



2006 Customer Satisfaction Rankings

DRILLING & WELLSITE CONTRACTORS



MarketPartners[®] Report



When EnergyPoint Research first began conducting its independent customer satisfaction surveys almost three years ago, our objective was simple. We wanted to provide a needed voice to the professionals and companies responsible for purchasing hundreds of billions annually in oilfield products and services by developing an independent measurement of their satisfaction with suppliers. Our own confidence in the merits of this service always remained steadfast, yet for some survey participants it was an act of faith that their participation in our unusually detailed surveys would ever really amount to much.

Today, EnergyPoint's ratings are some of the most popular barometers of customer satisfaction and provider performance in the oil services sector, affording purchasers, providers and industry observers valuable transparency and perspective not previously available. And participation levels continue to rise as this year's drilling and wellsite services survey includes evaluations from 476 respondents worldwide. This is almost two-and-a-half times 2004 participation levels, with the increase among respondents at national oil companies (NOCs) particularly pronounced.

PROSPERITY'S CHALLENGE

Coinciding with the growth of our services has been the remarkable vitality of the markets we cover. In fact, this year's expanded survey was conducted amidst some of the most favorable market conditions in recent memory for oilfield service providers, many of whom have waited a long time to reap the rewards of past and sometimes uncertain investments in assets, people and technologies.

Since EnergyPoint's last survey covering drilling and wellsite service providers in 2004, worldwide rig count has swelled as crude and natural gas prices have turned customers' previously marginal prospects into economically viable priorities. Consequently, during this period

providers have reported record revenues and profits, pushing the benchmark Oilfield Service Sector Index (OSX) up as much as 120 percent.

Not surprisingly, this strong dose of prosperity has also brought its own set of challenges, including that of meeting customers' insatiable demand for services at a time when the personnel and equipment needed to fulfill these services are as scarce as they have been in a generation. Throw in the threat from cash-flush competitors and hungry

new entrants looking to exploit instances of market opportunity, and executives and managers at oilfield service providers have plenty to keep them awake at night.

FADING PERFORMANCE

Adding to managements' concerns should be the fact that this year's results indicate operators are overall less pleased with the quality of services they are receiving from providers compared to just two years ago. In fact, the median customer satisfaction rating in this year's survey would have placed in the bottom of the third quartile in our 2004 survey — a big swing.

Unfortunately, the issues weighing on ratings are not confined to a single area of service or performance. As one respondent put it, "Virtually all providers are suffering from a lack of qualified personnel these days. Equipment maintenance has deteriorated, service quality is a fraction of what it was a few years ago, and constant supervision to the point of micro-management is almost a necessity. And rising costs and inefficiencies are beginning to severely impact project economics."

Part of the problem lies in the fact that providers, haunted by the ghosts of cycles past, have not been entirely willing to expand at the breakneck pace needed to meet today's burgeoning demand. The oilfield service sector's history is littered with the corpses of providers that have overestimated the strength of past cycles, and today's

IN THIS REPORT

INTRODUCTION & INSIGHTS

Pages 1 – 3

SURVEY DESCRIPTION & CONTENT

Pages 4 – 6

RATINGS & RANKINGS

Pages 7 – 8

CATEGORY RANKINGS

Pages 9 – 10

SOFT RATINGS

Page 11

INDUSTRY-WIDE RATINGS

Pages 12 – 13

ABOUT ENERGYPOINT

Page 14

DISCLAIMER

Page 15

executives want to avoid steering their own companies down similar paths.

This is not to say providers are standing still. Many have instituted record capital budgets and aggressive hiring programs. But even these efforts have been stymied to some degree. According to various industry sources, competition for everything from geoscience professionals to yard space is as fierce as it has ever been and shows no signs of abating. And in a final twist of irony, some of providers' toughest competition for resources actually comes from their customers, as they attempt to build up their own capabilities.

SAME AS IT EVER WAS

Despite the temptation to believe otherwise, customers' fundamental expectations actually have not changed much in the face of today's high activity levels. While customers might be willing to forgive, or at least look past, providers' current capacity constraints or latest price increases, they are not willing to do the same when it comes to the quality of services they receive. Most operators today are no more tolerant of missed deadlines, poor job quality, or half-hearted attempts at dispute resolution than they were when commodity prices were half their current levels.

To be sure, the implications to suppliers of declining satisfaction are embedded in economic reality. As one survey respondent pointed out, service costs can continue to rise without an appreciable improvement in quality for only so long before operators will find alternative suppliers or pull the plug on projects altogether.

ONGOING COMMITMENT

One company that certainly appears to understand how to meet the needs of its customers these days is Rowan Companies. The company finished first overall in this year's expanded survey, scoring well across multiple customer types. The strong showing was led by the performance of its U.S. and Canadian offshore drilling operations. Its land-

drilling ratings, though fewer in number, were quite strong as well.

According to CEO Danny McNease, Rowan's success with customers is in large part due to its longer-term operating philosophy. "Instead of drastically changing our business practices with the cyclical nature of the industry,

we focus on relationships in hopes of creating win-win situations during both the upcycles and downcycles.", says McNease.

Importantly, Rowan's commitment to managing across the cycle is not limited to its sales and marketing departments. The company has never incurred a layoff in its over 80-year history, and the resulting retention of operational talent and experience helps immensely in times like these. Customers have noticed as well, with Rowan's field person-

nel ranking first in this year's poll.

THE VALUE EQUATION

Another company known for its long-term perspective is Helmerich & Payne (H&P), which topped our list among land-based drillers and placed third overall in our standings. H&P's strong showing is especially noteworthy given

that most of its U.S. land-based competitors finished well in the bottom half of the survey as capacity constraints and tight labor markets took their toll on the group.

While not the cheapest provider in the oil patch by any stretch, H&P has shown itself to be a highly-competent driller, adept at adding value by driving down customers' overall costs. The company's management is particularly known for being actively engaged and focused on finding ways to decrease the time it

takes to drill quality wells.

An important aspect of H&P's competitive advantage is its proprietary FlexRig land-drilling rigs. According to the company, the rigs' automated systems control much of the drilling process, allowing H&P drillers to focus on the twin priorities of efficiency and safety. Customers have been so

TOP RANKED DRILLING CONTRACTORS

Rowan Companies
Helmerich & Payne
Noble Drilling
ENSCO International
Precision Drilling

TOP RANKED SERVICE COMPANIES

Frank's
Wood Group
Core Laboratories
Smith International
BJ Services

impressed with the performance of the rigs that they have agreed to effectively underwrite over 60 new units with long-term contracts.

This kind of focus on the value equation of customers is a common trait among top-ranked providers. Take Smith International, which again ranked highest among the integrated “big six” service companies. According to CEO Doug Rock, Smith’s ability to satisfy customers is in large part a function of how it views its role as a provider. “Fundamentally, we understand that our technologies, services, and people must solve problems in ways that lower our customers’ per-unit recovery costs.” That’s music to operators’ ears.

