



Field Audit Criteria

Audit Methodology

Below is a list of criteria that aims to determine whether critical elements of a harvesting contractor's safety management system have been communicated to operational personnel and that specific legislated controls have been addressed. Where appropriate standards specified in WorkSafe Victoria's "Industry Standard – Safety in Forestry Operations (Harvesting and Haulage)" will be applied. An assessment of the competence of each operator is also undertaken using key criteria from relevant Competency Standards of the relevant Training Package.

Objective observable indicators have been described for each criterion. The scores have been defined so that 0 indicates sub standard performance, 1 indicates that a basic level of compliance with the criteria has been achieved but improvement is possible and 2 indicate a high standard has been achieved. Several criteria have been given greater emphasis and will be weighted by a factor of 4 in the final score.

Evidence will be collected by interviewing field personnel, inspecting records in the field and making observations. As well as a numerical score a description of the evidence observed and any recommended actions will be reported.

The importance or priority of each criterion is nominated. This importance rating should be used to prioritise your program to fix up problems identified in the audit. The following table indicates the time frame for action to be taken for any criteria where a **zero** score was allocated.

Follow up audits will check that you have addressed the identified issues and that action taken is effective.

Importance	Time to address identified deficiencies
Critical	Must be fixed before further work is undertaken
High	Must be corrected within a week
Medium	Must be corrected within a month
Low	Must be corrected before next audit.

Percentages for each individual's performance will be calculated as well as an overall score for the operation. These will be reported along with observations of evidence gathered.

- Where a high standard of performance has been achieved observations will be recorded in green coloured text.
- Where improvement is possible observations and suggestions for improvement will be recorded in blue coloured text.
- Where a basic level of compliance was not observed then the observations and suggestions for improvement will be recorded in red coloured text.



Field Audit Criteria

1. Safety Awareness

To be assessed for every individual on operation.

Criteria	Indicator	Rating	Importance
1.1. Hazard assessment	Are individuals able to demonstrate a recent hazard assessment?	0 = No 1 = Verbal Evidence 2 = Written Evidence	High
1.2. Safe work procedures	Are individuals able to locate written safe work procedures?	0 = No 1 = Verbal Evidence 2 = Written Evidence	High
1.3. Working zone	Are individuals able to describe a working zone for which they are responsible?	0 = No 1 = Verbal Evidence 2 = Written Evidence	High
1.4. Other worker's zones	Is the operator able to describe the working zones of other members of the crew and what they must do if they wish to enter these zones?	0 = No 1 = Verbal Evidence 2 = Written Evidence	High
1.4. Unsafe plant isolation procedure	Are individuals able to describe a robust isolation procedure?	0 = No 1 = Verbal Evidence 2 = Written Evidence	Medium
1.5. Working Alone Procedures	Are individuals able to describe working alone procedures?	0 = No 1 = Verbal Evidence 2 = Written Evidence	Medium
1.6. Emergency procedures - Medical	Are individuals able to describe emergency response procedures to a medical emergency, including evacuation?	0 = No 1 = Verbal Evidence 2 = Written Evidence	Medium
1.7. Emergency procedures – Fire	Are individuals able to describe emergency response procedures to a fire starting on the coupe?	0 = No 1 = Verbal Evidence 2 = Written Evidence	Medium
1.8. Emergency procedures – Spill	Are individuals able to describe emergency response procedures to a spill?	0 = No 1 = Verbal Evidence 2 = Written Evidence	Medium
1.9. Emergency procedures - Protest	Are individuals able to describe emergency response procedures to a coupe invasion by protestors?	0 = No 1 = Verbal Evidence 2 = Written Evidence	Medium
1.10. Injury reporting procedures	Are individuals able to describe injury reporting procedure (including near misses)?	0 = No 1 = Verbal Evidence 2 = Written Evidence	Medium
1.11. Issue resolution	Are individuals able to describe issue resolution procedures both for internal issues and issues involving VicForest personnel?	0 = No 1 = Verbal Evidence 2 = Written Evidence	Medium
1.12. Disciplinary procedures	Are individuals able to describe disciplinary sanctions for unsafe work?	0 = No 1 = Verbal Evidence 2 = Written Evidence	Medium



Field Audit Criteria

2. Operator Personal Protective Equipment

To be assessed for every individual on operation.

