

From: [REDACTED]
To: Director of Marine Scotland Mailbox; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [Communications Net Zero & Rural Affairs](#); [Communications Net Zero & Rural Affairs](#); [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Press release from Uplift UK and Marine Conservation Society
Date: 08 November 2021 12:05:30
Attachments: [Outlook-jimf0aah.png](#)
[Outlook-ayhbewha.png](#)
[Cambo threatens protected sponges.docx](#)

Afternoon all

To note embargoed PR regarding Cambo.

It is true the gas pipeline is proposed to cut through the Faroe-Shetland Sponge Belt MPA. However under the terms of Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 it is the activity regulator who has the responsibility to ensure the MPA is not placed at significant risk (we don't have any power of intervention per se). The Joint Nature Conservation Committee has been providing statutory advice in this regard to the regulator (OPRED), and my understanding is that there are still some issues being resolved.

Best Wishes

[REDACTED]
Marine Scotland – Marine Planning and Policy
Mob: [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]@mcsuk.org>
Sent: 08 November 2021 09:38
To: [REDACTED]@gov.scot>
Subject: Press release from Uplift UK and Marine Conservation Society

Morning [REDACTED]

As discussed, attached is PR sent out this morning. The focus is the licensing decision by UK Government, it being a reserved matter of course, but we also wanted to acknowledge the Scottish Government's executively devolved remit in the offshore area regarding MPAs.

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Best wishes,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]
Head of Conservation Scotland

phone: [REDACTED]
mobile: [REDACTED]
email: [REDACTED]@mcsuk.org

[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Youtube](#) | [Linkedin](#) | [Instagram](#)



This email is confidential to the intended recipient(s) and the contents may be legally privileged or contain proprietary and private information. It is intended solely for the person to whom it is addressed. If you are not an intended recipient, you may not review, copy or distribute this email. If received in error, please notify the sender and delete the message from your system immediately. Please note that neither the Marine Conservation Society nor the sender accept any responsibility for any viruses and it is your responsibility to scan the email and the attachments (if any). Reg Charity No (England and Wales) 1004005.

Reg Charity No (Scotland) SC037480. Company Limited by Guarantee (England & Wales) No:2550966. VAT No. 321 4912 32. Registered Office: Overross House, Ross Park, Ross-on-Wye, Herefordshire, HR9 7US

██████████
OGA Consent and Authorisations
AB1
Second Floor
48 Huntly Street
Aberdeen
AB10 1SH

25 October 2019

Dear Madam,

PETROLEUM PRODUCTION LICENCE(S) P.1028 and P.1189 CAMBO FIELD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

I refer to the Petroleum Production licence(s) and the potential field development mentioned above.

Subject to the necessary management and partner approvals, Siccar Point Energy E&P Limited would intend to apply for Consent for the development of the said field, and this letter of application to provide preliminary notification of the proposals is made on behalf of:

Siccar Point Energy E&P Limited (Operator)	70%
Shell UK Limited	30%

The primary nature of this project will be for the development of the Cambo oil and gas field and it is proposed this project will comprise of the following:

- The concept for the Cambo Project is for a dedicated, moored Floating Production, Storage and Offloading (FPSO) vessel to produce hydrocarbons from two drill centres. Oil will be exported via shuttle tanker. Gas will be exported via a gas export pipeline extending 70 km to the southeast of the Cambo field, and will terminate at the West of Shetland Pipeline (WOSPS) Pipeline End Manifold (PLEM) tie-in.
- It is proposed that eight new production wells and four water injection wells will be drilled in the Cambo field. Additionally, the Cambo 204/10a-5Y well, drilled as an appraisal well in 2018, will also be completed for production.
- The Cambo field is expected to produce oil and gas for approximately 25 years.
- Offshore development activities are due to commence at the Cambo field in 2020, with first drilling operation in 2021. First oil is expected in 2023.
- The Cambo oil field lies within UKCS Blocks 204/4a, 204/5a, 204/9a and 204/10a, in the West of Shetland region.
- The proposed Development lies adjacent to the UK/Faroe Island transboundary line.
- The proposed Development footprint is situated at water depths of between 1,050 m in the southeast to 1,100 m in the northwest within the Faroe-Shetland Channel, with the Gas Export Pipeline route situated at water depths of 1,085 m to 190 m.
- The nearest coast line is the Shetland Islands, located approximately 125 km to the east.

