



**CGA TR-7—2023
METHODOLOGY TO
DETERMINE PIPING FAILURE
RATES FOR NONTOXIC
CRYOGENIC INDUSTRIAL GAS
SUPPLY SYSTEMS WITH PIPE
SIZE UP TO 6 INCHES**

FIRST EDITION

Currently in preview. Click buy full version

PLEASE NOTE:

The information contained in this document was obtained from sources believed to be reliable and is based on technical information and experience currently available from members of the Compressed Gas Association, Inc. and others. However, the Association or its members, jointly or severally, make no guarantee of the results and assume no liability or responsibility in connection with the information or suggestions herein contained. Moreover, it should not be assumed that every acceptable commodity grade, test or safety procedure or method, precaution, equipment or device is contained within, or that abnormal or unusual circumstances may not warrant or suggest further requirements or additional procedure.

This document is subject to periodic review, and users are cautioned to obtain the latest edition. The Association invites comments and suggestions for consideration. In connection with such review, any such comments or suggestions will be fully reviewed by the Association after giving the party, upon request, a reasonable opportunity to be heard. Proposed changes may be submitted via the Internet at our web site, www.cganet.com.

This document should not be confused with federal, state, provincial, or municipal specifications or regulations; insurance requirements; or national safety codes. While the Association recommends reference to or use of this document by government agencies and others, this document is purely voluntary and not binding unless adopted by reference in regulations.

A listing of all publications, audiovisual programs, safety and technical bulletins, and safety posters is available via the Internet at our website at www.cganet.com. For more information contact CGA. Phone: 703-788-2700, ext. 799. E-mail: customerservice@cganet.com.

Work Item 22-60
Process Safety Committee

FIRST EDITION: 2023

© 2023 The Compressed Gas Association, Inc. All rights reserved.

All materials contained in this work are protected by United States and international copyright laws. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical including photocopying, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system without permission in writing from The Compressed Gas Association, Inc. All requests for permission to reproduce material from this work should be directed to The Compressed Gas Association, Inc., 8484 Westpark Drive, Suite 220, McLean, VA 22102. You may not alter or remove any trademark, copyright or other notice from this work.

Contents	Page
1 Executive summary	1
2 Introduction and problem statement	2
3 Recent History of some relevant failure frequencies studies	3
4 Framing a useful conclusion for failure frequencies	4
4.1 Source	4
4.2 Data filtering	4
4.3 Small sizes	5
4.4 Normalized and formula driven	5
5 Formulation of the failure frequency guidance for small scale	7
5.1 General considerations for failure rates	11
5.2 Setting up a set of equivalent lengths for piping components	12
5.3 Hose examples	15
6 Comparison to other methodologies	16
7 Anticipated practice for use of the proposed failure frequency in risk-informed methods	23
8 References	31

Tables

Table 1—Equivalent length of various equipment	1
Table 2—HCRD equipment types	7
Table 3—Selected pipe and tubing types	7
Table 4—Selected mechanical joint types	7
Table 5—Selected dynamic seal types	8
Table 6—Data used in affirming annual failure rate equation	9
Table 7—Table of equivalent lengths	15
Table 8—Key for Figures 16 through 19	22
Table 9—Example equipment count	23
Table 10—Frequency calculations initial example	24
Table 11—Rank order of failure frequencies	25
Table 12—Range summaries of failure frequencies	26
Table 13—Example equipment count updated	26
Table 14—Frequency calculations updated example	27
Table 15—Rank order of failure frequencies updated	28
Table 16—Range summaries of failure frequencies updated	29
Table 17—Equipment count and equivalent length determination	30
Table 18—Updated equipment count and equivalent lengths	31

Figures

Figure 1—Loss of containment fishbone diagram	6
Figure 2—Hole size distribution for pipe less than 3 in (equipment type 1)	9
Figure 3—Piping annual failure rate plot	10
Figure 4—Numeric substitution for Equation 5.6 for hole sizes between 3 mm and 10 mm on a 50-mm pipe ..	10
Figure 5—Numeric substitution for Equation 5.6 for hole sizes between 3 mm and 50 mm on a 50-mm pipe ..	11
Figure 6—Nominal annual failure rate	12
Figure 7—Equivalent length determinations	13
Figure 8—Example of equivalent length for a dynamic seal	13
Figure 9—Development of make and break equation	14
Figure 10—Substitution for Equation 5.2.2 for a failure rate of 1 per 4 weeks	15
Figure 11—Hose example 1	15
Figure 12—Hose example 2	16
Figure 13—Hose example 3	16