Criteria	Indicator	Rating	Importance
2.1. Safety Helmet	Is operator wearing a safety helmet compliant with AS/NZS 1801? (stickers on outer shell can be deemed acceptable)	0 = No 1 = Not compliant with AS 2 = Compliant with AS	Critical
2.2. High visibility clothing	Is operator wearing high visibility clothing compliant with AS/NZS 4602?	0 = No 1 = Not compliant with AS 2 = Compliant with AS	Critical
2.3. Cut resistant leg protection	Are all chainsaw users using cut resistant leg protection compliant with AS/NZS 4453?	0 = No 1 = Not compliant with AS 2 = Compliant with AS	Critical
2.4. Hearing Protection	Are all operators exposed to hazardous noise wearing hearing protection compliant with AS/NZS 1270?	0 = No 1 = Not compliant with AS 2 = Compliant with AS	Critical
2.5. Safety footwear	Are operators wearing safety footwear compliant with AS/NZS 2210? The soles should be suitable for task eg spiked boots for fallers and rubber soles for plant operators.	0 = No 1 = Not compliant with AS 2 = Compliant with AS	Critical
2.6. Gloves – not applicable for hand fallers	Are gloves compliant with AS/NZS 2161 available to be used to protect against hazardous substances, wire sprags or other hazards?	0 = No 1 = Not compliant with AS 2 = Compliant with AS	Medium
2.7. Eye Protection – not applicable to machine operators or trucks	Is eye protection compliant with AS/NZS 1336 worn where necessary?	0 = No 1 = Not compliant with AS 2 = Compliant with AS	High



Field Audit Criteria

3. Competence and Equipment Condition

Specific field based assessments for each task

3.1. Hand Falling

Criteria	Indicator	Rating	Importance
3.1.1. Tree assessment	Does tree assessment ensure wind appropriate, lean not excessive, open area to fall into, no widow makers?	0 = No 1 = Most of the time 2 = All of the time	Critical
3.1.2. Escape route	Is appropriate escape route selected, cleared and used?	0 = No 1 = Most of the time 2 = All of the time	Critical
3.1.3. Falling technique	Is correct falling technique used?	0 = 0-50% 2 = 50-80% 4 = Greater than 80%	Critical
3.1.4. Stump check	Do recent stumps indicate that safe falling techniques have been used?	0 = 0-50% 2 = 50-80% 4 = Greater than 80%	Critical
3.1.5. Chainsaw condition	Is chainsaw maintained in compliance with AS/NZS 2726?	0 = No 1 = Most of the features 2 = All of the features	High
3.1.6. Additional gear	Does faller chainsaw operator have belt, wedges, axe and correct fuel container?	0 = No 1 = Most of the features 2 = All of the features	High
3.1.7. Communication with others	Is electronic communication available and used?	0 = Not compliant 1 = Electronic system in serviceable condition	High
3.18. Pre-operational checklist	Has documented check of safety features been completed?	0 = More than 5 days ago 1 = Not consistently or less frequently than weekly 2 = Weekly and consistently	Medium

Field Audit Criteria

3.2. Mechanical Falling

Criteria	Indicator	Rating	Importance
3.2.1. Follows safe work procedures	Are safe work procedures followed -3 point mount/dismount -doors closed -work zone?	0 = No 1 = Most of the issues 2 = All of the issues	Critical
3.2.2. Safe Working Condition	Is machine in safe working condition, including brakes, emergency exit, steps and grab rails?	0 = No 1 = Most of the features 2 = All of the features	Critical
3.2.3. Machine Guarding	Are all necessary guards in place and in a serviceable condition?	0 = No 1 = Most of the features 2 = All of the features	High
3.2.4. Falling Object Protection	Is there a Falling Object Protection Structure compliant with ISO 8083 or AS 2294.3 in a serviceable condition?	0 = No 1 = Minor Damage 2 = Present and compliant with standard	Critical <i>Weighted (x4)</i>
3.2.5. Roll Over Protection	Is there a Roll Over Protection Structure compliant with ISO 8082 or AS 2294.2 in a serviceable condition?	0 = No 1 = Minor Damage 2 = Present and compliant with standard	Critical <i>Weighted (x4)</i>
3.2.6. Operator Protective Guards	Is there Operator Protective Guarding compliant with AS 4988, ISO 8084 or AS 2294.1 Supp 1?	0 = No 1 = Minor Damage 2 = Present and compliant with standard	Critical <i>Weighted (x4)</i>
3.2.7. Windows	Are all windows in a serviceable condition?	0 = Window missing 1 = Present and damaged 2 = Serviceable Condition	Low
3.2.8. Seat Belts	Are seatbelts fitted and worn?	0 = Not fitted or fitted but not worn 1 = Fitted and worn	Medium
3.2.9. Safety information	Is appropriate safety information available? -decals -operators manual	0 = No 1 = Most of the features 2 = All of the features	High
3.2.10. Communication with other	Is electronic communication available and used?	0 = None 1 = Electronic system used	High
3.2.11. Trees felled safely	Are trees felled safely?	0 = No 1 = Most of the time 2 = All of the time	High
3.2.12. Leaves bush in safe condition for other workers	Are hang-ups or widow makers left after operation?	0 = Yes and not identified 1 = Yes and identified 2 = No	Critical
3.2.13. Tree placement	Are trees placed for ease of extraction?	0 = No 1 = Most of the time 2 = All of the time	Medium
3.2.14. Shut down safety.	Are implements grounded when machine is stationary?	0 = No 1 = Most of the time 2 = All of the time	High
3.2.15. Pre-operational checklist	Has documented check of machines safety features been completed?	0 = More than 5 days ago 1 = Not consistently or less than 5 days ago 2 = Less than a day ago	Medium

