

**PIPELINE INDUSTRIES GUILD**

**ONSHORE TECHNICAL PANEL**

**MEETING OF 14<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2004 AT THE PIG'S HEADQUARTERS**

The meeting was shortened due to the discussions with the Utilities Panel and the Christmas lunch.

**KEY POINTS**

1. ATTENDANCE
- 1.1 ATTENDEES (13)

Brian SPENCER (Chair)	Bill HUGHES
Richard BROUGHTON	Dick GRAY
John COPPACK	Eric MARTIN
Matthew DOHERTY	John VARDON
Roger SARGOLOGO	Bruce McCULLOUGH
Howard SMITH (part time)	Richard GLENISTER (part time)
Phil PARKINSON	

- 1.2 APOLOGIES (15)

Dave WILLIS	Richard PRATT
Andrew JACKSON	Stephen BLACKMAN
Ernie HOLDEN	Phill JONES
Paul O'CONNELL	Graham WILCOCK
Russell DEARDEN	Jason EVANS
John BARR	Mark JORDAN
Paul GODDEN	Richard ESPINER
Alan THAYNE (represented by Bruce McCULLOUGH)	

2. MOSCOW EXHIBITION, SEPTEMBER 2005: PRESENTATION BY THE DAILY MAIL GROUP

Richard GLENISTER introduced Peter McCONNELL, International Sales, Business Media International of the Daily Mail Group's (DMG's) World Media. Richard briefly outlined the initiative being developed between the PIG and DMG to promote the technical skills and innovations in the UK pipeline industry to international audiences.

Paul spoke on the opportunities for the PIG to promote itself (at no risk) in the international marketplace in presenting papers and attending and providing stands at international exhibitions and conferences.

DMG had many years' experience in promoting exhibitions and conferences around the world. They have:

- 38 offices worldwide
- £150 million turnover, and
- Seven major energy events annually, including the Global Petroleum Show.

They are planning for the exhibition to be held in Moscow between 13 and 15<sup>th</sup> September 2005. This will be a new event that will build on DMG's experience, intended to be a scaled-down version (at least initially) of the International Pipe Exhibition in Calgary. This had taken place since 2000 and was the largest pipeline event by a significant margin with 180

exhibitors, over 5,000 visitors and covering all aspects of the pipeline industry. DMG had partnered with *Expomedia* as their local Russian partner who'd successfully run more than 100 events in Moscow in 2004. A total of 1,800 m<sup>2</sup> exhibition space was planned in a former Olympic skating complex with a slightly smaller symposium than Calgary (300 papers). Their aim as their first attempt was to hold smaller, but successful exhibition.

To put the Moscow exhibition in context, the Russian pipeline network is the second largest in the world after North America with four times the length of pipelines in the OPEC countries. Their pipeline system provides 92% of Russia's GDP. Significant opportunities exist for pipeline business development with many new projects planned and with an overall \$47 billion to be invested in the next 10 years. Transneft and Gazprom were seen as the key potential clients. Feeder networks in the former FSU countries (eg Ukraine) were based in Moscow.

Richard GLENISTER had agreed to chair the Technical Steering Committee. The key emphasis was to be what western companies could bring to the Russians, but with an important emphasis being to learn from their experience of pipeline operation – historically run on a shoestring. The Russians are looking to improve their network of contacts and to invest, partly because they're now under pressure to meet their Kyoto commitments.

Specific product requirements had still to be defined. Pipeline integrity was thought to be a key issue, but services were required across the board.

The exhibition will provide an opportunity to get businesses in front of clients in a market where face-to-face contact is critical. Costs will be E3,105 for a 9m<sup>2</sup> stand and with sponsorship at E15,000. There is a need for a range of technical papers and support to build and demonstrate a credible level of expertise.

In discussion, Richard GLENISTER explained that he had agreed to chair the Committee as he had many contacts in Moscow. The PIG was looking for "state of the art technical papers". If this was successful, the PIG and DMG were looking to maintain a programme of such papers to be rolled out across the world subsequently and to build a long-term relationship to help PIG members.

It was not planned to hold a jointly organised show in UK at present as this was seen as a mature market and it was more difficult to get clients to attend conferences here than in less developed countries. Possible future markets may include India, Australia (Perth), South America and the "...stan" countries.

