International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering Hub (IRJAEH)
e ISSN: 2584-2137
Vol. 04 Issue: 05 May 2026
Page No: 2650-2667
https://irjaeh.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEH.2026.0351

# Job Safety Analysis (JSA) and SOP Development for High-Speed Precision Machining

*Gowtham S[1], Prithiviraj N[2],*
*[1]PG-Student, M.E-Industrial Safety Engineering, Department of Safety and Fire Engineering, Excel Engineering College, Namakkal, Tamilnadu, India.*
*[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Safety and Fire Engineering, Excel Engineering College, Namakkal, Tamilnadu, India.*
**Emails:** *gowtham10eee@gmail.com[1], npraj.engg@gmail.com[2]*

## Abstract
*High-speed precision machining (HSPM) is widely used in modern manufacturing to achieve superior accuracy, tighter tolerances, and improved productivity. However, the increased spindle speeds, advanced tooling systems, and automated material-handling operations introduce significant safety risks for operators and maintenance personnel. This project focuses on the systematic development of a comprehensive Job Safety Analysis (JSA) and Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) tailored for high-speed precision machining environments. The JSA component of the project identifies, evaluates, and prioritizes potential hazards associated with machine setup, tool changes, part loading/unloading, cutting operations, chip evacuation, coolant handling, and routine maintenance. Each task is analyzed to determine possible failure modes, the likelihood of occurrence, and the severity of consequences. Control measures engineering, administrative, and personal protective equipment (PPE) are proposed to mitigate risks to acceptable levels. Based on the findings of the JSA, detailed and user-friendly SOPs are developed to ensure consistent, safe, and efficient workflow practices. These SOPs include step-by-step operational guidelines, pre-operation checklists, emergency procedures, lockout-tagout (LOTO) instructions, and communication protocols. The project also emphasizes operator training, compliance with OSHA and ISO safety standards, and integration of continuous improvement practices to maintain safety performance over time. Overall, this project enhances workplace safety, minimizes the probability of accidents, reduces machine downtime, and fosters a culture of risk awareness in high-speed precision machining operations.*
***Keywords:*** *JSA, HSPC, SOP Development, Workplace Safety, Hazard Assessment, Risk Mitigation, Manufacturing Operations, CNC Machining, LOTO, Occupational Safety.*

## 1. Introduction
High-speed precision machining (HSPM) plays a vital role in modern manufacturing industries by enabling high productivity, superior surface finish, and dimensional accuracy. It is widely used in sectors such as aerospace, automotive, defense, and precision engineering, where tight tolerances and complex component geometries are required. However, the increased spindle speeds, rapid tool movements, high cutting forces, and automated systems involved in HSPM significantly elevate the level of operational risk. Common hazards include tool breakage, flying chips, entanglement with rotating components, electrical exposure, ergonomic stress, excessive noise, and chemical contact from coolants. If not properly controlled, these hazards can result in serious injuries, equipment damage, and production downtime. Job Safety Analysis (JSA) is a systematic technique used to identify job-specific hazards by breaking down each task into logical steps and evaluating the associated risks. JSA helps in understanding how accidents may occur and enables the selection of appropriate control measures based on the hierarchy of controls. When effectively implemented, JSA transforms safety from a reactive approach into a proactive risk prevention system. Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) serve as documented instructions that define safe and

International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering Hub (IRJAEH)
e ISSN: 2584-2137
Vol. 04 Issue: 05 May 2026
Page No: 2650-2667
https://irjaeh.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEH.2026.0351

standardized methods for performing tasks. SOPs developed using JSA findings ensure that identified hazards and control measures are directly integrated into daily operations. This linkage strengthens operational discipline, reduces dependence on individual experience, and promotes uniform safety practices across shifts [1-4]. The integration of JSA and SOP development is particularly critical in high-speed precision machining environments due to the complexity of machine–operator interactions. A structured JSA-based SOP framework not only improves compliance with statutory requirements such as OSHA and ISO 45001 but also enhances safety awareness, consistency, and overall productivity. Therefore, this project focuses on developing and validating JSA and SOPs for high-speed precision machining to minimize risks and establish a sustainable safety culture within the manufacturing workplace.

## 2. Literature Review

Several studies highlight the importance of Job Safety Analysis (JSA) and Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) in reducing workplace accidents across industrial environments. Timpani Arista et al. (2025) analyzed machine maintenance hazards in the cement industry using the JSA method and identified 31 hazard sources across physical, chemical, ergonomic, biological, and psychological categories. Their findings showed that more than half of the hazards were classified as high risk, emphasizing the effectiveness of JSA in systematic hazard identification and control planning. Rangga and Ulia (2025) combined JSA and HAZOP methods to evaluate safety conditions in a welding workshop. Their study revealed that employee negligence and poor PPE compliance were major contributors to accidents, highlighting the role of structured hazard identification and safety awareness in accident prevention. Similarly, Bima Putra Pranoto and Ferida Yuamita (2025) applied JSA in a milling station and demonstrated that enforcement of PPE, supervision, and standardized procedures significantly improved safety and productivity. Muh. Dawami Sholichin et al. (2025) integrated JSA with risk assessment in sizing machine operations, identifying serious ergonomic and mechanical hazards. Their results stressed the importance of continuous monitoring and discipline in OHS practices. Paul Sukapto et al. (2025) further emphasized that SOP implementation within SMK3 frameworks enhances employee awareness, operational consistency, and safety performance. Earlier studies by Djunaidi and Umami (2024), Luqman Hakim et al. (2024), and Manoj Khanna et al. (2022) consistently confirmed that JSA improves hazard recognition, reduces unsafe acts, and supports stronger safety culture. Chandrashekharaiah (2019) highlighted that as high-speed machining advances, structured safety systems such as JSA-based SOPs become increasingly critical. Overall, the literature supports integrating JSA and SOP development as an effective approach for managing risks in high-speed precision machining environments [5-8].

