

In the Chair:	Simon Jones (SJ)	Keller
In attendance:	Robert Speakman (RS) Rob Gold (RG) John Christie (JC) Brian Watson (BW) Daniel Hatcher (DH) Phil Matthews (PM) Matt Smith (MS) Colin Kempshed (CK) Michael Keaveny (MK) Tomas Keaveny (TK) Scott Reynolds (SR) Martin Lawson (ML) Neil Abbott (NA) Alan Turner (AT) Ellen Barrett (EB) Kenny Peters (KP) Nick Dewey (ND) Tom Bannister (TB) Colin Williams (CW) Steven Bursnell (SB)	Aarsleff Bachy Soletanche BAM Ritchies Bauer Technologies Bauer Technologies Cementation Skanska Expanded Foundation Piling Foundation Piling Foundation Piling Franki Franki GSS Piling Martello Piling Murphy Murphy Rock & Alluvium Roger Bullivant Van Elle Van Elle
Present:	Ciaran Jennings (CJ) Isabel Jennings (IJ) Melissa Bramley (MB)	FPS Secretariat FPS Secretariat FPS Secretariat

No.	Topic	
1.	<b>Apologies for Absence:</b> Paul Smith - RBL, Mark Lee – ABI Equipment, Phil Hines – Bachy Soletanche, Malcolm Mearns – Bachy Soletanche, Laylee Eftekhar -Bachy Soletanche	
2.	<b>Approval of the Minutes of the meeting held on the 21st September 2021</b> The minutes were approved by the Chair and Members of the Committee. Jon Christie mentioned he had not actioned a point raised in the minutes on Silica Dust because he was awaiting further information on Piling. SJ mentioned the Silica Dust Guidance document had been published since the last meeting, so JC could be excused from his action.	

<p>3.</p>	<p><b>Matters Arising</b></p> <p><b>i. Fatigue Science</b></p> <p>CJ noted the report had been circulated which had been created by Fatigue Science, and the focus was now on deciding as an Association what the next actions were to take, perhaps focusing on lifestyle factors that can make individuals 'at risk' at work. Matt Smith created a summary report for the Executive Committee, which was sent in September.</p> <p><b>ii. Reinforcement Suppliers Audit</b></p> <p>CJ said he had been trying to get virtual audits going, and the lack of economic incentive to confirm the next step was for the Executive Committee to engage with the Reinforcement Suppliers. CJ noted Lemon had been in touch, and PH was going to contact the Reinforcement Suppliers to encourage them to engage in the process.</p> <p><b>Action: CJ to circulate the reinforcement suppliers audit schedule and take this to the next Quarterly Committee meeting.</b></p> <p><b>iii. Rigging &amp; De-rigging Training &amp; Assessment</b></p> <p>CW stated he had not got any further forward at present, and he would report back at the next meeting. CW stated he was completing a template and was looking to create a document which he could distribute to the committee, and hoped to have something to hand over prior to the next meeting of the committee. CW stated the intention was to share the document with experienced Rig Operators before it's completion and then share with the Committee.</p> <p><b>iv. Working Platforms</b></p> <p>CJ stated there was a discussion previously that Working Platform Certificates were not being considered as they should be, and the three areas where there had been issues, and an article had been produced to highlight the risks.</p> <p>MB shared the video script created by Malcolm Mearns, and it was agreed to send this out to the committee following the meeting. SJ said the target audience of the script completed by MM was very much for an internal audience, with areas as follows: Fit To Work, Induction, Start of Shift Briefing, Pre Start Checks, Starting Work, Fatigue Management and End of the Day.</p> <p><b>Action: MB to share the script with the group following the meeting to encourage all to add to the script, or suggest other areas to cover.</b></p> <p><b>Action: This was a general safety script rather than Working Platforms, MS took the action to complete a working platform script and story board</b></p> <p>SJ stated there was a need for volunteers to progress the project.</p> <p><b>v. Skilled Worker Visa</b></p> <p>PH was not in attendance, and CJ gave an update to say there was not a great deal of further movement, and Visas were still an issue across the industry, trying to gain visas for foreign workers, and he was upping the pressure with HS2 talking to the government. CJ stated the Ground Forum were keeping an eye on the MAC list (Migration Advisory Council) which does at present, contain Geotechnical Engineers within, if an occupation appears on this list it does make it easier to obtain a visa, and felt the list may reopen at some point soon. CJ stated he was trying to convince, via Build UK, the government that the Piling Operatives Qualification was a Level 3 (as opposed to Level 2) Qualification, and until there was a test case this may not progress further.</p> <p>A discussion took place about the separation between a Level 2 and Level 3 qualification, with JC stating it was Supervision, which stood between the levels. CW felt taking this as a discussion point to the PRSO might be worthwhile.</p> <p>A discussion took place on creating an Occupational Working Standards group, which CW stated should contain Training Specialists from across the FPS Membership.</p>	<p>CJ</p> <p>MB</p> <p>MS</p>
-----------	--	-------------------------------

