

# HyApproval

## WP 5 Dissemination

**Deliverable D 5.1**  
**Verification of existing studies and formulation**  
**of suggestions to create dissemination models.**

**Final Version Restricted publication**

**Prepared by**

**FAST**

**With contributions from**

**TNO**  
**BP**

# HyApproval

## Introduction

In order to facilitate the preparation of the national dissemination models for the presentation of the HyApproval Handbook to local officials involved in the authorization of hydrogen refueling stations (HRS), a thorough verification of dissemination activities regarding local authorities of relevant EU transport and Hydrogen projects was undertaken. Many EU alternative transport projects on new clean transport solutions require general dissemination activities but few involve information to local authorities.

## Methodology

A list of EU transport projects since 2000 was compiled using the following criteria:

1. did the project address local regulation issues regarding clean transport applications;
2. did the project include local authorities in their target audience;
3. did the project produce dissemination material targeting local authorities.

The findings were put in a database that is included in this deliverable package. In addition all existing EU funded hydrogen and fuel cell projects were approached and asked to report on their dissemination activities to local authorities, or to report dealings with local authorities in general with regards to permission for certain hydrogen installations that were conducted during the project. Only few project coordinators responded in writing after several attempts and many coordinators responded that dissemination was not a big part of the project or would be addressed only at the end of the project and that no decision on final dissemination activities had been taken. It was decided that further work on data input was needed and therefore FAST will provide a final version of the EU project dissemination database at the end of the project. The current findings are included in this deliverable D5.1 package.

Representatives of European organizations that address local sustainable transport issues, Eurocities and Energie-cités offered valuable advice on how to best address and educate local officials regarding new and innovative technologies and offered their support to facilitate presentations at future events that regard sustainable transport.

BP offered valuable insight in their experiences with local communities addressing not only regulatory issues. Their contribution is added to this Report in Annex 1. BP has also provided a Powerpoint presentation on the Hornchurch (London) authorization process which offers helpful insight on the complete process.

In addition the suggestion of WP5 to include a question on how to best disseminate the Handbook to specific local authorization officials was included in the WP3 questionnaire that was collected in the beginning of the project::

I.	Dissemination of the handbook		
I.26	Would you use the Hyapproval handbook for future approval procedures of HRS's?	† yes	† no
I.27	What would in your country be the way to disseminate the handbook under the organisations/bodies most concerned in the hydrogen approval process?		

# HyApproval

## Conclusions

Although many EU alternative transport projects include dissemination activities, very little is documented on addressing officials. Most dealings with local authorities are/were carried out for specific demonstration projects for which in many cases special permits needed to be created rather than that existing legislation was applied. The CUTE project in its conclusions listed as the key problem for licensing HRS was the fact that there were no well-established Regulations, Codes and Standards for hydrogen refuelling installations. Most CUTE cities overcame this by:

- Applying well-established procedures for CNG refuelling sites or filling stations for compressed gases in general which are laid down in existing guidelines or regulations;
- Using hydrogen codes and standards for industrial plants;
- Employing hydrogen-related standards from outside Europe;
- Combining the above approaches, and adapting the specifications from these documents in an appropriate manner. The CUTE conclusions indicate that this process often involved “very time consuming procedures”. A cornerstone of the planning phase of the CUTE project was the Design Handbook [Ref 2] provided by the bus manufacturer. It summarised the requirements determined by the design and operation of the fuel cell buses and provided practical suggestions and options for the infrastructure design and establishment, in particular concerning safety.

Recent projects, as the EU FP6 project Roads2Hycom, approach local authorities in a more structured manner, collecting questionnaires from local authorities on specific requirements in order to develop Handbooks for setting up local hydrogen projects. The EU FP6 Project Hylights has collected valuable information on the needs of Regional governments in developing a local infrastructure, citing the need for standardization of regulation as urgent.

Past and current EU Transport projects include a wide variety of general dissemination instruments as brochures, seminars but very rarely describe structured dissemination activities that offer local authorities effective tools to facilitate local approval of alternative transportation .

The responses to the specific questions on dissemination of the Handbook of the WP3 questionnaire show various suggestions pointing to the specific needs of the organization interviewed. For example Dutch organizations would be in favour of and use a Handbook if it would contain relevant information with respect to their particular problems: e.g. one authority would like an overview of what type of activity can be allowed near HRSs; VROM (Environmental Inspection Agency) and DBM would like to see technical standards (BAT, BREF). Dutch Fire brigades would like an overview of intervention measures. Lack of knowledge on any of these aspects and lack of clarity about regulations and technical standards to be used, could slow down the approval process. In Italy Fire officials referred to the natural gas filling stations guidelines included in the Italian Law that regulates the authorization of these stations.

