



## A Review of Monitorability, Observability, and Controllability (MOC) in Modern Oil and Gas Operations

*Engr. Ndifreke Uwah*  
*Savannah Energy,*

**Abstract:** Process automation and control have played a central role in optimizing production within the modern oil and gas industry, particularly in environments characterized by high risks and operational hazards. While automation enhances efficiency, safety, and consistency, the indispensable role of human operators remains prevalent. According to Karthikeyan M. and Vijayachitra S., process control involves the application of methods and technologies to regulate process variables and reduce operational variability. However, automation does not eliminate the need for human oversight. This review examines the three foundational pillars of optimal operations—Monitorability, Observability, and Controllability (MOC) and highlights the critical roles played by operations personnel in achieving safe, effective, and efficient production. It further discusses how deficiencies in MOC contribute to industrial accidents, downtime, and off-specification products, and concludes with recommendations to strengthen MOC integration in oil and gas facilities.

**Keywords:** *Monitor ability; Observability; Controllability; Process Automation; Oil and Gas Operations; Operational Safety; Industrial Control Systems*

### 1. Introduction

The oil and gas industry, characterized by complex production systems and volatile operational conditions, increasingly depends on automation and advanced control systems to meet production goals. Production involves the integration of resources to create goods or services, while optimization is the act of maximizing performance, efficiency, and profitability.

Operational optimization in oil and gas refers to maximizing output within sustainable, cost-effective, and safe boundaries. Achieving this requires strict adherence to the principles of **Monitorability, Observability, and Controllability (MOC)** a framework fundamental to operational reliability.

- **Monitorability** enables real-time assessment of process parameters and system behaviors.
- **Observability** ensures accurate interpretation of system inputs and outputs to evaluate health and performance.
- **Controllability** allows the operator to influence or regulate system behavior to maintain desired outcomes.

These three components form the backbone of safe and optimal operations. The absence or ineffectiveness of any MOC element results in incomplete situational awareness, poor decision making, and suboptimal operational outcomes. This paper reviews the central role of MOC in oil and gas operations and

evaluates how the failure of these elements results in major operational threats.

## 2. Overview Of Monitorability, Observability, And Controllability (Moc)

### 2.1 Monitor ability

Monitorability is the ability to supervise system parameters and verify system properties in real time. According to Luca Aceto, monitorability underpins runtime verification by defining which system attributes can be validated during operation. In oil and gas facilities, proper monitorability ensures early detection of abnormal conditions, deviations, and inefficiencies.

### 2.2 Observability

Observability involves gathering information through system inputs and outputs to develop an accurate understanding of system health. It enables operators to diagnose issues early and supports predictive maintenance. High observability ensures that the system's internal state can be inferred from external measurements.

### 2.3 Controllability

Controllability refers to the ability to influence system behavior using structured strategies and control actions. This includes the implementation of process controls, safety instrumented systems, and manual interventions. Effective controllability ensures the system remains within defined operational boundaries and can recover from disturbances.

## 3. Role Of Operations Personnel In Moc Implementation

Even in highly automated oil and gas environments, operations personnel remain the first line of defense against system failures and process deviations. They:

- Conduct proactive monitoring of field parameters.
- Interpret system trends and alarms to make accurate decisions.
- Respond to abnormal operating conditions.

- Implement corrective actions to restore normalcy.

Human involvement is indispensable because automation cannot fully replace situational awareness, intuition, or on-the-spot judgment required during complex operational upsets.

## 4. Consequences Of Moc Failure In Oil And Gas Operations

Failures in executing monitorability, observability, and controllability manifest through three major operational threats:

### 4.1 Accident Threat

Accidents in oil and gas operations are predominantly linked to human error, including unsafe actions and overlooked warning signs. Proactive MOC practices enable operators to identify early indicators of abnormal conditions before they escalate. The cost of prevention is significantly lower than the cost of correction, making effective MOC essential for mitigating accident risks and preserving life, property, and corporate reputation.

### 4.2 Downtime Threat

Downtime occurs when a system becomes unavailable and may be categorized into:

- **Planned downtime:** scheduled for maintenance or modifications.
- **Unplanned downtime:** caused by equipment failure or human error.

