

Procedures for Standards Development

AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE
EIGHTH EDITION, AUGUST 2025

ANSI APPROVED: AUGUST 2025



Foreword

The American Petroleum Institute (API) *Procedures for Standards Development* (Procedures) provide specific guidance for API standards activities including; project justification and initiation of new standards; approval balloting; requirements for balance, consensus and due process; procedures for revision, reaffirmation and withdrawal; criteria for processing requests for interpretations; intellectual property and patent policy guidance; and API's appeals process.

These Procedures govern the development of all standards published exclusively by API and jointly with other standards developing organizations within the provisions of Section 4.3. All API standards development activities shall be conducted in accordance with these Procedures.

These Procedures also provides guidance that allows for the submittal of candidate API standards for approval as American National Standards including the national adoption of International Organization for Standardization (ISO) standards as American National Standards.

These Procedures have been approved by the ANSI Executive Standards Council (ExSC) effective August 12, 2025.

For additional information on API's standards program contact the Standards Director, American Petroleum Institute, 200 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20001.

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher. Contact the Publisher, API Standards Development, 200 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20001.

Copyright © 2025 American Petroleum Institute

Contents

1	Scope.....	1
2	Normative References	1
3	Definitions.....	1
4	API Standards Committees.....	3
4.1	Standardization Authority	3
4.2	Committee Operations.....	3
4.3	Joint Committees with other Organizations.....	3
5	Designation of API Standards	4
5.1	General.....	4
5.2	Specifications.....	4
5.3	Recommended Practices	4
5.4	Standards.....	4
5.5	Codes	4
5.6	Bulletins and Technical Reports	5
5.7	Other Document Designations	5
6	Consensus Process Procedures.....	5
6.1	General.....	5
6.2	Due Process	5
6.3	Notification of Standards Development Activities	7
6.4	Resource Needs	7
6.5	Membership on Standards Committees	9
6.6	Balloting.....	9
6.7	Revisions to Standards	14
6.8	Interpretations	15
6.9	Appeals	15
6.10	Maintenance of Standards	16
6.11	Standards Meeting Procedures	20
6.12	Standards Effective Date.....	21
6.13	Alternative Process (“Canvass Method”) for Establishing a Consensus Body.....	21
7	Normative Policies for API Standards	21
7.1	Records Retention	21
7.2	Terms Relating to Provisions in API Standards	22
7.3	Intellectual Property.....	22
7.4	Commercial Terms and Conditions	23
7.5	Implementation of Standards	24
7.6	Metric Policy	24
7.7	Liaison.....	25
7.8	Access to Standards Development Information	25
7.9	Internal Audits	26
8	International Standards Activities.....	26
8.1	Adoption of ISO Standards as American National Standards.....	26
8.2	Expedited Procedures for the Identical Adoption of an ISO Standard.....	26
Annex A	(normative) Processing of ANSI American National Standards.....	27
A.1	Overview	27
A.2	Submittal of ANSI Documentation	27
A.3	Consensus Process for American National Standards	28
A.4	Registration of Technical Reports with ANSI	28
	Bibliography	29

Introduction

The American Petroleum Institute (API) Procedures for Standards Development (Procedures) provide specific guidance for API standards activities including: project justification and initiation of new standards; approval balloting; requirements for balance, consensus, and due process; procedures for revision, reaffirmation and withdrawal; criteria for processing requests for interpretations; intellectual property and patent policy guidance; and API's appeals process.

These Procedures govern the development of all standards published exclusively by API and jointly with other standards developing organizations. All API standards development activities shall be conducted in accordance with these Procedures.

These Procedures also provides guidance for the submittal of candidate API standards for approval as American National Standards, including the national adoption of International Organization for Standardization (ISO) standards as American National Standards.

These Procedures have been approved by the ANSI Executive Standards Council (ExSC) effective August 12, 2025.

Suggested revisions are invited and should be submitted to the Standards Department, API, 200 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20001, standards@api.org.

Significant changes from the Seventh Edition are as follows:

- 1) Sections 3.5 and 6.2.2.2 – Added definition for “consultant” and requirement to disclose representation for interest category assignment.
- 2) Section 5.6 – Provisions for bulletins and technical reports clarified.
- 3) Section 6.2.2.2 – Removal of “Association” as an interest category and provisions included for assignment of interest category for Association, Trade Association, or Professional Society representatives.
- 4) Section 6.4.1 – Project initiation requirements added for bulletins and technical reports.
- 5) Section 6.5 – Consensus body voting rights and leadership position ineligibility specified for consultants compensated by API for standards development work related to that work.
- 6) Section 6.6.2 – Balloting process for individual work items clarified.
- 7) Section 6.6.4 – Details added for ballot format when balloting portions of proposed standards.
- 8) Section 6.6.7.4 – Provisions added for how to handle responses to recirculations and multiple recirculations.
- 9) Section 6.6.7.5 – Reballot vs. recirculation process clarified.
- 10) Section 6.7.2 – Additional provisions regarding substantive addenda included.
- 11) Section 6.9.2 – The time limit for an appeal to be filed with API has been reduced from within 30 days to 15 days of the date of notification of the action causing the complaint.
- 12) Section 6.10.3 – Provisions for continuous maintenance clarified.
- 13) Section 6.11 – Standards Meeting Procedures updated.
- 14) Section 7.5 – Implementation of Standards added.

API Procedures for Standards Development

1 Scope

The procedures established in this document govern the development of standards published by the American Petroleum Institute (API). These Procedures also provide guidance that allows for the submittal of candidate API standards for approval as American National Standards including the national adoption of International Organization for Standardization (ISO) standards as American National Standards (see Annex A).

2 Normative References

The following referenced documents are indispensable for the application of this document. For dated references, only the edition cited applies. For undated references, the latest edition of the referenced document applies (including any addenda/errata).

ANSI Essential Requirements: Due Process Requirements for American National Standards, January 2025

API Guide for the National Adoption of ISO Standards as API/ANSI American National Standards

3 Definitions

For the purposes of these Procedures, the following definitions apply.

3.1

addendum

A revision, addition, or removal of text that alters the provisions a published standard.

NOTE Addenda can be administrative or substantive (see 6.7.2).

3.2

can

Denotes a statement of possibility or capability.

3.3

consensus

When substantial agreement has been reached by directly and materially interested parties.

NOTE Consensus signifies the concurrence of more than a simple majority, but not necessarily unanimity. Consensus requires that all views and objections be considered, and that an effort be made toward their resolution.

3.4

consensus body

The group that approves the content of a standard by ballot and by its approval, demonstrates evidence of consensus.

3.5

consultant

Someone who agrees to provide professional service in exchange for compensation, financial or otherwise.

NOTE For API consensus body membership, a consultant is a subject matter expert under contract (other than to API) to an interested party with respect to the subject under standardization.

3.6

continuous maintenance

Maintenance of a standard by consideration of recommended changes to any part of it according to a documented schedule for consideration and action by the consensus body.

3.7**editorial change****non-substantive change**

A change that does not directly or materially affect the use of a standard.

NOTE Editorial changes have no effect on the way the standard is used or applied.

3.8**erratum**

A list of editorial corrections to, or corrections of errors introduced during publication process of, a published standard.

3.9**may**

Denotes a course of action permissible within the limits of a standard.

3.10**interpretation**

The answer to a question on the meaning or intent of a specific provision in a standard.

3.11**periodic maintenance**

Maintenance of a standard by review of the entire document and action to revise or reaffirm it on a schedule not to exceed five years from the date of its approval.

3.12**shall**

Denotes a requirement to conform to the standard.

3.13**should**

Denotes a recommendation, which is advised but not required to conform to the standard.

NOTE In some cases, third parties or authorities having jurisdiction can incorporate API standards by reference, and can mandate compliance with all requirements and recommendations.

3.14**stabilized maintenance**

Maintenance of an eligible standard on a 10-year review cycle approved by a standards policy committee.

3.15**standard**

A document that has been developed and approved in accordance with a recognized consensus-based process.

3.16**standards action**

A substantive action taken, or decision reached by an API committee or API staff relating to a standard or the manner in which such action was taken or decision was reached.

NOTE Standards actions can include approval of new standards, revision, substantive addenda, reaffirmation, or withdrawal of existing standards and the decision to nationally adopt an international standard.

3.17**standards committee**

A committee with the overall responsibility for developing, maintaining and approving API standards for a particular category or categories of equipment, materials, or practices in accordance with these Procedures.

NOTE 1 A standards committee can be responsible for an entire standards program or industry sector.

NOTE 2 Responsibility for standards programs can be assigned to intermediate committees with authority to form, guide, and coordinate standards committees as needed.

3.18**standards policy committee**

A committee with overall responsibility for standards program management in a particular subject area.