In discussion:

- The key issue was promoting UK pipeline technology.
- Richard GLENISTER asked how the PIG should progress this and how to identify suitable papers and presentations (all to be given in English). The conference and call for papers was to be publicised in *Pipeline World*.
- It was suggested the PIG should keep in touch with both UKOPA and UKOOA and seek their support.
- It was agreed that there was a need to involve not just operators but designers and builders, standards bodies, components suppliers, etc from all parts of the industry.
- It was asked if there was any scope for financial support to SMEs from UK Trade (DTI). This was being discussed by DMG. PIG members would need to see the exhibition as cost-neutral to be of benefit.
- The Russian are understood to have a particular interest in the UK's approach to health and safety management and the development of a safety culture at all levels.
- It was planned to involve Russian politicians and academics more than would be the case in the West.

### 3. NOTE OF THE MEETING OF 14<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER 2004: COMMENTS / ACTIONS

Item 3.1: Trans-Canada Pipeline: Stephen BLACKMAN had been unable to obtain an update on the two failures that occurred virtually simultaneously where corrosion defects were reported to have been the cause, as TCP were reluctant to provide further details.

### 4. UKOPA UPDATE

In the absence of both Phill JONES and Phil BROWN of UKOPA, Dick GRAY gave a brief update of UKOPA's last meeting. A summary of the 23 page minutes had been attached to the note of the 14<sup>th</sup> October 2004 meeting.

UKOPA circulates a lot of information on their website, though part is restricted to members only. The list of UKOPA's recent correspondence is attached below (Appendix 1).

[Further details regarding UKOPA and the development of a One Call system are covered in Item 6 below.]

### 5. SAFETY REPORTS AND THIRD PARTY INTERFERENCE:

#### 5.1 BELGIUM – FLUXYS' ZOMERGEN TO ZELZATE PIPELINE

Fluxys, the Belgian pipeline operator, had issued a press release on 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2004 confirming the need for them to replace the new Zomergem to Zelzate, 21 km, 600mm pipeline that had failed during the post-construction hydrostatic test due to quality problems. Failure was reported to have occurred at 101% operating pressure (the test was due to go to 120%).

[The press release had been circulated with Phil PARKINSON's e-mail of 9<sup>th</sup> December 2004.]

In discussion:

- Short-term hydrostatic test in the mill – typically of 10 seconds or less – was considered unlikely to have revealed the problem.
- Problems were reported with pipelines certificated to API 5L in terms of dimensions, seam welds or seamless pipes. Tolerances were considered to be crude and quality control in the mills was often a problem.
- Significant damage may also be caused during construction (dents, gouge marks, ovality, etc). The importance of post-construction hydrostatic tests was reiterated.

#### 5.2 SULLOM VOE – SKIP LORRY

A skip was reported to have been blown from a lorry en-route to BP's Sullom Voe Terminal.

#### 5.3 EYE LOSS DUE TO FAILURE OF TOOTH ON BACKHOE BUCKET

Loss of an operator's eye was reported due to the failure of a tooth on the backhoe's bucket that failed and passed into the cab.

### 6. PROMOTION OF A ONE-CALL SYSTEM

#### 6.1 UKOPA

Dick GREY reported that UKOPA had no specific initiative for the development of a One Call system.

He reported that Mark HARRISON of Huntsman was coordinating details of all infringements but he had not been at the last UKOPA meeting and had not provided any feedback. No report was available yet. Phil BROWN (Transco) was the new chair of UKOPA. Transco had published a paper recently on working in proximity to their pipelines.

UKOPA's plans were not known, nor ICE's thoughts – though Dick thought there was a need to cooperate.

In discussion, it was said that the utilities were reluctant to cooperate with ICE or PIG. The Ordnance Survey had a useable database: they could add layers easily, but the key problems were

- Who would pay for this, and
- Who manage the data and the project?

Above ground details were available on OS plans, but not subsurface information.

## 6.2 ORDNANCE SURVEY

Rob WILLIAMS (Utilities Panel) had forwarded to Brian SPENCER a copy of the letter from the Ordnance Survey that referred to an event with ICE. (A copy, in three parts, will be attached to the e-mail circulating this meeting note.) The letter included reference to third party interference and a proposed report for publication in January 2005.

