



UNITED
NATIONS

EP

UNEP(DEPI)/MED WG.434/Inf.7



UNITED NATIONS
ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME
MEDITERRANEAN ACTION PLAN

6 March 2017
Original: English

First Meeting of the Barcelona Convention Offshore Oil and Gas Group (OFOG)
Sub-Group on Environmental Impact of Offshore Monitoring Programmes

Greece, 3-4 April 2017

Agenda item 3: Offshore Monitoring Programme

Questionnaire for stakeholders and Competent Authorities

For environmental and economic reasons, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

Questionnaire for stakeholders and Competent Authorities

Introduction

In conformity with Decision IG.21/8 related to the establishment of Barcelona Convention Offshore Oil and Gas Group (BARCO OFOG) and its Terms of Reference (ToR), adopted by the 18th Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties (COP 18) to the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols (Istanbul, Turkey, 3-6 December 2013), representatives of the oil and gas industry as well as Intergovernmental Organizations and Nongovernmental Organizations with a relevant mandate to the topics discussed in the OFOG Sub-Group on Environmental Impact of Offshore Monitoring Programmes have been invited to participate in the Meeting, as observers, as well as representatives of other regional fora with a similar mandate to the OFOG Group.

In the context of a collaborative and consultative process and to benefit from stakeholders experience, the Secretariat prepared the questionnaire to be completed by the Competent Authorities, reproduced in **Annex I** and the questionnaire to be filled-in by all stakeholders attending the meeting, available in **Annex II**.

In accordance with the recommendations identified in Section 5.4.5 of the study on international best practices (REMPEC/WG.34/19/Rev.1) and considering the review of international best practices under Section 3.3.16 of the said study, the present questionnaire addresses the following topics:

- a. Defining criteria for “qualified entity” including competency requirement or any certification;
- b. Determining acceptable Operator conducted monitoring frequency and scope;
- c. Determining Operator reporting frequency, scope and geographical scope;
- d. Developing inspection scope and checklist;
- e. Determining the inspection frequency;
- f. Determining qualifications (competency and/or certification) required by inspector;
- g. Providing recommendation for the possible establishment of a shared/pooled set of inspectors from all Contracting Parties;
- h. Defining “removal operations” – recommended for decommissioned platforms and pipelines in terms of monitoring.

All questionnaires will be analyzed and considered by the Secretariat for the finalisation of the relevant documents aimed at establishing National and Regional Offshore Monitoring Programmes.

Actions requested by the Meeting

The Meeting is invited to:

- .1 **to complete** either the questionnaire for Competent Authorities (Annex I) or the questionnaire for stakeholders (Annex II) and return it the Secretariat, in hard copy or in electronic format, at the end of the session for further analysis after the meeting.

Annex I

Questionnaire for Competent Authorities

1. Inspection scope and checklist (Competent Authority)

1.1. Inspection Scope

- It is recommended that the Competent Authority Inspector must consult with IMAP in order to establish and implement an integrated monitoring and assessment programme to assess the Integrated Good Environmental Status (GES) and Targets indicators, which are organized according to Ecosystem Approach (EcAp) Ecological Objective (EO).

Do you agree? Please explain.

- It is recommended that the Competent Authority Inspector must also collaborate with key partners to avoid duplication and exchange best practices and information. What should some of these key partners be?

- Do you believe it is the responsibility of the Competent Authority Inspector to ascertain the implementation of relevant and applicable Conventions, Directives, and Laws in a scientifically appropriate manner? Please explain

1.2. Inspection Checklist

- The Integrated Monitoring and Assessment Guidance document (UNEP(DEPI)/MED IG.22/Inf.7), identifies the Common Indicators (CI) listed below. Which of these do you believe are applicable to the offshore activities within your jurisdiction and thus must be monitored by the Inspector (Competent Authority)?

	Applicable to the offshore activities within your jurisdiction (tick the box)	To be monitored by the Inspector (Competent Authority) (tick the box)
Common Indicator 1: Habitat distributional range, to also consider habitat extent as a relevant attribute (EO1);		

