

# Letters

## LGI Examinations

I note with interest the points raised by the two letters in the spring 1999 issue of the magazine concerning the introduction of the LG1 test and examination procedure.

The letter from Mr Bryan, quite correctly says that the LEIA members should have had time to arrange their procedure for the introduction of these tests. Mr Bryan quotes from the publications of SAFed that work began in 1995 on these guidelines, that the consultation period started in 1998, and that in that time all LEIA members should have been ready for the tests when they were announced at the joint LEIA/SAFed seminar

If the above is the case, I was surprised to see how many people were shocked at the news that these new tests were to be introduced with immediate effect. I am not talking about one or two companies, but nearly everyone I spoke to had no idea that the introduction would be straight away. Therefore many of us independent companies did indeed need time to set up new systems for the processing and handling of the new tests on field and office staff.

The 'immediate effect' introduction of LG1 meant that our company had to halt all PM/7 tests, devise the new processes, advise customers of the change, and where applicable re-negotiate contracts. As I mentioned above, we were not the only ones. However we did stop carrying out PM/7 tests,

whereas other lift companies continued to undertake them - raising the questions - what is the validity of these tests, and what are the legal implications if there is an accident? Another interesting point is, what are the LEIA members doing who did not attend the seminar?

The part that really annoys me about the introduction of LG1 however is the lift insurance companies and SAFed. Here are the people who were dealt a major hand in devising these tests (when perhaps it should have been LEIA), here are the people who would have known about all the drafting and consultation, and yet I have on my desk an insurance report sent to me in March with the inspector recommending PM/7s1 I find this situation unbelievable as at the seminar it was an Insurance Company representative who announced to us that PM/7 was finished, yet inspectors from his company obviously still do not know that PM/7 is dead.

This is where the confusion begins with the lift companies trying to tell their customers that PM/7 is gone, trying to introduce to them LG1, whilst their insurance inspector recommends they have PM/7 tests carried out. I am not trying to defend the actions of lift companies in this letter, as indeed we should have been ready for the immediate effect application of the tests, so this would indicate a breakdown of communications somewhere between SAFed, LEIA, the HSE and the lift companies. The lift industry as a whole should have been kept more up to speed with developments, and we should have been informed by either SAFed, LEIA or the RSE that LG1 would be introduced and PM/7 withdrawn with immediate effect on the day of the seminar.

*Christopher Fleetwood*  
*Langham Lifts Ltd.*