

Notes of the Meeting held at Guisborough Hall, Teesside on 18th/19th May 2005

Present:

P. Brown, Transmission Policy Manager, National Grid Transco (Chairman) (18th only).
R. Ellis, Manager, Pipeline Group, Shell UK Ltd.
M. Harrison, Olefins S&D Operations Manager, Huntsman Petrochemicals (UK) Ltd.
L. Boswell, Pipeline Availability Team Leader, bp FPSI.
N. Jackson, Transmission Policy Adviser, National Grid Transco.
K. Curtis, Pipeline Engineer, e.on UK Ltd.
R. White, General Manager, Total (UK) Ltd.
D. Cullen, Senior Pipeline Supervisor, Shell Expro.
P. Docherty, Mechanical Engineering Manager, Semcorp Utilities.
T. Taylor, Pipeline Plant Manager, Esso Petroleum Co. Ltd.
D. Gray, Pipeline Protection Engineer, Esso Petroleum Co. Ltd.
J. Varden, General Manager, OPA.
Paul Mitchell, Contract Manager, Unipen Ltd.
D. Perry, Engineering Manager Network Policy, National Grid Transco.
L. Haw, Huntsman Petrochemicals (UK) Ltd.
E. Reeder, Contract and Services Team Leader, Innovene, BP.
B. McKay, Pipeline Users Group (PLUG).
Martin Alderson, Network Integrity Engineer, National Grid Transco.
David Wilkes, BG Group.
J. Trounson, UKD Policy Manager – Transmission, National Grid Transco (19th only).
S. Chatfield, HSE (19th only).
P. Rycroft, HSE (19th only).
R. McConnell, Consultant.
J. Haswell, Consultant, Pipeline Integrity Engineers Ltd.
W. P. Jones, Pipeline Integrity Engineers Ltd, (Secretary).

Day 1 – 18th May.

1 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chairman thanked Mark Harrison and Huntsman Petrochemicals (UK) Ltd for hosting the meeting and extended a special welcome to Ed Reeder of BP, Linton Haw of Huntsman, and Martin Alderson of NGT who were attending for the first time. He also welcomed David Wilkes who was deputising for Ross Michie and Dan Vu of Advantica who was attending to give a presentation on Grouted Tee Technology

He also noted that John Trounson of NGT, Steve Chatfield and Peter Rycroft of the HSE and Mike Wastling of Advantica would be attending the meeting on the 19th May. Peter would be giving a

United Kingdom Onshore Pipeline Operators' Association

presentation on the HSE's Approach to Inspections and Mike Wastling will be giving a presentation on Vibration Related Failures.

2. **APOLOGIES.**

The Secretary reported that apologies had been received from:

P. Davis, Director and General Manager, BPA.

P. Williams, Head of Operations, UKD Construction National Grid Transco

M. Price, Operations Manager, BPA.

R. Michie, Transmission Operations Manager, BG Group – David Wilkes deputising.

3. **Presentation by Dan Vu, Advantica – Grouted Tee Technology**

Phil Brown welcomed Mr. Vu again and invited him to give his presentation. The overheads used in the presentation have been posted on the Association's website - reference UKOPA/05/0068 – and the content of the presentation was in line with the overheads.

The presentation covered:

- The background to the development.
- Grouted tee description.
- Qualifications Programme.
- Case Histories and Customer List.
- Benefits.

The presentation was well received by Members and some of the questions which arose in discussion are listed below:

Question: The presentation referred to gas pipelines. What is the situation regarding other products such as ethylene?

Answer: The grout does not interface with the product in the pipeline; the seal does. It is therefore a matter of selecting the correct seal.

Question: What is the cost?

Answer: Approximately £60k for a 36inch diameter. The total cost is cheaper than other methods because installation costs are considerably cheaper. This results from smaller installation crews and that the fact that installation is not affected by product flows.

Question: Reference was made to a 40 year life. What happens after 40 years?

United Kingdom Onshore Pipeline Operators' Association

Answer: The application is currently qualified for 40 years. It would need further testing to verify extended life beyond 40 years. This has not been requested to date.

Question: Who would an operator contact if he wanted to install a grouted tee?

Answer: Advantica provide the technical service and have the patent, but the Transco Pipeline Maintenance Centre at Ambergate and Firmanite are licensed to install the grouted tees.

Question: Does the grout provide a seal?

Answer: No, the grout cannot be guaranteed to provide a seal and is used to combat external loading.

Question: What are the maximum bending loads the tee can withstand?

Answer: The tee is designed to comply with the requirements of IGE/TD/1 and other pipeline standards,

Question: Can the tee be installed on offshore pipelines?

Answer: Advantica is currently progressing a joint project with an offshore contractor. The project involves diver assisted installation in shallow water.

Question: What surface finish is required for application of the grout?

Answer: The pipe is shot blasted in order to provide a good key for the grout.

The Chairman thanked Dan for an extremely interesting and informative presentation and for the time he had spared to attend the meeting to do so.

4. Presentations from Working Group Chairmen

The Chairman opened this agenda item by reminding all present that, following discussions at the last meeting, it had been agreed that it would be beneficial to all to receive short presentations from the Chairman of each Working Group on the work being progressed by the group. As agreed, the presentations will include a review of the Terms of Reference and Objectives and include confirmation that the original drivers still apply. Each presentation will be followed by discussion and consideration of any suggestions for changes.

4.1 Fault Data Management Working Group (FDMG) – Roger Ellis

The overheads used in the presentation have been posted on the Association's website - reference UKOPA/05/0069 – and the content of the presentation was in line with the overheads. The following questions were raised in discussion afterwards:

United Kingdom Onshore Pipeline Operators' Association

Question: During the presentation it was said that UKOPA failure data is an order of magnitude lower than the EGIG data. Is that correct?

