



**IRF Annual General Meeting  
Aberdeen, Scotland, United Kingdom, 4, 7-8 June 2018**

**Summary of discussions and action points**

Participants:

Australia

Stuart Smith	NOPSEMA
Derrick O'Keeffe	NOPSEMA
Graeme Waters	NOPTA

Brazil

Marcelo M Borges de Macedo	ANP
Alex Garcia Almeida	ANP

Canada

Stuart Pinks	C-NSOPB
Robert Normore	C-NSOPB
Scott Tessier	C-NLOPB
Paul Alexander	C-NLOPB
Keith Landra	NEB

Denmark

Torben Krarup	DWEA
Bénédicte Crapez	DWEA

Mexico

Carlos de Regules	ASEA
Ulises Carmona	ASEA

New Zealand

Donna Ellis	WorkSafe New Zealand
-------------	----------------------

Norway

Anne Myhrvold	PSA
Finn Carlsen	PSA

The Netherlands

Theodor Kockelkoren	SSM
Hans de Waal	SSM
Stan Goense	SSM

United Kingdom

Wendy Kennedy	OPRED
Chris Flint	HSE
David Walker	HSE

United States

Lars Herbst	BSEE
Doug Morris	BSEE



Observers:

Ghana

Francis Ackah  
Charles James

Petroleum Commission  
Petroleum Commission

Ireland

Roisin Cullinan

CRU



**MINUTES:**

	<p><b>Welcome and Introduction</b></p> <p>BSEE (U.S.) Lars Herbst, Regional Director, Gulf of Mexico Region, delivered the opening remarks and welcomed the IRF members to the Annual General Meeting (AGM).</p>
1	<p><b>Administrative Items</b></p> <p>U.S. led the session, which reviewed the 2017 AGM Action Items and the proposed agenda for this meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reviewed action items from the 2017 AGM minutes. All items completed.</li><li>• Highlighted upcoming session on the next Chair and Executive Secretariat, to be transferred from the U.S. at the end of 2018.</li></ul>
2	<p><b>2018 Conference Preparations</b></p> <p>U.K. provided logistical information about the <i>Safety30</i> conference: shuttle transportation, registration, conference layout, and IT support. The Executive Secretariat provided the communication strategy, which was tweeting from the IRF Twitter handle (IRFOffshoreSafT) on each IRF session.</p>
3	<p><b>Conference Session Highlights</b></p> <p>Each IRF session lead provided a highlight of their respective conference session:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Value of the Regulator – Australia (NOPSEMA)</li><li>• Beyond Compliance: Assessing and Advancing a Culture of Safety – Canada (NEB)</li><li>• Knowledge Sharing and Big Data: Are we doing enough to prevent Major Accident Events – Australia (NOPSEMA)</li><li>• Maintaining Safe Operations: Results of a Multi-National Audit – U.K. (HSE) and Norway (PSA)</li><li>• How Do We Improve on Safety Operational Transaction in Late Field Life – U.S. (BSEE) and Brazil (ANP)</li><li>• Industrial Digitalization and the Cyber Security Risk – U.K. (HSE) and Norway (PSA)</li><li>• Risk Identification and Mitigation for New Technology – U.S. (BSEE) and Australia (NOPTA)</li><li>• Improving and Promoting BOP Reliability – U.S. (BSEE)</li></ul>
4	<p><b>IRF Performance Indicators</b></p> <p>Brazil presented the 2017 IRF performance indicators, providing a comparison with this year's data to previous years. It was noted that the areas of fatalities, loss of containment and hydrocarbon gas releases have not improved over the last five years. Not all data was received by this presentation. Brazil will update the comparison once all data is received. In addition to the raw performance indicator data, a general comparison of previous years' performance data will be included and posted on the IRF website.</p> <p>Brazil agreed to continue gathering this data to present at the next AGM meeting.</p>