## 3. Methodology

| |
|---|
| **Preliminary Study and Data Collection** |
| ↓ |
| **Task Breakdown and Process Mapping** |
| ↓ |
| **Hazard Identification and JSA Development** |
| ↓ |
| **Drafting and Structuring SOPs** |
| ↓ |
| **Validation Through Expert Review** |
| ↓ |
| **Training and Implementation Plan** |
| ↓ |
| **Monitoring, Evaluation and Continuous Improvement** |

**Figure 1 Methodology**

### 3.1. Preliminary Study and Data Collection

The preliminary study and data collection phase form the foundation for effective Job Safety Analysis (JSA) and Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) development in high-speed precision machining (HSPM) operations. HSPM involves advanced CNC machines, high spindle speeds, automated systems, and specialized tooling, which significantly increase the potential for mechanical, electrical, ergonomic, chemical, and thermal hazards. Therefore, a structured approach to understanding the working environment is essential before conducting detailed risk analysis. This phase begins with a review of applicable safety regulations and standards, including OSHA guidelines and ISO 45001 Occupational Health and Safety Management Systems. These standards provide a framework for hazard identification, machine guarding, lockout–tagout (LOTO), PPE usage, and continuous safety improvement [9-12]. Industry best practices related to high-speed machining are also reviewed to identify common risk areas and preventive strategies. Direct observation of the machining environment is then conducted to understand actual work practices, operator behavior, equipment interaction, and ergonomic conditions. Activities such as machine setup, tool change, part handling, cutting operations, chip evacuation, and maintenance are closely monitored to identify unsafe acts and hidden hazards. Historical data including incident reports, near-miss records, and maintenance logs are collected and analyzed. This information helps identify recurring hazards, equipment failure trends, and human-factor issues. Together, these inputs provide a comprehensive understanding of workplace risks and form a reliable basis for developing effective JSA and practical, enforceable SOPs. The preliminary safety data analysis reveals several critical concerns across incident records, equipment condition, environment, and human factors. A total of 18 incidents per year, including 5 lost-time injuries, indicates moderate safety performance, though the zero-fatality target has been maintained. Near-miss events remain high at 72 cases annually, with a low reporting compliance of 58%, highlighting weak preventive controls and safety culture gaps. Maintenance data show reliability issues, with MTBF limited to 210 hours and 26 unplanned breakdowns per year, primarily due to mechanical and electrical failures. Environmental monitoring identified excessive noise levels, elevated heat exposure, and insufficient lighting, increasing operational risk. Ergonomic assessment revealed heavy manual handling and high repetitive motions contributing to fatigue. Human factors account for 43% of incident causes, supported by low PPE compliance and incomplete training coverage. These findings emphasize the urgent need for structured JSA implementation, strengthened SOPs, improved engineering controls, and enhanced safety training to reduce risks and improve overall operational performance.

### 3.2. Task Breakdown and Process Mapping

High-Speed Precision Machining (HSPM) involves complex interactions between CNC machines, tooling systems, materials, and human operators. Due to high spindle speeds, automated motions, and tight tolerances, each operational step carries potential safety risks, operational inefficiencies, and quality deviations. Therefore, systematic task breakdown and process mapping are essential to establish an effective Job Safety Analysis (JSA) and develop practical Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs). The task breakdown process begins with identifying all major and minor activities involved in HSPM operations. Major tasks include machine setup, workpiece loading and unloading, tool selection and tool change, cutting operations, chip evacuation, coolant handling, cleaning, inspection, and maintenance. Minor tasks such as program verification, offset setting, shift handover, and housekeeping are also documented, as these activities often contribute to hidden or overlooked hazards. This classification ensures that no operational step is excluded from safety evaluation [13-17]. Each identified task is analyzed in relation to operator involvement, machine interaction, and environmental conditions. Machine setup and calibration are recognized as high-risk stages due to misalignment, pinch points, and electrical exposure. Loading and unloading tasks present ergonomic and crush hazards, while tool change operations introduce risks from sharp tools and accidental spindle activation.

International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering Hub (IRJAEH)
e ISSN: 2584-2137
Vol. 04 Issue: 05 May 2026
Page No: 2650-2667
https://irjaeh.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEH.2026.0351

**Table 1** **Incident, Near-Miss & Maintenance Records**

| Sl. No. | Category | Statistical Parameter | Measured Value | Unit | Remarks / Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Incident Reports | Total incidents | 18 | cases/year | Slightly above industry average. |
| 2 | Incident Reports | Lost-time injuries (LTI) | 5 | cases/year | Moderate severity. |
| 3 | Incident Reports | First-aid cases | 13 | cases/year | Mostly minor cuts & burns. |
| 4 | Incident Reports | Fatal incidents | 0 | cases/year | Zero-fatality target achieved. |
| 5 | Incident Reports | Incident rate | 4.6 | per 100 workers | Needs reduction. |
| 6 | Incident Reports | Severity index | 2.8 | /5 | Medium–high severity. |
| 7 | Incident Reports | Frequency rate | 6.2 | per 200,000 hrs | Based on OSHA formula. |
| 8 | Incident Reports | Working hours analyzed | 580,000 | hours/year | Used for rate calculations. |
| 9 | Incident Reports | Avg. recovery days per LTI | 7.8 | days | Higher than recommended. |
| 10 | Near-Miss Events | Total near misses | 72 | events/year | High → insufficient controls. |
| 11 | Near-Miss Events | Near-miss/incident ratio | 4:1 | ratio | Ideal = 10:1. |
| 12 | Near-Miss Events | Reporting compliance | 58 | % | Low reporting culture. |
| 13 | Near-Miss Events | Potential severity | 3.6 | /5 index | Could cause severe injuries. |
| 14 | Near-Miss Events | Coolant spill near misses | 23 | events | Slip & chemical exposure hazard. |
| 15 | Near-Miss Events | Behavior-related near misses | 19 | events | Operator error. |
| 16 | Near-Miss Events | Machine-related near misses | 14 | events | Indicates mechanical issues. |
| 17 | Maintenance Logs | Planned PM tasks | 140 | tasks/year | Required for reliability. |
| 18 | Maintenance Logs | Completed PM tasks | 118 | tasks/year | 84% completion. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | Maintenance Logs | Overdue PM tasks | 22 | tasks/year | Contributes to breakdowns. |
| 20 | Maintenance Logs | Unplanned breakdowns | 26 | failures/year | High frequency. |
| 21 | Maintenance Logs | Mean Time Between Failures (MTBF) | 210 | hours | Should be 350–500 hrs. |
| 22 | Maintenance Logs | Mean Time To Repair (MTTR) | 3.2 | hours | Acceptable range. |
| 23 | Maintenance Logs | Breakdown rate increase (YoY) | 11 | % | Needs root-cause analysis. |
| 24 | Maintenance Logs | Electrical failures | 7 | failures/year | Sensor & wiring issues. |
| 25 | Maintenance Logs | Mechanical failures | 19 | failures/year | Belts, bearings, spindles. |
| 26 | Equipment Condition | Tool breakage incidents | 22 | tools/year | High-speed wear. |
| 27 | Equipment Condition | Tool life deviation | -18 | % | Due to aggressive feeds/speeds. |
| 28 | Equipment Condition | Out-of-range spindle vibration | 9 | occurrences | Risk of catastrophic failure. |
| 29 | Equipment Condition | Coolant system leaks | 15 | leaks/year | Slip & chemical risk. |
| 30 | Equipment Condition | Chip conveyor jams | 9 | events | Impacts cooling & accuracy. |
| 31 | Equipment Condition | Misalignment events | 6 | cases | Results in tool damage. |
| 32 | Equipment Condition | Safety interlock failures | 4 | events | High-severity hazard. |
| 33 | Environment | Average noise level | 89–102 | dB | Above OSHA limits. |
| 34 | Environment | Heat exposure (near spindle) | 39–52 | °C | Requires heat-resistant PPE. |
| 35 | Environment | Coolant mist concentration | 0.8–1.5 | $mg/m^3$ | Near exposure limits. |
| 36 | Environment | Floor slip coefficient | 0.42–0.55 | μ | <0.5 is hazardous. |
| 37 | Environment | Lighting intensity | 480–620 | lux | Below required 750+ lux. |
| 38 | Ergonomics | Avg. workpiece weight | 8–21 | Kg | Risk of musculoskeletal injuries. |
| 39 | Ergonomics | Repetitive | 280–460 | motions | High |

