19th IRF Annual Meeting

Windsor Atlantica Hotel, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 25-27 September 2012

Summaries of presentations, discussions and action points

Participants:

Australia	Jane Cutler	NOPSEMA
	Cameron Grebe	NOPSEMA
Brazil	Raphael Moura	ANP
	Alex Garcia	ANP
	Carlos Cabral	ANP
	Priscila Kazmierczak	ANP
	Raphael Queiroz	ANP
Canada	Max Ruelokke	C-NLOPB
	Dan Chicoyne	C-NLOPB
	Stuart Pinks	CNSOPB
Denmark	Hans Erik Christensen	DEA
	Jean-Pierre Posselt	DEA
Mexico	Lourdes Jamit Senties	CNH
	Gabriela González Rodríguez	CNH
New Zealand	Wayne Vernon	MBIE
Norway	Magne Ognedal	PSA
	Odd Bjerre Finnestad	PSA
	Thor Gunnar Dahle	PSA
The Netherlands	Jan de Jong	SSM
	Vincent Claessens	SSM
United Kingdom	Steve Walker	HSE
	Wendy Kennedy	DECC
United States	Lars Herbst	BSEE
	James Watson	BSEE
	Doug Morris	BSEE
	Tommy Beandrean	BOEM
Industry (Session 4)	Steve Kropla	IADC
	Stephen Colville	IADC
	David Miller	API
	Steve Cromar	OGP
	Arnt Even Boe (Norway)	Author of the IRF Book
	Andries Otter	ISO

Observer:

Brazil	Nero Ferreira	MRE

MINUTES OF THE 19TH IRF ANNUAL MEETING:

	SESSION 1 – CHAIR: RAPHAEL MOURA
1	**Welcome and Introduction of Delegates** Magda Chambriard opened the 19th IRF Annual Meeting and welcomed all delegates. She highlighted the importance of hosting the IRF meeting, informing that President Dilma Roussef fully supports the work conducted by the ANP related to offshore safety. She emphasized that considers IRF the ideal forum to share lessons from past accidents and to drive changes and improvements at the offshore petroleum industry.
2	**Review of agenda** There were no comments to the proposed agenda.
3	**Status of Actions from 2011 annual meeting** The list of action points from the last IRF meeting was reviewed. It was agreed that all had been adequately attended to with the following comments. • IRF internal project website fully developed, but the members are not using the tool as expected. • The roundtable outcomes were published in the IRF website. • • The IRF subgroup on standards was created in November 2011. OGP, ISO, IADC and API will participate at Section 4. • The author of the IRF history will participate in some sections of the meeting.
4	**History of IRF** The IRF was created in May 1994, during OTC Houston 19 years ago. Members decided to record the history of the forum in a book. The manuscript will be delivered in December 2012 for approval and concluded in March 2013. The intention is to launch it at the 2013 IRF conference in Perth, Australia, during the informal welcome event. The author of the book, Mr. Arnt Even Boe, mentioned the necessity of a good communication between regulators and the society, and asked for members' collaboration on providing information.

5	**Country Updates** NOPSEMA NOPSA gained additional regulatory responsibilities after Montara accident becoming NOPSEMA, and is now responsible for regulating well integrity and environment management. Since last IRF meeting, NOPSEMA hosted the Australian Petroleum Safety and Regulators Forum (APSERF) meeting and engaged with regional regulators such as Timor Leste, New Zealand and Indonesia. Technically innovative mega-projects such as floating LNG (FLNG) have prompted changes to facilitate early engagement by NOPSEMA. Key areas for possible future change are: security, design notification scheme and financial capabilities. ANP The philosophy to regulate safety in Brazil, is based on a document analysis, regular onboard safety audits, accident investigations and safety performance evaluation. The interfaces among the Maritime Authority (DPC), the Environmental Regulator (IBAMA) and Ministry of Labor are important. The ANP focuses on major hazards, process safety and drilling/well control systems. The creation of the Superintendent of Operational Safety and Environment, directly linked to the General Director, brought a new interface with IBAMA. Key developments since last IRF meeting are: evaluating the implementation of environmental indicators; the review of all drilling programs and well design risk assessment prior to the beginning of drilling operation; discussion on BOP and process plant 3rd party certification requirements; onboard audits focused on *well-to-rig* interfaces and well control; developed a hotline and conduct periodic meetings with Workers' Union; enforcement of continuous improvement through non-conformities (obligation to do); challenging the operators to demonstrate that risks are controlled - use of engineering tools opposed to assumptions and "experience"; and keep developing ANP technical staff through intense training and qualification process. Additionally, Magda Chambriard said that the ANP suggested to the federal government some adjustments at the Brazilian penalties law, to better address future events. C-NLOPB Recent accidents posed challenges to C-NLOPB. There were many questions regarding Chevron offshore drilling in the country. Night flights were forbidden as an outcome of the Helicopter accident, and an independent report will be published in 2 to 3 weeks. Since last IRF meeting, conducted a safety culture seminar and a forum concerning helicopter safety. Continue to monitor health issues, personal safety focus. CNSOPB The Deep Panuke natural gas project continued with hook up and commissioning. Canada is currently reviewing financial liability and capacity requirements. CNSOPB has introduced a qualification process for their rights issuance program for parcels in deep water and is considering third party verification of capabilities and capacities of spill response organizations. CNH After 70 years of PEMEX self-regulation, the deepwater regulation was implemented. CNH

