



Climate Control Companies Association of New Zealand responding to,

MBIE DISCUSSION DOCUMENT: “Ensuring effective regulation of Health & Safety risks associated with toxic or flammable refrigerant gases”

dated 3 September – 14 December 2018.

MBIE seek feedback on the Health & Safety risks associated with the impending ratification of the Kigali amendment to the Montreal Protocol. The subsequent Phasedown of high GWP refrigerants will lead to a predominance of and, ultimately exclusive use of low GWP refrigerants, which are substantially more volatile, toxic and flammable, thus putting the technicians, companies and the public at risk.

Climate Control Companies of NZ wish to thank MBIE for the opportunity to consult and provide their submission on this substantial issue to our membership.

About the Climate Control Companies Association of New Zealand (CCCANZ)

Climate Control Companies Association of NZ is the industry association for the Heating, Ventilation, Air Conditioning and Refrigeration (HVAC&R) Companies in New Zealand. Our 110-strong group of membership companies represent some 2000 employees in this sector. They are committed to promoting high standards of business competence and industry conduct for companies engaged in climate-controlled environments, plus the advancement of education, practice and technology in HVAC&R and a standard of workmanship and design for members to adhere to.

Our strategic statements are:

- Ethics in business
- Education for improvement
- Voice of industry
- Safety in performance

www.cccanz.org.nz

Executive Summary

CCCANZ members are, in the main, employers in the HVAC&R Industry and as the PCBU in business, are well poised to take the lead as our industry initiates a mandatory Industry Credential and registration/licensing programme. The CCCANZ board have, in recent months, collaborated with membership and discussed at length the MBIE Discussion Document, along with our intentions for a



Credential. Whilst members, as business owners, may not all share our view for their own businesses, most appreciate and accept the stance CCCANZ/IRHACE/RLNZ have taken. Some CCCANZ members may make submissions, others in the templated short form submission we have provided them. Otherwise, we do speak for many of our membership in the below submission.

Our industry associates, IRHACE and RLNZ, have consulted with us on this matter and we confirm our acceptance of their proposals in regard to mitigation of said risks.

CCCANZ and its members believe there is a need to mitigate the increased risk associated with new refrigerants as high GWP refrigerants are phased out and replaced with said new low GWP refrigerants in a fragmented market.

To point out, there is currently significant fragmentation of compliance and training from sector to sector, such as heat pumps through to commercial refrigerant sites, ammonia cool stores, mechanical services fitouts or even an aircraft air conditioning system. This is one of the key reasons we see the need to address an industry Credential. All sectors, however, handle refrigerant and must, in future, for safety's sake, employ the same principles in installation or service, be it at differing levels of complexity.

The Kigali Amendment and resulting HFC Phasedown represents a significant change to the way in which our Technicians and Engineers have traditionally applied their skills – particularly in regard to Health & Safety. Upon our internal examination of the increasing risk associated with handling these refrigerants, coupled with the wide scope in applications using them (as above) – there is an obvious need to review and redevelop the existing training model. We are in no doubt that there is a need for a mandatory “Credential”, which will cover all refrigerants in all sectors.

As PCBU, our members feel they are well placed to state their view. They see it as important to support the wider HVAC&R industry as they endeavour to raise the standard of all Technicians and Engineers who install, maintain or service refrigerant systems. The fact that many Technicians work remotely on sites means the PCBU must have confidence that those technicians can work safely and compliantly and ‘sign the job off’ when completed. They do not have that confidence under the current regime.

As we have worked through our response to MBIE, one significant and related matter of concern in the safety aspects of handling refrigerants by our Technicians has arisen repeatedly. Whilst this particular concern falls outside the scope of this discussion paper, it is of significant enough relevance to the subject for us to make mention of it here and accordingly, we wish to draw MBIE’s attention to the matter. We refer here to the treatment of imported packaged equipment into New Zealand (e.g., water chillers, split system heat pumps and motor vehicles), many of which contain refrigerant and will require additional controls to be addressed by the Government through border control.

In the below submission, we provide evidence-based feedback to your questions. Should MBIE require further clarification or information, we would welcome your questions.

Our Responses to the MBIE Discussion Document

Technicians are not required to demonstrate their competency to install, repair and maintain systems that use flammable or toxic refrigerant gases

1. Have we accurately identified the issues associated with the competence of refrigeration technicians to install, repair and maintain systems that use flammable or toxic refrigerants? Are there other issues associated with this matter?

