

Integrity Data Management and Integration

API BULLETIN 1178
FIRST EDITION, NOVEMBER 2017



AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE

Special Notes

American Petroleum Institute (API) publications necessarily address problems of a general nature. With respect to particular circumstances, local, state, and federal laws and regulations should be reviewed.

Neither API nor any of API's employees, subcontractors, consultants, committees, or other assignees make any warranty or representation, either express or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained herein or assume any liability or responsibility for any use, or the results of such use, of any information or process disclosed in this publication. Neither API nor any of API's employees, subcontractors, consultants, or other assignees represent that use of this publication would not infringe upon privately owned rights.

Classified areas may vary depending on the location, conditions, equipment, and substances involved in any given situation. Users of this standard should consult with the appropriate authorities having jurisdiction.

Users of this standard should not rely exclusively on the information contained in this standard. Sound business, scientific, engineering, and safety judgment should be used in employing the information contained herein. API is not undertaking to meet the duties of employers, service providers, or suppliers to warn and properly train and equip their employees, and others exposed, concerning health and safety risks and precautions, nor undertaking their obligations to comply with authorities having jurisdiction.

Information concerning safety and health risks and proper precautions with respect to particular materials and conditions should be obtained from the employer, the service provider or supplier of that material, or the safety datasheet.

API publications may be used by anyone desiring to do so. Every effort has been made by API to assure the accuracy and reliability of the data contained in them; however, the API makes no representation, warranty, or guarantee in connection with this publication and hereby expressly disclaims any liability or responsibility for loss or damage resulting from its use or for the violation of any authorities having jurisdiction with which this publication may conflict.

API publications are published to facilitate the broad availability of proven and sound engineering and operating practices. These publications are not intended to obviate the need for applying sound engineering judgment regarding when and where these publications should be utilized. The formulation and publication of API publications is not intended in any way to inhibit anyone from using any other practices.

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher. Contact the Publisher, API Publishing Services, 1220 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005.

Copyright © 2017 American Petroleum Institute

Foreword

Nothing contained in any API publication is to be construed as granting any right, by implication or otherwise, for the manufacture, sale, or use of any method, apparatus, or product covered by letters patent. Neither should anything contained in the publication be construed as insuring anyone against liability for infringement of letters patent.

The verbal forms used to express the provisions in this document are as follows.

Shall: As used in a standard, “shall” denotes a minimum requirement in order to conform to the standard.

Should: As used in a standard, “should” denotes a recommendation or that which is advised but not required in order to conform to the standard.

May: As used in a standard, “may” denotes a course of action permissible within the limits of a standard.

Can: As used in a standard, “can” denotes a statement of possibility or capability.

This document was produced under API standardization procedures that ensure appropriate notification and participation in the developmental process and is designated as an API standard. Questions concerning the interpretation of the content of this publication or comments and questions concerning the procedures under which this publication was developed should be directed in writing to the Director of Standards, American Petroleum Institute, 1220 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005. Requests for permission to reproduce or translate all or any part of the material published herein should also be addressed to the director.

Generally, API standards are reviewed and revised, reaffirmed, or withdrawn at least every five years. A one-time extension of up to two years may be added to this review cycle. Status of the publication can be ascertained from the API Standards Department, telephone (202) 682-8000. A catalog of API publications and materials is published annually by API, 1220 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005.

Suggested revisions are invited and should be submitted to the Standards Department, API, 1220 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005, standards@api.org.

Contents

	Page
1	Scope 1
2	Normative References 1
3	Abbreviations 1
4	Benefits to an Enterprise Data Management System 3
5	Data Quality Oversight 4
5.1	General 4
5.2	Objectives 4
5.3	Strategies and Policies 5
5.4	Data Governance 5
5.5	Data Quality Assessment 7
6	Transforming SME Knowledge into Data 7
7	Data Models 8
8	GPS Coordinates 8
8.1	General 8
8.2	Coordinate Nomenclature 9
8.3	Datum Selection 9
8.4	Accuracy 9
8.5	Base Station Elevation 9
9	Alignment for the Purpose of Pipeline Integrity 10
9.1	General 10
9.2	Linear Referencing 10
9.3	Weld Alignment 10
9.4	Centerline 10
9.5	Absolute Referencing 10
9.6	Axial Position and Extent 11
9.7	Circumferential Position 11
10	Sources of Measurement Error 11
10.1	Spatial Error 11
10.2	Severity Error 12
10.3	Confidence Interval of the Error 12
11	Management of Change 12
11.1	General 12
11.2	New Data Relates to Old Data 12
11.3	Accessing Historical Data 13
11.4	Rerouting (Centerline Swap) 13
11.5	Moving Fit Points 13
11.6	Data Reconciliation 14
12	ILI Life Cycle 14
12.1	General 14
12.2	General Reporting Requirements 14
12.3	Data Quality Letter and Preliminary Report 14
12.4	Immediate Responses 15
12.5	ILI Final Report Format 15

