

Certification Requirements Committee
Certification Requirements Ballot 1801 (Ballot 1) – Negative Vote Findings
Internal Committee Ballot - 090518

1. Although I support most of these changes I'll be voting negative due to the level one rescue. I feel it's contrived and would rather see it changed to "pickoff from descent" and "pickoff from ascent" as separate rescues without a specified method.

Committee Finding - Non-persuasive. The Committee believes the rationale given in section 4.9.3 of the ballot provides the value and reason for the new skill requirement. In addition, the Committee feels it's important to understand this is intended to be a test instrument for the candidate to demonstrate a minimum level of foundational skillset. The intent of the Level 1 Rescue is to show competency in a sequential series of skills and number of skills within one evaluation requirement.

2. Climbing with Y Lanyards should remain a skill that is taught and evaluated.

Committee Finding - Non-persuasive. As stated in the rationale in section 4.7.3 of the ballot, the Committee believes in the importance of a proper background for technicians in the use of standard fall protection, including the use of shock absorbing lanyards. At the same time, the committee has realized regional variations in fall protection can create issues and limited relevance of a rope access certification that includes the evaluation of shock absorbing lanyards.

Committee side note: (Previous response) The Committee believes the rationale given in section 4.7.3 of the ballot provides the reasoning for removing this skill requirement.

3. Generally disagree with adding complexity to level 1 certification requirements. Specifically, Sub-ballots 4.8, 4.9, and 4.10 should be rejected. Furthermore sub-ballot 4.14 should be rejected. The rescue from aid traverse should remain a level 3 skill and supervision should be moved from level III to level II to match the duties and responsibilities of Level II Technicians outlined in SPRAT Safe Practices. Given the fact that level II technicians may be delegated limited supervision over Rope Access Workers, the certification subcommittee should propose a ballot that moves evaluation of Team Leadership and Supervision into the level II certification requirements.

Committee Finding - Non-persuasive. The comment does not include persuasive statements or arguments to support a rejection. The Committee believes the rationales given for each section within the ballot provide the reasoning for the new skill requirements.

Regarding the request to include the evaluation of supervisor skills at Level II, this item is technically outside of the Certification Requirements scope. The Certification Requirements outlines a skills-based certification scheme and criteria for the evaluation of rope access technicians. It does not determine what Level of certification is required to be a rope access site supervisor.

4. I agree that aid climbing and rescue from ascent should be evaluated for level one certification, however the proposed method seems a little over complicated I think. They should definitely learn/ be assessed to know when circumstances need another 2 rope system, but doing a change-over on the casualty seems like it would waste time in an emergency situation.

Committee Finding - Non-persuasive. The committee feels it's important to understand we are not prescribing how an actual rescue is performed, this is intended to be a test instrument for the candidate to demonstrate a minimum level of foundational skillset. The rationale given within the ballot provides the reasoning for the new Level I Rescue Scenario.

5. I do not understand logic of removing the First Aid requirement. (3.1.3.3. SPRAT does not and cannot verify that technicians maintain those certifications throughout their certification period.) This is true but SPRAT also can not and does not verify that a technician can tie a figure of 8 knot after the certification session yet it is still a required competency. First Aid training is an entry requirement and staple of many industry certifications and licenses. An EMT has to have a CPR card to get EMT certified. A tower climber has to have first aid card to get tower certified. JMHO

Committee Finding – Non-persuasive. The Committee feels it's important to acknowledge the various industries utilizing rope access often have different FA/CPR requirements. There is no one size fits all. The rationale given in section 3.1.3 of the ballot provides additional reasoning for removing this requirement.

6. Most of the changes look great! I think there is still some work to be done on the document however, before I can vote Affirmative. I wish there was the option to vote on each proposed change individually, as the majority looks good.

The main concern I have is with the verbiage for the hauling exercises at all three levels as well as the L1 rescue. In my opinion the verbiage of the hauling exercises do not explain the scenarios and parameters clearly enough. The L1 rescue sounds contrived and not conducive for L1 training.

L1 hauling- is this intended as a solo skill? Can the belay line be operated by a second technician? In other words can you have a team of two operate a ground based rig-to-lower system with two IDs?

Committee Response: It is intended as a solo skill. The Candidate needs to operate both lines.

Committee Finding – Persuasive: Minor Editorial change. Add “lone” to 8.18.1. for additional clarification.

New language: 8.18.1 While working from a platform or ground level, a lone candidate shall demonstrate lowering and raising a load while using an appropriate descent control device attached to an anchorage system.

Certification Requirements Committee
Certification Requirements Ballot 1801 (Ballot 1) – Negative Vote Findings
Internal Committee Ballot - 090518

L2 hauling- are rescue ropes allowed? It appears so since the load is to be lowered back to the grade. Is there anything preventing the rescuer from fixing the rescue ropes and descending to the load in order to connect the hauling system?

