OSPAR Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic

Meeting of the Offshore Industry Committee (OIC)

Copenhagen (Denmark): 4 -6 March 2014

Contents of the Summary Record

Annexes

OSPAR Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic

Meeting of the Offshore Industry Committee (OIC)

Copenhagen (Denmark): 4 -6 March 2014

Summary Record

Agenda Item 0 – Opening and representation at the Meeting

0.1 The 2014 meeting of the Offshore Industry Committee (OIC) was held from 4 to 6 March 2014 in Copenhagen, at the kind invitation of the Danish Government

0.2 Mr Michel Schilling, Vice-Director of the Danish Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), opened the meeting and welcomed delegates to Copenhagen. He was delighted that Denmark had this opportunity to show its on-going commitment to the work of the OIC. He emphasised that the work done by OIC had inspired and guided offshore oil and gas legislation in Denmark. It has formed the legal framework for the results achieved in the form of reduced discharges of oil and offshore chemicals to the sea. He mentioned that over the years the politicians in the Danish Parliament and the Danish newspapers had often shown great interest in OIC activities and in the results achieved. He wished the meeting every success and the delegates a very pleasant stay in Copenhagen.

0.3 The meeting was chaired by Ms Hanne-Grete Nilsen (Norway) and was attended by representatives from the following:

a. **Contracting Parties**

Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (UK);

b**. Non-Governmental Observer Organisations**

The Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP), the Bonn Agreement Working Group on Operational, Technical and Scientific Questions concerning Counter Pollution Activities (OTSOPA), the European Oilfield Speciality Chemicals Association (EOSCA), the International Association of Oil and Gas Producers (OGP) and the Barcelona Convention Regional Marine Pollution Emergency Response Centre for the Mediterranean Sea (REMPEC).

0.4 The list of participants is at **Annex 1.**

Agenda Item 1 – Adoption of the Agenda

OIC 14/1/1-2, OIC 14/1/Info.1-2

1.1 OIC adopted the draft Agenda (OIC 14/1/1) and the provisional timetable (OIC 14/1/1 Add.1) and noted, as background for its discussions, the OIC Programme of Work 2013/2014 (OIC 14/1/Info.1), the North-East Atlantic Environment Strategy and JAMP 2010-2014 (OIC 14/1/Info.2) and the Letter from the OIC Chair highlighting priorities for OIC 2014 (OIC 14/1/2). The latter included preparations for the OIC overall assessment of impacts of offshore oil and gas industry on the marine environment, the review and finalisation of Theme O of the JAMP 2014-2021, ICG-REACH recommendations on harmonisation of the OSPAR Harmonised Mandatory Control System (HMCS) with REACH requirements and discussion of new initiatives as regards offshore developments in the Arctic, ageing installations and possible effects of

regular lighting from offshore installations.. A copy of the Agenda and List of documents submitted to the meeting is at **Annex 2**. A List of actions arising from the meeting is included in **Annex 3**.

1.2 The Secretariat explained the new trial routine adopted at OSPAR HODs November 2013 of marking meeting documents as "Category A: not for discussion" and "Category B: for discussion" to signal to delegates those documents that may require discussion in depth (Category B) in contrasts to documents labelled as Category A. The UK pointed out that the categorisation of documents prepared by Contracting Parties should be made by them rather than the Secretariat. The Chair explained that the experience from this first trial will be brought forward to the Secretariat as input to their annual review of the document "Secretariat Objectives".

Agenda Item 2 – Follow-up of Risk-based Approach national implementation plans

OIC 14/2/1, OIC 14/14/2/2

2.1 Norway presented document OIC 14/2/1 on its Risk-based Approach (RBA) implementation plan and informed the meeting that a numerical model called DREAM (Dose-related Risk and Effect Assessment Model) had been used since 2003 and that it is a PEC/PNEC based tool. After the adoption of the RBA Recommendation, the Environment Agency has engaged the Norwegian operators in a discussion on how and when to perform risk calculations for the installations discharging produced water. As a result, the proposed baseline frequency for performing new risk evaluations is every 5 years. In addition, new risk evaluations should be performed if new risk reducing measures are implemented, if there are any considerable changes in the produced water composition or as a result of changes in injection rates. Norway also informed the meeting that the operators will perform risk evaluations using both common OSPAR PNECs and the old list of PNECs for comparison and historic trends. According to the operators' time schedule, new risk evaluations/calculations shall be performed for all Norwegian installations by the end of 2014.

2.2 The UK introduced document OIC 14/2/2 on their RBA implementation programme which contains the schedule for undertaking the RBA assessments over the period 2014-2018. The operators of installations intending to undertake their assessments during the first half of 2014 were currently involved in contractual discussions with the laboratories and consultancies offering testing or modelling services. It was agreed that **an update on the RBA assessments undertaken during 2014 and any problems encountered, would be reported to OIC 2015.**

2.3 Denmark reported verbally that they have developed a first version of the Danish RBA paradigm (only in Danish for the time being) and thanked Norway and the UK for their kind assistance in this matter. Denmark hoped that RBA calculations and reports would be ready by the end of April 2014 for the first 5 offshore installations with discharges of produced water and would thereafter review the paradigm if necessary. When the paradigm is finished it would be translated into English and made available to the other Contracting Parties. The objective was to develop the regulatory framework for RBA with the Danish offshore operators towards the end of 2014 so that it can be ready when the produced water discharge permits are to be renewed by January 2015.

2.4 In the Netherlands, the RBA Recommendation has been implemented in the Mining Regulations since 1 January 2014. A RBA manual has been written by IMARES/Deltaris on how to carry out the RBA process in practice and this manual has been discussed with the oil and gas industry via the national industry representative body NOGEPA. It is planned that, on the basis of the Netherlands RBA implementation plan, sampling and analysis of two platforms in two sensitive areas would start this year and that discussions would take place with the operators about the possible practical issues. In 2015 the Netherlands would proceed with sampling and analyses of 20% of the platforms.

2.5 OIC reminded Contracting Parties that in accordance with paragraph 6.2 of the RBA Recommendation, progress against the implementation plans needs to be reported to OIC on an annual basis and invited **Contracting Parties to report progress to OIC 2015, as required by the Recommendation.**

Agenda Item 3 – Draft background document on PNECs

OIC 14/3/1

3.1 Norway presented the draft background document for the establishment of a list of Predicted No Effect Concentrations (PNECs) for naturally occuring susbstances in produced water (OIC 14/3/1) which was finalised by the Netherlands and Norway, assisted by the UK. The document should be forwarded to OSPAR to request that they endorse its publication.

3.2 The UK highlighted that it is not clear whether the current list of PNECs annexed to the RBA guidelines will be removed or replaced, as there are differences in § 1(b) and §3 of OIC 14/3/1. The intention needs to be confirmed. The UK also recommended that OIC should establish a review process for this PNECs document to ensure it is kept up to date. Germany stated that they had not been able to consult with their experts on the document in time for this meeting and entered a study reservation. OGP noted that Contracting Parties should advise OIC if they were aware of any new data relevant to the background document.

3.3 OIC agreed:

a. **that Germany should inform the Secretariat about their position by 22 May 2014**;

b. subject to the German study reservation being lifted, to recommend to OSPAR 2014 the publication of the Background document for the establishment of a List of Predicted No Effect Concentrations (PNECs) for naturally occuring susbstances in produced water, as presented in OIC 14/3/1;

c. to replace Table 1 (PNECs and EQSs for naturally occurring substances found in produced water) in Appendix 5 of the OSPAR RBA Guidelines (Agreement 2012/7) with a link to the Background document;

d. that the Background document should be updated when necessary. To this end, Contracting Parties should forward updates to the Secretariat, as and when available.

