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1 Introduction

1.1 Background
Statoil is an international energy company with more than 30 years of experience in the oil and gas industry. The offshore installations are complex plants with high demands concerning performance and profit making, as industry becomes more capital intensive. The fields grow older, and the need for a good maintenance strategy to minimize downtime and maximize production rates is increasing.

Turnarounds (TARs) and unplanned shutdowns are Statoil’s single-most important cause of lost production. Management of turnarounds and shutdowns is an essential part of Statoil’s strategy for safe and efficient operation of assets or plants. Statoil has launched several initiatives to improve its turnaround planning and execution process. The Turnaround & Shutdown Optimization project is developed by Statoil in cooperation with IBM as there is a need for minimalizing the negative effects a shutdown will have. The three main parts of the project was:

- Improve turnaround and shutdown preparedness and performance
- Optimize turnaround and shutdown frequency and duration for single installations
- Optimize turnaround frequency and duration across interdependent installations

(Thuestad L., Utne, Kleppa, Sjøflot, Thorstensen, & Finbak, 2010)

In the Activity A.3 – Shutdown Preparedness, the group developed a method for measurement of shutdown preparedness and utilization for shutdowns for maintenance work. They tested the method on two installations and prepared recommendations for continued development and implementation of the method. This master thesis is dealing with shutdown preparedness, and the process to improve methods and tools for monitoring of shutdown preparedness and the implementation of opportunistic maintenance. The shutdown preparedness monitoring will be based on the same methods used by the group described, and on the same installations. There will be a debate over the methods in use and the results. Hopefully it will be possible to point out trends from the measurements, and perhaps important differences between the two installations. Statoil will provide me with the data necessary in order to perform the measurements.

1.2 Statoil
Statoil is an international energy company listed on the stock exchange, with more than 30 years of experience in the oil and gas industry. Statoil has been one of the most important actor in Norwegian oil industry since early 70’s, and has contributed to develop Norway to a modern developed country. The Government of Norway is the largest owner, with 67% of the shares. The ownership interest is managed by the Norwegian Ministry of Petroleum and Energy. Statoil is operating nearly 80 percent of all oil and gas production on the Norwegian continental shelf (NCS). Today Norway is one of the world’s most productive petroleum register, and a laboratory for technology development. Statoil has also international target areas. As much as half of Statoil’s exploration activity is now outside Norway’s borders. The company has almost 30 000 employees, and is represented in 40 countries.
With a market value of approximately 400 billion Norwegian kroner, it is by far the most valuable country in Norway and the world’s 13th largest oil and gas company by revenue, profit and market capitalization. In 2010, Statoil delivered total liquids and gas entitlement production of 1.705 million barrels of oil equivalent (mmboe) per day, down 6% from 1.806 mmboe per day in 2009. Only on the NCS the numbers were 1.374 and 1.45 mmboe in 2010 and 2009 respectively. (The Global 2000, 2010) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Statoil)

1.2.1 Business benefits
The initiating of the Turnaround & Optimization project is to reduce lost production. Lost production is defined as the difference between the actual production and the potential production (theoretical production target). According to the Shutdown Preparedness final report the estimated value of production on the NCS by Statoil was approximately 77 billion USD in 2009, derived from the average of 1.450 mmboe. But this value of production has a potential of increasing with higher Production Efficiency (PE). The total PE losses was in 2009 13.2%. A small increase of the production efficiency will transmit into great increase in production and thus profit.

The total amount of planned and unplanned work including turnarounds on process related equipment accounted for approximately 6% loss of production efficiency in 2009. This corresponded roughly to 4.6 billion USD. The numbers were almost equally divided on planned and unplanned shutdowns. Further the report states that *it is believed that improved planning of all activities requiring shutdown may reduce the overall need for shutdowns. The business potential is significant. A 5% reduction of the need for shutdowns through improved planning and preparedness will for instance reduce the annual production losses with 230 million USD per year.* (Thuestad L., Utne, Kleppa, Sjøflot, Thorstensen, & Finbak, 2010)
2 Maintenance Management

According to the European committee for standardization maintenance management is:

“All activities of the management that determine the maintenance objectives, strategies, and responsibilities and implement them by means such as maintenance planning, maintenance control and supervision, improvement of methods in the organization including economic aspects.” (Maintenance Terminology, 2001)

Maintenance management cannot be understood without a good sense of the term maintenance.

2.1 Maintenance

Maintenance in everyday life is for most people the work of keeping something in proper condition. It is a broad term, and is defined by the European committee for standardization as:

“Combination of all technical, administrative and managerial actions during the life cycle of an item intended to retain it in, or restore it to, a state in which it can perform the required function.” (Maintenance Terminology, 2001)

In the award winning Master Thesis by Hägerby and Johansson, an equipment performance figure is presented to explain the meaning of equipment’s state. Before any action the performance is decreasing due to wear and tear from normal use. Action 1 shows that maintenance brings the equipment back to original state after a certain uptime. To further increase the performance of equipment, modification of the item or design changes are demanded (action 2 and 3).

![Figure 1 Equipment performance](Hägerby & Johansson, 2002)
Traditionally maintenance was only paid attention to in combination with failure. It was unsystematic and considered a necessary evil that reduced production. During and after the industrial revolution the view upon maintenance has changed. Condition monitoring of equipment was made possible due to technological changes, tougher environmental and safety demands and change in the people and organizational systems [Tsang, 2002] and today maintenance is generally accepted to be vital in terms of [Rasmussen, 2003]

- Safety and environment
- Availability (functionality, regularity, capacity)
- Economy

The enormous costs attended with production combined with the high incomes have made the oil and gas industry recognized to be one of the most capital intensive industries there is. As a result of this, the downtime costs are significant. The increasingly focus and requirements on safety and environment has forced the industry to take maintenance management more seriously than ever before.

![Figure 2 Main elements in the maintenance function objectives (Rasmussen, 2003)](image)

Being vital in the maintenance organization, it should be stressed that the maintenance function adds value to an organization, mostly noted by increasing availability of assets.
2.2 Maintenance organizations

Maintenance organizations can roughly be divided between the repair-focused and the reliability-focused organization. The main difference between the two strategies is that the repair focused organization accepts that failure will occur, while the reliability focused does not. The repair focused organization focuses on fast repair of failed equipment, while the reasons for failure are to some extent ignored. The preventive maintenance performed is in other words poorly managed.

The reliability focused organization on the other hand focuses on internal control, strategy and maintenance management in order to prevent failure. The organization uses condition based maintenance to eliminate equipment failure. Reporting and analysis of maintenance history and other data is part of the management, and the continually improvement process is implemented throughout the organization. Although showing two types of organizational maintenance strategies, it must be mentioned that in most organizations one will find something from both types. The two types can be illustrated in a quality circle where the repair-focused organization is focusing on the right hand side while the reliability-focused is focusing on the whole circle in order to maintain the smallest failure rate possible from a safety, environmental and economic perspective. [Rasmussen, 2003]

![Diagram](Figure 3 Long and short term maintenance management (Rasmussen, 2003))
Being a capital intensive industry, profit is often a drive power for changes. As mentioned earlier, maintenance adds value to an organization. Maintenance contributes to profitability through:

- Extended life of assets
- Improved reliability and availability
- Enhanced and consistent product quality
- Continuity of production and supplies
- Quick response and repair times

(Wilson, 2002)

### 2.3 Maintenance strategies

Maintenance can be divided between planned and unplanned maintenance, with each its subgroups as illustrated in figure 4. Planned maintenance is maintenance performed with a certain strategy.