	has recently developed a second version incorporating some identified gaps and new ideas based on the country's current situation. CNH is now focusing on the well design framework inspired by Norway, USA, EU and UK regulations. 3rd party will be responsible for well design verifications and regulation includes risk and change management. There are almost 8,000 wells under Mexican jurisdiction, and CNH is developing a criterion to choose which wells will have the integrity aspects reviewed. CNH will conduct a transport (pipelines) infrastructure assessment follow-up to a diagnosis made by the Ministry of Energy and PEMEX, concluded that the Mexican pipeline system was under critical condition and there is a need to redevelop reliability and operational strategies. Department of Labor - New Zealand Mining accident triggered the High Hazards Unit at the Labor Department. The newly created unit contains the Petroleum and Geothermal team. This team has a Chief Inspector, three inspectors and administrative support. Intend to charge industry to get funding. Key point is the development of information infrastructure, policies and procedures to strengthen regulatory activity in the sector while administering existing regulatory provisions. BSEE BSEE recognized and appreciated recent opportunities to discuss with ANP and HSE details on Chevron and Total accidents. The representative reinforced the rearrangement of the regulatory supervision, with 3 distinct bureaus. BSEE is dealing with the industry growth: 32 MODUs operating offshore, going to 45 over next 2 years. The 3 bureaus are functioning independently at this time. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management handling leasing, environmental review and resource management, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement handling permit and safety environmental compliance and enforcement. BSEE described recent studies and developments: clarification of rules (standards incorporated), 3rd party verification, environmental managements rule (SEMS), production safety systems, lifecycle analysis, BOP rule (based on API 53). BSEE mentioned that they have developed a strategic plan though 2015. Strategic plan and related funding looks to shift from compliance to performance expectation approach. Five key areas are: best available and safety technology, enforcement, safety and environment management system, human capital and IT transformation. HSE Ongoing challenges in the UK retaining and recruiting offshore specialists HSE has launched an inspection initiative (KP4), to ensure that the risks to asset integrity associated with ageing and life extension are controlled effectively. The post-Macondo agenda in the UK, focusing on the capping device, Well Lifecycle Practices Forum guidelines and NSOAF audits (2 facilities per country) to ensure that all relevant lessons with respect to failed barriers (*focussed on human and organisational factors*) learned from recent international blowouts were adequately implemented in the North Sea. Other emerging issues in the UK are fracking/shale gas and offshore renewable energy (wind farms etc). PSA

	There are new big discoveries in the country and renewed optimism for the industry. Regulations evaluation after recent accidents lessons do not indicate the need for updating regulations, only minor adjustments related to the clarification of regulatory requirements. PSA conducted a review on barriers for wells and identified that 40% of the wells were not in compliance with the rules. Many issues to operators were addressed, such as issues related to capping in shallow waters, problems with life boats and finding competent people to handle the increasing number of drilling rigs. SSM The SSM focus on controlling hazards with large potential consequences, as well as the presence and effectiveness of the essential barriers. He mentioned the government risk-based oversight philosophy: collect information, assessment and intervention. Strategic initiatives are: ensuring that operators improve their emergency response plans, execute IRF's strategic agenda, organizational/human factors and culture, EU legislation and implement lessons learned from accidents. Influencing behavior is vital. Denmark Denmark has issued two overall design approvals for new platforms and expects to conduct the 7th licensing round in 2013. Denmark has held the chair in EU during the first half of 2012, developing the regulation on offshore safety in the European Council.

