International ergonomics standards (ISO & CEN) and relevant methods for risk assessment and management in WMSDs area

by Karlheinz Schaub

Institute of Ergonomics; Darmstadt University of Technology with input from

Enrico Occhipinti & Daniela Colombini (IRCCS)

Istituto di Ricovero e Cura a Carattere Scientifico di Natura Pubblica; Milano

UWMSDs in Europe

- □ Background information on relevant CEN and ISO standards
- □ Applying standards at shopfloor level
- Emulating CEN & ISO standards by means of new methods (e.g. EAWS)
- □ Features & limitations of these new methods
- conclusions





provided by Enrico Occhipinti

Fourth European Working Conditions Survey - 2

4° SURVEY- 2005.	PRELIMINARY RESULTS								
PREVALENCE OF WORK RELATED HEALTH PROBLEMS									
27 EU COUNTRIES									
Table 7.1: Percentage of workers reporting each Individual symptom, EU27 (%)									
Symptom									
Backache	24.7								
Muscular pain	22.8								
Fatigue	22.6								
Stress	22.3								
Headaches	15.5								
Irritability	10.5								
Injuries	9.7								
Sleeping problems	8.7								
Anxiety	7.8								
Eyesight problems	7.8								
Hearing problems	7.2								
Skin problems	6.6								
Stomach ache	5.8								
Breathing difficulties	4.8								
Allergies	4.0								
Heart disease	2.4								
Other	1.6								

provided by Enrico Occhipinti



orovided by Enrico Occhipinti

4° EUROPEAN SURVEY- 2005.

PRELIMINARY RESULTS

PHYSICAL RISKS

THE SURVEY REVEALS THAT CERTAIN PHYSICAL RISKS STILL PERSIST.

THE PROPORTION OF WORKERS REPORTING REPETITIVE HAND OR ARM MOVEMENTS HAS INCREASED (BY 4%), WITH 62% OF THE WORKING POPULATION REPORTING EXPOSURE FOR 25% OR MORE OF THE TIME;

37 % OF WORKERS HANDLES HEAVY LOADS FOR ALMOST 25% OF WORKING TIME

50% OF WORKERS REPORT WORKING IN PAINFUL OR TIRING POSITIONS AT LEAST 25% OF THE TIME.





The most common musculoskeletal occupational diseases are:

tenosynovitis of the hand or wrist

epicondylitis of the elbow

and carpal tunnel syndrome.

Darmstadt University of Technology Institute of Ergonomics

EUROPEAN STANDARD NORME EUROPÉENNE EUROPÄISCHE NORM

EN 1005-2

April 2003

ICS 13.110; 13.180

English version

Safety of machinery - Human physical performance - Part 2: Manual handling of machinery and component parts of machinery

Sécurité des machines - Performance physique humaine -Partie 2: Manutention manuelle de machines et d'éléments de machines Sicherheit von Maschinen - Menschliche körperliche Leistung - Teil 2: Manuelle Handhabung von Gegenständen in Verbindung mit Maschinen und Maschinenteilen

This European Standard was approved by CEN on 13 February 2003.

CEN members are bound to comply with the CEN/CENELEC Internal Regulations which stipulate the conditions for giving this European Standard the status of a national standard without any alteration. Up-to-date lists and bibliographical references concerning such national standards may be obtained on application to the Management Centre or to any CEN member.

This European Standard exists in three official versions (English, French, German). A version in any other language made by translation under the responsibility of a CEN member into its own language and notified to the Management Centre has the same status as the official versions.

CEN members are the national standards bodies of Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom.

1 Scope

This European Standard specifies **ergonomic recommendations for the design of machinery** involving manual handling of machinery and component parts of machinery, including tools linked to the machine, in professional and domestic applications.

This European Standard applies to the manual handling of machinery, component parts of machinery and objects processed by the machine (input/output) of 3 kg or more, for carrying less than 2 m. Objects of less than 3 kg are dealt with in prEN 1005-51). The standard provides data for ergonomic design and risk assessment concerning lifting, lowering and carrying in relation to the assembly/erection, transport and commissioning (assembly, installation, adjustment), operation, fault finding, maintenance, setting, teaching or process changeover and decommissioning, disposal and dismantling of machinery.

