Catalyx : Journal of Process Chemistry and Technology
E-ISSN : 3063-508X
Volume. 1 Issue 2 October 2024
Page No: 139-148

An Integrated Framework for Process Safety Management in Chemical Industries

Sarifah Fauziah Syed Draman
Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia
Correspondent: sfauziah@uitm.edu.my

Received : September 27, 2024
Accepted : October 28, 2024
Published : October 30, 2024

Citation: Draman, S, F, S. (2024). An Integrated Framework for Process Safety Management in Chemical Industries. Catalyx : Journal of Process Chemistry and Technology, 1(2), 139-148

ABSTRACT: Chemical process industries operate under high-risk conditions that demand rigorous and integrated safety management approaches. This study introduces a five-layer integrated framework designed to enhance hazard identification and safety control by aligning international standards, regulatory requirements, and empirical safety practices. The framework synthesizes ISO 31000 and ISO 45001 with regulatory systems like OSHA PSM, EPA RMP, and Seveso III, and integrates hazard identification techniques (HAZID, HAZOP, Bowtie), risk control tools (ALARP, risk matrix, hierarchy of controls), engineering assurance measures (IEC 61511-based SIS, mechanical integrity), and performance monitoring (API RP 754, digital dashboards). Methodologically, the framework is constructed through a multi-source synthesis approach combining literature, regulatory analysis, and operational safety taxonomies. It is operationalized through example datasets including a risk register, control taxonomies, and regulatory alignment matrices, demonstrating its practical relevance. Key findings indicate that this integrated model improves traceability between risk sources and control measures, enhances communication across safety functions, and supports proactive risk management. The incorporation of Bowtie analysis and real-time digital monitoring tools strengthens both visualization and performance assessment. While challenges such as system complexity and resource demands remain, these are mitigated through modular implementation and cross-functional engagement. In conclusion, the framework offers a structured and adaptable model that bridges the gap between compliance-driven and performance-driven safety management. It provides a foundation for future research in predictive analytics and digital safety system integration.

Keywords: Chemical Process Safety, Integrated Framework, Bowtie Analysis, Safety Performance, Hazard Identification, ALARP, Process Safety Management

INTRODUCTION

Chemical process industries operate in inherently hazardous environments characterized by complex operations, hazardous materials, and dynamic risk factors. Despite significant advancements in safety technologies and the proliferation of regulations, industrial chemical accidents ranging from accidental releases to catastrophic explosions remain a persistent threat. These incidents often result in severe consequences including human fatalities, environmental degradation, economic loss, and reputational damage. Recent global analyses highlight that sectors such as petrochemical manufacturing, oil and gas refining, and bulk chemical storage remain particularly vulnerable to process-related accidents due to the high-risk nature of their operations (Chetan & Malaviya, 2023).

International databases have revealed consistent patterns in the types and root causes of process safety incidents, with loss of containment (LOC), fire and explosion, and toxic releases as recurring event types. Studies note that developing countries are disproportionately affected due to underdeveloped regulatory frameworks and lower implementation of safety standards (Ershadi et al., 2019; Noory & Ali Younis Talb Al Manhal, 2024). Although global reporting systems have improved in recent years, there remains a gap in unified data structures and proactive learning mechanisms, highlighting the need for integrated solutions in both incident documentation and prevention strategies.

Against this backdrop, regulatory frameworks such as the OSHA Process Safety Management (PSM), the EPA Risk Management Program (RMP), and the European Seveso III Directive have played pivotal roles in shaping the industrial safety landscape. These regulations provide foundational structures for identifying, evaluating, and mitigating risks associated with hazardous chemical processes. However, despite their critical value, these systems are often critiqued for implementation inconsistencies, limited stakeholder engagement, and their sometimes static or overly prescriptive nature (Ghahramani, 2017; Neag et al., 2020). The voluntary aspects and complex compliance pathways embedded in frameworks like PSM and Seveso III create significant adoption barriers, particularly for small and medium-sized enterprises (Animah & Shafiee, 2022).