Answer: Yes, the UKOPA failure data is an order of magnitude lower than the EGIG data, and it is very important that the data can be verified.

Question: Can the database be used to provide an indication of trends which can be used to target more effective surveillance, inspection and maintenance?

Answer: Yes it can. Interrogation of the data can provide an indication of the main reasons for failure and can be used to ensure the most effective inspection/surveillance and maintenance strategy in the safety and integrity management of pipelines.

Question: Where do we get the information to identify what we need to do to improve the performance and where do we discuss?

Answer: Periodic reports are issued which list the causes. It is noted however that the results are derived from the total pipeline population on the database and that operators need to review the results against their particular pipelines and operating conditions. Any queries can be directed to the Working Group or Members can attend to discuss or seek clarification on any matter.

In further discussion it was noted that it is important that Members continue to report and share experiences of failures and incidents, including lessons learned, so that best practice can be promoted in the industry and that the UKOPA database continues to provide data which is representative of UK pipelines.

The session was concluded with agreement that the work of Fault Database Management Group is fundamental to the safety management of pipelines and that the work should continue to achieve the stated objectives and deliverables.

The Chairman thanked Roger for the presentation.

4.2 Emergency Planning Working Group (EPWG) – Jane Haswell

Jane opened the presentation by reminding Members that due to the fact that the HSE has decided not to progress the proposed amendments to the Pipelines Safety Regulations, including the requirements for the testing of emergency plans and the intention to allow Emergency Planning Authorities to charge pipeline operators for such test. As a result, the workload of the EPWG had reduced considerably and recent effort had been directed at recording the work that had been completed to date relating to emergency plan testing. Consequently, the presentation is potted history of events.

United Kingdom Onshore Pipeline Operators' Association

The presentation covered terms of reference, original drivers, objectives, deliverables, programme and current status and overheads used in the presentation have been posted on the Association's website - reference UKOPA/05/0070. There were only two questions relating specifically to the presentation:

Question: There was an action to post the ACoP on the website, but that has not been done. Will it be?

Answer: Yes it will. Comments have been received and the document has been amended and will be posted on the website shortly.

Action: Jane Haswell.

Jane went on to say that the Working Group had been actioned to consolidate and place on record the work done relating to emergency plan testing, so that it can be used in the future if and when required. This action included submission of the draft ACoP and guidance text agreed with Local Authority Emergency Planners and HSE representatives, and the best practice document to the WGP for approval and submission to the MHSC with the recommendation for use when the issue is revisited in future. This has been done, so it is now recommended that these documents should be posted on the website. The recommendation was supported.

Action: Jane Haswell.

Question: Has any operator been requested to pay for the testing of an emergency plan?

Answer: No, to date a number of operators, particularly NGT have been involved in testing but have not been asked to pay anything, other than to fund their own resources.

In relation to preparation of Emergency Plans, it was reported by Martin Alderson that as a result of the Civil Contingencies Act Transco had been requested to supply similar information to that which had already been supplied previously to Local Emergency Planning Authorities for preparation of emergency plans, and that there appears to be little coordination between Emergency Authorities in this respect. As a result Transco has prepared a single standard document for use by the whole of Transco, and it was recommended that this approach could also be adopted by UKOPA. The suggestion was supported and, in response to an offer from the Transco representatives, it was agreed that a copy of the Transco document would be posted on the website in the first instance.

Action: Neil Jackson and Phill Jones.

It was noted that the Emergency Planning Work Group also manages the development and organisation of PERO (Pipeline Emergency Response Officer) Courses, and Roger Ellis reported details of planned courses and availability as follows:

Course Dates:

- June 28th & 29th - Fully Booked

United Kingdom Onshore Pipeline Operators' Association

- Sept 21st & 22nd - 7 places available.
- Nov 22nd & 23rd - 8 places available.

Costs:

- £420 per person.

Roger also commented that a cross selection of Member representatives does contribute greatly to the success of the course and, in this respect, Paul Docherty suggested that consideration should be given to inviting representatives of the Emergency Planning Authorities. The suggestion was supported and Jane Haswell and Ken Thomas were actioned to progress with John Wilson.

Action: Jane Haswell and Ken Thomas.

It was also noted that with the impending retirement of Ken Thomas Jane Haswell will take over the role of providing formal feedback from PERO courses.

Action: Jane Haswell.

The Chairman closed the session by stating that the Emergency Planning Group was now fairly dormant but would continue to complete the consolidation of work to date and to oversee the continued development and planning of the PERO courses on behalf of the Association. This was supported by Members.

The Chairman thanked Jane for the presentation.

4.3 Risk Assessment Working Group – Rod McConnell

The presentation by Rod covered terms of reference, rationale for the work programme, delivery to date, actions planned for the next meeting and specific points. The overheads used in the presentation have been posted on the Association's website - reference UKOPA/05/0071 – and the content of the presentation was in line with the overheads. The following questions were raised in discussion afterwards:

Question: There has been a long history of attempting to resolve land use planning issues and to agree open and transparent approaches with the HSE, and it appears that this has been associated with changes of management within the HSE. Is there confidence that the situation can be driven to a successful conclusion this time?

Answer: This is one of the reasons for the formation of the Working Group on Pipelines (WGP) and, although a successful conclusion cannot be guaranteed, there is confidence – but no guarantee - that the work will result in common understanding and consistent interpretation. In this connection it was noted that there has recently been good cooperation by the HSE and an apparent desire to achieve the same objective.

