

HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CONIAC)

Minutes of the M2/2008 meeting held on 23 June 2008

Present

Stephen Williams (Chair)
Richard Ash
Shelley Atkinson-Frost
Bill Belshaw
Bob Blackman
Peter Caplehorn
Kevin Fear
Clive Johnson
Peter Kent
Briony Krikorian
Rob Miguel
Alan Muddiman
James Preston-Hood
Bill Rabbetts
Phil Russell
Robert Sayers
Peter Wilson

Clive Young

Anthony Lees (Secretary)
Cathy Kerby (Secretariat)
Geoff Lloyd
Michael Ryan (Secretariat)

Representing

Health and Safety Executive
Engineering Construction Industry Association
Construction Confederation
Specialist Engineering Contractors Group
Unite (T&G Section)
Construction Industry Council
ConstructionSkills
National Specialist Contractors Council
Local Authorities
Association of British Insurers
Unite (Amicus Section)
Construction Confederation
Construction Clients' Group
Construction Confederation
Federation of Master Builders
Home Builders Federation
Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians
Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform
Health and Safety Executive
Health and Safety Executive
Health and Safety Executive
Health and Safety Executive

Members of the public

18 were present

Apologies

Alan Ritchie

Shona Dunn

John Ioannou
John Tebbit
Kevin Toner

Representing

Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians
Department for Communities and Local Government
Office of Government Commerce
Construction Products Association
Health and Safety Executive Northern Ireland

Summary of Action agreed:

- 1 **ACTION: Secretariat to provide CONIAC with sight of the inspector briefing on vulnerable workers (or a suitable version of it).**
2. **ACTION: CONIAC Members to write to the Secretariat with their views on:**
 - **Whether CONIAC should continue?**
 - **What its role should be?**
 - **How should it fit in the arrangements described in Giles Denham's paper?**
 - **What could be dealt with in a different way?**
3. **ACTION: Secretariat to inform Giles Denham of CONIAC's view of its future role and its response to the proposals in his paper on a framework for bodies established under the governance of the HSE Board (HSE/08/06), available as Appendix 1 to CONIAC paper M2/2008/2.**
4. **ACTION: Secretariat to ensure time at the 27 November CONIAC meeting for further consideration of the role of CONIAC.**
5. **ACTION: Secretariat to ensure time at the 27 November CONIAC meeting for a formal review of the work of the Sub-Groups.**
6. **ACTION: Secretariat to ensure time at the 27 November CONIAC meeting for an update on the LACE Project.**
7. **ACTION: CONIAC Members to contact Kevin Fear with their views on the proposal to develop an onshore version of the offshore Step Change web site.**

1. Welcome and apologies

1.1 Stephen Williams welcomed everyone to the meeting. He gave the apologies of absent Members and in that connection noted that Peter Wilson was representing UCATT in place of Alan Ritchie, and Briony Krikorian was representing ABI in place of Paul Hayward.

1.2 He took the opportunity to congratulate Bob Blackman on his recent award of the MBE.

2. Chair's introduction and briefing on urgent business

The following issues were addressed:

- (i) Strategic Forum for Construction follow-up work to the Construction Forum

2.1 The Strategic Forum for Construction's Health and Safety Task Group has, through a number of sub-groups, been carrying forward work stemming from the Secretary of State's Construction Forum held in September 2007, following the increase in worker fatalities during 2006/2007. Stephen said the H&S Task Group would next meet on 27 June, and asked Shelley Atkinson-Frost (the Group's Secretary) to update CONIAC on recent progress.

2.2 Shelley reported that the web portal designed by the **Sharing Best Practice Sub-Group**, to provide health and safety information, including intelligence on "near hits", would soon go live. The **Competency Sub-Group** is working with CSCS to streamline test and induction requirements. It has considered good practice in training and will suggest promulgation of key principles to the industry. It has received a demonstration from CCG of its CDM Assurance Webtool, and is working with the professional institutions to encourage their members to help clients engage more vigorously with health and safety issues. Additionally, in connection with its work to increase take-up by SMEs of organisational and individual competence schemes, it will discuss the Safety Schemes in Procurement (SSIP) initiative. Finally, the **Worker Engagement Sub-Group** will bring forward a blueprint for reinstating the Worker Safety Advisor scheme, and will consider current guidance on worker engagement before suggesting a new model.

