



Tony Quantrill Kerr McGee (Global Producer Mobile Platform) Setting Up From Scratch

BEHAVIOURAL SAFETY USER CONFERENCE 2002

Good afternoon ladies and gentleman. My name is Tony Quantrill and I work for Kerr McGee. I work on a floating platform in the East Shetland basin, a hundred and eighty miles east of Aberdeen. I've been asked to talk our experiences since the inception of our recent behavioural safety initiatives.



Firstly a bit of background. We brought a vessel over from Japan to Swan Hunter shipyard by the end of the year 2000. From the beginning of May last year the crew was raised for the ship, two weeks on, two weeks off. Tim Marsh and Mark Taylor of Ryder Marsh came around in the June and July to recruit volunteers for the behavioural safety system. Now those of us who have worked in the offshore industry before have encountered numerous safety issues over the years, all variations of the same theme and we were all a little sceptical about what we were been told, but we were willing to give it a shot. Initially there was 18 of us ready to volunteer. The ship, the 'Global Producer Three' was initially a storage tanker in the South China Sea. When it came to Swan Hunters to have all the production facilities installed, we had over 2000 shipyard workers and construction commission people swarming around the vessel. Cranes were working continuously to move all manner of hardware onto the boat, a hazardous situation.

The shipyard workers treated us with a great deal of suspicion at first, but once they realised that we weren't spies we were accepted a bit more. There were two gangways to the shore, one forward and one aft and they were to be avoided like the plague at certain times of the day, when the shift started or finished, breaks and meal times. If you were in that vicinity and you weren't trampled, you were carried bodily through to the works canteen. A couple of the incidents that stick in my mind about this time, was that there were about a dozen ship yard workers sat on the main deck and suspended over them was a very large load waiting to be loaded on the deck. They sat there watching it when you're not supposed to even walk under those. Eventually the penny dropped and there was a big starburst of people climbing over scaffold and equipment to get away. None of them were wearing safety hats. None of them were wearing safety glasses. Around this time a man fell 30 feet from some scaffolding onto the deck. When the Swan Hunter Safety man was asked how the faller was he said "It wasn't really a fall".

So some might say we were working on a virtual safety-free zone and so we were really starting from scratch. Early in our training we discussed a name for the process and we came up with 'Gloss'. We ran a competition for the workers and their families to name the process and this is what we came up with. Because of all the work going around we weren't able to implement the systems straight away as some parts of the ship had no clear access and Mark & Tim had warned us that if there was a delay, then morale would fall. We did actually manage to get up and running in the middle of December and then we tried to establish a base line to establish where the scores went from. In January and February, we conducted a number of presentations to the crew and the supervisors to raise awareness of 'Gloss'. We initially started out with 60 zones to measure, but we found that we couldn't do them all within an acceptable period of time. So we re-arranged them into segments of 40 minutes a time and now we've got seven "big" areas and we found that's the best way to do it.

So now we're up and running! We started to train observers, we've got three now and one of them is so keen he has to be physically restrained from taking measures. We've completed our six month review and are now ready to complete our accuracy and consistency checks, goal setting etc. Last May we were embarking on an unknown safety system, in a new vessel in a new oil field. Despite all the problems in the way, we are now a fully operational, efficient entity with no name and no blame.

Now I would like to answer a couple of questions that have been asked of me since I came here this morning. A few of you are unsure what behavioural safety is. It is an advisory process. If I go out onto the deck and find that there is someone working out there I'll go and talk to them. If I see that they are doing something wrong, or if I see someone using their equipment incorrectly, or they're not using the correct access, then I point that out to them. If I'm walking down the stairs and I pass someone with two or three boxes in their hand and not using the handrail then by your advice it would make them think about what they were doing.

Another question that I was asked was that if we use a no-name no-blame system and you observe someone doing a safety critical job, which they're doing wrong and it could go very badly wrong, then how is it possible to operate a no-name no-blame system. I answer this by saying that I would go up to them and telling them what they are doing wrong. If I were told to go away, I would then call the safety advisor on board. I would then mark that man as unsafe, but it's not named. It's then up to another process to sort out the problem. I have not named and blamed the person, but I am stopping the operation so that it can be rectified.

Looking at our graph (points to projection screen) we can see that from the marks that we have had so far since December and you can see for example that 'housekeeping' started out at 12% and there is an increasing upward trend and everything is going up now. Now we can alter the baseline and make our targets higher than they were before.

Anyway, it's been a fair few months since we launched and things are still looking good. It's easier with fewer people and we remain LTI free – which isn't bad when you include commissioning too! Scores are up for all categories.

The last thing I want to talk about though is ownership. For us it's important that we were all volunteers. No pressed men. I said at the start that we were sceptical... seen it all before but it really was owned by us. We made all the decisions and could have stopped the whole process if we'd wanted to. Right from the off we've had control. It's good to have genuine ownership where the lads can show what they can do and can do it for themselves!

Questions

Tony must have practised the flourishing sign off as he immediately left the stage and took no questions!