Agenda Item 4 – The PLONOR List

OIC 14/4/1, OIC 14/4/2

4.1 The Convenor of the ICG on harmonisation of the OSPAR HMCS with REACH requirements (ICG-REACH), Mr Derek Saward (UK), presented the work done within the ICG since OIC 2013 (OIC 14/6/2). The ICG worked intersessionally and also met twice, in The Hague (20-21 June 2013) and in Dublin (30-31 October 2013). As tasked in its Terms of Reference (ToR), the ICG reviewed the REACH PNEC risk data and Annex XIV of REACH classification status for substances on the OSPAR PLONOR List (Agreement 2013-06), to determine *inter alia* whether the published REACH PNEC values are relevant to the qualifying criteria for inclusion in the PLONOR List and whether designation as a candidate for inclusion in Annex XIV of REACH is relevant for substances on the PLONOR List.

4.2 The UK introduced OIC 14/4/1, which reported the outcome of checks on PLONOR substances that were conducted by the UK, The Netherlands, Norway, Ireland and Denmark. Concerns were identified for ten substances, which are summarised as follows, along with the UK's position as regards their retention on the PLONOR list:

1. *Ammonium Hydroxide* (CAS 7664-41-7): The UK considered that further time is required to complete a detailed assessment of this substance and volunteered to undertake this task and present its findings at OIC 2015. It was proposed that the substance is retained on the PLONOR List until then;

2. *Amylase α Aspergillus oryzae* (CAS 9000-90-2): The PNEC is derived from an EC50 that is inconsistent with PLONOR status, but the data is derived from a single study only. The UK therefore recommended that caution is exercised before taking any action, and invited industry to provide data to support retention on the PLONOR List for review at OIC 2015;

3. *Calcium sulphate* (Gypsum, CAS 7778-18-9): The precautionary statement P273 applied to this substance is considered to relate to landfill disposal of the solid waste, and it would not be relevant for operational discharge in the marine environment. The UK therefore recommended retention on the PLONOR List;

4. *Iron (III) oxide* (Fe2O3, CAS1309-37-1): The low LC50 was obtained from a single test that was ranked as unreliable (no PNEC is presented), and the hazard classification H411 contradicts the registrant's conclusion that aquatic toxicity is unlikely. The UK considered that the information provided does not present a coherent case to support the removal of the substance from the PLONOR List, and therefore recommended its retention;

5. *Methanol* (CAS 67-56-1): Methanol has been classified as a suspected carcinogen and further investigation is scheduled under the ECHA CoRAP programme. The UK therefore recommended retention on the PLONOR List pending the outcome of those investigations;

6. *Silica sand* (CAS 14808-60-7): a minority of self-classifications listed in the ECHA CLP Inventory considered the substance to be carcinogenic and/or mutagenic, although most registrants did not support this view. As OIC concluded in 2013 that only the harmonised classification data for a registered substance should be taken into consideration, the UK recommended retention on the PLONOR List pending full registration;

7. *Silicon Dioxide (CAS 7631-86-9):* this substance has been registered as a biocide under the Biocidal Products Regulation, but the toxicity data indicates that no acute or chronic toxicity effects would be expected in the marine environment. The UK therefore recommended retention on the PLONOR List;

8. *Urea (CAS 57-13-6):* the low PNEC value is derived from a single algal toxicity test whilst another two algal toxicity tests indicated that the substance was effectively non-toxic (all three studies have the same reliability rating). The mean of the three results is also indicative of low toxicity. The UK considered that the information provided does not present a convincing case to support the removal of the substance from the PLONOR List, and therefore recommended its retention;

9. *Disodium tetraborate, anhydrous ($Na_2B_4O_7$, CAS 1330-43-4):* the classification H360 was discussed at OIC 2011, and it was agreed that it was not relevant to the marine environment. The UK therefore recommended retention on the PLONOR List;

10. *Sodium nitrite ($NaNO_2$, CAS 7632-00-0):* the classification H400 is inconsistent with PLONOR status, but the data is dominated by freshwater studies, and the results of the small number of seawater studies support the conclusion reached at OIC 2009 that there was no evidence to indicate that marine toxicity was a concern. The UK therefore recommended retention on the PLONOR List.

4.3 The review exercise undertaken by ICG-REACH also identified a single Annex XIV REACH categorisation for Aluminosilicate Refractory Ceramic Fibres, as H350 carcinogenic (Cat 1B) by inhalation. However the UK did not consider this to be relevant to the related offshore chemical (*Aluminium silicate* (CAS 1335-30-4) included on the PLONOR List.

4.4 EOSCA presented OIC 14/4/2, which provided comments on OIC 14/4/1. EOSCA stressed that it must be remembered that PLONOR criteria refer to the marine environment not to human health. Data relevant to the latter, for example for mammalian toxicity, may not necessarily apply in the marine environment. EOSCA supported the retention of Ammonium Hydroxide; Calcium Sulphate (Gypsum); Iron (III) Oxide (Fe_2O_3); Silica Sand; Silicon Dioxide; Urea; Disodium Tetraborate, anhydrous ($Na_2B_4O_7$); and Sodium Nitrite ($NaNO_2$) on the PLONOR List.

4.5 In a short discussion, Norway pointed out that Silicon Dioxide has been registered as a biocide under product type PT18 and questioned whether it was appropriate to retain a biocide on the PLONOR List. Regarding Urea, as the substance does not qualify as PLONOR on the basis of the 47 ppm EC50 result used to calculate its PNEC, Norway recommended the collection of further data on this substance before making a decision on whether or not to retain it on the PLONOR List. On Disodium tetraborate, anhydrous, Norway recalled discussions held at OIC 2011 on the reprotoxic labelling of this substance. The reprotoxicity labelling is maintained for this substance as well as for several other borates, and therefore they do not fulfill the PLONOR criteria, in Norway's opinion. Norway recommended a further evaluation be carried out to inform any future decision on whether or not to remove this substance from the PLONOR List. Denmark supported the collection of further data on these substances.

4.6 Based on the discussion, OIC agreed:

a. that Calcium Sulphate (Gypsum, CAS 7778-18-9); Iron (III) oxide (Fe_2O_3, CAS1309-37-1); Methanol (CAS 67-56-1); Silica Sand (CAS 14808-60-7) and Sodium Nitrite ($NaNO_2$, CAS 7632-00-0) should be retained on the PLONOR List;

b. that the decision on whether to retain Ammonium Hydroxide (CAS 7664-41-7); Silicon Dioxide (CAS 7631-86-9); Urea (CAS 57-13-6) and Disodium Tetraborate, anhydrous ($Na_2B_4O_7$, CAS 1330-43-4) on the PLONOR List should be deferred until completion of a detailed assessment of these substances by OIC 2015;

c. that to this end the UK would review Ammonium Hydroxide (CAS 7664-41-7) and Norway would review Silicon Dioxide (CAS 7631-86-9); Urea (CAS 57-13-6) and Disodium Tetraborate, anhydrous ($Na_2B_4O_7$, CAS 1330-43-4) and both Contracting Parties would present their findings and recommendations at OIC 2015. In order to facilitate the UK and Norway to undertake this review, Contracting Parties should provide them with any relevant information by 1 September 2014;

d. that the decision on whether to retain Amylase α Aspergillus oryzae (CAS 9000-90-2) on the PLONOR List should be deferred until OIC 2015, in order to allow industry to provide data to support its retention on the PLONOR List;

e. to confirm that the Annex XIV REACH categorisation for Aluminosilicate Refractory Ceramic Fibres is not relevant to the inclusion of Aluminium Silicate (CAS 1335-30-4) on the PLONOR List.