2.3 Shelley mentioned that the H&S Task Group has now produced a paper summarising its members' experience with **public sector clients** and suggestions on how they can support the Public Sector Construction Clients' Forum (PSCCF) in driving forward change. She concluded by stating that the Strategic Forum will combine its next Construction Forum follow-up report to the Secretary of State with its next Ministerial report into a single document for submission in August.

(ii) Tower cranes

2.4 In response to the occurrence of a number of tower crane incidents, some involving fatalities, the Strategic Forum had set up a **Tower Cranes Group**, chaired by John Spanswick, to develop and take forward an action plan. Stephen asked Shelley Atkinson-Frost to update CONIAC on developments.

2.5 Shelley said that the Group had last met on 21 April and would meet again on 9 July, with conclusions expected in many areas during the next two months. The **Site Induction Working Group** has extended its brief to include planning, checks and liaison process before erecting, climbing or dismantling cranes. It will finalise a guidance document by the end of June. The **Competency Working Group** will clarify expected levels of competency for individuals, eg supervisors, in a document for publication by the end of June. The **Maintenance and Thorough Examination Working Group** launched its guidance document on 13 May and is now focussing on communicating it to the industry. The **Operator Working Conditions Working Group** is preparing best practice guidance. The guidance is sponsored by CSCS and will be published free of charge by the end of

August. **Communication to the Public** – a proposal for a mechanism to enable members of the public to access information on tower crane activity locally and quickly will be firmed up over the next 2 months.

2.6 Stephen said that the Inquest into the death of a Polish worker in the **Liverpool crane collapse** was expected to reach its verdict on 8 July, and thereafter HSE would be able to comment on likely enforcement action. HSE hoped to make an early report to provide information and advice to the industry. There had been two serious crane collapses in New York City recently, and HSE was in communication with the authorities there with a view to sharing information. [**Secretary's Note:** On 8 July the jury at Liverpool Coroner's Court returned a verdict of "accidental death".]

(iii) CDM update

2.7 Stephen reported that the **electronic F10** had gone live from 2 June, and was being used in more than 50% of notifications. Some minor issues had arisen and were being addressed by HSE. He thanked all those who had helped with piloting the F10.

2.8 Work is continuing under the LACE Project to identify ways in which Local Authorities can increase their involvement with construction health and safety via CDM enforcement and information provision. Stephen commented on a recent Building Magazine article "HSE deal may net 4000 new helpers" which described a joint HSE/Building Control initiative in 4 south-east counties in a way that suggested that Construction Division needed to supplement its inspector resource with Building Control inspectors. In fact, the article had misunderstood the purpose of the initiative, which aimed to develop closer working relationships with LAs.

(iv) EC work to develop a non-binding operational guide to the Temporary or Mobile Construction Sites Directive (TMCSO)

2.9 Stephen said that work on the guide had reached draft outline stage. The EC hoped to have a full draft by the end of the year, and then trial it at national level on a few projects. In response to a question from Richard Ash, Stephen confirmed that Andrew East continues to be the HSE contact for this work.

(v) Construction fatal injury statistics

2.10 Stephen informed CONIAC that provisional full year totals for workplace fatal injuries for the year 2007/2008 would be placed on the HSE website on 30 June. While the indications were that the figures would be slightly down on last year, there was no room for complacency.

[**Secretary's note:** The provisional figures for 2007/2008 launched on 30 June show that 75 people were fatally injured by construction work, of which 72 were workers and 3 members of the public. This compares with a total of 86 fatal injuries in 2006/2007 of which 7 were to members of the public.]

(vi) Judith Hackitt meeting with Baroness Vadera on 9 July to discuss, among other things, construction industry proposals for self-regulation

2.11 Stephen informed CONIAC that some industry stakeholder representatives had met Baroness Vadera, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Business and Competitiveness, and outlined a case for “self-regulation” by sections of the industry whose management of health and safety reached or exceeded specified standards. It was likely that this issue would be considered when Judith Hackitt, Chair of the HSE Board, met Baroness Vadera on 9 July. He noted that HSE had not been informed of the proposals before they were put to the Baroness. [**Secretary’s Note:** this meeting was subsequently postponed to 16 July.]

(vii) Campaigns and similar high profile events

2.12 Stephen drew CONIAC’s attention to the recent **Building Magazine Health and Safety Awards**, which by celebrating success provided a welcome counterpoint to the sometimes discouraging press coverage of construction health and safety issues.

