

To Truls Gulowsen  
General Manager  
Greenpeace Norway

We refer to our meeting in Oslo on 16 May 2014 and your email dated 23 May 2014.

Statoil has informed Greenpeace of our exploration plans for the Barents Sea on several occasions. The plans were announced at the company's AGM and at the 16 May meeting. Moreover, Greenpeace made its views known during the consultative process in connection with the discharge permit application, and also protested the decision of the Norwegian Environment Agency to grant the permit.

Statoil entered into a dialogue with Greenpeace and listened to the organisation's concerns. But the Hoop acreage, where the operations are to take place, has been subject to an environmental impact assessment. A licence was subsequently awarded by the Norwegian authorities and the area opened. It is also included in the official Management Plan for the Barents Sea.

In the meeting with Greenpeace, Statoil described its plans for the drilling operations and for emergency preparedness. The company underlined the fact that the exploration activities will take place in an area with a known geological structure along with low pressures and temperatures, for which Statoil has drawn up plans for its operations on the basis of a thorough risk assessment. An oil discharge is considered to be highly improbable, and a series of barriers have been put in place to limit the consequences should an incident nevertheless occur. For further details in this connection, we refer to the Norwegian Environment Agency's emission permit.

In its email, Greenpeace asks for details of oil-spill precautions in the case of an oil discharge reaching Bjørnøya, which is 173km away from the drilling operations. Statoil refers to the actual discharge permit, in which the Environment Agency states the following:

*"A certain probability has (also) been calculated for an oil discharge reaching Bjørnøya. Bjørnøya and the surrounding sea form a nature reserve of extremely high environmental value. The calculated probability of oil drifting into the reserve is not great. But the shortest drift time calculated is relatively short, while the largest calculated amount of emulsion stranded is relatively large. For Bjørnøya too, the Agency considers the environmental risk to be moderate, based on the relatively low probability of oil drifting into the area; the potential for damage however is considered to be great. It will be challenging to deal with acute pollution on Bjørnøya, both operationally and logistically. A primary strategy must therefore be to combat an oil discharge in the vicinity of the well, if necessary with greater resources than those deemed adequate."*

An emergency response drill was conducted at Sandsli in Bergen on 29 April 2014, where oil at sea was one of the topics addressed. Both Statoil and Transocean took part in the drill. All communication lines and resources were checked and controlled with regard to a potential oil protection action. Should such an eventuality occur,

Statoil would avail itself of a contractually agreed emergency response team as well as resources provided by the Norwegian Clean Seas Association for Operating Companies (NOFO). NOFO stages its own drills in which crews are trained and equipment tested on a regular basis. These concerted measures satisfy the requirements set by the authorities for drills.

In the meeting, and in emails, Greenpeace has also sought more information regarding safety related to seismic operations and safety on a DP (dynamic positioning) rig. Statoil's goal is for its operations to proceed without injury to personnel, and without environmental damage. Meanwhile Greenpeace has been informed of the following circumstances:

- A 500-metre safety zone has been established around every rig on the Norwegian continental shelf. If a vessel is found to be heading for an installation, then a number of set measures will be triggered. The crew on board will muster and enter the lifeboats. If a vessel is on a collision course, we will terminate drilling, disconnect the well and withdraw.
- If a light vessel should approach the rig a considerable risk will arise. On an unanchored rig there are several lateral propellers. On *Transocean Spitsbergen* there are eight such propellers, four on the outside and four on the inside. These are essential to maintaining the rig's position; they cannot simply be disconnected and they will be in continuous positioning activity. We do not want light craft in the vicinity of the propellers, incurring the very real risk of people falling into the sea. We clearly communicated these concerns during the meeting.
- Towed behind a seismic collection vessel there are cables that are several kilometres long. These cables determine the sailing pattern and manoeuvrability of the vessel. If the ship is brought to a halt, the cables might sink and be damaged. Preventing a seismic vessel from doing its job will therefore pose the considerable risk of equipment damage and, worse still, injury to the crew.

Greenpeace has also contacted Statoil with respect to the raw data (Shapefiles) relating to oil drift calculations. The environmental risk analysis summary for Apollo has been subject to a public consultative process to which Greenpeace *et al* have provided input. This analysis includes oil drift calculations, probability calculations and a map of the areas within scope. The analyses were conducted in accordance with the guidelines of the Norwegian Oil and Gas Association (OLF/NOROG) governing the methodology for environmental risk analysis (MIRA).

Greenpeace has therefore been given access to the information submitted to the Norwegian authorities that forms the background for granting the licence. We see no grounds for sharing the raw data, as we have now complied with the information requirements set for well approval.

Kind regards,

Irene Rummelhoff

Statoil ASA