

Guidance on assigning ignition probabilities in onshore and offshore quantitative risk assessments

GUIDANCE ON ASSIGNING IGNITION PROBABILITIES IN ONSHORE AND OFFSHORE QUANTITATIVE RISK ASSESSMENTS

2nd edition

May 2019

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 20 000 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, 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

Andeavor	Phillips 66
Apache North Sea	Qatar Petroleum
BP Exploration Operating Co Ltd	Repsol Sinopec
BP Oil UK Ltd	RWE npower
Centrica	Saudi Aramco
Chevron North Sea Ltd	Scottish Power
Chevron Products Company	SGS
Chrysaor	Shell UK Oil Products Limited
CLH	Shell U.K. Exploration and Production Ltd
ConocoPhillips Ltd	SSE
DCC Energy	TAQA Bratani
EDF Energy	Total E&P UK Limited
ENI	Total UK Limited
E.ON UK	Tullow Oil
Equinor	Uniper
ExxonMobil International Ltd	Valero
Innogy	Vattenfall
Kuwait Petroleum International Ltd	Vitol Energy
Nexen CNOOC	Woodside
Ørsted	World Fuel Services
Perenco	

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 © 2019 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 1 78725 068 0

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
Foreword	12
Acknowledgements	14
Overview	15
1 Introduction	17
1.1 Introduction	17
1.2 Application	18
1.3 Scope	18
2 Look-up correlations user guide	20
2.1 Look-up correlation selection	20
2.1.1 Onshore tank farms	20
2.1.2 Liquid spills	21
2.1.3 Offshore risers	21
2.1.4 Offshore blowouts	22
2.1.5 Onshore pipelines	22
2.1.6 Limiting ignition probabilities	22
2.1.7 Mass release rates	23
2.1.8 Substances above their ignition temperature	23
2.1.9 Easily ignited substances	23
2.1.10 High flashpoint (>55 °C) substances stored at 'near ambient' conditions	23
2.1.11 Modelling flashing releases	24
2.1.12 Modelling LNG releases	25
2.1.13 Modelling drifting vapour clouds where ignition timing is important	25
2.1.14 None of the correlations matches the situation	25
2.2 General selection guide	26
3 Full model user guide	37
3.1 Introduction	37
3.2 Model structure overview	37
3.3 Workbook model overview	38
3.4 Input data	39
3.5 Ignition characteristics	43
3.6 Plant configuration	44
3.7 Modelling complex geometries	45
3.7.1 Annular configuration	45
3.7.2 Modelling non-annular configurations	46
3.8 Gas vs. liquid releases	50
3.9 Inventory	52
3.10 Model output	52
3.11 Gas Build-up Workbook and flammability limits	54
3.12 Aerosol formation and rain-out from liquid releases	54
4 Ignition timing and ignited outcomes	56
4.1 Aspects of modelling ignitions in QRA	56
4.2 Ignition timing	57

Contents continued

	Page
4.3 Ignition outcome distribution.	59
4.4 Ignition timing vs. ignition outcomes.	60
4.5 Addressing ignition outcomes in QRA	61
4.5.1 Time-dependent ignition probabilities	61
4.5.2 Drifting flammable vapour clouds.	62
4.5.3 Probability of an explosion	63
4.6 Ignition timing and ignition outcomes	64
4.6.1 Typical approaches used	64
4.6.2 Cases where the timing may be important	65
4.6.3 Sequence of end events	65
4.6.4 Liquid-fuelled fires	65
4.6.5 Summary of aspects	65
4.6.6 Basis of the suggested approach	66
4.6.7 Suggested approach to assigning timing and outcome distributions in QRAs	67

