



INSTITUT INTERNATIONAL DU FROID
INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF REFRIGERATION

177, boulevard Maiesherbes
75017 Paris - France
Tel. +33 (0)1 42 27 32 35
Fax +33 (0)1 47 63 17 98

IIFIR.ORG
in |  |  | 
iif-ir@iifir.org

IIR WORKING GROUP “REFRIGERATION SAFETY”

MEETING MINUTES ADVISORY BOARD MEETING, 12 April 2021, 13:00-14:00 CET

Present: Hilde Dhont, Stefan Jensen, Tomaz, Cleto, Lambert Kuijpers, Alex Pachai, and Jean-Luc Dupont (IIR)

Regrets from: Radim Cermak, Tingxun Li, Andy Pearson (regrets received after the meeting)

The agenda for the meeting that was circulated:

- *Opening*
- *Competition rules*
- *Meeting report 8 March Advisory Board meeting*
- *Proceedings 15 March Safety WG meeting; observations, comments*
- *Which output of the 15 March meeting is useful?*
- *Membership; application procedures, others*
- *Subcommittees*
- *Other matters*

Lambert Kuijpers opened the meeting by reminding all about the competition rules. He asked whether the agenda could be agreed to and asked whether there were other matters to be brought in. Nobody had anything to add at that stage.

1. On the Advisory Board meeting report, 8 March 2021: it was accepted by all participants.
2. When asking for comments on the “informal Safety WG” meeting procedure on 15 March 2021, the conclusion from the AB members present was that “not much” had come out of that meeting. The impression was that several participants took part to learn more about the project, to actually seek information – there no further comments could be given. On the question, whether the 15 March group give some useful suggestions or comments – the ARB members had nothing to add, so, the conclusion is that the meeting had not really contributed to further work of the Advisory Board.

A number of comments (item 3-7 below) apply to the slides shown during the meeting.

3. **Goals of the work.** Suggestions were made for a number of modifications to the slide. The comment about raising awareness ... – needs reformulation to make it more action-oriented, using “stronger” wording. Raise the reputation ... - also needs reformulation so the possible future stakeholders will get more involved. Alex Pachai will improve and for that, will ask for possible support from one or two ARB members.
4. **Boundaries.** The part on “Transport and lessons learned” needs some more elaborate wording, some possible changes. This part also needs to be (more) clear on (1) what falls within the scope of the Safety WG and (2) what falls definitely outside.
5. **Terminology.** The way it is built up (including the text) needs to be strengthened. This in order to clarify it in a better way.
6. **Type of organisation.** The difficulty of handling the “near-miss” was addressed, and how this should be an integral part of the work. There are incidents that cause no threat to or ill health of anybody (this could e.g., be a dripping

from a tray, question whether that is something to cover? No). More specific examples need to be given of what is covered and what not.

7. **Subcommittees.** The information should be changed to reflect that both Radim Čermák and Andy Pearson have accepted to take on the individual chairman tasks for the subcommittees at the 8 March Advisory Board and the 16 March Safety WG meeting.

8. Substantial discussion took place on the safety WG membership. It was related to (1) specific persons that should be on board, as well as to (2) how to get IIR members and non-IIR members to participate in the work. This issue was not really resolved. Stefan Jensen commented that “fitters with many years of experience” have a lot of knowledge of where and how things related to that activity can go wrong. These people are no IIR members and could be afraid to participate because they would feel inferior to the more educated group. However, the meeting then agreed that it would be essential to have people participate that are one or two levels higher that can bring the relevant experience to the Safety WG. This is covered above by “specific persons etc.” Hilde Dhont prepared a first draft of an Excel sheet to be worked on by everybody on a common Teams site (to be set up by Jean Luc Dupont, expected to be ready by 23 April).

9. By the way. Each of the board members has the “duty” to think of relevant and experienced participants for the working groups – or a way to find them!!, with skills that bring appropriate knowledge to the committees. These people should not just be observers.

10. Vice-chair Lambert Kuijpers emphasised several times that a document needs to be developed that describes what the purpose of the work is, which deliverables are expected from a potential applicant and what the applicant should consider as useful and rewarding. In the development of such a document the chairs of the subcommittees need to be involved. Alex Pachai offered to give the drafting of this document a start together with the Subcommittee chairs (Lambert Kuijpers asked whether he could also be involved). This document needs to be ready in time for the next Advisory Board meeting where it has to be discussed.

11. If the Advisory Board keeps the deadline of 15-30 July 2021 to have everybody (needed) on board, the process will be tight. It is important that participation is open to both members and non-members of the IIR. Most important is that future members will really participate and have something to contribute, the second issue that one should strive to get the best “global participation” possible.

With no further issues to be discussed, the meeting was closed around 14:10 hrs. CET.

The next meeting of the Advisory Board is planned for 17 May 2021, 13:00 hrs. CET