

PROJECT CONCEPT DOCUMENT

1.1 Project / Initiative Description

1.2 Governar	nce			
Title:		Proj ID:		
Sponsor:				P0052/2019
Project Manager:				
Division/Team:	FPD	Date:	Click here to enter a date.	

1.3 What

(description, what outcomes and deliverables will be created)

Review of safety cases / operator performance standards to determine the number of operators using:

- Class rules/classification as their performance standard for hull integrity.
- Classification society surveyors to ensure the adequacy of maintenance such that equipment is fit for normal and emergency service as applicable

Researching the extent to which class rules/processes allow for a class certificate to be issued despite maintenance/inspection tasks not having been undertaken (i.e. the basis for discretion .

Assist NOPSEMA inspectors as an SME in a potential inspection/meeting of the class societies, particularly Lloyds where practicable.

Guidance note to clarify NOPSEMA's position on this issue.

1.4 Why

(what are the drivers for this change)

NOPSEMA has observed apparent willingness of the class societies to deviate from class rules by way of extending class certificates without the completion of inspection requirements as stipulated by class rules. Some facility operators are using class rules as a performance standard for integrity of hull structures, and when the class society agrees to extend without inspection the operators argue that they remain within their

the class society agrees to extend without inspection the operators argue that they remain within their performance standard. NOPSEMA fundamentally disagrees with this argument in the context of the operator's specific duties under subclause 9(2)(c) of schedule 3 to the OPGGS Act.

1.5 When

Activity Starts: 1/04/201	Activity Finishes:	15/08/2019	Duration:	4.5 months
---------------------------	--------------------	------------	-----------	------------

1.6 Cost Estimates (all costs must exclude GST)

	This financial year				Next financial year				
Costs	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 Q2 Q3 Q				
Internal									
External				Х	X				
Savings / Revenue									
Total Costs									



Net Total: \$Engagement and salary costs for							
Are components of the project ongoing / recurring? No							
Costs cease at a future date? (Financial Year / Qua	Costs cease at a future date? (Financial Year / Quarter): 15/08/2019						
1.7 Part 6 – Value / Risk Analysis	(these are the main factors that determine the relative p	oriority)					
Business Value (Benefits to NOPSEMA once completed)	Business Risk (Risks to NOPSEMA that will be reduced/removed once completed)						
Clarity of our position in relation to this issue communicated to industry	Legal challenges to enforcement action						
Understanding of the current state of the industry in relation to this matter – how big the problem is	Reputation risk of not having identified/intervened	_					
 Class societies are aware that NOPSEMA are applying scrutiny 	Workload on inspectors dealing with these issues						
The integrity of items under class are better managed by the industry							
Safety cases are clear in how they will manage integrity and the role of class							
Capability (of NOPSEMA to implement this initiative successfully)	Implementation Risk (that might prevent successful completion of this initiative)						
Recruiting SME to deliver this project scope – successful recruitment will deliver required capability	Failure to recruit a suitable SME Legal access to inspect class societies Perception that NOPSEMA is endorsing class rules as a prescriptive performance standard for hull integrity	-					

1.8 Project Risk Rating

If this project were to fail, or not proceed, the consequence rating to NOPSEMA would most likely be High

1.9 Additional Considerations	
This initiative depends upon (other initiatives, external events,)	Other initiatives which depend upon this one
 Recruitment of appropriate SME Legal team investigation into feasibility of inspection of class societies 	• Nil
Constraints	Resources Required (assistance from other teams, facilities,)



(Non-negotiable limits e.g. government directives or laws, externally imposed deadlines, resource restrictions ;)	
Length of contract forengagement of SME	 Legal team assistance re class society inspection HR – recruitment, contracts, etc. Relevant inspectors from FPD & VF teams

Timing

(<what timeframe, and why; what would happen if it were deferred until a later date, and how much longer could it be deferred until risks become unacceptable>

This is a current issue for NOPSEMA and has the potential to affect numerous facilities so failure to complete this project could create significant workload for inspectors in future, and allow unacceptable risk to remain offshore.

