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**THIS IS AN ANNOTATED VERION OF THE BASE 4 AUDIT TOOL. IT IS NOT FOR AUDIT SUBMISSION. IT IS INTENDED AS A REFERENCE WHEN WRITING A BASE AUDIT REPORT.**

**YELLOW HIGHLIGHTS ARE USED TO MARK KEY AREAS OF INTEREST IN QUESTIONS AND GUIDELINES.**

**RED TEXT IS EXPLANATORY TEXT THAT IS NOT PRESENT IN THE BLANK AUDIT TEMPLATE.**

**BLACK TEXT IS PRESENT IN THE BLANK AUDIT TEMPLATE.**

**This page automatically generates**

# Executive Summary

Placeholder for 2 page MAXIMUM Executive Summary as defined in Auditor Manual.

Please delete this description of the Executive Summary from the final report and replace with the actual Executive Summary that meets requirements.

The Executive Summary must be presented with each submission and gives an overview of the audit activities. The following requirements must be presented in the following order (but not necessarily using bullet points throughout):

* Clearly state whether company meets requirements (or would, in gap analysis case)
* State the type(s) of audit (Student, Certification, Maintenance, Joint, Phased, Gap Analysis, external, internal, etc.)
* Give actual score and score of lowest question (both to the nearest whole %) and state the requirements of achieving **≥80% overall and ≥50%** **in every question** (or element for IMRTW)
* In case of LSA (fast or formal) explain both initial and final status
* Give bullet list of major (3-5) strengths that logically flow from the notes
* Give bullet list of major (3-5) areas for improvement that logically flow from the notes
* Give company legal name, trade name if any and WorkSafeBC account if any
* List all the CUs the company has and all the CUs included in the audit activities (if any)
* State when and where audit occurred and number of site days
* Ensure the last day of onsite activities is clearly stated
* Provide a brief statement of the audit process covering documentation review, site observation and confidential interviews
* Include a statement that there are more recommendations included in the audit report that gives the company further guidance to improve on their health and safety program.

Placeholder for Page 2 of the Executive Summary

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scoring Summary – OH&S Program** | | | | | |
|  | **Awarded** | **Available** | **N/A** | **Available – N/A** | **% awarded** |
| **P. Planning for Reliable, Injury-free Work** | **0** | **130** | **0** | **130** | **0%** |
| **D. Doing the Work Well** | **0** | **150** | **0** | **150** | **0%** |
| **C. Checking for Safe Work** | **0** | **60** | **0** | **60** | **0%** |
| **A. Adjusting for Better Work** | **0** | **60** | **0** | **60** | **0%** |
| **Total** | **0** | **400** | **0** | **400** | **0%** |

**PDCA style: related to business ‘safety is good business’ (ISO, etc.)**

**40 questions, 10 points per question = 400 points.**

* **80% of 400 is 320 = pass**

**ELEMENT Scores do not matter**

* **every question at 50% causes every element to be over 50%**

**Limited Scope 70-79% and/or <5/10 in any number of questions**

**To auto-calculate tables, use <ctrl-A> to select all content in the document and then the ‘f9’ key to calculate all. This may have to be done up to 3 times to cycle all formulas.**

**Auditor is to erase this operational instruction paragraph in their final report**

**Do one question first to test the auto-math before you bet your entire report on it**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scoring Summary - Injury Management/Return-to-Work Programs** | | | | | |
|  | **Awarded** | **Available** | **N/A** | **Available – N/A** | **% awarded** |
| **I1. Policy, Management and Leadership** | **0** | **90** | **0** | **90** | **0%** |
| **I2. Resources, Education and Training** | **0** | **70** | **0** | **70** | **0%** |
| **I3. Stay at Work and Return to Work** | **0** | **155** | **0** | **155** | **0%** |
| **I4. Communications** | **0** | **100** | **0** | **100** | **0%** |
| **Total** | **0** | **415** | **0** | **415** | **0%** |

# Consolidated Corrective Action Log

Overall, there were XX recommendations and YY continual improvement suggestions from the audit.

T**hese must be identified as Recommendation or Continual Improvement suggestion; or at least the Continual Improvements suggestions.**

The auditor will complete the first three columns when writing the report, extracting one line for each Recommendation or Continual Improvement Opportunity. The company will complete the remaining columns and actions.

| # | Audit Question | Recommendation / Continual Improvement Item | Company Action Plan | Assigned To | Due Date | Date Closed | Verified By |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# 

