

	End year 02/03	Quarter 1 Ap-Jun	Quarter 2 Jul-Sep	Quarter 3 Oct-Dec	Quarter 4 Jan-Mar
<b>Delivering the Mission</b>					
1 <a href="#">Delivering Planned Work</a>					
2 <a href="#">Delivering Worker Health &amp; Safety PSA</a>					
3 <a href="#">Delivering Major Hazards Target</a>					
4 <a href="#">Delivering Health and Safety in HSE</a>					

<b>Managing Resources</b>					
5 <a href="#">Living within the Budget</a>					
6 <a href="#">Allocating resources to operational priorities</a>					
7 <a href="#">Recruit</a>					
8 <a href="#">Retain and Motivate</a>					

	End year 02/03	Quarter 1 Ap-Jun	Quarter 2 Jul-Sep	Quarter 3 Oct-Dec	Quarter 4 Jan-Mar
<b>Continuous Improvement</b>					
9 <a href="#">Leadership</a>					
10 <a href="#">Delivering Change</a>					
11 <a href="#">Applying Science and Technology</a>					
12 <a href="#">Business Improvement</a>					

<b>Reputation</b>					
13 <a href="#">Image and Profile</a>					
14 <a href="#">Trust and Reputation</a>					
15 <a href="#">Engaging Stakeholders</a>					

Key



**Green:** Work on track and clear progress being made towards aims/targets



**Yellow:** Work is showing some slippage but is recoverable with effort



**Red:** Work is showing significant slippage and is only recoverable with major effort



**Grey:** targets developed but no data available for end of year, reporting will commence from first quarter



**Cross:** Indicators still to be developed

1 DELIVERING PLANNED WORK	HSE	HSE	FOD	FOD	HID	HID	RI	RI	NSD	NSD
End Year 2002/03	Plan	Outturn	Plan	Outturn	Plan	Outturn	Plan	Outturn	Plan	Outturn
<b>OPMA</b>										
Number of safety cases etc processed	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of safety cases etc processed to time and quality standards	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
% safety cases etc processed to time	100.00%	#VALUE!			100.00%	#VALUE!	100.00%	#VALUE!	100.00%	#VALUE!
<b>OPMC</b>										
Total number of complaints reported	27,318	28,187	26,436	26,917	521	566	361	704		
Total number of complaints followed up	23,841	23,470	23,000	22,358	480	450	361	662		
% complaints investigated	87.00%	83.27%	90.00%	83.06%	90.00%	79.51%	90.00%	94.03%		
<b>OPMD</b>										
Total number of (incidents) reported	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total number of (incidents) that meet HSC criteria	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total number of incidents that meet criteria and were investigated	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
% incidents that met HSC criteria investigated	N/A	#DIV/0!	N/A	#VALUE!	N/A	#VALUE!	N/A	#VALUE!	N/A	#VALUE!
<b>OPME</b>										
Number higher risk workplaces identified	1,570	1,523	1,523	1,523			N/A	N/A	47	47
Number higher risk workplaces receiving an intervention	1,570	1,482	1,523	1,482			N/A	N/A	47	47
% high hazard/risk workplaces receiving an intervention	100.00%	97.31%	100.00%	97.31%			N/A	#VALUE!	100.00%	100.00%

#### Narrative

Apart from OPMC all the above OPMs are new measures. Data for preceding years is not available. However the end year outturn for 2002/03 using the old OPMs shows that performance was generally on track and output targets were either achieved or nearly achieved (see summary below)  
A Narrative report on these Key Outputs is provided in the End Year Report

KEY OUTPUTS AND PERFORMANCE for 2002/03	Profile	Outturn	Variance
Regulatory contacts	198,674	218,574	19,900
Preventive Inspections	80,502	84,234	3,732
Number of incidents investigated	18,044	11,251	-6,793
% of incidents investigated	8.20%	7.90%	-0.30%
Number of complaints investigated	23,845	23,473(p)	372(p)
% of complaints investigated	87.00%	83.3%(p)	(3.7%)(p)
Number of safety cases processed	791	545	246

