

# Guidelines for the assessment of corrosion threats in risk-based inspection



This is a preview. [Click here to purchase the full publication.](#)

GUIDELINES FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF CORROSION  
THREATS IN RISK-BASED INSPECTION

1<sup>st</sup> edition

November 2019

Published by

**Energy Institute, London**

The Energy Institute is a professional membership body incorporated by Royal Charter 2003  
Registered charity number 1097899

[This is a preview. Click here to purchase the full publication.](#)

The Energy Institute (EI) is the chartered professional membership body for the energy industry, supporting over 20 000 individuals working in or studying energy and 250 energy companies worldwide. The EI provides learning and networking opportunities to support professional development, as well as professional recognition and technical and scientific knowledge resources on energy in all its forms and applications.

The EI's purpose is to develop and disseminate knowledge, skills and good practice towards a safe, secure and sustainable energy system. In fulfilling this mission, the EI addresses the depth and breadth of the energy sector, from fuels and fuels distribution to health and safety, sustainability and the environment. It also informs policy by providing a platform for debate and scientifically-sound information on energy issues.

The EI is licensed by:

- the Engineering Council to award Chartered, Incorporated and Engineering Technician status, and
- the Society for the Environment to award Chartered Environmentalist status.

It also offers its own Chartered Energy Engineer, Chartered Petroleum Engineer, and Chartered Energy Manager titles.

A registered charity, the EI serves society with independence, professionalism and a wealth of expertise in all energy matters.

This publication has been produced as a result of work carried out within the Technical Team of the EI, funded by the EI's Technical Partners. The EI's Technical Work Programme provides industry with cost-effective, value-adding knowledge on key current and future issues affecting those operating in the energy sector, both in the UK and internationally.

For further information, please visit [energyinst.org](http://energyinst.org)

The EI gratefully acknowledges the financial contributions towards the scientific and technical programme from the following companies

BP Exploration Operating Co Ltd	Qatar Petroleum
BP Oil UK Ltd	Repsol Sinopec
Centrica	RWE npower
Chevron North Sea Ltd	Saudi Aramco
Chevron Products Company	Scottish Power
Chrysaor	SGS
CLH	Shell UK Oil Products Limited
ConocoPhillips Ltd	Shell U.K. Exploration and Production Ltd
DCC Energy	SSE
EDF Energy	TAQA Bratani
ENI	Total E&P UK Limited
E. ON UK	Total UK Limited
Equinor	Tullow Oil
ExxonMobil International Ltd	Uniper
Innogy	Valero
Kuwait Petroleum International Ltd	Vattenfall
Nexen CNOOC	Vitol Energy
Ørsted	Woodside
Perenco	World Fuel Services
Phillips 66	

However, it should be noted that the above organisations have not all been directly involved in the development of this publication, nor do they necessarily endorse its content.

Copyright © 2019 by the Energy Institute, London.

The Energy Institute is a professional membership body incorporated by Royal Charter 2003.

Registered charity number 1097899, England

All rights reserved

No part of this book may be reproduced by any means, or transmitted or translated into a machine language without the written permission of the publisher.

ISBN 978 1 78725 141 0

Published by the Energy Institute

The information contained in this publication is provided for general information purposes only. Whilst the Energy Institute and the contributors have applied reasonable care in developing this publication, no representations or warranties, express or implied, are made by the Energy Institute or any of the contributors concerning the applicability, suitability, accuracy or completeness of the information contained herein and the Energy Institute and the contributors accept no responsibility whatsoever for the use of this information. Neither the Energy Institute nor any of the contributors shall be liable in any way for any liability, loss, cost or damage incurred as a result of the receipt or use of the information contained herein.

Hard copy and electronic access to EI and IP publications is available via our website, [publishing.energyinst.org](http://publishing.energyinst.org).

Documents can be purchased online as downloadable pdfs or on an annual subscription for single users and companies.