# Audit Details

| P. PLANNING FOR RELIABLE, INJURY-FREE WORK | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **P1. Goals and Objectives** | | | | | |
| P1.1  **#1** | How does company leadership set and measure goals and objectives for improved safety performance and communicate them to all employees and contractors? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0** | **0-3** | **0-7** | **/10** |
| **Intent: Setting clear goals and objectives is a key method for management to demonstrate leadership. Having goals and objectives shows due diligence that leadership has reviewed the current company situation and set goals or directions for improvement. Goals are reviewed annually and have measurable targets and objectives. Communicating goals to the rest of the company is critical to success, so the communication portion of this question is weighted heavier than the existence of the goals.** | | | | | |
| **D (0,1) –** Ifthe senior management has written safety performance improvement goals and objectives and that these are related to previous results, award 1 point.  The format and method of recording those goals should be appropriate for the risk and complexity of the organization. Goals should be reasonably achievable, set by management and meet regulatory and legal requirements, including changes to those requirements.  **D (0,1) –** If the company can show that goals and objectives are communicated to workers and contractors, award 1 point. Potential methods include, but are not limited to:   * Meeting minutes at any degree of formality * Mailouts * Emails * Posters or signs   **D** (0,1)– If at least 50% of the goals are measurable, award 1 point  **This must be clearly defined within the notes.**  **I (0-7)** - Award up to 7 points based on the % worker and contractor interviews reporting that they understand the major themes of the company goals and objectives. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
| **Key company issue: Usually requires some lead time before the audit**  **D – 3 separate 1-point questions**  **Contractor interviews: NOT part of interview quota, but ‘some’ may be required in questions where specified and ‘reasonably achievable’. Intended to be for regular contractors, not occasional ones.** | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources | | | | | |
| Recommendation:  **Mandatory if score is <10/10**   * **Address the system issue primarily. Specific site issue may or may not be included.**   **Continual Improvement:**   * **Where company has inefficiency in implementation** * **Scored full points but still had low % interviews (i.e. Less than 90% of people knew the ERP)** * **Met audit requirements, but meaningful (to the company) legal / regulatory shortfall.**   **Resource:**   * **An external reference to the solution** * **Not a link to where the auditor pulled the data from** | | | | | |
| **P2. Policy and Procedures** | | | | | |
| P2.1  **#2** | Does the company have a written health and safety policy that identifies health and safety responsibilities? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0** | **0-10** | **0** | **/10** |
| **Intent: A clear written health and safety policy shows commitment by leadership and sets responsibilities for each layer in the company. While the actual policy may take many forms, better policies are signed or otherwise sanctioned by current senior management and dated within the last 3 years.** | | | | | |
| **D –** Award up to 10 points based on the appropriateness of the policy for the company operations, considering the complexity and risk of company operations  A safety policy could contain:   * A statement of intent, safety objective or aims; * General responsibilities of management * General responsibilities of supervisors (where supervisors exist) * General responsibilities of workers * A commitment to review the safety program and adjust as necessary * A balanced commitment to safety and production   **Explain why these are not deemed required if they are not included but don’t affect the score.**  The responsibilities may partially overlap, but cannot be wholly duplicated to award points unless all the company managers are supervisors and there are no supervisors that are not also managers. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: (Documentation only for **Endorsement**) | | | | | |
| **10 point range question**  **Up to the auditor to define appropriate and score it.**  **Tell the story to justify the points**   * **Common theme throughout the audit – tell the story to justify the points** * **The reviewer is not there and does not see the data (except for quotes/excerpts if included)**   **Don’t copy and paste the whole policy by default**   * **The auditor’s function is to interpret the data, not just forward the data to the reviewer.** * **So even if you clipped the policy into the note, you still need to explain it.**   **‘Documentation only for Endorsement’**   * **Administrative audit** * **Admin Audit can be done when not working** * **Assesses if company is ‘ready to work’** * **Requires full audit as soon as company up to 70% capacity** * **No COR $ but SAFE for 1 year (only)** | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | |
| Adjusting cell / row height is highly recommended to avoid hanging lines like this. | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Start all questions on a new page unless you fit 2 whole questions on a page** | | | | | |
| P2.2  **#3** | What processes are used to determine what the hazards and risks are at the work site before the job starts and as they become identified during operations? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0-6** | **0-2** | **0-2** | **/10** |
| **Intent: The company needs to have a method to identify existing and reasonably foreseeable hazards before work starts and as issues arise. Pre-work plans and Job Hazard Analysis are 2 common ways, out of many possible ways, to assess risk before a job starts. The objective is to focus on the higher risk issues first and is not intended to be onerous by requiring all low risk activities to have a formal hazard assessment.** | | | | | |
| **O -** Award up to 6 points based on the % of appropriate identification and management of hazards and risks on the work sites observed (i.e. for hazard observed on site, has the company appropriately managed them). For companies involved in creating plans for other companies, this includes identification and management of those hazards and risks to others. Some negatives are reasonably expected on every forestry work site, so the note should have both positives and negatives.  **D -** Award up to 2 points based on the % completion of records showing that hazards and risks are appropriately identified and prioritized at an appropriate frequency using a cascade of responsibilities from licensee to end-contractor to a degree appropriate to the risk of the hazard. Potential records include, but are not limited to, pre-work plans, supervisor diaries, notes, meeting minutes, manual falling activities with falling plans, maps, evacuation routes and check-in procedures, training records, CVSE logs, road grade assessments and maps, Notices of Project, Wildfire Management Branch notifications or notifications to agencies having jurisdiction that require notifications, inspections and assessment reports. Records need to show who performed the risk assessment, how workers are involved and how the personnel who performed the risk assessment were trained.  **I -** Award up to 2 points based on % interviewed workers and supervisors reporting appropriate identification and communication of known and foreseeable hazards at the work site. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: (Documentation only for **Endorsement**) | | | | | |
| **O - High observation bias.**   * **Explain only what you saw and why it was good or bad** * **All notes are O, D or I during the audit**   + **Not what you ‘know’ to be in the company (especially for internal auditors)**   **D – Large list of potential documents**   * **Example of where a bullet list might be clearer than a text block (but takes more space)**   **I – Interview workers and supervisors**   * **Not contractors or managers** * **Positive responses divided by total responses times the maximum score value = awarded points (rounded to the nearest whole number). 15 positive / 28 total responses for a 2 point question = 1.07 🡪1 point out of 2.** * **0= 0-24%, 1= 25-74%, 2=75-100%** * **mathematical rounding. 1.4999 🡪 1, 1.50🡪2** * **who does the hazard assessment – is it by knowledgeable and involved workers?** | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **P3. Planning to Manage Risks and Upset Conditions** | | | | | |
| P3.1  **#4** | Are there specific written safe work procedures for each routine, non-routine and high risk task? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  | **0** | **0** |
|  |  | **0** | **0-10** | **0** | **/10** |
| **Intent: The company needs written safe work procedures for the work that it does, focussing on the higher risk activities (as described in the company profile). Examples might include skidding as a routine activity and management of site-specific steep slopes as a non-routine high risk task. The safe work procedures need to address the key safety considerations of the company’s work.** | | | | | |
| **D -** Award up to 5 points based on % of safe work procedures written compared to those required based on the company work activities and OHS Regulations. The auditor needs to examine the list or table of contents of the Safe Work Procedures (SWPs) and compare to the company profile activities, observed field activities and auditor experience to determine if the list is appropriate. Safe Work Procedures must include and follow the hierarchy of control (engineering, administrative and then PPE in order). It is recognized that since auditor experience is used as one of the scoring inputs, scores may vary from auditor to auditor.  Award up to 5 further points based on the average completeness of the safe work procedures that have been written. The focus should be on the higher risk tasks performed by the company and the outcomes of the risk assessment process used in P2.2  Safe work procedures should cover the basics of routine, non-routine and likely upset conditions (i.e. steep slopes), but not necessarily to the level of a full operating manual from a manufacturer. Training materials, point form and graphics are fully acceptable substitutes for full sentences when appropriate and are not intended to be a measure of completeness for the purposes of this question.  Safe Work Procedures need to address as appropriate to company activities and injuries, particularly the high risk activities as listed in the company profile of this audit document and document the provision of standardized engineering controls (i.e. guarding, interlocks, etc.)  Transportation equipment used to transport 1 or more people includes, but is not limited to:   * On road and off-road vehicles * Boats * Aircraft * Bicycles   Transportation Safety equipment includes, but is not limited to:   * Seatbelts * First aid kits & PFD’s * Radios * Helmets | | | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| Audit Note from question on previous page: (Documentation only for **Endorsement**) |
| **D- 2, 5-point questions.**   * **5 for how many the company has compared to what they do/need** * **5 for how good/complete the procedures are**   **Probably one of the longer notes in the audit**   * **Used to explain / justify / document Classification Unit (CU) activities** * **Find a sweet spot between too short and too long**   + **Bullet lists within text paragraph**   + **Full complete sentences without running on**     - **Fine to have an opinion, but the note is about the facts** * **Reviewers try to guess and help you with the grammar, spelling and typos that they think matter to you**   + **Different standards for internal, external, different scopes, sizes, etc.**   + **There are regulatory / legal parallels to “Let’s eat mom” vs “let’s eat, mom”** * **Complete but not exhaustive** * **5-year test** * **Explains why you said 4/5 instead of 5/5 or 3/5 as a score**   **Don’t forget the transportation emphasis portion**   * **Includes ‘driving a pickup’**   **2 parts to a COR audit**   * **Safety**   + **Reducing the risk of fatalities and serious injuries** * **Accounting**    + **Does the company get money**     - **If so, how much and from where**   + **Sometimes 3 years WSBC account retroactive changes (you wrote in 2017. The change was in 2019. Did you have enough detail about a topic you could not know would matter 2 years later?)** |
| Recommendations and Resources: |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| P3.2  **#5** | How does the company ensure that health and safety plans and controls are in place so that workers or contractors performing activities at the same time, or otherwise interacting, are protected? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  | **0** |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0-6** | **0** | **0,4** | **/10** |
| **Intent: The company needs to have an overall plan that everyone who is or could be interacting understands where each other is and what they are each doing, to avoid running into each other. Avoiding mixing layout crews and active blasting would be an example. Managing vehicle and pedestrian traffic would be another.** | | | | | |
| **O -** Award up to 6 points based on % of positive observations of work settings and processes having hazards identified and controlled so that workers are not placed in positions of unacceptable risk.  Good work settings and processes should not place workers in hazardous situations without controls in place. Where practical, work activities should be separated by time or distance, specifically addressing stacking of workers on a slope where applicable. Physical controls such as lockout or keeping specified distances away from mobile equipment should be in place where maintenance and operational activities may be in conflict. The degree of control needs to be proportional to the degree of risk. Hazards should be managed by a hierarchy of controls (elimination, substitution, engineering, administrative and finally PPE) in a systematic manner  **I -** If at least 70% of interviewed workers report that the planning is effective, award 4 points. Interviews must include sub-contractors if reasonably available. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: (Documentation only for **Endorsement**) | | | | | |
| **O – Observations only, not Documentation**  **I – the first ‘all or nothing’ question of the audit**   * **Either they get 0, or they get full points.** * **1, 2 and 3 are not possible here** * **Actual permitted points are determined in each question**   **Most common error in BASE auditing (awarding partial points for an ‘all or nothing’ question)**   * **Range questions: 0-4 (dash between numbers) & “Award up to…:** * **All-or-nothing: 0,4 (comma between numbers) & “If at least…”**   **Still need to write what the achievement was. 71% and 99% are both ‘More than 70%’ but are importantly different. Continual Improvements are usually warranted for less than 95%** | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | |
| **Strong guideline: If <90% positive on a 70% threshold, you need a really good reason NOT to write a continual improvement (28% of workers saying planning is ineffective may get full points, but indicates a serious problem)** | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **P4. Planning to Protect Personnel** | | | | | |
| P4.1  **#6** | What written requirements does the company have for Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) requirements? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0-7** | **0-2** | **0,1** | **/10** |
| **Intent: The company needs to clearly communicate the PPE expectations to everyone on site. The expectations could be blanket statements such as wearing a hard hat unless inside a machine or risk-based, such as wearing a hard hat whenever there is a risk of overhead hazards.** | | | | | |
| **O -** Award up to 7 points based on % observation of workers wearing PPE appropriate for the tasks, based on regulatory and company requirements.  **D –** Award up to 2 points based on the % completeness of the PPE requirements appropriate to the company. The PPE requirements need to include the assignment, selection and maintenance of PPE. The requirements need to meet regulatory requirements and be consistent with company and industry risk assessments and controls (i.e. standard practices). The requirements may specify exactly what equipment must be worn or define risk-based criteria or use a mixture of methods.  **I -** If at least 70% of interviewed workers are able to describe their PPE requirements, award 1 point. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: (Documentation only for **Endorsement**) | | | | | |
| **High observation bias**  **Rather have workers wearing right PPE with poor policy than a great policy and no performance. Having both is best.** | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| P4.2  **#7** | How has the company clearly communicated how to provide first aid services and how to summon first aid services for each work site? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0** | **0-5** | **0,5** | **/10** |
