

From: Wall, Dave  
Sent: Tue Aug 17 22:49:56 2010  
To: Morten Haug Emilsen  
Subject: RE: Comments on the report  
Importance: High  
Attachments: image001.jpg

Morten,

there were so many changes that I don't think track changes would have been much help. If it helps you feel any better I worked on the report all day Sunday and much of Saturday.

What I have discovered is that this is all part of the required process to ensure a high quality report is eventually delivered, I have had many people review my part of the main investigation report and after nearly 6 weeks I have a product that is good.

Stick with it, try to stay patient and feel free to change anything your feel appropriate, it's your report. It is really important I get the report back tomorrow though.

All of the team leaders have now reviewed the report and I have further edits to offer you. What I propose we do is you send the report back to me tomorrow when you are ready and I will do track changes and add any of the TL comments I feel are value adding and then return before COB tomorrow.

This report will be the most scrutinized and challenged report you will ever write we need to get it to the point where it is really robust and you are completely happy with it but .....it has to be completed end of business Houston time on Thursday.

Dave  
*David Wall*  
*VP HSE & IM*  
*EPT - HSE, Operations & Engineering*  
07748180428

**From:** Morten Haug Emilsen [mailto:Morten.Haug.Emilsen@addenergy.no]  
**Sent:** 17 August 2010 17:34  
**To:** Wall, Dave  
**Subject:** Comments on the report

Dave,

I have read through the report and thought this would be an easy "Track changes and Accept" exercise, but was wrong. The Track changes was only used by NP (Nikolaos?) a couple of places in the report, all other

CONFIDENTIAL

AE-HZN-2179MDL00105478



changes were hard-coded. I have spent several hours going through the changes made and have yet not been able to cover all the pages. Some formatting has been done, that messed up the original document template, and therefore I had to start implementing all the changes in the original report. If BP wants to use their own template, that's ok, but the report I received did not look like this was the purpose.

General formatting changes like comma as thousand separator are fair enough and are implemented. Do not know whether the changed formatting on Figure captions was done on purpose or not, but now the Figures and Tables do not follow the same numbering and that cannot be correct. Figures now got a hyphen as separator whilst Tables got the period as is implemented in the add energy template. Feel free to use the one that satisfies BP's requirements.

Further comments so far:

- Investigation Team was written both with Capital Letters and small letters. I have used small letters. Feel free to change, but be consistent.

- In the Summary section the word well inflow simulations was used. I have removed well inflow.

- In the Summary section, the sentence "a net pay of between 13 ft to 16.5 ft" is changed to "a net pay between 13 ft and 16.5 ft".

- hrs behind all time points, ok - implemented

- drillpipe changed to drill pipe, implemented

- period behind all captions, not implemented

- In the Summary section, the blowout rates have been changed from the original and messed up, not correct. I changed back to the original numbers based on 15 ft net pay. If BP wants to specify the potential for 86 ft pay, (or other numbers of this input parameter) that's ok, but I will have to specify, or at least verify the numbers.

- In the Section "Blowout Potentials", the blowout potential to seabed was calculated to get another "tuning point" and second opinion/verification of the model. The investigation team made use of all available information in it's effort and I do not agree to the comment "Not relevant for the investigation". A lot of people, also within the team, did not believe in the first simulation model with respect to IPR, fast unloading and blowout potentials. Later, when pictures from the ROV became available together with other sources claiming the rate was higher than initially told, it became clear that the well had a high flow potential. For the simulations, it was an important input and used as a control point against the inflow performance, tubing performance and flow path determination.

As you might have noticed, it is time consuming to review the changes as they are not tracked. Also, I've noticed changes throughout the entire report, also within the Input Data Chapter. A lot of the changes are typos and formatting, that's fine, but some of the changes are of technical character, as the one mentioned in the Conclusions section, hence I've to read and compare the two documents side by side very closely.

Will continue, and hopefully get it done, tomorrow night.

Best regards,

cid:3310015153\_18375562

**Morten Haug Emilsen**  
Senior Petroleum Engineer

mob +47 91 17 09 03 | dir +47 66 98 32 93 | fax +47 66 98 32 99  
mail Morten Haug Emilsen

add wellflow as  
Billingstadsletta 19B | P.O. Box 165 | 1376 Billingstad | Norway  
addenergy.no

This message (including any attachments) contains confidential information intended for a specific individual and purpose, and is protected by law.

If you are not the intended recipient, you should delete this message and are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, or distribution of this message, or the taking of any action based on it, is strictly prohibited.

CONFIDENTIAL

AE-HZN-2179MDL00105480