

PROCESS SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SELF-ASSESSMENT

PROCESS SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SELF-ASSESSMENT

Abbreviations

AS 2885	Australian Standard: Pipelines – Gas and liquid petroleum
ERD	Energy Resources Division
JHA	Job hazard analysis
KPI	Key performance indicator
MOC	Management of change
PSE	Process safety and environment
PSEM	Process safety and environmental management
PSEMS	Process safety and environmental management system
PTW	Permit to work
SEO	Statement of Environmental Objectives
SWMS	Safe work method statement
The Act	Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Act 2000
The Regulations	Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Regulations 2013

PROCESS SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SELF-ASSESSMENT

SCOPE OF ASSESSMENT:

Site or activity being assessed:	
Licensee/operator	
Assessor(s)	
Assessment format	

1. Leadership and Awareness

To ensure that priorities and strategies for effective process safety and environmental risk management are established, championed and implemented. Sufficient resources for sustainable process safety and environmental risk management are provided and that sufficient capital investment is provided to maintain the integrity of the plant and process as well as the management systems. Business decisions are made in the light of the implications for process safety and environmental risk management and that stakeholders are informed and engaged on the performance of the business in relation to risk management. There is adequate and effective process safety and environmental risk communication, bottom up and top down, and visibility of senior managers is maintained to support and deliver a positive process safety and environment awareness.

1 Leadership and Awareness		
Score Guide	Assessment Criteria	Assessor's Comments
1	<p><u>Less than expected performance, urgent attention required</u></p> <p>Policies exist on paper. Scope of policies may be limited and not cover public safety, environmental protection, security of supply and effective consultation. Approach to PSEM/HSE is reactive at both the management and field level. Minimal PSEM or HSE awareness has been developed. Resources are limited to specific objectives or projects. There are no specific mechanisms for communication and awareness of process safety or environmental concepts and issues from top-down and bottom-up, or those that exists are one-directional.</p>	
2	<p><u>Acceptable but improvement is required in this area</u></p> <p>Policies cover all expected outcomes of a PSEMS but may not specifically reference process safety or environmental concerns. There are documented strategies for how the outcomes of the policies will be achieved. Awareness of HSE concerns and prevention is established, and awareness of PSEM concepts is in development (e.g. through promotion and engagement programs), Management, employees and contractors are aware of key PSE risks of the activities which the licensee/operator is undertaking. Resources are generally made available for delivery of essential process safety activities.</p>	
3	<p><u>Ongoing improvement evident</u></p> <p>Element is mostly implemented; plans are in place to improve performance.</p>	
4	<p><u>Expected outcome and satisfactory</u></p> <p>Policies clearly defined, consistent with the objectives of the Act. Good awareness of policies and strategies throughout the organisation. Strategies specifically address process safety. Managers and supervisors actively participate in PSEM processes and activities and develop and monitor both PSEM and HSE targets and measures with employees and contractors. PSEM awareness and ownership is present and is supported by proactive engagement programs. Adequate resources and an appropriate organisational structure allow for delivery of PSEM objectives.</p>	

5	<u>Better than expected performance</u> Evidence is to be provided that performance is beyond fit-for-purpose.	
		SCORE:

PROCESS SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SELF-ASSESSMENT

2. Identification and Compliance with Legislation and Industry Standards

To ensure that requirements of applicable legislation, regulations, licences, permits, codes, standards, practices and other governmental requirements are identified, kept current, understood and complied with.

