

Joint Industry Audit Report

CHC- Helikopter Service

AUDITEE					
CHC					
AUDIT NO.					
EA-2020-6					
APPROVAL					
Rev. no:	Date:	Auditor:	QA by:	Auditee:	Comments:
01	24.06.20	N/A	A. B. Meisler <i>A. B. Meisler</i>		

Verification Report
Common Audit
CHC Helikopter Service

June 2020

Key information:

Audit Title:	Verification Report Common Audit CHC Helikopter Service		
Audit period:	22 – 24 June 2020	Location:	Stavanger
Report status:	Final	Report date:	June 29 th 2020
		Classification:	Internal

Table of Contents

1	Objective and Scope.....	3
1.1	Objective.....	3
1.2	Scope	3
2	Executive summary	4
3	Audit execution	5
4	Participants	6
5	Summary of findings	7
5.1	Non-conformities.....	7
5.2	Observations/ Improvement Points	8
6	Appendix.....	9

1 Objective and Scope

1.1 Objective

This Common Audit is a co-operation between the Norwegian Oil & Gas members consisting of Equinor, AkerBP, ConocoPhillips, Vår Energi, Neptune Energy, Cairn, Wintershall Dea, Lundin, OMV, Repsol, Spirit Energy, DNO (the operators). The audit report is shared with selected other companies not directly involved in the audit.

The purpose of the audit is to verify that CHC Helikopter Service (CHC HS) has documented and implemented required systems in accordance with contractual requirements, and that the helicopter operations and maintenance are organized, planned, and performed in a safe and efficient manner.

1.2 Scope

Scope (as defined in the audit notification):

The audit will cover all activities related to the contracts, and have focus on areas such as, but not limited to:

- Accountable Manager/GOM responsibilities
- Safety & Compliance Monitoring
- HESS
- ERP
- Part 145
- Part M
- Flight Operations
- Ground Operations
- “Verneombudstjenesten”

Abbreviations:

ERP	Emergency Response Plan
HESS	Health Environment Safety & Security
MDR	Maintenance Deviation Request
MEL	Minimum Equipment List
MoC	Management of Change
MoM	Minutes of Meeting
NP	Nominated Person (approved by the aviation authorities)
Part 145	Regulations on helicopter maintenance
Part M	Regulations on the instruction and control of helicopter maintenance
S&CM	Safety & Compliance Monitoring

2 Executive summary

CHC HS give an overall excellent impression. Despite the complexity in the operation (number of bases and different aircraft types) and the current COVID-19 challenges, the reporting (incident reporting and audit findings) has not revealed any major concerns.

Personnel interviewed during the audit expressed a professional attitude and a genuine desire to seek continuous improvements. The audit team noted many positive aspects:

- The Part M CAME has been completely renewed and is recently submitted to the NCAA for approval.
- A reorganising of the Part M department is underway with the aim of increasing capacity and flexibility.
- Part M is in the process of specifying contracts towards HeliOne for each required area. This is positive for good order and oversight and is in line with the current regulatory requirements.
- Sick leave rates are generally low.
- The TRIR (Total Recordable Incident Rate) is low (and have been for some time).

Despite the fundamental solidity CHC HS display there are some general areas worth monitoring:

- Due to rightsizing in a challenging and competing marketplace combined with applied principles of seniority, the company demographic reflects an ageing technical and operational workforce driving cost and leaving the company susceptible to “generation gaps” unless controlled.
- Multiple CHC HS staff postholders hold significant positions/roles within corporate CHC, this is especially true for the accountable manager who is also responsible for the UK, Irish, and Dutch operations. One should ensure that the workload is manageable, and that Norwegian operation is sufficiently prioritized for effective and safe operations and that the accountable manager is delegated adequate authority at all time.