This standard provides current data on the general population and certain subpopulations (clarified in annex A).

This part of the standard does not cover the holding of objects (without walking), pushing or pulling of objects, hand-held machines, or handling while seated. This document is not applicable to specify the machinery which are manufactured before the date of publication of this document by CEN.



NOTE It is recommended to consider further steps to reduce risk factors to their lowest possible level.

Figure 1 — Flowchart identifying the step-wise approach to assessment

The first method is a quick screening method. Method 2, an easy to handle method, shall be applied if the screening method indicates risks. Some additional risk factors can be taken into account in method 2. Method 3 is an extended assessment method, which assesses risks in a more thorough way and is supplemented by additional risk factors not presented in methods 1 and 2. All three methods have different levels of complexity. The most efficient approach is to begin the risk assessment by applying method 1 (the most simple one) and use methods 2 and/or 3 only if the assumptions and/or operational situations identified in method 1 are not met.

Table 1 — Reference mass (M_{ref}) taking into consideration the intended user population

Field of	M _{ref} [kg]	Percentage of			Population group			
application		F and M	Females	Males				
Domestic use ^a	5	Data not a	Data not available		Children and the elderly	Total population		
	10	99	99	99	General domestic population			
Professional use (general) ^b	15	95	90	99	General working population, including the young and old	General working population		
	25	85	70	90	Adult working population			
Professional use	30	Data not available			Special working population	Special working		
(exceptional)	35					population		
	40							

^a When designing a machine for domestic use, 10 kg should be used as a general reference mass in the risk assessment. If children and elderly are included in the intended user population, the reference mass should be lowered to 5 kg.

^bWhen designing a machine for professional use, a reference mass of 25 kg should not be exceeded in general.

^oWhile every effort should be made to avoid manual handling activities or reduce the risks to the lowest possible level, there may be exceptional circumstances where the reference mass might exceed 25 kg (e.g. where technological developments or interventions are not sufficiently advanced). Under these special conditions other measures have to be taken to control the risk according to EN 614-1 (e.g. technical aids, instructions and / or special training for the intended operator group).



Figure B.3 — Example of force distribution functions of male and female subgroups Figure B.4 — Example of weighting and combining of all subgroup distributions

Figure B.5 — Example of calculation of percentiles

- EN 1005-1:2001+A1:2008 CEN Safety of machinery - Human physical performance – Part 1: Terms and definitions 08.09.2009 CEN EN 1005-2:2003+A1:2008 Safety of machinery - Human physical performance -Part 2: Manual handling of machinery and component parts of machinery 08.09.2009 CEN EN 1005-3:2002+A1:2008 Safety of machinery - Human physical performance – Part 3: Recommended force limits for machinery operation 08.09.2009 CEN EN 1005-4:2005+A1:2008 Safety of machinery - Human physical performance -Part 4: Evaluation of working postures and movements in relation to machinery 08.09.2009 CEN EN 1005-5 Safety of machinery - Human physical performance –
 - Part 5: Risk assessment for repetitive handling at high frequency

4.3.2.2.5 Manual carrying of loads

In general, machines should be designed so that manual carrying is avoided. Where this is not possible, the maximum manual carrying distance should be as low as possible (less than 2 m).



