ISA-TR84.00.02-2002 - Part 5

Safety Instrumented Functions (SIF)-Safety Integrity Level (SIL) Evaluation Techniques Part 5: Determining the PFD of SIS Logic Solvers via Markov Analysis

Approved 17 June 2002

ISA–The Instrumentation, Systems, and Automation Society

ISA-TR84.00.02-2002 – Part 5
Safety Instrumented Functions (SIF) — Safety Integrity Level (SIL) Evaluation Techniques Part 5:
Determining the PFD of SIS Logic Solvers via Markov Analysis

ISBN: 1-55617-806-9

Preface

This preface, as well as all footnotes and annexes, is included for information purposes and is not part of ISA-TR84.00.02-2002 – Part 5.

This document has been prepared as part of the service of ISA—the Instrumentation, Systems, and Automation Society—toward a goal of uniformity in the field of instrumentation. To be of real value, this document should not be static but should be subject to periodic review. Toward this end, the Society welcomes all comments and criticisms and asks that they be addressed to the Secretary, Standards and Practices Board; ISA; 67 Alexander Drive; P. O. Box 12277; Research Triangle Park, NC 27709; Telephone (919) 549-8411; Fax (919) 549-8288; E-mail: standards@isa.org.

The ISA Standards and Practices Department is aware of the growing need for attention to the metric system of units in general, and the International System of Units (SI) in particular, in the preparation of instrumentation standards. The Department is further aware of the benefits to USA users of ISA standards of incorporating suitable references to the SI (and the metric system) in their business and professional dealings with other countries. Toward this end, this Department will endeavor to introduce SI-acceptable metric units in all new and revised standards, recommended practices, and technical reports to the greatest extent possible. *Standard for Use of the International System of Units (SI): The Modern Metric System*, published by the American Society for Testing & Materials as IEEE/ASTM SI 10-97, and future revisions, will be the reference guide for definitions, symbols, abbreviations, and conversion factors.

It is the policy of ISA to encourage and welcome the participation of all concerned individuals and interests in the development of ISA standards, recommended practices, and technical reports. Participation in the ISA standards-making process by an individual in no way constitutes endorsement by the employer of that individual, of ISA, or of any of the standards, recommended practices, and technical reports that ISA develops.

CAUTION — ISA ADHERES TO THE POLICY OF THE AMERICAN NATIONAL STANDARDS INSTITUTE WITH REGARD TO PATENTS. IF ISA IS INFORMED OF AN EXISTING PATENT THAT IS REQUIRED FOR USE OF THE STANDARD, IT WILL REQUIRE THE OWNER OF THE PATENT TO EITHER GRANT A ROYALTY-FREE LICENSE FOR USE OF THE PATENT BY USERS COMPLYING WITH THE STANDARD OR A LICENSE ON REASONABLE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THAT ARE FREE FROM UNFAIR DISCRIMINATION.

EVEN IF ISA IS UNAWARE OF ANY PATENT COVERING THIS STANDARD, THE USER IS CAUTIONED THAT IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STANDARD MAY REQUIRE USE OF TECHNIQUES, PROCESSES, OR MATERIALS COVERED BY PATENT RIGHTS. ISA TAKES NO POSITION ON THE EXISTENCE OR VALIDITY OF ANY PATENT RIGHTS THAT MAY BE INVOLVED IN IMPLEMENTING THE STANDARD. ISA IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR IDENTIFYING ALL PATENTS THAT MAY REQUIRE A LICENSE BEFORE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STANDARD OR FOR INVESTIGATING THE VALIDITY OR SCOPE OF ANY PATENTS BROUGHT TO ITS ATTENTION. THE USER SHOULD CAREFULLY INVESTIGATE RELEVANT PATENTS BEFORE USING THE STANDARD FOR THE USER'S INTENDED APPLICATION.

HOWEVER, ISA ASKS THAT ANYONE REVIEWING THIS STANDARD WHO IS AWARE OF ANY PATENTS THAT MAY IMPACT IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STANDARD NOTIFY THE ISA STANDARDS AND PRACTICES DEPARTMENT OF THE PATENT AND ITS OWNER.