Common Indicator 2: Condition of the habitat's typical species and communities (EO1);		
Common Indicator 3: Species distributional range (related to marine mammals, seabirds, marine reptiles) (EO1);		
Common Indicator 4: Population abundance of selected species (related to marine mammals, seabirds, marine reptiles) (EO1);		
Common Indicator 5: Population demographic characteristics (e.g. body size or age class structure, sex ratio, fecundity rates, survival/mortality rates related to marine mammals, seabirds, marine reptiles) (EO1);		
Common Indicator 6: Trends in abundance, temporal occurrence, and spatial distribution of non-indigenous species, particularly invasive, non-indigenous species, notably in risk areas (EO2, in relation to the main vectors and pathways of spreading of such species);		
Common Indicator 7: Spawning stock Biomass (EO3);		
Common Indicator 8: Total landings (EO3);		
Common Indicator 9: Fishing Mortality (EO3);		
Common Indicator 10: Fishing effort (EO3);		
Common Indicator 11: Catch per unit of effort (CPUE) or Landing per unit of effort (LPUE) as a proxy (EO3);		
Common Indicator 12: Bycatch of vulnerable and non-target species (EO1 and EO3);		
Common Indicator 13: Concentration of key nutrients in water column (EO5);		
Common Indicator 14: Chlorophyll-a concentration in water column (EO5);		
Common Indicator 15: Location and extent of the habitats impacted directly by hydrographic alterations (EO7);		
Common Indicator 16: Length of coastline subject to physical disturbance due to the influence of man-made structures (EO8) to also feed the assessment of EO1 on habitat extent;		
Common Indicator 17: Concentration of key harmful contaminants measured in		

the relevant matrix (EO9, related to biota, sediment, seawater);		
Common Indicator 18: Level of pollution effects of key contaminants where a cause and effect relationship has been established (EO9);		
Common Indicator 19: Occurrence, origin (where possible), and extent of acute pollution events (e.g. slicks from oil, oil products and hazardous substances) and their impact on biota affected by this pollution (EO9);		
Common Indicator 20: Actual levels of contaminants that have been detected and number of contaminants which have exceeded maximum regulatory levels in commonly consumed seafood (EO9);		
Common Indicator 21: Percentage of intestinal enterococci concentration measurements within established standards (EO9);		
Common Indicator 22: Trends in the amount of litter washed ashore and/or deposited on coastlines (including analysis of its composition, spatial distribution and, where possible, source). (EO10);		
Common Indicator 23: Trends in the amount of litter in the water column including microplastics and on the seafloor (EO10);		
Candidate Indicator 24: Trends in the amount of litter ingested by or entangling marine organisms focusing on selected mammals, marine birds and marine turtles (EO10);		
Candidate Indicator 25: Land use changes (EO8);		
Candidate Indicator 26: Proportion of days and geographical distribution where loud, low, and mid-frequency impulsive sounds exceed levels that are likely to entail significant impact on marine animals (EO11);		
Candidate Indicator 27: Levels of continuous low frequency sounds with the use of models as appropriate (EO11);		

2. Inspection frequency (Competent Authority)

- Should the Inspector carry out a QA/QC review of the Operator's performance assessment submissions? If so, at what frequency?

- In terms of post-operation monitoring of the Operator, if there were no upset conditions reported during operations, is a semi-annual monitoring frequency and review of the Operator's assessments for a period of 2 years reasonable? If not, please explain.

3. Qualifications (competency and/or certification) required by inspector (Competent Authority)

- What qualifications should be required by the Inspectors? Similar/equivalent qualifications, as those specified for the Operators? Please explain.

- If the Secretariat of the Offshore Protocol develops a List of Qualification Criteria, would this find you in agreement?

- It is recommended that the Secretariat of the Offshore Protocol develops a training program for Competent Authority Inspectors. Do you agree? Please explain.

4. Recommendations for the possible establishment of a shared/pooled set of inspectors from all Contracting Parties

- It is recommended that a shared/pooled set of Inspectors from all Contracting Parties is established and managed by the Secretariat of the Offshore Protocol. Would you be willing to participate in this pooled set? Please explain.

- Further, it is proposed that the Inspectors from this set will be selected/assigned to inspect platforms located in other countries only, and platforms not owned/operated by entities of their own countries in order to ensure impartiality and objectivity. Do you agree? Please explain.

5. “Removal operations” recommended for decommissioned platforms and pipelines in term of monitoring

- When do you believe a seabed assessment must be conducted by the Operator and the Inspector when decommissioning a platform and/or pipeline? Please explain.

- What area coverage should be included in a pre-decommissioning assessment? Please explain.

- If debris resulting from the Operator’s operations or decommissioning activities is found during post-decommissioning assessments, It is recommended that removal operations of the debris must be carried out immediately. When should a joint follow-up assessment by both Operator and Inspector be carried out?

- The removal of debris must be completed within what time frame after decommissioning?

➤ What guidelines should be followed for debris removal?

Questionnaire for Stakeholders

1. Criteria for “qualified entity” including competency requirement or any certification standard

- It is recommended that all suppliers of services to Operators for monitoring programmes (analyses, field work) must use laboratories that have ISO 17025 accreditation for the methods they use. What do you think should be some other accreditation and qualification the Operators must have?

- If no official accreditation scheme is available in a particular area, how do you think Operators must document their own quality assurance routines?

