

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thu, 27 Feb 2025 03:06:07 +0000
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Regia MSS EP - Meeting 1 Prep - Acceptable Levels, EPOs and ALARP
Attachments: Regia MSS - Meeting 1 Prep - AL ALARP & EPOs.docx

Good morning [REDACTED]

Please find attached some preliminary questions for NOPSEMA on the topics for our first meeting next week. These should serve as useful prep for your team and are designed to deepen our discussion and make the most effective use of time. I expect there will be follow-ups based on your teams responses.

As soon as we've internally finalised the queries for the subsequent meetings, I'll send those through in separate emails. I hope to provide you with the preliminary questions for our second meeting by COB today. The questions for the meetings in a fortnight will likely come through next week.

Regards,
[REDACTED]

Meeting 1: Acceptable levels, EPOs, ALARP

4 March 2025

Presumptions to be agreed prior to the discussion:

- NOPSEMA’s objectives-based regime allows for multiple approaches to managing environmental impacts and risks, rather than prescribing a single method of compliance.
- Within the regime, the absence of regulated definitions or guidance means the titleholder has both the responsibility and the flexibility to determine how it assesses and manages environmental impacts and risks.
- Regulatory decisions focus on outcomes rather than prescriptive requirements, allowing innovation and continuous improvement in environmental management practices.

| Topic | Acceptable levels |
|--------------|--|
| Letter Items | 3.5 (the second one) |
| CGG Queries | Can NOPSEMA explain why the use of thresholds (def: the point at which a change becomes significant) as defining an acceptable level of impact or risks is not clear or appropriate? |
| | If the thresholds are not to be used as the defined acceptable levels: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Where would NOPSEMA expect to see them within the methodology CGG has applied? What purpose do the thresholds have? |
| | CGG have gone into more detail than any other EP (to the best of our knowledge) to define acceptable levels of each receptor group. If more detail is still required, can NOPSEMA specify i.e.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broader overview or more granular details? • More background context? • Case studies? • References? • Reasoning? • Comparisons? • Alternatives analysis? |

| Topic | EPOs |
|--------------|--|
| Letter Items | 4.1 |
| CGG Queries | NOPSEMA has listed 7 EPO’s that were created to address the defined acceptable levels for the activity. CGG did not propose these statements as EPO’s in the first submission and reluctantly repeated these activity limitation as EPO’s to positively respond to NOPSEMA previous feedback that the activity limitations needed some form of compliance monitoring. We note that this has also been corrected by clarifying that the Environment Compliance Register explicitly includes activity limitations which will be monitored. |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>NOPSEMA now claims these statements may be more suitable as EPSs. Given that EPSs are only required for control measures and are not required for activity limitations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) What is the performance of binary yes/no statements? b) How would one think about the effectiveness of a binary statement of performance? It is either complied with or not, unlike the performance of a procedure, for example, there is no grey area to contemplate variation in performance. c) What would the system, procedure, item of equipment, or person to which these apparent EPSs would relate? <p>Does NOPSEMA consider the acceptance criteria related to EPOs require that each EPO, EPS, and measurement criteria need to be perfect to be 'appropriate' or is there some latitude when titleholders propose multiple environmental performance metrics, across multiple levels of detail?</p> <p>If there is allowance for imperfection, how does NOPSEMA decide on what content can be disregarded and what needs correction?</p> |
|--|--|

| Topic | ALARP |
|-------------|---|
| Letter Item | 2.3 & 2.4 |
| CGG Queries | <p>NOPSEMA reasons contain some control measures, but mostly the items for consideration are activity limitations. What is the legal basis for requiring activity limitations to be considered as control measures given the absence of a definition of "activity limitation" and a clear definition of "control measures" in Regulation 5.</p> <p>How does NOPSEMA consider Regulation 17 and 18 relates to titleholders self-imposed activity limitations and its ability to enforce compliance?</p> <p>Further to the above, how did NOPSEMA consider CGG's own definition for "activity limitations"? - A measure that constrains, limits, or otherwise restricts the activity such that impacts and risks can be avoided, or lessened to or below acceptable levels. (App F2, Figure F2-1).</p> <p>Given that an ALARP demonstration is only concerned with the adopt/rejection of control measures. What is NOPSMEA seeking to achieve by trying to force fit activity limitations into an ALARP demonstration?</p> <p>CGG has made a case that the control measures adopted have already vastly exceeded what is grossly disproportionate evidenced by even the cost of further analysis now being grossly disproportionate. Do NOPSEMA consider that this is a reasonable endpoint for an ALARP demonstration? In other words, does an ALARP demonstration need to include consideration of all conceivable control measures?</p> <p>What is a "temporal control"? Does NOPSEMA mean a "control measure"? If so, which one of the defined items (system, item of equipment, person, or procedure) includes temporal considerations?</p> |