![Maintenance Types and Control Categories](image)

*Figure 4 Maintenance types and control categories (Rasmussen, 2003)*
2.3.1 Preventive maintenance

Preventive maintenance (PM) is planned and performed in order to prevent failures (direct PM), or find failures that may lead to breakdown (indirect PM). As seen from the figure, we further separate between periodic and condition monitoring.

**Periodic maintenance** is performed after predetermined intervals without taking the equipment’s state into consideration. The interval may be calendar based or run time based. The equipment can be overhauled onsite or at a workshop, while equipment with strict restraints due to lifetime is replaced. Cleaning and lubrication are examples of periodic maintenance activities.

**Condition monitoring** inspects whether the equipment satisfies a certain standard or not. It has its advantage with equipment that deteriorates towards failure under a period of time, which will enable the condition monitoring to detect the fault. Functional testing, inspection, manual and automatic measuring are examples of condition monitoring, and they can be performed during operation or stop.

2.3.2 Corrective maintenance

Corrective maintenance can be both planned and unplanned, and is performed after failure. This strategy is used for low risk equipment due to both safety and economy. It can be planned hours or days before an expected failure, or as equipment run until failure. Unplanned corrective maintenance will cause unplanned downtime and thus be more expensive. [Wilson, 1999]

The link between condition based maintenance and corrective maintenance needs further explanation. If the condition based maintenance find needs for a corrective action, the same routines as in corrective maintenance is followed. This is called condition based maintenance, and is part of the preventive maintenance. [Rasmussen]

Turnaround maintenance (overhaul) can be preventive, but is applied to whole installations due to the standstill. Some equipment on a long time operating installation may need maintenance or replacement. The turnaround maintenance will reduce costs of the maintenance and production and improve performance.
2.4 Maintenance management circle
In order to establish the maintenance strategy Reliability Centered Maintenance is central tool. RCM is one of the qualitative methods available in order to establish a maintenance strategy, which is the basic data any maintenance management system (MMS) is built upon. (Rasmussen, 2003).

The Norwegian Petroleum Directorate has developed a maintenance management model, called the Maintenance Management Circle, which is based on the structure of a quality system. According to NPD the use of self-assessment as a method for improving a company’s MMS has not been frequently applied by the operating companies on the Norwegian Continental Shelf. The NPD developed a method for systematic and comprehensive assessment of the company’s own maintenance management system. They wished to contribute to a general improvement of the quality of the operator’s system for managing safety-related maintenance and also provide better predictability for the operators in terms. (Øxnevad & Nielsen, 2000) It should also aid the personnel by standardizing the procedures for the maintenance work

Previously to the project performed by NPD, they claimed there was no common understanding in the industry of what a MMS really is. A goal was therefore to design the model that would be recognized and accepted by the petroleum industry in Norway.

![Figure 5 Maintenance Management Circle (Hägerby & Johansson, 2002) Internal DNV development of the NPD](image)

The MMC illustrates the process the management of the maintenance function needs to go through in order to reach its goals, illustrated as **outcome** (5) in the circle. The goals of the maintenance function are as previously mentioned to optimize expenses, regularity and safety, health and environment. The resources any organization have (9) are used in different activities (1-4, 6-8) by the **management** (10) in order to reach those goals.
In order for a company to improve, it needs goals and requirements and a way to measure progress towards these goals. Key performance indicators are a central part of this measurement and will be thoroughly reviewed later. A maintenance program, such as RCM and RBI, gives guidelines about maintenance strategies for equipment, i.e., what actions should be performed and when. Planning is synonymous with strategy, and vital for efficient maintenance work. The execution is the operational maintenance work done, and includes training of personnel, handling of different permissions, reporting guidelines and finally control of the jobs. In the reporting stages, the maintenance work is monitored, which forms the foundation for the analysis of the work done. Improvement measurement is necessary since without measurement there can be no certainty of improvement. (Øxnevald & Nielsen, 2000)

The foundation for this process is the resources of the organization, which is the organization itself and the competence in it. Its materials consist of tools and spare parts used for the maintenance work and the technical documents for the process. (Øxnevald & Nielsen, 2000)

2.4.1 Reliability Centered Maintenance

A maintenance program is as mentioned an integral part of the management circle. RCM is a process to ensure that assets continue to do what their users require in their present operating context. (Moubray, 1997) The advanced optimization technique has its origin from the aviation industry in the 1930s as security of the travellers gained more attention. It is defined as:

RCM is a method for establishing maintenance strategies for all equipment units in an installation based on internal and external criteria’s related to safety, environment, operation and economy. RCM views the equipment units in a system-perspective based on functional needs, functional failure and the preventing of these failures. (Rasmussen, 2003)

The method can be implemented in several phases of an installation’s life cycle, but in order to be evaluated as a RCM process it must fulfill the minimum criteria set by the standard SAE JA1011, Evaluation Criteria for Reliability-Centered Maintenance: The following questions must be answered satisfactorily (Netherton, 1999):

1. What are the functions and associated desired standards of performance of the asset in its present operating context (functions)?
2. In what ways can it fail to fulfill its functions (functional failures)?
3. What causes each functional failure (failure modes)?
4. What happens when each failure occurs (failure effects)?
5. In what way does each failure matter (failure consequences)?
6. What should be done to predict or prevent each failure (proactive tasks and task intervals)?
7. What should be done if a suitable proactive task cannot be found (default actions)?

Furthermore, every question also has its fixed criteria in order to answer the questions satisfactorily. (Rasmussen, 2003) Advocates gathering of information as the first step, where the establishment of an RCM team often is the best solution. Documentation, general arrangement sketches, and system description is essential and background experience in the sense of failure and failure frequencies is useful if available. Step two is identification and grouping of system/equipment, with the information from step one as a basis. The data’s are here edited for each system according to system limits and equipment in the system. There exists a general grouping system for both ships and
offshore industry. Step three is the Failure mode, effects, and criticality analysis (FMECA), which is an analytical method including criticality analysis used to decide the probability of failure modes measured up against the criticality of these failures. The significant units are identified for preventive maintenance. Significant units are those who will affect safety or production availability if failure occurs, or those units who can have their maintenance cost considerably reduced if repair is done at an early stage after failure. The non-critical equipment failures may be repaired after failure, and thus has the strategy corrective maintenance. The critical failures should be avoided, and are categorized as preventive maintenance (PM) task. PM tasks are the fourth and last step of the RCM analysis. The PM tasks must be evaluated in terms of applicability and cost. It may not be a good option to perform PM, which will result in either planned corrective maintenance or redesign if the risk is not acceptable.