<b>2 Delivering Worker Health and Safety PSA1</b>									
End Year 2002/03	1999/00	2000/01	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2007/08	2009/10
<b>Reduce Number of working days lost/100,000 workers from work related injury and ill health by 15% by 2004 and by 30% by 2010</b>			<b>Baseline</b>			RHS Mid-point			
No of working days lost/100,000 workers from work related injury and ill health			40.2m			34m			28m
<b>Reduce incidence rate of fatal and major injury incidents by 5% by 2004 and by 10% by 2010</b>	<b>Baseline</b>					RHS Mid-point			
<b>Incidence rate of fatal and major injury incidents</b>	263.2	262.0	268.9			250.0			236.9
<b>Reduce the incidence rate of cases of work related ill health by 10% by 2004 and by 20% by 2010</b>			<b>Baseline</b>			RHS Mid-point			
Incidence rate per 100,000 employees of cases of work related ill health			2,200			2000			1800
<b>Priority Programmes</b>	A separate report on progress with the Priority Programmes is provided in the End Year Report								
Progress with Priority Programme Plans									

## Narrative

### Progress with PSA Targets

A red traffic light has been highlighted because the 2001/02 Annual Health and Safety Statistics show no indications of the required reductions. For a number of reasons (e.g. base year figures have only recently been established on working days lost and ill health incidence), it is not possible at this stage to state categorically whether the targets will be delivered. However, on the limited evidence currently available, e.g. no real signs of improvement and the assumed impact of the Priority Programmes on the health-related targets (they are estimated to achieve 50% only), there is a more than small risk that the targets will not be achieved. But this is not clear. Work is in progress to improve arrangements for programme management and monitoring of delivery of the PSA.

### Progress with Priority Programme plans

A quarterly report on progress with the Priority Programmes will be annexed to future Balanced Scorecards. This will be in the same form as used for reporting to DWP.

<b>3 Delivering Major Hazards Target</b>	<b>End Year</b>	<b>2003/04</b>			
<b>End Year 2002/03</b>	<b>2003/04</b>	<b>Quarter 1</b>	<b>Quarter 2</b>	<b>Quarter 3</b>	<b>Quarter 4</b>
<b>Rail indicators</b>					
Signals passed at danger	196				
Track compromised	837				
derailments	93				
Acts of vandalism	984				
Level crossing incidents	182				
<b>Nuclear indicators</b>					
Reports made to HSE by licence holders which indicate a challenge to nuclear safety	143				
<b>Offshore indicators</b>					
Major and significant hydrocarbon releases	112				
<b>Onshore indicators (including COMAH)</b>					
Relevant RIDDOR reportable dangerous occurrences, e.g. unintentional explosions, failure of pressure systems	156				

## **Narrative**

A first report for this indicator will be provided with the first quarter return in early August  
The above presents the baseline data available for end 2002/03.

For 2003/04 HSE will operate the proposed target for Major hazards as an internal target to ensure the appropriate indicators have been selected and their suitability as measures of improved safety management and triggers for HSE action assured. For some industries, further work may be needed to develop a credible set of indicators that reflect safety controls and which can be confidently used to target HSE's activity. Progress with the indicators will be reported quarterly where data is available.

<b>4 Delivering Health and Safety in HSE</b>	<b>End Year</b>	<b>End Year</b>	<b>2003/04</b>			
<b>End Year 2002/03</b>	<b>2001/02</b>	<b>2002/03</b>	<b>Quarter 1</b>	<b>Quarter 2</b>	<b>Quarter 3</b>	<b>Quarter 4</b>
<b>Sick Absence</b>						
Number of instances of absence	6,534	7,152				
Average days absence per employee	8.06	8.36				
<b>Referrals to Occupational Health Provider</b>						
Number of cases referred to OH Provider for DSE Assessment	89	92				
<b>Notification of Accidents and ill Health</b>						
Fatal injuries	0	0				
Major injuries	2	1				
Over 3 Day injuries	9	13				
Minor injuries	114	148				
Dangerous occurrences	2	0				
Near misses including verbal abuse and possible accidental exposure to asbestos	72	85				
ill Health cases	129	158				
Total reported incidents	328	405				

## Narrative

HSE's targets for reducing the number of work days lost per staff year due to sickness absence were: by 2001, an overall rate of 9.0 work days per staff year lost and by 2003, an overall rate of 7.8 work days per staff year lost.