Annexes

Annex A	Full ignition model description	70
A.1	Data and methods review conclusions and implications for ignition modelling.	70
A.1.1	Model approach	70
A.1.2	Ignition data and simple probability correlations	70
A.1.3	Release source modelling	71
A.1.4	Control factors	73
A.1.5	Ignition timing and explosion probabilities – model implications	73
A.1.6	Categorisation of fluid types	74
A.1.7	Model development – initial concept.	75
A.1.8	Model structure	77
A.2	Model process detailed description.	80
A.2.1	Ignition modelling process	80
A.2.2	Ignition source characteristics	82
A.2.3	Self-ignition	85
A.2.4	Ignition of liquids vs. gases	85
A.2.5	Contact times	86
A.2.6	Gas build-up (flammable gas volume) in Area 1 plant areas.	87
A.2.7	Liquid pool size	88
A.2.8	Mist generation and rain-out	89
A.2.9	Gas momentum jet – hazard range and flammable volume.	90
A.2.10	Liquid jets	91
A.2.11	Release duration – decay factor.	92
A.2.12	Passive gas dispersion correlations.	93
A.2.13	Test for dispersion type	95
A.3	Model benchmarking	95
A.4	Model conclusions and recommendations	97
A.5	Issues for future work.	98

Contents continued

	Page
Annex B Modelling basis of look-up correlations	99
B.1 Introduction	99
B.2 Look-up correlation characteristics	99
B.3 Development of representative 'look-up' scenarios	102
B.4 General basis and assumptions for 'look-up' scenarios	103
B.4.1 Fluids considered	103
B.4.2 Release rates	104
B.4.3 Wind speed	105
B.4.4 Liquid pool sizes	105
B.4.5 Onsite offices and administration areas	106
B.4.6 Liquid only spills – no flashing or atomisation	106
B.4.7 Pressures	107
B.4.8 Module geometry and orientation factor	108
B.4.9 Areas 2 and 3 – confinement	109
B.4.10 Storage area ignition parameters	110
B.5 'Look-up' scenario specific configurations	111
B.5.1 Onshore pipeline (cross-country)	111
B.5.2 Onshore small plant	111
B.5.3 Onshore large plant	112
B.5.4 Onshore storage	113
B.5.5 Offshore NUI	114
B.5.6 Offshore FPSO	114
B.5.7 Offshore wellhead module	115
B.5.8 Offshore process or compression module	116
B.5.9 Offshore riser	117
B.5.10 Offshore release engulfing the platform	117
B.6 'Look-up' scenario ignition modelling results	122
B.6.1 Results presentation	122
B.6.2 Onshore pipelines	122
B.6.3 Onshore plant	122
B.6.4 Onshore storage	122
B.6.5 Offshore NUIs	123
B.6.6 Offshore FPSOs	123
B.6.7 Offshore risers	123
B.6.8 Offshore releases engulfing the platform	123
B.6.9 Results discussion	123
Annex C Ignition data and methods literature review	149
C.1 Review of historical ignition probability data	149
C.1.1 Forsth	149
C.1.2 Cox et al	150
C.1.3 CMPT	151
C.1.4 HSE OSD research	152
C.1.5 Offshore blowouts	154
C.1.6 E&P Forum	154
C.1.7 Per Holand	155
C.1.8 EGIG	155
C.1.9 HSE research – gasoline pipelines	155
C.1.10 Data – summary	156

Contents continued

	Page
C.2 Ignition models and related issues	156
C.2.1 JIP Workbook on Gas Build-up	156
C.2.2 WS Atkins – HSE research phase 1	156
C.2.3 WS Atkins – HSE research phase 2	157
C.2.4 WS Atkins – HSE research phase 3	158
C.2.5 IP classification and rain-out	159
C.2.6 DNV JIP – time-dependent ignition probability model	161
C.2.7 Ignition models – summary	162
C.3 HCR OIR12 ignition event analysis	163
C.3.1 OIR12 2001 ignition data	163
C.3.2 OIR12 2000 leak and ignitions data	167
C.3.3 OIR12 analysis – summary	178
C.4 Ignition modelling – specific aspects	178
C.4.1 Gas dispersion within plant areas	178
C.4.2 Gas dispersion outside plant areas	181
C.4.3 Ignition probability methods	181
C.4.4 Self-ignition	186
C.4.5 Ignition modelling and dispersion summary	186
Annex D Glossary	188
D.1 Abbreviations	188
D.2 Definitions	188
Annex E References	191
Annex F Ignition model spreadsheets	193

