

Please check the following boxes if applicable to this report						Nil Incident Report: <input type="checkbox"/>	Final report for this activity: <input type="checkbox"/>
Titleholder name:	Woodside	Titleholder business address:	240 St Georges Terrace Perth WA 6000	Title of environment plan for the activity:	Greater Enfield Tieback Environment Plan		
Activity type: (e.g. drilling, seismic, production)	Drilling and Completions Subsea Installation	Month, Year:	March 2019	Facility name and type: (e.g. MODU, Seismic Vessel, FPSO)	DPS-1 – MODU		
Contact person:	██████████	Email:	██████████@Woodside.com.au	Phone:	██████████		
Incident date	All material facts and circumstances (including release volumes to environment if applicable)	Performance outcome(s) and/or standard(s) breached	Action taken to avoid or mitigate any adverse environmental impacts of the incident	Corrective action taken, or proposed, to stop, control or remedy this incident	Action taken, or proposed, to prevent a similar incident occurring in future		
29 March 2019	As-built report documenting the final surveyed position of the 10" Water Injection (WI) Flowline shows that in two locations, the flowline has been laid outside of the +/- 10m target lay tolerance. The maximum distance beyond the targeted lay area was 20.4m. In all instances, the pipeline remained within the 170m wide flowline corridor described in Section 5.6.2 of the EP.	PS 4.7 Seabed disturbance verified as within the design parameters of the project. The design tolerance for this flowline was +/- 10m, which was exceeded at two locations.	Given the deep, featureless characteristics of the location where this incident occurred, there were no adverse environmental impacts arising from this incident. The flowline remains within the pipeline corridor and there are other lines on either side of this flowline. The flowline has been laid within the same benthic habitat type as the design route and there has been no change to the magnitude of seabed disturbance.	No further corrective actions will be undertaken to remedy this incident. The cost and impost associated with moving this line to within design tolerance exceeds any benefit that would be realised, particularly given the absence of any environmental impacts.	A root cause of this incident was that crosscurrents occurred during pipelay, causing the pipeline to move laterally. The pipelay vessel failed to compensate for this lateral movement in some areas. To address this, increased monitoring of oceanic currents at the seabed during pipelay was implemented to account for these currents.		