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# Introduction

This report is produced by the Office of the Federal Safety Commissioner (OFSC). The report provides an overview and analysis of data collected from companies accredited under the Australian Government Building and Construction OHS Accreditation Scheme (the Scheme) for the period July to December 2012. Comparisons are also made with data collected from previous biannual periods where appropriate.

Under their conditions of accreditation accredited companies are required to submit biannual reports twice a year, in addition to incident reports, Scheme project reports and end of project reports. The data used in this report has been collected from a combination of biannual, incident, and Scheme project reports.

# Overview

## Number of Accredited contractors

The number of accredited contractors continues to grow, with 246 contractors submitting biannual reports for the July to December 2012 reporting period. This is a 5.6 per cent increase on the previous period. Of the 246 accredited contractors, 129 did not undertake Scheme projects during the period, with 18 undertaking no projects during the period whatsoever.

## Applications

The OFSC received 64 applications for accreditation or reaccreditation during the July to December 2012 reporting period, which is consistent with the corresponding period in 2011. Of these 64 applications, 27 were first time applications, and 37 were applications for reaccreditation.

Twenty two contractors gained accreditation for the first time during the period, while 20 contractors achieved reaccreditation.

| Period | Applications for First Accreditation | Applications for Reaccreditation | Total Applications |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2006 | 24 | 0 | 24 |
| Jan to Jun 2007 | 61 | 0 | 61 |
| Jul to Dec 2007 | 50 | 0 | 50 |
| Jan to Jun 2008 | 35 | 0 | 35 |
| Jul to Dec 2008 | 41 | 0 | 41 |
| Jan to Jun 2009 | 58 | 0 | 58 |
| Jul to Dec 2009 | 48 | 17 | 65 |
| Jan to Jun 2010 | 29 | 34 | 63 |
| July to Dec 2010 | 39 | 30 | 69 |
| Jan to Jun 2011 | 34 | 19 | 53 |
| Jul to Dec 2011 | 38 | 26 | 64 |
| Jan to Jun 2012 | 33 | 19 | 52 |
| Jul to Dec 2012 | 27 | 37 | 64 |
| Total | 517 | 182 | 699 |

## Number of Projects

The OFSC has been notified of a total of 886 directly and indirectly funded contracts for building work with a combined value of $48.45 billion that had been covered by the Scheme.

Of the 886 notified contracts, 368 were active and 518 were completed as at 31 December 2012.

The data gathered for this current reporting period includes non-Scheme projects valued at less than $3 million. The data prior to the July 2010 reporting period only includes projects with a value in excess of $3 million.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Period | Number of Accredited contractors reporting active Scheme projects | Number of active Scheme projects | Number of Accredited contractorsReporting non-Scheme projects | Number of non-scheme projects |
| Jul to Dec 2007 | 25 | 42 | 58 | 1,019 |
| Jan to Jun 2008 | 32 | 71 | 85 | 1,212 |
| Jul to Dec 2008 | 44 | 103 | 107 | 1,416 |
| Jan to Jun 2009 | 61 | 128 | 124 | 1,730 |
| Jul to Dec 2009 | 75 | 183 | 145 | 2,170 |
| Jan to Jun 2010 | 94 | 249 | 153 | 2,255 |
| July to Dec 2010 | 102 | 293 | 177 | 6,943 |
| Jan to Jun 2011 | 108 | 329 | 185 | 7,861 |
| Jul to Dec 2011 | 113 | 343 | 197 | 11,081 |
| Jan to Jun 2012 | 110 | 357 | 218 | 8,824 |
| Jul to Dec 2012 | 117 | 347 | 228 | 7,235 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Period  | Scheme projects(million hours) | Non-Scheme projectsany value(million hours) | All projects(million hours) |
| Jul to Dec 2010  | 41.97 | 147.44 | 189.40 |
| Jan to Jun 2011 | 26.29  | 135.95 | 162.24 |
| Jul to Dec 2011 | 31.92 | 135.29 | 167.20 |
| Jan to Jun 2012 | 29.94 | 139.57 | 169.51 |
| Jul to Dec 2012 | 43.80 | 131.05 | 174.85 |

# Analysis/Findings

## Fatalities

There were three fatalities on Scheme projects in the July to December 2012 period. Despite recording the same number of Scheme fatalities as the corresponding period in 2011, the Scheme project fatality rate (6.85) is down 27 per cent on the 2011 figure (9.40). This is due to 37 per cent more hours being worked on Scheme projects in the July to December 2012 period. Three fatalities were also reported by accredited contractors on non-Scheme projects during the period, which is consistent with the corresponding period in 2011. The non-Scheme project fatalities frequency rate (2.29) also remains consistent with the July to December 2011 period (2.22).

