Wednesday 20 February			
	1.0 Plenary opening session		
8:00	Opening remarks		
8:15	[1] Managing complexity through collaboration will need the industry to move from a proactive to a predictive mindset, by **Chris Yoxall**, Rosen USA, Houston, TX, USA		
8:45	[2] Achieving and demonstrating pipeline engineering capability – the role of competency standards, and their use for qualifications and registration, by **Chris Harvey**, Chris Harvey Consulting, Australia		
9:15	[3] Assessing the competence of staff, by **Michelle Unger**, Rosen Group, Stans, Switzerland, and **Dr Phil Hopkins**, Phil Hopkins Ltd, Whitley Bay, UK		
9:45			
10:30	[4] A regulator's perspective on pipeline integrity concerns, by **Iain Colquhoun**, National Energy Board, Calgary, AB, Canada		
11:00	[5] Achieving an American record for longest intelligent inspection of a natural gas pipeline, by **Sheshi Epur** and **Aaron Schartner**, TransCanada Pipelines, Calgary, AB, Canada, **Steve Mayo**, Pipelines 2 Data Ltd, Aberdeen, UK, and **Frank Sander**, BHGE, Calgary, AB, Canada		
11:30	[6] Are you safer than you were 15 years ago?, by **Joel Anderson**, Enable Midstream, Oklahoma City, OK, USA		
12:00	YPP Awards		
12:30	Lunch		
	2.1 ILI applications	**3.1 Risk assessment & management**	**4.1 Evaluating dents reported by ILI for response and remediation**
2:00	[7] MFL high-temperature solution, by **Guenter Sundag**, **Thomas Stubbe**, and **Corey Richards**, Rosen USA, Houston, TX, USA	[28] Dissecting new PHMSA risk assessment guidelines, by **Sevinc Yeliz Cevik** and **William Kent Muhlbauer**, WKM Consultancy LLC, Austin, TX, USA	Chair: **Sergio Limon** Elevara Partners, Salt Lake City, UT, USA Engineering methods for evaluating and ranking dents reported by ILI tools **Rhett Dotson,** Rosen USA, Houston, TX, USA

	2.1 ILI applications *(cont'd)*	**3.1 Risk assessment & management** *(cont'd)*	**4.1 Evaluating dents** *(cont'd)*
2:30	[8] Transitioning from hydrostatic testing to in-line inspection for pipelines with challenging seam welds, by **J Bruce Nestleroth**, Kiefner & Associates, Columbus, OH, USA, **Matthew S Krieg**, Marathon Pipe Line LLC, Findlay, OH, USA, **Thomas Hennig**, NDT Global, Dublin, Ireland, and **Harvey Haines**, Applus RTD Technology Center, Houston, TX, USA	[29] Quantitative risk assessment following an ILI survey (ILI-based risk assessment), by **Jane Dawson, Ian Murray**, **Inessa Yablonskikh**, and **Thomas Hoffmann**, BHGE, Cramlington, UK	Repair systems for dents **Dr Chris Alexander** ADV Integrity, Inc., Magnolia, TX, USA What we have learned from decades of experimental research on dent behavior **Aaron Dinovitzer** BMT Fleet Technology, Ottawa, ON, Canada Q&A
3:00	[9] The role of ILI for MAOP verification, by **Simon Slater**, Rosen USA, Houston, TX, USA	[30] Knowledge risk management, by **John Godfrey, Tara McMahan**, and **Robert Barbeauld**, DNV GL, Dublin, OH, USA	
3:30	Coffee		
	5.1 ILI analysis	**3.2 Risk assessment & management** *(cont'd)*	**4.2 Evaluating dents** *(cont'd)*
4:30	[10] The art of looking: an in-line inspection perspective, by **Dr Mike Kirkwood,** T.D. Williamson, Dubai, UAE, **Dane Burden**, and **Miguel Maldonado**, T.D. Williamson, Tulsa, OK, USA	[31] Pipeline risk modeling: a comparative analysis of modeling techniques, by **Andrew Kendrick** and **Robin Echols**, Kendrick Consulting, Aurora, CO, USA	A gas operator perspective on managing dents **Rick Wang** TransCanada, Calgary, AB, Canada A liquids operator perspective on managing dents **Justin Harkrader** and **Michael Plishka** Colonial Pipeline Co., Alpharetta, GA, USA

