



International Regulators' Forum
GLOBAL OFFSHORE SAFETY

17th Annual IRF Meeting
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada
October 21, 2010

Summaries of presentations, discussion and action points

Participants:

| | | |
|-----------------|--|---|
| Australia | Jane Cutler Simon Schubach | NOPSA NOPSA |
| Brazil | Raphael Moura Alex Almeida Victor Cesarino | ANP ANP ANP |
| Canada | Stuart Pinks Keith Landra Dave Scratch Max Ruelokke Howard Pike Sean Kelly Brian Nesbitt | CNSOPB CNSOPB CNSOPB C-NLOPB C-NLOPB C-NLOPB NEB (Observer) |
| The Netherlands | Jan de Jong Jos Marx | SSM SSM |
| Norway | Magne Ognedal Odd Bjerre Finnestad Torleif Husebø Inger Anda | PSA PSA PSA PSA |
| United Kingdom | Steve Walker | HSE |
| United States | Lars Herbst Mike Saucier Doug Slitor Cheri Hunter | BOEMRE BOEMRE BOEMRE BOEMRE |
| Emeritus | Bud Danenberger | |

| | | |
|------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| Session 1 | Welcome | |
| | Review of agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed agenda (attached) was endorsed, with two new agenda items added as the meeting unfolded: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Future IRF Conference - IRF Communications / Public Relations Strategy and Plan | |
| Session 2 | Conference Wash-Up / Action Items | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A total of 69 conference evaluation forms were completed and submitted by delegates. Mostly very positive. - In general, IRF members expressed that the conference was very successful, but attendance was a little disappointing from some sectors, e.g. US industry, Far East regulators / industry. Conference didn't attract many new attendee organizations. - Q&A Sessions were good. - Should perhaps consider whether future conferences should be for just regulators, or whether they should continue to be an open forum for all stakeholders. - Future conferences could benefit from a better conference plan establishing clear objective and a targeted marketing plan. This conference was "fortunate" in that the Deepwater Horizon incident gave it a much defined focus. - From an attendance perspective, future conferences could potentially benefit by piggy backing on other major conferences. - The IRF profile has been raised. An IRF communications strategy is required. | |
| | Action Points | Who |
| | 1. Conference close out items need to be tended to; e.g. finances, thank you letters, etc. | Conference Organizing Committee |
| | 2. Performance Measures Presentation to be reviewed by IRF members prior to posting to address any concerns. Comments / requests to be sent to Sean Kelley of C-NLOPB by October 29 th . | All |
| | 3. Conference Outcome document to be prepared / finalized for posting with other presentations. | Bud Danenberger |

| | | |
|------------------|--|----------------|
| | 4. Copies of all presentations (when ready) to be forwarded to NOPSAs for posting on IRF website | C-NLOPB (Sean) |
| | 5. Performance Measures Presentation to be reviewed by IRF members prior to posting to address any concerns. Comments / requests to be sent to Sean Kelley of C-NLOPB by October 29 th . | All |
| Session 3 | Status of Action Items from 2009 IRF Meeting | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The list of action points from the 2009 IRF Plenary Meeting was reviewed. It was agreed that all had been adequately attended to with the following exceptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More discussion is required with respect to compiling a list of most common incident causal categories (referred to Session 6.2). - A decision is required with respect to an IRF “members only” website (referred to Session 9). | |
| Session 4 | Significant New Developments from Montara / Macondo Incidents | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - United States: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - US Court struck down Notice to Lessees. It was replaced by Interim Final Rules. - Europe: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Possible new layer of standards arising from EU Commission. - EU Commission recognizes the potential contribution of forums like the IRF. This needs to be taken into account when discussing the IRF Strategic Agenda to assure that the IRF takes a leadership role in identifying actions that should be taken by industry to advance safety. - Canada: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CNSOPB, C-NLOPB and NEB to again appear as witnesses before the House of Commons Standing Committee on Natural Resources who is conducting a study on the status of the emergency response to offshore oil and gas drilling. - Additional scrutiny likely when updating remaining regulations from a prescriptive approach to one that is goal oriented. - Australia: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NOPSAs may see an expanded role to include responsibility of oversight of well integrity. | |

