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Introduction

- Internal Corrosion cause of 51% [1] of upstream multiphase pipeline failures
- Pitting is a major concern
  - Under Deposit Corrosion
  - Microbe Induced Corrosion
- Need to disrupt deposits
- Improve pig effectiveness
- Improve pigging programs
- Improving pig performance can improve entire mitigation program effectiveness

Mitigating Pit Corrosion (UDC/MIC)

- Disrupt deposits
- Local pit environment
- Improve surfactant efficacy
- Remove Deposits from pit
- Clean to depths of pits
- Get inhibitors to pit bottom
Background Study

- AITF – PICOM Joint Industry Project Phase 1
  - Completed December 2014
  - Evaluation of Pig Design for Deposit Removal from Corrosion Pits
- Test Method and Apparatus
  - 4 Inch Flow Loop (Water), simulated ‘sludge’
  - Measure the depth and volume removed from pits

Results of Background Study [3]

• Evaluation of commercially available pigs
• Brushes are essential to effective pit cleaning
• Brushes did not reach to nominal size
• Effective cleaning to a depth equivalent to only to 25% of Pit Diameter
• Multiple passes provides only a very slight (not statistically significant) cleaning benefit

Improved Pit Cleaning Pig and Method

• Significant room for improvement
• Clear need to improve pit cleaning brushes
  – Improve effective reach into pits
  – Make multiple runs more effective
• Improve pigs and pigging programs
  – Increase pig performance
  – Develop pig that allows for multiple runs
  – Enable pigging in aggressive applications
New Pit Cleaning Brush Design

- Improved brush geometry
- Combination of Radial and Raked Brushes
- Increase brush oversize
- Brush spacing resists debris buildup and pack-off
- Performance testing completed at the 4” AITF Flow Loop
Cleaning Performance
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50% - 70% Improvement

Best AITF JIP Results [3]
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- Concentric rings in false colour image show conical drill point
New Pig Seal Design

- Composite Construction
- Brush/Diaphragm/Brush
  - Brushes = Support
  - Diaphragm = Sealing
- Modular Design
- Reduced pressure differential
  - Pig more often
Pigging with Reduced Differential Pressure

- New Seals reduce Differential Pressure (DP)
- Can select DP for requirements
- Alternative to Urethane
- Modular and easily adapted for aggressive environments
  - Aromatics, Bitumen, H₂S, CO₂, H₂, High Temperatures
Improved Pig for Pit Cleaning

New Pit Cleaning Brush

• Novel brush geometry
• Deep pit cleaning: effective to 37-40% of pit diameter
• Volume cleaning: removes up to 100% of pit deposits
• Performance improves greatly with multiple passes

Multiple Pass Pigging

• Enables improved corrosion pit cleaning – multiple runs
• New seal concept
• Reduced drag and applied differential pressure
• Reduced pigging impact on well production