United Kingdom Onshore Pipeline Operators' Association

Question: Liaison with the HSE on land use planning issues indicates expectancy that Operators should either divert or strengthen pipelines. What is the situation relating to risk reduction by alternative measures such as increased depth or slabbing?

Answer: Risk reduction by alternative measures is being progressed as part of the work programme.

In this connection it was noted that there is inherent risk involved in diverting and working on pipelines, and that this should be taken into account in discussions.

There followed a long discussion on the history of the use of QRA relating to pipelines, and specific reference was made to the paper by Rod McConnell titled UKOPA History of Land Use Planning which is posted on the website – reference UKOPA/05/0042. This is recommended reading for all Members. In addition it was noted that a paper is to be presented at a conference in Lake Buena Vista, Florida in May 2005 on the predictive model developed for UKOPA by Advantica in 2004. The paper will be prepared and presented by Bob Andrews of Advantica with the approval of UKOPA, and Neil Jackson accepted an action to provide a copy for posting on the website.

Action: Neil Jackson.

In conclusion it was agreed that the work of the Working Group was still very relevant to the needs of Members and that the work programme should progress as planned

The Chairman thanked Rod for the presentation.

4.4 Working Group on Pipelines -WGP (including Working Group – Risk Assessment)– Jane Haswell

The presentation covered terms of reference, original drivers, objectives, deliverables, programme (chronology) and current status and overheads used in the presentation have been posted on the Association's website - reference UKOPA/05/0072. The following questions were raised in discussion afterwards:

Question: What is the timescale for issue of the proposed code supplements on risk assessment associated with land use planning?

Answer: The first draft was agreed at the joint meeting with BSI and IGEM on the 10th May in terms of the scope. The committee draft which would be issued for technical consultation is scheduled for the beginning of September and the final draft is scheduled for the beginning of October. The drafts for each stage will be issued by both BSI and IGEM, and publication is currently targeted for the first quarter of 2006.

Question: Will the code supplements only cover MAHPs?

United Kingdom Onshore Pipeline Operators' Association

Answer: Yes as land use planning currently applies to MAHPs only. The supplements could however be amended to cover other pipelines if the the current regime were changed e.g. as a result of the publication of the proposed Pipeline European Directive.

Question: At which stage will the HSE comment on the supplements?

Answer: The HSE has stated that it wishes to be involved in the process and is represented on both committees by Alan Thayne. It is understood that Alan will invite the MSDU comment on the supplements and there is a possibility that the MSDU may attend committee meetings as well.

Question: Will the supplements be subject to independent audit and/or peer group review?

Answer: Independent audit is not considered necessary at the moment, as the supplements will be given extensive checks as part of the development process. The supplements will however be subjected to peer group review and the HSE has asked the WGP to provide suggestions in this connection. It was also noted that the supplements will need the agreement of the HSE as representatives of the committees before they are issued for public consultation.

The session closed with Members agreement that the work of the WGP was fundamental to the Associations' goals relating to land use planning, and that continued support and commitment was essential towards that purpose.

The Chairman thanked Jane for the presentation.

4.5 Infringement Working Group – Mark Harrison

The presentation covered the objectives of the working group, progress relating to the objectives, areas of success and current activities and issues, and the overheads used in the presentation have been posted on the Association's website - reference UKOPA/05/0073. The following questions were raised in discussion afterwards:

Question: Do you see the communications matrix providing information which could be developed into a UKOPA best practice document?

Answer: It depends on the results received but it is possible that this could be the case.

Question: If the less severe categories were removed, would the trend be the same?

Answer: Not sure of the answer, but the exercise would be worthwhile and will be actioned.

Action: Mark Harrison.

Question: Is, or can the data be categorised by zones such as rural and suburban?

United Kingdom Onshore Pipeline Operators' Association

Answer: No. This is something that could be developed in time if appropriate, but the database is by necessity (early stages) fairly simple at this time.

Question: Can the database show who is improving?

Answer: It will be able to do so in time. It is also worth noting that the HSE has a target to reduce accidents and that the support of the HSE in this initiative has been excellent and has proved to provide results in terms of the attitude of offending contractors who have been contacted by them.

Question: It is noted that landowners/tenant are the highest transgressors. What can be done about these?

Answer: Review landowner/tenant visitor briefing with emphasis on proposed activities in the vicinity of pipelines. The HSE pipeline inspectors have also indicated that they would be happy to arrange for their agricultural colleagues to visit persistent offenders.

Question: The results relate to the sponsors of an activity. What is being done regarding the contractors who actually cause the infringement?

Answer: Consideration is currently being given to the possibility of targeting construction training boards in order to ensure that pipeline awareness and the need for prior investigation on presence etc is included as part of the training.

Mark then requested Members feedback/support on specific issues as follows:

(i) Should the format of the reporting form be amended as recommended to include an additional field to confirm whether the infringement activity had been prenotified?

This was discussed and supported, and it was also agreed that two further fields should be added; one to provide an opinion whether increased surveillance would have prevented the situation, and one to identify whether the infringement was in a rural or suburban area as discussed earlier.

Action: Mark Harrison

(ii) Consideration is being given to the development of a web based system so that Members can up date on line.

The proposal was accepted.

Action: Mark Harrison.

(iii) HSE proposal to make an input to 'Utility Week' – HSE suggest drafting an article and having it issued under the UKOPA banner?

United Kingdom Onshore Pipeline Operators' Association

The proposal was supported and Steve Chatfield agreed to ask Jim Stancliffe to recommend magazines for publishing the article.

Action: Mark Harrison and Steve Chatfield.

(iv) Proposal to combine forces to fund a venue for a joint seminar with NGT on asset protection.

The proposal was supported.

Action: Mark Harrison.