An important finding of this verification is the discontinuity in addressing national and local authorization officials; contacts are incidental, depending on specific installation projects or, at best, in the form of a dedicated seminar. Follow up or the establishment of a long term information structure to inform local authorities of hydrogen infrastructure developments and case studies of successful installation has not been pursued. The

# HyApproval

dissemination of the HyApproval Handbook could facilitate the creation of an hydrogen information network for national and local officials and key decision makers involved in the authorization of hydrogen installations

The creation of an European info point on regulatory issues with national branches could help establish more confidence and continuity that will benefit future projects.

## **General suggestions collected from EU projects relevant to the installation of refuelling stations:**

1. Local authorities which are favourable to hydrogen / alternative fuels should be sought out already when considering HRS locations;
2. The planning history and local reputation of any HRS sites should be thoroughly investigated before a site is chosen. This should include any previous history of conflict with local residents;
3. The local community, including relevant local authorities, should be proactively engaged during the planning phase for any HRS site;
4. As some local authorization officials have close political ties with high ranking local government officials It must be clear what the local community can gain from the building of a HRS in their area;
5. The character, political make-up and previous decision-making history of the permitting authorities should be considered before choosing a HRS location;
6. Worst case scenarios for timelines and costs assuming planning delays should be factored into the project define phase;
7. A long term communication structure should be developed with close links and updates of similar projects in Europe.

## **General recommendations**

1. An important finding is the frequency and duplication in contacting local authorities. Every EU project seems to develop its own database of national and local officials to be contacted and no exchange mechanism has been set up to share contacts between relevant projects; an EU database of relevant national contacts in charge of the authorization of refueling stations as the one being developed for the HyApproval project should be kept updated and made available to EU current and future project coordinators;
2. As refuelling station approval regulations differ from country to country the support of local organisations is crucial to obtain in-depth information on procedures and responsible officials. National standardization bodies and other relevant industrial organisations, as hydrogen associations, could be instrumental in organizing workshops to update the national information on authorization procedures and international seminar to exchange best practice.
3. A structured and regular information structure to update national officials involved in the authorization of refuelling stations on new technological and regulatory developments is paramount to ensure the establishment of dedicated officials to hydrogen projects and to keep them involved and interested.

# HyApproval

## **Recommended Seven Step Plan for HyApproval Handbook dissemination:**

1. Handbook should be developed in a modular way in order to allow easy updates of chapters and to insert additional chapters as new national regulations emerge;
2. Identify national and local authorization officials involved in the approval procedure of refuelling stations;
3. Identify relevant industry associations involved in refuelling infrastructure development and technical gas production and distribution;
4. Verification of history of national and local refuelling infrastructure development: to identify key stakeholders and decision makers in future policy;
5. Verification of relevant events to propose Hyapproval presentation;
6. Verification of relevant media to the responsible authorities to report on HyApproval Handbook;
7. Establish close collaboration with national (hydrogen) organisations to organize Handbook presentation media coverage and to organize regular follow-up;

## Annex 1 BP Report

### **Community engagement – background and learnings on Hydrogen for Transport**

Local communities are an extremely important stakeholder group with respect to BP's hydrogen for transport activities. Public perception of hydrogen as a fuel is limited. Any prior knowledge usually pertains to safety, often with references to the Hindenburg airship disaster. This angle has also been played up in media coverage which can also have a lasting impact on public perception.

However, if a hydrogen economy is to develop then infrastructure is required. This is why BP is participating in demonstration projects today. Some of these projects are located on industrial land with minimal exposure to local communities. However, some are already being placed within communities. Indeed, opportunities exist to build hydrogen refuelling facilities at existing public service stations. This provides a means of both understanding what it takes to place this equipment within existing space and an opportunity to begin raising public awareness of the opportunities hydrogen presents.

BP has a group-wide commitment to carry out proactive community engagement where necessary. Our hydrogen for transport operations are no different. To date we have implemented community engagement plans in three locations.

In March 2005 the team held a two-day community engagement seminar designed to develop best practice around these plans. The seminar was attended by the US communications team who support our hydrogen activities, a member of the BTC pipeline team with enormous experience in this field, a communications colleague working on community engagement at the Crown Landing LNG site and a member of the Texas City communications group involved in the aftermath of the refinery explosion.

The information in this briefing note is designed to give insight into the output from this seminar along with specific lessons learned from our experience with our London site which went through a public enquiry in order to get planning permission.

