



From: Gray, Thomas B  
Sent: Fri Mar 02 20:28:28 2007  
To: Tanner, Keisha W; Church, Timothy R  
Cc: Jackson, Curtis W (HSSE); Gamer, Stan E.; Skelton, Cindi K; Marshall, Rob R  
Subject: FW: Baker Panel Feedback!  
Importance: Normal  
Attachments: RE: Baker Panel Feedback!; GOMSPU\_BakerPanelfeedback\_rawdata.ZIP

Tim and Keisha

Curtis and I agreed to have the two of you collaborate on a review of the SPU Baker Panel feedback as outline below by Doris Reiter. I discussed this today with your Keisha and Curtis was going to have a discussion with you Tim. There are two documents attached. One is the raw team feedback and the other is a rough distillation of the feedback done by Doris that was forwarded to London. The request is to complete a thorough distillation of the comments to find key themes, issues and request and recommend actions we should take in the SPU in response to the comments. You should target to complete this over the next two weeks so we have time to prepare a presentation at the ELT meeting at the end of February. Please let Curtis and I know if you have any questions and what supporting resources you may need to complete this task.

Tom

<<...>>

---

From: Reiter, Doris  
Sent: Thursday, March 01, 2007 7:00 PM  
To: Jackson, Curtis W (HSSE); Gray, Thomas B  
Subject: FW: Baker Panel Feedback!

Tom and Curtis,

Attached is the full compilation of the Baker Panel feedback from our SPU. All 26 pages of it. The XT would like for you to go through and see which items need to be actioned on and which we are already doing. The goal is to communicate with the wider organization in about 2 weeks time what we are doing with this feedback and what actions we decided to take, so the feed is not only one way. We also should see this as an opportunity to communicate on actions we are already doing, but based on the comments it appears need more publication. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,  
Doris

<<...>>

# GOM SPU Baker Panel Roll-out and Feedback Process



- Step 1: Roll-out, setting context to SPU LT in VP LT meetings— January 22<sup>nd</sup>
- Step 2: PULs and Functional Leads provided context plus communications pack to ELT
  - Communications pack included:
    - Executive summary – to be provided prior to discussion
    - Baker Panel press conference
    - Leader pack
- Step 3: ELT held discussion groups with their staff (80%+ coverage)
  - Compiled feedback and returned to the LT
- Data compilation PU by PU and functional organizations
- Final distillation and summary at SPU level

# Reactions to the Report



- Positive, thoughtful and fair assessment
- Positive feedback on BP accepting findings and commitment to implementation
- Questioning as to how findings translate to E&P?
- Questions about process safety –
  - What is it?
  - How does it fit with S&OI, IM, OMS?
- Agreement that focus has been on personal safety not on process safety, but concern that focus on process safety might compromise focus on personal safety
- What metrics to use to measure progress on process safety?
- Are we talking about the same company here ? – GoM safety processes far ahead of TC/R&M Segment



## Which recommendations are we pleased the Panel made?



- Need focus on process safety, not only personal safety
- Management need to listen more
- Safety and Operations Training for Upper Management
- Process safety should be a core competency
- Independent reviews for 5 years
- Pleased to see it addresses the corporate culture and how it needs to change

## What should BP's priorities be?



- Change the safety culture (more balance between personal and process safety)
- Clarify how process safety translates for E&P
- Clarify how this fits with all our initiatives S&OI, IM, OMS
- Recognize that not only process safety is important but put same rigor into platform, installation and well control safety

## What must BP do to effectively implement recommendations?



- Culture needs to be addressed first. Before jumping into fixing things
- Develop thorough plans before implementation – make it fit for purpose
- Stay consistent with implementation across locations
- Ensure right attitudes, behaviors and boundary conditions in place so right decisions can be made even in light of cost cutting efforts
- Need to develop process safety KPIs as we have done on personal safety



## What needs to be thought through before getting into action?



- Understand the report and recommendations and not over-reacting, creating more initiatives or executing the wrong actions
- How do these findings overlay with current workflow and other initiatives
- New initiatives need a lot of resources
- Need to think through and prioritize initiatives

## GOM SPU Baker Panel Roll-out and Feedback Process



- Step 1: Roll-out, setting context to SPU LT in VP LT meetings– January 22<sup>nd</sup>
- Step 2: PULs and Functional Leads provided context plus communications pack to ELT
  - Communications pack included:
    - Executive summary – to be provided prior to discussion
    - Baker Panel press conference
    - Leader pack
- Step 3: ELT held discussion groups with their staff (80%+ coverage)
  - Compiled feedback and returned to the LT
- Data compilation PU by PU and functional organizations
- Final distillation and summary at SPU level

### Performance

Predictably delivering successful project results  
Top free cash flow generator in Group  
The Group/Segment asks us to do more  
Divestments for value across the value chain  
Top quartile D&C performance in GoM

### Sustainability

Successfully renewed the lease hold  
1 discovery, 1 sanction, and 1 start-up per year  
Tie-back business ever increasing

### Org Capabilities

Organization aligned with strategy and operating consistent  
Value chain structure  
Engineering capability rebuilt  
Renewal and succession plans in hand  
Employer of Choice

### Technology

Maximizing value of incumbency (both performance & enabling) through technology  
Leading relevant technologies on behalf of the Segment  
Visibly advancing technologies that allow us to expand our resource base (e.g.. Kaskida)



## Reactions to the Report



- Positive, thoughtful and fair assessment
- Positive feedback on BP accepting findings and commitment to implementation
- Questioning as to how findings translate to E&P?
- Questions about process safety –
  - What is it?
  - How does it fit with S&OI, IM, OMS?
- Agreement that focus has been on personal safety not on process safety, but concern that focus on process safety might compromise focus on personal safety
- What metrics to use to measure progress on process safety?
- Are we talking about the same company here ? – GoM safety processes far ahead of TC/R&M Segment

Which recommendations are we pleased the Panel made?



- Need focus on process safety, not only personal safety
- Management need to listen more
- Safety and Operations Training for Upper Management
- Process safety should be a core competency
- Independent reviews for 5 years
- Pleased to see it addresses the corporate culture and how it needs to change

## What should BP's priorities be?



- Change the safety culture (more balance between personal and process safety)
- Clarify how process safety translates for E&P
- Clarify how this fits with all our initiatives S&OI, IM, OMS
- Recognize that not only process safety is important but put same rigor into platform, installation and well control safety

## What must BP do to effectively implement recommendations?



- Culture needs to be addressed first. Before jumping into fixing things
- Develop thorough plans before implementation – make it fit for purpose
- Stay consistent with implementation across locations
- Ensure right attitudes, behaviors and boundary conditions in place so right decisions can be made even in light of cost cutting efforts
- Need to develop process safety KPIs as we have done on personal safety



## What needs to be thought through before getting into action?



- Understand the report and recommendations and not over-reacting, creating more initiatives or executing the wrong actions
- How do these findings overlay with current workflow and other initiatives
- New initiatives need a lot of resources
- Need to think through and prioritize initiatives