Committee Response: Yes, rescue ropes are allowed. It is not prescribed to have, or not have rescue ropes.

The candidate is not allowed to fix ropes and descend to the load to establish connections. Section 9.14.5 states “Connections shall not be made to the load or the **two-rope system** suspending the load until the candidate is suspended from the **anchorage systems.**”

L3 hauling past knots- are rescue ropes allowed? The verbiage is very similar to the L2 hauling exercise which would lead me to believe rescue ropes are allowed. Is there anything preventing the rescuer from fixing the rescue ropes and descending to the load in order to make connections? In this case they would be bypassing the knots on the ropes the load is suspended on and defeating the purpose of the exercise. There is also something funky in the verbiage for the rationale (cut and paste?).

Committee Response: No, rescue ropes are not allowed.

The candidate is not allowed to fix ropes and descend to the load to establish connections. Section 10.10.5 states “Connections shall not be made to the load or the **two-rope system** supporting the load until the candidate is located at the **anchorage systems.**”

The rationale in the Ballot was incorrectly copied over from the Level II Hauling Scenario. The rationale for hauling past knots was intended to be:

1. This skill builds on Level II hauling requirements but adds hauling and lowering a load past a knot.
2. While unlikely to be encountered in normal work circumstances, the requirement shows a proof of a candidate’s understanding of rigging concepts and transferring a load.

L1 rescue- this scenario is contrived and confusing. Why would we have a L1 technician pick a casualty out of a chest ascender and place them on an ID if they didn't need to? I recommend making a separate requirement for a pick-off from descent and one from ascent; both required at L1. I don't approve of a contrived scenario especially for L1 training.

Committee Finding – Non-persuasive. The committee feels it’s important to understand we are not prescribing how an actual rescue is performed, this is intended to be a test instrument for the candidate to demonstrate a minimum level of foundational skillset.

Committee Side note: After seeing the demonstration at the Annual conference, the respondent noted they were okay with the Level 1 rescue scenario and would be willing to retract this comment.

7. This update is not based in the real world and does zero to address the issues causing the injuries and deaths in our industry.

Committee Finding – Non-persuasive. The voting member has provided no actionable input, suggestions or reasoning for not accepting the proposed changes and improvements.

8. This update is not based in the real world and does zero to address the issues causing the injuries and deaths in our industry.

Committee Finding – Non-persuasive. The voting member has provided no actionable input, suggestions or reasoning for not accepting the proposed changes and improvements.

9. This update is not based in the real world and does zero to address the issues causing the injuries and deaths in our industry.

Committee Finding - Non-persuasive. The voting member has provided no actionable input, suggestions or reasoning for not accepting the proposed changes and improvements.

10. Too many inconsistencies and too much emphasis on stupid and dangerous rope tricks. The focus should be on how to NOT have to do dangerous rope tricks with better planning and rigging.

8.16-Horizontal aid has no defined number of points or distance. Inconsistent with vertical aid which does have a defined distance

Committee Finding – Non-persuasive. The language proposed is very similar to the current language for this skill at Level II. The Committee will work with the Evaluations Committee to ensure additional guidance on the minimum number of points and spacing is provided in the Evaluation Guidelines. Similar to what currently exists for the skill at Level II.

8.17- 8.13.3 This is complicating and adding time into what should be an expedient process. Teaching candidates to add steps and time to a simple rescue encourages placing a casualty in danger. There should be NO reason to NOT pick a casualty off ascent then go to the ground as expediently as possible. Completely counter to training efficiency in rescue.

Committee Finding – Non-persuasive. The committee feels it's important to understand we are not prescribing how an actual rescue is performed, this is intended to be a test instrument for the candidate to demonstrate a minimum level of foundational skillset.

9.8.1 Suggest to not list just 2 examples as the munter hitch is arguably the most common friction hitch in the world

Committee Finding – Non-persuasive. The committee feels providing two common examples of a friction hitch is adequate. We received a second negative vote related to this section. The Committee will clean it up and re-ballot.

Committee side note: Once we got to the second negative comment on this section in # 11 below we decided it was best to clean this up and re-ballot. Proposed language is provided in the side note in # 11.

Certification Requirements Committee
Certification Requirements Ballot 1801 (Ballot 1) – Negative Vote Findings
Internal Committee Ballot - 090518

9.12.1 Aid rescue says rescue from 'horizontal aid climbing traverse" Directly related to 10.14.1 Teaches vertical aid but no vertical aid rescue. Thus it promotes placing a candidate/technician in position to need rescue but does NOT require rescue from that position.

Committee Finding – Non-persuasive. The committee feels the horizontal aid rescue requires the same foundational technique as a vertical situation.

9.13.1&2 Should emphasize 'another technician' NOT a bag. Virtually all training companies train raise-lower-belay with a bag even though the requirement clearly states 'another person'

Committee Finding – Non-persuasive. The committee recognizes the need to allow for live or simulated loads during training and evaluation. We will make a minor editorial adjustment to provide clarification.