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

	Page
Figures	
Figure 1	Look-up correlations for onshore pipelines. 34
Figure 2	Look-up correlations for onshore plant 35
Figure 3	Look-up correlations for onshore tank and storage areas 35
Figure 4	Look-up correlations for offshore plant 36
Figure 5	Look-up correlations for offshore risers and FPSOs 36
Figure 6	Ignition modelling areas 37
Figure 7	Ignition model structure 38
Figure 8	Ignition modelling areas – infinite offsite area 46
Figure 9	Ignition modelling areas – cloud areas 46
Figure 10	Alternative ignition modelling areas approach 47
Figure 11	Example module configuration 47
Figure 12	Remodelled example module configuration part (a) 47
Figure 13	Remodelled example module configuration part (b) 48
Figure 14	Example 1 module configuration 48
Figure 15	Remodelled example 1 module configuration 48
Figure 16	Example 2 remodelled module (with wind blow back) 49
Figure 17	Example 3 remodelled module (with modules on top of each other) 49
Figure A.1	Ignition modelling areas 75
Figure A.2	Ignition modelling areas – infinite offsite area 77
Figure A.3	Ignition modelling areas – cloud areas 78
Figure A.4	Ignition model structure 78
Figure A.5	Gas Build-up Workbook correlation 87
Figure A.6	Liquid release aerosol formation correlation 89
Figure A.7	Release maximum vs. average release rate – decay factor 92
Figure A.8	Model comparison – gas releases. 96
Figure A.9	Model comparison – liquid releases 96
Figure B.1	Look-up vs. model results for offshore risers 127
Figure B.2	Look-up vs. model results for release engulfing platform 127
Figure B.3	Look-up vs. model results for offshore NUI. 128
Figure B.4	Look-up vs. model results for offshore FPSO – no wall 128
Figure B.5	Look-up vs. model results for offshore FPSO – with transverse wall 129
Figure B.6	Look-up vs. model results for offshore process module – gas 129
Figure B.7	Look-up vs. model results for offshore process module – gas – congested or mechanically ventilated module. 130
Figure B.8	Look-up vs. model results for offshore process module – liquid 130
Figure B.9	Look-up vs. model results for onshore pipelines – gas/LPG 131
Figure B.10	Look-up vs. model results for onshore pipelines – liquid 131
Figure B.11	Look-up vs. model results for onshore small plant – gas/LPG 132
Figure B.12	Look-up vs. model results for onshore small plant – liquid 132
Figure B.13	Look-up vs. model results for onshore large plant – gas/LPG 133
Figure B.14	Look-up vs. model results for onshore large plant – liquid 133
Figure B.15	Look-up vs. model results for onshore storage – gas/LPG 134
Figure B.16	Look-up vs. model results for onshore storage – liquid 134
Figure B.17	Look-up correlations (best fit) for offshore liquid releases. 135
Figure B.18	Look-up correlations (best fit) for offshore gas releases 135
Figure B.19	Look-up correlations (best fit) for offshore engulfing release and riser release 136
Figure B.20	Look-up correlations (best fit) for onshore liquid releases 136

