



29. JAHRESTAGUNG 29TH ANNUAL CONGRESS



Topic Categories

Disclaimer

This is a summary of the of the comments are made by the DCA-Members to this item in the workshop. Some of the comments are contradicting each other. These do not necessarily represent the opinion or standpoint of the DCA as an organisation.

The DCA will use this information in the next revision of the technical guidelines as the association feel appropriate.

Topic

All comments

Are the limits between categories correct (table 11)?

- No, criteria for real small work, like for fibre optic cables, is missing completely, especially the relation between diameter and drilled lengths
- Limits should be defined for smaller drills
- Why only two categories
- Are the limits defined by clients?
- Will these limits be part of future contracts between client and contractor
- One criterium making an HDD already C2 is not good, a scoring system with points might be better
- Using length is a criterium is not sufficient, at least a pull force calc should be required
- Using borehole diameter only not the solution either, e.g. a DN600 (PE) over 80 m is not possible with large equipment
- The elevation difference of 5 m between entry and exit would lead to many HDD ´s falling in C2
- Site set ups may vary between easy and more demanding, however, this must be described in more detail, e.g. casing required, MRL, UXO issues, limited areas
- Having a rock of >50 MPa is daily business for drill rigs especially equipped for this; for differentiation in categories may be better to select on use of mud motor, varying geology or similar
- Ground water permeability of 10^{-5} m/s is standard in certain areas, hance not a good criterium
- The current categories do not seem to match with the DVGW differentiation (below or over 40 tonnes rig).
- More categories s for most participants, at a specific table, not a good idea
- There is no torque criterium
- Categories are not of much use; items listed could be used as a sort of checklist, with a scoring system or a type of risk matrix
- Limits based on lengths are understood, but also regarded a too black and white
- Category system is used, missing is an additional category for fibre optics
- The safety factor for cover should be decreased to 1 instead of 1.2
- Length of a drill is not a decisive criterium for making it challenging, is depending on multiple factors
- Possibly better to create a sort of risk table

BAMBERG 2025



29. JAHRESTAGUNG 29TH ANNUAL CONGRESS



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Existing utilities in the vicinity of the drill are missing• The elevation difference being a problem depends on more factors than only the 5 m• Clients are using the table to reduce payment• The environment, e.g. a railway crossing or nearby, is missing• May be there should be even 4 or 5 categories• Annular pressure should be listed• Equipment specification• More categories are required and possibly rated on a scale to give a more concise evaluation of the complexity of the drilling easy medium hard and very hard.• Borehole stability and landfalls should be added to the criteria• Availability of a stringing area should be a criterium• Do we really need categories?• Was the original categorisation mini, midi, maxi?• Should be possibly rated from 0-100% for a general guide only for the contractor and get expert review to see if they rate the risks accordingly.• Do we need cat 1 and 2 with Table 12 ? Possibly not• One criterium should not make a drill already cat 2• Introduction of a scoring system would be good• Drilling with a wire line system would make a drill complex• Every small (fibre optic) drill will have a cover smaller than the one from formula 1, which makes it a C2 drill. This does not make sense• Not to demand an SI for cat 1 is considered to be a wrong signal• Develop an AI supported software to determine complexity• The 5 m elevation difference can be deleted as criterium• Drilling in rock would make every drill Cat2• SI should be done for every drill, how easy and simple it may seem. Other participants were of a different opinion
Are the assignments and responsibilities correctly spread (table 12)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Both client and contractor should be responsible for the disposal plan, especially in case of pollution• Client should be responsible for a profile, incl soil layers in both categories• Both client and contractor should be responsible for a profile design, incl soil layers, for both categories• A method statement should be drafted by contractor in both categories• Client should be responsible for a design in top view in both categories

BAMBERG 2025



29. JAHRESTAGUNG 29TH ANNUAL CONGRESS



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not clear why certain lines need mentioning, or need being marked• The column responsibilities should remain• Client should be responsible for marking the HDD in the field
Are 2 categories sufficient?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No, since the (real) small scale drilling for FOC is neglected• K1 should be subdivided, with a subcategory for $L < 200\text{m}$, $\varnothing < 200\text{ mm}$• More categories (at least 3) would be better• Categories should become a traffic light system in relation of criteria and responsibilities• The old mini, midi, maxi classification should return• 2 categories is not sufficient, three would be better• Do not use categories at all anymore• Generally the categories are considered to be good, but three (like it used to be) would be better
With reference to table 13	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The scope of the SI is described in the DIN (and other national standards) . Should may be not be described in the DCA guidelines at all
With reference to table 14/15	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The scope for a decent SI in both soils and rocks are very important for both categories, not only for the execution, but also for the estimation of the costs in tender phase.
General	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A key word index would be a good idea• Guidelines should be sold outside the DCA (e.g. on Amazon)

BAMBERG 2025