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Its Organization and Roster of Members

Organization

The ASME Bioprocessing Equipment (BPE) Standards Committee membership in 2014 was made up, in whole, of 195 members holding membership to anywhere from one to five committee/subcommittee memberships. The ASME BPE Standards Committee is, as self-described, considered a “committee,” referring to itself as the ASME BPE Standards Committee, or simply Standards Committee. As indicated in Figure 1, organizational chart, the ASME BPE Standards Committee reports to the ASME Board on Pressure Technology Codes and Standards (BPTCS). Aside from the BPE Standards Committee, reporting also to the BPTCS are the Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (BPVC) Committees, the B16 and B31 Committees, and other committees related to pressure containing subject matter.

The ASME BPE Committee is divided into a set of subtier groups of interest referred to as subcommittees. In other Standards Committees these subtier groups are referred to as “subgroups,” not so with the BPE Standards Committee. Among this group of subcommittees there is no hierarchy. They are simply divided by and focused on the various subject matter interests of the BPE Standard and report directly to the BPE Standards Committee. These subject matter interests are referred to as Parts with the following identifiers as referenced in Table 1.

Referring to Figure 2, it is apparent that each of the subcommittee groups reports to the BPE Standards Committee. The work these subcommittees do, whether it’s maintaining an existing part in the standard, respective of the subcommittee’s part title, or in developing a new part for the standard, there is an ongoing liaison effort that takes place between all of the subcommittees. This helps in diverting conflicts among the various subcommittees and in improving content of the standard as a whole.
Table 1  Subcommittee subject matter part identifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>General requirements</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Sealing components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Systems design</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Polymeric materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>Dimensions and tolerances</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJ</td>
<td>Materials joining</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Metallic materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Surface finishes</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Process instrumentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each of the subcommittees is made up of a balanced membership wherein each member is assigned an interest category as follows:

- **Designer/constructor (AC)**—An organization performing design or design-related services, fabrication or erection, or both
- **General interest (AF)**—Consultants, educators, research and development organization personnel, and public interest persons
- **Manufacturer (AK)**—An organization producing components or assemblies
- **Material manufacturer (AM)**—An organization producing materials or ancillary material-related accessories or component parts
- **User (AW)**—An organization utilizing processes and/or facilities covered by the applicable standards

No one classification shall be represented by more than one-third of the subcommittee membership. By maintaining this balanced membership, no single interest group, whether it be a manufacturer or end user, or any other group, can monopolize the decisions made and the topics discussed in the subcommittee meetings.

Heading up the committees and subcommittees are elected officers of those groups. Each committee, subcommittee, and task group will have a chair and vice-chair. And depending on the size and complexity of any subcommittee, they may also have multiple vice-chairs and a secretary. The secretary for the BPE Standards Committee is an ASME staff secretary that not only provides a direct in-house link to ASME but also helps the entire membership maneuver through the procedural maze now and then when such procedural questions arise.

A subtier of groups under that of the subcommittees are the task groups. These are ad hoc groups that are assembled for a specific task and report to a particular subcommittee. These groups are where the majority of work gets done in standards development and maintenance. Some projects these groups are tasked to do are relatively small. But rather than take up time trying to resolve an issue during a subcommittee meeting, the issue or task will be assigned a temporary number, and volunteers are asked to work on resolving such issues offline or outside the confines of the subcommittee meeting.

Other task group issues are much more complex and involved. These tasks may take years to resolve and prepare for the balloting process. The balloting process itself is rigorous in that a proposal has to obtain consensus approval at multiple stages of the balloting process. That is, a proposal is balloted at the subcommittee level, then at the standards committee level, then to the board level, and finally to ANSI for procedural approval.

At each step of the process, a consensus has to be reached and each negative response has to be responded to with an attempt made to resolve all objections. But a consensus does not require unanimous approval. It does require approval by a simple majority of all of those voting. And to document all of this, ASME uses a system titled C&S Connect, the C&S standing for Codes and Standards. The basis for these procedures is consistent with the principles established for the World Trade Organization’s Technical Barriers to Trade Committee.
The BPE Executive Committee, as seen in Figure 2, is a direct subset of the Standards Committee. This group is responsible for recommending approval or discharge of personnel and the governing of administrative items or actions as they relate to ASME policy and procedures. The vice-chair of the Standards Committee automatically serves as chair of the Executive Committee, and the chair of the Standards Committee automatically serves as vice-chair of the Executive Committee. Subcommittee chairs automatically hold membership to the Executive Committee, but membership on the Executive Committee beyond that does not require being a member of the Standards Committee.

In referring to Figure 1, there is an adjunct committee that is closely related to the Part CR subcommittee with the title of “Committee on BPE Certification” (CBPEC). This is a committee on its own and reports, as shown, to the Board on Conformity
Assessment (BCA). I will refer you to Section 1.2 of this book for a very brief synopsis of the scope of Part CR and all of the other subcommittees. But to clarify here how these two groups, Part CR and the CBPEC, work together is relatively simple.

The Part CR subcommittee is the group that developed and maintains Part CR in the standard, which intrinsically defines what BPE Certification is and how it interacts with the standard. It defines what the requirements are for BPE Certification and provides guidance on how to become a BPE Certificate Holder.

The CBPEC is the assessment and enforcement arm of the certification process. This is the group that, in working with the BCA, performs audits of those applying for BPE Certification; they review the subsequent auditor’s assessment report and then make a determination, based on the auditor’s report and deliberation, whether or not to recommend approval of the applicant. The final decision on that point is made by the BCA.

**BPE Standards Committee Meetings**

All committee and subcommittee meetings of the BPE Standard are open to the public. The only meetings not open to the public are those meetings in which discussions and decisions regarding personnel are held. The CBPEC meetings are closed, but these are conformity assessment meetings that typically follow the meetings of the CR subcommittee and are not BPE meetings.

The BPE Standards meetings follow an evolved schedule that runs for four days, Monday through Thursday. The Monday meetings typically include subcommittees CR and GR and task group meetings for any active task groups that need to discuss and finalize any outstanding issue relating to a task group’s work.

Most task group activity takes place between the three committee meetings each year via conference calls and e-mail communication. Depending on the complexity and scope of a task group, some discussions and resolution need to take place in a face-to-face setting. These are the meetings that are scheduled for the Monday task group meetings. Tuesday and Wednesday are the two days in which the balance of subcommittees will meet. Thursday is the Standards Committee meeting at which the Standards Committee reports and all subcommittees report on what transpired at each of their meetings during the week.

As mentioned, all meetings are generally open to the public. New attendees should know that they are free to visit any meeting at any time except as explained previously. Only members are permitted to vote on subcommittee business. But any visitor is free to voice an opinion or make a point during a tabled discussion. It should also be known that visitors to these meetings are eligible to participate in task group work. If a visitor is considering membership, their work on task groups elevates their possibility of being approved.

Up until 2016 the BPE Standards Committee met three times each year. These meetings were held each year in January, May/June, and September/October. As a trial run it was voted on and planned that the committee hold only two meetings in 2016, one meeting in January and a second meeting in September. This was to test the waters to see if the committee could maintain the same level of efficiency and production of work on the standard with only two meetings per year.
A decision as to whether or not to remain with a two meeting per year format would not be decided upon until possibly the January 2017 meeting. That decision, I suspect, will be based largely on what is accomplished during 2016 and to what extent, good or bad, did the missing third meeting play a part.