(v) The Working Group will circulate the communications for Members to complete and the Group will review and attempt to identify best practice.

Action: Mark Harrison.

Donal Cullen noted that Shell Expro had been provided with a copy of Transco's video on SS22 - Safe Working Near to High Pressure Pipelines the content of which is considered to be excellent, and that Shell Expro is using the DVD (with Transco's approval) without amendment for issue to third parties relating to the control of activities in the vicinity of Shell Expro pipelines.

In response Mark Harrison stated that the Infringement Working Group is aware of the video and is considering how it might be used at minimum cost as a best practice approach by UKOPA.

The Chairman concluded the session with agreement of Members that the development of the Infringement Database has been worthwhile and successful, and that it should be progressed as planned.

The Chairman thanked Mark for the presentation.

5. Feedback and Discussion on the Format of Future Meetings

Phil Brown opened this item by referring to the email he had sent to Members and the feedback which had been collated into a single document and circulated to Members, reference UKOPA/05/0053, and noted that it is apparent from the feedback that Members are suggesting a more balanced meeting with:

- i) Greater participation by Members.
- ii) A higher emphasis in operational/day to day matters.
- iii) Careful selection of presentations which are relevant to Operator activities.
- iv) More focused reporting by the Working Groups.
- v) Less administrative/financial discussions – these should be covered by the Management Council.

United Kingdom Onshore Pipeline Operators' Association

Following the initial feedback Phil had issued a further email to Members asking for suggested topics for future meetings and the feedback from this one had been collated and circulated to Members; reference UKOPA/05/0061. This document shows an interest in a range of relevant matters with high interest relating to intelligent pigging, condition monitoring of unpiggable pipelines and management of third party infringements.

He noted that the format of future meetings had been discussed at the Management Council meeting held earlier in the day, taking account of Members' feedback, and that it had been agreed that the content needed to be rebalanced but that it would be difficult to implement a total change by the September meeting. Following lengthy discussion it had been agreed to recommend the following to Members for the September meeting:

(i) Presentations to be received on the following if they can be organised in the time available:

- Pipeline hydraulic modeling package by Atmos International – R. Ellis to arrange.
- Use of ISDN Private Wire Circuits for the Transmission of Data. (title to be confirmed) – D. Cullen to arrange.
- Feedback from HSE Inspections of Contractors – Mark Harrison to arrange.

Action: Roger Ellis, Donal Cullen and Mark Harrison.

The presentation on Pipeline Failures by Jane Haswell was to be kept in reserve for a future meeting or for the September meeting if any of the above could not be arranged.

(ii) In terms of operational activities and Members' participation, it had been agreed at the Management Council meeting that Members who had recommended intelligent pigging would be asked to liaise with each other with the objective of proposing a framework at the September meeting for a presentation on pigging at the January 2006 meeting. The proposal to include details on proposed presenters which can be external presenters or Members or a combination of both. The proposal was discussed and accepted and Shell Expro (Donal Cullen), Shell UK Ltd (Roger Ellis), Transco (Neil Jackson) and BP (Lindsay Boswell) accepted the action to progress the matter.

Action: Donal Cullen, Roger Ellis, Neil Jackson and Lindsay Boswell.

In conclusion the Chairman thanked all Members for the feedback which had been received and asked all to continue to consider how the meeting could be improved and to provide feedback as and when appropriate.

Day 2 – 19th May.

Roger Ellis took over the Chair in the absence of Phil Brown and welcomed John Trounson, UKD Policy Manager – Transmission, National Grid Transco attending as a Member for the first time, and Peter Rycroft of the HSE and Mike Wastling of Advantica who were attending to make presentations.

6. NOTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (15th/19th January 2005 - UKOPA/05/0027)

The notes of the meeting held on 19th and 20th January 2005 were accepted as a fair record of the discussions and were signed off by the Chairman.

7. Actions Arising (not covered on the agenda)

7.1 UKOPA Incident Reporting Form. (6.4)

The Infringement Working Group to consider the use and validity of the UKOPA Incident Reporting Form.

Mark Harrison confirmed that this had been added to the Infringement Working Group's list of actions and that he will report back on the matter at a future meeting.

Action closed.

7.2 Standard Pipeline Crossings. (6.5)

- (i) Phil Brown and Dick Gray to forward Transco and Esso documents to Donal Cullen.
- (ii) Members who are prepared to share their company details were requested to forward information to Donal Cullen.
- (iii) Donal Cullen to review the Transco and Esso documents and report back.

Donal Cullen reported that he had recently received the document from Transco and that he will prepare a draft UKOPA document based on the Transco document for consideration by Members. Neil Jackson offered to assist and this was accepted.

Action: Donal Cullen and Neil Jackson.

7.3 Network Rail. (6.6)

Phil Brown agreed to consider in conjunction with Network Rail whether aspects of the Transco agreement could be shared with Members.

In the absence of Phil Brown, Neil Jackson reported that there has not been much progress on this issue. Network Rail have terminated the National Agreement with Transco and are reviewing how they wish to progress, and when there is something in place Transco will investigate the possibility of sharing with Members.

It was noted that this agreement relates to new pipelines and both John Vardon and Roger Ellis enquired whether any Member had any feedback regarding Network Rail's aspiration to increase revenues from existing pipeline crossing licenses. No Member had any specific recent experience to report, and in response to a question by John Vardon, UKOPA Members agreed that they would resist any proposals

from Network Rail and landowners for pipeline wayleave/ easement costs based on pipeline throughput pipeline throughput.

Action: Members.

7.4 List of MAHP Operators. (9.2.1)

Phill Jones to write to Steve Chatfield to request a comprehensive list of operators.

Action completed and closed.