| **Intent: The company needs to have a plan for first aid. While every injury is preventable, not all are prevented. A good first aid plan minimizes the effect of any injury that does occur.** | | | | | |
| **D -** If the first aid procedure clearly describes how a worker is to obtain first aid services for themselves or an injured worker, award 3 points. It needs to include roles and responsibilities as well as meeting Regulatory requirements.  If the first aid procedure clearly defines what first aid services are to be provided, award a further 1 point.  If the first aid procedure includes a checklist of required supplies and services, that at least meets regulatory requirements, award a further 1 point.  **I -** If at least 70% of interviewed workers and supervisors are aware of the types of first aid resources available and can describe how to access them, award 5 points. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: (Documentation only for **Endorsement**) | | | | | |
| **Further**   * **Definition: Beyond the first** * **Can’t get the second (or third) parts without the first.**   **I – 70% ‘all-or-nothing’.** **Again, Continual Improvement warranted for less than 95%.** | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | |
| **28% of people not knowing how to call first aid may be full points, but is a pretty critical safety issue. Continual Improvement expected in that case to highlight the issue.** | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| P4.3  **#8** | What are the written Emergency Response Plans (ERPs) for handling other potential emergencies relevant to the company’s operations and how are they communicated to workers? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0-5** | **0-5** | **/10** |
| **Intent: The company needs to have a plan for each reasonably foreseeable emergency. Everyone on site needs to know what to do in an emergency at a level appropriate for their responsibilities. A master ERP may be many pages long and highly technical, while a laminated card on the truck keychain may be entirely appropriate for the truck driver. The plan is usually a mixture of information from the licensee, prime and contractor, but must be incorporated into the company system and ultimately owned by the company. This question is about the plans other than the First Aid response that is covered in P4.2** | | | | | |
| **D -** Award up to 4 points based on the % of topics included in the company Emergency Response Plan (ERP) compared to those needed for the operation. Plans should be a mixture of general plans and site-specific documents.  Topics that must be included are:   * General - Injuries (**MUST** specifically include management of blood borne pathogens where level 3 attendants are required or used) optional to apply to level 2 or even 1 if auditor feels appropriate * General - Fires (structural, equipment and/or wildfire, as appropriate) * General - Fatalities; * General and/or Site specific - Natural disasters appropriate to the general and site geography (floods, landslides, earthquake, tsunami, sudden severe weather, etc.) * Site specific - Evacuation (coordinates i.e. lats/longs and/or UTM grid /address of site plus as applicable, helipads or ambulance meeting and current routes with maps as applicable) * Site specific - Radio frequencies where radios are used   Other topics that may be included, depending on the complexity and risks of the company, include, but are not limited to:   * General - Environmental incidents (spills, leaks, etc.) * General - Missing worker (at least for when a worker who is working alone fails to check in) * General - Violence in the workplace appropriate to needs (road rage, protestors, theft-in-progress, etc.) * General and /or site specific - Rescue from height and confined spaces * General and/or site specific - Water rescue * General - Wildlife encounter   Topics may be combined or standalone and there is no requirement that the titles in the above list be used by the company. The ERP must be obvious in its instruction, have contact information and number/frequency, and assign general responsibilities. It should be easy to understand for all the topics.  If a selected sample of emergency contact phone numbers or radio frequencies are posted and are all correct, award 1 point.  **I -** Award up to 5 points based on the % of interviewed workers, Supervisors, Managers and Contractors aware of their roles in applicable emergencies. The workers should be able to discuss marshalling points, communication devices, how to contact help, location of emergency numbers and understand any specific assigned responsibilities. | | | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| Audit Note for question on previous page: (Documentation only for **Endorsement**) |
| **D - Pretty prescriptive guidelines for the minimum case.**  **Long guideline generally leads to a long note.**  **I – ‘specific assigned responsibilities’. Typically need to include attendants, ERT members, fire wardens, reception, in the interview pool. Question is explicitly more than just ‘Where do you go to evacuate?’** |
| Recommendations and Resources: |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| P4.4  **#9** | What is the process to manage existing and/or future young workers under the age of 25? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0** | **0-5** | **0-5** | **/10** |
| **Intent: Workers under age 25 are much more likely to have injuries and other work-related errors than older workers. Young and old workers communicate in very different ways. The forestry labour shortage means that there are very few older workers available to hire, so all companies need to have at least a plan for managing the young workers that they will need soon.** | | | | | |
| **D** – Award up to 5 points based on the effectiveness of the company system in managing young workers. This applies whether or not the company has any young workers at the time of the audit. If the company has workers under age 25, the documentation review is based on both procedure and records. If the company does not have any young workers, then the review is based only on procedures. An effective company system should cover   * Orientation * Competency assessment * Ongoing communications in an age-appropriate manner * Frequent assessments through to age 25 * Record-keeping   **I** – Award up to 5 points based on the % positive responses of all management and supervisors (not just those actually having young workers) in their knowledge of the company system | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
| **High risk topic statistically**  **A young worker hired at age 18 is still a young worker at age 24 even though they have 6 years’ experience.**   * **Brain @ 20 is cognitively and structurally different than brain @ 30.** * **More impact in males, but females affected as well.**   **Very non-prescriptive (other than age limit to match Regulation) on how the company does it.**   * **Many possible different positive solutions.**   + **Assess at 6 months instead of annually**   + **Different hat or clothes**   + **Different / additional topics on assessments**   + **2 person team has minimum total age of 55**   + **Ten years’ experience required to do X** | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **P5. Planning Documentation** | | | | | |
| P5.1  **#10** | How does the company manage and maintain safety documentation to ensure safety documents are communicated and available to workers and contractors? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0-3** | **0-4** | **0-3** | **/10** |
| **Intent: The company should share relevant current and historical info appropriate to the worker with the worker, and where applicable the JOHSC or Representative. This shows record keeping credibility, due diligence and accountability. If it is not recorded, it didn’t happen. If it is not reasonably retrievable, it’s not doing anyone any good.** | | | | | |
| **O –** Award up to 3 points based on the appropriateness of the documentation system and its users in being able to produce documents needed for the audit in a timely manner to the auditor.  **D -** Award up to 3 points based on the effectiveness of the company system in managing documents appropriate to the needs of the company. Documents need to be retained and where applicable communicated appropriately.  Program reports may include, but are not limited to:   * Internal audits or other safety program evaluations * External audits and inspections * Ergonomic assessments * Perception surveys * Medical or health monitoring results * Noise, chemical or other parameter surveys * Meeting minutes showing communication, specifically including posting and maintenance of JOHSC minutes where a JOHSC is present * Emails * Safety alerts   D – If the responsibility for the Workplace Hazardous Materials Information System is assigned in writing in accordance with Regulation, award 1 point.  **I** – Award up to 3 points based on the % of interviewed supervisors, managers and safety specialists (including JOHSC or Representative where required) in being able to describe how to find necessary safety documents. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
| **I - Must interview JOHSC / Rep in interview pool**  **D – WHMIS: be aware of WHMIS 2015**  **I and O are different because not all interviewees will have reasonable opportunity to be able to show auditor where documents are (6 hours away, back at the office in the filing cabinet)**  **¼ of the way through the audit at question 10.** | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | |
| **Recommendation if no WHMIS 2015 yet.** | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **P6. Planning for Investigations** | | | | | |
| P6.1  **#11** | What are the company’s written procedures for the reporting and investigation of incidents, specifically including close calls / near misses? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0-5** | **0-5** | **/10** |
| **Intent: Company reporting needs to capture close calls and near misses, not just actual injuries since this is where the ‘free learning’ is. Investigation needs to be appropriate for the degree of the risk of the event rather than just the severity of injury and maximize the learning from incidents.** | | | | | |
| **D -** Award up to 5 points based on the % of applicable requirements met. The investigation policies and procedures must include:   * Responsibilities of reporting by all personnel (employees, visitors, contractors) * Immediate reporting of all incidents including injuries, close calls / near misses and property damage * Descriptions of what type of event receives what level of investigation or review (if any). * Responsibilities and authorities of persons involved in the investigation including the requirement that they be knowledgeable of the type of work being investigated. * Procedure for carrying out investigations including the follow up of reports * A requirement for worker participation in investigations (other than the affected worker or as witnesses) when the company has sufficient personnel on a worksite to make this practicable or if the company has a JOHSC or Representative on-site   The company must specifically list injuries, close calls / near misses and property damage to be awarded the applicable points. Specifying ‘all incidents’ is insufficient unless the phrase ‘all incidents’ contains a definition that includes the specifics. There is no intent to require a company to perform formal individual investigations of ‘paper cut’ level injuries.  **I** - Award up to 3 points based on % of worker interviews reporting that they understand and follow their incident reporting requirements.  **I** - Award up to 2 points based on % of supervisor interviews reporting understanding of appropriate investigation protocol. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: (Documentation only for **Endorsement**) | | | | | |
| **D - Prescriptive MUST type list. 6 items, 5 points. Deducting one point per missed bullet item does not work.**  **Meets Workers Compensation Act (WCA) Parts 172-177**  **Include timelines and specifically reference the WCA in the note.**  **Just having management investigate then JOHSC reviews later is NOT compliant.**  **I – 2 different interviews. Workers report while supervisors investigate**  **First of several investigation questions** | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **P7. Planning for Contractors** | | | | | |
| P7.1  **#12** | If the company hires contractors, what is the method used to determine that contractors are qualified to work safely? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0** | **0-5** | **0-5** | **/10** |
| **Intent: The company needs to show due diligence by considering the safety of the contractors, not just accepting low-bid parameters. This could include reference checks, certifications held and personal knowledge.** | | | | | |
| **This question is not applicable if the company does not hire contractors.**  **D -** If there is a clear documented outline of non-dependent contractor safety requirements, award 4 points. This must include a system being in place to determine if the contractors are qualified to work safely. The rigor of the assessment should be proportional to the level of risk of the activities.  If there are records of the selection requirements being applied consistently to all contractors, award 1 point.  **I -** Award up to 5 points based on % interviewed persons hiring contractors understanding the company program.  Selection criteria may include non-safety items, but only safety-related items are in scope for this audit question.  This question applies to all contractors, working for the company rather than just forestry contractors. Visitors are excluded from the scope of this question. See ‘Definitions’ section for contractors and visitors | | | | | |
| Audit Note: (Documentation only for **Endorsement**) | | | | | |
| **If ‘not applicable’ say why (company does not hire contractors ever, company did not hire contractors in the last year, no contracted person came to a company site in the last year, etc.).**   * **Same requirement for any question or part that an auditor scores as ‘not applicable’.** * **The total points ‘removed’ for being ‘not applicable’ in the Element goes in the score box at the end of the Element. Not auto-calculating**   **No specific audit requirement for SAFE certification of contractors**   * **It’s a common contractual requirement, but not an audit requirement.**   **External auditors are contractors. Period.** | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **P8. Planning for Multi-Employer Workplaces** | | | | | |
| P8.1  **#13** | If Multi-Employer Workplaces are created by the company, how are these workplaces planned to ensure a mechanism is, or will be, in place to ensure they are coordinated and have a system of compliance? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0** | **0-5** | **0-5** | **/10** |
| **Intent: The company needs to show due diligence by managing multi-employer workplaces to ensure that they are properly coordinated. This could be done by assigning Prime Contractor status or by being the Prime Contractor or owner without assigning Prime to another party.** | | | | | |
| **This question is not applicable if the company does not create multi-employer workplaces.**  **D -** If there is a clear documented outline of how the company manages, or intends to manage its Multi-Employer workplaces (MEWP’s), award 4 points. This must include a system to ensure coordination of the multiple employers and ensure that the multiple employers are all in compliance to their own requirements and to the overall workplace plan. The rigor of the management should be proportional to the level of risk of the activities.  If there are records of the requirements being applied consistently to all worksites, award 1 point. Not applicable if there have been no MEWP’s in the last year  **I -** Award up to 5 points based on % interviewed persons who plan MEWP’s understanding the company program.  Program criteria may include non-safety items, but only safety-related items are in scope for this audit question.  This question applies to all MEWP’s that the company has rather than just forestry MEWPs. Visitors are excluded from the scope of this question. See ‘Definitions’ section for contractors and visitors. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: (Documentation only for **Endorsement**) | | | | | |
| **Company can be Prime or designate Prime. Question is the same: do they do it properly?**  **This is in the planning section, so no Observation question (that question is later)**  **Explain how the company controls MEWP’s. This can be done by retaining Prime, making sure all other workers on site are being supervised and/or escorted, and/or being oriented/preworked. Note that external auditor + host company = MEWP.** | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **P. Planning for Reliable, Injury- Free Work – Scoring Summary** | | | | | |
|  | **Awarded** | **Available** | **N/A** | **Available – N/A** | **% awarded** |
| **Total** | **0** | **130** |  | **130** | **0%**  **Min 50%** |

