2002, Issue 1

The Catalyst

The Official Newsletter of JOIFF March 2002

www.joiff.com

From the Editors

So here we are into our second year of The Catalyst !! In this edition, we carry more information and opinion on Foam related issues and as you will see, the debate that started in the September edition has widened and is bringing in important related issues. Of particular note are comments from JOIFF Fellow, Rob Wardle, with an article on the most important issue of Risk.

Congratulations and thanks to Darren Wright of CONOCO who contributed an article on Competency Based Training - known as CBT. As Members will see in their copy of the JOIFF Training Manual, CBT forms the foundation of the JOIFF accredited Training Programme.

Both Rob's and Darren's articles were to be published as letters to The Reactor Column, but the wise Mr. R. suggested that the content was so important that they should be highlighted by publishing them as Articles. And Mr. R, as always, is not short of a comment or two in his own Column which continues into Year 2.

Dr. Niall Ramsden, as Technical Editor for the Foam debate, has offered some very constructive comments throughout and in this edition, we publish an article by him and Paul Watkins, both of Resource Protection International, on Foam Concentrate and Foam System Testing.

Once again, we are pleased to welcome new Members to JOIFF and our particular thanks go to Lindsay Hamilton for explaining the system of First Response to Fires in High Risk Industry in New Zealand.

We hope that those from non Member High Risk Industries reading this will give serious consideration to applying for Membership.

At the beginning of January, the four editions of The Catalyst were put on the JOIFF website and we are delighted at the very positive comments that we have received regarding its availability in this form. Of course this gives us a much greater Readership and extends the influence of JOIFF to a much wider audience. This edition of The Catalyst will be put on the website in a few weeks.

As always, we look forward to your continuing support.

Thought for 2002

-kindly provided by a JOIFF member

"A CONCERN FOR SAFETY WHICH IS SINCERELY HELD BUT NEVERTHELESS IS NOT CARRIED THROUGH INTO ACTION IS AS MUCH PROTECTION FROM DANGER AS NO CONCERN AT ALL"

SIR A. HADDEN Q.C.
CLAPHAM INQUIRY.

About Joiff

JOIFF, the Joint Oil and Industry Fire Forum, is a grouping of Companies in High Risk Industry represented by their Emergency Services Manager or equivalent position, and nominated Deputies. A JOIFF High Risk Industry is any Organisation that is engaged in processing, storage, handling or transport of high risk materials and that has nominated personnel as Emergency Responders. JOIFF offers to its members a forum for discussion amongst peers, accredited training, information dissemination and technical advice.

JOIFF welcomes application for Membership from suitable Organisations - contact the JOIFF Secretariat, details on the back page.

The Catalyst — The Official Newsletter of Joiff

MEMBERS SECTION

Report from the JOIFF Secretary, Kevin Westwood C.Eng., M.I.Fire E

REPORT OF THE JOIFF SECRETARIAT FOR THE PAST THREE MONTHS.

1. Presentation of JOIFF.

- If any Member has not yet received their JOIFF Membership Certificate, please contact the Secretariat as we do not yet have complete records as to dates of joining.
- All last year's editions of The Catalyst are now posted on the JOIFF Website, with a link into Adobe Acrobat Reader for those who need to download it to read and print copies. Future editions of The Catalyst will be posted on the site shortly after initial distribution. Within the next few weeks, it is planned to develop the site further.

2. Membership:

- The Membership Directory is updated and distributed to Members regularly.
- The Membership Drive continues and more new Members were welcomed during this period - details in this edition of The Catalyst.

Please advise the Secretariat of the names of any Organisations that you think might be interested in becoming a Member of JOIFF.

3. Contact with other Organisations:

Contacts continue to be made and maintained with Regulatory Authorities and Organisations involved in Trades associated with High Risk Industry in Countries where JOIFF has Members and possible Members.