International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering Hub (IRJAEH)
e ISSN: 2584-2137
Vol. 04 Issue: 05 May 2026
Page No: 2650-2667
https://irjaeh.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEH.2026.0351

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | motions/day | | | ergonomic load. |
| 40 | Ergonomics | Fatigue reports | 12 | reports/year | Due to long shifts. |
| 41 | Human Factors | PPE compliance | 68 | % | Below safe threshold. |
| 42 | Human Factors | SOP non-compliance | 26 | % | Indicates procedural gaps. |
| 43 | Human Factors | Unauthorized machine access | 3 | cases/year | High-risk behavior. |
| 44 | Human Factors | Training completion | 72 | % | Should exceed 95%. |
| 45 | Human Factors | Operator error contribution | 43 | % | Major incident factor. |
| 46 | Root-Cause | Mechanical root-cause contribution | 31 | % | Needs engineering controls. |
| 47 | Root-Cause | Human-factor contribution | 43 | % | Highest contributor. |
| 48 | Root-Cause | Environmental causes | 18 | % | Coolant, chips, noise, heat. |
| 49 | Root-Cause | SOP inadequacy | 8 | % | Indicates need for revision. |
| 50 | Corrective Actions | Corrective action closure rate | 82 | % | Acceptable but improvable. |
| 51 | Corrective Actions | Pending high-risk actions | 9 | items | Needs urgent attention. |
| 52 | Corrective Actions | Repeat incidents after closure | 4 | events | Suggests ineffective measures. |
| 53 | Audits | Audit compliance | 76 | % | Below standard (≥90%). |
| 54 | Productivity Impact | Total machine downtime | 83 | hours/year | Affects output. |
| 55 | Productivity Impact | Productivity loss due to incidents | 2.3 | % | Significant in precision machining. |
| 56 | Cost Analysis | Annual maintenance cost | 67,000 | USD/year | Includes tools & parts. |
| 57 | Cost Analysis | Annual cost of accidents | 225,000 | USD/year | Includes LTI, downtime, replacements. |

IRJAEH
International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering Hub (IRJAEH)
e ISSN: 2584-2137
Vol. 04 Issue: 05 May 2026
Page No: 2650-2667
https://irjaeh.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEH.2026.0351

**Table 2 Example of Process Flow For HSPM**

| Stage | Task | Equipment/ Tooling | Potential Hazards |
|---|---|---|---|
| Setup | Align workpiece, calibrate axes | CNC machine, fixtures, measuring instruments | Pinch points, misalignment, tool breakage |
| Loading/ Unloading | Place workpiece, remove finished part | Hoist, clamps, gloves | Musculoskeletal injury, pinch, crush, slips |
| Tool Change | Select/install tool | Tool holder, torque wrench | Cuts, entanglement, flying debris |
| Cutting | Execute machining | High-speed spindle, cutting tool | Flying chips, heat, noise, vibration |
| Chip Evacuation | Remove debris | Chip conveyor, vacuum | Slips, chemical exposure, lacerations |
| Coolant Handling | Apply coolant | Pump, coolant container | Skin irritation, slips, chemical hazard |
| Cleaning | Clear debris, wipe surfaces | Brush, cloth | Eye injury, repetitive strain |
| Routine Inspection | Inspect wear, alignment | Calipers, gauges | Contact with moving parts |
| Maintenance | Replace parts, lubricate | Spindles, belts, LOTO system | Electrical shock, pinch, fatigue |

Cutting operations pose significant mechanical, thermal, and noise hazards due to flying chips, vibration, and high temperatures. Maintenance activities carry elevated risks related to electrical energy, moving components, and human error. Process mapping is then used to visualize the complete machining workflow. A step-by-step flowchart is developed to represent task sequences, decision points, and material flow. Hazard locations are annotated at each stage, allowing identification of critical control points that require engineering, administrative, or PPE-based controls. This structured mapping provides a clear foundation for JSA preparation and SOP development. Overall, task breakdown and process mapping enable comprehensive hazard identification, standardized work practices, effective training design, and regulatory compliance. This approach ensures safer operations, improved consistency, and sustained safety performance in high-speed precision machining environments [18-19].