These figures do not include deaths from heart attacks or other natural causes. The fatality frequency rate for non-Scheme projects includes hours worked on projects valued at less than $3 million, while the Scheme fatality frequency rate does not (there are no Scheme projects valued under $3 million). The result is a relative inflation of the fatality frequency rate on Scheme projects when compared to the rate on non-Scheme projects.

| Period | Number of Fatalities on Scheme projects | Scheme project Fatalitiesfrequencyrate | Number of Fatalities on non-Scheme projects | Non-Scheme projects Fatalitiesfrequencyrate | Number of Fatalitiesall projects | All projects Fatalitiesfrequencyrate |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Jul to Dec 2007 | 1 | NA | 0 | NA | 1 | NA |
| Jan to Jun 2008 | 0 | NA | 6 | NA | 6 | NA |
| Jul to Dec 2008 | 0 | NA | 4 | NA | 4 | NA |
| Jan to Jun 2009 | 1 | NA | 4 | NA | 5 | NA |
| Jul to Dec 2009 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 1.07 | 1 | 0.92 |
| Jan to Jun 2010 | 1 | 4.36 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.66 |
| Jul to Dec 2010 | 2 | 4.77 | 2 | 1.35 | 4 | 2.39 |
| Jan to Jun 2011 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.70 | 1 | 0.60 |
| Jul to Dec 2011 | 3 | 9.40 | 3 | 2.22 | 6 | 3.59 |
| Jan to Jun2012 | 0 | 0.00 | 6 | 4.85 | 6 | 3.90 |
| Jul to Dec 2012 | 3 | 6.85 | 3 | 2.29 | 6 | 3.43 |

## Lost Time Injury Frequency Rate (LTIFR)

Both the Scheme and non-Scheme mean LTIFR for the July to December 2012 period decreased from the corresponding period in 2011. The non-Scheme project mean was the lowest in the History of the Scheme, while the winsorised Scheme and non-Scheme mean decreased from the corresponding period in 2011.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Period | Scheme project Median | Scheme project Arithmeticmean | Scheme project Winsorisedmean | Non-Scheme project Median | Non-Scheme project Arithmeticmean | Non-Scheme project Winsorisedmean |
| Jul to Dec 2007 | 0.00 | 6.94 | 4.04 | 4.65 | 10.06 | 7.52 |
| Jan to Jun 2008 | 0.00 | 9.24 | 8.72 | 4.95 | 10.41 | 9.05 |
| Jul to Dec 2008 | 0.00 | 7.44 | 6.21 | 4.65 | 12.22 | 7.36 |
| Jan to Jun 2009 | 0.00 | 12.86 | 10.35 | 3.50 | 11.54 | 6.10 |
| Jul to Dec 2009 | 0.00 | 9.36 | 7.68 | 3.00 | 11.61 | 8.28 |
| Jan to Jun 2010 | 0.00 | 21.99 | 3.21 | 3.73 | 11.34 | 8.61 |
| Jul to Dec 2010 | 0.00 | 5.54 | 3.43 | 0.00 | 13.83 | 4.76 |
| Jan to Jun 2011 | 0.00 | 10.17 | 3.98 | 0.00 | 8.97 | 3.97 |
| Jul to Dec 2011 | 0.00 | 20.60 | 6.82 | 0.60 | 8.01 | 5.45 |
| Jan to Jun 2012 | 0.00 | 4.14 | 2.04 | 0.00 | 7.38 | 4.30 |
| Jul to Dec 2012 | 0.00 | 13.54 | 2.81 | 0.00 | 6.15 | 4.23 |

### Scheme LTIFR by construction type

When separated by industry sector, Scheme work carried out by accredited contractors on Commercial projects recorded the highest mean LTIFR (19.91), followed by Residential projects (2.95) and Civil projects (2.38). The winsorised mean for commercial Scheme projects was significantly lower (5.22 compared to 19.91) than the arithmetic mean; the result of a number of high outliers.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Residential | Civil | Commercial | All |
| Mean | 2.95 | 2.38 | 19.91 | 13.54 |
| Median | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Winsorised Mean | 0.00 | 1.36 | 5.22 | 2.81 |