3 Audit execution

Due to the COVID-19 situation it was agreed between the participating NOROG members that this audit would be executed by a two-person audit team and that the audit should be conducted in the form of interviews of key personnel. Interviews were conducted at the main base in Stavanger airport Sola as depicted in the plan below:

Item	Date	Time
Opening meeting	22.06	0900-0930
Accountable Manager		0930-1030
NP Part 145		1030-1200
S&CM Manager		1245-1530
HESS Manager	23.06	0900-1000
NP Part M		1000-1200
Hovedverneombud		1230-1330
NP Flight Ops	24.06	0900-1100
NP Ground Ops		1100-1200
Closing meeting		1300-1400

Auditors: Øivind Solberg, Equinor (lead)
John Arild Gundersen, Aker BP

4 Participants

Participants from CHC HS:

Name	Function
Per andre Rykhus	Managing Director/Accountable Manager
Ole Morten Løge	Safety & Compliance Monitoring Manager
Vidar Skaar	Nominated Person Part 145
Dag Johan Sætre	Nominated Person Part M
Tor-Andreas Horne	Nominated Person Flight Operations (temp. NP Ground Operations)
Eiliv Bjørnå	Manager Crew Training (Nominated Person Crew Training)
Jan Erik Price	Manager Operations Centre (to be NP Ground Operations)
Birte Meling Sunde	HESS Adviser
Frode Moi	Hovedverneombud

5 Summary of findings

5.1 Non-conformities

See appendix for color coding (risk class) and risk label (H, M, L).

Ch	Area	Topic	Description	Risk	Risk class
5.1.1	Management	ERP and SCM Manual	Responsibilities concerning the ERP (overall responsibility, responsibility for the manual, for the practical execution of exercises etc.) should be clearly stated in the manuals, or one of the manuals. (ref: the ERP and SC&M Manuals)	L	
5.1.2	Management	SC&M	An overall analysis of the data derived from the internal and external audits should be undertaken in order to assess the suitability and efficiency of the Quality (Safety & Compliance) monitoring system and function. (ref: ISO 9001:2015)	M	
5.1.3	Management	HESS Manual	The HESS Advisors responsibilities concerning security should be stated in the HESS Manual. (ref: the CHC HS HESS manual)	L	
5.1.4	Management	Contracts	A contract stating the relation between Securitas and CHC HS could not be presented during the audit. (ref: EASA ORO.GEN 205)	M	
5.1.5	Management	Process	The completed MoC concerning the Ground Operations restructure (outsourcing) could not be presented in the audit. (ref SC&M Manual)	L	
5.1.6	Management	Process	The management of risk is described in different processes. It is hard to see from the SC&M Manual how these different risk management descriptions come together in the risk register and the current bow tie, given those are the two ultimate (or penultimate) expressions of the current risk picture in the company. In sum it may be difficult to secure that all risks are managed as intended in ORO.GEN 200. (ref: EASA ORO.GEN 200)	M	

5.2 Observations/ Improvement Points

Ch.	Area	Topic	Description
5.2.1	Management	Safety cooperation	We register that the climate for cooperation between CHC HS and Bristow is good. However, there is something to be desired concerning the timely sharing of information between the companies in the cases of serious events. We suggest the companies look into this for the purpose of improving non-competitive information sharing.
5.2.2	Maintenance	Follow-up on staff	The yearly performance review had not been completed for all technicians at some of the bases.
5.2.3	Maintenance	Procedure	The CHC MOE does not mention any training requirement for the handling of parts in relation to ESD (Electrostatic Discharge).
5.2.4	Maintenance	Part M	The NP Part M will revert back to the Common Audit on why there is a sudden dip in MEL statistics for May. We also observe an increase in MEL use before May, but none of the other relevant KPIs (robberies, MDR) indicate anything in particular pointing to any problems related to the lack of parts.
5.2.5	Flight Ops	Action Tracking	In different MoM from different FDM meetings it is hard to see concrete actions and also whether the different outputs are being tracked in the management (SQID) system.

6 Appendix

Risk classification of non-conformities

The non-conformances listed in the summary are classified and are to be followed up according to the definitions given below. All non-conformances are labelled with the relevant colours (see code below). The level of risk is indicated in the summary column named “risk” as: low (L), medium (M) or high (H). Both classifications indicate the order of priority concerning the rectification of the different items.

Red	Nonconformance with regulatory requirements, nonconformance with contractual or internal governing documents, or other aspects that require immediate action with attention from a high management level in order for the activity/practice to be continued.
Yellow	Nonconformance with regulatory requirements, nonconformance with contractual or internal governing documents, or other aspects that require that actions be implemented as soon as possible with attention from the local management.
Green	A nonconformance has been identified or only minor aspects that are recommended to be improved. Any actions may be included in the ordinary plans for operations, maintenance and continuous improvement.