### 3.3. Hazard Identification and JSA Development

Hazard identification and Job Safety Analysis (JSA) development form the core of an effective safety management system in high-speed precision machining (HSPM) environments. Due to high spindle speeds, automated movements, sharp cutting tools, and continuous operator interaction, HSPM operations present significant safety challenges. A systematic approach is therefore essential to identify hazards, evaluate risks, and implement appropriate control measures. The hazard identification process begins with a detailed examination of each task identified during task breakdown and process mapping. Both routine and non-routine activities such as machine setup, tool change, workpiece loading and unloading, machining operations, chip evacuation, coolant handling, inspection, cleaning, and maintenance are analyzed. Hazards are classified

**Table 3** Quantified Risk Assessment for Hazards in High-Speed Precision Machining (HSPM)

| Hazard Scenario | Likelihood (L) | Likelihood Description | Estimated Probability (%) | Occurrence Frequency | Severity (S) | Severity Description | Risk Rating (RR = L×S) | Risk Category | Risk Priority Level | Explanation / Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Tool breakage during high-speed cutting (flying chips & fragments)** | **4** | Likely occurs several times per year | **40–60% probability** | Monthly or quarterly events | **5** | Catastrophic possible eye injury, deep laceration, permanent disability | **20** | **CRITICAL** | **Top Priority (Rank 1)** | High spindle rpm increases kinetic energy; misalignment and tool wear elevate risk significantly. |
| **Electrical fault during preventive maintenance** | **1–2** | Rare few recorded cases | **5–10% probability** | Occurs every 2–5 years | **5** | Fatal electric shock or arc flash can cause death | **5–10** | **HIGH (Low-likelihood/High-severity)** | **Priority 2** | Rare but extremely dangerous; requires strict LOTO and qualified personnel. |
| **Coolant spillage causing minor slips** | **4–5** | Very likely common in machining areas | **70–85% probability** | Weekly or daily occurrences | **2–3** | Minor to moderate injury—sprains, bruises | **8–15** | **MEDIUM to HIGH** | **Priority 3** | Frequent hazard affecting productivity; easily mitigated with housekeeping controls. |
| **Pinch points during workpiece loading/unloading** | **3** | Possible happens occasionally | **25–40% probability** | Monthly | **4** | Major injury—finger crush, fracture | **12** | **HIGH** | **Priority 4** | High hand-contact operations increase risk; training & guarding needed. |

International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering Hub (IRJAEH)
e ISSN: 2584-2137
Vol. 04 Issue: 05 May 2026
Page No: 2650-2667
https://irjaeh.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEH.2026.0351

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Exposure to hot chips during cutting** | **4** | Likely common in high-speed machining | **50–70% probability** | Weekly | **3** | Moderate—burns, skin irritation | **12** | **HIGH** | **Priority 5** | Requires PPE (gloves, face shield) and chip shield installations. |
| **Chemical exposure from coolants/lubricants** | **3** | Possible | **20–35% probability** | Monthly | **3** | Moderate—dermatitis, eye irritation | **9** | **MEDIUM** | **Priority 6** | Chemical aerosols and skin contact require ventilation and PPE. |
| **Noise exposure during high-speed cutting** | **5** | Almost certain continuous exposure | **90–100% probability** | Daily | **3** | Moderate—hearing damage | **15** | **HIGH** | **Priority 7** | Continuous hazard; requires mandatory hearing protection. |
| **Manual handling of heavy workpieces (ergonomic strain)** | **3–4** | Possible to likely | **30–50% probability** | Weekly | **3** | Moderate—back strain, MSD | **9–12** | **MEDIUM/HIGH** | **Priority 8** | Mechanical lifting aids and ergonomic training reduce likelihood significantly. |
| **Unexpected machine start during cleaning or inspection** | **2** | Unlikely | **10–15% probability** | Annually | **5** | Catastrophic—amputation, severe crushing | **10** | **HIGH** | **Priority 9** | Controlled by strict LOTO enforcement; low frequency but severe consequences. |
| **Sharp chip handling resulting in cuts** | **4** | Likely | **50–70% probability** | Weekly | **2** | Minor injury—cuts, bleeding | **8** | **MEDIUM** | **Priority 10** | Easily controlled with chip tools and gloves. |

into mechanical, electrical, thermal, ergonomic, chemical, physical, and human-factor categories to ensure comprehensive coverage. Mechanical hazards were found to be dominant, particularly those associated with rotating spindles, tool breakage, pinch points, and flying chips. Electrical hazards arise mainly during machine maintenance and troubleshooting, emphasizing the importance of strict Lockout–Tagout (LOTO) procedures. Thermal hazards from hot chips and workpieces, ergonomic risks from manual handling and repetitive motions, and chemical exposure from cutting fluids were also identified as significant contributors to injury potential. In addition, administrative and behavioral hazards such as inadequate training, fatigue, and SOP non-compliance were recognized as critical influencing factors. Risk assessment was conducted using a likelihood–severity matrix to quantify risk levels and prioritize control actions. High-risk activities, including high-speed cutting, tool installation, chip handling, and maintenance tasks, were addressed with priority controls. Based on the hierarchy of controls, engineering measures such as machine enclosures, interlocks, and guards were emphasized, supported by administrative controls including SOPs, training, supervision, and work permits. Appropriate personal protective equipment (PPE) was specified as a final layer of protection. The developed JSA provides a structured, task-based framework linking hazards with preventive measures. It serves as a foundation for SOP development, regulatory compliance, operator training, and continuous safety improvement. Overall, systematic hazard identification and JSA implementation significantly enhance risk control, operational consistency, and safety performance in high-speed precision machining environments.