# HyApproval

## **Audiences in H2 community engagement**

Our hydrogen demonstration programme brings us into contact with a wide variety of audiences. Below are the ones we believe it important to target in a community engagement plan:

- Local residents
- Local elected officials
- Local media
- Organised community groups
- Regulatory authorities
- First responders – e.g. fire services
- Fire marshals

## **Assessing risk**

The first stage of a community engagement plan should be to assess the risks of placing a site in a particular community. Below are some of the key points to consider:

- Reputation risk in this case is currently bigger than the reputation benefits
- Analyse your audiences
- Do a ‘needs assessment’ of issues going on in the area
- Understand history of the different relationships in the region and assess stakeholders
- Document costs and benefits of each site as you go: this is both in \$ and time
- Once selection complete begin assessment work immediately
- Understand impact on other parts of BP business
- Understand political capital
- Risk landscape has change after Texas City: NGOs and journalists have more tools available to know what’s going on faster
- The fact that hydrogen is different will create a cloud if we don’t have the education in place early enough for those interested
- Look at opportunities to tie in with other educational organisations
- Crucial to write down reasons for each project and their location. This was vital for Hornchurch public inquiry where documents were created in hindsight
- Have strong gate process – understand the implications of walking away. What do GPA need for that?
- You can walk away if you manage expectations – we will only do this if these conditions happen, otherwise we’re not prepared to site there

## **Key points for successful community engagement plan**

- What is the strategy for that site
  - crucial that the H2 business communicates this to internal stakeholders
  - CVP process should be in place
- Clarify decision making process between stakeholders
- Ensure joined up communications with partners
- Community needs assessment

# HyApproval

- Where are the areas of commonality
- Who are the partners
- Where are the hot spots
- Identify and prioritise your key audiences
- Create a resource plan
  - What will it take to deliver this project in manpower, materials etc.
- Know your exit strategy and be prepared to implement
- What are your engagement tactics?
  - Materials and tools
- Ensure you have a feedback process both internal and external

## Roles in establishing community engagement plan

We have demonstration sites around the world. Our communications and community engagement work is supported by regional C&EA colleagues. It is important to have clarity around individual roles and responsibilities when setting up a community engagement plan. They are as follows:

**C&EA:** has the expertise in this kind of external interaction and so takes the lead on any community engagement plan we put in place. Also provides advice and input on site selection so should be engaged at earliest opportunity. They are well placed to advise on sensitivities and issues that could affect the BP brand and reputation. GPA/H2 team/H2 comms manager work together to develop the plan but GPA has the lead on guiding it.

**H2 project lead:** has the responsibility for scheduling of the project. Needs to be clearly communicated with C&EA. Works with C&EA to ensure they are up to speed on where we are with a project and is closely involved in developing any community engagement plan and the basic content that may need to go with that and needs to be on hand for community engagement events. Also has responsibility for providing any background on site selection and owns the decision on site selection, but has some sign off through C&EA having helped advise.

**H2 communications manager:** has the functional communications role to ensure any content we wish to use for the community engagement plan is in place and helps create strong links between the project lead and C&EA. In these cases the H2 comms manager will support C&EA and the project lead but does not actually lead the process.

## Tools and materials

A range of tools and materials can be used to implement a community engagement plan. The following is a list of these tools which could be selected:

- Website
- Fact sheets
- Links into the BP Education Service
- Simple Q&As
- Neighbourhood pack

# HyApproval

- Database of all the issues that come through at a specific site. This was successfully implemented for BTC pipeline project
- Submit a question mechanism – either online or through telephone number
- Project process update
- Use of PIER – a system that creates a ‘dark site’ which allows you to build a crisis management website prior to any need without it being online. Used for Texas City. Has a system to track questions coming in. Run by Audience Central.

## **Hornchurch lessons learned**

In 2004 the H2 team was involved in a public enquiry process after planning application for the London site was initially turned down. The planning process had been complex and focused on technicalities. As a result not enough time was spent early on talking directly with the local community, explaining what we were doing and listening to their concerns. The community chose to raise those concerns through local media and government instead and our application was rejected because of concern over the use of green belt land. An appeal was placed and permission eventually granted. At this point we initiated a community engagement plan to ensure better links with the community. This involved a series of public meetings and specific communications materials designed to keep the community up-to-date on our work. The site was eventually opened in May 2005 and has recently received permission to extend its life by one year.

Below is a list of the specific lessons the H2 team learned during that process.

### Lesson 1

Had a very informal site selection process, almost all of which was not documented

Keep notes on justification for choosing site so that it can stand up in court

### Lesson 2

Know the history of your location (both internal and external if necessary) very well before you start

### Lesson 3

All strategic reasons for why you might choose a site and project might be completely contrary to the external perspective. Need to consider that external outlook as well

### Lesson 4

Using a planning consultant did not work. They were one step removed from the process and talking to the wrong people.

Now unable to use that consultant again in the area. Lost credibility

### Lesson 5

Figure out who are your key decision makers so you can engage them early on

### Lesson 6

First message should have come from BP. In this case it came from the council

# HyApproval

## Lesson 7

It's important to have a gated decision-making process: you need to understand clearly how important your project is strategically if pushed

## Lesson 8

Face to face dialogue is critical. Was important to have the owner of the project in front of the residents.

You need to set aside time as an expert to give that face to face time to the community.

## Lesson 9

We lacked honest brokers to help us in some of this process