

# OFFSHORE HELICOPTER SAFETY LEADERSHIP GROUP (OHSLG)

Document : Meeting Minutes

Date : Monday 21<sup>st</sup> September 2020

Location : Virtual Meeting

Present: Mark Abbey (CHC) – Co-Chair  
Rob Bishton (CAA) – Co-Chair  
Rick Newson (CAA)  
David Malins (CAA)  
Steve Rae (Step Change in Safety)  
Derek Whatling (BALPA)  
Matt Rhodes (Bristow)  
Trevor Stapleton (OGUK)  
Alan Combe (BP / IOGP)  
Grant Campbell (Shell)  
Ian Cooke (Babcock)  
Mike Gislam (NHV)  
Sue Fay (CHC)  
Kirstin Gove (Step Change in Safety)  
Douglas Barnes (AAIB)  
Lorraine Smith (CHC) - Secretariat

Apologies: Colin Cheesewright (Chrysaor)  
Jake Molloy (RMT)  
Jamie Carson (Scottish Government)  
Shauna Wright (Unite the Union)

## **Welcome and introductions with scope of workshop meeting and recap on progress to date**

### **Workshop provided by Mike Turner**

The prime outcome from this session is to agree the top three highest priority change initiatives. These are not the top three risks to take forward, but the top three change programmes that are going to establish what we need as the OHSLG to operate effectively.

The sub-groups have come up with some candidate change actions, which we think we need to deliver to really establish the OHSLG as an effective operating group. One of the groups also came up with some candidate risks.

Introductions made around the group for two new attendees :-

Rob Bishton, joining as co-chair and Douglas Barnes joining from AAIB.

**Recap :** It was agreed a great job was done through CAP 1145, with a very clear focus and the group delivered on that but we now feel the group has lost direction, become less effective, and may begin to lose credibility within the industry.

We looked at where OHSLG sat in the array of the various bodies who were working on offshore helicopter safety. It was recognised that it was very important that the OHSLG carves out a specific purpose for itself. It was clear how it interfaced with these other bodies and clear what our agenda was. Importantly, there were gaps identified and that meant that there was high risk to safety.

We therefore looked at the existing terms of reference and we agreed to review the purpose, the objectives and clarify how you measure success. We have to establish a new purpose and make sure we're set up to deliver the objectives. We can identify the top risks and start to deliver mitigations or eliminations of those risks via working with and through other groups across offshore helicopter safety.

We agreed that sometimes the group was too much of a talking shop. We have moved from the Offshore Helicopter Safety Action Group to the Offshore Helicopter Safety Leadership Group therefore we need to move to leading the risk mitigation work.

It is important we get a good plan in place with a clear trigger for change from CAP 1145. We need input messages that say what are the key industry wide risks in helicopter operations that need to be resolved and we need to be proactive about how we turn those into work. We then commission that work through the relevant bodies that are out there that have responsibility to respond ie, ASTG and other groups.

There was a resounding message to be clear about where we sit in the offshore helicopter array of stakeholders. It was agreed it was important for heli-offshore to join OHSLG so we have good link with that body.

It was also agreed we didn't have a way of managing the works of international groups, therefore we need a simple system of management.

#### **Review of sub-group work since June.**

#### **Review of the purpose statement.**

A new purpose has been drafted to state that the OHSLG is there to oversee the efficacy of safety regulation, make appropriate actions and facilitate continuous improvement, so that we deliver offshore helicopter operations and safety that is comparable to fixed wing operations.

Matt Rhodes asked for clarity on recommendations section of the purpose, questioning who we make the recommendations to?

Mike Gislam asked if AC operators should be integrated – Unifly in particular that may interact with the oil and gas operation, particularly in the southern part of the UK.

It was agreed with the array of stake holders that OHSLG has it may be necessary to build in these necessary links depending on the groups objectives and intentions.

The initial focus is for the group to identify the top two to three risks and start establishing our management system for taking those risks through to recommendations and then actions taken across the industry and tracking that through to completion. We may need to interface with different organisations which we will work into a communications regime, which will be constantly under review.

Rick commented it should be large commercial fixed wing.

Douglas commented he was on the call as an observer to engage with the industry and stakeholders and will not vote on any decisions the leadership group may have. He will deliver the perspective of the AAIB to get that engagement discussion going, but will maintain the integrity of AAIB.

### **Review of the three sub-groups.**

The scope of the helicopter operations subgroup was to look at the wording of the top three OHSLG objectives. More work was completed on objective two to ensure there is a two way process of lobbying influence between the operators and offshore oil and gas UK.

David Malins stated he and Rick think objective one and objective four are very similar of the two working groups. We need to be very clear of what the differences between those two are. Objective four is about evaluating the offshore risks and creating a plan so there is subtle differences.

