

.....

1. Executive Summary

On the day of 22.08.2018, the use of BMU (Building Maintenance Access Unit) Cradle located within the vicinity of the Helipad of the .. There were 6 people doing the training inclusive of the trainer.

During their training session they heard an approaching helicopter and took action to make safe at height by dropping the BMU in the cradle and securing it on the roof as per their instructions when working in the BMU.

On the [redacted] when [redacted] where engaged by the PPP contract the instructions around communicating helicopter landings was provided to the [redacted] Security team. These instructions are to contact the [redacted] onsite to notify of pending arrival of a helicopter to ensure they can make safe prior to the arrival of the helicopter on the landing pad. On the date of the incident ([redacted]) that communication did not come through from the Security Control Room Officer on duty prior to the helicopter arriving.

The investigation has identified that [redacted] security personnel were not trained in the procedure in place on the [redacted] and that a new procedure including notification of helicopter landing to abseiling contractors was amended post incident on the [redacted]. Other failures identified in relation to Contractor Management and Permit to Work processes have not been followed.

2. Incident Summary

2.1. Summary of the Event

Date of Event	
Time of Event	Approx. 9.30am
Sector	
Site / Location	
Type of Incident: Injury or Near Miss	Near Miss Level 2
Plant / Equipment	Mobile Phones and BMU Cradle
Injured Person (IP) / or Worker Involved	
Witnesses / Persons Involved	

ICAM Investigation Report

Incident outcome	Near Miss Level 2
Investigation team	
IRIM No.	
WorkSafe Reference	N/A

3. Investigation:

3.1. Sequence of events (timeline)

Date / Time	Detail	Evidence
6.00am	arrive at site	Sign on records evidenced
09.16am-09.26am	At 9.16am [redacted] advised of the imminent arrival of a helicopter to the hospital via the ASCOM portable phone stating the arrival of the helicopter at the [redacted] at 09.26am	Evidence #1 Security Incident Report Helicopter Landing Evidence #2 Statement from [redacted] CCTV footage requested but not yet provided
	[redacted] who was present at the time of the incoming call began to fill out the incoming Helicopter process form, handing it to [redacted] soon after. This was placed on the desk next to [redacted]	Evidence #1 Security Incident Report Helicopter Landing Evidence #3 Statement from [redacted]
	Local PSO Supervisor [redacted] was advised via radio and a PSO was dispatched to the helipad to conduct pre-arrival inspections. The pre-landing process requires 3 calls to be made by the control room operator being the CEW (Emergency Warden) Childcare centre and the façade maintenance team	Evidence #4 Statement from [redacted]
	PSO [redacted] contacted the CEW (Emergency Warden) and the child care centre, but did not notify the abseiling contractors.	Refer to #2 Statement from [redacted]
between 9.16am and 9.29am	The below members of [redacted] were conducting BMU training near the helipad:	Phone statements taken: Call to [redacted] 10.22am

ICAM Investigation Report

	During their training session they heard an approaching helicopter and took action to make safe at height by dropping the BMU in the cradle and securing it on the roof as per their instructions when working in the BMU. The group then removed themselves from the area and took a lunch break.	estimator) at 12.45pm 01.09.1 Appendix #7
22.08. 9.29am	Helicopter landed on helipad – no incident occurred but the near miss was reported due to breakdown in communication between security group and	

3.2. Investigation Data

3.2.1. Person Details

Name	Company	Position Held
Security		
		PSO – Control Room Operator
		PSO – Control Room Operator
		PSO – Control Room Operator
		State Manager
		Security Coordinator
		Engineering Manager Mechanical
		Supervisor

ICAM Investigation Report

3.2.2. Equipment

Helipad -



Security Control Room – Blue notification phone



BMU – Cradle

3.2.3. Environment

- Security Control Room

3.2.4. Procedures

Owner	Name	Document Type
	SOP-PPP-SEC- 20-01-HELPA D PROCEDURES (issue date 01.03. ')	Procedure Original #1
	Security – Incident Report Helicopter Landing V1.0 20.04.	Form Refer Evidence #1

ICAM Investigation Report

al	Safe Work Method Statement – Rope Access Pressure Cleaning Abseil 24.07.11	SWMS Form #2
	JSA – Safe Work Method Form – Pressure Clean/Window 01.08.11	JSA Form #3
is	Working at Heights Permit to Work – Permit Number 023, date 01.08.11. 31.08.	Permit form #4
Post Incident		
	SOP-PPP-SEC- 20-02-HELPAD PROCEDURES (issue date 23.08.11)	Procedure V#2
is	Helicopter Landing & Notification Procedure	Form #5

3.2.5. Organisation

Training

- o Insufficient evidence of training being provided to Officers, particularly relating to as officer on duty at time of incident.