### Non-Scheme LTIFR by construction type

Non-Scheme work carried out by accredited contractors on Residential projects recorded the highest mean LTIFR (8.01), followed by Commercial projects (6.01) and Civil projects (5.80).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Residential | Civil | Commercial | All |
| Mean | 8.01 | 5.80 | 6.01 | 6.15 |
| Median | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Winsorised Mean | 1.71 | 2.80 | 4.13 | 4.23 |

## Medically Treated Injury Frequency Rate (MTIFR)

The mean MTIFR for Scheme projects decreased from the previous corresponding period in 2011, while increasing for non-Scheme projects. The Scheme project winsorised mean decreased from the corresponding period in 2011, while the non-Scheme project equivalent rose from 18.10 to 21.57.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Period | Scheme project Median | Scheme project Arithmeticmean | Scheme project Winsorisedmean | Non-Scheme project Median | Non-Scheme project Arithmeticmean | Non-Scheme project Winsorisedmean |
| Jul to Dec 2007 | 0.00 | 12.06 | 9.53 | 19.90 | 26.23 | 23.32 |
| Jan to Jun 2008 | 0.00 | 18.06 | 16.29 | 19.00 | 29.39 | 24.36 |
| Jul to Dec 2008 | 2.78 | 21.79 | 14.50 | 13.18 | 21.10 | 16.67 |
| Jan to Jun 2009 | 8.58 | 33.93 | 22.78 | 14.32 | 26.82 | 17.21 |
| Jul to Dec 2009 | 13.04 | 21.84 | 16.62 | 18.17 | 38.51 | 28.73 |
| Jan to Jun 2010 | 0.00 | 34.67 | 16.95 | 21.03 | 40.15 | 28.45 |
| Jul to Dec 2010 | 0.00 | 11.30 | 6.44 | 12.71 | 63.91 | 21.07 |
| Jan to Jun 2011 | 0.00 | 19.93 | 8.12 | 11.02 | 36.31 | 20.00 |
| Jul to Dec 2011 | 0.00 | 16.30 | 7.23 | 10.83 | 34.12 | 18.10 |
| Jan to Jun 2012 | 0.00 | 13.13 | 9.65 | 10.24 | 32.21 | 18.69 |
| Jul to Dec 2012 | 0.00 | 14.77 | 6.96 | 9.08 | 40.91 | 21.57 |

### Scheme MTIFR by construction type

Scheme Residential construction projects recorded the highest mean MTIFR (56.02), followed by Commercial projects (10.51) and Civil projects (10.48).

The winsorised mean MTIFR for Residential Scheme projects was, however, lower than the Commercial Scheme project winsorised mean MTIFR, demonstrating a number of high outliers for the Residential Scheme project MTIFR figures.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Residential | Civil | Commercial | All |
| Mean | 56.02 | 10.48 | 10.51 | 14.77 |
| Median | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Winsorised Mean | 5.02 | 4.74 | 7.96 | 6.96 |

### Non-Scheme MTIFR by construction type

The mean MTIFR recorded by contractors working on non-Scheme Commercial projects (47.83) was slightly higher than the MTIFR recorded by accredited contractors working on Residential projects (45.00), with non-Scheme Civil projects recording the lowest mean MTIFR (33.42).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Residential | Civil | Commercial | All |
| Mean | 45.00 | 33.42 | 47.83 | 40.91 |
| Median | 0.41 | 4.10 | 11.54 | 9.08 |
| Winsorised Mean | 20.44 | 16.03 | 21.85 | 21.57 |

## LTIFR/MTIFR Summary

The graph below summarises the LTIFR figures across construction types and Scheme and non-Scheme projects. The non-Scheme LTIFR exceeds the Scheme LTIFR for both Residential and Civil construction types, however the Scheme LTIFR exceeds the non-Scheme LTIFR on Commercial construction and all construction projects.

The following graph summarises the MTIFR figures across construction types and Scheme and non-Scheme projects, with the Scheme MTIFR exceeding the non-Scheme MTIFR only on Residential projects.