ADDITIONALLY, THE USE OF THIS STANDARD MAY INVOLVE HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, OPERATIONS OR EQUIPMENT. THE STANDARD CANNOT ANTICIPATE ALL POSSIBLE APPLICATIONS OR ADDRESS ALL POSSIBLE SAFETY ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH USE IN HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS. THE USER OF THIS STANDARD MUST EXERCISE SOUND

PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT CONCERNING ITS USE AND APPLICABILITY UNDER THE USER'S PARTICULAR CIRCUMSTANCES. THE USER MUST ALSO CONSIDER THE APPLICABILITY OF ANY GOVERNMENTAL REGULATORY LIMITATIONS AND ESTABLISHED SAFETY AND HEALTH PRACTICES BEFORE IMPLEMENTING THIS STANDARD.

THE USER OF THIS DOCUMENT SHOULD BE AWARE THAT THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE IMPACTED BY ELECTRONIC SECURITY ISSUES. THE COMMITTEE HAS NOT YET ADDRESSED THE POTENTIAL ISSUES IN THIS VERSION.

The following people served as members of ISA Committee SP84:

NAME	COMPANY
V. Maggioli, Chair	Feltronics Corporation
R. Webb, Managing Director	POWER Engineers
C. Ackerman	Air Products & Chemicals Inc.
R. Adamski	Invensys
C. Adler	Moore Industries International Inc.
R. Bailliet	Syscon International Inc.
N. Battikha	Bergo Tech Inc.
L. Beckman	HIMA Americas Inc.
S. Bender	S K Bender & Associates
K. Bond	Shell Global Solutions
A. Brombacher	Eindhoven University of Technology
S. Brown*	DuPont Company
J. Carew	Consultant
K. Dejmek	Baker Engineering & Lisk Consulting
A. Dowell*	Rohm & Haas Company
R. Dunn*	DuPont Engineering
P. Early	ABB Industrial Systems Inc.
T. Fisher	Deceased
J. Flynt	Consultant
A. Frederickson	Triconex Corporation
R. Freeman	ABS Consulting
D. Fritsch	Fritsch Consulting Service
K. Gandhi	Kellogg Brown & Root
R. Gardner*	Dupont
J. Gilman	Consultant
W. Goble	exida.com LLC
D. Green*	Rohm & Haas Company
P. Gruhn	Siemens
C. Hardin	CDH Consulting Inc.
J. Harris	UOP LLC
D. Haysley	Albert Garaody & Associates
M. Houtermans	TUV Product Service Inc.
J. Jamison	Bantrel Inc.
W. Johnson*	E I du Pont
D. Karydas*	Factory Mutual Research Corporation
L. Laskowski	Solutia Inc.
T. Layer	Emerson Process Management
D. Leonard	D J Leonard Consultants
E. Lewis	Consultant
E. Marszal	Exida.com
N. McLeod	Atofina
W. Mostia	WLM Engineering Company
D. Ogwude	Creative Systems International

G. Ramachandran	Cytec Industries Inc.
K. Schilowsky	Marathon Ashland Petroleum Company LLC
D. Sniezek	Lockheed Martin Federal Services
C. Sossman	WG-W Safety Management Solutions
R. Spiker	Yokogawa Industrial Safety Systems BV
P. Stavrianidis*	Factory Mutual Research Corporation
H. Storey	Equilon Enterprises LLC
A. Summers	SIS-TECH Solutions LLC
L. Suttinger	Westinghouse Savannah River Company
R. Szanyi	ExxonMobil Research Engineering
R. Taubert	BASF Corporation
H. Tausch	Honeywell Inc.
T. Walczak	GE FANUC Automation
M. Weber	System Safety Inc.
D. Zetterberg	Chevron Texaco ERTC

_____
* One vote per company.

This standard was approved for publication by the ISA Standards and Practices Board on 17 June 2002.