**Put a number of not applicable points in the blank square, even if it is zero. Good practice and prompt for when not zero.**

**Typically 0, 10 or 20 in most audits for Element P.**

**1/3 of the way through the audit by question count at end of Element P**

| D. DOING THE WORK WELL | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **D1. Leading by Example** | | | | | |
| D1.1  **#14** | Are managers and supervisors leading by example and following the health and safety rules and procedures? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  | **0** |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0,7** | **0** | **0,3** | **/10** |
| **Intent: The company needs to demonstrate that safety applies from the top down and that everyone is expected to ‘walk the talk’. If supervisors do not follow the rules, workers will also cut corners.** | | | | | |
| **O -** If at least 90% of observations show that managers and supervisors are actively following regulatory, manufacturer and company safety rules and requirements, award 7 points. Examples of positive observations may include, but are not limited to: wearing appropriate PPE, wearing seat belts and driving within road rules and conditions, communicating their presence around mobile equipment and keeping clear of hazard areas.  **I -** If at least 90% of interviewed workers state that managers and supervisors always follow all safety rules, award 3 points. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
| **M and S tolerating poor practices or conditions that are under their control is not leading by example. Make the note clear.**  **High Observation bias. High observation threshold.**  **Fast LSA by photos is a corrective option.**  **Continual Improvements (CI) warranted if not 100%** | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| D1.2  **#15** | Have general safety responsibilities been written and communicated to employees? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0** | **0-2** | **0-8** | **/10** |
| **Intent: Company leadership sets the tone and culture in terms of safety expectations.** | | | | | |
| **D –** Award up to 2 points based on % of employees with general safety responsibilities (i.e. not job-specific safe work procedures). Examples could include   * wearing seatbelts, * driving with all lights on all the time, * staying between the yellow lines in the mill yard, * fit to work, (with fatigue included) * not going on sites without an orientation, * not operating any machine unless trained to do so   **I –** Award up to 8 points based on % of workers, supervisors and managers able to describe their general safety responsibilities. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
| **Fit for work MUST include reference to fatigue and how the company manages that risk (despite the rest of the list saying ‘could include’)**   * **WSBC requirement of all COR audits as of May 2015 based on a coroner’s inquest (after audit approved)** * **Lose 1 point (D) at minimum if fatigue not included**    + **Point rule based on need to make it a recommendation if not present.** | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **D2. Managing Risks and Upset Conditions** | | | | | |
| D2.1  **#16** | How are the documented hazards and risks and associated safe work procedures communicated to workers and contractors before the job starts and as issues arise during work? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0** | **0** | **0-10** | **/10** |
| **Intent: The quality of communication reinforces the ability of workers to know and more importantly understand the hazards and what to do about them. This interview question is different from the planning documentation question – this question addresses the communication of the plan at ground level.** | | | | | |
| **I -** Award up to 10 points based on % of positive responses from interviewed workers reporting receiving communication on the hazards, risks and controls for their work activities appropriate for the level of risk of those activities and understanding those communications. Communications need to be appropriate to the audience, such as new workers, young workers and those with different language and literacy levels. The reported risk communication may be written and/or verbal.  Potential hazard communication methods may include, but are not limited to:   * Pre-work meeting records * Signed falling plans for blocks * Steep slope and steep haul planning records * Shift change log book * Site safety meeting records * Supervisor journals * Email * Machine, vehicle or process log books * Lock-out / Tag-out. * Posting of inspections or reports from external bodies such as Primes, licensees and WorkSafeBC | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
| **Give clear explanation of how this is achieved.** | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| D2.2  **#17** | What is the maintenance program for company-controlled facilities, tools and equipment that meets company, manufacturer and regulatory requirements? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0-6** | **0-2** | **0-2** | **/10** |
| **Intent: The company needs to have a maintenance program for every important item that it controls that needs maintenance. The program needs to be appropriate to the level of risk involved with each item.** | | | | | |
| **O –** Award up to 6 points based on observation of company-controlled facilities, tools and equipment being maintained to necessary standards, based on the level of risk of the object being maintained.  **D -** Award up to 2 points based on the % of sampled tools and equipment covered by the maintenance program in a manner that meets manufacturer, regulatory and company safety requirements, based on the level of risk.  Potential sources of records include, but are not limited to:   * Equipment inventory lists; * Maintenance schedule; * Equipment inspection records (whether user or maintenance personnel inspections); and * Computer-based maintenance management systems.   Mobile equipment user inspection records need to meet all requirements for the appropriate type of mobile equipment, including the requirement for pre-use inspections and testing of emergency and warning systems.  **I -** Award up to 2 points based on the % of positive responses from interviewed managers and supervisors confirming the maintenance program meets manufacturer, regulatory and company safety requirements.  In all parts of this question, the scope only applies to facilities, tools and equipment that are under direct company control and is responsible for maintaining. If the company contracts out maintenance in whole or in part, then the documentation is limited to user records rather than detailed maintenance records.  For any commercial vehicles, the intent is not to duplicate CVI requirements but rather examine how the company maintains records and whether items not typically included in CVI, such as first aid kits, fire tools and log bunks are properly maintained. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: (Documentation only for **Endorsement**) | | | | | |
| **O – Observation only. Look at the facilities, tools and equipment and write the note speaking only to what you observed.** | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **D3. Working Safely** | | | | | |
| D3.1  **#18** | Are workers complying with safe work procedures, company safety rules, manufacturer standards and regulatory requirements? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  | **0** | **0** | **0** |
|  |  | **0-10** | **0** | **0** | **/10** |
| **Intent: The company needs to set and maintain expected levels of behaviour. While ‘safety is what happens when no one is watching’, auditor observations indicate how seriously workers are treating the system.** | | | | | |
| **O -** Award up to 10 points based on % observations of workers following applicable company, regulatory and manufacturer requirements.  Requirements, as appropriate to company activities and their risk levels, include but are not limited to:   * Hiring Contractors * Lockout * Manual Tree Falling * Commercial Vehicles * Heavy Equipment Operations * Respiratory Protection * Having Young Workers (under age 25) * Camps and Remote Accommodations * Working near High Voltage Power Lines * High Hazard Materials * Assigning Prime Contractor status * Working at Heights * Combustible Dust * Hot Work * Confined Space * Working over or on Water   Where particular company activities are not observable on the day(s) of the audit, interview workers as a replacement for the particular observations, scoring as observation and clearly noting the scope of the method substitution in the audit note. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
| **Specifically match and list to the company profile / NOAA ‘high risk activities’ list.**  **Reviewers often do a simple ‘find’ to see if/where the auditor wrote the target topics.**  **Example is annual confined space entry not occurring on the week of the audit.**  **Note that the scoring should match reasonable expectations. If you score 5/10, that means 50% of workers are doing something ‘wrong’, which is not a typical situations. On the other hand, perfect scores mean everyone you saw on all the days was always perfect, which is also not usual.** | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| D3.2  **#19** | What is the method for supervisors, workers and contractors to manage unforeseen hazards? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0-7** | **0-2** | **0,1** | **/10** |
| **Intent: The company needs to ensure that hazards under the company control are being managed (i.e. how does the company instruct its contractors to manage hazards and when, how and if they report back to the company). This needs to address unforeseen hazards – the issues not in the plan that come up during work and help discourage “production-first” attitudes. This is not intended to include matters solely under the control of the contractor.** | | | | | |
| The company needs to have a process that includes how to detect, document, communicate and control the hazards. The process may permit less-significant hazards to be controlled without requiring documentation of the hazard or action. Examples might include field level risk assessments, RADAR or simple verbal reporting.  **O -** Award up to 7 points based on % observation of good practices in managing and controlling hazards on site.  **D -** Award up to 2 points based on % of completeness of a process for identifying and reporting hazards appropriate to the company risk and complexity.  **I -** If at least 70% of interviewed workers are able to describe how a significant hazard that they detected would be reported to the company, award 1 point. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: (Documentation only for **Endorsement**) | | | | | |
| **O – Again, Observation only. Some negative findings are reasonably expected**  **I – CI warranted for less than 90%** | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| D3.3  **#20** | Are the on-site first aid personnel, supplies and equipment adequate and based on a completed first aid assessment? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  | **0** | **0** |
|  |  | **0-8** | **0-2** | **0** | **/10** |
| **Intent: Having the appropriate emergency response equipment and personnel for the site activities shows that the company is committed to being prepared and values the people on site.** | | | | | |
| **O -** Award up to 8 points based on % observations of appropriate first aid personnel, equipment, supplies and services for the site.  Appropriate, in this case, means whichever is the higher standard of company or regulatory requirements.  Personnel need to be evaluated for number and level at the time of the audit.  Equipment and supplies being complete and in good working condition.  First aid kits need to be sampled for location, accessibility, completeness, condition and usability of contents.  Supplies, such as oxygen and Automated External Defibrillators (AEDs), need to be sampled for correct storage, volume/charge and accessibility  Emergency Transport Vehicles (ETVs) and major equipment need to be evaluated for operability and location on the work site for appropriate time/distance to workers being served by that equipment.  **D -** Award up to 2 points based on % of completed, correct First Aid Assessments in the last year compared to those needed.  Assessments are needed for:   * Fixed facilities such as shops, offices, warehouses, processing facilities * Field sites * Mobile sites (worker transportation and solo drivers)   A company may supply supporting logic to justify grouping assessments due to similar situations. Examples include a single assessment covering all log transport vehicles or all survey sites in a local geographic area | | | | | |
| Audit Note: (Documentation only for **Endorsement**) | | | | | |
| **O - The auditor should spend some quality observation time on this topic and write a note that reflects that.**  **D – If there are 15 sites during the audit period, 15 First Aid Assessments must be correctly completed. OHSR requirement.** | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| D3.4  **#21** | Are there communication devices readily available and effectively used? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  | **0** | **0** | **0** |
|  |  | **0-10** | **0** | **0** | **/10** |
| **Intent: This is a key issue for routine communications, not just emergency response. Without communications, the company system simply cannot work.** | | | | | |
| **O-** Award up to 10 points based on the % of workers being served by appropriate readily available and functioning communication devices and being able to use them effectively in their particular setting (i.e. cell service or radio range must be included).  Communication devices include, but are not limited to:   * Radios * Cell phones * Land line phones * Satellite phones * Whistles * Horns, bells and alarms, including manual fire pull stations * Voice, where distance and background noise permit   The auditor must test a sample of communication devices if they are not otherwise observed in action to award the points. Testing of fire alarm bells or evacuation devices may be accomplished by reviewing test records rather than activating the alarm.  Having multiple workers share a communication device is acceptable as long as all workers in that group remain within verbal communication range with consideration for ambient noise, distance, terrain/layout and weather. For helicopter evacuation, there must be a method of communication with the pilot.  For ETV or industrial ambulances, there must be a method of communication between the driver and Attendant. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
| **Not just emergency devices.**  **What if the one person on the team who carries the Sat phone is the unconscious patient?**  **Un-pairing and re-pairing a satellite device via Bluetooth may be a relevant skill.** | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **D4. Safety Training** | | | | | |
| D4.1  **#22** | How are employees, contractors and visitors being provided with an appropriate orientation that meets company and regulatory requirements? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0,5** | **0-3** | **0,2** | **/10** |
| **Intent: The company needs to ensure appropriate orientation for the audience, including young workers, new workers, different languages and literacy levels. This applies to both the company orientation and any necessary site-specific orientation.** | | | | | |
| **O -** If the auditor was oriented to the company operations in general and to each different work site visited, award 5 points.  **D -** If there is documentation evidence that at least 90% of all workers, including workers of dependent and non-dependent contractors and visitors, receive orientation on or before the first day of work, award 1 point.  Award up to 2 points based on the % of orientation forms including all regulatory and company requirements. If the company has not hired any new or young employees in the scope of the audit, a review of the template or form is acceptable.  **I -** If at least 90% of interviewed young and new workers confirm orientation on or before the first day of work, award 2 points.  New workers include new hires, Return-to-Work cases and reassigned or transferred workers.  Young workers include any person under age 25.  Workers include workers of the company, of dependent contractors and of non-dependent contractors.  If there are no new workers in the scope of the audit, interview a sample of workers hired in the last 5 years.  If there are no new workers hired within the last 5 years, interview managers and supervisors for knowledge of the system and its applicability to future new workers. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: (Documentation only for **Endorsement**)  **O - Fast LSA for the orientation of the auditor – never let yourself be put in danger as an auditor**   * **Wait until it was obviously missed, then ask for it (for your own safety and for addressing the LSA)** * **For the LSA record that it was not offered initially, but then was provided on request.** * **Results in the executive summary stating the company did not initially pass, but then did after the LSA (assuming this was their only barrier to success)**   **Reg 3.23 is the provincial requirement. Be aware of federal parallel where applicable.**  **First 5 points could be ‘not applicable’ for internal auditor orientation if the internal auditor IS the person who usually gives orientation and they never went to any other site (i.e. a mill audit)**  **D- This is based on the orientation form(s) that have been used in the audit period (previous 12 months). If only one version has been used, and it is NOT 100% compliant with OHSR 3.23, then ZERO is scored.** | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| D4.2  **#23** | How does the company provide employees appropriate safety training geared towards their specific work activities and provide refresher training? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0-5** | **0-5** | **/10** |
| **Intent: Without training, both initial and ongoing, there can be no expectation that the workers will know anything. Appropriate safety training needs to include considerations for new workers, young workers and those with different languages and literacy levels.** | | | | | |
| **D -** Award up to 5 points based on the % of sampled workers and supervisors with current, appropriate initial and ongoing safety training records.  Sample workers and supervisors by examining a selection of training records. This must include first aid, PPE, inspection processes, driving, WHMIS, Fire Safety Training, spills, working from heights, manual falling and working near high voltage electrical transmission lines, respiratory protection, confined space entry and rescue and other high risk activities as appropriate for activities. Other topics may include topics such as EMS, Training topics can be both technical skills and the soft skills such as hazard awareness and use of degraded imaging.  **I -** If at least 90% of interviewed supervisors are aware of what training is required for which tasks and are ensuring only appropriately trained workers perform those tasks, award 2 points.  If at least 90% of workers are aware of and have received the training necessary for their assigned tasks, award 3 points. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: (Documentation only for **Endorsement**) | | | | | |
| **Very tough to do without a training matrix is the company is over ~ 25 people.**  **Include JOHSC initial and ongoing training.**  **Must record staff and contractor faller #’s here for QA (or verify during audit that they are valid).**  **Uncertified faller = LSA regardless of question score.**  **BCFSC can check BCFSC faller numbers for auditors during report writing (Enform, CUA – no check capacity)**  **‘degraded imaging’: technical term for being able to interpret a partially obscured image (spotting the loose overhead branch mostly behind the tree, driving with a lightly splattered windshield, etc.)**  **Specialized training MUST be included.** | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **D5. Safety Communication** | | | | | |
| D5.1  **#24** | How are workers and contractors encouraged to participate in discussion and resolution of current and ongoing health and safety issues? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0-2** | **0-1** | **0-7** | **/10** |
| **Intent: Those affected by the company program need to be able to quickly discuss safety issues. If the company includes contractors in its safety program, then the contractors also need to have a mechanism. There is no intent to require a company to give a voice to contractors who are not involved in the company’s safety program.** | | | | | |
| **O -** Award up to 2 points based on the % observations of the last 3 safety meeting minutes **and** where applicable JOHSC meeting minutes being posted or otherwise made available to all workers.  Scoring is to be based on the % of workers and contractors with access to the applicable minutes. For example, if 80% of workers could access all minutes, award 2 points, while if 80% of workers could only access half the minutes, award 1 point.  **D -** If safety meetings have been held in at least 75% of operating months in the previous 12 months, award 1 point.  The scope of these safety meetings is different from JOHSC meetings. They are intended as all-employee meetings. It is not necessary for all employees to physically meet. Telephone, radio and/or video aids may be used and it is not necessary that all workers attend the same meeting. It is expected that not all employees are able to attend all meetings, but there must be a mechanism to pass meeting information on to absent people. The minimum frequency of these meetings is to be monthly during operating months. More frequent meetings such as site-specific, new-project, one-on-one, weekly or daily meetings also meet the requirements of this question provided the meetings are documented.  **I -** If at least 70% of interviewed workers confirm existence of the monthly (or more frequent) meetings and their personal attendance at all of those meetings or having meeting information passed to them after the meeting, award 2 points.  **I** – Award up to 5 points based on % of worker (and contractor where contractors participate in committees) interviews reporting active worker participation in the discussions, specifically including resolution of issues. The workers do not need to be able to cite specific examples for a positive finding. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | |
| **D: 75% is full points, but not regulatory compliance 🡪Appropriate to write CI if not 100%** | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **D6. Reporting and Investigating Incidents** | | | | | |
| D6.1  **#25** | How are incidents, including near misses / close calls being reported to the company and to the relevant authorities or agencies that have jurisdiction? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0** | **0-5** | **0-5** | **/10** |
| **Intent: The company needs to consider how workers report to the company and the company to authorities. Near miss / close call reporting for workers is a key method for improving company safety performance. This is not intended to include workers knowledge of injury claim reporting to authorities.** | | | | | |
| **D -** Award up to 2 points based on % of completeness of instructions for reporting to relevant authorities for types of incidents that could reasonably occur in the scope of company operations.  Types of incidents may include, but are not limited to:   * Near misses and close calls * Minor injuries requiring medical treatment (and/or other WSBC claim parameters) * Serious injuries * Fatality * Structural Failure/Collapse * Major release of a hazardous substance * Motor vehicle accident on public road * Motor vehicle accident on forest service road * Motor vehicle accident on other forestry road (on public or private land) * Power line contact * Explosives handling incident * Fire   Relevant authorities depend on the company’s activities and location. They may include, but are not limited to:   * WSBC (fatality, serious injury, claim, hazardous occurrence, etc.) * BC Safety Authority (boilers and pressure vessels, etc.) * BC Hydro or local power provider (power lines) * Ministry of Environment (specified spills) * Ministry of Forest and Range (wildfire and other issues) * Ministry of Transportation (certain vehicle incidents) * ICBC (certain vehicle incidents) * ESDC / Transport Canada (certain aircraft and watercraft incidents) * Clients and licensees (meeting contractual obligations)   The intent of this question would be satisfied with a list of parties to notify in different cases.  **D -** If documentation (first aid records, incident reports, maintenance records, reports to authorities, etc.) is positively correlated to indicate all incidents are reported to the company and where necessary to authorities and agencies, award 3 points.  If the company had no reportable incidents in the audit scope, score these second 3 points only as ‘N/A’ and adjust total accordingly.  **I -** Award up to 4 points based on % of positive responses of interviewed workers being aware of, and following, reporting procedures.  If 80% of supervisors or managers who have responsibility for external reporting understand that responsibility, award 1 point.  Note on next page | | | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| Audit Note for question on previous page: |
| **Pretty prescriptive guideline but not all inclusive (missing RCMP for example)**  **The 3 points of Documentation would be lost if not meeting the 30 days to report an incident (for incidents from June 2015 onwards) or 3 days (after being aware of a claim) to report the claim.**  **Need to explain the N/A if auditor scores the part of the question as N/A.**  **I – CI for less than 95% supervisors or managers understanding.** |
| Recommendations and Resources: |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| D6.2  **#26** | Are all reported incidents effectively investigated by the company? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0,5** | **0-5** | **/10** |
| **Intent: Appropriate investigations maximize learning and prevent recurrence. This is not intended to require formal investigation of all paper cuts as that would not be appropriate, nor maximize learning.** | | | | | |
| **D -** If at least 90% of total incidents have an investigation report appropriate for the severity of the incident, award 5 points.  The minimum level of investigation for any reported incident is a preliminary informal review by the supervisor to determine if a more serious investigation is warranted. For the more significant investigations, worker participation should be included.  **I -** Award up to 5 points based on the % of positive responses from interviewed workers and supervisors stating all reported incidents are investigated. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: (Documentation only for **Endorsement**) | | | | | |
| **3rd question about investigations.**  **Nearly 15% of total points in the audit are about investigations.**  **This is only about the presence of the investigation. Quality of the investigation is a later question (C5.1).**  **High threshold all-or-nothing. But put the percentage in the note regardless.** | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **D7. Employee Engagement** | | | | | |
| D7.1  **#27** | What process does the company have to ensure managers, supervisors and lead hands have appropriate skills to effectively manage people for safety? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0** | **0-2** | **0-8** | **/10** |
| **Intent: This is a key cultural question that shows leadership commitment to success and recognizes that effective supervision is key in all areas. Supervisors need to have the ability to manage key human factors affecting safety. This could include catching when people are ‘off’, rushing, fatigued or complacent.** | | | | | |
| **D -** Award up to 2 points based on the % completion of records showing that supervision is being provided to all workers with a frequency appropriate to the scope, complexity and risk of the tasks. Potential records include, but are not limited to, supervisor diaries, notes, inspections and assessment reports.  **I** – Award up to 8 points based on % positive responses from interviewed senior managers, managers and supervisors being able to consistently describe how supervisory (including lead hand, team leader, relief supervisor, etc.) competence is ensured.  Positive practices may include, but are not limited to:   * Formal or in-house training and/or mentoring * Coaching and evaluation of supervisory practices * Documented competency evaluations of the supervisor by management and/or workers * Hiring standards * Assignment of duties to allow appropriate time for supervisory tasks   Desired topics of competence include, but are not limited to:   * Coaching skills * Human factors knowledge * Techniques for detecting and managing workers who are acting ‘off’ * Soft skills for supervisors | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
| **No worker interviews**  **8 points for interview, only 2 for documentation to reflect actual industry status / methods of good-performing companies.**  **This is about supervisors doing their job properly and how they are trained to be competent, or maintain competence.** | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| D7.2  **#28** | Does the company promote and encourage timely two-way communication for workers and contractors to speak up about perceived unsafe work procedures, practices or conditions? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0** | **0** | **0-10** | **/10** |
| **Intent: A culture of ‘speaking up’ is a key safety indicator. While it includes the ‘right to refuse’ it also involves the ‘right to participate’ in the resolution of safety issues.** | | | | | |
| I – Award up to 10 points based on interviewed workers (and where reasonably available contractors) reporting they have the ability to raise all real and perceived safety issues and that such reporting would be well received and satisfactorily addressed. This includes new, young and front-line workers reporting a senior worker or supervisor either engaging directly, or directing others to engage, in what they believe are questionable practices.  Interviewed Workers and Contractors need to report a process to manage unsafe work (or asking for assistance when out of their personal depth) by:   * The worker reporting the issue to their supervisor * Jointly developing a solution acceptable to both the worker and supervisor   The process described may or may not progress to the involvement of the JOHSC and/or representative and/or WSBC. The intended focus is the internal company processes and the comfort of the worker with managing perceived unsafe work as-given. The intent of the question is to provide a mechanism that is faster than waiting for the next scheduled meeting. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: (Documentation only for **Endorsement**) | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **D. Doing the Work Well – Scoring Summary** | | | | | |
|  | **Awarded** | **Available** | **N/A** | **Available – N/A** | **% awarded** |
| **Total** | **0** | **150** |  | **150** | **0%**  **Min 50%** |

**Put the N/A score in manually. Typically 0, 3 for no reportable incidents, 5 for internal auditor did not need site orientation or 8 (for both)**