Smith also balances growth, innovation and execution in ways few of its peers have been able to match. The company has enjoyed stability in its management and employee ranks despite meteoric growth in revenues. The end result is a culture that effectively melds entrepreneurial leadership with operational excellence in ways that produce standout results for customers.

CUSTOMERS RESPOND

Operators today can certainly be critical of providers that do not meet their expectations. But they have also shown themselves willing to acknowledge improvements in performance when warranted.

ENSCO International finished sixth overall in this year’s rankings amidst accolades from a host of satisfied respondents. But two years ago it was a different story, as issues associated with an ongoing program to overhaul its fleet of jack-ups contributed to respondents’ sub-par ratings of the company’s equipment and personnel.

Our findings suggest that initiatives put in place since 2004 have made a big difference. The company increased dialogue with major customers and instituted a more formalized program to survey and actively address

their needs. Training was beefed up, and the dissemination of best practices was improved across the organization. The net result is the largest ratings improvement for any company in this year’s survey.

Even more conspicuous changes were made at Key Energy Services. After finishing last in EnergyPoint’s 2004 survey, the company changed CEO’s and relocated its headquarters to Houston, in part to be closer to its major customers. Non-core operations were jettisoned, while spending on equipment and personnel was increased in an effort to improve safety and efficiency.

On both a relative and absolute basis, the company’s efforts appear to be paying off, albeit gradually. Ratings have climbed in the all-important areas of job quality and reliability. While Key’s overall scores remain below average, the culture and organization needed to obtain a second chance with previously disgruntled customers

appears to be taking shape.

PROVIDER INCENTIVES

Of course, improved customer satisfaction is of no value to providers if they do not reap their own rewards. The good news is that analysis by numerous parties has shown that publicly-traded companies rated highly in terms of customer satisfaction can enjoy stock price performance well in excess of their lower-rated peers. EnergyPoint’s own research suggests a similar correlation between customer satisfaction and investor returns in the oilfield service sector.

It has been said that good companies fixate on their own needs, while great companies fixate on the needs of their customers. In prosperous times this can be an easy mes-

sage to ignore as few want to think about the possibility of darker skies ahead. But today’s providers would be well advised to pay close attention to their customers. After all, one hears rumors that there may come a day when demand for their services can no longer be taken for granted. 🙏

SURVEY NEWCOMERS

Basic Energy Services
Core Laboratories
KCA DEUTAG
Pride International
Rowan Companies
Superior Energy Services
Tesco
Unit Drilling

MOST IMPROVED

ENSCO International
Geoservices
Key Energy Services

2006 CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY

DRILLING & WELLSITE CONTRACTORS

SURVEY DESCRIPTION

This report includes ratings information from EnergyPoint's 2006 customer satisfaction survey on drilling and wellsite service providers. As part of the survey, 1,858 evaluations were completed from November 2005 through July 2006 by 476 respondents at 178 exploration and production (E&P) companies and upstream consultants worldwide. Through participation in the survey, all respondents indicated having "significant experience" in selecting or utilizing drilling or wellsite contractors within the prior 24 months. A total of 30 providers received the minimum number of evaluations required to be included in the main sections of this report.

SERVICE CATEGORIES

For purposes of the survey, a company is considered a drilling or wellsite contractor if it provides services in any of the survey's listed categories. These categories, which are further described on page 9, include:

- Contract Drilling – Land & Offshore
- Directional Drilling & MWD
- Formation & Well Evaluation
- Casing & Tubing Installation
- Cementing Services
- Completion Services
- Workovers & Well Servicing
- Fishing Services

AREAS OF EVALUATION

Survey respondents were asked to rate companies on an overall basis as providers of drilling and wellsite services, as well as by service category, global region of use, well type, and application (see page 6 for additional details regarding survey content). Companies were also rated across multiple dimensions within each of the following service attributes:

- Pricing & Contract Terms
- Reliability
- Technology
- Job Quality
- Safety & Environmental
- Service & Professionalism
- Corporate Capabilities

RATINGS & RANKINGS

All satisfaction ratings in this report, unless otherwise noted, are derived from 1-to-10 point rating scales used in the survey, with 1 indicating respondents are "Very Dissatisfied" and 10 indicating they are "Very Satisfied." After the data set was reviewed, cleansed, sorted, and rationalized by EnergyPoint, ratings were totaled and combined with 2004 ratings on a weighted basis. Companies were then ranked in descending order according to their weighted ratings. Finally, companies were assigned EnergyPoint's "ribboned" ratings based on these results, with four ribbons representing the highest designation.

ATTRIBUTE RANKINGS

The letter rating applied to each service attribute on page 8 corresponds to the rank the company achieved versus its listed peers for that particular attribute. An "A" indicates the company ranked in the top third for that attribute, while a "C" indicates the company placed in the bottom third. Each attribute rating is based on results from multiple underlying attribute-related questions. See item 7 on page 6 for specific attribute-related questions.

PURPOSE & SCOPE

This report is intended to provide readers with independently gathered information regarding customers' expressed satisfaction with the drilling and wellsite contractor services they utilize. The ratings contained in this report reflect only the responses and expressed opinions of persons who chose to participate in the survey. EnergyPoint Research does not maintain or represent that the information, ratings, or conclusions presented in this report necessarily reflect the perspectives of all customers utilizing the services or providers covered in this report. Furthermore, nothing contained in this report should be construed to constitute any kind of recommendation on the part of EnergyPoint Research or survey participants.

BEHIND THE RESULTS

PROVIDERS & RESPONDENTS

Respondents chose from a list of 46 companies identified by industry participants and EnergyPoint Research as major drilling or wellsite contractors. Other contractors not listed were able to be selected through a “write-in” feature of the survey. Based upon information provided by respondents and gathered by EnergyPoint, a breakdown of the resulting pool of evaluations is provided below.