4. Finance:

- Invoices for the 12 months to December 2002 have been mailed to those whose Membership year is the calendar year. A number of Members have already sent in payment which has been forwarded to the Treasurer.
- JOIFF accredited Training has started once again and this will result in income through fees for JOIFF accreditation. These fees currently go towards offsetting the cost of operating The Secretariat.

5. Meetings:

- The Secretariat met with the Executive earlier this year to discuss all aspects of operation, including amongst other topics, means of expanding the Training portfolio, how to encourage more Organisations to become Members of JOIFF and the forthcoming Members Annual General Meeting

MEMBERS ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

As Members are aware, the Annual General Meeting will take place on 20th March. As well as the various Officers' Reports, a very important item on the Agenda will be the proposed changes to the Constitution. Of particular note are the proposals to allow Associate Membership of JOIFF, this resulting from an increasing number of enquiries from Organisations and persons who are not High Risk Industries, but who wish to become associated with JOIFF. Also of particular significance, is the proposal to change the Constitution to allow Postal Balloting by Members, as the number of Members of JOIFF from outside the United Kingdom increases. All those Members who can, are asked to make the effort to attend this most important meeting and to contribute to the development of your Organisation

FOAM CONCENTRATE AND FOAM SYSTEM TESTING

N. Ramsden and P. Watkins
Resource Protection International.

Introduction

There are many factors that can cause a foam system to not perform in accordance with its original design specification. Periodic maintenance and testing of the total system is vital. Part of any contract involving the supply of foam equipment, either portable or fixed, should include a requirement for descriptions of detailed testing methods. Heavy reliance tends to be placed on the equipment manufacturer or system installer for procedures. In practice the documentation provided is often very poor and consists of a few data sheets on system components put together as a "manual". At the very minimum, the documentation should include step-by-step instructions of how to measure the system parameters described in standards such as NFPA 11 (i.e. Systems flow, time to achieve effective discharge, proportioning rate, expansion and drainage time.)

Foam System Tests

The tests that can be carried out in the field at commissioning stage and at subsequent routine intervals are:-

(i) Foam expansion
(ii) Drainage time
(iii) Application rate
(iv) Solution strength (Proportioning Accuracy)

The parameters (i) and (ii) are sometimes referred to jointly as "foam quality".
It is advisable to make two tests for each of these properties in order to minimise the risk of any spurious results.
Comprehensive records should be kept of the test results recorded during regular maintenance procedures. If any changes occur from test to test, then it is important that the foam liquid and the system is investigated further to determine the cause.
It must be remembered that some of the parameters such as drainage time and expansion depend on the test method used to measure them as well as the foam equipment. Therefore, it is important to ensure that all tests are carried out in a standard way using the same techniques on every occasion.
While there are certain measurable criteria for evaluating the quality of foam as described above, interpretation of the results may require experience. Because of the number of types of foam available, the physical characteristics of the foams produced are subject to considerable variations.
It is vital to ensure that a standard test method and standard test conditions are used to monitor and assess the changes in foam produced from a particular system over a period of time. Any change in characteristics suggests degradation or contamination of the foam liquid or some change occurring in the system itself. The possible causes of such changes are numerous, so an investigation is required in order to find the exact reason and rectify the problem.
It is important to remember that, depending on the risk, other tests such as foam shear stress may also be required to provide a full assessment of foam quality.
When evaluating foam for use on water soluble fuels, a test of the foam's stability on a control fuel such as isopropyl alcohol will be required. With film forming foams, surface tension and film forming capability should be measured and with the new polymeric membrane forming foams, viscosity evaluation may be relevant.

Foam Concentrate

Test methods to determine changes in physical properties of foam concentrate are relatively easy to specify - pH, specific gravity, surface tension, viscosity, etc. All are simple laboratory tests which can be carried out by the end user at purchasing, batch acceptance and at regular intervals throughout the lifetime of the concentrate. In this way, test results can be compared against previous results or those of a retained sample, highlighting changes in the concentrate from time to time. It is important to realise that the physical properties of a foam concentrate will not determine the firefighting performance, but significant changes in physical properties may indicate a problem such as degradation or contamination that may ultimately compromise the effectiveness of the foam.