Agenda Item 5 – OSPAR Harmonised Mandatory Control System (HMCS) and EU REACH Regulation

OIC 14/5/1-4

OSPAR Guidelines for completing the Harmonised Offshore Chemical Notification Format (HOCNF)

5.1 As per its ToR, ICG-REACH reviewed OSPAR Recommendation 2010/4 on a Harmonised Pre-screening Scheme for Offshore Chemicals to incorporate reference to the use of REACH simulation test data. ICG-REACH agreed that it was unnecessary to amend OSPAR Recommendation 2010/4 for this purpose as the proposed approach is covered by the existing reference to *"any other OSPAR-accepted marine protocol"* in

§3.2.h (i) of the Recommendation. However, as indicated in OIC 14/5/1, ICG-REACH recommended amending the OSPAR Guidelines for completing the Harmonised Offshore Chemical Notification Format (HOCNF) (Agreement 2012-05) by inserting:

1. a new paragraph 60 that explains how the raw data from REACH simulation tests can be used in the Pre-screening Scheme;
2. a new Appendix 5 that gives extensive information regarding the use of raw data from REACH simulation tests to derive percentage biodegradability figures.

5.2 As further tasked in its ToR, ICG-REACH considered and concluded on the relevant data requirements for the registration of inseparable mixtures of substances, where testing at the substance level is considered inappropriate. ICG-REACH noted that there were inseparable mixtures covered by the OSPAR HMCS, for example the grease components in pipe dopes or jacking greases. Although the grease component is composed of a number of substances, it is treated as a single substance for the purpose of HOCNF testing, but the additives to the grease must still be tested separately. ICG-REACH agreed that this approach could be used by Contracting Parties for other inseparable mixtures or unresolved complex mixtures, and recommended OIC 2014 to endorse that proposal by including in the OSPAR Guidelines for completing the HOCNF (OIC 14/5/1):

1. a new paragraph 36 that clarifies the registration requirements for inseparable mixtures or unresolved complex mixtures, such as the grease components of pipe dopes and jacking greases.

5.3 In addition, the UK proposed the inclusion, in the OSPAR Guidelines for completing the HOCNF, of a new paragraph 32 to elaborate on the procedure for the assessment of chemicals where there is a reaction between the component substances (OIC 14/5/1).

5.4 Contracting Parties supported ICG-REACH proposals to amend OSPAR Guidelines for completing the HOCNF by including new paragraphs 32, 36 and 60 and new Appendix 5. OIC agreed **on the revised OSPAR Guidelines for completing the Harmonised Offshore Chemical Notification Format as presented in Annex 4.** OIC instructed the Secretariat to inform OSPAR 2014 of the update of the OSPAR Guidelines.

OECD 306 and BODIS tests

5.5 As instructed in its ToR, ICG-REACH considered and concluded on an assessment of the OECD 306 biodegradation test in the context of the Harmonised Pre-screening Scheme set out in OSPAR Recommendation 2010/4, with a view to determining whether OIC should recommend an improved test methodology e.g. an 'enhanced' method as referenced in the REACH guidance. In this context, the UK presented OIC 14/5/3, which summarised the difficulties encountered with the existing OECD 306 and OECD 301 test methods used for the hazard assessment of offshore chemicals, and invited OIC to consider the organisation of an intersessional workshop to develop a ring-test. The Netherlands presented OIC 14/5/4, which provided a summary of the anomalies found when reviewing the Marine BODIS biodegradation test reports submitted in support to the registration of offshore chemicals for use in the Netherlands and the UK, identifying problems that included the use of wrong test concentrations, the underestimation of the theoretical oxygen demand (ThOD) and chemical oxygen demand (COD) data, and the underestimation of or lack of consideration of nitrification.

5.6 Contracting Parties backed the UK proposal to hold an intersessional workshop to develop a ring-test to evaluate the enhanced methodology for the OECD 306 test and suggested that the workshop should also evaluate the Marine BODIS test. Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway and EOSCA confirmed their participation in the workshop, which will be opened to *inter alia* all OSPAR Contracting Parties and observers. On the BODIS test, it was further suggested that the OSPAR Guidelines for completing the HOCNF should elaborate on the conditions of use of the Marine BODIS test. OIC agreed:

a. **to invite the UK to set up a UK inter-sessional workshop with a view to developing a ring test to evaluate the enhanced methodology for the OECD 306 and Marine BODIS tests, and report back on the results to OIC 2015;**

b. **to invite the Netherlands to review the OSPAR Guidelines for completing the Harmonised Offshore Chemical Notification Format as presented in Annex 4, to take into account the discussion of the Marine BODIS test, and to report back at OIC 2015.**

Harmonisation of bioaccumulation and toxicity criteria

5.7 As per its ToR, ICG-REACH considered the harmonisation of bioaccumulation and toxicity criteria set out in the Harmonised Pre-screening Scheme with the criteria specified within OSPAR (DYNAMEC) and REACH. ICG-REACH accepted that there were differences in the bioaccumulation and toxicity criteria but noted that it had been agreed during earlier discussion of REACH harmonisation at OIC 2009 that it was acceptable for the HMCS to incorporate more stringent criteria. ICG-REACH therefore recommended to the meeting that no action should be taken at the present time, but it would be appropriate to reconsider this issue after 2018, when the REACH registration process would be completed and data would be available covering the vast majority of offshore chemicals. **OIC endorsed ICG-REACH's recommendation and agreed to include in the OIC 2019 Programme of Work a product on the harmonisation of bioaccumulation and toxicity criteria set out in OSPAR Pre-screening Scheme, OSPAR (DYNAMEC) and REACH.**

Assessment of substances that incorporate a biodegradable molecular component

5.8 As further tasked in its ToR, ICG-REACH considered how to deal with substances that contain a biodegradable molecular component, or are modified to contain such a biodegradable component, and are confirmed to be acceptable when subjected to biodegradation tests such as the OECD306 test, but are degraded to form non-biodegradable products. ICG-REACH agreed that there was a need to evaluate potential degradation products when assessing offshore chemicals and the ICG considered different approaches to do so following OIC 2013. However, ICG-REACH felt that further work was needed to take this matter forward and recommended that the meeting should address this issue once the UK had pursued it with other Contracting Parties. **OIC endorsed ICG-REACH's recommendation and agreed to invite the UK to develop a proposal for evaluation of potential degradation products for consideration at OIC 2015.**

Other chemicals issues

5.9 OIC noted that ICG-REACH had collected Contracting Party comments on the CHARM User Guide, and that the UK had forwarded the comments to OGP for consideration by the CHARM Implementation Network (CIN). OIC further noted that during ICG-REACH the Netherlands had provided an update on the checks on Manufacturers' Safety Data Sheets being trialled by the Netherlands and agreed that **further details on this topic should be provided to OIC in future.**

Review of OSPAR Recommendations 2010/3 and 2010/4

5.10 The UK presented OIC 14/5/2, and proposed mminor amendments to the HOCNF form annexed to OSPAR Recommendation 2010/3.

5.11 OIC agreed **to recommend adoption of the draft OSPAR Recommendation 2014/XX to OSPAR 2014, amending OSPAR Recommendation 2010/3 on Harmonised Offshore Chemical Notification Format (HOCNF) as presented in Annex 5**. The draft recommendation will be forwarded to JL 2014.

5.12 The UK indicated that it had conducted a review of OSPAR Recommendation 2010/4 on a Harmonised Pre-screening Scheme, and concluded that no changes to the document were required.

Agenda Item 6– Other chemical issues

OIC 14/6/1-4

Fire Fighting Foams (FFFs)

6.1 Following up on OIC 2013 conclusions, Norway had conducted a data collection exercise to assess the discharges of FFFs by OSPAR Contracting Parties. ICG-REACH agreed the final format of the spread-sheet for the collection of information, and on the basis of returns received from Denmark, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway and the UK, Norway had prepared and presented paper OIC 14/6/1. OIC was invited to consider the amendment of paragraphs 3 and 5 of OSPAR Agreement 2002/6 on Common Interpretation on which Chemicals are Covered and not Covered by the HMCS under OSPAR Decision 2002/2, so that FFFs would fall under the category of chemicals covered by the HMCS under OSPAR Decision 2002/2.

