

# **Process Safety Performance Indicators for the Refining and Petrochemical Industries**

ANSI/API RECOMMENDED PRACTICE 754  
THIRD EDITION, AUGUST 2021



American  
Petroleum  
Institute

## Special Notes

API publications necessarily address problems of a general nature. With respect to particular circumstances, local, state, and federal laws and regulations should be reviewed. The use of API publications is voluntary. In some cases, third parties or authorities having jurisdiction may choose to incorporate API standards by reference and may mandate compliance.

Neither API nor any of API's employees, subcontractors, consultants, committees, or other assignees make any warranty or representation, either express or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained herein, or assume any liability or responsibility for any use, or the results of such use, of any information or process disclosed in this publication. Neither API nor any of API's employees, subcontractors, consultants, or other assignees represent that use of this publication would not infringe upon privately owned rights.

API publications may be used by anyone desiring to do so. Every effort has been made by the Institute to assure the accuracy and reliability of the data contained in them; however, the Institute makes no representation, warranty, or guarantee in connection with this publication and hereby expressly disclaims any liability or responsibility for loss or damage resulting from its use or for the violation of any authorities having jurisdiction with which this publication may conflict.

API publications are published to facilitate the broad availability of proven, sound engineering and operating practices. These publications are not intended to obviate the need for applying sound engineering judgment regarding when and where these publications should be utilized. The formulation and publication of API publications is not intended in any way to inhibit anyone from using any other practices.

Any manufacturer marking equipment or materials in conformance with the marking requirements of an API standard is solely responsible for complying with all the applicable requirements of that standard. API does not represent, warrant, or guarantee that such products do in fact conform to the applicable API standard.

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher. Contact the Publisher, API Publishing Services, 200 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20001.

*Copyright © 2021 American Petroleum Institute*

## Foreword

Nothing contained in any API publication is to be construed as granting any right, by implication or otherwise, for the manufacture, sale, or use of any method, apparatus, or product covered by letters patent. Neither should anything contained in the publication be construed as insuring anyone against liability for infringement of letters patent.

The verbal forms used to express the provisions in this document are as follows.

Shall: As used in a standard, “shall” denotes a minimum requirement in order to conform to the standard.

Should: As used in a standard, “should” denotes a recommendation or that which is advised but not required in order to conform to the standard.

May: As used in a standard, “may” denotes a course of action permissible within the limits of a standard.

Can: As used in a standard, “can” denotes a statement of possibility or capability.

This document was produced under API standardization procedures that ensure appropriate notification and participation in the developmental process and is designated as an API standard. Questions concerning the interpretation of the content of this publication or comments and questions concerning the procedures under which this publication was developed should be directed in writing to the Director of Standards, American Petroleum Institute, 200 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20001. Requests for permission to reproduce or translate all or any part of the material published herein should also be addressed to the director.

Generally, API standards are reviewed and revised, reaffirmed, or withdrawn at least every five years. A one-time extension of up to two years may be added to this review cycle. Status of the publication can be ascertained from the API Standards Department, telephone (202) 682-8000. A catalog of API publications and materials is published annually by API, 200 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20001.

Suggested revisions are invited and should be submitted to the Standards Department, API, 200 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20001, [standards@api.org](mailto:standards@api.org).