NOTE 1 A standards policy committee can be established by the API Board of Directors, an API General or Segment Committee or an authorized subordinate level committee.

NOTE 2 Membership on standards policy committees is limited to representatives of API member companies.

3.19**subgroup**

A group formed by a standards committee for the purposes of developing consensus through the balloting procedures described in Section 6.6.

NOTE A subgroup can also provide oversight to additional subordinate groups responsible for (1) the definitive content of one or more standards, and (2) responding to views and objections therein.

3.20**substantive changes**

Changes that directly and materially affect the use of a standard.

EXAMPLES A non-exclusive list of examples are as follows:

- changing “shall” to “should” or “should” to “shall”;
- the addition, deletion, or revision of requirements, regardless of the number of changes;
- the addition of mandatory conformance with referenced standards.

4 API Standards Committees**4.1 Standardization Authority**

The authority to develop standards has been authorized by the API Board of Directors and rests with the API segment and standards policy committees. This authority may be delegated to subordinate committees with responsibility for standards development.

4.2 Committee Operations

API committees responsible for standards development may develop written procedures addressing individual committee organization, scope, membership and conduct. The Procedures stated herein shall not be amended by individual committee procedures or procedures developed for joint committee activities (see 4.3).

4.3 Joint Committees with other Organizations

Standards committees formed jointly with other standards developing organizations (SDOs) shall maintain written procedures addressing joint committee structure, scope, membership, and operations. Joint committees with other SDOs may also elect to conduct their standards development activities in accordance with the Procedures expressed herein. Standards shall not be published by API unless approved by procedures in

conformance with Section 6 of these Procedures, or the other SDO is accredited by ANSI for the joint standards activity.

5 Designation of API Standards

5.1 General

5.1.1 API standards shall be identified by an alphanumeric designation. API standards shall use one of the following designations to describe the standard:

- a) Specification;
- b) Standard;
- c) Code;
- d) Recommended Practice;

NOTE See 5.6 for information on Bulletins and Technical Reports.

Specifications, Standards, Codes, and Recommended Practices shall be developed and maintained in accordance with these Procedures unless the provisions of Section 4.3 apply.

5.1.2 API standards shall include the following statement in their foreword:

This document was produced under API standardization procedures that ensure appropriate notification and participation in the developmental process and is designated as an API standard. Questions concerning the interpretation of the content of this publication or comments and questions concerning the procedures under which this publication was developed should be directed in writing to the Standards Director, American Petroleum Institute, 200 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20001.

NOTE There is no hierarchal structure of API standards as described in Section 5 when considering regulatory compliance or other uses.

5.1.3 API designations shall be determined by API staff based on the content of the document prior to publication.

5.2 Specifications

Documents that provide performance requirements for equipment and materials, and are written in such a way as to facilitate communications between purchasers, manufacturers, and/or service suppliers.

5.3 Recommended Practices

Documents that communicate recognized industry practices. Recommended practices (RPs) may include both mandatory and non-mandatory provisions.

5.4 Standards

Documents that combine elements of both specifications and recommended practices.

5.5 Codes

Standards intended to be adopted by regulatory agencies or authorities having jurisdiction.

5.6 Bulletins and Technical Reports

5.6.1 General

Bulletins and technical reports are not standards, but it is recommended that they are approved for publication by API standards committees using the consensus process as defined in Section 6. See 6.4.1 regarding project initiation for bulletins and technical reports.

5.6.2 Bulletins

Documents that convey technical information on a specific subject or topic and are typically issued on a one-time basis. Bulletins provide information and shall not contain requirements or recommendations.

5.6.3 Technical Reports

Documents that convey technical information on a specific subject or topic such as the results of a research study. Technical reports shall not contain requirements but can contain limited recommendations. However, if technical reports contain recommendations, the draft technical report should be balloted for consensus as defined by these Procedures.

5.7 Other Document Designations

5.7.1 Draft Standards

A document that has been developed under these Procedures and is distributed for additional comment. Most draft standards are not published; however, with the approval of the appropriate committee, draft standards may be published for a specified period to obtain more widespread circulation to interested parties. A draft standard may be published if it is identified as such on its cover and includes an express disclaimer approved by the API Office of the General Counsel. Draft standards shall not be processed as Draft American National Standards for trial use, as they are no longer recognized by ANSI.

5.7.2 Other Designations

Any other designations such as, but not limited to, guide, publication or guidance document shall not be used to designate API standards.

The term “Chapter” may be used to designate a series or group of standards or documents within a particular suite.

6 Consensus Process Procedures

6.1 General

The following procedural requirements apply to the development of consensus for approval, revision, reaffirmation, and withdrawal of API standards.

6.2 Due Process

6.2.1 Openness

Participation in API standards activities is open to all parties (persons and organizations) that have a direct and material interest in the subject of a standard. Consideration shall be given to the written views and objections of all participants and the right to appeal shall be made available to adversely affected parties (see 6.9).

6.2.2 Balance

6.2.2.1 Overview

API seeks broad input to its standardization activities including the participation of all parties representing interest categories appropriate to the nature of the standard and allows for open attendance at standards development meetings (see 6.11.1). API strives for balanced representation on its standards development committees (for example, targeting one-third representation for the traditional model of the three interest categories of operator-user, manufacturer-service supplier, and general interest) to avoid a majority of any one interest category. The criteria for balance are that

- a) no single interest category constitutes more than one-third of the voting membership of a consensus body dealing with safety-related standards, or
- b) no single interest category constitutes a majority of the voting membership of a consensus body dealing with other than safety-related standards.

6.2.2.2 Interest Categories

The interest categories appropriate to the development of consensus in any given standards activity are a function of the nature of the standards being developed. Interest categories shall be discretely defined, cover all materially affected parties and differentiate each category from the other categories. Definitions for interest categories for a specific API standards development activity may be included in individual committee procedures (see 4.2).

In defining the interest categories appropriate to API standards development activities, consideration shall be given to at least the following.

- a) Operator-User—the entity that is using the product or service specified in the standard, or performing the operations or practices described in the standard.
- b) Manufacturer-Service Supplier—the entity that is fabricating a product specified in the standard or used in performing the operations or practices described in the standard, or the entity that is providing a service in conformance with the standard.

NOTE These may be considered as separate interest categories based on the scope of the standard.

- c) General Interest—an entity that is neither of the above but has a direct and material interest in the product, operation, or practice described in the standard. This category may include consultants (3.5) when they are not representing another company or organization (see below).

Where consultants (3.5) are used to represent a company or organization for the subject under standardization, the consultant shall disclose each organization whose interests they are representing, and their interest category is assigned in accordance with the business or other interests of their employers or the sponsors they represent in connection with the standards development activity.

Other interest categories such as the following may be established within a standards committee to ensure adequate levels of representation.

- Government—Federal, state, or other regional regulatory body.
- Academia—College or university-affiliated expert.
- Non-Governmental Organization (NGO)—Labor, consumer interest.

The terms Association, Trade Association, or Professional Society depict the type of membership category of an organization rather than the interests it represents, and therefore they shall not be used as an interest category or a subcategory (e.g. of a General Interest category) in and of themselves. Each organization shall be assigned a category based on the interest(s) it represents and may only be assigned to a General Interest

category [if the consensus body (3.4) has one] if the primary interests of the organization are not covered by another discretely defined interest category or cover multiple interest categories.

6.2.2.3 Designation of Interest Categories

Rosters shall be established for consensus bodies with the interest categories of each voting member stated. Members may have voting or non-voting status (see 6.5). Observers are non-voting members and may be listed on the roster as mailing list members. Those representatives identified on the mailing list of a consensus body roster are nonetheless considered members of the API consensus body, and as such, comments submitted by such members during a standards action ballot (see 6.6.2) are not considered public review comments.

6.2.2.4 Outreach

The size of a consensus body meeting the requirements of 6.2.2.1 shall be appropriate to the standard being discussed and should typically consist of at least ten members. If there are insufficient consensus body members identified, or the requisite interest categories are not adequately represented to achieve balance, API staff shall make efforts to contact organizations or individuals deemed appropriate for consensus body membership, or shall conduct outreach to under-represented interest categories, and document those efforts.

6.2.3 Consensus

API develops industry standards based on consensus. Consensus is established when substantial agreement has been reached by directly and materially interested parties that are voting members of the committee/consensus body. Substantial agreement means more than a simple majority but not necessarily unanimity. Consensus requires that all views and objections be considered, and that an effort be made toward their resolution. For purposes of these Procedures, consensus shall be defined as a majority of those eligible to vote shall have voted and approval by at least two-thirds of those voting, excluding abstentions.

6.3 Notification of Standards Development Activities

The following standards development activities listed in a) through d) shall be announced in a suitable manner to provide an opportunity for participation by all directly and materially interested parties. Such announcements may be in the form of committee notices to known interested parties or announcements in suitable media appropriate for the known interests.