For more information, contact the EI Publications Team.

e: [pubs@energyinst.org](mailto:pubs@energyinst.org)

This is a preview. [Click here to purchase the full publication.](#)

## CONTENTS

	Page
<b>Foreword</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>10</b>
1.1 Scope .....	10
1.2 Application .....	11
<b>2 Where to find CTA guidance</b> .....	<b>12</b>
2.1 Public domain .....	12
2.2 Industry .....	13
<b>3 The role of CTA in corrosion management</b> .....	<b>14</b>
3.1 General requirements .....	14
3.2 Periodic update .....	14
3.2.1 Performance measurement .....	14
3.2.2 Risk visibility .....	15
3.2.3 Optimising field activities .....	16
<b>4 CTA and the different stages of a corrosion management scheme</b> .....	<b>17</b>
4.1 Workflow and stages in the corrosion management scheme .....	17
4.2 CMS Step 1 – Define CTA method and assessment rules .....	18
4.2.1 Identify potential threats .....	18
4.2.2 Identify a risk table .....	18
4.2.3 Create probability of failure (PoF) assessment rules .....	18
4.2.4 Define corrosion circuit philosophy .....	19
4.2.5 Threat morphology and hole size guidance .....	19
4.2.6 Inspection effectiveness guidance .....	19
4.2.7 Remaining life assessment guidance .....	20
4.2.8 Time-based failure pattern or wear out mode guidance .....	20
4.2.9 Set strategies for different corrosion threats .....	22
4.2.10 CTA guidance maintenance .....	22
4.3 CMS Step 2 – Asset inventory build .....	23
4.3.1 Electronic piping line list and isometric requirements .....	23
4.3.2 Group piping into corrosion circuits and assign to systems .....	24
4.3.3 Define systems, create system PFD overviews .....	25
4.3.4 Assign vessels to corrosion circuits and systems .....	25
4.3.5 Pipeline and topsides equipment boundaries .....	26
4.3.6 Valves .....	26
4.3.7 Fixed and rotating equipment boundaries .....	27
4.3.8 Bolting and instrumentation and compression fittings .....	27
4.3.9 Data management complexities .....	28
4.3.10 Data management – databases versus spreadsheet .....	29
4.3.11 Maintenance Management Databases (MMDs) .....	30
4.3.12 Management of change .....	30
4.4 CMS Step 3 – Assess consequence of failure (CoF) .....	31
4.4.1 Assign high level data to equipment .....	31
4.4.2 Assess CoF and assign criticality .....	32

**Contents continued**

	<b>Page</b>
4.4.3	Maintenance-only regimes . . . . . 32
4.4.4	When basic PoF assessment is needed prior to CoF evaluation . . . . . 33
4.4.5	Maintenance-critical integrity assurance activities . . . . . 33
4.5	CMS Step 4 – Corrosion threat assessment – Assess probability of failure (PoF) . . . 33
4.5.1	Collect and review relevant input data . . . . . 33
4.5.2	Set expectations for level of detail of assessment . . . . . 36
4.5.3	Checklist for a high detail approach . . . . . 36
4.5.4	Assign key design, process and operations data . . . . . 37
4.5.5	Degree of wetting . . . . . 38
4.5.6	Identify credible threats and barriers. . . . . 38
4.5.7	Review of leaks, anomalies and KPI/IOW excursions . . . . . 40
4.5.8	Review of inspection data . . . . . 40
4.5.9	Inspection errors . . . . . 41
4.5.10	Evaluate PoF. . . . . 41
4.6	CMS Step 5 – Display risk . . . . . 42
4.6.1	PoF × CoF = Risk . . . . . 42
4.6.2	Identify maintenance only equipment. . . . . 42
4.6.3	Confidence based adjustment of risk . . . . . 43
4.7	CMS Step 6 – Set up primary assurance strategies for each threat . . . . . 43
4.7.1	Risk-Based Inspection (RBI) – create WSoE and set intervals . . . . . 43
4.7.2	RBI – select inspection effectiveness . . . . . 45
4.7.3	RBI – work pack preparation . . . . . 46
4.7.4	RBI – mechanical threats . . . . . 46
4.7.5	RBI – dedicated campaigns. . . . . 46
4.7.6	RBI – vessel entry versus NII . . . . . 46
4.7.7	KPI/IOW monitoring – good practice . . . . . 48
4.7.8	KPI/IOW monitoring – example KPI inputs for different threats . . . . . 49
4.7.9	Project work. . . . . 51
4.8	CMS Step 7 – Implement assurance strategies . . . . . 51
4.8.1	General . . . . . 51
4.8.2	Inspection reporting . . . . . 52
4.9	CMS Step 8 – Feedback – Review and update . . . . . 52
4.9.1	External industry alerts and networking . . . . . 52
4.9.2	Unexpected degradation . . . . . 53
4.9.3	Planned MoC . . . . . 53
4.9.4	Major/planned periodic or ad hoc inspection . . . . . 53
4.9.5	Major excursions of KPI/IOWs. . . . . 53
<b>5</b>	<b>Who performs CTA and resource norms . . . . . 54</b>
<b>Annexes</b>	
<b>Annex A</b>	<b>Credible corrosion threats in upstream systems . . . . . 55</b>
<b>Annex B</b>	<b>Carbon steel corrosion threat mechanisms and primary assurance strategies. . . 66</b>
<b>Annex C</b>	<b>Carbon steel corrosion threat morphology and most probable release size. . 73</b>

