



A NEW RISK ANALYSIS OF CLEAN-IN-PLACE (CIP) MILK PROCESSING

by

Mr Saravanan CHANDRAKASH

School of Chemical Engineering

The University of Adelaide

A thesis submitted for examination for the degree of

Master of Engineering Science

May – 2012

Addendum

p 31&93 The international publication from this thesis is now in press and available as:

Davey, K. R., Chandrakash, S. and O'Neill, B. K. (2012). A new risk analysis of Clean-In-Place milk processing. *Food Control* – accepted 6 June
doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2012.06.014

STATEMENT OF DECLARATION

I, Saravanan Chandrakash certify that this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

The author acknowledges that copyright of published works contained within this thesis¹ resides with the copyright holders of those works.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via University's digital research repository, the Library catalogue and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

Signature:

Date:

¹ Davey, K. R., Chandrakash, S. & O'Neill, B. K. 2011. Friday 13th risk model of Clean-In-Place (CIP) in a milk plant. In *Proc. 41st Australasian Chemical Engineering Conference (Engineering a Better World)* September 18-21, Sydney, Australia, paper 150 (ISBN 9780858259225).

Davey, K. R., Chandrakash, S. & O'Neill, B. K. 2012. A novel risk analysis of Clean-In-Place milk processing, *Food Control* – status date 30 March 2012.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The food and pharmaceutical industry are generally a nation's largest manufacturing sector – and importantly one of the most stable. *Clean-In-Place* (CIP)² is a ubiquitous process in milk processing as thorough cleaning of wet surfaces of equipment is an essential part of daily operations. Faulty cleaning can have serious consequences as milk acts as an excellent substrate in which unwanted micro-organisms can grow and multiply rapidly.

Davey & Cerf (2003) introduced the notion of *Friday 13th Syndrome*³ i.e. the unexpected failure of a well-operated process plant by novel application of *Uncertainty Failure Modelling* (Davey, 2010; 2011). They showed that failure cannot always be put down to human error or faulty fittings but could be as a result of stochastic changes inside the system itself.

In this study a novel CIP failure model based on the methodology of Davey and co-workers is developed using the published models of Bird & Fryer (1991); Bird (1992) and Xin (2003); Xin, Chen & Ozkan (2004) for the first time. The aim was to gain insight into conditions that may lead to unexpected failure of an otherwise well-operated CIP plant. CIP failure is defined as failure to remove proteinaceous deposits on wet surfaces in the auto-set cleaning time.

The simplified two-stage model of Bird & Fryer (1991) and Bird (1992) was initially investigated. This model requires input of the thickness of the deposit ($\delta = 0.00015$ m) and the temperature and Re of the cleaning solution (1.0-wt% NaOH). The deposit is considered as two layers: an upper layer of swelled deposit which can be removed ($x\delta$) by the shear from the circulating cleaning solution and a lower layer ($y\delta$) that is not yet removable. The output parameters of particular interest are the rate of deposit removal (R) and total cleaning time (t_T) needed to remove the deposit.

The more elaborate three-stage model of Xin (2003) and Xin, Chen & Ozkan (2004) is based on a polymer dissolution process. This model requires input values of temperature of

² see Appendix A for a definition of some important terms used in this research.

³ Unexpected (unanticipated) failure in plant or product of a well-operated, well-regulated unit-operation.

the cleaning solution (T), critical mass of the deposit (m_c) and cleaning rate (R_m). The output parameters of particular interest are the rate of removal during swelling and uniform stage (R_{SU}), the rate of removal during decay stage (R_D) and the total cleaning time needed to remove the deposit (t_T). The two CIP models are appropriately formatted and simulations used to validate them as a unit-operation.

A risk factor (p) together with a practical process tolerance is defined in terms of the auto-set CIP time to remove a specified deposit and the actual cleaning time as affected by stochastic changes within the system (t_T'). This is computationally convenient as it can be articulated so that all values $p > 0$ highlight an unwanted outcome i.e. a CIP failure.