6.2 The Norwegian proposal, supported by Denmark, triggered discussion on the use and discharge of FFFs in the OSPAR maritime area. FFFs may contain perfluorinated compounds (PFCs), such as PFOs and PFOA, which can cause serious health and environmental concerns. Nevertheless, it was noted that FFFs are not currently regulated through the HMCS, and the UK indicated that it did not consider that FFFs should be controlled under HMCS as there are other mechanisms that could be used to control discharges. Some Contracting Parties, including Norway and the UK, had also implemented the use of alternative FFFs that do not contain PFCs. Safety-related issues were further noted, as in some countries, like the UK, the testing regime rests with the Civil Aviation Authority. EOSCA stated that FFFs were also used in shipping and that it was important to see what contribution the offshore industry made to the overall discharges. It was felt that further work was needed before OIC could conclude on this point.

6.3 UK could not accept the Norwegian proposal and wanted to collect more information from the UK sector. They were concerned about the risk of restricting FFFs chemical use as a response to a HOCNF requirement, and also wanted to ensure that any permitting requirement would not affect offshore safety. OIC agreed to invite **Norway and the UK to undertake further assessment of the information relating to the components, use and discharge of FFFs submitted by Contracting Parties and to report back on the results to OIC 2015.**

Closed System Chemicals

6.4 The UK introduced OIC 14/6/4, which provided details of their interpretation of OSPAR Agreement 2002/6 and their policies in relation to the authorisation of closed system chemicals. In the UK, the policy in relation to closed system is related to the requirement for periodic discharge of the chemicals, rather than periodic refill of the systems as referred to in OSPAR Agreement 2002/6. The policy can be summarised as follows:

1. chemicals in 'closed systems' where there are no losses or periodic discharges to the marine environment do not require to be registered or permitted;
2. chemicals in 'closed systems' where there are losses or periodic discharges to the marine environment must be registered and permitted;
3. unregistered chemicals drained from closed systems for any reason must be returned to shore for treatment and/or disposal;
4. registered chemicals drained from closed systems can be permitted for discharge to the marine environment, provided there is an acceptable risk assessment;
5. offshore operators are encouraged to register all closed system chemicals, irrespective of whether this is necessary to comply with UK policy;

6. in all cases, accidental releases of all closed system chemicals, irrespective of whether they are registered on unregistered chemicals must be reported to the Department of Energy and Climate Change.

6.5 Only the UK had submitted information on this matter. Given that most of the information was still to be collected, OIC agreed on the following arrangements:

a. Contracting Parties who had not already done so should send to Norway details of their interpretation of OSPAR Agreement 2002/6 in relation to the authorisation of closed system chemicals by 1 September 2014;

b. based on information provided in OIC 14/6/4 and additional returns received, Norway should prepare an overview of Contracting Parties' policies in relation to the authorisation of closed system chemicals for OIC 2015.

Lost Circulation Materials

6.6 OIC noted information provided in OIC 14/6/3, which summarised the UK action to implement the OIC 2013 decision on zero discharge of plastic Lost Circulation Materials (LCM). The UK interprets the scope of the decision to include all solid plastic materials that could be released into the marine environment in a form that could result in an adverse impact on the biota. Applications for chemical permits will therefore be scrutinised to confirm whether any of the chemicals contain solid plastic materials, and whether there are any proposed discharges of these materials. To this end, a list of existing products containing solid plastic materials will gradually be compiled and these products will be flagged as "Contain Plastic" in the ranking lists of offshore chemicals published on the Cefas Offshore Chemical Notification Scheme (OCNS) website.

Agenda Item 7 – Follow-up on OSPAR Recommendation 2010/8 on the prevention of acute oil pollution

OIC 14/7/1

7.1 OIC 2012 endorsed the conclusions from the ICG-DRILLEX work following OSPAR Recommendation 2010/18 that there was no need for a specific OSPAR measure at this time; but that a reassessment of this conclusion after the finalisation and adoption of the proposed EU Offshore Safety Regulation would be appropriate. OIC 2013 agreed to revisit the ICG-DRILLEX conclusion to see if further action was needed and the UK agreed to be the leader for this task. The UK introduced OIC 14/7/1, which presented an assessment of the ICG-DRILLEX conclusion in light of the adoption of Directive 2013/30/EU on Offshore Safety. The Directive entered into force in 2013, but Member States have until 19 July 2015 to transpose it into national law. The European Commission has also set up the EU Offshore Authorities Group (EUOAG) to examine, amongst other topics, the data reporting requirements of the Directive and how these might best be met. Since the Directive is focussed on major hazards, the reporting format associated with the Directive will cover major accidents as defined by the Directive, but not other categories of incidents.

7.2 In discussion, *inter alia* the following key points were raised. The UK pointed out that work is underway in the EUOAG on the development of a common data reporting format, the exact scope of which remains to be determined in light of the requirements set in the Annexes to the Directive. The next EUOAG meeting will revisit this topic and discuss the modalities of reporting. This would be an excellent opportunity for OSPAR Contracting Parties and/or the Secretariat to call for regional coordinated information reporting in order to reduce reporting effort and duplication. Norway and Iceland stressed that they have comprehensive national regulations in place covering not only major incidents, as covered by the Directive, but other categories of incidents. Norway and Denmark mentioned extensive cooperation with EMSA regarding preparedness and response activities.

7.3 Based on the discussion, OIC agreed:

a. **to encourage Contracting Parties that are not EU Member States to adopt equivalent measures to those laid down in Directive 2013/30/EU in order to prevent major environmental incidents;**

b. **to invite Iceland, Norway and Greenland to detail their national regulations to prevent major incidents at OIC 2015;**

c. **to encourage Contracting Parties that are signatories to the Bonn Agreement to assist EMSA where relevant in undertaking the tasks laid down in Article 10 of the Directive 2013/30/EU, in particular in relation to its development of a catalogue of emergency equipment and services;**

d. **to follow developments in the EUOAG as regards the common data reporting format in order to seek a coordinated approach to reporting.** To this end, OSPAR Contracting Parties are encouraged to brief their national representatives to the EUOAG and the Secretariat is encouraged to explore the possibility of attending the next EUOAG meeting.

Agenda Item 8 – Reporting on incidents and placement of CO2

OIC 14/8/Info.1-OIC 14/8/Info.4

8.1 The UK presented document OIC 14/8/Info.1 (report of a methane release in UK waters) which provided further information in relation to the independent technical studies relating to the release and informed the meeting that independent researchers are now working on a peer-reviewed special edition of a scientific publication which is due to be published later this year. The UK advised that it will inform Contracting Parties when the studies are published. 8.2 The UK introduced an information paper on the Elgin gas and condensate release (OIC 14/8/Info.2). Following completion of the Elgin well securing operations, Total had undertaken further monitoring and the results of all the studies undertaken during and after the incident are detailed in the environmental impact assessment report. The UK mentioned they would be hosting a wash-up meeting with Total in the near future. Any comments on this report should therefore be sent to the UK so that they could raise the issues with Total.

8.3 The UK presented an update on an EU collaborative project - "Site Char" (OIC 14/8/Info.3), and a paper summarising information relating to potential Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) projects on the UK Continental Shelf (UKCS) (OIC 14/8/Info.4). The UK informed the meeting that since the latter paper had been issued the UK government had also announced the decision to award a contract for the funding for the Front End Engineering and Design (FEED) study for the Peterhead CCS project referred to in OIC 14/8/Info.4. Two projects are therefore now progressing into the next stage.

Agenda Item 9 – Work of the OIC Expert Assessment Panel

OIC 14/9/1-OIC 14/9/5

9.1 The Convenor of the EAP (Mr Andrew Taylor) presented document OIC 14/9/1 on the work done by the EAP and introduced the report of the meeting of the EAP which took place in Paris, 28 – 30 January 2014 (OIC 14/9/2). OIC considered the proposed tables for the reporting of risk-based approach assessments at Annex 3 of the meeting report, which would be included in Part A of the annual report. OIC agreed that the table in **Annex 3 to OIC 14/9/2 would be used on a trial basis but that the reporting format should be subject to review on a regular basis**.

