

Calculating Performance Properties of Pipe Used as Casing or Tubing

API TECHNICAL REPORT 5C3
SEVENTH EDITION, JUNE 2018

ADDENDUM 1, OCTOBER 2019



AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE

Special Notes

API publications necessarily address problems of a general nature. With respect to particular circumstances, local, state, and federal laws and regulations should be reviewed.

Neither API nor any of API's employees, subcontractors, consultants, committees, or other assignees make any warranty or representation, either express or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained herein, or assume any liability or responsibility for any use, or the results of such use, of any information or process disclosed in this publication. Neither API nor any of API's employees, subcontractors, consultants, or other assignees represent that use of this publication would not infringe upon privately owned rights.

API publications may be used by anyone desiring to do so. Every effort has been made by the Institute to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the data contained in them; however, the Institute makes no representation, warranty, or guarantee in connection with this publication and hereby expressly disclaims any liability or responsibility for loss or damage resulting from its use or for the violation of any authorities having jurisdiction with which this publication may conflict.

API publications are published to facilitate the broad availability of proven, sound engineering and operating practices. These publications are not intended to obviate the need for applying sound engineering judgment regarding when and where these publications should be utilized. The formulation and publication of API publications is not intended in any way to inhibit anyone from using any other practices.

Any manufacturer marking equipment or materials in conformance with the marking requirements of an API standard is solely responsible for complying with all the applicable requirements of that standard. API does not represent, warrant, or guarantee that such products do in fact conform to the applicable API standard.

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 Publishing Services, 1220 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005.

Copyright © 2018 American Petroleum Institute

Date of Issue: October 2019

Affected Publication: API Technical Report 5C3, *Calculating Performance Properties of Pipe Used as Casing or Tubing*, 7th Edition, June 2018

Addendum 1

Table of Contents: The entry for Table K.2 shall be changed to the following:

K.2 Performance Property Calculations—Interface Pressure of Casing Connections (SI Units) 260

Table of Contents: The entry for Table L.2 shall be changed to the following:

L.2 Performance Property Calculations—Interface Pressure of Casing Connections (USC Units) 338

Section 1 (Scope), 4th paragraph: The last sentence of the paragraph shall be changed to the following:

Similar caution should be exercised when using the performance equations for drill pipe or for collapse of cold-expanded API 5L pipe.

Section 3.1 (Terms and Definitions): The following terms/definitions shall be added to the section:

3.1.12

JCOE

An acronym-term referring to the process of forming pipe in which steel plate edges are formed into a “J,” the full plate is then shaped into a “C,” then an “O,” welded together and finally expanded “E.”

3.1.26

UOE

An acronym-term referring to the process of forming pipe in which steel plate is shaped into a “U,” then an “O,” welded together and finally expanded “E.”

Section 8.6: The entire section shall be replaced with the following:

8.6 Application of Collapse Pressure Equations to Line Pipe

The collapse pressure equations presented in this section are empirical relations derived from tests on pipe representative of the casing and tubing inventories listed in API 5CT or ISO 11960. Application of these relations outside the range of yield strengths and D/t ratios contained in API 5CT or ISO 11960 is not recommended. These equations do not apply to cold expanded pipe because Bauschinger effects significantly reduce collapse resistance. Some line pipe grades listed in API 5L have a rough casing equivalent in API 5CT or ISO 11960. However, the API 5L pipe inventory contains D/t ratios that often exceed casing D/t ratios.

Cold-expanded line pipe—for example, UOE or JCOE line pipe—can exhibit collapse performance lower than the design equations in this clause. Pipeline design guidelines API 1111 and DNVGL-ST-F101 provide correlations that have been shown to yield more accurate collapse design rating predictions when compared to collapse test results. Both pipeline guidelines provide factors to add a design margin to the predicted collapse pressure, resulting in a design rating approach commensurate with this clause.

For line pipe that is not cold-expanded and has a yield strength and D/t falling within the limits of the sizes and thicknesses listed in API 5CT or ISO 11960, application of the equations in this section should yield

reasonable estimates of minimum collapse pressure. Nevertheless, as with the application of any of the equations in this document, sound engineering judgment should prevail.

