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Contingent Resources – Not All Created Equal

Abstract: Thanks to the efforts of many industry bodies, not least the SPEE, Reserves in general, and Proven Reserves in particular, are better understood both inside and outside of the industry. There remain issues, of course, but we have come a long way from the dark days of the Ormen Lange controversy.

In my opinion, this clarity does not extend through to Contingent Resource, which often feels like the unloved cousin of the Resources family. This category works – more or less – for those trained in Reserves and Resources, but for the outside investor it is completely opaque.

This paper takes a quick tour of the treatment of Contingent Resources by PRMS and COGEH and tries to understand the thinking behind the classification and sub-classifications. The confusion appears to lie with the dual nature of Contingent Resources (maturity, problems) and a high level solution is proposed.
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Disclaimer

This presentation forms the personal view of Joel Turnbull and does not necessarily reflect the opinions or policy of any company that I have worked for in the past, or current work for.
Contingent resources in the news

**Company x**
Contingent resources
“Provided by IQRE yy”
1C, 2C and 3C estimates
Comment “there is no certainty that it will be commercially viable to produce any portion of these resources”

**Company y**
“Contingent resources are 267mmboe”
Some detail on what these resources are

**Company w**
“Gross recoverable 2C Resources 0.5 mmbbl”

**Company z**
“Gas contingent resources are 100%, unrisked”

**Company v**
“The fields contain at least 2.4 Tcf of Gas contingent resources”
• Subclasses
  1. Development pending
  2. Development unclarified or on hold
  3. Development not viable
  4. (Unrecoverable)

So let’s be clear, here. A contingent resource that is in category “Development not viable” is still classed as a contingent resource.
The project is seen to have **reasonable potential** for eventual commercial development, to the extent that **further data acquisition** (e.g. drilling, **seismic** data) and/or **evaluations** are currently ongoing [....]

The critical contingencies have been identified and are **reasonably expected to be resolved** within a **reasonable time frame**.

The project “**decision gate**” is the decision to undertake further data acquisition and/or studies designed to move the project to a level of technical and commercial maturity at which a decision can be made to proceed with development and production.

My loose interpretation is that so long as you are progressing the project, no matter what the maturity, you’re in “pending”. (If you are doing seismic or appraisal drilling, you’re probably a long way from development)
The project is seen to have potential for eventual commercial development, but further appraisal/evaluation activities are on hold pending the removal of significant contingencies external to the project, or substantial further appraisal/evaluation activities are required to clarify the potential for eventual commercial development.

So now we’ve got a roadblock. A big roadblock moves it out of “On hold” into “Not viable”. We still have a maturity aspect for confusion.....
• The project is not seen to have potential for eventual commercial development at the time of reporting, but the theoretically recoverable quantities are recorded so that the potential opportunity will be recognized in the event of a major change in technology or commercial conditions.

• The project “decision gate” is the decision not to undertake any further data acquisition or studies on the project for the foreseeable future.

Now we’ve got a really big roadblock. Even unreasonable oil prices ($200/bbl) breakevens can go in here. **Remember – resources in this category are still valid contingent resources**
PRMS Guidelines 2011

- Joel’s interpretation of PRMS

Roadblock free, we are progressing, but not necessarily mature

Significant roadblock and we’re not progressing

Huge roadblock and you’d be pretty lucky if this ever came in

Did I mention.....all three categories are valid Contingent Resources?
COGEH

- COGEH treats Contingent Resources slightly differently.
  - More explicit about what the contingency may be
  - Expressing numerical risks to the contingencies is encouraged
  - Four sub-classes making a distinction between “not sure if its good” and “we know there’s a problem”
  - The maturity aspect is more rigorously defined
  - Contingent Resources should be considered to be economic or non-economic
COGEH

• First step is an initial assessment to determine if there is potential for development.
  – “Development Unclarified”
• Once this is done, there are four possible outcomes
  1. We still need more data to decide – Development Unclarified
  2. We confident of a development – Development Pending
  3. There is still a reasonable chance of development but there are major contingencies – Development On Hold
  4. There is no further data acquisition or evaluation planned so there is a low chance of development – Development Not Viable

Figure 2-4. Flow Chart Illustrating the Relationship Among the Project Maturity Sub-Classes for Contingent Resources.
COGEH

• **Development pending**

• “Project activities are ongoing to justify commercial viability in the near future”.

• Needs a “high probability” to proceed which is defined as 80% or greater

So for COGEH “Development Pending” you need an overall chance of 80% of development; a reasonable timeframe to development and no outstanding contingencies that you can’t influence.

