Introductions and IADC Antitrust Policies & Guidelines
Brian Maness, Diamond Offshore, Committee Chairman, welcomed members to the meeting and reviewed IADC Anti-Trust Policy and Guidelines. An Occidental Petroleum representative provided facility safety orientation. Meeting attendees introduced themselves.

Overview of API BUL97 – SEMS and the Well Execution and Risk Assessment Plans
Scott Randall, PlusAlpha Risk

Mr. Randall provided an overview of American Petroleum Institute’s (API) BULLETIN 97, giving attention to the direct impact this Bulletin will have on IADC members, on well control training activities, and on other well control-related activities. He reported that BUL 97 provides expanded guidelines for bridging documents, and currently provides 2 examples of bridging document templates.

Mr. Randall described the vision for BUL 97 as expecting each operator and contractor to have a 13-element Safety and Environmental Management Program (SEMP) in place. In addition, the expectation is that the operator’s and contractor’s SEMP will include Stop Work Authorities. He indicated that one of the challenges of the bridging the operator’s and contractor’s SEMP is the identification of whether the operator’s or contractor’s risk assessment process and well control operations will be followed.

Mr. Randall also discussed the common threads between API Recommended Practice 96 and 30 CFR 250.1900 known as SEMS (Safety and Environmental Management Systems). He identified commonalities among these documents and regulations as: 1. identification of the person(s) responsible for maintenance of barriers, 2. design and construction of barriers, and 3. maintenance of barriers.

IADC’s HSE Safety Case was discussed as a logical solution for linking these three guidelines and regulations.

Particular emphasis was placed on rig personnel’s well control competencies. Mr. Randall challenged the Well Control Committee to develop a competency framework for personnel with well control responsibilities. This would help industry address the important issue of management of change for personnel, specifically defining equivalency of personnel competencies.

Risk analyses, and particularly barriers analyses, was discussed in context of the guidelines within BUL97. Mr. Randall expects an increased requirement for well control barrier management to result from introduction of BUL97. He also outlined impacts to well control training anticipated:

- The need for a universal approach to defining equivalent minimum competencies;
- A means of assuring equivalent minimum competencies be maintained during change of personnel;
- Training more focused on positional responsibilities;
- Training to include stop work authorities; and
- Barrier maintenance training needs to be supported by a systematic approach to risk management.

During member discussions, one member pointed out that implementation of regulations similar to SEMS in the North Sea following Piper Alpha resulted in 80% of industry’s response being documentation focused and 20% of the response actually achieving safety improvements to the industry.
Julia Swindle, IADC, reported to the committee highlights of a Notice to Leaseholders (NTL) regarding SEMS issued by BSEE on 21 October 2011. The NTL was designed to provide clarification around implementation of SEMS.

A point of confusion in the original regulation involved what BSEE meant by stating that an MOC would be required for all “personnel changes (including contractors)”. BSEE stated in the NTL, “the regulatory text at 30 CFR 250.1912(a)(3) does not require a MOC for a tour rotation (i.e. 12-hour crew rotation) or shift rotation (i.e. 7, 14, or 21-day change-out of crews).”

Ms. Swindle also pointed out that the NTL states that “Under 30 CFR 1914(b), the operator is required to document that each contractor working for you is knowledgeable and experienced in the work practices it will be performing.” This may pose an issue for SEMS programs that were designed with the intention of spot-checking or verifying contractor knowledge and skills via a process of sampling.

Of particular importance to the conversation of well control, the NTL addressed the relationship between SEMS and Subpart O. The NTL states, “[If] your operations include activities covered under Subpart O (well control and production safety), then you may provide BSEE with your Subpart O program . . . however, as part of this evaluation, you need to be able to provide additional program-related material and training documentation in relation to operations on your facilities in areas other than those addressed by Subpart O.”

Ms. Swindle stressed that there is a new requirement listed in the NTL that does not appear in either the SEMS regulation or API RP 75. Per the NTL, every operator is to provide BSEE with both primary and alternative SEMS contacts: names, mailing addresses, e-mail addresses and phone numbers. This information was to have been submitted to the SEMS Coordinator for OORP (Office of Offshore Regulatory Programs) by 15 November 2011.

