

| Asbestos Network Technical Working Group (ANTWG) | |
|--|---|
| Minutes of the meeting held on the 5th Nov 2024 via MS Teams | |
| <p>Present: Sam Lord (SL) HSE Specialist Division /Chair/Minutes Heather Campbell (HC) HSE Specialist Division Nick Garland (NG) FAAM Committee/Assure 360 Jonathan Grant (JG) BOHS-FAAM Gareth Jones (GJ) UKATA Steve Sadley (SS) ARCA Martin Saunders (MS) HSE Science Division Tony Dillon (TD) ACAD Graham Warren (GW) ASES Steve Watkins (SW) Independent Industry Rep Wayne Williams (WW) IATP Colette Willoughby (CW) NORAC</p> <p>Apologies: None</p> <p>Note: These minutes are a note of the discussions had on the date of the meeting. Some items will be discussed over a number of meetings. Taking one set of minutes in isolation may not reflect the final position and readers need to be aware of this. As and when a final position is reached this will be made clear within the relevant minute item.</p> | |
| 1 | <p>Welcome, introductions and apologies: SL welcomed all attendees to the meeting.</p> |
| 2 | <p>Minutes of ANTWG meeting (No.44) and acceptance: The minutes from August 2024 (No. 44) meeting were finalised and accepted. Action: Minutes to be sent to AsbNet members via AsbNet Secretariat. (SL)</p> |
| 3 | <p>Matters/actions arising from Meeting No.44 August 2024</p> <p>Scott Pro-Flow Mask (now 3M powered air turbo PF-602E-ASB) – issue with P3 filter cartridges coming loose during use. HSE RPE Policy have advised to deal with this concern as a Product Safety issue.</p> <p>Action: SL to initiate PMSU submission.</p> <p>Demo arisings containing asbestos A re-cap of discussion points to date, but clarification still required from EA. SL will progress this but will remove from the Action table for now.</p> <p>Are non-locking DCUs a breach of CDM Regs? – HC recalled asking Matt Greenly this question but will check. Action: HC to check with MG and SL to then add response to the minutes of this meeting. Note: SL to draft response to question to also include context of why this was asked for inclusion in March 25 meeting minutes.</p> |

| | |
|------------|---|
| | <p>ASB5 data clarification – MS spoke to ALU who confirmed that disclosure of the number of enclosures should not be a problem as this can be anonymised. ALU would still need to review decision on sharing other ASB5 data with external stakeholders.</p> <p>MS to confirm if number of enclosures can be amended on-line but advised in the meantime to contact HSE if any change in number of enclosures (major change to PoW).</p> |
| 4 | Appendices |
| 4.1 | <p>Asbestos Skips, Van Waste Compartments, Waste Storage and Movement on Site</p> <p>Following feedback it was agreed to remove reference to large demolition or industrial sites in next review and issue. SL welcomed any further feedback or tweaks to be brought to the TWG meeting as the guidance gets used by the industry.</p> |
| 4.2 | The Importance and Requirements of Leak Testing During Licensed Asbestos Work |
| | <p>SS led a discussion on some of the points which the Appendix would seek to clarify including the definitions – occupied buildings and separation. It was agreed that example scenarios to cover voids, lift shafts, transit routes, air ducting, long term enclosures and 1-day jobs would help inform a risk assessment based approach for this which is key for LARCs.</p> <p>SL made the observation that compared to when she was an analyst, analysts no longer seem to be assigned for the entire duration of the job but just attend site for the 4SC process. Any clarification on leak testing requirements is therefore likely to impact more widely on the use of analysts for licensed asbestos work. It was agreed that LARCs would benefit from guidance they can show clients the requirements, as would analyst organisations and consultants.</p> <p>SS suggested including CDM client requirements. WW suggested a table to show examples which can form part of the RAMS.</p> <p>Action: SS to add a table to the draft appendix and circulated for discussion next meeting.</p> |
| 5 | The Appendix status table was updated (see end). |
| 6 | AOB |
| 6.1 | <p>SL stated that the bagging of H-VACs would be discussed at the next meeting but reported that she had created a summary discussion document.</p> <p>Action: SL to finalise discussion document for next meeting.</p> |
| 6.2 | <p>Temporary Works and Asbestos Enclosures - clarity around when these two things interact, specifically the propping of an enclosure sat over external ductwork. (GW)</p> <p>SL advised that Asbestos Unit had recently replied to a question on temporary works and that she would send the response (copied below) from AU to GW to see if this provided the clarification required - Action.</p> |