2. Identification and Compliance with Legislation and Industry Standards		
Score Guide	Assessment Criteria	Assessor's Comments
1	<p><u>Less than expected performance, urgent attention required</u> Limited understanding of regulatory requirements at senior levels and poorly communicated and understood at employee and contractor levels. No dedicated compliance resource(s). Non-compliances with relevant legislation have been observed. Substantial intervention required by regulator to ensure compliance is achieved. Compliance with industry standards is declared on paper but verification is limited to regulator activities.</p>	
2	<p><u>Acceptable but improvement is required in this area</u> General understanding of the requirements of the Act and other relevant legislation. Some guidance from the regulator is required for routine activities and/or minor resubmissions of reports may be required to ensure all requirements are addressed. Compliance system is in development, and/or knowledge is limited to a single individual. Compliance assurance and verification activities exist but are sporadic or not undertaken by independent parties.</p>	
3	<p><u>Ongoing improvement evident</u> Element is mostly implemented; plans are in place to improve performance.</p>	
4	<p><u>Expected outcome and satisfactory</u> Applicable regulatory requirements are identified, understood and compliance achieved at the relevant levels of the organisation. Requirements are documented and tracked internally systematically by dedicated resource(s). Minimal to no assistance required from regulator to deliver compliance, except in non-routine situations. Requests for advice from the regulator are proactive and clear, and communication is open. Key industry standards are recognised, and internal standards defined where appropriate. A process exists for approving and managing deviation from standards. Any potential need to deviate from a standard is anticipated, allowing sufficient time for due diligence assessment and approvals.</p>	
5	<p><u>Better than expected performance</u> Evidence is to be provided that performance is beyond fit-for-purpose.</p>	
		SCORE:

PROCESS SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SELF-ASSESSMENT

3. Management of Change and Project Management

To ensure that new activities, modifications and alterations, whether temporary or permanent, are suitably assessed for process safety and environmental risks and consequences before changes are implemented. This includes physical, procedural and organisational changes.

Management of Change and Project Management		
Score Guide	Assessment Criteria	Assessor's Comments
1	<p><u>Less than expected performance, urgent attention required</u></p> <p>There is a change management system/procedure, but its application is poorly or inconsistently executed, or scope is limited. No or minimal structured project/activity management processes.</p>	
2	<p><u>Acceptable but improvement is required in this area</u></p> <p>Management of change process exists and is implemented but may not cover all types of changes. Criteria for when a specific management of change procedure is required may not be established. Awareness of the process and training in its application is provided. Assessments are undertaken to identify, assess and manage risk for new projects or modifications to existing processes but may not be systematic in approach. When undertaking an activity, the required deliverables and hold points are documented but a system does not exist or is not fully implemented to ensure that these requirements are met. Basic pre-start up processes are in place to ensure that all equipment and systems are fit-for-purpose before being energised. A process for tracking and closing out actions relating to a project is only implemented at a basic level.</p>	
3	<p><u>Ongoing improvement evident</u></p> <p>Element is mostly implemented; plans are in place to improve performance.</p>	
4	<p><u>Expected outcome and satisfactory</u></p> <p>Consideration for identification and elimination of hazards and minimisation of risk is incorporated from early planning stages. Change management system/procedures exist that clearly govern the level of evaluation of required for all physical, procedural or organisational changes, both temporary and permanent. Process addresses the inherent and introduced risk, approval requirements and the responsibilities and competencies of those involved. Key stages and steps in undertaking an activity or delivering a project are identified, including adequate risk assessment, and processes in place to ensure that all requirements are met before proceeding to the next stage (e.g. before disturbance, pre-construction, pre-commissioning, handover to operations). There is a systematic process for checking operational readiness and the integrity of systems before they are brought into service. All actions/issues arising from activities are registered, monitored and closed out in a timely manner.</p>	
5	<p><u>Better than expected performance</u></p> <p>Evidence is to be provided that performance is beyond fit-for-purpose.</p>	
		SCORE:

PROCESS SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SELF-ASSESSMENT

4. Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

To ensure that all types of hazards which can give rise to a catastrophic failure or major accident event are identified and quantified. To ensure that controls, both mitigative and preventative, reduce the likelihood of such an event and its potential consequences to an acceptable level are determined, implemented and effective

Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment		
Score Guide	Assessment Criteria	Assessor's Comments
1	<p><u>Less than expected performance, urgent attention required</u> PSE hazards and associated effects are only identified in a haphazard or reactive manner. Risk assessment process is not consistently applied. Triggers or frequencies for review and risk assessment are not defined or not implemented. Documentation of risk assessments and actions from such assessments is poor.</p>	
2	<p><u>Acceptable but improvement is required in this area</u> PSE hazards are identified and risks assessed at defined intervals. Workshops are not always facilitated by independent personnel and/or attended by representatives from operations, design and environmental teams (as appropriate). Action tracking exists but is not systematic or centralised. The tolerable level of risk is defined for all types risks (to human health and safety, environmental impact, property and financial loss).</p>	
3	<p><u>Ongoing improvement evident</u> Element is mostly implemented; plans are in place to improve performance.</p>	
4	<p><u>Expected outcome and satisfactory</u> Risk assessments are undertaken against a defined risk matrix using a structured process and reviewed by competent persons with representation from relevant areas of design and operations. All major hazards are identified. The level of acceptable level of risk is defined and is consistently understood and applied throughout the organisation. A comprehensive inventory of PSEM hazards and effects and critical controls has been documented for all activities and key risks are visible to appropriate persons within the organisation. Critical controls are identified and implemented, and their effectiveness monitored to ensure the risk has been reduced so far as is reasonably practicable. Risk assessment review triggers are well defined and consistently implemented. An effective system is implemented for the tracking and close out of actions raised through risk assessments.</p>	

5	Better than expected performance Evidence is to be provided that performance is beyond fit-for-purpose.	
		SCORE:

PROCESS SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SELF-ASSESSMENT

5. Asset and Integrity Management

To ensure that the performance and integrity of assets (such as pipe and plant) is maintained as fit for purpose.

Asset and Integrity Management		
Score Guide	Assessment Criteria	Assessor's Comments
1	<p><u>Less than expected performance, urgent attention required</u> Asset integrity issues not fully evaluated or addressed. No or minimal proactive maintenance program in place. Operate to failure approach employed for most equipment.</p>	
2	<p><u>Acceptable but improvement is required in this area</u> Basic asset integrity management plan in place for most equipment, based on industry standard and vendor requirements. Critical plant and associated inspection/remediation tasks are not specifically identified. KPIs/metrics are available to track work order completion and integrity management activities to some extent. Management and consideration of overdue/postponed critical integrity activities exists but may not have a formalised process.</p>	
3	<p><u>Ongoing improvement evident</u> Element is mostly implemented; plans are in place to improve performance.</p>	
4	<p><u>Expected outcome and satisfactory</u> Effective integrity management programs are in place, focused on critical requirements, which are clearly visible in the scheduling system. Industry standard requirements are identified and satisfied. Asset integrity is an integral part of existing facility and equipment, and of new development. Facilities and equipment are maintained as fit for purpose. Asset integrity issues related to facilities and equipment, such as failure modes and potential consequences, are clearly identified, understood and communicated to concerned parties. Effectiveness of integrity management program is tracked through KPIs and well communicated to appropriate levels within the organisation. Comprehensive and formalised procedure for deviations from integrity management program or overdue activities is in place. Procedure includes authorisations/ endorsement and where appropriate risk assessment for continuing operation.</p>	
5	<p><u>Better than expected performance</u> Evidence is to be provided that performance is beyond fit-for-purpose.</p>	
		SCORE:

PROCESS SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SELF-ASSESSMENT

6. Critical Equipment Management

To ensure that the performance and effectiveness of critical equipment including but not limited to sensors, alarms, communications, utilities, and control system are maintained within the acceptable level remain fit for purpose.

Critical Equipment Management		
Score Guide	Assessment Criteria	Assessor's Comments
1	<u>Less than expected performance, urgent attention required</u> Performance requirements for critical equipment not fully evaluated or addressed. No or minimal testing, inspection or proactive maintenance program in place. Operate to failure approach employed for most equipment.	
2	<u>Acceptable but improvement is required in this area</u> Basic inspection, testing and maintenance plans in place for most equipment, based on industry standard and vendor requirements. Basic maintenance management system is implemented. critical equipment/activities are not systematically identified. KPIs/metrics are available to track work order completion and to some extent. Management and consideration of overdue/postponed critical inspections and maintenance exists but may not have a formalised process.	
3	<u>Ongoing improvement evident</u> Element is mostly implemented; plans are in place to improve performance.	
4	<u>Expected outcome and satisfactory</u> Critical equipment is identified, and performance requirements are clearly defined and documented. Industry standard requirements are identified and satisfied. Effective inspection, testing and maintenance programs in place, focused on critical requirements, which are clearly visible in the maintenance system. Failure modes and potential consequences for critical equipment that are not meeting their performance standard are clearly identified, understood and communicated to concerned parties. Deficiencies identified are risk assessed and addressed in line with defined timeframes, proportionate to the risk. Effectiveness of critical equipment maintenance program is tracked through KPIs and well communicated to appropriate levels within the organisation. Formalised bridging procedure for critical controls, deviations from maintenance program or overdue actions is in place. Procedure includes authorisations/endorsement and where appropriate risk assessment for continuing operation.	
5	<u>Better than expected performance</u> Evidence is to be provided that performance is beyond fit-for-purpose.	
		SCORE:

PROCESS SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SELF-ASSESSMENT

7. Planning, Manuals and Procedures

To ensure that adequate information and instructions are provided to plant operators, maintenance staff and contractors to ensure that plant and processes can be operated within the established parameters/safe operating envelope during normal and abnormal conditions. To ensure that construction, environment and operating plans and procedures achieve the objectives of the SEO.

Planning, Manuals and Procedures		
Score Guide	Assessment Criteria	Assessor's Comments
1	<p><u>Less than expected performance, urgent attention required</u> Critical activities requiring written procedures or plans not identified. Procedures/instructions inconsistently used and enforced. Documents written with no or little employee input. No or inconsistent hold/gate stages in critical processes.</p>	
2	<p><u>Acceptable but improvement is required in this area</u> Procedures exist for most critical activities, including appropriate hold/gate stages. Manuals exists for key equipment but may be limited to generic/vendor supplied documentation only. Assurance for completion of these procedures exists but is sporadic or limited to audits. Plans address the requirements of the SEO, but are not consistently implemented in all activities, or no system exists to demonstrate this. Reviews of plans, procedures and manuals are infrequent and may not be in line with periods defined in the operator's systems.</p>	
3	<p><u>Ongoing improvement evident</u> Element is mostly implemented; plans are in place to improve performance.</p>	
4	<p><u>Expected outcome and satisfactory</u> Critical processes and operating limits to prevent unwanted process safety or environmental events are understood and controlled. Plans, work practices, procedures and manuals address all PSEM risks for specific site. Critical tasks are clearly addressed in the work practices and procedures. Defined process exists for development and review of plans, work practices, manuals, procedures and standards involving all relevant workforce. Critical processes and procedures have appropriate hold and handover mechanisms, and these are consistently utilised. Verification is incorporated into the plans and procedures where required for critical tasks. Full understanding of the potential impact of simultaneous operations and handovers, and suitable controls in place. Frontline personnel are genuinely involved in document development and modifications.</p>	
5	<p><u>Better than expected performance</u> Evidence is to be provided that performance is beyond fit-for-purpose.</p>	
		SCORE:

8. Document and Records Management

To ensure that accurate information is available to identify, assess and manage process safety and environmental risk when required

Planning, Manuals and Procedures		
Score Guide	Assessment Criteria	Assessor's Comments
1	<u>Less than expected performance, urgent attention required</u> No or very basic document control system in place.	
2	<u>Acceptable but improvement is required in this area</u> Document controls system exists. Training and access to the system may be limited. Review of documentation and records is identified but may not be completed within defined timeframes (such as a backlog of drawings to be updated, or plans and procedures past their review date).	
3	<u>Ongoing improvement evident</u> Element is mostly implemented; plans are in place to improve performance.	
4	<u>Expected outcome and satisfactory</u> Critical documents are identified and reviewed according to predetermined schedules and/or triggers. Version control and review are managed through a dedicated system, and ownership and authority for review of all critical documents is clearly defined. Drawings and datasheets are kept up to date and regularly audited/as-built for currency to capture creep changes. Historic records are retained in a functionally accessible system.	
5	<u>Better than expected performance</u> Evidence is to be provided that performance is beyond fit-for-purpose.	
		SCORE:

PROCESS SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SELF-ASSESSMENT

9. Work Control and Task Risk Management e.g. PTW

To ensure that effective work control, PTW and task risk management arrangements are in place and followed to control process safety and environmental risks arising from work activities.