---

**Contents continued**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Annex D Corrosion resistant alloy corrosion threat mechanisms and primary assurance strategies. ....</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>Annex E Corrosion resistant alloys corrosion threat morphology and most release size scenarios. ....</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>Annex F Geometry related issues applicable to multiple threats . ....</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>Annex G Probability of failure assessment criteria examples . ....</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>Annex H PoF assessment practical examples demonstrate how the PoF method can fail or succeed in pre-empting failures . ....</b>	<b>115</b>
H.1 Example 1 . ....	115
H.2 Example 2 . ....	115
H.3 Example 3 . ....	116
H.4 Example 4 . ....	116
<b>Annex I Condition assessment PoF criteria . ....</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>Annex J Inspection effectiveness example. ....</b>	<b>119</b>
<b>Annex K CTA/RBI Assessment examples for pipework and vessel item . ....</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>Annex L Glossary. ....</b>	<b>128</b>
L.1 Corrosion threat assessment . ....	128
L.2 Abbreviations. ....	136
<b>Annex N References. ....</b>	<b>138</b>

## LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

<b>Figures</b>	<b>Page</b>
Figure 1	Internal condition of risers within caissons highlighted with risk colours . . . . . 16
Figure 2	CTA and the different stages of the Corrosion Management Scheme . . . . . 17
Figure 3	Illustration of corrosion threat wear-out modes . . . . . 21
Figure 4	CTA typical inputs and outputs with blue boxes representing assessment of PoF . . . 35
Figure 5	Example risk matrix superimposed with inspection factor aligned with risk to determine inspection frequencies from remnant life . . . . . 45
Figure 6	Simple example of risk-based guidance on NII versus intrusive examination . . . . . 47
Figure 7	Typical bulk topsides and non-flexible pipelines materials selection . . . . . 66
<b>Tables</b>	
Table 1	Example of criticality approach to guide CTA/CMS requirements . . . . . 32
Table A.1	Credible corrosion threats in upstream systems . . . . . 56
Table B.1	Carbon Steel corrosion threat mechanisms and primary assurance strategies . . . . . 68
Table C.1	Carbon Steel corrosion threat morphology and most probable release size . . . . . 74
Table D.1	Corrosion resistant alloy corrosion threat mechanisms and primary assurance strategies . . . . . 78
Table E.1	Corrosion resistant alloys corrosion threat morphology and most release size scenarios . . . . . 87
Table F.1	Geometry related issues applicable to multiple threats . . . . . 90
Table G.1	Example of barrier effectiveness colour coding . . . . . 95
Table G.2	Carbon steel – Internal – CO <sub>2</sub> /H <sub>2</sub> S Corrosion – Probability of Failure (PoF) no barriers . . . . . 96
Table G.3	Carbon steel – Internal – CO <sub>2</sub> /H <sub>2</sub> S Corrosion – Probability of Failure (PoF) Material Barrier Adjustment . . . . . 97
Table G.4	Carbon steel – Internal – CO <sub>2</sub> /H <sub>2</sub> S Corrosion – Probability of Failure (PoF) Chemical Barrier Adjustment . . . . . 98
Table G.5	Carbon steel – Internal – CO <sub>2</sub> /H <sub>2</sub> S Corrosion – Probability of Failure (PoF) Coating Barrier Adjustment . . . . . 99
Table G.6	Carbon Steel – Internal – CO <sub>2</sub> /H <sub>2</sub> S Corrosion – Probability of Failure (PoF) Process Barrier Adjustment . . . . . 100
