

Presented:
18th Annual Insurance Law Institute

November 7-8, 2013
Houston, Texas

DOWNHOLE, OFFSHORE AND BLOWOUTS

—

A PRIMER ON OIL AND GAS COVERAGE: THE OFFSHORE ENERGY PACKAGE POLICY

Claude L. Stuart III

Author contact information:
Claude L. Stuart III
Phelps Dunbar LLP
Houston, Texas 77002

claude.stuart@phelps.com
713-626-1386

Table of Contents

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| I. | INTRODUCTION: The Offshore Energy Package Policy..... | 1 |
| A. | The Offshore Energy Package Policy | 1 |
| B. | Focus of the Paper: Control of Well and, to a lesser extent, Physical Damage..... | 3 |
| II. | LOOKING AT THE PACKAGE | 4 |
| A. | Operators Extra Expense (“OEE”) or Energy Exploration and Development (8/86) (“EED”) Policies..... | 4 |
| 1. | Overview | 4 |
| 2. | Prefatory Principles to Understanding the History | 5 |
| 3. | Historical Development of the OEE And EED POLICIES | 8 |
| a. | Raw History In The First Draft: The COW Cases Themselves | 9 |
| (1) | Central Manufacturer’s Mutual Ins. Co. v. Elliott, 177 F.2d 1011 (10 th Cir. 1949). | 9 |
| (2) | <i>Georgia Home Ins. Co. v. Means</i> , 186 F.2d 783 (5 th Cir. 1951)..... | 10 |
| (3) | Fidelity-Phenix Fire Insurance Company of New York v. Dyer, 220 F.2d, 697 (5 th Cir. 1955) | 11 |
| (4) | <i>Feeney and Myers v. Empire State Insurance Company of Watertown, New York</i> , (130 F. Supp. 729 E.D. Okla. 1955), rev’d on other grounds, 228 F.2d 770 (10 th Cir. 1955) | 13 |
| (5) | Equity Oil Company v. National Fire Insurance Company of Hartford, 144 F.Supp. 830 (D. Utah 1956)..... | 14 |
| (6) | Creole Explorations, Inc. v. Underwriters at Lloyd’s, London, 161 So. 2d 768 (La. 1964)..... | 16 |
| (7) | Sutton Drilling Company, Inc. v. Universal Insurance Company, 335 F.2d 820 (5 th Cir. 1964) | 17 |
| (8) | Aladdin Oil Co., Inc., v. Rayburn Well Service, Inc., 202 So. 2d 477 (La. App. 1967) | 20 |
| (9) | Phillip Rosamond Drilling Company, Inc. v. St. Paul Fire and Marine Insurance Company, 305 So. 2d 630 (La. App. 1974)..... | 21 |

| | | |
|-----------|--|----|
| (10) | Atlantic Richfield Company v. Underwriters at Lloyd’s London, 398 F. Supp. 708 (S.D. Tex. 1975) | 22 |
| b. | Contemporaneous On-The-Ground Observations | 25 |
| (1) | First Hand Accounts of the EED (8/86) Drafting | 26 |
| (2) | Adjusters Working In The Field as EED (8/86) Goes Into General Use Comment | 31 |
| c. | Summary of the four phases of policy development leading to the EED (8/86) | 36 |
| d. | Contemporary View of EED (8/86)’s Success | 39 |
| (1) | The Broker Perspective:..... | 39 |
| (2) | The Legal Perspective:..... | 42 |
| (3) | The Underwriter’s Perspective: | 43 |
| (4) | Present and Future Tweaks to the EED (8/86) Policy..... | 46 |
| 4. | PARSING THE POLICY | 47 |
| a. | Policy Guideposts | 47 |
| (1) | Learning the Lingo..... | 47 |
| (2) | The Role of American Domestic Forms | 48 |
| (3) | Partial Interest Clause (Scaled to Interest)..... | 48 |
| (4) | Indemnity/Reimbursement..... | 49 |
| (5) | Warranties / Due Diligence..... | 49 |
| (6) | Only Insured Wells Are Covered..... | 50 |
| (7) | Coverage Trigger | 51 |
| (8) | Not An All Risks Policy | 51 |
| (9) | The Reasons For, As Opposed to the Fact Of, The Well Getting Out of Control Are Defined Only Inferentially | 51 |
| (10) | The EED Policy Now Speaks In Terms of Unintended Flows Not Continuous or Uncontrolled Flows..... | 51 |
| (11) | Combined Single Limit..... | 51 |
| (12) | Common Conditions | 51 |
| (13) | Subrogation | 52 |
| (14) | Rating..... | 52 |
| (15) | Notice and Proof of Loss | 52 |
| (16) | Priority of Payments | 53 |
| b. | The EED Policy More Closely Examined | 53 |
| (1) | Control of Well Insurance..... | 53 |

