Regulatory Data Standards Committee
Meeting summary for September 7, 2016

Agenda Items
This committee meeting focussed on identifying key areas for the development of semantic standards, and decisions about the role of the proposed committee for achieving the business value for standards. We discussed the article prepared by the committee for publication in “Foundations”, and discussed how to share the vision for regulatory data standards at the upcoming Calgary Data Management Symposium. We agreed to draft two charters (one workgroup and one new committee), and to develop a draft MOU for committee members.

Communications and Events
Members of the committee collaborated to develop an article that discusses what participants hope to achieve through the Regulatory Data Standards Committee. This will be published in Foundations, Vol 2, Issue 3 (click here).

Mark Ducksbury spoke about the project intentions and expectations at the Perth Data Management Symposium in August 2016.

The Calgary Data Management Symposium will feature a panel discussion about this project. Members of the committee who will not attend in person have agreed to consider preparing a short recorded video statement about the project.

Semantic discussions
During the time between meetings, committee members compiled sets of information that is fraught with semantic confusion. This list was consolidated and compiled into several sets of (admittedly overlapping) semantic issues.

1. Specific terms that are ambiguous.
   a. Completion and completion date: The “What is a Completion” workgroup has been launched and is in progress. So far, 10 use case scenarios have been defined (click here).
   b. Milestone or trigger events and the dates associated with them: Examples include SPUD DATE and RIG RELEASE DATE.
   c. Outcome: The committee agreed to charter a workgroup to consider these key events and the dates associated with them at the well level.

2. Lists of values that have indicate the state, function or condition of a well.
   a. Most agencies have value lists that contain many kinds of information concatenated into a complex set of code values. The underlying information types are not all contained in all values, and values are often not mutually exclusive (so a well could potentially qualify for several codes on the list at the same time). This is confusing and difficult for industry, regulators and the public.
   b. Fluid types are included in some value lists; however, values may exist at different levels of granularity, or values may aggregate multiple substances in an undocumented way. For example, “OIL” may include NGL in some agencies but not in others.
   c. Other terms may indicate an “end of life” status, including a temporary state (suspended, shut in, plugged), a permanent state (abandoned, plugged and abandoned), or indicate
liability mitigation (reclaimed). In regulator usage, different agencies may or may not use the same term with the same meaning – and in many agencies clear definitions are absent or very difficult to find.

d. While it may not be possible to come up with a single agreed list, the ability to map to a common set of values would be useful.

e. **Outcome:** The PPDM Association has previously worked on this problem by developing a set of 16 atomic, faceted classification systems ([click here](#)). Committee members agreed to review these lists and bring recommendations to the next meeting.

3. **Lists of terms that are different between agencies.**
   a. Lists in this category are common. While every agency is trying to keep track of similar things, the lists of values they require operators to use are different, and often undefined (it may be assumed that the meaning is “intuitively obvious”).
      i. Water use and contamination
      ii. Environmental impact types
      iii. Greenhouse gasses
      iv. Drilling and operational activities (where is the demarcation between these?)
      v. Survey types (seismic, gravity, magnetic, seabed…)
   b. While it may not be possible to come up with a single agreed list, the ability to map to a common set of values would be useful.
   c. **Outcome:** In some cases, industry societies or standards may have developed industry standards that are not well known or in common use. The committee agreed that some research with other societies would be a helpful start. Trudy Curtis agreed to do some preliminary research and report back to the committee.

4. **Terms that describe workflows, processes, or events that trigger regulator requirements.**
   a. Lists in this category are common, but all are related to the particular processes and legal requirements of the agency.
   b. **Outcome:** While process differences do result in inefficiencies, the committee agreed that trying to reconcile these was not appropriate now.

**Standards adoption**

The underlying value behind all standards development lies in the ability of stakeholders to converge in processes, language and specifications. Often, this convergence is achieved through corporate revisions to Policy, Practice and Procedure, compliant software, and consulting services.

Done properly, this convergence results in the development of common industry skill pools, shared resource tools, process efficiencies, unambiguous communication, cost sharing and interoperability. Unfortunately, standards deployment often suffers from decisions made during tactical deployment; the consequences is a loss of interoperability.

The committee wants to engage industry stakeholders who are central to the Adoption Phase of standards development. These stakeholders will be responsible for evaluating plans for standards development, and the standards that are actually created, and reporting back to the committee.

A new committee will be chartered to focus in this area. Participants will be solicited from the PPDM membership, and will have several key objectives:
• **Feasibility review**: is it possible to operationalize standards that are planned or developed?

• **Best practices for implementation**: key best practices for adoption, with a focus on ensuring that global deployments (by different vendors) will be interoperable and compliant with the standard.

• **Compliance mechanism**: establish metrics and methods to measure conformance of implementation mechanisms with the standards and best practices for implementation.

The workflow of activities is driven from the Regulatory Data Standards Committee to the specific Work Groups then validated by the Business Value Committee to ensure best practices are in place and make sense for implementation for the community. Communication is iterative between all Committees and Work Groups in this stream. It is anticipated that the flow would look like
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**Iterative Process**

- Identify Pain Points
- Strategy & Priorities

**Charter**

- Standard Specification
- Use Cases

**Standard**

- Implement Guidelines
- Compliance Measures
- Socialize

**Best Practice**

- Feedback

**Regulatory Participation**

A great opportunity is still open for regulators to participate in the formation, understanding, and transformation of Global Energy Regulatory Data Standards! This common discussion and approach to addressing current and emerging regulatory requirements for data, analytics, and consistency is the foundation for the future. Those who are interested should contact PPDM (Kristell@ppdm.org).

**For more information** about this project, visit the website [here](#).
Who are the players?

1. Regulators
   - **Co-chair:** Arthur Boykiw (VP of Information Services) – Canada: Alberta Energy Regulator
   - **Co-chair:** John Broderick (Business Transformation Project Manager) – US: Bureau of Land Management
   - Alex Ross (Senior Information Strategist) – Australia (SA): Energy Resources Division, Department of State Development
   - Mark Ducksbury (Manager, Data Management Team) – Australia: National Petroleum Titles Administrator (NOPTA), Dept of Industry, Innovation and Science
   - Mark Snow (Supervisor, Permits and Bonding Unit) – US: Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, Office of Oil, Gas and Minerals
   - Thomas Schmidt (Manager, Well Data) – Canada: Saskatchewan Ministry of the Economy

2. Industry Operators and Data Vendors
   - Floy Baird (Supervisor, Better Data Faster Team, Geosciences Services) – Devon
   - Sean Udell (VP Operations and Technology) – geoLOGIC systems
   - Peter MacDougall (Canadian Well Data, Government Relations) – IHS Markit

3. PPDM Association
   - Trudy Curtis (CEO) – PPDM Association
   - Ingrid Kristel (Senior Project Manager) – PPDM Association
   - Elise Sommer (Senior Community Coordinator) – PPDM Association