Table G.7	Carbon steel – Internal – CO <sub>2</sub> /H <sub>2</sub> S Corrosion – Probability of Failure (PoF) IC Barrier Adjustment . . . . . 101
Table G.8	Carbon steel – Internal – CO <sub>2</sub> /H <sub>2</sub> S Corrosion – Corrosion Prediction Guidance . . . . . 102
Table G.9	Carbon steel – Internal – Sulfide Stress Corrosion Cracking (SSCC) – Probability of Failure (PoF) no barriers . . . . . 104
Table G.10	Carbon steel – Internal – Sulfide Stress Corrosion Cracking (SSCC) – (PoF) All Barrier Adjustments . . . . . 105
Table G.11	Carbon steel – Internal – Sulfide Stress Corrosion Cracking (SSCC) – (PoF) Notes for Use of PoF Tables . . . . . 107
Table G.12	Carbon steel – Internal – Sulfide Hydrogen Induced Cracking (HIC) – Probability of Failure (PoF) no barriers . . . . . 108
Table G.13	Carbon steel – Internal – Sulfide Hydrogen Induced Cracking (HIC) – Probability of Failure (PoF) All barriers . . . . . 109
Table G.14	Carbon steel – External – Corrosion Under Insulation (CUI) – Probability of Failure (PoF) no barriers . . . . . 110

**List of figures and tables continued**

	<b>Page</b>
Table G.15 Carbon steel – External – Corrosion Under Insulation (CUI) – Notes for Use of PoF Tables . . . . .	113
Table I.1 Example of integrity status (condition) PoF assessment criteria . . . . .	117
Table I.2 Example of integrity status (condition) PoF assessment and system summary diagram . . . . .	118
Table J.1 Inspection effectiveness example . . . . .	120
Table K.1 CTA/RBI assessment documentation examples . . . . .	127
Table L.1 Examples of PoF definitions which define corrosion threat PoF assessment criteria. . . . .	131



# 1 INTRODUCTION

The importance of corrosion management is represented in the EI *Guidance for corrosion management in oil and gas production and processing*. This document provides more detailed information to help the upstream oil and gas industry align on good practice for CTA to direct RBI and other corrosion management activities. It is consistent with key available public domain guidance but emphasises important factors for success with reference to North Sea experience.

The purpose of CTA is to assess and document material degradation/corrosion threats against equipment items, ensuring that corrosion management activities such as inspection and monitoring activities are aligned with risk. Understanding equipment condition provides visibility of risk, enabling targeted programmes of work to be delivered, which has significant benefits, particularly in a constrained operating climate.

Detailed definitions representing key concepts and terminologies for CTA are provided in the glossary section of this document and are recommended pre-reading before using this document.

## 1.1 SCOPE

The scope of this document was determined by an EI Steering Group comprising experienced corrosion and integrity technical professionals. It covers the full complement of criteria that can be used to assess corrosion threats specific to upstream oil and gas production and processing equipment, including offshore fixed and rotating pressure systems equipment, utilities systems, pipelines and structures.

Threats included in this document are aligned with those included in the Annexes of the revised EI *Guidance for corrosion management in oil and gas production and processing*:

- It covers North Sea or UK Continental shelf marine and temperate coastal environments.
- Includes corrosion threats applicable to gas sweetening and some consideration for H<sub>2</sub>S but not refinery conditions.
- It includes corrosion threats up to a temperature of 300 °C.