	<p>vi. <b>Silica Dust Guidance:</b></p> <p>SJ stated the schedule of <a href="#">Silica Dust guidance material</a> was now live within the Members Area on the FPS website. Contact <a href="mailto:fps@fps.org.uk">fps@fps.org.uk</a> if you require access.</p> <p>vii. <b>Collapses around a pile</b></p> <p>MM had created a process flow document, which MB shared following the meeting. CW stated at this point they were asking for Comment on the document – Working Platform Collapse Guidance Note. SJ felt it was perhaps a larger topic than purely a collapse around a pile. CW felt some subject matter experts were required if a Guidance note was to be created, which would also need to be reviewed in conjunction with the Technical Committee. JC wondered if the document was more of a hazard directory for Designers, CW agreed and stated the guidance had been created based on incidents that had occurred. CJ mentioned there was a note on CFA Over- flying, and a link should be made between the two. CW felt more substance was required beneath the points made in the document.</p> <p><b>Action: CJ to raise at the Executive Committee and clarify the end point required with the document.</b></p> <p><b>Action: MB to circulate the document to the committee (completed 15.11.21)</b></p> <p>viii. <b>NRMM Compliance</b></p> <p>CJ stated PH’s comment at the previous meeting was there were ways to comply, but wondered what the hierarchy of methods were that could be used to ensure adaptation and compliance. CJ stated he didn’t think there was an appetite from the Executive Committee to challenge the compliance. SJ confirmed there was no further action required from this committee.</p> <p><b>Action: CJ to raise with the Executive Committee</b></p> <p>ix. <b>NCR’s</b></p> <p>CJ stated he had drawn a blank and asked for insight from SJ. It was agreed to revisit this item in another meeting.</p>	<p>CJ MB   CJ</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p><b>Plant Sub-Group Updates</b></p> <p>i. <b>Safe use of Concrete Pumps – Task group update</b></p> <p>SJ stated the guidance had been added to the <a href="#">website</a>, and a news release would happen shortly to publicise the update.</p> <p>SJ mentioned the quick reference guide was being transformed into a poster, and asked if anyone had any further material to supplement the poster to send this to <a href="mailto:fps@fps.org.uk">fps@fps.org.uk</a></p> <p>ii. <b>Rig Operator Training – Task group update</b></p> <p>CW confirmed the launch of the provisional card had been completed, and CJ confirmed the next actions sat with him, and if there was an interest in putting individuals through the rig operator card, to send this to CJ, who would submit this to CPCS, to ensure the individual would gain access. CW stated access was granted on the basis that this was an FPS trial and the initial approach should come through CJ, to enable record management.</p> <p>CJ stated he was hoping to speak to the CPCS representative and get the application status started. SJ asked for CJ to circulate the form as soon as it was available.</p> <p>JC asked if the FPS were mandating it’s use, and CW stated he was certainly mandating to use the FPS trial.</p> <p>A discussion ensued on the liability, and good practice and best practice, and the practice of training delivery.</p> <p><b>Action: CJ to confirm the next steps when these have been agreed</b></p> <p>iii. <b>FPS Audit Task Group update</b></p> <p>CJ stated he needed to re-convene the group, following the sterling work undertaken by BS and SJ, to include in the audit awareness and compliance of FPS policies. SJ asked how the audit task group fitted with the audit schedule,</p>	<p>CJ</p>