Roster of Members

The following is a listing of all members of the ASME BPE Standards Committee and members of subcommittees reporting to the Standards Committee. The names are in alphabetical order and indicate if that person is a chair, vice-chair, or secretary of a committee or subcommittee and which subcommittees they are members of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
<th>CHAIR</th>
<th>V. CHAIR</th>
<th>SECRETARY</th>
<th>SUB-COMMITTEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allard, Michael</td>
<td>NewAge Industries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amant, Jannette</td>
<td>EMD Millipore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Paul</td>
<td>Northland Stainless Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews, Jacob</td>
<td>Zepnine Americas, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews, Todd</td>
<td>Color Products Company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankers, Jay</td>
<td>Ocean Alloys LLC</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anton, George</td>
<td>Quabtech Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avery, Richard E.</td>
<td>Nucleic Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balmer, Melissa L.</td>
<td>Sandor Patonar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bames, Patrick H.</td>
<td>Astro Pak Corp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baran, David</td>
<td>Clifton Enterprises</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benway, Ernst A.</td>
<td>Farnsworth Specialist Inc.</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhalla, Kadeem</td>
<td>ITT Engineered Valves, LLC</td>
<td>MJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bickel, Neil</td>
<td>Careventh</td>
<td>MJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billmeyer, Bryan A.</td>
<td>Central States Industrial Equipment</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>DT</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumenthal, Joel</td>
<td>Perceptual Focus LLC</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bord, Richard</td>
<td>Anderson Instrument Co.</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley, Jeffrey L.</td>
<td>Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bragg, Chuck J.</td>
<td>Burns Engineering, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockmann, Dan</td>
<td>Allfa Laval Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brey, William P.</td>
<td>DECCO, Inc.</td>
<td>MJ</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cagné, William H.</td>
<td>BSg, Inc.</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, Dr. Richard D., PE</td>
<td>Bechtel</td>
<td>MJ</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>GR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canby, Thomas</td>
<td>FM Conway Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl A. Johnson</td>
<td>Careventh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman, Chuck</td>
<td>Germy Valves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiu-Teng, Kuo</td>
<td>King Lai International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin, Anthony P.</td>
<td>Cerillo Consulting Services LLC</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>GR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen, Donald K.</td>
<td>Michigan Metrology, LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corley, Indumati</td>
<td>DPS Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copp, Carlyle C.</td>
<td>Top Line Process Equipment Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook, Todd J.</td>
<td>T &amp; C Stainless, Inc.</td>
<td>MJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper, Mark</td>
<td>United Stainless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consentino, Rodello</td>
<td>Galtis Ltda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotter, Randolph A.</td>
<td>Cotter Brothers Corporation</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>MJ</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford, Jan</td>
<td>Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly, James</td>
<td>BSI Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniels, James R., PE</td>
<td>FFT Engineered Valves, LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Kenneth R.</td>
<td>Northern Medical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defoo, John W.</td>
<td>Hooff Flow Controls Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deffors, Sean J.</td>
<td>Integra Company Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiBello, Robert J.</td>
<td>Parker Hannifin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunbar, Peter M.</td>
<td>VNE Corporation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvorcsek, James</td>
<td>Abbott Laboratories</td>
<td>MJ</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyment, Albert D., PE</td>
<td>Advent Engineering Inc.</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiel, Robert</td>
<td>Eego Manufacturing</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company/Institution</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen, Curtis W.</td>
<td>Central States Industrial Equip.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embury, Mark</td>
<td>Aspecco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esbenoff, Perren</td>
<td>Alfa Laval Kolding A/S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Greg</td>
<td>Beaum Series</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Featherston, Jai-Marx</td>
<td>Wood Instrument Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feldman, Jason</td>
<td>Yula Corporation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher, E. Burnett</td>
<td>Fisher Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frier, Robert B.</td>
<td>Specialty Systems Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foley, Gerard P.</td>
<td>FBM Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foley, Raymond F.</td>
<td>DPS Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forten, Jonathan</td>
<td>Lenzing Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank, John W.</td>
<td>Electro Specialties Company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedman Tanura</td>
<td>Varanay LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritz, Jonas</td>
<td>TMR Stainless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallagher, Joseph</td>
<td>Allergan Pharmaceuticals Ireland Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galtman, Paul G.</td>
<td>GP Price Systems LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaynor, Miss Evelyn L.</td>
<td>Holloway Americraft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George, David</td>
<td>Hallam ICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerra, Koran</td>
<td>Shire Pharmaceuticals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giffen, Jay</td>
<td>FBM Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillespie, David A.</td>
<td>BMWI Constructors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillis, John</td>
<td>Hamiltonian Company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon, Michele M., PE</td>
<td>Engineering Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goris, Vladimir</td>
<td>Genentech/Koewe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govaert, Roger</td>
<td>Mettler Toledo Process Anal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grige, Bradley D.</td>
<td>Top Lion Process Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gu, Mr. Zhonghua</td>
<td>Shangai Merck &amp; Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guttzeit, Marc</td>
<td>GEI Lyophil GmbH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris, Scott</td>
<td>Frisian Pumps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrisson, Todd</td>
<td>Ruthgibson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansella, Reinhard, PhD. PE</td>
<td>CRB Engineers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper, Larry</td>
<td>Wika Instruments, Ltd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison, S. Tom</td>
<td>Harrison Electropolishing, LP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartman, Scott M., PE</td>
<td>Inaolit US, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey, Tom</td>
<td>Gerz Valves, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heiland, Derris R.</td>
<td>Flow Products LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haren, Dr. Barbara K.</td>
<td>Magmatic LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebi, Troy L.</td>
<td>Holland Applied Technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hegeman Er. David</td>
<td>Amgen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holleman, Michael A.</td>
<td>Quality Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haupt, William M.</td>
<td>W. M. Haast Company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutton, L. T.</td>
<td>Aktenu Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inoue, Masa</td>
<td>Fujitsu Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insh, Daniel</td>
<td>Curtin-Fauch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jain, Mukesh K.</td>
<td>W. L. Gore &amp; Associates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janousik, John</td>
<td>Abbott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jensen, Bo B.</td>
<td>Alfa Laval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Carl A.</td>
<td>Genentec Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Michael W.</td>
<td>Entegris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juritsch, Daniel</td>
<td>Zeta Biopharma GmbH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keilher, Ciaran</td>
<td>Jensen Supply Chain</td>
<td></td>
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Preface

Scope and Intent of this Book with Early BPE History

Scope and Intent of this Book

This book is not meant to replace or act as a substitute for the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Bioprocessing Equipment (BPE) Standard. It is instead a companion guide to the standard in providing clarification and to give basis and background for much of what is covered in the BPE Standard. And, in so doing, it has to be made clear that the dialogue and inferences made in this book are those of the author and not those of ASME. What is contained in this book are the results of decades of experience and insights from firsthand involvement in the field of industrial piping design, engineering, construction, and management, which includes the bioprocessing industry.

It is intended that this book both explain and go beyond the content of the ASME BPE Standard in helping to clarify much of its subject matter. Industry codes and standards are written in a manner that goes to the heart of a requirement or guideline without embellishment. They do not explain the reason why some statements in the standard are requirements while others are simply suggestions or recommendations. Neither does a code nor standard describe how something should be done. The reader is left with the requirement, but not the means to achieve it. This book is meant to close that gap of ambiguity to a large degree and make clear not only the standard itself but also its intent.