A method similar to RCM worth to mention is Risk Based Inspection (RBI). It is a systematic method where the most efficient inspection schedule for an installation is found. The safety and reliability is increased as the costs are reduced. As in the RCM analysis the probability and consequence of failure for critical components is the key. But as the RCM analysis focuses on the best maintenance strategy, the RBI focuses on the optimal inspection strategy.
3 Shutdown Monitoring

3.1 R&D project Turnaround & Shutdown Optimization

As mentioned in the introduction Turnarounds (TARs) and unplanned shutdowns are Statoil’s single-most important causes of lost production. This project is developed by Statoil in cooperation with IBM as there is a need for minimalizing the negative effects a shutdown will have. The three main parts of the project was:

- Improve turnaround and shutdown preparedness and performance
- Optimize turnaround and shutdown frequency and duration for single installations
- Optimize turnaround frequency and duration across interdependent installations

![Figure 6 Three main parts of the T&S Optimization project](image)

The TAR Performance Monitor part consists of “Turnaround Management assistant”, “Turnaround Performance Monitor” and “Shutdown Preparedness Monitor” which is the topic of my project. Previous to my study a method for measurement of “shutdown preparedness” and “utilization of shutdowns” for maintenance work has been developed, which I will continue using.
The method is based on the assumption that all possible shutdown-related work orders are matured in accordance with the process illustrated. (Thuestad L., Utne, Kleppa, Sjøflot, Thorstensen, & Finbak, 2010)

**System Status**
- CRTD: Work Order created
- REL: Work Order released (approved for execution)
- TECO: Work Order technical completed
- CLSD: Work Order closed

**User Status**
- PREP: Work Order under preparation (planning)
- PRCO: Preparation completed
- RDEX: Ready for execution
- STRT: Job started
- RDOP: Job completed

**Figure 7 SAP work order life**

Terms used in Work Orders in SAP ref figure 7.

**3.2 Logistic tools**
In Statoil a program called SAP (Systems Applications and Products in Data Processing) is the logistic tool used for “corporate governance”. This is a module based program that contains accounting, economics, sales and distribution, purchasing and inventory management, logistics, maintenance, production and personnel management. The system for maintenance management is most relevant with regards to shutdown preparedness monitoring. As mentioned the “life” of the work orders follow a logically work flow, and the SAP user status shows the progress of this work order development.
The categories for maintenance work are as follows:

- PM01 – Unscheduled maintenance order (Corrective maintenance)
- PM02 – Maintenance program order (Preventive maintenance)
- PM03 – Modification order (Mod.)
- PM04 – Cost order
- PM06 – SAS change order
- PM10 – Project order
- PM20 – Project order, time only. No cost

(Thuestad L., Utne, Kleppa, Sjøflot, Thorstensen, & Finbak, 2010)

From the SAP all work orders related to shutdown can be extracted, where one can find details on work hours estimates, location, system, shutdown needed, status and creation and closure. The raw date used to measure shutdown preparedness was made available from the SAP as excel dump from a built in functionality in the program.

### 3.3 Indicators

Shutdown preparedness will be measured through monitoring of indicators identified by the group, that measure the quality & volume of shutdown-related work orders as they pass through the work order maturing process illustrated above. But in order to use the indicators one should understand what an indicator really is.

Previously we have separated between repair focused and reliability focused organizations, thus with the conclusion that most organizations uses something from both groupings. Shutdown monitoring as performed by Statoil in this project belongs to the reliability focused group, as it consists of reporting and analysis of maintenance history from the two installations, and the continually improvement process is implemented by the group.

As explained earlier, maintenance has seen severe changes since the industrial revolution. Earlier, financial measures were the only vital measurement describing performance in an operation in the company, business are or department. Now other performance measurements may prove to be equally important. According to NS-EN 15341 an indicator is defined as

*Measured characteristic (or set of characteristics) of a phenomenon, according to a given formula, which assess the evolution. (Indicators are related to objects)* (Maintenance Key Performance Indicators, 2007)

Indicators are thus strongly related to performance measurements. The purpose of performance measurements is to provide a base for improvement, since without measurement there can be no certainty of improvement.
3.4 Key performance indicators

Key performance indicators can be defined as:

*KPI’s are financial and non-financial metrics used to quantify objectives to reflect strategic performance of an organization* (Maintenance Key Performance Indicators, 2007)

KPI’s, also known as Key Success Indicators (KSI), help an organization define and measure progress toward organizational goals. The difference between an indicator and a key performance indicator is to be shown later. The idea is to give the organization defined goals and a way to measure progress towards those goals. It is thus a base for improvement, since without measurement there can be no certainty of improvement [how an organization defines and measures progress towards its goals [F John Reh]]. The indicators will vary from organization to organization. A hospital may have as one of its Key Performance Indicators the number of patient’s treated during a year, while a university may focus on publications per professor. No matter the organization, the key features and objectives can be summarized as: (Solutions, 2003)

- A numerical, objective measure of performance
- Key to the strategic business objective
- Actionable and influenced by the relevant stakeholder/manager
- Accountable to a stakeholder/manager
- Output oriented, not focused on input or activity
- Be possible to calculate with limited efforts and within limited time

Objectives of KPIs are to:

- Measure for continuous performance
- Measure for internal and external benchmarking
- Measure to set incentives.

Ideally good KPI’s that reflect organizational goals are used as a performance management tool – to manage performance. Another aspect that may be important in some organizations is the motivation factor. KPI’s may give each employee in an organization a picture of what’s important, of what they need to make happen. If the KPI’s, their target and their progress are exposed, it will motivate people to reach those KPI targets. There exist a wide range of proposed categories for KPI’s, and F. John Reh suggest the following sub-categories of KPI’s (Reh)

- **Quantitative indicators** which can be presented as a number.
- **Practical indicators** that interface with existing company processes.
- **Directional indicators** specifying whether an organization is getting better or not.
- **Actionable indicators** are sufficiently in an organization’s control to effect change.
- **Financial indicators** used in performance measurement and when looking at an operating index
With focus on maintenance management (Maintenance Key Performance Indicators, 2007) describes a system for measuring maintenance performance, with the aim for helping organizations in all sectors to improve their asset maintenance efficiency and effectiveness in pursuit of better global performance and competitive advantages. The standard suggest a structure of 3 types of KPIs:

- Economic Indicators
- Technical Indicators
- Organization Indicators.

Later these 3 types of KPIs will be used to exemplify the different levels of where to use the indicators.

### 3.5 Maintenance indicators

There exist numerous examples of different indicators for measuring performance, and as in this case, maintenance performance. Following are some common indicators for the maintenance management created by (Hägerby & Johansson, 2002):

- OEE (Overall Equipment Efficiency)
- Cost of lost production
- Relation between costs for PM and CM
- Contractor maintenance costs as percentage of total maintenance costs
- Maintenance overhead costs (maintenance management) as percentage of total maintenance costs
- Spare part inventory turnover
- Costs of poor quality, distribution on the relevant causes
- Number of incidents resulting in employee absence
- Costs of emissions (maintenance related)
- Required availability level of safety equipment (as it effects the amount of maintenance required)
- Preventive maintenance costs and/or hours as percentage of total maintenance costs and/or hours.
- Maintenance costs
  - As percentage of turnover
  - As percentage of fixed assets
  - Per unit of production
- Total operating hours / number of breakdowns $(MTBF)$
- Breakdown maintenance hours / number of breakdowns $(MTTR)$
- Hours of maintenance training / total maintenance hours
- Effectiveness (cost efficiency of PM)
Although being maintenance indicators, they can be divided between the 3 types suggested by the Maintenance standard (Maintenance Key Performance Indicators, 2007). It can easily be argued for that all indicators including ‘cost’ are economic indicators, for instance costs of maintenance, lost production etc. Organizational indicators are the ones concerning the personnel. Of highest interest is the maintenance man-hours. The technical indicators are all the indicators related to operational time, for instance MTBF and MTTR. The borders between these types of indicators are overlapping, as all the technical indicators to some extent is affecting the economy and vice versa. Dividing the indicators in groups like this does offer an understanding of the differences between the indicators. But it is anticipated that the usefulness of dividing the indicators regarding to whom they are to be used by in the organization, is of higher interest.