Field Audit Criteria

3.3. Snigging

Criteria	Indicator	Rating	Importance
3.3.1 Follows safe work procedures	Are safe work procedures followed while attaching/releasing logs, moving log, mount/dismount, working near ground workers incl: -Doors closed?	0 = No 1 = Most of the issues 2 = All of the issues	Critical
3.3.2. Safe Working Condition	Is machine in safe working condition, including brakes, emergency exit, steps and grab rails?	0 = No 1 = Most of the features 2 = All of the features	Critical
3.3.3. Machine Guarding	Are all necessary guards in place and in a serviceable condition?	0 = No 1 = Most of the features 2 = All of the features	High
3.3.4. Falling Object Protection	Is there a Falling Object Protection Structure compliant with ISO 8083 or AS 2294.3 in a serviceable condition?	0 = No 1 = Minor Damage 2 = Present and compliant with standard	Critical <i>Weighted (x4)</i>
3.3.5. Roll Over Protection	Is there a Roll Over Protection Structure compliant with ISO 8082 or AS 2294.2 in a serviceable condition?	0 = No 1 = Minor Damage 2 = Present and compliant with standard	Critical <i>Weighted (x4)</i>
3.3.6. Operator Protective Guards	Is there Operator Protective Guarding compliant with AS 4988, ISO 8084 or AS 2294.1 Supp 1?	0 = No 1 = Minor Damage 2 = Present and compliant with standard	Critical <i>Weighted (x4)</i>
3.3.7. Windows	Are all windows in a serviceable condition?	0 = Window missing 1 = Present and damaged 2 = Serviceable Condition	Low
3.3.8. Seat Belts	Are seatbelts fitted and worn?	0 = Not fitted or fitted but not worn 1 = Fitted and worn	Medium
3.3.9. Safety information	Is appropriate safety information available? -decals -operators manual	0 = No 1 = Most of the features 2 = All of the features	High
3.3.10. Communication with others	Is electronic communication available and used?	0 = None 1 = Electronic system used	High
3.3.11. Shut down safety.	Are implements grounded when machine is stationary?	0 = No 1 = Most of the time 2 = All of the time	High
3.3.12. Pre-operational checklist	Has documented check of machines safety features been completed?	0 = More than 5 days ago 1 = Not consistently or less than 5 days ago 2 = Less than a day ago	Medium

