

**Safety Training Standards & Delivery Fall Protection SME
March 18, 2009**

Invitees	Affiliation	Attend?	Invitees	Affiliation	Attend?
Dave Taylor	Chemfab	Yes	Kevin Mackowski	IOL	Yes
Blair Allin	Boilermakers	Regrets	Lonnie Cope	Suncor	Regrets
Dave Lambert	CSAO	Info only	Gary Krumholtz	Shell	Yes
Tom Hennessy	IEC	Yes	Jim Joncas	NOVA	Yes
Tracy Verdone	LamSar	Yes	John Huybers	Curran	No
Victor Horvath	Laborers	Yes	Ron Mombourquette	ALUMA	Yes
Brian Strong	Millwrights	No	Moe Carson	UA	Yes
Doug McKay - Scribe	Kel-Gor	Yes			

Acceptance of Previous Meeting Minutes

Minutes accepted as written

Template

Discussed in follow-ups

Follow Ups from Previous Meeting – Action Items

1. Committee for Cost/Benefit Analysis

Jim, Kevin and Ron developed a presentation for use in discussing the issue of 1.8 metre fall protection requirements with the Client group to gain acceptance. The group reviewed the presentation and felt that it was well done and to the point. A few suggestions were made for improvements. Jim will make the changes and resend the presentation to all committee members.

Tom agreed to research companies locally to determine those that currently use 3 metres and those that currently use 1.8 metres to determine the extent of the issue.

Discussion led to the conclusion that there needed to be a point made in the presentation of this material that Clients are already making concessions in their own procedures and standards to begin to align to a common standard. We felt that this would be a powerful motivator for others to accept changes to standards.

2. Populating Training Template

Lonnie, Dave, Doug, Tom and Mike Manz met on March 16. Mike assisted with an explanation of the template and how it works. The group began filling out the template in the meeting. It was decided that as a group, the SME has reached a certain point in the requirements to be able to complete the template, but significant work is still required.

The group was asked to review the template in its current state and come back to the meeting next week with suggestions for addition, deletion or change. Doug will send the document to the group.

The template was reviewed to its current state by the group and it was decided that Lonnie, Dave, Doug, and Tom would meet again on March 23 to determine appropriate next steps in populating the template.

The recommended path forward was that volunteers or small groups of volunteers would take away the responsibility for sections of the template.

On March 25, the group will review the suggested divisions for completion and choose champions for each section.

3. Scaffold Tagging Standardization

Ron and Kevin reviewed the issue of 3 tag vs. 2 tag systems and the value of everyone using the same system. The item was discussed with IOL and commitment was received to change over to a 3 tag system on the IOL site. It is currently being used for the Tail Gas project as a trial, but will be made site wide.

Additional follow-ups

1. Feedback Loop on IEC Website

The link on the website is functional. Requests, comments, questions will be sent to Doug through the use of an e-mail link identified on the site. The link works. The group discussed the possibility of additional “advertising” of the link to increase the probability of feedback. The group decided that the link had been sufficiently advertised and that anyone interested will use it. Forcing the issue may just cause a lot of unnecessary dialogue and too much information to process.

Other Discussion Items

Discussion was held on whether or not “double self-retracting lanyards” should be made mandatory equipment. Each member is to research within their organization what the consequences of such a recommendation being implemented might be.

Ron mentioned a style of equipment that has a shock absorber as part of the mechanism. He was asked to come back next week with information on how the mechanism works.

The group discussed the logistics of “certified” trainers having access to the training materials. It was felt that the best method may be to have the materials available through the IEC website with certified trainers having a password to access the materials as one option.

The question of recommending a particular type of equipment was tabled for later discussion by the group.

A question was raised about whether or not "Senior Management" in organizations understood enough about the issue of fall protection to be able to make valid observations of compliance in the field. The group agreed that there was probably a reasonable understanding among the Contractor management but there may not be among the Client Management.

It was felt that each organization needed to make a determination of what level within the organization would benefit from the training to give them a better understanding of the issues. The organization would then agree to ensure that level of management received the training.

Action Items

1. Everyone is asked to research their information related to Self Retracting Lanyards and come prepared to discuss at the next meeting. Ron agreed to bring back information on the shock absorbing self retracting lanyards
2. Everyone is asked to review the template in its current state and come back next week with additions, deletions or changes.
3. Dave, Doug, Lonnie and Tom will come back with recommendations for the next phase of template completion at the next meeting.
4. Jim will revise the Cost/benefit presentation based on feedback from this meeting

Next Meeting

March 25, 2009 – 1:00 – 3:00 IEC Board Room