Siccar Point Energy E&P Limited can confirm that an Environmental Statement ('ES') (BEIS Ref: D/4240/2019) for the potential development will be submitted to the Environmental Management Team at the Offshore Petroleum Regulator for Environment and Decommissioning (OPRED) in their capacity as environmental regulator acting on behalf of the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy.

Yours faithfully,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.A small black rectangular redaction box covering the name of the signatory.

Chief Executive Officer, Siccar Point Energy E&P Limited

Cc: Environmental Management Team, OPRED (by e-mail to bst@beis.gov.uk)

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@SiccarPointEnergy.co.uk>
Sent: Thursday, 25 June 2020 16:45
To: MS PON15
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Cambo Phase 1 Field Development Environmental Statement - D/4240/2019 - Additional Information
Attachments: Cambo ES_D-4240-2019_Marine Scotland.pdf; Cambo ES (D-4240-2019) Additional Information.pdf

Good afternoon,

Under Regulation 10(2) of the Offshore EIA Regulations, Siccar Point Energy E&P Limited (SPE) has been requested by BEIS to provide additional information in relation to the Cambo Field Development Environmental Statement (ES Ref: D/4240/2019). SPE is required to serve Marine Scotland Science with a copy of the additional information.

Please find attached a cover letter detailing the timeline for the consultation and another file containing the public notice and additional information.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
HSE Advisor

Siccar Point Energy Limited
3rd Floor, H1
Hill of Rubislaw
Anderson Drive
Aberdeen, AB15 6BY

Switch: 01224 678008
Mobile: [REDACTED]

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

[REDACTED]
MS.Chemicals@gov.scot

[REDACTED]
PETROFAC FACILITIES MANAGEMENT LIMITED

21 June 2019

MARINE SCOTLAND SCIENCE RESPONSE

WIA-882
CP-2038-0 (Version 1)
PETROFAC Chemical Permit 204/10a- 4Z Cambo

Marine Scotland, Marine Laboratory has reviewed the Chemical Risk Assessment included in the above Chemical Permit and has the following comments to be addressed in an update:

1. Section 4.3 of the CRA and section 2.4.1 of the EIA mentions the aborted cement request. However, neither of these sections discuss why discharge of an aborted cement batch is the best practicable environmental option (BPEO) or what other options are available. Please provide a fuller discussion of this in the documents.
2. Throughout both the CRA and EIA documents there is mention of the historic chemicals that will be encountered below the suspension plugs and behind the well casing. Do you have the application number that the use of these chemicals were covered under?
3. The BDF parameters of the cementing operation (op 3) are shown in the footnotes of the portal entry. For all the other operations (Op 1, 2 and 4) the rate and volume is shown in the respective column in the portal for these operations, but there are no parameters for density in the portal or in the CRA. MS cannot currently emulate the BDFs shown in these operations without the correct parameters. Please provide all the BDF parameters for operations 1, 2, and 4.
4. NEWDRILL PLUS is missing a dosage in the portal entry, therefore MS cannot emulate the modelling. Please check and amend.
5. In section 2.1 of the CRA and section 2.4.1 of the EIA, it is mentioned that the same drill rig is used for multiple well operations and the same drilling fluids are being utilised and carried over from each well if possible. Can you just clarify if that means the quantities of chemicals requested on this permit are a combined amount from all the drill rig operations (ie DRA/628 and DRA/689)?
6. Can you clarify why the dosages of the aborted batch cement chemicals don't equate to the use weight and discharge volume? For example CD-34L has a dosage of 4281 mg/l in the aborted discharge and it is mentioned that there is only 4 m3 of discharge volume, which would indicate a discharge weight of about 17 kg. But in the portal there is a request for 45 kg. This seems enough for more than one batch. Can you clarify?
7. In section 5.2 of the CRA there is discussion of the BOP control fluid and discharges. It is mentioned that the entire volume of the BOP is 1.893 m3, which will be fully vented upon recovery, and that the BOP has a discharges related to function testing on a weekly and 3 weekly basis of 0.303 m3. Given that operations are expected to take up to 30 days this would give about 6 x discharge of 0.303 m3. Combining the total volume and the 6 test discharges this gives a use and discharge of about 4 m3 of fluid. But on the permit you have

4500 kg of Erifon HD603HP (No Dye) at 53100 mg/l, which is enough for about 85 m3. Can you clarify why you would need so much of this hydraulic chemical offshore for these operations? Is there potentially greater number of discharges or are they at a potentially higher dosage?