<u>Producer Type</u>	<u>No. of Evaluations</u>		<u>% of Evaluations</u>	
	<u>2006</u>	<u>2004-06</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2004-06</u>
Supermajor	383	656	20.6%	22.7%
Major	386	619	20.8%	21.5%
Large Independent	262	371	14.1%	12.9%
Independent	216	434	11.6%	15.0%
Small Independent	259	383	13.9%	13.3%
National Oil Company (NOC)	266	331	14.3%	11.5%
Upstream Consultant	86	90	4.6%	3.1%
 <u>Role in Selection of Contractors</u>				
Primary Decision-maker	919	1481	49.5%	51.4%
Contributor to Process	780	1185	42.0%	41.1%
User of Services Only	159	218	8.6%	7.6%
 <u>Years of Upstream Experience</u>				
1 – 4	54	97	2.9%	3.4%
5 – 9	131	174	7.1%	6.0%
10 – 19	406	627	21.9%	21.7%
20 – 29	879	1402	47.3%	48.6%
30 +	388	584	20.9%	20.2%
 <u>Headquarters of Respondent’s Company</u>				
U.S. & Canada	1150	1815	61.9%	62.9%
Outside of U.S. & Canada	708	1069	38.1%	37.1%
TOTAL	1,858¹	2,884	100.0%	100.0%

SAMPLE SIZES

Results for contractors that received 15 or more evaluations in the area of Total Satisfaction in the 2006 survey (and 20 or more evaluations on a combined basis in the 2004 and 2006 surveys) are included in the main sections of this report. These minimums, and varying minimums for service category, customer type, global region, well type, and application were set in an effort to help reduce uncertainty in scores and rankings due to sampling error. Nevertheless, other surveys could produce materially different results than those published in this report. EnergyPoint does not maintain that the survey or this report includes all providers that could be viewed as major drilling and wellsite contractors. Inclusion in or exclusion from the survey or this report is not intended to reflect a company’s market share or prominence in any service category or region.

DESIGN & DEVELOPMENT

The survey and report were designed, managed and funded on an independent basis by EnergyPoint Research to facilitate the collection of customers’ expressed opinions regarding providers of drilling and wellsite contracting services. EnergyPoint was not hired to perform the survey or publish this report by any provider or purchaser of oilfield services. In developing the survey, EnergyPoint worked closely with industry professionals to develop questions focused on the attributes believed to impact customers’ satisfaction with drilling and wellsite contracting services. The survey was conducted primarily through a secure, state-of-the-art web-based platform and, to a lesser extent, by traditional mail.

¹A total of 1,735 evaluations were completed on the 30 contractors included in the main sections of this report.

SURVEY CONTENT

Below is a summary outline of the survey upon which the results in this report are based.

1. Confirm your **name, company, title, job function** and **years of upstream experience**.
2. Indicate your **role in the selection of wellsite contractors** within your company (Primary Decision-maker, Contributor to Process, or User of Services Only).
3. Indicate the **type of E&P company** for which you work (Supermajor, Major, Large Independent, Independent, Small Independent, National Oil Company, Upstream Consultant, or Other).
4. Indicate where your company is **headquartered**.
5. On a 1-to-10 scale, where 1 = "Least Important" and 10 = "Most Important," indicate the **level of importance** you assign to each of the following when selecting or evaluating wellsite contractors: Pricing, Reliability, Technological Capabilities, Job Quality, Safety & Environmental, Service & Professionalism, and Corporate Capabilities.
6. Indicate the **wellsite contractors** with whom you have had *significant experience* within the last 24 months and would like to evaluate (companies in **bold** are those contractors included in the main sections of this report).

Atwood Oceanics

Baker Hughes

Basic Energy Services

BJ Services

Core Laboratories

Crosco Drilling & Well Services

Cudd/Thru Tubing

Diamond Offshore

ENSCO International

Ensign/Caza Drilling

Expro International

Frank's

Fred Olsen/Dolphin Drilling

Geoservices

GlobalSantaFe

Grey Wolf

Halliburton

Helmerich & Payne

KCA DEUTAG

Key Energy Services

Maersk/Egyptian Drilling

Nabors/Pool/Ryan

Noble Drilling

Oil States International

Parker Drilling

PathFinder Energy Services

Patterson-UTI

Pioneer Drilling

Precision Drilling

Pride International

Rowan

Saipem Drilling

Sanjel Services

Schlumberger

Smedvig

Smith International

Superior Energy Services

Tesco

TETRA Technologies

TODCO

Transocean

Trican Well Services

Tucker Energy Services

Unit Drilling

Weatherford International

Wood Group

Other (specify) _____

7. Using a 1-to-10 scale, where 1 = "Very Dissatisfied" and 10 = "Very Satisfied," indicate **your satisfaction** in the last 24 months with each contractor you selected in the following areas:
 - a. **Pricing:** i) general price levels, ii) price competitiveness versus competitors, iii) prices paid for quality received.
 - b. **Reliability:** i) quality and reliability of field personnel, ii) quality and reliability of office personnel, iii) quality, reliability and condition of field equipment.
 - c. **Technological Capabilities:** i) responsiveness to requests for new technologies, ii) ability to develop value-creating technologies and processes, iii) ability to apply both in-house and third-party technologies.
 - d. **Job Quality:** i) ability to complete jobs on schedule and as specified, ii) quality of pre-job planning and design, iii) quality of post-job reporting and review, iv) ability to apply lessons learned and continually improve.
 - e. **Safety & Environmental:** i) application of in-house safety & environmental policies and procedures, ii) respect for other companies' safety & environmental policies and procedures, iii) perceived safety & environmental performance record.
 - f. **Service & Professionalism:** i) flexibility and responsiveness to customer needs, ii) accountability in resolving problems and disputes, iii) other professional qualities and behavior.
 - g. **Corporate Capabilities:** i) ability to provide necessary expertise, personnel and equipment, ii) size and scope to meet geographic and technical requirements, iii) general corporate capabilities to meet job requirements.
8. Indicate your **overall satisfaction** in the last 24 months with each contractor you selected. Also, indicate your satisfaction with these contractors for the specific **global regions, service categories** and **well types** for which you utilize their services.
9. How likely would you be to **recommend this contractor** to others as a wellsite contractor (1 = "Very Unlikely" and 10 = "Very Likely")?
10. Please provide any **additional comments** you have regarding the contractor or this survey.