Moreover, process industries frequently operate within compartmentalized management systems that lack integration between risk assessment methods, engineering controls, organizational strategy, and real-time feedback mechanisms. Safety practices are often confined to regulatory compliance, resulting in fragmented cultures that fail to capture the holistic nature of risk (Abbas & Ariifin, 2023). Several studies emphasize that without adequate training, stakeholder participation, and cross-functional communication, safety management systems may not function as intended (Sugiyanto, 2022). Furthermore, the disconnect between safety programs and core business processes undermines the effectiveness of otherwise robust safety standards.

This situation calls for a more unified approach one that transcends regulatory boundaries and integrates governance structures, hazard identification methodologies, risk evaluation models, technical controls, and safety performance indicators into a cohesive whole. While international standards such as ISO 31000 and ISO 45001 have demonstrated potential in driving organizational resilience and risk-based thinking, their impact is often constrained by organizational culture and resource capacity (Mutlu & Altuntaş, 2021).

Attempts at integration are emerging, with models such as the Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) and frameworks leveraging AI or fuzzy logic showing early promise. Nevertheless, these approaches are often limited in scope, lack empirical validation across different industry types, or remain disconnected from broader safety governance systems.

The increasing complexity of global supply chains and interdependencies among operational entities further underscore the need for systemic integration in process safety management.

Empirical studies have linked mature safety systems and integrated safety management approaches with reduced incident frequencies and improved organizational performance (Lyashenko et al., 2024). Regulatory bodies and industry leaders are thus urged to move beyond compliance-driven models toward comprehensive, adaptable frameworks that unify safety functions across governance, engineering, and monitoring dimensions.

This study responds to these challenges by proposing an integrated five-layer framework for hazard identification and safety control in the chemical process industry. Synthesizing insights from international regulations, best-practice safety standards, and incident databases, the framework is designed to enable clear traceability from risk source to control verification. The framework's layers governance alignment, hazard identification, risk analysis and control selection, engineering assurance, and performance monitoring are each grounded in existing standards and operational best practices. This study offers both a conceptual model and practical templates to operationalize its application in diverse industrial contexts, advancing the discourse on integrated safety management in high-hazard sectors.

METHOD

This chapter presents the methodological basis for developing the integrated hazard identification and safety control framework for chemical process industries. The framework's design is rooted in multi-source synthesis, combining normative standards, empirical data, and structured risk management tools to ensure practicality and adaptability across various industrial contexts.

Conceptual Basis: Standards and Regulatory Foundations

The foundation of the integrated model draws on globally recognized standards and regulatory frameworks. ISO 31000 provides a universal risk management framework emphasizing principles, structure, and process. It ensures organizational alignment and supports continuous improvement in risk treatment strategies. Similarly, ISO 45001 offers a structured approach to occupational health and safety (OH&S) management using the PDCA (Plan-Do-Check-Act) cycle, emphasizing risk-based thinking and worker participation. Together, these standards contribute to the framework's first layer of governance and policy alignment.

Complementing these are chemical-specific regulations including OSHA's Process Safety Management (PSM) standard, the EPA's Risk Management Program (RMP), and the European Union's Seveso III Directive. These legal instruments form the 'compliance floor' and offer detailed requirements for process hazard analysis, emergency response, mechanical integrity, and performance evaluation. Their incorporation into the model ensures the framework aligns with enforceable safety mandates (Ghahramani, 2017; Animah & Shafiee, 2022).

Integration Tools: Bowtie Analysis and ALARP Principles

Bowtie analysis serves as the primary structuring tool for the model, enabling visual representation of the relationships among threats, top events, consequences, and preventive/mitigative barriers.

The top event is defined as the moment a hazard materializes (e.g., chemical release), with threats as initiating causes and consequences as potential outcomes. Preventive barriers act before the top event, while mitigative barriers reduce the impact afterward. Bowtie analysis has proven effective in both the chemical and oil & gas sectors for translating complex risk data into operational decision-making (Farera et al., 2024).