Field Audit Criteria

3.4. Forwarding and loading

Criteria	Indicator	Rating	Importance
3.4.1. Follows safe work procedures	Are safe work procedures followed -loading/unloading -travelling -doors closed -3 point mount/dismount -safety zone?	0 = No 1 = Most of the issues 2 = All of the issues	Critical
3.4.2. Safe Working Condition	Is machine in safe working condition, including brakes, emergency exit, steps and grab rails?	0 = No 1 = Most of the features 2 = All of the features	Critical
3.4.3. Machine Guarding	Are all necessary guards in place and in a serviceable condition?	0 = No 1 = Most of the features 2 = All of the features	High
3.4.4. Falling Object Protection	Is there a Falling Object Protection Structure compliant with ISO 8083 or AS 2294.3 in a serviceable condition?	0 = No 1 = Minor Damage 2 = Present and compliant with standard	Critical <i>Weighted (x4)</i>
3.4.5. Roll Over Protection	Is there a Roll Over Protection Structure compliant with ISO 8082 or AS 2294.2 in a serviceable condition?	0 = No 1 = Minor Damage 2 = Present and compliant with standard	Critical <i>Weighted (x4)</i>
3.4.6. Operator Protective Guards	Is there Operator Protective Guarding compliant with AS 4988, ISO 8084 or AS 2294.1 Supp 1?	0 = No 1 = Minor Damage 2 = Present and compliant with standard	Critical <i>Weighted (x4)</i>
3.4.7. Windows	Are all windows in a serviceable condition?	0 = Window missing 1 = Present and damaged 2 = Serviceable Condition	Low
3.4.8. Seat Belts	Are seatbelts fitted and worn?	0 = Not fitted or fitted but not worn 1 = Fitted and worn	Medium
3.4.9. Safety information	Is appropriate safety information available? -decals -operators manual	0 = No 1 = Most of the features 2 = All of the features	High
3.4.10. Communication with others	Is electronic communication available and used?	0 = None 1 = Electronic system used	High
3.4.11. Shut down safety.	Are implements grounded when machine is stationary?	0 = No 1 = Most of the time 2 = All of the time	High
3.4.12. Pre-operational checklist	Has documented check of machines safety features been completed?	0 = More than 5 days ago 1 = Not consistently or less than 5 days ago 2 = Less than a day ago	Medium

Field Audit Criteria

3.5. Excavator Loading/Log Making

Criteria	Indicator	Rating	Importance
3.5.1. Follows safe work procedures	Are safe work procedures followed -log stacks stable -3 point mount/dismount -separation from ground workers - separation or physical protection from machines and moving logs when not in a machine?	0 = No 1 = Most of the issues 2 = All of the issues	Critical
3.5.2. Safe Working Condition	Is machine in safe working condition, including brakes, emergency exit, steps and grab rails?	0 = No 1 = Most of the features 2 = All of the features	Critical
3.5.3. Machine Guarding	Are all necessary guards in place and in a serviceable condition?	0 = No 1 = Most of the features 2 = All of the features	High
3.5.4. Operator Protective Guards	Is there Operator Protective Guarding compliant with AS 4988, ISO 8084 or AS 2294.1 Supp 1?	0 = No 1 = Minor Damage 2 = Present and compliant with standard	Critical <i>Weighted (x4)</i>
3.5.5. Windows	Are all windows in a serviceable condition?	0 = Window missing 1 = Present and damaged 2 = Serviceable Condition	Low
3.5.6. Seat Belts	Are seatbelts fitted and worn when machine moves off landing?	0 = Not fitted or fitted but not worn 1 = Fitted and worn	Medium
3.5.7. Safety information	Is appropriate safety information available? -decals -operators manual	0 = No 1 = Most of the features 2 = All of the features	High
3.5.8. Communication with others	Is electronic communication available and used?	0 = None 1 = Electronic system used	High
3.5.9. Load Shape	Are loads compliant with Code of Practice?	0 = No 1 = Most of the time 2 = All of the time	High
3.5.10. Shut down safety.	Are implements grounded when machine is stationary?	0 = No 1 = Most of the time 2 = All of the time	High
3.5.11. Pre-operational checklist	Has documented check of machines safety features been completed?	0 = More than 5 days ago 1 = Not consistently or less than 5 days ago 2 = Less than a day ago	Medium
3.5.12. Departure Time	Has departure time been recorded in barcode and sawlog books?	0 = No 1 = Most loads 2 = All loads	Medium

Field Audit Criteria

3.6. Landing Worker

Criteria	Indicator	Rating	Importance
3.6.1. Follows safe work procedures	Are safe work procedures followed? - notched logs - separation or physical protection from machines moving logs and flying debris	0 = No 1 = Most of the issues 2 = All of the issues	High
3.6.2. Chainsaw Technique	Is a safe chainsaw technique used?	0 = No 1 = Most of the time 2 = All of the time	Critical
3.6.3. Chainsaw condition	Is chainsaw maintained in compliance with AS/NZS 2726?	0 = No 1 = Most of the features 2 = All of the features	High
3.6.4. Additional gear	Does worker have wedges, axe and correct fuel container?	0 = No 1 = Most of the features 2 = All of the features	High
3.6.5. Communication with others	Is electronic communication available and used?	0 = Not compliant 1 = Electronic system in serviceable condition	High
3.6.5. Pre-operational checklist	Has documented check of safety features been completed?	0 = More than 5 days ago 1 = Not consistently or less frequently than weekly 2 = Weekly and consistently	Medium