9.2 On behalf of the EAP the Convenor proposed the development of an IT system to allow submission of Contracting Parties' annual data and generation of the Part A and B reports, rather than relying on spreadsheets and manual data entry. The Secretariat informed the meeting that a preliminary version of a "Discharge, Spills and Emissions from Offshore Installations" database has been created at the Secretariat

and that this will calculate, when provided with the correct figures, the resultant values for Parts A and B in a tabular format. To further advance work on this area, the Secretariat suggested and OIC agreed **that the EAP should consult with the Secretariat to discuss the matter further and to consider whether the development of the IT system could be dealt with within the OSPAR data and information management system (ODIMS).** Contracting Parties wishing to comment should contact the Convenor, who will then have a telephone conference with relevant Secretariat staff. The Convenor also raised the question of the country specific assesment reports and OIC agreed **to include in the OIC Work Programme (2014-2015) a product reflecting the fact that Norway and the UK will present their specific assessments reports by OIC 2015.**

9.3 The EAP Convenor presented three further documents:

a. the draft OSPAR report on discharges, spills and emissions from offshore oil and gas installations in 2012 (OIC 14/9/3). **OIC agreed that this report should be recommended to OSPAR for publication subject to the inclusion of the Spanish data, to be received with the next two weeks**;

b. the draft assessment of the OSPAR report on discharges and emissions to air from offshore installations, 2010-2012 (OIC 14/9/4). **OIC agreed that this report should be recommended to OSPAR for publication;**

c. the draft assessment sheet on produced water discharges from offshore oil and gas installations, 2007-2012 (OIC 14/9/5). After a proposal by France, supported by OGP, OIC agreed that the reference to "drill cuttings" would be deleted. **OIC also agreed that the final version of the assessment sheet, edited by the Secretariat, would be sent to the EAP for final approval before being recommended to OSPAR for publication.**

9.4 The EAP prepared a Terms of Reference which were adopted as at **Annex 6**.

Agenda Item 10 – Possible effects of regular lighting from offshore installations

OIC 14/10/1-2

Draft Guidelines on mitigation measures to reduce the impact of platform lighting on birds in high risk areas

10.1 The possible effects of regular lighting from offshore installations have been a standing item on the OIC Agenda since 2008. Under the co-lead of Germany and the Netherlands, this item has been taken forward throughout different meeting cycles, including the holding of an OSPAR Workshop in 2012, the report of which was published by OSPAR 2012 (OSPAR 2012/568). In 2013, as a way forward, OIC agreed on a two-step approach, which included the development of draft guidelines detailing voluntary practical measures to reduce the impact of platform lighting on birds in high risk areas and the collection of further evidence.

10.2 Following up on the OIC 2013 conclusions, Germany presented a proposal for draft OSPAR Guidelines on mitigation measures to reduce the impact of platform lighting on birds in high risk areas (OIC 14/10/1). The draft Guidelines build on the conclusions from the OSPAR 2012 Workshop and contain a set of measures to optimize the lighting equipment of oil and gas installations in the OSPAR maritime area. These measures refer to decommissioning, switching, optimum alignment and light guidance shields, control via the process control system and encasing the drilling tower.

10.3 In the ensuing discussion, the UK stated that they did not find reasonable grounds for concern that conventional lighting of offshore platforms could affect migratory birds at a population level. However, they had no objection to the development of guidelines to address this topic, as long as it is made it clear

that they are not legally binding but voluntary and suggested that they should not have the status of an OSPAR "agreement". Denmark, France and Norway supported the views of the UK.

10.4 Regarding the content of the draft guidelines, Contracting Parties felt that the guidelines needed further refinement to make them operational. For instance, since the guidelines have no biding force, the language used must reflect this fact. In addition, it would be advisable to restructure the guidelines to be reader-friendly, concise and unambiguous. It should be clear from the beginning to whom the guidelines are directed and also their purpose and scope. In refining the section on measures, safety implications as well as the difference between existing and new installations should be addressed.

10.5 Denmark and the Netherlands informed the meeting of preliminary discussions held with operators on the draft guidelines. Operators consulted saw the draft guidelines as a point of departure for further discussion and work. Sweden referred to HELCOM Recommendation 34E/1 on Safeguarding important bird habitats and migration routes in the Baltic Sea from negative effects of wind and wave energy production at sea. The Recommendation was adopted by the 2013 HELCOM Ministerial Meeting and may serve as inspiration for further developing the draft guidelines. The Recommendation is available at http://helcom.fi/Recommendations/Rec%2034E-1.pdf

10.6 Germany recalled the conclusion of the 2012 OSPAR Workshop that there is sufficient evidence to confirm that conventional lighting of human-made offshore structures has impact on large numbers of birds. Evidence is, however, not sufficient to conclude that there is an effect on populations, nor is there evidence to exclude such population effects.

10.7 OGP questioned the basis for developing guidelines in relation to mitigating the impact of regular platform lighting on birds, on the grounds that there were no sufficient data to conclude that platform lighting has a significant impact on migratory birds at population level. On the German experience in implementing mitigation measures as presented in the preamble of the draft guidelines, OGP pointed out that cases described were quite unique and that it could not be inferred from them that an OSPAR-wide measure, such as guidelines, is needed. In the view of OGP, developing guidelines would implicitly recognise that this is an issue in the OSPAR maritime area.

10.8 Based on the discussion, OIC agreed on the actions below to take work forward:

a. **Contracting Parties and observers should send to Germany their comments on the draft Guidelines on mitigation measures to reduce the impact of platform lighting on birds in high risk areas, as presented in OIC 14/10/1 by 21 April 2014;**

b. **based on input received, Germany should prepare a revised version of the draft Guidelines on mitigation measures to reduce the impact of platform lighting on birds in high risk areas for OIC 2015.**

Systematic data collection on the effects of platform illumination on migratory birds

10.9 Following up on the OIC 2013 conclusions, the Netherlands developed a proposal for further systematic data collection on the effects of platform illumination on migratory birds. The research programme presented in OIC 14/10/2 entails data collection in three areas in the North Sea (South, Central and North), during three periods (September, October and November) as follows:

1. *Step 1: Monitoring*. Data collection by monitoring bird numbers, victims, behaviour, and movements (visual observations) in combination with weather conditions on 9 selected platforms during September, October and November over a period of three years. Data collection by monitoring bird numbers and movements in detail on at least one platform per cluster during September, October and November over a period of three years;
2. *Step 2: Experiments.* Estimation of the actual number of victims by doing experiments with dead/dummy birds and placing horizontal nets on the 9 selected platforms once per year;

3. *Step 3: Analysis.* Combine data on mortality, behaviour, movements, weather conditions and number of actual victims, to get a better North Sea wide estimation of the number of birds (species specific) that die due to collisions with illuminated offshore structures in relation to the numbers of birds that make use of the North Sea during migration. Based on these findings, low and high risk areas and periods of time can be assigned and if necessary, mitigation regulations can be taken.

10.10 The Netherlands proposal indicated that participation from Denmark, Norway and the UK would be essential to cover the central and northern North Sea. The UK, Norway and Denmark advocated that participation in the proposed research programme should be voluntary and that Contracting Parties could encourage but not impose operators participation in the programme. OGP stated that operators may be reluctant to conduct such a detailed research programme, the costs of which could be significant. In this context, Denmark, Norway and the UK indicated that the cost implications and layout of the proposed research programme needed to be further discussed with operators before concluding on the programme. The Netherlands stated that the estimated costs for collection of data based on the proposal are approximately €200 000 per Contracting Party. The impression of Norway was that the cost of €200 000 was per installation, not Contracting Party (with different numbers of installations per Contracting Party included in the proposal). The UK queried whether information collected through the programme would shape the development of guidelines, or whether the guidelines would feed into the programme. Germany supported the Netherlands proposal.