2.13 Lord McKenzie had formally launched an initiative to reduce **respiratory disease due to exposure to dust from kerb, paving and block cutting** on 6 May at Rose Court. A free leaflet “Time to clear the air” had been published, and a cross-industry and cross-government working group was identifying suitable interventions. The Hire Association Europe had been active in raising awareness and producing information products, including a DVD.

2.14 The “Asbestos – the hidden killer” campaign had run in February and March and independent evaluation suggested that it had been effective in raising awareness among tradesmen at risk of exposure to asbestos. A larger follow-up campaign is proposed for the Autumn. Stephen took the opportunity to mention the **Asbestos Pneumoconiosis Workers Compensation Scheme** which aims to assist persons who, because they had moved from job to job, could not link their condition and compensation claim to any particular employer.

2.15 Stephen said that Construction Division hoped, in the last quarter of the year, to run a **campaign focussing on property developers**, linked to work on refurbishment, where there continued to be high levels of fatalities. An additional motivating factor is evidence of significant lack of health and safety awareness among developers, particularly the smaller ones.

2.16 The “**Shattered Lives**” campaign on slips, trips and falls was continuing into at least the Autumn. It would include a ladder exchange in September. HSE is grateful to the many stakeholders, eg FMB and CIOB, who have assisted in spreading campaign messages.

(viii) HSE's financial settlement

2.17 Stephen informed CONIAC that HSE's financial settlement for the next 3 years (£724 M) is favourable. HSE has recruited 40 new inspectors, of whom 10 are for Construction Division. There are around 125 front line construction inspectors and 20 frontline managers.

(xi) Vulnerable workers

2.18 Stephen said that accident figures continue to show impact on migrant workers, and mentioned that briefing for inspectors on issues to look for in connection with vulnerable workers (including migrants) is being prepared. Kevin Fear asked when the briefing would be available to CONIAC, and to the public. Stephen said that the release status of the guidance would be considered and, if necessary, a suitable version would be prepared for wider dissemination. Alan Muddiman suggested that more focus may be needed on migrant workers, as it appears that skill/experience levels are much lower in the more recent migrants. Bob Blackman said that while many migrants were in possession of CSCS general operative cards, possibly only a third had any construction experience. Stephen concluded the discussion by stating that HSE is in close contact with the Polish Authorities and an exchange visit by inspectors has been arranged .

ACTION: Secretariat to provide CONIAC with sight of the inspector briefing on vulnerable workers (or a suitable version of it).

3. Agreement of Agenda, approval of Minutes of last meeting and matters arising

3.1 Members agreed the Agenda and formally approved the Minutes of the 4 March 2008 meeting. They raised no points for consideration under AOB.

3.2 Stephen made the following points in connection with the Action Points Update from the 4 March meeting. He noted that:

- A suitable version of Construction Division's Business Group Delivery Plan was in preparation for distribution to Members.
- Information in connection with the (i) Accident and Emergency Reporting Pilot in Liverpool; (ii) the Artificial Optical Radiation Directive; and (iii) updating of the Working Well Together website was given in Annexes 2, 3 and 4 respectively of the Minutes of 4 March meeting.
- Shelley Atkinson-Frost's update to CONIAC on the WWT sub-group training package for SMEs is being deferred to a later meeting.

3.3 Stephen commended to Members the paper on recent activities of CONIAC's Working Groups [M2/2008/6] as an informative read, and said that CONIAC would turn more formally to this subject at its November meeting.

4. Demonstration of good practice DVD for designers by Peter Caplehorn of the Construction Industry Council [M2/2008/1]

4.1 Stephen invited Peter to show the DVD. Peter began by giving some background on the project. He said that Tom Harper of Constructing Excellence (and WWT) had raised, with RIBA, the possibility of non-profit production of a series of short DVDs for construction designers, covering the main health and safety issues in a short sharp way that would draw people into the subject. Subsequently, a core team, known as “SquaredCircle” and comprising Tom Harper (Constructing Excellence), Shelley Atkinson-Frost (Construction Confederation), Mark Poole (BBC) and Peter Caplehorn (RIBA), was assembled to manage the project. The team had now released its first DVD, giving an overview of CDM compliance.

4.2 Following showing of the film, Bill Belshaw inquired if the target audience was limited to architects. He was told that the aim was to reach a wider group of design professionals. Alan Muddiman wondered if temporary works designers were covered, and was told that they were.

