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Advancing the Learning Curve

- In 2015
  - Made significant step changes in drilling learning curve in all our playtypes
  - Also predicted the step changes
- Focusing today on SCOOP and STACK 2015 Learning Curves
- What’s next in 2016+?
STACK Learning Curve

2014 vs 2015:
- Averaged +30% improvement in Days to TD
- Exited 2015 with +50% improvement in Days to TD
- Averaged +28% improvement in Drill and Case cost
2014 vs 2015:

- Averaged +38% improvement in Days to TD
- Exited 2015 with +45% improvement in Days to TD
- Averaged +40% improvement in Drill and Case cost
Rewinding the Clock...

Back to September 2014:

- Actively Drilling in two major playtypes in Anadarko Basin, SCOOP and STACK
- The foundation for our team’s experience came from Arkoma and Granite Wash drilling programs
Laying the 2015 Path Forward

- We laid the path forward in 2015 by first looking backwards.
- Looked hard at our Learning Curve histories...what was holding our engineering & drilling performance back? The rock didn’t change.

### Arkoma Learning Curve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STACK Learning Curve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Granite Wash Learning Curve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RCA Logic on the Learning Curve

- Engineering - constraint based optimization problem solving
- If current year performance was always possible, then the prior years were engineered as overdesigns and sub-optimal.
- If our engineering output was sub-optimal in prior years, then the failure had to be a result of:
  - Incorrectly defined design constraints
  - Design solutions for incorrectly diagnosed problems
  - Weaknesses in problem solving approach
- Conclusions:
  - Excessive design constraints, inadequate root cause analyses and inappropriate transfer of lessons learned, result in overdesigned wells.
  - If these root causes remain unaddressed, then the current “best” result is still likely an overdesign.
  - If the team is focused on replicating the best achieved to date, then we’re likely attempting to replicate an overdesign.
  - An acceleration of a learning curve will always be paired with a simplification of the design.
- Therefore, in order to design and deliver a well beyond what has already been done:
  - Constraints need to be questioned & tested
  - Problems need to be correctly diagnosed
  - Solving approaches have to be efficiently transferred
  - The next step changes come from simplification of the design, not throwing more complexity into the design.
In order to design and deliver a well beyond what has already been done:

- Constraints need to be questioned & tested
  - Fear of the test outcome caused us to design around future possibilities that may or not have manifested themselves and accept an overdesign

- Problems need to be correctly diagnosed
  - The biggest hurdle to a good root cause analysis is getting past the proximate cause

- Solving approaches have to be efficiently transferred
  - The engineering problem solving approach is the real lesson learned, not the conclusion generated from the

- An acceleration of the learning curve will always be paired with a simplification of the design.
  - Constantly trying to replicate a result of something already achieved promotes increased complexity. The macro trend of every learning curve is simplification, not increased complexity. You design toward the ideal instead of designing with an eye toward replication
BOY 2015 Projections:

- Predicted we could deliver a <13 day well for $2.6MM
- Projected an ~35% reduction in Drill & Case cost
BOY 2015 Projections:

- Predicted we could deliver a <30 day well for $3.9MM
- Projected an ~35% reduction in Drill & Case cost
Other 2015 Projects

- In both cases, we cut the previous composite BIC in half within 3 wells.
What’s the Next Unrealized Potential?

- **Well Design**
  - Geometry
  - **Casing Design**
  - Cement Design
  - WH Design

- **Drilling Fluid Design**
  - **Fluid Design**
  - Hydraulics
  - Solids Control
  - Waste Management

- **BHA Design**
  - **BHA Design**
  - Bit Selection

- **Data Governance**
  - Electronic well file in database
  - E-document well file
  - Lessons Learned repository

- **Development Planning**
  - Economies of scale
  - LC Modelling
  - Left quadrant
Left Quadrant
Forward looking statements and related matters

This presentation contains forward-looking statements within the meaning of Section 27A of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and Section 21E of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended. The words “believe”, “intend”, “plan”, “expect”, “guidance”, “potential” or other similar expressions are intended to identify forward-looking statements. Other than historical facts included in this presentation, all information and statements, such as information regarding planned capital expenditures, estimated reserves, estimated production targets, drilling and development plans, the timing of production, planned capital expenditures, and other plans and objectives for future operations, are forward-looking statements. Although as of the date of this presentation Newfield believes that these expectations are reasonable, this information is based upon assumptions and anticipated results that are subject to numerous uncertainties and risks. Actual results may vary significantly from those anticipated due to many factors, including drilling results, commodity prices, industry conditions, the prices of goods and services, the availability of drilling rigs and other support services, our liquidity and the availability of capital resources, labor conditions, severe weather conditions, China and U.S. governmental regulations and other operating risks. Please see Newfield’s 2014 Annual Report on Form 10-K and subsequent quarterly and current reports filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) for a discussion of other factors that may cause actual results to vary. Unpredictable or unknown factors not discussed herein or in Newfield’s SEC filings could also have material adverse effects actual results. Readers are cautioned not to place undo reliance on forward-looking statements, which speak only as of the date of this presentation. Unless legally required, Newfield undertakes no obligation to publicly update or revise any forward-looking statements.

Cautionary Note to Investors – Effective January 1, 2010, the SEC permits oil and gas companies, in their filings with the SEC, to disclose only proved, probable and possible reserves that meet the SEC’s definitions for such terms. Actual quantities that may be ultimately recovered from Newfield’s interests may differ substantially from the estimates in this presentation. Factors affecting ultimate recovery include the scope of Newfield’s ongoing drilling program, which will be directly affected by commodity prices, the availability of capital, drilling and production costs, availability of drilling services and equipment, drilling results, lease expirations, transportation constraints, regulatory approvals and other factors; and actual drilling results, including geological and mechanical factors affecting recovery rates. Newfield may use terms in this presentation, such as “resources”, “net resources”, “net discovered resources”, “net unrisked drilling resource”, “net lower-risked captured resources”, “net risked captured resources”, “gross resources”, “gross resource potential”, “gross unrisked resource potential”, “gross unrisked resources”, and similar terms that the SEC’s guidelines strictly prohibit in SEC filings. These terms include reserves with substantially less certainty than proved reserves, and no discount or other adjustment is included in the presentation of such reserve numbers. Investors are urged to consider closely the oil and gas disclosures in Newfield’s 2014 Annual Report on Form 10-K, available at www.newfield.com, www.sec.gov or by writing Newfield at 4 Waterway Square Place, Suite 100, The Woodlands, Texas 77380 Attn: Investor Relations.
Thank you

Questions?