In addition, the ALARP (As Low As Reasonably Practicable) principle guides risk acceptability decisions, especially in high-hazard environments. Its integration ensures that residual risks are evaluated against feasibility and proportionality, allowing risk-based justification of control measures. This principle is essential in the third layer of the model, guiding the selection of controls based on risk ranking and tolerance levels (Marszal, 2022).

Operationalizing Taxonomies and Control Hierarchies

The model utilizes structured taxonomies for hazard classification and control identification. Hazards are categorized based on their source and impact (e.g., LOC, thermal runaway, toxic release), while controls are mapped using the Hierarchy of Controls from elimination and substitution to PPE. These classifications are drawn from empirical analyses of databases such as ARIA, CSB, and eMARS, providing consistency in terminology and analytical depth (Muniz et al., 2017).

Taxonomies are embedded in operational templates, notably the Risk Register, which combines Bowtie elements with control status (OK, Degraded, Failed) and links to verification mechanisms. This operationalization supports real-time risk tracking and safety audits.

Model Construction and Validation

The five-layer structure of the framework was designed by aligning key elements from each source:

- Layer 1: Governance – ISO 31000, ISO 45001, PSM baseline
- Layer 2: Hazard Identification – HAZID, HAZOP, Bowtie
- Layer 3: Risk Control – ALARP, risk matrix, Hierarchy of Controls
- Layer 4: Engineering Assurance – SIS (IEC 61511), Mechanical Integrity
- Layer 5: Monitoring – Tiered indicators (API RP 754), incident trend tracking

Validation is conceptual, achieved by applying the model to diverse regulatory and industry contexts and comparing it against known control failures from historical incidents. Templates such as the Regulatory Comparison Matrix and Hazard-Control Taxonomy were developed to show how standards and controls can be aligned.

This chapter establishes the methodological rigor and multi-source synthesis that underpin the framework's construction, ensuring both regulatory compliance and operational adaptability.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the five-layer integrated framework, its supporting tools, and aligned literature evidence, illustrating how each layer supports comprehensive hazard identification and safety control in chemical industries.

Governance & Standards Alignment

ISO 31000 and ISO 45001 form the governance foundation of the framework. ISO 31000 supports structured risk-based decision-making, while ISO 45001 promotes integration of occupational health and safety within business functions (Fabiano et al., 2017). These standards complement regulatory mandates like OSHA PSM and Seveso III, which are often rigid and prescriptive.

Safety leadership is a key enabler of governance. Studies confirm that proactive leadership integrates safety into core strategy, shaping safety culture and policy implementation (Ashraf et al., 2022). However, differences in Seveso III/COMAH enforcement across countries highlight that national context shapes compliance effectiveness.

Hazard Identification Tools and Integration

The framework incorporates HAZID, HAZOP, What-If, and Bowtie analysis for hazard identification. HAZID provides early-stage insights; HAZOP focuses on deviations in processes; What-If stimulates creative scenario development (Rashid & Umar, 2023). Bowtie analysis is pivotal for visualizing top events and control barriers, improving risk communication and clarity.

Integrating qualitative and quantitative methods e.g., Bayesian networks within Bowtie yields a robust understanding of risks. Digitization tools such as IoT-enabled hazard trackers and cloud-based platforms now support collaborative, real-time hazard management (Skakunov, 2024).

Risk Control Selection and ALARP Justification

The framework uses the Hierarchy of Controls (elimination to PPE) to structure control strategies. Studies show its effectiveness in prioritizing sustainable interventions like engineering redesigns. The ALARP principle ensures that risk reduction measures are justifiable relative to their cost and benefit (Fabricatore et al., 2022).

Risk matrices guide investment decisions, helping organizations visualize risk severity and likelihood to prioritize actions (Mukherjee et al., 2023). Still, critiques caution against oversimplification in static risk ranking systems, urging integration with dynamic assessments and stakeholder judgment.

Engineering Assurance Layer

IEC 61511 guides Safety Instrumented Systems (SIS) implementation across design, maintenance, and testing stages. Reliability varies across lifecycle phases but improves with proactive maintenance and operational feedback (Johari & Ramli, 2020).