As various topics are discussed, you, the reader, will learn the reasons why certain things are done in a particular manner, such as electropolishing or orbital welding, and what those terms actually mean. Why are some materials passivated and others not and what does the term passivation really mean? Why mechanically polish tubing and why should piping be sloped? How much slope is sufficient and what is hold-up volume? These questions and more will be discussed and their answers made clear as we move through this book.
In an effort to make this book work in a somewhat logical manner, a manner that coincides more with the way a facility would be designed and constructed rather than the way the standard itself is structured, this book will flow in the following manner: (i) It will first of all provide information on the history of the BPE Standard immediately following this introduction to the book; (ii) following that it will describe the BPE Standard and then discuss codes and standards in general; (iii) the design and engineering aspect of the book will begin with materials of construction, both metallic and nonmetallic; and (iv) it will then touch on components. (v) After components it will get into fabrication, assembly, and installation of piping systems. (vi) It will then roll into examination, inspection, and testing; (vii) next it will discuss the ASME BPE Certification process. (viii) And finally it will bring it all together by discussing system design.

Much of the safety aspects of the BPE Standard are relegated to the ASME B31.3 Process Piping Code through references. This relates to such topics as leak testing, weld criteria, inspection, examination, and so on. Where such topics are touched on, B31.3 will be brought into the discussion. B31.3 will also be referenced in conjunction with Chapter X, the B31.3 high-purity safety arm of BPE.

Information contained in this book is based on content found in the 2014 edition of the ASME BPE Standard. It will also reveal some of the relevant supplemental data not included in the standard. Such information is residual to the large amount of accumulated data obtained during research, testing, and development as part of the process in qualifying content that ultimately finds its way into the standard through a long and arduous process, a process you can learn about in this chapter under Section C—Creating and Maintaining an American National Standard (ANS).

A small amount of essential and useable information is distilled from the macro-data that is accumulated throughout the ongoing process of improving the standard and in keeping current with ever-evolving technology. The compiled macro-data resulting from such research, testing, and development is distilled down to its elemental properties. That essential data and information destined to be included in the standard is then formed into a proposal and submitted to consensus committees in seeking approval to be added to the standard. The data and information that does not find its way into the standard is considered supplemental or residual to that found in the standard, and while it is good, viable data and information, it is simply not suitable or practical as content in an industry standard or for an industry code.

Also woven into the pages of this book are lessons learned by over five decades of work in the piping design and engineering field by the author. These are lessons not found in codes or standards, but are instead methods and procedures developed by the author to enhance the execution of a project.

ASME codes are typically not written to serve as design guides and are stated as such in their introduction. The BPE Standard though is very different in this respect as design of high-purity systems is at the very heart of the BPE Standard. This too will be made clear as you make your way through this book.
Early History and Development of the ASME BPE Standard

The foreword of ASME codes and standards contains a brief, key-point history for each code or standard. The history included in the foreword of these codes and standards contains only the essential elements of that document’s creation and development with no narrative beyond that. The telling of the history of the BPE in this book will contain the names of the individuals responsible for its creation and development and will include some of the original documentation and communication of those early days. That documentation, as referenced in the following as Ref. 01, Ref. 03, and so on, can be found in Appendix K.

To recognize that the greatest error is not to have tried and failed, but that in trying, we did not give it our best effort

   Gene Kranz—NASA Flight Director during the Gemini & Apollo programs from 1969 to 1974

Paul Kantner of Jefferson Airplane/Starship fame famously quipped that “If you can remember the 60’s then you weren’t really there.” Well, you can take it from me that I was “really” there and I do remember those days. A huge part of the 1960s, that is, if you weren’t spending most of your time stoned at some antiwar rally, was the space program. And one of the rock stars, yes, right up there with Jim Morrison and Joe Cocker, was a guy by the name of Gene Kranz. While the press and most of the public were fixated on the astronauts and the spectacle of the Apollo launches, many of us were transfixed on Gene Kranz. As NASA Flight Director (1969–1974) he was calling the shots and running the show on the ground from the Mission Operations Control Center in Houston, TX.

Gene was an unassuming technical rock star who came to full notoriety during the Apollo 13 crisis. And I still, to this day, am in awe of their very publically documented meetings and their live camera feeds during that nail-biting space emergency that placed their discussions and decision-making process, throughout that crisis, under the public microscope—talk about pressure. That was an era of exciting things, monumental engineering feats in which massive rockets were blasted into space and men actually walked on the moon. This was the time of Apollo 13 in which engineers and technicians, guided by the indefatigable Gene Kranz, created magic and saved lives with chewing gum and bailing wire changing certain defeat into a lifesaving victory.

In my mind Mr. Kranz has since become an analogy. One against which other people and other actions are measured. To say that there are no engineers, technicians, or managers among us that do not measure up to Gene Kranz today and in years past would be a mistake. There are men and women involved at the many levels and facets of our little niche in the world—bioprocessing—that do perform such work, but go, for the most part, unnoticed, doing work that perhaps may not rise to the grand scale of building and launching manned Apollo rockets, but nonetheless do take on daunting tasks that others choose to ignore, feel inadequate for the job, or simply shy away from such perceived challenges because the task seems too overwhelming.
But people analogous to Gene Kranz do seem to appear from nowhere and seemingly at the right moment in time. They are the same individuals who first founded ASME in 1880, who initiated discussion on the creation of the Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (BPVC) first published in 1914/1915, and who have taken on tasks throughout the years to create the B31 Piping Codes, the B16 Standards, and many other meaningful documents used throughout the world. Typically these are unassuming but internally dynamic individuals who understand the critical need for something and have the intellect, work ethic, and conviction to step forward and be the driving force in creating that something from nothing.

Contained in the foreword of documents such as the B31 Piping Codes and the BPE Standard, there can be found a history of that particular document in timeline form. Meaning, it provides a very clinical interpretation of the history of the document in nothing more than an almost bulleted format. There are no names mentioned and there are certainly no real specifics, and justifiably so. The foreword in a technical standard or code is not the proper place to expound on a detailed history of how that document was conceived and developed. But that does not preclude the fact that the names and details of how such work was accomplished should be captured in some narrative written perhaps under separate cover. This is just such a narrative.

With the full support of their sponsoring company, many of the individuals who have spent countless hours of their own time and incurred the cost to spearhead the creation and development of the codes and standards we are all so familiar with will, most likely, never be known beyond their immediate associates. In that same context it must also be said that ASME and other such organizations do go to great lengths to recognize as many individuals as practical who have dedicated their time and effort in their ongoing work on codes and standards in a multitude of capacities.

For those that might otherwise go unrecognized along with the story behind the work they have done, a story to most likely be filed away in the back of a dusty file cabinet and shoved into the back room of history, their narrative, at least in this case, is herein documented before being lost through attrition. This narrative describes the inception and development of the BPE Standard with information taken from interviews with some of the key forward-thinking individuals involved in the difficult task of turning a need into an idea, into a plan, into a committee, and finally into the BPE Standard.

This narrative will take you through the very moments that the need was recognized, the idea came to light, a plan was formed, a committee was assembled, and the BPE Main Committee approved. In addition to those key moments in the history of the BPE Standard, we will also read about anecdotal moments that show both the resilience of its members and the development of friendships, friendships, in many cases, made for a lifetime, a quite unexpected bonus forged of hard work, long hours, and dedication to a singular objective.

Origins

In the mid-1980s Genentech had invested in a start-up by the name of Verax Corporation. Verax at the time was developing a design for a continuous fluidized-bed bioreactor. Bill Cagney, working for Genentech during that period, was
assigned to support Verax in converting their bench research prototype into a pilot plant skid design suitable for scale-up GMP manufacturing.

Genentech had recently completed the design and construction of a large-scale cell culture manufacturing facility for recombinant human tissue plasminogen activator (rhtPA) that Bill had been involved in and had, like most of us at that time, gone through significant struggles to obtain the high-purity equipment and achieve the type of high-purity piping system design needed for a system of this type to function properly.