Field Audit Criteria

3.7. Truck Driver

Criteria	Indicator	Rating	Importance
3.7.1. Follows safe work procedures	Are safe work procedures followed - safe load - 3 point mount/dismount - work zones?	0 = No 1 = Most of the issues 2 = All of the issues	Critical
3.7.2. Load Shape	Are loads compliant with Code of Practice? (if self loading)	0 = No 1 = Most of the time 2 = All of the time	High
3.7.3. Shut down safety.	Are implements grounded when machine is stationary? (if self loading)	0 = No 1 = Most of the time 2 = All of the time	High
3.7.4. Safe Working Condition	Is truck in safe working condition?	0 = No 1 = Most of the features 2 = All of the features	High
3.7.5. Stanchions and Pins	Are stanchions and pins in a serviceable condition?	0 = No 1 = Most of the features 2 = All of the features	High
3.7.6. Load Restraint Devices	Are load restraint devices adequate?	0 = No 1 = Most of the features 2 = All of the features	High
3.7.7. First Aid Equipment	Is first aid kit adequate?	0 = No 1 = Most of the features 2 = All of the features	High
3.7.8. Hazard Triangles	Are hazard triangles available?	0 = No 1 = Most of the features 2 = All of the features	High
3.7.9. Fire Fighting Equipment	Is fire equipment adequate?	0 = No 1 = Most of the features 2 = All of the features	High
3.7.10. Load Reading Device	Is a serviceable portable load reading device available?	0 = No 1 = Most of the features 2 = All of the features	High
3.7.11. Truck and Trailer Compliance	Is a current compliance plate fitted to each truck and trailer?	0 = No 1 = Fitted	High
3.7.12. Safety information	Is appropriate safety information available? -decals -operators manual	0 = No 1 = Most of the features 2 = All of the features	High
3.7.13. Communication with others	Electronic communication is available and used.	0 = None 1 = Eye contact 2 = Electronic system used	High
3.7.14. Safe load	Does driver check load for possible log movement prior to strapping/chaining the load?	0 = No 1 = Most of the time 2 = All of the time	High
3.7.15. Working at night	Is adequate illumination provided to back of truck cab?	0 = Not adequate 1 = Most lights operate 2 = All lights operate	High
3.7.16. Driving Hours	Record of hours up to date and within legal hours?	0 = No 1 = Only log book trips documented 2 = Time recorded for all trips	High
3.7.17. Pre-operational checklist	Has documented check of machines safety features been completed?	0 = More than 5 days ago 1 = Not consistently 2 = Daily	Medium
3.7.18. System Documentation (for owner operators)	Does driver have access to the following? - Safe Work Procedures - Induction Manual - MSDS's	0 = No 1 = Most of the issues 2 = All of the issues	Medium

Field Audit Criteria

4. Combined Hazard Assessment

To be assessed for the operation as a whole.

Criteria	Indicator	Rating	Importance
4.1. Landing Area Hazard Assessment	Are all visible hazards documented including hazardous trees within one and half tree lengths of the landing?	0 = No 1 = Most hazards recorded 2 = All hazards recorded	Critical
4.1. Work Area Hazard Checklist	Are all visible hazards documented in area(s) currently being harvested?	0 = No 1 = Most hazards recorded 2 = All hazards recorded	Critical
4.2. Hazards communicated	Are authorised personnel and visitors warned of hazards and informed of work areas?	0 = Not authorised personnel 1 = All authorised personnel and most visitors 2 = Everyone	High
4.3. Responsibility for action (signed off)	Have controls been documented and signed off?	0 = No 1 = Most controls 2 = All controls	Medium
4.4. Car Park	Are cars parked so they are not at risk, e.g. proximity to operations, hazardous trees?	0 = No 1 = Most of the time 2 = All of the time	Medium
4.5. Machinery Servicing area	Is there a designated safe designated servicing area, no overhanging limbs or tripping hazards?	0 = No 1 = Most of the time 2 = All of the time	Medium
4.6. Close proximity control plan	Do all the tasks where working in close proximity have a documented control plan?	0 = No 1 = Most of the tasks 2 = All of the tasks	High
4.7. Road Management Plan	Is the agreed Road Management Plan being implemented? (If no plan then an observation should be made to VicForests about this)	0 = No 1 = Most of the issues 2 = All of the issues	High
4.8. Details of Loading Requirements	Do all truck drivers list information to demonstrate their compliance with the <i>Road Safety (Vehicles) Regulations 1999 incl:</i> - <i>Gross Combination Mass.</i> - <i>Pay load.</i> - <i>Installed lashing capacity.</i> - <i>Allowable hours.</i> - <i>Fatigue management status.</i>	0 = No 1 = Most of the issues 2 = All of the issues	High
4.9. Construction Safe Method Statement (Safe Work Procedure)	Does all high risk construction work have a safe work method statement? N.B. High risk construction work includes but is not limited to road making where there is any movement of powered mobile plant.	0 = No 1 = Most Work 2 = All work	High



