Guidance on meeting expectations of El *Process safety management framework*

Element 20: Audit, assurance, management review and intervention



GUIDANCE ON MEETING EXPECTATIONS OF EI PROCESS SAFETY MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

ELEMENT 20: AUDIT, ASSURANCE, MANAGEMENT REVIEW AND INTERVENTION

1st edition

July 2016

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 23 000 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 El'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 El 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 EI 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

BP Exploration Operating Co Ltd

BP Oil UK Ltd

Centrica

RWE npower

Saudi Aramco

Scottish Power

Chevron SGS

CLH Shell UK Oil Products Limited

ConocoPhillips Ltd Shell U.K. Exploration and Production Ltd

DCC Energy SSE
DONG Energy Statkraft
EDF Energy Statoil

ENGIE Talisman Sinopec Energy (UK) Ltd

ENI Tesoro

E. ON UK
Total E&P UK Limited
ExxonMobil International Ltd
Total UK Limited
Total UK Limited
Tullow Oil
Maersk Oil North Sea UK Limited
Valero
Nexen
Vattenfall
Phillips 66
Vitol

Qatar Petroleum 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 © 2016 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 904 8

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.

Hard copy and electronic access to EI and IP publications is available via our website, https://publishing.energyinst.org. Documents can be purchased online as downloadable pdfs or on an annual subscription for single users and companies. For more information, contact the EI Publications Team.

e: pubs@energyinst.org

CONTENTS

| | | Page | | |
|----------------|---|--|--|--|
| Public | ation | s in this series5 | | |
| Forew | ord . | 6 | | |
| Ackno | wled | gements | | |
| 1 | Intro 1.1 1.2 | duction 8 Audit, assurance, management review and intervention 8 Expectations for Element 20: Audit, assurance, management review and intervention 8 | | |
| | Arrar 2.1 | Descriptions of actions for each step in the logical flow diagram | | |
| | Sugg 3.1 3.2 3.3 3.4 3.5 3.6 3.7 3.8 3.9 3.10 3.11 | Performance measure 1: Element compliance and implementation status (EIPSS rating) | | |
| Annex Annex | | References and bibliography.45A.1References45A.2Further resources45 | | |
| Annex | κВ | Glossary of acronyms and abbreviations | | |
| Annex | ς C | Mapping of proccess steps to EI <i>PSM framework</i> expectations47 | | |
| Annex D | | Example report template management and supervisory field observation 52 | | |
| Annex | κE | Rating the effectiveness of performance review meetings | | |

GUIDANCE ON MEETING EXPECTATIONS OF EI PROCESS SAFETY MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK ELEMENT 20: AUDIT, ASSURANCE, MANAGEMENT REVIEW AND INTERVENTION

Contents cont...

| | | Pages | |
|-------|---|--------------------------|--|
| Guida | nce on aggregation of 'base level' performance measures | es 54 | |
| F.1 | Introduction | | |
| F.2 | Aggregation criteria | 55 | |
| F.3 | Aggregation at site level | 55 | |
| F.4 | Aggregation at organisation level | 64 | |
| • | F.1 F.2 F.3 | F.2 Aggregation criteria | |

PUBLICATIONS IN THIS SERIES

Guidance on meeting expectations of El Process safety management framework

- Element 1: Leadership, commitment and responsibility
- Element 2: Identification and compliance with legislation and industry standards
- Element 3: Employee selection, placement and competency, and health assurance
- Element 4: Workforce involvement
- Element 5: Communication with stakeholders
- Element 6: Hazard identification and risk assessment
- Element 7: Documentation, records and knowledge management
- Element 8: Operating manuals and procedures
- Element 9: Process and operational status monitoring, and handover
- Element 10: Management of operational interfaces
- Element 11: Standards and practices
- Element 12: Management of change and project management
- Element 13: Operational readiness and process start-up
- Element 14: Emergency preparedness
- Element 15: Inspection and maintenance
- Element 16: Management of safety critical devices
- Element 17: Work control, permit to work and task risk management
- Element 18: Contractor and supplier, selection and management
- Element 19: Incident reporting and investigation
- Element 20: Audit, assurance, management review and intervention

FOREWORD

Process safety management (PSM) is vital to ensuring safe and continued operations in major accident hazard (MAH) organisations. However, PSM is a multifaceted process, and a number of high profile incidents since 2005 have suggested that without a holistic understanding of the various factors required for effective PSM it can be difficult and inefficient to ensure, and measure, performance.

In 2010 the Energy Institute (EI) published *High level framework for process safety management (PSM framework)*, which aimed to define what PSM should involve. Divided into four focus areas (process safety leadership, risk identification and assessment, risk management, and review and improvement) and sub-divided into 20 'elements', it sets out a framework of activities MAH organisations should undertake to ensure PSM. Each element lists a number of high level activities organisations should meet (expectations).

El *Process safety management guidelines* is a series of 20 publications ('guidelines') that build on the *PSM framework*. Commissioned by the El Process Safety Committee (PSC) each guideline captures and presents current industry good practices and guidance on how organisations can meet the expectations set out in each element of the *PSM framework*. Each guideline includes:

- a logical flow diagram of activities (steps) the organisation should undertake to manage that element;
- descriptions of those steps;
- example performance measures (PMs) to measure the extent to which key steps have been undertaken;
- a list of further resources to help undertake key steps;
- a table mapping the steps against the expectations in the *PSM framework*, and
- annexes of useful information.

Readers implementing the guidance in this publication should be aware of the *PSM framework* and the other publications in this series, particularly if they are a manager with oversight of the wider implementation of PSM.

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.