## Number of Notices Issued

There has been a significant increase in the number of notices issued to accredited contractors when compared to the corresponding period in 2011, with a substantial increase to the number of Infringement Notices issued in particular, pushing the notices total up to 240.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Period | Infringement Notices | Prohibition Notices | Improvement Notices | Other Notices (eg enforceable undertakings) |
| Jan–Jun 2011 | 10 | 63 | 140 | 7 |
| Jul–Dec 2011 | 2 | 51 | 137 | 1 |
| Jan–Jun 2012 | 4 | 52 | 136 | 5 |
| Jul–Dec 2012 | 46 | 46 | 143 | 5 |

# Incidents

Accredited contractors are required to provide incident reports for lost time injuries, medically treated injuries and notifiable dangerous occurrences that occur on Scheme projects, as well as lost time injuries that occur on non-Scheme projects valued at greater than $3 million. Incident reports for all fatalities—regardless of project value—must also be submitted.

## Nature of injury

Consistent with the previous reporting period, over two thirds of injuries reported to the OFSC relate to wounds, lacerations, amputations and internal organ damage (37.06 per cent) and traumatic joint/ligament and muscle/tendons (26.95 per cent).

### Nature of Injury

| Period | Injury A | Injury B | Injury C | Injury D | Injury E | Injury F | Injury G | Injury H |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Jul to Dec 2011 | 0.76 | 10.51 | 32.57 | 1.43 | 1.24 | 33.81 | 19.20 | 0.48 |
| Jan to Jun 2012 | 0.87 | 9.89 | 38.57 | 1.24 | 1.11 | 31.77 | 15.70 | 0.87 |
| Jul to Dec 2012 | 0.81 | 12.53 | 37.06 | 2.02 | 1.62 | 26.95 | 17.65 | 1.35 |

## Mechanism of Injury

Consistent with the previous corresponding reporting period, the top four mechanisms of injury reported to the OFSC; Being hit by moving objects (28.57 per cent), Falls trips and slips of a person (21.83 per cent), Hitting objects with part of the body (20.89 per cent), and Body Stressing (19.54 per cent), account for over 90 per cent of all injuries reported during the period.

### Mechanism of Injury

| Period | Mech. 0 | Mech. 1 | Mech. 2 | Mech. 3 | Mech. 4 | Mech. 5 | Mech. 6 | Mech. 7 | Mech. 8 | Mech. 9 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Jul to Dec 2011 | 20.92 | 21.78 | 23.78 | 0.29 | 24.74 | 2.10 | 1.91 | 0.67 | 0.00 | 3.82 |
| Jan to Jun 2012 | 21.26 | 23.49 | 25.34 | 0.00 | 20.64 | 2.84 | 2.10 | 1.73 | 0.25 | 2.35 |
| Jul to Dec 2012 | 21.83 | 20.89 | 28.57 | 0.13 | 19.54 | 3.91 | 1.62 | 0.94 | 0.27 | 2.29 |

## Location of Injury

Over 60 per cent of injuries reported were sustained to upper limbs (34.91 per cent) and lower limbs (27.49 per cent). Both of these locations of injury are consistent with the corresponding period in 2011.

### Location of Injury

| Period | Loc. 1 | Loc. 2 | Loc. 3 | Loc. 4 | Loc. 5 | Loc. 6 | Loc. 7 | Loc. 8 | Loc. 9 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Jul to Dec 2011 | 10.51 | 1.81 | 20.92 | 34.48 | 27.22 | 2.29 | 0.29 | 0.19 | 2.29 |
| Jan to Jun 2012 | 9.52 | 2.10 | 16.81 | 37.33 | 28.55 | 2.10 | 0.25 | 0.62 | 2.72 |
| Jul to Dec 2012 | 11.19 | 1.21 | 17.12 | 34.91 | 27.49 | 3.50 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 4.04 |

## High Risk Construction Work

When submitting incident reports, accredited contractors are required to disclose – where applicable – if any high risk construction work was taking place at the time of the incident. Of the incident reports submitted, 29.60 per cent nominated high risk construction work as having been undertaken at the time of the incident. This represents a 64 per cent increase on the previous period. The three most common categories of high risk work taking place at the time of an incident were:

* construction work on construction sites where there is any movement of powered mobile plant (32.92 per cent)
* construction work on or adjacent to roadways or railways used by road or rail traffic (20.58 per cent)
* construction work with risk of a person falling two metres or more (16.46 per cent).