8. In the Osborne-Adams modelling of the hydraulic fluid it mentions in section 5.2 that a residual current of 0.24 m/s is used. This mimics the residual current shown for operation 4 in the portal, but all the other operations show a residual current of 0.024 m/s in the portal entry. Please can you check that the model parameter of 0.24 m/s is correct and amend as necessary?

9. MS cannot emulate the RQ shown in the portal or justification for MCS-J using the most up-to-date Cefas template and the parameters shown. Please check.

10. In section 1.1 of the CRA it mentions that the proposed full abandonment is set for the summer of 2018. I think this should be 2019. Please check.

11. DFE-7002 in the portal mentions a dosage stream of NaCl brine, but it is not used downhole with the brine as it is shown as CWS and is described as a pit cleaner in the CRA. Can you check and clarify the dosage stream?

12. In the CRA when discussing the discharge of historic chemicals, as shown in table 2 and operation 2, there is mention of a corrosion inhibitor discharged in section 3.1, and cement spacers in section 3.2. Can you clarify that this was in reference to Oxygen for the corrosion inhibitor and Barazan as the spacer, as it is unclear from the descriptions of use if these are the chemicals being referred to in these sections or if there is potentially other chemicals that have not been included.

Please address the above comments in an Update. The changes should be clearly outlined in the Change Summary and it would also be helpful if these were highlighted throughout the submission. This should be submitted to BEIS, stating, that it is in response to Marine Scotland comments. Marine Scotland will review the update once notification from the BEIS PORTAL has been received.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any comments or queries.

The assessment of this application was conducted by [REDACTED]. Any correspondence should be sent to MS.Chemicals@gov.scot

Regards

[REDACTED]
Offshore Chemical Coordinator Assistant

From: [BST](#)
To: [MS PON15](#)
Cc: [REDACTED] ([Energy Development & Resilience](#)); [REDACTED] ([Energy Development & Resilience](#))
Subject: FW: CP/1520/3 (Version 1) Application Submitted
Date: 05 June 2018 16:17:10
Attachments: [PETS Application](#)

Good Afternoon,

Please be advised that we have received the following variation from AGR, who have requested this application be dealt with urgently due to commencement this weekend. May I politely request your comments, where possible, by COP 7th June?

Many thanks in advance,

[REDACTED]

From: ukop@ogauthority.co.uk <ukop@ogauthority.co.uk>
Sent: 05 June 2018 15:41
To: Environmental Management Team [REDACTED]@beis.gov.uk>
Subject: CP/1520/3 (Version 1) Application Submitted

UK Energy Portal Message

For the attention of: emt@beis.gov.uk
Subject: CP/1520/3 (Version 1) Application Submitted

The application **CP/1520/3 (Version 1)** has been submitted to OGA and is now available in your workbasket. Below is a summary of the details of the application:

Case Reference CP/1520/3 (Version 1)
Approval Type Chemical Permit
Date Submitted 5th June 2018 15:36:49
MAT Reference DRA/533
Operator AGR WELL MANAGEMENT LIMITED

Log in to your workbasket to view or process this application.

If you would like to download the additional documentation related to this SAT, please click [here](#). This link will expire in 14 days.

If this email has been copied to you, you may click [UK Oil Portal](#) to logon as yourself.
For assistance or support email: ukop@ogauthority.co.uk or telephone 0300 067 1682.

This message is intended for the addressee only and may contain private and confidential information or material which may be privileged. If this message has come to you in error you must delete it immediately and should not copy it or show it to any other person.

The Oil and Gas Authority is a limited company registered in England and Wales. Registered number 09666504. VAT registered number 249 433 979. Registered office: 21 Bloomsbury Street, London, United Kingdom, WC1B 3HF.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.