- a) Meetings of standards development committees.
- b) Intent to develop, revise, reissue, or withdraw standards.
- c) Availability of drafts of standards.
- d) Availability of ballots for approval of new or revised standards, reaffirmation or withdrawal of existing standards or national adoption of international standards.

See 7.8 for additional information on posting of notifications of standards development activities.

6.4 Resource Needs

6.4.1 General

Before undertaking the development of a new standard or the revision of an existing standard (regardless of whether funds are being requested to support subject matter experts, master editors or research projects), an API Standards Resource and Research Request (SR3) shall be completed and reviewed by the policy committee of jurisdiction. The policy committee or its designated subgroup shall review the need for the proposed activity, the time frame for completion, and the amount and type of resources required. Funding to support approved SR3 requests shall be reviewed by API staff as part of the annual budgeting process.

The policy committee may subsequently be asked to assist in prioritizing funding requests when the total request cannot be accommodated during the request year.

Before undertaking the development or revision of a bulletin or technical report, an SR3 shall be approved by the policy committee of jurisdiction, except in the following circumstances:

- a) If an SR3 is initially approved for a standard, but it is subsequently determined the document shall be designated a bulletin or technical report (see 5.1.3), a new SR3 is not required.
- b) If an SR3 is approved for a research study, and subsequent to completion of (a phase of) the study it is proposed the results should be included in a technical report, that proposal may be approved by the policy committee of jurisdiction (e.g. by a minuted meeting decision) without a new SR3 being submitted.

Initial work on the drafting or revision of a standard, bulletin, or technical report, shall not begin until the standards policy committee approves the SR3 unless the standards policy committee, in consultation with API staff, approves an exception on provision of sufficient justification as to why work needs to be expedited.

6.4.2 Business Need

6.4.2.1 Assessment

The business need and scope for the proposed action should be assessed using the SR3 form, which includes the criteria given in 6.4.2.2 through 6.4.2.7.

6.4.2.2 Coordination with Other Organizations

The policy committee should be advised if a similar or overlapping standard is on the work program of another SDO, and if so, how will the work be coordinated with the appropriate group(s).

6.4.2.3 Subject-matter Experts and Financial Resources

An assessment of the available subject-matter expert (SME) resources should be carried out to determine if there is a need for a content specialist or master editor to facilitate the standards development process. Other resource needs should also be included such as complex graphics or content that would require special arrangements for completion.

6.4.2.4 Standards Research Funding

Requests for research funding shall be submitted using an SR3 and address the business need for the research and whether it will result in technology enhancement for multiple standards. Opportunities for joint industry projects and leveraging of funding from other organizations should also be considered.

6.4.2.5 Effect of Not Initiating the Standards Activity

The effect of not initiating the proposed action should be addressed including potential safety, reliability and environmental impacts that may arise.

6.4.2.6 ANSI/ISO Candidate Standard

The value to industry of conducting a national adoption of an International Organization for Standardization (ISO) standard should be evaluated. All activities shall be legally compliant with applicable laws and regulations.

A national adoption results in the creation of an American National Standard and therefore the relevant procedures for processing an American National Standard shall be followed (see Annex A) as well as approval of an SR3 by the policy committee of jurisdiction (A.2.2). If it is decided to abandon the development or revision of an API standard in lieu of nationally adopting an ISO standard, a new SR3 shall be submitted and approved.

6.4.2.7 Project Timing

The SR3 requires a proposed timeline that includes a target initiation date for work on the standard to begin and a target balloting date for the standard. This information is used to update the API Standards Database and track the committee's progress.

6.4.3 Approval of Resource and Research Requests

Prior to submitting the SR3 to the policy committee for approval, the request shall be developed in accordance with the policy committee's procedures.

6.5 Membership on Standards Committees

Membership on standards committees is open to all parties having a direct and material interest. Members shall be able to fully participate in the standards committee activities and shall be capable of providing technical contributions or subject matter expertise; however, participation shall not be unreasonably restricted based on technical qualifications. Membership in API is not a requirement for membership on standards developing committees; however, membership in API is required for voting membership on standards policy committees.

The right to vote in any meeting is exclusively that of the members of the standards committee that is meeting. In the absence of a member of the standards committee, a duly appointed alternate or designated representative may exercise the member's right to vote.

Assignment of voting or non-voting status on a consensus body is determined by the chair in consultation with API staff. All directly and materially interested parties in the subject of a standard shall be assigned a vote (with one vote per company: see 6.6.5.1), unless a party elects to be a non-voting member of the consensus body or adding a new voting member would cause the consensus body to become unbalanced (see 6.2.2).

Consultants compensated by API for standards development work or those employed by/consulting for the same company shall not be assigned a vote on the consensus body for items related to that work.

All voting members shall be active participants in standards committee activities; removal of voting rights from consensus body members may be employed in accordance with individual committee procedures. Criteria for removal should include failure to regularly participate in meetings and to vote on ballots.

Individuals or those employed by/consulting for the same company who are compensated by API for standards development work shall not be assigned leadership positions (chair, co-chair, vice-chair etc.) on a consensus body or subgroup related to that work.

6.6 Balloting

6.6.1 General

Balloting shall be conducted using API's electronic balloting (e-ballot) system except for recirculation (see 6.6.7.3), which may be conducted via e-mail in lieu of the e-ballot system. Voters and commenters shall respond using the e-ballot system to facilitate the preparation of ballot summaries and comment registries suitable for recording and reporting the disposition of all comments.

6.6.2 Ballots

Standards actions, including approval of a new standard, the revision or reaffirmation of an existing standard or the national adoption of an ISO standard, shall be approved by ballot of a standards committee or consensus body.

No draft standard or standards revision shall be sent to any external standards organization for their adoption or potential use unless the standard has been balloted and approved in accordance with these Procedures, or a formal agreement between API and another standards organization has already been established for joint development/revision of standards.

Ballots on individual work items that do not address the entire content of a standards action [as specified in the SR3 (6.4.1)] may only be used to gather members' feedback prior to a standards action ballot. Individual work items can be subsequently collated and shall be balloted as the entire content of the standards action in order to demonstrate consensus has been achieved by the consensus body.

See 7.8 for additional information on issuing ballots and draft documents.

6.6.3 Ballot Duration, Preparation, and Distribution

A reasonable period of time should be set for balloting (generally six weeks). Such a period shall be established by the standards committee chair in consultation with API staff.

Ballots shall be prepared and distributed by API staff to members of the standards committee or consensus body who are eligible to vote and their alternates (if any). Information on accessing copies of ballot drafts and submitting comments shall be distributed to those who have expressed an interest in participating in the ballot.

6.6.4 Ballot Format

A ballot shall concisely state the proposed action being balloted. The ballot shall clearly explain if only portions of the proposed standard are open for consideration.

If only portions of the proposed standard are being balloted, the ballot:

- shall clearly indicate which portions of the proposed standard are being balloted;
- should make clear that no other portion of the document is under consideration during the ballot (and if appropriate, previous ballot results not pertaining to the reballoted portion remain final);
- should indicate how comments on portions not under consideration, if submitted, will be handled (e.g. kept on file for future revision).

All ballots shall provide for four voting options:

- a) affirmative;
- b) affirmative with comment;
- c) negative with reasons;
- d) abstain.

Negative votes shall be accompanied by comments related to the proposal; negative votes unaccompanied by such comments will be recorded as "negative without comments" without further notice to the voter.

6.6.5 Individual Ballot Qualification

6.6.5.1 Voting Requirements

Only one ballot is allowed for each company voting member or the voting member's alternate. If ballots are received from the member who is eligible to vote and the alternate of the same company, the member's vote shall prevail. If ballots are received from alternates representing the same company, the earliest ballot received by API shall prevail. Each valid ballot received by API shall identify the member who is eligible to vote or the alternate to the member casting the ballot, show the company affiliation, be dated, and be returned by the ballot closing date. Comments shall be easily understood, concise, and clearly indicate the part of the document to which it pertains; alternative wording to resolve the comment should be provided.

6.6.5.2 Joint API Committee Ballots

In cases where joint balloting of multiple API committees is determined to be appropriate because of the need to solicit input from multiple disciplines, special arrangements shall be made to ensure conformance with these Procedures. These arrangements include noting such joint ballot requirements in the SR3 (see 6.4.1), approval of the joint ballot by the parent committee, and coordination between voting members of the joint committees representing the same company and may include designation of segment interest categories such as Upstream Operator-User, Downstream Operator-User, or Pipeline Operator-User.

6.6.6 Ballot Approval

For a proposed standards action ballot to be considered approved, all comments shall be considered in accordance with 6.6.7, and the following conditions for consensus shall be satisfied (see 6.2.3):

- a) a majority of the members who are eligible to vote shall have voted; and
- b) at least two-thirds of the combined valid affirmative and valid negative votes (excluding abstentions) shall be affirmative.

