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# P&SS Services

## Pipeline
- Flooding
- Cleaning
- Pigging
- Inline Inspection
- Testing
- Integrity

## Process
- Testing
- Flushing & Jetting
- Leak Detection
- Oil Flushing
- Chemical Cleaning
- Drying

### Pre-Commissioning & Maintenance
- Leak Detection
- Dewatering
- Drying
- Purging & Packing
- Umbilical Monitoring & Testing
- Membrane N2
- Purging
- Camera Inspection
- Flange Management
- Controlled Bolting
- Shutdown
- Membrane N2
Latest Generation ILI Technologies

- Cleaning
- Gauging
- Geometry
- Mapping
- MFL
- Crack Detection
- Combos Tools
- Integrity Assessment
Ultrasonic Crack Detection background

For 20 years, ultrasonic (UT) in-line inspection (ILI) tools have played a crucial role in helping operators manage pipeline integrity threats. The predominant ILI applications utilizing UT technology have been for wall loss and crack inspection.

Technological improvements are still required to help operators manage the integrity of an ageing pipeline infrastructure:

- Probability of Detection (POD) / Probability of Identification (POI)
- Detection reliability under different pipeline conditions
- Increased ranges for pipeline operating parameters
- Leveraging synergies from a Combo Wall Measurement-Crack Detection (WM-CD) tool in a single run.
Listing of the types of defects best characterized by a Shear Wave UTCD tool:

- Stress-Corrosion-Cracking (SCC)
- Axial cracking
- Crack-Like defects
- Fatigue cracking
- Hydrogen-Induced-Cracking (HIC)
- Circumferential cracking
Crack-field associated with a dent
Pipeline located in the northeast USA
Stress Corrosion Cracking (SCC)

- Zoomed photo of the crack field

ILI:
- crack-field
- Depth: 40-80 mils

Field:
- crack-field
- Max Depth: 80 mils
An ultrasonic shear wave is propagated in the pipe-wall, by setting the crack sensors at a predetermined angle in the sensor carrier.

In addition a set of compression wave sensors is used to obtain pipe-wall thickness and girthweld information.
New Generation Ultrasonic (UT) Tools

In 2009/2010, Weatherford P&SS commissioned its new generation fleet of ultrasonic wall measurement and crack detection tools. A major design objectives was to address some of the ILI tool limitations identified in a previous slide.

This presentation focuses on reviewing the latest design improvements for the new generation tools and presents a case study on a recent survey conducted on the Adria-Wien Pipeline (AWP).
New Generation Tool Characteristics

- **Previous generation UT tools utilized since 2003**
- **Latest generation (2009) are better adapted for challenging pipeline conditions.** For example, improved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bend passing capability</td>
<td>1.5D versus 3D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability of Detection</td>
<td>POD = 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability of Identification</td>
<td>POI = 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crack Sizing</td>
<td>Depth Ranges Increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance in Challenging Pipelines</td>
<td>Improved SNR; Improved Sensor Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance in Challenging Environments

To achieve a successful operation in challenging environments much attention to prove performance under following conditions:

- Rough internal pipe walls
- Increasing temperature (now -20°C to +70°C)
- product velocity (up to to 2.2 m/s)
- bore restrictions (now 1.5D bend capable)
- product deposits (wax or scale)

Design included development of a Combo Wall Measurement / Crack Detection Tool

- All WM and CD tools ≥ 14” are WM-CD Combo capable
Improved Ultrasonic Transducers

Many CD – WM Combo ultrasonic immersion-type transducers were investigated to ensure improved detection and sizing characteristics for the UT tools.

- High sensitivity – signal is 15-20 dB greater sensitivity
  - Improved signal to noise ratio
  - Improved detection in waxy environments

- Improved transducer focusing
  - Less sensitivity to medium acoustical properties
  - Reduction in signal losses from transducer to medium transition

- Improved operational parameters:
  - Operating pressure up to 200 Bar
  - Temperature range of -20°C to 120°C
Data Processing Software and Sensors

WM sensor echoes comparison: 1mm hard wax deposit (blue) and clean internal surface (magenta)

Leveraging technology to minimize impact of degraded data

WM echoes with 1 mm hard wax deposit (zoomed), feature measurement capability is maintained
New Data Acquisition System

Specifications of the New Generation UT ILI tools are also based on the data acquisition system features:

• Echo-signals processing chain
  • Higher capacity for up-to-date signal processing algorithms
  • Optimum recording levels of inspection data.