For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: [REDACTED]
To: [MS Chemicals](#); [REDACTED]@beis.gov.uk
Cc: [Environmental Management Team](#)
Subject: Response to MS comments DRA\533 CP1520-0-Rev1
Date: 23 March 2018 16:26:00
Attachments: [image001.jpg](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

[REDACTED] / Sirs,

Please be advised that we have responded to your comments in an update to the Chemical Permit, Risk Assessment and change summary as requested.

Please also find below summary responses to your queries in blue.

MARINE SCOTLAND SCIENCE RESPONSE

DRA-533 CP-1520-0 (Version 1) AGR Chemical Permit 204/10a-Cambo E planned well Cambo

Marine Scotland, Marine Laboratory has reviewed the Chemical Risk Assessment included in the above Chemical Permit and has the following comments to be addressed in an update:

1. a) Marine Scotland are only able to emulate the RQ for LD-8e during all drill sections when the Log POW is omitted. Please note when the DR CHARM algorithm is used all parameters from the Cefas template must be used.

The RQs for LD-8e have been calculated as 0.00008 in all instances. With this comment in mind, these calculations have revisited but the same value has been generated in all cases. Therefore, no changes have been made to the RQs provided for LD-8e in any of the drilling sections. Please could you provide additional advice if you need an update to be made.

b) Marine Scotland are unable to emulate the RQ for EnviroSet R-40L HT using the most up to date Cefas template version 4. Please can you provide your working. Also please note the CS BDF has incorrectly been used to model this CM product. Please amend.

The batch dilution has been corrected in the portal to reflect that this is a CM product. The CHARM modelling has been redone and the RQ given in the portal corrected from 0.0001 to 0.001.

c) An incorrect CHARM algorithm has been entered in the portal for ASA-304L during cementing. Please amend.

This error has been corrected in the portal and the CHARM algorithm is now given as CM.

d) The footnote in the completion section of the portal gives the BDF parameters for the completion chemicals. However the BDF used for CLEANRIG CHP 50% does not correlate with the that listed and used for all other completion chemicals. Please can you clarify.

As described in the risk assessment attachment (Section 5.1), CLEANRIG CHP 50% will be used as the rig wash to keep the surfaces of the mobile drilling rig clean. As such, it will not be directly involved in well operations or discharged along with the completion fluids, and for this reason it has a different batch dilution factor. However, this question has prompted a review of the batch dilution factor used and attempts have been made to better reflect the characteristics of the discharge in this case. As such the batch dilution factor for CLEAN RIG CHP 50% has been revised, a note regarding the batch dilution factor added to the footnotes, and the RQ recalculated.

2. Section 2.6.2 of the EIA states that before demobilisation the drilling rig will place wireless monitoring gauges in well 204/10a-4Z. Please can you confirm the well reference. Will another well (4Z) be re-entered during these operations? Will there be any expected discharge from this well on re-entry?

This use of 4Z was a typo and this has been corrected from 4Z to EZ, the subject of the assessment document. No other wells will be re-entered as part of these operations.

3. a) Section 1.2 of the Chemical Risk Assessment contains an incorrect statement "All of the chemicals that will be discharged to sea were found to have an RQ of less than one or have been categorised as OCNS group E chemicals. Therefore, it is unlikely that those substances will cause a significant effect upon the marine environment." It should be noted that Milgard XPR has an RQ>1 throughout all WBM drill sections. Please amend.

This error has been corrected in Section 1.2 of the chemical risk assessment, now stating the "majority" instead of "all" chemicals.

b) This section of the CRA also states "two of the chemicals proposed for use during these operations contain components that carry a product warning or have been recommended for substitution (SUB)". However, the does not correlate with the portal or the Chemical Risk Assessment where four risk based justifications have been provided for products with substitution warnings or other environmental warnings.

This confusion has arisen due to the different types of warnings and an attempt to differentiate between the substitution and other warnings. This part of Section 1.2 has now been corrected as advised.

4. a) As Milgard XPR (Silver) has an RQ of 5.073 during drilling the risk based justification provided is insufficient and includes incorrect modelling results. RQs which are greater than 1 indicate a significant risk to the marine environment. In the case of very high RQs Marine Scotland will have to inform the BEIS of the risk posed by the discharge. There may then be restrictions on discharge conditions on the permit.