3.6 KPI logic and categories

However the defined types of KPI’s, the complex nature of the indicators are divided further.

![KPI hierarchy](image)

Illustrated is a KPI hierarchy by Simon Mills. In this model there is a clear relation between level of indicators and level of cooperation level. At board level the only relevant indicators are business indicators. At the senior management both business and financial indicators are to be dealt with. At departmental management efficiency and effectiveness indicators are relevant, and the supervisors are working with the operational and quality indicators. This direct hierarchy gives a presentation of how the indicators can be divided between the levels of cooperation, in its simplest way.
A three level maintenance KPI model have been created in the award winning thesis by [Hagerli and Johanson]. The KPI’s are here adjusted according to the level in the maintenance organisation in which it is to be used. The hierarchical breakdown of indicators consist of the top level, Main KPI’s, that are aimed at corporate level, the middle level, Basic KPI’s, that are aimed at the maintenance management level, and at the bottom - the Performance Indicators, aimed at the functional level/supervisors/operators.

Figure 9 Hierarchical breakdown of maintenance indicators (Hägerby & Johansson, 2002)

In the figure we are introduced to the terms basic KPI and KPP. KPP’s are Key Performance Parameters or just Performance indicators. The introduction of the new parameters is only a way of separating the indicators logically regarding to whom they are aimed for. The idea behind breaking the indicators down like illustrated above, is to make clear separation regarding who is to use the different indicators. With these borders the indicators are effectively separated between different levels of management. Now the supervisors for instance can focus on the indicators that are relevant to them and which they are able to manipulate.

(Gelder & Pintelon, 1992) Have proposed a three level classification in the maintenance organization where the top management does the strategically planning, the middle management the tactical planning and the supervisors the operational planning. They are working for the same super eminent objectives which are high availability and low maintenance costs. The strategic planning is concerned with provision of production resources to ensure company’s competitive capabilities. The decisions involve e.g. consideration of capacity, technology and investment criteria to retain or increase availability and keep maintenance costs low. (Thorstensen, Lifetime profit modelling of ageing systems utilising information about technical condition, 2008)

The tactical planning’s contribution concerns the maintenance strategies in use, like the Reliability Centered Maintenance method, also to ensure available and reliable equipment and a cost effective solution. They specify the direct activities to be performed by the operators, the interval for these
activities and the need for resources such as spare parts in case of repair or replacement of failed parts.

The final level is the operators which have the responsibility for the direct maintenance activities. They are also responsible for the sequences, in which the work orders are to be performed by, which is important in terms of both availability and profit. Some jobs are given higher priorities than others, e.g. those that may affect availability or the environment, and thus need to be performed before lower priority jobs. The availability of spare parts, workers and equipment is also something that needs to be taken into consideration by the operational planning.

3.7 Relations between indicators
Worth mentioning is the relation between the different levels in the management regarding the indicators. In the maintenance function there exist a flow of information and needs/requirement between the different levels of management. The KPPs are aggregated to calculate basic KPI's, which then again are used to calculate main KPI's.

3.7.1 Main KPI
The communication of maintenance activities to corporate level, main KPI's, are often of the economical type, or business indicators as from the model by Mills. The board has to answer to owners etc. and the economic indicators are of highest relevance here.

Total Maintenance Related Costs per Turnover, TC\textsubscript{Maintenance} is an example of a Main KPI in the maintenance performance. TC\textsubscript{Maintenance} consists of cost of lost production due to maintenance, redundant capacity cost and direct cost due to maintenance, DC\textsubscript{Maintenance}. Cost of lost production is naturally critical in a capital intensive industry like the oil and gas industry. Redundant capacity cost is whether unnecessary resources are tied in the installation or if supplementary redundant equipment could increase the efficiency of the plant. DC\textsubscript{Maintenance} is the direct cost connected with maintenance work, such as PM costs, unplanned CM cost, planned CM cost etc. as illustrated in Figure 10. For the top management the TC\textsubscript{Maintenance} indicator is a foundation for their decisions, the indicator to whom they act in accordance with. They don’t necessarily mind the material cost from the direct maintenance, even if its outcome is important for the Total Maintenance Related Cost per turnover. A general accusation towards the top management is that they are too focused on the cost, and not the driving forces and the possible earnings generated by these costs. This must be seen in relation with the historical perspective upon maintenance. The development has been toward increased attention towards maintenance and its positive effects on availability and production efficiency, and HSE. Norway and Statoil has for decades been a leader in the development in the offshore industry, and it is presumed that the accusation towards the top management is most valid for developing countries.
3.7.2 Basic KPI's

The KPI’s aimed for operation and management level can be derived from the Main KPI’s. The costs that all together form the TC\textsubscript{Maintenance} are basic KPI’s, such as DC\textsubscript{Maintenance}.

![Diagram of Turn Around Maintenance Costs (excl. modifications)]

**Figure 11 Constituent parts of KPI "DCmaint"**
As you would expect there are many constituent parts, or Performance Indicators, that form the Direct Cost of maintenance. Minimizing costs is the super eminent goal, but not on the expense of for instance availability or HSE. Optimizing maintenance costs is therefore a more accurate term, as simply reducing $DC_{Maintenance}$ continually, is bound to eventually transmit into increased failure rates.

Regarding the division between the economic, technical and organizational indicators introduced in Chapter 3.4 -Key performance indicators it is safe to say that this “second level” indicator is still inside the boundaries for the economic indicator, although more technical than the Main KPI meant for the corporate level.

### 3.7.3 KPP

Performance indicators aimed for detailed analysis of maintenance processes. KPPs are affecting the Basic KPI directly. Some examples extracted from Figure 11:

- Administrative costs
- Internal costs (PM, unplanned CM, planned CM, training and analysis)
- External costs (PM, unplanned CM, planned CM)
- Material costs
- 1st line maintenance

There is still a predominance of the economic indicators (over technical and organizational). Being indicators that together constitute the Direct Maintenance costs, $DC_{Maintenance}$, this is natural.

It is clear that the different level of management has a different view upon the different indicators. As the top level management looks upon as $DC_{Maintenance}$ as a Basic KPI, the same indicator figures as a Main KPI for the middle management. And further a PI from a top levels point of view may appear as basic KPI’s from a maintenance management point of view.

### 3.8 Leading and lagging indicators

However the types of KPI’s, there are two undisputable categories of indicators, leading and lagging indicators. Lagging indicators are of past events and results, in the case of shutdown monitoring of an installation this is the process prior to a shutdown. Leading indicators are measurements of what that will lead to the desired events and results; here the focus is on utilization of opportunistic maintenance, i.e. utilization of maintenance opportunities when during shutdown.