YES

We understand the problem and you have identified the issues.

The problem has been identified correctly, but accuracy as to the reasoning behind this fact is lacking, mainly due to the resultant fragmentation of our industry, in order to satisfy some growth sectors. In fact, the potentially least qualified industry sectors have a requirement to upgrade their basic refrigeration skills (along with an understanding of the characteristics of different refrigerants). Two examples are:

1. Split System Heat Pump Air Conditioning less than 18Kw
2. Automotive Air Conditioning

The Kigali Amendment deems such sectors will need to upskill to the same standard as all other sectors simply because they will be handling the same risks, in terms of the use of available refrigerants.

In 2018, in conjunction with BRANZ, CCCANZ developed a set of Flammable Fact Sheets. These were developed to inform construction professionals, owners and operators in the NZ built environment of the issues, roles and responsibilities of those encountering the use and application of refrigerants. They provide a stark reminder that our industry requires a higher level of qualification than that currently available.

The basic skill required to safely handle refrigerants in both sectors is still “Refrigeration”. The current level of skills required is insufficient for the above and many other sectors that handle refrigerant. We believe that the basic skills required in an environment covering all refrigerants, including low GWP refrigerants, need to be consistent and standardised.

To do this, they need to align with the current qualification framework, namely, Trade Certificate and the Approved Filler course. Other relevant topics, such as an understanding of Hazardous Substances (HASNO) and how to handle spills of Hazardous Substances (HAZCHEM), also need to be introduced as part of a standardised curriculum for all Technicians who handle refrigerant. HASNO and HAZCHEM are the two significant compliance areas where our companies that distribute refrigerants (i.e., Refrigeration Wholesalers) will need to verify our expertise – simply to enable us to communicate directly with our Technician/Engineer customers in a safe manner in our day-to-day business dealings.

Certain very high-pressure refrigerants, such as CO₂, are being considered for some of the sectors of our industry (e.g., automotive). CO₂ is covered by the Pressure Vessel Regulations; however, due to the unregulated nature of our industry, the regulations are not enforced and therefore not policed. We therefore strongly recommend that any Technician who may install, repair and maintain refrigeration, heat pump or air-conditioning systems using high pressure refrigerants that might be

considered, have a mandatory requirement to hold a current License/Certification, as part of the Credential being proposed. The level of skill attainment must align with a higher level of understanding than is currently the case.

2. Do you agree with these objectives? Would you suggest any others?

YES

Our members agree with the objectives as stated.

And in addition, the industry would be better served by including:

1. The alignment of the qualification standards for any technician handling any refrigerants.
2. Revising and increasing the existing qualification standards, such as Refrigeration Trade Certificate and Approved Filler courses, establishing these as the basic standard.
3. Specifying that only competent persons who install, repair or maintain refrigeration, heat pump or air conditioning systems that use high pressure refrigerants be added to any occupational regulation considered.

Option 1: Introduce an authorisation requirement for individual refrigeration service technicians in regulations under the HSW Act

3. Do you support the introduction of an authorisation requirement for individual refrigeration technicians in regulations under the HS&W Act?

YES

We support an authorisation for individual refrigeration Technicians, being persons who install, repair or maintain refrigeration, heat pump, or air conditioning systems that use all refrigerants, be they high pressure or otherwise, through regulation under the HS&W Act.

We support IRHACE's proposal to revise and upgrade the qualification framework as part of a new industry 'Credential' for their Technicians/Engineers. Our understanding is that the Credential will incorporate the following key elements;

1. An upgraded and consistently revised training regime with Trade Certificate in Refrigeration and Air conditioning (Level 4) being the initial qualification under NZQA followed by increasingly proportionate advanced steps up the NZQA ladder, plus
2. A renewable "License to Operate":
 - a. Licenses will be issued following the passing of both a practical and theoretical examination, as verified by an Approved Industry Assessor (a newly created function for a person possessing sufficient qualifications and industry experience and who maintains a current understanding of the latest curriculum, as updated by the Industry Provider, such as Competenz),
 - b. Licenses will become expire every 2 years and will require reassessment,
 - c. Our associate entity, RLNZ, will be the issuer of Licenses/Certifications and will maintain a register of Licensees/Certifications,

- d. Provision will be made for holders of current Trade Certificates to partially upskill to the new qualification standard at a local training provider (e.g., MIT) and then sit the two License examinations mentioned under item 2a above,
- e. A Technician, having passed the above qualification (item 1) AND possessing a current License (item 2a), is eligible to purchase and use any refrigerant approved under current NZ Government mandate.

