# Guidance on applying inherent safety in design: Reducing process safety hazards whilst optimising CAPEX and OPEX

2nd edition



### GUIDANCE ON APPLYING INHERENT SAFETY IN DESIGN: REDUCING PROCESS SAFETY HAZARDS WHILST OPTIMISING CAPEX AND OPEX

2nd edition

August 2014

Published by ENERGY INSTITUTE, LONDON The Energy Institute is a professional membership body incorporated by Royal Charter 2003 Registered charity number 1097899 The Energy Institute (EI) is the chartered professional membership body for the energy industry, supporting over 16 000 individuals working in or studying energy and 250 energy companies worldwide. The EI provides learning and networking opportunities to support professional development, as well as professional recognition and technical and scientific knowledge resources on energy in all its forms and applications.

The EI's purpose is to develop and disseminate knowledge, skills and good practice towards a safe, secure and sustainable energy system. In fulfilling this mission, the EI addresses the depth and breadth of the energy sector, from fuels and fuels distribution to health and safety, sustainability and the environment. It also informs policy by providing a platform for debate and scientifically-sound information on energy issues.

The EI is licensed by:

- the Engineering Council to award Chartered, Incorporated and Engineering Technician status;
- the Science Council to award Chartered Scientist status, and
- the Society for the Environment to award Chartered Environmentalist status.

It also offers its own Chartered Energy Engineer, Chartered Petroleum Engineer and Chartered Energy Manager titles.

A registered charity, the El serves society with independence, professionalism and a wealth of expertise in all energy matters.

This publication has been produced as a result of work carried out within the Technical Team of the EI, funded by the EI's Technical Partners. The EI's Technical Work Programme provides industry with cost-effective, value-adding knowledge on key current and future issues affecting those operating in the energy sector, both in the UK and internationally.

For further information, please visit http://www.energyinst.org

The EI gratefully acknowledges the financial contributions towards the scientific and technical programme from the following companies

BG Group	Premier Oil
BP Exploration Operating Co Ltd	RWE npower
BP Oil UK Ltd	Saudi Aramco
Centrica	Scottish Power
Chevron	SGS
ConocoPhillips Ltd	Shell UK Oil Products Limited
Dana Petroleum	Shell U.K. Exploration and Production Ltd
DONG Energy	SSE
EDF Energy	Statkraft
ENI	Statoil
E. ON UK	Talisman Sinopec Energy UK Ltd
ExxonMobil International Ltd	Total E&P UK Limited
International Power	Total UK Limited
Kuwait Petroleum International Ltd	Tullow
Maersk Oil North Sea UK Limited	Valero
Murco Petroleum Ltd	Vattenfall
Nexen	Vitol
Phillips 66	World Fuel Services

However, it should be noted that the above organisations have not all been directly involved in the development of this publication, nor do they necessarily endorse its content.

Copyright © 2014 by the Energy Institute, London. The Energy Institute is a professional membership body incorporated by Royal Charter 2003. Registered charity number 1097899, England All rights reserved

No part of this book may be reproduced by any means, or transmitted or translated into a machine language without the written permission of the publisher.

#### ISBN 978 0 85293 689 4

Published by the Energy Institute

The information contained in this publication is provided for general information purposes only. Whilst the Energy Institute and the contributors have applied reasonable care in developing this publication, no representations or warranties, express or implied, are made by the Energy Institute or any of the contributors concerning the applicability, suitability, accuracy or completeness of the information contained herein and the Energy Institute and the contributors accept no responsibility whatsoever for the use of this information. Neither the Energy Institute nor any of the contributors shall be liable in any way for any liability, loss, cost or damage incurred as a result of the receipt or use of the information contained herein.

Electronic access to El and IP publications is available via our website, **www.energypublishing.org**. Documents can be purchased online as downloadable pdfs or on an annual subscription for single users and companies. For more information, contact the El Publications Team. e: **pubs@energyinst.org**  GUIDANCE ON APPLYING INHERENT SAFETY IN DESIGN: REDUCING PROCESS SAFETY HAZARDS WHILST OPTIMISING CAPEX AND OPEX

# CONTENTS

Page	

Foreword				
Acknowledgements				
1	Intro 1.1 1.2 1.3 1.4 1.5 1.6 1.7 1.8	What is in Scope Application Inherent so Hierarchy Application Barriers to	7on7on7on8safety principles8of controls9on to human factors10o inherent safety11pitfalls12	
2	<b>Bene</b> 2.1 2.2	Reducing	erent safety in design	
3	Role	of project	leaders	
4	4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5	olying inherent safety in design.   Introduction   Conceptual design stage   Front-end engineering design stage.   Process design stage   Engineering design stage.		
Anne				
Anne			on of IS hierarchy of controls: An example	
Anne	хВ	Inherent	safety in design stages flowchart	
Anne	хC	Process f	or conducting inherent safety workshop	
Anne	x D	<b>Glossarie</b> D.1 D.2 D.3	es of terms, and abbreviations and acronyms30Introduction30Glossary of terms30Glossary of abbreviations and acronyms35	
Anne	хE	Referenc	es	
<b>Table</b> Table Table Table	1 2	Example	afety principles	