In the report Turnaround & Shutdown Optimization, Activity A3 – Shutdown Preparedness, we have a suggestion for measurement of shutdown preparedness, which is through monitoring of indicators that measure the quality and volume of shutdown related work orders as they pass through the process mentioned (work process: preparation, preparation completed, ready for execution, job started, job completed)
The leading indicators are divided into quality indicators, which measure the quality of the planning work, and volume work order indicators with associated man-hours. Presented are the indicators selected for measurement of shutdown preparedness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Number and percentage of work orders with one or more operations with no or insufficient man-hour estimates</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Number and percentage of work orders with no work location specified</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Number and percentage of work orders with no material received at installation or base</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Number and percentage of work orders with no description of work to be carried out</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Number and percentage of work orders with no WSC performed</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>Amount and percentage of man-hours per user status</td>
<td>Many RDEX</td>
<td>Many PRCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>Number and percentage of work orders per user status</td>
<td>Many RDEX</td>
<td>Many PRCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>Number and percentage of work orders with system status created &amp; released</td>
<td>Many REL</td>
<td>Many REL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 12 Indicators for shutdown preparedness monitoring**

The lagging indicators measures if, and to what degree maintenance opportunities are utilized. These are utilization indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>What is measured</th>
<th>Why interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U1</td>
<td>Number of work orders completed and man-hours carried out during unforeseen shutdowns</td>
<td>Measures whether or not unforeseen shutdowns have been utilized opportunistically, and the volume of work carried out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U2</td>
<td>Utilization degree or the percentage of man hours carried out during unforeseen shutdowns relative to man-hours theoretically available</td>
<td>Measures how much of the available time that has been used opportunistically, totally as well as split on shutdowns with short, medium and long lead times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 13 Indicators for Shutdown utilization, lagging indicators**
3.9 Scorecards
The top level management has historically relied more or less entirely on financial measures for the performance of operations in their company. As mentioned it is well-known that this is not sufficient in order for a company, business are or department to be driven in the most efficient manner, as these measures can give misleading suggestions for continuous improvement and innovation, and are out of step with the skills and competencies needed by today’s organization (Maltz, Shenhar, & Reilly, 2003). The balanced scorecard is an approach applied to establish a maintenance performance measurement system. There exist other similar systems, such as Du Pont Pyramid, SMART Pyramid and Cambridge PM Process, but the Balance Scorecard leads in this development.

The Balanced scorecard is a strategic planning and management system that is used extensively in business and industry, government, and non-profit organizations worldwide to align business activities to the vision and strategy of the organization, improve external and internal communications, and monitor organization performance against strategic goals. (Balanced Scorecard Institute)

The Balanced Scorecards goal is to give the top management a more “balanced” view of organizational performance. In addition to its financial perspective, they will by applying the Balanced Scorecard have non-financial measures for performance. As a multi-dimensional framework it also helps the tactical division identify what should be done and measured – i.e. actions are performed in accordance to the given strategies of the organization (Thorsten, The Role of Key Performance Indicators (KPI’s) in Maintenance Performance Measurements, 2008).

Figure 14 the balanced scorecard (Balanced Scorecard Institute)
As seen from Figure 12 the Balanced Scoreboard consists of four perspectives, upon which metrics is to be developed and data to be collected and analysed from.

### 3.9.1 Financial

Financial improvements are the foundation for any sustainable development of a company, and can’t be neglected. An example is that *maintenance activities are carried out in a cost-effective manner* (Thorstensen, 2008).

### 3.9.2 Customer

According to the balancedscorecard.org recent management philosophy has shown increasing realization of the importance of customer focus and customer satisfaction in any business. A customer objective could be *to do our utmost to deliver what we promise to each other, to our shareholders, and society at large.* (Thorstensen, 2008)

### 3.9.3 Internal business processes

Metrics from this perspective shows the managers how well their business is running, and if its products and services conform to customer requirements. Ex.: *backlog holds no safety critical job.* (Thorstensen, 2008)

### 3.9.4 Learning and growth perspective

This perspective includes employee training and corporate cultural attitudes related to both individual and corporate self-improvement. In a company with specialized expertise the people are a vital resource, and they need to be in a stimulating environment. In addition to this stimulating environment and communication, it also includes technological tools – or “high performance work systems”. *Our employees are competent and motivated.* (Thorstensen, 2008)

The scorecard differs from traditional performance measurements systems, which often specify the particular action they want employees before they measure these actions. Instead of this control measurement, the scorecard puts strategy and vision in the center. The objective of the balanced scorecard method is to bring together the most important operational measures together in a single management report. This will give the managers a better foundation for making decisions and it will guard against sub optimization. That is, let the managers see if improvement in one area may have been achieved at the expense of another (Kaplan and Norton, 1992).
3.10 **Microsoft Access**

In the Turnaround & Shutdown Optimization report one find a procedure for calculating the indicators manually in Microsoft Excel. However, it can be argued for that Microsoft Access can do this job better. The thought is to systematize the large amount of data from the week dump, so that the calculation of the indicators can be done more effectively. By extracting the data from Excel to Access a database is created. A so called Query in Access would presumably be more appropriate for this task than the Pivot tables created and used in Excel.

Microsoft Office Access, previously known as Microsoft Access, is a relational database management system (RDBMS) from Microsoft that combines the relational Microsoft Jet Database Engine with a graphical interface and software-development tools (Wikipedia). This system is based on the relational model introduced by E.F. Codd in his paper “A Relational Model for Large Shared Data Banks”. A short definition of an RDBMS from Wikipedia is:

> An **DBMS in which data is stored in tables and the relationships among the data are also stored in tables. The data can be accessed or reassembled in many different ways without having to change the table forms.** (Wikipedia.com/RDBMS)

As Excel is spreadsheet software, the database management system Access has its advantages for this particular case. The current data is stored in 4 sheets per week, which basically means relational data. Both Excel and Access can run powerful queries to sort and filter data, but here Access by its relational tools makes the process easier. There are other great advantages as well. If it is desirable to continue the queries furthermore, Access will simplify this too. The queries in Access are dynamical, as the instructions and not the results are saved, in case of adding more tables (weeks). Having to consider a large amount of data (thousands of entries) and as the criteria’s are increasing, Access should under equal circumstances work faster, i.e. be able to handle more data.

And in a commercial view Access offers both Forms that are meant to be user friendly and Data Access Pages for the more technical user. (Access 2010)
4 Method: Query Example, Microsoft Access

The scope of the work done by performing the queries performed in Microsoft Access based on the indicators given should be documented. Prior to the actual queries, the week dump was to be categorized. The raw data consisted of 4 work sheets per week, Work Orders, Operation, Material and Work Permit (see appendix). It is anticipated that the best way to do the queries, is to merge all the work order sheets in one sheet, all operation sheets in one sheet, etc.

After the database has been created from the week dump and extracted into MS Access, the queries can be performed. For each indicator follows one query. In MS Access a Query Wizard is used, which allows the user to select relevant parameters from the relevant database. 4 databases per installation are created, Work Orders, Operation, Material and Work Permit. After selecting the parameters, the queries can start.

As seen from Figure 17, we are here separating between OK and not OK man-hour estimations. In order to get to that particular result, number of shutdown Work Orders are first to be found. This is a simple operation where one database, Work Orders, is used to find the orders marked as Shutdown WO in the Work Scope Challenge status description. As seen from the graph the No. of WO’s with shutdown in week 20 for Installation A is 78. In the Query of current investigation, Q1, the goal is to sort out WO’s with one or more operations containing man-hour estimations less than one. The man-hour information derives from another database, Operation.

![Query Example](image)

Figure 15 Joint properties example

This is where MS Access shows some of its potential, by using Joint Properties in linking two databases together, as shown in Figure 15. The user now is given the possibility to extract data from one database, considering whether or not it matches the current criteria for both of the databases. Running the query at this point will give the user all shutdown related work orders, with existing man-hour estimations. By filtrating man-hour estimations less than one, marked as “work” in the week dump, the number of shutdown work orders containing man-hour estimations less than one,
Q1, is found. A note to the user of Custom Filtrating in Access is to filter for less than 0.99, as less than 1 will include work orders equal to 1.

