IRF Annual General Meeting
Washington, DC, 21-23 October 2015

Summary of discussions and action points

Participants:

Australia

Stuart Smith	NOPSEMA
Graeme Waters	NOPTA

Brazil

Alex Garcia de Almeida	ANP

Canada

Daniel Chicoyne	C-NLOPB
Scott Tessier	C-NLOPB
Stuart Pinks	C-NSOPB
Robert Normore	C-NSOPB
Keith Landra	NEB

Denmark

Katrine Krone	DEA
Peter Ronberg Hansen	DEA

Mexico

Carlos de Regules	ASEA
Alejandro Carabias	ASEA
Luis Martinez	ASEA
Benjamin Heras	ASEA

Norway

Anne Myhrvold	PSA
Finn Carlsen	PSA

New Zealand

Wayne Vernon	WorkSafe New Zealand

The Netherlands

Harry van der Meijden	SSM
Vincent Claessens	SSM

United Kingdom

Susan Mackenzie	HSE
Tony Hetherington	HSE
Andrew Taylor	DECC

United States

Brian Salerno	BSEE
Lars Herbst	BSEE
Doug Morris	BSEE

MINUTES:

	Welcome and Introduction BSEE (U.S.) Director Brian Salerno delivered the opening remarks and welcomed the IRF members to the Annual General Meeting (AGM).
1	**Review of Minutes from AGM 2014 Meeting Minutes and Action Items, and Review of Proposed Agenda for this Meeting** Australia (NOPSEMA) led the session, which reviewed the previous minutes, provided an update on progress, and proposed an agenda for this meeting. • Reviewed notes and updates from November 2014 IRF AGM in Cancun, Mexico • Reviewed notes and updates from 2014 midyear meeting at the Offshore Technology Conference in Houston (May)
2	**2015 IRF Offshore Safety Conference: Key Takeaways and Review** There was discussion about the format of the conference and general consensus that it succeeded because it engaged its participants. This exchange was valuable for the participants because they learned from what they heard and from what they contributed. There was agreement that the conference emcee identified four important themes at the conclusion of the conference: trust, experience, training and teamwork. The group also concluded that there were three more to consider, data, complacency and culture, and had a discussion about them. • Data: Can be useful for measuring performance and culture, and may lead to improvements. Relying too heavily on data, and not including firsthand engagement, may cause problems. • Complacency: Just because something has worked in the past – procedures, data collection, etc – does not mean that it will continue to work, especially as the sector changes from Analog to Digital. The changing workforce uses different tools and relies on different measures, which must be considered by operators and regulators. • Culture: Is there such a thing as Safety Culture, or is it one aspect of an organization's overall culture? If it is, in fact, an aspect of organizational culture, the focus should be on influencing organizational. Further, is it useful to focus on culture when the real goal is safety and performance?
3	**API and ISO Project Updates** **ISO** The International Standards Organization (IOS) presented its annual updates and information about ISO/TC 67. ISO/TC 67 is about the standardization of materials, equipment and offshore structure used for drilling, production, transport by pipeline, and processing of liquid and gaseous hydrocarbons. ISO's work in standard setting is global, inclusive, neutral and simple, and they continue to explore ways to work within the boundaries of national sanctions.

	API The American Petroleum Institute (API) provided an update that explained its accreditation process, talked about its standards in development, and discussed the status of its international outreach while sanctions are in place. New API standards in development focus on offshroe structures and operations, safety and drilling equipment, and subsea standards. Additionally, API reported that they continue to look for ways to engage experts and develop standards within the limits that exist due to sanctions.
4	**IOGP and IADC Project Updates** **IADC** The International Association of Drilling Contractors (IADC) presented its new online Subsea Reporting Database. The database collects data on all failures related to the BOP that cause downtime, not only significant downtime-related failures. The database sorts by areas of failure and includes some information on causes. Also, since it links to OEM's, it allows operators to work with OEM's to detect systemic failures and prevent downtime events. IADC stated that it would be unhelpful to look at the data on an operator-by-operator basis. That could lead to comparisons, which would discourage participation in the database. Their goal is to get more operators to participate so they can see the types of failures that led to downtime and enable OEM's to identify solutions. **IOGP** The International Association of Oil and Gas Producers (IOGP) provided updates about its three areas of activity: prevention, intervention and response. These Joint Industry Projects (JIP's) have led to: good practice guidance, short technical reports, pure research, and outreach and communication. Also, the IOGP shared that its Well Control Incident Database is online, and its reports and alerts are available to the public at safetyzone.iogp.org.
5	**Country Updates: UK, Netherlands, Brazil, Canada**
6	**Country Updates: Mexico, New Zealand, Australia, Denmark, U.S., Norway**
7	**Topical Presentation and Discussion: Well Integrity, Lifecycle Phases and Shared Responsibilities** The Netherlands led the session, which looked at the challenges that regulators are facing due to aging assets.
8	**Topical Presentation and Discussion: Maintenance in a Cost-Cutting Environment** Norway led the session that focused on the effects of a low-cost environment on safety performance. The members shared their findings, which indicated that many jurisdictions had seen an increase in maintenance-related issues. These included temporary fixes being used as permanent fixes, maintenance being postponed, incidents of noncompliance for safety-critical equipment, as well as others.