Privacy

Does this project constitute a high privacy risk? (A project may be a high privacy risk project if the agency reasonably considers that the project involves any new or changed ways of handling personal information that are likely to have a significant impact on the privacy of individuals).

No

2 Success measures

<What are the measures of success of this project, and what are their relative priorities? For example, is it more important to meet a time deadline than to keep to budget? If you have to make a choice, what would win? No two can have the same priority. The project manager and sponsor will base their project controls and reporting on the higher priority measures. The measures suggested in this template form may be amended, deleted or added to as appropriate to the project. Recognising that it is difficult to optimise for many measures simultaneously, the list will usually be shorter than shown here. >

Success	Measures		Relative Priority "10" is highest rating, "1" is lowest							Reporting criteria		
		N/A	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A.	Minimise risk											\times
B.	Optimise usage of industry levies											
C.	Deliver value as early as possible											
D.	Meet the expectations of stakeholders											
E.	Meet all the project's objectives / requirements											
F.	Meet the agreed budget, resources, etc											
G.	Deliver the key product / service on time											
H.	Add value to the organisation											
I.	Meet quality requirements											
J.	Sense of professional satisfaction for the team											
K.	Others specific to your project, e.g., improve satisfaction rating to 80% by end 2020, or "pay 100% of accounts payable for small businesses within 7 days"											



3 Project Plan

3.1 General approach

External SME will be recruited to deliver the project with support provided from internal inspectors.

3.2 Scope

Scope is limited to the items described in the deliverables section above.

3.3 Phases, deliverables, benefits, funding and resources

Stage 1:	Review of safety cases / pe	Duration or End Date:	Click here to enter a date.	
Objective or Deliverable		Benefit	Costs	
Summary paper on current status regarding reliance on class rules and the associated processes of issuing/renewing class certificates		Clear understanding of the extend of the problem	Hours	

Stage 2:	Inspection		Duration or End Date:	Click here to enter a date.			
Objective or Deliverable		Benefit	Costs				
Inspect class societies		Improve standards applied offshore, contain deviations	Hours				

Stage 3:	Guidance note	Duration or End Date:	Click here to enter a date.	
Objective or Deliverable		Benefit	Costs	
Guidance note		Clarify NOPSEMA's position to industry	Hours	





Stage/Risk	Initial L'hood	Initial Cons	Initial Rating	Proposed Treatment	Residual L'hood	Residual Cons	Residual Rating
Class societies refuse inspection	Almost certain	Mod.	High	Legal to investigate	Possible	Mod.	Mod.
Perception that NOPSEMA is endorsing class rules as a prescriptive performance standard for integrity of a range of items	Poss.	Low	Low	Careful wording of Guidance	Unlikely	Low	Low



4 Approvals

Save this document in a corporate file (within Strategic Management – Project Coordination - Project Concept Documents - Active and Planned Projects) named "Project xxx – name of project – YYYY". Name the document "PCD – name of project 9999/yyyy".

This spending proposal complies with the policies of the Commonwealth Government, including the Commonwealth Procurement Rules, the Public Governance, Performance and Accountability Act 2013 and the Public Governance, Performance and Accountability Rule 2014 and constitutes value for money.

NOPSEMA has sufficient available, uncommitted funds to support the expenditure under spending proposal as and when it may become payable

For *each stage*, submit for approval by commencing the Edoc workflow, specifying the actions and roles in the sequence below:

Action(s)	Officer(s)
Approve	Sponsor
Approve	СРО
Approve	CSC Secretary (only if PPG approval is required)

Notes:

- Sponsor edit the document if desired then Publish before approving the Edoc workflow.
- CFO complete the Edoc workflow to make the declaration above regarding funding.
- CSC Secretary After CSC approves or rejects, complete the Edoc workflow, then update the status
 of the project in the project portfolio.