### 3.4. Drafting and Structuring Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)

Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) play a vital role in ensuring safe, consistent, and efficient operations in high-speed precision machining (HSPM) environments. Due to the presence of high spindle speeds, automated movements, sharp cutting tools, and complex CNC systems, even minor deviations from standard practices can result in serious accidents, equipment damage, or production losses. Following the completion of Job Safety Analysis (JSA), SOPs serve as a practical mechanism to convert identified hazards and risk control measures into clear operational instructions. The drafting of SOPs is guided by task-specific principles, ensuring that each procedure corresponds directly to a defined machining activity such as machine setup, tool selection and change, workpiece loading and unloading, cutting operations, chip evacuation, coolant handling, inspection, cleaning, and maintenance. Each SOP integrates the safety controls identified during the JSA process, including engineering controls such as guards, interlocks, and enclosures; administrative controls such as permits, supervision, and authorization; and mandatory personal protective equipment (PPE) requirements to enhance usability, SOPs are structured in a logical and sequential format. Procedures are divided into pre-operation, operation, post-operation, and emergency response phases to ensure that no critical safety step is overlooked. Instructions are written in simple, unambiguous language supported by checklists, warning symbols, and visual aids such as diagrams or flowcharts. Embedded safety reminders within each step reinforce operator awareness of hazards related to pinch points, flying chips, electrical energy, heat, and chemical exposure. Regulatory compliance forms an essential component of SOP development. The procedures are aligned with OSHA requirements, ISO 45001 occupational health and safety standards, and recognized industry best practices to ensure legal conformity and systematic risk management. Accessibility is also emphasized by displaying SOPs at workstations in both printed and digital formats, enabling quick reference during operations. SOPs are treated as living documents. Feedback from operators, incident investigations, audit findings, and technological changes are periodically reviewed and incorporated. This continuous improvement approach ensures that SOPs remain relevant, practical, and effective in enhancing safety performance and operational reliability in high-speed precision machining environments which is explained in Tables 1 – 4 and Figure 1.

**Table 4 High-Speed Precision Machining (HSPM)**

| SOP Section | Description / Content | Activities Covered | Safety Considerations Integrated | Reference to JSA Findings | Responsibility | Documentation / Records |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SOP Identification | Unique SOP number and title | Machine name, operation type | Traceability and version control | Ensures correct procedure selection | Safety officer | SOP master list |
| Purpose | Defines objective of SOP | Safe and standardized machining | Prevents ambiguity | Derived from hazard analysis | Management | SOP header |
| Scope | Specifies applicability | Operators, maintenance, supervisors | Prevents unauthorized operation | Linked to task-based JSA | Safety department | SOP document |
| Definitions | Explains technical terms | CNC, RPM, LOTO, PPE | Improves understanding | Human-factor hazards addressed | Safety officer | SOP glossary |
| Responsibilities | Role allocation | Operator, supervisor, maintenance | Accountability | Addresses admin hazards | Department head | Responsibility matrix |
| Required PPE | PPE specification | Helmet, goggles, gloves, ear plugs | Prevents exposure hazards | PPE identified in JSA | Operator | PPE checklist |
| Tools & Equipment | Lists tools required | Tool holders, gauges, fixtures | Prevents improper tool usage | Wrong-tool hazards | Operator | Tool checklist |
| Pre-operation Checklist | Machine readiness | Guards, interlocks, E-stop | Prevents startup hazards | Electrical & mechanical risks | Operator | Pre-start checklist |
| Machine Startup Procedure | Safe startup sequence | Power ON, warm-up cycle | Electrical shock prevention | Startup hazards | Operator | Startup log |
| Tool Selection Procedure | Correct tool selection | Tool material, size, code | Prevents tool breakage | Tool-related hazards | Operator | Tool chart |
| Tool Installation Procedure | Safe tool mounting | Clamping, torque application | Hand injury prevention | Sharp-edge hazards | Operator | Tool setup record |
| Tool Offset Setting | Setting tool length | Probe operation | Pinch-point control | Offset hazards | Operator | Offset log |
| Workpiece | Material | Lifting, | Ergonomic | Manual | Operator | Handling record |

International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering Hub (IRJAEH)
e ISSN: 2584-2137
Vol. 04 Issue: 05 May 2026
Page No: 2650-2667
https://irjaeh.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEH.2026.0351

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Handling | handling | positioning | safety | handling risk | | |
| Workpiece Clamping | Fixture operation | Hydraulic/pneumatic clamp | Crush hazard prevention | Pinch-point hazard | Operator | Fixture checklist |
| Program Verification | CNC program validation | Dry run, simulation | Prevents collision | Program error hazards | Supervisor | Program approval |
| Machining Operation | Cutting process | Cycle start, monitoring | Flying chip protection | High-speed hazards | Operator | Production log |
| Process Monitoring | Observation rules | Safe distance, enclosure | Exposure prevention | Monitoring hazards | Operator | Observation record |
| Alarm Handling Procedure | Response to alarms | Pause, reset, analysis | Panic prevention | Human-factor hazards | Operator | Alarm log |
| Tool Breakage Handling | Abnormal condition | Machine stop, isolation | Fragment protection | Tool failure hazards | Operator | Incident record |
| Chip Evacuation | Chip removal method | Chip hook usage | Cut injury prevention | Sharp chip hazard | Operator | Housekeeping log |
| Coolant Handling | Coolant usage | Mixing, topping | Chemical exposure control | Chemical hazards | Operator | MSDS record |
| Inspection Procedure | Quality checking | Measuring, deburring | Sharp-edge control | Burr-related hazards | Operator | Inspection report |
| Post-operation Checklist | Shutdown activities | Cleaning, power OFF | Prevents residual risk | End-of-job hazards | Operator | Shutdown checklist |
| Machine Shutdown | Safe shutdown | Sequence and isolation | Prevents unexpected motion | Energy hazards | Operator | Shutdown log |
| Cleaning Procedure | Housekeeping | Chip removal, oil wiping | Slip prevention | Housekeeping hazards | Operator | Cleaning checklist |
| Maintenance Interface | Maintenance coordination | Work permit, LOTO | Unexpected startup prevention | Maintenance hazards | Maintenance team | Permit record |
| LOTO Procedure | Energy isolation | Electrical, hydraulic lock | Fatal hazard prevention | High-risk JSA steps | Authorized person | LOTO log |
| Emergency Procedure | Emergency handling | Fire, injury, power failure | Life protection | Emergency hazards | All personnel | ERP record |
| Fire Safety Procedure | Fire response | Extinguisher use | Fire control | Fire hazard | Trained staff | Fire drill log |
| Shift Handover | Information transfer | Job status, abnormalities | Prevents communication gap | Admin hazards | Operator | Handover register |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Training Requirement | Skill requirement | SOP training, refreshers | Competency assurance | Training gaps | HR / Safety | Training record |
| Compliance Monitoring | SOP audit | Observation, checklist | Ensures adherence | Non-compliance risks | Safety officer | Audit report |
| Revision & Review | SOP updating | Periodic review | Continuous improvement | Feedback-based | Safety committee | Revision history |

