



Committee Meeting Agenda / Minutes

Project Name	Regulatory Data Standards Committee		
Date	2017-08-28	Time	4:00 – 6:08 pm MDT
Location	Various - Dial In & PPDM Office	Prepared By	Ingrid Kristel
Attendees:	Trudy Curtis, PPDM <i>Facilitator</i> John Broderick, US Bureau of Land Management <i>Cochair</i> Emile Coetzer, Chevron <i>Guest Speaker</i> Irene Dawe, AER Floy Baird, Devon Sean Udell, geoLOGIC Peter MacDougall, IHS Markit Mark Snow, Michigan DEQ Mark Ducksbury, National Offshore Petroleum Titles Administrator (NOPTA) Martin Hensley, US Bureau of Land Management Ingrid Kristel, PPDM		
Regrets:	James Betterton, AER Evan Trevathan, BP Lower 48 Jane Stanczyk, Colorado Oil & Gas Conservation Commission Phillip Bailey, Oklahoma Corporation Commission Virginia Hullinger, Oklahoma Corporation Commission Thomas Schmidt, Saskatchewan Ministry of the Economy Alex Ross, Energy Resource Division, South Australia Elise Sommer, PPDM		
Related Documents:	170828_RDS_Meeting - PowerPoint Deck Well Timeline Survey Results (Basecamp) Regulatory Considerations for Data Management_v0.1 (Basecamp)		

Agenda Items / Minutes

Agenda items followed the 170828_RDS_Meeting deck.

1.	Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Attendee roll call ▪ Safety brief ▪ Agenda review
2.	Facilities & Pipelines – Emile Coetzer We were fortunate to have Emile Coetzer from Chevron as a guest for this meeting. Emile is a 30 year industry veteran. From his initial mechanical engineering degree he worked in oil and gas, mining and manufacturing on four continents and in technical, management and consulting roles. After an executive role in a mining corporation, he is now a Senior Advisor for Reliability and Integrity with

Chevron Canada, currently seconded to Shell's Albian Sands asset. The common thread in Emile's career is the continued use of (and search for) facilities engineering information.

Emile spoke from his perspective on where he thinks some of the issues that Regulators and their data management programs might be able to help with and lead this committee in a conversation around this. Emile first challenged us with scoping the data management interests from a regulatory point of view. Some of the challenges highlighted by the Regulators were:

- Have regulatory oversight on both surface (lands, water, environmental protection, mining etc) and subsurface.
- Some systems have decades of data and data collection, much is still non-digital. What is digital is measured in petabytes and more complex. Pulling all historic data and practices (updating these practices) in a business transformation.
- Move from understanding the need and developing a vision through to execution.
- Proprietary standards, including pipeline data. Trying to apply standards with regards to legacy data. Many engineering standards are followed, but these are often regional (API, NEPA)
- Need to share data seamlessly with others
- May also have to share jurisdiction with other agencies

Emile had a few points to bring synergy between the work he has been doing and that of this committee.

- Improve the bottom line and reduce operational risk. Operators face similar problems on a smaller scale when faced with the magnitude and volume of data and 6-7 dimensions of complexity inside of the data sets. They are managing this by defining the absolute minimum requirements (data or information) that they need.
- While the entire industry agrees that data cleanup is required, there is consistent resistance to apply the funding to make this happen. Interestingly, the regulator has a way of getting the attention of an operator by outlining those minimum requirements
- Define the end state. The cleanup strategy will fall out from there. Not defining this end state will cause a fragmented result and add time and cost to your effort.
- Regulatory philosophy (ie risk based vs strict compliance) will have an impact.
- Synergy with respect to semantics and terminology, as has been done for wells at PPDM. Cannot work in isolation. Recommend continued work with the SLC and others as required.

With regards to specific opportunities for regulators to show improvement. I.e. are they receiving enough information, are there gaps in the information collected. Points made here.

- Regulators collect data purposefully, whether this be for risk adverse compliance, risk management or public disclosure. In a risk adverse scenario, the regulatory might say that they want all of the API data from the state, buried or on the surface anywhere in the jurisdiction.
- Regulators will work with the industry to make the appropriate decision
- One specific example raised was the need for "as built" specifications. Many agencies only collect "as planned" information. The differences between the two can lead to regulatory difficulties in incident management, or risk awareness.

Emile thanked the group for the opportunity to speak with them and allowing him to learn more about each of them.

Where do we go from here?

- Put together information to support emerging regulators. I.e. the regulatory considerations document

ACTION ITEM: Trudy will coordinate a meeting between Emile and Irene to review and discuss further.