\*See glossary for high risk construction work details

### High Risk Construction Work

| Period | Jul to Dec 2011 | Jan to Jun 2012 | Jul to Dec 2012 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Risk 1 | 20.81% | 16.73% | 16.46% |
| Risk 2 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.41% |
| Risk 3 | 2.54% | 4.67% | 1.65% |
| Risk 4 | 0.00% | 1.56% | 0.82% |
| Risk 5 | 2.03% | 1.95% | 2.06% |
| Risk 6 | 0.00% | 1.17% | 0.82% |
| Risk 7 | 2.54% | 1.95% | 2.47% |
| Risk 8 | 0.51% | 1.95% | 7.00% |
| Risk 9 | 0.00% | 0.39% | 0.41% |
| Risk 10 | 0.00% | 1.56% | 0.00% |
| Risk 11 | 0.51% | 1.56% | 0.00% |
| Risk 12 | 2.54% | 8.56% | 8.23% |
| Risk 13 | 0.00% | 1.17% | 1.23% |
| Risk 14 | 7.11% | 8.17% | 4.12% |
| Risk 15 | 30.46% | 19.46% | 20.58% |
| Risk 16 | 27.92% | 26.46% | 32.92% |
| Risk 17 | 1.02% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Risk 18 | 2.03% | 2.33% | 0.82% |
| Risk 19 | 0.00% | 0.39% | 0.00% |

## Working Time Lost

The most common length of time an injured worker was absent from work was between one and three days (34.79 per cent), which was a significant decrease when compared to the previous corresponding reporting period. There was a considerable increase to the number of injuries resulting in Three days to less than a week of working time lost (25 per cent of injuries during the period). Over 70 per cent of workers who suffered a lost time injury returned to work in less than two weeks.

### Working Time Lost

| Period | A | B | C | D | E | F |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Jul to Dec 2011 | 45.26 | 22.40 | 13.98 | 9.47 | 7.22 | 1.65 |
| Jan to Jun 2012 | 46.41 | 17.66 | 13.55 | 12.53 | 8.21 | 1.64 |
| Jul to Dec 2012 | 34.79 | 25.00 | 13.75 | 13.33 | 9.58 | 3.54 |

## Age Breakdown

Over 75 per cent of injured workers were below the age of 45. The 25-34 age bracket accounted for the highest number of reported incidents (33.24 per cent), an increase over the previous corresponding reporting period.

### Incident Age Breakdown

| Period | 15-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65 & Over |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Jul to Dec 2011 | 19.77% | 28.65% | 21.97% | 19.96% | 8.69% | 0.96% |
| Jan to Jun 2012 | 20.77% | 28.18% | 22.13% | 20.02% | 7.66% | 1.24% |
| Jul to Dec 2012 | 17.84% | 33.24% | 25.00% | 15.14% | 7.43% | 1.35% |

## Injured Person’s Occupation

Over 90 per cent of people injured in reports submitted to the OFSC were Labourers (41.37 per cent) or Tradesmen (48.92 per cent).

### Workers Occupation

| Period | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Jul to Dec 2011 | 42.22 | 47.47 | 1.15 | 1.43 | 1.72 | 0.19 | 5.83 |
| Jan to Jun 2012 | 45.49 | 44.99 | 2.10 | 1.11 | 1.48 | 0.37 | 4.45 |
| Jul to Dec 2012 | 41.37 | 48.92 | 2.02 | 0.54 | 2.16 | 0.13 | 4.85 |

## Dangerous Occurrences

The OFSC encourages companies to accurately report Dangerous Occurrences both internally and to external bodies such as the OFSC. A Dangerous Occurrence (or ‘near miss’) can be as revealing of WHS system inadequacies as an incident that *does* result in an injury or fatality.

Eighty-three Scheme Dangerous Occurrences were reported to the OFSC in the July to December 2012 reporting period; a slight decrease on the previous period (79).

There was again some correlation between the circumstances of the Dangerous Occurrences reported to the OFSC and those of the incidents resulting in injury. For example the most common high risk work nominated in Dangerous Occurrence incident reports was also the most common nominated in LTI/MTI/Fatality reports (work on construction sites where there is any movement of powered mobile plant).