2006 Customer Satisfaction Survey

DRILLING & WELLSITE CONTRACTORS

Ratings & Rankings¹

2006 Rank ²	2004 Rank ^{2,3}	Company (Headquarters)	NO. OF Evaluations		Overall Rating ⁴	RANK BY Global Region ⁵		RANK BY Customer Type		RANK BY Provider Type	
			2006	2004 -06		U.S. & Canada	Outside U.S. & Canada	Multinationals & Large NOCs	Independents ⁶	Drilling Contractors	Service Contractors
1	-	Rowan Companies (Houston, Tx)	15	22	👍👍👍👍	1	-	2	1	1	-
2	6	Frank's (Lafayette, La / Houston, Tx)	42	81	👍👍👍👍	3	7	6	2	-	1
3	3	Helmerich & Payne (Tulsa, Ok)	27	45	👍👍👍👍	6	-	1	16	2	-
4	9	Noble Drilling (Houston, Tx)	17	30	👍👍👍👍	-	1	5	-	3	-
5	12	Wood Group (Aberdeen, Scotland)	29	55	👍👍👍👍	5	9	9	3	-	2
6	23	ENSCO International (Dallas, Tx)	16	30	👍👍👍👍	8	3	3	8	4	-
7	-	Core Laboratories (Amsterdam, Nl)	37	37	👍👍👍👍	12	6	10	7	-	3
8	5	Smith International (Houston, Tx)	48	82	👍👍👍👍	10	5	14	4	-	4
9	1	Precision Drilling (Calgary, Alberta)	35	52	👍👍👍👍	4	16	16	5	5	-
10	9	BJ Services (Houston, Tx)	134	224	👍👍👍👍	11	20	13	9	-	5
11	11	Baker Hughes (Houston, Tx)	213	317	👍👍👍👍	9	18	15	6	-	6
12	4	Transocean (Houston, Tx)	28	49	👍👍👍👍	2	17	7	15	6	-
13	17	Halliburton (Houston, Tx)	291	419	👍👍👍👍	16	10	11	12	-	7
14	14	Parker Drilling (Houston, Tx)	16	29	👍👍👍👍	-	8	8	-	7	-
15	-	KCA DEUTAG (Aberdeen, Scotland / Bad Bentheim, Germany)	15	22	👍👍👍👍	-	12	4	-	8	-
16	-	Superior Energy Services (Harvey, La)	17	27	👍👍👍👍	13	-	-	19	-	8
17	16	Schlumberger (Paris, Fr. / The Hague, Nl / Houston, Tx)	286	418	👍👍👍👍	15	15	12	17	-	9
18	22	Geoservices (La Blanc - Messnil, France)	29	47	👍👍👍👍	-	11	17	13	-	10
19	-	Pride International (Houston, Tx)	18	24	👍👍👍👍	-	13	19	14	9	-
20	18	Expro International (Reading, U.K.)	20	35	👍👍👍👍	7	21	22	10	-	11
21	19	Weatherford International (Houston, Tx)	137	224	👍👍👍👍	17	19	21	18	-	12
22	-	Tesco (Calgary, Alberta)	15	22	👍👍👍👍	14	-	-	20	-	13
23	15	GlobalSantaFe (Houston, Tx)	28	45	👍👍👍👍	22	14	18	26	10	-
24	-	Basic Energy Services (Midland, Tx)	25	28	👍👍👍👍	19	-	-	21	-	14
25	13	Diamond Offshore (Houston, Tx)	18	33	👍👍👍👍	18	4	25	11	11	-
26	20	Patterson-UTI (Snyder, Tx)	35	50	👍👍👍👍	21	-	24	22	12	-
27	24	Key Energy Services (Houston, Tx)	45	77	👍👍👍👍	20	-	20	23	-	15
28	2	Grey Wolf (Houston, Tx)	21	36	👍👍👍👍	23	-	-	25	13	-
29	-	Unit Drilling (Tulsa, OK)	16	21	👍👍👍👍	24	-	-	24	14	-
30	21	Nabors Industries (Houston, Tx)	62	90	👍👍👍👍	25	2	23	27	15	-

¹Ratings and rankings are based on indexes in which 2006 results are weighted at a minimum of 80% and 2004 results are weighted at a maximum of 20% depending on the number of evaluations. ²Derived from the average ratings received in the areas of "Overall Satisfaction" and "Willingness to Recommend." ³Rank out of 24 contractors. ⁴Based on a combination of a company's standing relative to the providers included in this survey and to providers rated in other EnergyPoint surveys conducted since 2003. ⁵By location of wellsite. ⁶Independents (includes consultants) and national oil companies with estimated annual production of 150,000 BBOE/d or less. A dash indicates a contractor does not provide services in the category or did not receive the minimum number of evaluations needed to be ranked in the category.

