

OHS PROHIBITION NOTICE

To: Saipem (Portugal) Comercio Maritimo, Sociedade Unipessoal, LDA

In conducting an OHS inspection in relation to the Castorone facility, I [REDACTED], a NOPSEMA inspector appointed under section 602 of the Act, am satisfied on reasonable grounds that:

- an activity is occurring at the facility that involves an immediate threat to the health or safety of a person; or
- an activity may occur at the facility that, if it occurred, would involve an immediate threat to the health or safety of a person.

I am satisfied that it is reasonably necessary to issue a prohibition notice to the operator of Castorone facility in order to remove the threat.

I THEREFORE DIRECT Saipem (Portugal) Comercio Maritimo, Sociedade Unipessoal, LDA to ensure that the following activity or activities is/are not conducted:

- (a) at this workplace or part of workplace:
 - Castorone facility
- (b) using this plant or substance:
 - Dynamic Position (DP) and Firing Line Workstations
- (c) following this procedure:
 - Performing software updates and/or rebooting of the Dynamic Position system

The activity that has caused or may cause the threat to health or safety is:

Performing software updates and /or rebooting of the Dynamic Positioning (DP) control system when lay pipe is positioned within the firing line while personnel are undertaking work within the firing line in close proximity to the lay pipe.

The reasons why the activity has caused or may cause the threat to health or safety are:

On 25 July 2015, following routine software maintenance of the DP system control stations, the vessel made an unplanned move astern and to starboard during the transfer of DP system controllers. This vessel movement resulted in an unplanned movement of the pipeline in the firing line, while workers were undertaking work activities in close proximity to the lay pipe, which could have resulted in injury to personnel.

Action that may be taken that will be adequate to remove the threat to health or safety is:

Develop and effectively implement a standing order or similar that clearly specifies that software updates and /or rebooting of the Dynamic Positioning system will not be conducted when personnel are undertaking work in close proximity to the lay pipe within the firing line.

Signed:

██████████

NOPSEMA inspector

Dated: 30 July 2015

NOTES: (Please see back of form)

This notice was delivered to: ██████████

in the office or position of

Master

)

at: _____ pm on

30th July 2015

NOTES:

1. Under clause 77 of Schedule 3 to the Act, a responsible person who fails to ensure that this notice is complied with, to the extent that it relates to a matter over which the responsible person has control, may be liable to a penalty of 600 penalty units.
2. Under clause 77A of Schedule 3 to the Act, a notice ceases to have effect in relation to a responsible person when a NOPSEMA inspector notifies the responsible person that the inspector is satisfied that the responsible person, or another person, has taken adequate action to remove the threat to health or safety.
3. This notice must be displayed in a prominent place at the workplace and must not be tampered with or removed before the notice has ceased to have effect.
4. If this prohibition notice (or a copy of the notice) is not given to the operator's representative at the facility, the operator must give a copy of the notice to the operator's representative.
5. The operator's representative at the facility must give a copy of the notice to the following persons:
 - if the workplace, plant, substance or thing to which the notice relates is owned by a person other than the responsible person—that owner; and/or
 - if there is a health and safety representative for a designated work group that includes a group member performing work at a workplace, or involving the plant, substance or thing, to which the direction relates—that representative.
6. If the only responsible person for the notice is the titleholder, as soon as practicable after issuing the notice, the NOPSEMA inspector will take reasonable steps to give a copy to both the operator and the operators representative at the facility (if the inspector is at the facility when the notice is issued).
7. Under item 5 of clause 80A of Schedule 3 to the Act, any of the following persons may request the reviewing authority in writing to review the NOPSEMA inspector's decision:
 - the operator of the facility;
 - the titleholder, if the notice is issued to a titleholder;
 - an employer, if affected by the decision;
 - a relevant health and safety representative;
 - a relevant workforce representative, if requested by a member of the workforce affected by the decision.