Section 10.3, Page 50: The paragraph above Equation (71) shall be changed to the following:

Since the external box diameter is always greater than the contact diameter, which in turn is always greater than the internal pipe diameter, p_2 will always be less than p_1 . Therefore, when the total interface pressure $p_1 + p_2$ equals the internal pressure p_i , the connection has reached the interface pressure threshold p . In other words, if p_i were greater than $p_1 + p_2$, leakage would occur:

Annex K, Section K.2: The title of Table K.2 shall be changed to the following:

Table K.2—Performance Property Calculations—Interface Pressure of Casing Connections (SI Units)

Annex K, Page 260: The title of Table K.2 shall be changed to the following:

Table K.2—Performance Property Calculations—Interface Pressure of Casing Connections (SI Units)

Annex L, Section L.2: The title of Table L.2 shall be changed to the following:

Table L.2—Performance Property Calculations—Interface Pressure of Casing Connections (USC Units)

Annex L, Page 338: The title of Table L.2 shall be changed to the following:

Table L.2—Performance Property Calculations—Interface Pressure of Casing Connections (USC Units)

Bibliography: The following entries shall be added to the bibliography:

[123] API Recommended Practice 1111, *Design, Construction, Operation, and Maintenance of Offshore Hydrocarbon Pipelines (Limit State Design)*

[124] DNVGL-ST-F101, *Submarine Pipeline Systems*

Foreword

Nothing contained in any API publication is to be construed as granting any right, by implication or otherwise, for the manufacture, sale, or use of any method, apparatus, or product covered by letters patent. Neither should anything contained in the publication be construed as insuring anyone against liability for infringement of letters patent.

The verbal forms used to express the provisions in this standard are as follows:

- the term “shall” denotes a minimum requirement in order to conform to the standard;
- the term “should” denotes a recommendation or that which is advised but not required in order to conform to the standard;
- the term “may” is used to express permission or a provision that is optional;
- the term “can” is used to express possibility or capability.

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 Director of Standards, American Petroleum Institute, 1220 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005. Requests for permission to reproduce or translate all or any part of the material published herein should also be addressed to the Director.

Generally, API standards are reviewed and revised, reaffirmed, or withdrawn at least every 5 years. A one-time extension of up to 2 years may be added to this review cycle. Status of the publication can be ascertained from the API Standards Department, telephone (202) 682-8000. A catalog of API publications and materials is published annually by API, 1220 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005.

Suggested revisions are invited and should be submitted to the Standards Department, API, 1220 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005, standards@api.org.

Contents

1	Scope	1
2	Normative References	2
3	Terms, Definitions, Symbols, and Abbreviations	2
3.1	Terms and Definitions	2
3.2	Symbols	4
3.3	Abbreviations	12
4	Conformance—Dual Referencing	13
5	Conformance—Units of Measurement	13
6	Triaxial Yield of Pipe Body	13
6.1	General	13
6.2	Assumptions and Limitations	13
6.3	Data Requirements	14
6.4	Design Equation for Triaxial Yield of Pipe Body	14
6.5	Application of Design Equation for Triaxial Yield of Pipe Body to Line Pipe	16
6.6	Example Calculations	16
7	Ductile Rupture of the Pipe Body	20
7.1	General	20
7.2	Assumptions and Limitations	20
7.3	Data Requirements	21
7.4	Design Equation for Capped-end Ductile Rupture	23
7.5	Adjustment for the Effect of Axial Tension and External Pressure	24
7.6	Example Calculations	28
8	External Pressure Resistance	29
8.1	General	29
8.2	Assumptions and Limitations	29
8.3	Data Requirements	30
8.4	Design Equation for Collapse of Pipe Body	30
8.5	Equations for Empirical Constants	36
8.6	Application of Collapse Pressure Equations to Line Pipe	37
8.7	Example Calculations	38
9	Joint Strength	38
9.1	General	38
9.2	API Casing Connection Tensile Joint Strength	39
9.3	API Tubing Connection Tensile Joint Strength	45
9.4	Line Pipe Connection Joint Strength	47
10	Pressure Performance for Couplings	47
10.1	General	47
10.2	Internal Yield Pressure of Round Thread and Buttress Couplings	47
10.3	Interface Pressure of Round Thread or Buttress Couplings	48
11	Calculated Masses	50
11.1	General	50
11.2	Nominal Linear Masses	51
11.3	Calculated Plain-end Mass	51
11.4	Calculated Threaded and Coupled Mass	51