A recent enquiry sent to HSE's Asbestos Unit advised:

All asbestos enclosures are considered temporary structures and should be constructed in accordance with the contractor's standard operating procedures. These procedures should specify standard solutions for stud wall construction and restraint conditions in most site situations. Where standard solutions do not apply, a bespoke temporary works design will be necessary. In all cases, company temporary works procedures should be followed and the temporary works designer must be competent to fulfil that role.

Temporary works are further defined in BS5975: 2008, "Code of practice for temporary works procedures and the permissible stress design of falsework," as "those parts of the works that allow or enable construction of, protect, support, or provide access to the permanent works and which might or might not remain in place at the completion of the works."

A suggestion was made to review the minutes of previous ANWTG meetings with the intention of collating a searchable and updatable list of clarifying points and placing this on the CONIAC Asbestos Network web-page as a resource. **Action** - HC and SL to progress.

Baglocks for small AIB licensed jobs? (SS)

6.3

SS asked whether it is practicable to require a baglock where there are just 1-2 bags of waste generated or can the bags be left inside the enclosure? SL advised that this question has been asked before, and reminded everyone that CAR12 ACOP states *where practicable, remove waste bags from the enclosure via a separate bag lock.*

The reason for using separate baglock is to (a) allow the waste to be cleared from the enclosure to ensure the entire enclosure can be visually inspected and (b) reduce the risk of contaminating the airlock (which is used for primary decontamination of workers) should a waste bag split. HSG247 gives examples of options for the baglock in limited space situations e.g. a section coming off of the airlock or airlock chambers can be lengthened to allow the baglock offshoot. There should be few circumstances where a baglock of any form can't be physically installed.

Removal of waste from full enclosures

407 Where practicable, remove waste bags from the enclosure via a separate bag lock. Waste bags should be placed in the inner stage of the bag lock, where they are decontaminated before being passed into the middle compartment of the bag lock.

408 In the middle stage of the bag lock, the waste bags should be placed into a second bag (ie an outer bag), sealed and the outer bag wiped down. The double-bagged waste should be placed in the outer stage of the bag lock.

409 The waste should be removed promptly from the outer stage of the bag lock by an 'outside worker' wearing appropriate PPE and RPE. The bags should be transferred directly to the waste skip or vehicle.

410 Under no circumstances should people exit the enclosure via the bag lock.

411 Where it is not practicable to have a separate bag lock system, the bag lock should be constructed from the inner or middle stage of the three-stage airlock which provides the entry/exit system for people. Waste bags should never be taken through the main hygiene facilities.

6.4

Gel-cut method development (NG) – SL asked the TWG if they would be happy to review the method as part of industry feedback to refine and clarify any points. NG advised that there was currently only one distributor of the gel packs so easy to control and identify users to get feedback even if this is anonymously.

Action: NG to send method document to SL to send out to TWG.

HSE update on a number of RPE issues (SL)

6.5

HSE had received **clarification from 3M, suppliers of the 3M™ Powered Air Respirator System PV-300 (formerly known as the Scott™ Phantom Vision) regarding what constituted the face seal.**



3M has stated that ‘all parts of the face seal (including the chin cup area – illustrated above in pink) are considered to be the sealing area and the wearer needs to be clean-shaven around all parts of the face seal’. Each wearer will have a different shaped chin and so it is impossible to state that certain areas of the chin cup area are not included in the sealing surface, as this will be different for each wearer. The amount the chin cup seals with the wearer’s chin also depends on how tight the wearer has the bottom straps, so this can also vary on the same wearer with a different donning. The area of the seal may also move on talking or bending down.