2006 Customer Satisfaction Survey

DRILLING & WELLSITE CONTRACTORS

Service Attributes & Commentary

Service Attribute Ratings^{2,3}

Overall Rank	Company	Special App's Rank ¹	Service Attribute Ratings ^{2,3}						Commentary & Analysis
			Pricing & Contract Terms	Technology	Job Quality	Service & Professionalism	Corporate Capabilities		
1	Rowan Companies	–	A	A	A	A	B	Some treat the industry cycle as their master, while this company sees the customer as king. Long-term and mutually beneficial relationships are the objective and satisfied customers are the result.	
2	Frank's	1	A	B	A	A	A	The current standard when it comes to reliably installing casing and production tubing for customers around the globe. Results reflect combined ratings for Frank's Casing Crew and Frank's International.	
3	Helmerich & Payne	6	C	A	A	B	A	The yawning gap between H&P's ratings and that of competitors is hard to miss. Its HSE marks were tops among land drillers, in part due to respect the company shows for others' policies and procedures.	
4	Noble Drilling	–	A	A	A	A	A	Noble jumped five spots in this year's rankings as respondents praised the company for its customer-oriented service and professionalism. Ranked particularly strong outside of the U.S. and Canada.	
5	Wood Group	–	A	A	A	A	A	Scored well across various customer types and geographic regions. Enjoyed especially large ratings increases in the areas of pricing and technology compared to two years ago.	
6	ENSCO International	2	A	B	B	A	B	By working to better understand customers' needs and expectations, the Dallas-based offshore driller catapulted toward the top of this year's rankings. Showed prowess both on the shelf and in the deepwater.	
7	Core Laboratories	8	B	A	A	A	B	A new survey entrant, Core Lab registered strong ratings in the category of formation & well evaluation. Hints of weakness in the Mid East and N. Africa belies an otherwise strong performance globally.	
8	Smith International	7	A	A	A	A	A	Smith slipped slightly in our standings in part due to the absence of drill bits as a rated category in this year's survey. The company's international operations appear to be hitting on all cylinders.	
9	Precision Drilling	5	A	A	A	A	B	The company still shows many of the same qualities that earned it the top ranking in our inaugural survey two years ago despite the sale of its energy services group and international drilling operations.	
10	BJ Services	13	A	A	B	A	B	BJ repeated its first-place finish in the category of workovers & well services, while adding a similar title in the newly-designated category of cementing services. Tubular services a relative laggard, however.	
11	Baker Hughes	9	B	B	B	B	A	Maintained its standing in this year's poll despite a decline in ratings for services outside the U.S. & Canada. Showed specific strength in the category of completion services and with independents.	
12	Transocean	3	B	B	B	B	A	The company maintained its strong standing in the Gulf of Mexico, but saw ratings slip to some degree elsewhere. Appears to handle directional / horizontal and HPHT applications like real pros.	
13	Halliburton	10	B	B	B	B	A	With its KBR issues at bay, Halliburton appears to have some momentum in its energy services group. Now it just needs to combine its big-company capabilities with some old-fashioned customer service.	
14	Parker Drilling	–	B	C	B	B	B	Parker's overall score was down slightly as respondents rated it lower in various service attributes. With its balance sheet shaping up, we'll be interested to see where the company focuses its resources.	
15	KCA DEUTAG	15	B	B	A	A	A	It appears KCA DEUTAG possesses a knack for certain frontier markets. Rated first in Europe & the former Soviet Union, as the company's new equipment received a generally favorable review.	
16	Superior Energy Services	–	A	B	B	B	B	Some might argue the company's service offerings lack the focus normally associated with strong customer ratings. But our respondents rate the company as above average in some key attributes.	
17	Schlumberger	12	C	A	A	B	A	A clear leader when it comes to satisfying customers with its technology. Scores pulled down by pricing and service & professionalism ratings, offset by considerable strength with national oil companies.	
18	Geoservices	14	B	B	B	B	B	Geoservices posted nice improvements in satisfaction, leapfrogging some of its larger rivals in the category of formation & well evaluation. Reliability and service & professionalism led the way.	
19	Pride International	–	B	C	C	B	C	Respondents' comments ranged from near adoration to some pretty tough criticisms. Despite the company's uneven performance in our survey, job quality and service appear to be on the upswing.	
20	Expro International	–	A	B	B	B	C	Growth has been the focus over the last several years as Expro has expanded into new regions and service categories. Ratings were again propped up by the strength of its services in the U.S.	
21	Weatherford International	17	B	B	B	C	B	The question going forward will be whether operations and leadership purchased from Precision can boost customer satisfaction. Some positive signs, but it's still too early to tell for sure.	
22	Tescoco	4	B	A	C	C	C	It seems these guys have a different approach to most things they do. Despite low office personnel ratings, its first-place finish in tubular services led the way to a similar crown in completion services.	
23	GlobalSantaFe	11	C	C	C	C	B	An increased number of GSF evaluations in this year's survey did not translate into higher marks. Respondents from independents seemed particularly prone to rate the company lower.	
24	Basic Energy Services	–	C	C	C	C	C	Fair to Midland might be the best way to describe respondents' ratings of this well servicing company. Relative weakness in technology and pricing ratings weighed on its overall ranking.	
25	Diamond Offshore	–	C	C	C	C	C	Ratings were down across multiple attributes, especially among respondents from larger operators and those utilizing its services in the Gulf of Mexico. The company's HSE ratings remain a strength.	
26	Patterson-UTI	16	C	C	C	C	C	The deterioration in respondent's satisfaction with U.S. land drillers is one of the clear messages in this year's survey. And Patterson-UTI was not spared, as its ratings fell in multiple categories.	
27	Key Energy Services	18	C	C	C	C	C	New leadership and increased investment in people and equipment have been good first steps to mending strained customer relationships. There's still plenty of room for improvement, however.	
28	Grey Wolf	–	C	C	C	C	C	Runner-up in our 2004 survey, Grey Wolf fell victim to the same downdraft in ratings as many of its peers. Refurbished rigs aren't viewed as offering the capabilities and performance of new builds.	
29	Unit Drilling	20	C	C	C	C	C	Respondents had issues with its flexibility and responsiveness. Nevertheless, Unit's rigs are operating full out with forthcoming fleet additions not likely to loosen capacity constraints any time soon.	
30	Nabors Industries	19	C	C	C	C	C	Nabors' ratings in the white-hot U.S. fell considerably. The company's bullishness on this market and its own particular prospects appears to have emboldened it in dealings with customers.	

¹Comprised of ratings in the areas of horizontal / directional, underbalanced / managed-pressure, high-pressure / high-temperature, and coalbed methane wells. ²Top Third = "A," Middle Third = "B," Bottom Third = "C." See page 6 for questions underlying attribute ratings. ³The ratings and other information included in this report should not be deemed as making any assertions or conclusions regarding any company's financial condition or compliance with any applicable laws or regulations.

2006 DRILLING & WELLSITE CONTRACTORS SURVEY

RANKINGS BY SERVICE CATEGORY

Number of 2006 / 2004–06 Evaluations Shown in Parentheses

CONTRACT DRILLING – LAND

1	Helmerich & Payne (22 / 36)
2	Parker Drilling (7 / 15)
3	KCA DEUTAG (10 / 14)
4	Precision Drilling (15 / 22)
5	Patterson-UTI (35 / 49)
6	Grey Wolf (21 / 35)
7	Unit Drilling (16 / 21)
8	Nabors Industries (47 / 67)

DRILLING-RELATED SERVICES

1	Precision Drilling (12 / 16)
2	Smith International (22 / 49)
3	BJ Services (95 / 128)
4	Halliburton (223 / 272)
5	Schlumberger (183 / 228)
6	Baker Hughes (135 / 184)
7	Key Energy Services (11 / 11)
8	Weatherford International (76 / 119)

COMPLETIONS-RELATED

1	Tesco (8 / 8)
2	Frank's (42 / 51)
3	Baker Hughes (115 / 173)
4	BJ Services (88 / 142)
5	Halliburton (191 / 272)
6	Expro International (11 / 18)
7	Schlumberger (150 / 220)
8	Weatherford International (101 / 143)
9	Key Energy Services (18 / 30)

CONTRACT DRILLING – OFFSHORE

1	Rowan Companies (12 / 18)
2	Noble Drilling (17 / 28)
3	ENSCO International (16 / 30)
4	Transocean (28 / 48)
5	KCA DEUTAG (8 / 11)
6	Parker Drilling (7 / 11)
7	GlobalSantaFe (28 / 43)
8	Pride International (9 / 11)
9	Diamond Offshore (18 / 30)

FORMATION & WELL EVALUATION

1	Precision Drilling (15 / 19)
2	Core Laboratories (25 / 25)
3	Schlumberger (221 / 306)
4	Geoservices (18 / 28)
5	Halliburton (136 / 182)
6	Baker Hughes (136 / 177)
7	Weatherford International (17 / 19)

WORKOVERS & WELL SERVICING

1	BJ Services (63 / 111)
2	Baker Hughes (66 / 104)
3	Halliburton (119 / 172)
4	Schlumberger (118 / 164)
5	Basic Energy Services (19 / 22)
6	Nabors Industries (24 / 28)
7	Weatherford International (41 / 73)
8	Key Energy Services (38 / 62)

SERVICE CATEGORY DESCRIPTIONS

Contract Drilling

Includes dayrate and turnkey contract drilling services for land, shelf and deepwater wells.

Drilling-related Services:

Directional Drilling & MWD

Includes directional/horizontal drilling, measurement-while-drilling, and related services.

Cementing

Includes cement pumping and related services.

Fishing

Includes both open-hole and closed-hole fishing services.

Formation & Well Evaluation

Includes mud logging, wireline logging, logging-while-drilling, core and fluids analysis, drill-stem testing, cased-hole logging, and related services.

Completions-related Services:

Casing & Tubing Installation

Includes casing and tubing installation services.

Completion Services

Includes perforation, fracturing, acidizing, sand control, and related services.