Fire Testing

What is more difficult is the precise specification of the fire test to be carried out. A regular fire test is essential to find out the true capability of any foam concentrate - after all its ultimate purpose is to prevent or extinguish a fire.
There are several fire tests that have been developed around the world. Some are good and selective, others very poor allowing low quality foam to pass. All have been designed with a particular risk or foam concentrate in mind. It is quite possible none of them test the precise properties for a particular application. In addition, most of them are only of the pass/fail type, so they do not usually differentiate between several foams that meet a minimum requirement.
It is, therefore, advisable to develop an in-house company fire test specific to the particular conditions of the risk in question. Often this may be a standard recognised test adapted only slightly to ensure that the best available foam is selected and that it retains its properties over a period of time. For example, for an AFFF for offshore use, it may be thought that the U.S. Mil-F-24385 test method is most appropriate, but a higher performance may be demanded from the foam in terms of burn back resistance. In the case of evaluating fire performance of foam for storage tank application, then a suitable fire test such as the 'LASTFIRE' Foam Test For Storage Tank Fires should be specified.
Ideally the foam concentrate tests including the fire test should be carried out in-house by the end-user. They should not, unless there is absolutely no alternative, be carried out by suppliers or manufacturers. If this is the case, the end-user should insist upon witnessing the tests and demand a certificate that clearly states test results, the test carried out and the exact results rather than just "pass" or "fail".

Specification of Acceptable Test Results

It is not possible to provide precise values for acceptable

test results unless full details of the risk are known, but it is possible to provide certain guidelines.

- Expansion, drainage time, flow rates and solution strength should be in accordance with an independent standard such as BS 5306, NFPA 11, or UL 162.
- Foam concentrate physical properties are obviously dependent on the foam concentrate chosen. The manufacturer's quality control values must be sought. In general, a supplier with good quality control and consistent product will be happy to provide these figures. Acceptable variations in physical properties' values from good suppliers would not be expected to be greater than + 5% of their nominal value.
- Fire test acceptable results must be based on the in-house specification suggested previously. Again, it must be emphasised that the tests should be carried out by the end-user himself or a recognised independent testing station witnessed by the end-user. Results provided by suppliers should not necessarily be relied upon.

Documentation

Standard in-house company test documentation policy should obviously be followed when developing paperwork to record foam system test results.
It is a relatively easy matter to build up standard sheets specifically for foam systems. Most of the information required is a straightforward record of the test figures. (i.e. Specific gravity, pH, etc.) Some test parameters, such as expansion and drainage time, require calculations as well as the record of results. It is suggested that the calculations should be recorded on the same documentation as the test measurements. A typical record sheet for foam concentrate is attached.
It is strongly recommended that space is also allowed to record acceptable values of the measured properties so that an immediate comparison can be made with the field or laboratory results.

Review of Results

Any result found to be outside acceptable values must demand immediate action. In the case of the foam concentrate this means that it should be immediately replaced. If a system test result is outside acceptable values then the cause must be investigated.
Equally important, however, is a review of the test results compared to those previously recorded. A tendency for the results to vary from test to test even though they may still be within acceptable limits suggests that some changes have occurred in the foam concentrate or system that might ultimately cause failure unless rectified. It is therefore important to compare the results with those obtained from at least the previous two tests.

(Editor's note: Both authors have extensive experience of testing foam systems on an International and independent basis.)

