

2.27. The situation in Norway is therefore somewhat similar to that in the UK, but as a result of the ability of the Directorates to make supplementary and mandatory safety regulations, the Norwegian industry is subject to more detailed direction.

2.28. One operator having experience in both Norwegian and UK sectors gave evidence to the Committee. The practice of the Norwegian Directorates of delaying comment on the installation until completion of the certification survey was expensive if modification should be required. In summary, he found their enforcement of safety regulations more rigid and less well-informed than in UK.

2.29. *USA.* The USA have long experience of offshore oil exploration and production and their system of safety, law and enforcement is therefore of particular interest. From information received through a company operating extensively in US and other waters, we find that nine agencies are involved in offshore safety regulation, four being predominant.

2.30. The US Geological Survey and the US Coast Guard (USCG), both within the Department of the Interior, have a reasonably well-defined division of regulatory responsibilities. The Materials Transportation Bureau (Department of Transportation) appears to have taken authority overlapping with USCG for pipelines; and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration has become superimposed on the specialist agencies.

2.31. Our informant has complained of the problems created by this complex system of Governmental control of offshore safety and we think that it is an inappropriate model for the UK.

2.32. A fuller account of offshore safety legislation and enforcement in the USA and Norway is given in Appendix 13, and the text (but not appendices) of the review* of the US system is published with Submission No. 16.

* Review of United States Regulations pertaining to Safety in Offshore Exploration and Production.