**2/3 of the way through the audit by question count at end of element D.**

| C. CHECKING FOR SAFE WORK | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **C1. Supervisor Oversight** | | | | | |
| C1.1  **#29** | How are supervisors monitoring the health and safety of all workers and contractors under their direct supervision and ensuring they operate within limits? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0,2** | **0-2** | **0-6** | **/10** |
| **Intent: Actively monitoring workers is part of a commitment to accountability at all levels. Supervisors pro-actively engaging with workers, rather than just passively watching, leads to superior safety results.** | | | | | |
| **O -** If **100%** of observations of supervisors show that supervisors are ensuring workers and contractors are following safe work procedures, specifically including intervening where workers or sub-contractors are observed by the supervisors not to be following safe work procedures, award 2 points.  If no interventions are necessary, evaluate based on % good supervisory techniques, such as observing and coaching workers, inspecting the site and directing the correction of deficiencies.  **D -** Award up to 2 points based on the % completion of records showing that supervision is being provided to all workers and contractors with a frequency appropriate to the scope, complexity and risk of the tasks. Potential records include, but are not limited to, supervisor diaries, notes, inspections and assessment reports.  **I -** Award up to 3 points based on % interviewed workers and supervisors reporting appropriate supervisory presence (i.e. frequency and duration) and communication of known and foreseeable hazards at the work site.  **I -** Award up to 3 points based on the % of positive responses from interviewed supervisors understanding the applicable legal and regulatory requirements, company safety standards and control measures required for evaluating work activities. This is intended to evaluate aggregate supervisor knowledge, so if 4 of 5 supervisors fully understand and 1 understands 50%, this would be 90% positive. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | | |
| **5 total note parts to this one question.** | | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **C2. Inspections** | | | | | | | |
| C2.1  **#30** | Does the company conduct inspections in accordance with an outline of what is to be inspected, at what frequency, and by a competent individual? | **O** | **D** | | **I** | | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  | |  | | **0** |
|  |  | **0-6** | **0-2** | | **0-2** | | **/10** |
| **Intent: The company needs inspections to prevent things going wrong. Doing it properly shows leadership follow-through.** | | | | | | | |
| **O -** Award up to 6 points based on the % of observed equipment, facilities, materials and sites having any evidence of appropriate inspections based on either the object being either safe for use or removed from service.  **D -** Award 1 point if all the following topics are covered in the inspection program:   * Equipment * Facilities, including camps and other remote accommodations under company control * Materials (i.e. supplies such as explosives, fuels and raw materials) * Worker (and contractor where applicable) activities and practices;(specifically including any company high risk activities) * Site conditions (specifically including company high risk activities).   Topics must define the frequency of inspection and have an overall statement of intent and involve workers in performing the inspections.  **D -** Award 1 point if all inspection frequencies are shown to occur at intervals that can reasonably be expected to prevent the development of unsafe working conditions AND the inspections are performed by competent (or where required by law or regulation – qualified) individuals. If a company is not performing an inspection at the frequency required by law or regulation, this is a negative finding.  **I** – Award up to 2 points based on % of interviewed workers stating that inspections are done on time, by competent (or qualified where required by law or regulation) individuals and to the appropriate depth. | | | | | | | |
| Audit Note: (Documentation only for **Endorsement**) | | | | | | | | |
| **O – OBSERVATION ONLY. Only what you see corrected. If a corrective action was to write a new procedure, this is not in the scope of this question. If it was to post this same procedure, it is in the scope.**  **D - The one D point is often the toughest point in an audit to achieve.**  **Must be performed purely on a D basis**  **100% on time, by the right people.** | | | | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | | | | |
| **Recommendations (in all cases) need to fit the pattern of the O, D and I evidence.**  **Good interview + bad docs 🡪 recommend improving record-keeping of inspections**  **Bad interview + bad docs 🡪 recommend improving on performance of inspections**  **Good Interview + good docs + bad observations 🡪 recommend improving training** | | | | | | | | |
| **C3. Checking Competency** | | | | | | | |
| C3.1  **#31** | What process does the company use to ensure workers are competent to perform their assigned tasks? | **O** | | **D** | | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  | |  | |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | | **0-3** | | **0,7** | **/10** |
| **Intent: People should only be doing work that they are trained to do and are competent to do. Competency is different than training – it is observation and feedback to the worker on how they are performing the job. While having worker signatures on evaluations is preferred, it is not required.** | | | | | | | |
| **D -** Award up to 3 points based on the % of worker **and supervisor** competence assessments completed compared to the number of workers and supervisors.  Every worker and supervisor (once they have completed training) must have a documented competence assessment for their current position or assigned tasks. Ongoing assessments are required and the frequency should be based on the risk of the tasks being performed and the skill (including age and experience) of the particular worker. Competence assessments must include observation of the persons performing the tasks. Competence assessments may include, but are not necessarily limited to:   * Training and practical examination records * Certificates supported by observation content * Supervisor journal notations * Assessments * Inspections   **I -** If at least 90% of interviewed supervisors and managers are:   * knowledgeable about the company program and regulatory requirements * assessing workers in accordance with company and regulatory requirements,   award 7 points.  If managers also assess workers, include applicable managers in the interview sample size.  If all supervisors are also managers, exclude supervisor assessment from the question.  Workers are limited to company workers and exclude contractors. | | | | | | | |
| Audit Note: (Documentation only for **Endorsement**) | | | | | | | | |
| **D – If there are 8 workers and 2 supervisors, and only the 8 workers have been assessed for competence, then that would be 80% = 2 out of 3 points scored.**  **I – CI warranted if less than 100%** | | | | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **C4. Communicating Results** | | | | | |
| C4.1  **#32** | How do managers and supervisors regularly share health and safety program performance information relevant to their operation with their workers and contractors? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  | **0** |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0-2** | **0** | **0-8** | **/10** |
| **Intent: This question is specific to the company sharing performance with workers, as opposed to having a document management system in P5.1. This is a link to the goals in P1.1 and keeping the goals visible and high profile.** | | | | | |
| **O -** Award up to 2 points based on the % of workers readily having access to performance information. Methods may include, but are not limited to:   * Signs * Posters * Mail outs * Emails * Presence of content in minutes * Posting of external reports or other documents, such as those from Primes, Licensees and/or WorkSafeBC   **I -** Award up to 8 points based on the % of interviewed workers with an awareness of the company safety program and its current key issues. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | | |
| **Links back to first question of the audit.**  **Nothing wrong with changing the order of interview questions script (as long as final report is this template in order)** | | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **C5. Investigation Quality** | | | | |
| C5.1  **#33** | How does the company properly complete investigations to lead to recommendations to prevent reoccurrence? | **O** | **D or I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0** | **0-10** | **/10** |
| **Intent: Investigations are key to preventing reoccurrence. Investigation needs to lead to preventing reoccurrence, not just stop at causes. Only if investigations lead to meaningful corrective actions will the rate of fatalities and serious injuries drop. While there are several investigation questions in this report, this question focusses only on the recommendations from the investigations.** | | | | |
| **Verify by documentation if the company has any incidents that have been or should have been formally investigated.**  **Verify by interview only if the company does not have any incidents that have been or should have been formally investigated.**  **Do NOT use both methods.**  **D -** Award up to 4 points based on the % of completeness of evidence collection as appropriate for the incident.  Evidence collection will usually, but not always, include:   * Events leading to the incident * Conditions of the work environment, tools, equipment and employees * Witness statements (if any witnesses) * Photos, diagrams and/or sketches * Reports on relevant employee training * Applicable safe work procedures * Emergency response actions   **D -** Award up to 4 points based on the % of completed investigations with applicable fundamental recommendations to prevent recurrence compared to investigations completed.  **D** – Award up to 2 points based on the % of investigators of the sampled investigations having formal training.  The investigation needs to use any standard investigative method to dig to the deeper system causes of an event in order to make fundamental recommendations. While addressing symptoms or immediate causes is important, it alone is insufficient for a positive finding. Worker participation is required unless impracticable.  **I -** In the absence of completed investigations due to a lack of incidents of sufficient severity for a formal investigation, this question may be evaluated through interview of investigators being able to explain how to investigate incidents using a form that has an ability to lead to preventing reoccurrence (i.e. evaluating their training and capacity). This method is particularly applicable to small and/or low-risk companies. Award up to 10 points based on the effectiveness of the individuals who would reasonably be investigating (by either company or regulatory requirements – i.e. must include worker JOHSC members) being able to explain the basics of investigation processes.  Note on next page | | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| Audit Note for question on previous page: (Documentation only for **Endorsement**) |
| **4th investigation question, this one about quality.**  **D – First part is about the completeness of the investigations. Explain what the parts are, of the investigations, in the note.**  **THE SECOND PART IS ABOUT FUNDEMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS THAT WILL PREVENT REOCCURRENCE. THERE MUST BE EXAMPLES PROVIDED WITHIN THE NOTE. TELLING WORKERS TO BE “More careful” IS NOT A FUNDEMENTAL RECOMMENDATION. HAVING TO DO THAT SHOWS DEEPER FLAWS IN THE SYSTEM.**  **Interview option for small, low risk companies that really did not need to do a formal investigation in the last 12 months (although they could/should do one on their ERP drill!)**  **LSA: Re-do deficient investigations with the right people, resources and forms**   * **Good activity for company safety, not just the audit score.**   **Formal training could be internal training**  **Formal training has (at least):**   * **Defined training materials** * **Competent trainer (they know the material AND they can generally train)** * **Test or other competency evaluation** * **Records of the above** |
| Recommendations and Resources: |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **C6. Checking Multi-Employer Workplaces** | | | | | |
| C6.1  **#34** | If multi-employer workplaces are created by the company, how does the company confirm that the workplaces are coordinated and a system of compliance is in place? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0,5** | **0-5** | **/10** |
| **Intent: Multi-employer workplaces can be managed by the company by assigning Prime Contractor to another company or can be self-managed by being the Prime Contractor. In either case, the company needs to have appropriate oversight of the workplaces in question. The oversight has to balance checking the activities and allowing the other companies on site to manage their own activities appropriately.** | | | | | |
| **This question is not applicable if the company does not create multi-employer workplaces.**  **D -** If documents show that company personnel who should have oversight of multi-employer workplaces are exercising the oversight appropriately for the risks and activities on those worksites, award 5 points.  **I -** Award up to 5 points based on % of interviewed personnel who should have oversight over multi-employer workplaces able to confirm that they are appropriately evaluating key safety coordination and compliance parameters appropriate to the risk and activities and providing direction based on those evaluations. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: **(documentation only for Endorsement)** | | | | | | |
| **Just having a co-contractor on site does not necessarily make the company ‘in charge of a MEWP’ (that could be the site Prime or owner)**  **‘personnel who should have oversight’ = auditor opinion and written justification** | | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **C. Checking for Safe Work – Scoring Summary** | | | | | |
|  | **Awarded** | **Available** | **N/A** | **Available – N/A** | **% awarded** |
| **Total** | **0** | **60** |  | **60** | **0%**  **Min 50%** |

