

**The companies are encouraged to evaluate and follow up the following measures:**

No.	Topic (M/T/O)	Proposed measures	The measure is based on	Company's evaluation of whether in place internally	Company's own action for further work
1.	Planning / execution of work/ leadership responsibility (M)	<p>The individual company must strengthen its <b>process for planning and execution of work</b> with respect to dropped objects. This entails managers on different levels being responsible for carrying out activities to increase the quality of preparations and the execution of the work. The attention must be on tidying up after the job is done / improving <b>the process for job completion</b>. The companies should clarify the responsibility of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the work executor to clean and secure the work site after completing the work</li> <li>- the area responsible to check the job at the work site</li> <li>- management to check that the procedures for planning and executing work are adhered to.</li> </ul>	Survey priority no. 1 (M) and proposal addressed further in workshop, also supported based on incident review.		
2.	Knowledge/ competence/ training/ leadership responsibility (M)	Continue the work on <b>incorporating understanding of risks</b> related to dropped objects in the company's <b>HSE culture</b> . This means clarifying leadership responsibility, integrate prevention of dropped objects in the planning, active use of risk assessments, train those who perform and supervise the work.	OLF workshop on Sept 21. emphasised that understanding of risks is a central element in the HSE culture.		
3.	Knowledge/ competence/ training (M)	A review of <b>the company's internal training systems</b> is required to check whether issues related to dropped objects are covered (at the introduction of new employees to the workplace, for service companies, in requirements to suppliers). The companies are encouraged to make use of Sfs' handbook "Best Practice - Dropped Object Management".	Survey priority no. 2 (M)		
4.	Knowledge/ competence/ training (M/O)	The company's requirements and procedures to prevent dropped objects must <b>be communicated to the entire value chain</b> to ensure better compliance (design phase, fabrication of equipment, suppliers, transportation, logistics, installation and operations/maintenance). For example by using materials prepared by Sfs (handbooks, videos, etc.)	A review of statistics shows that a common root cause is lack of compliance.		
5.	Management systems (O)	The importance of <b>picture-based checklists was emphasised in the survey in order to clarify requirements</b> and to ensure better compliance. Employees should also be involved in preparation of checklists. Companies without such systems in place are encouraged to establish this, including a process for regular updates. (Sfs has prepared	Survey priority no. 3 (M) ) and as no. 2 below (O)		

No .	Topic (M/T/O)	Proposed measures	The measure is based on	Company's evaluation of whether in place internally	Company's own action for further work
		functional requirements for such checklists)			
6.	Management systems (O)	Incorporate <b>checklists</b> for dropped objects <b>in the work order system</b> , check for dropped objects on work orders where this is relevant.	Proposed by the OLF work group, this measure should be prioritised by the companies		
7.	Procedures and guidelines (O)	Companies should <b>review</b> internal procedures and guidelines with respect to dropped objects <b>to improve the quality</b> .	Survey priority no. 1 (O)		
8.	Risk management (O)	Carry out <b>regular reviews/updates of risk assessments</b> with respect to dropped objects to identify potential system weaknesses or <b>creeping changes over time</b> .	A review of statistics shows that the risk assessment process must be improved.		
9.	Maintenance management (O)	The companies are encouraged to become part of an " <b>Industry Initiative</b> " to remove <b>unnecessary equipment at heights</b> . Each company is recommended to carry out a review to remove equipment at heights no longer in use (which is not part of the maintenance program).	Proposed by the OLF work group		
10.	Securing equipment and equipment used at elevations (T/(O)	The companies are encouraged to carry out a review to ensure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- that <b>securing devices</b> for use at heights <b>are readily accessible</b></li> <li>- that <b>a maintenance program has been established</b> for tools and equipment for use at heights</li> <li>- that there is <b>a sufficient number of lockers/cabinets</b> and to check that logging procedures have been established and are complied with.</li> </ul>	Survey priority no. 1, 2, 3 (T)		
11.	Inspections (O)	Experience shows that <b>regular inspections</b> are an effective measure for identifying potential dropped objects. Companies without such programs are encouraged to establish this (a criticality evaluation to select priority areas is a natural part of this work). Dropped objects should also be a <b>theme for management inspections</b> .	Survey priority no. 6 (M)		
12.	Management systems (O)	The companies are encouraged to review their <b>procedures for restricted areas</b> . It is important that the restricted area has a sign describing activities in the area. It is also important to have a procedure to remove signs describing restricted areas as soon as the work has been completed.	Survey priority no. 2 (T)		
13.	Management	The management systems must schedule for <b>inspections before bad weather occurs</b> .	Review of statistics		

No .	Topic (M/T/O)	Proposed measures	The measure is based on	Company's evaluation of whether in place internally	Company's own action for further work
	systems (O)	(Statistics show many" weather-related" incidents which might have been prevented with better inspections.)			
14.	Topic at work meetings and safety meetings (MO)	Organise <b>work meetings/safety meetings at the work sites</b> addressing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OLF's dropped objects project and the results from the survey</li> <li>• Review of specific incidents/examples</li> <li>• Company/worksite-specific root cause analysis of incidents with dropped objects</li> <li>• Prepare <b>internal company priorities and action lists</b>, preferably illustrated with pictures of potential dropped objects</li> </ul>	The OLF workshop on 21 Sept. showed that this is an efficient way to work. It is important for the companies to establish their own priority lists.		
15.	Process for handling of recommendations	During January 2011 the companies are encouraged to <b>nominate a contact person</b> from management for the OLF project for dropped objects who are responsible for implement and follow up measures.	Proposed by the OLF work group		
16.	Process for handling of recommendations	The Companies must provide <b>feedback</b> to OLF describing whether the measures have been assessed and work processes for follow-up have been initiated by 1Q 2011.	Proposed by the OLF work group		