## 6.3 PIG 's POTENTIAL INVOLVEMENT

The following points arose in the discussions with the Utilities Panel:

- It was understood that third party interference was high on UKOPA's agenda since Phil BROWN (Transco) had taken over their chair.
- PIG should seek to avoid duplication not only with UKOPA but also with ICE / OS.
- UKOPA was understood not to have developed any impetus of late on the need for a One Call system.
- The issue was on the Utilities Panel's agenda.
- Richard GLENISTER had met Mike TALBOT of DFT to promote a seminar on recoding all utilities' data. Mark COVELL (OS) seemed keen to facilitate all parties to map data on the basis of OS grid coordinates. But the OS will not / cannot manage the project. This was clearly an issue: the OS needed a pump primer with a commercial interest.
- It was felt the OS seemed a good body through whom to channel PIG's efforts. The PIG's Technical Forum (in Birmingham) failed to agree actions or what should be done next, though there was a wish to avoid duplicating others' efforts.
- On Call went quiet – it's "parked" as the result of government initiatives. The current position was not clear to those present. Transco had withdrawn funding. Richard GLENISTER had been asked not to run the system when he took over as Director General of the PIG. Nobody was thought to be driving this forward.
- A comment was made "it needs a major accident to prompt any action". This was countered by noting the complete lack of any reaction in the media, from MPs and from any other sources after the pipeline failure that resulted the 26 deaths at Ath, Belgium.
- It was agreed that if similar accident were to occur on the UK, the PIG would be criticised, even though the operator would be held directly responsible.
- Major cross-country pipeline were originally included in the One Call initiative. The government had appointed a consultant that had looked at issues such as road congestion, but had not considered issues related to potential direct damage to pipelines. DTI's Richard WEBB was to be contacted after the Birmingham Technical Forum (also regarding an initiative reported by NJUG).
- The key point was that nobody seems prepared to fund One Call at present.
- The improved Linewatch initiative sought to increase awareness at all levels. Incidents were reported at every UKOPA meeting. It was only a matter of time before

a major incident occurred. Fisher German can enquire on the web about utilities' plant at no cost (and low cost to the operator) at about £1 per enquiry (cheaper with more users) giving an instant answer and e-mail confirmation. UKOPA didn't want to know – it was seen as a “commercial pitch”.

- Why was UKOPA collecting infringements? To identify bad actors (mainly contractors) and notify the HSE. 2004 would be the first year using the same format. UKOPA statistics suggest landowners rather than contractors seem to be the principal culprits. Not sure of HSE's senior management will provide practical support (this needs to be discussed with Alan THAYNE).
- The US had imposed regulatory requirements to protect pipelines. The situation was different in the UK where there was a non-prescriptive approach regulated by the HSE.
- What was in it for the Guild? Is the PIG looking to facilitate and be involved or merely be kept aware of what others are doing? PIG had said it wants to drive this (as per the Cheshire initiative). How should the PIG let its position be known?
- If the transfer of information were the key issue, this was relatively easy, as the OS seemed to be suggesting. Were we nearer the One Call system than we thought? PIG had previously been hoping to get a commercial contract: this was no longer the case and needed to be publicised. Could there be anything in this for the Guild commercially? Will the PIG be criticised if there were an incident?
- Susiphone – not successful beyond Cheshire (though seems to work in Scotland). Moleseye not developed. Reliability of the data was an issue.
- Money is never available.
- Transco is a critical player as it operates 95% of the UK's major hazard pipelines. Phil BROWN's role was seen as crucial. This will change to a degree with the three new Network operators coming into play in the next few months.
- The OS' contact Mark COVELL was reported to be keen to give a presentation to PIG: he should be asked to give an update (similar to the presentation at Stoneleigh)?