6.6.7 Comments and Objections

6.6.7.1 Disposition and Documentation of Comments

Comments submitted by a member of the consensus body or resulting from the public review, shall be considered and attempts shall be made to resolve them in accordance with this subsection before a ballot is considered approved by the committee. ANSI public review comments shall be submitted using API's e-ballot system, which requires commenters to provide their name, e-mail address etc. Public comments shall not be accepted if provided through other means.

The chair of the appropriate committee, in conjunction with API staff and committee members or a designated subgroup, when appropriate, is responsible for the consideration of ballot comments pertaining to technical, safety, or environmental assertions and assertions of ambiguity, inaccuracy, or omission.

API staff is responsible for the consideration of ballot comments pertaining to API policies and procedures, including format, style, graphics, use of copyrighted material and patent-related issues.

Documentation of all comment resolution decisions including consideration given to all negative votes shall be recorded on the comment registry provided by API and re-submitted to API on completion prior to proceeding to publication. The following general format should be used to document comment resolution:

- a) Accepted: Indicates that the text will be changed as proposed in the accepted comment.
- b) Accepted in principle: Indicates that the text will be changed to reflect the principle of the accepted comment (i.e. the change will be made but not exactly as suggested by the commenter). In addition, some explanation of why and how the text will be modified to incorporate the comment shall be provided.
- c) Noted: Indicates that the comment has been considered, but that no change will be made at this time. In many cases "noted" comments have been considered during the preparation of the text but did not merit inclusion. In other instances, "noted" comments may be considered at the next revision. Some brief explanation of the reason for "noting" a comment shall be provided.
- d) Not accepted: Indicates that no change will be made to the text. An explanation of the reason for not accepting the comment shall be given.

Commenters shall be advised of the disposition of comments and objections with reasons therefore in writing, which may be achieved by directing them to a website for this information.

Comments received after the closing of the ballot, and in the case of ANSI/API standards the closing of the public review, may be considered by the appropriate committee or can be considered in the same manner as a new proposal.

6.6.7.2 Disposition and Documentation of Objections

API shall consider all objections in the form of negative votes which are accompanied by comments that are related to the proposal under consideration. This includes negative votes accompanied by comments of a procedural or philosophical nature. These types of comments shall not be dismissed because they do not necessarily provide alternative language or a specific remedy to the negative vote.

API shall not consider negative votes without comments and negative votes accompanied by comments not related to the proposal under consideration. If comments not related to the proposal are submitted with a negative vote, the comments shall be documented and considered in the same manner as submittal of a new proposal. However, such votes (i.e., negative vote without comment or negative vote accompanied by comments not related to the proposal) shall not be factored into the numerical requirements for consensus.

6.6.7.3 Final Disposition of Comments and Objections, and Recirculation Requirements

Each unresolved objection and attempt at resolution, and any substantive change made in a proposed API standard shall be reported to the consensus body (unless the provisions of 6.6.7.5.1 item b) apply) in order to afford all members of the consensus body an opportunity to respond, reaffirm, or change their vote in accordance with the following criteria:

- a) Comments with affirmative votes determined to be persuasive and editorial; the proposed editorial changes are incorporated into the document.
- b) Comments with affirmative votes determined to be persuasive and substantive; the proposed changes are recirculated in accordance with this section to the appropriate committee or consensus body offering them an opportunity to respond, revise or reaffirm their vote prior to incorporation into the document.
- c) Comments with affirmative votes determined to be non-persuasive are not considered further.
- d) Comments with negative votes determined to be persuasive and substantive; the proposed changes are recirculated in accordance with this section to the appropriate committee or consensus body offering them an opportunity to respond, revise or reaffirm their vote prior to incorporation into the document.
- e) Comments with negative votes determined to be not-persuasive are not considered further. The final disposition of these comments shall be communicated in writing to the voter and shall include notification of the right to appeal. The non-persuasive objection shall also be recirculated to the consensus body in accordance with this section to the appropriate committee or consensus body offering them an opportunity to respond, revise or reaffirm their vote.
- f) Comments with negative votes that are determined to be unrelated to the item being balloted, or negative votes submitted without comments, shall not be considered further and shall be recorded as “negatives without comments” for the purposes of reporting to ANSI with no further notice to the submitter (but shall not be factored into the numerical requirements for consensus – see 6.6.7.2).
- g) Comments with negative votes may be withdrawn by the voter after consultation with the chair or the designated subgroup. The vote may be changed in writing by the voter to either an abstention or an affirmative. A withdrawn negative vote is counted as affirmative unless specified by the voter as an abstention.

6.6.7.4 Responses to Recirculations/Multiple Recirculations

6.6.7.4.1 Responses

It is not required to address responses to recirculations (6.6.7.3) in the same manner as ballot comments (6.6.7.1) or negative votes (6.6.7.2) if consensus on the ballot has been achieved, i.e. documentation of

comment resolution and/or recirculation of outstanding objections is not required. However, actionable responses to recirculations shall be provided to the chair of the appropriate committee or designated subgroup, who in consultation with API staff may determine whether they should be considered in the same manner as a new proposal (for a future revision) or sent to the committee members for further consideration.

6.6.7.4.2 Further Recirculation

If substantive changes are proposed to address a response to a recirculation (6.6.7.3), the substantive changes shall be recirculated again to the consensus body in order to afford all members an opportunity to respond, reaffirm, or change their vote from the one registered from the previous recirculation. It is recommended that the reasons for the proposed substantive change [e.g. in the form of an explanation of how the response was addressed similar to documentation of ballot comment resolution – see items a) to d) of 6.6.7.1] are provided as part of the recirculation.

If consensus has been achieved following the final recirculation, the results of such recirculation shall supersede the previous results and shall be the final results.

The final results shall be included with the BSR-9 submission if the document is submitted for ANSI approval, noting that results of multiple ballots could be required as part of the BSR-9 submission if portions of a standard were reballoted (see 6.6.7.5.3).

6.6.7.5 Optional Reballot

6.6.7.5.1 Overview

In some cases it may be desirable to reballot an entire document or reballot a portion of a document in lieu of recirculation. The decision to use the reballot option shall be made by the committee chair in consultation with API staff, taking into account the following:

- a) Comments accompanying unresolved negative votes, i.e. votes not withdrawn by the voter, are required to be recirculated to the consensus body prior to reballot, unless the provisions of b) are enacted.
- b) If the entire content of the previous ballot (whether that is an entire standard or a portion of a standard) is withdrawn from consideration, a new ballot (which may be designated as a reballot) may be issued. However, no portion of the prior ballot can be used to demonstrate consensus has been achieved as the prior ballot has been voided, and in this case a reballot is actually starting over the standards action.

6.6.7.5.2 Reballoting an Entire Standard

When the decision is made to reballot an entire document (taking into account list items a) and b) of 6.6.7.5.1), the ballot should clearly explain the reason for the reballot. When an entire document is reballoted, the ballot should clearly indicate it is intended to restart the ballot process rather than serve as a recirculation, such that votes on the prior ballot does not count. The results of such reballots of the entire standard shall supersede the previous ballot and shall be the results which are reported to the committee and included with the BSR-9 submission if the document is submitted for ANSI approval.

6.6.7.5.3 Reballoting a Portion of a Standard

When the decision is made to reballot a portion of the document in lieu of recirculation (taking into account list items a) and b) of 6.6.7.5.1), the ballot shall clearly explain and/or the ballot document shall clearly indicate which portions of the proposed standard are being reballoted. It should be made clear that no other portion of the document is under consideration during the reballot and that the previous ballot results not pertaining to the reballoted portion remain final.

Comments and objections submitted on the reballoted portion of the document shall be considered in accordance with 6.6.7.1 and 6.6.7.2, which may require recirculation (6.6.7.3).

The final results of the reballot of portions of a standard, along with the results of previous associated final ballot results, i.e. final votes on other previously approved portions of the document, shall be included with the BSR-9

submission if the document is submitted for ANSI approval. Therefore, the results of multiple ballots may be required to be presented as part of the BSR-9 submission to demonstrate how consensus was achieved on different sections of a standard.

6.6.7.6 Posting of Voting Results and Comments from Voters and Guests

See 7.8.4 for additional information on posting of voting results and comment registries.

6.6.8 Joint Balloting of Multiple Committees

In situations where joint balloting of multiple consensus bodies (such as subcommittees) under a specific standards policy committee is determined to be appropriate because of the need to solicit input from multiple disciplines, the following procedures shall be followed.

NOTE The term “subcommittees” can also include other designated consensus bodies such as a task group.