Risk Matrix

Rob Wardle
Fellow of JOIFF

Having read the response by Dave Murray in the December issue of the Catalyst regarding the comments previously made by Dave Meyer the question some smaller Companies may be left with is "who is right and what actions they might need to take if a similar incident occurred at their site ?".
First of all both Dave Murray and Dave Meyer can be seen as both having correctly answered. Deciding whether or not to extinguish must be a management decision therefore all Companies need a plan of action which should be based on a RISK matrix.
Long before an outbreak occurs, the person responsible for fire leadership needs establish their worst case scenario (most Companies falling under the COMAH banner will have already considered their worst case scenario and taken action). Having established the worst case decide through trials (if need be) what foam works best on your line of products. Decide on the quantity of foam the Company would need to carry as stock to fully extinguish or suppress fumes from the worst case. Look at the equipment available in the market place and how easy is it to manipulate. As an example I thought Dave Murray gave a good account on portable monitors versus fixed systems.
If a Corporate Plan doesn't exist sit down with senior managers and work out a suitable Plan or Plans either for control of or for a controlled burn. Once agreed, pass your information on to others within your Corporation / Company.
Things that must be included / considered / ranked are:

Survival

What or how will the Company survive through loss of production/stock ? Will the loss interfere with your Customers long term ? Remember, loyalty is a thing of the past - Customers look for cost reductions, quality product delivered on time every time, profits plus the ability to pass on discounts to their customers. Unless your Company has redundancy built into the plant will your Customers come back to

you when your production line is once again operational - there is NO guarantee. Building in redundancy on a production line with a modern Company is costly and not always warranted nowadays. Companies want to operate "lean and mean" to keep their costs under control so they can pass on the differences to their Customers. "Lean and mean" really means being operational 24 hours 365 days a year. Breakdowns / incidents DO not form part of the Company plans.

Environmental

What are the long term effects on the Environment and the local population with a controlled burn ? Weigh up the impact and costs for clean-up, medical and of course not to be forgotten, the PRESS. The latter can and will do a lot of harm as a result of an incident. Similarly you need to look at the environmental effects of contaminated water / foam run off resulting from an extinguishment. Do you have plans in place for holding contaminated run-off and dealing with it, if not consider contract Companies who are available on call-out if needed. Some water Companies are prepared to deal with the problem (at a cost).

Loss Control

What is the total cost of rebuild by sitting back and not taking action ? Can the damaged equipment be constructed quickly or is there a long delay with spares / new equipment ? If the Company is insured what are the long term effects on the policy - presumably cost and the likelihood to be ranked as an 'at risk facility' which can have a long term cost attached with it.

Having just completed 33.5 years in a high risk industry as Fire Officer and Engineer and witnessed the long term loss effects a major incident had on the Company some 32 years ago when it was British owned I tend to stand alongside the Dave Murray's of this World by dealing with the incident. I have heard others say training of fire personnel and equipment is not cheap but I see it the duty of the Company Fire Officer / Leader to work out a plan of action offering it up convincingly to Management for their approval. Management like to see figures / costs so make sure your risk matrix shows the effects of a controlled burn versus total extinguishment making sure some of the items mentioned above are included in the plan. There will be a reluctance by managers to accept a plan unless some or all have witnessed the long term effects and costs an incident can have on a Company. If you are an insured Company, costs and long term effects can be obtained from your Insurance Carrier.

New Members

During the past three months, JOIFF welcomed the following new Members:

Caltex New Zealand Ltd.

A Chevron / Texaco Company represented by Lindsay G. Hamilton, National Fire and Safety Officer, who operates out of Lower Hutt. The facilities include bulk storage tank farms storing and distributing petrol and diesel. Most are fitted with semi fixed systems such as tank drencher rings and foam pourers to assist the Fire Service in extinguishing any fire. Lindsay tells us that Caltex does not have any fire responders in New Zealand and he is the Company's liaison with the National Fire Service and other Regulatory Bodies. In New Zealand, the National Fire Service by statute, is under an obligation to provide protection for any fires. Any industry that forms an Industrial Brigade that is within any Fire District or area under which the National Fire Service is under obligation to protect are required to enter into an agreement with the Fire Service Commission for coordination. Any such Industrial Fire Brigade may apply to the Commission to become an Industrial Fire Brigade which under the act would then fall under the NZ Fire Service. The NZ Fire Service is made up of roughly 1600 permanents and 8000 volunteers. Lindsay is currently an Officer in a volunteer Brigade as well as Caltex's Fire and Safety Officer. Through Caltex he regularly attends hot fire and other fire training principally in the US but more recently in the UK as well as in New Zealand.

