

Thomas, Nicole

From: paul oshea [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, 21 May 2010 1:27 PM
To: Blair, Joanna
Subject: Comments
Attachments: OShea comments on Montara draft findings report.docx

Hi Joanna,

please find attached a copy of my comments on the draft report.

thanks

paul

--

Paul O'Shea

Mob: [REDACTED]

20 May 2010

Joanna Blair

Montara Commission of Inquiry

Joanna,

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the document entitled "Montara DRAFT preliminary findings causes and circumstances 7 May 2010".

Initially I would express my concern the way the "inquiry" was conducted like an inquisition with the main purpose to find who was to blame, instead of focussing on what went wrong, how it went wrong and how this could be prevented from occurring again. I feel that a far greater level of engineering support and guidance could have been given to the commission to help with technical issues covered throughout the commission, including the contents of the preliminary findings. The preliminary findings report, in its current form, will unfortunately not benefit or improve the oil and gas industry. I plead with the commission to refocus the report from a "who's to blame" mentality, to a report that highlights recommendations to help minimise the chances of a similar blow-out incident occurring again.

The "inquiry" was a very public inquisition and a harrowing experience that I would not wish upon anybody. With the majority of senior personnel in all facets of the oil and gas industry reading the transcripts on a daily basis, I and others have had our names tarnished to varying degrees affecting our future employment prospects. With this in mind I would like to ask the commission to eliminate persons names and substitute employed positions.

The following comments are responses to the document entitled "Montara DRAFT preliminary findings causes and circumstances 7 May 2010".

1.3 a ii

Further investigation into this comment should be conducted. Yes the volume of tail cement was incorrect, but with the volume of lead cement and the type of lead cement pumped (ie the recipe) I do not believe "worm holing" would be an issue. I also believe that if the cement job had gone to plan the volume of tail cement would in no way compromise the integrity of the casing shoe and it's effectiveness as a barrier (this comment indicates the volume would affect the integrity).

1.3 e

This is a mixture of opinions and facts and should be clarified. The term "sensible oil field" practise is not a defined or recognised term. It should probably be good oilfield practise.

Page 36 Note 25

This is an opinionated statement and not fact and should be removed. I have a sound knowledge of what an inflow test is.

1.155, 1.156, 1.161

See comments previously made for 1.3 a ii

1.162 and note 41

This appears very opinionated in that the reports accepts only the persons comments to support the reports predetermined views. This should be investigated by the commission, ie several independent Qualified Drilling Engineers to evaluate with science and engineering rather than relying "he says, she says" type decision.

If the "inquiry" rejects Mr Wilson and Mr Duncan comments then it should provide an engineering reasons behind it.

1.197 and points 67 and 68 (from Mr Trueman's statement)

I find this hard to believe that Mr Trueman was unaware of the change of plan to remove the PCCC until just prior to the removal. I informed the Drill Floor personnel of the change in plans sometime around 6am on 20th August and the cap was not removed until sometime between 11:30-12:00hrs. That's 5½hrs that Mr Trueman was not aware what was going on, on his rig, the West Atlas. The Driller and the Tool Pusher were aware of the change of plans, as they were implementing this during the 5½hrs. In this time Atlas would have held there 9am meeting giving the Tool Pusher ample opportunity to explain the change of plans to the OIM if he wasn't already aware. After this it would not be unreasonable to assume the change in plans could have been relayed to Atlas management in Perth (**1.181**).

Page 71 note 62

I believe this statement has been taken out of context and should it be required in the report, needs to be elaborated.

1.260, 1.261, 1.262

References to SimOps needs to be clarified. The SimOps documents usually deal with operations on two facilities occurring at the same time under different management regimes. During the "tieback operation" all operations were run from the West Atlas. There was no secondary party (ie PTTEP construction) working on the Montara well head platform.

Thankyou for the opportunity to comment on the draft findings report.

Paul O'Shea