Simulations for the continuous CIP unit-operation are carried out using Microsoft ExcelTM spreadsheet with an add-in @RiskTM (pronounced 'at risk') version 5.7 (Palisade Corporation) with some 100,000⁴ iterations from Monte Carlo sampling of input parameters. A refined Latin Hypercube sampling is used because 'pure' Monte Carlo samplings can both over- and under-sample from various parts of a distribution. Values of the input parameters took one of the two forms. The first was the traditional *Single Value Assessment* (SVA) as defined by Davey (2011) in which a single, 'best guess' or mean value of the parameter is used. The output therefore is a single value. The alternate form was a *Monte Carlo Assessment* (MCA) (Davey, 2011) in which the 'best guess' values take the form of a probability distribution around the mean value. Many thousands of randomly sampled values for each input parameter are obtained using Monte Carlo sampling. Generally, in QRA the input parameters take the form of a distribution of values. The output therefore is a distribution of values with each assigned a probability of actually occurring.

The values of all inputs are carefully chosen for a realistic simulation of CIP.

Results reveal that a continuous CIP unit-operation is actually a mix of successful cleaning operations along with unsuccessful ones, and that these can tip unexpectedly. For example for the unit-operations model of Bird & Fryer (1991) and Bird (1992) failure to remove a

⁴ Experience with the models highlighted that stable output values would be obtained with 100,000 iterations (or CIP 'scenarios').

proteinaceous milk deposit ($\delta = 0.00015$ m) can occur unexpectedly in 1.0% of all operations when a tolerance of 6% is allowed on the specified auto-set cleaning time ($t_T = 914$ s) with a cleaning solution temperature of 60 °C. Using Xin, Chen & Ozkan (2004) model as the underlying unit-operation some 1.9% of operations at a nominal mid-range cleaning solution temperature of 75 °C could fail with a tolerance of 2% on the auto-set CIP time ($t_T = 448$ s).

Extensive analyses of comparisons of the effect of structure of the two CIP unit-operations models on predictions at similar operating conditions i.e. 2% tolerance on the auto-set clean time (~ 656 s) and 1%-sd in the nominal mean temperature of the NaOH cleaning solution at 65 °C, highlighted that the underlying vulnerability to failure of the simplified model of Bird & Fryer (1991) and Bird (1992) was 1.8 times that of the more elaborate model of Xin (2003) and Xin, Chen & Ozkan (2004).

The failure analysis presented in this thesis represents a significant advance over traditional analysis in that all possible practical scenarios that could exist operationally are computed and rigorous quantitative evidence is produced to show that a continuous CIP plant is actually a mix of failed cleaning operations together with successful ones. This insight is not available from traditional methods (with or without sensitivity analysis). Better design and operating decisions can therefore be made because the engineer has a picture of all possible outcomes.

The quantitative approach and insight presented here can be used to test re-designs to reduce cleaning failure through changes to the plant including improved temperature and auto-set time control methods.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr K R (Ken) Davey, my principal supervisor from the School of Chemical Engineering, The University of Adelaide, for providing me an opportunity to do research work and for his guidance and help throughout my candidature.

Also I wish to thank Dr Brian O'Neill, my co-supervisor from the School of Chemical Engineering, The University of Adelaide, for providing guidance.

I would also like to thank Professor Mark Biggs, Head of the School, and to all the staff members in the School of Chemical Engineering, for giving me the opportunity for continuing my studies.

I am greatly indebted to my parents who gave me an opportunity to come here and study in Australia and I would also like to thank them for providing me with the financial assistance for doing so.

I would also like to thank my colleagues and all my friends here in Australia for being there when needed and for providing moral support.

I trust that the results of my research work justify the expectations and confidence of all the people concerned, and the interest and encouragement of my family, friends and colleagues.

TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xi
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	4
2.1 Introduction	5
2.2 Clean-In-Place (CIP)	5
2.3 Factors influencing CIP cleaning	8
2.4 Types of CIP Systems	8
2.4.1 Comparison between different CIP systems	9
2.5 Equipment design types	9
2.6 CIP Failure seen from food process engineering and hygiene viewpoint	10
2.6.1 Causes of failure	10
2.7 Advantages of CIP	11
2.8 Milk fouling	11
2.9 Biofilms	12
2.10 Growth of micro-organisms	14
2.11 CIP process models	14
2.12 Single Value Assessment (SVA) modelling	21
2.13 Monte Carlo Assessment (MCA) modelling	21
2.14 Various risk assessment techniques	23
2.15 Insight offered by MCA	24
2.16 Uncertainty modelling using refined Monte Carlo Sampling techniques	25
2.17 Methodology for vulnerability to failure modelling	27
2.18 Summary	29

