

**ALARP/Safety Case Guidelines/Designated Petroleum Activities Consultation Papers
Respondent Meeting
ERM
Tuesday Jan 8th 2013**

Location: CER Offices
Time: 14.00

Attended by: Ian Hamilton ERM
Walter Bruton ERM
John Morgan CER Consultant, GL Noble Denton
Martin Maple CER Consultant, GL Noble Denton
Eamonn Murtagh CER
Liam Murphy CER

Minutes:

1. Introduction

- The meeting was opened by CER and attendees were introduced.

2. Discussion on ERM Response to Safety Case Guidelines Consultation Paper:

A number of points relating to the ERM submission were discussed, including:

- Safety Case Guidelines - 4.4.7 ALARP Assessment
ERM suggested that safety cases should include reference to a supporting document that identifies all Safety Critical Tasks. As part of this document, all routine tasks should be reviewed, hazards identified, human error factors applied using industry standard principles and control measures put in place. The Safety Management System will cover any non-routine tasks not listed in this supporting document. This document should satisfy that when error occurs, the error will not escalate into a Major Accident Hazard. ERM outlined that there is a clear understanding in industry of this process.
- Safety Case Guidelines 4.6.3.3 Human Factors
ERM suggested that this section should be expanded to include a focus on safety leadership and safety communication. ERM identified measurable aspects of this, which the undertaking can use as evidence. These measurable aspects include:
 - Assessment of Leadership performance
 - Appraisal of leadership performance.
 - Assessment of communication methods
 - Appraisal of routine communication methods

ERM suggested that undertakings typically fail on bottom up communications, an area where they can learn the most. ERM suggested the Human Factors list should include safety leadership and safety critical communications.

- Justifying Manpower Levels

ERM suggested that taking manpower levels into account during concept and Design Safety Cases is poorly understood within industry. ERM suggested that the Safety Case Guidelines should include a requirement for the undertaking to evaluate and demonstrate manpower levels in Design and Production Safety Cases. ERM stated that there is an integrity risk, due to maintenance backlog, from having insufficient persons on an installation. An undertaking should be able to demonstrate in a safety case how they have identified the required size of the workforce for an installation.

3. *Closing*

The CER noted that the Decision Papers are due for publication in February 2013.