

MINUTES OF THE FORTY-SECOND MEETING OF THE SHIPBUILDING AND SHIP-REPAIRING HEALTH AND SAFETY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE ON 12TH SEPTEMBER 2001 AT H.M. NAVAL BASE, PORTSMOUTH

PRESENT

Mr Bill Corteen, *Engineering & Marine Training Authority*
Mr Barry Irvine, *Fleet Support Ltd*
Mr Brad Hicks, *Fleet Support Ltd*
Mr Roger Upfold, *HSE*
Mr Don MacDonald, *Portsmouth Naval Base*
Mr Ted Mayell, *Portsmouth Naval Base*
Mr Nick Granger, *Shipbuilders and Shiprepairers Association*
Mr David Allison, *Marine Painting Forum*
Mr Steve Evans, *Appledore Shipbuilders Ltd*
Mr W O'Neill, *HSE Northern Ireland*
Mr Graham Morrison, *Warship Support Agency*
Mr W McLachlan, *BAE SYSTEMS (Marine) Ltd*

Ms Rosi Edwards, *HSE*
Mr Roger Sykes, *HSE*
Mr Graham Watson, *HSE*

APOLOGIES

Mr B Callaway, *Portsmouth Naval Base*
Captain A McFarlane, *Clyde Naval Base*
Mr E Paton, *BAE SYSTEMS (Marine) Ltd*
Mr B McGoogan, *BAE SYSTEMS (Marine) Ltd*
Nik Parker, *British Marine Industries Federation*
Mr A Lascells, *Environment Agency*
Mr A Clisby, *Babcock Rosyth*
Mr J Brown, *George Prior Engineering*
Mr J Atkinson, *A & P Tyne Ltd*
Mr R Dangerfield, *Offshore Contractors Association*
Mr B Steven, *MacDuff Shipyards Ltd*
Mr A Robson, *CSEU*
Mr M Lomas, *DML*
Mr A Kirkwood, *Semple Cochrane*
Mr P Harding, *Vosper Thorneycroft*
Miss M Simpson, *HSE*

WELCOME

Members were welcomed to the 42nd meeting by Mr Ted Mayell, Portsmouth Naval Base acting Chief Safety Officer. He gave an informative account of the Naval Base's history and explained future developments affecting the Base.

1. CHAIRPERSONS INTRODUCTION

Ms Rosi Edwards welcomed the members and Mr Ted Mayell who was attending on behalf of Brian Callaway who was unable to attend due to illness. Ms Edwards extended best wishes to Brian on behalf of the members. Also welcomed were Mr Don MacDonald, Mr Brad Hicks, and Mr Roger Upfold the local HSE Inspector with responsibility for FSL.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Ms Edwards passed on apologies for absence.

3. MEMBERSHIP CHANGES

Ms Edwards gave details of the following changes to the SSHSCC membership: Tom Nighy has retired from the BMIF and has been replaced by Nik Parker; Ken Chamberlain has retired from MacDuff Shipyards and has been replaced by Bill Steven. The Welding Institute has now appointed a replacement representative for Dr Jane Blunt, Mr John Hadaway who is TWI's Quality and Safety Manager. John however will be a papers only member. Ms Edwards also referred to a letter that had been received from Alan Brewster stating that his employment with Cammell Lairds had terminated as a result of them unfortunately entering into receivership. Mr Brewster resigning from the SSHSCC as a consequence of this. On the behalf of the members Mr Sykes had phoned to extend his thanks to Mr Brewster for the contribution that he has made to the SSHSCC over a number of years. Ms Edwards also referred to a letter that had been received from Mike Moran the General Manager and Director of Cammell Laird Merseyside, requesting that all information for Cammell Lairds be sent to himself so that it can be forwarded onto the new owners. On the behalf of the members Ms Edwards extended her thanks to all the representatives from Cammell Lairds for their invaluable help and commitment and wished them well for the future.

4. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

Two errors had been identified in the minutes of the last meeting. Item 4 (i) should read "ultra high pressure water jetting" and not "ultra high water pressure" and item 4 (j) should read "rescue procedures through manholes" and not "rescue procedures through manhole covers." With these amendments in mind members agreed the minutes.