• New data acquisition system scalability:
  • Covers diameter ranges required
Data Acquisition System continued…

- To minimize echo-loss:
  - Pulses are processed using a high selectivity matched digital filter
  - Filter criteria is chosen during UT system testing and calibration prior to the inspection run
  - Digital rectifier sharpens max signals peaks
  - A wide dynamic range of the receive path prevents signal saturation
    - Ensures maximum possible SNR

Noisy weak echo signals processed with onboard digital filtering, followed by rectification process for improved detection and signal recording accuracy
iView Data Processing Software

• Data processing software upgraded to improve accuracy of inspection data

• Field trials and pull tests confirmed the quality of data improved from previous Generation ILI tools
  • Increased quality of data for internal surface roughness, and…
  • Heavy oil with high content of wax in pumping medium and inner coating
i-View™ software window

- Pemex SCC Project
- ILI identified crack, confirmed by field verification
Case Study
Adria–Wien Pipeline (AWP) Pipeline

The Adria–Wien Pipeline GmbH

- Main pipeline is 3 sections of 460mm (18”) x 416 kms
- 762 mm (30”) x 4 kms connecting to the Transalpine Pipeline (TAL) system
  - From Würmlach to Schwechat Refinery, Austria
  - Provides oil supplies to Austria from oil terminal in Trieste
  - Improve classification of features and Fitness for Purpose

Pipeline Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Date</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>API 5L X52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Thickness</td>
<td>6.35mm - 9.52 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coating</td>
<td>External Bitumen with fiberglass inlay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inspection History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Inspections</th>
<th>1991, 2000, 2006 and 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ILI Technologies</td>
<td>Geometry, MFL, UT Crack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherford 2010</td>
<td>Crack Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crack Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crack Inspection Field Ops Summary

- Weatherford mobilized its crew from an ILI base in Germany to provide the turnkey service, services included:
  - Pre-inspection cleaning by magnetic and brush scrapers
  - Gauging Pig run
  - UTCD inspection runs
- Field data quality evaluation determined UTCD tool runs were successful.
- From preliminary report, AWP selected 4 verification locations
- The 4 features excavated comprised of 2 cracks, 1 crack-like anomaly and 1 longitudinal weld anomaly.
ILI Verification

- Weatherford provided a verifications specialist to aid AWP personnel in locating, classifying and sizing:
  - All 4 verified locations confirmed the measurements predicted by the ILI tool were within stated tolerances.
    - The probability of detection (crack POD @ 90%) within tolerances
    - Probability of classification within tolerances (POI @ 95% confidence)
    - Sizing within tolerances

- API 579 crack assessment was also performed:
  - Continue to operate with understanding of Remaining Strength Factors for a certain Operating Pressure.
  - Detailed sizing allows operator to monitor defect growth following future inspections.
Below are the results of the ultrasonic crack inspection of the 30” and 18” TAZ1 – US01 pipeline with a total length of 420 km.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cracks</th>
<th>Notches</th>
<th>LW Anomaly</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30” TAZ1 - PS01, 4 km</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18” PS01 – PS06, 169 km</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18” PS06 – PS09, 121.5 km</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18” PS09 – US02, 123 km</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total of Anomalies</strong></td>
<td><strong>880</strong></td>
<td><strong>880</strong></td>
<td><strong>880</strong></td>
<td><strong>880</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Dig Results

The actual versus predicted results of Feature no. 31 and Feature no. 2348 are outlined in the tables below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defect Parameters</th>
<th>ILI Results</th>
<th>Dig verification results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Crack</td>
<td>Crack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>69°</td>
<td>68°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length mm</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal wt in feature area</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum depth mm</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**18” PS01 – PS06,169 km**

**Defect no. 31**

**18” PS09 – US02, 123 km**

**Defect no. 2348**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defect Parameters</th>
<th>ILI Results</th>
<th>Dig verification results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Possible long weld anomaly</td>
<td>linear slag edges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>23°</td>
<td>26°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length mm</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal wt in feature area</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum depth mm</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Excavation Results

- These two tables highlight the predicted versus actual results from 2 anomalies identified on the same pipe joint.

### 18” PS06 – PS09, 121.5 km

**Defect no. 2148**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defect Parameters</th>
<th>ILI Results</th>
<th>Dig verification results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Possible crack</td>
<td>Laminations and crack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>204°</td>
<td>210°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length mm</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal wt in feature area</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum depth mm</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Defect no. 2149**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defect Parameters</th>
<th>ILI Results</th>
<th>Dig verification results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Crack</td>
<td>Laminations and surface cracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>191°</td>
<td>195°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length mm</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal wt in feature area</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum depth mm</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actual Versus Predicted - Anomaly 2148**

**Actual Versus Predicted - Anomaly 2149**
Excavation Results cont…

I–View™ Screenshot of Anomalies 2148 and 2149

Photo of pipe joint - Anomalies 2148 and 2149
Crack Assessment

- Crack assessment calculations
  - Performed in accordance with API 579 methodology (LEVEL 2)
  - Example of a Failure Assessment Diagram (FAD)
    - Defects in red outside the acceptable size for the pipeline section. The defects in red represent those that are > 1 for the Defect Acceptability Factor (DAF) described in API 579 or BS 7910.

Example of FAD diagram, API 579 Level 2
Summary of Results with DAF > 1

Below are the results of Anomalies with a Defect Acceptability Factor (DAF) > 1 according to API 579

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Cracks</th>
<th>Notches</th>
<th>LW Anomaly</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30” TAZ1 - PS01, 4 km</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18” PS01 – PS06, 169 km</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18” PS06 – PS09, 121.5 km</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18” PS09 – US02, 123 km</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total of Anomalies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

- UT CD technology performed well and within specifications
- The projects preparation and planning, tool technology and positive client-vendor collaboration contributed to a successful project.
- In accordance with the vendor’s internal project management indicators:
  - Scope was delivered on time
  - Delivered within budget
  - To the client’s satisfaction.
Thank you!

Questions?

www.weatherford.com/pss