10.11 Based on the discussion, OIC agreed on the following steps to take this work forward:

a. Contracting Parties and observers should send to the Netherlands their comments on the recommendations put forward in paragraph 9 of OIC 14/10/2 on a proposal for further systematic data collection on the effects of platform illumination on migratory birds by 21 April 2014;

b. on the basis of input received, the Netherlands should recommend a way forward to advance work by 12 May 2014. The Secretariat will invite OIC HODs to conclude on a way forward before the document deadline for the OSPAR Commission meeting (30 May 20124) in order to allow for any adjustments in the OIC work programme;

c. the Netherlands should present to OIC 2015 a progress report on developments of the systematic data collection to study the effects of platform illumination on migratory birds.

Agenda Item 11 – Ageing installations

OIC 14/11/1 Rev. 1

11.1 The OSPAR Offshore Oil and Gas Industry Strategy states in its paragraph 4.2.j that the OSPAR Commission will investigate whether there are specific environmental issues relating to ageing installations and infrastructure and, if required, develop appropriate measures. Environmental issues relating to ageing installations have been on the OIC Agenda since 2012, with the Netherlands acting as the task leader for this OIC product. As a first step to take work forwards, in 2012 a questionnaire was sent to Contracting Parties. Returns were received from Norway and the United Kingdom and on the basis of them, the Netherlands prepared a preliminary analysis for OIC 2013. OIC agreed to complete the collection of data as a basis for the Netherlands to carry out a full analysis to OIC 2014. Following up on OIC conclusions, and based on additional data from Denmark, the Netherlands prepared OIC 14/11/1 Rev. 1, which points out that:

1. there is no clear relationship between ageing and environmental performance;
2. the relationship between ageing and risk for pollution into the sea is captured by OSPAR Recommendation 2001/1 on the management of produced water;

3. in addition to OSPAR Recommendation 2001/1, OSPAR Recommendation 2012/5 on a Risk-based approach is also aimed at avoiding the most hazardous substances into the sea.

11.2 The Netherlands concluded that there is neither need to further assess whether there are specific environmental issues relating to ageing installations nor for a specific OSPAR measure addressing environmental issues related to ageing. Norway, Denmark and the UK supported the view from the Netherlands. **OIC <u>agreed</u> to endorse the Netherlands' conclusion.**

Agenda Item 12 – Offshore developments in the Arctic

OIC 14/12/1

12.1 The North-East Atlantic Strategy states that the Commission should assess the suitability of existing measures to manage oil and gas activities in Region I and, where necessary, offer to contribute to the work on offshore oil and gas activities taking place under the Arctic Council, specifically under the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment Working Group (PAME). Work to fulfil this commitment started in 2012, when Norway, as task manager, designed a questionnaire for the collection of information. On the basis of returns received to the questionnaire, Norway prepared an overview of the returns as basis for an assessment by OIC of the suitability of existing measures to manage oil and gas activities in Region I for OIC 2013. At OIC 2013, diverging views were expressed on the need to adopt additional OSPAR measures to manage oil and gas activities in Region I and OIC agreed that more information was needed before a decision on the need for a specific OSPAR measure in the Arctic could be taken. Following up on the OIC 2013 conclusions and building on additional input from Contracting Parties, Norway conducted a further assessment of the suitability of existing measures to manage oil and gas activities in the Arctic as presented in OIC 14/12/1.

12.2 OIC 14/12/1 provides an overview of existing OSPAR measures on operational discharges (produced water/offshore chemicals), work in the Arctic Council, including PAME Arctic Offshore Oil and Gas Guidelines, and national regulations by OSPAR Contracting Parties with ongoing or upcoming activities in the Arctic (Iceland, Greenland, Norway). The document points out that: (1) there are comprehensive environmental regulations in those OSPAR Contracting Parties with ongoing offshore oil and gas activities in the Arctic; (2) existing OSPAR measures with regard to regular discharges are suitable for the Arctic part of Region I; (3) accidental discharges and emergency preparedness measures are not regulated through OSPAR, however issues relating to major accident hazards will be covered by EU Directive on Offshore Safety; and (4) PAME Guidelines cover all stages of the offshore oil and gas activities. Although they are not legally binding they represent the consensus across the Arctic countries on how to manage oil and gas activities. Against this background, Norway concluded that there is no need for new OSPAR measures specifically designed for the Arctic part of Region I.

12.3 In the ensuing discussion, Germany asked Norway on its position as regards the EU Directive on Offshore Safety, as Norway is not member of the EU but is part of the European Economic Area (EEA). Norway stated that in Norway the EU Directive is not considered as EEA relevant, although Norway has in place extensive legislation covering environmental risk from accidental discharges and emergency preparedness response. Iceland noted that the maps of Iceland presented in the annexes to OIC 14/12/1, needed a legend to explain accurately the limits of maritime boundaries. Denmark noted that the map in Annex 2 covered activities on the west coast of Greenland, which is not part of the OSPAR area as that only covers the east coast of Greenland.

12.4 Sweden questioned the Norwegian conclusion that no specific OSPAR measure was needed to regulate Arctic offshore oil and gas activities. Sweden argued that conditions in the Arctic (e.g. remoteness, low temperatures, presence of ice) imposed additional environmental challenges to oil and gas operators that called for particular OSPAR measures (Decisions or Recommendations), in addition to the existing ones. Noting that the OSPAR Strategy covers all phases of offshore activities, Sweden further argued that

neither the PAME Guidelines nor domestic legislation should prevent OSPAR from adopting specific measures on those topics not sufficiently detailed in the Guidelines, e.g. emergency preparedness and response. In this context, Sweden pointed out that the Guidelines have a very broad scope and are not mandatory. Sweden emphasised the need to keep the Arctic item on the OIC Agenda. Germany supported the views of Sweden.

12.5 While recognising the non-binding nature of the Guidelines, Norway stressed the fact that the Guidelines represent a uniform and agreed understating of the actions needed to protect the Arctic marine environment. The UK referred to the process in place in PAME to revisit the Guidelines and pointed out that the Bonn Agreement and not OSPAR should be the international organisation competent to deal with emergency preparedness and response issues.

12.6 Based on the discussion, OIC agreed:

a. to instruct the Secretariat to upload on the OSPAR website a revised version of OIC 14/2/1 with the correct legends for the maps of Iceland and Greenland;

b. that there is currently no need for a new OSPAR measure specifically designed for the Arctic part of Region I;

c. to keep the Arctic topic on the OIC Agenda through pursuing further cooperation between OSPAR and the Arctic Council Group, including by following developments in the Arctic Council Group (PAME). Sweden was invited to explore to act as lead country and to take forward work on this matter.

12.7 Mr Jan Rene Larsen from the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP) http://www.amap.no/ gave a presentation on the Arctic Council work http://www.arctic-council.org/index.php/en/ and latest developments in the Working Group on Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME). This included the development of Health, Safety and Environmental Management Systems for Arctic Offshore and Gas Operations (HS&E project) and the revision of the 2004 Arctic Marine Strategy Plan by 2015. Mr Larsen also informed OIC that AMAP's "Oil and Gas Assessment" (2007) will be updated in 2014 and that the next major assessment activity is the "Adaptation Action for a Changing Arctic" (AACA-C), and OSPAR has been invited to participate. There was a brief discussion about the governance structure of the Arctic Council, and it was noted that the most recent agreement between the Arctic Sates is on "Cooperation on Marine Oil Pollution – Preparedness and Response in the Arctic". OIC thanked Mr Larsen for his presentation.

Agenda Item 13 – Overall assessment of impacts of offshore oil and gas industry on the marine environment

OIC 14/13/1-4, OIC 14/13/Info. 1

13.1 In order to assess progress against the objectives of the Offshore Industry Strategy, the OSPAR Joint Assessment and Monitoring Programme 2010-2014 requires an assessment of the impact on the marine environment from offshore oil and gas activities to be carried out, the preparation of which was postponed until 2015. The overall assessment primarily builds on the assessment of the impact on the marine environment from: (1) possible releases of oil and chemicals from any disturbance of cutting piles (OIC 2013-2014 Programme of Work, Product 14), (2) the oil and offshore chemicals from the offshore industry (OIC 2013-2014 Programme of Work, Product 19), and (3) noise from the offshore oil and gas activities (OIC 2013-2014 Programme of Work, Product 18). As agreed in OIC 2013, Norway, Denmark and the UK took the lead to take work forward regarding OIC Products 14, 19 and 18, respectively.

