

OTM-078: Remote supervision of operations

Remote supervision of operations

Challenge

| | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------|------|-------|--------|
| Challenge ID | OTM:078 | | | | |
| 1 Title | Remote supervision of operations | | | | |
| 2 Theme ID | ON 5.4: Logistics planning and operations - Monitoring of assets | | | | |
| 3 Originator of Challenge | Onshore: OTM | | | | |
| 4 Challenge Reviewer / initiator | | | | | |
| General description | | Overview of Challenge | | | |
| 5 What is the nature of the challenge? (What is not adequately addressed at present?) | We often sub-contract large workpack elements in remote locations, or locations that are geographically far away from our main offices. | | | | |
| 6 Thematic information requirements | 9. Obtain detailed imagery of assets, | | | | |
| 7 Nature of the challenge - What effect does this challenge have on operations? | It would be beneficial to us to be able to supervise our sub-contractors without the requirement for an on-the-ground representative. It would help us to ensure, for example, that regulations are being adhered to, logistical activity is occurring as prom | | | | |
| 8 What do you currently do to address this challenge?/ How is this challenge conventionally addressed? | We sometimes pay third-parties to validate sub-contractor work. Otherwise we need to be on site ourselves. | | | | |
| 9 What kind of solution do you envisage could address this challenge? | EO data can provide frequent, repeated information on the construction progress and detects delays in the construction phase. | | | | |
| 10 What is your view on the capability of technology to meet this need? – are you currently using EO tech? If not, why not? | EO could be a useful complimentary technology. | | | | |
| Challenge classification | | | | | |
| 11 Lifecycle stage | Pre license | Exp. | Dev. | Prod. | Decom. |
| Score from impact quantification [1] | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 12 Climate classification | NOT CLIMATE SPECIFIC | | | | |
| 13 Geographic context/restrictions | Generic onshore (Unspecified) | | | | |
| 14 Topographic classification / Offshore classification | Generic onshore (Unspecified) | | | | |
| 15 Seasonal variations | Any season | | | | |
| 16 Impact Area | HSE, operational cost reduction and efficiency | | | | |
| 17 Technology Urgency (How quickly does the user need the solution) | Immediately (0-2 years) | | | | |
| Information requirements | | | | | |
| 18 Update frequency | As close to real-time as possible | | | | |
| 19 Data Currently used | | | | | |
| 20 Spatial resolution | | | | | |
| 21 Thematic accuracy | | | | | |
| 22 Example formats | | | | | |
| 23 Timeliness | As close to real-time as possible | | | | |
| 24 Geographic Extent | asset areas / reservoir footprints | | | | |
| 25 Existing standards | | | | | |

[1] Impact quantification scores: 4 – Critical/ enabling; 3 – Significant/ competitive advantage; 2 – Important but non-essential; 1 – Nice to have; 0 – No impact, need satisfied with existing technology

Relevant products

Content by label



There is no content with the specified labels