Esso Refinery, Port Dickson, Malaysia, represented by Khairuddin Mohd Piah, Safety Health and Environment Manager with Loh Shoong Lok, Occupational Safety and Health Staff Analyst as his Deputy. The Refinery has fixed foam systems for its Hydrocarbon Tanks and the Emergency Services Team has Fire Trucks with Foam Making Capabilities and also deal with Oil Spill response.

We look forward to the involvement of our new Members in the development of JOIFF.

PPE Corner

Burns are amongst the most serious and most painful of all injuries. The terms 1st., 2nd., and 3rd. degree burns are used as a measure of the depth of the burn to the skin. 1st. degree burns are those in which only the superficial part of the epidermis - the outer layer of the skin - are injured. 2nd. degree burns, characterised by blister formation, are those in which the epidermis and a varying extent of the dermis - the layer below the epidermis - are burned and 3rd. degree burns extend through the dermis and into or beyond the subcutaneous fat.

In real life situations, many factors will contribute to the survival or otherwise of a person exposed to a flash fire but for the purpose of attempting to relate the results of the mannequin test described below to actual chances of survival of a person exposed to such a flash fire, some of the figures contained in the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons' Training Manual for Emergency Medical Technicians are of interest. In this Manual, "critical" burns are 3rd. degree burns that involve more than 10% of the body area, or 2nd. degree burns that involve more than 20% of the body surface area, and "moderate" burns are 3rd. degree burns that involve 2-10% of the body area, or 2nd. degree burns that involve 15 - 20% of the body surface area.

PPE against heat and flame should be designed to protect the body to eliminate the possibility of potential burns - or at least to keep the level of potential burns as low as possible. How can this design necessity be shown as having been carried out by the Supplier ? Certification of PPE to the relevant European Standard does not necessarily prove this. Because of the way that CEN, the European Standards Organisation, is structured, Technical Committees (TCs) writing Standards restrict themselves to looking at protection for separate parts of the body - TC 79 for Respiratory Protection, TC 85 for Eye Protection, TC 158 for Head Protection, TC 159 for Hearing Protection, TC 161 for Foot Protection and TC 162 for Body and hand protection. In many of the Standards drawn up by these TCs, testing is only carried out on samples of material used in the manufacture of the finished product and there is no

requirement for complete product testing. This system ignores the reality that Personal Protective Equipment is usually worn as a protective ensemble.
Currently there is no formal system in Europe to draw up Standards and Performance Requirements for ensembles although there is widespread discussion on how to rectify this unsatisfactory situation. But certain Companies recognised these shortcomings and some time ago, Du Pont built a rig at their site in Geneva, to test clothing likely to be exposed to flame engulfment. This rig is called Thermoman and it is a life-size instrumented test mannequin, designed to assess the fire-resistant properties of different fabrics and garments under realistic conditions. It incorporates over 120 thermal sensors at representative locations on its body - excluding the head, which is usually exposed in the tests and head and top neck injuries account for approximately 7% of total burns. The sensors are continually sampled by a Computer while Thermoman, dressed in protective clothing, is exposed to a controlled propane flash fire.
The Computer then prints out a "map" of the heat input received by the various body areas, which makes it possible to estimate reproducibly, which parts of the human body would have suffered 2nd. and 3rd. degree burns in such a flash fire if that particular type of protective clothing had been worn. The sensors in Thermoman identify only predicted 2nd. and 3rd. degree burns, then add both totals together to predict total burn injury.
The Thermoman mannequin can be dressed as a human will dress e.g. underwear, working rig and/or outerwear as relevant and exposure to flame engulfment - usually 3 to 4 seconds to simulate an Industrial flash fire and 10 to 12 seconds to simulate a Flashover - is intended to give an indication as to what will happen to the clothing and to the body underneath in such exposures.
Thermoman has recently been rebuilt as a mobile test unit and in April 2002, thanks to the initiative and support of JOIFF Founder Member Richard Coates and his colleagues in BP, Thermoman will be in Du Pont Gloucester and lectures and test burns will take place over a range of products. The tests will take place on 23rd to 25th April covering Firefighter, Industrial and Military and Police Protection. Du Pont, in association with BP, are inviting interested parties to apply to attend this event and are prepared to test on Thermoman, Safety garments submitted to them.