Contents

11.5	Calculated Upset and Threaded Mass for Integral Joint Tubing and Extreme-line Casing	53
11.6	Calculated Upset Mass	54
11.7	Calculated Coupling Mass	55
11.8	Calculated Mass Removed during Threading	59
11.9	Calculated Mass of Upsets	64
12	Elongation	69
13	Flattening Tests	69
13.1	Flattening Tests for Casing and Tubing	69
13.2	Flattening Tests for Line Pipe	70
14	Hydrostatic Test Pressures	71
14.1	Hydrostatic Test Pressures for Plain-end Pipe, Extreme-line Casing, and Integral Joint Tubing	71
14.2	Hydrostatic Test Pressure for Threaded and Coupled Pipe	71
15	Make-up Torque for Round Thread Casing and Tubing	73
16	Guided Bend Tests for Submerged Arc Welded Line Pipe	73
16.1	General	73
16.2	Background	75
17	Determination of Minimum Impact Specimen Size for API Couplings and Pipe	75
17.1	Critical Thickness	75
17.2	Calculated Coupling Blank Thickness	77
17.3	Calculated Wall Thickness for Transverse Specimens	78
17.4	Calculated Wall Thickness for Longitudinal Specimens	79
17.5	Minimum Specimen Size for API Couplings	80
17.6	Impact Specimen Size for Pipe	82
17.7	Larger Size Specimens	82
17.8	Reference Information	82
	Annex A (informative) Discussion of Equations for Triaxial Yield of Pipe Body	83
	Annex B (informative) Discussion of Equations for Ductile Rupture	96
	Annex C (informative) Rupture Test Procedure	134
	Annex D (informative) Discussion of Equations for Fracture	136
	Annex E (informative) Discussion of Historical API Collapse Equations	143
	Annex F (informative) Development of Probabilistic Collapse Performance Properties	157
	Annex G (informative) Calculation of Design Collapse Strength from Collapse Test Data	192
	Annex H (informative) Calculation of Design Collapse Strengths from Production Quality Data	195
	Annex I (informative) Collapse Test Procedure	209
	Annex J (informative) Discussion of Equations for Joint Strength	214
	Annex K (informative) Tables of Calculated Performance Properties in SI Units	224
	Annex L (informative) Tables of Calculated Performance Properties in USC Units	302
	Bibliography	380

Contents

Figures

1	Illustration of the Effect of Effective Axial Tension and External Pressure on Ductile Rupture	26
2	Threaded and Coupled Pipe	52
3	Upset Pipe	53
4	Upset Pipe—Both Ends	54
5	Pipe Coupling.	56
6	Coupling with Special Bevel	57
7	Mass Calculations for Buttress Thread Couplings	58
8	Round Threads and Line Pipe Threads	59
9	Buttress Threads	60
10	Extreme-line Pin Thread	61
11	Integral Joint Tubing	62
12	Extreme-line Casing	63
13	External Upset	64
14	Internal Upset.	65
15	Pin Upset	67
16	Box Upset.	68
17	Guided Bend Test Jig	74
A.1	von Mises Yield Criterion for a Tube Loaded by Internal and External Pressures and Axial Stress.	87
A.2	von Mises Yield Criterion for a Tube Loaded by Internal and External Pressure and Axial Stress, API 5C5 or ISO 13679 Representation	88
A.3	von Mises Yield Criterion Expressed in Terms of Internal and External Pressure and Effective Stress	90
A.4	Comparison of API Historical and Lamé/von Mises Predictions of Yield Pressure with Zero Axial Load as a Function of Pipe Body Cross-sectional Geometry, $k_{wall} = 0.875$	95
B.1	Correlations for Hardening Index from Typical Experimental Data for Steel Grades Listed in Table B.2.	100
B.2	Illustration of the Effect of Effective Axial Tension and External Pressure on Ductile Rupture	102
B.3	Ratio of Actual to Predicted Rupture Pressures for Klever-Stewart Model	115
B.4	Rupture De-rating for Cracks (Crack Assumed on Minimum Wall)	117
B.5	Influence of the Imperfection Penalty for 9-5/8 in., 53.5 lb/ft, P110 Casing	118
B.6	J-integral and J_{1C} for a P110 Pipe	120
B.7	J-integral and J_{1C} for a 13-Cr-95 Pipe	121
B.8	Influence of Crack Depth on Ductile Rupture	122
B.9	Distribution Bias to Very Small Defects—Very High COV	128
B.10	Exponential Distribution of Defect Sizes—Large COV	128
B.11	Distribution of Defects More Evenly Dispersed in Interval—COV ~ 50 %	129
B.12	Distribution Bias to Larger but Undetected Sizes—COV ~ 30 %	129
B.13	Upper Tail of Seam Lap Defect Depths Plotted on a Weibull Probability Scale.	130
B.14	Effect of “Below-the-Threshold” Imperfection Distribution on the Probability Distribution for Ductile Rupture Strength	132
B.15	Comparison of Shape Factor Effect on the Probability of Failure of a Single Length and a String (Mean Safety Factor of 1.3).	133
B.16	Comparison of Shape Factor Effect on the Probability of Failure of a Single Length and a String (Mean Safety Factor of 1.5).	133
C.1	Illustration of Minimum Specimen Length for a Pipe Rupture Test	135
D.1	Influence of K_{Imat} on Fracture Propagation Pressure (7 in. Diameter, 0.730 in. Wall, C90 with 5 % Imperfection, 0.875 Wall Factor)	141
E.1	Grade N80 Transition Collapse Equation Derivation.	156