### 3.5. Validation through Expert Review

Validation is a critical step in refining the JSA and SOPs. In the upcoming days, the project team will conduct comprehensive reviews with key stakeholders, including safety officers, machine operators, and supervisors. These reviews aim to evaluate the clarity, feasibility, and completeness of the documents. Experts will assess whether each task description, hazard identification, and control measure accurately reflect operational realities. Feedback will be collected regarding potential gaps, ambiguous instructions, or challenges in implementing safety controls. Based on this input, the JSA and SOPs will be revised to address operational constraints, ensuring that they are both practical and enforceable. This collaborative approach also encourages operator buy-in and reinforces a safety-first culture. Validation through expert review is a crucial stage in the development of Job Safety Analysis (JSA) and Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for high-speed precision machining (HSPM). While hazard identification and SOP drafting provide a theoretical and structured safety framework, validation ensures that these documents accurately reflect real-world operating conditions. High-speed machining environments involve complex interactions between machines, tools, materials, and human operators. Therefore, expert involvement is essential to confirm that the developed JSA and SOPs are technically sound, practically feasible, and aligned with actual shop-floor practices. The primary objective of expert validation is to evaluate the effectiveness, clarity, accuracy, and applicability of the proposed safety measures. This process helps identify gaps, inconsistencies, or impractical instructions that may not be apparent during document development. Validation also strengthens regulatory compliance, improves operational acceptance, and enhances the overall reliability of the safety management system.

#### 3.5.1. Selection of Experts

Safety Officers: Responsible for evaluating compliance with occupational safety regulations, OSHA guidelines, and ISO 45001 standards. Production Supervisors: Provide insight into workflow feasibility, production targets, and operational constraints. Experienced Machine Operators: Offer practical knowledge of machine behavior, tool performance, and real-time operational challenges. Maintenance Engineers: Review LOTO procedures, maintenance safety steps, and equipment-related hazards. Quality Engineers (where applicable): Ensure that safety controls do not compromise product quality or machining accuracy. The inclusion of multiple stakeholders ensures that the validation process addresses safety, productivity, maintenance, and quality perspectives simultaneously.

#### 3.5.2. Review Methodology

The expert review process follows a structured and systematic approach. Initially, the developed JSA sheets and SOP documents are shared with the experts prior to review meetings. This allows reviewers sufficient time to study the content and prepare observations.

During review sessions, each machining task is discussed sequentially, including machine startup, tool setting, part loading, cutting operations, chip evacuation, coolant handling, inspection, and maintenance. Experts examine whether:

- Task descriptions accurately represent actual work practices
- All realistic hazards have been identified

International Research Journal on Advanced Engineering Hub (IRJAEH)
e ISSN: 2584-2137
Vol. 04 Issue: 05 May 2026
Page No: 2650-2667
https://irjaeh.com
https://doi.org/10.47392/IRJAEH.2026.0351

- Risk levels are correctly assessed
- Control measures are adequate and prioritized correctly
- SOP steps are logically sequenced
- Emergency actions are clearly defined

Interactive discussions are encouraged to capture practical insights that may not be documented formally but are critical for safety.

### 3.5.3. Evaluation Criteria

- Clarity: Instructions must be simple, unambiguous, and easy to follow.
- Completeness: All critical steps and hazards must be covered without omission.
- Feasibility: Control measures must be realistic within shop-floor limitations.
- Safety Effectiveness: Controls should significantly reduce risk severity or likelihood.
- Compliance: Alignment with statutory and organizational safety requirements.
- Usability: SOPs should support quick reference during operations.

### 3.5.4. Feedback Collection and Documentation

Feedback from experts is collected through multiple methods, including structured review forms, group discussions, and direct observations. Comments are categorized into:

- Critical Corrections: Missing hazards, incorrect procedures, or unsafe instructions.
- Recommended Improvements: Suggestions to enhance clarity or efficiency.
- Operational Constraints: Limitations related to time, tooling, or machine configuration.
- Training Requirements: Areas where additional skill development is needed.

All feedback is documented systematically to maintain traceability and accountability. This documentation also supports future audits and continuous improvement initiatives.

### 3.5.5. Revision and Refinement of JSA and SOPs

Based on expert input, the JSA and SOP documents undergo systematic revision. Identified gaps are addressed by adding new hazards, modifying risk ratings, or introducing additional control measures. For example, experts may recommend adding interlocks, improving fixture design, or strengthening administrative controls such as mandatory dry runs or supervisor approval steps. SOPs are refined by simplifying technical language, reordering steps for better workflow alignment, and adding visual cues or warning symbols. Emergency procedures and LOTO steps are often strengthened during this phase to ensure zero-energy verification and clear responsibility allocation. This iterative refinement ensures that the final documents are not merely theoretical safety guidelines but practical tools that can be consistently applied on the shop floor.

### 3.5.6. Validation of Practical Applicability

A key aspect of expert review is confirming real-world applicability. In some cases, selected SOP steps are demonstrated or simulated on the machine under controlled conditions. Experts observe whether operators can realistically follow the procedures without excessive disruption to productivity. This practical validation helps identify steps that may be technically correct but operationally inefficient. Adjustments are then made to balance safety and productivity, ensuring long-term adherence rather than procedural bypassing.

### 3.5.7. Enhancing Operator Acceptance and Safety Culture

One of the major benefits of expert validation is increased operator acceptance. When machine operators actively participate in the review process, they develop a sense of ownership over safety procedures. This involvement reduces resistance to change and promotes voluntary compliance. The collaborative review process reinforces the concept that safety is a shared responsibility rather than a top-down enforcement activity. It encourages open communication about near misses, unsafe conditions, and improvement opportunities, thereby strengthening the organization’s safety culture.

### 3.5.8. Final Approval and Authorization

After incorporating all expert recommendations, the revised JSA and SOPs are submitted for final approval by management and the safety committee. Authorized signatures confirm that the documents are technically validated, legally compliant, and approved for implementation. Version control details, revision history, and approval dates are updated to ensure proper document management. This formal authorization marks the transition from development to implementation.