![Figure 16 Filtrating example MS Access](image)

The result is displayed as shown in Figure 16. In week 20 there are 16 shutdown related work orders containing work-hour estimations less than 1. By sorting out the same data for each week and comparing with the total amount of shutdown related work orders, the first Quality indicator Q1 is found.

For Query 1 the procedure explained is to be performed for weeks 20 – 39. For the Volume indicator V5 on the other hand, the process is more time consuming. This indicator asks of number of work orders per order type. We are separating between 5 different order types. Furthermore installation B consists of 3 installations treated separately. This altogether makes Query V5 the largest and most time consuming of the indicators, existing of 204 unique sums.(Figure 56).

From the report T&S Optimization, A.3 – Shutdown Preparedness, we have the results from the measurements performed by the previous described group from Statoil and IBM. In this report the measurements will be continued from week 20 – 39. For the breadth of view both the results for week 7 – 20 and 20 – 39 are presented beside each other.

Due to confidentiality these installations are referred to as Installation A and B. There is a need for confidentiality as this is sensitive material and may be used against Statoil in one way or another.
4.1 Q1 – Work orders with one or more operations containing man-hour estimations <1. Installation A

From Installation A the fraction of bad orders is decreasing for the first measurement period, which is expected to be an adequate indicator. Measuring until week 39 gives another picture of what is actually happening. We see that the fraction of bad orders is increasing in week 21-24, before decreasing again from week 25-33, until it finally increases towards week 39. The fraction is changing, but the number of bad WO’s stays relatively the same. Many of the bad WO’s are found in several weeks. This is verified by going through the queries after making the table.
4.2 Q1 – Work orders with one or more operations containing man-hour estimations <1. Installation B

Figur 19 Q1 – B (Thuestad L., Utne, Kleppa, Sjøflot, Thorstensen, & Finbak, 2010)

The fraction of bad WO’s is decreasing from Week 12 – 30, which again is expected to be an adequate indicator. In week 33 and 35 we see a sudden boost in bad WO’s. Installation B had a turnaround from 16.8 – 7.9 and from 17.8 – 7.9, which was in weeks 33-36 (extracted from SAP). It is presumed that late orders without man-hours estimates have been reported in relation to this turnaround. The WO’s are terminated, both ok and not ok, which is positive.
4.3 Q2- Location code exists on work order – Installation A

Proper location code on the work orders is important in the planning perspective. The WO’s should have a location code telling where the work order is to be performed. We can see that installation A has a decreasing fraction of bad location codes until week 21, in which the total amount of WO’s are decreasing whereas the bad location codes stay the same. The number of bad location codes stays the same from week 35-36, during the shutdown, where they hopefully would’ve been terminated.
5.4 Q2 - Location code exists on work order – Installation B

Figur 23 Q2 – B (Thuestad L., Utne, Kleppa, Sjøflot, Thorstensen, & Finbak, 2010)

Figur 24 Q2 – B

The fraction of not ok location codes is stable high, especially if compared to installation A. During the shutdown the majority of both OK and Not OK WO’s are terminated. Optimally all the bad WO’s should be terminated, but some are still there after the turnaround.
4.4 Q3 – Material fully received on installation A

User status and material status is important for utilization of opportunistic maintenance. If the planning horizon is short it’s only possible to perform opportunistic maintenance if user status is RDEX (ready for execution) and all the material is located on the platform, or no material needed. For the plan able case (i.e. longer planning horizon) one could include the WO’s in PRCO (preparation completed) with no material need or material stored on base onshore.

The fraction of material offshore is increasing for RDEX. This is positive and the opportunity to perform opportunistic maintenance in an unforeseen shutdown based on this indicator is impressive. There are all over few orders in PRCO, and the majority of these few are not received, so this doesn’t provide much information.
4.5 Q3 – Material fully received on installation B

The number of work orders offshore is constantly very high for RDEX, which is more than satisfactorily.


Figur 28 Q3 – B

The number of work orders offshore is constantly very high for RDEX, which is more than satisfactorily.
4.6 Q4- Short text on work order operations, installation A

If short text information is missing, it may be difficult for the scheduler to know exactly what to do. As shown in the figure, there are hardly any WO’s missing short text.
Q4- Short text on work order operations, installation B

For installation B the situation is the same – hardly any WO’s are missing short text.
4.7 Q5- Work Scope Challenge (WSC) performed, installation A

The WSC performed indicator serves two purposes, as stated in the A.3 Shutdown Preparedness report. Both the fraction of WO's where WSC is provided, and the degree of following the work process in APOS. For installation A the fraction of WSC performed is low throughout the period, and is not satisfactory.
4.8 Q5- Work Scope Challenge (WSC) performed, installation B

For installation B a very positive trend can be seen from the graph. Until week 18 the fraction of WSC not performed is high, before almost every WO has WSC performed for the rest of the period. Week 29 has been investigated, and no activity on installation B that is known should cause this extreme case. The result shown is therefore considered to be a failure in the queries, as the rest of the data instantly seems “normal”.

Figur 35 Q5 – B (Thuestad L., Utne, Kleppa, Sjøflot, Thorstensen, & Finbak, 2010)

Figur 36 Q5 – B
4.9 V1 - Man hours per user status, installation A

The user status (from SAP) shows the progress of the WO development according to the previous described work flow. The graphs show a high number and amount of PREP work orders. As explained earlier, only work orders in the RDEX category can be utilized in unforeseen shutdowns. Hence V1 for installation A is not satisfactory. Furthermore the considerable reduction in man-hours in RDEX in week 10 means shutdown work was carried out. The same can be seen in week 21 and 35.
4.10 V1 - Man hours per user status, installation B

![Graph showing man hours per user status for installation B]


Figur 40 V1 – B

Also installation B has more work in PREP than in PRCO and RDEX.

“1142” sets apart from “1140” and “1141”, by having almost only work orders in PREP. “1142” is an unmanned installation, which makes the utilization of opportunistic maintenance difficult without planning. In week 22 we see the numbers of WO’s are reducing drastically, which indicates shutdown work was carried out. Also understood from the graph is that both “1140” and “1141” had shutdown work carried out in week 35, as the nr. Of WO’s are reduced. The small increase in WO’s in week 33 is also due to this shutdown. It is presumed the increase in week 34 would be even higher.
4.11 V2 – Number of work orders per user status, installation A

This indicator measures the number of work orders per user status, as opposed to man hours per user status as the case was in V1. The results from V1 and V2 should be analyzed with respect to each other. In week 39 there are about 10 WO’s in RDEX and 20 in PREP. The connected number regarding man hours is 100 hours for RDEX and 1600 for PREP. It is known that the number of WO’s and man hours for RDEX should be high to be satisfactory in the shutdown preparedness perspective. The results from V2 are thus a lot more positive than the ones from V1. As proposed in the A.3 Shutdown Preparedness report some work orders may demand more resources than others. The measurements performed here strengthen that theory.
4.12  V2 – Number of work orders per user status, installation B

For “1140” there is a very similar situation as described for installation A. The number of WO’s in PREP is about one fourth of all the WO’s for this unit, whereas the fraction it earlier (regarding to man-hours) was much higher. Again, V2 shows better prospects for utilizing shutdown opportunistically than V1. The case for “1142” is alike the measurements for V1, as almost all the WO’s are in PREP, making unplanned shutdowns hard to utilize.
4.13 V3 – Work orders per created or released, installation A

A work order has to be released before executed. Prior to the release, the work has to be subject to quality assurance. This indicator seeks to follow up that no shutdown work is held up because of a missing “release”. (Thuestad L., Utne, Kleppa, Sjøflot, Thorstensen, & Finbak, 2010)

Figure 45 and 46 shows that installation A has very few WO’s in CRTD, making the shutdown preparedness satisfactory for this indicator.
4.14 V3 – Work orders per created or released, installation B

![Diagram showing work orders per week for installation B]

Figur 47 V3 - B (Thuestad L., Utne, Kleppa, Sjøflot, Thorstensen, & Finbak, 2010)

![Diagram showing work orders over weeks]

Figur 48 V3 - B

For installation B there are some WO’s in CRTD for the first measurement period, but as they are close to eliminated by the end of the first period and the second, the shutdown preparedness has been improved here as well.
4.15  V4 – Old work orders, installation A

Indicator V4 was created in order to ensure that the information in SAP is up-to-date. As seen from the figures there are no old work orders except for the few in week 7-9 (which are terminated). This tells us that there are no old work orders in SAP for installation A.
V4 – Old work orders, installation B

Installation 2 hasn’t got any old workers either. The Shutdown Preparedness Report has questioned the usefulness of this indicator, as old work orders obviously isn’t a relevant problem.