	<p>and CJ stated Members had agreed to give the audit a hiatus for a year and was trying to rationalise a 14-month window to ensure everyone was being assessed against the same audit criteria.</p> <p><b>iv. Manual Handling Task Group</b></p> <p>It was agreed to remove this from the agenda as the guidance had now gone live on the <a href="#">website</a></p> <p><b>Action: MB to ensure this is removed from the Agenda for the next meeting</b></p>	<p><b>MB</b></p>
<p>5.</p>	<p><b>FPS Website</b></p> <p>It was agreed an audit should take place of the guidance on the website, and a schedule should be created to alert the Committee to review.</p> <p><b>Action: CJ to create a schedule of the guidance</b></p>	<p><b>CJ</b></p>
<p>6.</p>	<p><b>Q3 Accident/Incident Statistics</b></p> <p>IJ mentioned there was an issue with the AFR data, and this would be shared following the meeting. IJ shared the Q3 statistics, which highlighted 27 accidents had occurred this quarter, which included 11 HiPo's, 10 RIDDORs, with 10 incidents taking place on a Tuesday this quarter (37%) IJ noted in Q3 the incidents were generally taking place in the afternoon. IJ stated the form had been changed to allow respondents to add in greater detail as to the activity being undertaken by the Injured Person at the time of the accident (e.g., Manual Handling, Operating Ancillary Plant), and wondered if the form should offer different categories. IJ stated she had added in non-Applicable option for HiPo's in the Body Part Injured category.</p> <p>IJ shared that the job factor listed as highest was the provision and maintenance of plant, with 10 accidents taking place as a result this quarter listing this. IJ also mentioned there were 12 non-applicable responses in the Personal Factors category which should perhaps be investigated in the creation of the form. IJ felt it might be worth inserting a comments box.</p> <p>IJ displayed the Service Strikes map and wondered what it would be beneficial to see in relation to any Service Strikes of which four had occurred this Quarter. CW stated the map was useful to show hotspots, and service strikes would generally take place in urban areas, and stated it would be interesting to see if a service strike took place in a rural area, however the map did not show the significance of the asset (e.g. high voltage cable, high pressure gas main or a private service not listed).</p> <p><b>Action: All to consider information which would be useful to capture as part of the service strike data</b></p> <p>CJ wondered if the ability to show the type of site e.g., private commercial, housebuilders would be useful. CW agreed it would be useful to know the sector this occurred in and the type of asset. JC wondered if it would be useful to know why the service strike occurred, and CW asked if the information was requested, in terms of the extent of the survey asked.</p> <p>IJ urged those who submitted their incident data, did so removing any company names. CW challenged this and stated previously the data had not been anonymised, which had assisted with learning shares, to enable continued improvement on safety. PM</p> <p><b>Action: All to ensure those who submit incident data removed any organisation names from their submissions</b></p> <p>SJ asked if there were any incidents the group would like to share. There were none.</p> <p>SJ wondered, if following the incidents listed, whether safety alerts were being issued to the FPS. DH stated he had submitted an incident, but this had not yet been shared.</p> <p><i>**Post meeting note – the volume of incidents detailed within the statistics does not reflect the number of safety alerts issued to the FPS Mailbox in the past</i></p>	<p><b>All</b></p> <p><b>All</b></p>

	<p>quarter (2). Please submit your safety alerts to <a href="mailto:fps@fps.org.uk">fps@fps.org.uk</a> to enable the Secretariat to disseminate</p> <p>CW said there was an unfortunate spike in incidents during Q3 in his organisation, and he had been trying to identify the root cause, and had identified this as the return to work effect following the pandemic, with the volume of work returning to pre-pandemic levels. SJ stated in the last quarter they had not experienced this, but had experienced a spike earlier in the year, and trying to understand a root cause was a challenge. CW said previously over trading had been identified as a cause for a sudden spike in incidents. PM also stated there had been a spike, ND also said they had identified this too. BW said the volume of work and the lack of skills to ensure work that takes place is completed safely was a concern. CW agreed skills are being lost to other sectors.</p> <p>EB shared NGE had a Rig Overturn in Q3, and the issue was that the Piling Platform was not where they were told it was, and the client, a housing developer had dug through it, but due to the make up of the chalky ground they could not see where it was, despite it being signed off on a weekly basis. EB stated there were no injuries involved but it had written off the rig completely. EB said the HSE had accepted the report, and there were records of the drawings from the client and data email exchanges. EB stated it showed the need to absolutely confirm where edges were, even though at the time they were being marked out.</p>	
7.	<p><b>Associate Member Questions</b></p> <p>CJ stated the plan was to invite Associate Members to the next meeting in March to present.</p> <p><b>Action: FPS Secretariat to invite AM's to present and give specific timeslots.</b></p>	FPS Secretariat
8.	<p><b>Innovation &amp; Technology</b></p> <p>SJ asked if anyone had any particular innovations they wished to share from a plant or safety perspective.</p> <p>CJ stated he had a conversation about remote operated plant with an AM, and who had stated that technology existed but there was no appetite for its use, and wondered if there should be a future facing discussion and whether this was desirable.</p> <p>CW stated BBGE tried this, but the operators were very wary of it, and wondered whether the technology had moved on, and wondered the behaviour implications of being detached from the machine. PM stated as an operator you did get a feel for the machine and would know when something was going awry. MK wondered if it was possible to delineate between loading and unloading which works well when operated remotely, and the operation of mini rigs. CW stated there was a rig overturn of a remote operated rig, which overturned when it was being derigged.</p>	
9.	<p><b>Safety Campaigns – Video &amp; Webinars</b></p> <p>SJ thought campaigns could be run on a quarterly basis across the FPS Membership, following the breakout sessions run two meetings previously. SJ stated without a great volume of volunteers, he would get a document drafted on one of the topics, ready for the new year.</p> <p>N.B – The topics prioritised are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Behavioural Safety</li> <li>• Restricted Zones implementation</li> <li>• Mental Health Campaigns</li> <li>• Mid-week incidents</li> </ul> <p>SJ wondered if a safety campaign on Restricted Zones might be worthwhile exploring first, to recap on it's use.</p>	