List of figures and tables continued

	Page
Figure B.21 Look-up correlations (best fit) for onshore gas/LPG releases	137
Figure B.22 Onshore pipeline – oil	137
Figure B.23 Onshore pipeline – LPG	138
Figure B.24 Onshore pipeline – gas	138
Figure B.25 Small onshore plant – open plant area	139
Figure B.26 Small onshore plant – confined/congested plant area	139
Figure B.27 Large onshore plant – open plant area	140
Figure B.28 Large onshore plant – confined/congested plant area	140
Figure B.29 Onshore tank farm – LPG – passive dispersion	141
Figure B.30 Onshore tank farm – oil – passive dispersion	141
Figure B.31 Onshore tank farm – LPG – released treated as momentum jet	142
Figure B.32 Onshore tank farm – oil – released treated as momentum jet	142
Figure B.33 Offshore process module – oil releases	143
Figure B.34 Offshore wellhead – oil releases	143
Figure B.35 Offshore NUI	144
Figure B.36 Offshore FPSO process module	144
Figure B.37 Offshore FPSO process module – behind transverse wall	145
Figure B.38 Offshore process module – gaseous releases	145
Figure B.39 Offshore wellhead and compression modules – gaseous releases	146
Figure B.40 Offshore riser – release near to edge of installation	146
Figure B.41 Offshore riser – release away from edge of installation	147
Figure B.42 Offshore release engulfing platform	147
Figure B.43 Cox, Lees and Ang ignition probabilities for comparison	148
Figure C.1 Simple correlation of fraction of liquid not raining out vs. discharge pressure based on RELEASE model estimates	160
Figure C.2 Simple correlation of fraction of liquid not raining out vs. discharge pressure based on cyclohexane test data	161
Figure C.3 Cumulative event based ignition probabilities – based on average release rate . . .	174
Figure C.4 Cumulative event based ignition probabilities – based on maximum release rate . .	175
Figure C.5 Ratio between maximum (initial) release rate and averaged release rate for '294' cut of OIR12 data	175
Figure C.6 Cumulative event distribution for '294' data cut	176
Figure C.7 Gas Build-up JIP workbook – output for selected typical module configurations . .	179
Figure C.8 A comparison of different indicators for gas dispersion	180
Figure C.9 A comparison of ignition probabilities assigned by various models for some selected scenarios	185

Tables

Table 1 Look-up correlation selection guide	26
Table 2 Ignition model input data	40
Table 3 Ignition area types set up in model	44
Table 4 Release types – data entry	50
Table 5 Model output data and format	52
Table 6 Model output information	53
Table 7 OIR 12 Data ignition timings	57
Table 8 Ignition timings overview	58
Table 9 OIR 12 Data ignition outcome distribution by media	59

List of figures and tables continued

	Page
Table 10	OIR 12 Data ignition outcome distribution by leak severity. 60
Table 11	Plant ignition timings distribution 62
Table 12	Ignition source densities (per hectare) 62
Table 13	Plant ignition timings distribution 66
Table 14	OIR 12 Data ignition outcome distribution by media type 67
Table 15	Proposed generic ignition timings distribution 67
Table 16	Proposed ignition outcome distribution by media 68
Table A.1	Generic ignition probabilities (Cox et al and 'Revised') 71
Table A.2	Pool spill sizes 72
Table A.3	IP fluid categories 74
Table A.4	Relationship between IP fluid categories and petroleum classes 74
Table A.5	Ignition source densities for onshore offsite areas 82
Table A.6	Typical ignition source densities for onshore plant 82
Table A.7	Hot work ignition characteristics 83
Table A.8	DNV time-dependent ignition model – recommended ignition source densities. 84
Table B.1	Look-up correlation characteristics. 101
Table B.2	Release materials and properties 104
Table B.3	Release mass flow rates used. 105
Table B.4	Scenarios pressures used 108
Table B.5	Storage ignition parameters. 110
Table B.6	Ignition probability scenario configurations 119
Table B.7	Offshore module f4 geometry and orientation factor assessment. 121
Table C.1	Analysis of offshore ignition sources 149
Table C.2	Generic ignition probabilities 150
Table C.3	Generic explosion probabilities (given ignition). 150
Table C.4	Ignition sources for industrial plant 150
Table C.5	Generic ignition probabilities (CMPT). 151
Table C.6	Generic ignition probabilities (Cox et al). 151
Table C.7	Ignition delay probabilities. 152
Table C.8	Judged ignition probabilities for a range of offshore scenarios. 152
Table C.9	Proposed generic ignition probabilities for typical offshore hydrocarbon releases. 153
Table C.10	Suggested method for assigning ignition timings. 153
Table C.11	Ignition timings – based on an analysis of LPG releases 154
Table C.12	Probability of explosion given ignition – based on offshore data. 154
Table C.13	Onshore gas pipeline leak ignition probabilities 155
Table C.14	Onshore gasoline pipeline leak ignition probabilities 155
Table C.15	Ignition source densities (per hectare) 158
Table C.16	Ignition parameters for 'area' based model 159
Table C.17	Estimated rain-out fractions for flammable liquid releases (RELEASE model). 160
Table C.18	Analysis of all ignitions by cause and source of ignition 164
Table C.19	Analysis of OIR12 major accident hazard (MAH) related ignition events 165
Table C.20	Analysis of OIR12 database large releases 167
Table C.21	Analysis of OIR12 database large releases – more bands 169
Table C.22	Analysis of OIR12 database large releases – '499' events by maximum and average release rate basis 171
Table C.23	Analysis of OIR12 database large releases – comparison with cumulative basis. . . . 172