Contents

F.1	Predictive Accuracy (Mean) vs Dataspace Position	162
F.2	Actual/Klever-Tamano Predicted Strength vs Dataspace Position	164
F.3	Klever-Tamano Predictive Accuracy (Dispersion) vs Dataspace Position	165
F.4	Pipe Dimension and Stress Data	171
F.5	Effect of Input Variable Cross-correlation	173
F.6	Possible PDFs for Calculation of Design Collapse Strengths	174
F.7	Predicted Failure Probabilities for API 5C3 [2]	180
F.8	Predicted Failure Probabilities with Potential Governing Case Means in $H_{t_{des}}$	181
F.9	Effect of $H_{t_{des}}$ on Pipe Mass	182
F.10	Predicted Failure Probabilities for Probabilistic Method	183
F.11	Comparison of Design Margin	184
F.12	Comparison of Design Collapse Strengths with Collapse Test Data (Sharp-kneed Stress-strain Curves), $h_n = 0$	185
F.13	Calibration of h_n via Design Strength (Rounded-kneed Stress-strain Curves)	186
F.14	Comparison of Previous and Revised Design Strengths	187
F.15	Sensitivity Factors	188
G.1	Reduction in Design Strength vs Dataset Size	194
H.1	Case-specific Calibration for Mill FD00 (Multiple Pipe Sizes)	205
H.2	PDF and CDF of Predicted Failure Probability ($L_{nom} = 5960$ psi)	207
H.3	Reduction in Design Strength vs Dataset Size (Mill FD00, 9-5/8 in. 47 lb/ft P110 HRS)	208
I.1	Measurements prior to Collapse Testing	210
I.2	Order of Cutting Specimens from Test Pipe	211
I.3	Example of Preparation of Residual Stress Correction Curve	212
Tables		
1	Example Calculations: Yield in the Absence of Bending and Torsion	19
2	Suggested Values for Hardening Index in Ductile Rupture Equation	21
3	Example Calculations: Ductile Rupture of an End-capped Pipe	28
4	Example Calculations: Ductile Rupture for a Given True Axial Load	29
5	Yield Collapse Pressure Equation Range	31
6	Equation Factors and D/t Range for Plastic Collapse	33
7	Equation Factors and D/t Range for Transition Collapse	34
8	D/t Range for Elastic Collapse	35
9	Example Calculation: Collapse Resistance with Internal Pressure and Tension	38
10	Casing and Tubing Flattening Tests: Distance between Plates	70
11	Line Pipe Flattening Tests: Distance between Plates	70
12	Factors for Test Pressure Equations	72
13	Values of Strain for Guided Bend Test	74
14	Standard Values for Dimension A_{gbtj} in Guided Bend Test	75
15	Critical Thickness of Various API Couplings	76
16	Calculated Couplings Blank Thickness for API Couplings	77
17	Transverse Impact Specimen Size Required for API Couplings	78
18	Longitudinal Impact Specimen Size Required for API Couplings	79
19	Minimum Size Transverse Charpy Impact Test Specimens for Various API Couplings	81
20	Minimum Size Longitudinal Charpy Impact Test Specimens for API Couplings for All Pipe Less Than Label 1: 3-1/2 Outside Diameter and for Larger Sizes Where Transverse Test Specimens One-Half Size or Larger Are Not Possible	81
B.1	Equations for Rating a Pipe Body for Internal Pressure Resistance	96
B.2	Suggested Values for Hardening Index in Ductile Rupture Equation	99