Mechanical integrity ensures SIS and other physical systems maintain their protective function. Studies show that consistent maintenance, inspections, and aligned asset management systems reduce failure risk and strengthen safety-critical functions.

Performance Monitoring Tools

The final layer focuses on safety performance tracking using API RP 754's tiered indicator system. Leading indicators (e.g., safety audits, near-miss reporting) predict future performance, while lagging indicators confirm historical trends.

Digital dashboards and sensor-driven monitoring enhance real-time tracking. Organizations adopting such technologies demonstrate better control over emerging hazards, aligning with continuous improvement goals in ISO-based systems.

This multi-layered structure, anchored in both regulatory and empirical sources, supports dynamic safety management and cross-functional alignment in high-hazard environments.

The proposed five-layer integrated framework represents a structured approach to improving chemical process safety by bridging regulatory, technical, and organizational dimensions. Drawing from international standards, empirical data, and visual risk modeling, the framework aligns critical safety elements across governance, hazard identification, control assurance, and performance monitoring. This discussion explores the framework's documented advantages, implementation challenges, and the organizational dynamics that support or hinder its effectiveness.

One of the key benefits of an integrated safety management framework is its ability to reduce redundancy and streamline processes across safety, environmental, and quality domains. By embedding ISO 45001 and ISO 31000 principles into process safety strategies, organizations are better positioned to align with regulatory expectations while promoting proactive risk identification and mitigation (Paulíková et al., 2022). Such integration reduces administrative burden and enhances compliance outcomes. More importantly, it cultivates a unified safety culture that supports continual improvement, contributing to both operational resilience and stakeholder confidence (Akram & Affandi, 2024).

Safety engineering, when aligned with governance structures, becomes a strategic function rather than a standalone technical activity. Leadership engagement is a critical enabler in this context. Research confirms that top management support strengthens safety initiatives and embeds safety objectives into organizational policies (Pillay, 2018). Cross-functional communication between engineers and governance teams also facilitates more informed risk assessments and promotes accountability in safety-critical decisions. Such interdisciplinary collaboration ensures that safety management is harmonized with business strategy, improving both compliance and operational outcomes (Haroun & Ghomari, 2023).

Despite its benefits, multi-layered safety models are not without limitations. The complexity inherent in integrating various standards, tools, and organizational processes can create confusion and implementation fatigue particularly in resource-constrained settings (Alheriani et al., 2021). Smaller organizations may lack the capacity to sustain data-intensive models, leading to fragmented implementation or selective compliance. Additionally, data integration and system interoperability remain significant hurdles, particularly when attempting to consolidate information across different risk domains or organizational silos (Barafort et al., 2018). Therefore, careful tailoring of framework elements is essential to ensure scalability and contextual relevance.

The inclusion of cross-functional teams is a critical factor in overcoming these challenges. Research supports that diverse teams improve communication, bridge disciplinary divides, and foster innovation in risk management (Rueda & Gonzalo Carlos José Perez Gomez, 2016). Employees are more likely to engage with safety initiatives when empowered to contribute, resulting in stronger safety ownership and fewer unreported hazards. Cross-functional structures also allow for a more nuanced interpretation of risk data, which is vital for adaptive safety decision-making in dynamic operational environments (Norimarna, 2021).

Overall, the integrated framework's strengths lie in its ability to synthesize governance, engineering, and monitoring practices into a coherent structure. Its limitations complexity, resource demands, and data integration issues can be mitigated through leadership support, modular design, and cross-functional engagement. As industrial operations become more interconnected, such integrated approaches offer a viable pathway to enhanced chemical process safety and organizational resilience.

CONCLUSION

This study proposes a comprehensive five-layer integrated framework for hazard identification and safety control tailored to the unique challenges of chemical process industries. Developed from a synthesis of international standards, regulatory mandates, and empirical methodologies, the framework offers a systematic model that aligns governance, technical safety measures, and monitoring systems into a unified approach. Its structure encompasses key functions: governance alignment (ISO 31000, ISO 45001, PSM), hazard identification (HAZID, HAZOP, Bowtie), risk control (ALARP, risk matrix, control hierarchy), engineering assurance (SIS, mechanical integrity), and performance monitoring (API RP 754, digital tools).