Communication and Consultation

- o Currently th engage and alert the contractor of pending arrival of helicopters and this is not clearly communicated between relevant parties.
- o have been engaged by the contract since the 01.08.11 with no direct guidance given to notifying their permit authority what activity and where on site they are going to be working each day.

Procedures

- o Responsibility for who manages the contractors and communicates the changes is not clear in relation to helicopter landing/departures.
- o SOP-PPP-SEC- 20-01-HELPAD PROCEDURES (issue date 01.03.11) – this SOP does not state the change in contacting the contractors in relation to helicopter landing/departures.
- o SOP-PPP-SEC- 20-01-HELPAD PROCEDURES (issue date 01.03.11) – this SOP only states that the Childcare Centre were to be contacted.
- o SOP-PPP-SEC- 20-01-HELPAD PROCEDURES (issue date 01.03.11) – was modified post incident 23.08.11.

ICAM Investigation Report

- SOP-PPP-SEC -20-02-HELPAID PROCEDURES now states "Upon receipt of notification of arrival of helicopters, SCR (security control room) will commence the Helicopter Arrivals/Departures Notifications Procedure (app.1)
- Helicopter Arrivals/Departures Notifications Procedure (app.1) – this procedure is not in existence the (app.1) is titled "Helicopter Landing & Notification Procedure"
- SOP-PPP-SEC- -20-02-HELPAID PROCEDURES – this procedure still does not clearly state "the SCR are to contact the contractors" it refers to the (app.1) which also does not have this instruction.

Inductions

- The Site Induction Training Checklist, does not cover off the SOP-PPP-SEC 20-02-HELPAID PROCEDURES or the "Helicopter Landing & Notification Procedure"

Failure to follow: Permit to Works procedure:

- Permit to work is for the duration of one month 01.08-31.08. where it clearly states on the permit that the permit is only valid for one shift
- Permit to work not signed off by all named parties
- No spotter has been nominated on the Permit to Work form

Management of Change

No evidence of management of change process in place with the introduction of a new contractor and associated processes to effectively manage risk. This is evidenced by the change to process SOP-PPP-SEC -20-01-HELPAID PROCEDURES to SOP-PPP-SEC -20-02-HELPAID PROCEDURES.

Contractor Management

Failure to follow contractor management process, this is evidenced by SWMS

Safe Work Method Statement: - Rope Access Pressure Cleaning Abseil/JSA – Safe Work Method Statement Pressure Clean/Window Clean and Permit to Work 023 – South Entry Level 6 +0 ground floor external walls not relevant to the task being conducting on the day of the incident.

Risk Management

Lack of evidence to demonstrate appropriate assessment and measurement of risk. This is evidenced by the SWMS – Safe Work Method Statement –

Rope Access Pressure Cleaning Abseil not being risk scored pre/post controls. The JSA– Safe Work Method Statement Pressure Clean/Window Clean risk scoring has not been reduced after controls have been put in place.