4.3 Shelley said that the DVD is part of RIBA’s CPD programme and was going out free of charge to every school of architecture. Further information on the films, and information on pricing and how to obtain them, could be found at SquaredCircle’s website: <http://squaredcircle.info>. She said that the group is seeking sponsorship to cover production costs. Stephen Williams concluded by saying that this was a very good initiative and he had been happy to be involved in the launch of the film at the BBC. He thanked Peter for showing it to CONIAC.

5. The future role of CONIAC [M2/2008/2]

5.1 Stephen introduced this item by saying that following the HSC/HSE merger the new HSE Board had considered a paper by Giles Denham, HSE’s Head of Policy, which suggested a new framework for advisory bodies. In light of the proposals in the paper and the expiry of CONIAC’s term at the end of 2008, it was now appropriate for HSE to consult Members on the future role of CONIAC. He emphasised that this should be seen as an opportunity, not a threat. In particular, in developing a future role we should challenge ourselves on efficiency, for example by seeking to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort with existing industry fora. In this connection Stephen mentioned a meeting with Giles Denham and John Spanswick where the potential for duplication with the Strategic Forum’s Health and Safety Task Group had been noted, and John will now review his work against ours to spot possible overlaps.

5.2 Anthony Lees said that it was appropriate to reflect on CONIAC’s terms of reference and the links between its workplan and HSE’s and industry’s strategies. He summarised the ideas in Giles’ paper and said that, while they were not set in stone, it was important for CONIAC to agree a collective response to them.

5.3 Richard Ash was unsure of the wisdom of Giles's proposed sharp division between groups to consider risk assessment and those to consider risk management. Until he knew more about the proposals, he would favour a pragmatic approach as taken by the CDM Working Group, for example.

5.4 Bill Belshaw expressed the view that CONIAC was needed as an open forum but that it should give more time to strategic issues, unlike some of the items on this meeting's agenda. He was hopeful that there would be enough flexibility in the new arrangements to accommodate CONIAC.

5.5 Rob Miguel did not think any of the proposed models were suitable for CONIAC. He had met Giles Denham recently and asked him to rethink the paper. He felt that, until the Board agreed the way forward, it would not be possible to make any decision about CONIAC. He suggested that a future CONIAC might perhaps report to the Board directly without going through HSE officials.

5.6 Peter Kent said that it was not clear from the paper whether there was a future for an HSE strategic body on construction. He was sure that there was a need for such a body. CONIAC was valuable for liaison with industry stakeholders, particularly for LAs.

5.7 Alan Muddiman thought that Giles Denham's proposals, if adopted for CONIAC, would fragment the industry even further. HSE would be seen as not part of the industry. CONIAC had worked much better in recent years and had to continue.

5.8 Phil Russell accepted the need to work smarter and reduce duplication. However, he felt the value of CONIAC is that it is the only body that brings all sections of the industry together, e.g., big companies, SMEs, professions, etc. FMB wants to work with and have direct contact with HSE in some form.

5.9 Kevin Fear agreed that a body is needed that fully represents the industry; no other group that he was aware of included LAs, insurers and CCG. While it was right to look at terms of reference, etc, CONIAC had been constituted carefully to bring together different groupings and this should be preserved.

5.10 Bob Blackman said that the strengths of CONIAC are its broad representation and that it deals with practical issues. The Trades Unions can bring information on what is happening on site and few other bodies facilitate this. CONIAC is working well now and it is difficult to see how change can improve it. The specific proposals may dilute TU involvement.

5.11 Shelley Atkinson-Frost said that Giles Denham's paper was too brief and that more discussion was needed, particularly in light of the relationship with the big three industry bodies. There was real value in what CONIAC does that was not achievable through the Strategic Forum. However,

CONIAC needs a tighter focus and clearer deliverables. It provides an opportunity to discuss the regulatory framework – no other body does this.

5.12 Bill Rabbetts said that SMEs see potential benefits for themselves from the LA/HSE work and a body is needed to support HSE in this work. CONIAC offers an opportunity for representatives of SMEs to interface directly with HSE. On the issue of duplication, he suggested that it a management issue for CONIAC and the Strategic Forum to sort out.

5.13 James Preston-Hood enquired when John Spanswick's review of possible overlaps between the SF H&S Task Group and CONIAC would be completed. Shelley Atkinson-Frost thought this might be clearer following the next meeting of the H&S Task Group on 27 June. James noted that no formal minutes of the HSE Board's reaction to Giles' paper had appeared and that Giles' consideration of the matter was ongoing, as evidenced by the talks with Amicus.