- a) A lead subcommittee and the associate subcommittee(s) whose input is also being sought, shall be identified on the SR3 at the initiation of the project. Any dispute as to determining the lead subcommittee shall be referred to governing standards policy committee for adjudication where a decision shall be made by majority vote.
- b) The proposal (SR3) to develop a new standard or revised standard using joint committee balloting shall initially be considered within the lead subcommittee. If approved within the lead subcommittee, the proposal shall be subsequently considered within the associate subcommittee(s). The SR3 shall be approved by the policy committee in accordance with 6.4.
- c) When the final draft of the standard is ready, a ballot shall be initiated and distributed to all members of the lead and associate subcommittee(s). Voting on the joint ballot shall be as follows.
 - 1) All voting members of the lead subcommittee shall have a vote.
 - 2) Where a voting member's company on an associate subcommittee is NOT represented on the lead subcommittee, that member shall have a vote on the joint ballot.
 - 3) Where a voting member's company on an associate subcommittee already has a voting representative on the lead subcommittee, the associate subcommittee member shall NOT vote on the joint ballot. In this case, the viewpoint of the associate subcommittee representative shall be directed through their voting representative of the lead subcommittee.

Members who have representatives on the lead subcommittee and associate subcommittee(s) should coordinate the submission of comments via their lead subcommittee representative.
- d) Once the joint subcommittee ballot has closed, the chair of the lead subcommittee, in consultation with the chair(s) of the associate subcommittee(s), shall ensure that the disposition of ballot comments and any negative votes have been addressed satisfactorily in accordance with 6.6.6 and 6.6.7. Disputes between the chair of the lead subcommittee and the chair(s) of the associate subcommittee(s) as to the disposition of ballot comments and negative votes shall be referred to the standards policy committee for adjudication where a decision shall be made by majority vote.

6.6.9 Legal Review

Standards shall not be considered final until the API Office of the General Counsel has reviewed and approved the document.

6.7 Revisions to Standards

6.7.1 General

In addition to publishing a new edition of a standard, revisions may be issued in the form of an addendum (3.1) or erratum (3.8).

The type of action to be taken (revision, new edition, addendum or erratum) shall be determined by API staff based on the complexity/scope of the new content.

6.7.2 Addenda

Addenda can take two forms as follows.

- a) Administrative addendum: used when specific portions of a standard are moved to another standard with a different designation, or the designation of a series of standards is changed, and notification is required to advise users of this change. Balloting in accordance with 6.6 may not be necessary as long as no substantive changes are made to the content of the standard(s).
- b) Substantive addendum: used when substantive changes (3.20) are made to specific portions of a published standard. A proposed addendum which puts forth a substantive change to a published standard shall be balloted and approved in accordance with 6.6 before being issued. Substantive addenda proposed to ANSI/API standards require submission of PINS, BSR-8, and BSR-9 documentation to ANSI. Substantive addenda to ANSI/API standards may not be issued until final approval is obtained from ANSI.

Addenda are issued as stand-alone documents as well as being incorporated into the published standard. The addendum number and year of publication shall be added to the front cover of an API standard when addenda have been incorporated.

For standards under periodic maintenance (6.10.2), a maximum of 3 substantive addenda may be published prior to the publication of a new edition of the standard.

An addendum may include editorial corrections as described in 6.7.3.

If a substantive addendum results from the review of an entire published standard and is approved as specified in b) above, it is considered a standards action and therefore the maintenance cycle (6.10) may start from the date the addendum is published.

6.7.3 Errata

An erratum is used to correct editorial errors in a published standard. Errata shall not include corrections or changes that alter the meaning of a provision in a standard.

An erratum shall not contain substantive changes subject to a standards action.

6.8 Interpretations

Requests for interpretation (RFI) of an API standard shall be submitted to API in writing; guidelines for submissions can be found at <https://rfi.api.org/>.

6.9 Appeals

6.9.1 General

Appeals shall be granted and conducted in accordance with these Procedures. These appeals shall address procedural matters only, which can include whether a technical issue was afforded due process.

Directly and materially interested parties who believe they are or will be adversely affected by a standards action are eligible to file an appeal. Administrative procedures for conflict resolution in the standards development process, including consideration of negative votes, shall be exhausted before lodging any appeal. Appeals shall be considered by the committee or committees responsible for the issue. The decision of the appeal authority is final; however, the API Global Industry Services Committee may, at its discretion, review the decision to ensure conformance with API policies.

6.9.2 Submission

Appeals shall be submitted in writing to the API Standards Director or their designee with a \$500.00 filing fee. This fee may be waived or reduced upon presentation of evidence of the appellant showing hardship. The appeal shall include a statement identifying specifically the action or inaction objected to; the basis for the objection, including any adverse impacts on the complainant; and suggested remedial action. The appeal shall be filed with API within 15 days of the date of notification of the action causing the complaint or at any time with regard to inactions.

NOTE A 15 day wait period does not need to pass following the recirculation of an unresolved objection to a ballot (6.6.7.3) if the objector notifies API in writing that they do not intend to submit an appeal.

Further, challenges to published standards shall be initiated within 1 year of their distribution unless it can be demonstrated that the objection is based on grounds that have subsequently arisen. The API Standards Director or their designee shall investigate the objections raised, respond promptly and attempt to resolve the issue within 45 calendar days of receipt.

6.9.3 Hearing

If the Director or their designee cannot resolve the objections, a hearing by the appropriate committee or its designated appeals board may be convened. The Director or their designee shall advise the appellant in writing that their objections are not considered resolved, and if sufficient evidence has been provided by the appellant of API *Procedures for Standards Development* violations, they shall be given the opportunity to appear before the appeals board and present arguments in support of his or her objection. A hearing should generally follow the format described in the ANSI *Appeals Board Operating Procedures* ^[5] with API staff and their designated committee representatives appearing as the Respondent. The hearing should be held within 45 calendar days from the date the appellant was advised that their objections were not considered resolved. If the appellant does not request a hearing within 15 business days of the Director's or their designee's response, the appeal shall be considered closed.

The appeals board shall determine whether applicable API policies and procedures were satisfied and whether the procedural and substantive actions or requirements complained of merit corrective action. Competing suppliers or manufacturers of the process or service that is the subject of the appeal shall not participate in the appeals process. An appeals board shall generally consist of at least three individuals selected by the Director or their designee in consultation with the committee chair, API Executive Staff member, and the API Office of the General Counsel. Board members shall not have been directly involved in the disputed matter. The appeals board may call upon experts familiar with the issues of the dispute. The appellant is notified of the appeals board's composition and given the opportunity to object to members on the appeals board. Objections shall be substantiated to be considered.

6.9.4 Decision

The appeals board shall issue a written decision following the hearing within 45 calendar days. The decision shall indicate the conclusions reached, and their basis. The Standards Director or their designee shall ensure that a complete record of the appeal is compiled and maintained in conformance with API's record retention policy (see 7.1). The appellant shall receive a written copy of the final decision.

Specified time limits in this policy may be modified by the API Standards Director or their designee responsible for the appealed standard or their designee upon demonstration of reasonable cause.

6.10 Maintenance of Standards

6.10.1 General

API standards may be maintained under any one of the options described in 6.10.2, 6.10.3, or 6.10.4.

6.10.2 Periodic Maintenance

6.10.2.1 Overview

Standards under periodic maintenance shall be reviewed when technological changes affect their currency or at least once every 5 years unless revised or withdrawn sooner by the appropriate standards committee. If a standard has not been revised by the end of year four of the 5-year period, API staff will advise the responsible standards committee, who will then assess to determine whether to:

- a) revise the standard,
- b) ballot to reaffirm it,
- c) withdraw it, or
- d) request to extend the standard.

The standards committee may ask its parent committee for an extension of up to 2 years for the revision, reaffirmation, or withdrawal of a standard. No extension beyond the initial 2 years is permitted. Any standard that is not acted upon (revised, reaffirmed, or withdrawn) at the end of 7 years should be administratively withdrawn as an API standard. Requests for extensions should demonstrate that work is underway to revise (and that the revision is at an advanced stage), reaffirm or withdraw the document. Requests for extensions of ANSI/API standards should be submitted to ANSI using the BSR-11 form within 30 days following five years after the ANSI approval date.

6.10.2.2 Reaffirmation

Documents under the periodic maintenance option that meet the requirements for reaffirmation shall be marked on the cover with a designation that includes "REAFFIRMED, MONTH YEAR" indicating the date that the reaffirmation ballot was approved (see 6.6.6 and 6.6.7) by the appropriate consensus body.

6.10.3 Continuous Maintenance

6.10.3.1 Overview

Continuous maintenance allows proposals for suggested revisions to be processed for consensus body ballot at any time during the documents current cycle. No portion of the standard shall be excluded from the revision process under the continuous maintenance option.