5. MATTERS ARISING

Minute item 18 Any other business

Mr Watson informed members of the current situation regarding olivine, an issue raised at the last meeting by David Allison due to concerns of possible asbestos contamination. The main importer of olivine is Quay Minerals who import it from Norway. Asbestos has been found in the olivine that they import, the asbestos occurring naturally in the area from where the olivine is quarried. The Asbestos Prohibition Regulations prevent the importation of asbestos into the UK, efforts had been made to prevent the importation of the olivine affected unless it could be proved that it was asbestos free. The Norwegian government has however complained that these Regulations extend beyond what was intended by the initial Directive and that as a result the UK is unfairly restricting trade. In response to this it is likely that an exemption will be issued allowing the importation of the olivine regardless of whether or not it contains asbestos. The presence of asbestos in the olivine occurring naturally.

Mr Watson explained that the risk from any asbestos that may be present depends on the use of the olivine. A large proportion is imported for use as a slag conditioner. While this is likely to carry a low level of risk the same is not true of using olivine as a blasting medium. This could result for example in the release of asbestos fibres during the blasting process itself or the sweeping up of the used abrasive. Mr Watson therefore advised members not to use olivine as a blasting medium unless the supplier can guarantee that it is asbestos free. This is an ongoing issue and members will be informed of any further developments at the next meeting.

Action: Mr Watson

6. ULTRA HIGH PRESSURE WATER JETTING

Mr Watson referred to the draft Sector Information Minute circulated at the 40th meeting providing information on protective equipment to be worn when undertaking UHP water jetting. While this document had been approved by the Water Jetting Association its release had been delayed as protective clothing referred to in the guidance was awaiting CE accreditation. This has now been undertaken although the guidance will not be released until confirmation is obtained of the tests that were carried out as part of the accreditation procedure. Members will be informed when the guidance is issued.

Action: Secretariat

7. BREATHING APPARATUS

Mr Allison had kindly sent the secretariat details of a prototype, mini breathing apparatus that could benefit rescue procedures through manholes. Mr Watson explained that this product had not been developed commercially due to a lack of financial backing. Members were however provided with details of a similar type of breathing apparatus manufactured by Draeger. Mr Watson asked members if they would like Draeger to attend the next meeting to carry out a demonstration of their breathing apparatus, members agreed that this would be useful. It was however stated that Draeger are not the only suppliers of breathing apparatus and that the secretariat are not endorsing the breathing apparatus produced by Draeger in preference to that provided by other suppliers.

Action: Secretariat

8. European Directive Update

Mr Sykes updated the members on development of the Temporary Working at Heights, CAD/ATEX, and the Physical Agents EC Directives.

The Temporary Working at Heights Directive was adopted on 14 June 2001 and published in the Official Journal of the European Communities on 19 July 2001. Member States have until 19 July 2004 to transpose the Directive into national law and a further optional 2 year transitional period until July 2006 before the new requirements need to come fully into force. The Directive sets a hierarchy for the selection of equipment for temporary work at a height and minimum requirements for the use of that equipment. It contains specific requirements on ladders, scaffolding and rope access equipment. The implications of the directive for shipyards is the removal of the access and staging requirements from the Shipbuilding and Ship-repair Regulations. The proposals contained in the Directive are generally goal-setting and broadly reflect the requirements contained in the Construction (Health, Safety and Welfare) Regulations 1996. A full copy of the Directive can be found on HSE's web site at www.hse.gov.uk/spd/spdwem.htm#ecdir.

The Chemical Agents/ATEX Directives will replace the hot work requirements of the Shipbuilding and Ship-repair Regulations. A Consultative Document explaining how the Directives will be implemented is expected around November, with Regulations possibly being made in the summer of 2002. Both Ms Edwards and Mr Sykes had seen the draft CD but not yet the Approved Code of Practice (ACoP) which will accompany the Regulations. A lot of what will need to be done to comply with the Regulations will be contained in the ACoP, which will adopt good practice arrangements from existing regulations which will then be applied across the board. Members were recommended to look out for the CD on HSE's web site at www.hse.gov.uk/condocs/index.htm.