The HS&W Act is the appropriate legislation to put such a License under.

4. What do you think are the main benefits and costs of this proposal? (Please quantify any impacts identified and express in dollar terms to the extent practical)

The main benefit to this proposal would be to maximise risk mitigation of not only the Technicians, but also their customers and the general public.

CCCANZ are very clear that the word 'authorisation' in this context equates to Technicians holding a mandatory industry Credential (including a License/Certification, as defined above) and this will only be achieved through a form of regulation, such as the HS&W Act, to give it credibility.

Clearly, there will be added costs. For many, this will be viewed as a cost of doing business and improving the quality of safe delivery for our industry. Others may not share that view. Regardless, a mandatory Credential will raise the *quality* and *professionalism* in the industry, both being necessary prerequisites for improving accountability in terms of safety in the use of refrigerants both for the Technicians and the public in general.

Whilst we have a view as to cost implications, we see that the final cost of a Credential is best determined following finalisation of the government's direction. A rule of thumb would be between \$500 and \$2,000 depending over a 2-year period and would vary based on whether the courses were face to face or online, practical or theory and what training is required

In order to provide guidance in response to MBIE's question regarding costs, we make the following points:

- The goal is to upgrade the existing level 3 Trade Certificate to include required training around low-GWP refrigerants. It is paramount to ensure that we do not devalue the Trade Certificate and what apprentices have achieved. The content, however, must be revised to reflect the changing refrigerants and to ensure Health & Safety implications are understood for all refrigerants.
- We point out there is already a cost to qualify to Trade Certificate (currently borne as part of the Apprenticeship scheme) and this is unlikely to change substantially.
- We envisage that meeting this revised criterion will require a small amount of additional training for all who have already graduated with Trade Cert; however,
- There are some current Technicians and Engineers who currently hold many of the additional qualifications required, others potentially none (or few), therefore some will be able to comply faster than others and therefore at less cost.

- You will note that in the RLNZ submission (Appendix A) we also make distinction between the qualification required to comply as solely a Heat Pump or Automotive Air Conditioning Technician, in comparison to the qualification required to meet the standard as a Refrigeration Technician working on equipment over 18kg, or an Ammonia Plant Operator.
- Making this distinction between these qualifications ensures that Technicians cannot seamlessly transfer between levels and would understand that to do so would require additional training (this is currently not the case).

The RLNZ submission provides more detail on how the HVAC&R industry wish to implement a training framework and compliance regime.

RLNZ discuss the recommended qualification framework and relevant governance and compliance register in detail in their submission. The general points are outlined below. These include, but are not limited to:

- Enhancement of existing Trade Certificate qualifications
- Additional training for existing Technicians
- A form of grandfathering of all existing Technicians at the outset
- A method of Capstone and/or Prior Recognition of Learning for some in the industry, be they older Technicians, or those looking to immigrate
- Use of Continuous Professional Development (CPD) to incentivise upskilling on an ongoing basis
- As refrigerants are likely to change markedly in future years, there is a need to regularly revisit the Technician knowledge and training
- Any changes to the regulatory framework introduced now must be suitably robust enough to accommodate a world where increased pressure, flammability, or toxicity of refrigerants becomes more prevalent, the norm even
- Requiring the individual to demonstrate competency when installing, repairing, or maintaining these systems will provide a much higher level of certainty than other options available
- An industry licensing or registration model is also being proposed to further reinforce that process and assessment procedure. It is envisaged that, for practicality's sake, a managed register would align to other similar registers within the construction industry and wider built environment, however, would be managed jointly by a body common to our industry associations, such as RLNZ.

There will also be a cost to compliance, and we have investigated costs and assumptions regarding an industry managed Registration body, which is further explained in the RLNZ submission.

5. Do you agree that technicians who only work on automotive air conditioning systems should be excluded from the proposed requirement to hold an authorisation? If no, why?

Definitely **NO**.

This answer is **no** because of the magnitude of risk to life (their life and others). Whilst we don't have day to day contact with the practices and procedures currently employed in the automotive industry, the risks are similar.

We point out, given that parts of the automotive manufacturing industry have opted for the widespread use of high-pressure refrigerant CO₂, we believe those Technicians who service or maintain such equipment must be required to hold this industry Credential if the risks to consumers or third parties are to be mitigated.

