Human Reliability in future operations

NG Downstream
Symptomatic 20st century joke in the world of Process Automation

Question:

How many resources do you need to run a refinery?

Answer: Two: one operator and one dog

The operator is there to feed the dog

The dog is there to make sure that the operator doesn’t touch anything…
The 20st century
Automation Engineers’ heaven:

100% automated plants
No more operators, no more human errors
Infinite workforce productivity

*Just a matter of time and resources...*
Just a matter of time and resources ... ?

- **Major investment effort**
  - Digitalize all controls
  - Develop software applications and optimizers
  - 2003, voting systems, UPS, …
  - Fool-proof SIS, Layers of Protection, risk matrix …
  - …

- **In the meantime, human errors continued to happen with evolving diagnosis**
  - ~1970 : “Humans are not machines”
  - ~1980 : “residual problem from the past, will soon be solved”
  - ~1985 : “need more detailed procedures for remaining human interventions”
  - ~1990 : “problem to transfer competency to new generation operators”
  - ~1995 : “need behavioral program … so that procedures are followed”
  - …
21st century: several wake-up calls
Classical (20th century) approach of Automation

Operator = (un)avoidable source of errors and losses

- Human errors are at the origin of many incidents of process safety, reliability, ...

- Automation objective = avoid depending on human intervention

- Technology = a tool to reduce the exposure of the process to human intervention and errors

- Operator error = caused by not following procedures and / or lack of competency
Human error:
2 most observed root causes

Just aspects of a more complex reality
Humans are not machines…

so we cannot do anything …

Let’s do AT LEAST what we, engineers, do for machinery:

- ensure utilisation in their optimum operating range
- install alarming and overload protection
- ensure long lifetime with a maintenance plan
- design an adapted control scheme to influence their functioning
- use our expertise to constantly enhance their RELIABILITY

= the (‘hard’) science of

Human & Organisational Factors
Human & Organisational Factors: domain

- **Basis = brain functioning**
  - Handling of conflicting priorities
  - Tunnel effect
  - Mental models during operations
  - ...

- **Functioning of peer groups**

- **Quantified effects and limitations of human reliability:**
  - « double independent check »
  - Time constraint on probability of operator error
  - Effect of personal signature
  - Length of procedures
  - Controls standardisation
  - Use of colors in operator displays
  - ...

- **Applications available:** nuclear sector, aviation, military...

---

**Second checker**

Effect of second checker on human error probability of operator executing a task (p-factor 100)

**Effect of time constraint**

[Graph showing human error probability as a function of time after signal]

**Length and use of checklists**

**Table 20-7 Estimated probabilities of errors of omission per item of instruction when use of written procedures is specified**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Omission of Item:</th>
<th>HEP</th>
<th>EF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Short list, ≤ 10 items</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Long list, &gt; 10 items</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Short list, ≤ 10 items</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Long list, &gt; 10 items</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>When written procedures are available and should be used but are not used (i.e., rely on memory)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Human error = linked to specific nature of people

Required strategy =
- Understand human error

- Reduce error-likeliness by organizational and technical measures

- Strengthen the error recovery by the peers

- Continuous learning: active tracking of minor work errors and near misses

Figure from Honeywell & ASM Consortium
Human Error typology in the Process Industry: Classification according to CCPS

Active failures
- Slip
  - Correct Intent but failure in execution
    - Expertise failure
    - Lack of expertise
- Mistake
  - Action as intended but intention was wrong
- Laps
  - Error in memory recall
- Violation
  - Intended action that deliberately ignores a known rule, restriction or procedure
- Socio-technical failure

Latent conditions
- Mgt / org. failure
  - Based on team behaviour
    - E.g. unclear goal setting, poorly defined responsibilities, allowing deviation, unadapted tools, ...
  - In combination with active failure, will result in incident
    - Includes Mgt/ org. failure

Shortcut
Necessary
Optimising
Exceptional
The human ‘control loop’ of the operator

Inputs from Process (sensors, analyzers, radios, video, instructions, sounds & smells)

