

TECHNICAL DAYS

DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION & INDUSTRIAL CYBERSECURITY IN THE OIL&GAS INDUSTRY



JUNE, 24 & 25 Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Data Fusion – Fusão de Dados de Pig MFL-A e MFL-C

Rafael Almeida

ROSEN Group – Business Line Manager

Traditional MFL Technology

MFL-A





Integrity Management Challenges



Pipeline Inspection Technology Selection



Precise Digs

 ILI Results and Integrity studies with uncertainties result in in-ditch investigation on non threating defects. Extra expense.



Complex Anomalies Identifications Challenges

 Deepest part identification within general defect



Uncertainties in Sizing

• Inaccurate failure pressure calculations.

Laser vs. Traditional MFL



Two magnetization directions are needed to capture all the defect information







MFL-C



MFL-A

Enhancing ILI Reporting Process

Combined Reporting



How to Solve the Issue

20

15

10









Major Enhancement on the Input ILI data

Better visualization of the data for operators.

Minimize impact of physical limitation of Standard MFL Technologies

New Approach of Anomalies Reporting

 Individual Profile based "Failure Pressure" is calculated directly during reporting.

Minimize subjectivity in Analysis

 Enhanced Analysis Approach that minimizes Human impact on ILI results by conscious use of AI

Characterize all Morphologies with High Accuracy





Covering ALL POF cagegorites, and "more"



🔰 Innovarpel 2025

7

Conclusion

- Data Fusion leverages information from both MFL-A and MFL-C
- Data Fusion generates a 3D Depth Profile
 - neural network
 - Efficiently for the entire line
- Increased certainty in depth measurements
 - API 1163
 - Reduces the number of digs in safe remaining life analysis
- Non-conservative failure pressure calculations
 - Compared to Laser BP calculation









www.arpel.org