



SafeGulf Advisory Group Meeting Minutes

Notes for 8 October 2014 SafeGulf Meeting

Alexis Vitone called the meeting to order.

Attendees:

Safety Moment:

Dwight Fusilier provided a safety moment about texting and driving. We should all choose to not text while driving because there are consequences. Ms. Vitone recently taught a driving course at BP in which the trainees discussed whether or not to respond to their boss if a text or call comes in while driving. There was recent a court case in which a company was held culpable because an employee ran over a 15-year-old while attempting to answer a call from an employer. The employee was found guilty of manslaughter.

KPIs from the Accrediting Organizations:

PEC has trained 321,502, adding 5,482 since 26 Aug, the last meeting. Ms. Vitone asked if many of those are international.

Alma Roberts reported that IADC trained 3,092 since the last report.

Sarah Branch reported that 343 mariners were trained by OMSE.

Ms. Roberts reported that some providers had not uploaded records in a timely way.

Updates from Operators:

Terry Windgate, ExxonMobil, does not have an update.

Dwight Fudilier (on behalf of Wendell Cheeks), Chevron, does not have an update.

David Dugas, Fieldwood Energy, said his company is in its 2nd or 3rd year of requiring SafeGulf. They ensure that their offshore workers are checked for their SafeGulf training. About 45,000 have been "scanned" to go offshore for Fieldwood.

Ms. Vitone reported that BP requires SafeGulf and several other programs for all of their offshore workers through their "License to go Offshore" (LTGO). When they remove LTGO, they want to ensure that all of that material is captured through the new program. Credential and language verification is an important part of the process. LTGO will be retired in February of 2015. They will also retire the Controlled Work Academy, which has been required for offshore workers to understand their processes. These will now be captured in their Performing Authority and ...Authority courses. BP is considering accepting the T-HUET course, which is recognized by Shell. This will require a policy change, so it will be considered in Q1 of 2015.

A meeting participant asked what the difference was between the regular HUET (OPITO) and the T-HUET. Another participant (from a HUET training provider, MSTC) explained that the T-HUET is for tropical waters only and is an international standard that incorporates the helicopter training and the water survival training. This course also includes a passenger muster and evacuation (including entering a lifeboat) training module. They also discuss the possibility of ditching on land and hoisting (air evacuation). The MSTC course also requires a cross-cabin evacuation. OPITO is considering including this cross-cabin exit requirement, too.

Ms. Vitone asked how it would work if an Operator does not want to include the cross-cabin requirement. The training provider typically tries to work with the Operator, but if a training module is required, then they teach it. Optional requirements can be taught at the end of the course as an "add-on," so some of the trainees would not have to take that module. The MSTC representative will send Ms. Vitone information about his course.

Ms. Vitone explained that Margaret Laney brought her into the discussion about the IADC-accredited HUET course and that they believe the IADC course does not include hoisting and mustering, which they need to see in the course. The MSTC rep said SEMS requires mustering, lifeboats, and hoisting.

Mike Farris, Anadarko, has no update from his company; however, Anadarko wants to stay tuned into this Advisory Group to participate in discussions about the new curriculum. Anadarko does endorse SafeGulf.

Chuck Simpson, York, said he visited McMoran last week and that they are continuing with their position on contractor safety and requiring SafeGulf. They do not anticipate any changes to their requirement for SafeGulf anytime soon. Arena will become a bigger player in the Gulf soon and does also endorse SafeGulf.

Ms. Vitone attended the WorkforceNEXT conference last week and saw a presentation by Marty Monte (CNJ Energy), who said his company recently bought Nabors Drilling and another company called Tulles Energy. She is going to reach out to Mr. Monte to participate in SafeGulf. Phillip Perry, Halliburton, also wants to join this group.

Adding New Members to the Board:

All Operators voted to accept Phillip Perry and David Dugas as new members. David Dugas had been a member previously when he worked at Apache, and now he represents Fieldwood Energy.

As a point of order, the MSTC explained that all members are authorized to vote but that the Operators can overrule the vote if they see fit. Mr. Perry and Mr. Dugas were accepted unanimously.