ICAM Investigation Report

4. Incident analysis

4.1. Incident Causations

Category	Contributing Factor Type	
Absent or Failed Defence	<input type="checkbox"/> DF1 Awareness- Hazard identification	<input type="checkbox"/> DF12 Control and Recovery- bypass valves/ circuits
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DF2 Awareness- Communication	<input type="checkbox"/> DF13 Control and Recovery- emergency shut down
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DF3 Awareness- Competency/ knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/> DF14 Protection and Containment- PPE
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DF4 Awareness- Supervision	<input type="checkbox"/> DF15 Protection and Containment- Fire fighting
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DF5 Awareness- Work Instruction/Procedure	<input type="checkbox"/> DF16 Protection and Containment- Spill response
	<input type="checkbox"/> DF6 Detection- Visual warning system	<input type="checkbox"/> DF17 Protection and Containment- Bunding/barricading/ exclusion zone
	<input type="checkbox"/> DF7 Detection- Aural warning system	<input type="checkbox"/> DF18 Escape and Rescue- Safe access/egress
	<input type="checkbox"/> DF8 Detection- Speed/ movement detectors	<input type="checkbox"/> DF19 Escape and Rescue- Emergency planning/response
	<input type="checkbox"/> DF9 Detection- Vigilance / fatigue	<input type="checkbox"/> DF20 Escape and Rescue- emergency communication
	<input type="checkbox"/> DF10 Detection- Gas/ substance	<input type="checkbox"/> DF21 Other
	<input type="checkbox"/> DF11 Control and Recovery- procedures	
Evidence- (Note the detail for each of the contributing factors identified)		
<p>DF2 –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to communicate to per work instruction provided on form Security-Incident Report Helicopter Landing Evidence of conflicting statements and recollection of the day's activities relating to the contractor's tasks on the 22.08. Contractor stated that 6 people were performing a training exercise whereas stated there were only 2 people doing window cleaning. <p>DF3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of lack of competency to complete relevant risk documents to ensure hazards are correctly identified and controls assessed to reduce the risk – this is demonstrated by the contractor SWMS SWMS – Abseilers Safe Work Method Statement – – Rope Access Pressure Cleaning Abseil and JSA – Safe Work Method Statement Pressure Clean/Window Clean, which has omitted risk scores together with incorrect scoring which has been accepted by Work Permit - Permit to Work 023 – South Entry Level 6 +0 ground floor external walls, has been dated to run over the duration of a month however are only valid for 1 shift which is clearly stated on bottom of form. Work Permit- Permit to Work 023 – South Entry Level 6 +0 ground floor external walls has remained with the contractor rather than the permit authority within Training records for Permit to Work, do not indicate that training was conducted by an approved competent person and no Permit to work authority to issue form available. <p>DF4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failed to effectively manage the contractor onsite conducting permitted work outside of routine task – this is evidenced by the supporting Permit to Work (Permit to Work 023 – South Entry Level 6 +0 ground floor external walls) provided for this investigation is not accurate or relevant to the training that was being conducted by the abseiling contract on the day of the event. <p>DF5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SOP-PPP-SEC- 20-01-HELPAID PROCEDURES (issue date 01.03. does not give clear instructions around the notification process to relevant stakeholders when dealing with a Helicopter Landing/Departure. This SOP only states that notification to Child Care Centre is required. Failure to produce relevant SWMS/JSA and Permit to Work for the training activity being conducted by on the day of 22.08. Notification process (completion of the Security – Incident Report Helicopter Landing Form) on the day was not completed by one person commenced this process and left midway to attend the helipad, at this point took over to complete the process. 		

ICAM Investigation Report

Category	Contributing Factor Type					
Individual Team or Action	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	IT1	Supervisory error or violation	<input type="checkbox"/>	IT8	Equipment/material handling error or violation
	<input type="checkbox"/>	IT2	Operating authority error or violation	<input type="checkbox"/>	IT9	Horseplay/ thrill seeking error or violation
	<input type="checkbox"/>	IT3	Operating speed	<input type="checkbox"/>	IT10	Hazard recognition/ perception
	<input type="checkbox"/>	IT4	Equipment use error or violation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	IT11	Hazard management error or violation
	<input type="checkbox"/>	IT5	PPE use error or violation	<input type="checkbox"/>	IT12	Work method error or violation
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	IT6	Procedural Compliance	<input type="checkbox"/>	IT13	Occupational Hygiene Practices
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	IT7	Change Management Error	<input type="checkbox"/>	IT14	Other
Evidence- (Note the detail for each of the contributing factors identified)						
<p>IT1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No evidence of spotless supervising contractor activity on the day of 22.08. –this is evidenced by the supporting Permit to Work (Permit to Work 023 – South Entry Level 6 +0 ground floor external walls) provided for this investigation is not accurate or relevant to the training that was being conducted by the abseiling contract on the day of the event. <p>IT6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ F followed procedure SOP-PPP-SEC- 4-20-01-HELPAD PROCEDURES (issue date 01.03.) as written but not as allegedly instructed. ○ There is no evidence to support that the work instruction relating to Security Incident Report Helicopter Landing has been delivered to any of the team. <p>IT7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ is failed to effectively manage the change in SOP-PPP-SEC- 4-20-01 HELPAD PROCEDURES TO SOP-PPP-SEC- 4-20-02 HELPAD PROCEDURES by failing to communicate and consult with all relevant stakeholders. has also failed to provide any evidence of management of change. <p>IT11</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In reference to Security – Incident Report Helicopter Landing form this does not reflect the perceived risk in relation to the management of the hazard (low risk first – high risk last in terms of who they contact first). The forms requires the SCO to contact the CEW, Child Care Centre then seilers last when the Abseilers would be at the great risk of incident. 						