CHAPTER 3	A NEW UNCERTAINTY MODEL FOR CLEAN-IN-PLACE (CIP)	
	MILK PROCESING BASED ON A BIRD & FRYER (1991) AND	
	BIRD (1992) UNIT-OPERATIONS MODEL	31
3.1	Introduction	32
3.2	CIP model of Bird & Fryer (1991) and Bird (1992)	33
	3.2.1 A unit-operations model	33
	3.2.2 Data from Bird (1992) for model constants	35
3.3	Traditional Single Value Solution (SVA)	36
3.4	Vulnerability to failure model solution	37
	3.4.1 Defining CIP Failure (Risk Factor)	38
	3.4.2 Simulation of vulnerability to failure	38
3.5	Results	39
3.6	Discussion	39
3.7	Summary and conclusions	43
CHAPTER 4	A NEW UNCERTAINTY MODEL FOR CLEAN-IN-PLACE (CIP)	
	MILK PROCESING BASED ON A XIN (2003) AND XIN, CHEN	
	& OZKAN (2004) UNIT-OPERATIONS MODEL	45
4.1	Introduction	46
4.2	Xin (2003) and Xin, Chen & Ozkan (2004) model	46
	4.2.1 A unit-operations model	48
4.3	Effect of temperature and flow rate	53
4.4	Traditional Single Value Solution (SVA)	54
4.5	Vulnerability to failure Modelling	55
	4.5.1 CIP Failure (Risk Factor)	55
4.6	Results	56
4.7	Discussion	58
4.8	Summary and conclusions	60

CHAPTER 5 A COMPARISON BETWEEN CIP UNIT-OPERATIONS MODELS DEVELOPED FROM XIN (2003) AND XIN, CHEN & OZKAN (2004) WITH THAT OF BIRD & FRYER (1991) AND BIRD (1992)	61
5.1 Introduction	62
5.2 CIP unit-operations model structure	62
5.3 Vulnerability to failure predictions	64
5.4 Effect of nominal cleaning solution temperature (T) on removal of deposits	66
5.4.1 Bird & Fryer (1991) and Bird (1992) model	66
5.4.2 Xin (2003) and Xin, Chen & Ozkan (2004) model	68
5.5 Overall effect of cleaning solution temperature (T) on removal	71
5.6 Summary and conclusions	72
 CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSIONS	 73
6.1 Recommendations for future research	75
 APPENDIX A A definition of some important terms used in this research	 78
 APPENBIX B Fish Bone Diagram for simulation of CIP unit-operations model based on Xin (2003) and Xin, Chen & Ozkan (2004) analyses	 80
 APPENDIX C Referred publications from this research	 81
 NOMENCLATURE	
Bird & Fryer (1991) and Bird (1992) model	87
Xin (2003) and Xin, Chen & Ozkan (2004) model	88
 REFERENCES	 90

LIST OF FIGURES		PAGE
Fig. 2-1	Schematic of wet surface in 5-step CIP operation	7
Fig. 3-1	Predicted CIP curve obtained using Bird & Fryer (1991) and Bird (1992) unit-operations model for a cleaning solution (1-wt% NaOH) temperature of 60 °C on a proteinaceous milk deposit of thickness 0.00015 m	37
Fig. 3-2	Predicted effect of %-tolerance on CIP failures with a 1-wt% NaOH cleaning solution at a mid-range temperature of $T = 60$ °C with a tolerance of 6% on total cleaning time (t_T)	40
Fig. 3-3	Fish bone (Ishikawa) diagram to highlight uncertainty model solution of the unit-operations CIP model of Bird & Fryer (1991) and Bird (1992)	42
Fig. 4-1	Diagrammatic representation of Xin (2003) and Xin, Chen & Ozkan (2004) CIP model	47
Fig. 4-2	Predicted CIP curve based on Xin (2003) and Xin, Chen & Ozkan (2004) model for <i>Alkali-clean</i> step (with 0.5-wt% NaOH) at a temperature $T = 348$ K (75 °C) and $Re = 5418$	55
Fig. 5-1	Effect of nominal temperature of the (1-wt% NaOH) cleaning solution (T) on maximum removal rate (R_{max}) of proteinaceous milk deposit ($\delta = 0.00015$ m) for the CIP unit-operations model of Bird & Fryer (1991) and Bird (1992) for $30 < T < 80$ °C	66
Fig. 5-2	Effect of nominal temperature of cleaning solution (1-wt% NaOH) (T) on total cleaning time (t_T) for removal of proteinaceous milk deposit ($\delta = 0.00015$ m) for the CIP unit-operations model of Bird & Fryer (1991) and Bird (1992) for $30 < T < 80$ °C	67