| | | |
|------------------|--|--------------|
| Session 5 | Audit Protocol – BOP Integrity and Operational Issues | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steve Walker walked the group through the draft Proposals for a Standard International Approach to Inspection of Well Control Issues (as previously circulated). - Could consider depicting results using a traffic light system. - A more strategic discussion is required (referred to Session 7) on how to challenge industry/manufacturers to have an entirely new look at BOPs and their design from the perspective of modern engineering principles. | |
| | Action Points | Who |
| | 6. IRF members to submit comments on the draft Proposals to Steve Walker by November 30 th . | All |
| | 7. Steve Walker to consider comments received, and synthesize with a similar NSOAF audit program. Updated IRF Proposals document to be distributed for comment by all IRF members by December 31 st . | Steve Walker |
| Session 6 | IRF Issues Update | |
| | 6.1 Performance Measures Project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Working group carrying on as intended. - There is an issue of getting timely data given that IRF members have different reporting timeframes. The Working Group should look for ways to speed up the collection and reporting of data. - Presentations of performance measures results should be vetted by IRF members prior to being presented publicly. - The Working Group needs face-to-face meetings and resources to do what the IRF wants done. - It was acknowledged that this Working Group was formed because industry metrics did not present an accurate picture. IRF needed its own metrics. Group formed and asked to start slowly. Now it is important to discuss trends. | |
| | Action Points | Who |
| | 8. Meeting of working group to be convened. | BOEMRE |

| | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|
| | <p>9. Working Group to initiate the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Select a new project team lead from another member organization. It was recognized that the US has led this for several years (with excellent results), and that it is time to transfer leadership responsibility. - Consider how trending of data could best be incorporated into annual reporting of performance measures data. - Consider possible metrics that could be collected and reported for asset integrity and safety culture. | Performance Measures Working Group |
| | <p>10. When ready, Working Group to make recommendations for reporting of trend data, and additional metrics for IRF member consideration and ratification.</p> | Performance Measures Working Group |
| | <p>6.2 Incident Causation and Reporting Systems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A presentation (attached) was provided by NOPSA. - Project has been stalled because of issues around identifying root cause categories. - It was agreed to continue this initiative as part of the Performance Measures Working Group with a narrow focus initially. | |
| | Action Points | Who |
| | <p>11. Working Group to identify the three most significant root causes leading to hydrocarbon releases.</p> | Performance Measures Working Group |
| | <p>12. Data analysts to share current root cause schemes and devise a method for combining data from all members.</p> | Performance Measures Working Group |

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|
| - | <p>6.3 Helicopter Transportation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Canada (C-NLOPB): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Offshore Helicopter Safety Inquiry Report to be submitted to the C-NLOPB in approximately one week. - Current plan is that Report will be released publicly one week after receipt. - C- NLOPB is committed to outlining an implementation plan to address recommendations contained within the Report thirty days after it is made public. - Phase II of the Inquiry will commence when Transportation Safety Board report is issued – expected in January 2011. | |
| | <p>6.4 Statutes / Coordination of Future Carolita Kallaur Awards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discussion focused on the number of nominations received for the 2010 awards, and participation of IRF members on the selection panel. | |
| | Action Point | Who |
| | 13. The organizer of the next IRF conference will need to resurrect discussion on the CK statutes / protocols as part of the conference planning exercise. | PSA (currently proposed) |