Further consideration should be given to how the products are being used, in order to ensure that the RQ is as realistic as possible.

- How representative is the batch dilution factor of the actual discharge? Can further dilution be incorporated either in the pits or with a simple deck hose, either prior to or during discharge?
- How realistic is the batch dilution factor used? Do the limitations of the batch dilution factor result in an exaggerated RQ, and if so, why?

If the RQ indicates a higher environmental risk than is probable, then further investigation / explanation should be provided to supplement the justification.

- What is the actual discharge rate of the chemical and how long will the discharge take to complete? Can you put this in context with the tidal currents and wind speed in the area?
- Could the length of time between use and discharge of the chemical be sufficient to reduce the toxicity or result in significant biodegradation of the chemical?

During development of the permit applications, the use and discharge of Milgard XPR was looked at in detail by the project team, due to the high RQ it generated for these operations (5.073). Through discussions with the mud suppliers, it was ascertained that a dosage of 1 lb/bbl (2,583 mg/l) was sufficient for this well, reducing the RQ to 1.015. This change and RQ was reflected in the justification document, but incorrectly not updated in the portal. Corrections to the proposed dosage and resultant RQ have now been made in all portal entries.

Considering it is a Silver chemical and has still generated an RQ of greater than 1, the proposed use of this chemical has been reviewed again by the project team at this stage. There is no available replacement for this chemical, so the team looked at whether its use was definitely required. This chemical is a contingency option, which may need to be added into the fluid system and pumped downhole if there were signs of hydrogen sulphide. This is deemed to be very unlikely but, given the health and safety concerns associated with hydrogen sulphide, this option needs to be retained.

Prior to backloading, Milgard XPR may also be added to the mud slops at the surface, to mitigate against the formation of hydrogen sulphide when storing and transporting slops back to shore. While still a contingency option, this usage is more likely in this scenario. In this case, the chemical would be used at the surface only and, as it would be added to contained fluids which will be transported to shore, would be transferred with these fluids and disposed onshore. In this scenario there would be no discharge to the marine environment. This explanation of the more likely scenario for use has been add to the justification text in the risk assessment attachment.

b) The risk based justification for Milgard XPR also states that it is listed as contingency only for both the drilling and completion fluids. However it is listed as both primary and contingency during completion. Please amend.

As described above, it is not the intention to apply Milgard XPR in all cases, only if hydrogen sulphide gas is suspected. This chemical was originally included as a primary chemical within the completion chemicals, as a build-up of hydrocarbon sulphide was deemed to be more likely at this stage of the operations. However, as it has been confirmed that this chemical will not be added as part of the normal operations and is included as a contingency option, the primary entry has been removed from the Oil Portal.

5. The risk based justification for MCS-J states that the SUB warning has only been applied in the last couple of years. This statement is no longer applicable and should be removed.

This statement has been removed from the MCS-J justification text as suggested.

6. a) Section 3.2 states that the discharge of cement from the cement plugs and sidetrack casing will "not exceed more than 10% of the chemicals used (Table 1)". However FP-16LG has a 20% discharge amount listed in Table 1 for the pilot hole abandonment and the 9 5/8" sidetrack casing. Please can you clarify why this product has a greater discharge amount to the others?

This was an error, which has now been corrected in both the portal and the risk assessment attachment. The discharge quantity for this chemical will not exceed 10% in either of these two jobs.

b) It has been confirmed that cement spacer fluid used ahead of the cement during casing of the 36" x 30" conductor will be 100% discharged. Therefore in Table 1 an incorrect percentage discharge has been entered

for RX-9022 in the 36" x 30" conductor and overall cement usage columns. Please amend.

This typo has been corrected from 0 to 100% in Table 1 of the risk assessment document. As the use and discharge quantities were correct, no change was required to the portal entries for this chemical.

c) SealBond Plus when used in the cement spacers for the pilot hole abandonment has been listed with a 100% discharge. Please can you clarify why this product has a greater discharge amount to the others listed?