| | | | |
|-----------|------|---|-----------|
| | (a) | Section A..... | 53 |
| | (b) | Section B: Redrilling/Extra-Expense..... | 58 |
| | (c) | Section C: Seepage and Pollution, Cleanup and Contamination..... | 62 |
| (2) | | Additional EED Endorsements | 66 |
| | (a) | Care, Custody and Control Endorsement (“CCC”)..... | 66 |
| | (b) | Evacuation Expenses | 68 |
| | (c) | Contingent Joint Venture Endorsement | 69 |
| | (d) | Underground Control of Well Endorsement | 69 |
| | (e) | Making Wells Safe Endorsement (“MWS”)..... | 71 |
| | (f) | Extended Redrilling and Restoration Cost Endorsement | 72 |
| | (g) | Resultant Plugging and Abandonment Endorsement..... | 74 |
| | (h) | Windstorm Endorsement | 75 |
| | (i) | OPOL Endorsement..... | 75 |
| | (j) | OPA Endorsement | 75 |
| c. | | CURRENT AND RECURRENT EED ISSUES | 76 |
| | (1) | Efforts To Relabel Or Repackage Expenses In The Face Of Inadequate Policy Limits | 76 |
| | (2) | Scheduled Property And A Combined Single Limit Raises Limit Issues | 77 |
| | (3) | The Concept Of Indemnity Under The COW Meets The “Undrilled Redrill” | 78 |
| | (4) | New Technology Issues | 78 |
| | (5) | Misuse Of EED Policy As Claimed Underlying For Excess Cover..... | 79 |
| | (6) | Indemnity/Reimbursement..... | 79 |
| | (7) | The Sophisticated Insured: Contra Preferendum on the Ropes? | 80 |
| | (8) | Late Notice..... | 80 |
| | (9) | Prompt Payment..... | 80 |
| | (10) | Waiver Of A Final Proof Of Loss..... | 81 |
| | (11) | Reporting Requirements | 81 |
| 5. | | SUMMARY | 81 |
| 6. | | Physical Damage Coverage (“PD”): Brief Summary | 81 |
| 7. | | Historical Overview | 82 |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| a. | The London Standard Platform Form | 83 |
| b. | Institute Time Clauses, Hulls Port Risk..... | 83 |
| c. | The Pipeline Form..... | 83 |
| 8. | London Standard Platform Form (“LSPF”) (1972) (amended in 2009) | 84 |
| a. | Basic Coverage Part..... | 84 |
| b. | Physical Loss or Damage..... | 85 |
| c. | Causation..... | 87 |
| d. | Due Diligence | 88 |
| e. | “All Risks” | 90 |
| f. | Period of Cover: Generally 12 Months | 90 |
| g. | Occurrence-Based Policy | 91 |
| h. | Property Insured..... | 92 |
| i. | Limits of Liability | 93 |
| j. | Policy Limitation | 94 |
| k. | Modifications to the Clause | 95 |
| l. | Constructive Total Loss | 96 |
| m. | Total and Constructive Total loss - Potential Contentious Issues | 98 |
| n. | Coinsurance..... | 99 |
| o. | Deductible | 99 |
| p. | Sue and Labour Expenses | 100 |
| q. | Exclusions | 101 |
| | (1) Control of Well Related Exclusions | 102 |
| | (2) Exclusions Relating to Naturally Occurring Causes | 103 |
| | (3) Electrical Derangement..... | 104 |
| | (4) Consequential Losses..... | 105 |
| | (5) Liabilities and Wreck Removal | 105 |
| | (6) Additional Property Damage Exclusions..... | 106 |
| | (7) War Risks Exclusion (F.C &S.)..... | 107 |
| | (8) Radioactive Contamination Exclusion..... | 107 |
| | (9) Additional Customised Exclusions | 107 |
| | (10) Downhole Equipment Exclusion | 108 |
| r. | The Role of the Package Policy | 108 |
| s. | The Significance of Form J..... | 109 |
| t. | The Assured | 109 |
| u. | Territorial Limits..... | 110 |
| v. | General Average and Salvage Charges..... | 110 |
| w. | Other Clauses Included in the Standard LSPF..... | 111 |
| x. | Blowout Preventor Warranty (BOP)..... | 111 |
| y. | Release Agreements and Waivers of Subrogation..... | 112 |
| z. | Cancellation | 112 |
| aa. | Discovery of Records and Limitation of Action..... | 113 |