Operator Mental & Physical Activities

- **Orienting**
  - (1) Sensing, Perception, and/or Discrimination

- **Evaluating**
  - (2) Analysis, Interpretation, and/or (3) Projection

- **Acting**
  - Physical and/or Verbal Response

Situation Awareness

Process State

Assessing

External Feedback

Internal Feedback

Outputs to Process (SP, OP%, Manual adjustments)

Figure from the ASM Consortium
Adaptation of Supervisory Control Activity models of Jens Rasmussen and David Woods - CMA.
Factors which influence the overall intervention success of the operator

Orienting
- Information overload
- Missing information
- Inappropriate level of detail
- Vigilance decrement
- Difficult navigation
  - Distracting environment

Evaluating
- Inconsistent information
- Inaccurate information
- Conflicting priorities
- Lack of knowledge
- Inappropriate detail
- Poor information accessibility

Acting
- Inadequate communications
- Deficient / complex procedures
- Fail to follow procedures
- Inappropriate actions
- Inappropriate tools / interface
- Lack of experience
- Inadequate feedback

Assessing
- Lacking “big picture” view
- Inaccurate information
- Inadequate information
- Erroneous conclusions

Red = human influencing factors which are directly impacted by available automation technology + already applied in nuclear, aviation, …
21st century approach of Automation

Operator = unavoidable source of errors and losses

- Human errors are at the origin of many incidents of process safety, reliability, ...
- Automation objective = avoid depending on human intervention
- Technology = a tool to reduce the exposure of the process to human intervention and errors
- Operator error = caused by not following procedures and / or lack of competency

Operator = unique source of safety and reliability

- Unique human contribution = manage abnormal situations (anticipate, detect, respond) in process safety, ...
- Automation objective = maximize the operator’s impact on his process
- Technology is a tool to boost the Human Reliability of the operator
- Operator error = failure of operational and technical management to adapt work organization and tools to the human characteristics of the operator
- (more automation doesn’t remove any operator functions...)
Transverse competencies remain KEY for Automation success also in the 21st century.

20th Century:
- Process Automation & DCS expertise
  - Owns technology
  - SOLUTIONS
- Process design and engineering science
  - Owns the NEEDS

21st Century:
- Conduct of Operations and HUMAN FACTORS science
  - Owns the NEEDS
- Process Automation & DCS expertise
  - Owns technology
  - SOLUTIONS
R&D consortium of 15 companies and universities

- Initially co-funded by US Govt (NIST) +$16M for first 4 years
- Jointly invested +50M$ over 15 years
- Creating knowledge, tools and products designed to prevent, detect and mitigate abnormal situations that affect process safety in the control operations environment

Charter

- Stage 1 (1994-1998) : Research
- Stage 2 (1999-2001) : Prototyping
- Stage 3 (2002-2004) : Development
- Stage 4 (2005-2008) : Deployment

Deliverables

- Technology, prototypes, guidelines, best practices, metrics, application knowledge, workshops, products

The state-of-the-Art “lab” for technology - enhanced Human Reliability of the Operator: Abnormal Situation Management® Consortium
R&D domain of the ASM Consortium

Technology to radically enhance the operational teams’ capability to:

- Error-free **DETECT** indicators and precursors
- Error-free **DECIDE** on appropriate course of actions
- Error-free **RESPOND** and execute corrective actions

in order to **PREVENT** or **MITIGATE** any abnormal situation

![Graph showing impact vs. time with labels: Normal, Abnormal, Emergency. Star indicating earlier awareness, more informed response.]
Human and Organizational Factors: a mature and applied science, and an *largely untapped resource* for the Process Industry

- The first users: marketeers ...

  *Influencing the human decisions of their customers (while the Process Industry concentrated on reducing headcount?)*

- Nuclear and Aviation industries!

  *They could only survive by improving their Human Reliability (while the Process Industry translated accidents and risk into an economic cost?)*

- "High Reliability Organisations" (HRO)

  *Human Factors = core competency for them (while the Process Industry concentrated on technical competencies?)*

- Process Industry?

