

This document is a translation of the original assessment in Swedish by SHK of the response to the recommendation. In case of discrepancies between this translation and the Swedish original text, the Swedish text shall prevail in the interpretation of the assessment.

Document type	Page
Letter	1 (2)
File number	Date
0-01/24	2025-09-02
Your reference	
2025/018356	

Swedish Work Environment Authority
Box 9082
171 09 Solna

Assessment of recommendation response from the Swedish Work Environment Authority

On 20 March 2025 the Swedish Accident Investigation Authority (SHK) published a final report (SHK 2025:05) into a fire that occurred on the construction site Liseberg Oceana Waterworld in Gothenburg on 12 February 2024.

In the report, SHK directed two safety recommendations at the Swedish Work Environment Authority (SHK 2025:05 R1 and R2).

The Swedish Work Environment Authority is recommended to

- Investigate the feasibility of increasing, within the scope of construction sites, the focus on systematic work environment management and other matters relating to a good safety culture. (SHK 2025:05 R1)
- Implement measures within the scope of its work with product safety and market surveillance to enhance safety when using electrofusion machines. Such measures can encompass, for example, market surveillance, regulatory changes or standardisation work. (SHK 2025:05 R2)

The Work Environment Authority has responded that the authority has studied the recommendations and that they essentially share SHK's observations and conclusions, and believes that the report is of value to the Work Environment Authority's continuous development work. In its response, the Work Environment Authority has also provided a general description of the authority's work and its current priorities and how these priorities can contribute to a good safety culture.

The Work Environment Authority's response addresses, in parts, relevant issues in relation to the intention of recommendation R1, i.e. to increase the focus on systematic work environment management and other matters relating to a good safety culture. However, the response is general in nature and describes the authority's activities and current priorities. It does not contain any tangible measures that can be deduced as having been implemented as a consequence of the recommendation. Consequently, the recommendation is deemed to be only partially implemented (Concluded – partially satisfactory response).

With regard to the other recommendation (R2), the Work Environment Authority's response does not contain any measures that relate to product safety and market surveillance with regard to the use of electrofusion machines. Consequently, it is not possible to deem the recommendation to have been implemented. (Concluded – unsatisfactory response).

Best regards,

Kristina Börjevik Kovaniemi
Chair Accident Investigations