These were issues that anyone designing, engineering, or constructing high-purity systems had to deal with at the time. In order to obtain acceptable, high-quality welds on a consistent and acceptable basis, orbital welding, which was just coming into its own in those years, was the preferred method of welding. However, in order to achieve such consistent and acceptable welds on a repeatable basis between two welded components, the sulfur content of 316L stainless steel, the preferred material of construction then and now, had to be within a very narrow range, a range requirement that was nonexistent at the time. In the years prior to 1995, the maximum limit of 0.030% sulfur was indicated in the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) material specification without option.

In order to dance around this issue, it was necessary to specify that all welded components had to be purchased from the same heat of material, meaning that suppliers would have to corral all weld fittings for a specific project with documentation verifying that they were manufactured from the same material heat. If this was not achievable, it was acceptable to alternately use weld fittings from heats of material in which the content of their sulfur was all reasonably close in comparison. “Reasonably close” was at the owner’s direction; there were no industry recommended, much less standard values for such a range. Some companies also took the approach of developing techniques and procedures using mixed gases to overcome these same welding issues.

Aside from the welding issues, there were also issues with hygienic clamps not fitting properly over the ferrules. Poorly fitting clamps would leave installers with a false sense of having created a leak-tight seal. In many cases a clamp could be tightened against its own metal (metal to metal) and still spin loosely over the ferrules leaving less than a desirable compression load at the ferrule and gasket interface. In order to increase the odds of a clamp fitting properly over mated ferrules and gasket, the clamps were specified to come from the same manufacturer as that of the ferrules. This created logistical issues when having to purchase replacement parts in later years by having to return to the same manufacturer time and again, essentially eliminating competitive pricing and no options when delivery was an issue.

In addition there were no standard guidelines for high-purity pressure vessel design, no standards on fitting dimensions and tolerances, and no standard guidelines or requirements for slope, drainability, dead legs, and surface finishes, and the list goes on. The 3A Food and Dairy Standards somewhat filled the gap, but fell way short of what was really needed for the bioprocessing industry and pharmaceutical industry in general.
As Mr. Cagney worked with Verax, he conveyed his concern to them over these same issues. Those concerns reached the ear of Robert C. (Bob) Dean, Jr., founder of Verax. Bob had been very involved with ASME over the years and was actually an ASME Fellow, becoming a recipient of the ASME Gold Medal in 1996. But in 1988 he confided in Mr. Cagney that he was surprised to discover that there were no industry standards to guide the requirements for the design of equipment for pharmaceutical use.

Rather than keeping the issue internal to his company by choosing to simply develop their own set of specifications in order to rectify and move through the problems posed by Bill for that particular project and move on, like most of us did back then, Bob went the extra distance. He decided to take action by asking Bill if he would be interested in running an industry forum at the upcoming ASME 1988 Winter Annual Meeting in Chicago to test the waters and perhaps solicit industry support in developing a standard for the emerging bioprocessing industry. This singular action that Bob took in approaching Bill with this idea was the genesis of the BPE Standard. If you are looking for the spark of life for the BPE, this was the moment.

Bill Cagney did indeed accept the opportunity to chair the panel discussion at the 1988 ASME Winter Annual Meeting. In preparation for that meeting in Chicago, Bob had worked with the ASME meeting facilitators in getting the panel forum onto the WAM meeting agenda and invited the following individuals to participate in the discussion panel. They were:

William H. (Bill) Cagney (Panel Chair)—Genentech
Tony Wolk—US FDA
Ivy Logsdon—Eli Lilly
Dave Delucia—Verax
Dave Cowfer—Southwest Research Institute
Rick Zinkowski—ITT Grinnell
Cas Perkowski—Stearns Catalytic
Bob Greene—Fluor Daniel
Mel Green—ASME

Dave Delucia was one of the main facilitators at this meeting and helped drive the meeting. In addition, two individuals involved with the work being done at Verax were present as audience participants. They were:

Frank J. (Chip) Manning—TEK Supply, Inc.
Randy Cotter—Cotter Bros.

The 1988 Winter Annual Meeting was one in which the panel sat on an elevated dais and the audience were assembled in a theater-type seating arrangement. After much active discussion and debate from both the audience and the panel, the unanimous consensus, from all participants, was that a standard was most certainly needed and it was agreed that the process of developing a BPE Standard should move forward to the next step in its development.
At an interim meeting it was decided that an Ad Hoc BPE Committee would be formed. Dave Smith, who had recently guided a new ASME Standard for Reinforced Thermoset Plastic Corrosion-Resistant Equipment, ASME RTP-1, through development and approval, was tapped to serve as chair of this new Ad Hoc BPE Committee, and he accepted. On December 6, 1989, a letter notifying Dave (Ref. 01) that he had been appointed chair and a letter notifying Bill Cagney that he had been appointed vice-chair of the Ad Hoc BPE Committee had been sent out.

Leading up to the 1989 Winter Annual Meeting, various companies heavily invested in the pharmaceutical industry at the time had been contacted inquiring as to their assistance in recommending and supporting the nomination of employee delegates to participate as members in the new Ad Hoc BPE Committee.

Lloyd Peterman recalls that:

...someone, or some group, I don’t recall which, solicited resume’s of people who might be qualified for the first ad hoc group. I knew that several people within TriClover, as well as several other companies, had applied. I believe I was selected because I started working with Upjohn and Eli Lilly in 1972 to replace their glass lines with stainless.

At the 1989 Winter Annual Meeting in San Francisco, CA, resumés were received in response to the solicitation and were reviewed. From that review a list of potential members was developed. To that small but talented group of designees, acceptance letters then went out (Ref. 02). These were like-minded individuals who could bring experience and know-how to the committee in helping to create something from nothing. Many of them answered the call and agreed to participate in the development of the BPE Standard. On February 23, 1990, letters went out (Ref. 03) to those respondents, which included the following:

Hans Koning-Bastiaan—Genentech, Inc.
Frank J. (Chip) Manning—TEK Supply, Inc.
Richard E. Markovitz—Trinity Industries, Inc.
Theodore Mehalko—Kinetic Systems, Inc.
Joseph Van Houten—Merck & Company, Inc.
Ivy Logsdon—Eli Lilly and Company
Lloyd Peterman—Tri-Clover, Inc.
Frederick D. Zikas—Parker Hannifin Corp.

The letters notified them that they had been appointed as members to the Ad Hoc BPE Committee.

On March 1, 1990, the Ad Hoc BPE Committee held its first meeting in the ASME offices in New York. The minutes of that meeting (Ref. 04) reflected attendance of the following members:

David Smith (Chair)—United Engineers and Constructors
William H. (Bill) Cagney (V. Chair)—Biogen, Inc.
Hans Koning-Bastiaan—Genentech, Inc.
Frank J. (Chip) Manning—TEK Supply, Inc.
Richard E. Markovitz—Trinity Industries, Inc.
Theodore Mehalko—Kinetic Systems, Inc.
Joseph Van Houten—Merck & Company, Inc.
Ivy Logsdon—Eli Lilly and Company
Lloyd Peterman—Tri-Clover, Inc.
Mark E. Sheehan—ASME Secretary
Frederick D. Zikas—Parker Hannifin Corp.

