

## Pitfalls in the Typical RBI Methodology for CUI Management Programs

Ahmad Raza Khan Rana

Integrity Products & Supplies Inc.  
188-2121 Premier Way Sherwood Park, Alberta, T8H 0B8 Canada

Joel Chapman

Antea Canada Inc.  
B-203 - 7900 Taschereau Blvd. Brossard  
Quebec, J4X 1C2 - Canada

Syed Umair Niaz Bukhari

Bureau Veritas  
9110 Jumeirah Road, 2<sup>nd</sup> December Street  
Dubai – United Arab Emirates

Touqeer Sohail

Enbridge Pipeline Inc.  
10175 101 St. NW, Edmonton  
Alberta, T5J 0H3 Canada

Graham Brigham

Integrity Products & Supplies Inc.  
188-2121 Premier Way Sherwood Park,  
Alberta, T8H 0B8 Canada

### ABSTRACT

Modern-day risk-based inspection (RBI) platforms are designed to evaluate the safety and/or financial risk of assets using industry-recommended RBI methodologies (e.g., API 581). There are cases where the RBI methodology does not represent the true risk profile of the asset, despite implementing the best possible inspection programs and careful input of inspection data. One of the main pitfalls present is the inherent limitation in the risk calculation methodologies that makes no or little use of the inspection data. An example of such a situation is the CUI risk assessments that are subjected to uncertainties due to numerous scientific parameters that are partially addressed (or even unaddressed) in modern-day RBI approaches. This work addresses two case studies of external corrosion rates due to CUI for two pairs of test rigs made with small bore piping deployed with two different insulation designs, namely conventional design, and moisture egress design. The assemblies were tested using two different methods for CUI simulation and testing conditions. The first pair was tested per ASTM G189-07 under isothermal wet-dry conditions at 100 °C (212°F) for three days, while the second pair was submerged under water for two days followed by outdoor exposure for one year. The experimentally determined corrosion rates were compared to those