

Economics Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Department of Industry, Science, Energy and Resources
2021 - 2022 Supplementary Budget Estimates

AGENCY/DEPARTMENT: National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority

OUTCOME: Agencies

TOPIC: Montara Venture, Nganhurra and Pyrenees Venture Reports

REFERENCE: Written Question – Senator Rex Patrick

QUESTION DATE: 05 November 2021

QUESTION No.: SI-88

In response to questions arising during a public hearing NOPSEMA has confirmed that the individual Inspection Reports for the Montara Venture, Nganhurra and Pyrenees Venture were not produced, despite having different owners. This lack of action appears contrary to the understanding of the requirements of the OPGGS Act and the responses provided to QON 3582. It also appears inconsistent with providing information to operators, owners and service providers that would enable them to take the necessary action.

In response to questioning NOPSEMA has stated that a single report was prepared that covered all of the findings, however the single report only covers the Northern Endeavour and was only provided to Lloyd's Register, UPS and NOGA, it was not provided to the other operators. The Inspection Report provided to Lloyd's does not include a statement that there were common findings to all ship type facilities.

1. Why were the Inspection Reports not prepared and issued?
2. Was the decision to not issue the reports communicated to the:
 - a. Minister?
 - b. NOPSEMA Board?
3. Was the commonality of the findings of the inspection at Lloyd's Register communicated to the:
 - a. Minister?
 - b. NOPSEMA Board?
4. Will NOPSEMA now issue the remaining 3 individual inspection reports for these assets as contained in draft format in the File Note as required by the OPGGS Act?

ANSWER

1. On occasion, NOPSEMA undertakes reviews of third party service providers for purposes such as verifying the claims made by operators or titleholders in permissioning documents. NOPSEMA undertook such a review of Lloyds Register and produced a single report which contains findings common to the four facilities noted above. Examples of these common findings include:

Pg 5. 'Planned Survey Programme Findings: It was noted (as stated by LR during the inspection) that none of the facilities queried had a Planned Survey Programme Document as required by LR Offshore Rules...'

Pg 6. 'LR Class Direct Findings: The inspectors sampled the LR Class Direct system... various facility operators had been able to provide 'survey status' reports for their facilities, which did not provide all the information.'

Engagement with the operators of the four facilities has been ongoing with regard to Lloyds Register Class issues through processes such as NOPSEMA OHS inspections. All of those inspections are subject to inspection reports.

2. Not applicable
3. All Northern Endeavour enforcement actions and investigations underpinning those actions were summarised in briefs issued to the Minister's Office. This is in accordance with the *Offshore Petroleum and Greenhouse Gas Storage Act 2006* (the Act), where NOPSEMA is required to report investigations of potential breaches under the Act to the responsible Commonwealth Minister.

NOPSEMA raised the Lloyds Review with the NOPSEMA Advisory Board. The Senate Economics References Committee was advised on 21 March 2021, in NOPSEMA's response to Question on Notice 3244, about NOPSEMA's update to the Board.

4. NOPSEMA has undertaken OHS inspections of all four facilities which have had regard to the issues identified in the Lloyds Review. All of those inspections are subject to inspection reports which have been provided to the operators of the four facilities. In some cases, NOPSEMA has had to pursue issues raised from the Lloyds Review with the operator. In other cases, the operator has proactively managed its service arrangements with no further action by NOPSEMA being warranted.