The number of instances of sickness absence in 2002/03 was 7,152 which was higher than 2001/02 (6,534) and 2000/01 (6,183), although HSE did employ more staff during 2002/03. The overall rate of working days lost per staff year was 8.36 (a rise of 0.3 over last year, two instances accounting for 0.32 days/year). However, whilst sickness absence incidence increased last year, the overall historical trend remains downward. But a continuing rise in numbers would be cause for concern as this would lead to a reversal of the historical trend."

### NOTE

The instances referred to relate to staff who have since retired on health grounds, one of which contributed a number of days lost to the total that could only be repeated if an existing long term absence continues into 2004/05.

There were 15 RIDDOR reports during 2002/03, 2 of which were reported by employers of non-HSE staff. This compares with 15 last year (including 3 non HSE staff) and 15 in 2000/01 (including 2 non HSE staff). The incident rate for RIDDOR incidents is 303 per 100,000 employees. HSE estimates the total cost of the accidents/ill health to be approximately £275,000, but believe this underestimates the cost of ill health particularly due to stress. There were no claims settled during the year relating to work-related accidents.

Staff have been encouraged to report health and safety incidents and in particular cases of stress. This encouragement has been reflected in the increased levels of reporting and in particular the number of cases of stress reported increased from 11 in 2001/02 to 44 in 2002/03.

5 Living within the Budget	Estimate	Forecast Outturn	Variance		Budget Profile	Outturn	Variance
HSE excl HSL		To Date	(+or-)		To Date	To Date	(+or-)
End of Year 2002/03	£k	£k	£k		£k	£k	£k
<b>Admin cost: is spend on payroll and GAE in line with plan</b>							
Pay	142,442	130,824	11,618		133,348	130,824	2,524
GAE	60,464	68,439	-7,975		70,164	68,439	1,725
<b>Administration Limit</b>	<b>202,906</b>	<b>199,263</b>	<b>3,643</b>		<b>203,512</b>	<b>199,263</b>	<b>4,249</b>
<b>Programme: is spend in line with plan</b>							
Programme	50,500	50,197	303		50,673	50,197	476
<b>NET Resource Budget: is expenditure and income within net resource limit</b>							
Income	50,398	52,109	-1,711		-51,210	-52,109	899
<b>Net</b>	<b>203,008</b>	<b>197,351</b>	<b>5,657</b>		<b>202,975</b>	<b>197,351</b>	<b>5,624</b>
<b>Capital Management: is capital spend according to Plan</b>							
<b>Capital Spend (excl capital sales)</b>	<b>6,402</b>	<b>7,091</b>	<b>-689</b>		<b>8,599</b>	<b>7,091</b>	<b>1,508</b>

#### Narrative

The admin costs 'underspend' reflects the Board's decision to bear down on expenditure to help the 2003/04 position. The programme underspend was not forecast and EYF is not available on programme in respect of 2002/03. Income exceeded Estimate by £1.7 million in HSE Main, nearly £1 million of which was not reflected in the February forecast.' The indicator in respect of income alone would be red. A full Financial Report is provided in the End Year Report to the Board (Paper B/03/043).

#### The position for HSE including HSL is provided below

5 Living within the Budget	Estimate	Forecast Outturn	Variance		Budget Profile	Outturn	Variance
HSE incl HSL		To Date	(+or-)		To Date	To Date	(+or-)
End of Year 2002/03	£k	£k	£k		£k	£k	£k
<b>Admin cost: is spend on payroll and GAE in line with plan</b>							
Pay	154,431	141,303	13,128		144,650	141,303	3,347
GAE	66,017	75,063	-9,046		76,592	75,063	1,529
<b>Administration Limit</b>	<b>220,448</b>	<b>216,366</b>	<b>4,082</b>		<b>221,242</b>	<b>216,366</b>	<b>4,876</b>
<b>Programme: is spend in line with plan</b>							
Programme	55,300	54,438	862		55,200	54,438	762
<b>NET Resource Budget: is expenditure and income within net resource limit</b>							
Income	-76,375	-78,366	1,991		-77,187	-78,366	1,179
<b>Net</b>	<b>199,373</b>	<b>192,438</b>	<b>6,935</b>		<b>199,255</b>	<b>192,438</b>	<b>6,817</b>
<b>Capital Management: is capital spend according to Plan</b>							
<b>Capital Spend (excl capital sales)</b>	<b>11,000</b>	<b>8,504</b>	<b>2,496</b>		<b>10,299</b>	<b>8,504</b>	<b>1,795</b>



