|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Cadent Draft Determination** | | |
| **DD Query** | | |
| **SQ Reference number** | CADENT\_DDQ\_45 | |
| **Document Name** | Cadent\_DDQ 1 2 Response (GD2 EJP Final Report Rev 00 – Appendix 1. | |
| **Topic/Activity:** | Page 5. Row ‘Reduced Depth of Cover > 7 bar’. | |
| **Question:** | For Reduced Depth of Cover > 7 bar, it states ‘accept (Modify Volume) & Uncertainty Mech’.  Please can you elaborate on this outcome and the modifications required?  Specifically:   1. What is the volume modification – scale and scope 2. What is the proposed UM, and 3. What is the basis for the proposed change. | |
| **DDQ raised by** | Rachel Slater | |
| **Date Sent** |  | |
| **Response Due Date** | 21/07/2020 | |
| **Response Received** |  | |
| 1 & 3) The paper clearly describes the needs case for reduced depth of cover remediation. There are however significant uncertaintities and variations around the costs of remedition schemes within the paper for works other than ditch crossings.  Given that all HP pipelines will be well into their second cycle of inspection any significant issues should be known. A significant percentage of IP (high risk) pipelines will also have been surveyed.  The forecast for this type of works other than ditch crossings and associated costs should be reviewed to remove uncertainty where possible. Any remaining volumes should be considered with an appropriate uncertainty mechanism.  For ditch crossings the volumes/profiles discussed in response to SQ56 are appropriate.  2) We have proposed to include this investment in the Capital Project PCD. | | |
| Attachments: | | |