Figur 52 V4 – B
4.16 V5 – Old work orders, installation A

The work orders are registered with order types, which represent preventive maintenance, corrective maintenance, modifications etc. This indicator gives an overview of the volume and type of maintenance work in the system, providing additional information to the indicators V1 and V2 on the work portfolio for execution during an unforeseen shutdown. (Thuestad L., Utne, Kleppa, Sjøflot, Thorstensen, & Finbak, 2010)

The order types are presented in Chapter 4.3. For the first period everything remains unchanged before PM01 and PM02 increases in week 19-20. They then decrease until week 24, which shows than maintenance work has been done. From week 25-33 the situation is again stable before shutdown work is done and the number of WO’s is decreasing for all order types.
4.17 V5 – Old work orders, installation B

From graph 55 and 56 unit “1142” stands out again. Where “1140” and “1141” has their majority of WO’s in PM01 and PM02, “1142” has a predominance of project work orders, PM10. Installation B represents a real case installation, with three units. Given the different nature between the units, the results are not in surprising. Except from this, the numbers of WO’s are stable for all the order types, before they all decrease by week 35 (shutdown).
5 Conclusion and further work

It is said that an excellent set of measures does not guarantee a winning strategy, but it certainly increases the chances for success. After every indicator measurement, a conclusion so to speak is given. It’s seen that both installation A and B has had shutdown related work in the measured time period. Increase in WO’s, followed by a noticeably decrease is a proof of that.

It can be concluded with that the measurements show two stable installations. Where there are prominent changes, it usually is for the better, i.e. improving the shutdown preparedness for the plants. One should however be careful in comparing the two installations too directly, as the indicators are built upon some different fundamentals. Also, they are two different physical assets.

The Quality indicators measures the quality of the work orders from SAP, as the Volume indicators measures the amount of maintenance work in “pipeline” and to what extent this work is ready for execution. As concluded in the A3 – Shutdown Preparedness report, the indicators indicate god possibilities for performing opportunistic maintenance, but that in the case of actually improving shutdown preparedness, more inspection is necessary.

In the corporates perspective all these indicators can be categorized as Performance Indicators. The further work in is then to create a higher level indicator, a Key Performance Indicator, showing how prepared the two installations are to perform opportunistically maintenance in an unforeseen shutdown. This higher level indicator should satisfy the criterion’s mentioned in the report, making it more understandable and thus valuable in the corporates perspective. Unfortunately the time scope didn’t allowed that for this thesis, but would be very interesting and absolutely feasible.

Learning MS Access is time consuming, but valuable. The group performing shutdown preparedness monitoring at Statoil are using the program, and according to Rasmus Bjerkan, Group Manager at AGR Field Operation, Trondheim, MS Access is an vital tool at their office performing maintenance management. Being so time consuming as it is, it is questionable whether or not this is a good method for Statoil.
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Appendix: Week dump examples

### Work order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Order Type</th>
<th>Functional loc.</th>
<th>SystemLocat</th>
<th>Revision</th>
<th>System status</th>
<th>User status</th>
<th>Main Work</th>
<th>WCS</th>
<th>WSC status</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>HiGe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0010</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Pumpen sår seg ut bilant</td>
<td>PPMAUT</td>
<td>1230-PE-6G24</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>PM01</td>
<td>29.02.2008</td>
<td>29.02.2008</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0020</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>L-AUT Assistanser ved feilsøking</td>
<td>PPMAUT</td>
<td>1230-PE-6G24</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>PM01</td>
<td>01.03.2008</td>
<td>01.03.2008</td>
<td>05.07.2007</td>
<td>05.07.2007</td>
<td>PCCF REL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0110</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>L-AUT Dokumentasjonsoppdatering</td>
<td>PPMAUT</td>
<td>1230-PE-6G24</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>PM01</td>
<td>06.09.2009</td>
<td>07.09.2009</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Oper.Wk</th>
<th>Work center</th>
<th>Opr. short text</th>
<th>Order Type</th>
<th>Functional loc.</th>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>Actual start</th>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>Actual start</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0010</td>
<td>PPMAUT</td>
<td>1230-PE-6G24</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>PM01</td>
<td>29.02.2008</td>
<td>29.02.2008</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0020</td>
<td>PPMAUT</td>
<td>1230-PE-6G24</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>PM01</td>
<td>01.03.2008</td>
<td>01.03.2008</td>
<td>05.07.2007</td>
<td>05.07.2007</td>
<td>PCCF REL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Shutdown Preparedness Monitoring
## Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>We</th>
<th>Short text</th>
<th>Pri</th>
<th>Offshore</th>
<th>Hc</th>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>User status</th>
<th>Functional Location</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Mat. ETA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20732362</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>RMS Nye tastaturer til ballast/pos. PCør</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>@0A@</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>RDEX DUIN WP</td>
<td>1230-52</td>
<td>29.01.2007</td>
<td>17.01.2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21326740</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Oppmåling/ inst. av nye isol.kasser, DBB</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>@0A@</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>PREP WP</td>
<td>1230-WB-23</td>
<td>15.02.2007</td>
<td>15.02.2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20784008</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Oppdatering av Lastkalkulator Tankvolum</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>@08@</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>RDEX WP</td>
<td>1230-IW-52-€</td>
<td>11.05.2007</td>
<td>23.03.2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20827921</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Installere alarmlogger for RMS systemet</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>@08@</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>PREP WP</td>
<td>1230-IO-05-0</td>
<td>11.05.2007</td>
<td>24.03.2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20855245</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>RMS tidssynchroniseres mot GPS klokke</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>@08@</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>RDEX WP</td>
<td>1230-IO-52-0</td>
<td>11.05.2007</td>
<td>03.02.2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20886884</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Hot Standby datamaskin til ankerømsjysys</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>@08@</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>1230-IO-05-0</td>
<td>11.05.2007</td>
<td>21.05.2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20902423</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Opprydding i RMS kabinett</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>@08@</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>STRT WP</td>
<td>1230-05</td>
<td>11.06.2007</td>
<td>12.09.2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20945179</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Trekke fiberkabel C2112 -L3152</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>@08@</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>STRT WP</td>
<td>1230-IC-80-0</td>
<td>01.07.2007</td>
<td>29.01.2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20945181</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>IO: Oppkobling av Prograf på S@P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>@08@</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>STRT DUIN WP</td>
<td>1230-69</td>
<td>01.07.2007</td>
<td>26.10.2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20946264</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Oppgradering fra step 5 til step 7.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>@08@</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>RDEX WP</td>
<td>1230-69</td>
<td>03.08.2007</td>
<td>06.09.2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21213829</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Best. av bolter m/mutter til nye carrier</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>@0A@</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>PREP SHUT FR</td>
<td>1230-69</td>
<td>24.08.2007</td>
<td>18.09.2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20978177</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>BN System 1 ligger i ubeskyttet nett*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>@0A@</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>STRT WP</td>
<td>1230-68</td>
<td>01.10.2007</td>
<td>11.12.2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20873139</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Installere ny monorail for 23-HZV-0177</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>@08@</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>PREP WP</td>
<td>1230-HZV-2</td>
<td>01.03.2008</td>
<td>26.07.2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20964639</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>IO: Oppgårder HMI og koble mot S@P</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>@08@</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>STRT PLAN WP</td>
<td>1230-I0-80-0</td>
<td>02.04.2008</td>
<td>04.03.2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20994485</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Bytte gyro</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>@0A@</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>STRT WP</td>
<td>1230-JE-93-¢</td>
<td>21.04.2008</td>
<td>06.02.2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21035075</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Skiute Bundle 6 tr Kompressor</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>@08@</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>RDOP NTWR W</td>
<td>1230-KA-23</td>
<td>28.05.2008</td>
<td>28.05.2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21034609</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Bestilling av utstyr og personell fra BJ</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>@08@</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>PREP SHUT WI</td>
<td>1230-P30</td>
<td>01.06.2008</td>
<td>27.05.2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21140806</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Mye rust på solenoider og spalter.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>@08@</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>RDEX</td>
<td>1230-IV-45-0</td>
<td>14.11.2008</td>
<td>14.11.2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21203888</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Insp av guideskinne for tennerør.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>@08@</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>RDEX SHUT FR</td>
<td>1230-43-ROF</td>
<td>25.05.2009</td>
<td>25.05.2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20873784</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>BESTILLING AV DBB VENTILER</td>
<td>@09@</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>PREP NTWR W</td>
<td>1230-P30</td>
<td>29.05.2009</td>
<td>31.10.2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work permit