Work Control and Task Risk Management e.g. PTW		
Score Guide	Assessment Criteria	Assessor's Comments
1	Less than expected performance, urgent attention required Haphazard application of generic work control measures. Permit to Work (PTW) system not fully or consistently implemented or used. PTW records sporadic, incomplete or non-existent. Permitting system in place for environmental approvals (e.g. land clearances) only meets the minimum requirements of legislation.	
2	Acceptable but improvement is required in this area PTW system and other operational hazard assessments are implemented and generally understood by personnel. Appropriate internal processes in place for environmental clearances and permitting to ensure compliance with the SEO, however some instances of non-compliances have occurred.	
3	Ongoing improvement evident Element is mostly implemented; plans are in place to improve performance.	
4	Expected outcome and satisfactory Risk associated with occupational, process and environmental safety hazards managed through proactive application of work control measures, e.g. PTW, JHA, SWSMs. PTW system in place for all critical operations and well understood by all and its application appropriately and well implemented. Personnel familiar with their roles in work control procedures. Systems developed/selected to be fit for the specific application and with input from frontline personnel.	
5	Better than expected performance Evidence is to be provided that performance is beyond fit-for-purpose.	
		SCORE:

10. Competency Management

To ensure that personnel have the right training, experience, skills and capacity to undertake process safety or environmentally critical tasks to the desired standard of performance. To ensure that there are sufficient personnel and staffing levels to undertake all critical operational and maintenance tasks required to maintain the integrity of the plant and the processes.

Competency Management		
Score Guide	Assessment Criteria	Assessor's Comments
1	<u>Less than expected performance, urgent attention required</u> No active training schedule apart from general induction. Critical roles and competence requirements not defined. Not all employees have a training plan and records.	
2	<u>Acceptable but improvement is required in this area</u> Training needs analysis in place for frontline personnel but does not specifically identify PSE critical positions. Training programs are implemented for new operators, but refreshment training (including for new/update procedures) is inconsistent.	
3	<u>Ongoing improvement evident</u> Element is mostly implemented; plans are in place to improve performance.	
4	<u>Expected outcome and satisfactory</u> Competencies understood for all PSEM critical positions, both field and office based. All such positions are occupied with qualified staff. Training records in place and up to date. Employees training plan up to date and training is provided when procedural controls and critical systems (e.g. PTW, MOC) are updated.	
5	<u>Better than expected performance</u> Evidence is to be provided that performance is beyond fit-for-purpose.	
		SCORE:

PROCESS SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SELF-ASSESSMENT

11. Communication with stakeholders

To ensure that stakeholder confidence and “licence to operate” is established and maintained through identifying key stakeholder groups, developing and maintaining good working relationships with them and identifying and addressing their issues and concerns. Genuine and ongoing consultation with stakeholders is undertaken including: government agencies, emergency services, media, customers, Regulatory consultation and notification processes, landowners and community liaison activities. AS 2885 requirements regarding external interference protection are met.

Communication with stakeholders		
Score Guide	Assessment Criteria	Assessor's Comments
1	<u>Less than expected performance, urgent attention required</u> No, or haphazard at best, evidence of procedures or defined system for communications to stakeholders. Communication is limited to minimum requirements of the legislation with significant ERD oversight.	
2	<u>Acceptable but improvement is required in this area</u> High level communication protocols are defined, and relevant stakeholders are identified. Communication is not consistently documented and may be sporadic.	
3	<u>Ongoing improvement evident</u> Element is mostly implemented; plans are in place to improve performance	
4	<u>Expected outcome and satisfactory</u> Systems are in place to identify relevant stakeholders and tracking communications. Organisation maintains good working relationships with statutory and non-statutory stakeholders about its activities, including emergency response communications and recording and responding to stakeholder issues. Communications system is well documented and defined and demonstrably reviewed and updated. Communication with stakeholders is proactive and transparent.	
5	<u>Better than expected performance</u> Evidence is to be provided that performance is beyond fit-for-purpose.	
		SCORE:

PROCESS SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SELF-ASSESSMENT

12. Contractor and Vendor Management

To ensure that contractors and third parties who fulfil a process safety role or function, and vendors who provide critical components or equipment, have sufficient competence, supervision, expertise and information about process safety and environmental risks to undertake work or provide services safely and without degrading the integrity of the plant and process, or leading to a breach of the SEO.