Workovers & Well Servicing

Includes fracturing, acidizing, coiled tubing intervention, sand-control, re-entry and recompletions, and related services.

2006 DRILLING & WELLSITE CONTRACTORS SURVEY

RANKINGS BY GLOBAL REGION

Number of 2006 / 2004-06 Evaluations Shown in Parentheses

U.S. & CANADA

1	Rowan Companies (8 / 13)
2	Transocean (13 / 24)
3	Frank's (25 / 55)
4	Precision Drilling (14 / 23)
5	Wood Group (20 / 41)
6	Helmerich & Payne (22 / 39)
7	Expro International (10 / 15)
8	ENSCO International (9 / 17)
9	Baker Hughes (112 / 176)
10	Smith International (24 / 51)
11	BJ Services (90 / 148)
12	Core Laboratories (21 / 21)
13	Superior Energy Services (15 / 25)
14	Tesco (13 / 19)
15	Schlumberger (149 / 229)
16	Halliburton (158 / 239)
17	Weatherford (75 / 127)
18	Diamond Offshore (12 / 26)
19	Basic Energy Services (25 / 28)
20	Key Energy Services (45 / 77)
21	Patterson-UTI (35 / 50)
22	GlobalSantaFe (10 / 17)
23	Grey Wolf (21 / 35)
24	Unit Drilling (16 / 21)
25	Nabors Industries (48 / 74)

EUROPE & FSU

1	KCA DEUTAG (10 / 15)
2	Baker Hughes (33 / 43)
3	Halliburton (34 / 45)
4	BJ Services (11 / 19)
5	Schlumberger (46 / 56)
6	Weatherford (17 / 25)

LATIN AMERICA

1	Halliburton (17 / 28)
2	Schlumberger (28 / 44)
3	BJ Services (9 / 21)
4	Baker Hughes (23 / 34)
5	Weatherford (11 / 21)

ASIA - AUSTRALIA

1	Smith International (12 / 16)
2	Geoservices (10 / 14)
3	Halliburton (50 / 65)
4	Schlumberger (51 / 69)
5	Baker Hughes (40 / 55)
6	BJ Services (14 / 26)
7	Weatherford (20 / 30)
8	GlobalSantaFe (6 / 7)

MIDDLE EAST & AFRICA

1	Noble Drilling (6 / 9)
2	GlobalSantaFe (10 / 19)
3	Nabors Industries (9 / 13)
4	Frank's (9 / 16)
5	Smith International (14 / 20)
6	Parker Drilling (7 / 10)
7	Geoservices (12 / 18)
8	Halliburton (83 / 108)
9	Transocean (6 / 13)
10	Schlumberger (85 / 113)
11	Baker Hughes (58 / 80)
12	BJ Services (26 / 37)
13	KCA DEUTAG (8 / 10)
14	Weatherford (36 / 54)
15	Precision Drilling (10 / 12)

RANKINGS BY WELL TYPE

Number of 2006 / 2004-06 Evaluations Shown in Parentheses

LAND WELLS

1	Expro International (10 / 15)
2	Frank's (22 / 39)
3	Smith International (31 / 56)
4	Baker Hughes (140 / 208)
5	Helmerich & Payne (22 / 36)
6	BJ Services (100 / 166)
7	Halliburton (200 / 289)
8	Schlumberger (196 / 287)
9	Precision Drilling (25 / 39)
10	Superior Energy Services (8 / 15)
11	Geoservices (14 / 25)
12	Parker Drilling (10 / 17)
13	Core Laboratories (19 / 19)
14	Tesco (12 / 18)
15	Weatherford (96 / 156)
16	KCA DEUTAG (11 / 15)
17	Basic Energy Services (24 / 27)
18	Key Energy Services (43 / 75)
19	Patterson-UTI (35 / 50)
20	Grey Wolf (21 / 35)
21	Nabors Industries (61 / 83)
22	Unit Drilling (16 / 21)

OFFSHORE-SHELF

1	Frank's (15 / 34)
2	Rowan Companies (12 / 19)
3	ENSCO International (14 / 25)
4	Smith International (16 / 26)
5	Noble Drilling (11 / 18)
6	KCA DEUTAG (8 / 12)
7	Diamond Offshore (9 / 17)
8	BJ Services (34 / 64)
9	Baker Hughes (70 / 114)
10	Halliburton (90 / 136)
11	Schlumberger (95 / 139)
12	Weatherford International (38 / 67)
13	Parker Drilling (7 / 13)
14	Geoservices (8 / 15)
15	GlobalSantaFe (19 / 35)
16	Transocean (11 / 20)

OFFSHORE-DEEPWATER

1	Noble Drilling (7 / 11)
2	Transocean (24 / 36)
3	Frank's (13 / 28)
4	Baker Hughes (52 / 72)
5	BJ Services (21 / 25)
6	Schlumberger (64 / 84)
7	Halliburton (59 / 74)
8	Smith International (8 / 14)
9	Weatherford (24 / 39)
10	Diamond Offshore (12 / 21)
11	GlobalSantaFe (10 / 13)

In the Background

OTHER DRILLING & WELLSITE CONTRACTORS

Soft Ratings

In EnergyPoint's 2006 and 2004 surveys, there were certain providers of drilling and wellsite services that were evaluated by too few respondents to include their resulting ratings alongside those included in our primary rankings. For the first time, EnergyPoint is now providing what we call "soft ratings" information for a group of these less frequently-rated, but still noteworthy, providers.

Although these providers might lack the market share of some of those listed in the main sections of this report, many appear to possess an impressive ability to satisfy customers in the markets they do serve. And who knows, some of these companies might even break into the primary list in our next survey in 2008 if they receive an increased number of evaluations.

The grey and white soft ribboned ratings shown below are based on the combined Total Satisfaction ratings for the providers in EnergyPoint's 2006 and 2004 surveys. As with our standard ribboned ratings shown in other sections of this report, the top designation is four ribbons. Providers are listed alphabetically.