Status Work Permit Week Location Work description Hc Ho Ent Iss PT Wa DS Rm W Ex Cl Ot WI From hr. To hr. Extended In Applicant name
@06@ 5052360987 08 C10 Skjærerpumpe Mek. 00:10:00 23:55:00 00:00:00 Jarle Haugstad
@06@ 5052342434 08 D10 Skjærerpumpe Mek. 00:10:00 23:55:00 00:00:00 Knut Normann H
e
@07@ 5052357574 08 D10 Skjærerpumpe Mek. 00:10:00 23:55:00 00:00:00 Jarle Haugstad
@07@ 5052327829 08 D10 Fjerning av kabler/MCC sl 00:10:00 23:55:00 00:00:00 Mads Monstad/E
@07@ 5052327746 08 D10 Installasjon nytt utstyr – J 00:10:00 23:55:00 00:00:00 Knut Normann H
e
@07@ 5052330443 08 D10 Fjerning og trekking av ka 00:10:00 23:55:00 00:00:00 Knut Normann H
e
@07@ 5052351767 08 D10 MudMix Mekærer 00:10:00 23:55:00 00:00:00 Mads Monstad
@07@ 5052351768 08 D10 Mudmix E&I: montering av 00:10:00 23:55:00 00:00:00 Mads Monstad
@07@ 5052335385 08 D10 Mudmix E&I: Arbeid i LIR 00:10:00 23:55:00 00:00:00 Even Moldsver/K
@07@ 5052335404 08 D10 Mudmix E&I: Kabeltrekking 00:10:00 23:55:00 00:00:00 Even Moldsver/K
@07@ 5052342027 08 D10 Mudmix E&I: Arbeid i LIR 00:10:00 23:55:00 00:00:00 Mads Monstad
@07@ 5052328919 08 D20 Bygge stillas i mikserom 00:10:00 23:55:00 00:00:00 Geir Våleom
@07@ 5052357664 08 D30 Tubing fra plant air på bør 00:10:00 23:55:00 00:00:00 Torfinn Heier
@07@ 5052360141 08 D30 Montering av braketter og 00:10:00 23:55:00 00:00:00 Torfinn Heier
@07@ 5052243556 08 D30 Installasjon av HVAC anlk 00:10:00 23:55:00 00:00:00 Jarle Haugstad
@07@ 5052337634 08 D30 HANDLING AV SUBSEA 00:10:00 23:55:00 00:00:00 Per-Ole Ingebrigts
@07@ 5052223438 08 L10 Rioxing av Gammel Byro 00:10:00 23:55:00 00:00:00 Per Einar Lørens
@07@ 5052239249 08 L10 Montering av utstyr i IC-Sl 00:10:00 23:55:00 00:00:00 Per Einar Lørens
@07@ 5052343175 08 L20 HW-Connection change X 07:00:00 19:00:00 00:00:00 Per Einar Lørens
@07@ 5052344522 08 L30 Varmtarbeid i sveiseverk 00:10:00 23:55:00 00:00:00 Gunnar Veivåg

Work Orde Tag/line nc Discipline Approver - HSE Fu Senior aJ Levê SJA Text S From Date To Date

20855317 1230-00 BOR Eirik Skars 2 @0Z@ 19.02.2010 23.02.2010
20855317 1230-00 BOR Reidar L. 2 @0Z@ 10.02.2010 23.02.2010
20855317 1230-00 BOR Eirik Skars 2 @0Z@ 18.02.2010 23.02.2010
21241852 1230-XX-11BOR Johnny Gje 2 @0Z@ 03.02.2010 09.02.2010
21241852 1230-XX-11BOR Johnny Gje 2 X @0Z@ 03.02.2010 09.02.2010
21241852 1230-XX-11BOR Frode Rydi 2 @0Z@ 03.02.2010 10.02.2010
21241852 1230-XX-11BOR Reidar L. 2 @0Z@ 15.02.2010 23.02.2010
21241852 1230-XX-11BOR Reidar L. 2 @0Z@ 15.02.2010 23.02.2010
21241852 1230-XX-11BOR Ingvald Grø 2 @0Z@ 07.02.2010 09.02.2010
21241852 1230-XX-11BOR Ingvald Grø 2 @0Z@ 07.02.2010 09.02.2010
21241852 1230-XX-11BOR Reidar L. 2 @0Z@ 10.02.2010 23.02.2010
21241852 1230-XX-11BOR Ingvald Grø 2 @0Z@ 02.02.2010 09.02.2010
21128339 1230-AF-0:BOR Eirik Skars 2 @0Z@ 17.02.2010 23.02.2010
21128339 1230-AF-0:BOR Eirik Skars 2 @0Z@ 19.02.2010 23.02.2010
21322863 1230-CF-1 BOR Eirik Skars 2 X @0Z@ 14.02.2010 23.02.2010
21295590 POMPRO Ingvald Grø 2 @0Z@ 08.02.2010 15.02.2010
20978177 1230-68 PPMAUT Heine Skei 2 @0Z@ 14.12.2009 16.12.2009
21469691 1230-UR-1 PPMAUT Harald EdvJan Erik Ottar Ski 2 @0Z@ 11.02.2010 11.02.2010
21266125 C01SLVIS Bjørn Ohm 2 @0Z@ 12.02.2010 16.02.2010