Ms. Swindle then presented highlights of the proposed changes to the Safety and Environmental Management (SEMS) requirements issued by BOEM on 14 September 2011. While there are minor changes throughout the new document, Ms. Swindle pointed out changes in 4 existing elements:

- Job Safety Analysis (JSA) – Supervisory sign-off on JSA before a task is performed will now be required.
- Training – Awareness of new SEMS II requirements must be added to SEMS training.
- Audit Requirements – All audits must be performed by independent third party auditors. Internal audit staff may no longer conduct SEMS audits.
- Qualifications of Auditors – Qualifications must be submitted to Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement.

In addition, Ms. Swindle described 4 proposed new elements: Stop Work Authority, Ultimate Work Authority, Employee Participation, and Reporting Unsafe Work Conditions.

Ms. Swindle reported that Alan Spackman, IADC Vice President-Offshore Technical and Regulatory Affairs, has prepared comments that were submitted to BOEM on behalf of IADC and its members.

The full text of the proposed rule, and also the comments submitted by Mr. Spackman, can be found at the following link: http://www.iadc.org/iadc-committees/iadc-offshore-operating-division/documents/. Scroll down to “29 September 2011 – Federal Register/Vol.76, 178/Wednesday, September 14, 2011/Proposed Rules” or “14 November 2011 – Joint API/IADC/IMCA/IPAA/NOIA/OMSA response to the BOEMRE/BSEE 14 September Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on Safety and Environmental Management Systems (SEMS 2)".
Underbalanced Drilling and Concern about Barriers
Ian Davidson, Blade Energy and Brian Grayson, Weatherford

Mr. Davidson presented the proposed changes to the format of the WellCAP UBD course. Currently the course is 4 days long and requires a refresher and recertification every 2 years. A proposal has been made to change this from one course to two separate courses, an Introductory level and Supervisory level course.

The Introductory course would be 1.5 days long with no refresher/recertification necessary. This course would describe the differences between conventional and Underbalanced Drilling (UBD) and give an overview of UBD methods and downhole equipment. The Introductory course must be taken prior to advancing to the Supervisory course.

The Supervisory course would be 3.5 days long that would have minor overlapping of content with the Introductory course. The course would address equipment, layout, and HSSE topics, and would provide scenario-based simulation exercises. Written examination and assessment by simulation would be required. Refreshing and recertification would be required every 2 years.

There was a great deal of discussion regarding whether either course should require a standard WellCAP certification as prerequisite, at least for the Supervisory course.

Also discussed was the availability of simulators that could delivery the required scenario-based exercises. Software exist that could deliver this type of practical training. Simulator manufacturers of conventional well control simulators are exploring the possibility of interfacing with UBD simulator software.

Other concerns raised were removal of the conventional well control training prerequisite, and consideration of managed pressure drilling issues.

Brian Grayson then led a discussion of underbalanced drilling (UBD) and managed pressure drilling (MPD) well control issues. Mr. Grayson pointed out that in conventional well control, the fluid in the wellbore serves as the primary means of controlling the well pressures and formation fluids flow. UBD, on the other hand, utilizes the hydrostatic pressures of the fluid column plus back pressure applied by the choke.

Other differences for the UBD/MPD community are the specialized equipment used, e.g., the rotating control device (RCD) and choke manifold. The RCD is used to create surface back pressure. Of particular concern is that DNV now certifies MPD equipment as the primary well control device. The RCD is not designed for or intended to be a well control device, and thus should not be certified in the same way as the blow out preventer (BOP) is certified for well control in conventional drilling. To certify the RCD in the same way as the BOP is problematic for the MPD industry.

Subsea Curriculum – Should It Be Different for Drilling and Workover/Completion?
Brian Maness, DODI

Mr. Maness asked Ed Geissler (WCS) to lead a discussion on subsea content for the drilling and workover/completion courses. Mr. Geissler explained that subsea curriculum content is only specified inside the WellCAP drilling curriculum. Now that the WellCAP program eliminates combining a drilling course with a well service-type course other than the workover/completion course, a course combining workover/completion with other well service-type courses does not contain the subsea content. Thus taking a separate drilling course to gain the subsea content is necessary if subsea content is required.

This issue needs further discussion in committee to find a solution. The topic will be added to the next Committee meeting agenda.
WellCAP Review Panel Discussion
Brian Maness, DODI

Mr. Maness presented some concerns about the current functioning of the WellCAP Review Panel. The following were among issues or recommendations discussed.