NAME	COMPANY
M. Zielinski	Emerson Process Management
D. Bishop	David N Bishop, Consultant
D. Bouchard	Paprican
M. Cohen	Consultant
M. Coppler	Ametek, Inc.
B. Dumortier	Schneider Electric
W. Holland	Southern Company
E. Icayan	ACES Inc
A. Iverson	Ivy Optiks
R. Jones	Dow Chemical Company
V. Maggioli	Feltronics Corporation
T. McAvinew	ForeRunner Corporation
A. McCauley, Jr.	Chagrin Valley Controls, Inc.
G. McFarland	Westinghouse Process Control Inc.
R. Reimer	Rockwell Automation
J. Rennie	Factory Mutual Research Corporation
H. Sasajima	Yamatake Corporation
I. Verhappen	Syncrude Canada Ltd.
R. Webb	POWER Engineers
W. Weidman	Parsons Energy & Chemicals Group
J. Weiss	KEMA Consulting
M. Widmeyer	Stanford Linear Accelerator Center
C. Williams	Eastman Kodak Company
G. Wood	Graeme Wood Consulting

This page intentionally left blank.

This is a preview of "ISA-TR84.00.02-2002 ...". Click here to purchase the full version from the ANSI store.

– 7 –   ISA-TR84.00.02-2002 - Part 5

Contents

This page intentionally left blank.

Safety Instrumented Functions (SIF)

— Safety Integrity Level (SIL) Evaluation Techniques

Part 5: Determining the PFD of Logic Solvers via Markov Analysis

Foreword

The information contained in ISA-TR84.00.02-2002 – Part 5 is provided for information only and is not part of the ANSI/ISA-84.01-1996 Standard[1] requirements.

The purpose of ISA-TR84.00.02-2002[2] is to provide the process industry with a description of various methodologies that can be used to evaluate the Safety Integrity Level (SIL) of Safety Instrumented Systems (SIS).

ANSI/ISA-84.01-1996 provides the minimum requirements for implementing a SIS given that a set of functional requirements have been defined and a SIL requirement has been established for each safety function. Additional information of an informative nature is provided in the annexes to ANSI/ISA-84.01-1996 to assist the designer in applying the concepts necessary to achieve an acceptable design. However, Standards Project 84 (SP84) determined that it was appropriate to provide supplemental information that would assist the user in evaluating the capability of any given SIS design to achieve its required SIL. A secondary purpose of this document is to reinforce the concept of the performance based evaluation of SIS. The performance parameters that satisfactorily service the process industry are derived from the SIL and reliability evaluation of SIS, namely the probability of the SIS to fail to respond to a demand and the probability that the SIS creates a nuisance trip. Such evaluation addresses the design elements (hardware, software, redundancy, etc.) and the operational attributes (inspection/maintenance policy, frequency and quality of testing, etc.) of the SIS. The basis for the performance evaluation of the SIS is safety targets determined through hazard analysis and risk assessment[6] of the process. This document demonstrates methodologies for determining the SIL and the probability of spurious trip of the SIS.

The document focuses on methodologies that can be used without promoting a single methodology. It provides information on the benefits of various methodologies as well as some of the drawbacks they may have.

> **THE METHODOLOGIES ARE DEMONSTRATED THROUGH EXAMPLES (SIS ARCHITECTURES) THAT REPRESENT POSSIBLE SYSTEM CONFIGURATIONS AND SHOULD NOT BE INTERPRETED AS RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SIS. THE USER IS CAUTIONED TO CLEARLY UNDERSTAND THE ASSUMPTIONS AND DATA ASSOCIATED WITH THE METHODOLOGIES IN THIS DOCUMENT BEFORE ATTEMPTING TO UTILIZE THE METHODS PRESENTED HEREIN.**

The users of ISA-TR84.00.02-2002 include:

- Process Hazards Analysis teams that wish to develop understanding of different methodologies in determining SIL

- SIS designers who want a better understanding of how redundancy, diagnostic coverage, diversity, etc., fit into the development of a proper SIS architecture

- Logic solver and field device suppliers

- National and International standard bodies providing guidance in the use of reliability techniques for SIS architectures

- Reliability engineers (or any engineer performing this function) can use this information to develop better methods for determining SIL in the rapidly changing SIS field

- Parties who do not have a large installed base of operating equipment sufficient to establish appropriate statistical analysis for PFD_{avg} and $MTTF^{spurious}$ for SIS components

- Operations and maintenance personnel

ISA-TR84.00.02-2002 consists of the following parts, under the general title "Safety Instrumented Systems (SIS) — Safety Integrity Level (SIL) Evaluation Techniques."