Contents

B.3	Values of n Used to Evaluate the Klever-Stewart Model	106
B.4	Comparison of Rupture Predictions for Candidate Models	108
B.5	Illustration of Equation Performance over Population	109
B.6	Statistical Evaluation of Klever-Stewart Rupture Model for All Data	110
B.7	Comparison of Rupture Equation (B.6) and Necking Equation (B.18) with Shell Mini-pipe [12] Test Data at Axial Tension Exceeding the Capped-end Load (Italic Numbers for p_i/p_{uts} Are Considered Given)	116
B.8	Comparison of Rupture Equation and Test Data at Zero Axial Tension, Ring Tests	116
B.9	Typical J_{1C} Values	119
D.1	Values of G_0 to G_4 for FAD Curve	139
E.1	Yield Collapse Pressure Equation Range	144
E.2	Equation Factors and D/t Range for Plastic Collapse	146
E.3	Equation Factors and D/t Range for Transition Collapse	148
E.4	D/t Range for Elastic Collapse	149
E.5	Average Plastic Collapse Pressure Regression Equations	151
E.6	Minimum Plastic Collapse Equations for Grades K, N, and P	152
E.7	Plastic Collapse Equation Factors for Grades K, N, and P	153
E.8	Plastic Collapse Equation Factors for Grades K, N, and P as Calculated	153
E.9	Tolerance Limit C_c to Be Subtracted from Average Collapse Equations to Convert to a Minimum Base	154
F.1	Comparison of Design Collapse Strengths	159
F.2	Predictive Accuracies (Q&T Only)	160
F.3	Production Quality Data (API Survey Only)—Yield Stress	167
F.4	Production Quality Data (All Datasets)—Other Variables	169
F.5	Development of PDFs for Potentially Governing Cases	173
F.6	Average Predicted Failure Probability for API 5C3 [2] (Seamless L80)	180
F.7	Summary of Probabilistic Data	182
F.8	Down-rating Factors	183
F.9	Values of $H_{t_{des}}$ and $k_{y_{des}}$	189
F.10	Iteration for p_o	191
G.1	Dataset Size Factor F (TRL = 0.5 %)	193
H.1	Data Representativeness	196
H.2	Probability Data—Large Datasets	198
H.3	Probability Data—Small Datasets	199
H.4	Input Variable PDFs (Bias and COV Format)	201
H.5	Input Variable PDFs (Mean and SD Format, 9-5/8 in. 47 lb/ft P110 HRS)	202
H.6	Case-specific Calibration for Mill FD00 (9-5/8 in. 47 lb/ft P110 HRS)—Large Datasets	202
H.7	Iteration for D/t	203
H.8	D/t for Each Dataspace Position	203
H.9	Nominal Loads	204
H.10	Mill-specific Design Ratings	205
H.11	Random Realizations of PDF Parameters (9-5/8 in. 47 lb/ft P110 HRS)	206
H.12	Sampling Uncertainties	206
H.13	Predicted Failure Probability for Each Realization ($L_{nom} = 5960$ psi)	207
H.14	Case-specific Calibration for Mill FD00 (9-5/8 in. 47 lb/ft P110 HRS)—Small Datasets	208
I.1	Format for Reporting Collapse Test Data	213
K.1	Performance Property Calculations—External and Internal Pressure for Casing (SI Units)	226
K.2	Performance Property Calculations—Interface Pressure of Casing Connections (SI Units)	260