Thank you to Emile for his time, information and guidance.

3. Well Status and Classification

ACTION ITEM: Trudy will reach out to her contact with CNH (Mexico) and TNO (Netherlands) about both getting involved in this committee as well as participating in the WS&C review.

	<p>Trudy will be engaging the committee chairs to collaborate contact with these organizations for participation. OGA in the UK will be contacted as well.</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Alex will reacquaint himself with the latest version, socialize internally and gather specific feedback to support endorsement by September.</p> <p>No update</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Virginia and Phillip have started working on feedback from Oklahoma and intend to have their feedback in by September.</p> <p>No update.</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Sean and Mark S have volunteered to assist Trudy for a half day to assist with the review. We will also engage Dave Fisher to assist.</p> <p>Once the last of this feedback is received we will arrange the timing.</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Irene will meet with Trudy to better understand what is needed in this area and begin working on feedback from AER for the end of September.</p> <p>The objective of this body of work is to have Regulators endorse this set of values and recommend that people start using them or map to them.</p>
4.	<p>Well Milestone Survey</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Trudy will complete a first draft of a report and pass to Pete. Soft target has been set for the fall conference and a hard target for the end of 2017.</p> <p>Trudy did a review of the results of the timeline survey to get feedback on the presentation style and format that is currently being used for suggestion. Some comments received are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is a lot of information on each slide to absorb. ▪ Consequence to the condition. Understanding these consequences are important. Difficult for the regulator if the definition is too stringent. ▪ Initially confusing, it would be nice to do as what was done with WIAW ▪ The results are useful. Would be more useful if we structure next survey as multiple choice to streamline the responses. ▪ This is scary. Good starting point. Possibly break up and present one at a time. ▪ Admirable to get more. This is too much to absorb. We need to simplify. Using groupings go a long way to do this. ▪ This raises the level of horror. If we eliminate the wavy line going down the page from the chevron it would help tame the visual busyness. <p>ACTION ITEM: We need to create a secondary survey to stream line the response options to make the results more usable.</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: When we are pleased with the state of how the results are being presented (scary but clear), Ingrid will coordinate a social media teaser to kick off socializing.</p>
5.	<p>Pipelines</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Mark, Virginia and Martin will reach out to the groups inside their jurisdictions and inquire if their legislations include these definitions or provide the links to their legislations so that we can investigate the same. Ingrid / Trudy will research the same for the OGA, Alberta and Saskatchewan. We would then use this series of definitions as a starting point.</p>

	<p>No update.</p>
6.	<p>Greenhouse Gas</p> <p>Trudy socialized this with the PPDM Board of Directors. Two (2) of these members (operators) are currently working on some rules in this area and are going back to their organizations to see if they can share these with this group.</p>
7.	<p>Regulatory Considerations for Petroleum Data</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Trudy will create a high level sample table of contents for the Committee to review</p> <p>High level review was done of the draft document posted to Basecamp, Regulatory Considerations for Data Management_v0.1.</p> <p>While thinking of cross jurisdictional requirements, the committee needs to consider if this a practical and helpful tool. Do we want to continue investing time in this area? Benefits to supporting the emerging agencies. Feedback from the group received was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This is a very useful activity. Helpful to the emerging but also to the more mature NDRs to serve as a checklist. ▪ Seems relatively comprehensive on only a skim but would like to see more clarity on 3 things: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What is the regulatory mandate? ○ Why is the regulator doing this? What are the regulatory aims/goals? ○ Who are the stakeholders in their jurisdiction? What is the level of complexity? ▪ Agree with the above and plan how we are going to use the information. ▪ Great – will be a challenge to make sure we can get it in the hands of those who really need it. ▪ See good things. May get in the weeds a bit if we are setting the minimum scope. ▪ See validity. Setting the ground rules then moving from there. May help focus next steps. ▪ What is required to make data accessible and consumable. Elements faced like multiple collection tools and what becomes the master record. <p>We will be looking for volunteers to assist with writing the white paper.</p>
8.	<p>What is a Completion</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Everyone is to give consideration for reviewers that they can recommend within their own organization that we can work with. Please forward to Ingrid.</p> <p>Everyone is to give consideration to this and forward the contact information for those they nominate within their organizations to Ingrid.</p>
9.	<p>Next Steps</p> <p>Next meeting will be set up for the timeframe of October 5th to 13th</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ingrid will send out a Doodle Poll for that meeting and schedule accordingly.
<p><i>Thank you to all for attending.</i></p>	