

---

# Suspended Access Accidents: What an Engineering Investigation Examines

*By Uwe Janssen · Rauch Safety & Engineering · Las Vegas, Nevada*

An engineering investigation of a suspended access accident — a building maintenance unit, a suspended platform, a fall-protection or rope descent system — examines how the event came to be, and its examination can extend across the asset's lifecycle rather than stopping at the moment of the event. The examination can reach the design that set the geometry, the acceptance record that established what was delivered, the inspection and service history and the scopes those documents actually covered, the system's configuration as it existed on the day measured against the configuration that was engineered, and the observations available before the event to the people who operated the system. What the engineering analysis contributes to the legal questions that follow — including questions framed as standard of care — is the factual and technical foundation those questions rest on. The ultimate legal conclusions remain for counsel and the trier of fact. What engineering supplies is what existed, what was done, what was knowable, and when.

## **The event and the condition**

The organizing idea of this series applies with its greatest force after an accident: a failure is an event with a date, and the condition that produced it has a history. The failure modes article in this series describes how conditions in these systems can develop progressively — in drivetrains, in wire rope and its guidance, at the machine-building interface, in controls and safety devices, and in areas outside routine examination — and how development can create a period in which evidence exists before the event does. An engineering investigation is, in large part, an inquiry into that history — one that can trace from the event to the condition, from the condition to its development period, and from the development period to the question of what examined the system during it, for what purpose, and within what scope. The event reveals the condition. The investigation asks what can reliably be established about its history, and what stood between that condition and earlier recognition.

## **Where the investigation can look**

Because the condition's history can span the lifecycle, the investigation's reach can too — and which of these lines an investigation actually pursues depends on the matter, the questions presented, and the evidence available. At the design stage: the geometry the system was given — reach, clearance, accommodation — and the rescue feasibility that geometry created, subjects the early design article in this series develops; a rescue path is a geometric fact before it is a procedural one, and an investigation of a rescue that failed or was improvised can begin with the geometry the procedure inherited. At delivery: the acceptance record — what factory and site acceptance testing examined,

what it did not, and what the file established about the system as delivered and erected, the subject of the acceptance article. In service: the inspection and certification history read against its scope — the first article in this series develops the distinction between a certificate and engineering visibility into condition, and after an event that distinction becomes evidentiary: what the inspections were designed to examine, what they were not, and what fell between. Across the years: configuration — the system as it existed on the day, reconciled against the system as engineered, with the accumulation of substituted components, adjusted settings, and revised arrangements that the failure modes article describes as configuration drift. And throughout: the operator record — what the people who ran the machine observed, reported, and were told, in whatever form those observations survived.

### **The record determines what can be established**

Each of those inquiries is informed by the documentary record — alongside physical examination, testing, measurement, and the accounts of those involved — and an early task of any investigation is establishing the state of that record. The acceptance file, the inspection scopes, the maintenance and modification history, the manuals and load charts, the operator reports: where these exist, the analysis can be anchored to them. Where records are unavailable, the gap becomes part of the investigative problem — the analysis must distinguish what can be established from the available evidence, what may be reconstructed from other sources, and what cannot reliably be determined. The acceptance article in this series describes the acceptance file as the asset's baseline record, and the first article describes documentation decay across ownership transitions and service changes. After an event, those observations become the practical boundaries of the analysis. The questions may remain similar; the evidence available to answer them may not.

### **The multi-party structure of these events**

A suspended access system passes through many hands: designed within one set of scopes, manufactured under an equipment standard, sold — sometimes through intermediaries — installed, accepted, inspected, serviced, operated, and owned, by parties whose responsibilities are defined by different contracts, different regulations, and different periods of custody. The failure modes article observes that conditions can arise, or become difficult to see, at boundaries — between components, between scopes, between the system as engineered and as it exists. In an investigation, that observation has a methodological consequence: an analysis confined to the last actor, or to the machine alone, may not describe how the event came to be, because the condition's history may cross several parties' periods and scopes. This is not a proposition about where fault belongs — that allocation is legal, contractual, and factual, and it is made elsewhere. It is a proposition about analytical completeness: the engineering account of the event should be able to follow the condition wherever its history went — and an analysis that cannot should identify the resulting limitation rather than treat the available fragment as the whole.

## **What the standard-of-care question asks of the engineering analysis**

When a matter raises questions of standard of care, engineering analysis can establish the technical conditions, requirements, practices, records, and decisions relevant to those questions; the legal significance of that evidence is determined within the applicable legal framework. What the analysis can supply, depending on the facts and the available evidence, includes: which regulations, consensus standards, and manufacturer requirements applied to the system and the activity at the relevant time — including, for imported machines, the correspondence between the equipment's originating standard and the regime governing the installed asset, a subject this series treats at acceptance; what the parties' own documents show was specified, delivered, inspected, maintained, and communicated; what conditions existed; what can reliably be established about when evidence of them became observable; what forms of examination could have identified them; and what information was available when the relevant decisions were made. That last element carries particular weight. An analysis anchored in hindsight describes the event. An analysis anchored at the relevant time — what was specified then, inspected then, observable then, required then — provides the technical context in which the decisions were actually made. Engineering that keeps its time index honest serves the analysis regardless of who retained the expert.

## **What counsel can ask of an engineering expert**

For an attorney evaluating engineering support on a suspended access matter, the dimensions above translate into questions that can be asked of any candidate expert, including this one. Whether the analysis can examine the lifecycle rather than the event alone — design geometry and rescue feasibility, acceptance, inspection scope, configuration, operator record — and what documents it would ask for to do so. Whether the expert can read the system's documentation in the regime it was written in — which, for imported equipment, can mean the European framework and the US framework on the same machine. What direct experience the expert brings with these systems — design review, acceptance testing, operation, inspection, examination in service — and how that experience bears on the questions in the matter. And whether the expert distinguishes clearly, in their own writing and testimony, between what the engineering establishes and what conclusions belong to the legal process. The published articles in this series are, among other things, a record of how this author draws that line.

Rauch Safety & Engineering provides independent engineering analysis and expert services on suspended access, fall-protection, and building maintenance unit matters — drawing on engineering practice that spans design review, factory and site acceptance testing, and the examination of systems in service, across the US and international frameworks these systems are built and operated under. RSE does not sell equipment, perform service work, or compete with the parties who do. This article is a general discussion of engineering investigation practice; it is not legal advice, and it is not an opinion on any matter or party.

---

*Standards and regulatory references are current as of August 2026. Users are responsible for verifying the current text of any standard or regulation applicable to their project and jurisdiction.*

© 2026 Rauch Safety & Engineering, Inc.