There was a brief discussion about how new members will affect the dynamics of the Advisory Board and interest in having information for a vote such as this in advance of the meeting, so members can consider the effect of new members.

The next initiative for SafeGulf (after the curriculum changes are complete) will be to revise the Bylaws for SafeGulf. Currently, there must be a quorum of three out of four of the approved Operator participants and/or 50% of the membership. We will create a subcommittee (a sub of the SGAG Chair Committee) for revising the Bylaws.

Participants agreed that all shareholder voices should be heard but that we may want to limit the membership and the authorized voters. The group also agreed that we should review the current SafeGulf guidelines/bylaws.

SafeGulf Timeline to Propose New Curriculum:

Ms. Vitone provided an update on the effort to revise the SafeGulf curriculum to include a half day of orientation and training modules on specific topics.

One meeting attendee asked if the new training modules will allow the companies to pick and choose the modules they want covered. Ms. Vitone explained that the SafeGulf Board will decide what training modules to endorse so trainees can get credit for that training. The intention is to decide what needs to be covered in the orientation (and that it is truly at the awareness level) and then what modules to add that could satisfy training requirements.

In the past, the Operators had targeted certain topics needed at a training level rather than orientation level.

The MSTC rep said there are other accrediting bodies, such as the USCG, which accredits some of his courses. Once the SGAG establishes the criteria, then they need to decide which accrediting bodies are out there that could effectively provide accreditation to ensure that the TPs are following the criteria. Anyone can develop the training and then bring it to one of the accepted accrediting bodies to apply for accreditation. The group discussed the need to stay on track and focus on the SG curriculum and the discuss criteria for accepting new accrediting bodies at a later date.

The group referred to the training topics listed in the minutes from the last meeting. The understanding is that we will cover these topics at the level needed according to the role of trainees.

Ms. Vitone explained that the Curriculum Subcommittee reviewed the originally required SG curriculum and condensed the material (e.g., from 21 to 2 slides on one of the topics). They want to cover “What is your role?” and “Why is it important?” [Review with AV to ensure this is accurate.] Essentially, we are shortening the content of each topic to allow for more time for training topics.

The SGAG endorses the content, not the accrediting body or training provider.

Brian McCann pointed out that the curriculum being reviewed at the previous few Curriculum meetings was that provided by PEC, not the other accrediting bodies. The focus needs to be on general time guidelines and the CONTENT rather than on the number of slides.

Another participant said a focus should also be on the AUDIT because some TPs are not meeting the letter of the standard/requirement.

Ms. Vitone provide the following example: One of their accepted TPs is teaching confined space in 2 ½ hours with a class of 30, but it was NOT training and NOT what it was supposed to be. Other TPs were covering the same material in 2 days and going far more indepth. The 2 ½ hours was not considered proper “Training.” BP was paying for training, not for awareness.

In this Tier 2 approach, we are trying to land the content required for recognition by BP and other Operators.

We should also look at the OSHA and USCG requirements to see if there is content in those standards that we should cover.

Ms. Vitone has some people also looking at the land requirements and that BP is interested in employees being able to meet the standards for both onshore and offshore.

The next curriculum meeting will be on 15 October at BP. Ms. Vitone wants for this Board to establish a timeline for revising the new curriculum so new people entering the conversation will not require more changes and more explanations. One participant suggests that we freeze the participation in the Curriculum Subcommittee, particularly in the decision-making role. Listening to stakeholders is valuable, but perhaps not during the conversation in the Curriculum meetings. Ms. Vitone agrees and explained that, after the last Curriculum meeting, she realized that she was spending too much time explaining what has transpired and why. She will be telling new participants to email her their questions and comments rather than bringing them up at the meeting. She will address those offline.

Many companies start their annual training on 1 January, so we either need to have it complete by then or wait. The group realizes that new requirements can only be met upon renewal of credentials or for new employees receiving training for the first time. Everyone will not be required to go through the training again to meet the new requirements.