List of figures and tables continued

	Page
Table C.24 Analysis of large liquid releases	177
Table C.25 Analysis of OIR12 database – ignition timing	177
Table C.26 Analysis of OIR12 database – ignited events	177
Table C.27 CHAOS based model from DNV Ignition JIP – Appendix G – Gives average gas concentration in module vs. time.	180
Table C.28 DNV time-dependent ignition model – recommended ignition source densities . . .	182
Table C.29 Application of DNV TDIM ignition sources to a typical module	182
Table C.30 Selected results for a typical offshore module based on the WS Atkins onsite ignition methodology	183
Table C.31 Comparison of ignition probabilities assigned by various models to selected scenarios	184
Table C.32 Self-ignition probabilities	186

IGNITION MODEL SPREADSHEETS CONTENTS

Ignition model workbook – single scenario format

Read me
User guide
Results record
Summary
Area 1 – plant area
Areas 2-4
Area 2 ign
Area 3 ign
Area 4 ign
Area 1 – liquid
Area 2 – liquid
Area 3 – liquid

Ignition model workbook – multirun format

Read me
User guide
Data file
Results record
Chart_all
Summary
Area 1 – plant area
Areas 2-4
Area 2 ign
Area 3 ign
Area 4 ign
Area 1 – liquid
Area 2 – liquid
Area 3 – liquid

Look-up correlations workbook

Read me
User guide
Examples
Look-up factors
Full test
Select
Chart select
Basis
Data
Chart_all
Chart_onsh_tank_pipe
Chart_onsh_plant
Chart_offsh

FOREWORD

This report is based on research which was conducted in the period 2002–04 on behalf of the sponsors Oil and Gas UK (formerly UKOOA), the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) and the Energy Institute (EI) (formerly Institute of Petroleum (IP)). The original project, to develop *IP Research report: Ignition probability review, model development and look-up correlations*, had the aim of providing a technical review of ignition data and methods to develop improved models and guidance for the estimation of ignition probabilities for use in quantitative risk assessment (QRA). It was recognised that the methods available at that time could be very simplistic and not take account of the latest leak and ignition data, which were showing a reduced trend in ignition probabilities. Also, the models available at that time mainly did not take into account other factors known to be important such as vapour dispersion and the concentration of ignition sources. The study reviewed the data and models available and went on to develop a detailed ignition probability model. A series of look-up correlations were then developed for a range of representative onshore and offshore release scenarios to provide a simple and consistent means to apply the model covering most QRA situations.

The look-up correlations have now become the primary method for assigning ignition probabilities in both offshore and onshore QRAs and are quoted in the *OGP Risk assessment data directory*, which is widely adopted as the basis for offshore installation QRAs.

In 2012, the EI conducted an internal review of its 2006 publication and as a result of this decided to undertake a wider survey on the use of the EI/UKOOA ignition probability model and look-up correlations. The aim of this survey was to better understand the extent of use of these models and the situations they were being applied to, and to seek users' feedback on what, if any, improvements were worthwhile in terms of changes to the model, look-up correlations or associated guidance.

The survey was conducted in late summer 2012 and its findings were then presented at a workshop in September 2012 where further discussion between model users, including operators, consultants and QRA technical specialists, was used to identify what improvements were considered worthwhile.

