

Event Safety Working Group

BSR ES1.43, Event Safety - Material Handling Draft Public Review 2 Comment resolutions

Reference document: BSR ES1.43, Event Safety - Material Handling (Document number ES/2024-20017r1a)

ANSI Public review period: 22 August 2025 through 06 October 2025

Question: In your opinion, do you think the requirements of BSR ES1.43, Event Safety - Material Handling (DCN ES/2024-20017r1a) are reasonable, and adequately address the intended subject matter?

Please answer the question using one of the options below. Select “Yes”, “Yes, but...” (provide comments to support your opinion), or “No, with reasons” (the document’s requirements are unacceptable or unreasonable). Note that you are offering your opinion, which is in no way construed as a vote of acceptance or approval.

Responses:

Janet Sellery – Sellery Health + Safety (JS)	No, with reasons
Richard Nix (RN)	No, with reasons

Individual Comments:

No.	Commenter	Ref. section	Comment	Resolution
1	JS	General	Throughout - replace “&” with “and”	Accepted in principle.
2	JS	General	Throughout - I disagree with how "must" is used in this standard. It is used so broadly as to be meaningless. I would ask the Task Group to look at each use of the word "must". As a sample of event professionals, if "must" refers to a requirement that they are not routinely implementing their own events, then (unless it is a requirement found in legislation), it should be changes to "should".	The Task Group reviewed every instance of the word “must” in the draft. The following sections were revised from “must” to “should”: - 4.2: bullet 5 - 5.2 - 6.1.1, 6.1.2, 6.3 - 8.1: second “must” changed; first retained - 13.1.1.3 - 13.2.7: first “must” changed; second retained - 13.3.2 - 13.3.3 - 13.4.3 - 13.4.4: both instances - 13.5.3.1 - 13.5.3.3 - 13.5.4 - 13.5.5 - 13.5.6

No.	Commenter	Ref. section	Comment	Resolution
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 13.5.7 - 13.5.11 - 13.9.5 <p>After review, the Task Group agreed that all remaining uses of “must” are appropriate and should remain as written.</p>
3	JS	General	Throughout - There is a lot of duplication and info that is out of scope. Editing is needed to make this standard more concise.	Thank you for the comment, no action is required as there are no specific changes requested. However, the task group did consider the comment and revisit the document. Any information included is considered by the task group to be relevant, in-scope and certain information that may be considered repetition is included to accommodate the different users of this standard.
4	RN	General	My general comment is a request to remove all subjective, unenforceable adjectives – e.g. “appropriate”, “safe”, “proper”, “adequate”, etc (throughout the document) because such terms are subjective, unenforceable, arbitrary based on interpretation by the person reading the words, and do not establish a common baseline of expectation. In all cases where such terms are used, the phrases can be reworded to establish clear and unambiguous requirements.	Accepted in principle. The task group conducted a detailed review and revised instances where subjective or unenforceable terminology was identified. These sections were updated to establish clear, objective, and unambiguous requirements.
5	RN	General	I also take issue with any wording that refers to “any of the following”, “all of the following”, “the following” and similar, because such examples do not establish an end to the referenced examples – i.e. any and all words following to the end of the document may be construed as being a part of “the following” words, since they all follow after. This usually occurs prior to and referencing a bulleted list. Please convert such lists to to alphanumeric lists, using proper and consistent list format terminations, then refer to the list as a group of requirements or examples as given in the [first list item] through the [last list item]. Examples of where this should be fixed are in 4.2, 5.2, 6.3, 7.1, 9.1, 9.1.1, 9.1.2, 9.2, 10.4, 11.1, 12.1, 12.3, 13.1, 13.1.1.5, 13.1.2, 13.1.4, 13.1.5,	Accepted in principle. The task group reviewed and revised list-referencing language throughout the document. Several sections were reformatted to use clearer explanatory language, and corresponding renumbering and structural updates were made where appropriate (for example, 7.1 was updated to E7.1, and revisions were applied across Sections 8.1 through 13.9.3).
6	JS	Introduction	Rewrite the first sentence, as "the field of ergonomics" is not a hazard, it's a way of mitigating material handling hazards.	Accept in principle, We edited the language and removed "the field of ergonomics" to improve clarity.
7	RN	1 Scope, purpose, and application	Rewrite to state: This standard shall apply to the safe provision, availability, and use of material handling procedures, equipment, training, and planning to minimize hazards associated with material handling at special events. Events include, but is are not limited to, musical productions, festivals,	Accepted in principle. The section was revised to incorporate the intent of the suggested language and clarify the scope and purpose of the standard.