Our industry does and can work in a mix of disciplines and must be trained for the optimum outcome and safety for all.

IMPORTANT ADDITIONAL NOTES (Regarding Question 5)!

1. The argument about volume of refrigerant contained in each system (or vehicle) should not apply because refrigerant (to service these vehicles) can be supplied in bulk – the Technician can be dealing with larger volumes during service procedures.
2. The question of how NZ is going to handle imported vehicles (both new and used) in this regard is very important.
3. Notes 1) & 2) above apply equally to imported packaged equipment (e.g., heat pumps).
4. The NZ government must look at existing border controls of all sources of refrigerant entering (& leaving) NZ.

Example

The Tamahere Coolstore fire in 2008 rocked the country and certainly our industry in its severity. Our industry has learned much from this disaster but the risk of another catastrophic event occurring in NZ is possible without adequate mandatory training

https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10509214

<http://www.stuff.co.nz/waikato-times/news/513662/Volatile-gas-fired-Icepak-disaster>

6. Do you agree that Technicians should not be required to hold an authorisation for any work on a refrigeration system, heat pump or air conditioning system that uses non-toxic or non-inflammable refrigerants? If no, why?

CCCANZ **DO NOT** agree with your statement.

Every Technician should be required to hold an authorisation (Credential) independently. No-one should be exempt. Otherwise, there is a risk of loopholes being found.

One reason CCCANZ propose this is that Kigali approves CO₂ (as a non-toxic and non-inflammable refrigerant); however, this is a very high-pressure refrigerant and CCCANZ are concerned that currently there are no controls on the design and service of systems employing this refrigerant. The use of CO₂ is currently increasing markedly, particularly in sub or trans-critical supermarket applications.

Currently, we have no way of telling if any single refrigerant is going to become the ‘refrigerant of choice’ for refrigeration, heat pump or automobiles, but one can safely say that CO₂ will be a consideration.

To introduce a Credential for Technicians, yet leave a ‘loop-hole’ to circumvent the safe use of any refrigerant, would be contrary to the HS&W Act in a regulated governance structure advocated in the HVAC&R’s Credential proposal.

The HVAC&R Credential includes a tiered Certificate of Competence structure with increasing grades of eligibility within, to cater for safe handling of all refrigerants. That is, all Technicians must sit a practical and theoretical examination and be graded according to competency level. This applies equally to every Technician wishing to handle or purchase any refrigerant.

7. Should the proposed authorisation requirement apply (or not apply) to technicians who work on refrigeration or air conditioning systems in aircraft, vessels, transportable containers and mobile (truck or van) refrigeration units? Why?

YES, it must apply.

The key is the *refrigerant* type – not the system type or size.

Accordingly, our opinion is that the proposed authorisation should indeed apply to all Technicians working with any refrigerant.

Regardless, this must apply to:

- all refrigerants,
- all categories
- all Technicians/Engineers

8. Do you agree with the proposed categories for the refrigeration Technician authorisation? If no, why?

NO, as explained in our answers to items 5 through to 7 above.

Regardless of the situation, this must apply to:

- all refrigerants
- all categories
- all Technicians/Engineers

9. Do you agree with the proposed high-level criteria to be met before a technician authorisation will be issued?

YES, we do agree.

There cannot be any exceptions. *Any* Technician working with *any* refrigerant should be trained and acknowledged via authorisation (i.e. Credential).

We are committed to the view that to not follow this methodology will result in the potential (and likelihood) for loopholes to be found and exploited. That's where accidents happen!

10. Are there any other high-level criteria that should be met before a refrigeration Technician authorisation will be issued?

YES

CCCANZ believe there are shortcomings and believe our industry can introduce a better training regime. The Credential will include training under Pressure Hazards, HASCHEM and HASNO, and in brief below:

1. A practical test to demonstrate understanding for the grade they wish to practice
2. A test to demonstrate knowledge of related legislation, such as HASNO & HAZCHEM signage and clean-up procedures
3. Training to understand refrigerant Safety Standard 5149
4. Along with training to ensure competency in differing levels and sectors of the industry who handle these refrigerants.

Option 2: Introduce an authorisation requirement for refrigeration service businesses in regulations under the HSW Act

<p>11. Do you support the introduction of an authorisation requirement for refrigeration service businesses in regulations under the HSW Act? If no, why?</p>
--

NO.