The Chairman noted that a list that was received appears to be incomplete and out of date and that it has been circulated to Members for updating based on the knowledge of Members. He stated that this is currently ongoing and placed a deadline of 27th May for the feedback from Members following which Phill Jones would respond to the HSE with any additional information provided.

Action: Members and Phill Jones.

7.5 UKOPA Fact sheet (9.2.1(iii))

Phil Jones and Peter Davis to amend the draft to include details of the entitlements of the three categories of Membership, and to consider improving the presentation.

It was reported that Phil Brown had accepted an action to progress this with the Transco PR Department.

Action: Phil Brown.

7.6 Reports from PIG (11.2)

Phil Brown to attend a future meeting of the Panel, at which time he would make a short presentation regarding UKOPA and its activities.

Phil Brown has accepted an invitation to attend a meeting of the Panel in July.

Action closed.

7.7 Working Group on Pipelines

- (i) J Haswell will request that a formal review of HSE LUP zones for pipelines is recorded under this item. (13.1)

Jane Haswell reported that this action had been raised with the MSDU in April and that Moira Wilson had stated that the timescale for agreeing use of revised LUP zones should be dictated by completion of

United Kingdom Onshore Pipeline Operators' Association

revised models and HSE's operational priorities. She advised against setting a timescale for a formal revision of LUP zones, as this would be complicated by non-technical roll out issues such as mapping and supply of information to local authorities. There was no date set for the matter.

Action closed.

- (ii) Rod McConnell to update the list clearly summarising the issues which UKOPA is seeking to resolve and agree with HSE to reflect recent developments. (14.1.1)

It was agreed that this action had been cleared through the paper produced by Rod titled UKOPA - History of Land Use Planning – reference UKOPA/05/0042.

Action closed.

7.8 RAWG (14.1)

Rod McConnell to review and amend the plan and submit to the Management Council for revised approval

It was agreed that this would be progressed outside the meeting, by Rod McConnell and Phill Jones.

Action closed for this meeting.

7.9 EPWG

- (i) PERO Issues – Training, Competence and Future Plans (16.1.2)

Roger Ellis suggested that it would be useful to publish details and updates relating to PERO courses on the website. This was supported and Ken was actioned to ask John Wilson to speak to Phill Jones on the matter.

Details of PERO courses have been received and are reported under 4.2. Jane Haswell was actioned to speak to John Wilson regarding the possibility of providing a link from the UKOPA website to the Sembutilities site to avoid the need to continually update the UKOPA site.

Action: Jane Haswell

- (ii) Emergency Planning Issues and Development of the ACoP (16.2.1)

(a) When finalised, UKOPA/05/0019 should be posted on the public section of the website complete with document number, revision number and date.

Reported under 4.2 – **Action on Jane Haswell and Phill Jones.**

(b) Following formal approval by the EPWG, UKOPA/05/0018 is to be submitted to the Working Group on Pipelines for review and submission to MHSC/ACDS.

Action completed. Further action raised to post the document on the open section of the website,

Action: Phill Jones.

(c) Management of damaged pipelines - members operating liquid pipelines to consider whether they could make internal company procedures (or part procedures) available to EPWG for this purpose. (16.2.2)

Jane reported that there had been no progress on this issue and suggested the action should be combined with the ongoing action relating to the PD8010 questionnaire. This was agreed.

Action: Jane Haswell.

7.10 Group of Experts to Advise the Commission on a Strategy for dealing with Accidents in the Transport Sector (refs UKOPA/04/0099 to 0101 inclusive) (16.4)

Tony Taylor to keep UKOPA informed of discussions.

Tony Taylor reported that Servie Simons of Shell had attended the plenary meeting and that attendees had been advised to proceed on the basis of independent investigation, possibly a European body. It is not at all clear how this will be progressed and is being resisted in terms of pipelines as it is considered that the emphasis should be on preventing incidents in the first instance.

Jane Haswell asked whether this is a proposal to set up a European equivalent to the US Office of Pipeline Safety which has a role in investigating incidents and making recommendations to changes in legislation and codes. In response Tony said that the intention is not clear at this stage.

Tony went on to advise that the next meeting is to be held in July when Members will be asked to describe the pipeline legislation in their home countries. He added that the notes of the meetings are confidential and cannot be circulated, but agreed to keep Members informed.

Action: Tony Taylor.

7.11 Third Party Infringements (17.2)

UKOPA report on third party infringements should be posted on the public section of the website. The suggestion was supported by Members, and Mark Harrison agreed to prepare a draft of a report for posting on the website for approval at the May meeting.

Covered under section 4.5.

7.12 UKOPA WEBSITE – Development and Management. (18.2)

Phill Jones was actioned to investigate two queries raised by Members:

- i) Can Members change the allocated password to another chosen by themselves?

Phill Jones reported that it would be possible for Members to change their passwords, but members will have to email the request to “darryn@visualnetcentre.com”, complete with the new password and their existing username and password for a security check. The password will then be changed and confirmed.

Action closed.

- ii) The right click of the mouse –“save target as” – should allow saving to disc but this does not work?

Phill Jones reported that this problem was related to a small number of documents and had now been resolved.

Action closed.

7.13 Safe Isolation of Plant and Equipment. (20.2)

A revised version of the document is to be issued in due course, and this will be reviewed by Stuart Kennedy and Dave Perry on behalf of UKOPA, and taking account of the Association's comments.

The Chairman advised that the revised document has been issued and circulated to Members for comment by 24th April in order to allow a consolidated reply to be prepared and submitted by the due date. He also confirmed that the comments should be sent to Dave Perry.

Action: Members and Dave Perry.