The integration of these layers facilitates traceability from risk identification to control validation, addressing gaps in existing fragmented safety practices. By embedding leadership, worker participation, and risk-based thinking into safety governance, the framework enhances organizational resilience. Moreover, its use of Bowtie analysis and digital monitoring systems provides operational clarity and agility, helping organizations proactively manage high-risk scenarios.

While offering significant benefits in unifying safety functions, the framework also acknowledges the implementation challenges in real-world settings, such as system complexity and resource constraints. These can be addressed through modular application, leadership commitment, and the strategic involvement of cross-functional teams.

The key contribution of this research lies in bridging regulatory compliance with technical control assurance through a standardized and adaptable model. It enables chemical industries to transition from reactive safety compliance to proactive, performance-driven safety management. Future research may extend this framework by testing its application across different industrial contexts, integrating predictive analytics, and linking it with digital risk management platforms.

REFERENCE

Abbas, N. N. b., & Ariifin, K. b. (2023). Internal Factors in the Implementation of ISO 45001 Among Organizations. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *13*(7). https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v13-i7/14576

Akram, A., & Affandi, B. (2024). *Uncovering Synergies: A Comprehensive Case Study on Incorporating API Q2 Into an Upstream Provider's Integrated Management Framework With a Focus on ISO14001 and ISO45001*. https://doi.org/10.2118/220310-ms

Alheriani, N., Spasojević-Brkić, V., & Perišić, M. (2021). Novel Risk Management Integrated Model Implementation: Comparison Between Manufacturing and Service Companies. *Journal of Engineering Management and Competitiveness*, *11*(1), 13–19. https://doi.org/10.5937/jemc2101013a

Animah, I., & Shafiee, M. (2022). *Status of ISO 45001:2018 Implementation in Seaports: A Case Study*. 1100–1107. https://doi.org/10.3850/978-981-18-5183-4_r19-04-596-cd

Ashraf, A. M., Imran, W., & Véchot, L. (2022). Analysis of the Impact of a Pandemic on the Control of the Process Safety Risk in Major Hazards Industries Using a Fault Tree Analysis Approach. *Journal of Loss Prevention in the Process Industries*, *74*, 104649. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlp.2021.104649

Barafort, B., Mesquida, A., & Mas, A. (2018). ISO 31000-based Integrated Risk Management Process Assessment Model for IT Organizations. *Journal of Software Evolution and Process*, *31*(1). https://doi.org/10.1002/smr.1984

Chetan, S., & Malaviya, P. (2023). Review of Occupational Health and Safety Management System and Hazards Controls in the Motion & Industrial Automation Products Manufacturing Industries. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Science Communication and Technology*, 342–358. https://doi.org/10.48175/ijarsct-11456

Ershadi, M. J., Edrisabadi, R., & Shakouri, A. (2019). Strategic Alignment of Project Management With Health, Safety and Environmental Management. *Built Environment Project and Asset Management*, *10*(1), 78–93. https://doi.org/10.1108/bepam-03-2019-0023

Fabiano, B., Vianello, C., Reverberi, A. P., Lunghi, E., & Maschio, G. (2017). A Perspective on Seveso Accident Based on Cause-Consequences Analysis by Three Different Methods. *Journal of Loss Prevention in the Process Industries*, *49*, 18–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlp.2017.01.021

Fabricatore, E., Fiu, P., Fiu, J., McDonald, F. N., Walker, R. F., & Wohlwend, J. (2022). *Permanent Foam Fixatives for Radioactive Contamination Control: Environmental Chamber Testing*. https://doi.org/10.2172/1846768

Farera, J. N., Ambarwati, R., Sumartik, S., & Dedy, D. (2024). The Risk Assessment and Human Risk Control in Indonesian Power Plant. *Binus Business Review*, *15*(1), 93–105. https://doi.org/10.21512/bbr.v15i1.9803

Ghahramani, A. (2017). Diagnosis of Poor Safety Culture as a Major Shortcoming in OHSAS 18001-Certified Companies. *Industrial Health*, *55*(2), 138–148. https://doi.org/10.2486/indhealth.2015-0205