| | | |
|------------|---|-----|
| bb. | Typical Coverages Included in Manuscript Policies | 113 |
| cc. | Faulty Design | 113 |
| dd. | Removal of Wreck | 114 |
| ee. | Social Responsibility for Wreck Removal..... | 115 |
| ff. | Pollution Hazard (Deliberate Damage) Clause..... | 116 |
| gg. | Old Mines and Torpedoes..... | 116 |
| hh. | Terrorism..... | 116 |
| ii. | Other Clauses Customarily Included as Enhancements in Manuscript Policies | 116 |
| jj. | Minor Works Clause | 116 |
| kk. | Automatic Acquisition | 117 |
| ll. | Evacuation Expenses | 117 |
| mm. | Shut-Down Clause | 117 |
| | | |
| 9. | General Discussion regarding the 2009 Wording of the LSPF | 118 |
| | (1) Insuring Agreements..... | 118 |
| | (2) Warranty and Due Diligence | 118 |
| | (3) Pollution..... | 119 |
| | (4) Selected Notable Changes to the 2009 LSPF | 119 |
| | | |
| 10. | Post-Script: Common Issues Arising Out Of Physical Damage Policies..... | 120 |
| | a. Failure to Schedule Property and the E&O Clause..... | 120 |
| | b. No Coverage for Wells | 120 |
| | c. Removal of Debris | 120 |
| | d. Property Betterment May Be Necessary But Not Insured..... | 121 |
| | e. Scheduled Property and A Combined Single Limit Provoke Questions Regarding Limits..... | 121 |
| | | |
| 11. | Post-Script: The Strains Of The Hurricanes On LSPF | 122 |
| 12. | SUMMARY | 124 |
| | | |
| B. | POLLUTION | 124 |
| | | |
| C. | BUSINESS INTERRUPTION (“BI”) INCLUDING CONTINGENT BUSINESS INTERRUPTION (“CBI”) / LOSS OF PRODUCTION INCOME (“LOPI”)..... | 124 |
| | | |
| 1. | History of the Policies..... | 124 |
| | a. Historical Development Of Business Interruption Coverage (“BI”)..... | 124 |
| | b. Historical Development Of Contingent Business Interruption Coverage (“CBI”) | 125 |