Political agreement on the Physical Agents (Noise) Directive was reached in June 2001. Following negotiation this now proposes a limit value of 87 dB(A) [85 dB(A) had previously been proposed]. The requirement for health surveillance at 80 dB(A) has become a right to hearing checks at 85 dB(A) and hearing protectors are no longer required to reduce the risk below 80 dB(A). Where noise levels vary from day to day they can now be averaged over a week. The other provisions in the directive remain. It is likely that adoption will occur before the end of this year, UK regulations to be introduced within three years. Mr Granger raised a concern regarding the concept of average exposures as this may involve a need to keep detailed records of noise exposures. Mr Sykes mentioned that the current noise guidance mentions how to cope with varied exposure. He agreed to look again at this and to report back to the committee as this may also provide clues as to the way the Directive is going. Mr Sykes did however explain that at such an early stage members should not get too concerned about detail.

Action: Mr Sykes

Mr Granger felt that the approach being taken was geared at the exposure of individuals to noise and not just noise in the workplace. There being a concern where large numbers of people are exposed that individual exposures will need to be assessed. Ms Edwards explained that the approach to take would be a broad brush one involving a worst case assessment, with measures directed at reducing noise levels and hence exposure to noise.

At the 41st SSHSCC Mr Allison had queried references made in the directive to A and C weightings. Mr Sykes had agreed to look into this and explained that the ear hears differently at high and low levels. 'A' weighting reflects the way in which the ear hears at lower levels and is judged the best measure of exposure particularly for the limits on exposure in the Directive. By contrast, 'C' weighting reflects the way that the ear hears at higher levels and is judged the best measure of high levels of noise and for limits on impulse level, possibly because they tend to be high.

European Parliament agreement is still awaited on the Physical Agents (Vibration) Directive. This has been delayed pending agreement on an ISO standard which is quoted in the Directive. Adoption of the Directive is now expected later this year which will mean that the resulting regulations are likely to come into force late 2004.

Directives on electromagnetic fields and optical radiation could follow next which will have implications for arc welding and thermal cutting.

9. SSA GUIDANCE

Ms Edwards introduced paper SSHSCC/42/A which raises the issue of SSA guidance and asked Mr Granger for his thoughts on the guidance. Mr Granger said the original intention behind the guidance was for it to be readily accessible to the people at the sharp end. However, whilst the guidance was still worthy the notion of a foreman flicking through the guidance to obtain advice on a particular issue was misguided due to the sheer volume of material contained in the guidance series. He also felt that some of the guidance had been in existence for a long time and should be reviewed to see if it is still valid. However, this he felt was a decision which the yards should make depending on their practical use of the guidance. Mr Granger also endorsed the guidance being placed on the SSA's web site, this would be easy to set up as a password protected area and would make the guidance readily accessible and hence easier to use. The other members present agreed with this proposal.

Specific SSA guidance notes were then discussed beginning with SSA 1 concerning the Control of Substances Hazardous to Health Regulations. Mr Watson felt that this guidance was out of date as many of the publications referred to in it were now out of print, the regulations referred to in the guidance had also moved on. The guidance did not contain much advice specific to the shipbuilding and ship-repair industries and other general COSHH guidance is readily accessible. Mr Watson therefore felt that instead of updating the guidance it should be deleted from the series, members were asked for their thoughts on this. Mr Irvine mentioned that FSL had not used the SSA COSHH guidance, using other COSHH guidance instead. The SSA guidance covers some valuable areas however he felt that COSHH was not one of them. He also felt that

guidance would not be used unless it was readily accessible for example via the web site or via small pocket cards issued to team leaders. Ms Edwards explained that this could be achieved by distilling the "do's" and "don'ts" from the guidance to produce a brief document for day to day use, keeping the in-depth guidance behind it for when needed. Mr MacDonald referred to CIRB tool box cards as simple to use guides providing practical guidance which did not refer to the law as the end user was not interested in this. Ms Edwards agreed that perhaps they could be used a possible model for future guidance.

Following further discussion it was agreed that the SSA COSHH guidance should be deleted although it could be returned to at a later date and made more industry specific. A discussion was held regarding the practicalities of deleting the guidance. It was agreed that this could be achieved by issuing a new index for the guidance series explaining the COSHH guidance had been deleted and why, and detailing the alternative general COSHH guidance that could be used instead.