The risk management subgroup focused on objective four. Their exercise was more in depth and included discussions more related to managing specific risks rather than working how the OHSLG will improve its operations to fulfil its purpose and objectives. Six risks were originally identified and the sub-group proposed how the OHSLG needed to think about the criteria they might use to assess whether those risks are within the scope of the OHSLG. This group also looked at objective five, but were unable to look at six and seven, therefore it was proposed we relook at these objectives in phase two.

The work that David and the rest of the group did, which is essentially the six candidate risks, were shown on a slide.

David explained they had taken the operators risk picture with the assumption of the accountable managers and grouped them together to look at any themes or risks across the board, including the CAA's regulatory risk picture. With the help of Alan, this group also took a couple of recent industry surveys and looked at what was coming through in their surveys with emerging risks. They then had six key risks that they wanted to feed back to the group around dangerous goods, heli-deck management, distraction, the effectiveness of safety and quality management systems, wrong deck landings and critical parts management.

They wanted to understand whether these risks were current and relevant to operations and if there were any mitigating actions, to be taken by whom and in what timescales. Also, they wanted the OHSLG to consider if these risks were more strategic or tactical issues, and what was in the best interest of the OHSLG.

Something that became evident as they went through the collective risk register that is held in our safety management system, is that there were a number of very low level risks, which were also common. It is suspected that, once we get into the detail here, we may find that there are a number of relatively low level risks that are common across all the operators, and sharing those would also be a useful tool to understand what might become, at some point a significant risk.

Our key ambition is to identify some change initiatives, which we can look forward to establishing OHSLG as an effective group within its scope.

Mike suggested that the group use the work as a test case, to walk through objective one, particularly where the four operators get together and look at the operator perspective with the CAA to generate what they believe to be the key operations risks. This can be aligned and added to and amended with input from the other industry groups.

Steve led the communications group and looked at two key objectives. Objective eight is largely dialogue within the realm of the operators, the industry reps, the worker reps within the environment in which you're operating, identifying risks, commissioning them to groups, checking out when they're done, and then communicating that things are happening and then making people aware of the outcomes.

Objective nine is keeping the wider stakeholder group up to date with two way communications, particularly with the travelling community now, the passengers and other community groups.

Steve advised that there is a need to clarify the communication plan and would like to establish some simple surveys so we can regularly check that the communication is working.

This will be the "oil that keeps the OHSLG working". How we work together, how we work with our groups and how we bring the voices of the industry back in, so that sources of value are improving safety for lost voices.

No work has been done about what the brand should look like. We can progress this.

Trevor asked whether OGUK comms had been involved in the comms group discussions and was advised Kirstin is in close contact with them.

We now have three sets of objectives around operational risk management system and governance and comms and in terms of key KPIs, there was a number of leading and lagging indicators identified. We need to measure the extent to which the communications are working.

We now have some objectives that we can now publish and pursue and some KPIs set up to measure.

Mark added in terms of the bigger picture OHSLG is the forum for coordinating ERP from interface to industry, and asked if that was captured in here?

Should this be on the risk management plan and is it more reactive rather than proactive. Agreed this is reactive.

Matt added we have a common side of things and this matters, particularly with the 175 for example. It's the facilitator of the industry as a whole.

Matt added it is for us to make that point and manage in an appropriate fashion so if there's an issue we do actively come together for that event.

When we do the work in the breakout rooms, assuming we agree that there's a key objective here I think we should take that incident response into that group now.

The comms group may come out with some other form of comms slightly adjusting what you put on your website that would be how you communicate that to the industry.

Trevor noted that the original terms of reference and additional good material are available and operating in the event of an incident.

It was agreed we may need to only resurrect reference material and not reinvent the wheel and see what is fit for purpose.

The terms of reference has a whole section on incident response and we haven't tackled that. We don't want to lose this. It is in existence so if we could commission the Comms group to address this.

We agreed to have a look at what's been documented, how we will respond to an incident and see what else fits the purpose.

Mike showed a slide to get clarity on how the OHSLG works and who they do work with.

This slide showed the different elements of the way that the OHSLG works. From the operator's perspective they should meet prior to the OHSLG with the CAA and they should be looking at the risk picture, particularly from an operational point of view.

We want to start by having a system by which we identify those top risks, which should come out by department (e.g. flight ops).

There should be a helicopter operators pre OHSLG meeting with the CAA and the CAA should bring a risk picture to that group to develop a picture from an aviation flying point of view as to what we need to be working on.

There are other sources for potential risks that we need to look at and those will come from a number of different sources, eg OGUK and this was what was played out in the second subgroup work, where a number of you got together and identified there are a number of potential risks. There should be a feed into the OHSLG from that source.