<b>6 Allocating Resources to our operational priorities</b>	<b>2002/03</b>		<b>Quarter 1</b>		<b>Quarter 2</b>		<b>Quarter 3</b>		<b>Quarter 4</b>	
End of Year 2002/03	Plan	Outturn	Plan	Outturn	Plan	Outturn	Plan	Outturn	Plan	Outturn
<b>(OPM B) % of resource committed to priority operational activities.</b>										
FOD	60.00%	63%								
HID										
RI										
NSD										
HSE										
<b>Overall % resource committed to priority programmes as a proportion of that published in HSC Business plan</b>		<b>105%</b>								
<b>No regulatory contacts delivered</b>										
FOD	172,985	186,203								
(preventative inspections included in above)	71,858	74,112								
HID	16,528	21,042								
(preventative inspections included in above)	8420	9830								
RI	5,989	7,764								
(preventative inspections included in above)										
NSD	992	948								
(preventative inspections included in above)										
HSE	196,494	215,957								
(preventative inspections included in above)	80,278	83,942								
<b>FOD only - balance of resource committed to Proactive/reactive</b>	60-40	51-49								

### Narrative

OPM B is a new measure data will be formally reported from the first quarter. However FOD have been able to provide a final figure for the percentage of its resource allocated to priority programmes and this is given above.

Information on the number of contacts delivered for 2002/03 is provided to supplement the information on resources allocated.

For 2003/04 numbers of regulatory contacts will continue to be provided as Management Information but it will not be reported as a headline OPM.

<b>7 Recruit</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>2003/04</b>			
<b>End of Year 2002/03</b>	<b>2002/03</b>	<b>Quarter 1</b>	<b>Quarter 2</b>	<b>Quarter 3</b>	<b>Quarter 4</b>
<b>Occupancy of unfunded posts (the priority list)</b>					
Number of people occupying unfunded posts in Rose Court					
Band 1	1				
Band 2	5				
Band 3	1				
Band 4	0				
Band 5	1				
Band 6	0				
Total Number occupying unfunded posts in Rose Court	8				
Number of people occupying unfunded posts in Bootle					
Band 1	1				
Band 2	2				
Band 3	2				
Band 4	2				
Band 5	1				
Band 6	2				
Total Number occupying unfunded posts in Bootle	10				
<b>Total number occupying unfunded posts across HSE</b>	<b>18</b>				
<b>Length of time on list to placement in permanent post</b>	<b>N/A</b>				
<b>Success in filling agreed number of advertised posts within agreed timeframe</b>					
<b>Number of agreed posts advertised</b>	<b>N/A</b>				
<b>Number of agreed posts advertised filled</b>	<b>N/A</b>				

#### **Narrative**

**There is no historical data is available for this indicator this represents the Baseline for 2002/03**

The suggested target is for numbers occupying unfunded posts to fall, together with a gradual rise in the number of internal vacancies advertised

<b>8 Retain and Motivate</b>					
End of Year 2002/03	End Year		Turnover rate	Turnover rate	variance
	2002/03	Targets	2000/1	2001/2	
<b>Turnover rate by the principle 9 disciplines in HSE</b>					
Admin	9.00%		8.70%	9.00%	0.30%
FAQ	4.60%		4.60%	4.60%	0.00%
Nuclear	3.10%		5.10%	3.10%	-2.00%
Offshore	5.40%		7.50%	5.40%	-2.10%
Other	11.00%		13.20%	11.00%	-2.20%
Professional and Technical	5.60%		12.70%	5.60%	-7.10%
Railway	11.30%		18.60%	11.30%	-7.30%
Scientific	7.20%		9.10%	7.20%	-1.90%
Specialist	4.30%		4.80%	4.30%	-0.50%
<b>Turnover rate for all staff</b>	<b>7.20%</b>		<b>7.70%</b>	<b>7.20%</b>	<b>-0.50%</b>

