

Bp case



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

1. The aspects of BP's ethical culture that could have contributed to the Gulf Coast oil spill disaster include: * The company tried to assure concerned stakeholders that it took environmental concerns seriously, but BP's actions have not always concided with its words. BP has engaged in numerous instances of questionable behavior including fraud, environmental, and ethical transgressions clearly demonstrate that the company has a history of disregarding the well-being of stakeholders.

The company has claimed to be an ethical company, concerned with stakeholder well-being, but its many violations tell a different story. * BP's code of conduct was not sufficient to prevent a man made environmental disaster on an unprecedented scale. Apparently, BP's code did not effectively address specific high risk activities within the scope of daily operations. * An investigation implies that BP cut short procedures and quality testing of the pipe (tests that are meant to detect has in the well).

Also, BP used a less costly well design that some investigators deemed "risky". Installation of this design is easier and costs are lower. Although, BP didn't break any laws by using this design, they ignored safer alternatives (to savemoney) that might have prevented, or at least hindered, the accident. * BP admitted that they had ignored several procedures required by the Clean Air Act for ensuring mechanical integrity and a safe startup between 1999 until the explosion in 2005 that killed 15 employees and injured another 170 people.

The explosion was the result of a leak of hydrocarbon liquid, and vapor. Another leak that happened in 2006 occurred after BP failed to respond to numerous red flags. One of these flags consisted of a dangerous corrosion in

its pipes that had gone unchecked for more than a decade. * To narrow this entire question up, BP took shortcuts in their productions to cut their costs, and ignored defaults, regular routine cleanings, and maintenance of the rigs causing explosions and leaks, and people getting killed, harmed, or injured. . Yes, BP engaged in purposeful avoidance of risk management. * Some suggest that BP cut corners in risk management to save time and money. * BP had a responsibility to ensure that appropriate precautions were taken to prevent a disaster, but they failed to meet their responsibilities. For example, one technician that worked on the oil rig accused BP of willful negligence. He claims that BP did in fact have knowledge that the rig's blowout preventer was leaking weeks prior to the explosion, but did not halt the production. BP's contingency plan in case of a disaster was inadequate. It contained many important inaccuracies. For example, one of the wildlife experts listed as an emergency responder had been dead since 2005. Another example, is that the contingency plan estimated that if a oil spill should occur, that the company would be able to recover about 500, 000 barrels of oil per day, when in reality it took BP months to just contain the leak, at a spill rate of much less than listed in their plan.

The inaccuracies of BP's contingency plan shows how unprepared the company was for a disaster like the Deep Water Horizon spill. 3. I think that in order for BP to rebuild their reputation and manage the risks associated with offshore drilling, they should not take shortcuts or cut corners to save time or money. They should commit to a socially responsible approach and stakeholder engagement. They should have safety organizations in place.

They should follow safety rules and regulations. Conduct better start up procedures.