How does that work?

Are these risks fed to the CAA, who will then consolidate to the top two to three risks and bring them to the group for ratification or do the Heli-offshore subgroup and the CAA together, work out the top two to three risks and then at the OHSLG meeting at that point, those are brought to the table. Then the members of the OHSLG that come from both OGUK and Stepchange, they bring their risks, and you have a working session where you identify your top two or three risks?

Once you have got them you then go off and get those commissioned through various bodies and track that's happening. Then you have a process of handling the risks and funnelling down the ones the group should work on.

Once you have the top two to three risks, then you use the simple system of management. This means you now need to delegate actions to resolve those risks, so they may go to the ASTG, HTC etc

You will need a risk management system to visualise what action needs to be taken and how do we then commission that action effectively.

We need to make sure that these risks are tracked and managed and actions are resolved. They may go back to the operators or our customer bases but our KPIs will demonstrate we have been effective.

This all needs to be managed by a communications regime and we then need to communicate that with external stakeholders, passengers, community groups, etc.

David Malins commented and said what was evident when we looked at the CAA's risk register and we had taken all of our risks from the operators, it was evident that we still did not have a coherent picture. The challenges that came from our group was that we should look across global operations outside of perhaps the North Sea, look at them and identify if they are all affecting your operations. In many cases when we look at these Matt, Mark and Ian will likely say these are covered, but there's something in there that we need to look broader and wider than just the North Sea.

Matt added that yes we look at UK regulation and UK operations, the wider remit itself follows IOGP and heli-offshore and that they feed into this group to provide us with that kind of this picture. What we're looking at specific risks that are specific to the UK helicopter operations and the UK environment.

Mark added it was really about how to consolidate the risks together. There's industry risks for the operators which we can do off our risk registers and understanding how they consolidate down and then you've got that missing element of identifying global issues and how you bring those in. I still think there is a place for that because ultimately if there is a risk we haven't seen yet but there are things that we should be considering and consolidate in the register.

Looking at the safety management systems with the four operators and then consolidating down to a picture that we can all align from as an operator standpoint and bringing that to the forum of OHSLG, so we are not debating

entire SMS issues, and then consolidate into that the industry areas that we should be considering within our top two and three, I think probably is the best approach for me.

There are a number of things that say in terms of our future work let's imagine there's a risk with the OHSLG that it needs to assess and to determine what it's going to focus on first and that risk is going to be fed from a number of different sources and we know we're going to get the source from a premade group.

For example, Trevor, you will bring us the voice from OGUK. There may be other voices from a risk perspective there so, if the risk management system can be built that would enable those to be identified, then it can be brought into the process by which the OHSLG works at its agenda for change. The comms group will then communicate you are addressing these bodies in the correct way and you should establish those links in the right way so you are identifying the voice that you need to collect and there isn't confusion.

Mark commented on review and timing, and the definition of a change programme where there's going to be a number of items that we identify that could be categorised under the strategic change we are going to try and make within the business. There's also an element we can probably manage it through an agenda where there's going to be some short-term tactical requirements at the top of this register. Mark added we've got to be cognizant of that the risk picture changes and that can change fairly rapidly so my view on timing is perhaps an annual review on the strategic leadership plans we want to put into place. We need to recognise there are two levels here; one as an agenda item where we should be watchful of data and also a strategic level where we can formalise more over the longer term.

Rick agreed we need to look at both risk levels.

Mike detailed a proposal for the 3 change initiatives ahead of the breakout sessions, based on an analysis of the outcomes of the sub-group work.

For the first project, it seems like we are trying to establish a process by which the four operating companies work together with CAA to identify the top two or three aviation-based risks. They will identify proposed solutions and bring those to the OHSLG where the group can discuss them and move them into resolution.

For the second project, we should build on this system (coming out of the first project) and identify some other pan industry risks, including from international sources. Evaluate and break them into an agenda item, where the OHSLG can make decisions about what you are going to focus on. Then you will commission the action and monitor progress.

This is a system that needs to start with the top two or three coming in from the heli-ops/aviation pre-meet, how you bring in the other inputs, how you would come to decisions about what to do, how you plan the action, how you monitor progress, how you would actually report on your KPI. That's the scope of that project.

The third project is to establish that effective sustainable comms approach. That would not just be around what's happening on top three risks that would also be around on the general stuff that you need to do and I think it should also include communications activity. It should include how we respond to major accidents and incidents, how we gather the right people together and what we need to include on our homepage.

There is also a simple action (not a project) to get Heli-Offshore on this group. Also make sure that we align with the other groups by adding a standing item on our agenda each time the group meet, to identify what is going on in terms of relationships with the array of stakeholders and what we need to be doing to improve that. With Douglas here we have some key stakeholder groups represented.