GUIDANCE ON APPLYING INHERENT SAFETY IN DESIGN: REDUCING PROCESS SAFETY HAZARDS WHILST OPTIMISING CAPEX AND OPEX

### Contents continued...

Table 4 Table 5 Table 6 Table 7 Table 8 Table 9 Table 10	Example of IS applied during conceptual design stage17IS workshop record19Examples of IS applied to construction20Example of IS applied to inspection21Example of IS applied during HAZID study22Example of IS applied during HAZOP study23Example of problems caused by poor documentation of ISD features25
Figures Figure 1 Figure 2 Figure 3 Figure A.1 Figure B.1 Figure C.1	Illustration of effectiveness of IS hierarchy of controls10Benefits of ISD early in the design stages (illustrative)13Illustrative risk matrix21Example application of effectiveness of IS hierarchy of controls to a hazardous event27ISD stages flowchart showing IS interventions28Process for conducting inherent safety workshop.29

# FOREWORD

The greatest opportunities to reduce risks from process facilities with potential for harm to people and/or the environment occur during the design. The principles of inherent safety in design (ISD) are well established but are often not systematically applied.

This publication is aimed at project leaders and provides encouragement and guidance on the practical application of ISD during the early stages of design in order to gain maximum benefits in terms of reducing both hazards and life cycle costs.

This publication addresses the lack of tools to identify potential ISD improvements, particularly during the early conceptual design stage where potential benefits are greatest. Setting ISD goals for the project during this stage and carrying out an ISD workshop should make a significant contribution towards safer facilities in the future. In time and as technology progresses, serious process safety incidents should be eliminated at the 'drawing board', rather than relying on 'add-on' safety systems that can and do fail, revealing weaknesses in the basic process design.

Traditional process safety approaches have often required 'add-on' risk safety systems that are costly to install and maintain. By comparison, ISD provides the opportunity to eliminate hazards or reduce their severity or likelihood by better design, with the potential of reducing overall capital expenditure (CAPEX) and operating expenditure (OPEX). ISD should promote a culture of challenging the need for designs that rely on 'add-on' safety systems, by confirming why they are needed, and how the need could be avoided by improving the basic process design.

The first edition of this publication (*Guidance for safer design of offshore installations: An overview*) was also sponsored by the GB Health & Safety Executive (HSE) and UK Offshore Operators Association (UKOOA), and aimed to reduce the occurrences of adverse findings in design safety cases for the UK offshore oil and gas sector. The scope of this second edition is broadened to large and small organisations in the global energy industry, including offshore production platforms, and onshore facilities such as petroleum refineries, bulk fuel storage installations, and power generation stations.

The information contained in this document is provided for general information purposes only. Whilst the EI and the contributors have applied reasonable care in developing this publication, no representations or warranties, expressed or implied, are made by the EI or any of the contributors concerning the applicability, suitability, accuracy or completeness of the information contained herein and the EI and the contributors accept no responsibility whatsoever for the use of this information. Neither the EI nor any of the contributors shall be liable in any way for any liability, loss, cost or damage incurred as a result of the receipt or use of the information contained herein.

The EI welcomes feedback on its publications. Feedback or suggested revisions should be submitted to:

Technical Department Energy Institute 61 New Cavendish Street London, W1G 7AR e: technical@energyinst.org GUIDANCE ON APPLYING INHERENT SAFETY IN DESIGN: REDUCING PROCESS SAFETY HAZARDS WHILST OPTIMISING CAPEX AND OPEX

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This is dedicated to the memory of Trevor Kletz (1922 – 2013). His contribution to improved awareness of process safety is legendary throughout the world, most famously for introducing IS principles to the process industry during the 1970s with his motto 'What you don't have, can't leak'.

Graeme Ellis (ABB Consulting) updated this publication under the technical direction of the El Process Safety Committee which comprised during the project:

Martin Ball	Bossiney Consulting Group
David Bleakley	ConocoPhillips
John Brazendale	Health and Safety Executive
John Briggs	Kuwait Petroleum International
lan Buckland	Health and Safety Executive
Gus Carroll	Centrica
Jonathan Carter	Marsh Ltd
Paul McCulloch	E.ON UK
Peter Davidson	UK Petroleum Industry Association Ltd
Dr David Firth	Chilworth Technology Ltd./DEKRA
Peter Gedge (Chairperson)	BP Exploration Operating Company Limited
John Henderson	Chicago Bridge and Iron/Lummus (representing British Chemical
	Engineering Contractors' Association (BCECA))
King Lee (Vice-Chairperson) Lloyd's Register	
SreeRaj Nair	Chevron
Peter O'Toole	Tullow Oil plc
John Pond	Independent Consultant
Dr Niall Ramsden	Resource Protection International
Andrew Robertson	Nexen
Dr Mark Scanlon	Energy Institute
Don Smith	ENI UK
Toby St Leger	ConocoPhillips

The Institute wishes to record its appreciation of the work carried out by the author and also its gratitude for the valuable contributions made by Process Safety Committee members during the course of the project. In addition, the El acknowledges the following who provided significant comments during the stakeholder technical review (in particular, those members of the Oil and Gas UK Major Hazards Forum and the BCECA Design Safety and Environment Committee):

Lee Allford	European Process Safety Centre
Andy Bolsover	DNV GL
Adrian Bunn	KBR
Paul Davison	Amec
David Edwards	Granherne Limited
Dave Fargie	BP Exploration Operating Company Limited
Richard Gowland	European Process Safety Centre
David Mansfield	ESR Technology
Dr John Morgan	DNV GL
Dr Andy Rushton	ESR Technology
Jayadevan Vellani	Safetec
Howard Williams	Essar Oil UK

Dr Mark Scanlon managed the project and technically edited the publication.