	5.1 ILI analysis *(cont'd)*	**3.2 Risk assessment & management** *(cont'd)*	**4.2 Evaluating dents** *(cont'd)*
5:00	[11] Challenges associated with pit-to-pit matching (or how to know when corrosion is taking place), by **Dr Thomas Bubenik**, **Steven Polasik**, and **Zach Booth**, DNV GL, Dublin, OH, USA	[32] Risk-based approach to inspection interval optimization, by **David Joyal**, Jana Corporation, Aurora, ON, Canada	API 1183 Upcoming dent assessment and management recommended practice **Mark Piazza** Colonial Pipeline Co, Alpharetta, GA, USA Q&A
5:30	End of day, Exhibition reception		

Thursday 21 February			
	5.2 ILI analysis *(cont'd)*	**6.1 Engineering assessment**	**7.1 Materials**
8:00	[12] Analysis of factors which reduce MFL sizing accuracy of pinholes, by **Joel Falk**, Desjardins Integrity Ltd, Calgary, AB, Canada	[33] Realistic burst pressure predictions in pipelines with non-ideal crack profiles, by **Dr Ted Anderson**, TL Anderson Consulting, Longmont, CO, USA	[50] Nondestructive testing of pipeline materials: analysis of chemical composition from metal filings, by **Mary Louie, Dr Monty Liong** and **Nathan Switzner** Exponent, Menlo Park, CA, USA, **Dr Peter Veloo**, Exponent, Los Angeles, CA, USA, **Bill Amend** and **Melissa Gould**, DNV GL USA (Inc.), Dublin, OH, USA and **Troy Rovella** and **Peter Martin**, PG&E, Walnut Creek, CA, USA
8:30	[13] Advancing ILI technology and pipeline risk management through advanced analytics of big data, by **Geoff Hurd**, **Stuart Clouston**, **Jeff Sutherland**, and **John Elliott**, BHGE, Calgary, AB, Canada	[34] Evaluation of limitations and applicability of stress and strain concentration factors for use in engineering critical assessments of dents, by **Shanshan Wu**, **Dr Thomas Bubenik**, **Joseph Bratton**, and **David Kemp**, DNV GL USA (Inc.), Dublin, OH, USA	[51] Nondestructive classification of LF, HF, and HF-normalized electric-resistance-welded (ERW) longitudinal seams, by **Steven Palkovic**, **Parth Patel**, **Soheil Saffari Loaliyan**, **Mohammad Islam**, and **Dr Simon Bellemare,** MMT, Cambridge, MA, USA
9:00	[14] The good the bad and the ugly: categorizing pipelines using big data techniques, by **Roland Palmer-Jones** and **Michael Smith**, Rosen UK, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK	[35] Nondestructive examination protocols for MAOP verification of station pipe, by **Simon Lockyer-Bratton**, **Dr Peter Veloo,** Exponent, Los Angeles, CA, **Mary Louie,** Exponent, Menlo Park, CA, USA, **Mark Ryan, Michael Rosenfeld**, Kiefner & Associates, Columbus, OH, USA, and **Troy Rovella**, PG&E, Walnut Creek, CA, USA	[52] Bayesian inference approach to establish sample size for material verification, by **Troy Rovella**, **Peter Martin, Masoud Moghtaderi-Zadeh** PG&E, Walnut Creek, CA, USA, **Joel Anderson**, Enable Midstream, Oklahoma City, OK, USA, **Kofi Inkabi**, Exponent, Oakland, CA, USA, **Vyaas Gururajan**, USC, Los Angeles, CA, USA and **Dr Peter Veloo**, Exponent, Los Angeles, CA, USA
9:30	Coffee		