Visitors attending that first meeting, as reflected in the minutes, included:

Pat Banes—Oakley Services, Inc.
David Baram—Vanasyl Valves, Inc.
Nigel Brooks—Fluor Daniel
Anthony (Tony) Cirillo—Jacobs Engineers
Randy Cotter—Cotter Corp.
Robert Daggett—Allegheny Bradford Corp.
William M. Dodson—Precision Stainless
Randolph Greasham—Merck & Co.
Barbara Henon—Arc Machines, Inc. (AMI)
Peter Leavesley—Membrex, Inc.
Julie Lee—ASME BPEP Manager
Tom Ransohoff—Dorr-Oliver
Arlene Spadafino—ASME Codes and Standards
Rick Zinkowski—ITT Engineered Valves

The purpose of that first meeting, as stated in the meeting minutes, was to:

...determine the need for a standard and to initiate preparation of a presentation to the Board on PTCS describing said need. Since these meetings are to be conducted under ASME policies, all meetings are open to the public and guests are invited to participate in discussions, but not in voted actions.

The minutes went on to state, under Para. 90-3-5, that:

This Ad Hoc Committee has been charged with the development of a recommendation to the Board on PTCS with respect to the formation of a Main Committee to develop and administer Standards for bioprocessing equipment. The scope of such standards was stated by the Council as follows:

This standard is intended for design, materials, construction, inspection, and testing of vessels, piping, and related accessories: such as pumps, valves, and fittings for use in the biopharmaceutical industry. The rules provide for adoption of other ASME and related national standards and when so referenced become a part of the standard.
The minutes go on to state:

*Assuming that this committee determines that there is a need for these standards and that the Board on PTCS approves the formation of a new Main Committee, the next task for this group would be to develop a proposed charter for the committee and subsequently develop preliminary operating procedures for the Main Committee. The development of the charter may involve some fine tuning of the scope of the standards to be developed.*

The March 1990 issue of the Bioprocess Engineering Program (BPEP) Newsletter (Ref. 04-13) had captured the highlights of the pre-Ad Hoc BPE Committee meeting during the 1989 ASME Winter Annual Meeting at which the group discussed a path forward. The article describes the meeting as follows:

*The annual session at the ASME Winter Annual Meeting has become a popular venue for informal public discussions between all interested parties involved with bioprocess equipment. A panel-facilitated dialog culminated in a consensus that further pursuit of standards and references for bioprocess equipment is essential to the industry.*

The article then went on to include key points discussed at the meeting in addition to the organization of “the ASME Ad Hoc Standards Writing Committee” and also provided information for application to join the committee.

It was also noted in the meeting minutes that there would be “…three meetings a year for starters with a basic format consisting of one day of subcommittee meetings followed by a second day when the Main Committee would meet.”

In that same Para, 90-3-11 of the minutes, the chairman noted that, in anticipation of “…timely action by the Board on PTCS, it was decided to hold a meeting as soon as possible after the Board takes action.” That next meeting was scheduled for June 27, 1990, at the ASME offices in New York. On June 4, 1990, the Board on PTCS met and “Based on the presentation prepared by the Ad Hoc Bioprocessing Equipment Committee and presented by [Dave Smith] as Chairman (Ref. 11), the Board on Pressure Technology Codes and Standards (BPTCS), at its 6/4/90 meeting, took action to:…” and it goes on to say that it recommended to CCS “…the formation of the Bioprocessing Equipment Main Committee (BPE) with a scope to read: Design, materials, construction, inspection, and testing of vessels, piping, and related accessories such as pumps, valves, and fittings for use in the biopharmaceutical industry.”

Along with that the board on PTCS also approved the officers and members.

The very next day, on June 5, 1990, the Council on Codes and Standards (CCS) met and approved the recommendation of the board on PTCS creating the BPE Main Committee. On June 26, 1990, letters (Ref. 05) reaffirming the membership of officers and members to the newly created BPE Main Committee were sent out. Those letters went to:

David Smith (Chair)—United Engineers and Constructors
William H. (Bill) Cagney (V. Chair)—Biogen, Inc.
Hans Koning-Bastiaan—Genentech, Inc.
Frank J. (Chip) Manning—TEK Supply, Inc.
Richard E. Markovitz—Trinity Industries, Inc.
Theodore Mehalko—Kinetic Systems, Inc.
Joseph Van Houten—Merck & Company, Inc.
Ivy Logsdon—Eli Lilly and Company
Lloyd Peterman—Tri-Clover, Inc.
Mark E. Sheehan—ASME Secretary
Frederick D. Zikas—Parker Hannifin Corp.

At the second meeting, held on June 27, 1990, Lloyd Peterman made meticulous notes for his in-house report (Ref. 12) to Tri-Clover. In it he writes:

Ten of the twelve original committee members were present, and we were immediately informed that this is no longer an ad hoc committee inasmuch as this comm. was accepted by the Board of ASME to become a full-fledged committee which will probably last a lifetime. Our official designation within ASME is BPE-1. Further the original 12 members (writer included) had our terms approved for a five-year period ending June 30, 1995.

Lloyd goes on to write, in those same notes:

One of the visitors, but who also was elected to the permanent committee, Randy Greashman, Director, Bio-Process Research, Merck & Co., in Rahway, NJ, is really pushing frantically for quick results of this comm. He actually stated he wd. prefer a document by the end of 1990; however, the group as a whole, especially those with more experience with these types of meetings, said they would be quite happy with a document by the end of 1991.

I tend to think that the group’s naïveté worked in the industry’s favor. Had they known what lay ahead, there may have been a very different outcome.

At the following meeting that took place in Dallas, TX, November 28–30, Lloyd writes in his notes (Ref. 13):

“At this meeting, the (4) Task Groups assigned at the previous meeting were scheduled to give a brief report on their activities during the last two months.” He goes on to say, “All these (4) Task Groups were voted upon to become full-fledged subcommittees. The writer [Lloyd] was selected as Chairman for the sub-comm. on gaskets and seals.

Contained in the May 1991 issue of the BPEP Newsletter (Ref. 06) was an article on the fledgling BPE Standard. It read, in part:

The ASME BPE Standards Writing Committee continues to expand and formalize its subcommittees.
There are currently 23 members on the main committee divided into the following 6 subcommittees: Dimensions and Tolerances; Material Joining; Gaskets and Seals; Surface Finish; General Requirements; and the newly formed subcommittee, Equipment Design for Sterility and Cleanability.

Later that same year the ASME PR machine went to work soliciting members and notifying interested parties of this new standard. A pamphlet (Ref. 07) produced by Lloyd Peterman and mailed out in late 1991 stated up front that:

“The ASME Committee of Bio-Processing Equipment (BPE) is actively soliciting participation of all interested parties involved in bioprocessing. The BPE committee was formally established and approved by the ASME Board of Pressure Technology Codes and Standards (BPTCS) in June 1990 to create a standard for design, materials, construction, inspection, and testing of vessels, piping, and related accessories such as pumps, valves, and fittings for use in the biopharmaceutical industry.” The standards may provide for adoption of other ASME and related national standards, and when so referenced become a part of the standard.