- The Panel is not functioning as effectively as needed for the rapidly expanding WellCAP program. IADC Accreditation and Certification Department (ACD) staff are challenged to keep the Panel members responding to ballots and keep the applications moving through the system.
- Mr. Maness recommended changing responsibilities for the Panel as follows:
  - Committee to define qualifications of Panel member (as a guide to ACD staff for selection), and
  - ACD to select Panel members.
- Mr. Maness recommended removing the limitation of the “University” position on Panel to permit broader member company participation. He specifically proposed permitting university, service company, or training provider representative to serve in this position.
- From discussions, members suggested the following qualifications for Review Panel members. Panel members should:
  - Be a current member or have been a past member of the Well Control Committee,
  - Have a well control training background, and
  - Be an approved WellCAP instructor or a representative of a WellCAP-accredited program.

ACD staff was asked to draft qualifications and circulate the draft to Committee members for review. This will be discussed further in a future meeting.

Action item:
- ACD staff to draft qualifications; circulate to Committee members for review and discussion.

Subcommittee Reports – Update on WellCAP Drilling Supervisory Level Curriculum Revision
Goran Andersson, Chevron

Mr. Anderson reported on the review comments received on the proposed Drilling Supervisory level Curriculum revisions. He reported that comments were received from five members. Two comments were in full support of curriculum as proposed.

The Subcommittee met 8 November to address comments. All have been addressed except for the 126 comments from one member and most of these have already been addressed. A follow-up meeting will be held to address all remaining comments.

Once all comments have been addressed, the curriculum will be circulated by e-mail with an accompanying electronic ballot.

Mr. Andersson restated the subcommittee’s recommendation to change the current simulator requirement from the “maximum of 30%” as currently stated in the Handbook of Accreditation to a “minimum simulation time to be not less than 30% of the course time, not including testing time”. He requested ACD staff prepare the proposal for members’ comments in preparation for electronic vote as soon as possible.

The Curriculum Subcommittee proposed the following curriculum revision priorities for future curriculum reviews:
1. Fundamental Drilling course
2. Workover Supervisor course (to include Fracturing)
3. Workover Fundamental course
4. Wireline course
5. Coiled Tubing course to add Simulation standards

Other issues discussed by the subcommittee:
- Urgency of curriculum reviews recognized
  - Volunteer effort (current model) cannot satisfy urgency
  - Propose that IADC fund contracted personnel to perform curriculum reviews and report to subcommittee. This would speed up revision time.
- IADC asked to bring clarity to committee’s and sub-committee’s roles with respect to well control curriculums. (Currently various committees have input into the curriculums with no clear delineation of authority or ownership of each curriculum to a committee.)
- Look at opportunity to engage IADC chapters on a global basis by appointing regional representatives that convey input to the central Well Control Committee.

Lunch

WellCAP Plus Endorsement Proposal
Mark Denkowski, IADC

Mr. Denkowski began his presentation by reminding attendees of the current WellCAP Plus course format and intentions. He stated that IADC has been approached by Shell with a request to create a new designation, or special endorsement, for a WellCAP Plus course that goes beyond the original vision for the course. The proposed WellCAP Plus endorsement would increase training time to a minimum of 5 days, require simulator exercises, and require a final simulator assessment. He then asked for comments.

Members expressed strong opposition to altering WellCAP Plus program criteria. Members questioned whether adding simulation might actually constrain team learning processes because of limitations of simulator capabilities and become counterproductive to the creative, unbounded thinking and teamwork intended for attendees.

Additionally, members stated that, as currently written, the course imposes minimum requirements on a provider, not a maximum. As such, an accredited WellCAP Plus training provider is not prevented from adding simulation or a final assessment as they desire. These additions would continue to meet the minimum WellCAP Plus accreditation standard, and therefore, would not rate any special designation or endorsement.

The topic was left open, however, and the suggestion was made to write up a clear outline of the proposed endorsement and send this out to the full Well Control Committee for comment and electronic vote.

Action Item: Outline the proposed WellCAP Plus simulator endorsement and send the proposal to the full Well Control Committee for comment and electronic vote.

WellCAP Issues/IADC News
Brenda Kelly (IADC) facilitated the reporting by IADC staff on several items of interest to the Well Control Committee members.

1. IADC Well Control Advisory Board (Mark Denkowski) – Mr. Denkowski presented the vision for a Well Control Advisory Board that would help guide ACD execution of the WellCAP program. Invited members of the Board would be: operators, drilling contractors, and Chairmen for Well Control Committee and Well Servicing Committee.

