

From: phil@strategicsafety.co.uk on behalf of Phil Chambers at Strategic Safety Systems Ltd.
[phil@strategicsafety.co.uk]
Sent: 13 September 2013 11:26
To: phil@strategicsafety.co.uk
Subject: News and Legal Updates from Strategic Safety Systems Ltd.!



Strategic Safety Systems Ltd. Newsletter

**September 2013
Issue 1**

Dear Philip,

Welcome to the first September 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 FSC AND PEFC](#)
- [FORKLIFT TRUCK DRIVERS AND HEARING PROTECTION](#)
- [UPDATES COMING IN RIDDOR](#)
- [INCIDENTS AND COURT CASES](#)
- [DAILY UPDATES](#)

QUICK LINKS

- [Our website](#)
- [More about INTACT](#)
- [Health, safety, environmental support](#)

Requirement to report "Greenhouse" gases

Here's one that has sneaked in through the back door: The Companies Act 2006 (Strategic Report and Directors' Report) Regulations 2013 requires medium and large companies to disclose greenhouse gas emissions.

A bit of detective work has indicated that the "medium" threshold applies to all UK incorporated companies listed on the main market of the London Stock Exchange, a European Economic Area market or whose shares are dealing on the New York Stock Exchange or NASDAQ.

Forklift truck drivers and mandatory hearing protection

A local client recently posed this issue:

"If you have a mandatory hearing protection area, should forklift truck drivers who enter this area be required to wear hearing protection?"

The issues are:

1. Are drivers above the 2nd action point of the Control of Noise at Work Regs?
2. Will risks increase if drivers are wearing hearing protection?
3. Does "mandatory" mean what it says on the tin?

The answers are:

1. A calculation shows that drivers are below the 2nd action point.
2. Forklift truck operations are always high risk, and impediments will increase the risk.
3. If you've got a mandatory area, then all must wear hearing protection.

Risk [2] far outweighs risk [1].

Therefore, you should not require your forklift truck drivers to wear hearing protection and you should amend your signage and working practices in the high noise level areas to state that the wearing of hearing protection does not apply to forklift truck drivers.

Changes to RIDDOR

RIDDOR 2013 is due to come into force on 1st October. The main changes are:

- Occupational diseases reduced to 6
- Dangerous occurrences reduced

There is not enough space in this newsletter to list the diseases and dangerous occurrences, but SSS have made this available in Technical Paper 21.

[See Technical Paper 21](#)

Incidents and court cases

There's a depressing theme in the following 3 cases. All involve overridden or missing interlocks. Overriding interlocks is both crazy and anyone disabling an interlock is contravening clause 8 of HSAW Act., which effectively means it's a criminal act. The other observation I make is that the level of the fines is incredibly low; however, they do not reflect the additional changes made by the HSE under the Fees for Intervention Scheme.

Lack of interlocked guard causes broken arm and lost job

B&W Group Ltd, a Worthing company that makes audio equipment used by leading recording studios, has been fined £10,978 (inc. costs) after a worker broke an arm in an unguarded machine.

[See details](#)

Disabled guard interlock claims another victim

Radford HMY Group Limited, Newcastle, were fined £7,388 (inc. costs) on 10th September 2013, after a worker's hand was badly crushed in a machine on which an interlocked guard had been deliberately disabled.

[See details](#)

Defeated interlock switch causes finger loss

Incube, a Staffordshire furniture company, has been fined £9,025 (inc. costs) after an employee severed a finger in an unguarded machine..

[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 

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](#)





Try it FREE today.

This email was sent to phil@strategicsafety.co.uk by phil@strategicsafety.co.uk | [Update Profile/Email Address](#) | Instant removal with [SafeUnsubscribe™](#) | [Privacy Policy](#).