No.	Commenter	Ref. section	Comment	Resolution
			<p>concerts, theatre and film production, video productions, special events, corporate events, trade shows, sporting events, broadcast production, and events related to them.</p> <p>This standard provides guidance on the identification and assessment of specific material handling hazards related to life safety risks, and how lack of planning, training, or use of inappropriate equipment can negatively impact life safety at an event.</p>	
8	JS	1.5 Normative references	DELETE: ANSI ES1.4, 1.42 and 1.43 as they are rated to the scope of this standard. REPLACE WITH: Documents related to material handling.	Accepted
9	RN	1.5	Delete references to ES1.4, E1.42, and E1.43 as they are not relevant to this document's scope.	Accepted
10	RN	2 Definitions	Verify that all definitions are needed - i.e. differ enough from standard dictionary definitions to justify special definition here - and that they are used in the document.	Accepted in principle. The task group reviewed all definitions and confirmed that each is necessary and used within the document, with the exception of "control measure," which was removed in alignment with Comment 13.
11	JS	2 Definitions	<p>ADD: Ergonomics (two options)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ergonomics is about designing for people. The goal is to fit the job to the worker, rather than forcing the worker to fit the job. (Source: Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety) - Ergonomics is the science of fitting workplace conditions and job demands to the capabilities of the working population. (Source:US OSHA) 	Rejected. The term "ergonomics" has been removed from the document, and therefore a definition is no longer required.
12	JS	2 Definitions	<p>ADD - Training</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training is a planned effort to facilitate the learning of specific competencies, knowledge, skills, and abilities needed for safe and effective job performance. (Source: Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety) - Training is instruction that enables employees to acquire the knowledge and skills they need to safely and effectively do their jobs. (Source: US OSHA) - Additional info: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Workers must demonstrate understanding (through tests, demonstrations, or observation). - Employers must keep records of who was trained, when, and on what topics. 	Reject with reasons. The task group determined that existing regulatory definitions are sufficient and that the training section of this document already provides clear guidance on how training applies within the scope of the standard. Additional definitions or requirements are not necessary.
13	RN	2 Definitions	Delete 2.5 Control measure, and rewrite the single place where the term is used in 4.2	Accepted in principle. The term "control measure" has been removed from the document, and the

No.	Commenter	Ref. section	Comment	Resolution
				related language in Section 4.2 was revised accordingly.
14	RN	2 Definitions	Delete definition 2.10 - the term is defined in the dictionary, and has no special meaning in the context of this standard.	The task group determined that this term is commonly defined within related standards and its inclusion here supports consistency and clarity across documents.
15	JS	2 Definitions	2.11 Material Handling - ADD (either as part of this definition or a separate one): Manual material handling (MMH) involves lifting, lowering, holding, carrying, pushing, or pulling of a load by human force. (Source: Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety)	Reject with reasons. The group reviewed the comment and determined that the definition is intended to apply to the full scope of material handling activities. Manual material handling is specifically addressed in a separate section of the document and therefore doesn't require its own definition.
16	JS	9.3 Training	If this is going to be a "must" requirement, then the standard should describe training in more detail. Equipment use (forklifts etc.) has specific training requirements that should be referenced. For manual material handling, it would be more accurate to suggest that it should be included in regular Health & Safety briefings.	Accepted in principle. The task group agreed that additional clarity would be beneficial and added language to the end of Section 9 to reference applicable training regulations and standards, while keeping the level of detail appropriate to the scope of this document.
17	JS	12 Boxes	ADD: Note about moving wheeled equipment on ramps and closing the lids of cases so they don't close on hands.	Accepted in principle. Language was added to Section 12.3 addressing safe movement on slopes/ramps and the importance of securing case lids to prevent injuries.
18	JS	12.3	Same note about training as 9.3 above.	Accept in Principle: (Added to section 9.3)
19	RN	13.3 onward	Everything from 13.3 and beyond is out of the stated scope of this standard, and should be removed from this document.	Reject with reasons: The task group determined that the materials addressed in the sections following 13.3 (e.g., flammable materials, wardrobe, special effects, etc.) present unique handling risks that fall within the intended scope of this standard. Retaining these sections is necessary to ensure comprehensive guidance on material-handling hazards.
20	JS	13.4 onward	Most of this information is out of scope for this standard. While there is some useful info, much of it has nothing to do with material handling. A suggestion that these details should be written into a standard doesn't mean it would appear in this standard.	Reject with reasons: The task group determined that the materials addressed in the sections following 13.4 (e.g., flammable materials, wardrobe, special effects, etc.) present unique handling risks that fall within the intended scope of this standard. These sections were retained to ensure comprehensive guidance on material-handling hazards.