Field Audit Criteria

5. Site Safety Gear

To be assessed on operation overall

Criteria	Indicator	Rating	Importance
5.1. Coupe Entry Signs	Is adequate warning evident for personnel entering coupe -UHF channel -visitor control -tree falling sign -PPE?	0 =No 1 =Most of the signs 2 = All signs at all entrances	High
5.2. Landing warning signs	Are adequate warning signs around landing -PPE -"No unauthorised access"?	0 =No 1 =Most of the signs 2 = All signs	High
5.3. First aid equipment	Are all personnel able to rapidly access to a well maintained, first aid equipment adequate to deal with a major laceration?	0 =No 1 = Most of the time 2 = All of the time	High
5.4. Emergency communication equipment	Does crew have the ability to call emergency services and direct them to coupe: - phone / radio - emergency plan incl. map?	0 =No 1 = Most of the time 2 = All of the time	High
5.5. Fire fighting Equipment	Is fire fighting equipment serviceable? - Extinguishers available charged and checked. - Gear prescribed by Utilisation Procedures will be checked during periods set by Utilisation Procedures	0 =No 1 = Most of the time 2 = All of the time	High
5.6. Drinking Water	Is adequate clean drinking water available for the crew?	0 =No 1 = Most of the time 2 = All of the time	High
5.7. Washing, Sanitation Facilities and Shelter	Are these arrangements well maintained? - washing water - shelters which are a suitable rest place for truck drivers who are required to wait for more than 30 minutes to be loaded	0 =No 1 = Most of the arrangements 2 = All of the arrangements	Medium
5.8. If you are injured poster	Is an "If you are Injured" poster available to crew?	0 =No 1 = Available 2 = All aware of location	High
5.9. MSDS	Are MSDS's available for hazardous substances?	0 = less than 75% of substances 1 = More than 75% of substances 2 = All substances	Medium
5.10 System documentation	Is all system documentation current and well maintained? - Induction Manual - Safe Work Procedures	0 =No 1 = Manuals available 2 = Current version	High



Field Audit Criteria

5. Stump Check Methodology

In order to assess whether a Hand Faller is working consistently in accordance with the falling technique recommended by AS 2727 stumps will be assessed for defects. Defects that are considered significant may include:

- Undercutting the scarf.
- Overcutting the scarf.
- Backcut or scarf cuts not horizontal.
- Back Cut not high enough above scarf.
- Insufficient hinge-wood retained.

Each of these defects can lead to loss of control of the direction of fall. Undercutting and overcutting of scarfs can lead to slabbing up of free splitting timber.

For each faller a percentage compliance is calculated as follows.

$$\frac{(\text{No of Stumps} - \text{No Stumps with a Defect})}{\text{No of Stumps}} \times \frac{100}{1}$$

During Full Day Audits the following numbers of stumps will be assessed where practical:

- 35 previous stumps
- 15 fresh stumps (fallen during the audit)

During Half Day Audits the following numbers of stumps will be assessed where practical:

- 15 previous stumps
- 5 fresh stumps (fallen during the audit)

All stumps that are assessed will be marked with crayon and the defects will be marked on the stump.

An appendix will be added to the field report indicated the number of the stump the defects identified and the diameter of the stump.