  - *Little generalized use of HF, but some interesting Best Practices can be observed ...*
Process Safety Officer (PSO)

**(Science : the positive energy required for an individual or a team to succeed a difficult operation prevents the same brain(s) to make proper decisions for a conflicting priority – like process safety…)**

**Solution : Process Safety Officer (PSO)**

- = a dedicated function (brain) during planned and unplanned critical operations (incl. all startups, …)
- whose sole purpose is to keep an oversight, check the proper conditions for carrying out the operation, and **stop the operation** if he feels that it is needed for **process safety**
- The PSO is independant from the operation : does NOT participate to the proceeding of the operation

**At the moment of execution of critical operations, a « PSO event » is formally declared**

- Assigned PSO puts on **red vest**
- Not required personnel leaves the operational area
- Result = spontaneous higher level of concentration
Quality policy on procedure writing

- *(Science : a competent professional will be reluctant to use a training manual to support the execution of his task, because it suggest incompetency)*

- Formal procedure policy : purpose of procedure = boost the operator’s *Human Reliability*, to be used by *trained and competent* professionals only (cfr. airline pilots)
  - NOT as training tool
  - NOT to compensate lack of competency
  - Main philosophy: the reliable human intervention will prevent the accident, not the SOP

- Ensure complete separation between training and procedures
  - Experienced operators would never use the procedure if it means « training »

- Besides the Action Steps : only 4 standard types of messages
  - P.S.O. REQUIRED FROM THIS POINT (/ P.S.O. NO LONGER REQUIRED)
  - CAUTION : ......................... (regarding safety)
  - WARNING : ......................... (regarding equipment damage)
  - NOTE : .............................. (general and basic technical information)

- Style and format prescriptions (cfr. CCPS guideline)
Operating Procedures criticality classification

- **Science**: Human reliability when executing a sequence of instructions is increased by a factor of 10 when following a procedure at hand compared to relying on memory, and by 100 when using a procedure with sign-off provision per item.

- **Procedure criticality classification based on human error likeliness**
  - Low frequency = high probability of human error
  - Complexity (information access, mental loading, physical loading, communications, stress)
  - Dynamic judgment: based on incidentology or changing team composition / experience

- **For critical procedures**:
  - Mandatory use « in hand » during operation
  - Signing off on each step + at the end
  - Critical phase: PSO presence required (start and end is indicated)
  - Indication of the need to execute the exact sequence, or that some parts can be done in parallel

- **Other procedures**: also required to follow but no mandatory sign-off per step
Use of « double independent check »

- (Science: the presence of a second independant checker reduces the human error probability by a factor 100!)

- Each manipulation of a safety element is double checked by a second operator (cfr. Interaction pilot – copilot)
  - Valve under relief valve
  - Transmitter of SIS
  - ...

- Strong verification after opening of process
  - Torque tags are attached to all flanges which have been opened
    - Indication of torque value and type of joint
    - Date + ID of person who tightened the flanges
  - After maintenance: signing off by both parties
    - Operator verifies together with maintenance the equipment status and all torque tags
  - Torque tags are gradually removed after being pressure tested (no more torque tags allowed when equipment is effectively taken in service)
  - Yellow lining: before start-up of unit which has been changed or opened for maintenance
    - 2 independent operators walk the entire P&ID(s) of the unit and mark in yellow all correspondent and in red all deviations.
Human process interface

- **Science**: the human brain’s capability of information processing (qualitative / quantitative reading, recording, interpreting) is limited, function of time constraints and standardisation

- **Formal alarm rate policy in place**:  
  - normal operations: max. 1 alarm every 10 minutes  
  - upset conditions: max. 10 alarms every 10 minutes

- **Intelligent alarm processing by the DCS**:  
  - Prioritising / suppressing alarms

- **Alarm reduction project and workgroup in place**:  
  - Continuous alarm rate monitoring  
  - Defining improvement initiatives  
  - Defining unique standard alarm philosophy and controls design

- **Intuitive operator displays**:  
  - Use of colour for abnormal situations (normal = grey)
Conclusions towards future operations

- Human Reliability is a largely untapped improvement opportunity for the Process Industry

- Ensuring Human Reliability is the main mission of the Operational Management, through organisational and technical measures

- The science of Human & Organisational Factors a core competency for future Operational Management

- There is still a long way to go...