5	<p><b>IRF Networking</b></p> <p>The Netherlands led the discussion on the Decommissioning Network, noting the terms of reference is not finalized. Furthermore, the scope and suggested list of deliverables are broad. Members also discussed setting up an IRF network of specialists. List of specialists would include well control, capping and containment, etc. and could even include decommissioning specialists. Members agreed that a Community of Practice – a list of experts in shared areas - could be useful in developing the IRF network. Canada (NEB) will create a terms of reference for the Community of Practice. Members agreed to discuss this further at the 2019 AGM.</p>
6	<p><b>Observers: Country Presentations</b></p> <p>Ghana provided an overview of its regulatory regime, current oil and gas activities, challenges, and short-medium term strategic focus, and emerging trends.</p>
7	<p><b>Country Updates: Australia, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Mexico, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, U.K., and U.S.</b></p> <p>Australia led the session. Members provided updates; common themes included: decommissioning, new market entrants, financial assurance, walk-to-work, Step Change in Safety, digitalization, and transparency and increased public reporting.</p>
8	<p><b>Topical Discussion: Valuing Safety Choices</b></p> <p>Norway led a discussion on valuing safety choices. Regulators are concerned about which values the industry stands for, which ones are emphasized by each company, and how both companies and the sector as a whole apply them. Members discussed the role of regulator and how they value safety.</p>
9	<p><b>Industry Association Preparation</b></p> <p>Members prepared for the Industry Association session on Day 2 and reviewed the presentation materials provided by API, IADC, IOGP, and ISO. Members discussed highlighting the importance of data sharing across industries in the improvement of safety performance.</p>
10	<p><b>Industry Association Activities</b></p> <p>API, IADC, IOGP, and ISO provided an update on their respective activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• API highlighted in-process standards of interest to IRF members. This included Recommended Practice 2D-2 – Offshore Crane Operator Training and Recommended Practice 75 – Development of a Safety and Environmental Management Program for Offshore Operations and Facilities. API also highlighted its global cooperation with IOGP and ISO with information sharing and reducing duplication.</li><li>• IADC provided an update on its activities, which included: (1) IOGP/IADC BOP Reliability Joint Industry Project; (2) WellSharp Well Control Training Program; and (3) Well Control Institute.</li><li>• IOGP provided an update on its initiatives in decommissioning, safety, standards, and well expert.</li><li>• ISO noted its work to prevent duplication of effort/resources between API and ISO. It also noted the ISO/TC 67 standards (materials, equipment and offshore structures for petroleum, petrochemical and natural gas industries), which is developed and maintained together with API and IOGP within the given constraints allowing everyone to input to the published standards.</li></ul>



	Discussions underlined the importance of data sharing, identifying gaps in standards, and enhancing collaboration between regulators, industry and the global stakeholder community. Alignment and improvement of industry standards is seen as a means to enhancing industry practice.
11	<p><b>Observers: Country Presentations</b></p> <p>Ireland provided an overview of its regulatory regime, current oil and gas activities, challenges, and emerging trends.</p>
12	<p><b>IOPER Report Out</b></p> <p>U.K provided an update from the International Offshore Petroleum Environmental Regulators (IOPER) meeting, held 3-4 May in Houston, Texas. IOPER has three working groups: (1) Environmental Performance Indicators; (2) Oil Spill Response; and (3) Marine Sound.</p>
13	<p><b>Case Study: Uncontrolled Released Incident Investigation</b></p> <p>New Zealand presented a case study about an uncontrolled liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) release at a tanker loading facility. Some lessons learned included strengthening internal investigations, pre-equipment checks, and identifying root cause analysis.</p>
14	<p><b>Working Group Status Report</b></p> <p>Each of the four working groups provided an update on current activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Measures – Using IOGP taxonomy, the working group has examined a sample of data related to barrier failures and associated causal factors to provide insights into system risks. The findings will be shared with IOGP in order to enhance understanding of risk and how to avoid major accident events, as well as the need for revisions to taxonomy and standards to improve quality of data reported. Australia confirmed it's intention to finish as a member of this Group and New Zealand undertook to join</li> <li>• Asset Integrity – New Zealand and the North Sea regulators have piloted the use of a standardized template to evaluate maintenance of safe operations. A workshop related to the results of this effort will be conducted by the North Sea Offshore Authority Forum (NSOAF) in September. The template to enhance regulators' assessment of operations was found to be valuable, especially within a basin with multiple jurisdictions. The assigned task of the work group will be finalized and the work group will stand down.</li> <li>• Standards – Having completed and published its pilot program on well integrity standards, the work group will develop a strategic vision and tactical plan for continued engagement with the Standard Development Organizations.</li> <li>• Culture of Safety – The working group will develop a synopsis of the culture of safety workshop held during the <i>Safety30</i> conference and post it on the IRF website as a conclusion to the work group's assigned task. A Community of Practice will be formed to ensure the culture of safety remains an important part of IRF discussions.</li> </ul>
15	<p><b>Topical Discussion: Risk Based Inspections</b></p> <p>U.S. provided a review of its risk based inspections. These inspections (1) allow for better focus on relatively higher risk, higher consequence facilities; (2) confirm the companies are properly identifying, managing, and mitigating risks; and (3) identify best practices regarding offshore operations and risk management.</p>