Figure 14—Hose example 4	16
Figure 15—Hose example with comparison to FERC.....	16
Figure 16—Pipe cumulative annual failure rate ([1/m-yr])	18
Figure 17—Valve cumulative annual failure rate ([1/ yr])	19
Figure 18—Flange cumulative annual failure rate ([1/yr])	20
Figure 19—Hose cumulative annual failure rate ([1/m-yr])	21
Figure 20—Individual risk at range plot.....	26
Figure 21—Individual risk at range plot updated.....	29
Figure 22—Application of Miner’s Rule.....	30
Figure 23—Application of Miner’s Rule updated	31

Appendices

Appendix A—Data sorts (Normative).....	33
Appendix B—Hole distribution plots (Normative).....	50

Appendix Tables

Table A-1—Instruments	33
Table A-2—Pipe less than 3 in.....	34
Table A-3—3 in <Pipe<11	36
Table A-4—11 in <Pipe	37
Table A-5—Flanges<3 in	37
Table A-6—3 in <flanges<11 in.....	38
Table A-7—Flanges>11 in	38
Table A-8—All flanges	39
Table A-9—Manual valves	41
Table A-10—Auto valves	42
Table A-11—All valves	43
Table A-12—Centrifugal compressors	1
Table A-13—Reciprocating compressors	1
Table A-14—Centrifugal pumps	1
Table A-15—Reciprocating pumps	46
Table A-16—All dynamic seals	47

Appendix Figures

Figure B-1—Equipment type 0-3, piping	50
Figure B-2—Equipment type 4-7, flanges	51
Figure B-3—Equipment type 8-12, dynamic seal	52
Figure B-4—Equipment type 13-15, valves	53

1 Executive summary

This technical report applies to 300 series austenitic stainless steel piping up to and including 6 inches in diameter, suitable for nontoxic cryogenic service, and where the design pressure stress of pipe and tube does not exceed one half of the basic allowable stress.

Small scale industrial gas installations, and in particular ones for cryogenic service, need reasonable equipment failure rates to drive risk informed frameworks for siting and guideline setbacks. Current failure rate guidance does not fit well for small scale and is unnecessarily conservative. The study of recent efforts in this area demonstrates interest but no useful guidance on approaches.

Such guidance should be practical in its application and transparent in its design basis. The publicly available Hydrocarbon Release Database (HSE Hydrocarbon Release Database, www.hse.gov.uk/offshore/statistics) (HCRD) for leak rates is used to generate a universal failure rate equation that has small scale and cryogenic considerations included [1].¹

$$FF_{\text{cryo}}(d1, d2, D) = \left[\frac{1}{1 + \left(\frac{d2}{1.5}\right)^{-1.5}} - \frac{1}{1 + \left(\frac{d1}{1.5}\right)^{-1.5}} \right] \cdot \left[\left(2.539 + 25.2 \cdot e^{-\frac{D}{29.412}} \right) \cdot 10^{-5} \right] \cdot \frac{1}{\text{yr}}$$

Additionally, a simplified approach to estimate equipment limits is developed that allows for quick estimates of system aggregate risks using an equivalent length approach.

Table 1—Equivalent length of various equipment

Equipment type	Equivalent length (m)	Notes
Pipe or tube (per meter)	1	Welded joints are assumed to be part of this equipment type and are not subject to additional equivalent length consideration
Static mechanical joints (each)	1	These are mechanical seals held in place by some threaded, bolted, clamped, or swaged joint
Valves (each)	2	This is for any valve that has a body seal and packing. Features such as flanged inlets, 2-piece bodies, etc. do not require additional equivalent length. Automatic valves that have more than 96 full cycles (full return to starting position as in open to closed and returning to open) in an 8-hour period shall be evaluated as a dynamic seal at the nominal diameter of the shaft being sealed.
Hose not under flexure (per meter)	20	Hoses are assumed to be stainless steel, corrugated, and reinforced with a stainless-steel braid and properly maintained in accordance with CGA P-82, <i>Standard for Maintenance of Transfer Hoses</i> [2].
Dynamic seals and hoses (bellows) under flexure (each)	$350 - 349 \cdot e^{-\left(\frac{\text{cycles}}{10^7}\right)}$	This equivalent length should be added to the aggregate of shaft diameters for valves, pumps, and compressors. For hoses in flexure, they should be aggregated against the full inside diameter of the hose corrugation. Cycles= the annual number of full design cycles. When less than full cycle range can be demonstrated, the annual number of full cycles can be pro-rated accordingly.
Make-and-break connections (each)	$350 - 349 \cdot e^{-\left(\frac{\text{breaks}}{10^2}\right)}$	This equivalent length should be added to the aggregate for the full piping diameter being assessed Breaks= the annualized number of connect breaks.

¹ References are shown by bracketed numbers and are listed in order of appearance in the reference section.