Contents

K.3 Performance Property Calculations—Axial Tension of Casing Pipe Body and Connections (SI Units)	261
K.4 Performance Property Calculations—External and Internal Pressure for Tubing (SI Units)	278
K.5 Performance Property Calculations—Axial Tension for Tubing Pipe Body and Connections (SI Units)	294
L.1 Performance Property Calculations—External and Internal Pressure for Casing (USC Units)	304
L.2 Performance Property Calculations—Interface Pressure of Casing Connections (USC Units)	338
L.3 Performance Property Calculations—Axial Tension of Casing Pipe Body and Connections (USC Units)	339
L.4 Performance Property Calculations—External and Internal Pressure for Tubing (USC Units)	356
L.5 Performance Property Calculations—Axial Tension for Tubing Pipe Body and Connections (USC Units)	372

Introduction

Performance design of tubulars for the petroleum and natural gas industries, whether it is formulated by deterministic or probabilistic calculations, compares anticipated loads to which the tubular may be subjected to the anticipated resistance of the tubular to each load. Either or both the load and resistance may be modified by a design factor.

Both deterministic and probabilistic (synthesis method) approaches to performance properties are addressed in this technical report. The deterministic approach uses specific geometric and material property values to calculate a single performance property value. The synthesis method treats the same variables as random and thus arrives at a statistical distribution of a performance property. A performance distribution in combination with a defined lower percentile determines the final design equation.

Both the well design process itself and the definition of anticipated loads are currently outside the scope of standardization for the petroleum and natural gas industries. Neither of these aspects is addressed in this technical report. Rather, this text serves to identify useful equations for obtaining the resistance of a tubular to specified loads, independent of their origin. This technical report provides limit state equations (see annexes) that are useful for determining the resistance of an individual sample whose geometry and material properties are given, and design equations that are useful for well design based on conservative geometric and material parameters.

Whenever possible, decisions on specific constants to use in a design equation are left to the discretion of the user.

Calculating Performance Properties of Pipe Used as Casing or Tubing

1 Scope

This technical report illustrates the equations and templates necessary to calculate the various pipe properties, including the following:

- pipe performance properties, such as axial strength, internal pressure resistance, and collapse resistance;
- minimum physical properties;
- product assembly force (torque);
- product test pressures;
- critical product dimensions related to testing criteria;
- critical dimensions of testing equipment;
- critical dimensions of test samples.

For equations related to performance properties, extensive background information is also provided regarding their development and use.

Equations presented here are intended for use with pipe manufactured in accordance with API 5CT or ISO 11960, API 5DP or ISO 11961, and API 5L or ISO 3183, as applicable. These equations and templates may be extended to other pipe with due caution. Pipe cold-worked during production is included in the scope of this technical report (e.g. cold rotary straightened [CRS] pipe). Pipe modified by cold working after production, such as expandable tubulars and coiled tubing, is beyond the scope of this technical report.

Application of performance property equations in this technical report to line pipe and other pipe is restricted to their use as casing/tubing in a well or laboratory test, and requires due caution to match the heat-treat process, straightening process, yield strength, and so forth, with the closest appropriate casing/tubing product. Similar caution should be exercised when using the performance equations for drill pipe or for collapse of cold-expanded API 5L pipe.

This technical report and the equations contained herein relate the input pipe manufacturing parameters in API 5CT or ISO 11960, API 5DP or ISO 11961, and API 5L or ISO 3183 to expected pipe performance. The design equations in this technical report are not to be understood as a manufacturing warrantee. Manufacturers are typically licensed to produce tubular products in accordance with manufacturing specifications that control the dimensions and physical properties of their product. Design equations, on the other hand, are a reference point for users to characterize tubular performance and begin their own well design or research of pipe input properties.

This technical report is not a design code. It only provides equations and templates for calculating the properties of tubulars intended for use in downhole applications. This technical report does not provide any guidance about loads that can be encountered by tubulars or about safety margins needed for acceptable design. Users are responsible for defining appropriate design loads and selecting adequate safety factors to develop safe and efficient designs. The design loads and safety factors will likely be selected based on historical practice, local regulatory requirements, and specific well conditions.