

**University *of*****Limerick**

**OLLSCOIL LUIMNIGH**

## MINUTES

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Meeting** | : | Safety Representative Committee |
|  | **Venue** | : | MS Teams Meeting |
|  | **Date** | : | Part 1: 4th of March 2021  |
|  | **Time** | :  | 12h00 – 13h00  |
|  | **Attendance****Recording Secretary**  | :: | P Thornton (Chair), G Armstrong, J Kennedy, S Clothier, S Murphy, M Hayes T Considine, A Dormer, M Toomey, L O’Shea, T IrwinL Fitzpatrick |
|  | **Apologies** | : | P Davern, A Moloney |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.**1.11.2**2.**2.1**3.****3.1****3.2****3.3****3.4****3.5****3.6****3.7****3.8****4.****5.****6.** | **Welcome**NOTED P Thornton welcomed all present to the Committee meeting. It was confirmed that M Fernstrom the safety representative for CSIS has retired and his contribution to the safety representative committee over the years was greatly appreciated.**Apologies**NOTED P Davern, A Moloney.**Minutes of previous meeting**NOTED Minutes of previous meeting – 11February 2021 were approved.**Control of Service Providers (SP):**NOTED P Thornton addressed committee members that the purpose of this meeting was to focus on the main agenda item of the Control of Service Providers and to provide resolutions to any queries and feedback which arose as part of the Control of SP Awareness Workshops which were held the past few weeks. Furthermore, P Thornton advised that this meeting is to clarify the role of the SP Coordinator and to provide clarification surrounding the Control of SP SOP document.**UPDATE:** M Hayes informed the committee that since our last meeting 3 SPs has been added to the SharePoint platform, 5 awareness workshops on the Control of SPs were held and from that a number of concerns and queries arose which will be examined in this forum for review and discussion. M Hayes provided a detailed itemised summary of the queries and concerns which were raised at the workshops. M Hayes summarised them as follows:**Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) Status*** Lack of consultation with staff, Head of Departments
* SOP is approved, staff have not been made aware of it.
* How will Service Providers know when UL Control of Service Provider documents are revised?

NOTED G Armstrong identified that colleagues have expressed impressions that this procedure has been approved by the Safety Reps Committee and asked for clarity surrounding the approval of the SOP.NOTED M Hayes confirmed that the Control of SP SOP was approved by the HR Division and P Thornton advised that the procedure was brought to this forum for notification purposes and feedback before it went through the approval and quality management system within the HR Division.NOTED J Kennedy thanked H&S for the clarification and requested /queried whether the safety reps minutes could be published on the H&S website. She advised that this request was raised at CTO level regarding making the minutes available for viewing.NOTED P Thornton advised that the safety reps minutes were always publically displayed on the notice board onsite but due to remote working this is obviously not the case at present. He asked L Fitzpatrick could the minutes be made publically available to staff.**ACTION** L Fitzpatrick advised that she would update the H&S website to include the up to date minutes.NOTED M Hayes highlighted a question that arose in the workshops about an email being sent to all SP Coordinators as to what points have changed within the SOP.**ACTION** M Hayes advised that the H&S Unit can arrange a MS Teams meeting with HOD’s to create further awareness. NOTED G Armstrong advised that his general manager was unaware of the new Control of SP SOP and highlighted that a number of HODs & Schools are not aware of their roles and responsibilities in relation to the Control of SPs.NOTED P Thornton advised that correspondence was sent to all Members of Management Council and a number of responses are still outstanding.NOTED J Kennedy attended the Control of SP Awareness Workshop and it was stated at the workshop that the HOD was the person responsible for nominating a SP coordinator and they need to be briefed and their responsibilities highlighted to them for them to be aware.**AGREED** Committee members agreed that all HODs needed to be briefed on their role & responsibility under the SOP. **SOP Responsibilities** * Confusion of stakeholder responsibilities between the SOP and Awareness workshop

NOTED M Hayes stated that there was confusion regarding one of the slides in the workshop surrounding the responsibilities of the stakeholder that conflicted with the SOP and this slide has been updated. **UL Staff SOP Training*** Awareness of Heads of Department of the new process and work involved – HOD need training
* All UL staff need training in this process.
* Dates for additional Service Provider Co-Ordinator training

NOTED M Hayes advised that there would be further training for Service Provider Co-ordinators delivered by J Mc Loughlin from Optima and dates will be reviewed following completion of this month’s safety reps meeting.NOTED J Kennedy queried what the external training would encompass.NOTED M Hayes advised that there will be more detailed information surrounding the paperwork required for Control of SPs.NOTED J Kennedy queried whether the training was for HODs also and whether it would be beneficial to hold off on the external training until the HODs have awareness of the SOP.M Hayes advised that the training dates with Optima can be postponed until clarification is confirmed with the HODs.NOTED J Kennedy and M Toomey queried who was the competent person to sign off on the risk assessment for the Control of SPs and who the responsibility lies with. They highlighted that this would need to be teased out further.ACTION P Thornton highlighted that this will be reviewed.**Shared SPs*** Ownership of SPs in common to most departments e.g. printer servicing and repairs/

