

International Regulators Offshore Safety Forum Day 2

Session Summary Notes

Day 2 Summary

When:	Thursday 31. March 2005
Chair:	
Morning Session	Mr. Howard Pike, Manager, Operations and Safety, Canada-Newfoundland Offshore Petroleum Board, Canada
Afternoon Sessions	Mr. Taf Powell, Director of Offshore Division, Health & Safety Executive, UK Mr. John Clegg, CEO, National Offshore Petroleum Safety Authority, Australia Mr. Magne Ognedal, Director General, Petroleum Safety Authority, Norway Mr. Bud Danenberger, Chief of Offshore Engineering and Operations, Minerals Management Service, USA

Introduction to morning session:	<p>Mr. Pike brought the Day 2 session to order and introduced the Keynote Speaker, Mr. Timothy Walker.</p> <p><i>Timothy Walker, Director General, Health and Safety Executive, UK:</i> Mr. Walker highlighted the importance of a common focus by all industry stakeholders, at both the national and international levels, to ensure a safe and healthy workplace. He addressed some of the ways in which the UK industry has moved forward towards achieving this common goal. The key points included a review of the experience with the safety case regime, challenging duty holders in how they are managing safety, and the importance of sharing learnings. Finally, he identified fundamental approaches for moving forward with this objective, namely: working in partnership, engaging with the objectives of others, and improving communications. Mr. Walker concluded with a challenge to the group to select three area/issues of focus and that within one year, there would be an agreed upon standard in each, which would be a visible sign of the commitment to collaboration.</p> <p>Mr. Pike thanked Mr. Walker for a very insightful address. Mr. Pike then highlighted the focus of the day's session: "<i>Knowing and Understanding Main Health, Safety and Regulatory Issues and Concerns in 3 Regions of the World</i>". He then introduced the three speakers for the morning session:</p> <p>Mr. John Clegg, CEO, National Offshore Petroleum Safety Authority, Australia</p>
----------------------------------	---

	<p>Mr. Bud Danenberger, Chief of Offshore Engineering and Operations, Minerals Management Service, USA</p> <p>Mr. Jan de Jong, Inspector-General, State Supervision of Mines, The Netherlands</p> <p>John Clegg presented the following paper: "<i>What are the Major Issues and Concerns in Asian/Far Eastern Countries</i>". Mr. Clegg indicated that while there are specific geographical challenges, the safety issues are similar throughout the world. He also noted that sufficient standards and guidance generally already exist. However, he noted that in the areas of regulation consistency and operator compliance with recognised good practice, improvements are required. It was his belief that the regulatory regimes should reflect the international nature of the offshore oil and gas industry. As well, Mr. Clegg noted that the adoption of common regulation, standards and data collection would enable the regulator and the industry to benchmark themselves and hence provide a basis for real improvement in health and safety. Finally, he also suggested ways that this could be achieved.</p> <p>Bud Danenberger presented the following paper: "<i>What are the Major Issues and Concerns in North American Countries</i>". Mr. Danenberger gave an introduction to the US regulatory philosophy. He explained their views on the components of a comprehensive safety program. He also talked about performance measurement tools. Then he took a broad review of issues and concerns in the North American Region, such as, new technology, aging facilities, hurricanes and severe weather, vessel collisions with platforms, sustained casing pressure, crane and lifting incidents, helicopter incidents, and finally, management of contractors.</p> <p>Jan de Jong presented the following paper: "<i>What are the Major Issues and Concerns in North West European Countries</i>". Mr de Jong noted that on the basis of a number of recent major incidents and fatal accidents, which have occurred in the North West European offshore industry, and on the basis of overall safety performance statistics, a number of main risk contributors have been identified. A particular factor is the aging of the offshore industry workforce. Other concerns of the region are: the level of workers' involvement in offshore health and safety matters, worksite supervision, vessel collisions with platforms, maintenance management and in particular that of ageing assets. He also noted that operations in sensitive offshore areas are not only a challenge for the industry but also for the regulators. Finally, Mr. de Jong introduced the new Dutch approach towards regulatory supervision.</p>
--	---

<p>Round Table Discussion 2:</p>	<p>Round table discussion 2 was a discussion on whether there were seen to be any similarities or differences with regard to Health, Safety and Regulatory issues and concerns in the offshore petroleum industry in various parts of the world.</p>
----------------------------------	---

Mr Powell, Mr. Clegg and Mr. Ognedal chaired this roundtable session and presented some ideas and hints with regard to highlights from the presentations that could be debated by the various tables.

1. Is there general agreement that HSE challenges worldwide are basically similar?
 - a. If not, what are the particular regional challenges and how do they affect the regulator's role?
 - b. Are there any cultural or regional differences that may affect the statutory requirements and the implementation of these?
2. To what degree does the regulatory authority need to be independent of the industry and the political system in order to be able to take the necessary action in HSE matters?
 - a. What does independent mean in this regard?
 - b. How should a regulatory authority be funded?
 - c. What extent of statutory powers should the regulator be vested with?
3. Discuss the issue of how to ensure that regulators possess the knowledge, skills and experience needed to establish credibility and undertake the regulatory role efficiently. Of particular interest is views on:
 - a. Whether the expansion of many regulators' focal points to also include company organisational change issues (as a consequence of application of new technologies, automation of processes, remote monitoring and control, integrated operations, etc.) require special knowledge and skills?
 - b. Do regulators in countries with young petroleum provinces face greater challenges than those of more experienced countries? In what way?
 - c. Should the IRF assist in any way?
4. Given all the experience, data, guidance, codes of practice, and so on that exist, what can we do to apply all this in an efficient implementation of the regulatory functions?
 - a. What can we do to facilitate and improve the exchange of information between petroleum regulators?
 - b. Can the IRF play a role in this?
5. Regulators generally aim to emphasize the total responsibility of the duty holder to ensure regulatory compliance. At the same time there is an increase in demand for the regulatory to take an advisory role towards the industry.

a. Is there an inherent conflict between these two objectives?

b. How can we balance these two objectives?