13.2 Norway introduced OIC 14/3/2 on a draft assessment of possible releases of oil and chemicals from any disturbance of cutting piles. Replies to a set of questions circulated interssessionally were received

from Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Iceland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and the UK. A summary of the replies was presented by Norway as follows:

1. only Norway and the UK have had activities in the near vicinity of cutting piles since 2009;
2. only Norway have had releases from cutting piles since 2009, and all of these are as a consequence of dredging;
3. during the dredging activities of 4000 m3 at Ekofisk/Albuskjell in 2010 environmental monitoring was done. It was concluded that the pollutants were coupled to particles and the spreading of particles close to the seabed not far from the dredging site. There was little chance of accumulation in organisms although some physical effects are expected 100 m to 200 metres from the site;
4. during the summer of 2012 studies, similar to those at Albuskjell, were performed during dredging at Valhall. In the water column concentrations of PAH/NPD similar to those found elsewhere around the installation were found. The area where particles could be found was somewhat bigger than at Albuskjell (150 – 300 m), but the effects were once more seen near the seabed and most clearly closest to the dredging site.

13.3 In addition, OIC noted OIC 14/13/Info.1, from the UK, which provides a review of recent literature on cuttings pile disturbance; a presentation of recent modelling carried out for the decommissioning of an installation with a large historic cuttings pile; an analysis of the results of a cuttings pile over-trawling experiment; and a review of drill cuttings disturbance information relating to recent decommissioning operations on the UKCS.

13.4 The meeting further noted OIC 14/13/4, on comments from Greenpeace International on OIC 14/3/2 and OIC 14/13/Info.1. In the view of Greenpeace International, the assessments from Norway and UK have been based on a relatively limited body of information and there was insufficient detail on the chemical characteristics of cuttings piles to enable any detailed assessment. An example of the type of chemical data that may be more widely available, or which ultimately should be gathered, was provided in documentation relating to the Murchison decommissioning programme.

13.5 In the ensuing discussion, it became apparent that further data should be collated in order to better inform the assessment of cutting piles. The UK stressed that this should be done before entering into any review of OSPAR Recommendation 2006/5 on a management regime for offshore cuttings piles, as proposed by Greenpeace International. The UK also raised concerns over the potential for oil and chemicals to be released into the marine environment from the removal of cuttings piles. France noted that they do not have cutting piles. OGP stated that releases from any disturbance of cutting piles should be addressed separately from leakages of cuttings from reinjection wells.

13.6 Denmark presented OIC 14/13/1 on a draft assessment of the impact of oil and chemicals from the offshore industry on the environment. The paper builds on previous OIC assessments and information submitted intersessionally by the Netherlands, Norway and the UK on environmental concentrations and impacts of oil and chemicals on the marine environment. Denmark pointed out that for the draft assessment in OIC 14/13/1 to contribute to the overall assessment, there may be a need for the collection of further information. In this context, Denmark referred to the OSPAR RBA Recommendation, as a useful tool to provide data that could be used to identify which substances would be most relevant to initiate further investigations on the possible biological impacts on the biota in the sea.

13.7 The document submitted by Denmark triggered discussion on preparations for the OIC overall assessment and how the different underlying assessments would feed into it. It was generally felt that in order to conclude next year on the draft assessment of the impact of oil and offshore chemicals from the offshore industry, further information should be gathered on environmental impacts of produced water discharges on the water column and seabed.

13.8 The UK introduced OIC 14/13/3, which provided an overview of the work undertaken by Contracting Parties on the impact of noise from the offshore oil and gas industry on the marine environment as well as a draft overview assessment. In presenting their document, the UK pointed out the difficulties associated with quantifying the scale and extent of the impacts of the underwater noise, as there is great variability in the characterisation of the sound, the sensitivity of different species and the noise-generating activities.

13.9 Regarding impacts of underwater noise from offshore oil and gas activities, the Netherlands referred to ongoing research to validate models for underwater sound generation, propagation and reception with the aim of assessing the impact of anthropogenic noise on fish and marine mammals. The project is intended to provide a firm basis for future studies. Work on EIHA ICG-Noise was mentioned and it was felt that to take forward work on an assessment of the impacts of noise from offshore oil and gas activities, closer engagement with EIHA was needed to avoid any duplication of work.

13.10 Based on the discussion, OIC agreed:

a. **to postpone the development of the OIC overall assessment of impacts of offshore oil and gas industry on the marine environment until 2016.** This would allow OIC to further refine the underlying assessments to feed into the overall assessment. In addition, a 2016 publication date would allow a connection with the Intermediate Assessment for 2017;

b. **to invite Norway, Denmark and the UK to refine their assessments as presented in OIC 14/13/2, OIC 14/13/1 and OIC 14/13/3 respectively in light of additional input from Contracting Parties, in order to allow OIC 2015 to conclude on them.**

Agenda Item 14 – OIC and RSC coordination

OIC 14/14/1-2, OIC 14/14/Info. 1-2

14.1 The meeting examined OIC 14/14/2 in conjunction with OIC 14/14/Info1, which presented the main outcomes of the joint OIC/RSC meeting to promote closer cooperation between OIC and RSC in their shared areas of interest concerning the discharge of NORM from offshore oil and gas activities. The joint meeting was held on 6 September 2013 at the OSPAR Secretariat premises in London, was co-chaired by the OIC (Ms Hanne-Grete Nilsen) and RSC (Dr Justin Gwynn) Chairs and attended by OIC and RSC representatives from Norway and the United Kingdom. Recommendations arising from the joint OIC/RSC meeting included:

1. to move to the RSC work programme and then include in Theme R of the JAMP 2014-2013, OIC work products related to the assessment of discharges and the impacts on biota of NORM (in produced water and from descaling activities);

2. to further elaborate on current practices concerning sampling, analytical methodologies and reporting of NORM from offshore oil and gas activities;

3. to further elaborate on current practice concerning disposal of low specific activity scales and sludges.

14.2 The Secretariat informed the meeting on RSC 2014 conclusions to take this work forward. RSC 2014 agreed:

a. to extend continued cooperation between OIC and RSC EAP/Task Managers on NORM related issues from oil and gas activities;

b. that RSC should lead on collecting data on discharges and environmental concentrations, and assessing these data and the impacts of discharges on the marine environment. OIC should then be responsible for developing measures to reduce the inputs if the RSC assessment concludes that there is an unacceptable impact of NORM discharges on the marine environment;

c. that as follow-up of RSC 14/10/3 and RSC 14/10/4, the RSC and OIC EAPs should further review the current practice regarding disposal of low specific activity scales in order to present a review report to RSC and OIC by 2015;

d. to include in draft Theme R of JAMP 2014-2021 Product R-2 on: Assessment of impact of NORM in produced water [and scales and sludges].

14.3 The Secretariat further informed the meeting that RSC 2014 has agreed to adopt for the oil and gas sub-sector a baseline for Ra-226 and Ra-228 discharges based on the reported data for the years 2005-2011.

14.4 The UK made reference to the fact that in terms of methodology for the assessment of effects of NORM discharges, RSC had also advised that there was no value in determining the baseline environmental concentrations as it would not be possible to distinguish the input from oil and gas sector from the natural environmental concentration. The IAEA methodology currently under development for the nuclear sector could be used for the non-nuclear sector for assessing the impacts. Such assessment will be dependent upon obtaining reliable discharge data from Contracting Parties. In terms of management measures to reduce NORM discharges, the UK confirmed that by implementing OSPAR Recommendation 2001/1, these discharges are, where possible, already being reduced by implementing produced water re-injection.