Contents

	Page
12.6	Quality Assurance of Final Report before Acceptance 16
12.7	Anomaly Assessment. 16
12.8	Excavation Program 19
12.9	Provide Correlation Results to ILI Vendor 20
12.10	Program Closeout and Establishment of Reassessment Intervals 20
13	Execution of Digs/Field Data Collection. 21
13.1	Pre-dig Information. 21
13.2	In-ditch Data Collection 24
14	As-built Asset Integration 30
14.1	General Data Requirements. 30
14.2	GPS Survey 31
14.3	Data Collection 31
14.4	Virtual Pipeline Creation 32
14.5	Data Storage 32
14.6	Continuity of Linear Referencing Schema. 33
14.7	Baseline In-line Inspection 33
14.8	Baseline Indirect Assessments. 34
15	Over-the-Line Surveys (Indirect Assessments) 34
15.1	General. 34
15.2	Alignment. 34
16	Operational Data 35
17	Reporting and Data Mining 36
17.1	General. 36
17.2	Data Integration/Analysis. 36
17.3	Data Integration and Analysis Output 37
17.4	Integrity Metrics 37
	Annex A (informative) Data Integration and Interpretation Report 38
	Annex B (informative) Representative Data Listing. 50
	Bibliography 53
Figures	
1	Schematic of Relevant Excavation Site Information 26
2	Examples of Common Feature Locations 35
Tables	
1	Typical Location and Correlation Work Package Contents. 23
2	Guidelines for Photographs 27
A.1	Threat Matrix and Interpretive/QC Methodologies 40

Integrity Data Management and Integration

1 Scope

This bulletin provides a compendium of methodologies and considerations for integrating the underlying data used to support integrity management. Any one approach, let alone the entirety of the document, may not be appropriate or applicable in all circumstances. The document reviews possible approaches for consideration by operators in the context of their specific circumstances.

The primary focus of this bulletin is the methodologies and processes used to spatially integrate and normalize the data to support the application of comparative techniques used in interpreting integrity data, with particular emphasis on in-line inspection (ILI) data. The document begins with a discussion of general data-quality processes, goals, and considerations such that data quality approaches can be considered in the context of the data integration processes.

An impediment to informed integrity decisions is the inability to efficiently review a broad spectrum of data in a format that has been normalized and spatially aligned. With the variations in organizational structures, integrity management programs, and technologies used across the pipeline sector, individual operators design data integration procedures that are customized to their organizational structure, processes, and pipeline systems.

Properly managed and integrated data support agile analytics to integrate new data as they become available and to recognize coincident events and patterns. The data source may be from within an organization, or may be external to the company, as in the case of representative data based on industry experience or manufacturing processes. The intent is to empower operators to efficiently analyze and integrate threat- and integrity-related data to support their integrity management programs.

2 Normative References

The following referenced documents are indispensable for the application of this document. For dated references, only the edition cited applies. For undated references, the latest edition of the referenced document applies (including any addenda/errata).

API RP 1160, *Managing System Integrity for Hazardous Liquid Pipelines*

API RP 1163, *In-Line Inspection Systems Qualification*

API RP 1173, *Pipeline Safety Management Systems*

API RP 1176, *Recommended Practice for Assessment and Management of Cracking in Pipelines*

3 Abbreviations

AC	alternating current
ACVG	alternating current voltage gradient
BSEE	Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement
CFR	<i>Code of Federal Regulations</i>
CIS	close interval survey

CP	cathodic protection
DA	direct assessment
DCVG	direct current voltage gradient
DMA	discrete metal loss anomaly
DOC	depth of cover
ECDA	external corrosion direct assessment
ERF	estimated repair factor
EXT	external
FPR	failed pressure ratio
GIS	geographic information system
GPS	global positioning system
HCA	high consequence area
HDD	horizontal directional drill
ILI	in-line inspection
IMU	inertial mapping unit
INT	internal
IT	information technology
MAOP	maximum allowable operating pressure
MFL	magnetic flux leakage
MIC	microbiologically influenced corrosion
ML	metal loss
MOC	management of change
MOP	maximum operating pressure
MPI	magnetic particle inspection
MTR	mill test report
NAD27	North American Datum of 1927
NAD83	North American Datum of 1983
NDE	nondestructive examination

OD	outside diameter
POD	probability of detection
PODS	Pipeline Open Data Standard
POI	probability of identification
ROW	right-of-way
RPR	rupture pressure ratio
RTK	real time kinematic
SCC	stress corrosion cracking
SME	subject matter expert
SMYS	specified minimum yield strength
TDC	top dead center
TPD	third party damage
TQM	total quality management
UT	ultrasonic testing
WB	wrinkle bend
WGS84	World Geodetic System 1984

4 Benefits to an Enterprise Data Management System

Managing pipeline integrity data historically involved the rather manual process of populating data within spreadsheets or disparate databases. Transitioning to an enterprise database to manage large pipeline integrity data sets provides an operator with several advantages, including the following:

- Improved auditing and traceability: When spreadsheets are created, the logic and judgment that is applied while an individual is manipulating data is not captured, or easily understood. In most cases, this logic exists only in the mind of the individual who created the spreadsheet, which may result in compliance risk.
- Improved tracking of data corrections: Propagating corrections to data errors across multiple dependent spreadsheets, or back to the original data sources, is difficult and may potentially introduce further errors.
- Improved safeguards against human error: Human errors, such as versioning errors and corruption errors, can compromise the integrity of data entry. Databases and their associated graphical interfaces facilitate the implementation of quality rules and constraints that mitigate the potential for human error.
- Improved resource utilization: Databases may provide improved efficiency over data management that uses disparate spreadsheets.