6. Are there other issues in other regions that have not been discussed? In terms of priorities, what role do they play?

The key points made during the RTD feedback session are summarised as follows

- General agreement that the HS&E challenges worldwide were very similar because the technical and operational challenges are fundamentally the same; however the manner in which the Regulator could address these challenges must of necessity vary with the maturity of both the Regulator and the industry, regional cultural expectations, political pressures, climate, etc
- The Regulator had to be able to conduct intervention activities with sufficient independence from the industry and political pressures to be able to take appropriate enforcement action; however it was essential that the Regulator and Industry worked together to develop an appropriate regulatory framework
- The Regulator should be funded by charges levied on the industry.
- The Regulator must have 'teeth' to be effective
- IRF could/should facilitate the sharing of good practice guidance and provide a focus for exchange of information, standards, ideas and good practice. A discussion forum
- Regulators in 'young' petroleum provinces face the particular challenge from lack of ready access to information and do not necessarily have all the skills. IRF could help by providing a contact network and providing a regulatory framework model
- IRF should agree some specific targets to be achieved within a year and share these (as a first step), eg PTW, safety training, alarm systems.
- IRF needs to expand its membership and have a website; BUT there are significant risks in making IRF too big!
- IRF should facilitate the setting up of regional groups, similar to NSOAF, eg Caribbean, west Africa, Asia etc
- There is a limit to how far a Regulator should go in advising the industry, though 'goal setting' has increased the Regulators' advisory role. The use of constructive enforcement (eg notices) can help to keep the industry focused on their responsibilities.

Round Table Discussion 3:

Round table discussion 3 was a discussion on how we can work together on common Health, Safety and Regulatory issues and concerns.

Mr Danenberger and Mr. Ognedal chaired this roundtable session and presented some ideas and hints with regard to highlights from the presentations that could be debated by the various tables.

1. Establishing a contact network would be a good outcome, but it was uncertain what form it should take or how it could be organized. Should it work through the IRF or be in addition to the IRF? Should it be just for those attending the conference or should others be invited to join? Will each member appoint a contact person as a door into his or her organization? Will the network be e-mail only? How will the network be used – eg just for problem solving, or for sharing information? If the latter, what information should be shared?
2. Should we go beyond a network to a more established body with a permanent secretariat? Should this be an expansion of IRF or just in association with IRF? Would staff exchanges be helpful and realistic? Should there be future meetings or conferences – if so how often? Would more regional groups (like NSOAF, for example) be a good idea? How would they link globally?
3. Should there be an international regulators website? Should this be based on an existing site, e.g. continuing the existing conference website, or perhaps asking ICRARD to set up links to other sites? Should it be virtual site? Should it be restricted to regulators or should some or all of it be open? Who would act as gatekeeper?
4. Are there specific tasks to be tackled on a common basis, e.g., identifying common standards? Collating basic guidance etc? Or even developing joint guidelines for regulators? How should these tasks be accomplished, e.g. through working parties?

The key points made during the RTD feedback session are summarised as follows

- An IRF contact network should be established for sharing safety issues and best practice, problem solving, etc. An e-mail network would be a good start
- Whatever else IRF does in terms of working together on H&S issues, a key message is “Keep it Simple”.
- To be effective as a contact network, IRF would benefit from a more formal structure with key contact points.
- An IRF website could provide a vehicle for linking with industry. Responsibility could rotate among member countries – but could be difficult to manage without a secretariat. The website must be dynamic and kept up to date

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• An IRF website should include a restricted access inter-Regulator exchanges, but for the most part the site should be open to all• IRF should meet every couple of years; local regional groups should meet as necessary and be supported by IRF• Specific tasks to be tackled on a common basis that were suggested include, development of a model regulatory framework, maintenance of aging infrastructure, survival training, cranes and lifting operations, task risk assessment, sharing of standards and identifying gaps in standards, incident statistics. HOWEVER it was important to concentrate IRF efforts on only 2 or 3 subject areas at a time. |
|--|--|

Table No.:	Table Leader		Table Recorder	
1	John Clegg	NOPSA	Ole-Johan Faret	PSA
2	Peter Wilkinson	NOPSA	Michael de Vos	SSM
3	Ian Whewell	HSE	Simone Keough	CNOPB
4	Tony Blackmore	HSE	Neal Dawe	CNSOPB
5	Finn Carlsen	PSA	Don Howard	MMS
6	Jan de Jong (day1&2) Roel van de Lint (day 3)	SSM	Thor Gunnar Dahle	MMS
7	Jos Marx	SSM	John Kennedy	CNOPB
8	Howard Pike	CNOPB	Robert Paterson	HSE
9	Stuart Pinks	CNSOPB	Joao Tavares	ANP
10	Johnnie Burton	MMS	Melinda Mayes	PSA
11	Chuck Schoennagel	MMS	Graham Collins	HSE
12	Bud Danenberger	MMS	Anne Vatten	PSA
13	Magne Ognedal	PSA	Rae MacIntosh	HSE
14	Taf Powell	HSE	Helge I. Vestre	PSA