Members were asked for their views on SSA 2 which provides advice on the use of temporary support systems for ships. This was felt to still be valid and as it is the sole source of guidance on this issue it should be retained. Mr Allison believed the guidance should be revised as it refers to a particular incident as being the reason for why the guidance was originally issued. He hoped the industry had moved on from there. He was also not sure that the guidance adequately addresses the use of long props, there perhaps being a need to provide more detail on their physical characteristics. Ms Edwards stated that there were 2 issues, yes there was agreement that the guidance should be kept and updated and that an order of priority should be established for revising the guidance notes which were felt in need of updating. The latter issue could however be determined at a later date. Mr Sykes commented that there was essentially two classes of revision, those involving cosmetic change and those involving substantive change. Mr Allison however felt that some recommendations could be both depending on your viewpoint.

Members agreed that SSA 3 and 4 providing guidance on the use of personnel carrying devices suspended from cranes and the use of MEWPs should be deleted as both documents had been revised and replaced by more recent guidance notes.

SSA 5 advising on the use of competent analysts was felt to be worth retaining however it needed updating. It was agreed that this should be left until the new regulations stemming from the CAD/ATEX Directives have been implemented. The SSA hot work guidance could also be revised at the same time.

Members were asked for their views on SSA 6 which advises on work with cellular plastics on the cargo tanks of gas carriers. While this type of work is rarely undertaken in UK shipyards Mr Granger believed that it could be a possible area of future activity. It was therefore agreed that the guidance should be retained but not revised. Instead the areas where the guidance was felt to be out of date should be highlighted.

Mr Corteen raised problems that he had experienced in the past of not being able to find guidance which had been of use but had been withdrawn. There being value in parking guidance for example in an accessible albeit mothballed area of a web site. Mr

Granger stated that a cheap way of doing this would be to download the guidance onto a CD Rom. Ms Edwards mentioned that some members may prefer paper copies. Mr Granger therefore agreed to prepare a paper for the next meeting detailing the various options that could be taken along with costings.

Action: Mr Granger

It was agreed that at the December SSHSCC the remaining guidance notes in volume 1 would be reviewed.

Mr Allison raised a concern regarding an apparent lack of awareness on the behalf of ship owners and their representatives of the SSA guidance. To address this the Marine Painting Forum wished to produce a booklet for ship owners and their representatives providing relevant health and safety advice. It was hoped to reproduce the SSA isocyanate guidance note and the tank work guidance note in this booklet. Mr Granger commented that legally the SSA has the copyright on the guidance notes however he had no objections to the guidance notes being used in this manner and he would write to Mr Allison to confirm this.

Action: Mr Granger

Mr Allison believed a good way of making ship owners and their representatives more aware of the SSA guidance would be to have a display at a trade fair such as ShipRepair and Conversion 2001. Mr Granger stated that the SSA will have a stand at this event and that he had no objection to displaying a poster advertising the work of SSHSCC and the SSA health and safety guidance notes and distributing an associated leaflet. Most of the shipyards in the county would be present at this event along with ship owners and representatives, ship masters and ship superintendents. Mr Sykes stated that whilst the HSE does make efforts to promote awareness of the SSA guidance it would be useful to adopt the approach suggested. The Secretariat will contact Mr Granger at a later date to make the necessary arrangements.

Action: The Secretariat

Mr Watson confirmed that the safe work on lifeboat guidance written by a SSHSCC working party has now been issued by the SSA. The additional HSE Information Documents that members agreed at the 41st SSHSCC should be issued as part of the SSA guidance series have also been issued. Mr Granger explained that the HSE Information Documents have been issued as part 1 of Volume 3. The second part of the volume containing SSHSCC drafted guidance including the lifeboat guidance.

10 HEALTH AND SAFETY DATA SHEETS

Mr Watson informed members that a number of coating suppliers have placed the health and safety data sheets for their products on their web sites. Companies who have done this include: International Marine Coatings (www.international-marine.com), W.J. Leigh's Paints (www.wjleigh.co.uk) and Ameron International

(www.ameroncoatings.com). Mr Irvine stated that most companies provide CD Roms of their products which include health and safety data sheets.

11 THE ENGINEERING INDUSTRY NOISE TASK GROUP

Mr Watson provided members with details of the Engineering Industry Noise Task Group (EINTG). This was formed by the HSE in 1999 to try and improve the control of exposure to noise in the engineering industry. It is comprised of representatives from the engineering sector including employers bodies such as the EEF, machine manufacturer associations, trade unions and noise specialists from within and out with HSE.

The EINTG's mission statement, terms of reference and business plan were distributed at the meeting (copies attached for those members who were not present at the meeting). One of the tasks the EINTG has set itself is to produce noise guidance specifically for the engineering sector. Justification for this arising from 45% of DSS disablement benefit cases for occupational deafness for 1997 - 2000 originating in industries covered by the engineering sector. Of the 548 cases involved, 152 of them (28%) relate to ship-repairing and shipbuilding. As however both industries are under represented on the task group, members were asked to consider joining the task group. They hold 3 to 4 meetings a year which are generally held in the Midlands. The next meeting is due to take place on 23 October 2001.

Mr Watson explained to members the Sector's current noise programme which involves inspectors discussing the issue of noise when they visit engineering premises. Feedback from Inspectors suggests concerns still remain regarding the poor quality of noise assessments, the use of ear protection rather than engineering controls as a means of reducing noise exposure and a failure to ensure people wear ear protection where the second action level is exceeded. As a result the current noise programme will continue into the next work year. A draft outline of what is proposed was distributed at the meeting, members were asked to forward any comments that they may have on the proposal to Mr Watson by 24 Sept. Ms Edwards stated that the initiative did not focus specifically on shipbuilding and repair as she was sure that the industry had made good progress on this issue.

12 TRAINING

Mr Corteen gave a presentation of the various training initiatives that EMTA are currently developing for the marine industry. Mr Corteen emphasised however that they are all dependant on the necessary funding becoming available. One initiative, the Shipbuilding Forum is comprised of various organisations involved in the marine sector including shipbuilders and repairers and the SSA. This aims to make the sector more competitive for example through training and development. Issues that have been identified include a need for up skilling, for supervisors and managers to be better trained and improved access to shipbuilding terminology. Securing the necessary funding has however been made more difficult by the advent of the 15 Regional Development Agencies which means nothing comes out at a national level.

Shipbuilding and repair has also not been included in the development strategy for the North East.

For the last 8 years NVQs have been generic rather than relating to a specific industry. EMTA along with other national training bodies has however successfully campaigned for them to be made industry specific including the development of qualifications specific to the shipbuild/repair industries. The qualifications are aimed at different levels ranging from craft levels 2 and 3 to management level. Eventually there will be NVQs which talk specifically about shipbuilding which have separate qualifications for different units including for example sheet metal manufacture and installation and pipe work manufacture and installation. The core units in these qualifications reflecting exactly what the work involves. Health and safety will be built into these units and will relate specifically to what needs to be done. As health and safety will be tailored by trade it will be much more focused and will be seen to be part of the job rather than a bolt on extra. Mr Corteen advised members not to expect to see shipbuilding material for levels 4 and 5 as they did not yet have scope to do this.

Mr Corteen described what he sees as a national problem concerning academic qualifications. City and Guilds are currently being replaced by progression awards, the problem with this is that the Shipbuilding/repair City and Guilds are being replaced by generic engineering units. He is therefore trying to replace the qualifications of relevance to the shipbuilding/repair industries with ones which are industry specific e.g. replacing the generic electrical engineering qualification with one for electrical engineering in shipbuilding/repair. This will set standards to assess against. Writing academic guidance is not a problem however, delivering it is. Not all parts of the country where there is shipbuilding/repair have access to technical colleges or other training providers who can supply this training. Mr Corteen stated however that the main focus is to get the qualifications sorted out first and then to tackle its delivery. There is a promise of DTI funding to develop the qualifications however it is best to wait till this happens.

Developments in the North East include an application to One North East for funding to up skill the workforce. This will involve tackling problems in the supply chain by identifying the labour pool available and the likely demands for skilled labour and then training that labour pool so they can be up and running when the work starts. They are also trying to develop adult apprenticeships involving training semi-skilled labour into a trade, the intention being to make them equivalent to a young apprentice who has completed a 4 year apprenticeship.

A further North East initiative involved the development of a passport system identifying the skills that people have. An application for funding to develop this proposal was not successful although it was a local college and not EMTA who were behind the proposal. EMTA are however trying to pick up a health and safety passport system. North West projects include the development of a shipbuild/repair CD Rom. The bid for funding initially included Cammell Lairds. This will need to be modified.