Fig. 5-3	Effect of nominal temperature of the (0.5-wt% NaOH) cleaning solution (T) on reptation time (t_r) of proteinaceous milk deposits for the CIP unit-operations model of Xin (2003) and Xin, Chen & Ozkan (2004) for $308 < T < 373$ K	69
Fig. 5-4	Effect of nominal temperature of the (0.5-wt% NaOH) cleaning solution (T) on maximum rate of removal (R_m) of proteinaceous deposits for the CIP unit-operations model of Xin (2003) and Xin, Chen & Ozkan (2004) for $308 < T < 373$ K	70
Fig. 5-5	Effect of nominal temperature of the (0.5-wt% NaOH) cleaning solution (T) on Reynolds number (Re) for removal of proteinaceous milk deposits in the CIP unit-operations model of Xin (2003) and Xin, Chen & Ozkan (2004) for $308 < T < 373$ K	70
Fig. B-1	Fish bone (Ishikawa) diagram for Xin (2003) and Xin, Chen & Ozkan (2004) CIP model	80

LIST OF TABLES		PAGE
Table 2-1	Comparison of different CIP systems	9
Table 2-2	Summary and chronological listing of models available for CIP unit-operation	15
Table 2-3	Comparison of experimental conditions of selected CIP models	20
Table 3-1	Constants for the unit-operations model of Bird & Fryer (1991) extracted from the experimental data of Bird (1992) for the <i>Alkali-clean</i> step (1-wt% NaOH) as a cleaning solution on proteinaceous milk deposit	36
Table 3-2	Summary comparison of uncertainty model with traditional SVA for the CIP unit-operations model of Bird (1992) and Bird & Fryer (1991 a, b) for an <i>Alkali-clean</i> step with a 1-wt% NaOH cleaning solution at a mid-range temperature of $T = 60$ °C with a tolerance of 6% on total cleaning time (t_T)	39
Table 3-3	10 failures per 1,000 CIP operations at $T = 60$ °C and %-tolerance = 6	41
Table 4-1	Experimental parameters used in Xin (2003) and Xin, Chen & Ozkan (2004) model for <i>Alkali-clean</i> (0.5-wt% NaOH) step	53
Table 4-2	Temperature dependence of parameters in the CIP model based on Xin (2003) and Xin, Chen & Ozkan (2004) and reported by Davey, Chandrakash & O'Neill (2012)	54
Table 4-3	Summary comparison of vulnerability to failure model with traditional SVA for the CIP unit-operations model based on Xin (2003) and Xin, Chen & Ozkan (2004) for an <i>Alkali-clean</i> step (with 0.5-wt% NaOH) at a mid-range temperature of $T = 348$ K (75 °C) with a tolerance of 2% on total cleaning time (t_T)	57

Table 4-4	19 failures in total cleaning time (t_T) per 1,000 CIP operations with a cleaning solution (0.5-wt% NaOH) temperature of $T = 348 \text{ K}$ ($75 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$) on a proteinaceous deposit	58
Table 4-5	Effect of standard deviation in the risk function for cleaning solution (0.5-wt% NaOH) temperature $T = 348 \text{ K}$ ($75 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$) on the number of failures ($p > 0$) of CIP total cleaning time (t_T)	59
Table 5-1	Summary comparison of the two CIP unit-operations models for the <i>Alkali-clean</i> step	63
Table 5-2	Comparison of predictions of vulnerability to failure of the two unit-operations models at a mid-range cleaning solution temperature $T = 65 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ together with a 2% tolerance on auto-set clean time (t_T) and a sd of 1% in the temperature distribution	65
Table 5-3	Comparison of predictions of vulnerability to failure of the unit-operations model of Bird & Fryer (1991) and Bird (1992) with a 2% tolerance of auto-set clean time (t_T) and a sd of 1% in the mean value of temperature for $30 \text{ }^\circ\text{C} < T < 80 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$	68
Table 5-4	Comparison of predictions of vulnerability to failure of the unit-operations model of Xin (2003) and Xin, Chen & Ozkan (2004) with a 2% tolerance on auto-set clean time (t_T) and a sd of 1% in the mean value of temperature for $308 \text{ K} < T < 373 \text{ K}$	71