Tenth International Conference on Managing Fatigue: Abstract for Review

Beyond conformance: what does an effective FRMP implementation plan look like?

*David J C Flower, BP International Ltd, Sunbury-on-Thames, UK; david.flower@uk.bp.com
Angela Baker, Shell International B.V., The Hague, The Netherlands; Angela.Sprajcer@shell.com
Artemis Kostareli, IPIECA, London, UK; artemis.kostareli@ipieca.org

***Corresponding Author**

Problem

Over the recent decades academics and researchers have proposed a range of solutions for identifying and treating fatigue risks in the workplace. The Fatigue Risk Management Plan (FRMP) is the carrier of such solutions and has been cited as the way forward in such documents as Digging Deeper for the mining industry, API RP755 for refining and petrochemicals, guidance documents prepared by Government agencies and workplaces, etc.

There is a plethora of information as to why fatigue risk should be actively managed and the potential consequences if we fail to do this adequately. However, anecdotal evidence would suggest that the way FRMPs are formally implemented (or not), impacts understanding, human error rates and subsequent event outcomes/investigations and the overall risk improvement process. FRMPs are relatively easy to develop as there is adequate information and examples available through the internet and through HSSE networks and industry bodies. However, there is very little information on what to do once the FRMP has been approved and accepted by senior workplace leaders.

This can create a problem, we can be conformant with internal and external audits that require the existence of such a document but there is no guarantee based solely on audit outcomes that the document has been successfully rolled out, understood, accepted and applied as planned and written to reduce actual fatigue risk. An organization could have developed and rolled out an FRMP without the FRMP having any impact to workplace behavior or practice.

Method

Within some industries and workplaces a controlling requirement is for an FRMP to be developed and implemented with a grace period provided before such documents would be audited.

The actual FRMP completion date may be provided whereby the fatigue risk profile and any subsequent gaps between the profile and existing controls and or management processes are

identified and closed, the target population/roles recognized and informed of the development work, and finally the FRMP rolled out across the business.

To assist industry roll out of an FRMP, a detailed, step-by-step implementation plan has been developed from case studies in Nigeria, the UK and USA. The resulting plan will be piloted in a large entity in the oil and gas industry and post implementation, an initial and 3 month assessment will be undertaken to determine take up, application and understanding of the FRMP across the business.

Results

Key findings and results shall be presented

Discussion

While the core elements of an FRMP are well understood and documented, the implementation of such a program is often undertaken by operational or health and safety personnel with little understanding of the science of fatigue and no experience of introducing such a program.

The implementation plan utilized here provides detailed information on the tasks and activities that need to be undertaken at the entity level from understanding the key fatigue drivers in the entity, the development of the FRMP itself and the identification of role holders and their responsibilities etc. The plan continues with identifying the supporting materials, lead in time frames, detailed in a series of nine steps necessary for successful implementation and evaluation of a FRMP.

Summary

This paper will present the key elements of a comprehensive FRMP implementation plan together with field-based learnings following its operational deployment across a major entity in the oil and gas industry. It will also point out the important messages from all IPIECA-IOGP Health Publications related to fatigue.