Company	Headquarters	No. of 2004 – 06 Evaluations	2004 – 06 Soft Rating	Categories Rated					
				Contract Drilling – Land	Contract Drilling – Offshore	Drilling-related Services	Completion-related Services	Formation & Evaluation	Workovers & Well Servicing
Atwood Oceanics	Houston, Tx	7			✓				✓
Croscos	Zagreb, Croatia	6		✓		✓			✓
Cudd / Thru Tubing	Houston, Tx	18					✓		✓
Dolphin Drilling	Oslo, Norway	7			✓				
Ensign / Caza Drilling	Calgary, Alberta	11		✓					
PathFinder Energy Services	Houston, Tx	12				✓			
Pioneer Drilling	San Antonio, Tx	8		✓					
Saipem Drilling	Milan, Italy	15		✓	✓				
Sanjel Services	Calgary, Alberta	14				✓	✓		✓
Smedvig	Stavanger, Norway	16			✓				✓
Tetra Technologies	The Woodlands, Tx	22					✓	✓	✓
TODCO	Houston, Tx	6							
Trican Well Services	Calgary, Alberta	8				✓	✓		✓

AT A GLANCE

INDUSTRY-WIDE RATINGS

Company	Ratings Category	LATEST Rating ¹	SURVEY Scope	RATINGS Dates	NO. OF '04-06 Evaluations
Aker Kvaerner	Wellsite Products		Global	2005	13
Atwood Oceanics	Wellsite Services		Global	2004 / 2006	7
Baker Hughes	Wellsite Products		Global	2005	106
Baker Hughes	Wellsite Services		Global	2004 / 2006	317
Basic Energy Services	Wellsite Services		Global	2004 / 2006	28
BJ Services	Wellsite Products		Global	2005	76
BJ Services	Wellsite Services		Global	2004 / 2006	224
Carbo Ceramics	Wellsite Products		Global	2005	9
Caterpillar	Wellsite Products		Global	2005	15
CenterPoint Field Services	Gas Midstream Services		U.S.	2006	28
Cooper Cameron	Wellsite Products		Global	2005	56
Copano Energy	Gas Midstream Services		U.S.	2006	15
Core Laboratories	Wellsite Services		Global	2006	37
Crosco	Wellsite Services		Global	2004 / 2006	6
Crosstex Energy	Gas Midstream Services		U.S.	2006	33
Cudd / Thru Tubing	Wellsite Services		Global	2006	18
Davis Lynch	Wellsite Products		Global	2005	12
Derrick Equipment	Wellsite Products		Global	2005	17
Diamond Offshore	Wellsite Services		Global	2004 / 2006	33
Dolphin Drilling	Wellsite Services		Global	2004 / 2006	7
Dril-Quip	Wellsite Products		Global	2005	22
Duke Energy Field Services	Gas Midstream Services		U.S.	2006	108
Enbridge Energy	Gas Midstream Services		U.S.	2006	56
Energy Transfer	Gas Midstream Services		U.S.	2006	44
Enogex	Gas Midstream Services		U.S.	2006	29
ENSCO International	Wellsite Services		Global	2004 / 2006	30
Ensign / Caza Drilling	Wellsite Services		Global	2004 / 2006	11
Enterprise Products	Gas Midstream Services		U.S.	2006	53
Expro International	Wellsite Products		Global	2005	12
Expro International	Wellsite Services		Global	2004 / 2006	35
FMC Energy Systems	Wellsite Products		Global	2005	34
Frank's	Wellsite Services		Global	2004 / 2006	81
Gardner Denver	Wellsite Products		Global	2005	15
Geoservices	Wellsite Services		Global	2004 / 2006	47
GlobalSantaFe	Wellsite Services		Global	2004 / 2006	45
Grant Prideco	Wellsite Products		Global	2005	37
Grey Wolf	Wellsite Services		Global	2004 / 2006	36
Halliburton	Wellsite Products		Global	2005	124
Halliburton	Wellsite Services		Global	2004 / 2006	419
Hanover Processing	Wellsite Products		Global	2005	10
Harbison-Fischer	Wellsite Products		Global	2005	8
Helmerich & Payne	Wellsite Services		Global	2004 / 2006	45
Hydril	Wellsite Products		Global	2005	30
KCA DEUTAG	Wellsite Services		Global	2004 / 2006	22
Key Energy Services	Wellsite Services		Global	2004 / 2006	77
Kinder Morgan	Gas Midstream Services		U.S.	2006	32
Lufkin Industries	Wellsite Products		Global	2005	17
MarkWest	Gas Midstream Services		U.S.	2006	13
Maverick Tube	Wellsite Products		Global	2005	7

¹Grey and white ribboned ratings reflect EnergyPoint's "soft" ratings designation based on a more limited number of evaluations.

AT A GLANCE

INDUSTRY-WIDE RATINGS

Company	Ratings Category	LATEST Rating	SURVEY Scope	RATINGS Dates	NO. OF '04-06 Evaluations
M-I SWACO	Wellsite Products	👍👍👍👍	Global	2005	37
M-I SWACO	Wellsite Services	👍👍👍👍	Global	2004	41
Nabors Industries	Wellsite Services	👍	Global	2004 / 2006	90
NATCO Group	Wellsite Products	👍👍👍👍	Global	2005	15
National Oilwell	Wellsite Products	👍	Global	2005	43
Newpark Drilling Fluids	Wellsite Products	👎👎👎	Global	2005	7
Noble Drilling	Wellsite Services	👍👍👍👍	Global	2004 / 2006	30
Norton Proppants	Wellsite Products	👎	Global	2005	8
Oceaneering	Wellsite Products	👎👎👎	Global	2005	11
Oil States International	Wellsite Products	👎	Global	2005	10
ONEOK Field Services	Gas Midstream Services	👍👍	U.S.	2006	29
Parker Drilling	Wellsite Services	👍👍👍	Global	2004 / 2006	29
Pathfinder Energy Services	Wellsite Services	👎👎👎	Global	2004 / 2006	12
Patterson-UTI	Wellsite Services	👍	Global	2004 / 2006	50
Pioneer Drilling	Wellsite Services	👎	Global	2006	8
Precision Drilling	Wellsite Products	👍👍	Global	2005	12
Precision Drilling	Wellsite Services	👍👍👍	Global	2004 / 2006	52
Pride International	Wellsite Services	👍👍	Global	2004 / 2006	24
Regency Gas Services	Gas Midstream Services	👍👍	U.S.	2006	14
Robbins & Myers	Wellsite Products	👎👎👎	Global	2005	10
Rowan Companies	Wellsite Services	👍👍👍👍	Global	2004 / 2006	22
Sanjel	Wellsite Services	👎👎👎	Global	2004 / 2006	14
Schlumberger	Wellsite Products	👍👍👍	Global	2005	130
Schlumberger	Wellsite Services	👍👍	Global	2004 / 2006	418
Scientific Drilling	Wellsite Products	👎👎	Global	2005	15
Sid Richardson	Gas Midstream Services	👍👍	U.S.	2006	27
Smedvig	Wellsite Services	👎👎👎	Global	2004 / 2006	16
Smith International	Wellsite Products	👍👍👍👍	Global	2005	48
Smith International	Wellsite Services	👍👍👍👍	Global	2004 / 2006	82
Sumitomo Pipe & Tube	Wellsite Products	👎👎👎	Global	2005	11
Superior Energy Services	Wellsite Services	👍👍	Global	2004 / 2006	27
Targa Resources	Gas Midstream Services	👍👍👍	U.S.	2006	48
Technip-Coflexip	Wellsite Products	👎	Global	2005	9
Tenaris	Wellsite Products	👍👍👍	Global	2005	15
TEPPCO	Gas Midstream Services	👍👍👍	U.S.	2006	14
Tesco	Wellsite Services	👍👍	Global	2005	22
Tetra Technologies	Wellsite Services	👎	Global	2004 / 2006	22
TODCO	Wellsite Services	👎	Global	2006	6
Transocean	Wellsite Services	👍👍👍	Global	2004 / 2006	49
Unit Drilling	Wellsite Services	👍	Global	2004 / 2006	21
US Steel	Wellsite Products	👎	Global	2005	9
Vallourec & Mannesmann	Wellsite Products	👍👍👍👍	Global	2005	13
Varco International	Wellsite Products	👍	Global	2005	24
Vetco Gray	Wellsite Products	👍👍	Global	2005	42
Weatherford International	Wellsite Products	👍👍	Global	2005	82
Weatherford International	Wellsite Services	👍👍	Global	2004 / 2006	224
Williams Midstream	Gas Midstream Services	👍👍	U.S.	2006	26
Wood Group	Wellsite Products	👍👍👍	Global	2005	30
Wood Group	Wellsite Services	👍👍👍👍	Global	2004 / 2006	55

