



Pipeline Open Data Standard

PODS Offshore Workgroup Charter

Approved by work group: January 2015
Adopted by PODS Board of Directors: February 5, 2015

Table of Contents

Change Log	2
Section 1 – Working Group Plan.....	3
1. Working Group Name:	3
2. Work Group Members:	3
3. Reporting Relationships	3
4. Reporting Frequency	3
5. Work Group Objectives	3
6. Scope	3
7. Guiding Principles:	4
8. Deliverables:	5
9. Schedule:.....	5
Section 2 – Responsible Committee Review	5
Section 3 – Board Approval	6
Section 4 - Process Description.....	7

Change Log

Date	Author	Description
2014/11/11	Charter Team	Initial Document
2014/12/15	Christa Freeman	Formatted

Section 1 – Working Group Plan

1. Working Group Name: PODS Offshore Work Group

2. Work Group Members:

- 2.1. Chair: Craig Hawkins , BP Americas
- 2.2. Co-chair: Zemfira Huseynli , Genesis Oil and Gas Consultants
- 2.3. Secretary: Anjali Bhangay , Woodgroup Kenny
- 2.4. Other Work Group Members:

Adam Davis	Wish Software
Peter Veenstra	Willbros Engineering
John Linehan	Woodgroup Kenny
Chad Rivers	Genesis Oil & Gas Consultants
Layne Tucker	MCS OilEcho RFID
Mike Scurlock	Project Consulting Services

3. Reporting Relationships

- 3.1. Reports to: PODS Data Modeling Team
- 3.2. Liaison¹: Peter Veenstra

4. Reporting Frequency

Triweekly

5. Work Group Objectives

The objective of this workgroup is to expand the current PODS relational database model by designing features and tables that apply to offshore pipeline operations. All work shall be completed and submitted for acceptance by the PODS Committee on May 1st, 2015.

6. Scope

- 6.1. The scope of the workgroup shall be contained in developing the schema for subsea facilities installed offshore and any special inspections required as such. The workgroup will limit its effort to offshore subsea facilities extending from the seafloor (well, or wellhead) to an endpoint at landfall (where the pipe would be considered onshore) or to an offshore (above water) platform. The workgroup will focus on developing for operational use with limited attention to storage of integrity evaluation data.

- 6.2. Schema is defined as entities (described as tables with attributes and indexes) and the formal relationships between entities (including description of cardinality and direction). Schema will also include ‘code list value’ tables, with a representative sampling of common values, if appropriate).
- 6.3. Schema will include suggested inclusions or specification for how entities will comprise or alter/modify specific modules in the PODS Relational v6.0 data model.
- 6.4. Schema will include specification for online locations as point or linear events to designate the position of offline features.
- 6.5. This Scope will include development for:
 - 6.5.1.1. Subsea Equipment such as Pipeline End Terminations (PLETs), Umbilical Termination Assemblies (UTAs), and Manifolds.
 - 6.5.1.2. Subsea Lines such as Risers, Flowlines, Umbilicals, Bundles, Pipe-in-Pipe and Flying Leads.
 - 6.5.1.3. Subsea Assets considered to be ‘online’ or located on or along the pipeline such as Buoyancy and Bend Restrictors.
 - 6.5.1.4. Online events for offline Subsea Support features such as Mattresses, Anchors and Tie-Backs.
 - 6.5.1.5. Equipment and pipeline material and design criteria.
 - 6.5.1.6. Offline Construction features such as Survey Frames, Markers, Target Boxes, and Sample Sites.
 - 6.5.1.7. Subsea Inspection tables including for Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV), Side-scan Sonar (SSS), Profile and Out-of-straightness.
 - 6.5.1.8. Integration with the Seabed Survey Data Model (SSDM).

7. Guiding Principles:

The offshore module to the PODS database is intended to model the elements described in the previous section within the context of defining eighty (80) percent (%) of entities and attributes that would be used by eighty (80) percent (%) of the pipeline companies operating offshore and/or subsea assets. The module will not seek to model the entire offshore system including specification of details within sites or subsea equipment other than how those systems relate to the pipeline (product transport or pressurized) system itself. The scope of the pipeline system ends where pressure is confined at a logical stopping point when the pipeline is located within a given site. These points are typically located at landfall or on a platform and are considered to be:

- Launchers and receivers

- Emergency Shutdown Valves (ESDV)
- Monolithic isolation joints
- Wellhead

8. Deliverables¹:

- 8.1. Charter and Statement of Purpose.
- 8.2. Data Model Overview and Design Process.
- 8.3. Logical Data Model.
- 8.4. Listing of Entities, Attributes (types), indices, relationships (cardinality), code-value entities with default or suggested values.
- 8.5. Data Dictionary describing entities, attributes and relationships.
- 8.6. Meeting agendas and meeting minutes.