The workshop, as described in *EI Technical workshop proceedings: Leak frequency and EI UKOOA Ignition probability model review*, concluded that there was no need to improve the detailed model or look-up correlations themselves. However, the guidance should be improved in the following areas:

- Its application to liquefied natural gas (LNG) – the correlations are not appropriate to larger releases of LNG, particularly refrigerated LNG, owing to differences in dispersion characteristics.
- The selection of suitable correlations, particularly with regard to floating production/storage units (FPU/FPSOs) with or without weather-vaning capability.
- Changing the format of the report to make it more user-friendly, as it was originally presented as a Research Report.

The findings from the survey and workshop have been the primary driver behind this update of the 2006 research report to develop this publication.

The information contained in this publication is provided as guidance only and while every reasonable care has been taken to ensure the accuracy of its contents, the Energy Institute, the project co-sponsors, the developer and the technical representatives listed in the acknowledgements, cannot accept any responsibility for any action taken, or not taken, on the basis of this information. The Energy Institute shall not be liable to any person for any loss or damage which may arise from the use of any of the information contained in any of its publications.

The information contained in this publication may be reviewed from time to time. It would be of considerable assistance in any future revision if users would send comments (e.g. on the performance of the model and the look-up correlations) or suggestions for improvement to:

The Technical Department
Energy Institute
61 New Cavendish Street
London W1G 7AR
e: technical@energyinst.org.uk

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project was undertaken by David Mansfield of ESR Technology¹ with the original analysis and modelling work conducted in 2002–2004 and published by the EI in January 2006. David Mansfield also acted as primary author for this update of the publication and contributed to the workshop and surveys in mid 2012 which form the basis of this update.

The EI wishes to record its appreciation of the work carried out by the steering group for the original work and others who participated during the technical review. Significant contributions were made by:

David Aberdeen	BP (Chairperson)
Brian Bain	DNV
Gerry Burke	WS Atkins
Stephen Connolly	Health and Safety Executive
Howard Crowther	Consultant
Tim Davenport	Shell
Alastair Gunn	ExxonMobil
Richard Jones	Acona
Robert Kyle	United Kingdom Offshore Operators Association
Colin Morgan	ESR Technology
Mark Scanlon	Energy Institute
Chris Venn	WS Atkins

Affiliations refer to the time of preparation.

The EI also wishes to record its appreciation to those EI members and other invited operator and consultant representatives, including David Mansfield of ESR Technology, for their preparation, organisation and participation in the EI *Leak frequency and EI UKOOA ignition probability model review workshop*, held in Aberdeen on 18 September 2012 and the associated surveys used to inform the workshop. These surveys and the workshop provided the impetus to update this guidance, highlighting those specific areas where additional guidance or clarification was considered worthwhile.

Project coordination and technical editing was carried out by Lee Allford (Energy Institute).

¹ ESR Technology, Whittle House, 410 The Quadrant, Birchwood Park, Warrington, WA3 6FW, United Kingdom. Telephone +44 (0)1925 843400. Facsimile +44 (0)1925 843500, www.esrtechnology.com

OVERVIEW

The probability of ignition of flammable releases from onshore and offshore installations is a key factor in determining the risks such installations present to people, assets and the environment, yet data and practical models available to enable assessors to assign suitable ignition probability distributions in QRA have been lacking.

This publication presents the findings of a project to improve the modelling of ignition probabilities in onshore and offshore installation QRAs. Specifically, the project reviewed current data and models, developed an ignition probability model for assigning ignition probabilities in QRA, and developed a simple basis and guidance for assigning ignition probabilities to generic scenarios.

The project reviewed knowledge and research in the field of ignition probability estimation in support of QRA. This was evaluated, together with the usefulness of the UK offshore industry hydrocarbon release data, as a basis for developing an improved ignition probability model. The review concluded that the commonly applied approach of adopting generic correlations based on the mass release rate for the probability of ignition was overly simplistic and may lead to unrealistic and very conservative estimates in some situations. Further, some of the correlations in use do not reflect recent ignition probability data and knowledge.

