

SOLUTIONS FOR ALL ACCESS CHALLENGES!

2017
AMSTERDAM
2 - 4 MAY

The International Access
Platform Exhibition

Register online for a **FREE** entry
www.apexshow.com




Sponsored by:

access
INTERNATIONAL

Supported by:

IPAF

khl

Find us on 

Readers Letters

c&a

letters



Truth, facts and openness

Dear Editor,

Following on from your excellent editorial, I was recently told by the managing director of one London based Contractor, how he was Paid (yes Paid) by another National Contractor to plead guilty to a Health & Safety Executive charge and take the rap for him.

When I pointed out to him that any attempt to 'Pervert the Course of Justice' was a Criminal Act, he replied that "This Kind of Thing goes on all the Time in the Construction Industry?"

So the problem of Lies, Alternative Facts and Suppression of the Truth maybe much bigger than you think !

Yours Sincerely

Vertikal Supporter.

*This letter as shocking as it is, was sent in response to an online editorial **Truth, facts and openness** in which we point out that lies and suppression of information, particularly around near misses and accidents, not to mention 'alternative facts' do occur but that those companies where this practice becomes part of the culture tend to do less well over the long-term than those with a more open, honest and truthful approach. An online poll on this subject indicates that many of our readers agree - it currently stands at 74.1 percent supporting this point while only 25.9 percent disagree - although so far only 220 individuals have voted. When this letter arrived in our offices it included the readers name, when we asked if that was OK to publish he said yes, then called back having had second thoughts and suggested the sign off we have used.*

More Sympatico

Dear Sir,

I really enjoyed reading the article about Mr Magni and the founder of the Chinese platform company (Xu Sughen - founder of Dingli) what particularly appealed to me was the personal aspect you added in to the coverage which I find sadly lacking in most industrial, or "trade" periodicals. I have followed Mr Magni's career since the early days of his involvement with Manitou, and had the pleasure to meet him on one occasion. He is a lovely man, and a genius engineer to boot. If his new booms are anything like the other products he has been responsible for, they will be the best in the market. I also liked the feature on the Ellis family by the way with the old photographs. Great magazine please keep it up and give us more stories like these.

I always enjoy receiving my copy regardless - many thanks
George Mathews

Battery charger developments for 110 volt supplies

Hi Mark

I hope you are well. I read Malcolm Bowers' letter about Battery Chargers for our big Scissor lifts.

We as a company are working towards providing Holland Lift, PB Lifetechnik, Airo (XL19E, A21) with a solution to try to manage the charging issues with these platforms from type 3(a) being Mobile vertical units.

We have supplied the charger that will shortly be installed in a development unit of an HL165 for a trial and test evaluation. We have an HF unit also in development but we want three to six months feedback with the SCR unit before attempting to improve and refine it.

What Mr. Bowers has omitted from his message is that most 110VAC supplies on site are limited to 16 amps which means that if you have say a 48 volt 50 amp charger designed to run on 110 volt AC 32 amp supply then you will simply get 50 percent output in charging current.

Take a look at the new Zivan SG3 charger. This is rated at 25 amps on a 120 Volt AC supply. When you put it onto 110 Volt AC system you will only get 22.5 amps at best.

Then you throw in voltage drop for using extension fly leads (see my prior letter In March 2015 cranes & access p67) you start to appreciate the "Real World" problems.

James Davies

Norco Energy

Scissor lift comparison correction

In the last issue we carried a comparison of slab electric scissor lifts (page 32) following the introduction of the new JCB range. Given the mass of data and tight deadlines we made an error in that we appear to have used the ANSI specification for the Skyjack SJIII4740 rather than the CE version. The platform capacity should have been 350kg rather than the 227kg we published, while GVW should have been 2,985kg not 3,393kg. The online/digital version has been updated. For thoroughness here is the corrected chart.

The JCB S4046 v the competition

Make Model	Haulotte Compact 14	Imer IT12122	JCB S4046	Genie	Skyjack SJIII 4740
Work Height	13.85m	13.9m	13.9M	13.89m	13.8m
Capacity	350kg	350kg	320kg	249kg	350kg
Width	1.2m	1.22m	1.15m	1.19m	1.19m
Length	2.49m	2.47m	2.39m	2.44m	2.40m
Stowed Height*	2.08m	2.11m	1.98m	1.88m	2.21m
Weight	3,175kg	3,085kg	2,996kg	3,260kg	2,985kg
Battery	340Ah	300Ah	300Ah	300AH	300Ah
Deck ext	920mm	1.4m	900mm	910mm	900mm
Raise/lower	61/50 sec	75/60sec	75/60sec	71/41sec	71/41 sec
Gradeability	23%	25%	25%	25%	25%
Travel speed	2.7kph	4kph	3.2kph	3.1kph	3.2kph

* Guardrails folded

Training is the playing field level?

The following Open Letter from Mr Mick Norton to Gordon Jenkins director of operations at the Construction Skills Certification Scheme included us in the distribution. It raises concerns that the playing field is not level when it comes to training. In his letter he specifically cites ALLMI and IPAF training. Mr Jenkins responded promptly to Mr Norton, copying us in on his response, which we also publish below.

Dear Mr Jenkins,

In recent correspondence, you have staunchly defended the status quo in the awarding of the CSCS logo to various industry card schemes, and the respective requirement for some to achieve an NVQ level 2 whilst others are granted an opt-out. The CSCS seems to be returning to the days when its scheme was not clear and free of ambiguity. Whilst the CSCS insist on the achievement of an NVQ level 2 for the NPORS and CPCS schemes an opt-out has been granted for ALLMI, PAL/IPAF and EUSR-Utilities by the CSCS, where the latter schemes can carry the logo but without its card holders having to work toward, or achieve an NVQ.

All of the above schemes are comprised of skilled occupations and the CSCS policy is clearly contradictory when it states that the minimum standard is an NVQ level 2 qualification relevant to the occupations plus a separate health and safety element for all?

If a site worker seeks a Lorry Loader qualification through ALLMI there's no NVQ required whereas the CPCS and NPORS schemes will impose a vocational qualification with additional expenditure for the candidate/employer. Similarly, a candidate seeking a Mobile Elevating Work Platform qualification through PAL/IPAF will not need to fund an NVQ level 2 whereas the same qualification through CPCS or NPORS will need to achieve NVQ level 2.

The ALLMI course does not incorporate an NVQ, although it is mapped against National Occupational Standards, (NOS), as well as applicable parts of the BS 7121 series. The CPCS training outcomes, syllabus and technical test are similarly mapped against the relevant (NOS). Notwithstanding the clear lack of parity for all those seeking a CSCS logo it is inconsistent and without a doubt grossly unfair in as much it imposes financial hardship on many individuals that have to fund their own NVQ.

When the great and the good gather to make these decisions on awarding affiliation to the CSCS logo they need to put themselves in the place of a ground worker on £10/hour seeking a singular NPORS or CPCS qualification in order to get him/herself started on site. Eg: A Leeds based CPCS test centre is charging potential Lorry Loader A36, (hook or clamshell), candidates £1,500 to qualify for red card status in one day. Add to that the NVQ charge of say, £650, and this candidate will have to work six weeks to accrue £2,150. NPORS candidates will have to fund the same route albeit at a much lower cost than CPCS. By comparison, the ALLMI route to full competence will see an expenditure of only approximately £500. Where is the parity when NPORS, CPCS and ALLMI delivery of the lorry loader modules are based on identical learning outcomes based on the national occupational standards?

The disparity of the CLC/CSCS decision on who must do an NVQ and those such as ALLMI, PAL/IPAF and EUSR - Utilities who many consider should be challenged in court, if necessary, by those in industry who find themselves

financially penalised when seeking comparable qualifications from two card schemes carrying the same CSCS logo.

Whilst the concept of a single logo embracing all stakeholders who support the CSCS initiative is best intentioned, some have clearly been more aggressive with their applications with provisos that the status quo remains unaltered and the need to achieve an NVQ be deleted.

There is a simple solution which the CSCS and CLC must consider for the maintenance of a level playing field,

- "Either all schemes do an NVQ or the NVQ is not required by all schemes seeking the CSCS logo, with no exceptions."

I am in no way questioning the quality of what ALLMI are delivering it is second to none for those seeking the lorry loader competency with regulated training and quality assured instructors, key points lacking in other schemes.

Once again, on the independent auditor for the CSCS could you confirm that it is ex CITB Head of Education and Research, Nick Gooderson?

Regards,

Mick Norton BEM

The response

Dear Mr Norton,

Regarding your follow up there is little I can add to my previous responses. All schemes applying to display the CSCS logo have been through an approved audit process to ensure compliance with the CLC requirements.

In accordance with the CLC requirements our responsibility is to ensure all schemes adopt NVQ's, or suitable equivalents as confirmed by the relevant standard setting body, before granting use of the CSCS logo. If you have a concern that any of the schemes you mentioned do not map to the sector standard then you should raise this directly with CITB who is the appropriate standard setting body in this case.

Regards

Gordon Jenkins

Director of Operations

Construction Skills Certification Scheme Ltd

Erwin Müller 1951-2017

Access industry veteran Erwin Müller passed away on Saturday, March 11th, he was 65. Müller retired as managing director of Rosenbauer Schweiz at the end of 2015 and remained as a consultant to the company until late last year.



He began his career with Simon Aerials in the 1980s and was with the company when it was acquired by Terex. He later moved to Grove Manlift, where he became a district manager. At the time of his retirement the company said: "Under the leadership of Erwin Müller, Rosenbauer Switzerland has developed into the leading fire brigade supplier in Switzerland in recent years."

He leaves behind his wife Elisabeth and three adult children. The funeral took place on Friday 17 March near his home in Switzerland. Anyone who wishes to commemorate him may send a donation to the Krebsliga Schaffhausen, PC account: 82-3096-2, Note: Erwin Müller.