9. Member Commitment Expectation:

Due to the short schedule and the high expectation of delivery on this team, attendance is expected. If for some reason a member misses 3 meetings, they may be asked to leave the sub-group.

10. Schedule:

Workgroup Kick-off meeting -	16Oct14
Charter Review and submission -	11Dec14
Charter Acceptance -	15Jan15
Listing of main entities and categorization of entities	22Jan15
Listing of entity attributes and code-list value tables	12Feb15
Listing of relationships and documentation draft	12Mar15
Finalization of submittal to PODS TC	24Apr15
Submit to PODS for acceptance	1May15
Review and update	TBD
Final submittal	TBD

Section 2 – Responsible Committee Review

Proposal received: <Date>

¹ See also *Process Description §2d*



Pipeline Open Data Standard

Offshore Work Group Charter

Reviewed by the Responsible Committee: <Date>

Reviewing members:

<Committee member 1>, < Committee member 2>, ...

Recommendation to the Board:

<Recommendation to approve or reject, with rationale and any suggested follow-up>.

Guidance to Working Group:

<Proposal approved: issues to consider during project execution. Proposal rejected: issues needing resolution prior to approval.> ...

Section 3 – Board Approval

Recommendation approved: <Authorized Board representative>

Date: <Date>

Comments: <Optional>

Section 4 - Process Description

1. **Purpose** – the Purpose of the Working Group Charter is three-fold:
 - 1.1. To clearly delineate the scope of and deliverables for proposed work or changes, including minimum required deliverables.
 - 1.2. To provide a process framework for the Working Group’s activities, including the need to:
 - 1.2.1. Establish mechanisms for communication between the proposed Working Group and the Committee within whose area of responsibility (“Responsible Committee”) the Working Group’s focus falls;
 - 1.2.2. First identify and document the Business Requirements Specification;
 - 1.2.3. Include in any development of technical standards or documentation certain key deliverables (see §2d below).
 - 1.2.4. The above are intended and expected to facilitate the Working Group's progress and incorporation of its results into the PODS Association’s portfolio of products and services.
 - 1.3. To authorize such proposed work or changes. The proposed changes are thus brought about through Working Groups formed under the authority of the relevant Responsible PODS Committee and authorized by the Board.
2. **Section 1** is to be completed by the individual or individuals proposing to initiate the new Working Group.
 - 2.1. Regular written status reports to the Responsible Committee are required. The proposed period between reports should be consistent with the rate at which the Working Group plans to progress. Bi-weekly or monthly updates are considered typical.
 - 2.2. Identification of a Responsible Committee Liaison is optional. Whether or not a Liaison is identified, a written status report is still required.
 - 2.3. Self-explanatory entries for “Scope” and “Objective” are critical. They should include enough information to allow the Responsible Committee to assess the impact of the proposed Working Group’s activities on the PODS standards for which the Responsible Committee is responsible.
 - 2.4. “Deliverables” will vary according to the stated objectives. For any Working Group reporting to the Technical Committee, these should include, at the very least, documentation for the Working Group’s results. In addition, if one of the Working Group’s objectives is to alter the PODS data model, other required deliverables include:
 - 2.4.1. An Entity-Relationship Diagram,
 - 2.4.2. A Data Dictionary for all new or modified model objects, and
 - 2.4.3. A listing of existing objects in the then-current PODS data model which will be impacted (modified or dropped) by the proposed model alteration.
 - 2.4.4. User documentation for the new standard that is conformant with the existing documentation format being used for equivalent PODS technical standards.

- 2.5. Note that changes to the initial Charter may be effected at any time by submitting a new version for review and approval.
3. **Section 2** is to be completed by the Responsible Committee.
 - 3.1. If the Responsible Committee recommends that the Board approve the proposed Working Group charter, then “Guidance to Working Group” will identify issues about which the Working Group should be aware, and provide recommendations to facilitate incorporation of their results into existing standards.
 - 3.2. If the Responsible Committee recommends that the Board reject the proposed Working Group charter, then “Guidance to Working Group” will present the rationale for this recommendation, and indicate what changes to the plan, if any, would result in an acceptable charter.
4. **Section 3** is to be completed by a member of the Board of Directors authorized by them to represent the result of their review of both the charter and the recommendation provided by the Responsible Committee.
 - 4.1. If the Board approves the Responsible Committee’s recommendation, one copy each of the approved charter will be archived by the PODS Secretary, returned to the Working Group Leader, and the Responsible Committee Chair.
 - 4.2. If the Board rejects the Responsible Committee’s recommendation, the rationale for that rejection will be provided in “Comments,” and the charter returned to the Responsible Committee Chair. The Responsible Committee will resolve the issues that resulted in the Board’s rejection of its recommendation by discussing the charter with the Working Group and/or Board of Directors. When a resolution has been identified, the Responsible Committee will resubmit the charter to the Board for their review and approval.