An ignition probability model was developed that combined work on the dispersion of flammable vapours in process areas with the identification of ignition characteristics in offshore and onshore plant areas and other relevant onsite and offsite land use types. It has been benchmarked against historical ignition probability data.

The model – made available as a functional workbook – provides a means to estimate the overall ignition probability and an approximate time/location distribution for specific release scenarios. It can also provide an insight into the main ignition factors and allows sensitivity analysis and 'what-if' analysis, which may help designers to change the plant layout or process conditions to reduce the ignition potential.

Recognising that the number of factors taken into account by the model means it may be too onerous to apply for some risk assessments, the project developed a series of simple, mass release rate based, ignition probability look-up correlations for a selected range of representative onshore and offshore plant and storage release scenarios. These correlations – made available as a functional workbook – provide users with a simple and convenient introductory means to incorporate more appropriate ignition probability data in many typical QRAs. Their scope includes liquid and vapour release correlations; in addition, two-phase releases can be assessed by combining the liquid and vapour results. The look-up correlations are supported by guidance on selecting the appropriate correlation to use in a given situation, and details of the underlying basis and assumptions used in deriving them. Note that the full model should be run for complex scenarios or where additional detail is required.

Some guidance is provided on ignition timing and estimating the likelihood of an explosion, given ignition.

This publication comprises the following:

- The published report: *Guidance on assigning ignition probabilities in onshore and offshore quantitative risk assessments*.

- Ignition model spreadsheets (Version D1) in single scenario and multirun formats (provided as Microsoft Excel ® spreadsheets).
- Look-up correlations workbook (Version D2) (provided as Microsoft Excel ® spreadsheet) including the updated guidance on their application.

The report adopts the following structure:

1.0 Introduction:

This provides an overview of background to the project and the project scope and application.

2.0 Look-up correlations user guide:

This section presents guidance for users on the selection and application of the look-up correlations for assigning ignition probabilities within QRAs.

3.0 Full model user guide:

This section presents guidance for users wishing to use the full ignition model to estimate ignition probabilities for specific scenarios.

4.0 Ignition timing and ignited outcomes:

This section provides general guidance on using ignition timing, etc. to determine the split of probabilities between different ignited outcomes, including the probability of an explosion, given ignition.

Annex A Full ignition model description:

This section describes the basis of the full ignition model and is provided for those wishing to understand the basis of the model and how it works. It provides a useful source of information on the model for advanced users wishing to exploit the full potential of the full ignition model.

Annex B Modelling basis of look-up correlations:

This section describes the basis of the look-up correlations and is provided for those wishing to gain a fuller understanding of the basis of these to help with selecting, using or adapting the correlations.

Annex C Ignition data and methods literature review:

This section presents the review of ignition data and models undertaken as part of the original work and published in the 2006 research report. Whilst some of these data may now be superseded, it still provides a useful overview of the data available and a historical perspective on the modelling and assigning of ignition probabilities in QRA.

Annex D Glossary

This section contains a list of abbreviations and definitions referred to in the publication.

Annex E References

The section contains the list of references quoted in the publication.

Annex F Ignition model spreadsheets

This section contains the ignition model (single scenario, multirun version) and look-up correlations workbooks.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Ignition probabilities are key inputs in QRA that can have a major influence on the estimated risks. In the past, the ignition probabilities adopted for offshore and many onshore QRAs were drawn from relatively few sources and data points, many of which may not be appropriate to the modern design and operation of oil and gas installations.

Attempts were made to develop simple models or relationships to assign ignition probabilities in QRAs. A common approach to assigning ignition probability is to relate this to the media and release flow rate. Such an approach is proposed in the *E&P Forum leak and ignition data report* and in the Cox, Lees and Ang formulae found in IChemE *Classification of hazardous locations* which were developed in 1990.

