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Overview

• Stakeholder engagement
• Maintaining OHS / structural integrity standards in a challenging economic environment
• State waters conferral of powers to NOPSEMA
• International Regulator’s Forum
• Triennial independent review of NOPSEMA
• NOPSEMA’s industry performance datasets are generated from duty holder submissions

• The datasets and NOPSEMA’s analyses are made available to all stakeholders in multiple formats

• NOPSEMA will be regularly publishing a larger suite of charts alongside our quarterly and annual tables on our website.
Based on data at end 2014.

* Numbers fluctuate slightly as facilities enter and leave the regime e.g. mobile facilities and inactive facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Group</th>
<th>Industry TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Platforms</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPSOs</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODUs</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipelines</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>148 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## 2014 Incidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident Category</th>
<th>Industry Total</th>
<th>MODU Total</th>
<th>MODU %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Death or Serious Injury</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Incapacitation &gt;= 3 days LTI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Could have caused death or serious injury</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Could have caused incapacitation &gt;= 3 days LTI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Damage to safety-critical equipment</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Fire or explosion</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Other kind needing immediate investigation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• 46% of all high potential incidents attributed to MODU’s

• Dropped objects continue to dominate the statistics

• Hand injuries are still prevalent
### MODU Root Causes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL OPERATORS 2014</th>
<th>MODU OPERATORS 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preventative Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Human Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedures</strong></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Engineering</strong></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Work Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment Parts / Defects</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>NA or None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NA or None</strong></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Equipment Parts / Defects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Direction</strong></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Preventative Maintenance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inspection
Topics and Issues
• 21 MODU Inspections in 2014
  – Dropped Objects
  – Maintenance
  – Well Control Equipment
  – Lifeboats
  – Emergency preparedness/medivac
Principal Findings

• **Dropped Objects**
  – Compliance with procedures
  – Operators own inspections
  – Corrosion & secondary retention

• **Maintenance**
  – Backlog & deferral
  – Training in computer based maintenance systems
  – Implementation of Performance Standards
Principal Findings

• **Well Control Equipment**
  – Maintenance requirements of API RP or STD 53 in line with safety case commitments
  – Maintenance deferrals and Performance Standards

• **Lifeboats**
  – Adequacy of lifeboat provision
  – Inspection & testing arrangements

• **Emergency Preparedness**
  – Workforce awareness of procedures
  – Evacuation contingencies for remote locations
  – Implementation of Performance Standards
Emergency Preparedness
Operators have **specific duties** under the OPGGS Act:

```
.......to take all reasonably practical steps to implement and maintain appropriate procedures and equipment for the control of, and response to, emergencies at the facility
```
The **safety case** needs to adequately address emergency preparedness:

- Describe a response plan to address possible emergencies identified in the FSA

- Provide for the implementation of the plan
The Emergency Response Plan must:

(a) specify all reasonably practicable steps to ensure the facility is safe and without risk to the health of persons likely to be on the facility at the time of the emergency; and

(b) specify the performance standards that it applies.
• The plan must have **performance standards** that specify emergency system requirements.

• For example:
  – Emergency shutdown
  – Disconnect capabilities
  – Escape and evacuation timeframes
  – Response time to reach a hospital with an appropriate level of capability (Primary Care Hospital).
• The plan must provide for the appropriate medical care of the facility workforce for foreseeable scenarios (illness or injury)

• Operators should be able to demonstrate that they have assured themselves of the adequacy of selected onshore support capability

• The plan shall include worst case scenarios like multiple casualties and full facility evacuation
NOPSEMA 2015
• Legislative changes
  – Wells Regulations under review by DoIS
    Amendments anticipated by end 2015
• Continue focused topic inspection programme
  - BOP & Associated Well Control Equipment
  - Performance Standards
  - Management of Change
  - Workforce Involvement
Publications

www.nopsema.gov.au

• Annual Report (May 2015)
• Regulator’ – quarterly e-publication
• Guidance Notes and Guidelines
• Safety Alerts
• Information Papers – Human Factors
QUESTIONS?