**Short element. Only 6 questions. Typically 0 or 10 N/A points to fill in the N/A box.**

| A. ADJUSTING FOR BETTER WORK | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A1. Continual Improvement** | | | | | |
| A1.1  **#35** | How are senior leadership and managers actively involved in measuring and evaluating safety performance and evaluating opportunities for continual improvement? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0-5** | **0-5** | **/10** |
| **Intent: For this important cultural question, leadership must show that they are meaningfully involved in promoting continuous improvement in the operations.** | | | | | |
| **D -** If documents show managers measure and evaluate key safety performance indicators, award 3 points. Key performance indicators may include, but are not limited to:   * timely completion of safety program activities such as inspections, assessments, investigations and corrective actions * near miss / close call, first aid, medical aid and time loss statistics * training and competency assessments * analysis of records and statistics that determine injury trends such as frequency, nature, type and severity of worker injury   If documents show managers provide directions for continual improvement based on the results of their evaluations, award a further 2 points.  This process is different than managers attending JOHSC or other similar meetings as a participant. This process needs to show that management has a plan for driving change and improvement. There is no intent in the audit to specify what the nature or scope of that plan should be.  **I -** Award up to 5 points based on % of interviewed managers able to confirm that they are appropriately evaluating key safety performance indicators and providing direction for continual improvement based on those evaluations. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | | |
| **Include CAL from previous audit in this audit’s scope.**  **Input to management (Information to correlate)= 3 points. Output from management (Suggestions to the company on how to achieve improvement)= 2 points. Both of these parts are all or nothing.**  **Legal requirement for at least one annual management-only meeting that includes safety.**   * **Valid (for the purposes of the law and the audit) management meetings may include non-safety topics.** * **Auditors need to be aware of confidentiality and their ‘need to know’ status.** | | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A2. Adjusting Procedures** | | | | | |
| A2.1  **#36** | How are risk control measures and safe work procedures reviewed and updated with worker involvement on a regular basis and when there are changes in work conditions? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0-5** | **0,5** | **/10** |
| **Intent: The company needs to have a living and evolving management system that adapts to change, not just a dusty manual on the shelf. Workers, since they are most affected by the company program, are the best voice for operational feedback.** | | | | | |
| **D -** Award up to 5 points based on records showing that risk control measures and safe work procedures are reviewed at least every 2 years and/or updated when necessary. It is not necessary to show that the procedures change every 2 years, only that they are examined to determine if they are still applicable. One-on-one review of safe work procedures with workers is considered acceptable provided there is an opportunity to cause change in the measure or procedure.  **I -** If at least 70% of interviewed managers, supervisors and workers report that at least some workers are involved in the review process, award 5 points.  It is not necessary for every worker to be directly involved in the process. Worker involvement may be via a committee or representative. However, the interviewed worker must at least be aware how their issue or idea could be evaluated for incorporation into a revised procedure to be considered a positive response. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: (Documentation only for **Endorsement**) | | | | | | |
| **Needs to show that they have been reviewed for improvement opportunities, not a worker refresher, even if there is no actual history of updates.**  **JOHSC is an acceptable, but not mandatory, method** | | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A2.2  **#37** | What are the methods in place for reviewing, implementing, tracking and following up on the investigation, inspection and other recommendations? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0-6** | **0-2** | **0-2** | **/10** |
| **Intent: The company needs to follow through and show due diligence in addressing corrective actions of any type and learn from experience. The company must allocate sufficient resources for safety.** | | | | | |
| **O -** Award up to 6 points based on % auditor observation verification that sampled corrective actions have been completed. If there are no recommendations that yielded reasonably observable actions, score the observation portion as not applicable and deduct 6 points from the total.  **D -** If there is a process for tracking corrective actions award 1 point. Having different processes for each of investigations, inspections, etc. is acceptable.  **D –** If at least 90% of documented deficiencies are reported and corrected within established time frames, award 1 point.  Potential records of interest may include, but are not limited to:   * CAL from the previous audit if there was a previous audit (a primary and mandatory document) * Inspection forms * Investigations * JOHSC minutes * Safety Meeting minutes * Daily equipment logs * Maintenance reports * Monthly inspection reports * Danger Tree assessments * Supervisor journals * Report forms such as RADAR or SafeStart * 3rd party inspections (Prime, Licensee, health or other authority, WorkSafeBC, etc.)   The process may be integral with the investigation form, a separate system or part of an overall company system, but it must include target completion dates and assign tasks to people. Updating target completion dates as situations change is acceptable.  Actions that are not yet due should be excluded from the calculation.  If the company has a system, but has no actions assigned that should have been completed, score the second part of the question as ‘N/A’ and deduct 1 point from the total. If the concept of due dates is not included in the company system award zero points for Documentation parts of this question.  **I -** Award up to 2 points based on the % of positive responses from interviewed workers stating corrective actions are completed by the target date.  Audit note on next page | | | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| Audit Note for question on previous page: (Documentation only for **Endorsement**) |
| **Mandatory to review CAL from previous audit**   * **If there was a previous audit (Inc. SEBASE)**   **Auditor needs to review D before O and I for efficiency.**  **O - THIS AGAIN, IS OBSERVATION ONLY. If the corrective actions are not reasonably observable, then it would be N/A. Not reasonably observable would be rewriting procedures, or possibly a corrective action in a remote location not visited in the audit, etc. New guarding or painting walkways, or posting signs, etc., are reasonably observable.**  **Select items that auditor can reasonably verify via O**   * **At least some from last audit CAL** * **Consider logistics vs criticality of the observation** |
| Recommendations and Resources: |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A3. Adjusting Emergency Response** | | | | | |
| A3.1  **#38** | Are appropriate drills being conducted to periodically test and refine the effectiveness of the Emergency Response Plan (ERP)? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0** | **0-5** | **0-5** | **/10** |
| **Intent: While holding a drill as a training exercise is very useful, the main benefit comes from adjusting the future emergency response rather than just checking it.** | | | | | |
| **D -** If an emergency response drill, such as a general fire/evacuation drill, has been conducted in the last 12 months, award 2 points.  If drills have been conducted to test at least one other scenario, such as injury, confined space rescue or missing worker, award a further 1 point. **Note that if the company work from heights and/or over/on water and/or has confined spaces that are entered at least annually, then they must perform all applicable rescue drills to be awarded this point**, even if they have performed other scenarios.  If results of drills are reviewed and the ERP amended as necessary award a further 2 points.  Proof of review may include meeting minutes or formal reports to management, workers, JOHSC, etc.  I – Award up to 5 points for positive % responses from interviewed managers, supervisors and workers being aware of the learnings from emergency drills. If no drills have been held, score zero interview points. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | | |
| **If company has multiple sites, teams, shifts, needs a drill per site, team or shift.**  **LSA is ‘hold the required drills’ (ideally before the auditor has completed the report).**  **Interview is about being aware of the learnings not whether they personally were in the drill.**  **Real responses do NOT count as drills. Drills have different learning opportunities and outcomes than real events.**  **Tabletop exercises may count in some circumstances, such as missing worker search.** | | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A4. Worker Input to Adjustments** | | | | | |
| A4.1  **#39** | Is the company's safety program structured to involve employee/ contractor representatives in the regular review of the safety program with recommendations to management? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0-5** | **0-5** | **/10** |
| **Intent: The program needs a mechanism to allow those affected by the program to have input into the evolution of the program. This could range from suggestion boxes (that are used), JOHSC, open emails, annual formal meetings with contractors. This shows a positive culture with worker engagement via feedback and company follow-through/response.** | | | | | |
| **D -** Award up to 5 points based on the existence of a mechanism to involve workers and/or sub-contractors in the regular review of the safety program.  Positive evidence may include, but is not limited to:   * Terms of reference of a compliant JOHSC or Representative where required by regulation * an absent or non-compliant JOHSC or Representative where one is required by regulation is a negative finding * Meeting minutes from multi-company committees involving sub-contractors (only where such committees exist) showing program review * meetings that do not involve program review content are not positive findings * Emails or other communications * Safety Manual sections defining program review * Worker participation in performing inspections and investigations, etc.   **I -** Award up to 5 points based on the % of interviewed managers, supervisors and workers reporting how workers or contractors can effectively make changes to the company system if necessary. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | | |
| **Loss of 5 points for not having the required JOHSC or Rep per site (matching to Leg / Reg / Order)**  **A company with 2, 15-person sites that are separated and do not interact, usually legally requires only 1 Rep per site (rather than a JOHSC for the whole company) as the minimum.**  **Going above minimum can never result in points loss (unless the documentation or implementation is somehow non-conforming)**  **Check that a Rep really is a WORKER Representative.**  **April 3, 2018 was the first required annual JOHSC self-evaluation Reg 3.26**  **Compare Terms of Reference to the fine details of sections 127-137 of the Workers Compensation Act.** | | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A5. Performance Management** | | | | | |
| A5.1  **#40** | Are individual responsibilities and accountabilities supported by regular review and recognition of performance towards safety goals, targets, and expectations? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0,3** | **0-7** | **/10** |
| **Intent: Leadership should be demonstrating and reinforcing individual accountability for safety performance, goals and expectations. This should be a two-way communication process in a one-on-one setting and is formal, documented, structured and scheduled.** | | | | | |
| **D -** If the company has a mechanism for formally reviewing personal safety performance, award 3 points.  There may be different programs for different levels or work units in the company, especially where different unions have involvement. There is no requirement that the programs be uniform across the organization. This topic deals with the results of assessments, rather than the performance of assessments. Disciplinary processes for enforcing the use of engineering, administrative and PPE controls must be included.  **NOTE:** **This question specifically prohibits records of completed discipline or reward from being examined. Only policy documents or blank forms are in scope.**  **I -** Award up to 7 points based on % of interviewed managers and supervisors being able to describe a functioning system. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | | |
| **Last question of the OHS side of the audit.**  **Includes but not limited to discipline policy (must reference ‘discipline policy’ in your note)**   * **Positive as well as negative feedback** * **results of assessments, not the performance of assessments.** * **Managing over- and under- achievers that are still ‘competent’** * **High I bias to accommodate informal positive feedback mechanisms** * **Discipline policy must include enforcing controls**   **No reading or referencing actual discipline or private reward data (public is OK)**  **Citing that a worker appears in company newsletter for positive performance is allowed.**  **Photo-inserting unredacted discipline record is definitely prohibited.** | | | | | | |
| Recommendations and Resources: | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A. Adjusting for Better Work –Scoring Summary** | | | | | |
|  | **Awarded** | **Available** | **N/A** | **Available – N/A** | **% awarded** |
| **Total** | **0** | **60** |  | **60** | **0%**  **Min 50%** |

**Usually zero ‘not applicable’ points to fill in the field.**

**Stop here unless you have to do the Injury Management audit. Only companies that already have Injury Management certification are allowed to do the audit. Failing to do the audit for a company that has Injury Management results in the un-recoverable loss of IM certification.**

| **I. INJURY MANAGEMENT / RETURN TO WORK PROGRAMS (OPTIONAL)** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **I1. Return to Work Policy, Management and Leadership** | | | | | |
| I1.1 | Is there a corporate policy outlining the company’s commitment to the Injury Management (IM)/Return-to-Work (RTW) Programs? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0,10** | **0,20** |  | **/30** |
| **O -** If the company IM/RTW policy is conspicuously posted or otherwise made available to workers in physical or electronic format, award 10 points.  Possible methods may include handouts, manuals or reference materials as well as physical or electronic posting.  **D -** If the document includes an outline of the intent of the program, award 10 points.  If the document outlines the objectives of the program, award 10 points. | | | | | |
| **If this whole element is not applicable, leave all scores blank, and do not enter anything in scoring tables at the end of the Element** | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| Recommendation: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I1.2 | Is there a written IM/RTW program with defined roles and responsibilities for all relevant groups? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0,10** | **0-10** | **/20** |
| **D -** If there is a written program containing responsibilities for at least the following groups, award 10 points:   * OHS personnel; * Human resources department; * Medical professional; * WCB case management; * Employee assistance program; * Employee representation (e.g. union); * Senior management representation; and * Workers (i.e. potential users of the IM/RTW program).   Depending on the company structure, several responsibilities may be combined into a single person (i.e. senior management, OHS and HR may be covered by an owner). This is acceptable for the purpose of the question. The responsibilities can exist in any company program/policy/procedural document, not necessarily in an IM/RTW-specific document. Examples include but are not limited to JSB’s and job descriptions.  Documenting the responsibilities in a record document such as meeting minutes or a report is not sufficiently significant or directive to be awarded the points.  **I -** Award up to 10 points based on the % of positive responses of interviewed representatives of groups understanding their responsibilities. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| Recommendation: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I1.3 | Are case progressions and outcomes tracked? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0-10** |  | **/10** |
| **D -** Award up to 5 points based on % of case files showing progress review.  Progress review may include, but is not necessarily limited to:   * Injured worker contact; * Results of medical assessment; * Performance on alternate or modified duty program; and * Modification of RTW plan.   Award up to 5 points based on % of case files showing outcome review.  Outcome review may include, but is not necessarily limited to:   * Duration of short and long term injury; * WSBC claim cost; and * End results of case.   If there are no case files in the scope of the audit, score this question as ‘N/A’ and deduct 10 points from the total. | | | | | |
| **If this question is not applicable (but the element as a whole is applicable) leave the score blank and add ‘10’ to the ‘Not Applicable’ cell at the end of the element.** | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
| If there were cases, but no case files, that is a 0 score, not N/A  If N/A still must say that there are no case files. | | | | | |
| Recommendation: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I1.4 | Is there a process to implement the opportunities for improvement identified through the analysis of program outcomes? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0,10** | **0,5** | **/15** |
| **D -** If there is a process to review case files for opportunities for improvement to the IM/RTW system, award 5 points.  If the process involves multiple groups (see I1.2) in the process, award 5 points.  **I -** If at least 70% of interviewed group members can describe the review process, award 5 points.  This question is to address opportunities for improvement in the system, rather than in individual cases.  Examples of opportunities for improvement would include but are not limited to items such as:   * Modifying a form to be sent to a doctor for increased clarity and options ; * Changing the default planned contact frequency for absent workers; and * Changing the default progress review frequency for workers present at work on an IM plan.   It is a positive finding if the company reviews files for system improvements, but finds no practicable opportunities. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
| **A process relies on a policy/standard rather than records.** | | | | | |
| Recommendation: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I1.5 | Do case records support that identified opportunities for system improvement are being implemented? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0-10** | **0,5** | **/15** |
| **D -** Award up to 10 points based on % of case files having documentation indicating program review occurred.  **I -** If at least 70% of group members can describe examples of program improvement based on reviews, award 5 points.  If there are no cases, or no cases resulting in system improvement, score this question as ‘N/A’ and deduct 15 points from the total. | | | | | |
| **If this question is not applicable (but the element as a whole is applicable) leave the score blank and add ‘10’ to the ‘Not Applicable’ cell at the end of the element.** | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
| **If there should have been case files, but there aren’t any, score zero.** | | | | | |
| Recommendation: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scoring Summary – I1** | | | | | |
|  | **Awarded** | **Available** | **N/A** | **Available – N/A** | **% awarded** |
| **I1. Policy, Management and Leadership** | **0** | **90** |  | **90** | **0%**  **Min 50%** |

| **I2. Resources, Education and Training** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I2.1 | Have the duties of an IM/RTW coordinator been assigned and do the duties outline the authority to establish and implement RTW plans? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0,10** | **0,10** | **/20** |
| **D -** If the IM/RTW program or other documentation assigns program coordination duties, award 10 points.  **I -** If at least 70% of interviewed workers, supervisors, managers are aware of the program coordinator’s duties, award 10 points.  The coordinator may be a committee, a lead or technical member of a committee or an individual. Each site or division may have its own coordinator. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
| **‘Aware of duties’ is not ‘aware of who the coordinator is’.** | | | | | |
| Recommendation: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I2.2 | Does the IM/RTW coordinator have appropriate education and/or training for their duties? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0,15** | **0,15** | **/30** |
| **D -** If records demonstrate appropriate training for the IM/RTW coordinator with respect to their role in the program, award 15 points.  Records may include attending courses, seminars, presentations or formal education.  **I -** If the IM/RTW coordinator, when interviewed, understands their role in the program and is aware of relevant legislation award 15 points.  The IM/RTW coordinator needs to at least know where to access information on:   * Human Rights Act; * BC Human Rights Code; * Workers Compensation Act; * Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act; and * (PIPA) Personal Information Privacy Act (SBC 2003, Chapter 63).   If the IM/RTW coordinator is a contract agency, review agency publications for evidence and score the interview portion as ‘N/A’. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
| **For internal auditors, you might be the coordinator. Scoring N/A for a situation where you interview yourself is acceptable, but so is writing about how you understand your role. Writing that you interviewed yourself is poor form.** | | | | | |
| Recommendation: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| I2.3 | Does the company have policies and procedures for IM/RTW case record security and retention periods? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0,10** |  | **/10** |
| **D -** If policies and procedures for record retention and security exist and they meet legal and regulatory requirements, award 10 points. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| Recommendation: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I2.4 | Have relevant groups been trained in the IM/RTW policies, procedures (including Stay-at-Work) and privacy issues? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  |  | **0-10** | **/10** |
| **I -** Award up to 10 points based on the % of positive responses of interviewed groups having appropriate knowledge and education on their role in the IM/RTW program, including Stay-At-Work and privacy issues.  Interviewed groups include:   * Managers; * Supervisors; * Human resources personnel; * OHS personnel; * Committee members; and * Union representatives. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| Recommendation: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scoring Summary – I2** | | | | | |
|  | **Awarded** | **Available** | **N/A** | **Available – N/A** | **% awarded** |
| **I2. Resources, Education and Training** | **0** | **70** |  | **70** | **0%**  **Min 50%** |