# Contents

Page

<b>1</b>	<b>Scope</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	General	1
1.2	Applicability	1
1.3	Guiding Principles	2
1.4	Introduction	2
<b>2</b>	<b>Normative References</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Terms, Definitions, Acronyms and Abbreviations</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1	Terms and Definitions	3
3.2	Acronyms and Abbreviations	11
<b>4</b>	<b>Leading and Lagging Performance Indicators</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Tier 1 Performance Indicator-Process Safety Event</b>	<b>12</b>
5.1	Tier 1 Indicator Purpose	12
5.2	Tier 1 Indicator Definition and Consequences	13
5.3	Calculation of Tier 1 PSE Rate	14
5.4	Tier 1 PSE Severity Weighting	15
<b>6</b>	<b>Tier 2 Performance Indicator-Process Safety Events</b>	<b>19</b>
6.1	Tier 2 Indicator Purpose	19
6.2	Tier 2 Indicator Definition and Consequences	19
6.3	Calculation of Tier 2 PSE Rate	20
<b>7</b>	<b>Tier 3 Performance Indicators-Challenges to Safety Systems</b>	<b>21</b>
7.1	Purpose of Indicator	21
7.2	Examples of Tier 3 PSEs	21
<b>8</b>	<b>Tier 4 Performance Indicators-Operating Discipline and Management System Performance</b>	<b>24</b>
8.1	General	24
8.2	Purpose of Indicator	24
8.3	Examples of Tier 4 Indicators	25
<b>9</b>	<b>Guidelines for Selection of Process Safety Indicators</b>	<b>25</b>
9.1	General	25
9.2	Purpose of Indicators	26
9.3	Lagging vs Leading Indicators	26
9.4	Characteristics of Effective Indicators	26
9.5	Selection of Indicators	27
<b>10</b>	<b>Reporting Performance Indicators</b>	<b>27</b>
10.1	Format and Forum	27
10.2	Transparency	28
10.3	Stakeholder	28
10.4	PSE Data Capture	29

## Contents

Page

Annex A (informative) Application to Petroleum Pipeline and Terminal Operations . . . . .	43
Annex B (informative) Application to Retain Service Stations . . . . .	45
Annex C (informative) Oil and Gas Drilling and Production Operations . . . . .	46
Annex D (normative) Tier 1 PSE Severity Weighting . . . . .	47
Annex E (informative) PSE Examples and Questions . . . . .	51
Annex F (informative) Listing of Chemicals Sorted by Threshold Quantity (Based on UNDG Hazard Class or Grouping) . . . . .	84
Annex G (informative) Application of TRCs to Multicomponent Releases . . . . .	87
Annex H (informative) PSE Tier 1/Tier 2 Determination Decision Logic Tree . . . . .	90
Annex I (informative) Guidance for Implementation of Tier 3 and Tier 4 Indicators . . . . .	92
Annex J (informative) Tier 4 Example Indicators . . . . .	112
Bibliography . . . . .	123

### Figures

1 “Swiss Cheese (Static) Model” and “Spinning Disk (Dynamic) Model” . . . . .	3
2 Process Safety Indicator Pyramid . . . . .	12
3 Example of Safe Operating Limit for Tank Level . . . . .	21
D.1 Tier 1 PSE Severity Weighting . . . . .	50
D.2 Tier 1 PSE Trend . . . . .	50
F.1 Inhalation Toxicity: Packing Group and Hazard Zones . . . . .	86
G.1 Flammability Limits of Methane, Nitrogen, Oxygen Mixtures . . . . .	88
H.1 PSE Tier 1/Tier 2 Determination Decision Logic Tree . . . . .	91
I.1 Personal Safety/Process Safety Graphic . . . . .	94
I.2 Illustration of Process Safety Elements Relating to Equipment . . . . .	95
I.3 Daily Indicator Listing Example . . . . .	96
I.4 Illustration of Data Flow and Need for Categorization . . . . .	101
I.5 Example of Data Funneling Flow Diagram . . . . .	105
I.6 Example PSE Tier 3 Other LOPC Graph . . . . .	106
I.7 Example PSE Tier 3 Other LOPC Graph by Plant and Process Unit . . . . .	106
I.8 Example PSE Tier 3 Other LOPC Graph for Plant 1 FCC and Alkylation Units by Equipment Involved . . . . .	107
I.9 Example PSE Tier 3 Other LOPC Graph by Plant and Equipment Involved . . . . .	107
I.10 Example PSE Tier 3 Other LOPC Graph by Plant and Management System Root Causes . . . . .	108
I.11 Example PSE Tier 3 Other LOPC Graph by Plant and Mode of Operation . . . . .	108
I.12 Example of Moving Average for Demands on Safety Systems . . . . .	109
I.13 Example of Moving Average for Demands on Safety Systems—Separated into Stages . . . . .	109