This was just an error and discharges of this chemical will be in line with the other spacer chemicals for this cement job. The percentage discharge has been corrected to 20% in Table 1 of the risk assessment and the discharge quantity correspondingly updated to 800 kg. The overall cement discharge has been recalculated to take account of this correction, and updated in both Table 1 and the UK Oil Portal.

d) Similarly when used in the sidetrack cement plugs for suspension SealBond Plus has been listed with a 10% discharge. Please can you clarify why this product has a smaller discharge amount to the others listed?

Similar to the question above, this was an error that has now been corrected and the corresponding total discharges amended in Table 1 of the risk assessment document and in the Oil Portal.

e) Marine Scotland are unable to emulate the overall cement use, discharge or total percentage discharge for cement spacer FP-16L using the figures provided in Table 1 of the CRA. Please amend.

The estimated chemical use and discharge have been checked for the individual cement job and found to be correct. The disparity between these and the totals was due to an error in the formula used to calculate the total values. This has now been corrected in Table 1 and also the Oil Portal.

f) The use and discharge figures listed in the UK Portal for MCS-J (19,190 kg and 8,230 kg) do not correlate with those provided in Table 1 of the CRA (3,200 kg and 640 kg). Please can you clarify.

The numbers provided in Table 1 of the risk assessment were correct and the estimated use and discharge quantities given in the portal have now been updated to reflect these. As MCS-J has been highlighted as a candidate for substitution, greater scrutiny was given to the use of this chemical in these operations, ensuring it is only proposed for use where completely necessary. As such, its initial proposed use in all cement jobs has been reduced to only the production casing when cement contamination by the drilling mud is a greater concern. The risk assessment attachment reflected this change from the earlier proposed application, but the portal did not. This error has now been corrected and the two correspond.

7. ERIFON STACK GYCOL has been listed in the portal with a discharge code of OTH. Please can you clarify why this discharge code has been used as no explanation has been provided.

Erifon Stack Glycol acts as an antifreeze within the BOP control fluid, so a description of this function has been added to Section 5.2 of the risk assessment describing the control fluids. As the BOP control fluid will be discharged at the seabed, the chemicals involved have been given a discharge code of other (OTH). An explanation of this code has also been added.

Best regards,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]
Corporate HSEQ
Regional HSEQ Manager (EMEA)

Tel: +44 1224 [Redacted]
DD: +44 1224 [Redacted]
Mob: [Redacted]
Fax: +44 1224 [Redacted]



3rd Floor, Union Plaza, 1 Union Wynd,
Aberdeen, AB10 1SL
United Kingdom
www.agr.com



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

The information contained in this message may be CONFIDENTIAL and is intended for the addressee only. Any unauthorised use;

dissemination of the information or copying of this message is prohibited. If you are not the addressee, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and delete this message.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

This email has been received from an external party and has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

From: ukop@ogauthority.co.uk
To: [MS PON15](#)
Subject: UKOP: SA/1155 GS/941/0 (Version 1) Folder Ref: 01.01.01.01-3464U, Application to carry out a Marine Survey Apply for Consent to Undertake a Geophysical Survey: Full Review Delivery
Date: 12 June 2019 16:16:02

Oil and Gas Authority (OGA)

UKOP: UK Energy Portal

For the attention of: [REDACTED]

Subject: UKOP: SA/1155 GS/941/0 (Version 1) Folder Ref: 01.01.01.01-3464U, Application to carry out a Marine Survey Apply for Consent to Undertake a Geophysical Survey: Full Review Delivery

A full review requiring your response has recently been delivered to your workbasket. Use the URL below to login to your workbasket. There you will be able to manage and respond to this review.

Use the following URL http://itportal.ogauthority.co.uk/eng/fox/live/PORTAL_LOGIN/login to visit the UKOP (UK Energy Portal) login page.

For assistance or support email: ukop@ogauthority.co.uk or telephone 0300 067 1682.

This message is intended for the addressee only and may contain private and confidential information or material which may be privileged. If this message has come to you in error you must delete it immediately and should not copy it or show it to any other person.

The Oil and Gas Authority is a limited company registered in England and Wales. Registered number 09666504. VAT registered number 249 433 979. Registered office: 21 Bloomsbury Street, London, United Kingdom, WC1B 3HF.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] (MSS) on behalf of MS PON15
Sent: Friday, 26 June 2020 08:54
To: 'BST'
Subject: Siccar Point Energy - Cambo Phase 1 Field Development Environmental Statement
- D-4240-2019 -

Dear EMT,

Marine Scotland have received additional information directly from the operator -Siccar Point Energy in association with the Cambo Phase 1 Field Development Environmental Statement (D-4240-2019).