The following degradation issues are excluded from this document:

- Thermo-mechanical degradation and equipment primarily affected by this mode of failure, such as flare tips and some components of fired equipment or waste heat recovery units.
- Purely mechanical degradation mechanisms such as fatigue, fretting or overload. Examples are: flexible hose fretting and wear; vibration of high-cycle fatigue; low-cycle fatigue (for example for moving well conductors); U-tube heat exchanger bundle baffle fretting; offshore platform dropped object impact damage, etc.
- Fitness-for-service assessment for equipment cracking or thinning.

Management of temporary repairs and the interface with maintenance and engineering to organise simple like-for-like component replacement are not included in this document. It is, however, considered good practice to manage the above areas in conjunction with the corrosion discipline for the following reasons.

The suitability and performance of temporary repairs can be strongly influenced by corrosion, even if this does not affect the life of the repair material in itself. Corrosion assessment is required for approval of temporary repair types and their monitoring strategies and designated life; for example, relating to damage beneath temporary wraps that could in time extend beyond, or create a hole beneath, the wrap, which some wraps are not designed for at high pressures. This also includes evaluation of the suitability of mechanical pipe connectors in critical service, which must be carefully evaluated due to the potential introduction of internal and external crevices as well as requiring mechanical input to address the ability to tolerate bending or additional loading to hoop stress.

## **1.2 APPLICATION**

This document is intended for anyone who wishes to improve their understanding of CTA, or to gain further knowledge to improve corrosion and integrity management. This document is particularly relevant for:

- corrosion, inspection and integrity engineers;
- integrity managers, and
- engineering disciplines who aim to improve process safety or cumulative risk management.

The good practice outlined in this document can be used to:

- identify audit methods or improvement activities needed to avoid the pitfalls of inaccurate CTA;
- demonstrate good risk visibility, and
- improve the planning of corrosion management activities and eliminate low value work and avoid wasted effort on inspection, anomaly management, maintenance and upgrade projects.

## 2 WHERE TO FIND CTA GUIDANCE

CTA is heavily experience-based, and it is not always possible to obtain required knowledge from public domain books or codes of practice. Companies themselves often generate or collect their own internal information to justify assessment of key threats. This can be difficult for others to access and may even be proprietary.

It can be beneficial for smaller organisations, or those new to the upstream operating environment, to participate in one or more opportunities to formally or informally share information at conferences, or in the form of collaborative partnerships, networking forums and technical committees, whilst keeping up to date with Health and Safety Executive (HSE) safety alerts.

### 2.1 PUBLIC DOMAIN

CTA public domain guidance typically aligns on key principles of CTA.

All guidance is complex and requires simplification work to turn into methods geared for managing upstream operational integrity. There is no previous specific public domain CTA guidance for the upstream industry to share key factors for success based on the experience of upstream operating companies.

Public domain CTA guidance is not easy to locate but is well represented by the following:

- API 580 *Risk-based inspection (RBI)*;
- API 581 *RBI technology*, and
- DNV RP G101 *RBI of offshore topsides static mechanical equipment*.

CTA, or the word corrosion, is not a term used in titles within the above documents but is clearly dealt with under headings such as degradation mechanisms or Probability of Failure (PoF). Although not an exhaustive list, the following documents also provide guidance:

- Norsok M001 *Materials selection* includes requirements for corrosion protection of hydrocarbon production and processing facilities for fixed offshore installations and including subsea production systems. The standard assumes a minimum of 20 years' design life and includes various useful tables listing process condition/material/corrosion barrier combinations representative of general low PoF scenarios.
- EI *Guidance for corrosion management in oil and gas production and processing* deals with corrosion threats and corrosion barrier types in the Annexes in some detail. Each Annex contains information about how to best manage the threats or barrier. The document does not provide detailed guidance for implementation of CTA for RBI and development of chemical and corrosion control key performance indicators (KPIs).

Specific EI guidance documents or HSE website semi-circulars or various published papers can address specific threats.