| | | |
|------|--|------------|
| c. | Application Of Business Interruption And Contingent Business Interruption Coverage To The Offshore Context: LOPI And Contingent LOPI Policies | 125 |
| 2. | The LOPI Policy | 126 |
| a. | The Evolution And Role Of LOPI/Contingent LOPI In Today's Market..... | 126 |
| b. | Reviewing The LOPIW Policy | 126 |
| c. | The Insuring Clauses..... | 128 |
| d. | The Recovery Period..... | 131 |
| e. | The Limit of Liability | 136 |
| f. | The Measure of Recovery | 138 |
| g. | The Definitions | 139 |
| h. | EXCLUSIONS..... | 141 |
| i. | The Conditions..... | 143 |
| j. | Resumption of Operations | 144 |
| k. | Ordinance Cover | 144 |
| l. | Post Script: The Strains Of The Hurricanes On LOPIW | 145 |
| m. | Summary | 146 |
| D. | THIRD PARTY LIABILITY (INCLUDING EXCESS)..... | 147 |
| E. | CONSTRUCTION RISKS | 147 |
| F. | CHARTERER'S LIABILITY | 148 |
| G. | WINDSTORM..... | 148 |
| H. | CRUDE OIL STORAGE..... | 148 |
| I. | POLITICAL RISKS..... | 148 |
| J. | WAR AND RELATED RISKS | 148 |
| K. | CONTINGENT OEE/EED | 148 |
| III. | BIBLIOGRAPHIES..... | Appendix A |
| | JURY CHARGE & VERDICT FORM | Appendix B |
| | JURY INSTRUCTIONS & VERDICT FORM..... | Appendix C |
| | LONDON STANDARD PLATFORM FORM (2009) | Appendix D |
| | GENERAL PROVISIONS | Appendix E |

I. INTRODUCTION: The Offshore Energy Package Policy

A. The Offshore Energy Package Policy

The Offshore Energy Package Policy is an essential necessity for offshore drilling.¹ Developed by the London Insurance Market and having at its core Control of Well Insurance, the package bundles together a series of complimentary policies and endorsements which each provide separate coverage. Taken together, the Offshore Energy Package Policy addresses a wide array of interlocked operational and property risks.² The Offshore Energy Package Policy has become so ubiquitous and of such long standing that relationships among the Assureds, their Brokers, and given Underwriters have effectively turned certain packages into well known “Market brands.”³

While it comes in many forms and its various bespoke wordings are the subject of a constant to and fro among Underwriters, Assureds, and Brokers, the Offshore Energy Package Policy can and typically does include some or all of the following policies or endorsements and perhaps others as the Market continuously evolves:

1. Operator’s Extra Expense (“OEE”) or Energy Exploration and Development (“EED”)⁴ which themselves aggregate a number of related covers into a harmonious whole:
 - Control of Well which itself includes:
 - Section A: Control of Well
 - Section B: Redrilling/Extra Expense
 - Section C: Seepage and Pollution, Cleanup and Contamination
 - Underground Control of Well
 - Extended Redrill and Restoration
 - Making Well Safe
 - Care Custody and Control
 - OPA Endorsement
 - OPOL Endorsement
 - Resultant Plugging and Abandonment Endorsement
 - Evacuation Expenses
 - Deliberate Well Firing

¹ There are exceptions to every rule. A major player in the Macondo blowout did not have such a package.

² Particularly as to contractors and service providers (as opposed to owners and operators), marine exposures must be considered.

³ See DAVID SHARP, UPSTREAM AND OFFSHORE ENERGY INSURANCE at 339 (Witherbys Insurance 2009)(“Sharp II”)(“by developing its own operating package the oil company is able to focus its market relationship with a chosen panel of leaders and following markets, creating continuity with these markets and a ‘brand’ or identity in the market. The package approach is now universal practice”) and at 395-96 (“The rationale for this approach was explained in terms of creating bulk buying capability and brand image[.]”) See the discussion of the “Wellsure” Energy Package Policy in *Prime Natural Resources, Inc. v. Certain Underwriters at Lloyd’s London*, No. 01-11-00995-CV (Tex. App. – Houston [1st Dist.] 2012) (briefs only). This mechanism can be compared to a similar quota share arrangement in Onshore Energy Package Policies.