### Tables

1 Material Release Threshold Quantities . . . . .	16
2 Stakeholder Report Information . . . . .	28
D.1 Tier 1 PSE Severity Weighting . . . . .	48
E.1 Process Safety Event Examples and Questions: Injury . . . . .	51
E.2 Process Safety Event Examples and Questions: Fire or Explosion . . . . .	54
E.3 Process Safety Event Examples and Questions: Loss of Primary Containment . . . . .	57

## Contents

	Page
<b>E.4 Process Safety Event Examples and Questions: A Release Within Any 1-hour Period</b> . . . . .	<b>64</b>
<b>E.5 Process Safety Event Examples and Questions: Mixtures and Solutions</b> . . . . .	<b>66</b>
<b>E.6 Process Safety Event Examples and Questions: Pressure-relief Device, Unsafe Location</b> . . . . .	<b>68</b>
<b>E.7 Process Safety Event E Examples and Questions: Company Premises, Process Safety Event with Multiple Outcomes, Pipelines</b> . . . . .	<b>71</b>
<b>E.8 Process Safety Event Examples and Questions: Marine Transport</b> . . . . .	<b>71</b>
<b>E.9 Process Safety Event Examples and Questions: Truck and Rail</b> . . . . .	<b>72</b>
<b>E.10 Process Safety Event Examples and Questions: Downstream Destructive Devices</b> . . . . .	<b>74</b>
<b>E.11 Process Safety Event Examples and Questions: Vacuum Truck Operations</b> . . . . .	<b>75</b>
<b>E.12 Process Safety Event Examples and Questions: Direct Cost</b> . . . . .	<b>76</b>
<b>E.13 Process Safety Event Examples and Questions: Officially Declared Evacuation or Shelter-in-Place</b> . . . . .	<b>77</b>
<b>E.14 Process Safety Event Examples and Questions: Upset Emissions</b> . . . . .	<b>78</b>
<b>E.15 Process Safety Event Examples and Questions: Ancillary Equipment/Active Staging/Active Warehouse</b> . . . . .	<b>80</b>
<b>E.16 Process Safety Event Examples and Questions: Responsible Party</b> . . . . .	<b>82</b>

## **Introduction**

The purpose of this recommended practice (RP) is to identify leading and lagging indicators for the refining and petrochemical industries, suitable for nationwide public reporting, as well as performance indicators for use at individual facilities including methods for their development and use. A comprehensive leading and lagging indicators program provides useful information for driving improvement and when acted upon contributes to reducing risks of major hazards (e.g. by identifying trends and underlying causes and taking action to prevent recurrence). This RP may augment a Company's existing practices and procedures.

This RP cannot and does not preempt any federal, state, or local laws regulating process safety. Therefore, nothing contained in this document is intended to alter or determine a Company's compliance responsibilities set forth in the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 and/or the OSHA standards themselves or any other legal or regulatory requirement concerning process safety. The use of the term or concept "process safety" in this document is independent of and may in fact be broader than the term or concept "process safety" contained in OSHA regulatory requirements or as the term may be used in other legal or regulatory contexts. In the event of conflict between this RP and any OSHA or other legal requirements, the OSHA or other legal requirements should be fully implemented.

## Notes to the Third Edition

As part of the revision process, the drafting committee gathered input from companies that had adopted this RP. The committee sought comments regarding the utility and usefulness of the Tier 1 and Tier 2 indicators to drive performance improvement, as well as any comments regarding suggested improvements. The result of the input gathering exercise was a desire for continuous improvement rather than any need for fundamental change.

Although the RP was written for the U.S. Refining and Petrochemical industries, it has been widely adopted around the globe and by additional industry segments. The revision committee benefited from broad participation by parties with a direct and material interest from academia, trade associations, engineering and construction, regulators, and owner/operators both domestic and international.

The purpose of this RP is to identify leading and lagging process safety performance indicators for the refining and petrochemical industries, suitable for nationwide public reporting, as well as indicators for use at individual facilities including methods for their development and use. A comprehensive leading and lagging indicators program provides useful information for driving improvement and when acted upon, contributes to reducing risks of major hazards (e.g. by identifying trends and underlying causes and taking action to prevent recurrence).

