

Anomaly Detection and Characterization – Issues and R&D Priorities

Government/Industry Pipeline R&D Forum
Working Group No. 3 – Anomaly Detection/Characterization

Mark Stephens
m.stephens@cfertech.com
C-FER Technologies
18 July, 2012
Arlington, VA

The Integrity Management Process

The Approach for Existing Damage

- Find existing damage before it becomes failure critical
- Manage integrity through periodic inspection & selective repair

Key Process Elements and Associated Considerations

- Detect existing defects
 - Detection capability of inspection method
- Size existing defects
 - Sizing accuracy of inspection method
- Assess existing defects at time of detection
 - Accuracy of remaining strength prediction model
 - Uncertainties associated with capacity model inputs
- Assess time to remediation or re-inspection
 - Applicability of adopted growth rate model
 - Uncertainties associated with growth model inputs

Comments on Available Assessment Methods

- Deterministic (e.g. B31G modified)
 - Uncertainties addressed through conservative input selection
 - Desired safety level achieved through safety factor (design factor)
- Semi-probabilistic (e.g. Probability of Exceedance, POE)
 - Some uncertainties explicitly considered in analysis (e.g. feature sizing error)
 - Other uncertainties addressed through conservative inputs
 - Desired safety level achieved through prescribed limit on maximum allowable POE and conservative exceedance criteria (i.e. burst and leak condition)
- Full probabilistic (e.g. Probability of Failure, POF or RBDA)
 - All significant uncertainties explicitly considered in analysis
 - Desired safety level achieved through prescribed limit on maximum allowable POF

All meant to do the same thing → provide a basis for demonstrating fitness for service. Differences lie in the treatment of uncertainties (implicit vs. explicit), the safety margins achieved and the consistency in the achieved safety levels.

Detection

- Desired end point
 - Technologies with high probability of detecting significant features
- Current status
 - High detection probability not always assured and varies with feature type, size, shape and location
 - Technology gaps (i.e. feature types for which detection/identification is potentially problematic)
 - Crack and crack-like features, in proximity to welds in particular (ILI) – the issue is detection
 - SCC features (ILI) – is the issue detection or correct identification?
 - Gouges/cracks/metal loss within dents (ILI) – is the issue detection or correct identification?
- Requirements given current status
 - Detection capability of chosen technology should be understood
 - Standardized procedures to verify/update detection claims (how to correctly interpret dig data)
 - Third party pull test facility for in-line tool performance validation
 - Detection uncertainty should be acknowledged in the integrity assessment
 - Explicit guidance on how best to address within a deterministic or probabilistic analysis

Sizing

- Desired end point
 - Technologies with minimal sizing uncertainty
- Current status
 - Sizing uncertainty is not insignificant and varies with feature type, size and shape
 - Technology gaps (i.e. feature types for which sizing is potentially problematic)
 - Crack and crack-like features, including SCC and long seam features (both ILI and in-ditch)
 - Gouges or cracks or metal loss within dents (ILI)
- Requirements given current status
 - Sizing accuracy of chosen technology should be understood
 - Standardized procedures to verify/update sizing claims (how to correctly interpret dig data)
 - Third party pull test facility for in-line tool performance validation
 - Better in-ditch tools/procedures for sizing cracks and crack-like features
 - Better information on accuracy of in-ditch sizing methods (req'd for API 1163 procedure)
 - Sizing uncertainty should be reflected in the integrity assessment
 - Explicit guidance on how to appropriately and consistently address sizing uncertainty within a deterministic or probabilistic analysis

Remaining Strength Prediction

- Desired end point
 - Accurate strength prediction models with minimal uncertainty
- Current status
 - Accuracy of capacity prediction models varies with feature type
 - Technology gaps (i.e. feature types for which capacity prediction is potentially problematic)
 - Metal loss in high strength pipe / very deep metal loss
 - Real (as opposed to idealized) planar defects (i.e. cracks)
 - Dents with cracks/gouges, dents with metal loss, dents with welds
 - Other combined damage features
- Requirements given current status
 - Accuracy of chosen capacity model should be understood
 - Additional burst test data for feature types identified above
 - Capacity prediction uncertainty should be reflected in the integrity assessment
 - Explicit guidance on how to appropriately and consistently address model uncertainty within a deterministic or probabilistic analysis

Remaining Life Prediction

- Desired end point
 - Remaining life prediction methods with appropriate treatment of inherent uncertainties
- Current status
 - Remaining life prediction highly dependent on growth rate assumptions
 - Technology gaps (i.e. feature types for which growth prediction is potentially problematic)
 - Planar features growing by fatigue (e.g. ERW and other long seam defects)
 - Planar features growing by environmental processes (e.g. SCC)
- Requirements given current status
 - Appropriate methods/models for estimating feature growth should be employed
 - Additional lab/field growth data for feature types identified above
 - Growth rate uncertainty should be reflected in integrity assessment
 - Explicit guidance on how to appropriately and consistently address growth uncertainty within a deterministic or probabilistic analysis