	<p>SJ asked if there were any other areas that should be considered by the group and it was agreed the four areas listed should be progressed.</p>	
10.	<p><b>Working Group Reports</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CPCS Management Committee: CJ mentioned Colin Newman was taking on the action, and the main project was the rig operator trial. CW stated subgroups met up, and confirmed the next meeting was on 24<sup>th</sup> November.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action: CJ to double check Colin Newman was attending the Committee following a hand over from CW.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EFFC H&amp;S Group – SJ mentioned MS had attended this group, and MS said there was a presentation on a training programme for unskilled workers travelling across the EU, akin to the CPCS card issue, Rig Operators and Silica Dust were also discussed. MS mentioned there was a call to arms for safety seminars, taking place in December and January, and urged for support from the FPS in advertising the dates.</li> </ul> <p><i>**NB The Sessions are advertised to the Committee via the Distribution List, and do follow the EFFC &amp; FPS LinkedIn feeds to sign up too**</i></p>	CJ
11.	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p>SJ asked Martin Lawson to introduce the topic of HVO Fuels –and stated independent testing had been showing the diesel particulates as slightly higher and they were under pressure to use HVO Fuels but, the HS2 report in partnership where two excavators have been tested which show there was no real benefit to using the fuel and wondered if any other firms had started using HVO fuels. ML wondered if any other organisations were using HVO fuels.</p> <p>PM said at Cementation were looking at doing so, ND stated R&amp;A were also going so, and there were no issues. ML asked if any testing had taken place – and PM said he would be able to send some information over</p> <p><b>Action: PM to send information to ML</b></p> <p>RG stated he did some testing on a retro fit and if the HVO Fuel had been used it would not have passed testing regulations due to the particulate matter.</p> <p>CJ stated he felt he could ask the Associate Members to present on their view of the use of HVO Fuels, and stated the FPS Sustainability Committee were considering running a webinar on the topic.</p> <p><b>Action: CJ to ask Associate Members to present on the topic of HVO Fuels on 3<sup>rd</sup> March</b></p> <p>RG stated he had some contacts to use for testing to send to ML.</p> <p>Dan Hatcher responded to say he would assist with the safety campaign briefs alongside his Apprentices.</p> <p>Michael Keaveny stated further information on HVO fuels would be of interest to him.</p> <p>ND wondered if there were any innovations on concrete wash outs –and using a blue rinse out cleaning out the pumping agitator, as a client was not accepting the discharge to the mat, or disposed of into drainage, following an enquiry with the Environment Agency.</p> <p>MS stated the EFFC have asked for at least one Safety Alert per month to distribute and capture learning. SJ stated he had a standard request for any Safety Alerts distributed by the FPS Secretariat to be put into the EFFC Standard template too and distributed.</p> <p><b>Action: FPS Secretariat to ensure dissemination of Safety Alerts and conversion into the EFFC Standard template.</b></p>	<p>PM</p> <p>CJ</p> <p>FPS Secretariat</p>

**Dates of 2022 Meetings (10am – 1pm)**

- Thursday 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2022, Keller Offices, 2 Kingdom Street London

**Please note the meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> March will be a hybrid meeting, a maximum 20 people can physically attend with the remainder in attendance virtually through Teams. Names will need to be submitted to [fps@fps.org.uk](mailto:fps@fps.org.uk) with confirmation of attendance to be shared with Security and facilitate access to the building.**

- Wednesday 8<sup>th</sup> June 2022
- Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> September 2022
- Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> November 2022