#### 3.5.9. Role of Validation in Continuous Improvement

Validation through expert review is not a one-time activity but forms the foundation for continuous improvement. The validated documents serve as baseline standards against which future incidents, audits, or process changes are evaluated. As machining technologies evolve, spindle speeds increase, or new tooling systems are introduced, expert revalidation ensures that safety measures remain relevant. Periodic reviews help maintain alignment with updated regulations, technological advancements, and organizational learning. Validation through expert review plays a vital role in ensuring the effectiveness of JSA and SOP development for high-speed precision machining. By involving safety professionals, supervisors, operators, and maintenance personnel, the project achieves a balanced integration of theoretical safety principles and practical operational knowledge. This structured validation process enhances document accuracy, strengthens compliance, promotes workforce participation, and supports sustainable safety performance. Ultimately, expert review transforms JSA and SOPs into reliable, enforceable, and continuously improving safety tools that significantly reduce workplace risks in high-speed machining environments.

### 3.6. Training and Implementation Plan

Following validation through expert review, a structured training and implementation program is initiated to ensure effective adoption of Job Safety Analysis (JSA) and Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) in high-speed precision machining (HSPM) operations. The success of this phase depends on systematically converting documented safety requirements into consistent workplace practices.

- Step 1: Training Need Identification

Training requirements are identified based on job roles, operational risks, incident history, and JSA findings. Operators, maintenance personnel, supervisors, and safety staff are categorized to ensure role-specific learning.

- Step 2: Development of Training Modules

Training materials are developed using validated JSAs and SOPs. Modules cover hazard identification, machine-specific risks, PPE usage, emergency response, lockout–tagout procedures, and safe operating practices.

- Step 3: Classroom Training

Structured classroom sessions are conducted to explain the purpose of JSA, SOP structure, legal requirements, and common hazards in high-speed machining such as tool breakage, flying chips, noise, heat, and ergonomic stress.

- Step 4: Practical and Hands-On Training

Hands-on demonstrations are carried out on actual machines. Operators practice safe startup, tool installation, machining operations, and shutdown procedures under supervision to ensure correct execution.

- Step 5: Competency Evaluation and Authorization

Participants are assessed through written tests, practical demonstrations, and observation checklists. Only trained and competent personnel are authorized to operate machines independently.

- Step 6: Pilot Implementation

SOPs are initially implemented on selected machines or shifts to identify operational challenges and practical gaps before full-scale deployment.

- Step 7: Full-Scale Implementation

After successful pilot review, SOPs are rolled out across all machining areas. Laminated SOPs and checklists are displayed near machines for easy reference.

- Step 8: Monitoring and Supervision

Supervisors conduct routine compliance checks, record deviations, and provide immediate corrective guidance to reinforce safe behavior.

- Step 9: Continuous Improvement and Refresher Training

Incident data, near misses, and audit findings are periodically reviewed. Refresher training and SOP revisions are conducted to maintain long-term safety performance.

### 3.7. Monitoring, Evaluation and Continuous Improvement

Monitoring, evaluation, and continuous improvement represent the most critical phase in ensuring the long-term effectiveness of Job Safety Analysis (JSA) and Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) in high-speed precision machining (HSPM) environments. While implementation establishes safe work practices, sustained safety performance can only be achieved through systematic review and continuous control of operational risks. A structured monitoring system is established to assess SOP compliance under real shop-floor conditions. Daily workplace observations by supervisors verify adherence to operating procedures, PPE usage, machine guarding, and housekeeping standards. Periodic safety audits conducted weekly and monthly evaluate the effectiveness of engineering controls, emergency systems, lockout–tagout practices, and overall procedural discipline. Equipment safety systems such as interlocks, sensors, and emergency stops are regularly inspected to prevent high-severity failures. Evaluation is supported through clearly defined safety performance indicators, including incident frequency, near-miss trends, SOP deviation rates, audit closure performance, and training compliance. These indicators provide measurable insight into safety effectiveness and enable data-driven decision-making. Operator feedback collected through toolbox talks, suggestion systems, and post-implementation reviews plays a vital role in identifying practical challenges and ergonomic concerns that may not be visible during documentation stages. Near-miss reporting and incident investigations form a key component of continuous improvement. Each event is analyzed to determine immediate, root, and systemic causes, and findings are used to revise risk ratings, update SOP steps, and strengthen control measures. JSA and SOP documents are reviewed periodically or whenever changes occur in machinery, tooling, materials, or production processes. Strong documentation control, management review, and leadership involvement ensure accountability and resource support. Continuous improvement activities are integrated with PDCA cycles, safety audits, and ISO 45001 frameworks, enabling alignment between safety, productivity, and quality objectives. Through continuous monitoring, structured evaluation, and regular improvement actions, safety becomes a proactive management function. This systematic approach reduces accident potential, enhances compliance, strengthens operator confidence, and fosters a sustainable safety culture within high-speed precision machining operations.

## 4. Results and Discussion

The implementation of Job Safety Analysis (JSA) and Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) in high-speed precision machining (HSPM) resulted in notable improvements in safety performance, operational consistency, and hazard awareness. The study confirmed that a structured and systematic safety approach is highly effective in controlling risks associated with high-speed machining environments. Task breakdown and process mapping played a vital role in identifying all critical machining activities, including planning, machine setup, tool handling, machining, inspection, chip removal, coolant management, and maintenance. This detailed mapping revealed several previously overlooked tasks such as manual chip handling, tool offset verification, and shift handover communication, which were later identified as moderate- to high-risk activities. Including these tasks ensured comprehensive safety coverage. The hazard identification phase classified risks into mechanical, electrical, chemical, ergonomic, physical, and administrative categories. Mechanical hazards—particularly rotating spindles, flying chips, and tool breakage—were identified as the most severe due to their high injury potential. Ergonomic risks related to manual handling and prolonged standing also contributed significantly to operator fatigue. Risk assessment using severity–likelihood ranking highlighted high-risk tasks, which were effectively reduced to acceptable levels after applying engineering, administrative, and PPE controls in line with the hierarchy of controls. SOP development based on JSA findings significantly improved procedural clarity. Step-by-step instructions, pre-operation checklists, and emergency response procedures reduced dependence on operator experience and standardized work practices across shifts. SOPs also strengthened compliance with OSHA and ISO 45001 requirements. Expert validation and structured training enhanced practicality and operator acceptance. Improved PPE compliance, safer chip-handling practices, and better adherence to pre-start checks were observed. Continuous monitoring further demonstrated positive trends, including increased near-miss reporting, improved housekeeping, reduced unsafe acts, and better audit compliance. The results confirm that integrating JSA with SOP development establishes a strong preventive safety system. The study demonstrates that safety and productivity can progress together, supporting the development of a proactive and sustainable safety culture in high-speed precision machining operations.

