

2015-08-10 - Lone working discussion

Discussion 10-08-2015

BC - Lone Working is a difficult one because sometimes there isn't anyone in the space for whole evenings

nottinghack have 350 members and still have the same issue

they have a lone working system, which purportedly doesn't work very well

CH - Have a deadmans switch for lone working? With webcams and a speaker for if something happens, allowing us to call 999?

Might want to add an emergency services over-ride to the buzzer with webcam for the next hackspace

BC - So *noooooow* i'm allowed webcams

CH - Emergency makes sense?

KR - define the times that count as "emergency"

CH - Deadmans switch failsafe

Dangerous equipment requires two member swipe to use

If not utilising dead mans switch

BC - Lone worker button makes sense - press button, it chirps every 15 minutes and you need to press the button or turn it off so we know you're still alive

CH - maybe wrist mounted, with pulse sensor?

KR - that would be very annoying

CH - yes, exactly Kat... that's kinda the point :)

the chirping would mean the alarm wouldn't go off, and all hell wouldn't break loose

and if it's that or no lone working...

KR - that's going to get to a "rule 1" level of annoyance

and also would make it so no one actually turns it on

CH - if it's not on, then equipment won't start

BC - It'd only be a blocker for band saw / table saw / grinder really

KR - i'm all for making things safe to work with, but forcing certain actions to "protect" me from myself will - like a chirp that i have to respond to, just won't get my vote

CH - well, @BinaryKitten, you don't exactly use that equipment frequently? Is it going to negatively affect you and others in a way that would be as harmful as the risk?

What i instead of a chirp, it was the thing from lost and you had to type in numbers

KR - I don't care if i don't use the equipment as much as you think should warrant the blockade

CH - I'm cool with it having a 1min or so leeway, and having it buzz for the first 10 sec

KR - that's not the point i was going for, but not really going to get into an argument over it

CH - no, that wasn't the point... i may have phrased it ineliquently @BinaryKitten

my point was more that these tools are not heavily used, so this is not going to be particularly onerous

and it's not so much of a blockade as having to have two people in the hackspace to use the tool is that infantilises members far more

KR - come back to me with which tools would be covered and how the system would work fairly ... and I might reconsider my position

CH - Cool, will do

KR - atm the proposed system doesn't work with Rule 1.

BC - I think the proposed system is fairly sensible TBH.

TK - Although I think having more than one person in the space is, in this instance a more sensible solution than a lone working button. I'm happier with a lone working button than the current complete lack of safety.

The problem with the lone working button is that, if you have managed to cut your hand off, by the time someone gets to you you're already dead and so is hackspace.

KR - can we not have a swipe in, swipe out on equipment that if the machine is run for a longer than "usual" time frame requires a reswipe, to confirm you're not in harm

BC - Thats how haccess is going to work anyway

KR - protect the people on the equipment not from being in the space alone

BC - Swipe in, press out

TK - Any major accident or death WILL SHUT US DOWN.

CH - HSE standard is no lone workers on machinery full stop

Yep

and risk EVERY OTHER HACKSPACE

TK - that's what we're avoiding here. I don't care if people are annoyed. Annoyed people are alive/uninjured people.

KR - the issues i have atm are:

1. determining "Lone worker"
2. protecting the people in the workshop environment

CH - and @BinaryKitten hoping for compliance from members won't work either - we need compliance to be mandatory, otherwise we can still be liabal

KR - I'm all for protection on all things, but i don't feel that the space itself be locked down if you go in on your own

CH - 1) one RFID swipe for one worker, two different for a second person in the space

@BinaryKitten that's what I want to avoid, as it would suck and we would loose members quickly

KR - swipe out on toilet breaks, swipe out when leaving

CH - easier if it's purely on the machines, and less intrusive surely

KR - exactly my point

thus the "every 15 minutes press a buttoin" is what i'm saying is bad

CH - button can be on the machine, surely?

BC - How would you clarify theres a second person in the space?

CH - second key used to access the machine

KR - thus returning to 2 people in space to operate machinery, rather than 15minute chiirp alarm

CH - if they pinch someone elses, that's fraud and we are protected

BC - So every time i want to turn the bandsaw on i have to ask tas to stop feeding bran and come and turn on the machine for me?

CH - I was suggesting both working in tandum

KR - how?

CH - go to machine, swipe, asks for second person, first person swipes again and it's in first person mode

TK - Why the hell would we lock down the whole space.

CH - or Tas throws you her fob @thinkl33t

TK - I'd just give you my keys thus invalidating the system.

This is only about the machines that can kill you.

BC - If you are alone in the space, you press the lone worker button. This allows you to turn on the

dangerous machines, with the corollary that you have to re-press a button every X minutes

CH - this is purely for:

- bandsaw
- Chop saw
- Table saw
- Lathe
- Grinder

KR - i'm in favour of that per machine, regardless of amount of people

BC - If you arent alone in the space, you get the other person to scan their card on the lone worker box, which turns everything on, accessbile from a single tag, for 30 minuites

CH - laser should be safe enough for no ID10T errors of this form

BC - The haccess nodes on the machines control the actual machine istelf

KR - I think we should forget about the 2nd person part

just make all dangerous machines (like @Badspyro's list for e.g.) to follow that

BC - so its just an interlock for the haccess system

CH - yep, as at the moment, we are potentially in deep problems, as I know a fair number of members do not follow that rule... including me up to this point we also need to think about the summoning of help bit, as it shouldn't put too much of an onus on us either

infact, technically, the only ones who are allowed to break that rule are Tas and Bob, as directors

BC - The problem with locking things out entirely is that people will use other tools to achieve the same effect, which will most likely be more dangerous

CH - yep

or just disconnect the interlock, which is also an ID10T error waiting to happen

KR - ok. let me calrify my points here.

1. Am not against lone worker protections
2. now understand per machine
3. am in favour of protecting people
4. would suggest that we don't need a "2 person in the space" override system

I am just making sure that we cover issues that are there, but in the end, @thinkl33t since you'll probably be implementing how it works am not going to argue against the end result

Discussion 28-08-2015

BC - I read the insurance documents, I think there are some bits of "our understanding of you" that are incorrect

lone worker policy is limited to certain tools for example

From:

<http://testwiki.hecatron.com/> - **Hacman DEMO ONLY**

Permanent link:

http://testwiki.hecatron.com/doku.php?id=operations:governance:board_minutes:2015-08-10

Last update: **2022/11/30 16:33**