7.14 Policy and Procedures Manual. (23)

Phil Brown to address the comments and reissue the manual as an approved UKOPA document.

Action completed and closed.

7.15 UKOPA Work in Progress Report – Review of 2004 Activities. (24)

Following implementation of comments an updated version of the document will be submitted by Jane to the Management Council for approval to place on the open section of the website.

Action completed and closed.

7.16 Format of Future Meetings. (25.1)

- i) Members to consider how they might wish to restructure the agenda of future meetings and submit suggestions to the Chairman and the secretary. In particular, should the agenda include other issues that people are involved with on a day to day basis such as maintenance and reliability.
- ii) The format of the next meeting to be restructured as follows:
 - Day 1 – Presentations from the Chairman of each Working Group including a review of Terms of Reference and Objectives including confirmation that the original drivers still apply. The presentations will be followed by discussion and consideration of any suggestions for changes.
 - Day 2 – Outstanding Actions from the January meeting.

It was agreed that these actions were being addressed under agenda items 4, 5 and 15.

7.17 Newcastle University – Research Projects. (25.2)

Newcastle University is looking for suggestions from industry for research projects to be carried out as part of the course and Members were asked to consider and submit any suggestions.

Rod McConnell reported that a number of suggestions had been received in response to the request and thanked those who contributed for their assistance and cooperation.

Action closed.

7.18 Safe Working Distances from Wind Powered Generators. (25.3)

Phil Brown reported that Advantica is being sponsored by Transco to look at safe working distances from wind powered generators and that consideration will be given to sharing the results with UKOPA Members when available.

Neil Jackson reported that Advantica had completed the work and had produced a draft report. Transco is prepared to share the work with UKOPA Members but will need to seek the permission of GAS Unie first because part of the information was provided with them. The work has considered three failure modes – blade failure, tower failure and motor failure and, subject to Gas Unie agreement step one would be to issue the report and step 2 would be to consider preparation of UKOPA/industry guidance on the issue.

Action: Phil Brown/Neil Jackson.

7.19 Hydrostatic Testing. (25.4)

The Chairman agreed to contact Brian to check if such an update could be provided relating to the presentation given to Members by Brian Woodhouse of Transco in September 2003.

No progress to report at this meeting. Neil Jackson will request a formal update from Brian Woodhouse.

Action: Neil Jackson.

All other actions covered on the agenda.

8. Presentation by Peter Rycroft, HSE – HSE Approach to Inspections

The overheads used in the presentation have been posted on the Association's website - reference UKOPA/05/0074 – and the content of the presentation was in line with the overheads and, covered:

- Main Purpose for Inspection of Pipeline Operators.
- Main Legislation.
- Annual Reviews/Inspections – Generic Agendas.
- HSE –Recent Interests.
- Human Factors – HSE Concerns.

The presentation was well received by Members and some of the questions which arose in discussion are listed below:

Question: What triggers enforcement action by the HSE?

Answer: There is a HSE Enforcement and Management Model which can be viewed on the HSE website. It is difficult to apply in hazardous situations but is use as guidance. The enforcement decision will depend on how serious the problem and whether it is repetitive. Typically though the route would be improvement notice in the first instance, then an enforcement notice (prohibition) and in an extreme case prosecution. Enforcement records are available for viewing on the HSE website.

Question: What is your guidance on competency assessment?

Answer: It is to provide a single answer on this issue as it would need to be based on a case by case basis. In general however it would be based on experience, knowledge and qualifications and that operators must have the necessary abilities and skills to meet the required standards at all levels.

Question: Do you find differences between operators in response to the goal setting regime?

Answer: Yes, and the HSE will provide advice where considered necessary with the objective of promoting an acceptable minimum standard.

United Kingdom Onshore Pipeline Operators' Association

Question: How does the HSE satisfy itself that it is visiting everyone who is an MAHP Operator, there may be such Operators that the HSE is unaware of?

Answer: It is possible that such a situation could exist particularly for an MAHP which was constructed pre the notification requirements.

Question: In dealings with other inspectors such as the Environmental Agency it is noticeable that they receive direct feedback from the public. Do MAHP inspectors receive the same type of feedback?

Answer: There is very little awareness of pipelines and consequently there is very little or no feedback or queries from the public in this area.

Question: What are your views on approaches to the Major Accident Prevention Document (MAPD)?

Answer: The MAPD does not always receive the attention it deserves and can be generic. The value of the MAPD is very much down to the operator and commitment by the company, an MAPD used properly can provide the same results as a safety case.

The Chairman thanked Peter for a most informative and topical presentation and for the time he had spared to attend the meeting to do so.

9. Presentation by Mike Wastling, Advantica – Vibration Related Failures.

The overheads used in the presentation have been posted on the Association's website - reference UKOPA/05/0075 – and the content of the presentation was in line with the overheads.

The presentation covered:

- Causes of Vibration Failures at Pressure Reduction Stations
- Examples
- Advantica/Transco Approach to Tackling the Problem
- Progress to date and lessons learned.

Some of the questions raised in discussion were recorded as follows:

Question: In cases of failures, has experience shown that adjacent fittings have also been affected?

Answer: No, generally the fitting is at risk or it is not.

Question: What fittings are recommended?

Answer: Advantica/Transco recommend the use of weldoflanges in proximity to vibration sources.

United Kingdom Onshore Pipeline Operators' Association

Question: How many failures are being experienced?

Answer: Typically 2 to 3 per year and it is noticeable that the culture is changing. Personnel are now aware of the risks associated with vibration and its affect and are also aware that precautionary measures can be taken to reduce the risk of failure.

Question: Has the three stage approach been successful?

