

Pipeline Fitness-for-Service and Defect Assessment Training Course

22 – 26 March 2027
Tokyo

AGILE LEADERS
Training Center

AGILE LEADERS
Training Center

Pipeline Fitness-for-Service and Defect Assessment Training Course

Ref: 2025_249008 **Date:** 22 – 26 March 2027 **Location:** Tokyo **Fees:** 12000 Euro

Overview

Pipeline Fitness-for-Service and Defect Assessment Training Course is a one-week intermediate-to-advanced course for integrity, inspection, corrosion, maintenance, and engineering personnel who leave with a Pipeline Defect Assessment and Disposition File. Participants connect inspection-data quality, defect characterization, assessment levels, remaining strength, acceptance, repair, and reassessment. The course uses ASME B31G screening, API 579-1/ASME FFS-1 principles, interaction maps, decision records, and reassessment plans. Agile Leaders Training Center presents this course on pipeline fitness-for-service and defect assessment.

Who Should Attend

- Teams responsible for pipeline integrity assessment and anomaly response
- Functions responsible for in-line inspection data and field verification
- Personnel responsible for corrosion threat evaluation and remaining strength
- Engineering groups responsible for fitness-for-service decisions
- Maintenance teams responsible for repair selection and execution evidence
- Assurance functions responsible for acceptance and reassessment records

The course assumes participants can interpret pipeline inspection, material, geometry, and operating data; it leaves out detailed finite-element modeling and certification preparation.

Departments and Industries

The course supports departments and industries responsible for evaluating pressurized linear assets.

- Oil and gas transmission and gathering organizations
- Water transmission and utility pipeline operators
- Pipeline integrity, corrosion, and inspection departments
- Engineering, operations, and maintenance functions
- In-line inspection and nondestructive examination teams
- Asset assurance and repair-management groups

Learning Objectives

By the end of this course, participants will be able to:

- Apply a fitness-for-service assessment workflow to pipeline defects
- Evaluate inspection data quality and defect dimensions
- Analyze metal loss using ASME B31G principles
- Compare dents, cracks, and interacting-defect assessment routes
- Prioritize run, repair, replace, or pressure-control decisions
- Build traceable repair and reassessment records

Course Agenda

Day 1: Frame Fitness-for-Service Decisions

- Pipeline Fitness-for-Service Assessment Workflow
- API 579-1/ASME FFS-1 Assessment-Level Map
- Defect, Flaw, and Anomaly Classification Matrix
- Operating Data and Material Property Input Register
- Run-Repair-Replace Decision Record

Day 2: Qualify Inspection Evidence

- In-Line Inspection Data Quality Checklist
- Field Measurement and Dig Verification Plan
- Defect Dimension and Location Validation Sheet
- Measurement Uncertainty and Conservatism Log
- Assessment Input Traceability File

Day 3: Assess Metal Loss

- ASME B31G Metal Loss Screening Method
- Corrosion Profile and Effective Area Record
- Remaining Strength and Failure Pressure Worksheet
- Longitudinal and Circumferential Interaction Map
- Metal Loss Acceptance and Sensitivity Review

Day 4: Evaluate Complex Defects

- Dent Geometry and Strain Assessment Route
- Crack-Like Flaw Screening and Escalation Matrix
- Dent, Gouge, Weld, and Corrosion Interaction Map
- Repair Method Selection and Limitation Checklist
- Reassessment Interval and Monitoring Plan

Day 5: Practice Defect Disposition

- Suggested Exercise: Validate a Pipeline Defect Data Set
- Suggested Exercise: Screen a Metal Loss Indication
- Suggested Exercise: Evaluate an Interacting Defect Case
- Suggested Exercise: Select Repair and Reassessment Actions
- Capstone Exercise: Present a Pipeline Defect Assessment and Disposition File

Practical Exercises

The course uses suggested activities to connect inspection evidence with controlled engineering decisions.

- Suggested activity: review inspection accuracy, material properties, operating history, and field measurements before assessment.
- Suggested activity: calculate a metal-loss screening result and test the effect of uncertain dimensions.
- Suggested activity: classify a dent, crack-like indication, or interacting anomaly and select an escalation route.
- Suggested activity: document acceptance, repair, pressure control, monitoring, and reassessment in one disposition file.

FAQs

Who suits pipeline fitness-for-service and defect assessment training, and what does it assume?

Integrity, inspection, corrosion, maintenance, and engineering personnel suit the training. It assumes participants can interpret pipeline inspection, material, geometry, and operating data.

How does pipeline fitness-for-service assessment differ from in-line inspection training?

Pipeline fitness-for-service assessment uses verified inspection findings to evaluate structural acceptability and disposition. In-line inspection training focuses on tool selection, operation, data acquisition, and initial reporting.

How does ASME B31G support pipeline metal loss assessment?

ASME B31G provides a recognized screening approach for evaluating the remaining strength of corroded pipelines using defect dimensions, pipe properties, and operating pressure information.

How are interacting pipeline defects assessed?

Interacting defects are assessed by identifying proximity, orientation, morphology, stress concentration, measurement confidence, and the applicable evaluation route. Complex combinations may require escalation beyond screening methods.

What decisions follow a pipeline defect assessment?

Pipeline defect assessment supports documented decisions to continue operation, control pressure, monitor, investigate further, repair, replace, or reassess, based on verified inputs and the selected assessment method.

Conclusion

Participants take a Pipeline Defect Assessment and Disposition File back to their organization. It combines data validation, metal-loss screening, complex-defect routes, acceptance, repair selection, and reassessment. Teams can use it to make inspection findings traceable to controlled engineering and maintenance decisions.