

Phil Chambers

From: phil@strategicsafety.co.uk on behalf of Phil Chambers at Strategic Safety Systems Ltd.
[phil@strategicsafety.co.uk]
Sent: 10 December 2013 10:32
To: phil@strategicsafety.co.uk
Subject: News and Legal Updates from Strategic Safety Systems Ltd.!



Strategic Safety Systems Ltd. Newsletter

December 2013
Issue 1

Dear Philip,

Welcome to the first December edition of our newsletter. What we aim to do is to provide information which is of use to you and to let you know the activities in which we have been involved. We also aim to let you know of any incidents that have occurred in, and legislation that is related to, the areas in which we work. We realise that, with the broad spectrum of our activities, some may not be relevant to you but we hope you find the rest useful.

Whilst the intention of this newsletter is to be useful, we realise that most people are plagued by spam and should you wish to prevent future issues being sent to you, unsubscribe using the link at the bottom of the page.

Regards,

Philip Chambers
Strategic Safety Systems Ltd.

IN THIS ISSUE

[BEWARE NEW MACHINERY](#)

[COMPENSATION CULTURE THE MAIN CULPRIT](#)

[LACK OF GUARDING](#)

[INCIDENTS AND COURT CASES](#)

[DAILY UPDATES](#)

QUICK LINKS

[Our website](#)

[More about INTACT](#)

[Health, safety, environmental support](#)

Beware new machinery

There seems to be a belief with some companies that all new machinery must be safe. There is also the belief that CE marked machinery has passed the test of some inspector.

For a start, all new machinery must be CE marked and the lack of such a mark and accompanying certificates should start alarm bells ringing. I have just checked two new machines, one from Canada and another from within the EU; neither had CE marks and there were deficiencies with both machines. In the end, it is the user company who must ensure that equipment is safe and who ultimately carry the can, even if the supplier is also prosecuted. And forget about the CE inspector; apart from very specific cases, the process is that of self-certification.

If you are a buyer, then make sure that you clearly specify that the supplier must CE mark the equipment and be able to provide support documentation if requested. Wise buyers add a 5 or 10% payment hold back until this is supplied.

To explain CE marking a bit more, within the next hour we are sending an e-mail specifically on this topic, and you can always click the links below to see more.

[See Technical Paper on CE Marking.](#)

[See SSS services on CE Marking](#)

Compensation culture the main culprit

Claims by the PM and others that health and safety legislation poses a major burden on business are false, states Kevin Bridges, who is a Partner at Pinsett Masons and also a council member of IOSH.

It is the 'compensation culture', whether real or perceived and the insurance industry imposing unnecessary requirements on businesses that is the biggest burden, not health and safety laws,

states Bridges.

Whilst section 69 of the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013 (who comes up with these names?) which changed the Health and Safety at Work Act so that personal injury claimants will need to prove negligence will go some way to address the compensation culture, it is now the turn of the insurance injury to take action to reduce the unnecessary burden it places on employers.

Source: SHP December 2013

Need help with insurance company requirements? [See SSS support services.](#)

Lack of guarding a major cause in injuries

The three court cases listed below are the latest in a lengthening list of cases where the accident should have been prevented with proper guarding.

There is no excuse for failing to guard drives on any equipment, whether it be conveyors, as in two of the cases, or other machinery. Whilst interlocks on some equipment can be difficult to implement, the plastics silo case was inexcusable.

In general, equipment can be properly guarded, and this is certainly true with guards over drive trains.

[See SSS support in identifying problems and solutions with guarding.](#)

Incidents and court cases

Lack of guarding causes loss of two fingers

Sofidel UK Ltd, one of Europe's largest tissue and paper towel manufacturers based in Leicester, has been fined after a worker had to have the tips of two fingers amputated after trapping them in a badly-guarded conveyor drive while trying to clear a blockage.

[See details](#)

Unguarded conveyor drive chain causes loss of 3 fingers.

A Lincolnshire timber company has been fined £28,000 after an employee severed three fingers in an unguarded chain drive on a conveyor.

[See details](#)

Lack of guarding causes loss of 2 fingers in plastics silo

A worker at Regain Polymers had two fingers pulled from their sockets as he cleaned a silo because inadequate guarding.

[See details](#)

Daily updates

Don't forget, there's lots of useful information that is highlighted typically daily on the SSS Twitter and Blog sites.

Follow us on 

 Visit our blog

I hope you have found this information of interest. If you have any suggestions of other information you would like to see, please [contact me](#)

Regards,

Philip Chambers

Strategic Safety Systems Ltd.

[Forward email](#)



This email was sent to phil@strategicsafety.co.uk by phil@strategicsafety.co.uk | [Update Profile/Email Address](#) | Instant removal with [SafeUnsubscribe™](#) | [Privacy Policy](#).
Strategic Safety Systems Ltd. | 8 The Highgrove | Bishops Cleeve | Cheltenham | GL52 8JA | United Kingdom