Answer: A great deal of time and effort was taken in preparing the questionnaires in order to avoid the need to request additional information, and the staged approach has been successful in identifying the sites most susceptible to failure based on the questionnaires. (Noted by Martin Alderson that the screening approach on his patch had reduced from over 100 sites in total to 35 and then down to 3). It has to be accepted however that the the screening process cannot be perfect, and that some may have been missed.

Question: Have the lessons learned resulted in any design changes, and in particular the type of regulators used?

Answer: Design recommendations have resulted from the work including use of quiet regulators where appropriate, selection of the type of fittings and the design of small bore pipework, including supports. Neil Jackson added that good design recommendations had already been included in Transco specifications and will be included in the next issue of IGE/TD/13 and, possibly PD8010.

Question: Is this a service that could be extended to other pipeline operators?

Answer: Yes it is, although it may need a slight variation to the approach. Contact details for enquiries are as follows:

Dr. Mike Wastling,
Asset Optimisation UK
Advantica Technologies Ltd
Ashby Road
Loughborough
Leicestershire LE11 3GR
Tel : +44 (0)1509 282161.

The Chairman thanked Mike for an informative and topical presentation and for the time he had spared to attend the meeting to do so.

10. H,S & E Issues

10.1 Actions Arising

On line inspection (10.1)

It was suggested that members should consider collating, comparing and reviewing on-line inspection data with subsequent investigation and measurement. It was agreed Phil Brown and Neil Jackson would consider this within Transco and advise whether a wider study would be of value. (Outstanding Action)

Neil Jackson reported that three papers had recently been issued relating to this issue:

- (i) UKOPA/05/0063 -A paper by Guy Desjardins of Morrison Scientific Inc, presented at Corrosion 2005, this paper presents a very good summary of the issues associated with ILI performance.
- (ii) UKOPA/05/0064 - A proposal that has been put together by Advantica for GERG (European Gas Research Group) this proposal is to examine the accuracies associated with ILI tools. BP is known to be one of the companies that are interested in participating in this project.
- (iii) UKOPA/05/0065 -A proposal that Advantica have put together for an external client to develop guidance on the different ILI techniques that are currently available and what techniques should be used in what circumstances.

10.2 Reports on Incidents

10.2.1 Shell Brent Bravo

Donal Cullen advised Members of an offshore incident which resulted in two people being killed and Shell being prosecuted and fined. A detailed investigation had been carried out and one of the underlying factors had been the narcotic effects of hydrocarbons.

In the discussion regarding the incident Roger Ellis noted that in terms of people killed from gas effects most were associated with nitrogen rather than the pipeline product.

10.2.2 Moling Operation

Peter Rycroft referred to an incident which occurred during the relaying of a service using the moling technique. The mole penetrated a sewer which became blocked and which caused was cleared by the contractor resulting in a syphon effect which cleared the water traps in the house. In clearing the blockage however the contractor cut the service pipe and the leaking gas tracked through the sewer into the house.

10.2.3 LNG Terminal Egypt

David Wilkes referred to an incident on an LNG terminal in Egypt in which four people were killed. A welder had had entered a large diameter stainless steel pipe which was full of inert gas to inspect a weld

and was overcome by the gas. Two colleagues entered the pipe to try and get him out and were followed by another. All four were overcome by the gas and died.

10.2.4 Overhead Cables

Mark Harrison advised Members of an incident which occurred on a plant in India where work was being carried out on equipment using a mobile scaffold platform. The mobile scaffold was moved and touched overhead cables which resulted in one of the workmen being killed and one being severely injured.

10.2.5 BP Refinery Texas

Lindsay referred to the incident which occurred on the BP owned refinery in Texas which resulted in 15 fatalities and advised Members that the report of the incident has been published and is available for viewing on the BP website.

11. Emergency Pipeline Repair Procedures, and Record of Pipeline Emergency Equipment and Spares.

11.1 Actions Arising (19)

(i) Donal to progress preparation of the spreadsheet, together with relevant contact details, for posting on the website after clearance by contributing Members. He noted that he would still welcome information from any Member who had not submitted to date.

(ii) Donal also to:

- Contact Cliff Chenery of NGT to enquire regarding the current position relating to the Ambergate Pipelines Maintenance Centre's ability to respond to pipeline emergencies – it is understood that the position may have changed recently.
- Investigate the availability of information relating to the pipeline repair club being operated in Holland.

Actions covered in the update below.

11.2 Update

Donal Cullen reported that he has received responses from a number of Members, but in certain cases the response was not complete and enquiries are to be issued seeking clarification. Initial indications are that there is little pipe held in stock by Operators; a little is held by Shell and it is likely that some is held by Transco although no details have been received regarding the latter. In terms of equipment, most kit is held by Shell and BP including stopple equipment and clamps.

United Kingdom Onshore Pipeline Operators' Association

Donal also reported that he had written to Cliff Chenery requesting clarification on the Ambergate situation and suggesting the possibility that UKOPA Members may be interested in a service on several levels – technical advice for a small fee, response to a problem and response to an emergency. Cliff had responded and had confirmed that the situation within Transco had changed and that Ambergate would be glad to provide a service if requested.

Donal also advised that he had investigated the situation in Holland and confirmed that 16 operators participate in a repair club involving services as listed in the previous paragraph.

Following discussion on the way forward, Donal advised that he was prepared to progress the matter if there is an interest. Dick Gray confirmed that Esso are very interested, and other Members were asked to confirm as soon as possible if they are interested.

Action: Members and Donal Cullen.

12. Pipeline Industrial - 2005 Rating Revaluation.

12.1 Actions Arising. (21)

(i) Peter Davis agreed to prepare a note of the key points relating to developments and reasons to challenge the costs quoted by the valuer. (Outstanding Action)

See update below.