Originally, accredited Tier 2 training was for companies that do not have the infrastructure to provide training to their own employees. Tier 2 defines the content that must be taught as training. People who are already employed in the Gulf are required to have certain Tier 2 training, but they will not have to

meet new requirements. All new people will be required to meet new requirements. Ms. Vitone said that BP, for example, does not require contractors to go outside their own companies to get Tier 2 training. [I am confused. I thought she had said BP always requires Tier 2 training for people offshore.]

MSTC rep said he thought there would be ½ day of orientation (Tier 1) and ½ day of training (Tier 2). Ms. Vitone explained that, in the last two meetings, the suggested was that we would have both and that Tier 1 would be solely awareness level (with those topics identified by the end of this year) and that we will tackle Tier 2 later.

We need to provide TPs with the new content by the end of the year and then give them some time to develop their new curriculum and content.

The next Curriculum Committee should be limited to 15 people and be a closed group going forward. No new people will be accepted or allowed to have input.

Action Item: Ms. Vitone will distributed the list of accepted participants and the guidelines for participation.

Tier 1 and Tier 2 are different products. The current committee decided that Tier 1 will be established first and approved. Tier 2 will be developed and offered as optional training modules. The accrediting organizations will each provide a 15-min. proposal on what they believe should be included in the Tier 1 (1/2 day) part of the SG course.

Ms. Vitone will be chairing the effort to revise API's T-1. API wants to ensure that T-1 is aligned with the new SG curriculum. She is recruiting people to participate on the API T-1 Board.

A participant asked what is included in Tier 1 (awareness level) because that information is not included in the minutes from the Board meeting. (The Curriculum meeting was AFTER the last Board meeting.)

- Incident reporting and investigation
- Behavioral safety (high level) [Mike Farris says this should not be included in Tier 1, and AV explained that this is a part of the Hazard Recognition component.]
- Drug and alcohol
- Electrical safety
- Hazcomm
- SWA (SEMS overview)
- [Is that all they identified?]

The group decided to remove the following topics from the current curriculum:

The group reviewed the topics that would be moved to the Tier 2 training modules part of the course:

[Copy those topics from the last minutes.]

(They are removing topics that could be considered training and move those to the Tier 2 training modules part of the course.)

If an Operator only requires the Tier 1 part, then their employees could leave after the morning orientation.

[She stopped there, but I think there were more topics.]

The minutes from the last Board meeting does include the Tier 2 topics that had been discussed.

Ms. Vitone said the Tier 2 training would occur in the afternoon after Tier 1 material is covered.

Perhaps the way to look at it is what is required versus what would be nice to know.

Fieldwood rep said he was interested in approving Tier 2 training on topics such as confined space. The MSTC rep said he thought Tier 2 should not be optional.

Ms. Vitone said it is not realistic to expect the 15 members of the Curriculum Subcommittee to crank out all of the requirements for Tier 1 and Tier 2 by the end of the year. That group will work aggressively on what this Board asks them to do. We should let the Curriculum group make their proposal instead of hashing all of this out here at the Board level.

The contractors' complaint has been that they go to 8 hours of "training," but don't get credit for it as training. Mr. Farris said originally this Board believed that there was not value in the way the course is being delivered now because it is too deluded. "You cannot take people who know nothing about this industry and put them through 8 hours of orientation and expect them to remember anything." Farris believes this training is getting too deep and that we have gone full circle in this discussion. Vitone does not agree. The first task of the Curriculum group should be to come back with a list of topics required for Tier 1 and that the first 4 hours of orientation should also include the Marine Trash and Debris module.

Suggestion/Compromise from MSTC: Find out what the topics are that should be in Tier 1 and what are the learning objectives? Let's just focus on that. (He believes we are already pretty close in what we think should be included.) He believes the Board doesn't need to hear what he and other training providers think should be taught but rather what the accrediting bodies and industry believe should be taught.

Action Item: Distribute to the Board what currently included topics have been decided to keep and what to remove.

MSTC rep. said this Board should have provided more guidance to the Curriculum group.

Suggestion from Mike Farris: Could we move the meeting back an hour or so and allow the Board to kick around the topics in the first hour of that meeting to provide them with some guidance?

Gary L. summarized his understanding of the new curriculum, and AV said some Operators had come back and said their employees already cover those topics in their internal training, so their people would not stay for the afternoon training modules.

AV believes SG will land a curriculum that does include Tier 2 training.

Mr. McCann explained that his biggest concern is making sure the Board is on the same page as the Curriculum group.

The Fieldwood rep. said he never imagined we could try to provide such training in 1 day. He said we should look at the topics and then determine how much time would be needed for this to be considered training-level.

Farris asked Dugas: What orientation do you require of your employees? For the past 3 years, Fieldwood has been requiring the current SG (RigPass, OMSE) orientation, but that Fieldwood has additional requirements for training, which he wants to make sure are coming from a reliable source (accredited TP).

AV said the Operators cannot require the Contractors to go to a 3-day training.

AV says an 8-hr orientation is “ridiculous” and that the TPs are going to have to accept what the Operators want done.

Review of COS Update and Discussion of OPITO Interest:

OPITO has requested to be involved in the effort to revise API T-1.

A new group has formed to meet with Ocean Energy ... (OESI) and identify research gaps that are not already been worked on by COS. COS has decided to create a task group to influence the rewrite of API RP-75. The Offshore Operators Committee has created a group to work with COS [?].

[Get AV to check all of this.]

In summary, there are a lot of collaborative efforts going on right now that may affect our work. This Board may, for instance, want to look at what we’re doing to help these other efforts.

Initiatives of SG:

Curriculum Tier 1 revamp.

Identify additional training topics.

Revamp the guidelines (Bylaws).

Engage with other industry groups.

IMIST/SafeGulf Accreditation:

IMIST is looking to be accredited [directly by the SafeGulf Advisory Group, like Gary's company is?]. We must first establish the new criteria.

Jim Gunther (MSTC) says IMIST will be in line with our requirements once we complete our revision of the curriculum. Action Item: Gunther will send Alexis his company's gap analysis on IMIST vs. SafeGulf.

Other Business:

Mr. Gunther requests that AV send out an email detailing what we are going to discuss at the next curriculum meeting and what we have already identified as Tier 1 (Awareness/Orientation) and Tier 2 (Training). He says this will move the conversation forward much faster.

Mike Farris suggests that we stop calling these tracks "Tier 1" and "Tier 2" and go back to calling them "orientation" and "training."

[Find out what is the difference between T1 and T2 vs. Tier 1 and Tier 2. Farris says they do not equate.]

Action Item: Recruit a new Contractor Chair (for the Contractor Subcommittee). Find out the status of Chad Comeaux, who is still the current Chair of this committee but has been unable to attend meetings. [Would JP Mook want to do this?]

API T-1:

Action Item (all members): Send contact information to AV for anyone who wants to be involved in the T-1 effort. The first meeting is in November.

Mike Farris is willing to help with the T-1 revision if the meetings are scheduled at times he can attend.

Note: SEMS references these standards, so people can either participate in this or live with the result.

AV believes the T-1 changes will involve orientation, not training. [Is this correct?] A new T-1 standard will not be implemented for at least a year.

Next SafeGulf Board Meeting:

Informal/Tactical Board Meeting to review the Curriculum meeting results: **29 October 2014** in Houston from **10 – 1 or 2**.

Action Item: Distribute these minutes and get feedback on where people could meet (Houston vs. Lake Charles, and/or a Webex meeting).

Action Item: Send the next minutes (Curriculum) out as a DRAFT right after the meeting—at least by the following Monday.

Next formal Board meeting: **13 November 2014** from **10 – 2**, possibly in Lake Charles.

[Should we develop a proposal for required content AND optional content? Should we include an explanation of how training modules would work?]

[Could we do a pilot program and somehow look at the statistics and actual benefit of the original SG curriculum was vs. the new curriculum? Will this new curriculum actually improve safety? How can we determine this?]