Water provision/shredding. General permits for same. NOTED P Thornton queried whether the water supply to departments was under the management of B&E.NOTED T Considine advised that each dept. is in charge of their own water cooler and that only half the water coolers supplied and maintained were arranged by B&E but the maintenance of other coolers were the responsibility of the depts.NOTED M Toomey advised that they have 2 water coolers in GEMS, 1 was installed by B&E and the other was installed by the dept. Recently there was servicing of water coolers arranged by B&E and the SP was told not to enter GEMS and as far as the dept. is aware the SP did not enter GEMS to service the water cooler.NOTED T Considine advised that the water cooler maintenance SP was probably following a scheduling of locations to check and advised there are exceptions to the rule that B&E and H&S should liaise offline regarding these type of situations and come up with a resolution.**AGREED** T Considine & H&S Unit to discuss in further detail. NOTED G Armstrong advised that there is unintended inefficiencies within the servicing system. He stated that a SP arranged by B&E to service dispensers which were installed by B&E and under instruction by B&E the SP was informed not to service dept. owned units even though the SP was in the building. NOTED T Considine advised that he wasn’t aware of this and it had not been raised at the B&E Steering committee.**ACTION** T Considine advised that B&E will come up with a suggestion.**Sourcing SP Training Records*** Staff are not comfortable with sourcing SP training records and checking the validity of same.
* Storing SP training certificates and UL Induction competency answer sheets on the UL SharePoint site.

NOTED M Hayes addressed that staff were not comfortable with sourcing SP training records and checking the validity. M Hayes suggested as a resolution to this concern if a declaration from the SP was provided stating the competency of their SP personnel. M Hayes advised that this would then remove the need to store and check validity.NOTED T Considine advised that there is expected due diligence that the person is trained and competent that a list of personnel from the SP could be an option.NOTED G Armstrong highlighted that their dept. would get SP service engineers and there is not just one formal qualification for the work that they are doing.NOTED T Considine agreed in those scenarios a list of personnel that are appropriately trained by the SP would be suitable. **AGREED:** P Thornton highlighted that there were still 3 items remaining and they required reasonable consideration. Committee members agreed to meet again on Monday 8th of March @11h00 to continue discussions on the remaining queries surrounding the Control of SPs.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Meeting** | : | Part 2: Continuation of Safety Representative Committee Meeting |
| **Venue** | : | MS Teams Meeting |
| **Date** | : | 8th of March 2021 |
| **Time** | :  | 11h00 – 12h00 |
| **Attendance****Recording Secretary**  | :: | P Thornton (Chair), G Armstrong, J Kennedy, S Clothier, S Murphy, M Hayes, T Considine, , A Dormer, M Toomey, L O’Shea, T IrwinM Hayes  |
| **Apologies** | : | P Davern, A Moloney, L Fitzpatrick |

**General Permits*** Some Service Provider Co-Ordinators are not comfortable with issuing general permits to work, it is felt the general permit is a legal agreement between UL and another company and should be only signed by a senior UL representative e.g. HOD
* Paper format for General Permit to work form -COVID-19- could an IT solution e.g. app be used?

NOTED M Hayes highlighted that the general permit goes through safety concern whereas in the past the SP would have provided all these details verbally with staff that were bringing in a SP on campus.NOTED S Clothier advised that he had no problem signing the general permit but had concerns for having to be present with the SP with general work permit if work was being carried out in the chemistry labs without having the knowledge.NOTED M Hayes advised that yes the SP has to be issued with a general permit but the SP Coordinator does not need to accompany the SP for the duration of the works.NOTED J Kennedy queried if the RA could be linked in better to the general work permit as there seems to be duplication.NOTED M Hayes highlighted that the purpose of the general permit is to authorise the SP to work there and that due diligence was completed on the SP background for the permit. M Hayes stated that it was open to discussion as to how the risk assessment can be included.NOTED J Kennedy highlighted that the general work permit template was based on B&E form and some of the content doesn’t fit for departments SPs.NOTED T Considine stated if depts. wanted to tweak the basic general permit that would be fine. The general work permit could be altered to suit depts. that don’t require B&E intervention.**ACTION** M Hayes advised that the permit to work form could be edited and that feedback from CTOs would be necessary to document the required changes.NOTED The feasibility of an app was discussed and the committee agreed it would be welcome if it could be made available. NOTED J Kennedy enquired if the General permit would be in an electronic format. Committee agreed to same.**ACTION** Health and safety to revise general permit. **Additional Permits & Roof Access*** Concerns about getting an additional permit from B&E if the need is determined when issuing the general permit to work/ it is discovered that an additional permit is needed while the SP has started work on campus/ in an emergency call out.
* Service Providers are not happy/ felt strongly against that roof risk assessments must be carried out and the UL Department bringing in the SP is responsible for supervision while the SP is on the roof.
* Why has the process changed from previous ownership by B&E?

