

**PIPELINE INDUSTRIES GUILD
14/15 BELGRAVE SQUARE
LONDON SW1X 8PS.**

**ONE-CALL SYSTEM
MANAGEMENT GROUP**

**Notes of the meeting held on Monday 14th October 2002,
At 14/15 Belgrave Square, London SW1X 8PS.**

Attendees:	Sir John Cullen	-	Management Group Chairman
	Tim Barrow	-	DfT
	Neville Briscoe	-	HSE
	Peter Davis	-	BPA
	Lester Sonden	-	Sutton & East Surrey Water
	Carl Leadbeater	-	Thames Water(dep. for Greg Holland)
	John Caygill	-	BT
	Richard Impey	-	BT
	Peter Boreham	-	Transco
	David Start	-	Electricity Association
	Barrie Wright	-	Eastern Power Networks
	Kevin Brown	-	Anglian Water
	Ken Elder	-	NTL
	Martin Freeman	-	Bedfordshire County Council
	Gary Wesley	-	Cambridgeshire County Council
	Richard Glenister	-	Guild Bus. Dev. Manager

1. Apologies.

Apologies had been received from Mark Preston, McNicholas Construction; Robert Scotson, Susiephone Limited; Paul Harvey, Eastern Power Networks; and Dave Capon, Suffolk County Council. Sir John welcomed both Management Group members and invited asset owners' representatives from the Stage 1 area.

2. Confirmation of minutes of meeting held on 16th July 2002.

The minutes were agreed as a true record.

3. Update on the One-Call Initiative:

RHG summarised the actions, which had taken place since the last meeting. He had held meetings with all the asset owners in Stage 1 and whilst gaining commitment from some, was still awaiting answers from BT and Transco. RHG also explained that all the elements to progress the initiative were now in place and that only the financial commitment from asset owners was required to get the system operational.

4. Update on the Government Study:

Tim Barrow explained that initiating the study was never aimed at stopping worthwhile initiatives such as the One-Call System, but is intended to look at the entire field of initiatives to see whether there

would be advantage in imposing some form of framework to allow systems to work together. He went on to outline the tender process, which had closed last Friday, 11th October 2002. It was hoped the work would commence early in November and was anticipated to last 6-9 months before the final report was issued, although it was hoped to issue an interim report, covering issues related to the exchange of information, in February 2003.

5. Round-table discussion presenting individual asset owners views:

Sir John opened the discussion by commenting that Government was taking a positive view. If One-Call is to work effectively, then it must get the buy-in from industry and that commitment is needed from all companies with underground apparatus and that the system will not fulfil its objectives if this is not 100%. He also reminded industry that in his view they would be criticised if they had not participated and an accident were to occur.

BT: BT has taken a keen interest in the project. They are supportive of the concept and congratulate the Guild for taking the initiative. The reality is that BT are unable to support the project financially at this time because:

- having looked at the costing, the financial elements are not attractive;
- plant records are taken seriously within BT and as such they have developed the service of 'maps by e-mail' which serves the majority of their requirements;
- they are not convinced that One-Call will get 100% commitment and therefore question if it will be successful;
- they spent time and effort on the NJUG system, which has not progressed.

Transco: Transco supported the BT view and confirmed that without BT or electricity participation then they were unable to support the initiative.

Bedfordshire County Council:

Whilst Bedfordshire would support the initiative, they are concerned that the initiative requires a critical mass to become operational and that without the major players this objective will not be achieved.

Cambridgeshire County Council:

They have decided to support the HoleWorld initiative when it goes live early next year.

Anglian Water:

AW has demonstrated that by investing in their Digdat system, which delivers maps by internet, that savings can be made.

They confirmed that unless all players are sharing the information, then it is difficult for a system to operate.

NTL: NTL are supportive of the initiative and waiting for the system to become operational. In the meantime they are looking at other systems. Getting the finance will be difficult and they will need to demonstrate the benefits.

Thames Water:

TW cannot give a definite answer at this time. They are keen to participate although concerned about the business case and the lack of support from the major asset owners.