Committee side note: Change “rope access technician” to “a person, live or simulated,” is on rope. Then “rope access technician” to “person” in the next sentence.

4.20.2 Needs to be REMOVED. It is completely unrealistic and promotes a dangerous and horrible rope trick. 4.20.3.1 Is NOT similar to a knot passing rescue AT ALL

Committee Finding – Non-persuasive. The skill is relevant at the level. No data has been provided into why it is being considered “horrible” or “dangerous”.

4.22.3.3 Says "Suffice 'is' to say....". This is completely assumption based and contrary to factual data

Committee Finding – Non-persuasive. The comment specific to rationale language and not a critique of the actual proposed standards language.

4.22.1 Word it either a Deviation or Redirect and stop waffling back and forth with parentheses-

Committee Finding – Non-persuasive. The comment appears to be referring to 4.24.1 instead of 4.22.1. This has been resolved as deviation. The term Redirect in parentheses is in the current language, not the proposed language.

1.2.1 8.5.2.1 Says to minimize free fall potential. Suggest "minimize FF potential as directed and limited by back up device manufacturer"

Committee Finding – Non-persuasive. The Committee feels the terminology properly identifies the goal.

11. While I support the majority of changes to the CR document, there are a few items I strongly disagree with. 4.9.2 As written, this type of process lends to a confusing set of steps for a level 1 candidate. The concern for long line rescues should be addressed at L2, allowing the L1 to focus on either a pick-off in decent or ascent, using the same rope or a separate set of ropes. You could make it a draw from the hat checkoff. (descent vs ascent - with or without adjacent ropes).

Committee Finding – Non-persuasive. The Committee believes the rationale given in section 4.9.3 of the ballot provides the value and reason for the new skill requirement. In addition, the Committee feels it’s important to understand this is intended to be a test instrument for the candidate to demonstrate a minimum level of foundational skillset. The intent of the Level 1 Rescue is to show competency in a sequential series of

skills within one evaluation requirement.

4.10.2 - sec 8.18.4 states a m/a system shall be used. Then in 4.10.3.2 it states a simple m/a system must be employed. Is it a simple system or any m/a system?

Committee Finding – Non-persuasive. The requirement states “mechanical advantage system”. The term “simple” was used only in the rationale and is not part of the proposed language.

4.11.2 sec 9.8 states the candidate MAY BE asked. Should be defined what will be asked. One of the two? or Both?

Committee Finding – Persuasive. Committee will clean up language and re-ballot.

*Committee side note: Re-ballot language – “Knots and Hitches: In addition to the knots required of a **Level I Technician**, the candidate shall demonstrate the proper tying and dressing of:*

9.8.1 Prusik

9.8.2 Munter hitch tied off

10/25/18 - Amended response after rebalot within the Committee: Persuasive. The Committee will address with a Major Editorial Change to better outline the expectation that both hitches will be required.

4.18.2 This is a hard line for me. SPRAT evaluators do not have the time, resources or expertise to properly evaluate a candidates ability to manage a jobsite, lead others or problem solve industry specific projects. Nor should SPRAT place the burden of liability on the shoulders of the trainer and evaluator to bless someone as a supervisor in the course of a weeks worth of training and an 8-hour evaluation. The rest of the professional world spend years evaluating their employees through peer and supervisor evaluations, often requiring candidates to participate in promotional exams, role plays and paperwork exercises (with no less than 3 people evaluating the candidate for each task. SPRAT should remove supervision altogether and stick to evaluating ones knowledge, skill and abilities to perform maneuvers, rig, evaluate hazards and mitigate them and perform tasks associated with their level of certification. The rationale stated in 4.23.3 further justifies the removal of supervision. If the candidate will not be made to write a JSA, how can their written communication skills be evaluated? Is written communication not a common, if not the MOST common, responsibility of a supervisor. And do companies not hold high value for ones ability to communicate effectively through written reports?

Committee Finding – Persuasive. The Committee will rework this requirement and establish a new proposal focused on the Team Leadership element and less on the “Supervision” component.

Committee side notes:

- Re-ballot as a team leadership skill – complete a safe work plan*
- Strike communicate and delegate and add responsible for the completion and delegation of team scenario.*
- Prior to re-ballot remove “supervision”*

10/25/18 - Amended response after rebalot within the Committee: Persuasive. The

Certification Requirements Committee
Certification Requirements Ballot 1801 (Ballot 1) – Negative Vote Findings
Internal Committee Ballot - 090518

Committee will address this initially with a Major Editorial Change that will replace the words "Team Leadership and Supervision" with "Team Scenario". This will allow the focus of the skill to be more on the team element and less on the "supervision" aspect. The Committee will also look to rework this requirement and ballot again in the future.