Contractor Management		
Score Guide	Assessment Criteria	Assessor's Comments
1	<p><u>Less than expected performance, urgent attention required</u> No prequalification system of contractors, subcontractors and vendors exists. Only high-level bridging documents exists for integration of HSEMS systems. Minimal supervision or oversight of contractor activities is provided. No or minimal assurance for vendor supplied equipment. Third party technical reports are accepted as supplied, and minimal assessment of competency is undertaken.</p>	
2	<p><u>Acceptable but improvement is required in this area</u> Contractors are assessed and management system bridging documents are put in place, however assurance of the contractors' systems is limited. Only high-level oversight is provided to vendors providing critical equipment. Contractor inductions are undertaken. There are some processes in place for the review and acceptance of third-party technical work..</p>	
3	<p><u>Ongoing improvement evident</u> Element is mostly implemented; plans are in place to improve performance.</p>	
4	<p><u>Expected outcome and satisfactory</u> All major contractors and sub-contractors pre-qualified and audited. Contractors and sub-contractors' systems are integrated into the site PSEM systems. There is appropriate supervision of contractor activities including regular assurance by the licensee/operator. Responsibilities and communication protocols with respect to process safety and environmental controls and events are clearly defined. A process exists to ensure that third parties providing technical expertise are assessed for competency and reports are reviewed and accepted by defined approvers. QA/QC oversight and/or specification is in place for vendors providing critical parts. Contractors are fully aware of the PSEM risks and critical controls relating to the regulated activities which they are undertaking.</p>	
5	<p><u>Better than expected performance</u> Evidence is to be provided that performance is beyond fit-for-purpose.</p>	
		SCORE:

PROCESS SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SELF-ASSESSMENT

13. Monitoring, assurance, audit and review

To ensure that relevant information and intelligence is gathered to confirm that the PSEMS(s) are capable of providing the right level of risk reduction in a sustained way over the lifetime of the facility. Feedback on deficiencies and deterioration in both preventative and mitigative controls is provided in a timely manner to allow for problems to be fixed and lessons applied across the whole business. Appropriate monitoring and scrutiny is available to senior executives, the board and stakeholders (including regulators) to demonstrate that risks are being adequately controlled. Strategic priorities and improvement programs are adequately informed.

Score Guide	Monitoring, assurance, audit and review	
	Assessment Criteria	Assessor's Comments
1	<p><u>Less than expected performance, urgent attention required</u></p> <p>Auditing program is minimal, and scope is not comprehensive. Limited first party audits may be undertaken. No formal process evident for incorporation of audit or review findings into existing processes or tracking of actions. No or minimal monitoring metrics are available for critical controls.</p>	
2	<p><u>Acceptable but improvement is required in this area</u></p> <p>There is an audit program in place to cover most management system elements, but reliance primarily on first party audits or independent internal audits only, rather than a combination of audit types. Performance indicators exist but may not be fully linked to critical controls or management system elements. Treatment of audit actions or response to KPI trends is reactive and/or limited to non-conformances. Some evidence of a holistic/formalised PSEM performance review which takes into account information from audits and KPIs.</p>	
3	<p><u>Ongoing improvement evident</u></p> <p>Element is mostly implemented; plans are in place to improve performance.</p>	
4	<p><u>Expected outcome and satisfactory</u></p> <p>Audit process is clearly defined and implemented and is a combination of first party, independent internal and third-party reviews. Managers and Supervisors take ownership of the audit process. Audit recommendations are documented, prioritised on a risk basis, and tracked to closure within allocated time frame. Key performance</p>	

	indicators for each element of the PSEM framework are identified, monitored and communicated within the organisation. KPI collection and tracking focussing on leading rather than lagging indicators. Formalised PSEM performance review is consistently implemented, and information communicated throughout the organisation. Trends are observed and programs initiated to proactively improve performance.	
5	Better than expected performance Evidence is to be provided that performance is beyond fit-for-purpose.	
		SCORE:

PROCESS SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SELF-ASSESSMENT

14. Incident Reporting and Investigation

To ensure that incidents and “near misses” are consistently reported and investigated and that identified corrective actions and learnings are implemented on a timely basis.