2. KSA Project (Mark Denkowski) – The Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities (KSA) Project was suggested by the OOC SEMS Competence Subcommittee, who requested IADC
review and update current KSA defined for 12 drilling positions and define KSA for other rig positions that have not yet been defined. A Request for Proposals was distributed with 7 companies responding. A team consisting of IADC’s Mark Denkowski and Brenda Kelly, and Training Committee Chairman Bob Burnett and Co-Chairman Mike Mathena will select the vendor and provide project oversight. IADC member companies may participate in the project by providing positional KSAs, review work products, and provide financial support for the project. The project would be executed in phases, with the first phase focusing on safety critical positions with well control responsibilities.

3. Meeting/Event Sponsorship (Julia Swindle) – IADC is seeking hosts/committee sponsors for the 2012 Well Control Committee meetings. Ms. Swindle indicated that 2012 hosts/sponsors would have their company names and logos displayed at all meetings of the year. Forms were provided for members to express their interest in hosting. Members may also contact Ms. Swindle at julia.swindle@iadc.org if interested in hosting or sponsoring a future Committee event.

4. Test Question Database – Brenda Kelly reviewed the capabilities of the Test Question Database donated to IADC a couple of years ago. The database currently houses hundreds of questions; member companies have offered to donate additional questions. Questions are categorized by course, level, curriculum topic and sub-topic, as well as level of difficulty. As Committee members discuss the potential for providing a standardized test, they should remember that this product is available for expansion and utilization within the WellCAP program.

5. WCT-01 Handbook of Accreditation has been finalized and will be available to members as soon as the Simulator proposal vote is finalized. The document will be sent by email to all accredited training providers and will be available at the IADC website: http://www.iadc.org/accreditation/iadc-accreditation-programs/online-forms-documents/.

6. WellCAP International Audits – Now that WCT-01 has been rewritten, the program application and site visit checklist will be revised to align with the order of the accreditation criteria in the handbook. Auditor’s notes will be finalized and a comprehensive regime of provider audits will commence. Det Norske Veritas will conduct most WellCAP audits going forward. Current auditors will continue to be needed for special audits as initial site visits or in response to complaints.

7. E-Learning Requirements Proposal – Discussion postponed as work is not currently completed.

8. WellCAP-WellCAP Plus Facilitator Certification Course Schedule for 2012 – The final WellCAP Facilitator Course for 2011 scheduled for 5-8 December 2011 is full. Courses for 2012 are scheduled for 27 February – 1 March and 27-30 August. Additional courses may be scheduled as demand necessitates.

9. Other WellCAP News:
   • No other news to report.

Open Discussions

The next meeting is scheduled for 7 March 2012. Contact Janet Lara if you would like to host an upcoming meeting.
It was requested that one of the 2012 meetings be scheduled in conjunction with the Annual Meeting. This will be discussed with IADC conference staff.

It was also requested that IADC provide teleconferencing capabilities to accommodate international members whenever possible.

No other discussions.

**Topics for Next Meeting:**
- Subsea content for Workover/Completion and other WellCAP courses

**Action item:**
- ACD staff--draft WellCAP Panel member qualifications; circulate to committee members for review and discussion.
- Outline the proposed WellCAP Plus simulator endorsement and send the proposal to the full Well Control Committee for comment and electronic vote.

**Adjournment** – Meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

**Today’s Meeting Sponsors:**
- Lunch – Shell Oil Company
- Refreshments – Falck Alford and Well Control School (WCS)

**Attendance:**
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<tr>
<th>Name</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. Gene Wilson</td>
<td>Aberdeen Drilling School, Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Davidson</td>
<td>Blade Energy Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Ljungdahl</td>
<td>Boots &amp; Coots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goran Andersson</td>
<td>Chevron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Nance</td>
<td>Chevron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Maness</td>
<td>Diamond Offshore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Ramsay</td>
<td>Drilling Systems (UK) Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Scheet</td>
<td>ExxonMobil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexey Zernov</td>
<td>ExxonMobil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Kelly</td>
<td>IADC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlene Diaz</td>
<td>IADC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Swindle</td>
<td>IADC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Denkowski</td>
<td>IADC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elfriede Neldert</td>
<td>IADC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Fischer</td>
<td>IADC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Shemwell</td>
<td>Knowledge Ops, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Dowleam</td>
<td>Knowledge Ops, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Rollinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benny</td>
<td>Mason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otto</td>
<td>Santos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor</td>
<td>Fleming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Sonnemann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ossama</td>
<td>Sehsah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Davidson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm</td>
<td>Lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen</td>
<td>Wanzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Filipchuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Geissler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Langlois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>