Part 1:   Introduction

Part 2:   Determining the SIL of a SIF via Simplified Equations

Part 3:   Determining the SIL of a SIF via Fault Tree Analysis

Part 4:   Determining the SIL of a SIF via Markov Analysis

Part 5:   Determining the PFD of SIS Logic Solvers via Markov Analysis

Introduction

ANSI/ISA-84.01-1996 describes a safety life cycle model for the implementation of risk reduction measures for the process industry (Clause 4). The standard then proceeds to provide specific guidance in the application of SIS, which may be one of the risk reduction methods used. The standard defines three levels of safety integrity (Safety Integrity Levels, SIL) that may be used to specify the capability that a safety function must achieve to accomplish the required risk reduction. ISA-TR84.00.02-2002 provides methodologies for evaluating SIS to determine if they achieve the specific SIL. This may be referred to as a probability of failure on demand (PFD) evaluation of the SIS.

ISA-TR84.00.02-2002 only addresses SIS operating in demand mode.

The evaluation approaches outlined in this document are performance-based approaches and do not provide specific results that can be used to select a specific architectural configuration for a given SIL.

THE READER IS CAUTIONED TO CLEARLY UNDERSTAND THE ASSUMPTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE METHODOLOGY AND EXAMPLES IN THIS DOCUMENT BEFORE DERIVING ANY CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE EVALUATION OF ANY SPECIFIC SIS.

The evaluation processes described in this document take place before the SIS detailed design phase of the life cycle (see Figure I.1, Safety Life Cycle Model).

This document assumes that a SIS is required. It does not provide guidance in the determination of the need for a SIS. The user is referred to ANSI/ISA-84.01-1996 Annex A for methodologies that might be used in making this determination.

This document involves the evaluation of the whole SIS from the sensors through the logic solver to the final elements. Process industry experience shows that sensors and final elements are major contributors to loss of SIS integrity (high PFD). When evaluating the performance of sensors and final elements, issues such as component technology, installation, and maintenance should be considered.

Frequently, multiple safety functions are included in a single logic solver. Generally, the safety function case with the highest SIL requirement will be the case that determines whether the logic solver meets performance requirements. When multiple safety function cases have the same SIL, select the case with the largest number of I/O, number of I/O channels, etc., to determine whether the logic solver meets performance requirements. The logic solver should be carefully evaluated since a problem in the logic solver may adversely impact the performance of all of the safety functions (e.g., common cause).

This principle (e.g., common cause) applies to any

- element of a SIS that is common to more than one safety function; and

- redundant element with one or more safety function.

Each element should be evaluated with respect to all the safety functions with which it is associated

- to ensure that it meets the integrity level required for each safety function;

- to understand the interactions of all the safety functions; and

- to understand the impact of failure of each component.

This document does not provide guidance in the determination of the specific SIL required (e.g., SIL 1, 2, 3) for the SIS. The user is again referred to ANSI/ISA-84.01-1996 or to other references.

The primary focus of this document is on evaluation methodologies for assessing the capability of the SIS. To understand what is meant by the SIS, refer to the model defined in ANSI/ISA-84.01-1996 and repeated in Figure I.2 defining the boundaries of the SIS.


Figure I.1 — Safety life cycle model

SIS Boundary

Figure I.2 ⎯ Definition of Safety Instrumented Systems (SIS)

The SIS Safety Requirements address the design elements (hardware, software, redundancy, etc.) and the operational attributes (inspection/maintenance policy, frequency and quality of testing, etc.) of the SIS. These elements are used to evaluate the PFD of each safety function.

The PFD of these systems can be determined using historical system performance data (e.g., statistical analysis). Where systems, subsystems, components, etc. have not been in use for a sufficiently long time and in large enough numbers to have a statistically significant population available for the evaluation of their performance solely based on actuarial data, a systematic evaluation of the performance of a system may be obtained through the use of PFD analysis techniques.

PFD analysis techniques employ systematic methodologies that decompose a complex system to its basic components. The performance and interactions of these basic components are merged into reliability models (such as simplified equations, fault trees, Markov models) to determine the overall system safety availability.