| **I3. Stay-at-Work and Return-to-Work** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I3.1 | Does the company have a written process (series of steps) for dealing with all IM/RTW cases and is this posted or made available to employees? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0,10** | **0-20** |  | **/30** |
| **O -** If the overview of steps in the IM/RTW process is conspicuously posted or otherwise made available to workers in physical or electronic format, award 10 points.  Possible methods may include handouts, manuals or reference materials as well as physical or electronic posting.  **D -** Award up to 20 points based on the % completeness of the IM/RTW process.  It needs to include a summarized step-by-step instruction for injury management. For example:   1. 1st response to injury; 2. Worker reporting requirements; 3. Medical assessment; 4. Contact with worker; 5. Employer reporting requirement to WSBC; 6. Claims management; 7. Identification of available alternate or modified duties; and 8. Process to develop IM/RTW plan | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| Recommendation: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I3.2 | Does the company have a “Stay-at-Work” initiative as part of their IM/RTW program? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0,15** | **0-10** | **/25** |
| **D -** If the documentation indicates that the program applies to ‘Stay-at-Work’ cases, award 15 points.  **I -** Award up to 10 points based on the % of interviewed supervisors describing how they use Stay-at-Work opportunities to avoid time loss. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| Recommendation: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| I3.3 | Does the company have alternate duties identified in writing and are supervisors aware that they can offer modified duties when required? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0,10** | **0-10** | **/20** |
| **D -** If alternate duties are identified in advance, award 10 points.  Alternate duties may include a range of standard opportunities, a list of functionally acceptable restrictions on workers or a statement that alternate duties have been researched and none exist in the company. If no duties are possible, the company needs to justify this conclusion in order to be awarded the points.  **I -** Award up to 10 points based on the % of supervisors understanding how they can offer or arrange modified or alternate duties to workers in both Stay-at-Work and Return-to-Work situations. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| Recommendation: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I3.4 | Does the company have a procedure for initial and ongoing contact with an absent injured worker? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0,10** | **0-5** | **/15** |
| **D -** If the company has a procedure for initial and ongoing contact with absent injured workers, including timelines or methods for developing case-specific timelines, award 10 points.  **I -** Award up to 5 points based on % of interviewed supervisors, IM/RTW coordinator or other contact personnel used in the company system being able to correctly describe the initial and ongoing contact protocol. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
| **The company must specify when it will initially contact the absent worker (the first day of absence is typical) and then how often after than (typically 1 or 2 weeks at maximum)** | | | | | |
| Recommendation: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| I3.5 | Do case records support that the procedure for initial and ongoing contact with absent workers is being used? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0-5** |  | **/5** |
| **D -** Award up to 5 points based on the % of case files showing initial and ongoing contact being followed.  If there are no case files, score the question as ‘N/A’ and adjust the score accordingly. | | | | | |
| **If this question is not applicable (but the element as a whole is applicable) leave the score blank and add ‘5’ to the ‘Not Applicable’ cell at the end of the element.** | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
| **If there should have been case files, this is another zero score.** | | | | | |
| Recommendation: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I3.6 | Is there a procedure to develop, approve, monitor and modify case specific IM/RTW plans? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0,10** | **0-10** | **/20** |
| **D -** If the company has a procedure to develop, approve, monitor and modify IM/RTW case plans, award 10 points. The process must include a mechanism to set and modify plan end-dates.  **I -** Award up to 10 points based on the % of interviewed IM/RTW Coordinator (and any other company personnel involved in case plan decisions) being able to describe the company process to develop, approve, monitor and modify IM/RTW case plans, including the mechanism for setting and modifying end-dates. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
| **For internal auditors, you might be the coordinator. Scoring N/A for a situation where you interview yourself is acceptable, but so is writing about how you understand your role. Writing that you interviewed yourself is poor form.** | | | | | |
| Recommendation: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| I3.7 | Do case records support that the procedure to develop, approve, monitor and modify case specific IM/RTW plans is being followed? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0-10** |  | **/10** |
| **D -** Award up to 10 points based on the % of IM/RTW case files showing proper development, approval, monitoring and if necessary modification.  If there are no case files, score the question as ‘N/A’ and adjust the score accordingly. | | | | | |
| **If this question is not applicable (but the element as a whole is applicable) leave the score blank and add ‘10’ to the ‘Not Applicable’ cell at the end of the element.** | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
| **If there should have been case files but there aren’t any, score zero.** | | | | | |
| Recommendation: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I3.8 | Do case records support that all IM/RTW plans have planned progress review dates and end dates, where practical? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0-15** |  | **/15** |
| **D -** Award up to 5 points based on the % of IM/RTW case files showing a planned progress review date.  Award up to 10 points based on the % of IM/RTW case files showing a planned end date, where such a date can be medically determined or estimated.  If there are no case files, score the question as ‘N/A’ and adjust the score accordingly.  Not all case files can have a planned end date, since some case progressions are not reasonably medically determinable. These cases should be excluded from the sample for the end date portion of the question.  If all case files have end dates that are not able to be medically determined, score the end date portion of the question as ‘N/A’ and adjust the score accordingly. | | | | | |
| **If this question is not applicable (but the element as a whole is applicable) leave the score blank and add ‘15’ to the ‘Not Applicable’ cell at the end of the element.** | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
| **If there should have been case files but there aren’t any, score zero.** | | | | | |
| Recommendation: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| I3.9 | Are workers and supervisors knowledgeable of the reporting process and requirements under workers compensation legislation? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  |  | **0-10** | **/10** |
| **I -** Award up to 3 points based on the % of interviewed supervisors able to describe their reporting requirements to authorities. If the company program has supervisors reporting information to other company parties for submission to authorities, also include those other parties in the interview sample.  Award up to 7 points based on % of interviewed workers having correct knowledge of reporting requirements. Reporting requirements must include both the obligation to report an injury and the obligation to report seeking medical aid for a work-related reason. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| Recommendation: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I3.10 | Do case records support that the different groups within the company worked together to support the goals of the IM/RTW case and program? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0-5** |  | **/5** |
| **D -** Award up to 5 points based on % of reviewed case plans that show a coordinated approach to case management.  A coordinated approach will be shown by an absence of conflicts and a presence of smooth interaction between:   * Employee benefit package (medical, extended healthcare plan, employee assistance plan); * OHS (incident reporting, training); * Claims management; and * Stay-at-Work / Return-to-Work program.   If there are no case files, score the question as ‘N/A’ and adjust the score accordingly. | | | | | |
| **If this question is not applicable (but the element as a whole is applicable) leave the score blank and add ‘5’ to the ‘Not Applicable’ cell at the end of the element.** | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
| **If there should have been case files but there aren’t any, score zero.** | | | | | |
| Recommendation: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scoring Summary – I3** | | | | | |
|  | **Awarded** | **Available** | **N/A** | **Available – N/A** | **% awarded** |
| **I3. Stay at Work and Return to Work** | **0** | **155** |  | **155** | **0%**  **Min 50%** |

| **I4. Communications** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I4.1 | Have IM/RTW policies and procedures been effectively communicated? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0,20** | **0-25** | **/45** |
| **D -** If IM/RTW policies and procedures have been communicated to all employees as evidenced by a systematic process to provide Injury Management/RTW information to the workforce, award 20 points.  **I -** Award up to 25 points based on % of interviews at all levels showing awareness of the company IM/RTW program. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| Recommendation: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I4.2 | Does the employer actively promote the benefits of the IM/RTW Program? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0-15** |  |  | **/15** |
| **O -** Award up to 15 points based on % positive evidence of posting or making information available to employees.  Promotion materials should be posted at strategic locations throughout the company such as bulletin boards, lunch rooms and circulation of pamphlets. If there is no opportunity to post information for workers, determine if the employer has distributed printed information to workers. The promotion material must convey the benefits of the program rather than just state that the program exists. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| Recommendation: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I4.3 | Are new employees provided with information on the IM/RTW Program at a new employee orientation? | **O or D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  | **0,20** |  | **/20** |
| **O -** If workers are observed to be given IM/RTW materials during orientation, award 20 points.  **D -** If an orientation session was not observed, award 20 points if IM/RTW materials were included in orientation packages or templates.  Note: This question is an observation OR a documentation question, not both. | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | |
|  | | | | |
| Recommendation: | | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I4.4 | Does that company have a process and written information package prepared to advise medical practitioners of the company’s IM/RTW initiatives? | **O** | **D** | **I** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  | **0** |
|  |  |  | **0-20** |  | **/20** |
| **D -** If the company has a process to communicate the existence of the company IM/RTW plan to medical practitioners, award 10 points.  Award up to 10 points based on the completeness of the package, form or template ready to send to medical practitioners with an injured worker.  Examples of documents included in the package are:   * Description of the company’s IM/RTW program; * List of available alternate or modified duties; * Company cover letter to medical practitioners; and   Physician report template. | | | | | |
| Audit Note: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| Recommendation: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scoring Summary – I4** | | | | | |
|  | **Awarded** | **Available** | **N/A** | **Available – N/A** | **% awarded** |
| **I4. Communications** | **0** | **100** |  | **100** | **0%**  **Min 50%** |

# Key Definitions

| **Term** | **Definition** |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | The organization being audited.  The company may have clients, licensees and/or Prime Contractors above them in the responsibility structure. To those organizations, the company would be a contractor (or subcontractor).  The company may have contractors and sub-contractors below them in the responsibility structure. To those organizations, the company would be a client, Prime and/or licensee.  The audit report is to be about the company being audited and the areas that they have control over. The actions of a company under the audited company in the contractor chain only impact the audit report in how the audited company should be managing the activities, and not deal with issues that are internal to the contractor (i.e. failure of the subcontractor to maintain equipment is not a deficiency in the maintenance program of the company, but may be a weakness in contractor selection or oversight). Similarly, if the deficiencies that impact the company are caused by a company above them in the responsibility pyramid, they only impact the company audit is so far as the company has control over the issue (i.e. reporting needed road maintenance to the Prime is the maximum expectation if the company being audited has no road maintenance responsibility.) |
| **Contractor** | A company or a person other than an employee, that the company pays (including indirectly via a contractor chain) AND  is present on the company-controlled worksite.  Contractor, for the purposes of the audit, is a relative term that applies to an organizational level UNDER the company being audited. It is not an absolute term, since most companies are also contractors to the company above them in the responsibility pyramid.  Examples: a water taxi would not typically be a contractor since they are not on the company site.  A camp cook could be a contractor if the company operations include control of the camp, but would not be a contractor if the cook (or the company that the cook is employed by) has control over the camp.  A fuel delivery service would typically be a contractor if they are allowed unescorted on the company forestry site during off-hours.  External auditors are contractors. |
| **IOO** | A company with no more than one field worker other than IOO-exempt personnel, AND  no contractors other than IOO-exempt personnel AND  with no more than one office support person who does NOT supervise, direct or dispatch the field worker. |
| **IOO-Exempt Personnel** | One person of safety watch for an unlimited number of days per year per IOO.  An additional field employee for no more than 10 person-days per calendar year per IOO for vacation, relief or additional special project labour. |
| **Multi-person IOO** | A company with no more than 3 field workers other than IOO-exempt personnel AND  no contractors other than IOO-exempt personnel AND  with no more than one office support person who does NOT supervise, direct or dispatch any field workers AND  the up to 3 field workers are all self-contained and do not rely on each other for daily support.  A multi-person IOO may not exceed 4 field workers other than safety watch, including temporary workers, at any point in the year.  While a multi-person IOO can be awarded SAFE-certification, it is on a per-person basis rather than per-company and is therefore not COR-eligible. |
| **Visitor** | A person or company who is not paid by the company AND  is present on the company-controlled worksite |
| **Documentation only for Endorsement** | The company submits the required policy, procedure, standard or other guidance document for the applicable topic using a condensed tool. |
| **Young Worker** | Any worker, including a supervisor, under 25 years of age, regardless of their experience. For example a 23 year old worker with 6 years in the company is a young worker and still requires enhanced supervision until they are 25. |
| **New Worker** | means any worker who is   1. new to the workplace, 2. returning to a workplace where the hazards in that workplace have changed during the worker's absence, 3. affected by a change in the hazards of a workplace, or 4. relocated to a new workplace if the hazards in that workplace are different from the hazards in the worker's previous workplace; |

# Company Profile

Council Received

Stamp Here

Council Received

Stamp Here

Complete all fields – an incomplete NOAA cannot be processed

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company’s audit due date: | | | | | | | | | **This form is a Pre-Audit NOAA** | | | | | | |  | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | **This form is a Post-Audit NOAA** | | | | | | |  | | |
| 1. **Type of Audit** – check all that apply (double-click each box to activate) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Certification | |  | | Student |  | Verification | | | |  | Administrative | | | | | | |
|  | Maintenance | |  | | Gap Analysis |  | IM/RTW | | | |  | Limited Scope | | | | | | |
|  | Recertification | |  | | Team  list members in sec I. |  | A.M.A.P. yr 1 | | | |  | Phased – part | | |  | | of |  |
|  | A.M.A.P. yr 2 | | | |
|  | Combined - Must use Joint NOAA | |  | |  |  | W.I.V.A. | | | |  | Targeted Operations  (SAFE Only – not COR) | | | | | | |
|  | Other: |  |  | | Version 4 |  | Internal | | | |  | External | | | | | | |
| 1. **Company Information** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Legal Company Name: | | | | | | | | | | Company Trade Name/*dba*: | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | |  | | | | | | | | |
| WorkSafeBC account: | | | | | | | | | | SAFE Certification #: | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | |  | | | | | | | | |
| Address: | | | | | | | | | | City: | | Province: | | Postal Code: | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | |  | |  | |  | | | | |
| Company Contact: | | | | | | | | | | Position: | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | |  | | | | | | | | |
| Phone: | | | | | | | | | | Email: | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | |  | | | | | | | | |
| 1. **Audit Period** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | **Start Date** | | | | **Date of last data collection** | | | | | **Report Submission Date** | | | | | |
| **Estimated** | | | |  | | | |  | | | | |  | | | | | |
| **Actual** | | | |  | | | |  | | | | |  | | | | | |