6.10.3.2 Submission of Proposed Revisions

6.10.3.2.1 General

Proposals for revision of a standard under continuous maintenance shall be submitted in writing to the attention of the Standards Director, American Petroleum Institute, 200 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20001, standards@api.org, or to the appropriate Standards Program Manager/Specialist. Proposals received by the Director or their designee shall be reviewed and assigned to the designated Standards Program Manager or Specialist for processing.

6.10.3.2.2 Review of Proposed Revisions

The designated Standards Program Manager/Specialist shall review each proposal prior to submission to the appropriate committee. If the Program Manager/Specialist concludes the proposal requires further clarification, the submitter may be given up to 14 additional business days to resubmit the proposed revision. The Standards Program Manager/Specialist shall then forward the proposal to the chair of the committee responsible for developing and/or maintaining the standard for consideration.

6.10.3.2.3 Submission Deadlines

Proposals for revision of a standard under continuous maintenance shall be received at least 30 days prior for consideration at the next scheduled committee meeting. Proposals received after the deadline date shall be considered at the next scheduled meeting of the committee.

6.10.3.3 Publication

6.10.3.3.1 Publication Frequency

Standards under continuous maintenance shall be revised at a defined interval. The schedule for publication shall be documented and reviewed twice a year by the standards committee responsible for the standard.

An addendum shall be published at a minimum every 18 months incorporating the approved revisions in order to maintain the continuous maintenance status. Standards that do not meet this requirement may be transitioned to periodic maintenance status.

6.10.3.3.2 Addenda

Standards actions approved under the continuous maintenance option shall be incorporated in the next addendum or edition. When an addendum is issued, the addendum number and year of publication shall be published on the cover. If the addendum is of significant extent and complexity, a new edition of the standard may be published.

6.10.3.3.3 New Edition, Reaffirmation, or Withdrawal

Publication of a new edition of a standard under the continuous maintenance option shall occur within five years of the publication of the previous edition. The new edition may either be a complete revision or an incorporation of the addenda approved since publication of the previous edition. If no revisions or addenda are approved for publication within four years of the prior publication date, action to reaffirm or withdraw the standard shall be initiated by the responsible standards committee.

6.10.3.4 Change Proposals

6.10.3.4.1 Submission of Change Proposals

API standards committees operating under continuous maintenance will normally meet semi-annually. Change proposals shall be received by the API Standards Department 30 days prior to the meeting dates for consideration at the next meeting. Proposals received after the deadline date will be considered at the next succeeding meeting. Information on meetings is available at <http://www.api.org>.

6.10.3.5 Notice in the Standard

The following notice shall be included in public review drafts, published standards, and addenda of standards maintained under the continuous maintenance option:

The American Petroleum Institute maintains this standard under continuous maintenance procedures. These procedures establish a documented program for regular publication of addenda or revisions, including timely and documented consensus action on requests for revisions to any part of the standard. Proposed revisions shall be submitted at any time to the Standards Director, American Petroleum Institute, 200 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20001, standards@api.org.

6.10.3.6 Standards Committee Action

6.10.3.6.1 Disposition of Proposals

The responsible standards committee shall take consensus action on each proposed revision within one year of receipt of the proposal. The committee's disposition of each proposal shall be documented in meeting notes, minutes, or other records and submitted to API.

6.10.3.6.2 Revisions of Standards

Substantive revisions to standards maintained under the continuous maintenance option shall be subject to all the requirements of 6.6.

6.10.4 Stabilized Maintenance Option

A standard that is maintained under the stabilized maintenance option shall satisfy the following eligibility criteria:

- a) the standard addresses mature technology or practices, and as a result, is not likely to require revision;
- b) the standard is not safety or health related;
- c) the standard has been reaffirmed at least once;
- d) at least 10 years have passed since the approval or last revision of the standard;
- e) the standard is required for use in connection with existing implementations or for reference purposes.

A standard maintained under the stabilized maintenance option is not required to be revised or reaffirmed on a routine 5-year cycle; however, it shall be subject to review of such status by the appropriate policy committee on a 10-year cycle.

If the stabilized standard is an American National Standard and it is determined in connection with this review that the standard shall continue to be maintained under the stabilized maintenance option and as such does not require revision or withdrawal, then this shall be communicated to ANSI by API and a related announcement shall be published in *ANSI Standards Action*. Notification to ANSI shall be accomplished via the submittal of an informational announcement if the standard will continue to be maintained under the stabilized maintenance option or will be withdrawn, or via a PINS, if the standard will be revised.

If a recommendation is made at any time by a materially affected and interested party that a standard maintained under the stabilized maintenance option requires revision or should be withdrawn, then that recommendation shall be considered in the same manner as a new proposal but within a maximum of 60 days from receipt. A recommendation should include rationale to begin a revision and shall not be dismissed because it does not necessarily suggest a specific revision. A response to the submitter of such a recommendation shall be provided in writing within 60 days of the receipt of the recommendation advising the decision relative to the maintenance status of the standard. A standard that is maintained under the stabilized maintenance option shall include a clear statement of the intent to consider requests for change and information on the submittal of such requests.

The decision to maintain a standard under the stabilized maintenance option and the process by which it is maintained can be subject to appeal to API.

6.10.5 Criteria for Withdrawal

API standards shall be revised or withdrawn if the API Office of the General Counsel determines that there are significant legal issues arising out of the publication of the standard. API standards may also be withdrawn if API staff, in consultation with the appropriate standards committee, determines the standard would no longer be in the interests of the industry. If the standard is an ANSI/API standard, API shall notify ANSI immediately

and the standard shall be withdrawn as an American National Standard and a notification published in ANSI *Standards Action*.

6.11 Standards Meeting Procedures

6.11.1 General

Standards committees shall meet as needed to conduct their work. With the exception of those portions of meetings dealing with policy and/or budget issues, standards meetings are open to all directly and materially interested parties.

The date, time and location (if face-to-face) of all API standards committee meetings shall be established after consultation by the chair with API staff. With regard to API standards meetings, API staff shall be:

- a) invited to all meetings;
- b) provided remote access capability;
- c) copied on all invites;
- d) provided agendas in advance.

See 7.8 for additional information on posting of agendas and records of API meetings.

6.11.2 Agendas

Notices of meetings accompanied by an agenda shall be prepared and distributed to appropriate committees, subcommittees, subordinate groups (such as task groups, work groups, or ad-hoc groups), and if appropriate, known interested parties.

6.11.3 Minutes

The committee, subcommittee, or task or work group secretary shall prepare minutes. Minutes of each meeting contain the name of the committee, subcommittee, task group, or work group; date(s) of the meeting; a list of members attending/participating and visitors present/participating; the time the meeting opened and its location (or listed as a virtual meeting); approval of previous minutes, if appropriate; a synopsis of each subject discussed and action items; and the time the meeting adjourned.

Minutes of API meetings should be limited to a short concise statement of the issue that was discussed, the resolution of the issue, and any future action items.

6.11.4 Recordings

Meetings shall not be recorded, and artificial intelligence tools shall not be used to transcribe or summarize any meetings or discussions without the prior, written approval of the Standards Director and the API Office of the General Counsel.

6.11.5 Presentations

Presentations must be provided to the applicable committee or subordinate group officer(s) in advance and placed on the agenda. Presentations shall comply with the API Antitrust Guidelines.

Presentations addressing technical topics such as new technologies and research studies must be approved by API staff prior to presentation.

Presentations addressing routine committee business such as standards drafting updates do not require prior API staff approval – but chairs are responsible for ensuring staff are copied in advance and for flagging issues with new content to API staff.

6.12 Standards Effective Date

6.12.1 General

The effective date of an API standard shall be the date of publication printed on the cover unless implementation language is approved in accordance with Section 7.5.

6.12.2 Effective Date of Standards used in the API Monogram Program and APIQR (Quality Registrar) Program

In addition to the date of publication, the effective date of a new edition or addendum to a standard used in the API Monogram and/or APIQR program, shall be clearly identified as the effective date for those programs and shall be printed on the cover, except for first editions. The default effective date is six (6) months after the new standard or addendum is published by API. A longer or shorter period between the publication date and the effective date may be established after consultation with API staff and approval by the responsible policy committee. The effective date of a new standard or addendum should not exceed one year beyond the publication date.

If a standard is reaffirmed, subsequent copies of the document shall show the original effective date of the applicable edition and its reaffirmation date.

6.13 Alternative Process (“Canvass Method”) for Establishing a Consensus Body

6.13.1 General

In situations when there is not an existing consensus body API staff may elect to use the process described in 6.13.2. The consensus process described in 6.2 through 6.12 shall apply to consensus bodies formed in accordance with 6.13.2.

6.13.2 Consensus Body Formation

Timely and adequate notice of any action for the approval, revision, reaffirmation, or withdrawal of a standard, and the establishment of a new consensus body, shall be provided to all known directly and materially interested parties.