Unplanned downtime is typically more disruptive and financially draining. Industry data show that human error contributes to nearly 90% of unplanned downtime events. Effective MOC reduces downtime and enhances key maintenance indicators such as:

- Mean Time Between Failures (MTBF)
- Mean Time to Repair (MTTR)
- Mean Time to Acknowledge (MTTA)
- Mean Time to Failure (MTTF)

### 4.3 Off-Specification (Off-Spec) Production Threat

Off-spec production arises when output fails to meet required quality standards. This is often caused by ineffective monitoring and poor control strategies. Off-spec products can lead to:

- financial penalties,
- rejected products,
- rework costs, and
- reputational damage.

Proactive and coordinated MOC practices are essential to maintaining product quality and consistency.

## 5. Factors Affecting Effective MOC Operations

Four key factors contribute to MOC ineffectiveness in oil and gas operations:

1. **Lack of experienced personnel** – resulting in poor decision-making and weak situational awareness.
2. **Lack of job commitment** – reduced engagement leads to negligence and oversight.
3. **Complacency** – familiarity breeds laxity, increasing the likelihood of human error.
4. **Demoralization** – caused by inadequate management practices such as poor incentives, lack of recognition, and unfavorable working conditions.

The first three factors stem from operational behaviors, while demoralization is predominantly management related. Addressing these factors strengthens the operational execution of MOC.

## 6. Recommendations

To enhance MOC performance and optimize oil and gas operations, the following measures are recommended:

- Establish continuous training and competency development programs.
- Implement proper staff placement based on skills and experience.

- Improve remuneration structures to motivate personnel.
- Introduce incentive-based performance systems.
- Enhance system design to support real-time monitoring and diagnostics.
- Promote a safety culture focused on proactive rather than reactive operations.

## 7. Conclusion

Monitorability, Observability, and Controllability form the backbone of successful oil and gas operations. The absence or poor implementation of these elements lead to severe consequences including accidents, downtime, and off-spec production. Human operators, even with advanced automation systems, remain critical to maintaining operational integrity. Strengthening MOC practices through training, proper management policies, and system improvements offers a cost-effective approach to ensuring operational excellence, safety, and long-term sustainability.

## Reference

- Hollnagel, E. (2014). *Safety-I and Safety-II: The past and future of safety management*. Ashgate.
- Leveson, N. G. (2011). *Engineering a safer world: Systems thinking applied to safety*. MIT Press.
- ISA (International Society of Automation). (2016). *ISA-18.2: Management of alarm systems for the process industries*. ISA Standards.
- Reason, J. (1997). *Managing the risks of organizational accidents*. Ashgate.
- API RP 1167 (2012). *Pipeline control room management*. American Petroleum Institute.
- Khan, F., & Abbasi, S. A. (1999). Major accidents in process industries and an analysis of causes and consequences. *Journal of Loss Prevention in the Process Industries*, 12(5), 361–378.
- [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0950-4230\(99\)00020-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0950-4230(99)00020-5)

- 
- Itaketo, U. T. (2019). *Process control engineering with work examples*.
- Martinotti, S., Nolten, J., & Steinsbe, J. A. (2014). *Digitalizing oil and gas production*.
- Karthikeyan, M., & Vijayachitra, S. (2014). Industrial process integration for control and automation: A review. *International Journal of Engineering Research and Technology (IJERT)*, 2(6), 81–87. Retrieved from <https://www.ijert.org/industrial-process-integration-for-control-and-automation-a-review>
- Guma, T. N. (2020). An overview of industrial automation and its implementation approaches for boosting Nigeria and other developing economies.
- Skogestad, S. (2004). Control structure design for complete chemical plants. *Computers & Chemical Engineering*, 28(1–2), 219–234. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compchemeng.2003.08.002>
- Seborg, D. E., Edgar, T. F., Mellichamp, D. A., & Doyle, F. J. (2017). *Process dynamics and control* (4th ed.). Wiley.
- Endsley, M. R. (1995). Toward a theory of situation awareness in dynamic systems. *Human Factors*, 37(1), 32–64. <https://doi.org/10.1518/001872095779049543>
- IEEE. (2018). *Industrial automation and control systems security*. IEEE Standards Association.