In revising this document, the drafting committee maintained a focus on indicators of process safety performance vs indicators of health, personal safety, or environmental performance. Each is important and each should have its own performance indicators as part of a comprehensive and robust Health, Safety, and Environmental Program. Process safety hazards can result in major accidents involving the release of potentially dangerous materials. Process safety incidents can have catastrophic effects such as multiple injuries and fatalities, as well as substantial economic, property, and environmental damage, and can affect workers inside the facility and members of the public who reside or work nearby.

Numerous issues including process safety indicator definitions, chemical release thresholds, data capture, statistical validity, and public reporting were again considered, this time with the benefit of 10 years of implementation experience. One of the most significant revision proposals was the adoption of the *Globally Harmonized System for Classification and Labeling of Chemicals* (GHS) for threshold release categorization. The drafting committee chose to include the equivalent GHS classifications in parallel to the U.S. DOT version of the United Nations Dangerous Goods (UNDG) hazard classifications. The GHS system offers analogous categories to nearly all toxic, flammable, and corrosive characteristics identified by the U.S. DOT version of UNDG hazard classification. In addition, a variety of GHS categories were aligned to specific packing group material classifications. Another significant change was regarding how corrosives are viewed in relation to process safety events. Given the localized effects of corrosive loss of primary containments (LOPCs) compared to flammables and toxics, the committee chose to reduce the material hazard classification for corrosive agents to better align with the other hazard classes.

Other significant continuous improvement changes include:

- clarifications to the definitions of primary and secondary containment, direct cost, indoor release, and unsafe location;
- making process safety event (PSE) severity weighting reporting mandatory;
- expanding the resolution and usefulness of causal data collected by adding an additional layer of causes under each primary cause;
- expanded the data collection capability to include non-petroleum-based chemical facilities.

# Process Safety Performance Indicators for the Refining and Petrochemical Industries

## 1 Scope

### 1.1 General

This recommended practice (RP) identifies leading and lagging process safety indicators useful for driving performance improvement. As a framework for measuring activity, status, or performance, this document classifies process safety indicators into four tiers of leading and lagging indicators. Tiers 1 and 2 are suitable for nationwide public reporting and Tiers 3 and 4 are intended for internal use at individual facilities. Guidance on methods for development and use of performance indicators is also provided.

### 1.2 Applicability

**NOTE** At joint venture sites and tolling operations, the Company should encourage the joint venture or tolling operation to consider applying this RP.

This RP was developed for the refining and petrochemical industries but may also be applicable to other industries with operating systems and processes where loss of containment has the potential to cause harm (see Note). Applicability is not limited to those facilities covered by the OSHA Process Safety Management Standard, 29 *CFR* 1910.119, or similar national and international regulations.

**NOTE** To enable consistent application of this RP to other refining and petrochemical industry subsegments, informative annexes have been created to define the Applicability and Process definition for those subsegments. The user would substitute the content of those annexes for the referenced sections of this RP: Annex A—Petroleum Pipeline and Terminal Operation, Annex B—Retail Service Stations, Annex C—Oil and Gas Drilling and Production Operations.

This RP applies to the responsible party. At co-located facilities (e.g. industrial park), this RP applies individually to the responsible parties and not to the facility as a whole.

Events associated with the following activities fall outside the scope of this RP and shall not be included in data collection or reporting efforts:

- a) releases from transportation pipeline operations outside the control of the responsible party;
- b) marine transport operations, except when the vessel is connected or in the process of connecting or disconnecting to the process;

**NOTE** The boundary between marine transport operations and in the process of connecting to or disconnecting from the process is the first/last step in loading/unloading procedure (e.g. first line ashore, last line removed, etc.).

- c) truck or rail transport operations, except when the truck or rail car is connected or in the process of connecting or disconnecting to the process, or when the truck or rail car is being used for on-site storage;

**NOTE 1** Active staging is not part of connecting or disconnecting to the process; active staging is not considered on-site storage; active staging is part of transportation.

**NOTE 2** The boundary between truck or rail transport operations and in the process of connecting to or disconnecting from the process is the first/last step in loading/unloading procedure (e.g. wheel chocks, set air brakes, disconnect master switch, etc.).

- d) vacuum truck operations, except on-site truck loading or discharging operations, or use of the vacuum truck transfer pump;