Dick GRAY gave a brief presentation on Linewatch (video):

- Linewatch was a non-commercial operation
- From 1<sup>st</sup> January 2005 they would employ a full-time employee: Huntsman were expected to join.
- It is not a one-call system: aims to improve awareness and information: not an enquiry agency. Covers:
  - Government pipelines: 2,500 km
  - Esso Mainline: 1,150 km
  - UKOP (BPA)
  - Fina
  - Conoco
  - UNIPEN Manchester Jetline, and
  - Airport supplies (Heathrow, Gatwick, Stansted, Luton, etc), and
  - Other hazardous pipelines up to 100 bar.
- Can't assume the pipeline is on a straight line between markers. Give information on all markers and provide maps.
- Provide copies of their safe working booklet.
- Other pipeline-related infrastructures – e.g. CP bed and cables – may extend several hundred metres away from the pipeline easement.
- CONCAWE: reports on European failures and the leakage of oils. Third-party interference was by far the biggest cause (210m<sup>3</sup> residual – i.e. after cleanup): data are published annually. UK derived data were available from UKOPA

Linewatch's website is <http://www.linewatch.com>

In discussion, reference was made to examples of recent pipe failures

- US: Billingham; Walnut Creek, Ca
- UK: Hunton Hill, Birmingham, and Salisbury Plain.

A key consideration was how to address contractors in terms of both the Duty of Care to ensure information was passed to them and the requirement to supervise their work (after ensuring they're competent).

**ACTION:** Brian SPENCER would contact Rob WILLIAMS of the Utilities Panel after Christmas to agree the actions to be taken to progress the One Call initiative and report to Panel members ahead of the next meeting.

7. STANDARDS UPDATE - PD8010

No further report.

8. ONSHORE PANEL'S TERMS OF REFERENCE: ACTIONS

At the next Panel meeting, members would be asked to agree the actions to promote and put into effect the Terms Of Reference for the Onshore Technical Panel. These are reproduced in Appendix 2, below.

9. CONFERENCES AND COURSES

No report.

10. PIG UPDATE (PIPELINES 2004, etc)

No report.

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

**COMPETENCE MATRIX:** Members were asked to review / add their entries on the matrix originally produced by Bill HUGHES (see Appendix 3) and return their details to Phil PARKINSON before the next meeting. (An electronic copy would be attached to the note of this meeting.)

**BULGARIA – JANUARY, 2005:** The Pipeline Industries Guild had established a new international branch based in Sofia, Bulgaria to be known as the *Balkan and Black Sea Branch*.

Phil PARKINSON would circulate (see e-mail of 15<sup>th</sup> December 2005) the details of the planned visit and the INVITATION TO ATTEND AN ENERGY AND UTILITY EVENT to be held in Sofia, Bulgaria, 18th -23rd January 2005 that had been circulated by Richard GLENISTER.

12. NEXT MEETINGS

**Tuesday 15<sup>th</sup> February 2005:** venue to be confirmed.

**Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> April 2005:** venue to be confirmed.

Phil PARKINSON  
20<sup>th</sup> December 2004

## APPENDIX 1:

## UKOPA CORRESPONDENCE INDEX 2004

UKOPA/04/0096

Reference No.	Date Sent	To	From	Subject	No. of Pages
UKOPA/04/0001				Agenda for the Meeting held on 14/15 <sup>th</sup> January 2004.	3
UKOPA/04/0002				Notes of RAWG Meetings held on 10/9 and 3/12/003	2
UKOPA/04/0003				Draft notes of FDMG Meeting held on 10/9/03.	3
UKOPA/04/0004				UKOPA Work in Progress Report – Review of 2003 Activities – Draft.	10
UKOPA/04/0005				Pressure Equipment – Guidance Notes on the UK Regulations – November 1999.	52
UKOPA/04/0006				Use of Mechanically Propelled Vehicles on Rights of Way – Consultation Document	38
UKOPA/04/0007				Notes of PIG Meeting held on 16/12/03.	6
UKOPA/04/0008				Herbert Smith H&S Briefing – Responsibilities of Corporations and Directors.	4
UKOPA/04/0009				Proposed PERO Course – Overview, Core Material and Programme	5
UKOPA/04/0010				EPWG – Update Report January 2004	7
UKOPA/04/0011				Pressure Equipment User Responsibilities.	2
UKOPA/04/0012				MHSC Working Group on Pipelines – Update Report – January 2004	11
UKOPA/04/0013				Civil Contingencies Bill – Briefing Note for UKOPA	2
UKOPA/04/0014				Summary of Presentation made by Richard Glenister – DG of PIG on 15/1/04.	4
UKOPA/04/0015				Overheads used by Richard Glenister in his presentation.	11