5.14 Rob Miguel stressed that it is important to the TUs that CONIAC remain a tripartite body, and not just a technical advisory committee. The Asbestos Campaign had provided an example of the good work that can flow from the influence of an IAC. He said that CONIAC should make it clear to Giles that the proposals in his paper need to be improved.

5.15 Alan Muddiman recalled that it had been necessary to delay the advent of CDM 2007 by a few months in order to get things right, and how valuable it was to have CONIAC to create consensus support for this.

5.16 Clive Young said the government recognises the value of good stakeholder engagement, and the value of CONIAC is that it provides independent input. He suggested that consideration should be given to whether the proposed structures would allow CONIAC to carry out its role, not just on technical issues but strategic as well.

5.17 Stephen Williams said that it was important not to underestimate CONIAC's achievements, for example, the CDM Working Group and the agreement to delay the CDM Regulations to get them right. Additionally, CONIAC has been very useful in policy development. Traditionally, it has advised in connection with regulatory development, EC aspects and other matters. While advice is still needed, it is necessary to be clear about role and deliverables, as CONIAC is an expensive forum just to exchange information.

5.18 Stephen asked Members to submit written comments on the future role of CONIAC.

ACTION: CONIAC Members to write to the Secretariat with their views on:

- **Whether CONIAC should continue?**
- **What its role should be?**

- **How should it fit in the arrangements described in Giles Denham's paper?**
- **What could be dealt with in a different way?**

5.19 Subsequently, the Secretariat would ensure that Giles Denham was aware of CONIAC's view.

ACTION: Secretariat to inform Giles Denham of CONIAC's view of its future role and its response to the proposals in his paper on a framework for bodies established under the governance of the HSE Board (HSE/08/06), available as Appendix 1 to CONIAC paper M2/2008/2.

5.20 Stephen concluded by saying that at the next meeting CONIAC would return to the issue of its future role. In addition, it would sit as a programme board to formally review the work of its sub-groups (which provide many deliverables) and would also look at progress with the LACE Project.

ACTION: Secretariat to ensure time at the 27 November CONIAC meeting for further consideration of the role of CONIAC.

ACTION: Secretariat to ensure time at the 27 November CONIAC meeting for a formal review of the work of the Sub-Groups.

ACTION: Secretariat to ensure time at the 27 November CONIAC meeting for an update on the LACE Project.

6. Description of the offshore Step Change in Safety website and project to develop an onshore version of it by John Moran and Ian Aitchison of the Steel Construction Institute

6.1 Stephen asked Kevin Fear to introduce this item. Kevin introduced John Moran and Ian Aitchison of the Steel Construction Institute (SCI) and asked them to make their presentation.

6.2 The presenters said that SCI provides information systems to government departments and industry organisations. SCI designed and operates Step Change in Safety. It was started in 1997 with the aim of reducing the offshore industry accident rate by 50%. It is funded by the industry and users can register for free. It features a web site and a discussion forum. Users submit incident alerts and about 1000 incidents are now held in the database. The discussions are lightly moderated by the Step Change Team. The system "pushes" incident and near-miss description alerts and information on current news and events, and provides the offshore sector with a shared and developing resource of safety information and solutions.

6.2 The offshore sector is now keen to extend this model for collaboration onshore. The idea is that there would be a ConstructionSkills-sponsored construction-focussed system using the same information dissemination

platform and creating an equivalent construction collaboration. The offshore sector would broadcast content to the construction system and accept, filter and rebroadcast content from the construction system to the offshore system. ConstructionSkills would own the onshore information. It remains to engage the construction sector to see if there is a desire for this to happen and to resolve such issues as sector fragmentation, legal issues, integration with existing information flows, financial support, etc. Stephen Williams thanked the presenters and asked for observations from CONIAC.

6.3 Rob Miguel asked what the difference is between Step Change and HSE's and other sites. John Moran said that, in contrast to sites written by health and safety professionals, Step Change's content is generated by a wide variety of people who are working with real situations and real incidents, Rob asked what level of coverage there was on health issues. Ian said that the site was predominantly concerned with safety but there was an increasing focus on health. Rob asked whether there was any evidence that Step Change had influenced the reduction in accident rates in the offshore sector. Ian admitted that the evidence was anecdotal in nature, as it was very difficult to measure such things in a quantitative way.