	5.3 ILI verification	**6.2 Engineering assessment** *(cont'd)*	**8.1 Cracks & seam welds**
10:30	[15] Validation of computed tomography technology for pipeline inspection, by **Mark Piazza**, Colonial Pipeline Co, Alpharetta, GA, USA, **Timothy Burns**, Shell Pipeline Co, Houston, TX, USA, **James Medford**, Inspection Associates, Inc., Cypress, TX, USA, and **Taylor Shie**, Shell Pipeline Co, Houston, TX, USA	[36] Leveraging ILI data to support ancillary asset integrity tasks, by **Lisa Barkdull,** Quest Integrity, Houston, TX, USA and **LeeAnn Escobar**, Shell Pipeline Co., Houston, TX, USA	[53] Improved system for the detection, sizing and prioritization of seam weld corrosion, by **Matthew Romney,** T.D. Williamson, Salt Lake City, UT, USA and **J. Bruce Nestleroth**, Kiefner and Associates, Columbus, OH, USA
11:00	[16] Guidance for interacting corrosion features reported by ILI, by **Lucinda Smart,** Kiefner and Associates, Inc., Ames, IO, USA, **Yanping L**i, Enbridge, Edmonton, AB, Canada **J. Bruce Nestleroth**, Kiefner and Associates, Inc. Columbus, OH, USA, and **Suzanne Ward**, Enbridge, Edmonton, AB, Canada	[37] Reliability-based criteria for corrosion assessment, by **Riski Adianto**, **Maher Nessim**, **Dongliang Lu**, **Shahani Kariyawasam**, and **Terry Huang**, C-FER Technologies, Edmonton, AB, Canada	[54] High-resolution inspections for crack detection: the next level of accuracy, by **Rogelio Jesus Guajardo Rodriguez** and **Thomas Hennig**, NDT Global GmbH & Co KG, Stutensee, Germany
11:30	[17] Use of NDE data in correlation with MFL data to refine neural network sizing algorithms, by **Jenny Jing Chen, Ron Ostafichuk** and **Dr Stephen Westwood,** Onstream Pipeline Inspection, Inc., Calgary, AB, CANADA	[38] Equivalent load fatigue – An efficient modification to the familiar Paris equation, by **Stephen Wood** and **Alfonso Garcia**, Enbridge, Edmonton, AB, Canada	[55] Innovative EMAT crack tool for difficult to inspect pipelines, by **Clay Goudy**, Q-Inline, Houston, TX, USA and **Milton Altenberg** and **Phil Bondurant**, Quest Integrated, Kent WA, USA
12:00	[18] Location and validation of metal loss defects identified by ILI, by **Dr Michael Beller**, Rosen, Lingen, Germany, **Gordon Reid**, Sonomatic, AbuDhabi, UAE, and **Dr Roger King**, International Corrosion Services, Manchester, UK	[39] Technical background of a simplified process for conducting ECA of indicated pipeline indentations with metal loss, by **Fan Zhang**, **Michael J Rosenfield**, Kiefner and Associates, Columbus, OH, USA	[56] Common pitfalls to avoid when managing seam-weld integrity, by **Michael Turnquist**, Quest Integrity, Boulder, CO, USA
12:30	Lunch		

	5.4 ILI verification *(cont'd)*	**9.1 Hydrostatic testing I**	**8.2 Cracks & seam welds** *(cont'd)*
2:00	[19] Total quality API 1163 approach to ILI verification, by **Chad Haegelin** and **Joel Lindstrom**, Integrity Solutions Ltd, San Antonio, TX, USA	[40] Hydrotesting and ILI: now and in the future, by **Dr Mike Kirkwood**, TD Williamson, Dubai, UAE, and **Jerry Rau**, RCP, Houston, TX, USA	[57] Investigation of crack assessment parameters for a hypothetical pipeline, by **Tara McMahan**, **Eric Graft**, and **Dr Thomas Bubenik**, DNV GL, Dublin, OH, USA
2:30	[20] Run comparison as a solution to incomplete ILI data and as an alternative to re-inspection of a challenging pipeline, by **Kai Xin Toh**, Quest Integrity, Cheras, Malaysia	**10.1 Hydrostatic testing II** [41] A practicum on pressure testing – compilation of best practices, by **Sheri Baucom** and **Jerry Rau**, RCP, Houston, TX, USA	[58] Screening for long seam anomalies in ERW pipe using ultrasonic crack ILI data: a method for pipeline operators to unlock the value of their data, by **Bernardo Cuervo** and **Mark McQueen**, G2 Integrated Solutions, Houston, TX, USA
3:00	Coffee (Marriott)		
	11.1 Repair	**12.1 Leak Detection I**	**13.1 Mechanical damage**
3:30	[21] Composite repairs – what does "permanent" mean?, by **Casey Whalen**, Milliken Pipe Wrap, Houston, TX, USA	[42] The challenge of implementing and maintaining CPM leak detection on gathering networks, by **Peter Han**, Atmos International, San Antonio, TX, USA	[59] Assessment of mechanical damage within dented pipe using multi-data ILI technology, by **Luis Torres**, **Kaitlyn Korol**, and **Neil Hodson**, Enbridge Pipelines, Edmonton, AB, Canada
4:00	[22] Full-scale finite element analysis and field success prove composite reinforcement is a viable repair for girth weld joint defects on vintage pipelines, by **Buddy Powers**, **Tim Mally**, and **Mahdi Kiani**, ClockSpring, Houston, TX, USA	[43] Pipeline leak detection using tracer compounds and sledding techniques, by **Ian Harris**, Praxair Services, Inc., Tucson, AZ, USA	[60] An evaluation of instrumented indentation testing to estimate yield and tensile strength, by **Dr Nicoli M Ames**, Exponent, Denver, CO, USA**, Mary Louie**, Exponent, Menlo Park, CA, USA **Dr Jeffrey A Kornuta**, Exponent, Houston, TX, USA**, Dr Peter Veloo**, Exponent, Los Angeles, CA, USA, **Troy Rovella**, and **Peter Martin** PG&E, Walnut Creek, CA, USA
4:3	End of day		