Reference No.	Date Sent	To	From	Subject	No. of Pages
UKOPA/04/0016				Pipeline Integrity Management – 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Interference – Presentation by Cees Voermans	10
UKOPA/04/0017				Notes of UKOPA Meeting held on 14/15 <sup>th</sup> January 2004.	30
UKOPA/04/0018				GIS – Revolutionising Working Practice.	14
UKOPA/04/0019				Updated Members Contact Details List	7
UKOPA/04/0020				Substances Prioritisation for the Development of EU Acute Exposure Toxicity Thresholds: Risk Informed Decision Making	7
UKOPA/04/0021				Further request for vies of UK Stakeholders on Substances Prioritisation for the Development of EU Acute Exposure Toxicity Thresholds in the context of the EU Acutex Project	8
UKOPA/04/0022				Acutex – List and UK Priority of Substances	
UKOPA/04/0023				Acutex – Paper prepared for CAP-EPLG	8
UKOPA/04/0024				Acutex – Criteria used by HSE to select the top 10 substances.	1
UKOPA/04/0025				Acutex – HSL’s Preliminary Overview of Factors of Importance	12
UKOPA/04/0026				Overheads used By Lindsay Boswell in the Presentation – BP Grangemouth Pipelines, Aerial Surveillance – Expert Panel Review	6
UKOPA/04/0027				HSE Operational Strategy for the Pipeline and Natural Gas Supply Industries - 2003/2006	13
UKOPA/04/0028	26/03/04	Jurgen Wettig	Roger Ellis	. Proposed Pipeline Safety Instrument	1

Reference No.	Date Sent	To	From	Subject	No. of Pages
UKOPA/04/0029	10/03/04	Peter Sargent	Phill Jones	Proposed Amendments to PSR 1996	2
UKOPA/04/0030	17/03/04	Phill Jones	Peter Sargent	Response to UKOPA/04/0029	2
UKOPA/04/0031				Infringement Database Update – January 2004	2
UKOPA/04/0032				Paper – GIS Revolutionising Work Practice	14
UKOPA/04/0033				PIG Technical Forum-Third Party Interference and Pipeline Security -17/02/04 – Slides of Presentation by Mark Harrison on the UKOPA Infringement Database	27
UKOPA/04/0034				Email dated 24/3/04 from S. Kennedy re review of HSE Guidance on Safe Isolation of Plant and Equipment Document	7
UKOPA/04/0035				Revised Draft – HSE Guidance on Safe Isolation of Plant and Equipment	87
UKOPA/04/0036				Fire Fighters' Lawsuit Dismissed	1
UKOPA/04/0037				Informal Notes of a P5 Meeting with HSE on 31/3/04 to Assess HSE Pipeline Risk Assessment Methods	6
UKOPA/04/0038	14/01/04	S.Coldrick	G Walker	Working Group on Pipelines Proposals for Future Working	1
UKOPA/04/0039				UKOPA Proposal for WGP Technical Work Programme	2
UKOPA/04/0040				WGP - Remit for the Working Party (Risk Assessment)	1
UKOPA/04/0041	3/02/04	G Walker	S.Coldrick	Response from S. Coldrick re UKOPA/04/0038	2
UKOPA/04/0042	6/04/04	P. Jones	M. Potter HSE	Email re Guidance on Operator	1
UKOPA/04/0043				PSR 1996 – HSE Additional Guidance on Operator	14
UKOPA/04/0044				HSE Liaison – UKOPA Strategy Notes of Meeting held at Ambergate on 29/03/04	7