	SESSION 2 – CHAIR: MAGNE OGNEDAL	
6	**Meeting with IOPER** IOPER is similar to IRF, but focusing on environmental performance. Environmental matters can typically be divided in 3 categories: where companies can operate, the carrying out of operation and response to spills. IOPER intends to meet on an annual basis. IRF and IOPER would benefit by working together in respect of operational issues. IOPER members explained that they have identified three principal areas of focus at this time: performance measures; transparency and accountability; and spill response.	
	Action points	**Who**
	1. IRF members to provide assistance as appropriate in helping IOPER establish itself.	All
7	**Performance Measures Project** PSA presented the existing indicators (fatalities, major injuries, lost time injury, loss of well control) and referred to the IRF board's recommendation that new indicators should be leading indicators. The work group has proposed new indicators, such as preventive maintenance, corrective maintenance and well integrity (well in operation and well barrier status), and stated that further work needs to be done on these indicators, mainly because lack of data makes implementation of the improvements harder. After a discussion of this matter in the meeting, it was decided to ask the work group to reassess the proposed new indicators with regard to what should be achieved, and if it is realistic to implement such indicators. Denmark explained that the high value for major injuries per million work hours is due to the difference between the definition from the major injuries of IRF and Denmark. BSEE recommended normalization of the indicators using the industry as a reference, such as OGP.	
	Action points	**Who**
	2. The work should be continued on existing indicators.	Workgroup
	3. The workgroup should reassess the proposed new indicators and report back to the IRF considering the reasons why they should be developed and If they are realistic.	Workgroup
	4. Can an IRF common profile be produced?	Workgroup
	5. Produce long-term presentations in the form of trend curves.	Workgroup

8	**Safety Culture Project** The deliverables were reviewed for this project: guidance for defining in a good definition of safety culture and its attributes, review of the OGP safety culture guide, and provision of representatives components of an inspectors' tool kit. IRF members recognize that guidance is being prepared by industry (OGP), and IRF members expect industry to be held accountable for its implementation. It was discussed that building a good safety culture depend upon the implementation of good management systems including operational procedures, qualification management, along with assuring that necessary human and financial resources are available.	
	Action points	**Who**
	6. The IRF working group to resume work once the OGP guidance is published to achieve four agreed objectives: develop guidance on safety culture definition and attributes; define linkage between leadership and safety culture; update the IRF Regulators Guide to Safety Culture; and provide feedback to OGP with respect to their guidance document. Work is to take into account and consider materials provided by Hearts and Minds, the US Nuclear Industry and Nicholls State University. The working group would then also look at a framework and representative documents for an inspectors' tool kit.	Workgroup

9	**Fitness to Operate Project** NOPSEMA presented a prototype tool designed to provide an evaluation of a company's fitness to operate. The tool could be used as a method of encouragement for the industry, having their status measured periodically. The tool can be useful for monitoring change in fitness (improvement). The prototype focuses on three areas: Organizational Capital, Human Capital and Social capital. All the groups interact. The questionnaire used to measure the fitness to operate was shown. It was discussed how the regulators could use the tool and it could be used by the company to improvement. It can be used on audits and even to compare with different operators. The complexity of the tool was also commented. In the discussion, it was also suggested that the tool could be used as a pre-screening tool by the operators themselves before they submitted a formal application to operate. A question raised was how complex is the analysis, how the target level of fitness is determined and whether different level can be set for differing circumstances. It could be administered in different ways, e.g. self-assessment or in association with an inspection or audit with the intention to acquire evidences of the compliance.	
	Action point	**Who**
	7. NOPSEMA to continue the good work and involve the IRF members in the final stages;	NOPSEMA
	8. NOPSEMA will provide information on the timeline and how it might be used to IRF members.	NOPSEMA