ICAM Investigation Report

Category	Contributing Factor Type	
Task Environment Conditions- Workplace	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TE1	Task planning, Preparation, manning
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TE2	Hazard Analysis/Job Safety Analysis/Take 5
	<input type="checkbox"/> TE3	Work Procedures Availability and Suitability
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TE4	Permit to Work Availability and Suitability
	<input type="checkbox"/> TE5	Abnormal Operational Situation/Condition
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TE6	Tools/ Equipment condition availability
	<input type="checkbox"/> TE7	Materials availability and suitability
	<input type="checkbox"/> TE8	Equipment Integrity
	<input type="checkbox"/> TE9	Housekeeping
	<input type="checkbox"/> TE10	Weather Conditions
	<input type="checkbox"/> TE11	Congestion/Restricted Access
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TE12	Routine/Non-Routine Task
<input type="checkbox"/> TE13	Fire and/or Explosion Hazard	
<input type="checkbox"/> TE14	Lighting	
<input type="checkbox"/> TE15	Equipment, material temperature, condition	
<input type="checkbox"/> TE16	Noise	
<input type="checkbox"/> TE17	Ventilation	
<input type="checkbox"/> TE18	Gas/ Dust/ Fumes	
<input type="checkbox"/> TE19	Radiation	
<input type="checkbox"/> TE20	Chemical	
<input type="checkbox"/> TE21	Wildlife	
<input type="checkbox"/> TE22	Surface Gradient/Conditions	
<input type="checkbox"/> TE23	Reduced, restricted visibility	
<input type="checkbox"/> TE24	Other	

Evidence- (Note the detail for each of the contributing factors identified)

TE1

- Lack of task planning in relation to high risk work and issues of work permits. There is no evidence of SWMS/Permit to Work being completed for the training task. They were conducting on the day. As this contractor was only engaged on the 01.08.2017 there has been no scheduled/planned works program put in place.
- Work Permit (Permit to Work 023 – South Entry Level 6 +0 ground floor external walls) was issued for the duration of 1 month when the permits are only valid for 1 shift which is clearly stated on the bottom of the form.

TE2

- Evidence of lack of competency to complete relevant risk documents to ensure hazards are correctly identified and controls assessed to reduce the risk. Lack of evidence to demonstrate appropriate assessment and measurement of risk. This is evidenced by the SWMS – (SWMS – Safe Work Method Statement – Pressure Cleaning Abseil) not being risk scored pre/post controls. The JSA (JSA– Safe Work Method Statement Pressure Clean/Window Clean) risk scoring has not been reduced after controls have been put in place.

TE4

- Work Permit (Permit to Work 023 – South Entry Level 6 +0 ground floor external walls) has been dated to run over the duration of a month however it clearly states on the permit that the permit is valid for only 1 shift. Work Permit (Permit to Work 023 – South Entry Level 6 +0 ground floor external walls) has remained with the contractor rather than the permit authority within spotless.

TE12

- Failure to recognise non-routine task (the BMU-Cradle training) being conducted on the day of the near miss and to complete the appropriate permit to work for the work being done.

ICAM Investigation Report

Category	Contributing Factor Type			
Tasks Environment Human Factors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HF1	Complacency/desensitisation to hazard	Motivation/
	<input type="checkbox"/>	HF2	Drugs/Alcohol Influence	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HF3	Familiarity with task	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	HF4	Fatigue	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HF5	Situational Awareness	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	HF6	Time/ Productivity Pressures	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	HF7	Peer Pressure/Supervisory Example	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	HF8	Physical Capabilities	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	HF9	Mental Capabilities	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	HF10	Physical Stress	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	HF11	Mental Stress	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	HF12	Confidence level	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	HF13	Secondary Goals	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	HF14	Personal Issues	
Evidence- (Note the detail for each of the contributing factors identified)				
HF1				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notification process on the day was not completed by one person commenced this process and left midway to attend the helipad at this point! took over to complete the process. 				
HF3				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Task instruction to contact contractor when working in helipad region lacks a formal training process and competency assessment. The process has only been in place for 1 month although the contract has been operational for 11 months. 				
HF5				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Security personnel are given the responsibility of notifying abseiling contractors of helicopter activity however the responsibility of managing the contractors onsite sits with the contractor. When contractors sign in via the "Beacon Kiosk" the contractor managers are notified by email when they are onsite but not notified of their actual location onsite at the time. 				
HF24				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to recognise non-routine task (the BMU-Cradle training) being conducted on the day of the near miss and to complete the appropriate permit to work for the work being done. 				