Reference No.	Date Sent	To	From	Subject	No. of Pages
UKOPA/04/0045	April 2004	P. Baker HSE		COMAH 1999 – Review and Revision of Safety Reports	2
UKOPA/04/0046				EPWG Update April 2004 – with details of reserved allocations for PERO courses.	
UKOPA/04/0047				Informal Notes of a Second P5 Meeting with HSE at Bootle on 23 April 2004 to assess HSE Pipeline Risk Assessment Methods	3
UKOPA/04/0048				Summary Notes of Meeting on PERO Course – Wilton – 14/05/04	2
UKOPA/04/0049				HSE's Implementation of the Fundamental Review of Land Use Planning - 2 <sup>nd</sup> Issue of the IFRLUP Newsletter from the Project Manager Linda Murray	10
UKOPA/04/0049-1				Appendix 1 to UKOPA/04/0049 - Table 1 - LUP Principles adopted by HSE	5
UKOPA/04/0049-2				Appendix 2 to UKOPA/04/0049 – Major Hazards Land Use Planning Principles	2
UKOPA/04/0050				Pipeline Training International Ltd - Pipeline Testing Loop Outline of the Company.	2
UKOPA/04/0051				Agenda for the Meeting of 16/17 <sup>th</sup> June 2004	3
UKOPA/04/0052	11/06/04	D. Mitchell HSE	R. Ellis	Working Group on Pipelines Proposals for Future Working – UKOPA Delivery of WGP Technical Work Programme.	2
UKOPA/04/0053				UKOPA Work in Progress Report Review of 2003 Activities	10
UKOPA/04/0054				Updated Correspondence Index	4
UKOPA/04/0055				Notes of RAWG meeting 29/4/04	3
UKOPA/04/0056				Update on BSI / ISO Pipeline Standards June 2004 D Willis, Chairman BSI PSE/17/2 Committee	2

Reference No.	Date Sent	To	From	Subject	No. of Pages
UKOPA/04/0057				Report on ISO TC67 SC2 meeting Berlin – DIN Offices 25 <sup>th</sup> and 26 <sup>th</sup> May 2004 D Willis, Chairman BSI PSE/17/2 Committee	14
UKOPA/04/0058				EPWG Report – June 2004.	6
UKOPA/04/0059				WGP Report – June 14/6/2004.	6
UKOPA/04/0060				Notes of UKOPA Meeting held at Lensbury on 14 <sup>th</sup> /15 <sup>th</sup> June 04.	25
UKOPA/04/0061				Overheads used by Salvador Vasquez on his presentation on Pipeline Integrity Systems on 14/6/04.	16
UKOPA/04/0062				Determining Corrosion Growth Rates using Inspection Data – A paper by Julia Race GE Power Systems	13
UKOPA/04/0063				Determining the In –situ Tensile Properties of Pipelines using the Automated Ball Indentation (ABI) Technique – A paper by A C Russell, B.L.Jones and L.Manning GE Power Systems	13
UKOPA/04/0064				Fault Database Update June 2004	2
UKOPA/04/0065				Preliminary review of CONCAWE data	16
UKOPA/04/0066				Slides of Update by Mark Harrison on the UKOPA Infringement Database 15/6/04	47
UKOPA/04/0067	R. Ellis	D. Mitchell HSE		Working Group on Pipelines Proposals for Future Working – UKOPA Delivery of WGP Technical Work Programme	1
UKOPA/04/0068				Programme for the PD 8010:2004 Workshops.	4
UKOPA/04/0069				Initial report on Belgian Pipeline Failure.	1
UKOPA/04/0070	26/7/04	S. Howes Secretary to APEPLG	P Sargent HSE	Letter from P Sargent confirming HSE will not progress proposed amendments to PSR	1
UKOPA/04/0071	26/7/04	J Haswell Sec to WGP	P Sargent HSE	Letter from P Sargent confirming HSE will not progress proposed amendments to PSR	1
UKOPA/04/0072	29/6/04	G Walker Chairman WGP	D Mitchell HSE	Working Group on Pipelines – Proposals for Future Working	1