⁴ As will be seen, the present and predominant EED form is the EED (8/86) Policy which supplanted and replaced the EED (9/85) Policy. **All references to “EED”, unless otherwise stated, will be to the EED (8/86) form.** The OEE Policy in its original pure form is rarely, if ever, seen in the Market today. Variations of it survive and, to be sure, the name lives on. See **Preliminary Word of Caution** in Section II.A.1 at 4, *infra*.

- Contingent Joint Ventures
 - Turnkey Wells Endorsement
 - Farmout Wells Endorsement
 - Developmental Drilling Wells Endorsement
 - Wild Well Contractor Endorsement
 - No Claims Return of Premium Endorsement
 - Priority of Payments Endorsement
 - Various Excess Cover Endorsements
 - Windstorm Endorsement
2. Physical Damage (“PD”)
 - Physical Damage
 - Removal of Debris (Removal of Wreck) (“ROD”, “ROW”)
 - Sue and Labor
 - Oil in Line
 - Property in Transit
 - Oil & Gas Well Drilling Tools Floater/All Risks
 3. Pollution⁵
 4. Business Interruption (“BI”) including:
 - Contingent Business Interruption (“CBI”)
 - Loss of Production Income (“LOPI”)
 - Loss of Hire
 - Delay of Start Up
 5. Third Party Liability
 6. Construction Risk
 7. Charterer’s Liability
 8. Windstorm
 9. Crude Oil Storage
 10. Political Risk⁶
 11. War and Related Risks

⁵ As will be seen, the OEE and EED Policies contain a seepage and pollution cover but it is restricted to a control of well event as the operative trigger so a broader third party liability pollution cover must be included in the Offshore Energy Package Policy.

⁶ There may be different markets for confiscation and expropriation.

12. Contingent OEE/EED

B. Focus of the Paper: Control of Well and, to a lesser extent, Physical Damage

This paper will focus on the EED Policy and, to a lesser extent, on the PD cover. The EED Policy's core is the Control of Well section to which various endorsements have been added over time to result in the EED Policy.⁷ This mini-package policy then provides the core to which the full panoply of coverages outlined in Nos. 2-12 above attach to form the complete Offshore Energy Package Policy.⁸ The numerous sections under the Offshore Energy Package Policy are too broad to be covered in detail in one paper. However, there will be broad brush information provided about the other sections to provide a starting point for research.

The discussions of EED and PD will contain extensive quotations to sometimes difficult to find sources in an effort to make the paper a more user friendly, comprehensive working research tool. A working bibliography will also be included. However, bear in mind any cited case must be read with great care since policy language has evolved over time with sometimes startling ultimate effect on the holdings of what at first blush would appear to have been on point cases. Secondary authorities will be provided to support further explanation and research. Note, however, there is a dearth of on point case law interpretation.⁹ A final goal of this paper will be to, at least in a very broad stroke sense, suggest how the various risks encountered by an offshore operator/contractor are structured into the various components of the Offshore Energy Package Policy.¹⁰

⁷ As will be seen, the EED Policy is a specialized cover essentially corresponding to the contractual risk allocation in the oilfield that generally places responsibility for a blowout on the well operator.

⁸ Bear in mind that physical damage was not available through the London Market for offshore property until the 1960s. See section on Physical Damage II.B., *infra*. This situation is true even though the first control of well policies per se were themselves ironically add-ons to onshore physical damage policies.

⁹ The leading treatise on the topic is David Sharp's *Upstream and Offshore Energy Insurance*, today's "Energy Insurance Bible" ("Sharp II"), which superseded his earlier classic *OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS INSURANCE* (Witherby & Co. Ltd. 1994) ("Sharp I"). His views have also recently been summarized and updated in Lloyd's *Energy Drilling in Extreme Environments* (2011) ("Sharp III"). The leading article in this area is J. Clifton Hall III, *Offshore Energy Insurance*, 83 Tul. L. Rev. 1303 (2008-2009) ("Hall I") recently supplemented by his article presented in connection with a panel presentation "Offshore Industry in the 21st Century, Practice, Procedure and Liability", entitled *Offshore Energy Insurance: Building a Program*, Maritime Law Association (Fall 2013) ("Hall II"). This paper is indebted beyond measure to and largely built on their excellent foundation. The paper will cite as yet undecided, pending cases in the nature of a "watch this space" since typically in Federal Court, at least, pleadings and briefings irrespective of a final reported decision are generally now available with electronic research, shed some light on the current "state of play" and provide some forecast of potential rulings on pertinent issues.