Training indicators to be developed	End Year	2003/04				
	2002/03		Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
Diversity In HSE	End Year	2003/04				
	2002/03	(by 2005)	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
Progress towards SCS Disability Targets 2005	1.80%	3.70%				
Progress towards SCS Gender Targets 2005	25%	29.00%				
Progress towards SCS Race Targets 2005	0%	1.80%				

## Narrative

### Turnover rate by the principle 9 disciplines in HSE

HSE may want the indicator to rise marginally in coming months to encourage numbers of staff across the organisation (in certain groups of staff) to decrease

The current turnover rate is on target at within 1% of the current overall rate

## Training

Indicators are still to be developed

## Diversity in HSE

The SCS diversity targets are for 2005. The above figures represent the baseline for measuring this indicator progress will be given in the first quarter

Our targets were set in April 1999 using an analysis of factors such as: the current situation across all job bands; age profiles; likely promotion rates; the effects of increased recruitment activity in attracting ethnic minority applicants, women and people with disabilities; and the impact of awareness raising activities, particularly on the development of staff from underrepresented groups. To these factors we then applied an element of 'stretch' to ensure our targets are genuinely challenging. We will be reviewing the targets shortly when the results of the 2001 population census are analysed.

<b>9 Leadership</b> End of Year 2002/03  <b>Indicators are to be developed</b>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## **Narrative**

### **Leadership Narrative.**

The Staff Survey 2002 suggested that views on whether HSE had strong Leadership had deteriorated from previous surveys. For example only 24% thought that HSE had strong leadership compared to 25% in 2001. Work is in hand to develop and implement a strategy for developing leadership skills in HSE.

Plans for 2003/04 include:

- 1) Participation in DWP "Leading the Vision" coaching programme (between April 2003 and January 2004) with evaluation of impact by March 2004;
- 2) Map SCS development objectives for 2003/04 by July 2003;
- 3) Produce corporate development plan and benchmark against other government departments by September 2003;
- 4) Develop strategy by January 2004;
- 5) Develop improved arrangements for publishing leadership schemes for the benefit of HSE staff by April 2004.
- 6) A Leadership Development Programme presently being run for SCS by STAR alliance. The programme will run for the rest of the year and presumably be followed by some kind of evaluation - although I don't know what form this will take as yet.

As the strategy develops PEFD will work with PD to develop appropriate Balanced Scorecard indicators to track progress with this strategy.

**10 Delivering Change**  
End of Year 2002/03

**Indicators to be developed**

### **Narrative**

**Indicators are under development for this Programme. A milestones Narrative report is provided below**

The period May-Nov 2002 was essentially a design phase and that from Nov 2002 to April 2003 an implementation phase, although for some projects the design phase has continued.

Outcomes from the Change Programme for 2002/03 include;

- agreeing a remit for the Strategy and Intelligence Division, selecting the Head of the Division and staffing the Division
- establishing the Policy Group with joint Directors and significant realignment of responsibilities at Band 0
- setting up COSAS and embedding S&T expertise in Operational Directorates and the Policy Group
- piloting the Ways of Working workshops and designing revised workshop programmes for rollout
- agreeing a new approach to sector work.

The Change Programme continues into 2003; key activities are the Communications Project, a Leadership Development Programme for the SCS and rolling out the Ways of Working workshops. But as important is ensuring that completed projects and new structures deliver their intended benefits. A report on Benefit Management is expected by the end of June. In the longer term it is intended to use Benefits management to track progress with the Change Programme and to report progress in the Balanced Scorecard.

<b>11 Applying Science and Technology</b>	<b>End year</b>	<b>2003/04</b>			
End of Year 2002/03	2002/03	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	quarter 3	quarter 4
<b>Implementation of Guidance from the Chief Scientific Adviser (CSA), including Guidelines 2000 and the Code of Practice for Scientific Advisory Committees</b>					
(i) Annual reports of reviews of at least two major policy development processes to assess how well Guidelines 2000 have been implemented.					
(ii) Numbers of staff, especially policy staff, attending training on Guidelines 2000					
(iii) CSA satisfied with HSE implementation of his Guidance.					
<b>% of spend on work assessed as high priority by the S&amp;I Blocks.</b>					
<b>% of projects where S&amp;I Blocks can demonstrate a link between their commissioned research/scientific support and policy/operational outputs (eg in guidance, legislation, or other activity).</b>					
<b>% of projects where it can be shown that the output of commissioned research and support has made a significant contribution to improved H&amp;S outcomes</b>					