(ii) A case is being developed based on construction cost of smaller diameter pipelines including age allowance. This could have a considerable impact on proposals, and discussions are ongoing with the valuer regarding the issue, and Peter Davis is to keep Members informed.

See update below.

12.2 Update

Roger Ellis reported on this issue and the overheads used in his presentation have been posted on the website – reference UKOPA/05/0077:

Roger advised that the industrial rate is a property tax which is based on the capital cost of replacing a pipeline and the rental it would attract. By definition this involves large sums of money.

The current revaluation is being contested through challenge of the cost elements which are being used to determine the revised level of rates. These elements are shown on the overheads and as can be seen the greatest impact by far is the proposed increase arising out of construction cost. These are based largely on project costs supplied by Transco, the evidence being mainly related to large diameter pipelines. A.B. Rhead have been engaged by Shell to undertake detailed analysis of the Transco costs.

United Kingdom Onshore Pipeline Operators' Association

Negotiations are ongoing with the UK Valuation office, but as yet no figures have been agreed. The Valuation office will however have advised all pipeline operators of the 2005/06 rates based on their initial valuation.

In response to a Member who asked whether discounts can be obtained for partial use, Roger confirmed that this was the case if it can be shown that a smaller diameter pipe than that installed could be used to deliver the product. He noted however that the saving/discount relates mainly to pipe material which in overall terms is very little as construction costs would be very similar e.g. for 8 inch and 12 inch diameter pipelines.

13. Feedback from the PD 8010 Questionnaire.

13.1 Actions Arising.

Jane Haswell accepted an action to prepare and circulate a questionnaire to Members. The questionnaire to be issued by the end of February and responses to be returned to Jane by end of April to allow collation and presentation of results at the May meeting. (12.1)

Jane Haswell reported that 11 responses from a total expected of a potential 13 responses have been received to date, and a number of the responses received require discussion with the relevant company to clarify understanding of the question/answer. In general however the responses indicate that in general operators operate their pipeline in line with PD8010 requirements.

In addition she noted that the UKOPA best practice document, which was prepared in 1997, is out of date and does not comply with sections of BS EN 14161/PD 8010, which is not mandatory, and legislation, which is mandatory. For example there is no mention of emergency plans in the UKOPA document.

Taking this into consideration she recommended that following receipt of the outstanding responses that:

- (i) A summary of the responses without names of member companies be circulated approximately 1 month before the next meeting, and that this be used to identify any gaps.
- (ii) The gap analysis is discussed at the September meeting and that volunteers are requested to form a small working group to update the best practice document for the January meeting.

The recommendation was supported.

Action: Jane Haswell.

14. Future Presentations

This was covered under section 5, but the Chairman requested Members to continue to consider possible contenders for future meetings and to submit recommendations regarding presentations at any time.

Action: Members.

15. Agenda for the September Meeting

The Chairman stated that this item had been covered in discussion under other items on the agenda and in particular section 5, and that agendas for future meetings will be organised around the feedback which had been received from Members. He then invited feedback from Members regarding the format of this meeting:

Comment: The meeting was much more informative, particularly for new and relatively new Members, and the presentations were very good in terms of content and delivery.

Comment: Agreed that the presentations were excellent and a review of the history etc of the Work Groups has been worthwhile as key factors can be lost if not involved on a regular basis. Support the earlier recommendation to read the UKOPA History of Land Use Planning.

Comment: The working groups should be given the opportunity to present the findings of their deliverables e.g. the addendums to PD8010

Comment: It is suggested that the Secretary should invite agenda items from Members about one month in advance of the meeting.

This suggestion was supported.

Action: Phill Jones

16. Any Other Business.

16.1 Membership Fees 2006

The Chairman advised Members that based on the expenditure forecast which was discussed at the Management Council meeting, available funds will slowly erode over the next eighteen months based on current expenditure plans. The level of reduction is however quite small and he advised that it had been decided to confirm to Members that membership fees for 2006 remain the same as for 2005 i.e. £10,000 for Full Members, £5,000 for Associate Members and £2,000 for Affiliate Members.

16.2 Notes of the Management Council Meetings

The Chairman also advised that in future notes of Management Council Meetings will be posted on the website, and if any Member wishes to see any of the supporting papers then they should formally request a copy via the Secretary.

16.3 Land Use Planning - PADHI

Neil Jackson advised Members that the currently PADHI is being operated by HSE inspectors but there is an intention to roll out PADHI Plus to the Local Planning Authorities. This will require maps of pipeline routes ideally in electronic format and this has given rise to concerns relating to compatibility issues, verification of the data, inappropriate use of the data and data control. The matter has been raised with the HSE and is currently under consideration.

16.4 Oil Spills

Tony Taylor informed Members that he had been made aware of the fact that National Guidelines are being prepared for Fire Brigades on how to deal with the environmental impact of oil spills. The team preparing the guidelines is headed up by Dave Hanton of the Oxford Fire Brigade.

16.5 Geospatial Conferences

Roger Ellis drew attention to an advert that he had recently seen relating to forthcoming geospatial conferences, and to a statement in the advert relating to buried services which states that "it is now a legal requirement to make the records digital". He asked if anyone was aware of this legal requirement but no one was and it is not clear whether the statement refers to a specific population of underground services.

18. Date(s) and Venue(s) of Future Meeting(s)

21st/22nd September 2005 – to be hosted by Sembutilities in the Teesside area – venue to be confirmed.

18th/19th January 2006 – to be hosted by Total (UK) Ltd.

17th/18th May 2006 – details to be confirmed.

Signed: (Phil Brown) – Chairman.

Date: