



**A Meeting of the EFFC Health & Safety Working Group
held at ToRVEhslerne, Vejle, Denmark
on 1 April 2016 8.00am.**

Present:	Luc Van Hecke	Franki Foundations (in the Chair)	Belgium
	Michal Nowakowski	Keller	Poland
	Tony Bo Jensen	Per Aarsleff	Denmark
	Anja Jensen	Per Aarsleff	Denmark
	Lorenzo Alessi	Soletanche Bachy	France
	Henk de Koning	NVAF	Netherlands
	Martin Sonnberger	Porr	Austria
	Bob Speakman	Aarsleff UK	UK
	Jozsef Csanadi	Bauer	Hungary
	Horst Leisering	BGBau	Germany
	Anders Lind	Hercules	Sweden

In attendance: Ciaran Jennings EFFC Secretariat

No.	Topic	Action
	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Luc welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked Anja Jensen and Tony Bo Jensen for helping arrange the meeting and for hosting the dinner the previous evening.</p> <p>He also thanked Tony Bo for his contribution to the group over the years and announced that this was Tony's last meeting as his role had changed within Per Aarsleff.</p> <p>Tony thanked the group for supporting the industry in this way and wished everyone well for the future.</p>	
1.	<p>Apologies for Absence</p> <p>Dejan Lukic (INFRA), Jindrich Ricica (ADSZS), Miguel A Para (AETESS), Reto Stump (Stump Foratec).</p> <p>It was requested that the attendance list for the meeting is circulated to everyone ahead of the meeting.</p>	EFFC Secretary
2.	<p>Introduction of new members of the group</p> <p>Horst Leisering from Germany was welcomed to the group.</p>	
3.	<p>Approval of Minutes of meeting held on the 18 September 2015.</p> <p>The minutes of the previous meeting held on 18 September in Brussels were</p>	

	approved.	
4.	<p>Outcome of Accident Investigation workshop</p> <p>Lorenzo Alessi summarised the workshop from the previous day where he had given a detailed presentation on how to carry out a root cause analysis of an accident. This presentation is currently used within Soletanche Bachy to train workers and site managers on this topic.</p> <p>It covered issues such as how the operatives on site should respond immediately after an accident has occurred, through to interview techniques when talking to the people involved. It also gave examples of good and bad accident reports.</p> <p>The attendees at the workshop felt that the presentation was excellent and very comprehensive. Lorenzo stated he was happy to use the presentation as the basis for an EFFC training programme that could be offered to foundation contractors. However, he felt that it needed more input from the group in order for it to be an EFFC resource rather than one produced by Soletanche Bachy. It was agreed that everyone would supply examples of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety Alerts • Good and bad accident investigation reports • Other resources (presentations, reports, videos etc.) that could be used to support the programme. <p>Action: All to provide the above resources before the end of June for Lorenzo to finalize the presentation.</p> <p>It was agreed that the training programme should be presented in the form of a training seminar that should be open to foundation contractors. Ideally this should be ready for September.</p> <p>It was believed the course would be of benefit to HSE managers, project managers and small companies. It was also identified that senior management did not understand the importance of carrying out a proper investigation and did not support the process properly. This required a culture that did not look to simply blame an individual, but to understand fully the different factors involved. It was agreed that senior managers should be encouraged to attend the course and that the EFFC Executive should be encouraged to attend.</p> <p>It was agreed the proposal for this seminar will be put to the Executive Committee for approval.</p> <p>It was also agreed that the next subject to be looked at by the group is to be lifting operations in order to produce a best practice document. It was discussed that consideration needs to be given to different types of loads with different requirements. The example of sheetpiles was given as one where a number of incidents had led to injuries and prosecutions in Germany and the UK.</p> <p>Everyone agreed to prepare this subject for the next meeting and provide procedure documents and guidance notes to the group for consideration and information on the national requirements that need to be recognised.</p>	<p>ALL</p> <p>Executive agenda</p> <p>All</p>
5.	<p>New EFFC Website</p> <p>Presentation</p> <p>Ciaran presented the new EFFC website and explained the purpose of the different sections. He highlighted that the Members Section provided an</p>	

Menard and Soletanche and supported by the Polish Federation. The video was considered to be very strong and illustrated the issues well. Ciaran agreed to investigate putting it on the EFFC website and making it a resource available to Members and the public.

Ciaran Jennings

b) Environmental issues

Ciaran reported that FIEC is looking at the issue of the End of Waste Criteria whose requirements are currently under review by the EU. He highlighted that in the UK there were issues related to asbestos on previously developed sites especially where demolition waste was being used in the working platform. No action was required from the group at present.

c) Safety Co-ordination

Martin Sonnberger reported that the Austrian Federation had run a seminar on safety co-ordination with 160 participants. This number included clients, designers and foundation contractors. It had three speakers, including a safety co-ordinator, an insurer and a project manager who explained the responsibilities involved. The authorities present confirmed that clients held legal responsibility for safety co-ordination, which caused much alarm among the clients who had been unaware of their responsibilities. Martin agreed to send a shortened version of the presentation from the seminar to Luc and the Secretariat.

Martin Sonnberger

Henk de Koning said that the NVAF had developed a guideline on this issue as clients often did not know how to carry out their responsibilities.

The Secretary reported that an EFFC delegation had presented to FIEC's ECOPLEN committee on the use of BIM and collaborative working. A specific part of this presentation was given over to safety co-ordination as it was believed that BIM planning processes could significantly improve the situation. This was welcomed, however Luc believed that it would be wrong to rely on this to solve the issue and more action was required to promote this issue to main contractors and project designers.

d) Machinery Safety

Horst Leisering reported that a letter had been sent to the CEN committee responsible for the new rig standard (CEN/TC 151) from ANIMA (Federation of National Associations of Mechanical and Engineering Industries). This letter had required clarification over the application of the rig standard and was asking the EU commission to start market surveillance owing to the different ways the standard is being interpreted.

Horst explained that the German Federation of Machinery Manufacturers had sent a letter in response to this that challenged some of the claims made by ANIMA. Specifically

- ANIMA had claimed that not all rigs were applying the guarding requirements properly. It was pointed out that not all machines had to have guards
- ANIMA had claimed that there was no alternative to guarding and that some machines were CE marked but were not using them. The German Federation had pointed out that Special Protection Mode was given as a valid alternative to guarding in the standard and that the machines they were referring to had this mode and were therefore compliant.

Horst also reported that the German Federation is seeking the allowance for anchor drilling rigs to be allowed to run in special operation mode. Specifically, for the hold to run requirements to apply to the rotational function only as currently four hands are needed to operate the other functions.

	<p>The Secretary reported that the Convenor of CEN/TC 151 WG3 was Daniel Perpezat and he is funded by the EFFC. He would be providing a report on the current status of the standard at the May Executive Meeting.</p> <p>e) FIEC SOC 2</p> <p>Martin Sonnberger reported that FIEC is initiating a project on working safer with construction machinery. Out of their first steering group meeting it had been determined that a number of workshops will be run on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access • Operational visibility • Safe use of lifting couplers • Safe operation when using earth moving machines. <p>Ciaran agreed to ask FIEC for information and circulate details to everyone.</p> <p>Martin also reported that SOC2 are starting a project looking at the psychosocial risks in construction. Martin agreed to send the project description to share among the group.</p>	<p>Ciaran Jennings</p> <p>Martin Sonnberger</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Incident reports and analysis</p> <p>Ciaran Jennings presented the latest accident statistics – presentation enclosed. He highlighted the results that showed a significant proportion of accidents were occurring to the younger and less experienced operatives. Also slips and trips continued to be a significant issue in the data. This was felt to underline the need for pedestrian safety to be a consideration for the Working Platform.</p> <p>Lorenzo Alessi questioned whether the data was robust enough given that it covered approximately 750 incidents. Ciaran said this was a problem and made it a pointless exercise to segment the data too much as the sample size becomes too small to be representative. More data is required if any genuinely valuable analysis is going to be possible.</p> <p>It was suggested that this issue should be raised with the Executive as participation in providing accident data was still low and there was an ongoing issue with Federations being able to provide information centrally.</p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p><i>Respirable Crystalline Silica</i> – Martin Sonnberger asked for Members’ support in asking the EU Commissioner responsible for the issue of respirable silica to come back to the table to discuss it with FIEC. He reported that FIEC had been asking the Commission to reverse or delay their decision to include Crystalline Silica under the Carcinogen’s Directive. This was because it was felt by FIEC Members that the requirements of this Directive were too demanding in relation to the risk that the substance poses to workers. Instead it would be preferred that Silica was included under the Chemicals Directive as this provided a more appropriate control regime for the substance.</p> <p>A letter had been written by FIEC, Martin agreed to circulate this letter and for Members to consider whether they will support it and ask their respective Federations to send it to Commissioner Marianne Thyssen.</p> <p>The question was asked at what level does Silica become an issue. Horst</p>	<p>M Sonnberger</p> <p>H Leisering</p>

	<p>Leisering offered for his colleague to present on this issue at the next meeting. Bob Speakman offered to provide some links to guidance relating to Silica that is provided by the HSE in the UK.</p> <p><i>Health & Safety of suppliers and sub-contractors</i> – Josef asked the group how they managed the health and safety of the suppliers and sub-contractors on site. He explained that in Hungary they were trying to manage this via their contract, but the ultimate responsibility remained with their Member companies.</p> <p>The group explained that commonly there was a responsibility to inform the suppliers of risks on site. Typically, safety plans were provided to suppliers and they are spoken to about these risks and solutions planned with them.</p> <p>In the case of an accident, it was reported that authorities will generally look at the employer of the injured person first and then at the safety planning in place after that.</p>	<p>B Speakman</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p>Date of the next meeting</p> <p><u>8-9 September 2016 – Warsaw</u></p>	