

Glove Stop

Further development of glove stop technology to make head removal a safer operation

Project Code
2021-1071

Disclaimer The information contained within this publication has been prepared by a third party commissioned by Australian Meat Processor Corporation Ltd (AMPC). It does not necessarily reflect the opinion or position of AMPC. Care is taken to ensure the accuracy of the information contained in this publication. However, AMPC cannot accept responsibility for the accuracy or completeness of the information or opinions contained in this publication, nor does it endorse or adopt the information contained in this report.

No part of this work may be reproduced, copied, published, communicated or adapted in any form or by any means (electronic or otherwise) without the express written permission of Australian Meat Processor Corporation Ltd. All rights are expressly reserved. Requests for further authorisation should be directed to the Executive Chairman, AMPC, Suite 2, Level 6, 99 Walker Street North Sydney NSW.

Project Description

To utilize the known safety technology of body contact with equipment control circuitry to protect the operators hand whilst using the single hand operated manual head cutters. This circuitry is incorporated into the control system to respond with the same functionality as if an emergency stop is activated.

Project Content

Establish a system trigger that reliably activates when a person's protected area makes contact with the metal of their operating machinery, specifically the blade.

The hydraulic cutter jaw closing speed will need to be permanently restricted by mechanical hydraulic means as to allow for system response time delays.

Project Outcome

The original concept of the operator wearing the silver impregnated glove allowed for minimal contact with the cutter surfaces before the safety features activated. This concept proved effective in a clean environment. Unfortunately testing the system with animal product produced an issue with the glove detection. It was found that a gradual build-up of blood contamination reduced the effectiveness of this function and the need for regular glove changes highlighted the fact that this approach was not suitable or practical.

The next approach was to protect the hand with a mesh glove, covered by the silver impregnated glove, covered by a thin blue glove. The theory was that the cutter would pierce the outer blue glove and trigger the safety functions of the cutter and eliminate the glove contamination issue. This function worked effectively but relied on the fact that the cutter blades would be sharp at all times. It was found during testing that if that was the case then the cutter would minutely pierce the glove and the damaged portion of the glove would be no longer than 1mm in length. Even though the safety devices were triggered and this system would most likely eliminate an amputation, it couldn't be guaranteed not to cause some form of unacceptable injury. Due to this unacceptable risk of personnel injury in the form of a fracture or laceration the obvious decision was to abandon this equipment concept and to concentrate further efforts on eliminating personnel from this manual task.

One such way to achieve this is by the use of factory automation in the form of robotics. Robotics in conjunction with vision and x-ray technology has been utilized in similar environments so it is planned to contact one of these companies to investigate the implementation of such technology to replace this manual process.

Benefit for Industry

Hydraulic cutters don't have a current emergency stop and with how rapidly they complete their operation the window for manual intervention is essentially nil. If the operator accidentally commits to a cut without clearing their person from the cut path, there is no recourse. To mitigate the chances of this where possible use dual anti-tie down controls for hydraulic cutters which require both hands on the device and hence clear of blades in order to cut (Two trigger system); with each operation requiring two separate inputs to remove the temptation for operators to tie down one of the controls. This setup is an effective industry practice but not feasible for all operations and can be un-ergonomic for the operator.

Increased health and safety levels for skilled operators of hazardous machinery in the workplace, reducing the likelihood of laceration or even amputation.

