
Safety Assessment Federation

MINUTES of the inaugural meeting of the SAFed LG1 Main Review Committee

held at

LEIA, 33-34 Devonshire Street, London W1G 6PY
on Tuesday 16th March 2004

PRESENT:

Antony Thompson	- Health and Safety Executive - Chairman
Richard Morgan	- SAFed, Technical Director - Secretary
Mark Wilson	- Health and Safety Executive
Clare Field	- Health and Safety Executive
Alex Carmichael	- SAFed (Plant Safety Ltd)
Martin Banasik	- SAFed (Allianz Cornhill Engineering)
Richard Hulmes	- SAFed, Technical Director (Designate)
Bob Lee	- LEIA
Derek Smith	- LEIA (Otis plc)
Ray Shivers	- Westminster City Council
Alan Taylor	- Carillion Services Ltd
Gabriel Izienicki	- London Underground Ltd
Derek Cooper	- Lift Forum (Dunbar Boardman and Cooper)
Lee Smith	- INITA (Oast Engineering Inspection Ltd)
John Smith	- BAA plc
John Carroll	- CIBSE Lifts Group (Hoare Lee Lift Engineering)

1. Apologies, Opening and Introduction

It was noted that apologies had been received from Mr Roy Markham – LEIA (Schindler Lifts).

Upon completion of a “tour de table” and a summary of the background to and origin of SAFed Lifting Guidelines 1 (LG1), the Chairman commented that the Guidelines, which were very widely used by many parties, had been produced by industry for use by industry. The Chairman continued by stating that he was pleased to see a wide representation of interests within the Main Review Committee and that the present LG1 would remain extant until such times that the revision process was complete.

2. Confirmation of Agenda

The proposed Agenda was confirmed.

3. Terms of Reference (TOR)

Noting that there would undoubtedly be a need to treat the Committee TOR with a certain degree of flexibility in order to achieve the aim of producing a revised LG1, Derek Cooper proposed and Alan Taylor seconded a proposal to adopt the TOR as presented.(Attachment I)

4. Identification/Confirmation of the issues that need to be considered during the review

The issues that had been detailed within Attachment II to the meeting Agenda were reviewed in turn. Discussions highlighted that the issues were indeed all highly relevant, the following notable points were made:

- The need to clarify the scope, status and purpose of LG1 is an essential part of the review. A revised LG1 will need to be written in such a manner that it can be easily understood by all potential readers, not just those within industry.
- Terminology needs to be consistent with that used in the relevant harmonised standards.
- References to risk assessment in the present LG1 need to be clarified – Ideally the process of identifying what thorough examination supplementary tests are considered necessary should take account of original design parameters.

It was agreed that 2 additional issues needed to be considered as part of the review namely:

- Updating the legal commentary, and
- Reviewing the recommended “Test Report Forms”

5. LG1 Review Modus Operandi

Acknowledging that it would not be appropriate for the Main Review Committee to consider all the identified issues, there was agreement to a proposal by the Chairman for the main part of the review process to be undertaken by 2 Working Parties (WPs). It was further agreed that the division of work between the 2 WPs would be on the basis of one WP reviewing technical issues and the other reviewing those issues that were considered to be strategic. (Refer to Attachment II for division of work)

A proposal for Martin Banasik (SAFed) to lead WP1 (Strategic issues) and Derek Smith (LEIA) to lead WP2 (Technical issues) was agreed. Members of the committee agreed to participate in the WPs as shown at Attachment II.

[Post meeting note: WP1 is scheduled to meet on 26th May at Allianz Cornhill Engineering, Liphook. WP2 is scheduled to meet on 29th April 2004 at LEIA, London]

It was noted that the WPs would need to work flexibly to achieve their allocated tasks and that they would probably need to co-opt appropriate persons other than those from within the Main Review Committee.

Bob Lee (LEIA) volunteered to provide secretarial support to the WPs.

6. Date and Time of next meeting

The Chairman commented that in order to achieve the review completion date of April 2005, the inertia of the review needed to be maintained. To this end it was agreed that the Main Review Committee would next meet on the **30th June 2004 at 10.30 at the offices of LEIA.** The main purpose of the meeting would be to receive progress reports from the 2 WPs. It would become more clear at the 30th June 2004 meeting whether the target date of April 2005 for completion of the review was indeed a realistic target.