2. Acceptable Operator-conducted monitoring frequency and scope

3.2.1. Monitoring frequency

- It is recommended that the Operator must monitor at a specified frequency not exceeding a period of **3 months**, taking into account the spatial and temporal range of scales on which relevant phenomena need to be studied. Is this a reasonable time frame? What other monitoring frequency would you suggest and why?

- In terms of post-operation monitoring, if there were no upset conditions reported during operations, is a semi-annual monitoring frequency for a period of 2 years reasonable? If not, please justify.

- What should be the maximum time for post-operation monitoring?

3.2.2. Monitoring scope

- The Operator should carry out desktop and field baseline surveys before the start of any exploration drilling, or production drilling, or field development construction, or production operations, or decommissioning activities, or seismic surveys, or scientific research surveys. What would be your proposition?

- The Operator must follow a pre-defined Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Programme for sample collection and laboratory analysis activities, taking into consideration calibration and maintenance of all equipment, data management and handling, document control, test performance, as well as personnel and training. Who should define such a QA/QC Programme?

- The Operator must examine during the monitoring process a comprehensive set of indicators (for physical, chemical and biological parameters), based on the existing Ecological Objectives (EOs) and Common/Candidate Indicators (CIs). Which of these following 27 CIs do you think are relevant to the Offshore Monitoring Programme?

Common/Candidate Indicators (CIs)	Relevant to the Offshore Monitoring Programme (Tick the box)
Common Indicator 1: Habitat distributional range, to also consider habitat extent as a relevant attribute (EO1);	
Common Indicator 2: Condition of the habitat’s typical species and communities (EO1);	
Common Indicator 3: Species distributional range (related to marine mammals, seabirds, marine reptiles) (EO1);	
Common Indicator 4: Population abundance of selected species (related to marine mammals, seabirds, marine reptiles) (EO1);	
Common Indicator 5: Population demographic characteristics (e.g. body size or age class structure, sex ratio, fecundity rates, survival/mortality rates related to marine mammals, seabirds, marine reptiles) (EO1);	
Common Indicator 6: Trends in abundance, temporal occurrence, and spatial distribution of non-indigenous species, particularly invasive, non-indigenous species, notably in risk areas (EO2, in relation to the main vectors and pathways of spreading of such species);	
Common Indicator 7: Spawning stock Biomass (EO3);	
Common Indicator 8: Total landings (EO3);	
Common Indicator 9: Fishing Mortality (EO3);	
Common Indicator 10: Fishing effort (EO3);	

Common Indicator 11: Catch per unit of effort (CPUE) or Landing per unit of effort (LPUE) as a proxy (EO3);	
Common Indicator 12: Bycatch of vulnerable and non-target species (EO1 and EO3);	
Common Indicator 13: Concentration of key nutrients in water column (EO5);	
Common Indicator 14: Chlorophyll-a concentration in water column (EO5);	
Common Indicator 15: Location and extent of the habitats impacted directly by hydrographic alterations (EO7);	
Common Indicator 16: Length of coastline subject to physical disturbance due to the influence of man-made structures (EO8) to also feed the assessment of EO1 on habitat extent;	
Common Indicator 17: Concentration of key harmful contaminants measured in the relevant matrix (EO9, related to biota, sediment, seawater);	
Common Indicator 18: Level of pollution effects of key contaminants where a cause and effect relationship has been established (EO9);	
Common Indicator 19: Occurrence, origin (where possible), and extent of acute pollution events (e.g. slicks from oil, oil products and hazardous substances) and their impact on biota affected by this pollution (EO9);	
Common Indicator 20: Actual levels of contaminants that have been detected and number of contaminants which have exceeded maximum regulatory levels in commonly consumed seafood (EO9);	
Common Indicator 21: Percentage of intestinal enterococci concentration measurements within established standards (EO9);	
Common Indicator 22: Trends in the amount of litter washed ashore and/or deposited on coastlines (including analysis of its composition, spatial distribution and, where possible, source). (EO10);	
Common Indicator 23: Trends in the amount of litter in the water column including microplastics and on the seafloor (EO10);	
Candidate Indicator 24: Trends in the amount of litter ingested by or entangling marine organisms focusing on selected mammals, marine birds and marine turtles (EO10);	
Candidate Indicator 25: Land use changes (EO8);	
Candidate Indicator 26: Proportion of days and geographical distribution where loud, low, and mid-frequency impulsive sounds exceed levels that are likely to entail significant impact on marine animals (EO11);	
Candidate Indicator 27: Levels of continuous low frequency sounds with the use of models as appropriate (EO11);	

- Do you think the Operator must create a pollution emergency plan and have it approved in accordance with the procedure established by the appropriate national authority, if no pollution emergency plan is in place for the offshore unit?

- How important is it for the Operator to identify and specify the range of temporal scales on which relevant phenomena need to be studied?