API staff shall develop a list of potential entities consisting of those organizations, companies, government agencies, standards developers, individuals, etc., known to be, or who have indicated that they are, directly and materially interested in the standards activity.

API shall contact the potential entities in writing providing the scope and a description of the proposed standard for development or proposed standards action with respect to revision, reaffirmation, or withdrawal, to determine their interest in participating. The notice should include a clear and meaningful description of the purpose of the proposed activity and shall identify a readily available source for further information. If an entity is interested in participating, API staff shall assign an interest category appropriate to the proposed standard in accordance with 6.2.2.2.

Once an interest survey has been completed for a standard, it need not be repeated for subsequent balloting of the document. However, API strives for balanced representation on its consensus bodies and additional members may be added to the roster after the initial interest survey has been completed.

7 Normative Policies for API Standards

7.1 Records Retention

Records concerning the documentation of origin, development, and completion of API's technical standards, including basic data correlations, equations, or other technical material necessary to allow the documentation of the standard's development shall be retained permanently. These may include meeting minutes, ballot results or general correspondence if contained therein.

Standardization minutes, ballot results and general correspondence shall be retained for five years or until publication of the next edition of the standard, whichever is the longest time duration. Records concerning withdrawn standards shall be retained for five years from the date of withdrawal.

7.2 Terms Relating to Provisions in API Standards

The terms “shall”, “should”, “may” and “can” as defined in these Procedures shall be used to state provisions in all API standards and any other documents developed in accordance with these Procedures. See the API *Document Format and Style Manual* [2] for more information.

7.3 Intellectual Property

7.3.1 Participant’s Obligations

7.3.1.1 General

API considers its standards to be a valuable asset of the Institute that are protected by a variety of federal and state laws. By participating in API’s standardization programs, participants agree to the principles given in 7.3.1.2 to 7.3.1.5.

Questions regarding intellectual property issues such as copyrights, trademarks or patents shall be directed to the API Office of the General Counsel.

7.3.1.2 API Intellectual Property License Agreement

Prior to publication or distribution of any API standard or derivative works based on any API standard by any other organization, API and the other organization shall execute an intellectual property licensing agreement in a form approved by API’s Office of the General Counsel.

7.3.1.3 Copying and Distribution

Individuals shall not copy or distribute final or draft standards without the authorization of API staff.

7.3.1.4 Ownership

Unless expressly agreed otherwise by API, all material and information that is provided by participants and is incorporated into API publications is considered the sole and exclusive property of API.

7.3.1.5 Third Party Information

Participants shall not provide any documents, data, or information if the use of such material by API in a standard infringes upon the rights of any third parties in the information including, but not limited to, copyrights, patents, trade secrets, trademarks, publicity, and privacy. Participants shall immediately notify API if a participant determines that any information contained in a final or draft API standard violates the rights of third parties if published by API or if used by a third party.

7.3.2 Patents

7.3.2.1 General

It is API’s intent to fully comply with the 2025 edition of the ANSI *Essential Requirements: Due Process Requirements for American National Standards* and sets forth the following additional policy statements that are also compliant with the 2025 edition.

As a general rule, API standards are developed using performance-based language. In accordance with 6.2, any patent holder may participate in API standards activities, but patents or patent claims that are required for compliance with the standard should not be included in API standards. These types of patents or patent claims may, in exceptional circumstances, be included in proposed, revised, or approved API standards provided that

- a) there are significant technical reasons why the standard cannot be drafted without the use of terms covered by patent or patent claims, and
- b) where the patent holder, and any successors or assignees, are bound by an agreement in written or electronic form to a letter of assurance approved by the API Office of the General Counsel granting either
 - a royalty free license under reasonable terms and conditions that are demonstrably free of any unfair discrimination to applicants desiring to utilize the license for the purpose of implementing the standard, or
 - a release to API and all users of the document from any claims of patent infringement based on the publication or use of the standard.

Such assurance shall indicate that the patent holder (or third party authorized to make assurances on its behalf) will include in any documents transferring ownership of patents subject to the assurance, provisions sufficient to ensure that the commitments in the assurance are binding on the transferee, and that the transferee will similarly include appropriate provisions in the event of future transfers with the goal of binding each successor-in-interest. The assurance shall also indicate that it is intended to be binding on successors-in-interest regardless of whether such provisions are included in the relevant transfer documents.

7.3.2.2 Record of Statement

A record of the patent holder's statement shall be retained in API's permanent standards files and shall be made publicly available (at API's election, either on API's website or ANSI's Letter of Assurance (LOA) repository).

7.3.2.3 Notice

When API receives from a patent holder the assurance set forth above, the standard shall include a note approved by the API Office of the General Counsel that notifies users of the patent holder's statement concerning patent rights.

7.3.2.4 Responsibility for Identifying Patents

Neither API nor ANSI shall be responsible for identifying all patents for which a license may be required or for conducting inquiries into the legal validity or scope of those patents that are brought to its attention.

Participants in the API standards development process should notify API immediately if they believe that compliance with an API standard would require use of a patented process or product.

7.4 Commercial Terms and Conditions

7.4.1 General

Except as otherwise permitted by these Procedures, API standards shall not include terms or conditions that are primarily contractual or commercial in nature, as opposed to technical, engineering or scientific in nature. Thus, for example, an API standard shall not include contractual requirements (7.4.2); endorse or require the use of proprietary products or services (7.4.3); or endorse or require the use of particular conformity-assessment bodies, testing facilities or training organizations (7.4.4).

7.4.2 Contractual Requirements

Except as provided below, API standards shall not include contractual requirements such as those relating to particular products or services, guarantees, warranties, reworks, indemnities, buybacks, price-related terms and other conditions of sale or use.

7.4.3 Endorsements of Proprietary Products or Services

API standards shall not endorse or require the purchase or use of proprietary products or service providers as a condition of implementing the standard. Proprietary in this context means products or services that are the property of an owner and cannot be obtained or recreated without the consent of the owner. For example, an API standard may not endorse or require the purchase or use of brand-name tools or components, licenses, manufacturer lists, service provider lists or copyrighted materials.¹

However, for informational purposes, where known sources exist for products or services necessary to comply with the API standard, it is permissible, but not obligatory, to identify the sources (which may include a source's name and address) in a footnote, an informative annex, or reference to a website. The referenced products or services shall be reasonably available from the referenced sources, the words "or the equivalent" shall be added to the reference, and the reference shall also expressly state that identification of products or services is not an endorsement of those products or services or their suppliers.

7.4.4 Conformity Assessment, Testing and Training

In connection with API standards that relate to the determination of whether products or services conform to one or more standards, the process or criteria for determining conformity may be standardized as long as the description of the process or criteria is limited to technical, engineering or scientific concerns and does not include what would otherwise be contractual or commercial terms.

It is permissible for health, safety or environmental protection reasons to include a generic requirement for third-party, i.e. independent, conformity assessment, testing or training. API standards shall not dictate the use or non-use of a particular conformity-assessment body, testing facility or training organization.

However, for informational purposes, where known sources exist for products or services necessary to determine compliance with the API standard, it is permissible, but not obligatory, to identify the sources (which may include a source's name and address) in a footnote, an informative annex, or reference to a website. The referenced products or services shall be reasonably available from the referenced sources, the words "or the equivalent" shall be added to the reference, and the reference shall also expressly state that identification of sources is not an endorsement of those sources.

7.5 Implementation of Standards

See 6.12 regarding standards effective dates. Language concerning implementation of an API standard or any provisions therein such as its normative references shall not be included in the standard except under the following conditions. In exceptional circumstances, upon appropriate justification, and notwithstanding that provisions to address contractual or commercial issues shall not be included (see 7.4.1), the relevant standards policy committee (3.18), in consultation with API staff, may approve implementation language for inclusion in the standard. Implementation language is considered standards policy and therefore approval by the consensus body is not considered final until ratified by the relevant standards policy committee and the API Standards Director.

7.6 Metric Policy

International System of Units (SI) is the preferred units of measurement for API standards. U.S. customary units (USC) may also be utilized; however, when citing units in dual units, the SI unit should be listed first with the corresponding USC unit listed either in parentheses in the text or in separate tables, figures, datasheets or in separate annexes.

¹ The term "copyrighted materials" is not intended to include: (a) manufacturers' instruction/safety manuals; or (b) third-party standards, when such documents are incorporated by reference into the text of an API standard for non-commercial technical, or safety-related purposes, as long as such references do not otherwise violate other provisions of the Commercial Terms and Conditions Policy (e.g. they cannot also include warranties, guarantees and like commercial clauses).

7.7 Liaison

API standards committees that develop standards in subject areas for which other national or international organizations develop related standards of substantial interest to the petroleum industry should maintain committee and/or API staff liaison with such organizations to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts. All activities shall be legally compliant with applicable laws and regulations.