#### **Narrative**

This is a new indicator baseline data for 2002/03 is not available the first quarter outcome will represent the baseline for this indicator

#### **Implementation of Guidance from the Chief Scientific Adviser (CSA), including Guidelines 2000 and the Code of Practice for Scientific Advisory Committees**

The first two reviews of major policy development processes are being completed and will be reported shortly provisional indications are encouraging

Training of staff has to be organised and staff persuaded to attend at a difficult time - tight resource position and following changes.

The quantity of Chief Scientist Adviser guidance is growing but CSA remains satisfied with our implementation

the % spend on high priority work will be reported at the 6 month stage.

There is currently no background data for examples of links between commissioned research and policy/operational outputs. This will be reported in the first quarter



<b>12 Business Improvement</b>	<b>End Year</b>	<b>2003/04</b>			
<b>End of Year 2002/03</b>	<b>2002/03</b>	<b>Quarter 1</b>	<b>Quarter 2</b>	<b>Quarter 3</b>	<b>Quarter 4</b>
<b>%age of D/Ds with a significant and balanced business improvement programme</b>					
<b>%age of strategic projects hitting key milestones whilst in development</b>					
<b>%age of strategic delivered projects hitting benefit milestones</b>					
<b>Overall “benefits” collated expressed as a %age of administrative costs equal 5% year-on-year</b>	<b>6.4%</b>				

### **Narrative**

A separate report on Business Improvements in 2002/03 is provided in the End Year Report to the Board

HSE exceeded its targets for Business Improvement during 2002/03, which was to achieve overall benefits of 3%. This Performance Measure will be increased to 5% for 2003/04.

Other performance Measures will be reported on from the 1st quarter of 2003/04.

**13 Image and Profile**  
End of Year 2002/03

**Indicators to be developed**

### **Narrative**

No indicators have been developed for this traffic light yet.

Images and perceptions of HSE are based on people's acquired knowledge and experience - direct and indirect - including corporate identity, media coverage and commentary, advertising, promotion, personal and telephone contacts. Different audiences will have different images of HSE and different expectations.

The challenge is to match perceptions with reality and with the values and beliefs of HSE. A positive image leads to trust, confidence and a good reputation. There is therefore a strong link between this indicator and 'Trust and reputation'.

Whereas different people may perceive HSE's image differently, its corporate identity should be the same for everyone. Corporate identity is managed and controlled; it projects who we are, what we do and how we do it, and comprises visual elements including colour, logo/symbol and typeface, with an associated strapline "Reducing risks - protecting people". The HSE logo is widely sought after which indicates its high value in the safety and health market.

Profile is more difficult to measure and to benchmark. It is feasible to measure media profile periodically, and to incorporate in surveys like the Customer Focus research being carried out over the summer months.

### **HSE's Media Profile**

HSE's media profile during 2002/3 continued to be predominantly positive. A huge range of trade and technical publications regularly published information about our activities. These tended to be factual and supportive.

Rail matters continued to be the main subject that interested the national media on a regular basis. The Potters Bar derailment and subsequent reports, decisions on ERTMS, acceptance of LUL Safety Case, and the Cullen Inquiry update reports produced substantial coverage. This was generally positive. However, a couple of the leading specialist rail magazines continue to be extremely critical.

The extensive work HSE did on co-ordinated central government issues such as the firefighters strike and anthrax in the post, provoked a lot of interest. These enhanced our reputation within Government and supported our image as the authoritative regulator with extensive expertise.

Negative coverage from the national media tended to come from opinion writers and campaigning journalists like Christopher Booker of the Sunday Telegraph. He wrote a series of attacking articles on the duty to manage asbestos and was instrumental in getting the issue raised in Parliament.

