

# What is Wrong with EPC Contracting?



A decorative graphic on the left side of the slide consists of a vertical black line intersecting a horizontal black line. To the left of the intersection are three overlapping squares: a yellow one at the top, a red one in the middle, and a blue one at the bottom.

# What Drives the Cost?

---

- Project Cycle Times
  - Decisions made in timely manner allow for proper definition of the development solution
  - Decisions delayed in the selection of alternatives compress the decisions made in the execution phase of the project and lead to mistakes
  - Time pressure created by decision delays drive Project Managers to “same as before” solutions when it may not be the best.

A decorative graphic on the left side of the slide consists of overlapping colored squares (yellow, red, blue) and a black crosshair.

# What Drives the Cost?

---

- Distribution of Risk
  - Contractors taking on project risks that they can't define just to win the work
  - High Insurance rates driving operators to push more risk onto contractors
  - Lack of specific experience for either contractor or operator at a given water depth, flow rate, reservoir characteristic, etc.
  - Ultimately risk money is added that is ill defined, too high in price and hidden from the operator. This lack of transparency erodes trust.

A decorative graphic on the left side of the slide consists of a vertical black line intersected by a horizontal black line. To the left of the vertical line are three overlapping squares: a yellow one at the top, a red one in the middle, and a blue one at the bottom. The horizontal line is positioned below the vertical line.

# What Drives the Cost?

---

- Fixed price bidding
  - First cost of fixed price bid is the lowest possible price, yet rarely the final price – it can only go up from there
  - Instinctively drives contractor into “protection” mode rather than “collaborative” mode
  - Unknowns and risk add money to the bid price
  - Overly competitive situations cause contractors to “buy” projects and then rapidly get into trouble during execution phase
  - Ultimate installed price is far higher than necessary

# Less than what? Selecting the Right Benchmarks

A decorative graphic on the left side of the slide, consisting of a vertical black line intersected by a horizontal black line. To the left of the intersection are three overlapping squares: a yellow one at the top, a red one in the middle, and a blue one at the bottom.

- Large share of benchmarks are for shelf projects that don't apply
- Geography plays a very large role in:
  - Best practices – N. Sea vs GOM vs Brazil vs West Africa
  - Government oversight – can impact cost
  - Local infrastructure “assistance” and logistical support
- Operator preferences
  - Can vary widely
  - Sometimes override contractor lessons learned due to “not invented here” attitude
  - Asset managers still driven to first cost of capital rather than optimizing on life of field and aftermarket costs
  - NOC's often focus on lowest initial bid, not life of field cost

## Benchmarks according to Independent Project Analysis (IPA)

---

- The cost of facilities has improved by about 12 percent in real terms over the last 5 years
- Execution schedules have improved nearly 30 percent over the past decade
- Construction safety has improved dramatically
- Operability has held steady



We should be collectively focusing on positive impacts on Life of Field costs

## A Modest Proposal – How to drive down the costs

---

- Project Life Cycles
  - Bring preferred **equipment suppliers** early rather than **engineering houses** – suppliers have the latest knowledge on technology and field development
  - Select a preferred field development strategy and then freeze designs as early as possible – sometimes “Better is Worse than Good Enough”
  - Go beyond standardized designs – standardize your processes. **Repeatable processes are the cornerstone of quality.**
  - Embrace the “One Team” approach to achieve the project goal of first oil. Walk your Talk.

# A Modest Proposal – How to drive down the costs

A decorative graphic on the left side of the slide consists of a vertical black line intersecting a horizontal black line. To the left of the intersection, there are overlapping colored rectangles: a yellow one at the top, a red one in the middle, and a blue one at the bottom.

## ■ Distribution of Risk

- Develop real contractual relationships with key suppliers
  - Standardize contract terms
  - Reduce "risk money" in bids
- Beware of Frame Agreements
  - Develop pricing based on philosophies of development, not standardized equipment
  - Variations can become expensive
- Assign the risks to those who can actually impact
  - Installers cannot assume product liabilities
  - Equipment suppliers cannot assume weather downtime
- Physically separate Risk Price from Equipment/Services Price when constructing contract models – see what you pay for when you review your contracts



# A Modest Proposal – How to drive down the costs

---

- **Life of Field Approach**

- Suppliers should interact with **Production** companies/departments in addition to **Development** companies/departments
- Incentivize Asset managers on total field productivity, not just first cost of capital/NPV
  - Provide products and services that extend beyond traditional hardware supply and service contracts
  - Link field development bonuses to long term performance of the assets

# A Modest Proposal – How to drive down the costs

A decorative graphic on the left side of the slide, consisting of overlapping colored squares (yellow, red, blue) and a black crosshair.

- Incentivize suppliers with a Balanced Scorecard that includes Life of Field
  - Equipment uptime
  - Expandability
  - Logistics and continued service
  - Long term support
  - Selling price
  - Shared risk pool
  - Change Order Minimization

# A Modest Proposal – How to drive down the costs

A decorative graphic on the left side of the slide, consisting of overlapping colored squares (yellow, red, blue) and a black crosshair.

- Embrace New Technology
  - The same “old” two challenges for new technology acceptance:
    - Reliability concerns
    - Value proposition
  - Time for 50% market acceptance of new technology:
    - Consumer products - 7 years
    - Medical (pharmaceuticals) - 12 years
    - Telecoms - 16 years
    - Oil and gas - 32 years
  - Thank goodness there are some Bravehearts out there!

A decorative graphic on the left side of the slide consists of overlapping colored squares (yellow, red, blue) and a black crosshair.

# Some Enabling Technologies/Systems

---

- **Next generation sub-sea processing & production control management systems**
  
- **No surface piercing structures**
  - **Subsea to beach**
  
- **Low cost well construction/intervention systems**

A decorative graphic on the left side of the slide, consisting of overlapping yellow, red, and blue squares with a black crosshair.

## Conclusions of Note

---

- Improve your front end design by bringing in the companies that produce the products
- Separate the risk from the product when you ask for pricing – determine the real value of what you need
- Bridge the gap between development and production – get the team involved across that interface to improve your Life of Field
- Understand the new technologies and embrace their potentials

A decorative graphic on the left side of the slide, consisting of a black crosshair overlaid on a yellow square, a red square, and a blue square.

# A Final Thought

---

We need to continuously challenge  
all of our current approaches....

## **Definition of Insanity**

“Doing the same thing over and over and  
expecting a different result”