| Session 7 | IRF Strategic Agenda | |
|-----------|--|----------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The draft Strategic Agenda Working Paper (previously circulated) was presented by NOPSA. The Paper focuses on three objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Positioning the IRF to provide leadership on safety and safety related regulatory matters for the offshore industry. - Raising the IRF's profile, and - Improving the IRF's effectiveness at influencing Operators and Industry Associations. - The topics identified in the working paper for consideration were reviewed, taking into account outcomes of the conference and discussions so far during this plenary meeting. Five topics were selected for action by the IRF. - For each of the five topics selected, as listed below under Action Points, the go forward process (and deliverable dates) are detailed in section 2.2.3 of the Strategic Agenda Working Paper (page 4 of 11). - Focus should be on clearly defining the issue from an IRF perspective, and then passing the challenge (where possible) to the "owner of the problem", which likely would be an industry association, for their action. | |
| | Action Points | Who |
| | <p>14. Safety Culture & Leadership – how we as regulators influence, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Develop a paper for IRF review o Paper to examine what is safety culture, how do we know it exists, and what is our role as regulators. o Engage key gatekeepers (OGP, CAPP) | Canada (C-NLOPB) |
| | 15. BOP integrity & operational issues – BOP design / well control training, audit protocol, etc. | PSA |
| | <p>16. Performance indicators – <i>ongoing</i> + root causes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Refer to notes under Incident Causation and Reporting above). o New Performance Measures working group lead (to be selected) will likely require guidance from his / her IRF Member organization in advancing this initiative. | Performance Measures Group |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|------------------------------|
| | <p>17. Define criteria for Operator competencies / capacity to undertake work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o C-NLOPB to send Australia a list of criteria for assessing operator applications for drilling | NOPSA / BOEMRE C-NLOPB |
| | 18. Standards / best practices | SSM / UK HSE |
| Session 8 | Future IRF Conference | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The PSA proposed that an IRF conference / summit be held in one year's time with a focus on the progress made in respect of the five Strategic Agenda items captured above. | |
| | Action Point | Who |
| | 19. With input from all IRF members, a proposed conference program and objectives is to be drafted by no later than December 17 th to facilitate decision making. | PSA (Lead) |
| Session 9 | IRF "Members Only" Website | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposal tabled by NOPSA for an internal member's only website was accepted. Presentation attached. | |
| | Action Points | Who |
| | 20. NOPSA to proceed with setting up the internal website over the next few weeks | NOPSA |
| | 21. NOPSA to send email requesting technical administrator contact information for each IRF member organisation | All |
| Session 10 | Update on NSAOF Working Groups | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A presentation (attached) was provided by SSM. | |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|---------|
| Session 11 | IRF Membership | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discussion focused on maintaining a manageable size. If new members are to be considered, among other things they need to be independent of industry, fully committed to the principles of the IRF, and have an active offshore oil and gas industry within their jurisdiction. | |
| | Action Points | Who |
| | 22. India – invitation for membership to be withdrawn. Letter advising of such to be sent. | C-NLOPB |
| | 23. Qatar – letter seeking clarification of organizational arrangements and the matter of independence from industry to be sent. | CNSOPB |
| | 24. Mexico – Invitation to become a member of IRF to be drafted and sent to all IRF members for comment and input prior to sending. Letter to set out terms for membership, and will offer a “peer review” if requested. | CNSOPB |
| | 25. National Energy Board – an invitation to join IRF will not be considered at this time. NEB to be so advised. | C-NLOPB |
| Session 12 | IRF Role | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is recognized that responsibilities in respect of environmental protection vary between IRF members. - It is also recognized that an International Offshore Petroleum Environmental Regulators forum has been established. Regulators from a number of IRF member countries participate in this forum. Its objectives are very similar to that of the IRF except that the focus is on environmental protection rather than health and safety. - It was the consensus that the focus of IRF should remain on health and safety. Having said this, the benefit of updating IRF member country profiles to indicate each member’s role in environmental protection would be useful. | |

| | Action Point | Who |
|-------------------|--|--|
| | 26. It was agreed to expand the country profiles posted on the IRF website to include member responsibilities with respect to environmental regulation and oil spill response, and to address transparency. IRF member organisations to forward updated profiles to NOPSA for posting (if not already done so). | All |
| Session 13 | IRF Communications / Public Relations Strategy and Plan | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recognizing that IRF profile has been raised, and given that the IRF has reconfirmed its commitment to improve the safety of offshore operations and to provide leadership in global offshore safety regulations, it was agreed that additional focus on communications is required. | |
| | Action Points | Who |
| | 27. Post meeting communiqué to be prepared soonest following up on communiqué issued after Washington meeting. Draft to be circulated for comment prior to issuance. | PSA(Inger) C-NLOPB (Sean) |
| | 28. Go-forward communications strategy and plan to be drafted and circulated to IRF members for comment. | PSA(Inger) C-NLOPB (Sean) CNSOPB (Tanya) |
| | 29. IRF member communications / public relations contact person to be forwarded to Sean Kelley of the C-NLOPB. | All |
| Session 14 | Wrap-Up | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Action points (as documented above in) were reviewed and endorsed. - Location / timing of 2011 annual meeting (currently scheduled for Brazil in October) to be put on hold pending decision on another IRF conference / summit in one year's time | |