NOTED S Clothier enquired if there was a phone number for UL departments to contact B&E for permits in an emergency or to advise if an SP is running late. M Hayes directed the committee to Section 7 of the SOP. **ACTION** T Considine agreed to meet with M Hayes to detail specific lines of communication after he consulted with B&E colleagues. NOTED L O’ Shea queried the management of the ASRS in the library, T Considine confirmed that management of same would remain with B&E. NOTED J Kennedy raised concerns about additional permits. Staff are concerned about managing roof access for SPs. The competence to assess the risk and manage the SP’s roof access is not available in the departments. People were not happy to access the roof and feel it is a B&E responsibility. J Kennedy confirmed that it is a major concern for staff.NOTED S Clothier confirmed that he did not feel comfortable assessing or accessing the roof or supervising roof access as per the SOP. He advised that B&E should be responsible. He stated that the UL department would need training and at regular intervals due to infrequent roof access. NOTED T Considine provided information on roof classification; stating 4 classes and more than likely departments would need to access 2 out of the four roof classifications. He stated that these roofs would have railings and matting installed. NOTED J Kennedy asked whether B&E could do the roof access risk assessments for each of the buildings. NOTED T Considine advised that this would not be feasible as there are too many variables for the drawings and it would become unreadable. NOTED Committee members raised issues including that department staff have never been on the roof, there is a lack of connectivity between issuing permits e.g. hot work, roof access and there could be other work being carried on the roof and UL staff issuing the permit would not know about it. NOTED A Dormer enquired if roofs are already marked out/ is the video footage available? NOTED T Considine provided that B&E have a drone with good camera capability and could look to provide photographs, drawings of building roofs to help assist with risk assessment authoring.The committee queried why the process of permit issuing has changed? NOTED T Considine advised that the process has been tightened up as regulations are more stringent. B&E staff were doing favours by meeting UL department SPs and they didn’t know if the SP had insurances etc. and they were seen as the permit holder who was officially connected to the SP by the permit. T Considine stated that B&E do not have the resources to manage and supervise other UL department SPs.NOTED J Kennedy indicated that the issuing of permits needs to be further teased out as there is a lot of unrest about roof access. Biological Sciences currently have two SPs (Kelly Refrigeration and NSP) who need roof access. Staff will not go up on the roof. NOTED J Kennedy asked whether B&E would issue drawings of the roof/plans for the SP’s roof access? NOTED J Kennedy queried if insurance is part of H&S or should it be a procurement issue? Noted S Clothier queried what is the procedure if access is required to a Class C or D roof? NOTED T Considine indicated that the department would need to conduct a risk assessment and if fall arrest equipment is needed then B&E would take over the management of it as the SP would need Fall Protection training. T Considine indicated if there are unknowns in the risk assessment departments can get help from the H&S Unit and B&E. T Considine indicated that additional training will aid departments to manage roof access. NOTED M Toomey reported that there are issues in getting inclusion of the UL indemnity on the SP’s insurance certificates. She advised that the Insurance Coordinator C Donnellan in B&E confirmed that it is satisfactory if the SP’s insurance certificate contains the text “indemnity to principal clause”**ACTION** M Hayes to update the SP SOP. NOTED M Toomey queried Section 8 of the SP SOP regarding supervision and indicated that the text is misleading and would be understood that an SP supervisor needed to be on campus while the SP was working there. **ACTION** H&S Unit to review wording. NOTED M Toomey queried how actors involved in GEMS practical/exams are classified? Actors are paid for the day/week they work. **ACTION** H&S Unit to query with UL Insurance Coordinator C Donnellan. NOTED S Clothier queried if a SP sends in the completed SF-032 COVID-19 Screening questionnaire on Friday, are they allowed to work on the following Monday?NOTED M Hayes & P Thornton agreed that if there are no issues declared that they are permitted to work on the Monday. NOTED S Clothier queried what are the next actions regarding this procedure?NOTED P Thornton advised that the views of the committee would be considered and reviewed.  **SharePoint Site*** Can departments access the B&E Service Provider library?

**ACTION** T Considine will discuss with the B&E Health and Safety committee to investigate feasibility to sharing access to B&E SP information.**Accidents & Dangerous Occurrences**- **for the period 11.02.2021-08.03.2021.**Accidents and incidents were not included in the meeting. There were also no accidents or dangerous occurrences during the reporting period.**Any Other Business**NONE**Next Meeting**NOTED P Thornton confirmed our next meeting will be on April 8th 2021 @ 14H00. | **LF****PT & MH****PT****TC & H&S****TC****MH****PT & MH****TC & MH****MH****PT & MH****PT & MH** **TC** |