the statement is made "Chemicals can affect each other".	Due to the extent of this teaching practice, the proposed move straight to DIS ballot is not recommended. A working committee draft should be required to allow time for these issues to be worked.	
US				The document has numerous instances where instructions are given to conduct a specific activity for acceptance but no guidance is given as to method or acceptance criteria. See 5.3 on fluid compatibilities.	All requirements for testing or evaluation should include methods and acceptance criteria to enable determination of when a requirement has been met.	
US				The document uses NORSOK standards extensively for normative references. See 5.4.1.	Equivalency of NORSOK standards against ISO standards should be a major work item of the task group assigned to develop this document.	
US				The document has numerous instances where a requirement is stated then exceptions are allowed with documentation showing acceptable performance. See 4.4.3 (page 9, 7th paragraph up from the bottom)	If the document is indeed a specification, the instances where the requirements can be met by other means need to be clearly identified with methods, acceptance criteria, etc. so that demonstration of compliance with the document will be possible and repeatable.	
US				The document refers to activities that take place at significantly different time intervals than is the case with most specifications. For example, corrosion monitoring is listed as a requirement in clause 4.6. However, this activity will likely be carried out by organizations other than those who were contracted to supply the materials.	Edit the document to remove these sections and place them either in an informative annex or as a Part 2 document to facilitate the interchange between the user and purchaser.	
US				This document (M-001) is narrowly focused on the Norwegian sector with its particular set of operating	In this sense, the document would not even serve well as a recommended practice without very major overhaul.	

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

## Annex B- Comments

Date: 3 April, 2007 Document: **NWI – Materials selection for Upstream Operations**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations
				conditions. For example, Table 2 in section 5.3 on well completion metallurgy provides for 13Cr as "base case" for the service conditions for equipment that is run in the North Sea, but does not provide criteria for selection of this material so that it could be applied to other parts of the world.		
US				M-001 appears to be a guideline for operators, not a manufacturing or purchasing Standard for equipment suppliers.	Put purchasing guidelines in an informative annex.	
US				If it is released as (or converted into) an ISO standard that can be listed as a controlling document for purchase of completion equipment, it will present problems for manufacturers as presented.	Overhaul document.	
US				The NORSOK terminology should be eliminated and ISO nomenclature should be used.	Use ISO Terminology	
US				The interconnecting reference to other NORSOK documents should be deleted. The requirements should be placed into this ISO document.	Place requirements in ISO document.	
US				The ISO document should represent international standards etc. The reference to the PED and North Sea practices in the "splash zone" appears that the spec only applies in this part of the world. North Sea should be removed or other worldwide locations added.	Make the document applicable on an "International" basis.	
US				Other International standards (i.e. ASTM, ASME etc) shall also be referenced in addition to European documents.	Place European standards in Bibliography.	
US				Both English and Metric units should be integrated into the document similar to other ISO documents.	Integrate fully the use of the dual units.	
US				Section 5.7.4: "For drilling risers a total erosion/corrosion allowance of minimum 6 mm shall be included for accumulated design lives exceeding 10 years." .	This level of corrosion allowance conflicts with existing API standards	
US				Section 7.3: "welding/joining of bimetallic (clad) pipes;"	The recommendations of joining weld-clad pipe highlighted in EEMUA Pub 194: 2004 should be referenced / followed.	