ICAM Investigation Report

Category	Contributing Factor Type			
Organisational Factors	<input type="checkbox"/>	HW	Hardware	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RM Risk Management
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TR	Training	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MC Management of Change
	<input type="checkbox"/>	OR	Organisation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CM Contractor Management
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CO	Communication	<input type="checkbox"/> RI Regulatory Influence
	<input type="checkbox"/>	IG	Incompatible Goals	<input type="checkbox"/> OL Organisational Learning
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PR	Procedures	<input type="checkbox"/> VM Vehicle Management
	<input type="checkbox"/>	MM	Maintenance Management	<input type="checkbox"/> MS Management Systems
	<input type="checkbox"/>	DE	Design	
	Evidence- (Note the detail for each of the contributing factors identified)			
<p>TR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Insufficient evidence of training being provided to _____ particularly relating to _____ as officer on duty at time of incident. <p>CO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Currently the _____ engage _____ contractors and _____ security alert the contractor of pending arrival of helicopters and this is not clearly communicated between relevant parties. <p>PR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Responsibility for who manages the contractors and communicates the changes is not clear in relation to helicopter landing/departures. o SOP-PPP-SEC- _____ 20-01-HELPAID PROCEDURES (issue date 01.03 _____ – this SOP does not state the change in contacting the contractors in relation to helicopter landing/departures. o SOP-PPP-SEC- _____ -20-01-HELPAID PROCEDURES (issue date 01.03. _____ – this SOP only states that Childcare Centre were to be contacted. o SOP-PPP-SEC- _____ -20-01-HELPAID PROCEDURES (issue date 01.03. _____ – was modified post incident 23.08 o SOP-PPP-SEC- _____ 20-02-HELPAID PROCEDURES now states “Upon receipt of notification of arrival of SCR (security control room) will commence the Helicopter Arrivals/Departures Notifications Procedure (app.1) o Helicopter Arrivals/Departures Notifications Procedure (app.1) – this procedure is not in existence the (app.1) is titled “Helicopter Landing & Notification Procedure” o SOP-PPP-SEC- _____ 0-02-HELPAID PROCEDURES – this procedure still does not clearly state “the SCR are to contact the abseiling contractors” it refers to the (app.1) which also does not have this instruction. <p>Inductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The Site Induction Training Checklist _____ does not cover off the SOP-PPP-SEC _____ -20-02-HELPAID PROCEDURES or the “Helicopter Landing & Notification Procedure” <p>Failure to follow _____ permit to Works procedure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Permit to work(Permit to Work 023 – South Entry Level 6 +0 ground floor external walls) is for the duration of one month 01.08-31.08 _____ where it clearly states on the permit that the permit is only valid for one shift 				

ICAM Investigation Report

- Permit to work (Permit to Work 023 – South Entry Level 6 +0 ground floor external walls) not signed off by all named parties
- No spotter has been nominated on the Permit to Work (Permit to Work 023 – South Entry Level 6 +0 ground floor external walls)

MC

No evidence of management of change process in place with the introduction of a new contractor and associated processes to effectively manage risk. This is evidenced by the change to process SOP-PPP-SEC-20-01-HELPAID PROCEDURES to SOP-PPP-SEC-20-02-HELPAID PROCEDURES.

CM

Failure to follow contractor management process, this is evidenced by SWMS (SWMS – Safe Work Method Statement – Rope Access Pressure Cleaning Abseil) /JSA (JSA - Safe Work Method Statement Pressure Clean/Window Clean) and Permit to Work (Permit to Work 023 – South Entry Level 6 +0 ground floor external walls) not relevant to the task being conducting on the day of the incident.

RM

Lack of evidence to demonstrate relating to assessment and measurement of risk. This is evidenced by the SWMS (SWMS – Safe Work Method Statement – Rope Access Pressure Cleaning Abseil) not being risk scored pre/post controls. The JSA (JSA - Safe Work Method Statement Pressure Clean/Window Clean) risk scoring has not been reduced after controls have been put in place.