1. **High Risk Company Activity Types**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Check all that apply | | | |
|  | Hiring Contractors |  | Creating a multi-employer workplace |
|  | Lockout |  | Camps and Remote Accommodations |
|  | Manual Tree Falling |  | Working near High Voltage Power Lines |
|  | Commercial Vehicles |  | High Hazard Materials |
|  | Heavy Equipment Operations |  | Working at Heights |
|  | Respiratory Protection |  | Combustible Dust |
|  | Hot Work |  | Confined Space |
|  | Having Young Workers (under age 25) |  | Working over or on Water |

1. **Personnel Count**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total personnel count per month for last 12 months:  (Total = owners + management + supervisors + workers + workers of dependent contractors) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Year  (yyyy) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Month  (mmm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Count |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | | Attach an Organizational Chart or other description of the structure of the company. | | | | | | | | | | |

1. **Audit Sampling Plan (IM/RTW)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Injury Management not attempted in audit  **Scope of IM/RTW Records** | | | | | | | | | | | | **Number of case files in organization** | | | | | | **Number of cases sampled in audit** | | | | | |
| Last 6 months  Last 12 months  Current Calendar Year | | | | | Since last audit  Other: | | | | | | |  | | | | | |  | | | | | |
| **RTW Minimum Sample Chart** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Cases** | 1 – 8 | 9 - 11 | | | | 12 - 13 | | | 14 - 15 | | | | 16 - 17 | | | 18 - 19 | | | | 20 - 23 | | | 24 - 27 |
| **Min #** | all | 8 | | | | 9 | | | 10 | | | | 11 | | | 12 | | | | 13 | | | 14 |
|  |  | | |  | | | |  | | |  | | | |  | | | |  | | |  | |
| **Cases** | 28 - 34 | | 35 - 44 | | | | 45 - 54 | | | 55 - 67 | | | | 68 - 80 | | | 81 - 100 | | | | >100 | | |
| **Min #** | 15 | | 16 | | | | 17 | | | 18 | | | | 19 | | | 20 | | | | 20% | | |

1. **Lead Auditor Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Audit Completed by: | Auditor Number (or ‘Student’): |
| Lead |  |
| Lead auditor email: | Lead auditor cell: |
| Team |  |
| Team |  |

1. **Company Representation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Accompanied by Company Representative(s) / Hosts** | | | | | |
| Name: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Occupation: |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Scope of audit**

| List all WorkSafeBC CUs, their fixed locations, and operating sites. Indicate if work activity is intended (pre-) and actually present in the audit.  If the company contact is unsure of their CUs or locations, please contact the BC Forest Safety Registrar.  Insert additional rows above the total line if necessary  Total interviews performed are automatically calculated with <CTRL-A><f9> (or when opening or printing) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **C U** | **LOCATION**  WSBC fixed location name or address  (list separately for each CU) | **SITE**  Audit site name  (if more than one site per location) | **COUNT** Total personnel at each site | Sites selected for visit | | | | | Number of personnel interviewed for current audit | | | | | | Scheduling for current audit | | |
| This year | 1 yr ago | 2 yrs ago | | 3 yrs ago | Pre-NOAA = *planned*  Post-NOAA = *actual* | | | | | | Auditor Initials | Start Date | End Date |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | M |  | S |  | W |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | M |  | S |  | W |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | M |  | S |  | W |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | M |  | S |  | W |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | M |  | S |  | W |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | M |  | S |  | W |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | M |  | S |  | W |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | M |  | S |  | W |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | M |  | S |  | W |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | M |  | S |  | W |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | M |  | S |  | W |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | M |  | S |  | W |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | M |  | S |  | W |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | M |  | S |  | W |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | M |  | S |  | W |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum count from table E on previous page: | | |  | Total interviews | | | 0 | | M | 0 | S | 0 | W | 0 |  |  |  |
| Minimum interviews required for count on line above based on table J on following pages: | | |  | Note: Min 80% worker interview target | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments, notes, descriptions regarding sampling plan (pre- or post-): (Attach additional pages for proposals for and/or outcomes of special time frames, unique sampling protocols, etc. This space can be used on the post-audit form for justifying why a particular plan was not met. |
|  |
| Describe the overall scope (nature and type) of the company’s activities. Include reference to the company’s locations as they relate their WorkSafeBC Classification Unit(s) making mention of locations and sites included in this audit: |
|  |
| Locations visited (post audit only): |
|  |
| Equipment observed (post-audit only): |
|  |
| Occupations observed (post-audit only): |
|  |
| Observed company activities on day(s) of audit (post-audit only): |
|  |
| Interview sampling description and count (i.e. 2 owners, 1 mechanic, 3 buncher operators, 6 truckers, etc.) (post-audit only): |
|  |

1. **Minimum Interview Table**

The minimum number of interviews required for an audit is based on the annual monthly peak value for staff count in the 12 months before the audit. The staff count is equal to the total number of personnel in the company, including owners, management, supervisors, field personnel, office personnel, shop personnel and the total staff of dependent contractors. This applies whether they are permanent or temporary and counts each unique person rather than as full time equivalents. Two people each working half time count as 2 (not 1) staff.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Staff** | **Minimum Interviews** |  | **Total Staff** | **Minimum Interviews** |  | **Total Staff** | **Minimum Interviews** |
| <5 | all |  | 234-240 | 35 |  | 560 | 66 |
| 5 | 4 |  | 241-249 | 36 |  | 561-570 | 67 |
| 6-7 | 5 |  | 250-299 | 37 |  | 571-580 | 68 |
| 8 | 6 |  | 300-302 | 38 |  | 581-595 | 69 |
| 9 | 7 |  | 303-309 | 39 |  | 596-605 | 70 |
| 10-11 | 8 |  | 310-312 | 40 |  | 606-615 | 71 |
| 12-14 | 9 |  | 313-315 | 41 |  | 616-625 | 72 |
| 15-16 | 10 |  | 316-320 | 42 |  | 626-638 | 73 |
| 16-17 | 11 |  | 321-325 | 43 |  | 639-645 | 74 |
| 18-20 | 12 |  | 326-329 | 44 |  | 646-655 | 75 |
| 21-24 | 13 |  | 330-332 | 45 |  | 656-665 | 76 |
| 25-27 | 14 |  | 333-335 | 46 |  | 666-678 | 77 |
| 28-30 | 15 |  | 336-338 | 47 |  | 679-689 | 78 |
| 31-36 | 16 |  | 339-341 | 48 |  | 690-699 | 79 |
| 37-44 | 17 |  | 342-348 | 49 |  | 700-705 | 80 |
| 45-49 | 18 |  | 349-354 | 50 |  | 706-719 | 81 |
| 50-64 | 19 |  | 355-359 | 51 |  | 720-729 | 82 |
| 65-74 | 20 |  | 360-364 | 52 |  | 730-740 | 83 |
| 75-88 | 21 |  | 365-369 | 53 |  | 741-749 | 84 |
| 89-99 | 22 |  | 370-374 | 54 |  | 750-790 | 85 |
| 100-120 | 23 |  | 375-379 | 55 |  | 791-840 | 86 |
| 121-149 | 24 |  | 380-389 | 56 |  | 841-959 | 87 |
| 150-199 | 25 |  | 390-399 | 57 |  | 960-1000 | 88 |
| 200-204 | 26 |  | 400-475 | 58 |  | 1001-1499 | 89 |
| 205-209 | 27 |  | 476-499 | 59 |  | 1500-1800 | 90 |
| 210-212 | 28 |  | 500-509 | 60 |  | 1801-2500 | 91 |
| 213-214 | 29 |  | 510-519 | 61 |  | 2501-4000 | 92 |
| 215-220 | 30 |  | 520-529 | 62 |  | 4001-4999 | 93 |
| 221-222 | 31 |  | 530-539 | 63 |  | 5000-9999 | 94 |
| 223-226 | 32 |  | 540-549 | 64 |  | 10000-24999 | 95 |
| 227-230 | 33 |  | 550-559 | 65 |  | 25000+ | 96 |
| 231-233 | 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Post Audit Signatures**

Complete and submit with your post-audit NOAA. Leave blank for pre-audit NOAA

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Company Management Representative (for internal and external audits)**  I hereby acknowledge that I have provided true and accurate information to the auditor to the best of my abilities and agree that the audit sampling was completed as stated above. | | |
| Name | | Signature (optional) | Date |
|  | |  |  |
|  | | | |
|  | **External Auditor**  I affirm that I have read, understood, and agree to abide by the terms and conditions of the British Columbia Forest Safety Council Auditor Code of Ethics.  I have not violated the Auditor Code of Ethics during this audit, and have not received any economic benefit from OH&S consulting activities from this company in the 36 months preceding the audit.  In addition, I have not been in a position which could be perceived as a conflict of interest by either the current BASE Auditor Manual or the current COR Standards and Guidelines.  Marking the box to the left of this text block and applying my name by any means in ‘signature’ constitutes signing. | | |
| Name | | Signature (manual or electronic) | Date |
|  | |  |  |
|  | | | |
|  | **Internal Auditor**  I affirm that   * I have not violated the Auditor Code of Ethics during this audit; * I have done my best to be objective in conducting this audit * I have followed the current BASE Auditor Manual. * I am a permanent employee of the company | | |
| Name | | Signature (manual or electronic) | Date |
|  | |  |  |

1. **Submission**

|  |
| --- |
| Submit completed NOAA via: <http://app.bcforestsafe.org/upload/>  Receipt of your pre-audit NOAA will be acknowledged by return email within one business day.  **DO NOT PROCEED with the audit until NOAA is approved (not just acknowledged) by the Council.**  Approval will be sent by email to the auditor and to the company contact indicated on page 1, within 5 business days of receipt of the NOAA.  If you have not received approval within one (1) week of submission, please contact the Council. |

**Auditor Conclusion**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| As the auditor, I confirm that this audit report contains material supporting the inclusion of the following Classification Unit(s) as listed below. | |
| Classification Unit (CU) | CU Description The real words from WorkSafeBC |
| What they have per WSBC, not what they should have, did have or want to have |  |
|  |  |
| Notes for Registrar: | |
| As the auditor, I confirm that this audit report does **NOT** contain material supporting the inclusion of the following Classification Unit(s) as listed below. | |
| Classification Unit (CU) | CU Description |
|  | This area can be left blank if there are no excluded CUs (one of the very few allowable blank fields in the whole report |
|  |  |
| Notes for Registrar: | |

# Reviewer Conclusion

**This section is completed during the audit QA process by the reviewer**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I hereby certify that this audit meets the intent and requirements of the SAFE Companies program and the total quality assurance process required by the BC Forest Safety Council. | | | |
| Reviewer name: |  | | |
| Classification Unit (CU) | CU Description | This audit contains material supporting the CU(s) | |
|  |  | Yes | No |
|  |  | Yes | No |
|  |  | Yes | No |
|  |  | Yes | No |
| Reviewer notes: | | | |

**Typical edit request email**

Please find attached the marked-up copy of your audit report. I have used the review features of Word to mark up your report with comments.

Please do not delete my comments or turn off tracked changes. I delete each comment and accept each of your changes during the edit cycle so that I do not have to take us both back to zero with your changes.

For each comment, any auditor can

• make the suggested change

• make an alternate change that fits the actual situation better

• make a totally different change that better supports your original concept

• make comments back for further clarification

• any combination of the above.

All auditors have 2 weeks to get all the edits back to me. If any scores change, then the executive summary scores may also need updating.

Please send the files back to me with a slightly different file name (change ‘QA1’ to 'Rev 2', ‘revised’, ‘edited’, ‘updated’ or similar change of your choice) so we can both track what was sent to you and what you sent back the same way.

# Outcome

**This section is completed during the audit QA process by the reviewer so auditors must not touch it.**

Based on the contents of this audit report, the following result and score is awarded by the BC Forest Safety Council:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Results** | **Score – OHS** | **Score – RTW** |
| SAFE Companies | **SAFE Certification Probationary SAFE Certification /**  **Endorsement / Limited Scope /**  **Not Successful** | **0%** | **0%**  **N/A** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Scope of Operations Certified** | **Other conditions** |
| Limitations | **Company without Contractors**  **Company hires Contractors**  **Company Assigns Prime Contractor Status** | **(these are examples)**  **Forestry Operations Only**  **(name) site only**  **Excludes (activity)**  **WIVA: Pass**  **WIVA: Minor Nonconformity**  **WIVA: Major Nonconformity**  **WIVA: Non-compliance** |

**This section is completed during the audit QA process by the Registrar**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Company Intent** | **Certification Outcome** |
| COR Eligibility - OHS | **Intended for COR**  **NOT Intended for COR** | **Eligible for COR**  **PARTIALLY Eligible for COR**  **NOT Eligible for COR**  **Offered Limited Scope** |
| COR Eligibility - RTW | **Intended for COR**  **NOT Intended for COR**  **Not Included in audit** | **Eligible for COR**  **PARTIALLY Eligible for COR**  **NOT Eligible for COR**  **Offered Limited Scope**  **N/A** |