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

## Annex B- Comments

Date: 3 April, 2007 Document: **NWI – Materials selection for Upstream Operations**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations
US				The NORSOK Standard covers everything from drilling equipment to production equipment to process facilities to chains and mooring lines and even more. The preference would be to see the applicable recommendations from NORSOK M-001 integrated into the specific API / ISO specifications to which they apply.	For example, put the requirements that apply to surface valves and wellhead equipment into API 6A / ISO 10423 and the requirements that apply to subsea valves and wellhead equipment into API 17D / ISO 13628-4.	
US				While it may not present a problem to create the first edition of a document with such a far reaching scope, staffing a task group to update and maintain it will be a problem. It covers too many types of equipment.	Narrow the focus of the document by sub-dividing the document around the subject equipment.	
US				This Materials Selection topic should be left up to the individual standards writing committees, particularly with regard to the subsea suite of standards. This would avoid potential conflicts, that are sure to occur, between such a newly generated materials standard and the existing product specifications and standards. The preferred <i>performance</i> standards for the materials used are better addressed within the specific standards covering the equipment to which they apply.		
US				It was felt that although there could be substantial benefits for such a document, the proposed NWI was too broad in its scope and would be, therefore, difficult to achieve a clear, concise document in a reasonable timeframe		
US	4.3.1			The corrosion allowance of 3 mm recommended for carbon steel: Coiled tubing carbon steel supply in offshore installations has been below 3mm actual wall thickness in a number of projects.	Maybe some comment about smaller corrosion allowances can be made based on actual well/product conditions or for smaller OD/WT carbon steel pipelines?	
US	4.3.10			This suggests the weld procedure for installations include corrosion testing. There is no reference to any requirement. Should there be a requirement? Does ASME Section IX or DNV-OS-F101 refer to a welding qualification with corrosion testing as an option or supplementary requirement?		
US	6.1			The yield to tensile strength ratio for carbon and low alloy steels states it shall not exceed 0.9; however, this doesn't	See Section 6 Table 6.3 of OS-F101 for reference.	

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

**Annex B- Comments**

Date: 3 April, 2007 Document: **NWI – Materials selection for Upstream Operations**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations
				match DNV-OS-F101 for pipeline systems. C-Mn steel linepipe for some grades have a maximum of 0.92 Y:T ratio in the transverse and 0.94 in the longitudinal direction. Potentially up to 0.95 if sour service tubing.		
US				<p><b>Scope of Proposed Project-</b> The stated scope is "...to provide an international standard that offers general principles, engineering guidance and requirements for materials selection and corrosion protection for all parts of on- and offshore hydrocarbon drilling, production, transmission, and processing facilities...".</p> <p>* Many of the issues (see below) taken with the proposal, and the draft attachment in particular, are the result of such a broad scope, resulting in a "one size fits none" solution. For example, many design specifics that are reasonable and cost-effective in marine and other corrosive environments are not so in other severe, but different environs. Attempting to cover all equipment, systems, structures, etc. in all applications, both onshore and offshore is prone to deficiencies in some, and inefficiencies in others.</p>		
US				<p><b>Purpose and Justification-</b> The NWI notes that the OGP Standards committee survey indicated a number of OGP members were in favor of the NWI.</p> <p>However, there is no mention of the actual <i>purpose</i> of the proposed standard in terms of realized or potential problem(s) to be solved by such a standard, nor economy to be gained, nor does there appear to be a <i>justification</i> for either the dedication of resources to create and maintain the standard, nor the costs to industry for compliance (including restraint of innovation from a potentially excessively prescriptive standard).</p>		
US				<p><b>Some specific concerns-</b></p> <p>- The document is largely prescriptive (vs. performance based). For such a large scope, this is an inefficient means</p>		

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

**Annex B- Comments**

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
MB <sup>1</sup>	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comment (justification for change) by the MB	Proposed change by the MB	Secretariat observations
				to achieve the fundamental goal of <i>performance</i> . - The document seems to be more applicable to process and production equipment that is in normal contact with produced fluids - Many of the requirements are not cost effective for mobile equipment that does not remain in an offshore environment. - Some of the requirements are not justifiable, or even ill-advised for conventional fluid power components (e.g. 4.3.9). - Some requirements are unnecessary or cumbersome (e.g. 6.1) as appropriate methods of proper application/use of other materials are well established in the current standards). - Some requirements are in conflict with and/or redundant to current API/ISO equipment standards (e.g. 6.2.1).		
US	5.2			The one paragraph (5.2) in Norsok M-001 concerning drilling equipment materials is not adequate in addressing materials standardization for drilling equipment.		
US				The Norsok document gives little or no weight to the wide range of service conditions or applications that exist in the worldwide oil and gas industry.		
US				Most requirements in Norsok M-001 assume production environments with 20- or 30-year lifetimes. That assumption is not applicable to most drilling equipment, which will typically experience occasional exposure of short duration to well fluids.		

1 **MB** = Member body (enter the ISO 3166 two-letter country code, e.g. CN for China; comments from the ISO/CS editing unit are identified by \*\*)

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general                      **te** = technical                      **ed** = editorial

**NOTE**    Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.