The pamphlet also announced that the BPE Committee had met six times since their “establishment” in June 1990, their most recent meeting having been September 12, 1991. It went on to list the officers and subcommittee chairs on the BPE Main Committee at that time. That list included:

David Smith (Chair)—United Engineers
William H. (Bill) Cagney (Vice Chair)—Abbott Biotech
Frank J. (Chip) Manning (Dimensions and Tolerances Chair)—TEK Supply
Randy Cotter (Welding Chair)—Cotter Corp.
Lloyd Peterman (Seals Chair)—Tri-Clover, Inc.
Ted Mehalko (Surface Finishes and Cleanliness Chair)—Kinetic Systems
Casimir A. (Cas) Perkowski (General Requirements Chair)—United Engineers
Nigel Brooks (Equipment Design for Sterility and Cleanability Chair)—Fluor Daniel

After six years of earnest work in establishing the framework of a main committee and six subcommittees, creating a formula for functioning in a harmonized manner and creating content for what would become the international benchmark standard for the bioprocessing and pharmaceutical industry, an initial draft (Ref. 08) of the first ASME BPE Standard was finally pulled together and printed on April 16, 1996. A final proof of the standard was issued on February 14, 1997, and on May 20, 1997, the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) approved the first edition of the ASME BPE Standard. On May 21, 1997, the ANSI Board of Standards Review submitted a letter of approval (Ref. 09) to Ms. Silvana Rodriguez-Bhatti, Manager, Standards Administration, ASME, acknowledging approval of the ASME BPE Standard. The standard was finally printed on October 17, 1997, followed five months later by an ASME press release (Ref. 10) issued on March 14, 1998.
It has since grown and improved with every edition since, which includes a 2000 Addenda, a new edition in 2002, a 2004 Addenda, and subsequent editions in 2005, 2007, 2009, and 2012. In that time period from the inaugural 1997 issue to the 2012 issue, the BPE Standard grew from 108 pages in 1997 to 292 pages in the 2012 issue. Membership reflected in the 1997 issue lists fifty-nine personnel and includes the following:

D. Smith, Chair, Raytheon Engineers & Constructors
A. P. Cirillo, Vice Chair, Life Sciences International
P. D. Stumpf, Secretary, the ASME
D. S. Alderman, Waukesha Cherry-Burrell
W. R. Anton, Advance Fittings
G. A. Attenborough, Fluor Daniel, Inc.
M. A. Atzor, Bayer Corp.
D. D. Baram, Consultant
H. D. Baumann, Chair SG, H. D. Baumann Assoc., Ltd.
R. Becker, Tri-Clover, Inc.
E. A. Benway, Cajon Co.
I. Bemberis, W. R. Grace Amicon, Inc.
W. K. Black, Cashco
R. L. Boraski, Robert James Sales
N. R. Brooks, Chair SD, Fluor Daniel, Inc.
C. R. Brown, Whitey Co.
W. H. Cagney, IDC
R. D. Campbell, Welding Solutions
G. W. Christianson, Ribi ImmunoChem Research, Inc.
D. C. Coleman, ICOS Corp.
R. A. Cotter, Chair MJ, Cotter Corp.
S. D. Dean, Pall Trinity Micro Corp.
J. A. Declark, Trent Tube
P. G. El-Sabaaly, Chair SF, Alloy Products Corp.
D. F. Fijas, American Precision Industries
B. E. Fisher, Waukesha Cherry-Burrell
T. J. Gausman, Nupro Co.
K. Gilson, Kinetic Systems
G. C. Grafinger, ITT Standard
J. W. Harrison, Rath Manufacturing Co.
B. K. Henon, AMI
M. A. Hohmann, Eli Lilly & Co.
T. Hoobyar, Asepco
V. L. Horswell, G&H Products, Corp.
S. T. Joy, Jenson Fittings Corp.
M. W. Keller, Amgen, Inc.
A. G. Leach, APV Crepaco, Inc.
J. T. Mahar, Dorr-Oliver
J. R. Maurer, Allegheny Ludlum Steel
In comparison the 2012 issue of the BPE Standard lists a membership of 185, a growth in excess of 300%.

One group of individuals that cannot be left out of the telling of this narrative are the ASME BPE secretaries. These men and women have been and still are instrumental in guiding the leadership and assisting the BPE general membership in so many facets of the functioning of an organization such as the ASME BPE Standard. In the years leading up to the first edition of the BPE Standard in 1997, in which Paul Stumpf served as secretary, there were five others that preceded him. They include:

Mark Sheehan
S. Weinman
G. Eisenberg
J. Gonzalez
Christine Krupinsky

Like Paul, his predecessors served as an irreplaceable and integral part of the BPE Standard Committee helping the leadership as well as the general membership of the BPE Standard with any myriad of things from guiding committees through the procedural spider web of regulatory conformance issues to assisting on balloting protocol and mediating hotel meeting room issues.

Throughout Paul’s tenure with the BPE Standard, he has also become a good friend and colleague of the BPE leadership teams whom he has traveled the globe with. Paul is always on call serving as the standard’s short-term and long-term memory for each sitting BPE chair, reflecting the attributes of a chief of staff rather than a secretary.
Exceptional Leadership Time and Again

Typically leadership walks a fine line between cajoling and harassment of, in this case, a volunteer membership in attempting to reach a specific set of goals. What seems to occur with the role of chair in the BPE organization is something tantamount to a NASCAR driver sitting perched in a Formula 1 race car; he is certainly someone who has driven fast before, but not like this. With a membership made up largely of self-made type A individuals, whoever takes on the leadership role of such a membership group has to be prepared to meet the challenge or get the pointy end of the spear. From its very beginning the BPE has been fortunate in both the availability and its selection of chairs and vice-chairs.

The hard, timely, and diligent work of the BPE Standard membership, and in particular its leadership, has made it the poster child, or benchmark if you will, for standards development. As Tony Cirillo, past chairman (1999–2005), has said, and I paraphrase, “The BPE has set the bar for the time it takes to develop a new standard and for its inroads into the international marketplace.”

As you will notice in the text outline that follows, but is more readily discernible in Figure 1, is the overlap of personnel in the vice-chair and chair offices throughout the years. This overlap has provided a great deal of continuity in the passing of responsibility that has not gone unnoticed. The various individuals who have selflessly given of their time and expertise in serving as chair and vice-chair for the BPE Standards Committee include Dave Smith, the first chair of the BPE Standard, being transitioned into that office by the CCS in June of 1990 and continued as chair of BPE until June 1999. William H. (Bill) Cagney served as vice-chair under Dave until 1993 at which time Anthony P. (Tony) Cirillo was elected as vice-chair. He would serve in that capacity until 1999. At that time Tony was then voted in as chair of the BPE Standards Committee. Tony served three consecutive three-year terms and retired from that position in June 2008. Barbara Henon served as vice-chair under Tony from 1999 to 2005 when Rick Zinkowski was elected as vice-chair. Rick would serve as vice-chair under the remainder of Tony’s term as chair until 2008. Jay Ankers was duly elected as chair of the BPE Standards Committee in 2008 with Rick Zinkowski continuing to serve as vice-chair. Rick would step down in 2011 to be replaced by Marc Pelletier as vice-chair under Jay.

The nominating committee for the upcoming 2014 elections for the offices of chair and vice-chair of the BPE Standards Committee nominated both Jay and Marc to continue serving in their respective positions. This decision was arrived after all prospective nominees had been interviewed and chose to waive the right to be nominated on the presupposition that Jay and Marc would continue for another term in their respective positions, a huge vote of confidence.

A Never Ending Work in Progress

In the early stages of development, thinking among the fledgling membership at that time quickly coalesced into establishing six primary categories or parts for the standard, SD being the last. These six parts would supposedly cover all of the
criteria identified as applicable to what the BPE Standard should encompass. The 1997 issue of the BPE Standard reflected that thinking by publishing the standard with the following six parts:

1. General requirements (Part GR)
2. Design relating to sterility and cleanability of equipment (Part SD)
3. Dimension and tolerances (Part DT)
4. Material joining (Part MJ)
5. Surface finishes (Part SF)
6. Seals (Part SG)

As Tony Cirillo, vice-chair at the time, recalls, in Philadelphia at the 1996 meeting, the decision was made to publish the standard the following year in 1997. At the executive meeting, chaired by then vice-chair of the BPE Standard Committee Tony Cirillo, Tony went around the table of subcommittee chairs and asked where each one was with relation to their part being complete.
Each announced that their respective parts were ready, that is, until he got to Nigel Brooks who confessed that he was still working on expanding SD. Tony then stood up and said to everyone, “...as of right now stop. Everything you’re doing, stop. Tweak it. Make it right; because we’re going into publication next year.”

