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Overview

- Introduction
- Presentation and Q&A: The work program
- Presentation and Q&A: The next initiative
- Brainstorming: Future initiatives
- Close @ 1130
Problem solving approach

1. Identify issues
2. Analysis
3. Identify measures for success
4. Develop strategies
5. Consultation
6. Coordinate
7. Implement
8. Evaluate
9. Close / do not pursue
## What’s the problem?

### Step 1 & 2: Identify. Analyse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>NO PROBLEM</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>PROBLEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspection outcomes</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community expectations</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review findings</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>More than one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJR Statement of Reasons requests</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-party correspondence</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of Information requests</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 1: Identify the problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Aims</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A wide range of and some poor consultation practices leading to a loss of trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency of decision making not meeting community expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Step 2: Analyse the problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Aims</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A wide range of and some poor consultation practices leading to a loss of trust</td>
<td>Deliver effective consultation processes to ensure stakeholder views are taken into account</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency of decision making not meeting community expectations</td>
<td>Build a view of trust in the community of offshore petroleum environment management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Step 3: Measuring success

#### Step 3: Measure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>NO PROBLEM</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>PROBLEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspection outcomes</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community expectations</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review findings</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>More than one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJR Statement of Reasons requests</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-party correspondence</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of Information requests</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 4: Develop strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Aims</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A wide range of and some poor consultation practices leading to a loss of trust</td>
<td>Deliver effective consultation processes to ensure stakeholder views are taken into account</td>
<td>Promote and ensure titleholders provide the right information, to the right persons, at the right time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency of decision making not meeting community expectations</td>
<td>Build a view of trust in the community of offshore petroleum environment management</td>
<td>Create a more open offshore petroleum regime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop better ways to deliver regulatory services to the community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Completed initiatives

BILBY 2D MULTI-CLIENT MARINE SEISMIC SURVEY 2015

Activity name: Bilby 2D Multi-client Marine Seismic Survey 2015

Activity types: Seismic survey

Submitted by: Searcher Seismic Pty Ltd

Submission date: 17/11/2014

Submission type: New

Status: Accepted

Decision date: 05/03/2015

Activity description:

Searcher Seismic Pty Ltd (Searcher) proposes to undertake a two-dimensional marine seismic survey (Bilby 2D Survey) in Commonwealth waters of the Offshore Roebuck Basin, Western Australia, commencing in March 2015 for a period of up to four months. The survey will be undertaken in an area of the North West Shelf located approximately 90 km north of Port Hedland and approximately 180 km west/south-west of Broome.

Searcher currently anticipates acquiring approximately 12,290 line km of 2D seismic data within the survey area. A broader operational area of approximately 15,000 line km will accommodate those vessel manoeuvring and ancillary activities (i.e. additional area for the purpose of in-water equipment deployment, recovery and maintenance etc.) that are required to occur outside of the survey acquisition area.

A phased approach to data acquisition is planned, which will reduce the intensity of data acquisition within the 100 m isobath. Data acquisition has been planned to occur in two phases, separated by a period of 2-3 weeks in April when Bilby 2D Survey activities will cease and the survey vessel will conduct data acquisition elsewhere:

- Phase 1 of data acquisition to initially focus on areas deeper than 100 m, using a minimum of 4 x 4 km line density grid, followed thereafter by data collection in a 4 x 8 km grid over the shallower area further south, in shallower waters.
- Phase 2 of data acquisition to focus on 'filling' the line density over the shallower acreage in the central of the survey area. Line density during this Phase 2 has been planned to a minimum of 8 x 4 km and a maximum of 9 x 8 km.

Note: This information has been extracted from the EP Summary. Please refer to the attached EP Summary for more information.
Next steps

1. Identify issues
2. Analysis
3. Identify measures for success
4. Develop strategies
5. Consultation
6. Coordinate
7. Implement
8. Evaluate
9. Close / do not pursue

We are here...
The benefits

- Improved confidence in the offshore petroleum industry
- Reduced risk of decisions being successfully challenged
- Less resources required for effective consultation
- Fewer negative interactions between titleholders and stakeholders
- Demonstrated social license to operate/regulate
- Reduction in assessment timeframes
- High certainty in assessment timeframes
Questions on the work program?
Stakeholder engagement and transparency: The next initiative
• To solidify the decisions made within the EP preparation and assessment process by:
  – Reducing the range of consultation practices across industry
  – Gaining a deeper understanding of what constitutes ‘appropriate and effective’ consultation
  – Making sure external context features heavily in environmental impact and risk assessments.
Submission in Jan 2012

Sufficient information provided by the titleholder

Titleholder Consultation

NOPSEMA Assessment

Publish EP Summary

Specific information as requested by the stakeholder

Ongoing Consultation

Undertake Activity

NOPSEMA Industry Performance Report

Aug-15

Apr-16
Improving consultation and transparency
• **Update**: Consultation requirements guidance note

• **Update**: EP summary guideline

• **Update**: Decision notifications

• **Update**: NOPSEMA website

• **Survey**: Benchmarking and feedback/ideas
Consultation process

Please submit feedback to feedback@nopsema.gov.au by no later than 23 September 2015 in any of the below forms:

- Tracked changes in documents
- Letter
- Email.
Questions on the next initiative?
Brainstorming session

• Consider aims and strategies and answer ‘what could be done to deliver on these strategies’?
  – The industry
  – The regulator
  – Policy-makers
  – Industry associations
  – Other marine users
  – The community

• Think of a more granular problem you have faced. How could this have been prevented?

Example Ideas
- Offshore petroleum portal
- Earlier notice of upcoming submission
- Communicate examples of good performance
- Voluntary publication of EP implementation strategy on titleholders website
What could be done to deliver on these strategies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Aims</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A wide range of and some poor consultation practices leading to a loss of trust</td>
<td>Deliver effective consultation processes to ensure stakeholder views are taken into account</td>
<td>Promote and ensure titleholders provide the right information, to the right persons, at the right time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency of decision making not meeting community expectations</td>
<td>Build a view of trust in the community of offshore petroleum environment management</td>
<td>Create a more open offshore petroleum regime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Maintain collaborative relationships with government to ensure meaningful consultation by industry

- Develop better ways to deliver regulatory services to the community