10	**SESSION 3 – CHAIR: JANE CUTLER** The chair began by summarizing the issues discussed in sessions from day 1 regarding the recommendations from the author of the book, asset integrity well managed to the future, capability of the regulator and the industry (capable people to execute what they were hired to, retaining and training them), participation of the IOPER and the ongoing projects.	
11	**Standards project** This project started 2 years ago and the IRF standards sub-group was created in 2012, chaired by UK. HSE presented the report from the sub-group, which described the work done over the last year. HSE asked the IRF to agree the proposed work priorities by the sub-group for 2013. In discussion, the sub-group were asked to include API in the bodies they liaise with (work priority 7 will be amended accordingly).	
	Action point	**Who**
	9. IRF approved the 2012/2013 standards sub-group priorities.	Workgroup
12	**Chevron Incident – Frade Field** The chair introduced the session highlighting some offshore incidents (KS Endeavour, Aban Pearl, Russell Peterson and Bayon St. Denis) and their causes to show the relevance of such a technical discussion to encourage sharing of lessons learned. It was noted that ANP was disappointed with the Chevron final investigation report because the recommendations were too shallow, lack of independence from Managers associated with the original well design and lack of clear lessons learned the accident investigation (available on the ANP website in English) was presented: • Casual Factor 1: Kick; • Causal Factor 2: Fracture Formation in the vicinity of the well; • Causal Factor 3: Migration of oil from the point of fracture to the seabed; • Contributing factors: Lack of risk perception by Chevron, evidenced by the absence of a structured risk analysis for the well design. To contain the oil seeping, Chevron is using a capping network to collect the oil that is leaking across the seepage lines. In conclusion, it was summarized that the accident could have been avoided if Chevron Brasil Upstream Frade Ltda. had conducted its operations diligently, in full adherence to regulations, in accordance with the good practices of the oil industry and with its own manual procedures. Following the ANP investigation, 24 offences were applied, totaling US$ 17,580,000 in fines. Besides that, Chevron will have to implement all the recommendation to be able to continue its operation in Brazil. The ANP final investigation report was distributed to all representatives attending the meeting.	

13	**Discussion of recent Major Offshore Incidents** CNH (Mexico) - Two incidents were presented. The first was the Usumacinta accident, which the root causes were exposed to the representatives and were related to safety culture. There were 72 recommendations arising from the 3rd party accident investigation. The second accident presented was the Jupiter event. It was emphasized that after the first accident, PEMEX implemented the recommendations, including training and safety culture, which avoided more severe consequences in this accident. Usumacinta was one of the reason that PEMEX invested in safety procedures and training. BSEE (USA) – The investigation of the implementation of Macondo accident recommendations is in progress with the identification of the root causes and many new elements have been incorporated into the permit reviews. Inspectors are now witnessing every BOP testing at the surface and just before the latching at the seabed. HSE (UK) – Elgin field HP/HT incident: Investigation is still ongoing. The leakage continued for 52 days and the amount of gas and condensate lost to the environment was approximately 6172 tonnes. However, environmental damage was negligible due to the nature of the substance spilled and it l trajectory away from the coast. HSE investigation is still ongoing. PSA (Norway) – Some of the last year's accidents were mentioned, including a fire on a production facility a gas leak and a drilling installation that listing 7 degrees due to a ballasting bad operation. More information can be found on the PSA website. The concern of operators of not having enough competent people to do the work was emphasized. NOPSEMA (Australia) – The recommendations from the Montara commission of inquiry are in the implementation phase. A successful prosecution was recently achieved however the penalty applied by the Magistrate was lower than anticipated due to amalgamation of three offenses into one. The government is progressing proposals to amend legislation and increase penalties. The Stena Clyde fatalities incident was also discussed. Some key lines of thinking as to be potential root causes were highlighted.

	Session 4 – CHAIR: RAPHAEL MOURA	
14	**Progress since 2011 Offshore Summit in Stavanger** This agenda item was chaired by Mr. Jan de Jong. As exposed, the objective of the GIRG is to build a capability to respond adequately in case of a severe accident happens. There will be an OECD website that could be accessible by the IRF members. Members discussed that the ministerial representatives intend to align the next ministerial meeting to follow the IRF Conference in 2013, in Perth, Australia. Mr. James Watson mentioned that the ministerial group might expect that the IRF representatives feed them with technical aspects regarding oil and natural gas safety issues in order to define policies. Mr. Stuart Pinks said that Canadian government expects synergy between the Canadian regulatory bodies in oil and gas safety matters. Ms. Jane Cutler said that the group may define some subjects to be brought from the IRF meeting to the ministerial meeting. Mr. Raphael Moura mentioned from Brazil's perspective that the government is aligned with ANP and the country considers that IRF is the ideal form to discuss safety matters. Mr. Steve Walker gave a summary of the European Commission offshore proposals, which will probably be finalized in 2013. He also explained that a European Union Offshore Authorities Group had just been created, similar to NSOAF.	
	Action point	**Who**
	10. Try to coordinate the Ministerial Summit to follow the IRF Conference.	NOPSEMA