In the Hull area a marine alliance has been created which has 18 members, if this is extended into South Humberside a further 20 firms are involved. The same process of up skilling is involved, looking at the labour pool and identifying what additional skills are

needed. An application for funding has been made and they are awaiting an answer. At best they will get £60 000 funding although this is only a portion of what they need.

EMTA are also involved with an initiative in North East Scotland looking to see if they can convert trawlers into pleasure craft. They are exploring whether or not they can apply for funding for training in the skills that would be needed to assist with this.

Mr Corteen concluded by saying that his remit is national including the south. If anybody wants to talk to him about training they should feel free to contact him. His e-mail address is: bcorteen@emta.org.uk

Ms Edwards thanked Mr Corteen for an interesting presentation.

13 REVITALISING

Mr Sykes opened the discussion by reminding members that it had been agreed sometime ago to keep Revitalising on the agenda in order to try and encourage the spreading of good practice. It is a 10 year initiative and members were urged to think of what they can do to contribute towards it and to share their ideas with other members. There are many ways people can feed into Revitalising. Particular topics HSE has identified as priority issues are falls from a height, slips, trips and falls and musculoskeletal disorders including handling. All three are big issues for the yards. Other priority issues of relevance to yards include transport, stress, noise and HAVS.

Members were then asked to say what they have been doing. Mr Mayell stated that they have been looking at the quality of their risk assessments and had identified a need for them to be validated. Mr Upfold felt the biggest problem was implementing risk assessments and making them work. Ms Edwards said the MSF had also identified a concern regarding risk assessments, hence it was an issue that was being tackled from all areas.

Members were also reminded of the challenge made by the Health and Safety Commission to the top 350 UK companies to improve health and safety and to see what they can do to contribute to Revitalising. (A press release providing details of the challenge is enclosed with the minutes). Top level visits have been made to a number of the companies that have responded to the challenge including BAE. Inspectors will be doing similar visits to members' yards to see what they are doing to contribute to Revitalising. Members therefore need to look at their existing problems and decide what they are going to do to tackle them. They should see if they can set targets for achievement including target dates.

Ms Edwards recommended that the committee should formally adopt the Revitalising targets and that this should be recorded in the minutes. These targets are, by 2010, to reduce: the number of working days lost per 100,000 workers from work-related injury and ill-health by 30%; the incidence rate of cases of work-related ill-health by 20%; the incidence of fatalities and major injuries by 10%; and to achieve half these reductions by 2004.

Following a discussion about the difficulties that could be caused by increasing numbers of compensation claims being made, members agreed to adopt the targets. It was agreed that adopting the targets would help to focus minds on improving health and safety. Ms Edwards stated that it was unfortunate that nobody from the unions was present to also formally adopt the targets however, members should now go back to their yards to see how they will achieve the targets that have now been adopted.

14 FALLS FROM A HEIGHT

Mr Watson introduced paper SSHSCC42/B which provides details of a newly adopted HSE strategy designed to reduce the number of people who are killed or injured whilst working at a height. It was emphasised that the HSE cannot achieve this on their own. As much of the work in shipyards involves working at a height members were asked to consider what they can do to contribute towards this initiative. It is hoped that details of the strategy will appear on the Revitalising page of HSE's web site at www.hse.gov.uk/revital/index.htm

Mr Irvine raised a concern regarding people working at a height such as scaffolders not securing their harnesses. Mr MacDonald referred members to the SG4.00 publication "The use of fall arrest equipment" written by the National Access and Scaffolding Confederation as being an excellent source of guidance. This establishes best practice for the industry and can readily be transferred across to shipbuilding/repair. All the large scaffolding companies are said to have signed up to follow the guidance. Mr Irvine explained however that there was a problem of individuals not following the guidance. Using a disciplinary procedure to tackle the problem was also difficult as it was generally difficult to get skilled contractors. Ms Edwards suggested that an alternative approach was needed which tackles the subcontracting firm.