Suggested revisions are invited and should be submitted through the

Technical Department Energy Institute 61 New Cavendish Street London W1G 7AR.

e: technical@energyinst.org

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

El Guidance on meeting expectations of El Process safety management framework was commissioned by the Energy Institute (El) Process Safety Committee (PSC) and prepared by Martin Ball (Bossiney Consulting). During this project, PSC members included:

Martin Ball Bossiney Consulting
David Bleakley ConocoPhillips

John Brazendale Health and Safety Executive

Kuwait Petroleum International

Gus Carroll Centrica
Jonathan Carter Marsh
Peter Davidson UKPIA
Graeme Ellis ABB

Dr David Firth Chilworth Group

Peter Gedge (Chairman)

John Henderson

Bob Kilford

King Lee (Vice-Chair)

BP

CB&I

EDF Energy

Lloyd's Register

Paul McCulloch
SreeRaj Nair
Chevron
Peter O'Toole
John Pond
Dr Niall Ramsden
Toby St.Leger
Dr Mark Scanlon (Secretary)

E.ON
Chevron
Tullow Oil
Consultant
NRG Consultants
ConocoPhillips
Energy Institute

Don Smith Eni UK

The following additional individuals are acknowledged for commenting on the draft for consultation of this series of publications:

Lee Allford European Process Safety Centre

John Armstrong E.ON Mike Beanland ABB

Amanda Cockton Health and Safety Executive

Peter Davidson UKPIA Edwin Ebiegbe E.ON Allen Ormond ABB

Stuart Pointer Health and Safety Executive
Ian Travers Health and Safety Executive

Technical editing was carried out by Stuart King (EI), assisted by Sam Daoudi (EI).

Affliations refer to the time of participation.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 AUDIT, ASSURANCE, MANAGEMENT REVIEW AND INTERVENTION

These guidelines set out good practice for audit, assurance, management review and intervention. Regular review and audit of performance, and compliance with the El *PSM framework* are vital to ensure that HS&E and process safety performance continues to meet the defined targets. Management must ensure that there is both routine review and independent audit of performance and compliance with El *PSM framework* expectations.

In order to establish and maintain effective assurance arrangements it is important to ensure that:

- A comprehensive set of PMs are established and routinely monitored.
- Effective supervisory field observations or in-line control checks are implemented to check understanding of and compliance with the implemented PSM arrangements.
- Effective processes are established, to verify compliance with the El PSM framework expectations, encompassing:
 - 1st party audits carried out by personnel from the organisation.
 - 2nd party audits carried out by personnel from the organisation, but independent of the area being audited.
 - 3rd party audits carried out by personnel who are independent of the organisation.
- Required corrective interventions are identified, prioritised and implemented.

This document provides guidance on how to establish good practice processes for audit, assurance, management review and intervention.

Annex G reproduces the suggested in-line control checks (management and supervisory field observations) and suggested PMs which are provided in each of the guidelines for each element of the EI *PSM framework*. Additionally, Annex G provides suggested aggregation criteria for each of the suggested PMs. These aggregation criteria are not provided elsewhere.

1.2 EXPECTATIONS FOR ELEMENT 20: AUDIT, ASSURANCE, MANAGEMENT REVIEW AND INTERVENTION

Element 20 of El High level framework for process safety management ('PSM framework') describes 13 expectations – arrangements and processes that organisations should (to an appropriate degree) have in place in order to ensure they are managing this aspect of PSM appropriately:

'Overview

Regular review and audit of compliance with the EI *PSM framework* is vital to ensure that HS&E and process safety performance continues to meet the defined targets.

Management must ensure that there is both routine review and independent audit of compliance with EI *PSM framework* expectations.

20.1 EI *PSM framework* performance measures are established to monitor the degree to which the EI *PSM framework* expectations are being complied with.

20.2 The organisation's operations are routinely monitored, incorporating the PSM performance measures, and reviewed, by specified levels of management, at predetermined frequencies. 20.3 The El PSM framework expectations are reviewed annually and updated as necessary to ensure that they continue to meet the needs of the organisation. 20.4 Audit criteria are defined to provide a consistent basis for audit and a consistent basis for development of the audit opinion. 20.5 A routine internal (2nd party) audit programme is in place with audits carried out by personnel from the organisation. The audit assesses compliance with the EI PSM framework expectations and the effectiveness of the management review arrangements. 20.6 A routine external (3rd party) audit programme is in place with audits carried out by personnel independent of the organisation. The external audit assesses and provides an independent opinion on compliance with the El PSM framework expectations and the effectiveness of the management review arrangements. 20.7 Assessments are conducted by trained, competent multidisciplinary teams, including HS&E and process safety professionals and personnel with operational and technical expertise. 20.8 The frequency and scope of the assessments will reflect the complexity of the operation, the level of risk and previous EI *PSM framework* compliance history. 20.9 Audit opinion and findings from the EI PSM framework audits are reviewed with specified levels of management. 20.10 The effectiveness of the EI PSM framework audit arrangements is periodically reviewed and the findings are used to make improvements. 20.11 Necessary interventions to correct identified issues, non-compliances and deviations in performance, beyond defined tolerance levels, are identified, appropriately prioritised, scheduled and tracked to completion. 20.12 Arrangements for audit, assurance, management review and intervention are understood and followed; understanding of arrangements and compliance with them is regularly tested. 20.13 Compliance and performance trends are reviewed by specified levels of management.'

This guideline provides a process, along with guidance, to help organisations meet these expectations. It also suggests a number of compliance checks and performance measures (PMs) to measure the extent to which key activities involved in meeting these expectations have been or are being undertaken.