¹⁰ See Theresa M. Fadul, *Maximizing Insurance Protection as part of contractual risk allocation*, 2004 No. 2 RMMLF-Inst. Paper No. 12 Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Foundation (2004) for an excellent discussion in a contract context of various coverages and their workings under an Offshore Energy Package Policy.

II. LOOKING AT THE PACKAGE

A. Operators Extra Expense (“OEE”) or Energy Exploration and Development (8/86) (“EED”) Policies

1. Overview

Beginning in the 1940s, the London Market began offering Control Of Well policies (“COW”) as an add on to onshore physical (property) damage policies. A **preliminary word of caution** on confusion in terms is warranted. The original policy began simply as “control of well”. As will be seen, this control of well policy began to attract add-ons such as redrilling and seepage and pollution like a super magnet. By the 1970s the predominant form of this conglomerate control of well package was the Operators Extra Expense (“OEE”).¹¹ Later the OEE was eclipsed in the late 1980s by the Energy Exploration and Development Policy (“EED (8/86)”) – which itself had quickly eclipsed the short lived EED (9/85) form. However, one must be aware that many EED form policies are generically referred to in the same way that all copiers are “Xerox machines” as an “OEE Policy” or sometimes even just “Control of Well” as an all-inclusive term. Technically, the Control of Well policy now is simply Section A of either the EED or OEE Policy. While a bit confusing, this linguistic looseness must be kept in mind when reading the policies, cases and secondary authorities. Our focus is the Market dominant EED (8/86) form.

As the industry grew and Spindletop gushers and fabled wild wells lost their adventuresome allure, it was becoming apparent that the costs of controlling a well blowout were substantial and growing. The somewhat tortured history of the development of today’s predominant control of well wording over the past 70 years is a classic study in the London Market’s creative adaptation of policy language to match practical and judicial interpretation realities so that the risks in drilling could be realistically and actuarially insured.¹² As will be seen in the development of the policy language, there is (1) an ever present tension between ordinary expected kicks encountered in drilling and the development of incipient and actual blowouts when a necessary balance between upward and downward pressures is lost and the well becomes out of control and, (2) inherent linguistic difficulties in striking that balance unambiguously on paper.

An in-depth review of the evolution in language will not only probe the underlying geoscience and dangers inherent in drilling but also underscore and explain how today’s COW language expresses in writing the blend of risks which can be feasibly insured. While nothing is perfect and language is fluid, the resulting EED (8/86) Policy is, by any fair measure, a splendid work of underwriting art. However, it is interesting to note as we go through the history that contemporaneous commentators on the EED (8/86) Policy when it first emerged were concerned about its perhaps overly restrictive nature - a concern which, over time, has proved largely unwarranted in the Market place. At the conclusion of reviewing the history, we will briefly

¹¹ See discussion of David Sharp’s description of the original OEE Policy at II.A.3.c., *infra*.

¹² There are, of course, other significant, secondary Markets, e.g., Norwegian, Scandinavian and American.

Find the full text of this and thousands of other resources from leading experts in dozens of legal practice areas in the [UT Law CLE eLibrary \(utcle.org/elibrary\)](http://utcle.org/elibrary)

Title search: Downhole, Offshore and Blowouts — A Primer on Oil and Gas Coverage: The Offshore Energy Package Policy

Also available as part of the eCourse

[Coming Attractions in Insurance Coverage Disputes; Coverage Issues in the Oil Patch; plus Cyber Liability and Data Loss Claims](#)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the
18th Annual Insurance Law Institute session

"Downhole, Offshore and Blowouts: Primer on Oil and Gas Coverage"