This document provides users with a number of PFD evaluation techniques, which allow a user to determine if a SIS meets the required safety integrity levels.

Safety integrity is defined as "The probability of a Safety Instrumented System satisfactorily performing the required safety functions under all stated conditions within a stated period of time." Safety integrity consists of two elements: 1) hardware safety integrity and 2) systematic safety integrity. Hardware safety integrity, which is based upon random hardware failures, can normally be estimated to a reasonable level of accuracy. ANSI/ISA-84.01-1996 addresses the hardware and systematic safety integrity by specifying target failure measures for each SIL. For SIS operating in the demand mode the target failure measure is **PFD$_{avg}$** (average probability of failure to perform its design function on demand). **PFD$_{avg}$** is also commonly referred to as the average probability of failure on demand. Systematic integrity is difficult to quantify due to the diversity of causes of failures; systematic failures may be introduced during the specification, design, implementation, operational and modification phases and may affect hardware as

well as software. ANSI/ISA-84.01-1996 addresses systematic safety integrity by specifying procedures, techniques, measures, etc. that reduce systematic failures.

An acceptable safe failure rate is also normally specified for a SIS. The safe failure rate is commonly referred to as the false trip, nuisance trip, or spurious trip rate. The spurious trip rate is included in the evaluation of a SIS, since process start up and shutdown are frequently periods where chances of a hazardous event are high. Hence in many cases, the reduction of spurious trips will increase the safety of the process. The acceptable safe failure rate is typically expressed as the mean time to a spurious trip ($\textbf{MTTF}^{\textbf{spurious}}$).

NOTE   In addition to the safety issue(s) associated with spurious trips the user of the SIS may also want the acceptable MTTF^{spurious} to be increased to reduce the effect of spurious trips on the productivity of the process under control. This increase in the acceptable MTTF^{spurious} can usually be justified because of the high cost associated with a spurious trip.

The objective of this technical report is to provide users with techniques for the evaluation of the hardware and systematic safety integrity of SIS ($\textbf{PFD}_{\textbf{avg}}$) and the determination of $\textbf{MTTF}^{\textbf{spurious}}$. The three methods in this technical report allow modeling of both systematic failures so that a quantitative analysis can be performed.

ISA-TR84.00.02-2002 shows how to model complete SIF, which include the sensors, the logic solver and final elements. To the extent possible the system analysis techniques allow these elements to be independently analyzed. This allows the SIS designer to select the proper system configuration to achieve the required safety integrity level.

ISA-TR84.00.02-2002 - Part 1 provides

- a detailed listing of the definition of all terms used in this document. These are consistent with the ANSI/ISA-84.01-1996, IEC 61508 and IEC 61511 standards.

- the background information on how to model all the elements or components of a SIF. It focuses on the hardware components, provides some component failure rate data that are used in the examples calculations and discusses other important parameters such as common cause failures and functional failures.

- a brief introduction to the methodologies that will be used in the examples shown in this document. They are Simplified equations [3], Fault Tree Analysis [4], and Markov Analysis [5].

ISA-TR84.00.02-2002 - Part 2 provides simplified equations for calculating the SIL values for Demand Mode Safety Instrumented Functions (SIF) installed in accordance with ANSI/ISA-84.01-1996, "Applications of Safety Instrumented Systems for the Process Industries." Part 2 should not be interpreted as the only evaluation technique that might be used. It does, however, provide the engineer(s) performing design for a SIS with an overall technique for assessing the capability of the designed SIF.

ISA-TR84.00.02-2002 - Part 3 provides fault tree analysis techniques for calculating the SIL for Demand Mode Safety Instrumented Functions (SIF) installed in accordance with ANSI/ISA-84.01-1996, "Applications of Safety Instrumented Systems for the Process Industries." Part 3 should not be interpreted as the only evaluation technique that might be used. It does, however, provide the engineer(s) performing design for a SIS with an overall technique for assessing the capability of the designed SIF.