- Should the Operator be responsible for following the methodology and analysis requirements specified under the IMAP as well as under the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) and other EU Directives (e.g. Water Framework Directive-WFD, and the Habitats and Birds Directives)? Please explain.

- Should the assessment sheets provided by the Operator be based on IMAP Indicator Guidance Factsheets? Please explain.

- Should the Operator examine and follow any existing guidelines provided by the Working Groups (WG) of the Ecosystem Approach (EcAp) Correspondence Groups on Monitoring (CORMON)?

- The Operator must propose measures to halt and prevent further loss of biodiversity, and to protect and conserve ecosystems, and to restore, where practicable, marine areas which have been adversely affected by the offshore activities. Do you agree? Please explain.

- Based on your experience, what types of pressures anthropogenic activities exert on the natural environment?

- Should consistent methods, such as those described by the International Standards Organisation (ISO) and the European Committee for Standardization (CEN) for monitoring across a region/sub-region be required?

- Where no methods exist or are appropriate for the objective of the monitoring, what operating procedures should be used?

- What type of field sampling Station Network should the Operator establish?

- When selecting the Station Network what should the Operator base his/her decisions on (i.e. topography, currents, sediment conditions, etc.)?

- How many reference stations should the Operator establish and within which distance from the offshore activities? What factors should the Operator take into consideration for establishing these reference stations?

- Do you believe it is important to obtain data for the full water column, including at the seabed where discharges are planned/ expected, if applicable for the project activities? Please explain.

- In addition to the reference stations, field-specific stations are needed. How should these be established in relation to the offshore platform of operations/discharge point, and to which distance?

3. Operator reporting frequency, scope and geographical scope

3.3.1. Reporting Frequency

- The Operator must report the assessments and data at least following a specified frequency identified by the Contracting Parties/Competent Authorities. What should this frequency be?

- Should the Operator provide an environmental impact assessment before an offshore activity starts? Please explain.

- In order to monitor the consequent effects of the exploitation phase of the offshore activity studies, It is recommended that the Operator reports just as frequently as carrying out the monitoring (i.e., every 3 months). Do you agree? Please explain

- In terms of post-operation monitoring, It is recommended that the Operator reports just as frequently as carrying out the monitoring (i.e. every 6 months for 2 years). Do you agree? Explain

3.3.2. Reporting Scope

- It is recommended that the Operator provides the assessments below, which are routinely addressed within Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) studies. Do you agree? Should any of these assessments not be required? Please explain.

Proposed assessments to be routinely addressed within Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) studies	Please tick the box if <u>required</u>
Assessment of the quantities, types, sources and trends of marine litter, including the impact of litter on the marine environment;	
Assessment of the pressure from underwater noise;	
Assessment of environmental impacts of shipping (i.e. movement of vessels to and from the offshore installation);	
Assessment of the impact caused by deposits of dredged material on the marine environment;	

Proposed assessments to be routinely addressed within Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) studies	Please tick the box if <u>required</u>
Assessment of IMAP biodiversity indicators (e.g., abundance and distribution of selected species, critical load exceedance for nitrogen);	
Assessment of hazardous substances following the OSPAR Hazardous Substances Strategy, and the proposed “assessments of contaminants-related common indicators [developed] during the initial phase of IMAP” – UNEP(DEPI)/MED IG.22/Inf.7;	
Assessment of impacts of certain pressures from discharges, spills and emissions from offshore installations;	
Assessment of impacts of discharges of oil and chemicals in produced water on the marine environment;	
Assessment of trends in discharges of radioactive substances from nuclear and non-nuclear sources and trends in their concentrations and impacts in the marine environment;	
Assessment of impact of Naturally Occurring Radioactive materials (NORM) associated with oil and gas activities (IAEA No. NW-G-1.1), and the proposed “assessments of contaminants-related common indicators [developed] during the initial phase of IMAP” – UNEP(DEPI)/MED IG.22/Inf.7;	

- It is recommended that the assessments should provide a concise summary of contemporary knowledge (both natural science and socio-economic) and current management. Do you agree? Please explain.

- It is recommended that the assessments (EIAs) should provide an identification of significant gaps in knowledge which can provide an authoritative basis for defining priorities for further natural scientific, socio-economic and other investigations. Do you agree? Please explain.

- It is recommended that the assessments (EIAs) should provide a basis for judging the effectiveness and adequacy of environmental protection measures and for making any necessary adjustments. Do you agree? Please explain.

3.3.3. Reporting Geographical Scope

- It is recommended that the assessments (EIAs) prepared by the Operator must cover all regional and field-specific stations monitored within a distance of 4 kilometres (~2.16 nautical miles) from the offshore platform, or extend to any other distance specified by the Competent Authority. Do you agree with these limits? Please explain.