4.2. Summary of Contributing Factors

- did not effectively manage the change in SOP-PPP-SEC-20-01-HELPAID PROCEDURES to SOP-PPP-SEC-20-02-HELPAID PROCEDURES with a defined training program.
- failed to effectively manage the contractor onsite conducting permitted work outside of routine task – this is evidenced by the supporting Permit to Work (Permit to Work 023 – South Entry Level 6 +0 ground floor external walls) provided for this investigation is not accurate or relevant to the training that was being conducted by the abseiling contract on the day of the event.

4.3. Root Cause

- No evidence of training of newly introduced procedure SOP-PPP-SEC-20-02-HELPAID PROCEDURES to Control Room Operators in relation to notification of contractors onsite when helicopters arrive/depart helipad.
- SOP-PPP-SEC-20-02-HELPAID PROCEDURES this procedure was modified on the 23.08. post the incident.

ICAM Investigation Report

- SOP-PPP-SEC- 20-02-HELPAID PROCEDURES now states "Upon receipt of notification of arrival of SCR (security control room) will commence the Helicopter Arrivals/Departures Notifications Procedure (app.1)
- Helicopter Arrivals/Departures Notifications Procedure (app.1) – this procedure is not in existence the (app.1) is titled "Helicopter Landing & Notification Procedure"
- SOP-PPP-SEC -20-02-HELPAID PROCEDURES – this procedure still does not clearly state "the SCR are to contact the abseiling contractors" it refers to the (app.1) which also does not have this instruction.
- Failure to follow contractor management process, this is evidenced by SWMS/JSA and Permit to Work not relevant to the task being conducting on the day of the incident.

5. Recommendations and corrective actions

5.1. Corrective actions

Item	Action	Responsible	Due Date	IRIM Action No.
1.	Develop and Implement a training program to ensure all procedures/instructions are formally delivered and competency assessed	WHS Advisor	Oct	
2.	Safety Leadership Training to be delivered and to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Just and Fair Culture - Risk Management - Incident Escalation / Notification - recordable incidents 		Dec	
3.	Permit to Work Training issuer to undergo training	Training Coordinator	Dec	
4.	Internal Contractor Management audit to be conducted		Oct	
5.	Risk Management training to undertaken by high risk work contractors and support staff.	WHS Advisor	Jan	
6.	All staff engaging or managing contractors are to be retrained on the contractor management process	Managers / Supervisors	Dec	
7.	Pre-qualification process for contractors to be implemented/reviewed if in place to ensure approval is given by suitably qualified spotless representative.	WHS Advisor	Ongoing	
8.	Ensure contractors provide a Safety Management Plan to demonstrate their operational flow of their activities when onsite. Contractors must provide relevant SWMS referring to activities and signed off by relevant spotless personnel and ensure the reference the correct Australian Standards and Codes of Practice	Managers / Supervisors	Nov	

ICAM Investigation Report

9.	Investigate alternative methods of communication with contractors aside from mobile phone usage and or radios such as automated alarms or notifications when working in the helipad area.	Security Coordinator	Feb	
10	Investigation training to be undertaken by nominated staff.	WHS Advisor	Jan	
11	site staff to undergo Incident Escalation/Notification Training in relation to recordable incidents.	All Staff	Dec	

ICAM Investigation Report

6. Report Sign Off

Feedback and comments- Security Manager -		
Name:	Signature:	Date: 22/08/
Feedback and comments- State Manager ()		
Name:	Signature:	Date: 22/08/
Feedback and comments		
Name:	Signature:	Date: 22/08/

ICAM Investigation Report

7. Appendices

Eg PHOTOS, STATEMENTS, RISK ASSESSMENTS/JSAs/SWMSs, TRAINING DOCUMENTS, PROCEDURES

- Evidence #1 – Security Incident Report Helicopter Landing – day of event
- Evidence #2 – Security Incident Report statement from
- Evidence #3 – Security Incident Report statement from
- Evidence #4 – Security Incident Report statement from
- Original #1 – SOP-PPP-SEC- 1-20-01 HELIPAD PROCEDURES
- #2 , Safe Work Method Statement
- #3 JSA Safe work Method statement
- #4 Working at Heights Permit to Work
- V#2 SOP-PPP-SEC- 20-02 HELIPAD PROCEDURES
- #5 Helicopter Landing and Notification Procedure
- Appendix #1 Site Induction Training Checklist
- Appendix #2 Security – Incident Report
- Appendix #3 Qualifications for I
- Appendix #4 Training Register , permit training
- Appendix #5 Inductions Records for
- Appendix #6 Qualifications of