6.4 Richard Ash said that he used Step Change quite a bit and considered it very useful because there was so much on it. He asked whether it would be necessary to have a fully populated construction site from the outset in order to attract people. He was told while the new site did not need to be fully populated from the start it would be developed and kept fresh every day.

6.5 Stephen said that he particularly liked the idea of sharing best practice and problem solving from the "shop floor". Certainly, John Spanswick for his part had identified the need to share information quickly on the details of accidents. Members should forward their views and ideas to Kevin Fear. In passing, Stephen asked Kevin if he had raised the issue with the SF's Best Practice Working Group and was told that this had been done.

ACTION: CONIAC Members to contact Kevin Fear with their views on the proposal to develop an onshore version of the offshore Step Change web site.

7. Government procurement and SMEs, presentation by Bill Rabbetts of the Construction Confederation [M2/2008/3]

7.1 Stephen asked Bill Rabbetts to give his presentation. Bill explained that the public sector was making increasing use of framework agreements in its procurement of construction work. The way these agreements were implemented by many public sector clients was leading to a steady reduction in the number of SMEs involved in such work. As a result, these companies were not benefiting from the public sector's ability to set best practice and drive up standards. This adverse impact would then be likely to affect others in the supply chain, e.g. the micro SMEs these companies subcontracted work to and the private sector clients (often one-off and occasional) they

worked for. However, some Local Authorities had shown that it was possible to implement framework agreements in a way that included SMEs and it was suggested that this could provide a basis for best practice advice. Additionally, there might be an argument to introduce appropriate Key Performance Indicators (KPI) for Local Authorities.

7.2 Following the presentation Stephen said that it had been accepted for some time that SMEs can benefit from contact with larger firms and large clients. He asked what the implications were if SMEs were not winning public sector contracts.

7.3 Peter Kent thought that if an SME had a low standard to begin with it was less likely to get public sector contracts. For their part, LAs were unlikely to welcome another Key Performance Indicator.

7.4 Bob Blackman asked if SME involvement in public sector work was reducing because LAs were raising the bar. Bill Rabbetts thought perhaps so, but SMEs were doing a huge amount of work to raise their standards. He said 85% of SMEs thought their failure to obtain work was down to the tendering process. They can do the work safely but they cannot necessarily present that very well.

7.5 James Preston-Hood said that the CCG had many public sector clients. Outside the metropolitan areas good clients should be taking a more holistic approach to the supply chain. They should take an interest and work to bring on the people they are dealing with. The CCG would be happy to engage with work to provide a deliverable on best practice recommendations on procurement (as described in paragraph 2(b) of M2/2008/3).

7.6 Stephen asked if Bill had taken his presentation to the PSCCF, which was there to drive best practice for public sector clients. Bill indicated that he had not yet done so. Shelley Atkinson-Frost clarified that the broad findings of the survey of SMEs had been put to the Forum. Stephen thanked Bill for the presentation.

8. Current construction policy issues – update and discussion [M2/2008/4, M2/2008/5]

8.1 Stephen asked Anthony Lees to speak to this item. Anthony briefly summarised the role and current and forthcoming work of the Policy Team. This included:

- commenting on proposals from other Government Departments for revisions to planning and building regulations;
- work in connection with a revision of the EU Construction Products legislation and non-binding guidance on the TMCS Directive;
- preliminary work on the review of CDM 2007;
- exploring with CLG the scope for better integration of CDM 2007, Building Control and Planning regimes;

- follow on work from the 2006 Buying for Life initiative aimed at addressing standards of health and safety in construction work procured within the public sector;
- CONIAC reconstitution; and
- a large amount of reactive work.

[**Secretary's Note:** The issues of (i) CDM embedding and (ii) timescale for reconvening the CDM Working Group were due to be considered under this item but time was unavailable. These issues will be considered at a future meeting.]

9. **AOB**

9.1 Stephen said that Briony Krikorian had had to leave early but had left some booklets produced by the ABI providing guidance for SMEs on insurance cover, e.g. against flooding, which Members might be interested to examine.

10. **Below the line item: Review of recent activities of CONIAC's sub-groups**

10.1 Stephen drew Members' attention to this paper.

10.2 Stephen concluded the meeting by thanking Members for their contributions, and reminding them that the next meeting of CONIAC is scheduled for Thursday 27 November.