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| **Question** | **OGA Response** |
| Andy Samuel (AS), Gunther Newcombe (GN), Scott Robertson (SR), Alistair Macfarlane (AM), Nick Richardson (NR), Matt Farris (MF) | |
| If the OGA is asking companies for area plan concept plans are the OGA going to make infrastructure information available for example the Buchan Pipeline which would be useful for parties preparing the plan. | SR responded the OGA would need to review what data we hold and what permissions we have.  AM advised that the redacted Buchan CoP document would be released which holds some of the higher-level information. |
| Are the OGA releasing a list of participants? | SR Will seek counsel and decide if the OGA can release any details which align with the current GDPA rules. May potentially send out an email to all attendees to request permissions. |
| Will the OGA delay the 32nd licence round if there are any delays in the 31st supplementary licence round? | NR responded: No, the 32nd round will launch as planned. There are currently no plans to delay the round which is scheduled for mid-next year but we cannot give any further details at this time. |
| He believes that the timeline is ambitious and that as a result the OGA will not receive quality applications. More time is required to prepare a quality proposals and that the OGA have an unrealistic expectation. Only people this depth of information is the previous operator and they relinquished it.  Would the OGA consider allowing more time? | SR responded that the OGA would soak on Simon’s feedback but he would welcome feedback and comments from any of the other participants. |
| He thinks that the new marking category is a step forward and that the expectation is not for applicants to submit fully formed view rather that the applicants are expected to just demonstrate intent and he for one is all for it. | AS responded that behaviours, innovation and partnerships will be key.  SR Responded that the OGA will look to provide greater support and guidance to applicants on what the OGA will be looking for in applications. |
| What is the OGA expectation one all-encompassing concept or a number of independent developments smaller plans for clusters or one big plan? | SR responded that the OGA had learnt that if we declare our hand it can constrain the creative thinking so he is reluctant to share the OGA’s thinking. There may be more than one answer. The OGA has a view to provide context for it’s own decision making. The OGA do not want to share this however and risk skewing people’s applications.  MF concurred and advised it is up to industry.  AM added that industry will come up with more ideas which may be better that the OGA’s but we will form our own view and understanding to help us compare the proposals in the applications  AS Added that it isn’t the case that the OGA expects one group and that there is room for all of the players but we expect people to play nice with others. If parties are not interested in the core Buchan but other prospectivity then apply, if a group wants to submit an application but feels they could take the lead then apply and say that, they won’t be disadvantaged for being honest. |
| Will the OGA look to split licences vertically? | NR responded that stratigraphic splits will not be arranged by licence and should be arranged commercially between relevant parties. |
| Considering facilities how will the OGA view weightings on the proposed plan if for example someone proposes 3 new big facilities would the OGA view that’s this is good because of the investment and provisions of jobs or would it be viewed negatively because of the decom liability implications? | SR responded The OGA would consider it from a MER perspective and it would depend on the specific details of the application for example the CAPEX vs recoverables etc.  AM added the OGA will review the proposals and if there is a disproportionate expenditure for a development this would be evident in the MER economics.  GN added there is regulation for decommissioning |
| Will the OGA provide the well abandonment status? | AM Yes but it is up to the individuals to form a view on whether to re-use or not. |
| Do the OGA envisage any further relinquishments in the area? | MF There may be. Maps will be updated throughout the process and as advised in the presentation individuals should regularly check online for data updates.  GN added it will be frozen once the 90day period commences. |
| Is the well status on CDA accurate? | AM advised the well status had been reviewed and to the best of our knowledge it is correct, however if anyone else knows otherwise please feedback and it will be taken under review. |
| He is struggling with the Area plan marriage concept for the licence round and how that works in an application process and from an area plan context. Can the OGA provide any guidance? | SR, we are trying to promote area plan thinking but it is a normal licence round process. But part of this promotion of the round is to encourage area plan thinking and culture.  GN added for example a company looking at the more mature opportunities could join up with a good explorer which could enhance a development scheme.  AM added the proposals don’t have to be firm that companies could simply set out where they see potential linkages in their applications. |
| Does the area plan proposal fit in the appendix B of the application?  Will appendix B still be limited to 50 pages? | MF Yes and in his experience the applications of more than 50 pages are very rare. |
| When considering compatibility issues do the OGA want to see multiple development options and will there be early release of drilling results. | NR with respect to drilling results from the previous years these can be released however they will not contain fluid details.  SR with respect to the development concept as previously discussed the OGA will not offer its view on this to avoid potentially constraining the applicants thought process and skewing applications |
| He believes it is unrealistic to expect him to try form a view and he believes there is risk unrealistic proposals are submitted in the applications. Do the OGA recognise this as a risk? | AM The OGA will make as much information available as possible and in parallel the OGA will form its own view of the area to provide context and a way to test the credibility of the applications proposals. We will not publish this but it will help us frame questions to probe applications during the interview process and assess how credible the applications are. So, the OGA encourage the applicants to be realistic in their submissions. |