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UNKOWNs – Loss of Knowledge

Operational Memory loss
Planning for retirement = 40 years
Handover of all knowledge of an asset gathered over 40 years = ?

When the oil price plunges, or bankruptcies = 0
UNKNOWNS – Documentation

Loss of records

Records get lost over time

M&A activity: Transfer of assets, transfer of records

‘According to my records this pipeline is 5 years old’
UNKNOWNs – Pipe Features

- Forgotten thermocouple
- Plug placed in the line

‘Unknowns’ caused by the loss of operational knowledge or records.

The ¾” plug on the left and the Thermo couple caused damage to the cleaning pigs.
3rd party damage or damage during the installation/operations of a pipeline can be a cause of ‘unknowns’

30% dent caused by an anchor

10% dent caused by a ripper on a shallow gas pipeline
UNKOWNNS – Receiving a Damaged Pig

Damaged cleaning pigs or unexpected pressure increases can be a first indication that there is an unknown problem.

Sending a gauge pig through the line can be the next step. Gauge pig indications are not that reliable, don’t tell us geometry or location.
UNKNOWNs – Risk

Low risk tolerance for damaged ILI tools or damage/blockage to the pipeline

Identifying the unknown from the exterior in a subsea environment is unreliable.
Case study 1: 10/12” dual diameter subsea pipeline

Operationally challenging area
Potential for reduction to 8” under the mud line.

1st exploratory run with UT based extra large operating envelope ILI tool.
Collect data in 12” pipeline
Ability to collapse and pass a reduction to 8”

10” reduction identified at the start of the line
Case study 1: 10/12” dual diameter subsea pipeline

✓ Avoided the elevated risk of a 12” gauge pig stalling in the reduction
✓ Identified the ‘unknown’ and converted into a known
✓ Deployed 10/12” dual diameter ILI tool for the inspection run.
✓ Executed low risk combination of runs in a single mobilization
✓ Acquired high quality data for the entire pipeline

10” flange identified below the mudline.
Case study 2: 14-Inch subsea pipeline

- Subsea line, between 2 platforms
- Pipeline ID = 311.14 mm
- Gauge plate OD = 305 mm
- Gap between Gauge plate and pipe wall = 3mm

- Gauge plate indicated a reduction in bore to 255mm
- ILI contractor did not attempt to inspect the pipeline
- Client suspected a reduced bore feature
- Drawings did not indicate a reduction in ID

Steel body BiDi Mandrel gauge pig with brushes

Cup shaped damage could be associated with a 360° reduction. For example a reduced bore valve
Case study 2: 14-Inch subsea pipeline

- An ILI tool was selected with a large ID variation operating envelope.
- Negated the need to identify the perceived reduction in ID
- Lowest risk and cost effective solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measured Pipeline ID (mm)</th>
<th>ILI tool ID range (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>255? 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>311.2 325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The riser pipe had no ID reduction
- Mainline pipe on the seafloor
Ovality was encountered for the entire length on the seabed.

Transition from the platform pipe to the mainline clearly indicates the ovality starting point.
Conclusion

When faced with ‘unknowns’…

Select an ILI tool with a large operating envelope.

Use the most flexible tool on the market
Thank you for your attention. We welcome your questions.
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