| Letter Item | 2.1 | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|---|-----------------------------|--|
| CGG Queries | <p>CGG understands the analysis being requested and believes it will be useful as part of a demonstration that impacts and risks will be of an acceptable level. However, it is unclear how a month-by-month analysis of this type is related to the ALARP process. For example, there is no variance of sacrifice – surveying in March is the same cost as April, May, or any other month except July/August when the weather is too poor.</p> <p>Further, ALARP is the process of considering the adoption of control measures.</p> | | | | | | |
| Letter Item | 2.2 | | | | | | |
| CGG Queries | <p>CGG has completed a semi-quantitative analysis of ALARP with a ratio system to explain the sacrifice (cost) of adopting each measure. CGG provided education about this method in the document, yet NOPSEMA states its “unclear”. Here is the explanation from App F2. What is unclear about this methodology?</p> <p>“Baseline Contexts</p> <p><i>When making decisions about the levels of sacrifice required to adopt a measure, or the level of impact/risk reduction achieved through adoption, a baseline is required as a point of comparison. For this assessment CGG has adopted the baselines in Table F2-2 below as part of the ALARP assessment.</i></p> <p><i>Table F2-2 - ALARP Baselines for the Regia MSS.</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="472 1115 1385 1518"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="472 1115 753 1149">ALARP Assessment</th> <th data-bbox="753 1115 1385 1149">Baseline</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="472 1149 753 1335">Level of Sacrifice</td> <td data-bbox="753 1149 1385 1335"><i>The baseline sacrifice is a calculation of the total costs of preparing the EP, the costs of complying with environmental management law, costs of complying with industry standards, and the costs of consultations. It is inclusive of time value associated with obtaining the approvals necessary to undertake the activity. The baseline sacrifice is expressed as a unit value of 1 (one).</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="472 1335 753 1518">Level of Risk/Impact</td> <td data-bbox="753 1335 1385 1518"><i>The baseline level of impact/risk is taken from the outcome of the environmental assessments which applied legislative requirements and industry standards as the base case upon which environmental impacts and risk were assessed. The impact/risk rankings in Appendix B9 were used as the basis of both the baseline and the level of impact/risk reduction achieved by adopting the measure.</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Following feedback from the consultation process CGG did consider requests for different methods of calculating baselines/points of comparison. In general terms, providing absolute values for costs in any case would require disclosures of commercially-in-confidence information from trusted suppliers to CGG. Similarly, disclosing project costs and assumptions in publicly available documents is not in CGG’s overall best interests, nor is it a legislative requirement.</i></p> <p><i>A straight monetary value was requested during the consultations whereby the profit of CGG in undertaking the activity should be disclosed and then compared to the monetary cost of adopting the measure. This method of calculating a baseline cost and subsequent comparison was not used because CGG’s margin is not calculable due to the terms of sales being on a licence basis, and the method proposed would not consider the</i></p> | ALARP Assessment | Baseline | Level of Sacrifice | <i>The baseline sacrifice is a calculation of the total costs of preparing the EP, the costs of complying with environmental management law, costs of complying with industry standards, and the costs of consultations. It is inclusive of time value associated with obtaining the approvals necessary to undertake the activity. The baseline sacrifice is expressed as a unit value of 1 (one).</i> | Level of Risk/Impact | <i>The baseline level of impact/risk is taken from the outcome of the environmental assessments which applied legislative requirements and industry standards as the base case upon which environmental impacts and risk were assessed. The impact/risk rankings in Appendix B9 were used as the basis of both the baseline and the level of impact/risk reduction achieved by adopting the measure.</i> |
| ALARP Assessment | Baseline | | | | | | |
| Level of Sacrifice | <i>The baseline sacrifice is a calculation of the total costs of preparing the EP, the costs of complying with environmental management law, costs of complying with industry standards, and the costs of consultations. It is inclusive of time value associated with obtaining the approvals necessary to undertake the activity. The baseline sacrifice is expressed as a unit value of 1 (one).</i> | | | | | | |
| Level of Risk/Impact | <i>The baseline level of impact/risk is taken from the outcome of the environmental assessments which applied legislative requirements and industry standards as the base case upon which environmental impacts and risk were assessed. The impact/risk rankings in Appendix B9 were used as the basis of both the baseline and the level of impact/risk reduction achieved by adopting the measure.</i> | | | | | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p><i>environmental benefit achieved – only the cost of that environmental benefit which is similarly incalculable.</i></p> <p><i>CGG also considered providing a proportionate assessment of sacrifice. This would have meant using the total project cost as the baseline level of sacrifice and further mitigation measures would have been expressed as a proportionate incremental increase on that baseline. This method was rejected because the relationship between the cost of a measure and its effectiveness on impact/risk reduction is not always linear. For example, using this method weighs the mitigation measures as equally effective for a nominal value, which is often not the case as low sacrifice measures can be highly effective and vis-versa.”</i></p> |
|--|---|