Could you please advise if you require a response from Marine Scotland and whether this should be forward to the Department in the usual manner.

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]

0131 244 [REDACTED]
MS.PON15@gov.scot

EMT
BEIS
Aberdeen

MARINE SCOTLAND SCIENCE RESPONSE

WIA-882
CP-2038-0 (Version 3)
PETROFAC Chemical Permit 204/10a- 4Z Cambo

Marine Scotland, Marine Laboratory has reviewed the Chemical Risk Assessment included in the above Chemical Permit.

We entered into discussion with the operator with regard to clarifying historic chemical permit and what is being discharged, dosages and clarification for aborted cement chemicals, providing BDF parameters for most of the operations, providing missing information from the portal for modelling, clarifying subsea discharge parameters for modelling worst-case, and clarifying discrepancies between documents and the portal.

The operator provided the information in an Update and submitted this to the BEIS PORTAL.

Marine Scotland agrees with all the generated RQs and adequate justification was provided for products with substitution warnings and other products of an environmental concern.

Therefore, we can confirm that Marine Scotland has no objections to a Chemical Permit for this application.

Marine Scotland advise that the following comments should be addressed in a future variation/submission.

1. Please note that whilst BDF parameters have been provided in the footnotes of operation 1 for the abandonment chemicals, the parameters for DFE-7002, which is used as a detergent topside only, have not been provided. Please can you confirm the BDF parameters for this chemical in operation 1 footnotes too.
2. MS cannot emulate the RQ shown in the portal for NEWDRILL PLUS using the parameters provided and the most up-to-date template (version 14). Please check this modelling and amend as necessary.

The assessment of this application was conducted by [REDACTED]. Any correspondence should be sent by email to MS.PON15@gov.scot.

Regards

[REDACTED]
Offshore Chemical Coordinator Assistant
25 June 2019

[REDACTED]

From: ukop@ogauthority.co.uk
Sent: 03 July 2018 13:55
To: MS PON15
Subject: UKOP: SA/972 GS/776/0 (Version 1) Folder Ref: 01.01.01.01-2709U, Application to carry out a Marine Survey Apply for Consent to Undertake a Geophysical Survey: Full Review Delivery

Oil and Gas Authority (OGA)

UKOP: UK Energy Portal

For the attention of: [REDACTED]

Subject: UKOP: SA/972 GS/776/0 (Version 1) Folder Ref: 01.01.01.01-2709U, Application to carry out a Marine Survey Apply for Consent to Undertake a Geophysical Survey: Full Review Delivery

A full review requiring your response has recently been delivered to your workbasket. Use the URL below to login to your workbasket. There you will be able to manage and respond to this review.

Use the following URL http://itportal.ogauthority.co.uk/eng/fox/live/PORTAL_LOGIN/login to visit the UKOP (UK Energy Portal) login page.

For assistance or support email: ukop@ogauthority.co.uk or telephone 0300 067 1682.

This message is intended for the addressee only and may contain private and confidential information or material which may be privileged. If this message has come to you in error you must delete it immediately and should not copy it or show it to any other person.

The Oil and Gas Authority is a limited company registered in England and Wales. Registered number 09666504. VAT registered number 249 433 979. Registered office: 21 Bloomsbury Street, London, United Kingdom, WC1B 3HF.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED] (MARLAB)
Subject: RE: DRA-533 CP-1520-0 (Version 2) AGR Chemical Permit 204/10a-Cambo E planned well Cambo
Date: 27 March 2018 14:02:01
Attachments: [image001.jpg](#)
[image002.jpg](#)

Hi [REDACTED],

I've found it. I had 0.24 in the refreshment rather than 0.24 in the residual current speed. That makes the two the same.

I'm glad that's solved. I'll redo the calculations and make sure they are updated in the next update if that is okay?