15	**API and ISO Discussions** BSEE explained that API and ISO would give to the IRF members an update regarding the standards revision for offshore safety matters. Mr. David Miller, API's Director of standards, presented current status of international standardization in the industry with Focus on 2012 issues and the progress on post Deepwater Horizon activities. Industry concerns about impact of US and EU trade regulations on standardization activities prevented API and ISO cooperation. In order to allow continued improvement of international standards, API and OGP formed a new workgroup to develop a new process. The industry, started by API and ISO, wants a consistent set of global/international standards that is acceptable to regulators. ISO's Andries Otter indicated that a Joint API/OGP task group will propose the process for global/international standards based on principles such as Legally compliant, single set of standards, global usable and acceptable, accepted by regulatory community and build on existing models, infrastructures and resources. API and OGP together expect to gain operational efficiency. They said yet that API Rules are revised every 5 years at the top and allows many stakeholders to participate on that. Safety rules will be available to the public until January 2013.	
	Action point	**Who**
	11. Closely follow developments in US and EU on the follow up of the trade sanction and support and stimulate the cooperation between ISO and API.	All

16	**BOP/Well Integrity Project and OGP Presentation** Mr. Steve Cromar, from OGP, started to present and said that the guidance made by OGP has to be complied by all 70 members of the Organization. The GIRG's (Global Industry Response Group) task are to improve the industry's well incident prevention, intervention and response capabilities and by doing so, the likelihood and impact of future well incidents will be reduced. The WEC (Well Expert Committee), part of the prevention group, is concentrated in four task forces: Database of well control incidents, Human factors (training, competence and behaviours), international standards and BOP reliability and technology development. The Objective of the well control incidents data base is to improve the sharing of lessons learned amongst OGP members relating to well control events. The human factors objective is to improve performance and behaviours of operations teams with respect to well control. The WEC standards taskforce has developed a comprehensive list of standards applicable to wells and a separate list of priority standards under development that we will monitor for on-going progress. They are also working on the BOP reliability definition. WEC taskforce is gathering data for existing BOP Systems to establish list of system, sub-system and maintainable components and identify key failure data needed to support the assessment. Also, estimating BOP System reliability and importance of individual sub-systems and components perform failure modes, effects and criticality analysis (FMECA). A guidance will be released to estimate BOP system reliability. There is another deliverable to recommend improvements for the BOP systems reliability, including data requirements and potential impact of reliability change.	
	Action point	**Who**
	12. PSA, on behalf of the IRF, will follow the work closely.	PSA
17	**IADC Presentation** IADC's core purpose are enhancing the operational integrity and shaping better regulation focusing on members' critical issues that usually is related to people (competence and attraction), equipment (criticality, data, maintenance and reliability), processes (competence, compliance and process safety), legislation (globalization) and contractor dynamic (contracts and accountability). IADC presented an ongoing action plan for each of the items above to improve the performance of its members. IADC has yet key operations activities, which are KSA (knowledge, skills and abilities), well control training, HSE Case Guidelines Update, International Maritime Organization, ISO Jackup Site Assessment Standard and IADC Committee Review/Restructuring.	

18	**Debate** In general, the regulators demonstrated concerns regarding the reliability of the BOP equipments and challenged the industry to develop a more reliable equipment and wonder if there isn't a new BOP design even more reliable than the existing ones. The industry representatives said that developing a more reliable BOP, changing its design, is the next step of the industry but for now they are working on the enhancing the existing models. ANP suggested that new technologies development could be a subject of a specific meeting due to relevance of this topic. HSE recommended to pay attention on other safety elements and not only BOP, because there are other safety barriers that need to be improved. All countries agreed. BSEE presented the drill and the capping device to contain oil leakage from the wellhead. Showed to the group the development exercise in USA, including the pressure tests that are made, how connection is supposed to be made and how the device is launched.	
	Action point	**Who**
	13. ANP, on the behalf of IRF, will analyze the main points of the IADC presentation, based on other members' input.	ANP

