

**Consultation on High Level Design of Petroleum Safety Framework  
Respondent Meeting  
PSE Kinsale Energy  
Tuesday, October 11<sup>th</sup> 2011**

**Location:** CER Offices  
**Time:** 09:30  
**Attended by:** Fergal Murphy PSE Kinsale Energy  
Michael Murray PSE Kinsale Energy  
Tom O'Shea PSE Kinsale Energy  
Paul McGowan CER  
Eamonn Murtagh CER  
Róisín Cullinan CER  
Kieran Walsh CER  
Theresa Reddy CER Consultant, GL Noble Denton

**Minutes:**

*1. Introduction & Presentation*

- The meeting was opened by CER and all attendees were introduced.
- PSE Kinsale Energy representatives were informed of the process by which the Consultation Response Paper and Draft Decision Paper would be published. Consultation Responses and minutes of Consultation Response Meetings will be published in early November. Consultation Response Paper and Draft Decision Paper expected to be published before Christmas 2011.

*2. Discussion on PSE Kinsale Energy Response to Consultation Paper:*

A number of key specific points relating to the letter accompanying the PSE Kinsale Energy ("KE") submission were discussed, including:

1. Overlap between Gas Storage Safety Cases (submitted under the natural gas Safety Regulatory Framework) and Petroleum Safety Framework:  
KE requested clarity from the CER on how this transition would be managed.
2. Project Design Approval:  
KE outlined their view that the Concept Safety Case was unworkable and was likely to make the permissioning process unnecessarily complex. KE suggested that pre submission meetings with the CER prior to a Safety Case being submitted (after FEED) would be more appropriate. KE suggested that a Safety Case post FEED would be more beneficial from a regulatory perspective and more defensible from an operator perspective as it would contain fewer unknowns than a Safety Case at Concept Stage.

3. Interfaces with other State Agencies:

The interface between the various regulatory bodies should be clear and efficient to ensure that there is no regulatory overlap or dual approvals required which would increase the bureaucracy of the regulatory system.

4. Costs:

KE expressed dissatisfaction with the idea of the operators paying for the Development associated with the Petroleum Safety Framework. KE also requested clarity on the basis by which the CER intends to recover costs. KE raised concern regarding the duplication of resources within the CER and other regulatory bodies involved in the regulation of Petroleum safety and suggested that duplication should be avoided and resources shared between agencies.

A number of points relating to specific questions within the questionnaire (as indicated below) and other general areas were raised for discussion by KE as follows:

5. The question of responsibility of EPA and CER was raised regarding the issue of major environmental hazards, and monitoring of petroleum activities to prevent them from occurring. (Q2, Q5, Q8, Q58)
6. The need for timelines for approval of safety cases to be established. (Q12)
7. Some flexibility should be allowed regarding lower limits of ALARP. (Q18)
8. KE felt that QRA numbers for petroleum activities are well established and that it is not necessary to define new numbers, rather the numbers currently in use in standards and customary practice should be maintained. (Q19)
9. Queried possible ambiguity regarding Decommissioning and the definition of being connected to the well. (Q25)
10. The idea of the 5 year review cycle is accepted as being reasonable by KE. (Q34)
11. Regarding the joint and severally liable issue on a Safety Case and that there was a desire to avoid multiple submissions or multiple safety cases on the same issues. (Q60, Q17)
12. KE requested further clarity on how and what information the CER intends to publish with respect to safety performance information given the potential for such information to be misconstrued. (Q63)
13. KE made the point that a system of feeding back information or opinions on the operation of the PSF would be useful, given that the system is new and may need to be modified. (Q64)
14. KE raised the point that some clarity is required regarding what constitutes a material change or a development regarding a change to the Safety Case.
15. The proposed arrangement for Safety Cases for Wells was considered too complicated by KE. (Q28)