The CCCANZ preference remains for **Option 1**, as outlined above, because it is the closest control point for mitigating the risk. To further explain this:

- We have no confidence that an authorisation requirement such as IRHACE have proposed in their Credential (for a Technician) would guarantee that all employers (PCBU's) would invest in staff to ensure they are qualified and compliant.
- Currently, each PCBU is covered under the HS&W Act, under which there is sufficient compliance for their work scope.
- How can a PCBU have sufficient control over employees? (i.e., the man in a van who is working remotely, say 50km from base). How will his employer know the quality of the man in the vans' work and what is more sign off on it?
- There are potentially 2 PCBU involved on any given job, one being the building owner, the other the employer of the Technician who goes to the site. There is a strong likelihood that the building owner would take on the cheapest contractor and potentially not know to check on or understand his responsibilities over the Technician who comes to site. The site owner also is unlikely to have the knowledge or expertise to assess the standard of the job or whether Health & Safety obligations are being met by the Contractor or Technician.

We also point out that the PCBU will be a stronger business by having satisfactorily trained and qualified staff. In turn lifting the value of their business.

Example

The Electrical regulations require *individual Electricians* to hold the necessary qualification and License for similar reasons. The PCBU does not take the responsibility to sign off their work remotely. Similarly, each individual Electrician issues a “Certificate of Compliance” for their own particular work. We see a direct parallel with this and our proposed Credential.

<https://toolbox.ewrb.govt.nz/home/is-this-high-risk-work/>

Questions 12 thru 19

Not applicable

Option 3: Build on the current approach to industry self-regulation supported by WorkSafe effort to improve awareness, understanding, and compliance with current regulatory requirements

20. Do you support building on the current approach to industry self-regulation supported by WorkSafe improving awareness, understanding and compliance with current regulatory requirements? If no, why?

NO

Due to the Kigali Amendment and as an entity representing our Companies operating within our industry, CCCANZ no longer supports this particular approach. There needs to be a change.

We support a more direct approach for 2 reasons:

1. Option 1, as outlined above, is the closest control point for mitigating the risk.
2. Our industry has become fragmented in terms of skill levels. We either exclude some sectors from using Kigali gases altogether **OR** standardise on an upgraded level of competency and in this way, consolidate the industry to control the risk points (by certification/registration /licensing) more effectively. It is the latter direction that we prefer.

We also anticipate the Registration body mentioned in item 4 and further explained in the RLNZ submission will satisfactorily manage compliance for anhydrous ammonia.

21. What do you think are the main benefits and costs of this proposal? (Please quantify any impacts identified and express in dollar terms to the extent practical)

There are no benefits to this proposal. There is only the inherent risk of our industry standing still, which is the option offered here.

No large or small amount of money spent on training would have any value under this option. In fact, there is a likelihood of an escalation of issues with low GWP refrigerants, as consistently mentioned throughout our response.

Compliance with the joint Australian/New Zealand Standard for commercial refrigeration systems is not mandatory for systems using anhydrous ammonia

22. Have we accurately identified the gaps in the current regulatory requirements for ammonia refrigeration systems? Are there any other issues associated with this matter?

YES

The problem has been identified correctly. This subject is another example of an anomaly present in our standards of training and regulation for Refrigeration Technicians. The current discussion along with ratification of the Kigali Amendment, provides the motivation to correct this situation in the same way that we have described for other lower level attainment areas of our industry.

The basic skill required to safely handle all refrigerants (including anhydrous ammonia, which is being utilised more and more as A1 refrigerants become less available) is still “Refrigeration”. The safe handling of anhydrous ammonia needs to align with the current qualification framework. Anhydrous Ammonia is simply another refrigerant and has its own particular dangerous characteristics in relation to safe handling.

23. Do you agree that there is a case for requiring operators of ammonia systems to comply with the joint Australian/New Zealand Standard for commercial refrigeration systems?

YES

However, this answer is reserved for anyone operating Plants employing ammonia refrigerant; it does not change the CCCANZ belief regarding Technicians and their qualifications, which need to have a wider focus encompassing all Kigali refrigerants.

Specialised training to handle ammonia has only developed in a declining market due to insufficient numbers of qualified Technicians. This market is reversing now and the need for more trained Technicians will increase as high GWP refrigerants become more costly and scarce.