We need to build such links, over and above what we are doing to address risk.

In terms of the other candidate improvement actions, we can start implementing in phase two after we've done the work to determine how we mobilise.

By doing those three pieces of work and that one action you are addressing all but one objectives are being addressed. You will be helping to establish a strong culture of safety across the sector but this may need specific focus in phase 2. My proposal is that you split the work.

Project three - step back and make sure that what we have in the media already is relevant, perhaps brush off what is there or updating accordingly.

### **Breakout Rooms Work Output**

Matt Rhodes (Operation Group) - For the operation side of things the main project descriptions identify the investment process of which these are managed in the analysis operation service basis and just summarise what we've done.

Intention will be by the end of October we are going to have a sub-group meeting to thrash this out and identify timing on AOC data and how we capture the information and manage it through the appropriate tracker.

We will define those key risks that go into the SRB Safety Management System data base operations. So will start with three key risks for discussion, see where the challenges are that we have and then identify, manage and mitigate those risks.

The last piece is just to make sure we get lined up to a management system so we can ensure the planning is done and we can make progress.

Rick Newson (Risk Group) - The regulatory SMS is the the home for all of the risks utilising our entity performance tool, and that tool is a way of the CAA understanding what we think are your collective risks. We propose within our regulator SMS to put together the density default risk matrix and populating it with a really simple system of scoring so that we can identify what we consider to be the top three to five risks. Utilising the data we get from operators to validate the risk picture, then utilising the feeds from our other stakeholders, heli-offshore, or the offshore industry in general to make sure that we've got 10 potential risks or potential risks that we will be able to support into the matrix and identify a significant risk rating.

We will then have an intermediary risk meeting with the risk subgroup between the OHSLG meetings which will run concurrently allowing for data to be shared.

Any findings will be taken to the main group to have a meaningful discussion of the recommendations of those top ticket items.

Steve Rae (Comms Group) - We are looking at the existing website, establishing what exists, what can be done in the future by updating and revitalising it.

We want to develop a structure for OHSLG and its stakeholders and we also have to develop a communication network, which will focus on strategic communications providing a single source message.

We need to respond to major accidents and incidents and also accident investigations of what's going on in the world right now. We should be putting our collective message out on behalf of the industry.

For the group we aim to have a plan by mid October, however that is a stretch target for us. We will come together as a group within the next seven days, to think about how to attract additional resources – perhaps an intern can help.

We will then contact external communication comms groups to see what key messages are circulating and what we can be sending from a strategic level.

Mike asked if Matt, Rick and Steve could complete the scoping documents within the next two weeks. This will give everyone the chance to comment on these project scopes and be clear of what we are trying to achieve.

Matt is also going to arrange a pilot session with the heli-ops and the CAA to develop the top two to three risks.

Rick should go ahead and plan the first pilot risk meeting to get it started and then it can be developed as it goes on.

Steve, to have a chat with Rob and Mark and see who else you might want to draw in to get a wider perspective.

Mike added that we talked about team effectiveness and he is not proposing to do this at this time. We have got to finish this project work and get moving on these actions. For the next OHSLG group meeting Mike has prepared a survey, based upon team effectiveness which looks at how well you've organised to achieve your tasks, how can you invest time as a group when you are as a group and the third element looks at how you as an individual work within the group. The survey has 19 simple statements, you should select if you fully agree with it or disagree with it. The extent to which you agree or disagree will then tell us whether you think we are effective or not. Mike will then summarise what comes out of the survey, identifying differences and gaps for our next OHSLG meeting and suggest a few ideas to address the items that need to raise your effectiveness.

Looking at next steps, it looks like we should next meet mid November, rather than leaving the full three months to get this momentum going. Suggested date is 11<sup>th</sup> November which is currently held in the diary.

In November, we should have achieved some work on the first three projects, also have looked at a communications plan and we should have identified the top two or three risks.

We will identify how we're going to manage those risks at the OHSLG and Mike will also cover the effectiveness results. Mike will send the survey around mid to third week in October.

Mike was asked if he could share his slide deck to the group which was agreed.

Rob asked how this will be promoted in terms of the work that is done to show we're very focused on safety outcome orientated collaborative efforts.

Mark advised it will be covered in the comms section. We have not been a recognised communication forum previously and not been particularly good at that. It should be something the comms group perhaps pick up within the work in the scoping document and something that we do need to do more of.

Rob mentioned that as a regulator they step back and look at independently what that means for the CAA. He is conscious that given the depth and breadth of our industry and the people in it, there's always monumental amounts of good thinking about effort, and good work and then we seem to collectively as an industry, slightly let ourselves down on the promotion. We don't use enough promotion when there are so many platforms to target to get the message across.

Meeting Ends.