

Title	Offshore Technology Report 1999 048: Explosion Pressures Evaluation in early project phase
Publisher/Author	HSE
Publication Date	2000
Executive Summary	<p>Designing topsides structures and equipment to withstand credible explosion events is an essential part of the route towards inherently safer designs. One of the main factors inhibiting the design process currently is the lack of detailed geometry information early in design phase: ie prior to start of construction. If congestion due to small items is not allowed for when undertaking explosion pressures analysis design pressures will be severely under-estimated. Figure 1 illustrates the schedule problem, ie the explosion pressures are needed to perform the design but the design is needs to be defined for the explosion pressures analysis.</p> <p>This study involved a FLACS sensitivity study performed by Gexcon at CMR on a complete and fully detailed module to see how the assessed explosion pressure progressed in relation to the development of the CAD geometry model. Explosion pressures were found to grow by a factor of 30 from the stage where the basic equipment and boundaries was defined through to final inclusion of all detail. At east half the congestion is rectangular (mostly secondary structure). The rise in pressures due to addition of piping 2" and below was 25%. This was simple open geometry. For larger geometries a larger increase may be expected.</p> <p>The study has been carried out in three phases. In the second phase in 1996 a method for accounting for growth in explosion pressures due to yet-to-be-added equipment was developed. This method involved adapting a similar module for which complete equipment information is available, performing on its geometry data base a similar exercise to that applied in the case study. The growth factors determined for the similar module would then be applied to the partially completed new module.</p> <p>During the second phase an alternative method for accounting for shortfall of detail was identified but not at that time investigated. With this method the steps are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To quantify the shortfall of small-item congestion in the geometry model. 2. To implement representative artificial congestion into the geometry model prior to performing explosion pressures analysis. <p>Over the past 18 months the method has been applied on about 10 projects in UK and overseas and has been found to be effective, more effective than the growth factor method advocated in phase 1 and 2 of the study. Building the CAD model is done jointly by the Engineering Contractor and the explosion pressures consultant and gives the opportunity to improve the inherent explosion performance of the design.</p> <p>The difference between pressures predicted in early design and those predicted when the actual CAD geometry model was commonly found to be in the range 10 - 30%, ie within the accuracy band of the prediction technique. This compares with orders of magnitude difference when artificial congestion is not implemented. A third study phase was therefore undertaken to bring the advocated methodology into line with industry practice.</p> <p>Whichever method is used to account for unidentified congestion during design development, the operating safety case should be based on or checked against an explosion pressures analysis made using the final detailed geometry model with all</p>

pipng down to 1" or less included.

Table of Contents	1.0	SUMMARY	1
	2.0	INTRODUCTION AND STUDY OBJECTIVES	3
	3.0	SCHEDULING & DEFINING THE SCOPE OF EXPLOSION PRESSURES ANALYSES	6
	3.1	Major new projects	6
	3.2	Small projects and platform/tanker conversions	12
	3.3	Obtaining Explosion pressures for equipment design	12
	3.4	Using the series of Analyses to progressively optimise the design	15
	3.5	Summary of chapter 3	16
	4.0	BUILDING THE GEOMETRY MODEL AND POPULATING IT WITH ARTIFICIAL CONGESTION	17
	4.1	Estimating "yet to be added" equipment and congestion	17
	4.2	Locating congestion in the right part of the module and optimising the design in the process	18
	4.3	Implementing Artificial congestion into the CAD geometry Model	19
	4.4	What is a typical content of a CAD geometry model and what is the sequence for implementing it	22
	4.5	Summary of Chapter 4	22
	5.0	THE DEVELOPMENT OF DETAILED LAYOUT INFORMATION IN TOPSIDES PROJECTS	23
	5.1	Layout group, latest developments in CAD	23
	5.2	Information generated and held by weight control/MTO group	26
	5.3	Summary of Chapter 5	28
	6.0	QUANTIFYING THE DEGREE OF COMPLETENESS OF THE MODEL AND THE PROBABLE IMPACT OF ANY SHORTFALL ON ASSESSED EXPLOSION PRESSURES	29
	6.1	Congestion Parameters	29
	6.2	Growth Factors for explosion pressure	30
	6.3	Growth Factors for impulse	31
	6.4	Using Congestion Parameters and Growth factors in projects and studies	32
	6.5	Summary and findings of Chapter 6	32
	7.0	PART D: CASE STUDY ON CONGESTION EFFECTS	35
	7.1	Introduction	35
	7.2	Description of simulated geometry	36
	7.3	FLACS Sensitivity studies	39
	7.4	Results of explosion simulations	41
	7.5	Parametric study	43
	7.6	Discussion	45
	7.7	Summary and findings of Chapter 7	51
	8.0	CONGESTION PARAMETER AND GROWTH FACTOR STUDY	53
	8.1	Definition and use of Congestion Parameters	53
	8.2	Prediction of final explosion pressures from intermediate stage geometry models in platform example	55
	8.3	Summary and findings of Chapter 8	58
	9.0	CONCLUSIONS	61
	10.0	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	61
	11.0	REFERENCES	61
	12.0	GLOSSARY OF TERMS	61
	APPENDIX A: REPORTS OF INTERVIEWS WITH TOPSIDES ENGINEERING CONTRACTORS		
	A1	Amec London	A2
	A2	McDermott London	A3
	A3	Brown and Root London	A4
	A4	Kvaerner Oslo	A5