



AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE

API Standard 1163

In-line Inspection Systems Qualification

SECOND EDITION | APRIL 2013 | 79 PAGES | \$131.00 | PRODUCT NO. D11632

This standard covers the use of in-line inspection (ILI) systems for onshore and offshore gas and hazardous liquid pipelines. This includes, but is not limited to, tethered, self-propelled, or free flowing systems for detecting metal loss, cracks, mechanical damage, pipeline geometries, and pipeline location or mapping. The standard applies to both existing and developing technologies.

This standard is an umbrella document that provides performance-based requirements for ILI systems, including procedures, personnel, equipment, and associated software. Nothing in this standard is intended to inhibit the use of inspection systems or engineering solutions that are not covered by the standard. This may be particularly applicable where there is innovative developing technology. Where an alternative is offered, the standard may be used, provided any and all variations from the standard are identified and documented.

For ordering information:

Online: www.api.org/pubs

Phone: 1-800-854-7179
(Toll-free in the U.S. and Canada)

(+1) 303-397-7056
(Local and International)

Fax: (+1) 303-397-2740

API members receive a 30% discount where applicable.

Contents

Page

1	Scope	1
2	Normative References	1
3	Terms, Definitions, and Abbreviations	1
3.1	Terms and Definitions	1
3.2	Abbreviations	12
4	Systems Qualification Process	12
4.1	General	12
4.2	Personnel Qualification	13
4.3	Operator and Service Provider Responsibilities	13
5	In-line Inspection System Selection	13
5.1	General	13
5.2	Inspection Goals and Objectives	14
5.3	Physical and Operational Characteristics and Constraints	14
5.4	Selection of an In-line Inspection System	14
5.5	Performance Specification	15
6	Qualification of Performance Specifications	15
6.1	General	15
6.2	Performance Specifications	15
6.3	Qualification Requirements	23
6.4	Documentation and Other Requirements	25
7	System Operational Verification	26
7.1	General	26
7.2	Project Requirements	26
7.3	Preinspection Requirements	27
7.4	Inspection Requirements	28
7.5	Postinspection Requirements	28
8	System Results Validation	30
8.1	Introduction	30
8.2	Evaluation of System Results	32
8.3	Using Validation Measurements	37
8.4	Conclusions on Using Validation Results	37
8.5	Assessment of In-line Inspection Performance	37
9	Reporting Requirements	37
9.1	General	37
9.2	Report Contents	39
9.3	Reporting Formats	41
9.4	Data Deliverable	42
10	Quality Management System	42
10.1	System Scope	42
10.2	Quality System Documentation	43
10.3	Quality Control	44
10.4	Continual Improvement	45
10.5	Quality System Review	46

Contents

Page

Annex A (informative) Performance Specification Example Template	47
Annex B (informative) Sample On-site Report for Caliper and MFL Inspection Tool Runs	50
Annex C (informative) Estimating the Performance Specifications from a Comparison of Individual Validation Measurements	53
Annex D (informative) Excerpt of API Data Integration Matrix	71
Annex E (informative) Example Validation Dig Documentation	74
Annex F (informative) Example: On-site Feature Location/Verification Activities	76
Bibliography	79

Figures

1 Inspection Terminology	2
2 In-line Inspection Process Flow Diagram	13
3 Dimensional Classes for Metal Loss Indications	17
4 Probability of Detection Function vs Metal Loss Depth	20
5 Overview of Three Levels of ILI Validation	31
6 Inspection Results Verification and Validation Process	33
C.1 Unity Chart Example	57
C.2 Example of Error Plot	59
C.3 Example: Unity Plot of Two Independent Sets of Measurements	62
C.4 Error Plot as a Function of Reported Feature Depth	66
C.5 Unity Plot with a 10 wt % Reporting Threshold Applied to Both ILI and Field Recorded Depth Values	66
E.1 Metal Loss Profile for Interaction Criteria	75
F.1 Feature Location Example	77
F.2 “Gap” Interpolation Example	77

Tables

1 Characterizing Cracking Probabilities of Detection—Depth Detection Threshold	19
2 Characterizing Metal Loss Probabilities of Detection—Proximity to Welds	19
3 Characterizing Cracking Probabilities of Identification	20
A.1 Features and Probabilities of Identification	47
A.2 Example Probabilities of Detection and Sizing Tolerances for Metal Loss (at a Specified Confidence Level)	48
A.3 Direction and Sizing Accuracy for Crack or Crack-like Anomalies	49
A.4 Detection and Sizing Accuracies for Dents and Ovalities	49
A.5 Detection and Sizing Accuracy in 90° Bends	49
A.6 Location Accuracy of Features	49
A.7 Horizontal and Vertical Accuracy of Pipeline Location as a Function of Marker Distance and Certainty	49
C.1 Example: Agreement Test of Two Independent Sets of Measurements	62
D.1 Sample of API Enhanced Data Integration Survey Results	72