Eastern Power Networks:

EPN confirmed the content of the letter they had sent to the Guild as follows:

- they believe the initiative will be a dilution of their existing system and lead to an increase in the number of enquiries;
- EPN is a large organisation with widespread apparatus therefore everybody knows to contact them;
- they have difficulty making the business case. Excavators currently have records and still cause damage, so it is difficult to see how the initiative will reduce third party damage;
- they are looking to move their records to a web based system and would like to come back to One-Call when this is done to examine a link.

Water:

Lester Sonden reported on the water companies in the Stage 1 area as follows:

- Essex & Suffolk have indicated positively;
- Cambridge cannot see the business case;
- Tendring Hundred are not interested;
- Three Valleys cannot see the business case.

Electricity Association:

David Start reported that the view of the electricity industry is that the cost benefit cannot be justified and the system is limited in scope. He went on to express the view that the industry is in a period of time when a confrontational attitude is coming across and money is being milked from the utilities, therefore there is a general negative approach.

BPA representing the Oil Sector:

Peter Davis confirmed that the oil sector had supported the initiative all the way through its development. Their problem is the need for people to contact them and the One-Call system would provide a central point that people would know where to go .He

questioned whether the system needed to have legislation put in place to ensure its success and reminded members that the European Pipeline Regulations may well require a One-Call system to be put in place and that this would be something which would be a threat to industry.

Health & Safety Executive:

Neville Briscoe reported that he was hopeful to receive an indication shortly that the EU were seeking to propose a Pipeline Safety Instrument and that in the draft version the requirement for a One-Call system as a regulatory tool was indicated. He went on to explain the legal responsibilities of both pipeline operators and excavators, concluding that One-Call is the formal arrangement that meets these two requirements.

Following the individual presentations a general discussion was held, the main points raised including:

- the larger asset owners are developing their own discreet systems which they see as adequate to address their existing obligations;
- the inability to justify the business case is based on the tangible benefits and no account is taken of the safety aspects which will be addressed;
- providing records alone will not solve the problem or change the existing situation;
- there is a tendency for UK to be complacent in its operations as we have not suffered tragic accidents as in the USA where this has led to enforced legislation;
- the suggestion that the UK should go for legislation to achieve a One-Call system was supported by many, particularly the larger asset owners;
- a suggestion was made to hold a list of asset owners by postcode, but this was not generally viewed as being useful;
- every stakeholder has a different angle on the problem, the DfT is trying to reduce traffic disruption and therefore the proposed framework to come from the study should help to focus the approach.

6. Options for the way forward:

Sir John summarised the situation, saying that the view was that we have developed a system which the industry generally supports, but is unable to commit to at this time. The options for the way forward are:

1. To close down the initiative completely;
2. To put the system 'on ice' until the findings from the Government study are published ;
3. To launch the system on a commercial basis; or
4. To adopt the database suggested in the previous discussion.

The members of the Group agreed that the preferred option was the

second, but to use the term 'to park' the initiative rather than 'put on ice'. It was also agreed that: a) the initiative should not be allowed to go cold and therefore should be promoted at every opportunity;
b) we should work with the

Government consultants undertaking the study to appraise them of the work that has been undertaken on the initiative.

7. Any other business:

a) Funding the Development of the Project:

RHG tabled a paper on the issue of funding. It was explained that the Guild had always made it clear that it was acting as a facilitator and that funding would need to come from the industry.

The paper detailed the costs and the payments made by industry, showing that the Guild had a current deficit of £26,000 on the project. The paper proposed that each of the eight sectors represented at the meeting should pay £3,250 each. BT and the electricity industry both confirmed that they had attended the meetings without prejudice and that no financial commitment was available.

DfT commented that they had contributed to the project in the hope that it would be matched by industry. The negativity of certain sectors was seen as disappointing.

The matter was left to the Guild to progress.

b) Vote of thanks:

The Management Group wished to record their thanks to Sir John for his devoted efforts in facilitating the One-Call Initiative and raising the profile of this important issue both within the industry and with Government.