Field Audit Criteria

<p>Version Information</p> <p>Original version was used for audits during January 2002 – August 2002. The criteria were agreed to at a meeting on Monday 4th February, 2002 by representatives of Syndicated Central Gippsland Logging, Australian Paper, Gould's Central Harvesting, Tambo Logging Company, Upper Yarra Logging Syndicate, Eastern Syndicated Logging, East Gippsland Logging, Safety Development Fund, Victorian Timber Harvesting Association and Central Gippsland Harvesting Safety Committee.</p>
<p>August 2002 changes</p> <p>After feedback from Lina Vennix, Victorian Workcover Authority and discussion by the syndicate heads at a meeting on August 26th 2002, the following criteria were changed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Machine and Truck Safety</u> criteria. These criteria were changed by increasing their importance and focusing them on the mechanical features of a machine designed to improve operator safety also a new element about safety information was created. - The mechanical falling criterion about the <u>condition of the bush</u> following the operation was increased in priority to critical - Suggested changes about the water availability for fallers were not included, it was felt that this issue was adequately dealt with in the Site Safety gear criteria by assessing adequate water availability for the whole crew not just the faller. <p>Following concerns raised by fallers in the Tambo FMA the scoring methodology for falling technique and stump check was altered. Original rating: 0-%50 = 0, >50% but <100% = 1 and 100% = 2 New rating: 0- 25% = 0, 26-50% = 1, 51-75% = 2, 76-95% = 3 and >96% = 4</p>
<p>October 2002 changes</p> <p>Following concerns raised by contractors working for GCH Harvesting The following changes have been made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The requirement to have flares to guide an air ambulance to the coupe was removed - The requirement to have additional fire fighting equipment on site will only be audited during the time required by DNRE. At other times it is expected that fire extinguishers are available, charged and checked.
<p>February 2004 changes</p> <p>Following the publication of Australian Standard No 2294.1 Supplement 1: <u>Operator protective structures fitted to plant used in the timber industry (forest operations</u> and subsequent review by the Central Highlands and Central Gippsland OH&S Committees (refer minutes 4/12/2003, 5/12/2003) the audit criteria was changed to include a check for evidence that machines comply with this standard and in the case of machines with cut-off saws ensure that there is a physical barrier between the saw and the operator that is capable of stopping a chain link thrown towards the operator.</p>
<p>November 2005 changes</p> <p>Following serious injury to a workers on landing landings and subsequent review by the Central Highlands, Central and East Gippsland OH&S Committees criteria 4.6 was added.</p>
<p>August 2006 changes</p> <p>Following the introduction of Mill Door Sales by VicForests the criteria were reviewed by Bill Paul, Doug Liston, Charles Stansfield, Andrew McGuire and Chris Stevenson to ensure suitability for VicForests operational arrangements and to pick up recommendations of STEMS auditors following feedback from contractors. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Operator Competence Section has been renamed Competence and Equipment Condition. - A written description of the procedure for assessing stumps was included - Some additional elements were added to reinforce the importance of forest workers maintaining separation distances and continually communication their position to other workers. - The criteria for a landing worker have been separated from the Excavator Loading criteria to provide better flexibility of the criteria. - In order to facilitate owner/operator truck audits additional elements have been included in the Truck Driver Competence and Equipment Condition Section.
<p>August 2007 changes</p> <p>Following feedback from contractors and the introduction of WorkCover's Industry Standard for the Forest Industry (Harvesting and Haulage) the criteria relating to the engineering controls of plant and trucks have been given greater emphasis. A single criterion has been split into seven criteria and the importance of each feature has been reassessed. A greater emphasis has been placed on operator protective structures. This review is an attempt to ensure that final scores allocated provide a greater incentive to contractors to focus on maintaining the safety features designed into their plant and equipment. Doug Liston and Bill Paul led this review.</p>

Field Audit Criteria

August 2008 changes

Following changes to legislation (*Road Legislation Further Amendment Act, 2007* and *Occupational Health and Safety Regulations, 2007 Chapter 5*) the criterion relating to:

- log loading, despatch and haulage were reviewed resulting in the modification of 3.7.15. and 5.7, the addition of 3.5.12. and 4.8.
- high risk construction activities resulting in the addition of 4.9.

Also the following changes were made:

- modification of rating system for results of stump checks.
- Specific inclusion of requirement for closed doors in all machines moving in coupe.
- Use of seatbelts changed to compliance / non-compliance.
- Check of compliance plates on log trucks now undertaken in field audit.