7.8 Access to Standards Development Information

7.8.1 General

To comply with the information accessibility requirements of these Procedures, the following criteria shall be used when posting various materials relevant to the standards development process on API's website.

Documents posted on API's committee websites shall be in a non-revisable format (such as PDF) unless there is reasonable justification for a revisable format to be provided.

7.8.2 Notification of Standards Actions

In accordance with 6.3, when the standards development activities listed in a) through d) are announced on the API public website, the announcements shall be available for public review without any security requirements.

7.8.3 Ballots and Draft Documents

In accordance with 6.6.2, ballots for standards actions and associated document drafts for new or revised standards shall be made available during the balloting period on the API e-ballot system. The API e-ballot system shall allow individuals who are not members of the consensus body to register as guests on the e-ballot system to submit comments. The associated draft document shall be available without any login requirements. All documents shall be marked "Draft—For Committee Review" and shall contain the following notice:

This document is not an API Standard; it is under consideration within an API standards committee but has not received all approvals required to become an API Standard. It shall not be reproduced or circulated or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of API committee activities except with the written approval of the chair of the committee having jurisdiction and staff of the API Standards Dept.

At the conclusion of the ballot period, the ballot shall be closed and the associated ballot information including the link to the ballot draft shall be removed from the API website.

7.8.4 Voting Results and Comment Registries

When voting results and comment registries are produced following the closing of a ballot, this information shall be made available to the chairs of the consensus body and relevant subgroups. The voting results and comment registries may be made available to all members of the consensus body and relevant subgroups.

Upon final publication of the standard, if the summaries of voting results and comments registries have previously been posted to the API website, they shall be removed and archived.

7.8.5 Meeting Agendas and Action Items

In accordance with 6.11, meeting agendas and action items shall be posted after review by API staff. Minutes/actions items shall be posted only on a secure committee-accessible site with individual login requirements.

7.9 Internal Audits

The API Standards Department should maintain a documented procedure to define responsibilities for planning, conducting, and documenting internal audits. Audits should verify that the standards development process is effectively implemented and maintained and conforms to the requirements of these Procedures.

8 International Standards Activities

8.1 Adoption of ISO Standards as American National Standards

The national adoption of ISO standards shall be performed in accordance with the API *Guide for the National Adoption of ISO Standards as API/American National Standards*. This document provides guidance when preparing to nationally adopt an ISO standard as an ANSI/API standard and has been prepared from information found in ISO/IEC Guide 21-1 ^[3] and ISO/IEC Guide 21-2 ^[4].

ISO standards to be adopted as ANSI/API standards shall be processed in accordance with Annex A.

8.2 Expedited Procedures for the Identical Adoption of an ISO Standard

API reserves the right to exercise the option of following the expedited procedures set forth in the ANSI *Procedures for the National Adoption of ISO and IEC Standards as American National Standards*. Consensus shall be in accordance with 6.6.6 of these Procedures.

Annex A

(normative)

Processing of ANSI American National Standards

A.1 Overview

The decision to submit an API standard to ANSI for approval shall be determined by the standards committee responsible for the document in consultation with API staff. Notification of activities related to API standards that are intended for submittal and processing through the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) shall be published in *ANSI Standards Action*. API shall maintain ownership of all copyrights and other rights to such API standards.

A.2 Submittal of ANSI Documentation

A.2.1 General

When it has been determined that an API standard will be submitted to ANSI for approval as an American National Standard, or a candidate international standard will be nationally adopted as an American National Standard, the documents listed in A.2.2 to A.2.4 (and if necessary, A.2.5) shall be prepared and submitted to ANSI by API staff. Consult the latest revision of the *ANSI Essential Requirements: Due Process Requirements for American National Standards* (ANSI *Essential Requirements*) for complete information (<http://www.ansi.org>).

A.2.2 Project Initiation Notification System (PINS)

If it is decided to submit an API standard to ANSI for approval at the initiation of development or revision of the API standard, upon approval of the Standards Resource and Research Request (SR3) (see 6.4.1) (including the national adoption of ISO standards), notification shall be transmitted to ANSI using the Project Initiation Notification System (PINS) form for listing in *ANSI Standards Action*.

If it is decided to submit an API standard to ANSI for approval subsequent to API work being initiated, notification shall be transmitted to ANSI using the Project Initiation Notification System (PINS) form at the time the decision was made by the standards committee responsible for the document.

A PINS form is not required at the initiation of a project to reaffirm or withdraw an ANSI/API Standard.

If a written request for additional information, or for the opportunity to discuss the proposal from a directly and materially interested party or current consensus body member, is received during the PINS comment period, a response shall be provided in writing within 30 days of the comment deadline.

A.2.3 Public Review Request (BSR-8)

A.2.3.1 General

Proposals for new ANSI/API standards, proposals to revise, reaffirm, or withdraw approval of existing ANSI/API standards and proposals to nationally adopt a candidate ISO standard shall be transmitted to ANSI using a Public Review Request Form (BSR-8) for publishing in *ANSI Standards Action* to provide an opportunity for public comment. Submission of the BSR-8 form should be concurrent with final balloting (which may be a recirculation – see 6.6.7.3). However, any substantive change subsequently made in a proposed ANSI/API standard requires listing of the change for public comment in *ANSI Standards Action*. Consideration shall be given to the written views and objections submitted during the public review by the consensus body in accordance with 6.6.7.1.

A.2.3.2 ANSI/API Standards under Continuous Maintenance

ANSI/API standards maintained under the continuous maintenance option shall follow the provisions stated in 6.10.3. A BSR-8 form shall be prepared and submitted to ANSI to provide an opportunity for public comment on the proposed revision items. Submission of the BSR-8 shall be concurrent with final balloting (which may be a recirculation – see 6.6.7.3). However, any substantive change subsequently made in a proposed ANSI/API standard requires listing of the change in ANSI *Standards Action*. A BSR-9 form shall be submitted in accordance with A.2.4 following the resolution of comments and objections.

A.2.4 Proposed American National Standard (ANS) Formal Submittal Checklist (BSR-9)

Following the final resolution of comments and objections, a Proposed American National Standard (ANS) Formal Submittal Checklist Form (BSR-9) shall be submitted requesting approval by the ANSI Board of Standards Review (BSR). In the event of an outstanding, unresolved objection, the objector shall be advised of their right to appeal, and there shall be a 15-day waiting period to allow the appeals filing period to elapse prior to submitting the BSR-9 unless the objector advises API in writing prior to the 15 days that they will not appeal.

A.2.5 Extension Request (BSR-11)

If a BSR-9 cannot be filed within one year following the close of the ANSI comment review period listed in *Standards Action*, an extension shall be requested using the ANSI BSR-11 form. Failure to make the submittal within two (2) years from the close of the comment period listed in *Standards Action* shall require consideration by the BSR, i.e. withdrawal, extension for cause, or another listing in *Standards Action*.

If an ANSI/API standard is more than 4 years past its approval date as an ANS and for which a PINS or BSR-8 has not been submitted, an extension shall be requested using the ANSI BSR-11 form.

If an API standard is not published within 6 months following its approval as an American National Standard, an extension shall also be requested using the ANSI BSR-11 form.

A.2.6 Other Forms

The ANSI *Essential Requirements* shall be consulted for information regarding other issues including, but not limited to, continuously maintained ANSI/API Standards and requests for extension of overage ANSI/API Standards.

A.2.7 Discontinuance of a Standards Project as an American National Standard

If it is decided to abandon the processing of a proposed new or revised API standard as an American National Standard or portion thereof, it may be done so without a vote of the relevant consensus body.

API shall notify ANSI immediately of such actions, which will be published in ANSI *Standards Action*.

A.3 Consensus Process for American National Standards

The provisions in Section 6 and Section 7 shall apply to the development and revision of ANSI/API standards.

A.4 Registration of Technical Reports with ANSI

An API Technical Report may be registered with ANSI for publication and shall include the official designation as a “Technical Report prepared by the American Petroleum Institute and registered with ANSI”. Registration requires compliance with ANSI’s *Procedures for the Registration of Technical Reports* with ANSI and submission for registration to ANSI using the Formal Submittal for Registration as a Technical Report form PSA-01. (For additional information on the procedures for ANSI Technical Reports see <http://www.ansi.org>.)

Bibliography

- [1] *API Antitrust Compliance Guide*
- [2] *API Document Format and Style Manual*
- [3] *ISO/IEC Guide 21-1, Regional or national adoption of International Standards and other International Deliverables — Part 1: Adoption of International Standards*
- [4] *ISO/IEC Guide 21-2, Regional or national adoption of International Standards and other International Deliverables — Part 2: Adoption of International Deliverables other than International Standards*
- [5] *ANSI Appeals Board Operating Procedures*



200 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20001-5571
USA

+1-202-682-8000