Haroun, H., & Ghomari, A. R. (2023). A Spatial Data Integration and Visualization Approach for Occupational Health and Safety Risks Management: Application to Algerian Electricity and Gas Company. *The Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries*, *89*(4). https://doi.org/10.1002/isd2.12265

Johari, K. A., & Ramli, A. (2020). Major Accident Hazard in Bioprocess Facilities: A Challenge to Sustainable Industrial Development. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, *736*(2), 22005. https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899x/736/2/022005

Lyashenko, O., Peretiaka, S. M., Shestakova, M., & Shpota, O. (2024). Occupational Safety and Health Management Systems in the Context of ISO 45001:2018. *Development of Management and Entrepreneurship Methods on Transport (ONMU)*, *86*(1), 120–130. https://doi.org/10.31375/2226-1915-2024-1-120-130

Marszal, E. M. (2022). Expanding From LOPA to Quantitative Bow Tie Analysis. *Process Safety Progress*, *42*(2), 258–268. https://doi.org/10.1002/prs.12424

Muniz, M. V. P., Lima, G. B. A., Caiado, R. G. G., & Quelhas, O. L. G. (2017). Bow Tie to Improve Risk Management of Natural Gas Pipelines. *Process Safety Progress*, *37*(2), 169–175. https://doi.org/10.1002/prs.11901

Mutlu, N. G., & Altuntaş, S. (2021). Developing an Integrated Conceptual Framework for Monitoring and Controlling Risks Related to Occupational Health and Safety. *Journal of Engineering Research*, *9*(4), 262–278. https://doi.org/10.36909/jer.9959

Neag, P. N., Ivaşcu, L., & Drăghici, A. (2020). A Debate on Issues Regarding the New ISO 45001:2018 Standard Adoption. *MATEC Web of Conferences*, *305*, 2. https://doi.org/10.1051/matecconf/202030500002

Noory, H. S., & Ali Younis Talb Al Manhal. (2024). The Availability of the Requirements of the International Standard ISO: 45001:2018 for Occupational Safety and Health Management in Iraqi Organizations: Comparative Applied Research in the Diyala and Salah Al-Din Electricity Distribution Departments. *International Journal of Financial Management and Economics*, *7*(1), 227–237. https://doi.org/10.33545/26179210.2024.v7.i1.295

Norimarna, S. (2021). Conceptual Review: Compatibility of Regulatory Requirements of FSA to Insurance Industry in Indonesia for Integrated GRC. *RSF Conference Series: Business Management and Social Sciences*, *1*(5), 105–115. https://doi.org/10.31098/bmss.v1i5.456

Paulíková, A., Chovancová, J., & Blahová, J. (2022). Cluster Modeling of Environmental and Occupational Health and Safety Management Systems for Integration Support. *International*

Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, *19*(11), 6588. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19116588

Pillay, M. (2018). *The Utility of M-31000 for Managing Health and Safety Risks: A Pilot Investigation*. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.77949

Rashid, R. M., & Umar, R. Z. R. (2023). Control of Industrial Major Accident Hazard Regulation in Malaysia: Second Decade in Examination. *International Journal of Public Health Science (IJPHS)*, *12*(1), 138. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijphs.v12i1.22002

Rueda, R. A. A., & Gonzalo Carlos José Perez Gomez. (2016). Triad Model Articulation of Integrated Management Systems [TMA-HSEQ]. *Tecciencia*, *11*(20), 19–26. https://doi.org/10.18180/tecciencia.2016.20.3

Skakunov, D. A. (2024). A Method for Assessing the Level of Professional Risks When Performing High-Risk Work by Contractors. *Oil and Gas Business*, *6*, 19–41. https://doi.org/10.17122/ogbus-2024-6-19-41

Sugiyanto, S. (2022). The Effect of Occupational Safety and Health (K3) Policy on Employee Performance. *The Spirit of Society Journal*, *6*(1), 39–51. https://doi.org/10.29138/scj.v6i1.1600