

DRAFT

Kevin Allars

ACDS MHSC Working Group on Pipelines

Meeting preparatory to formal start-up - 10.30am Wednesday 5th September 2001

Approach outline

1. Introductions - this should be fairly straightforward, although Jane Haswell might want to say something about her career change.

2. Scene-setting - I thought that you would be able to do this by referring back to the UKOPA and gasoline operators meetings, taking Gordon and Jane through what was discussed and agreed at each, how we brought things together to the point where we were able to go to ACDS with the joint approach, how that was debated and the outcome [Copies of the ACDS paper will be on hand for each, as will the notes of the UKOPA and gasoline operators meeting]. I think it is important at this point to stress the ACDS link and why we and ACDS see value in the new working group being set up - not only that it will be able to look at some areas of immediate concern, but also then be able to move on to other onshore pipeline issues, as agreed with ACDS. I think the significance of our prolonged debate on gasoline and the expectations of the CBI should be highlighted, not least in helping to move ACDS to agreeing to a working group being set up under its aegis in the first place. It might also be appropriate here to give an outline of the extent of our relationship with the working group, perhaps by setting us somewhere away from centre stage i.e. we are obviously interested - we want to contribute and advise the process, but do not want to dominate.

3. The working group - can I suggest that we look at the practical aspects first. They should all be relatively straightforward to resolve, either on the day or by subsequent correspondence.

a) name - a mouthful, but - the ACDS MHSC Working Group on Pipelines should work;

b) venue - to be agreed by them. I would anticipate that Gordon will either want to draw people to Stoke, or making it a "roadshow" by calling on members to host, and in this we can take our turn. This should help to set some distance (no pun intended) between ourselves and the working group;

c) secretariat - I see them setting the agenda for each meeting and taking the actual notes, not least because of the likely substantial technical content. We would then organise the actual copying and sending out to the members. I would anticipate this working group being quite resource demanding and I do not think we could manage any more than this. We would also be responsible for maintaining the formal record of the activities of the working group, including what goes on the Internet;

d) ACDS MHSC - we would have the responsibility for actual written material getting to the subcommittee. This would include the provision of any general feedback on the activities of the working group, and any submissions/recommendations. This would sit alongside any direct input made by the Chairman. The ownership of all material produced would rest with ACDS and decisions to circulate, publish etc would have to rest with that advisory committee. This would not preclude the working group actually searching out views and contribution from the industry and other outside bodies, but would prevent it from expressing views without recourse to ACDS;

e) attendance at ACDS MHSC - as an existing ACDS member, Gordon could be expected to attend whenever, but for others, it would be up to Gordon to arrange with you, as Chairman, in advance;

f) expenses - There is a need here for consistency with other formal advisory bodies. We will have already stressed the significance of ACDS accountability - this working group would meet that criteria.

Ian Greenwood has confirmed that as the working group would be accountable to a HSE advisory committee, the members should qualify for the same terms to be applied to main committee members [Copies of forms and guidance available]. I would hope that this would be restricted to travelling expenses, with the subsistence being caught up by lunches being provided, either by HSE (if we host), or by others. Obviously, much will be down to when and where for meetings (no early starts/late finishes or in exotic places). If you go along with this, it might be appropriate to set out where we see the parameters lying - APEX tickets, planning meetings with travel in mind etc.

Authorisation of members expenses would be made by me and sent to PEFD for payment.

4. The membership - I have circulated Rod McConnell's e-mail to Gordon and Jane. I have also sent a copy each to Neil Johnson and Bob Turner, to help emphasise to them that the HID nomination should be someone "substantial". As it stands, this is now likely to be Bob, although as the agenda "develops", experts from his team would likely emerge. This is provisional. Bob is meeting Neil on the 5th to get his views (I suspect Neil will go along with his offer) and will confirm. Unless you feel otherwise, I will take up the policy slot - this is important not only to maintain the link between the working group and MHSC, but also to ensure that the practical aspects are actioned etc.

With regard to the UKOPA nominations, although Gordon might have some knowledge of the individuals, I suggest that Jane will be better placed to comment. As far as I am aware, all have "reputations" in the sector - I do not see them as just turning up for meetings but actually getting involved.

Paul Siddals from Transco you have already met. Representing the major pipeline operator, he cannot be ignored. Jane will know him very well.

Mark Harrison I do not know much about, but with ethylene background, he will be well familiar with land-use-planning issues.

In the light of ACDS discussion, we must not ignore **Peter Davies**. You met him at the gasoline operators meeting. He has been involved with all the gasoline work. He carries a lot of weight in that sector.

Steve Thomas I have not come across (at least knowingly), but **John Coppack** I have. John chairs one of the PIG Technical Committees. He is well regarded in the pipeline world. HSE involvement with him includes our preparatory work on the "Pipeline Directive".

Rod McConnell you have met. He is the driving force in UKOPA on risk assessment.

Whilst I think all could be legitimately accommodated under the terms of reference (particularly the "others" clause), I think we need to defer to ACDS with regard to its own nominations - but none so far (apart from the Mike Considine expression of interest on the day - I suspect he has spoken to Peter Davies with regard to this). Perhaps what we need to do is to go to the members with "nominations" - i.e. with details of the names offered so far, plus some background (provided by Jane), asking for ACDS member endorsement in advance of the actual ACDS meeting. With sensitive handling I think that members would go along with this approach, although we should not be surprised to receive comments from LGA and perhaps TUC representatives who might want to claim a piece of the action. I do not see this as a problem. If we say that the proposed membership reflects the likely technical nature of the early agenda we can follow this up with the clear statement that "other" places exists to draw in other relevant expertise (LUP comes to mind), from wherever. I think what we see is a core structure that will need to be augmented to meet specific needs.

5. Members interests - we will need to set up a simple record of who the members are (including HSE), showing where each is from, and what their interests in the topic are etc. This would then be kept with the registered files we will have to set up [I hope to have copies of the Code of Practice for members of advisory bodies].

6. The working group agenda - so far it has been tied up in general terms such as making what we do more accessible, transparent, understandable etc, particularly to the industry. We need to agree what this actually means including drawing from them some initial thoughts on how they see this being tackled (I am sure they have this well thought through already), including what they envisage HSE needing to do. In this context they need to be aware of the distinction between achieving improvements in what we already do, as opposed to those where there fundamental changes to policy are indicated. There needs to be an understanding of what and why changes/modifications etc can be quickly effected in some areas, as opposed to those where change takes a lot longer.

7. The first meeting - it would be good to run with a meeting before ACDS on 11th October, to enable us to demonstrate to the members that we have acted, but I suspect that this will prove impossible. We will of course be able to report that the process has begun - membership has been organised along with the practical arrangements, and that the first agenda has been set for ACDS consideration. We need to ask Gordon for dates which we will then work on. It will be for Gordon to suggest the venue.

Please advise if you are happy with this approach or that you have any changes/suggestions to make. Ideally, I would like to get a note along these lines out to Gordon and Jane over the weekend.

Neville Briscoe

H:\pipelines\pipelines\acdspipegrp4.lwp