	SESSION 5 – CHAIR: STUART PINKS	
19	**Future of the IRF** Mr. Stuart Pinks (C-NSOPB) opened the session to review the draft International Regulators Forum Charter document. Mr. Pinks committed to incorporate members' comments and circulate a final version for approval. Discussion took place with the respect to new members and it was raised that Uruguay had asked about the requirements to join IRF. Members confirmed the importance of concluding the Charter in order to have clearly defined criteria for membership that can be communicated.	
	Action point	**Who**
	14. Stuart will circulate the final version of the charter for members' approval.	C-NSOPB

20	**Program Committee for 2013 Conference (key insights from the 19th IRF annual meeting)** Jane Cutler reviewed preliminary details of the next conference to be held by Australia. ANP, SSM, HSE and BSEE volunteered to participate on the program committee. Topics for the conference program should include the strategic priority set forth by the IRF. Other suggestion would be to include Petrobras and their challenges and technologies on deepwater drilling operations, IRF work related to standardization, BOP equipment technologies and reliability, safety technology in well operations, environmental accident response. The importance of setting this conference apart from industry to endorse the singularity of the congress organized and other industry conferences in terms of regulatory focus was stressed as well the importance of attracting senior executives to present at the conference.	
	Action point	**Who**
	15. Program committee to develop inspiring conference program until the end of the year.	NOPSEMA, ANP, SSM, HSE and BSEE
21	**Debate (Time do discuss matters such as agree meeting communiqué, statement to go on the website, host/location for 2014 IRF 21st meeting)** Members agreed that the 2014 IRF Annual Meeting would be hosted by Mexico, and CNH suggested Cancun as a potential venue. A communiqué will be released after the meeting. NOPSEMA presented the functionalities of the member exclusive section of IRF website and asked for an extra effort to concentrate information there.	

Action points sum up	Who
1. **Meeting with IOPER:** IRF members to provide assistance as appropriated in helping IOPER established itself**.**	All
2. **Update on Performance Measures Progress:** The work should be continued on existing indicators.	Workgroup
3. **Update on Performance Measures Progress:** The workgroup should reassess the proposed new indicators and report back to the IRF considering the reasons why they should be developed and If they are realistic.	Workgroup
4. **Update on Performance Measures Progress:** Can an IRF common profile be produced?	Workgroup
5. **Update on Performance Measures Progress:** Produce long-term presentations in the form of trend curves.	Workgroup
6. **Update on Safety Culture:** The IRF working group to resume work once the OGP guidance is published to achieve four agreed objectives: develop guidance on safety culture definition and attributes; define linkage between leadership and safety culture; update the IRF Regulators Guide to Safety Culture; and provide feedback to OGP with respect to their guidance document. Work is to take into account and consider materials provided by Hearts and Minds, the US Nuclear Industry and Nicholls State University. The working group would then also look at a framework and representative documents for an inspectors' tool kit.	Workgroup
7. **Update on the Fitness to Operate Project:** NOPSEMA to continue the good work and involve the IRF members in the final stages;	NOPSEMA
8. **Update on the Fitness to Operate Project:** NOPSEMA will provide information on the timeline and how it might be used to IRF members.	NOPSEMA
9. **Update on the standards project:** IRF approved the 2012/2013 standards sub-group priorities.	Workgroup
10. **Progress since 2011 Offshore Summit in Stavanger:** Try to combine the IRF Conference with the Ministerial Forum.	NOPSEMA

11. API and ISO Discussions: Closely follow developments in US and EU on the follow up of the trade sanction and support and stimulate the cooperation between ISO and API.	All
12. Introduction to the update on BOP/Well Integrity Project and OGP Presentation: PSA, on behalf of the IRF, will follow the work closely.	PSA
13. Debate: ANP, on the behalf of IRF, will analyze the main points of the IADC presentation, based on other members' input.	ANP
14. Future of the IRF: Stuart will circulate the final version of the charter for members' approval.	C-NSOPB
15. Program Committee for 2013 Conference Program committee to develop inspiring conference program until the end of the year.	NOPSEMA, ANP, SSM, HSE and BSEE