CCCANZ believe that anyone handling anhydrous ammonia should have a similar level of standardised training and regulation as anyone handling any refrigerants. As mentioned in our answer to question 1 above, as the level of use of ammonia increases, additional trained Technicians will be required, even if they eventually operate a single plant (i.e., become a plant operator).

Example

Fine Settlement from a death caused by an ammonia leak in 2012. Whilst a US case, this accident highlights the need for all practitioners to be fully trained in all aspects of their role and to assess risks on all sites they work on.

<https://www.coolingpost.com/world-news/330k-fine-fatal-ammonia-release/>

To summarise, the reasons for the current “fragmentation” of operators possessing ammonia skills are twofold:

1. A historical declining need that is *now reversing*, and
2. A lack of qualified technician numbers (in Ammonia Refrigeration skills) as a trained source of Plant Engineers.

24. Do you agree with the proposed change to regulation 10.10 of the Hazardous Substance Regulations? If no, why?

YES

We agree noting that this is a standard applicable to each site using anhydrous ammonia. It should not be confused with our clear advice in this submission that the industry Credential should also include the necessary knowledge to handle ammonia, the HASNO (storage and handling regulations) and HAZCHEM (signage) that are fundamentally applicable to the associated level of risk.

25. Do you agree with the proposed transitional arrangements? If no, why?

YES

We believe this to be a practical step for existing ammonia plants and the Technicians.

26. What do you think are the main benefits and costs of this proposal? (Please quantify any impacts identified and express in dollar terms to the extent practical)

The main benefit of the proposal is to establish a common basis of understanding between Plant Owners, Plant Operators and external service providers (i.e., Technicians).

Costs will be similar to those proposed by IRHACE for the Credential; however, some specialised training would come at an additional cost. These are unlikely to be greater than the costs incurred for current additional plant operator training.

The Credential for all Technicians, including Plant Operators, will also assist to “defragment” training, providing additional career paths for Technicians towards becoming a Plant Operator.

In Conclusion

CCCANZ and the wider HVAC&R industry are committed to ensuring Health & Safety risks to any sectors of the industry are mitigated. Our member companies, as PCBU see the current regulatory framework to be deficient and are advocating for a new mandatory Credential for all Technicians/Engineers that are required to utilise refrigerants. They see that, whilst under the HSW Act the PCBU is unable to abrogate their responsibility, for safety’s sake, the individual must also hold a suitable qualification and be able to demonstrate the required knowledge in every instance.



To introduce a framework where all Technicians can demonstrate suitable qualifications in use of all refrigerants without exception will ensure the industry meets their Health & Safety obligations and reduce risk to workers and the public as the more flammable, higher pressure and toxic refrigerants become more prevalent. Ultimately, our industry sees that the Credential and regulation recommended in this submission could be worn as a 'badge of pride' and ensure high standards within a safe, competent, and progressive industry.

As mentioned previously, our industry has collaborated in depth with membership and beyond. As such we believe we can speak on behalf of our membership and would welcome any approaches by MBIE for clarification of the above responses or additional information.

Please therefore direct those queries to the undersigned.

In order to further clarify our concerns, we have assembled a list of referenced concerns and incidents that have occurred around the world within our industry as Addendum 1 to our proposal – we in NZ need to make changes to how we function as an industry in order to minimise such events.

Submission made on behalf of CCCANZ by;

Christine Johnston (General Manager)

IRHACE

PO Box 217184 Botany Junction

AUCKLAND 2164

Ph: (09) 273 0044

Mob: (021) 929729

E: christine@irhace.org.nz

14th December 2018

Addendum 1 (Links)

Worldwide Refrigerant Related Health & Safety Concerns/Incidents

If you have difficulty opening links below, please copy and paste link into your browser to access.

Australia, June 2018

Cold storage company fined for ammonia accident – H&S failure: workers were in vicinity of ammonia and not aware of risks

<https://www.coolingpost.com/world-news/ammonia-accident-leads-to-fine/>

Czech Republic, June 2018

Automotive company fined for recovery failure of R134a

<https://www.coolingpost.com/world-news/auto-firm-fined-e3500-for-f-gas-breach/>

Sweden, May 2018

Swedish EPA expect HVAC industry to tow the line regarding conversion to alternative low GWP refrigerants

<https://www.coolingpost.com/world-news/sweden-rejects-f-gas-exemption-request/>

Waikato-NZ, April 2018

Botched heat pump installation burns house to the ground.

https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=12031254

Germany, April 2018

Federal Motor Transport Authority violated European law by allowing Daimler to continue use of R134a in car air-con systems after a European MAC directive banned the use after 1 Jan 2011.