ABOUT ENERGYPOINT RESEARCH

OUR FOCUS

EnergyPoint Research provides independent research regarding the oil and gas industry's satisfaction with the products and services it purchases and utilizes. We offer industry professionals and their employers opportunities to provide **comprehensive** and **confidential** feedback to suppliers through objective and independent evaluation processes. In return for participating in our surveys, respondents and their employers receive **complimentary survey results** in the form of EnergyPoint's highly-regarded *MarketPartners*[®] Reports.

MARKETPARTNERS[®] PROGRAM

Through our *MarketPartners*[®] Program, EnergyPoint regularly surveys significant cross-sections of experienced industry participants involved in the selection and utilization of product and service providers. Survey participants range from managers at some of the world's largest energy companies to field personnel at regional independents. For more information on EnergyPoint Research and our *MarketPartners*[®] Program, go to www.energypointresearch.com.

SURVEYS & REPORTS

To help ensure that our research is both relevant and timely, EnergyPoint's surveys focus on the areas industry participants tell us are most important. We design our surveys to measure satisfaction by service and product attribute, customer and provider type, product and service category, geographic region, well and application type, respondent title and experience, and other appropriate measures. We provide survey results in two primary forms:

MARKETPARTNERS[®] REPORTS — Through the *MarketPartners*[®] Program, EnergyPoint provides complimentary survey results to all survey participants and their employers in the form of our *MarketPartners*[®] Reports. These high-quality reports are designed to **set a standard** for market-based evaluations in the industry and provide insightful perspective regarding the performance of product and service providers.

DETAILED DATA & ANALYSIS REPORTS AND DATA — EnergyPoint also publishes comprehensive reports and data related to its surveys for sale to providers. These same reports and data are also made available to other parties including exploration and production companies, consultants, industry analysts, investors, researchers, etc. These proprietary reports and data, for which EnergyPoint charges a fee, contain detailed results from our surveys plus **in-depth analysis** designed to assist readers in identifying **specific factors** customers consider when assessing their satisfaction with suppliers. By providing comprehensive information that builds on the data presented in our *MarketPartners*[®] Reports, EnergyPoint believes its services help foster improvements in product and service quality.

CONFIDENTIALITY

EnergyPoint takes great care to maintain high levels of **confidentiality** and **anonymity** related to the data it collects and publishes. While individuals' responses are included in EnergyPoint's various published reports and data packages, the names of respondents and their employers are not divulged.

LEARN MORE

To learn more about EnergyPoint Research and our commitment to the oil and gas industry, visit the company's website at www.energypointresearch.com. You may also e-mail us at marketpartners@epresearch.com or call us at 713.529.9450.

DISCLAIMER

The information, data, commentary and analysis included in this report were collected, compiled and published by Energy Point Research, Inc. ("EnergyPoint") with the intent of providing readers with relevant, although not necessarily fully definitive, information as to customers' satisfaction with providers of certain products and / or services. EnergyPoint does not maintain or represent that the resulting information, opinions, and conclusions presented in this report necessarily reflect the perspectives of all customers and / or the complete market for the products and / or services covered in the report because surveys of this type (and the resulting data, commentary and analysis) are inherently impacted by certain factors including, but not limited to, sampling error, timing of data collections, respondents' own product / service weightings, geographic distribution of customer bases, language barriers, access to the world-wide web and other facilitating mediums, ongoing competitive and market dynamics, etc. Furthermore, EnergyPoint does not maintain or represent that the survey or this report includes all companies or parties that could be viewed as providers of the products and / or services covered herein. Inclusion in or exclusion from the survey or this report should not be construed as reflecting a company's market share or prominence in any category of products or services.

ENERGYPOINT (I) MAKES NO EXPRESS OR IMPLIED REPRESENTATIONS, WARRANTIES OR COVENANTS AS TO THE ACCURACY AND / OR COMPLETENESS OF THE INFORMATION, DATA, OPINIONS, COMMENTARY, ANALYSIS AND / OR ANY DIRECT OR INDIRECT RECOMMENDATIONS INCLUDED IN THE SURVEY OR THIS REPORT, AND (II) DISCLAIMS ANY AND ALL DAMAGES, COSTS, AND LIABILITIES WHATSOEVER TO THE RECIPIENT OR READER OR ITS REPRESENTATIVES (TANGIBLE OR INTANGIBLE, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO LOSS OF BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY, LOSS OF PROFIT, LOSS OF MARKET SHARE OR LOSS OF GOODWILL) FOR ANY RELIANCE OR USE MADE BY THE RECIPIENT OR PURCHASER OR ITS REPRESENTATIVES OF SUCH INFORMATION, OR ANY ERRORS THEREIN OR OMISSIONS THEREFROM. BECAUSE THIS INFORMATION IS IN-PART OPINION-BASED, THE RECIPIENT OR READER AND ITS REPRESENTATIVES SHOULD RELY SOLELY UPON THEIR OWN INDEPENDENT JUDGMENTS, ASSUMPTIONS, ESTIMATES, STUDIES, COMPUTATIONS, EVALUATIONS, REPORTS, EXPERIENCE AND KNOWLEDGE WITH RESPECT TO ANY PARTICULAR BUSINESS-RELATED DECISION OR CONCLUSION AND THE EVALUATION OF ANY POTENTIAL TRANSACTION, UNDERTAKING, STRATEGY OR OTHER INITIATIVE.

EnergyPoint

RESEARCH

P.O. Box 132049
Houston, TX 77219
713.529.9450

www.energypointresearch.com



Copyright ©2006 EnergyPoint Research, Inc.

1.2

... BECAUSE THE RIGHT PARTNERS CAN MAKE ALL THE DIFFERENCE