ISA-TR84.00.02-2002 - Part 4 provides Markov analysis techniques for calculating the SIL values for Demand Mode Safety Instrumented Functions (SIF) installed in accordance with ANSI/ISA-84.01-1996, "Applications of Safety Instrumented Systems for the Process Industries." Part 4 should not be interpreted as the only evaluation technique that might be used. It does, however, provide the

engineer(s) performing design for a SIS with an overall technique for assessing the capability of the designed SIF.

ISA-TR84.00.02-2002 - Part 5 addresses the logic solver only, using Markov Models for calculating the PFD of E/E/PE logic solvers because it allows the modeling of maintenance and repairs as a function of time, treats time as a model parameter, explicitly allows the treatment of diagnostic coverage, and models the systematic failures (i.e., operator failures, software failures, etc.) and common cause failures.

Figure I.3 illustrates the relationship of each part to all other parts.

| Part 1 |
| Development of the overall terms, symbols, explanation of SIS element failures, comparison of system analysis techniques, and uncertainty. |

Part 2

Development of SIL for SIF using Simplified Equation Methodology.

Part 3

Development of SIL for SIF using Fault Tree Analysis Methodology.

Part 4

Development of SIL for SIF using Markov Analysis Methodology.

Part 5

Guidance in determining the PFD of E/E/PE logic solver(s) via Markov Analysis.

Figure I.3 ⸺ ISA-TR84.00.02-2002 overall framework

1   Scope

1.1   ISA-TR84.00.02-2002 - Part 5 is informative and does not contain any mandatory requirements. ISA-TR84.00.02-2002 - Part 5 is intended to be used only with a thorough understanding of ISA-TR84.00.02-2002 - Part 1 which defines the overall scope.

 1.2   ISA-TR84.00.02-2002 - Part 5 provides:

a)   guidance in PFD analysis of logic solvers;

> NOTE   The term "logic solver" will be used throughout Part 5 to indicate the SIS logic solver. The logic solver technology may be any E/E/PES.

b)   a method to determine the PFD of logic solvers;

c)   failure rates and failure modes of logic solvers;

d)   the impact of diagnostics, diagnostic coverage, covert faults, test intervals, common cause, systematic failures, redundancy of logic solvers on the PFD of the logic solver; and

e)   a method for the verification of PFD of logic solvers.

1.3   The procedures and examples outlined in ISA-TR84.00.02-2002 - Part 5 provide the engineer with Markov modeling steps to be followed in determining a mathematical value for the PFD for typical configurations of SIS logic solvers designed according to ANSI/ISA-84.01-1996.

1.4   Persons using ISA-TR84.00.02-2002 - Part 5 require a basic knowledge of Markov Analysis.

1.5   See ISA-TR84.00.02-2002 - Part 1 (Introduction), Part 2 (Simplified Equations), Part 3 (Fault Tree Analysis), and Part 4 (Markov Analysis) if it is necessary to mathematically evaluate the SIL of the safety instrumented function (SIF).

NOTE   The method illustrated herein (i. e. Markov analysis) may also be used to determine the PFD of other SIF components such as sensors and final elements. The logic solver was selected to illustrate how Markov Analysis is applied to a complex SIF component.

2   References

1.   ANSI/ISA-84.01-1996 "Application of Safety Instrumented Systems for the Process Industries," Instrumentation, Systems, and Automation Society, Research Triangle Park, NC, 27709, February 1996.

2.   ISA-TR84.00.02-2002, "Safety Instrumented Functions (SIF) – Safety Integrity Level Evaluation Techniques, Part 1: Introduction; Part 2: Determining the SIL of a SIF via Simplified Equations; Part 3: Determining the SIL of a SIF via Fault Tree Analysis; Part 4: Determining the SIL of a SIF via Markov Analysis; Part 5: Determining the PFD of SIS Logic Solvers via Markov Analysis," Instrumentation, Systems and Automation Society, Technical Report, Research Triangle Park, NC, 27709, 2002.

3.   "Reliability, Maintainability and Risk" by David J. Smith, 4th Edition, 1993, Butterworth-Heinemann, ISBN 82-515-0188-1.

4.   "Guidelines for Safe Automation of Chemical Processes," Center for Chemical Process Safety, American Institute of Chemical Engineers, New York, NY 10017, 1993.