Score Guide	Incident Reporting and Investigation	
	Assessment Criteria	Assessor's Comments
1	<p><u>Much less than expected performance, urgent attention required</u> Ad-hoc system in place for incident reporting, investigation, follow-up and lessons learned that only just meets the requirements of legislation.</p>	
2	<p><u>Acceptable but improvement is required in this area</u> Documented system in place for incident reporting which covers both statutory requirements and internal incidents or near misses. Incident investigation is undertaken to determine the casual factor, but root cause assessment is inconsistently undertaken. Actions are identified and tracked to completion but are often limited to remediating that particular event/site.</p>	
3	<p><u>Ongoing improvement evident</u> Element is mostly implemented; plans are in place to improve performance</p>	
4	<p><u>Expected outcome and satisfactory</u> Incident reporting and classification well understood at all levels within the organisation. Reporting and investigation processes are well understood and applied, and clearly defines the type of investigation required for different classifications of incidents. The investigation adequately addresses root causes, including human and organisational factors, and identifies recommendations to address these. Supervisors trained in and direct incident investigations. Proactive employee involvement in reporting and assisting investigations. Lessons learnt are disseminated. Accountabilities for corrective and preventative actions assigned and tracked to closure. All reports entered in database to allow for monitoring of trends and accessibility of learnings. Proactive actions identified to address themes or trends identified through investigations. Actions tracked through an effective centralised database management system. Alerts issued and information proactively shared with key stakeholders.</p>	
5	<p><u>Better than expected performance</u> Evidence is to be provided that performance is beyond fit-for-purpose.</p>	

		SCORE:

PROCESS SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SELF-ASSESSMENT

15. Emergency Arrangements

To ensure that, in the case of a developing emergency adequate procedures and competent personnel are available so the plant and processes can be safely shut down/controlled to mitigate escalating consequences. People are effectively evacuated from the facility or can reach a safe refuge in the event of an emergency. On-site and external emergency responders have sufficient information, resources and capacity to deal with all foreseen emergency situations. Assets, neighbouring facilities and the surrounding environment are protected from detrimental harm from an emergency situation. Appropriate clean up, including spill response and recovery is effectively facilitated.

Score Guide	Emergency Arrangements	
	Assessment Criteria	Assessor's Comments
1	<u>Less than expected performance, urgent attention required</u> Emergency Response Plans exist but do not comprehensively address all foreseeable PSEM emergencies, focus on HSE or medivac scenarios. No evidence of having been comprehensively tested or drilled beyond the minimum requirements of legislation.	
2	<u>Acceptable but improvement is required in this area</u> Emergency response plan addresses key credible scenarios and are drilled at frequencies exceeding the statutory requirements, however limited drills are undertaken for major incidents or include stakeholder involvement. Basic training and familiarisation is undertaken for critical roles. Required emergency equipment is available.	
3	<u>Ongoing improvement evident</u> Element is mostly implemented; plans are in place to improve performance.	
4	<u>Expected outcome and satisfactory</u> Emergency response plans in place addressing all foreseeable PSEM emergencies. Roles understood by responsible persons. Emergency drills and exercises undertaken at defined frequencies to test credible and challenging scenarios and lessons actively disseminated within company. External emergency contacts identified and contact details up to date. Liaison with external stakeholders (e.g. other operators, emergency services) is undertaken. Response plans include rehabilitation and recovery, specifically for emergency and security of supply impacts. Emergency response equipment is available and incorporated as required in the systematic management of critical equipment.	
5	<u>Better than expected performance</u> Evidence is to be provided that performance is beyond fit-for-purpose.	

SCORE:

Results Summary

<u>Process Safety and Environment Element</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Leadership and awareness	
2. Identification and compliance with legislation and industry standards	
3. Management of change and project management	
4. Hazard identification and risk assessment	
5. Asset and integrity management	
6. Critical equipment management	
7. Planning, manuals and procedures	
8. Documents and records management	
9. Work control and task risk management e.g. PTW	
10. Competency management	
11. Communication with stakeholders	
12. Contractor and vendor management	
13. Monitoring, assurance, audit and review	
14. Incident reporting and investigation	
15. Emergency arrangements	
Total	

TOOL FOR THE SELF-ASSESSMENT OF PROCESS SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM MATURITY

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS[illegible]