COMPETENCY-BASED TRAINING

Darren White,
CONOCO Humber Refinery

As we move into an age of more and more accountability, Industry is now looking more commonly at Competency Based Training. Many view this as a paper work exercise designed to keep agencies such as the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) at bay and as a paper loaded exercise to their already overstretched staff.
Others view this as an excellent tool to improve the way we train our staff, and to improve both core skills and emergency strategies. I myself am one of the latter and believe this is the way forward with training - it offers the chance to look at the way we train and ensure that our training mirrors the incidents we are most likely to encounter in our place of work through the use of training scenario's. It also offers the chance to look at and assess an individual's performance on each drill session and offer remedial action and training. If the session appraisal forms are correctly designed they are a welcome back up to the Personal Training Records (PTRs) that everyone has.
Where the two items differ is that although the PTRs may record that you have carried out the training it fails to identify how your training matches incidents you attend and also each shift/watch will almost certainly end up training with a varying degree of difference and when the inevitable happens, where personnel change shifts /watches then they will almost certainly be working to a different set of rules and procedures.
I have heard lots of views from all corners saying that it takes the realism out of training and reduces the aspects which introduce the unexpected in to training session's and keeps the Firefighters alert. I believe that this is not true here at the Humber refinery we have some excellent training facilities and I can assure anyone that if they were to attend one of our training scenario's of a high pressure pipe line fire that although you know the scenario the fire still behaves in exactly the same way as ever and as long as the scenario briefing is well thought out then there is still a lot of room for variation within the session. But as long as each watch /shift trains from the same scenario sheet then their strategies will almost be identical, it will just be the tactics which vary a little.
I am the first to agree that the initial work on deciding your training scenario's and then formatting them and writing them out can involve a great deal of work but I feel that once they are in place then it is relatively easy to keep the system updated and it only takes minimal time to complete the form's for each individual after a training session.

I would be very interested to hear peoples views on this subject and to also see how they set the Standards of Competency and how many training scenario's they

have for there work area. I would also be interested to know if they have adapted the system to include the use of small gear off the appliances or if this is still covered by the traditional PTRs system

I think the question you have to ask yourself is can you afford not to adopt the new CBT System because as I said earlier we are now in a new era of accountability and when you have a major incident and even if you are successful and extinguish the fire without loss of life then Government Agencies such as the HSE will come and inspect your System's and records and I honestly believe that the old system of PTRs will no longer be enough to satisfy them.

About the Author:
Before joining CONOCO, Darren Wright was a Firefighter at Humberside International Airport where in particular, he worked hard at getting Operational and Training Risk Assessments up and running. He has been with the Emergency Services Department in Conoco for just under a year and is a retained Sub Officer with Humberside Fire Brigade in charge of a Station with 17 personnel.
Darren can be contacted at Darren.Wright@conoco.com

"THE REACTOR COLUMN."

Write to The Reactor, Mr. R., with comments, problems, ideas or anything at all that you would like to be heard. The Editors may decide not to print a letter or part of a letter and letters may be edited. No letter will be published unless the name and address of the Writer is given to the Editors, but names and addresses will not be published without the writer specifically requesting it.