The Dual European System of Health & Safety at Work

Machinery-Directive 89/392/EEC

Annex I: Essential health and safety requirements relating to the design and construction of machinery

"Under the intended conditions of use, the discomfort, fatigue and psychological stress faced by the operator must be reduced to the minimum possible taking ergonomic principles into account." Framework-Directive 89/391/EEC

Preamble:

Whereas Article 118a of the Treaty provides that the Council shall adopt, by means of Directives, minimum réquirements for encouraging improvements, especially in the working environment, to guarantee a better level of protection of the safety and health of workers; Whereas this Directive does not justify any reduction in levels of protection already achieved in individual Member States, the Member State being committed, under the Treaty, to encouraging improvements in conditions in this area and to harmonizing conditions while maintaining the improvements made

Karlheinz Schaub

17 | 30

Relations between CEN and ISO

CEN (draft) standards ISO (draft) standards EN 1005 - 5 Safety of Machinery -ISO 11228 - 3 Ergonomics - Manual Manual handling of low loads handling - low loads at high frequencies at high frequencies EN 1005 - 4 Safety of Machinery -ISO 11226 Ergonomics -Evaluation of working postures Evaluation of working postures in relation to machinery EN 1005 - ? Safety of Machinery -ISO 11228 - 2 Ergonomics - Manual Pushing & pulling in relation handling - Pushing and pulling to machinery Safety of Machinery -EN 1005 - 3 ISO 11228 - ? Ergonomics -**Recommended force limits Recommended force limits** for machinery operation ISO 11228 - 1 Ergonomics - Manual Safety of Machinery -EN 1005 - 2 handling - Lifting and Carrying Manual handling of machinery and component parts of machinery

C ------

ASSESSMENT OF MANUAL HANDLING TASKS BASED ON KEY INDICATORS Version 2001 Where there are a number of individual activities with considerable physical strains, they must be estimated seperatly.

Workplace/Activity:

1st step: Determination of time rating points (Select only one column !) ifting on diamlasses Li e leline e

operations (< 5 s)		(> 5 s)	(> 5 m)			
Number at working day Time rating points		Total duration at working day	Overall lenthg at working day	Time rating points		
< 10	1	< 5 min	1	< 300 m 1		
10 bis < 40	2	5 bis 15 min	2	300 m to < 1km	2	
40 bis < 200	4	15 min to < 1 hr	4	1 km to < 4 km	4	
200 bis < 500	6	1 hrs to < 2 hrs	6	4 to < 8 km	6	
500 bis < 1000	8	2 hrs to < 4 hrs	8	8 to < 16 km	8	
≥ 1000	10	≥4 hrs	10	≥ 16 km	10	
Examples: • laying bricks, • placing workpleces into a machine • taking boxes out of a container and puttung them onto a converver belt		Examples: holding and guiding a cast iron stug while working on a wheel stand, • operation a hand grinding machine, , • operating a weed- building site			movalt, • arts to a	

2nd step: Determination of rating points of load, posture and working conditions

Effective load ¹⁾ for men	Load rating point	Effective load ¹⁾ for women	Load rating point
< 10 kg	1	< 5 kg	1
10 bis < 20 kg	2	5 bis <10 kg	2
20 bis < 30 kg	4	10 bis ≺15 kg	4
30 bis < 40 kg	7	15 bis < 25 kg	7
≥ 40 kg	25	≥25 kg	25

1) "Effective load" means in this context the real action force, which are necessary for moving load. This action force does not correspond to the load mass in each case. When tilting a carton, only 50 % of the load mass will have an effect on worker and when using a cart only 10 %.

Typical posture, position of load ²⁾	Posture, position of load	Posture rating point
XIX	 Upper body upright, not twisted When lifting, holding, carrying und lowering the load is close to body 	1
xt-	 Slightly bending forward or twisting the trunk When lifting, holding, carrying und lowering load is near to medium to body 	2
πĬ(=>	 I ow bending or far bending forward Slightly bending forward with simultaneous twisting of trunk Load far from the body or above shoulder height 	4
-1-L	Bending far forward with simultaneous twisting of trunk Load far from body Hestricted stability of posture when standing Crouching or kneeling	8

2) For determination of posture weightening the typical body posture when manual handling must be use. E.g. when there are different postures whith load a mean values must be used - not occasionally extreme values.