### Dangerous Occurrences

| Period | Dangerous Occurrences |
| --- | --- |
| Jul to Dec 2011 | 79 |
| Jan to Jun 2012 | 89 |
| Jul to Dec 2012 | 83 |

## Workers’ Compensation

### Accredited Companies

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Period | Mean premium rate ACT % | Mean premium rate NSW % | Mean premium rate NT % | Mean premium rate QLD % | Mean premium rate SA % | Mean premium rate TAS % | Mean premium rate VIC % | Mean premium rate WA % |
| Jul to Dec 2007 | 5.589 | 3.069 | 2.675 | 1.346 | 2.940 | . | 3.098 | 2.496 |
| Jan to Jun 2008 | 4.962 | 3.508 | 2.355 | 1.438 | 3.037 | . | 2.054 | 3.348 |
| Jul to Dec 2008 | 4.274 | 3.106 | 2.261 | 1.568 | 3.750 | 1.087 | 2.297 | 2.066 |
| Jan to Jun 2009 | 3.742 | 2.811 | 1.973 | 1.117 | 3.832 | 1.155 | 2.289 | 2.342 |
| Jul to Dec 2009 | 3.849 | 3.351 | 2.376 | 1.424 | 3.695 | 1.302 | 2.202 | 1.948 |
| Jan to Jun 2010 | 3.521 | 2.975 | 2.372 | 1.316 | 3.560 | 1.475 | 2.270 | 1.731 |
| Jul to Dec 2010 | 3.025 | 3.051 | 2.389 | 1.548 | 3.845 | 1.015 | 1.980 | 1.896 |
| Jan to Jun 2011 | 3.699 | 3.014 | 2.310 | 1.449 | 3.668 | 1.701 | 1.905 | 1.767 |
| Jul to Dec 2011 | 3.534 | 3.019 | 2.028 | 1.735 | 2.913 | 2.277 | 1.746 | 1.518 |
| Jan to Jun 2012 | 3.712 | 3.102 | 3.508 | 1.717 | 3.204 | 2.014 | 1.680 | 3.048 |
| Jul to Dec 2012 | 3.488 | 3.177 | 2.303 | 1.702 | 2.981 | 1.858 | 1.773 | 1.568 |

### Industry

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Period | Mean premium rate ACT % | Mean premium rate NSW % | Mean premium rate NT % | Mean premium rate QLD % | Mean premium rate SA % | Mean premium rate TAS % | Mean premium rate VIC % | Mean premium rate WA % |
| House construction September 2012[[1]](#footnote-1) | NA | 5.040 | NA | 2.849 | 2.90 | 3.97 | 1.683 | 1.20 |
| Non-residential construction September 20121 | NA | 3.928 | NA | 2.963 | 2.90 | 3.55 | 2.038 | 2.15 |

# Awards and Recognition

During this reporting period accredited contractors have been the recipients of many prestigious safety awards, including—but not limited to—the following:

* Arenco (NSW) Pty Ltd – Master Builders Association of NSW, Excellence in Construction Awards 2012 – Winner, Innovative Safety Systems-Sydenham Station – Winner, Site Safety Commercial Projects-$10 million to $50 million-Sydenham Station – Merit, Refurbishment/Renovation/Extension-$10 million to $20 million-Central Station
* Blackett Homes (Aust) Pty Ltd – ACT – 2012 Master Builders & Boral Excellence in Building Awards Winner Excellence in Work Health & Safety – Residential
* Brookfield Multiplex Constructions Pty Ltd, Brookfield Multiplex Constructions Qld Pty Ltd, Brookfield Multiplex Engineering and Infrastructure Pty Ltd – 2012 National Safety Council of Australia member of the year
* Buildcorp Contracting NSW Pty Ltd – Master Builders Association of NSW, Excellence in Construction Awards 2012 – Winner, Site Safety Commercial Projects-$50 million and over.
* Fairbrother Pty Ltd – 2012 Master Builders Tasmania Excellence Award for Workplace Health and Safety
* Leighton Contractors Pty Ltd – Worksafe WA Platinum Safety Award
* Ri-Con Contractors Pty Ltd – 2012 HIA-CSR Queensland Work Health & Safety Award
* Shaw Contracting (Aust) Pty Ltd – National Earth Award for the Winnaleah Irrigation Scheme project

# Initiatives

Accredited contractors submit details of interesting safety initiatives developed by their company during the reporting period. Many of these initiatives will form the basis of case studies and fact sheets to be published on fsc.gov.au over the coming months.

