

PLATFORM DECOMMISSIONING IN THE NORTH SEA

Henning Bø 18.11.2015

www.tdwilliamson.com



® Registered trademark of T.D. Williamson, Inc. in the United States and in other countries. © Copyright 2014





Assets -> have a life cycle

Parameters

- Aging asset and fields
- Expansion pipeline systems
- Changing requirements / engineering standards
- Technology development
- Legislation

Maintain – Repair – Replace

Remove – Decommission



(Source: GASSCO)





Platform Decommissioning Cases

- Frigg platform bypass (2004)
- B11 platform bypass (2013)
- Huldra platform decommissioning (2014)





Decommissioning – Background analysis

- By 2019 (UK Cont. Shelf)
 - 140 fields could cease production by 2019
 - Spending up 50% on decomm. work
- Many applications for Decom (www.gov.uk)







Decommissioning – Background analysis

- Key UK projects (examples):
 - Murchison Field CNR
 - Brent A, B, C Shell
 - Miller BP
 - Stamford & Rose Centrica







Decommissioning – Background analysis



(Source: Oil & Gas UK)



Annual Estimated North Sea Decommissioning Expenditure



Source: Oil & Gas UK⁽¹⁾, Mackay Consultants^p





Platform Decommissioning Cases

- Frigg platform bypass (2004)
- B11 platform bypass (2013)
- Huldra platform decommissioning (2014)



Case 1: Frigg – Bypass

- Objectives:
 - MCP-01 platform to be removed and decommissioned
 - TP1 platform to be bypassed connect the Alwyn line to the UK line

Alternatives;

- Depressurizing and flooding
- Local isolations



Frigg field overview (Source: University of Aberdeen, Frigg history article)





- 3 off isolation tools used
 - 2x 32in SmartPlug® tools
 - 1x 24in SmartPlug® tool



Field overview during bypass operation (Source: TDW)



Case 1: Frigg – Bypass

- TP1 bypass operation
 - 1x 24in SmartPlug® isolation
 - 1x 32in SmartPlug® isolation
- July 31st Aug 14th
- Aug 5th Aug 8th





- MCP-01 bypass operation
 - 1x 32in SmartPlug® isolation
 - 2x pigs



- Returned St. Fergus Aug 26th



Field overview during bypass operation (Source: TDW)



Case 2: B11 – Bypass

Removal of B11 from Norpipe

- Similar to H7 bypass in 2007
- Subsea bypass spool

Two risers cut and spool tied in

Alternatives;

- Depressurize and flood pipeline
- Isolate platform from pressurized line





(Source: GASSCO)



- Use of two SmartPlug® isolation tools
- 60 bar pressure
- 11 days of isolation
- 300km pigging to shore







GAS BOOSTER



B11

36'



Sequence of events 2013

- 04.june:
- 08.June:
- 08.-18. June:
- 18.June:
- 18.-21.june:
- 22.June:



Loading tools

- Unsetting tools
- Pigging to shore
- Tools retrieved









Huldra – decommission old platform

- Tie-in of new platform - Valemon

New platform tie-in alternatives:

- New line (177km) to Heimdal
- New line (27km) to existing line (Huldra/Heimdal)

Solution chosen:

 Tie-in to existing line between Huldra and Heimdal



Source: Andre Osmundsen / Statoil





Alternatives

- Decommission pipeline to make inert and safe
- Isolate local section using inline isolation tooling.

Solution

 SmartPlug® tool isolated local section to prevent flooding during the tie-in operation and maintain production



Source: Andre Osmundsen / Statoil



Production gains

- Continued production from Huldra for an additional five months
- No decommissioning, flaring & flooding
- Isolation for 89days @ 74bar (avg.)

Additional gains

- Remote monitoring of isolation from shore
- TDW tracking system including cabled, acoustic, radio link and GSM-based monitoring



Source: Andre Osmundsen / Statoil





- 2005: 2x20in GOM region
- 2005: 16in GOM region
- 2006: 20in GOM region
- 2007: 36in North Sea region

- Platform de-commissioning
- Pipeline de-commissioning
- Platform de-commissioning
- Platform de-commissioning











- SmartPlug® inline isolation technology provides significant advantages to:
 - Minimize de-commissioning & re-commissioning scope
 - Minimize disruption to production
 - Avoid shut down or enable only partial shut down of system
 - Cost & schedule