Ed. by •Federal Institution of Occupational Safety and Health and •Regional Committee of Occupational Safety and Safety Techniques (•Bundesanstalt für Arbeitschutz und Arbeitsmedizin - BAuA und •Länderausschuss für Arbeitsschutz und Sicherheitstechnik - LASI) 2001

Darmstadt University of Technology Institute of Ergonomics

Working conditions	Working conditions rating point
Good ergonomic conditions, e.g. sufficient space, no phsical obstacles within the workspace, even level and solid flooring, sufficient lighting, good gripping conditions	0
Space for movement restricted and unfavourable ergonomic conditions	1
(e.g. 1: space for movement restricted by too low high or working area less than 1,5 $\rm m^2$ or 2: posture stabilyty impaired by uneven floor or soft ground)	
Strongly restricted space of movement and/or instability of centre of gravity of load (e.g. transfer of patients)	2

3rd step: Evaluation

The rating points relevant to this activity are to be entered and calculated in the diagram.



On the basis of the rating calculated and the table below it is possible to make a rough evaluation. ³⁾ Regardless of this provisions of the Maternity Leave Act apply.

Risk range	Risk score	Description
1	< 10	Low load situation, physical overload unlikely to appear.
2	10 bis < 25	Increased load situation, physical overload is possible for less resilent persons ⁴⁾ . For that group redesign of workplace is helpful.
3	25 bis < 50	Highly increased load situation, physical overload also possible for normal persons. Redesign of the workplace is recommended.
4	≥ 50	High load situation, physical overload is likely to appear. Workplace redesign is necessary ⁵⁾ .

Basically it must be assumed that as the number of point rating rises, so the risk of overloading the muscluar-skeletal system increases. The boundaries between the risk ranges are fluid because of the individual working techniques and performance conditions. The classification may therefore only be regarded as an orientation aid. More exact analyses require specialist ergonomic knowledge

Less resilent persons in this context are persons older than 40 or younger than 21 years, newcomers in the job or people suffering from illness.

Design requirements can be determinated with reference to the number of point in the table. By reducing the weight improving the execution conditions or shortening the strain time, elevated stress can be advoided

Check the workplace necessary for other reasons:

Reasons

Date of assessment:

Ed. by •Federal Institution of Occupational Safety and Health and •Regional Committee of Occupational Safety and Safety Techniques (•Bundesanstalt für Arbeitschutz und Arbeitsmedizin - BAuA und •Länderausschuss für Arbeitsschutz und Sicherheitstechnik - LASI) 2001

Assessed by:

Karlheinz Schaub



© IAD Darmstadt, 2009

Risk evaluation / basic philosophy







EAWS_V1.2.2_eng.doc © IAD 2006 page 1 of 4 EAWS_V1.2.2_eng.doc © IAD 2006 page 2 of 4





Result of overall evaluation:

□ gre □vell	en low		E	=	Postures	+	Forces	+	Manual handling	+	Extra	UPPER LIMBS
D r	red			=		+		+		+		
AWS aluation	O-25 Points green Low risk: - recommended; no action is needed 26-50 Points yellow Possible risk: - not recommended; redesign if possible, otherwise take other measures to control the risk											
ev:	>5	0 Points	rec	d	High risk:-	to	be avoided;	acti	on to lower the risk is	s ne	ecessary	

By total score from:



- □ Screening methods (with a holistic concept) work proper in the field of short cycled work (0,5 – 5 min.)
- They are not properly applicable for longer cycle times (i.e. >10 min.)
- or non-cyclic work
- For longer cycles or non-cyclic work, holistic methods are not available (do green postures, forces and materials handlings last into overall green situations?)

- **□** Efforts are needed to complete the system of standards
- Efforts are needed to transform standards into easy applicable methods
- Efforts are needed to develop risk assessment tools for longer cycle times or non-cyclic work (simultaneous & successive superposition of physical workload)
- □ Efforts are needed to create awareness for poor ergonomics and WMSDs as a possible consequence (especially SMEs)
- Efforts are needed to show that good ergonomics & high productivity are linked to each other (and not contradictory)

Darmstadt University of Technology Institute of Ergonomics

Thank you for your attention!



Darmstadt University of Technology Institute of Ergonomics