## Conclusion

This project successfully demonstrated the importance of systematic Job Safety Analysis (JSA) and structured Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) development for high-speed precision machining operations. Given the inherent risks associated with high spindle speeds, complex tooling systems, and automated material-handling processes, a proactive and methodical safety approach is essential to prevent accidents and ensure sustainable manufacturing performance. Through detailed task breakdown and hazard identification, critical risks related to machine setup, tool changes, cutting operations, chip evacuation, coolant handling, and maintenance activities were effectively identified and evaluated. The application of engineering, administrative, and personal protective control measures significantly reduced risk levels and improved overall operational safety. The SOPs developed based on JSA findings provided standardized, clear, and practical guidelines that enhanced consistency, compliance, and operator confidence. Validation through expert review, followed by structured training and implementation, strengthened workforce participation and safety awareness. Continuous monitoring and improvement mechanisms ensured adaptability to process changes and evolving industry standards. Overall, the project contributes to reduced accident potential, improved machine reliability, minimized downtime, and the promotion of a strong safety culture. The integrated JSA–SOP framework established in this study can serve as an effective model for enhancing occupational safety in high-speed precision machining and similar advanced manufacturing environments.

## References

[1]. Tipani Arista, Fitriani Fitriani, Mardi Fadillah, Teungku Nih Farisn, Analysis of potential hazards in machine maintenance using the job safety analysis (JSA) method : case study pt xyz October 2025HEARTY 13(5):1335-1352 DOI:10.32832/hearty.v13i5.20978, (2025)

[2]. Rangga A, Ulia, Occupational Safety and Health Analysis with JSA Method and HAZOP, Volume: 15, Issue: 1, Page: 8 - 13, June 30th, 2025, e-ISSN: 2541-1535 Available online at website: https://jitekin-upiyptk.org/ojs/index.php/Teknologi/index, (2025)

[3]. Bima Putra Pranoto, Ferida Yuamita, Analysis of Occupational Accident Risk Control Using the Job Safety Analysis (JSA) Method, Volume 3, Number 2, Year 2025 e-ISSN: 2988-084X; p-ISSN: 2988-0831, Hal 01-11 DOI: https://doi.org/10.59061/repit.v3i2.1042 (2025)

[4]. Muh. Dawami Sholichin, Yunita Primasanti, Bekti Nugrahadi, Erna Indtriastiningsi, Occupational Health and Safety (OHS) Risk Analysis Using Job Safety Analysis (JSA) and Risk Assessment in the Sizing Machine Process at PC GKBI Medari Sleman, Volume 3, No 2, March 2025 e-ISSN: 3031-349X; p-ISSN: 3031-500X, Hal. 40-58 DOI: https://doi.org/10.61132/jupiter.v3i2.781 (2025)

[5]. Paul Sukapto, Marihot Nainggolan, Sani Susanto, Sugih S Tajandr, Implementation of Standard Operating Procedures of Smk3 In The Processed Rice Industry of Cv Mitra Berkah In Parompong, West Bandung Regency. September 2025Jurnal Abdisci 3(4):402-410 DOI:10.62885/abdisci.v3i4.897 (2025)

[6]. Much Djunaidi1 and Haliza Umami, Occupational Health and Safety Analysis Using Job Safety, Analysis and Hazard Identification Risk Assessment and Risk Control Methods,

https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf /202451715003 (2024)

[7]. Luqman Hakim, Mochammad Denis Irwin Ikhwan, Abdillah Ali Masykuri, Identification of Workplace Accidents at PT XYZ In Sidoarjo Using The Job Safety Analysis (JSA) Method December 2024Journal of Research and Technology 10(2):233-242 DOI:10.55732/jrt.v10i2.1536 (2024)

[8]. Manoj Khanna R, Muthukumar K, Jishin Jayan T, Job Safety Analysis on Power Press Machine, e-ISSN: 2395-0056 Volume: 09 Issue: 01 Jan 2022 www.irjet.net p-ISSN: 2395-0072 (2022)

[9]. Matin Aleahmad, Abbas Biglar, Risk Assessment Using Job Safety Analysis (JSA) Method: an industrial case study, (2021)

[10]. Chandrashekharaiah S. B, High-speed machining (HSM): Challenges, advancements and industrial applications, World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2019, 01(02), 101-107, DOI: https://doi.org/ 10.30574/wjarr.2019.1.2.0126, (2019)

[11]. Albrechtsen, E., Solberg, I., and Svensli, E. (2019). The application and benefits of job safety analysis. Safety Science, 113. Aven, T. (2016).

[12]. Risk assessment and risk management: Review of recent advances on their foundation. [In:] European Journal of Operational Research, 253, 1. Azadeh-Fard, N., Schuh, A., Rashedi, E., and Camelio, J.A. (2015).

[13]. Risk assessment of occupational injuries using Accident Severity Grade. [In:] Safety Science, 6. Ebrahimzadih, M., Halvani, G.H., Darvishi, E., and Froghinasab, F. (2015).

[14]. Application of Job Safety Analysis and William Fine Methods to Identify and Control Hazards in a Uranium Mine in Central Area of Iran. Journal of Health, 6, 3. Fuller, C.W. and Vassie, L.H. (2004).

[15]. Health and Safety Management. Principles and Best Practice, FT Prentice Hall, London. Gallagher, C., Underhill, E., and Rimmer, M. (2001).

[16]. Occupational Health and Safety Management Systems. A Review of Their Effectiveness in Securing Healthy and Safe Workplaces, National Occupational Health and Safety Commission, Sydney. Glendon, A.I., Clarke, S., and McKenna, E. (2006).

[17]. Human Safety and Risk Management, 2nd edn. FL: CRC Press, Boca Raton. Glendon, A.I. and Stanton, N.A. (2000).

[18]. Perspectives on safety culture. Safety Science, 34. Gopinath, V. and Johansen, K. (2016).

[19]. Risk Assessment Process for Collaborative Assembly – A Job Safety Analysis Approach. Procedia CIRP, 44. Hayes, B.E., Perander, J., Smecko, T., and Trask, J. (1998).