Friday 22 February			
	11.2 Repair *(cont'd)*	**14.1 Data management**	**13.2 Mechanical damage** *(cont'd)*
8:00	[23] Evaluating the performance of composite systems for reinforcing non-leaking crack-like defects in transmission pipelines, by **Colton Sheets** and **Chantz Denowh**, Stress Engineering Services, Houston, TX, USA	[44] Practical application of machine learning methods to ILI data, by **Michael Gloven**, Expert Infrastructure Solutions, Inc., Denver, CO, USA	[61] Compositing multi-technology ILI surveys for the integrity management of mechanical damage, by **Luis Torres**, **Catherine Rieck**, and **Collin Taylor**, Enbridge Pipelines, Edmonton, AB, Canada
8:30	[24] Predictive modeling for shrink sleeve failure using machine learning, by **Matthew Brown**, Lake Superior Consulting, Duluth, MN, USA	[45] Enhanced utilization of ILI inertial measurement data, by **Dane Burden**, T.D. Williamson, Salt Lake City, UT, USA	[62] Gouge detection on dents below 1% depth with multiple data set technologies on an ILI tool, by **Timothy Goller** and **Adrian Belanger**, T.D. Williamson, Salt Lake City, UT, USA
9:00	[25] Steel sleeves: a new look at a widely-used repair method, by **Dr Chris Alexander,** ADV Integrity, Inc., Magnolia, TX, **Tommy Precht,** Allan Edwards, Lake Charles, LA, and **Chip Edwards**, Allan Edwards, Tulsa, OK	[46] Enabling the digital pipeline, by **Steve Banks**, i2i Pipelines, Manchester, UK	[63] Detailed dent assessment: avoiding the pitfalls, by **Aaron Lockey**, **Tim Turner**, and **Susannah Turner**, Highgrade Associates Ltd, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK
9:30	Coffee		
	12.2 Leak detection II	**14.2 Data management** *(cont'd)*	**15.1 SCC**
10:00	[26] Leak detection and prevention using free-floating in-line sensors, by **Joel Smith, David Ham, Anouk van Pol** and **John van Pol**, INGU Solutions, Calgary, AB, CANADA	[47] The challenges of keeping integrity management systems relevant, by **Sonny Llave**, **Pradeep Dhoorjaty**, and **Danny Golczynski**, Wood Group, Houston, TX, USA	[64] The detection and sizing of circumferentially oriented stress corrosion cracking using axially oriented magnetic flux leakage inspection, by **Ron Thompson**, **Ray Gardner**, **Katrina Dwyer**, and **James Hare**, Novitech, Inc., Vaughan, ON, Canada

	12.2 Leak detection II *(cont'd)*	**14.2 Data management** *(cont'd)*	**15.1 SCC** *(cont'd)*
10:30	[27] Development of a framework for evaluating and verifying external leak detection systems for pipelines, by **Mathew Bussiere**, C-FER Technologies ~~(1999)~~ Inc., Edmonton, AB, Canada	[48] Swimming in the data lake – efficient pipeline data records discrepancy analysis and management, by **Michael Smith**, **Ollie Burkinshaw**, **Sam Acheson** and **Simon Slater**, Rosen USA, Houston, TX, USA	[65] An approach for evaluating the susceptibility of a pipeline to circumferential SCC, by **Jane Dawson** and **Ian Murray**, BHGE, Cramlington, UK
11:00		[49] Leveraging machine learning techniques to improve corrosion risk prediction in pipelines, by **Ramnath Easwar**, **Abhinav Priyadarshi**, **Andreas Gaarder**, **Jay Karen William**, and **Vijaytha Balaji**, Wood Group, Houston, TX, USA	[66] Full-scale testing of SCC in high frequency-ERW pipe with comparisons of inspection techniques to actual flaw measurements, by **Colton Sheets**, Stress Engineering Services, Houston, TX, USA
11:30	End of conference		