



**UKOPA Risk Assessment Work Group Meeting
Held at Advantica, Loughborough on 30 January 2002**

Present: Jane Haswell, Ken Thomas, Roger Ellis, Neil Jackson, Ken W Smith, Richard Espiner, Peter Davis, Rod McConnell

1 Actions from previous meeting held at Loughborough 31 October 2001

Action 1.1 – Members to generate internal lists of difficult planning issues

Roger Ellis / Phil Joyner / Neil Jackson

Lists generated and circulated by Neil Jackson (Transco), also list produced by Ken Smith (BP) - Rod McConnell to circulate to RAWG - **done**

Action 1 - Shell to generate list of their issues - Roger Ellis

- 7.9 Rod McConnell to prepare paper on UKOPA principles for the use of risk assessment - developed further following FDMG meeting – see item 5 below
- 7.11 Rod McConnell to prepare list of who's who in HSE – outstanding - to be requested as part of MHSC first meeting – still awaited, partly in HSE website

2 Review of MHSC Workshop

Seen as good opportunity for open discussion on risk assessment and land use planning issues.

Planned roll-out of the “codified” land use planning advice from MSDU for Natural gas pipelines was 31 Jan 2002, but this has apparently been delayed for 2 months. Work done by Transco indicates that inner, middle and outer zones appear to be significantly reduced for most of their pipelines – their results have been sent to Ian Hirst of HSE MSDU for comment. Adopting inner zone distance of 1 BPD seen as major progress. Significant progress in sharing of views.

HSE agreed that current LUP zones for other pipelines based on PRAM are too large but there is not the resource internally to progress re-examination and development of risk assessment techniques for all other pipelines. UKOPA offered to help but this was not seen as acceptable to HSE who wish to maintain an element of independence. HSE agreed the need for ongoing programme to consider several risk assessment topics. No progress on gasoline pipelines.

3 Next meeting of MHSC is 11 February 2002.

RAWG discussed key aspects for progress at the next MHSC meeting.

These were agreed as:-

- 1 establish a joint working group with HSE to meet with RAWG to progress key aspects

- 2 facilitate urgent adoption of UKOPA leak database and predictive models into HSE's modelling for pipeline risk assessment
- 3 re-evaluation of LUP zones for the 4 ethylene pipelines – as a first step in getting all pipelines re-assessed
- 4 Event trees, ignition probability, consequence modelling
- 5 Mitigation aspects – how to incorporate these into risk assessments
- 6 Risk Criteria

Action 2 RAMcC to produce a brief paper covering these points to table at the 11 February meeting - done

4 Register of LUP issues

File of LUP issues now established. This will be a powerful collection of case studies for future reference and discussions. Ken Smith gave a brief presentation of the BP list of issues.

Action 3 - RAMcC to produce a summary index to enable a common set of key points to be drawn out from each of the issues now recorded

Action 4 - RAMcC to plan in an agenda item for one of the Companies to present / discuss its issues at each meeting

5 Action from FDMG Meeting

– The next stage of development for Risk Assessment?

Following the FDMG meeting earlier in the day, an action was passed forward to RAWG to consider how the next stage of development from the UKOPA Leak and Fault Database and Predictive Modelling capability might take place.

One idea was that a “UKOPA Risk Assessment User Guide” might be developed to describe how we see our database results, and risk assessment in general being applied by practitioners in the industry.

Areas of which might need to be covered are:-

- Design of new pipelines, routing, design features, risk minimisation / reduction, TD1
- Upgrading of existing pipelines – e.g. as in the 80 bar uprate, for the Regulator, specific parameters
- Developments near existing pipelines, cost effective mitigation, ALARP demonstration, Societal risk,
- Assessment of CDs and LUP zones, QRA for planning issues
- Risk assessments by operators, for PSR MAPD, ongoing management, ageing pipelines and assets, define safety improvement priorities

The guide might contain decision trees and logic (algorithms) to help decide when to use simple leak data (e.g. for screening studies) and when (and how?) to use the Predictive Modelling techniques. Also Case Studies.

Before deciding on how to proceed and producing a detailed proposal, RAWG agreed to consider this further.

Action 5 - RAMcC agreed to circulate part of a similar industry guide produced for SIGTTO for shipping terminals to indicate how and why this was developed

Action 6 – Neil Jackson agreed to present Transco's existing approach at the next meeting

6 Other Business

- ◆ Jane Haswell reported on developments of BS 8010 – progress is likely to be slow
- ◆ Seminar – unlikely to be ready for a seminar till late 2002 – consider at next meeting
- ◆ Ken Thomas reported on progress in defining incident reporting for excavations within hazard range of pipelines as follows:-

	Damage	Serious Potential	Limited Potential
Within Wayleave	A1	A2	A3
Within Notification Zone	N/A	B2	B3

Such information is useful in building predictive models on the probability of an excavation striking the pipeline, causing rupture or puncture, and how often surveillance inspections are carried out.

Date of Next Meeting - Agreed that this should follow the FDMG meeting on 30 April 2002 at Advantica, Loughborough.

R A McConnell
6 February 2002