Reference No.	Date Sent	To	From	Subject	No. of Pages
UKOPA/04/0073	29/6/04	R Ellis Chairman UKOPA	D Mitchell HSE	WGP -Proposals for Future Working – UKOPA Delivery of WGP Work Programme	1
UKOPA/04/0074				Agenda for the Meeting of 15/16 <sup>th</sup> September 2004	3
UKOPA/04/0075				Email from Phil Brown Tranco re. the Non Transco Version of SSW2 –See UKOPA/04/0076	1
UKOPA/04/0076				SSW2 – Safe Working in the Vicinity of HP Pipelines – Non Transco Version	13
UKOPA/04/0077				UKOPA Rating Valuation Contacts	1
UKOPA/04/0078				UKOPA Network Rail Contacts	1
UKOPA/04/0079				UKOPA Standard Overhead Template	1
UKOPA/04/0080				Application of the Standard Overhead Template	1
UKOPA/04/0081				Notes of PERO Course Review Meeting Held on 27 <sup>th</sup> July 04	3
UKOPA/04/0082				Notes of the PIG Onshore Technical Panel Meeting of 9 <sup>th</sup> March 2004	4
UKOPA/04/0083				Notes of the PIG Onshore Technical Panel Meeting of 25th May 2004	4
UKOPA/04/0084				Updated Correspondence Index for 2004	6
UKOPA/04/0085				Further Information relating to the Belgian Pipeline Failure.	3
UKOPA/04/0086				Photographs of Damage associated with the Belgian Pipeline Failure.	2
UKOPA/04/0087				RAWG -Technical Work Programme Progress Report - 9/9/04	4
UKOPA/04/0088				HSE Strategy for Workplace Health and Safety to 2010 and beyond – issues for the Pipelines Industry – Presentation by Steve Chatfield to UKOPA on 16/9/04.	13
UKOPA/04/0089				HSE Principles for Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) in Support of ALARP Decisions	5
UKOPA/04/0090				Cost Benefit Analysis Checklist	5

## UKOPA/05/0004

Reference No.	Date Sent	To	From	Subject	No. of Pages
UKOPA/04/0091				Notes of the Meeting held at BG's <sup>th</sup> Offices, Reading on 15 /16th September 2004	23
UKOPA/04/0092				UKOPA HSE Interface – Proposal September 2004	8
UKOPA/04/0093				Fluxys Pipeline Incident 30th July 2004	10
UKOPA/04/0094				Photographs Relating to Excavator Driver Injury	2
UKOPA/04/0095				Pipelines Directive – List of Articles.	17
UKOPA/04/0096				Updated Index 15/10/04.	7

## APPENDIX 2

### TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE PIG'S ONSHORE TECHNICAL PANEL

The Onshore Technical Panel is made up of a group of Pipeline Industry experts with experience in the manufacture, construction, operation, maintenance, design, construction, commissioning, decommissioning and health, safety and environmental aspects of pipeline engineering. Its members include practitioners, managers, legal representatives and consultants. The primary roles of the forum are as follows:

- To act as a focal point for technical issues related to pipelines on behalf of Guild Members
- To meet on a regular basis and discuss current areas of concern to members
- To propose solutions to both individual members and to the Guild Board
- To provide information to allow lobbying of appropriate bodies on any pipeline related issues
- To liaise with the Utilities and Offshore Panels on areas of common interest
- To propose topics and assist with the organization of six monthly Technical Forums on subjects of key interest to Guild Members
- To consider recent incidents from around the world and to assess with the UK pipeline industry is taking sufficient precautions to prevent similar occurrences – the most urgent of these is still the matter of a One Call System
- To consider any forthcoming changes to legislation and how that may impact on members
- To review presentations from external experts such as the Health & Safety Executive on possible future issues or areas of interest with a view to inclusion in future Technical Forums

### APPENDIX 3 (NEXT PAGE): INTERESTS / COMPETNCES OF ONSHORE PANEL MEMBERS



**UKOPA/05/0004**

<b>LINEPIPE</b>	Manufacture		X				X	X		X	
	Trenchless Technology		X	X				X	X		X
	Thrust Bores		X	X				X	X		X
	Augur Bores	X	X	X				X	X		X
	Directional Drilling		X	X				X	X		X
	Construction methodologies			X	X				X		X
	Hydrostatic Testing	X	X					X	X	X	
	Tunnelling								X		X
	Geo-technical investigation			X					X		X
	Linepipe Coatings						X		X	X	
	Failure Analysis						X		X		X
	Seminars				X	X	X				
	Associated Bodies				X	X					
	<b>SEMINARS &amp; TRAINING</b>	I.Chem.E.				X					
I.Gas.E					X	X		X		X	X
I.Mech.E.					X			X			X
I.P					X	X					
Training			X						X		X
web site							X				
I.Mar.E.S.&T		X							X		
RICS										X	
CAAV										X	
Cathodic Protection							X		X		
<b>CORROSION</b>	a.c. induced corrosion					X		X			
	Weld metal corrosion									X	
	Corrosion Control							X	X		
	Contacts	X	X				X				
<b>UKOPA</b>	ISO/API linepipe working group						X				
	BSI PSE17 & 17/2						X				