# Glossary

Arithmetic mean (average) - The mean is the sum of all the scores divided by the number of scores.

Dangerous occurrence - An incident where no person is injured, but could have been injured, resulting in Serious Personal Injury, Incapacity or Death. Also commonly called a “near miss”.

Fatality Frequency Rate – Fatality Frequency rates are calculated as follows:

****

Frequency rate - Frequency rates are calculated as follows:



High risk construction work hazards

1. Construction work where there is a risk of a person falling two metres or more
2. Construction work on telecommunications towers
3. Construction work involving demolition
4. Construction work involving the disturbance or removal of asbestos
5. Construction work involving structural alterations that require temporary support to prevent collapse
6. Construction work involving a confined space
7. Construction work involving excavation to a depth greater than 1.5 metres
8. The construction of tunnels
9. Construction work involving the use of explosives
10. Construction work on or near pressurised gas distribution mains and consumer piping
11. Construction work on or near chemical, fuel or refrigerant lines
12. Construction work on or near energised electrical installations and services
13. Construction work in an area that may have a contaminated or flammable atmosphere
14. Tilt-up and precast concrete construction work
15. Construction work on or adjacent to roadways or railways used by road or rail traffic
16. Work on construction sites where there is any movement of powered mobile plant
17. Construction work in an area where there are artificial extremes of temperature
18. Construction work in, over or adjacent to water or other liquids where there is a risk of drowning
19. Construction work involving diving

Incident - An incident resulting in an injury that is required to be notified by the OHS legislative requirement for notifiable incidents in the jurisdiction in which the project is being undertaken.

**LTIFR (Lost Time Injury Frequency Rate)** - The number of occurrences of lost time injury that result in a fatality, a permanent disability or time lost from work of one day shift or more in the period. The number of hours worked refers to the total number of hours worked by all workers in the period, including overtime and extra shifts.

Mechanism of incident classification –

Major Groups

0. Falls, trips and slips of a person

1. Hitting objects with a part of the body

2. Being hit by moving objects

3. Sound and pressure

4. Body stressing

5. Heat, electricity and other environmental factors

6. Chemicals and other substances

7. Biological factors

8. Mental stress

9. Vehicle incidents and other

Median - The median is the middle of a distribution; half the scores are above the median and half are below the median. If the number of values in the data set is even, then the median is the average of the two middle values. The median is less sensitive to extreme scores than the average.

MTIFR (Medically Treated Injury Frequency Rate) - The number of occurrences of treatment by, or under the order of, a qualified medical practitioner, or any injury that could be considered as being one that would normally be treated by a medical practitioner. The number of hours worked refers to the total number of hours worked by all workers in the period, including overtime and extra shifts.

### Nature of injury classification

1. Intracranial injuries
2. Fractures
3. Wounds, lacerations, amputations and internal organ damage
4. Burns
5. Injury to nerves and spinal cord
6. Traumatic joint/ligament and muscle/tendon injury
7. Other injuries
8. Diseases and conditions

Non-Scheme projects – Projects where the accredited contractor is the head contractor, the value of building work is $3 million or more, and the project is not a Scheme project.

Scheme projects - Projects that are directly funded by the Australian Government with a value of $3 million or more, plus, projects that are indirectly funded by the Australian Government where:

* the value of the Australian Government contribution to the project is at least $5 million and represents at least 50 per cent of the total construction project value; or
* the Australian Government contribution to a project is $10 million or more, irrespective of the proportion of Australian Government funding.

Winsorised mean - involves the calculation of the mean after replacing given parts of a distribution at the high and low end with the most extreme remaining values, typically replacing an equal amount of both ends. Often 10 per cent of the ends are replaced. The winsorised mean is a useful estimator because it is less sensitive to outliers than the mean but will still give a reasonable estimate of central tendency.

1. *Source:* Safe Work Australia publication Comparison of Workers’ Compensation Arrangements in Australia and New Zealand July 2013, Table 7.6 Selected Industry Premium Rates as at 30 September 2012, page 211. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)