14.5 RSC 14/10/3 summarises the responses from Contracting Parties in relation to sampling and analytical methodologies for produced water and sand discharges. The UK noted that Germany and Ireland indicated they had no sand discharges; Norway indicated that the reporting requirement only applied to produced water; and the Netherlands detailed their sampling and analytical protocol but failed to address the other questions in the questionnaire. The UK advised that it has provided details of practices relating to produced water and sand discharges whilst other Contracting Parties have not provided a full account of any sand discharges.

14.6 OIC welcomed the initiative taken by the Chairs of OIC and RSC to establish closer co-operation between the two committees on NORM issues related to offshore oil and gas activities and endorsed **conclusions from RSC 2014 as presented in §14.2.a-c above.** In addition, OIC agreed **to include in the OIC work programme for the next meeting cycle (2014-2015) a work product on further conclusions on the need for any action regarding disposal of NORM in the form of low specific activity scales and sludges.**

14.7 OIC noted the draft assessment of the discharges of radionuclides from the non-nuclear sub-sectors (section on the oil and gas sub-sector) in 2012 (OIC 14/14/1).

Agenda Item 15 – Preparation of contributions to Theme O of JAMP 2014-2021

OIC 14/15/1; OIC 14/15/Info. 1

15.1 As background for discussion on preparation of contributions to JAMP 2014-2021, the meeting noted document OIC 14/15/Info.1, which summarized current developments on taking forward work on Theme A of JAMP 2014-2021 and on the 2017 Intermediate Assessment, within the Task Group established under CoG, under the lead of Prof. C., Moffat (UK) and the Chairs of the five main OSPAR Committees. In this context, OIC considered a proposal for Theme O of JAMP 2014-2021 as presented in OIC 14/15/1. The proposal built on input provided at OIC 2013 and was drafted by the Working Group on Theme O of JAMP 2014-2021 following OSPAR 2013. The Working Group comprised of Denmark (task leader), Norway, the Netherlands and the UK. They worked intersessionally during the period 2013-2014 and held three phone conferences.

15.2 As presented in OIC 14/15/1, the draft Theme O for JAMP 2014-2021 included five major OIC products (i.e. assessment of impacts of offshore oil and gas industry on the marine environment, assessment of impacts of discharges of oil and chemicals in produced water on the marine environment;

assessment of the impacts/benefits of decommissioned pipelines on the marine environment and on other uses of the sea; assessment of impact of decommissioning on cutting piles and assessment of impacts of offshore oil and gas industry on the marine environment) to be delivered in the period 2014-2021. To further refine Theme O, a small drafting group was convened during OIC and reported back to the plenary to share progress. Following discussion at the drafting group and plenary, OIC agreed **to forward to CoG(1) 2014 the draft Theme O of JAMP 2014-2021 as presented in Annex 7** to allow CoG to finalise a consolidated draft of the entire JAMP for adoption at the OSPAR Commission meeting in 2014.

Agenda Item 16 – Interaction with OSPAR Coordination Group (CoG)

OIC 14/16/1-2

16.1 OIC noted current work under the OSPAR data and information management (OIC 14/16/2) and recent developments of the OSPAR Science Agenda (OSA) (OIC 14/16/1), which are currently taken forward by a CoG task group comprised of the Netherlands, Sweden and the UK. OIC confirmed that a better understanding of the link between discharges, spills and emissions of oil and chemicals and their effect on the marine environment is a priority science need.

Agenda Item 17 – Cooperation with the Bonn Agreement

OIC 14/17/1

17.1 Mr Ole Kristian Bjerkemo, Chairman of OTSOPA, updated the meeting on Bonn Agreement Activities and Report on Tour d'Horizon (TdH) for 2012. OIC noted the activities undertaken by the Bonn Agreement and endorsed the recommendations from the Bonn Agreement detailed below to improve reporting procedures to ensure good communication between flight crews and inspectors in relation to TdH flights.

a. Aircrew should be instructed to systematically contact the appropriate National Focal Point (NFP) by phone for each detection, if possible during the flight, and as soon as a written report is available they should send this report with photos and/or sensor images attached, preferably by mail, to the relevant coastal station with a request to acknowledge receipt;

b. It may be recommended to add the competent authorities as additional recipients of the written report. It may also be recommended to work with a TdH liaison officer or centre for detection reporting;

c. In general, aircrew should be instructed to keep closer contact with NFPs throughout the TdH mission, not only for the purpose of detection reporting, but also for changes in planning or for CSN alert verification efforts/possibilities;

d. Contracting Parties with offshore oil and gas platforms in their waters may consider a re-briefing of their NPFs and relevant coastal stations with regard to TdH missions and in particular agreed detection reporting and dispatching procedures.

17.2 Mr Bjerkemo also updated the meeting on the Bonn Agreement BE-AWARE Project which focuses on modelling the risks from collisions between ships, and between ships and maritime installations such as wind-farms or oil and gas platforms and the potential for any oil spills. On oil spills, the project looks at pollution risks from platform spill and Mr Bjerkemo referred to the oil spills forecasts from offshore oil and gas platforms for the period 2014-2020. This triggered a robust discussion on the accuracy of the predictions. The UK saw the predictions as misleading and confusing and questionned the reliability of them given the validated data on oil spills available in the OSPAR Annual Reports of on discharges, spills and emissions from offshore oil and gas installations. The same view was shared by Norway, France and the Nethelands. The UK added that the forecasts presented may reflect worse case scenarios included in oil pollution emergency plans, but noted that gas platforms were also included in the forecast.OIC requested Mr Bjerkemo to provide Contracting Parties an opportunity to comment on the draft report. OIC agreed

that Contracting Parties should send comments on the draft report to the Secretariat of the Bonn Agreement (John.Mouat@ospar.org). OIC thanked Mr Bjerkemo for his presentation and agreed **to continue cooperation with the Bonn Agreement in particular in relation with the BE-AWARE Project.**

17.3 M. Frédéric Hébert from REMPEC http://www.rempec.org/ gave a presentation on emergency, preparedness and response activities in REMPEC. He also informed the meeting of ongoing work in drafting an Action Plan for the implementation of the Protocol for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea Against Pollution Resulting from Exploration and Exploitation of the Continental Shelf and the Seabed and its Subsoil (Offshore Protocol), adopted in 1994 and in forced since March 2012. Mr Hébert referred to the challenges in implementing the Protocol in the Mediterranean area, including the liability provisions, and the two Workshops organized to take work forward. The OSPAR Secretariat informed the meeting on the participation of the Secretariat in these Workshops. OIC thanked Mr Hébert for his presentation and agreed **to continue cooperation between OSPAR and REMPEC.**

Agenda Item 18 – Draft Work Programme for 2014/2015 and meeting arrangements

18.1 On the basis of a working document prepared by the Secretariat in the light of the progress of the meeting, OIC agreed a draft 2014/2015 Programme of Work for the Offshore Industry Committee for adoption by OSPAR 2014 (as at **Annex 8**).

18.2 Taking into account the draft 2014/2015 Programme of Work, OIC agreed to **advise OSPAR 2014 to allocate 3 meeting days (tentatively 3-5 March 2015) for the work to be carried out by OIC in the next cycle of meetings**. The final decision about this should be made before the OSPAR Commission meeting in light of the experience from this meeting's Summary Record written procedure. It was also suggested that if it is decided to continue to use a written procedure for the approval of the Summary Record, the conclusions related to each agenda item should be presented and discussed before the closing of the meeting.

18.3 Germany very kindly offered to host the meeting of OIC 2015.

Agenda Item 19 – Any Other Business

19. There was no other business.

Agenda Item 20 – Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

20. OIC elected by acclamation Ms Hanne-Grete Nilsen as its Chair and Mr Mikael Palme Malinovsky as its Vice-Chairman for the next two intersessional periods 2014/2015 and 2015/2016.

Agenda Item 21 – Adoption of the Summary Record

21. The Summary Record of the meeting was adopted in a written procedure.