From COGEH Volume 2, section 2

Figure 2-5. Requirements for the Assignment of a Project Maturity Subclass of Development Pending.
COGEH

- Development on hold
- “Projects may be described as development on hold where there is considered to be at least a reasonable chance of commerciality but where there are major non-technical contingencies that must be resolved before the project can move toward development”.

The key bar here is the subjective “reasonable chance of commerciality”, if not → Development Not Viable

From COGEH Volume 2, section 2
• Development unclarified
• “Projects may be assigned a maturity subclass of development unclarified if they are still under evaluation or require significant further appraisal to clarify the potential for development, and where the contingencies have yet to be fully defined”.

You can put the project in “Unclarified” for a short time but you can’t keep it there unless you have a good reason.
• Development not viable
  • “The project “decision gate” for a status of development not viable is the decision **not to pursue development or to undertake any further data acquisition or studies** on the project for the foreseeable future.
  • However, **there may be potential** for eventual commercial development....

There “may be potential” still leaves the door open for a project that is never going to see the light of day, and allowing an impossible project to be classified as Contingent Resource.
• **Unrecoverable**

  • “Unrecoverable is that portion of Discovered or Undiscovered PIIP quantities which is estimated, as of a given date, **not to be recoverable by future development projects**”.

  • “A portion of these quantities **may become recoverable in the future** as commercial circumstances change or technological developments occur.....

  • “All quantities estimated as DPIIP or UPIIP in an accumulation that will not be recovered [.....] should be classified as unrecoverable, even though a technically feasible project may be identified in the future”

How is this materially different from “not viable”?
COGEH 2014

Joel’s interpretation of COGEH:

- Roadblock free, and at least 80% chance of development
- Significant roadblock but reasonable chance of commerciality
- Huge roadblock and you’d be pretty lucky if this ever came in
- We don’t know yet.

Did I mention.....all four categories are valid Contingent Resources?
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From SPE ORGC Mapping Final Report Dec 2005

No contingent resources in SEC

Table 1: Correlation of Status Categories

* Chinese classification is EUR-based - includes production. Contingent Resources equivalent is technically recoverable minus economically recoverable
** The NPD classification is for recoverable quantities only based on development projects.
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So what are the problems?

1. Contingent Resources is a very broad church
   - They vary between 90% Chance of Development to 0.1% Chance of Development

2. You are allowed to have Contingent Resources even when there is a virtually zero chance of developing
   - You can mention Contingent Resources in a press release with no intention to develop them.

3. The reason you are in Contingent Resources (and not reserves) is either maturity or the fact there is a problem
   - Even within some subcategories

4. The length of time prior to development is not spelled out in most circumstances
   - Relies on “Reasonable potential for commerciality” (PRMS) or “80% chance of development” (COGEH)
So what could be the solutions?

• Before answering this question, it's worth reminding ourselves why we have contingent resources at all
  – Reporting
    • Most reporting jurisdictions do not require reporting of Contingent Resources
    • In fact, in the US you are not allowed to
  – Investor information
    • Typically the statements are light on technical (classification) detail
  – Company valuations
    • Will be done by a qualified person
  – Internal portfolio management
    • You can do what you like! (But would be easier if there was a simple system)
Possible solutions: sub-categories

Figure 2-4. Flow Chart Illustrating the Relationship Among the Project Maturity Sub-Classes for Contingent Resources.
Possible solutions: Stage gates

- **Explore**
- **Assess**
- **Select**
- **Define**
- **Execute**

- **Discovery**
- **Range of development concepts**
- **Mid-select concept ratified**
- **FID**

**Prospective Resources** → **Contingent resources** → **Reserves**

Can be possible to book reserves prior to FID
Stage gates

1. Development is initially unclarified until it can be proven that there is at least one possible economic solution
2. Development is pending if work is progressing to remove uncertainties, but:
3. If the project remains in a single stage longer than is appropriate, then it automatically goes into Development On Hold
4. Definition of how long is appropriate will not be a trivial exercise.
5. If at any point it is clear that the development has a very low chance of development then it goes into unrecoverable.
Investor thoughts

• Company “y” has 30mmbbl of unrisked Contingent Resources *Pending*
  – OK, must have at least some chance of going ahead
• Company “x” has 50mmbbl of unrisked Contingent Resources *On Hold*
  – Well I’d better understand what the contingency is before I put any money into that
• Company “z” has 100mmbbl of unrisked Contingent Resources *Unclarified*
  – Might be interesting but perhaps I’ll wait until it becomes clearer before committing any money
Thanks and questions