These formulae typically assign a minimum ignition probability of 1 % for small releases, rising to a maximum of 30 % for 100 kg/s releases. The upper limits have generally been derived from offshore blowout ignition data. This assumes that the maximum ignition probability for any offshore release would be no greater than the average ignition probability from a range of blowouts on drilling units; an assumption that does not stand up to detailed interrogation.

Models and simple fractions have also been suggested to estimate what proportion of ignitions are early or delayed and which may result in explosions (an example is given in *Classification of hazardous locations*). These probabilities determine the hazardous outcome from any ignited event (e.g. jet fire, flash fire or explosion followed by a jet fire), and so can be critical in determining the risk characteristics.

Given the greater attention to major hazard safety, and the need for ignition control highlighted by the current safety regimes in the UK North Sea and the worldwide oil and gas industry in general, it could be expected that current ignition probabilities might be less than those from past experience. This may be being reflected in some of the latest ignition data.

The objective of the research originally reported in 2006 and updated here as guidance was to provide a current and informed view on ignition probabilities for use in QRA and develop a simple model to assist practitioners in assigning ignition probabilities for use in QRA, together with guidance on the model and its application. The guidance also addresses the timing of ignition and methods for estimating the likelihood of an explosion, given ignition.

The model development considered both offshore and onshore situations and addressed the key differences between the onshore and offshore environments, including the confined layout of most offshore installations as opposed to the relatively open nature of many onshore facilities. The model takes account of large leaks that could spread to adjacent areas and reach external sources of ignition and recognises that the leak size needed to spread from one offshore module to the next would be smaller than ones capable of drifting between onshore plant areas.

The model – made available as a functional spreadsheet – provides a means to estimate the overall ignition probability and an approximate time/location distribution for specific release scenarios. It can also provide an insight into the main ignition factors and allows sensitivity analysis and 'what-if' analysis, which may help designers to change the plant layout or process conditions to reduce the ignition potential.

Recognising that the number of factors taken into account by the model means it may be too onerous to apply for some risk assessments, a series of simple, mass release rate based, ignition probability look-up correlations was developed for a selected range of representative onshore and offshore plant and storage release scenarios. These correlations – made available as a functional spreadsheet – provide users with a simple and convenient introductory means to incorporate more appropriate ignition probability data in many typical QRAs.

1.2 APPLICATION

This guidance should be drawn to the attention of safety practitioners, risk analysts and designers who need to determine or evaluate ignition probabilities in QRA, such as where required for safety cases or safety reports.

The project sponsors believe that the model and look-up correlations provide a more appropriate means for assigning ignition probabilities in QRAs, as they take better account of the release type and plant characteristics, and results better align with historical data including the UK offshore industry hydrocarbon release data. However, their use requires expert judgement and results should be used and interpreted with a degree of caution, in particular where they are less conservative than former approaches. In addition, those preparing or revising safety cases or safety reports should include details of pertinent assumptions and input data that support the derived ignition probabilities.

1.3 SCOPE

The scope of application of the model and look-up correlations is to assess the ignition potential of momentum driven releases of hydrocarbons; however, these are not suited to the ignition probability assessment of:

- refrigerated liquefied gases e.g. LNG;
- vaporising liquid pools;
- subsonic gas releases, or
- other non-momentum driven releases, such as those following catastrophic storage vessel failure.

This is due to the limits of the simple dispersions models used within the ignition model, see Note 6 in Table 1. The full ignition model does have the option to manually enter the volume/area of the flammable clouds in each assessment area, so can be used in this manual mode to address situations such as those previously mentioned in combination with suitable external dispersion models.

The scope of application of the look-up correlations includes liquid and vapour release correlations. In addition, two-phase releases can be assessed by combining the liquid and vapour results. The look-up correlations are supported by guidance on selecting the appropriate correlation to use in a given situation, and details of the underlying basis and assumptions used in deriving them. Note that the full model should be run for complex scenarios or where additional detail is required.

The ignition model uses a series of annular areas to represent the plant configuration and does not take elevations into account. The model is, therefore, not directly able to address modules at different levels (heights). However, the model can be configured to approximate some vertical configurations. Guidance on these aspects is given in 3.7.