

From: Skelton, Cindi K  
Sent: Mon Jan 28 18:26:35 2008  
To: Garza, Esthela  
Subject: FW: Production PU Org Structure Feedback - Input for Monday Discussions  
Importance: Normal  
Attachments: T3Org.ppt

Print for 1 PM mtg

---

From: Morrison, Richard  
Sent: Sunday, January 27, 2008 12:38 PM  
To: G GoM DWP LT  
Cc: Zeynalova, Zarina T  
Subject: Production PU Org Structure Feedback - Input for Monday Discussions

All,

Below is a brief summary of the input I received during last weeks LT meeting on Tier 3 organization. I think it sets us up for a good day on Monday to land our Tier 3 org structure and get deep into the remaining positions and interfaces within our teams.

Headlines:

1. **Asset Model:** Strong desire to tune-up Ops support for the AM/OIM - there is a strategic agenda to execute (Ziff, OMS, Perf Mgmt) and the need to communicate/connect deeply with our O/S staff will no doubt increase - having a skilled Ops hand at the Asset Table is preferred in the near term. This shouldn't be interpreted as installing a ghost Ops Manager - the AM has the direct accountability for operations. In the current proposal, ops support feels buried inside Engr Mgr role. Consider modifying the OMS role to include the above.

(see attached ppt for revised roles)

2. **HSE:** After a great discussion the HSE improvement plan, we looked at the proposed HSE org and concluded that our HSE agenda remains cluttered, we're letting the urgency of the moment (investigations/interventions) distract us from the long term agenda (climate/culture). We also believe that our HSE leaders/advisors are doing a lot of work but there remains a disconnect between what the line leaders need and what they are getting. To develop and deliver our HSE improvement agenda, we believe that a direct accountability relationship between the line and HSE is what is required at this moment (hard line reporting). I will have an HSE manager reporting directly to me and he/she will be accountable for supporting our HSE improvement agenda - getting the right advisors in the right place to do so. Curtis will manage less of the day to day and keep us on the plot for the long term delivery of incident/injury free in his functional director role.

(see revised org chart in ppt)

3. **JV Pompano:** Would like to consider an alternate model whereby we don't have

a fully loaded resource team w/ SS Team lead deployed to mars/ursa/ram etc.  
Take a look at a skilled pair of recognized leaders (technical/commercial) to run as a business. They could draw upon a RE/GP tag in one of the existing assets (Thorse?) if/when a technical peer review was required. Is there evidence/proof we have created material value to the business by shadowing shell with resource team?

4. **Marine Authority:** We have a strong desire to retain a 1 stop shop for marine engineering and operations services/assurance and not blur it into a central engineering team - the function is too specialized to have a general engineering manager in charge.

But.....

- We need to illuminate the interfaces and mechanisms required to assure we don't have fortress Marine.
- There is a need to make visible the activity set/work fronts currently being worked by our marine engineers and ask the question - are they working the right things or are they going where they are being pulled hardest?
- Understand the major pinch points occurring with Marine/Ops/Proj/D&C... and what can we do to sharpen the explicit roles and accountabilities?
- Consider the Riser/Flow line team move to IM/CIC.
- We will not add staff to implement marine standard, we will do it with our existing team.
- Need to challenge every position from a zero base.

Given this, I'd think the key leadership roles reporting to Neil would be:

Marine Operations

SPU Vessel Planning and Logistics

Vessel Inspection and Assurance

Marine Systems Engineering/IM

Marine Technical Authority (unless within Engineering above).

5. **Operations and OMS/IM:** Understand & support the logic of the Tier 3 Structure, need to quickly understand the shape & role of the teams below, especially central engineering teams. Need to be very clear on exactly what capability is needed centrally to deploy to key workfronts in Assets and how this will be managed/allocated/recovered.

6. **Logistics:** Still confusion between Neil's new role as the Vessel "master planner" and what the embedded marine advisers on Keith's team do (Keith, I know you feel these folks give you the pulse of the asset needs). Need to bite the bullet here and get the accountabilities/reporting right. Need to map out as part of the Master plan how the short and long term demand planning forecast is generated and the critical players/inputs required for executing. Thorse/Atlantis and maybe others feel they are getting hit with double marine inquiries.

These were the key points, I'm sure you all have a few others to surface as you've thought about your new teams further.

This pack contains the Tier 3 structure with proposed edits. For discussion purpose I've only included a generic Asset and JVP.

<<...>>

Our Monday afternoon meeting will focus on finalizing each of your Tier 3 orgs with peer challenge/support.

Thanks,

R



