The main risk to HSE's reputation continues to be the lumping together of health and safety issues and the "compensation culture". Administrative rules introduced by many organisations, particularly public bodies – banning conkers, closing swings in playgrounds on the grounds they were a few millimetres too high, ladders on tanks etc – under the banner of "health and safety", can do damage to the serious work we do. Simon Jenkins, writing in The Times or The Evening Standard, is a prime example of a journalist who criticises HSE for promoting safety at any price. Organisations that adopt a 'risk-averse' approach often impose a high level of internal paperwork relating to health and safety, which is often cited in publicity about businesses drowning in red tape.

Another risk is the need for us to respond quickly and effectively to campaigns against us, particularly from the Centre for Corporate Accountability, on, for example, inspection/prosecution statistics.

**14 Trust and Reputation**

End of Year 2002/03

**Indicators to be developed****Narrative**

No indicators have been developed for this traffic light yet.

HSE recently published a research report on "Perceptions of Trust in the HSE as a risk regulator" (Research Report 100 prepared by the University of East Anglia, HSL and the University of Wales). The research conducted both qualitative and quantitative work. The main findings of the report were that public perceptions of HSE were fundamentally positive and apparently robust. Levels of trust appeared relatively high based on perceptions that HSE was motivated primarily to act in the public interest through activities that demonstrate and provide care for workers and others, and acted to constrain employers some of whom, if unregulated, might place workers and the public at risk. HSE also works to raise awareness about health and safety issues rather than to deny or attempt to explain away hazards. Finally, HSE was thought to act independent from vested interests and was non-partisan and unbiased in its approach to health and safety regulation. The report concluded that HSE is perceived as performing a fundamentally altruistic role in 'reducing risks and protecting people'.

However though there was widespread public knowledge of HSE as something to do with workplace health and safety there was very limited knowledge of our actual core functions. This vague and impressionistic basis for public perception highlighted potential for instability and fragility in our trust profile and the need to reinforce our position here.

Other research related to trust and reputation included "Confronting Reality" conducted by Radical, which interviewed 38 stakeholders from Government, trade unions and trade associations, pressure groups and dutyholders. This research concluded that public trust in HSE was high but fragile and, based on the views of stakeholders, HSE was in danger of becoming less and less relevant.

Further work is needed to develop suitable indicators in this area that are sufficiently robust and can track our reputation over time. We have commissioned Customer Focus market research and this will report in September. This may provide a source of information and potential indicators which would provide the necessary tracking which is currently missing from the process.

<b>15 Engaging Stakeholders</b>
End of Year 2002/03
<b>Indicators to be developed</b>

### **Narrative**

Key Activities on Stakeholder Engagement during 2002/03 focused on the

Development of outline stakeholder engagement strategy (HSC/02/136 refers) with emphasis on continued engagement with traditional 'tripartite' stakeholders but also on more strategic, better co-ordinated engagement with more varied stakeholders such as the media, insurance and financial sectors

Development of individual stakeholder engagement plans by the eight priority programmes

Wider HSC/E stakeholder activities included:

#### **HSC/SASD:**

"Top UK challenge" - Ministerial/HSC visits to discuss public company reporting on health and safety, principles of their policies, performance and targets;

National Account Manager (NAM) Scheme - involving HSE staff undertaking the role of NAM to 15 top UK companies, to promote greater corporate responsibility and accountability for health and safety

#### **NSD:**

development of a stakeholder charter setting out the vision for and key expectations of the principal stakeholders

#### **RI:**

HSE policy advice on automatic train protection involving the use of focus groups;

emphasis on stakeholder engagement prior to formal consultation on new post-Cullen regulations - process being evaluated using consultants.

#### **DIAS/OCB**

development of customer focus initiatives to better identify what our customers think/expect of our services; and

development of proposals for an 'intermediaries database/consultation module, to facilitate two-way communication with consultees and more 'joined-up working' in respect of key stakeholders

#### **SID**

##### **Consultation on the strategy.**

1) We have commissioned People Science and Policy to research/consult hard to reach groups on emerging strategic thinking;

2) We are running an A list consultation (using Consultation Directory) with a "work in progress" document - deliberately different in style and function seeking their views on open questions; and

3) The Regional Directors are also consulting on the strategic thinking - the methodology has been left open but this will generally be done either in the course of their routine business or with small focus/working groups.

4) We will shortly be running a targeted Local Authority consultation.

5) Further down the line a more traditional style consultation document will also be made available for the traditional consultees (on the Consultation Directory).