There was simply so much low-hanging fruit for Nigel and the SD group; it was like kids in a candy store. And as you will see in the following paragraph, and quite simply throughout the various issues themselves over the years, a line had to be drawn in the sand at some point or the standard would have never been published; it is to this day still expanding.

To provide some basic understanding of the continued expansion of the standard, following its inaugural issue, Part PM for polymers and elastomers was added in 2002. This effort was championed by Ted Hutton the standard’s resident nonmetallic guru. In 2009 Part MMOC, spearheaded by the untiring Ken Kimbrel, was added to house the specifics on materials being used in the industry. Also in 2009 Part CR for certification, a segment of the standard that required the strong will and determination of Rich Campbell to forge into place, became a reality. The addition of Part CR was prompted in response to having to gain an upper hand on the issue of nonconforming components being manufactured and distributed as being BPE compliant when in fact there was nothing in place to assure that compliance. And again in that same year, the subcommittee for Part PI was introduced, guided by the hard work and tireless effort of Dan Kleese. Part PI was finally published in the 2012 edition. And by not identifying the hard work and tireless effort of all the general membership also involved in the process does not deny their major role in creating these segments of the standard. Leadership is only as good as those that support it.

Shepherding these various parts of the standard from inception to publication is a long and arduous undertaking, three to five years on average, an undertaking that requires a dedication to its concept, a full understanding of the need for its particular subject matter to be included in the pages of the standard, and a desire to ensure that its content provide the essential elements needed for the industry. This is no small task.

**Anecdotal Recollections**

Back in 1988 Barbara Henon recalls that she:

... received a brochure about a meeting in Chicago that would discuss materials to be used in the newly developing bioprocessing industry.

She attended the meeting and:

... one of the materials being promoted was Al-6XN. The presenter said that Al-6XN required the use of filler metal during welding to prevent loss of corrosion resulting from molybdenum segregation. Since orbital welding with filler metal is not used in biopharmaceutical applications, I arranged to get some of the material and weld
some autogenously and some using Hastelloy C-22 insert rings. Allegheny Ludlum did corrosion tests on the welds and I wrote a paper with Jack Maurer of Allegheny Ludlum at that time on these corrosion studies [in preparation for] the ASME Winter Annual Meeting in 1989. Randy Cotter was also a presenter at this same venue. I gave presentations at the ASME Bioprocessing Seminars, which at that time were being held at the University of Virginia and, for a couple of years, at organized ASME Bioprocessing Conferences being held at the ASME Winter Annual Meetings.

Barbara goes on to recall that:

I attended early BPE meetings but don't know exactly when I became a member. Randy, Chip Manning, Tony Cirillo were already on the committee at the time I joined. Dave Smith was Chair. The entire committee could go to dinner together after the meeting.

As mentioned in the opening dialogue, one of the more pressing issues that the BPE chose to address early on was that of welding issues and more specifically orbital welding. This was and still is a crucial aspect in the construction of hygienic piping systems.

Arguably one of the biggest issues pertaining to orbital welding was the max. 0.030% sulfur content in 316L stainless steel stipulated by ASTM. Resolution of this issue took place just prior to 1995, but in knowing its beginnings we actually have to go further back to 1984.

Barbara Henon worked for AMI at the time. She recalls that back in 1984:

...my boss, Lou Reivydas, handed me a paper by Fihey and Simoneau at Ontario Hydro describing the effects of sulfur on welds of 304 stainless steel. Later, in 1985 I did some research on the sulfur content of heats of tubing material supplied to me by AMI customers. Following the research I issued a memo to those same customers advising them to specify heats of 316 or 304 with a sulfur content range of between 0.005 and 0.017 wt%. This did not go over well with some suppliers or steelmakers.

When I joined MJ in the early 1990’s I presented the findings on the sulfur data to them. With help from Tony and Randy, we were then able to propose this change to Chip who was chairing DT at the time who in-turn proposed it to ASTM.

Barbara goes on to say that:

... this really paved the way for achieving repeatable orbital welds in the biopharmaceutical industry. While an individual can’t change an industry, a group working together can make big positive changes.

Under the leadership of Frank J. (Chip) Manning as chair of the DT subcommittee and material experts such as Jack Declark, with Trent Tube at the time and also a member of DT, the DT subcommittee hit the ground running and began to impact the industry soon after its subcommittee was organized, years before publication of the 1997 BPE Standard.
In order for the orbital welding of 316L stainless steel tubing to be used to its utmost benefit, the sulfur content between two butt weld components has to be within a range much more refined than the 0.030% max. allowed under ASTM standards as written at that time. Barbara Henon, as mentioned in the foregoing paragraphs, had handed a resolution to the DT subcommittee. Jack Declark, a member of the DT subcommittee, was also a member of the ASTM A 270 standard. The DT subcommittee realized that the best approach in mitigating the issue was to affect the root cause and add a modifier to the mill specifications. The data that Barbara had handed to DT was the answer.

The DT subcommittee, through Jack Declark, petitioned the ASTM A 270 committee for a supplement that would provide a more explicit option for weldable material to be used in high-purity piping systems. DT was looking for an A 270 option that refined both sulfur content and surface finishes that would be more compatible with the needs of the pharmaceutical industry. This petition and Jack’s appeal to the committee convinced ASTM that this supplement was indeed needed. In 1995, three years prior to the actual publication of the first issue of the BPE Standard, ASTM issued a revised A 270 containing the S2 supplement stipulating the option for a much refined 0.005–0.017% sulfur content requirement.

In 2001 Tony Cirillo, chair of the BPE Standard Committee during that period, was contacted by a European tube and fitting manufacturer requesting a meeting with regard to the inclusion of a DIN material specification into the BPE. The meeting took place during the May 2001 BPE meeting at the Hilton Anatole Hotel in Dallas, TX. Uncertain as to what to expect, Tony, in preparation for the meeting, armed himself with Chip Manning and Dr. Rich Campbell.

What this visiting group wanted to discuss was the addition of the DIN equivalent to 316L stainless steel containing a sulfur range of 0.003–0.005% into the BPE Standard. Rich conveyed to the European representatives that the BPE Standard could not recommend a stainless steel chemical composition with a sulfur content in that range. As Rich explained, and I paraphrase, “Such a low sulfur content would inhibit weld flow and penetration, providing less than acceptable results for the BPE Standard.” Chip then went on to explain, and I paraphrase, “We worked extremely hard with ASTM in getting acceptance and inclusion of the S2 supplements into the ASTM A 270 standard. We then worked on the mills to gain acceptance by the manufacturers. We would therefore request that you do the same in order to get DIN to meet the supplemental requirements of BPE.”

Things were not quite the same after that. Through that meeting the BPE was fortunate enough to gain an addition to its membership that still exists to this day in the form of Dr. Jan Rau, one of the two European representatives at the meeting. Jan has since been a selfless advocate in the giving of his time and dedication to the betterment of the BPE Standard, helping to keep it aligned with the needs of the international community.