<https://www.coolingpost.com/world-news/germany-faces-fine-r134a-dispute/>

Auckland, March 2018

Worksafe, Enforceable Undertaking

<https://worksafe.govt.nz/laws-and-regulations/enforceable-undertakings/accepted-enforceable-undertakings/airtech-limited/>

USA, March 2018

Fine settlement from a death caused by ammonia leak in 2012.

<https://www.winesandvines.com/news/article/196998/Final-Settlement-on-Winery-Ammonia-Death>

<https://www.coolingpost.com/world-news/330k-fine-fatal-ammonia-release/>

USA, March 2018

Man with automotive business illegally brought in R22 from China.

<https://www.coolingpost.com/world-news/r22-importer-faces-10-years-jail/>

New Plymouth – NZ, February 2018

Near miss, ammonia leak.

<https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/100512872/workers-evacuated-after-ammonia-leak>

France, Feb 2018

IIR reviewing refrigeration safety due to new flammable refrigerants on the market.

<https://www.coolingpost.com/world-news/iir-group-look-refrigeration-safety/>

Australia, Feb 2018

Automotive business fined for imported vehicles charged with R134a.

<https://www.vasa.org.au/business-fined-for-unlicensed-import-of-vehicles-containing-refrigerant/>

Whanganui – NZ, January 2018

Three injured after ammonia leak.

<https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/100512872/workers-evacuated-after-ammonia-leak>

Australia, December 2017

Ammonia leak harms two, incurs fine.

<https://www.coolingpost.com/world-news/meat-processor-fined-ammonia-leak/>

USA, November 2017

Ammonia leak injures one, incurs fine.

<https://www.coolingpost.com/world-news/10000-fine-ammonia-leak/>

Canada, October 2017

Ammonia leak kills three.

<https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/british-columbia/three-killed-at-fernie-bc-arena-were-doing-maintenance-work/article36645031/>

Netherlands, October 2017

Five injured in cylinder explosion.

<https://www.coolingpost.com/world-news/ammonia-cylinder-explodes-gea-factory/>

Gisborne -NZ, September 2017

Ammonia leak.

<http://gisborneherald.co.nz/localnews/2993900-135/firefighters-turn-out-to-leaking-ammonia>

Germany, July 2017

Improper procedure causes explosion at a refrigeration plant. Injures eight.

<https://www.coolingpost.com/world-news/mystery-surrounds-refrigeration-explosion/>

USA, July 2017

Ammonia explosion injures two and causes water main leak.

<http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/local/breaking/ct-elk-grove-village-explosion-20170707-story.html>

USA, June 2017

Violation of ammonia regulations incurs fine.

<https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/us-epa-commits-sanger-calif-poultry-processor-protect-workers-local-community-risk>

USA, June 2017

Thailand, June 2017

Freon leak affects 20 crew.

<https://www.bangkokpost.com/news/general/1261299/crew-hospitalised-after-gas-leak-on-foreign-fishing-vessel>

Northland – NZ, May 2017

Major leak at a meat works plant.

https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=11854906

Bluff-NZ, April 2016

Fire enables ammonia leak at a coolstore.

<http://www.newstalkzb.co.nz/news/emergency/fire-service-attempts-to-control-ammonia-leak-on-wharf-at-bluff/>

USA, March 2016

Ammonia leak causes one death.

<https://www.boston.com/news/local-news/2016/03/23/firefighters-respond-to-ammonia-leak-in-seaport-district>

NZ, January 2016

Beca questions ammonia safety procedures in NZ

<https://www.beca.com/ignite-your-thinking/ignite-your-thinking/january-2016/have-you-reviewed-your-ammonia-safety>

Invercargill – NZ, March 2015

Ammonia leak.

<http://www.newstalkzb.co.nz/news/emergency/fire-service-attempts-to-control-ammonia-leak-on-wharf-at-bluff/>

Australia, June 2014

Hydrocarbon refrigeration explosion kills two.

<https://www.vasa.org.au/fatal-pub-fire-blamed-on-use-of-automotive-hc-refrigerant/>

China, September 2013

Ammonia leak kills 15.

<http://www.abc.net.au/news/2013-09-02/an-china-ammonia-deaths-caused-by-detached-cap/4928574>