15 INVESTIGATION OF ACCIDENTS

Mr Sykes introduced paper SSHSCC/42/C providing details of proposed regulations placing a duty on employers to investigate accidents. The draft requirements are the investigation of accidents, dangerous occurrences and cases of ill health currently reportable under RIDDOR. These have to be investigated by the person who reports them, who has to commence the investigation no later than the time the event is required to be reported. Mr Upfold stated that while a record has to be kept showing that the investigation has been carried out, the draft regulations do not explicitly require that a record of the investigation report itself is kept. Mr Allison expressed concerns regarding the regulations providing HSE with an ability to grant exemptions, HSE Inspectors being given dictatorial powers. Mr Sykes stated that an Inspectors powers granted under the Health and Safety at Work Act were substantial.

16 SOURCES OF GUIDANCE

Mr Watson distributed details of developments in health and safety guidance (a copy of which is attached for those members not present at the meeting).

17 NEWS ROUND UP

Mr Watson informed members that HSE was launching a workplace transport initiative seeking to reduce the number of people who are killed or seriously injured in workplace transport accidents. A working group comprising representatives from across HSE and from external bodies has been formed to progress the initiative. The aim being to bring about improvements in planning and systems of work, competence and training of workers and selection and use of work equipment. On a separate note the HSE has also announced that it is to develop guidance clarifying the roles and responsibilities for the health and safety of agency workers. The guidance will be publicised widely when it is completed.

Mr Watson gave brief details of enforcement notices issued since the 41st SSHSCC, these included 10 improvement notices served on boat builders and 9 improvement notices served on shipbuilders/repairers. 2 prohibition notices had been issued on contractors preventing their use of old style needle guns. They were being used for more than 4 hours a day without any assessments, without control over the duration of tool use, without adequate training of the operatives and without any health surveillance.

Prosecution cases that had been heard since the last meeting: these involved a £16000 fine in relation to a failure to control exposure to asbestos onboard a ship undergoing refurbishment; a £15 000 fine following an accident where an employee sustained multiple injuries from a fall from height caused by inadequate edge protection; a £3000 fine when an employee fell through a skylight window, a risk assessment had not been carried out and no precautions were in place. A group of companies had also been fined £4000 for not having employers liability insurance.

18 RECENT ACCIDENTS

Due to a lack of time it was not possible to elaborate on paper SSHSCC/42/D. Members were therefore asked to read this paper in their own time.

19 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Mr Irvine wished to know what standards members adopted for scaffolding. The contractors they use have said that they should erect scaffolding to CITB standards. Mr Irvine has however told them to follow the standards set out by the Shipbuilding and Ship-repairing Regulations for various reasons including the need to remove inside boards to be able to paint and the thickness of MoD scaffolding boards. Their contractors however feel they are open to prosecution if they do not follow best practice standards. Mr McLachlan said they employ CITB standards and if for any reason they cannot then they use some other means of access such as cherry pickers. Mr Sykes mentioned that the regulations implementing the Temporary Work at a Height Directive will apply uniform standards across industry although it is not yet known what detail this will go down to. Members were therefore advised to keep an eye out for the Consultative Document. HSE Inspectors will work to the 1960's Regulations although they will also be looking for good practice. The HSE guidance on staging HSE Information Document 730/12 (contained in SSA guidance volume 3) sets out HSE's position on this issue.

Mr Morrison stated that he felt that scaffolders trained to CITB standards were not competent to work in shipyards and that was why the MoD provided their scaffolders with industry specific scaffold training. Ms Edwards concluded the discussion by stating that the HSE Information Document was the starting point, members should refer back to it and then tackle their contractors.

Mr Hicks, FSL, showed members two types of trunking they have been using during welding on ships to reduce the risk of trunking fires. One type melted rather than supporting combustion however as it was not particularly robust the walls sometimes collapsed during use depending on air flows. The other was 8x more expensive but very robust. It did not melt or burn when exposed to a flame just charring and crumbling instead. They used the high quality trunking in the immediate welding area, and connected it to the less expensive trunking. They had also found a flame resistant plastic trunking which they were using for general ventilation in areas where there were ignition sources. Mr Hicks circulated a list of suppliers and data sheets. The prices quoted however were those offered to FSL according to the quantity of trunking purchased. This information is provided out of interest to other members and does not reflect an endorsement of these products over similar types of LEV trunking that may be available from other suppliers.

20 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

5th December 2001 - the Trinity Maritime Centre, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.