16	<p><b>Case Study: SeaRose FPSO</b></p> <p>Canada presented a case study about ice management plan (IMP) on the SeaRose facility. The facility chose not to disconnect when an iceberg drifted too close to it. As a result, operations were suspended for nine days. The incident noted the importance of transparency (i.e. increased communication) to the public about the status of the investigation.</p>
17	<p><b>Topical Discussion: Workforce Engagement</b></p> <p>Australia led the discussion on workforce engagement, which often vary widely across facilities, industry, and jurisdictions. Norway, U.K., and Australia summarized their legislative and other requirements for workforce engagement that apply for offshore petroleum activities in their respective country. In Norway, a strong bi- and tripartite collaboration (government – industry – union) has contributed in reaching a high HSE level. The U.K. has a plethora of methods for open communication and understanding about safety at all levels. Australia has similar legislative provisions to Norway and the UK, but the application of the provisions is different due to the limited appetite of some groups to collaborate. (For example, Australia has provisions for a tripartite forum but industry is unwilling to participate.) Other members shared their country's model and experiences.</p>
18	<p><b>Topical Discussion: Long-Term Regulatory Certainty</b></p> <p>Mexico presented on the need for institutional strengthening of ASEA to ensure a long-term reliable regulatory environment. Unlike Mexico's National Hydrocarbons Commission (CNH) and Energy Regulatory Commission (CRE) who both have appropriate levels of independence, ASEA falls under the Ministry of Environment. The Executive Director is appointed and removed by the President. ASEA's strategic priorities for institutional strengthening include: (1) formalize ASEA's regulatory model; (2) optimize operation; and (3) expand capabilities.</p>
19	<p><b>Case Study: Third Party Well Testing Equipment</b></p> <p>Australia presented a case study on a set of well test equipment that were not maintained or suitably tested for the intended service. Australia noted that there was a lack of understanding – or ownership – around the safety controls required on third party well test equipment when used offshore. NOPSEMA enlisted the help of IADC and the Drilling Industry Steering Committee to support a workshop to engage industry leaders, practitioners and decision-makers to seek underlying causes and progress solutions.</p>
20	<p><b>Case Study: Cracks in Jacket Leg</b></p> <p>New Zealand presented a case study on the joint regulatory response to cracks located on a Wellhead Platform 21. The case study highlighted the importance of clear lines of communication at the time of, during and post event management among all the New Zealand regulatory authorities involved.</p>
21	<p><b>Case Study: Well Control Incident</b></p> <p>Australia presented a case study on an appraisal well control incident, in which two cyclones and unknown bottom hold pressures resulting in sheared drill pipe and problems in setting effective plugs. Key questions from this incident revolved around the predictability of such an event, and whether all reasonable measures were applied to prevent its occurrence during design and during operations.</p>
22	<p><b>Future AGMs and next Chair</b></p> <p>The IRF elected Canada, through the Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Offshore Petroleum Board (C-NLOPB), the Canada-Nova Scotia Offshore Petroleum Board (C-NSOPB) and the National Energy Board (NEB), to serve as Chair.</p>



	<p>Norway and Australia will continue on the Management Committee.</p> <p>The 2019 AGM will be held in The Netherlands, tentatively the week of June 16. The 2020 IRF Offshore Safety Conference and AGM are scheduled to be held in Perth, Australia, tentatively in May to coincide with the industry conference.</p>
23	<p><b>Case Study: Regulating Normally Unattended Installation Activities</b></p> <p>The U.K. presented a case study regarding the review and revision of the intervention strategy for Normally Unattended Installations (NUIs). The U.K. highlighted that the unmanned facilities caused intrinsic challenges for effective asset integrity management. As new operators took over, the NUIs were being manned daily to increase production.</p>
24	<p><b>Case Study: Safety Levels for Offshore Production Units</b></p> <p>Due to a technical error, members were provided an electronic copy of this case study. Any questions should be directed to Brazil.</p>
25	<p><b>Topical Presentation: Communication Strategy</b></p> <p>The U.S. provided diagnostic stats for the IRF website. The website showed significant growth in traffic to the website, especially to the monthly articles. Users also spent less time searching for the information they were seeking.</p> <p>Members agreed to continue publishing the monthly articles on topics central to the current offshore oil and gas environment on the IRF website.</p>
26	<p><b>New Membership</b></p> <p>Members reviewed the membership requirements in the IRF Charter, noting the application for membership.</p>
	<p><b>Action Items</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. U.K. will send new market entrants template.</li><li>2. Australia will send a summary of the response received from the dynamic positioning letter sent October 2017.</li><li>3. Brazil will update and send performance indicators PowerPoint and Excel sheet.</li><li>4. Canada (NEB) will draft a terms of reference for a Community of Practice.</li><li>5. Brazil will send the English version of the executive report of the P-48 incident.</li></ol>