

PETROCONTROL

Advanced Control and Optimization

MORE ABOUT CLOSED LOOP OPTIMIZATION

By
Y. Zak Friedman, Ph.D
Principal Consultant

Guest editorial, Hydrocarbon Processing Journal, august 1998.

MORE ABOUT CLOSED LOOP OPTIMIZATION

“In Control” of March 98 [1], has named several controversial issues and requested readers’ input. This editorial responds to one of the questions, perhaps the most controversial one: Does real time closed loop optimization work?

I am one of the first “whistle blowers” on this issue. In 1995, after seeing companies spending millions on closed loop optimization with dubious benefits, I published a paper: “What’s wrong with unit on-line optimization” [2], explaining why such applications are difficult. Having written the article I received flak from colleagues and vendors who complain that I was destroying the business. This caught me by surprise. There is much solid control technology in existence, and selling “vaporware” cannot be in anyone’s long-term interest. We should all be aware of the history of advanced control, which naively started out with real time optimization, failed miserably, and that failure hindered advanced control development for over a decade. More recently, certain vendor companies who consistently sold non-working optimization schemes have lost reputation and market share even for their working technology.

An example of such flak is a July 97 editorial by my friend Pierre Latour [5]. Pierre’s criticism of me is not in the content of what he says, but in the tone of naming my assessment “bemoaning”. After that he goes on to acknowledge that real time optimization does not work, though his conclusion was that contracts between vendor and operating company are flawed. If only contracts were based on percentage of profit, as opposed to fixed price, Pierre would guarantee a profit of \$50 per bbl.

In his editorial Pierre refers to two of my publications [2,4] to support his view. One of these publications is about closed loop optimization, whereas the other discusses mostly advanced process control (APC). Pierre lumps all control and monitoring tools under one name: CIM. In so doing he loses the distinction among tools and the ability to judge which ones work and which do not. In referencing my work Pierre did not mention the differentiation between “APC” versus “closed loop optimization”. These are two entirely different technologies with very different success rates.

APC has been with us for three decades. It is a collection of techniques to control the plant at or near constraints, while keeping product qualities at targets. APC tools have changed over time, and there are arguments as to which ones work best, but there is no doubt that most can be configured to work well. My papers dealing with APC failures [3,4] have concluded that these problems can be addressed by certain management practices, aiming to improve the quality and maintainability of control engineering work.

APC could optimize the plant minute by minute, except it needs instructions from the operator as to which constraints are to be held, and what the optimal product qualities are. Closed loop optimization aims to determine these constraints and targets automatically via the use of rigorous simulation of the unit. This sounds good though presently there are many failures, and few, if any, working applications. One could overlook past failures in the hope that some useful technology might emerge. Still,

closed loop optimization is an entirely new tool, new approach, new untested level of complexity, and we would be justified separating it out as “uncharted territory”.

My paper “What’s wrong with unit on-line optimization” [2] has identified a number of difficulties, standing in the way of successful closed loop optimization:

- Lack of procedures for estimating intermediate product prices. A unit cannot be optimized in isolation unless its product economics are known.
- Inability to define unit feed makes it impossible to predict the products.
- The use of steady state simulation models in a dynamic environment prohibits re-setting of new optimized constraints and targets in small steps. Present real time optimizers use steady state models and wait several hours between runs. Applying only a small increment of the solution after each run would take too long.
- Effective optimization requires detailed accurate models and complex simulations.

I would like now to add another problem to the list: shortage of people. In the current management environment of “streamlining”, plants are badly short of engineers, and have no hope of maintaining but the simplest of applications. Consider the priorities of any control engineer:

1. Identify and chase instrument problems such as sticky valves, incorrect control structures, etc.
2. Tune basic (DCS) control loops in the unit.
3. Maintain APC applications: identify and tune dynamic models, come up with working inferential calculations, add new constraints when needed, etc.
4. Create APC checking logic to deal with erroneous instruments or abnormal situations, which call for abnormal control strategies.
5. Train operators. Solve any operator-misunderstanding problem.
6. Implement new APC applications (by in house personnel), or supervise vendors implementing new applications.
7. In your spare time deal with on-line optimization applications.

In the current reality people normally accomplish tasks 1 and 2. The control engineers understand that for APC applications to work the DCS controllers must be well tuned. Then they struggle to do justice to tasks 3, 4 and 5, and often there is no time left after that. Supporting new APC applications of task 6 is a problem. Task 7 is Utopia. To make matters worse, real time optimization is labor-intensive, and requires skills that are in high demand elsewhere in the plant. Until more skilled engineers are available, I have given up leaning on clients to resurrect closed loop optimization applications. I consider it enormous success when a plant has APC applications on most units, and all of them run well.

Literature cited

1. Kane L. A., “Controversy in Control”, editorial note, *In Control*, March/April 1998.
2. Friedman, Y. Z., “What’s wrong with closed loop optimization?” *Hydrocarbon Processing*, October 1995.

3. Friedman, Y. Z., "Avoid Advanced Control Project Mistakes", *Hydrocarbon Processing*, October 1992.
4. Friedman, Y. Z., "Advanced Process Control – It takes effort to make it Work", a guest editorial note, *Hydrocarbon Processing*, February 1997.
5. Latour, P. R., "Does the HPI do its CIM business right?" a guest editorial note, *Hydrocarbon Processing*, July 1997.