Many of the industry-accepted criteria, in the days prior to the BPE Standard, were taken as sacrosanct, but had indeed no substantiative basis of origin. These anecdotal criteria were nevertheless carried over into the standard until such time as the industry-accepted values could be researched. One such criterion was the slope issue.
For hygienic requirements, such as those to be included in the BPE Standard, the need to establish clarity for cause and foundational empirical data in creating a baseline of values for slope requirements, and any other requirements for that matter, was and still remains critical to the BPE’s goal of getting it right.

It was because of this tenet that Cotter Corp., guided by Randy Cotter back in 1992, elected to sponsor testing that established slope requirement values that are the basis and determinant factor for slope requirements used in the BPE Standard and elsewhere around the globe.

This testing and analysis takes into account the variables in surface tension between mechanically polished and electropolished stainless steel as well as weld joint concavity and convexity. Like the work that Barbara had done with the sulfur content issue, these were early signs that the content within the BPE Standard would be content that would not only change the industry but also do so at a level of scrutiny and consideration that would be hard to match.

In 1999, soon after Tony Cirillo became chair of the BPE Standards Committee, he approached Ernie Benway, who worked for Swagelok at the time, about how many facilities Swagelok had around the world. When Ernie told him about their facilities in Europe and Asia, Tony then went to Paul Stumpf and asked that ASME provide Ernie with as many BPE Standards as he could use in distributing them on his overseas trips. The same was done with others such as Lloyd Peterman who was uniquely invested in Asia. This effort expedited acceptance of the BPE Standard throughout the world.

In a 2003 e-mail between Tony and Lloyd Peterman, Tony is imploring Lloyd, who is now working for United Industries, who by the way became the first recipient of the BPE Certification Program in January of 2013, saying that “I once again need your help. We need to get moving on promoting the standard internationally” asking Lloyd if he could put together a list of countries that are using the standard. In response Lloyd provided a list of 19 countries that at the time were using the standard.

Tony recalls that at the Raleigh meeting back in January of 2001, Nigel Brooks cornered him between meetings exclaiming that he “… simply could not continue to chair SD. It is becoming too much so I will need you to find someone to replace me.” To understand the angst that was apparently being felt by Nigel, it would help to at least understand the person to a very limited extent. Along those lines Barbara Henon writes:

*I do remember Nigel Brooks showing slides of mechanical seals that were so complex they rivaled diagrams of Intel chips. He was a very intense individual.*

After his angst-filled conversation with Nigel, Tony’s thoughts immediately turned to a recent attendee by the name of Jay Ankers as a potential replacement. Jay had attended only two other BPE meetings that had taken place in May 2000 at Atlantic City followed by a September meeting in San Francisco. In those first two meetings, Jay had made quite an impression on the SD membership and apparently had impressed a few others outside of SD. Word had gotten back to
Tony, and fortunately for the BPE he drew the right conclusion and approached this, fresh off the boat, member who had barely gotten his feet wet in his work with the standard—talk about getting tossed into the deep end of the pool, one full of sharks.

Jay recalls that:

...the first meeting I attended was in Atlantic City with Thys Smit, my friend from Fluor Daniel who worked with Nigel Brooks and I in the U.S. and South Africa. Thys and I heard about the BPE from Nigel while at Fluor Daniel. He had invited us to our first meeting. The SD Subcommittee meeting was in a HUGE room with 7-8 people. We went through the WHOLE SD Part with David Baram making editorial comments..., that were actually all very good.

He remembers Tony talking to him during the 2001 Raleigh meeting about taking over SD. It helps to imagine this new guy being asked to take over a sub-committee with only two meetings under his belt. He has to be thinking this is probably normal...right? How little he knew.

Fortunately for the BPE Jay could not have possibly known what he was getting into and accepted the position of SD chair. In thinking back he recalls that:

When Nigel Brooks handed me his files (box and electronic) he handed me an OLDER version of the SD Part, the one that had the Sprayball Testing from before the update that Tony Cirillo added. After it was published in the 2002 issue and we next met in San Diego Tony called me into a meeting with just him and me to ask, “What the hell happened??” That was my first publication as Chair of Part SD and Nigel got me good! We issued an errata revision immediately.

That erratum went out in 2004.

It is difficult to say, but Marc Pelletier was apparently a bad influence on Jay during his early days in the BPE. He caused Jay to become addicted to golf during some of the early meetings in Puerto Rico. You can almost picture Marc “the pusher” Pelletier standing at the first tee, 9 iron in hand pushing his drug of choice on to Jay: ahhh the feel of the soft tropical breeze against sun-tanned skin, the smell of hibiscus in the air as you drive through the lush green, undulating fairways chasing that white dimpled object that just won’t go the distance or won’t stop hooking to the right, who wouldn’t fall victim to that. As Jay recalls:

... we used to play the old Bahia Beach course, located just east of San Juan. Before the SD Subcommittee meetings Marc and I could get in several rounds of golf; showing a severe lack of commitment to Tony.

He goes on to say that:

When Tony and Humphrey [Murphy] planned the big launch to Europe, starting in Cork Ireland [in 2001] Marc and I planned a one week golf trip around Ireland with our wives. We rented a van and played a great Irish course each day the whole week, staying in different B&Bs and towns every night. That did not go over well with Tony, especially when we rolled into Cork just before the meeting started on that Tuesday;
or worse yet, during the meetings when several of us would get up early to go play a scheduled round. Years later in Dublin [June 2004], Tony took us out to the countryside for a meeting. The hotel had a golf course with the first tee near the front door! I remember walking into the Executive meeting with my golf shoes on and grass stains on my pants.

In 2005 Tony would be going into his third three-year term, which would end in 2008. At the May 2005 meeting in Dublin, Tony, along with Paul Stumpf and Jennifer Delda, pulled Jay to the side as he did in Raleigh and asked him, once again, to step up to the plate and allow his name to be nominated for chair of the BPE Standards Committee.

Jay of course said yes and has proven over his past two terms that Tony was right once again. This was confirmed in a statement contained in his letter of nomination from the Nominating Committee for the 2014 elections, which states:

Mr. Ankers has proven, throughout his past two terms in that office, to be a dedicated and passionate leader and advocate of the BPE Standard. He has guided the growth and continued development of the BPE Standard during a time in which it experienced a 215% growth in content from its 2007 edition through its 2012 edition. During that same period the BPE Standard has been acknowledged and accepted into the 2012 edition of the B31.3 Process Piping Code, and has experienced a substantial increase in its acceptance and impact as an internationally accepted industry standard.

During Jay’s first two terms, the BPE’s expansion and use throughout Asia and South America as well as the involvement from both regions has substantially increased as an offshoot of the international push under Tony’s watch and Jay’s persistence. As Jay puts it:

There is no question that Lloyd Peterman blazed the trail for the BPE in Asia and SE Asia. Sei Murakami, our BPE Japan delegate, connected ASME to all the engineering codes and standards in Japan better than anyone ever could or, I expect, ever will. Let’s just say the ASME BPE was well established across the Pacific when I started working full time in Singapore in 2006.

Folks like Lloyd Peterman, Chuck Chapman with Gemu and Carl [Kettermann] with Rath were writing articles (I am sure there were many others I am forgetting). I had a couple of Large Biopharm Projects in Singapore and I was the Chairman at the time, so it was as easy for me in SE Asia as when Tony was building projects in Ireland to expand the BPE. Those two little islands (with no natural resources) allowed a US standard and US goods to flow naturally.

He goes on to say that:

We set up many of our BPE folks with Singapore reps. who capitalized on the 4–5 large biopharm projects within a 5-block area in Tuas. I think I had over 50 BPE colleagues visit Singapore in three years. We changed sections of the BPE based on Ministry of Manpower requirements (some on the fly as Roche was building ECP-1