INDG 479 provides clear guidance to those carrying out fit tests: *Do not conduct fit tests if there is any hair growth between the wearer’s skin and the facepiece sealing surface, such as stubble beard growth, beard, moustache, sideburns or low hairline, which cross the respirator sealing surface.*

Thattha Beard Bands – HSE has reviewed current evidence on ‘Thattha’ beard band and concluded that the use of these ‘beard bands’ with tight fitting respirators cannot be accepted, as it not in line with HSE guidance.

New requirements in ADR 2025 relating to the carriage of UN 2212 and UN 2590. (GW/SL)

6.6

New provision (SP 678) concerning transport of bulk waste containing free asbestos in ‘container bags’. HSENI have published the new provision on their website including some explanation from Department of Transport. [New requirements in ADR 2025 relating to the carriage of UN 2212 and UN 2590 | Health and Safety Executive for Northern Ireland](#)

| | |
|-----|--|
| 6.7 | <p>HSE are aware that there has been some confusion regarding interpretation and scope of this. HSE will be updating the current webpage to reflect changes.</p> <p>Action: Please advise of any specific points as this will help ensure clarification.</p> <p>Post meeting Update: SL raised this in the Asbestos Network meeting in November where she advised that members would be updated as soon as any guidance has been agreed.</p> <p>SW suggested that a short appendix on ‘outside man requirements’ is needed – TWG agreed and SW volunteered to draft. CW indicated that she recalled this being discussed previously at a TWG meeting.</p> <p>Post Meeting Update: This was briefly discussed at Meeting #37 in Nov 2022 where it was agreed that adequate supervision is required for the job based on risk assessment as many different factors involved e.g., multi-level working, lone working.</p> <p>Action SL has added to the Appendix List.</p> |
| 7 | <p>Date of Next Meeting</p> <p>21st January 2025 via MS Teams</p> |

Appendices in Draft: Status Update (November 2024)

| Appendix Title | Lead Author | Proposed Completion Date | Current Status | Addition AN resource required on T&F basis? |
|--|-------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| The Importance and Requirements of Leak Testing During Licensed Asbestos Work | SS | Mar 25 | Aug 24 - Initial draft completed by SS for review and consideration of scope and content. Nov 24 – initial draft discussed | No |
| Licensed removal with no enclosure | SS | May 25 | Feb 23 - SL to confirm the position set out by HSE Inspector has not changed and that written advice from an HSE inspector to be used as the basis of a draft Appendix. Glovebag use to be incorporated into this Appendix. Oct 24 – GW volunteered to lead on this appendix. | No |
| NPU Connection & Disconnection | SS | ON HOLD | Sept 22 – HSE comments to be incorporated into Appendix for discussion at Nov meeting | |
| Abrasive Blasting Removal Systems – revision only | SL | ON HOLD | March 22 - Members to provide details of current use of abrasive blasting including intel on dry ice systems. July 22 – Needle scalers to be included in the revision – intel being gathered. | |
| Calculating NPU airflow – revision only | SL | ON HOLD | July 22 - Revision to include additional guidance for LARCs on selection and use of an anemometer. | |
| Independence of Analysts | SL | ON HOLD | Drafting to start in August 22 – scope to include issues of DCU certs not being issued to LARCs if they are not appointed by them and also Personal Monitoring on behalf of the LARC | |
| Selection and Use of Encapsulants | SW | ON HOLD | Scope and content to be agreed by TWG in Sept 22 Initial draft discussed at Nov 22 meeting | |
| Equipment to measure differential pressure | SL | ON HOLD | Intelligence being gathered from LARCs who use this equipment by SS and SW. | |