Dear Reader,
When I started this column - initially under the pen name Mrs Merton - in the first edition of The Catalyst in March 2001, I said that "…..the purpose of this column is to try to stimulate a "heated debate" amongst the readers of the Newsletter…..". Well a year has passed and this is beginning to happen as Readers are contacting me with their comments and opinions. As the Editors say on the front page, two of these contributions are published in this edition as Articles, as we hope that in this form, they might have a greater impact. Below, I give you some more food for thought on matters pertinent to High Risk Industry.
Mr. R

Foam Debate

What an excellent debate has developed on different strategies in using Foam in recent editions of The Catalyst and particular credit must be paid to David Meyer of Orion Safety Industries, Australia for putting pen to paper - or should I say fingers to keyboard - and for giving such strong opinions as he did in the September 2001 issue of The Catalyst, which started this whole debate. As you have seen, the debate has widened and it has been very interesting to read the different opinions expressed and the growing number of issues that are being addressed by other contributors to the debate. One of these issues is the very important one of possible Environmental impact in the event of a Fire being allowed to burn and the possible damage that run-off of Firefighting agents can cause. It was therefore of particular interest to read in the February 2002 edition of FIRE magazine, an article that stated that the UK Environment Agency had recently commissioned research into the feasibility of allowing controlled burns in circumstances where extinguishing fires could pollute the Environment. The article reports that the initial research highlighted a degree of agreement on the principle of protecting the Environment providing there were no risks to Health and Safety. Apparently, the research concluded that while there are instances when controlled burns would have a lesser

Environmental impact than putting the fire out, making such a decision to adopt such a measure is a difficult one. So the issue is not as clear-cut as some would have us believe !!

Mr. R.

Dear Mr. R.

WHAT NEXT ??? Over the years as a member of JOIFF I have seen many developments and made many friends. JOIFF to me has been a centre of knowledge and experience, made up of experienced professionals from around the world. No other organisation can offer me what JOIFF has and will be able to in the future. The development of JOIFF has seen the Training Standards created, which is a benchmark for the entire industry and long overdue, JOIFF Seminars being organised, the exchange of views, experiences, advice and techniques.

As we all now sit back and tell ourselves what a good job we have done, let's dust off the cobwebs and take time to examine what we still need to do. I sometimes get the impression when talking to some members (a very few I may add) that they think it is now complete - the job is done. I have the view that we have just started.

The job has just started, now we have decided to do something we need to maintain the Standards that we have created and improve. To re-examine on a regular basis, to audit, to ask the question "Can I improve on what I have got". What is your remit? What are your responsibilities under the law? Whose head is it on the block when the axe falls, who is the scapegoat ? How many of us in JOIFF have a detailed job description and do we understand our responsibilities within the scope of that job description ?

I often ask myself these questions. There have been several investigations in recent years and one of the first questions people ask is "who's fault is that then ?" I think that people are more interested in apportioning blame than in finding out how to stop it happening again and learning from what has happened.

My question is: - "How can we as an Organisation examine on a regular basis the Standards we set" ? You may think that the answer is simple. To some it may be simple but to Organisations that are strapped for man power, cash and are still under the knife it is far from simple.

JOIFF I am sure as an Organisation could offer advice and a service to Members, which would make sure we are all doing the job we should be doing when we should be doing it and the records are being maintained. It is very simple to examine our selves but are we 100% honest when we do ? Would your Systems stand up to an external audit - one would hope so ? I believe that at least two members of JOIFF have been audited by the Health and Safety Executive - would your Standards and Systems stand up to an audit by them ?

Maybe JOIFF could offer an audit service, to point out areas for improvement, an introductory audit to new Members to give guidance on the way to approach with fire legislation. Lets not forget, all Companies don't have safety fire professionals on site. If we are to offer JOIFF as an international organisation we should lead from the front.

And yes there may be some of you who will say "let's get our own house in order first", and I would say YES let's do that, but don't forget that fire protection no matter where it is, is the job we have taken on. What happens in one industry one day could happen in your industry the next day.

So as I asked at the beginning of my letter - WHAT NEXT ??? I invite your comments.

Yours etc.

Pre Determined Attendance.