LG1 MAIN REVIEW COMMITTEE - TERMS OF REFERENCE

OBJECTIVES

- To bring forward the revision of the Safety Assessment Federation (SAFed) Guidelines - “Thorough Examination and Testing” (LG1)
- To consider the scope and application of LG1
- To involve all parties with significant interests and incorporate any proposed amendments arising from:
 - * Experiences gained since LG1 was adopted in 1998
 - * The application of current knowledge and techniques
 - * Changes in technology
 - * Components not previously considered
- To consider all relevant European and United Kingdom legislation and Standards

AIMS

- To consider any issues regarding the present edition of LG1 submitted to the Main Review Committee
- To convene any necessary Work Groups to provide recommendations to the Main Review Committee on changes to technical or other issues
- To draft a revised LG1 incorporating all relevant information
- To complete a consultation exercise and incorporate any necessary amendments
- To accomplish the task by April 2005

Working Party 1 (Strategic Issues)

- Martin Banasik - SAFed (Allianz Cornhill Engineering) – WP Leader
- John Smith - BAA plc
- Alan Taylor - Carillion Services
- Roy Markham - LEIA (Schindler Lifts)
- Lee Smith - INITA (Oast Engineering Inspection)

- Clare Field - HSE – Corresponding member- Legal Commentary only

Meeting scheduled for 26th May 2004 at Allianz Cornhill Engineering, Liphook.

Issues to be considered:

1. The need to clarify the status and purpose of the Guidelines – Large numbers of duty holders and lift maintenance companies are confused with respect to the status and purpose of the Guidelines. The biggest confusion appears to be centered around whether the recommended examinations and tests are mandatory and also whether they constitute everything that is required to be undertaken as part of a lift thorough examination.
2. Terminology requires reviewing to ensure that there is consistency and clarity of purpose with respect to the recommended tests.
3. All LG1 recommended tests/examinations need reviewing in light of the informative Annex E to EN 81-1/2:1998 (Periodical examinations and tests) which states that “periodical tests should not be more stringent than those required before the lift was put into service for the first time” and that “periodical tests should not, through their repetition, cause excessive wear or impose stresses likely to reduce the safety of the lift”.
[Note: This issue will also be considered by WP2]
5. Risk assessment. The references to "risk assessment" in LG1 implies merely a mental exercise that does not need to be documented - is this really "risk assessment?" If not, then should it be called by something different?
6. Update legal commentary.

Working Party 2 (Technical Issues)

Derek Smith	-	LEIA (Otis plc) – WP Leader
Gabriel Izienicki	-	London Underground Ltd
Alex Carmichael	-	SAFed (Plant Safety Ltd)
Derek Cooper	-	Lift Forum (Dunbar Boardman and Cooper)
John Carroll	-	CIBSE Lifts Group (Hoare Lee Lift Engineering)

Meeting scheduled for 29th April 2004 at LEIA.

Issues to be considered:

1. Pressure testing versus visual inspection of hydraulic cylinders.
2. The recommendations for testing “Car overload detection devices” needs to be reviewed.
3. Consideration needs to be given to providing information regarding the testing of Machine Room Less lifts (MRL’s)
4. All LG1 recommended tests/examinations need reviewing in light of the informative Annex E to EN 81-1/2:1998 (Periodical examinations and tests) which states that “periodical tests should not be more stringent than those required before the lift was put into service for the first time” and that “periodical tests should not, through their repetition, cause excessive wear or impose stresses likely to reduce the safety of the lift”.
[Note: This issue will also be considered by WP1]
5. Testing with weights compared with using test system such the Adia system. Testing with weights is expensive and manual handling is the greatest cause of industrial accidents. On the other hand, the Adia system is not a full test.
6. The need or otherwise to test buffers.
7. Gearboxes. Are there sufficient competent people available to accurately assess the internal condition of gearboxes, even if they are dismantled? Even partial dismantling of gearcases, when undertaken by persons of limited competence, can create its own hazards.
8. Test report forms.