

**Voluntary Information-sharing System
Federal Advisory Committee
Subcommittee – Best Practice**

Report Out Presentation

February 28, 2018

Subcommittee Members

- Alternate Designated Federal Official: Max Kiebia
- Subcommittee Chair: Eric Amundsen
- Subcommittee Members:
 - Leif Jensen
 - Mark Hereth
 - Mike LaMont
 - Joe Subsits
 - John MacNeill
 - Kate Blystone
 - Bryce Brown
 - Walter Jones
 - Randy Parker

Best Practices Subcommittee Task Statement

Evaluate existing processes (including other industry VIS models and practices) and make recommendations on best practices that will promote the sharing of data and information that accomplishes:

- Active participation of all stakeholders: Compelled by the value proposition
- Integrity management process and technology improvements
 - Identification of current industry VIS processes and systems (PRCI, API, INGAA, SGA, Service Providers) and assessment of active participation by stakeholders
 - Identification of current gaps in data, technology and/or analytics that need to be closed
 - Sharing occurs between technology providers and operators
 - Sharing of enhanced processes and practices i.e. solutions to known problems including experience with new data/information technology
 - Training and education of lessons learned with respect to execution of the various integrity management processes
 - Improved analytics
 - Near misses
- Post incident related RCFA's and subsequent company/regulator learning
 - Systemic or acute process improvements
 - Cultural improvements
 - Technology/Technology deployment improvements
- Communication to and with stakeholders including regulators, public advocacy, public

A Framework/Best Practice for Voluntary Information Sharing

The sharing opportunity is characterized by the following:

- **High Value** – the opportunity results in an increase in knowledge, process improvement or best practice at a company level. To this end the sharing should target the right side of the value chain (data, information, **knowledge, understanding, wisdom**).
- **Deliberate** - The sharing process is via active engagement between one or more parties and is a pitch/catch relationship; at a minimum at least one party is learning/gaining knowledge or wisdom from another or they are engaged in process improvement.
- **Actionable** – The result of the engagement generates action by one or more parties and processes or practices change within that entity (industry or service providers).
- **Measurable** – The sharing process as well as the results of the improvements/actions are measurable (leading and lagging KPI's).

Best Practice for Voluntary Information Sharing

Recommendations for the Committee

The following external resources and collaboration with other subcommittees are recommended:

Additional subcommittee members

- PRCI – Cliff Johnson/Walter Kresic
- AGA – Staff member (contribute existing bench marking data management processes, data?, challenges and solutions)

Request as guest presenter

- FAA – Warren Randolph
- INGAA/INGAA Foundation – CJ Osman/Paul Mckay (lessons learned and sharing processes)
- APGA – Erin Kurilla
- API – Stuart Saulters (lessons learned and sharing processes, PSMS and PPTS)

Active collaboration with other VIS subcommittees

- Process Sharing
- Technology and R&D

Suggested Contexts for the VIS WG Committee

Consider the following suggested contexts and outcomes as a targets of the VIS WG initiative:

- Improve (industry consistent/best in class) application and deployment of existing technology whether it be ILLI tools, DA, hydrotesting, etc. Operators deploy a comprehensive, systematic and integrated process relative to integrity assessments.
- Perfect existing technology capabilities via Operator/Industry collaboration Drive development of new and/or improved technology (sensors, analytical techniques) via Operator/Industry gap analysis

Suggested Contexts for the VIS WG Committee

- Drive development of new and/or improved technology (sensors, analytical techniques) via Operator/Industry/Regulator gap analysis
- Identify unique (low probability, high consequence) integrity threats and approaches to assess susceptibility and threats (Operator transparency relative to emerging/discovered threats or false negatives; “I was not expecting to find this but we did”)
- Improve transparency/communication of industry capabilities and confidence level with existing technology, pursuit of gap filling technology – define data, information and messaging for the industry and public communications – what is the state of the state not just in terms of what we are capable of but how well we actually deploy that capability

Suggested Contexts for the VIS WG Committee

Context	Data/Information	Participants	Value of Outcome	Measures
Bolster deployment of best practices and technology	As-found defect data, ILI as-called data, relevant physical, environmental and operational data	Operators, Service Providers	Assure consistent performance from best available technology and processes	Improved characterization and response, lower incident rates
Perfect existing technology and analytical techniques deployment	As-found defect data, ILI as-called data, relevant environmental and operational data, lessons learned	Operators, Service Providers	Improve performance from best available technology and processes	Improved characterization and response, lower incident rates
Improve state of the art	Physical samples and data for unique or rare defects/interaction	Operators, Regulators, Service Providers	New or significant improvement in technology including sensors and analytics	Success rate for identification, characterization and mitigation of problematic threats, lower incident rates

Suggested Contexts for the VIS WG Committee

Context	Data/Information	Participants	Value of Outcome	Measures
Identity and transparency of false negatives, low probability high consequence threats	Lessons learned, Case Studies, RCA Recommendations	Operators, Regulators, Service Providers	Realization and mitigation of unique threats	lower incident rates
Stakeholder Communications	Industry integrity assurance capability, process and performance metrics, VIS outcomes	Operators, Regulators, Public and Advocacy groups	Industry credibility and stakeholder confidence	

Questions/Comments