Question: *How long will it take for the Municipal Fire Brigade to attend and what is their PDA ?*

Answer: *5 Appliances in 7 minutes.*

Question: *What if the Municipal Fire Brigade is dealing with a serious life threatening incident when it gets your Emergency Call ?*

Answer: *Oh then it is probably 1 appliance within 25 minutes.*

In the New Members Section of this edition of The Catalyst, our colleague Lindsay Hamilton of Caltex New Zealand explains that the NZ Fire Service clearly has responsibility for first response to Industrial incidents. What about in other Countries ? For example in the UK, the UK Fire Services Act 1947 only requires Fire Services to meet normal Fire requirements in their area of responsibility. Therefore under this requirement, the Local Authority Fire Brigade could lack the capability to satisfactorily contain the risks found on some Sites. Pre-determined attendance (PDA) of the Municipal Fire Service should unquestionably form a very important basis of your Organisation's Emergency Plan. How many JOIFF Members base their Emergency Plan on the "best possible scenario" PDA? An Emergency Plan must take into account reality and responsible planning practice should demand that the worst possible scenario is the basis on which the Plan should be made. Taking this approach will not only give you a correct picture of what could happen when things start to go wrong, but it will also help to strengthen your case to Management to justify more Training and more resources.

Mr. R.

JOIFF TRAINING NOTES

JOIFF Training for 2002 is under way with good interest in the 3 day Auxiliary Firefighter Course and the 5 day Crew Leader Course. This JOIFF Accredited Auxiliary Firefighter Course is a 3 day Course aimed at providing basic practical skills and understanding of the equipment and procedures used in Occupational Fire Brigades, including the Chemistry and Physics of Fire, Fire Extinguishers, Foam, Basic Breathing Apparatus and exercises in Fire techniques, working in smoke - search and rescue - plus tackling major Fire scenarios such as a Fire Screen and valve isolation rig.

The JOIFF accredited 5 day Crew Leader Course is a 5 day Course is aimed at providing technical and practical Training in Command and Control of Firefighting Teams in High Risk Industry. The Course includes lessons and exercises on Team Building, Motivational Skills, Management of Emergency Procedures as well as Crisis Management. Other subjects covered include Leadership, Communications, review of Breathing Apparatus procedures and there are numerous practical exercises on the Fireground involving valve fires, plus ignited gas release fires, fires on multi rigs, bulk storage and road tanker incident, etc.

If you need places on any of these Courses, please book as soon as you can.

Dates	Detail	Venue
March 25th - 27th	3 day JOIFF accredited Auxiliary Firefighter Course.	IFTC Teeside
April 15th - 19th	5 day JOIFF accredited Crew Leader Course.	IFTC Teeside
April 22nd - 24th	3 day JOIFF accredited Auxiliary Firefighter Course.	IFTC Teeside

For details on the JOIFF accredited Fire Extinguisher Instructor Course, contact Humberside Fire Brigade Industrial Training Centre, Tel. 01482 462 815 (Outside UK dial + 44 1482 462 815).

JOIFF ACCREDITED TRAINING IN SINGAPORE

We are delighted to give preliminary notice of the intention to hold the first JOIFF accredited Training Course outside the United Kingdom. This is being planned to take place during August 2002 in the Singapore Aviation Academy, Singapore.

The Course will be a 5 day Command and Control Course directed at Shift Fire Officers, those in charge of providing first response to Major Incidents in High Risk Industry. The Course will include theoretical and practical exercises dealing with Fire, Search and Rescue, Explosion, Gas release, Toxic release etc. As with all JOIFF Courses, successful Students will be issued with a JOIFF Certificate of Qualification. Places on this course are limited so book early.

Please contact Fulcrum Consultants for further detail on any aspect of JOIFF Training - detail at the bottom of this page.

JOIFF Secretariat:
Fulcrum Consultants
GD House, Tallaght Business Park
Dublin 24, Ireland
Telephone: + 353-1-4137300; Fax: +353-1-4137301
Website: www.joiff.com Email: info@gdgroup.ie

JOIFF in Partnership with
FULCRUM CONSULTANTS

Published by ABCom. www.abcom.ie