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]@gov.scot [REDACTED]@gov.scot]
Sent: 27 March 2018 13:50
To: [REDACTED]@aureliaenvironmental.co.uk
Subject: RE: DRA-533 CP-1520-0 (Version 2) AGR Chemical Permit 204/10a-Cambo E planned well Cambo

Hi [REDACTED],

Here is what I have been generating with regards to the RQ for LD-8e. I have used the spreadsheet you sent and just enabled editing and enabled the content to allow me to input the figures. I've used the 17.5" drill section as this has generated the highest RQ of 0.011 and taken the RQ ecosystem from the results page.

Like I said I won't be holding up the permit as the RQ is less than 1 in this case.

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]

Offshore Chemical Risk Assessor
Marine Scotland Science
Scottish Government | Marine Laboratory, PO Box 101| 375, Victoria Road | Aberdeen AB11 9DB
Tel: +44 (0)131 244 [REDACTED]
S/B: +44 (0)131 244 2500

e: [REDACTED]@gov.scot
w: www.gov.scot/marinescotland



From: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]@aureliaenvironmental.co.uk]
Sent: 27 March 2018 12:51
To: [REDACTED] (MARLAB)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: DRA-533 CP-1520-0 (Version 2) AGR Chemical Permit 204/10a-Cambo E planned well

Cambo

Hi [REDACTED],

[REDACTED] forwarded me your e-mail and asked me to take a look. I'm afraid I just get the same RQ in all scenarios, so I'm not sure how to proceed with this. I have attached the CHARM spreadsheet I have been using, which is just the standard sheet from EOSCA. Let me know if you think there might be an error. However, I'm happy to just update the application based on the highest RQ you have generated as, as you said, the RQs are all still below one in this case.

Thanks,

[REDACTED].

[REDACTED]
Senior Environmental Consultant

Aurelia Environmental Ltd
Belgrave Business Centre, 45 Frederick Street, Edinburgh, EH2 1EP
E-mail: [REDACTED]@aureliaenvironmental.co.uk
Mobile: [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]@gov.scot [REDACTED]@gov.scot]
Sent: 27 March 2018 09:50
To: [REDACTED]@agr.com>
Subject: DRA-533 CP-1520-0 (Version 2) AGR Chemical Permit 204/10a-Cambo E planned well
Cambo

Hi [REDACTED],

Thank you for submitting your update to DRA/533 CP/1520. Most of Marine Scotlands comments have been addressed other than the issue with LD-8e.

The Log POW of LD-8e does have a significant effect on the RQ when using the DR algorithm and indicates that it accumulates in the sediment. The highest RQ Marine Scotland has generated for LD-8e is 0.011 during the 17.5" tophole section. Although this RQ<1 in this instance the Log POW for LD-8e very often results in RQs>1. It may be best if we can find out why your RQs are not changing when the Log POW is used so that it does not become an issue on future permits.

Would it be possible for you send me a copy of your CHARM spreadsheet or all the parameters you have used in your CHARM calculation of LD-8e in all drill sections? If not is there a good time for me to call for us to go through each parameter used?

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Offshore Chemical Risk Assessor
Marine Scotland Science
Scottish Government | Marine Laboratory, PO Box 101| 375, Victoria Road | Aberdeen AB11 9DB
Tel: +44 (0)131 244 [REDACTED]
S/B: +44 (0)131 244 2500

e: [REDACTED]@gov.scot
w: www.gov.scot/marinescotland



This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return.

Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government.

Tha am post-d seo (agus faidhle neo ceanglan còmhla ris) dhan neach neo luchd-ainmichte a-mhàin. Chan eil e ceadaichte a chleachdadh ann an dòigh sam bith, a' toirt a-steach còraichean, foillseachadh neo sgaoileadh, gun chead. Ma 's e is gun d'fhuair sibh seo gun fhiosd', bu choir cur às dhan phost-d agus lethbhreac sam bith air an t-siostam agaibh agus fios a leigeil chun neach a sgaoil am post-d gun dàil.

Dh'fhaodadh gum bi teachdaireachd sam bith bho Riaghaltas na h-Alba air a chlàradh neo air a sgrùdadh airson dearbhadh gu bheil an siostam ag obair gu h-èifeachdach neo airson adhbhar laghail eile. Dh'fhaodadh nach eil beachdan anns a' phost-d seo co-ionann ri beachdan Riaghaltas na h-Alba.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>