	It was mentioned that members could explore what they could do to enablet safety and maintenance to remain a priority. Ideas included encouraging operators to find ways to eliminiate administrative costs and paperwork, and ensuring that the time and money spent on maintenance were used in the most effective way. The members concluded the session by committing themselves to maintaining safety as a top priority and communicating that clearly.
9	**Strategic Path Forward for the IRF** The session on the IRF's strategic path forward began with several questions for the members to consider - Who are we, and how do we see ourselves? - How do we collect information? - How do we use that common information to ask questions to industry? - How do we communicate with the industry and other groups? - What are our relationships with other groups? **UK Discussion Paper** The UK presented a draft paper on principles for the regulation of the offshore oil and gas industries. The members discussed the draft paper's contents and agreed that it would be useful as a guidance document. Using this draft paper as a starting point, the members discussed their priorities for the IRF. There was agreement that the group's influence came from its ability to share information, communicate and identify common risks that need to be addressed. The meeting determined that they needed to define their priorities as a group and decide on a work plan. **New Member and Observers** The members discussed the benefits and costs of expanding the membership and inviting observers to IRF meetings. It was agreed that new members and observers could be considered in the future. Before that would be considered, however, the members agreed that they needed to define the IRF's purpose, priorities and work plan. **Working Groups and Member Engagement** The group used this session to discuss how to move the group forward, specifically in relation to its work groups. It was agreed that the members who volunteered for work groups needed to commit to dedicating the resources to doing so. The group identified the following subjects for work groups: - Asset Integrity - Performance Measures - Culture Further, the group determined that it would be useful to define specific tasks, goals, roles and timelines for the projects that the work groups would pursue. **Moderator-Led Activity: Creating and Defining Working Groups** The members divided into the working groups and decided on a specific project to

undertake in the next year. Each working group created terms of reference for its project.

- Group 1: Performance Measures – Group members will provide data about understanding root causes and will brief other IRF members no later than OTC
- Group 2: Asset Integrity – Focusing on aging assets, the group will compile a top 10 list of safety critical equipment
- Group 3: Culture – Group will identify 5 key indicators of culture with impacts on safety performance

Management Committee Governance and Proposed Reforms

Members circulated Management Committee notes for Mexico meeting. Recognizing that the Management Committee had not been optimally effective, IRF members proposed a new structure:

- Four members, with geographic inclusion

- The chair would take the position for 3 years

- 2-3 committee members would take the position for 2 years, with one member from the Americas, one from Australia/Asia, one from Europe

- A fourth member from the country hosting the next conference would be appointed for one year with an option to be reappointed for a second year
- A position will be appointed to the Management Committee, not a particular person

The members agreed to this management structure, and it was approved. Stuart Pinks will incorporate this into the Charter. Other IRF Members should provide Stuart Pinks any additional written comments within 30 days

Nomination and Election of Management Committee Members
- Chair – Brian Salerno (BSEE)
- Committee Member – Anne Myhrvold (PSA)
- Committee Member – Stuart Smith (NOPSEMA)
- Committee Member – fourth member, based on who hosts next conference

End of Day Recap
- Discussed communicating internally and externally
- Identified three subjects working groups for the next year
- Approved a new management structure

Action Items

- Update charter: Stuart Pinks will update this, and others will provide comments to him within 30 days

- Next conference: the group needs to identify a host
- Principles document: covered by working groups

-
- New members and observers: most agree IRF is not ready for observers at this point in time, may consider it in the future
- Issue of secretariat: still open as to whether updates to the Management Committee Structure will cover this

10	**Topical Presentation and Discussion: 2014 Key Performance Indicators (KPI's)** PSA presented its findings for the 2014 KPI's. They noticed the following changes: • Frequency of major injuries increased • The frequency and number of hydrocarbon releases increased significantly • Fires and major collisions decreased • Losses of well control decreased The members discussed the results and what could be done to reduce the number of these incidents. They agreed that more root cause analysis would be useful. BSEE presented its near-miss reporting system, called Safe OCS. The system allows people to share information confidentially and without it being assigned to individuals. BSEE has worked with the SPE and others to gain industry buy-in so the system will gather the most information. It was discussed that the near-miss reporting system was a valuable tool since it could help to identify trends that could prevent problems. A common theme that the members identified was guaranteeing confidentiality and gaining industry buy-in. The members acknowledged that without confidentiality it could be difficult to find participants. The members agreed that if they gather more information and share it with each other, they will have a stronger position from which to raise safety concerns.
11	**Formalization of Communication Mechanisms** DWEA led the discussion, which focused on safety alerts, Objective Connect, and the IRF website. Safety Alerts were determined to be a project for the Performance Measures working group. In 2014 the IRF website had 1500 visitors. So far in 2015, the IRF website had had an increase in visitors, especially from the U.S. This may be related to the Conference. The meeting discussed use of Objective Connect. They determined that Objective Connect serves an important function as an archive for IRF information, and they will look for ways to improve its ease of use and functionality. The members discussed the website's ease of use for them. It was decided that the group would think of ways to make the website more user friendly. They agreed that BSEE would manage the process of changing the website with input from the members. Each member would designate a website POC and forward that information to BSEE.
12	**Review of Action Items** **2016 Midyear Meeting** • The midyear meeting is valuable. The 2016 Midyear Meeting will be especially important ebcause it will give the Working Groups the opportunity to present the

progress on their projects.
- The members can arrange to set up a phone or VTC for members who cannot attend the meeting.
- Depending on the agenda and the Working Group presentations, the members could reserve a room for a half day of a full day

2016 AGM

- New Zealand will host the meeting
- Due to national holidays, New Zealand proposed Tuesday Oct. 18 to Thursday Oct. 20, 2016.

Observers at Future Meetings
- Need to establish rules for deciding on observers.
- Consider creating parameters for participation
- Need to look for observers who add value to the IRF meeting

Next Conference
- Need to determine who will host the conference soon.
- Before deciding on when and where to host conference, need to demonstrate results from the Working Groups.

UK Plan
- The UK will add a preface that explains that the paper is a guidance document

Communiqué
- Correct the draft, return it, and BSEE will try to send it by 12:00 Monday (10/26)